Inhibit
Reactant

Jan 1852 - Dec. 1855

$ 5

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/catholiclaym1a04dubluoft

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

EDITED BY

ARTHUR EDWARD GAYER, ESQ., Q.C., LL.D.

VICAR GENERAL OF THE DIOCESES OF MEATH, OSSORY, LEIGHLIN, FERNS, WATERFORD, AND LISMORE, AND NOW ONE OF HER MAJESTY'S ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSIONERS FOR IRELAND.

PART I.

CONTAINING VOLUMES I., II., III., AND IV.

DUBLIN:

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY, 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET.

LONDON: WERTHEIM AND MACINTOSH, 24, PATERNOSTER-ROW.

M.DCCC.LXII.

...Y OF ST. MICHAEL
LIBRARY

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN,

VOL. I.

JANUARY TO DECEMBER

1852.

DUBLIN:
PUBLISHED BY WILLIAM CURRY, & CO.
9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET.
LONDON: WERTHEIM AND MACINTOSH,
24, PATERNOSTER-ROW.

ST. MICHAEL'S LIBRARY

PREFACE.

The following work was not undertaken as either a literary or commercial speculation; the sole motive of its originators (whose labours from first to last were wholly gratuitous) was a desire to promote the cause of religious truth, by bringing before their fellow-countrymen, in a readable form, such a knowledge of controversial theology and ecclesiastical history, as is necessary to enable a man of ordinary intelligence and education to form an independent judgment between the rival claims of the Churches of England and Rome.

The originators were not satisfied with the prevailing tone and spirit of religious controversy in Ireland, and aimed at improving it; and, while doing so, desired to facilitate the researches of the student or religious inquirer, by rendering more easy of access the learned writers usually referred to in such controversies, and by furnishing those who have not a ready access to extensive libraries with extracts and authorities, on the accuracy and honesty of which they might safely rely.

The conviction that some such work was needed was based upon the known facts, that good theological libraries are not everywhere accessible to general readers, and that the parochial clergy, even when themselves possessing the necessary collection of books, are generally so much occupied by their laborious pastoral duties, that they have not the leisure needful to enable them to give their personal assistance in guiding religious inquirers to the sources from which an accurate knowledge on such subjects can alone be derived.

It was thought also that it would be more easy to render such subjects generally interesting by treating of them in a monthly periodical, than by publishing at once the same amount of matter, in a more elaborate and systematic form, in a volume which would, from its very bulk, have been more likely to deter than attract the general reader.

It also occurred to the originators of the work that the novelty of the experiment of opening the pages of such a periodical freely to the best writers on *both* sides of the questions in dispute, without any restriction, except that the combatants should preserve a kindly tone and Christian temper, would tend not only to secure a fair and accurate discussion of the great questions at issue, but to excite attention and public interest, without rousing bad passions or sacrificing Christian charity.

In these expectations they were not disappointed. The work attained such extensive popularity that, (had the object partaken in any degree of the nature of a pecuniary speculation,) it might have been profitably continued at the very time of its voluntary termination; inasmuch as for the year preceding it had attained the almost unparalleled circulation of 16,000 copies monthly. As the writers, however, had accomplished, to the best of their powers, the task they had imposed upon themselves, the success and popularity of the periodical afforded no inducement to them to continue it; and they deemed it more consistent with the character of the work to close its pages while its popularity and success were at the highest, than to wait until either failing health on the part of the Editor, or satiety on the part of the public, might compel its termination with a more questionable success.

The spirited manner in which able Roman Catholic Controversialists from time to time responded to the challenge thrown out to them, as well as the general tone and spirit in which their communications were conducted, have been the subject of very general approbation. And if the impartial reader should arrive at the conclusion that the writers on the Roman Catholic side have had the worst of the argument, such a result must be attributed to the nature of the task they undertook, and not to the want of either learning or ability to deal with it satisfactorily. Though the challenge given to the Roman Catholic priesthood was never formally accepted, no one who has perused the able contributions of the Roman Catholic laymen who have from month to month written in our pages, can doubt that they had the best assistance their clerical friends and spiritual guides could give them, without running the risk of compromising the church of which they were the champions.

For obvious reasons, writers on neither side were required *publicly* to give their real names, though some of them voluntarily did so; and the Editor has since the close of the publication been somewhat surprised to find that he has been anticipated in the intended announcement of the part he took in the work, by seeing his name included in a list of Protestant writers, in an elaborate treatise on the Church recently published by the Rev. P. Murray, Theological Professor at Maynooth, as if he had *already* publicly acknowledged his connection with the work.

It was always the intention of the Editor, as soon as his task should be completed, by the conversion of what was hitherto a mere monthly periodical into a permanent work of reference (as he hopes the *Catholic Layman* will henceforward become),

not only to disclose the part he personally took in the publication, but to acknowledge publicly the valuable and extensive assistance which he received during the long period of seven years from the able and valued friends whose names he has now permission to give to the world. To assign to each of those distinguished men the exact part he took in writings so diversified and numerous would be tedious and inconvenient; but the Editor is proud in being able to enumerate amongst his most valued friends and most constant contributors the names of the Rev. Samuel Butcher, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Dublin; the Venerable Edward Adderley Stopford, Archdeacon of Meath; the Rev. George Salmon, D.D., Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin; the Rev. Joseph Carson, D.D., Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin; and also to acknowledge the more occasional, but equally valuable, assistance of his Grace the Most Rev. Richard Whately, Archbishop of Dublin; the Rev. J. H. Todd, D.D., S.F.T.C.D.; Rev. Edward Moeran, D.D., late Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Dublin; Rev. John Gwynn, F.T.C.D., and Warden of St. Columba's College; Rev. Robert King, author of the Ecclesiastical History of Ireland; Rev. Wm. M'Ilwaine, of Belfast; Rev. R. H. Loane, Bandon; Wm. Dwyer Ferguson, Esq., LL.D., and several others.

To his Grace the Lord Primate of Ireland (Lord John George Beresford, Archbishop of Armagh) the Editor owes a deep debt of gratitude, not only for his undeviating kindness and vigilant superintendence during the whole period of the publication, but for having munificently relieved him, from an early period, from the pressure of the heavy pecuniary responsibility which such an undertaking involved, and supplied him with the means of gratuitously disseminating the work extensively among educated Roman Catholics, from nearly the commencement of the undertaking to its very close.

The *Analytical Digest* of the whole work, now for the first time published (and for which the Editor is largely indebted to the valued friendship of Dr. Wm. Dwyer Ferguson), will, it is hoped, considerably facilitate the labours of the theological student and religious inquirer, and save much time and labour to the controversialist, by referring them at once to the principal arguments and authorities brought forward in the course of the work, in a more systematic order than the nature of the original publication permitted; whilst the *General Index*, now also added for the first time, will enable the reader to find without difficulty whatever the *Catholic Layman* contains bearing on the subject of his inquiries. Carefully-formed *Chronological Tables* of the Popes, Councils, Fathers, and other eminent writers, have also been added, as an aid to the student in forming a clear idea of their exact position and relative importance in the history of the Church.

The more learned reader will find that the greatest care has been taken throughout the work to ensure minute accuracy in the references; and that few passages have been relied on or cited from any of the Fathers or eminent ecclesiastical writers, without giving the very words of the writer in the original language, together with the volume, page, and (what is often of almost equal importance) the exact edition of the work referred to.

The Douay version of the Bible has been almost invariably quoted, not because the Editor believed *it* to be the most correct or faithworthy, but to diminish the points of controversy, as much as was felt to be compatible with the advocacy of truth.

In the same way, the writings of the earlier Fathers have been relied on, not because any of them were believed to be in all things safe or infallible guides, but because they were obviously the most faithworthy witnesses of what was or was *not* the universal or general belief of the Church at the time in which they wrote. To leave out the early Fathers in a controversy with members of the Church of Rome, or to expect *them* to trust the authorized Protestant version of the Bible as a safe guide, would obviously be to suppose that the parties addressed were already substantially Protestants. It is plain, that it is only by discussing matters in controversy with Roman Catholics *upon their own grounds* that it is possible to expect to convince them, that their peculiar dogmas are not supported by either the Holy Scriptures or tradition, but comparatively novel additions to the doctrines of the Apostolic age.

That such is the truth the Editor has not the faintest doubt; and should any writer of credit impeach the accuracy of the statements and soundness of the reasoning in any part of the work now given to the world, during the lifetime of the Editor, he trusts he and his colleagues will be able to substantiate what they have written in every particular of practical importance.

That it may please the Great Author of Truth to bless these pages to the good of souls, and the promotion of Christian love, is the earnest prayer of

THE EDITOR.

INDEX TO VOLUME I.

Page

Abuse of anything not an argument against its lawful use 44, 138
Achan, his case throws light on the history recorded in the Maccabees 94, 142
Adrian (Pope), by his Bull, makes a present of Ireland to the English 30
Aldworth (Rev. John), his letter to people of Glanworth .. 140
Ambrose (St.), forgeries passed off as his writings 34
calls the Eucharist the *figure* of our Lord's body .. 57
America, the Irish who go there become Protestants 103
Angel, who was it that Joshua worshipped 87
did the angel allow St. John to worship him 87
invocation of them condemned by Athanasius, Origen, &c. 80
Anointing of sick, that spoken of in St. Mark confessed by Roman Catholics not to be Extreme Unction 85
that spoken of by St. James the same as that spoken of by St. Mark; both were for cure of *body* 86
Apostles, teachers of error existed in their days 7
were they commanded to write the Scriptures? .. 77
Apostles' Creed has its clauses in wrong order if Church of Rome be right 98
Apostolic Fathers say nothing of Blessed Virgin Mary .. 116
Armagh, rival Archbishops of 53
Roman Catholics cannot admit that St. Patrick was first Archbishop of 33
Athanasius (St.), his testimony to the sufficiency of Scripture .. 110
condemns prayers to saints and angels .. 79
Augustine (St.), on the duty of reading the Scriptures 14, 39
whether a man can obtain saving knowledge without them 69, 78
whether he thought himself bound to submit to the judgment of the Fathers who preceded him 110
how he thought the question was to be settled, "Which was the true Church?" 98, 110
his views on the Eucharist 47, 58
denies the authority of general councils to be decisive on a point of controversy 137
mistaken in pronouncing communion of infants an apostolical tradition 137
his prayer for his mother discussed .. 58, 82
says our Lord *did* command his Apostles to write the Scriptures 61
Aylmer, Mr., his letters on Bible reading, &c. .. 34, 69, 103
remarks on his letters 44, 77

Ballintubber, two farmers of 74
Briccone's visit to 112
Baronius, (Cardinal), his account of the degraded state of the Holy See in the 10th century 109, 114
Basle, Council of, decreed that it was desirable the question of immaculate conception should be settled 20
how they failed in doing so 20
Belief, merely because our fathers believed, is not rational .. 50
Church of Rome requires us now to believe more than was sufficient for the salvation of the saints of old .. 138
Bellarmine (Cardinal) says that we are bound to believe vice a good thing, if the Pope says so 98
Bert (of Turin), his trial for writing in defence of Protestantism 89
Bible (Authorized Version), its differences from the Douay not important 28, 42
Bishop Kenrick's testimony to its excellence 42
Bible burning, a monk condemned for it 41
Tablet newspaper approves of it 41
Bible reading, sure (the priests say) to make a man a Protestant 15
approved of by Fathers and Popes 14, 37
is it condemned by Church of Rome? .. 13, 38
punished in Italy 13
Bishops (Irish), appointed in early time, without consulting the Pope 32, 43
how are R. C. bishops appointed now 32
Boniface VIII. appoints first jubilee 112
Briccone, his visit to Ballintubber 112
Browne (R. C. bishop) orders three dozen Testaments for the workhouse children 15

Cajetan (Cardinal) confesses that Scripture alone does not compel us to understand the words, "This is my body," literally .. 59
Carson (Rev. Mr.), his correspondence with Mr. Wilson .. 56
Cashel, Synod of (A.D. 1172) 38
authority of Pope then first acknowledged in Ireland .. 39
Catherine (St., of Sienna) gives the Pope inspired advice, which he bitterly regrets following 133
said she had marks of our Saviour's wounds on her body, but nobody could see them 133
Catholic, who are entitled to the name 3
Challenge to Romish priests to discuss points in controversy 9, 43, 68
to Bible readers at Kilkenny 80
from Archdeacon Stopford to priests of Meath .. 93
Christian, what makes a man a 63
Christians, are they to be allowed to read the New Testament as freely as the Jews were to read the Old 51
Chrysostom (St.) on the duty of the laity to read the Bible .. 14
his testimony that it was read by them in his day .. 37
on the sufficiency of Scripture 111
his advice good for emigrants 115
his mode of translating John v. 39 14
the laity received the cup in his time 63
prayers were offered for the dead in his time 81
but he did not believe in purgatory 39
Church, admitted by Protestants to be always visible .. 104
discussion of texts of Scripture which speak of its perpetuity and its other privileges 85
double meaning of the word 97
one, in reference to its invisible head, though divided into several communities 104
posterior to the Word of God 137
notes of the 98
what other questions must be settled before we can determine which is the true church 98
how Augustine examined which is the true church .. 98
Clement (of Alexandria) says that Eucharist is, *allegorically*, body and blood of Christ 57
Clement (of Rome), his opinions on Bible reading 14
Collette, Mr. his letter on the blessed Virgin 128
Columbanus, his life and a specimen of his instructions .. 3
on reading the Bible 37
Commandment, second left out in Romish Catechisms 27, 77, 142
its omission a sign of a guilty conscience 123
Communion in one kind, acknowledged by Romanists to be a very modern practice 63
condemned by ancient Popes 63
made rule of the church by Council of Constance .. 63
Concomitance, doctrine of 18, 34
Constance, Council of, (A. D., 1414) decrees the withholding the cup from the laity 63
recognises the antiquity of the kingdom of Ireland .. 33
Constantine (Emperor), prayers offered for his soul, though he was supposed to be with the apostles 140
Constantinople, second Council of 58, 137
Controversy, in what temper to be carried on 3
evil of charging men with opinions which they do not hold 18
Conversions and perversions 28
converts made on both sides 1, 28, 103
number of Irish converts to Protestantism in America .. 103
converts to Protestantism more learned than those to Romanism 28
Creagh, Mr., his speech on reading the Scriptures 14
Creed, Apostles', what to be inferred from the order of its clauses 98
contains nothing not found in Scripture 138
of Pope Pius IV., the only one with Amen in the middle 107, 130
Cup, is it right to withhold it from the laity? 63
Cursing, not the way in which the saints of old tried to save men's souls 4
who is hurt by the curse causeless 5
are priests privileged to curse, by law of God? .. 5
what is the law of the land as to a priest's curse .. 5
any one cursed in chapel can recover damages against the priest 5
Cullen (R. C. Archbishop) had no better title to See of Armagh than Wauchop, who was rejected by people of Ireland 53
his pastoral to the people of Dublin 135
Cyprian (St.), on the state of souls after death .. 81, 82
Cyril (of Jerusalem), on prayers for the dead .. 50, 81, 140
on the Eucharist 56, 57

Dead, their state 16
love for them 27
Denvir (R. C. bishop) aids in circulating Scriptures among the people 13, 14
Development, theory of, its history 109
Is it approved by Roman Catholic Church .. 29, 109
Directory (Catholic), incredible stories told in it 54
Disagreements among Protestants, no proof that Roman Catholics are right 113
Protestant disagreements in some things strengthen the argument for those things in which they agree .. 114
Divorce, English law of 79, 106, 141
Douay Bible, not very different from Protestant version 16, 28, 42
but much dearer 28
its note on John v. 39 .. .. .. 14, 71
translation of John ii. 1 discussed 117
Dowdall, acknowledged by Irish Church and nation as Archbishop of Armagh, in opposition to the Pope and to the Council of Trent 53
Dublin (Archbishop of), his argument on infallibility .. 7, 21

Education, shall Rome have the exclusive command of 10, 88
Elections, the 89
priests' interference in 90
Emigration and St. Chrysostom 115
Erin Mavourneen 3
Error, why are we left liable to 72
existed in the Apostles' days 7
what safeguard the Apostles recommended against errors 7
Eucharist, is it right to withhold cup from laity 63
discussions on 18, 33, 46, 56
Excommunication, a Roman Catholic bishop has to pay £125 damages for excommunicating a Mr. Boyle .. 131
Extreme unction, its novelty 83
no one pretends to know when Christ instituted it .. 83
Roman Catholic divines cannot agree what is the use of it 86
is it allowed to criminals about to be executed 107, 130

Faith of Roman Church confessedly not the same as in the Apostles' days 5, 128, 135
Fathers, right use of the 66
their works far more voluminous and expensive than the Scriptures 67
their genuine works mixed up with much that is spurious and interpolated 67
sometimes made mistakes 67
of the first four centuries knew nothing of purgatory 81, 140
nor of saint worship 79
Fisher (R. C. bishop), his acknowledgment that purgatory is a modern invention 82
French (R. C. barrister), falsifies a passage from Jeremy Taylor, at the Hammersmith Discussion 126

Gelasius (Pope) calls it sacrilege to communicate without the cup 63
Gnostic heretics, the source whence Roman Catholics derive their views as to the insufficiency of Scripture and the independent authority of tradition 136
Gregory the Great (Pope), his opinions on Bible reading .. 13
in what cases he thought prayers for the dead useful .. 50
no *tradition* for purgatory in his time 39
prohibits worship of images 127
Gregory (Nazianzen), no part of the faith of the Church in his time that holy souls hear addresses made to them .. 80
did not believe in purgatory 39
Guide, one or two 73

Heathens, Roman Catholic image worship an obstacle in the way of their conversion 132
Henry VIII. a thorough-going Romanist to the day of his death 121
his six articles 121
Heretics, *undisguised*, thought very formidable by Dr. Murray, of Maynooth 104
Hindoos, religious change among 4
what they think of Roman Catholic image-worship 122, 143

Idolatry forbidden in Scripture 122
not exclusively worship of false gods, but worship of true God under form of an image 143
a Hindoo's opinion of Romish 122
Images, what is the "due honour" that is to be given them .. 123
cannot be worshipped without committing what some Roman Catholic authority pronounces mortal sin .. 123
Image worship approved by second Council of Nice 127
condemned by second Council of Constantinople, and by Gregory the Great 127
Roman Catholic, a stumbling-block in the way of heathen 143
Immaculate conception, feast of attacked by St. Bernard .. 19
Disputes on the subject in Church of Rome 19
both parties called each other heretics 20
their infallible guide (Sixtus IV.) let them fight it out, only told them not to call each other such hard names .. 20
why the Council of Basle could not settle the question .. 20
Council of Trent could not decide it .. 20, 23
testimony of Romish authorities that the Church has no tradition on the subject 5, 20
more known now at Thurles than was known at Trent 300 years ago 77
pleaded in prayer with God by Roman Catholics .. 23
what the present Pope has done on the question 20, 22
Incarnation pronounced incredible by Roman Catholics, if immaculate conception be not true 23
not practically acknowledged by Romanists 64
Indulgences, Mr. Spring's letter on 93
what they are 113
must be bad if penance is a good thing 114
Roman Catholics say they are useful, *provided the Divine justice accept them* 116
Infallible, is the Pope so in matters of fact? 112
an infallible Church cannot be universal 21
Infallible guide, if St. Paul knew of any, why did he not tell the Ephesian elders 7
if wanted because men are unfit to judge in religious matters, how are they to judge whether God has provided such a guide, and who he is 21
no infallible way of finding him 114
if we want one easily consulted, none but our own priest will do 21
not necessary (according to Dr. Murray, of Maynooth) for those once instructed in the truth 101
is the *preserving* sound doctrine any part of his business .. 104
unnecessary for the transmission of religious truth .. 105
long periods in Church history when no one could be sure who he was 133
supposed necessity for one does not prove his existence 8, 114
(pretended Romish) unable to provide accurate versions of Scripture in the vulgar tongue .. 9
" " lets Roman Catholics fight out their own controversies without giving them any help 9
" " provides no books of devotion free from error 9
tries to evade the decision of any disputed question .. 9
never has settled where infallibility resides 9
Infallibility, does the Church of Rome believe in her own claims to it 8, 22
where does it reside, an unsettled question .. 9
natural craving for it leads men to give a ready ear to all pretenders to it 7
claims to it lead to infidelity 8
arguments on the subject by Archbishop of Dublin .. 7
argument by Dr. Murray of Maynooth 101
Infidelity caused by the prejudice that a Divine revelation requires an infallible interpreter .. ..
Innocent I. (Pope), the earliest witness, appealed to in defence of Extreme Unction 86
he thought the laity might anoint themselves .. 90
Innocent XIII. (Pope) releases monks from the obligation of saying masses they had been paid for 18
did he think the dead would be the worse of his indulgence to the monks 16
Interpretations of Scripture, have Romanists got any infallible, and where are they to find them .. 45, 70, 130
Romish and Anglican, how different 130
Ireland, her misfortunes, and the way to remedy them .. 13
the Isle of Saints 3
given over to the English by Pope Adrian 30
its ancient dignity 33
formerly noted for study of the Scriptures .. 37, 38
Irenæus, had to argue with heretics who, when reproved from Scripture, appealed to tradition 71
his testimony to perfection of Scripture 110
made mistakes as to length of our Lord's life .. 109, 126
and as to Millenarian doctrines 109, 126
was led into these mistakes by undue reverence for his predecessors 126
contrasts Eve with B. V. Mary 135
Irish, deprived by Pope of the appointment of their own bishops 31
in former times did not consult Rome 31
read the Bible formerly 37
Irishmen's rights 4
Irish nationality 29
in Roman Catholic times 44
in Roman Catholic Defence Association 32
Italians, their character 19
education in 19
Italy, recent movement for reformation in 127
address from some English clergymen to them .. 127

Jerome (St.) on the duty of the laity to read the Bible .. 14
on the sufficiency of Scripture 110

Page

JEROME (St.) the laity received the cup in his time .. 63
Jews allowed freely to read *their* Scriptures .. 51
John (St.), discussion of John, v. 39 .. 51, 70
Fathers do not agree whether his sixth chapter relates to the Eucharist .. 34, 46
Johnson, his "Unbloody Sacrifice" quoted for prayers for the dead 142
but with unfair omissions 142
Jubilee, what meant by it 118
who first instituted it 111
Justin, martyr, compares Eve with B. V. Mary 135

KEANE (R. C. bishop) will not give us any information about indulgences 115
Kells, Synod of (A.D., 1152) 33
Irish archbishops then first received palls from Rome 33
Kennedy (Mr.), his reasons for abandoning Romanism 76
Kenrick (R. C. bishop), his opinion of Protestant authorized version of Bible 42
Kilkenny, challenge to Bible-readers at 80
Kingstown Harbour, and masses for the dead 119

LAITY have a right to satisfy their own minds on religious questions 2
their duty to read the Bible, according to ancient Fathers 14
R. C., at present not permitted to read it without priests' consent .. 38, 44
Learning did not make the Oxford perverts Roman Catholics 28
Leo (Pope) knew nothing of purgatory 39
was once prayed *for*, now prayed *to* 50
condemns communion in one kind 63
Leyne (Mr.), his letter on the case of the Madiai 128
Liberty, its prospects in Europe 31
civil and religious 41
Liguori (St.), his "Glories of Mary" 40
Lucas (Mr.) thinks the imprisonment of the Madiai very proper .. 128
swears that he has no intention to subvert the Church Establishment, and also promises to cut it down by the roots 93

MACCABEES, on prayer for the dead discussed .. 81, 94, 106, 141
Madiai, history of their case 128
Maimbourgh (Jesuit) states that a council inspired by the Holy Ghost was unable to determine which was the true Pope 133
Manhood of our Lord not practically recognised by Romanists .. 64
Mary (B. V.), Glories of 40
what Scripture tells us of her 99
what tradition tells us of her 116, 135
what Roman Catholics say as to the silence of Scripture with respect to her .. 117, 128
Mediator, only one between God and man .. 27, 40
Milner (Bp.), his fraudulent quotation from Jeremy Taylor .. 126
Miracles, pretended, at Rimini .. 54
other Romish 139, 143
absurdity of Romish, illustrated 113
Missal, on the Eucharist, quoted 57
Moore, his melodies 3, 18, 30
Murray (Archbp.) prayers offered for him when he was said to be in heaven 141
Murray (Pat, of Westmeath), his letter on masses for the dead .. 119
Murray (Dr., of Maynooth), his answer to Archbishop of Dublin thinks that those once well instructed in Christ's religion have no need of an infallible guide 100 101

NATALIS ALEXANDER, on texts which are brought forward for purgatory 45
Newman, Mr., admits present Roman Catholic faith to be not the same as that of the apostles 5
his learning still on the side of Protestantism 29

OATHS, Romish doctrine of 93
those contrary to the interests of the church said to be not binding 93
Origen on Bible reading 14
on prayer to angels 80
his character and his errors 67
his heretical notions put forward by Romanists as proofs of purgatory 67, 141

PASCHASIUS the first to write on transubstantiation 56
Patrick (St.), his life 25
his hymn, and its history 18
he had no commission from the Pope 25
his father was a deacon, and his grandfather a priest 25
he knew nothing of purgatory 26
his opinions on reading the Bible 37
not Archbishop of Armagh if the Pope's authority be required to make an archbishop 33
Paul (St.), wrote his letters, not to the clergy alone, but to all the faithful brethren 65
says he kept back from the Ephesians nothing profitable for them, and yet never mentioned the See of Rome to them 7
Penance, if it be useful, why give indulgences to do without it .. 114
Pius IV. (Pope), his creed 130
Pius VI. (Pope), commends Martini for translating the Scriptures into the vulgar tongue 13
Pius IX. (Pope), his character 5
how he governs his own states 10
how kept at Rome now 138
his letter on immaculate conception 5
his opinions on B. V. Mary 116

Page

Plato, a heathen philosopher, the inventor of purgatory .. 16
Plunket (Mr.), his letter on purgatory 46
Popes exhort to Bible-reading 13
Power (Mr.), his letter on matrimony and Purgatory 141
Post-office, dishonest proceedings with newspapers, how punishable 131
Prayer, to whom should it be made 64
God's readiness to answer 51, 86
to one absent not justifiable 87
Prayers in an unknown tongue, St. Paul's opinion of 126
the Council of Trent does not insist on them 89
Prayer to saints not *commanded* by Church of Rome 64
not justified by the fact that we approach the Queen through her ministers 74
not taught in New Testament (according to Jesuit Salmoron), lest it should lead men to idolatry 79
a roundabout way; if God must first communicate our petitions to the saints, and they then present them to God unknown to the earliest ages of the Church 75 79
Prayers for the dead offered in early times for Virgin Mary and all saints 49
reasons for primitive prayers 50
such prayers do not proceed on the supposition of a purgatory 50
on the contrary, the belief in purgatory originated from the practice of prayers for the dead, and not *vice versa* 50
the priests do not say all they are paid for 16
Priests, their judgment, where to be found 100
their power 130
Irish, why afraid of controversy 9
their interference at elections 90
Private judgment, we cannot help exercising it 77
we cannot find the true Church without it 98
that advocated by Protestants not unaided judgment 45
Promise of our Lord to be with his Church always, not understood by Paul of an infallible guide 7
Prophecies, of future state of Church, wrongly applied by Romanists to its present state 130
Protestant Bible agrees with Douay 42
Bishop Kenrick's testimony to its excellence 42
Psalm 14th, difference in Hebrew and Greek versions 70, 79
Purgatory, what is it 95
Council of Trent decined nothing about it 40
heathens, its first inventors 16
if the Pope can let souls out, why does not he without being paid for it 18
if priests can pray souls out, why are they not charitable enough to do it gratis 16
have priests any way of knowing when souls are out, and when further prayers for them are unnecessary 119
why did our Lord keep secret from his disciples the sufferings they should have to bear in the next world, when he honestly told them of their sufferings in this 40
are tortures there necessary to purify souls 83
if so, why should we pray to have our friends' purification cut short 83
did the Fathers of the first three centuries know of such a place 69, 80, 82
Popes and Fathers who did *not* know of its existence 39
examination of Scripture texts urged in its behalf 45
texts which speak against it 49
late origin of the doctrine acknowledged by Romanists 82

QUOTATIONS, unfair Romish ones from Protestant writers 107, 119, 121, 125, 142
mode of quoting admitted in CATHOLIC LAYMAN 13
by Romish correspondents from spurious writings ascribed to Fathers 34

READE (Rev. Geo.), his letter on John ii. 4 117
Religion, should we meddle with other people's 1
cannot be thrust in the back ground 1
Rimini, alleged miracles at 54, 139
Roman Church not the Catholic Church 138
Rule of Faith discussed 61, 109, 136
to what this name is given by the Fathers 68
has God given us a single or a double 73
letter from an Inquirer (Celbridge) 118, 129

SACRAMENTS, must be instituted by Christ himself 85
Saints, prayers to them not commended by R. C. Church 64
Salmeron (Jesuit) thinks that prayer to saints is not taught in New Testament, lest it should make men of that day idolators 79
Schism (Great Western), its history 133
Scripture, is its free use allowed in Church of Rome 13
Italians imprisoned for reading it 13
reading of it condemned by Church of Rome 38
not written by accident 61, 77
not unintelligible 51, 65
its testimony to its own sufficiency 62
contains everything important for our salvation 136
no Catholic Father ever called it defective 136
in what sense received on authority of the Church 78
has given rise to all heresies (according to Romish authorities) 70
seems, at least, opposed to many Romish doctrines 73
useless or dangerous, if there be an infallible tradition to guide us 73
the giving it to the Irish people compared by Romanists to throwing pearls before *swine* 71

Page

Scripture, Romanists borrowed their views of its insufficiency from Gnostic heretics 136
alleged lost books of, how affect the argument between Protestants and Roman Catholics 118, 129
Search (W. C.) on purgatory 80, 94, 106, 140
his misquotations from Bishop Jeremy Taylor 106, 119
Search the Scriptures, is this text rightly translated 14, 51, 70
Ships, the two 97
Sixtus IV. (Pope), his decree on immaculate conception 20
tells the disputants to fight it out, without calling each other names 20
Souls, their state after death 18
Spain, is it the better of its Romish training 88
Spring (Rev. E.), his letter to Dr. Keane 95
Stopford (Archdeacon), his challenge to priests of Meath 93
his letter to Dr. Cantwell 92
Swearing forbidden 27

TABLET (newspaper) approves of Bible burning 41
and of imprisoning Protestants for reading it 128
Talbot (R. C. bishop) denies that St. Patrick was ever an archbishop 33
Talk of the Road .. 15, 27, 40, 50, 74, 86, 98, 123
Taylor (Bishop) dishonestly quoted by Romanists 107, 125
Tertullian, his testimony to the sufficiency of Scripture 110
became a follower of a heretic teacher, from whom he learned a doctrine something like that of purgatory .. 67, 81
Think, importance of learning to 6
Touchstone, the 55, 68, 104, 124
Tradition, the word ambiguous 77
in what sense rejected, in what sense received by Church of England 61
in Romish Church a rule independent of Scripture 61
though in Romish *theory* on a *level* with Scripture, in Romish *practice* above it 137
its inadequacy to transmit doctrine 62
how it loses in value as we leave the source 116, 134
the only one recorded in Scripture, as having got current in the Apostle's time, became falsified 125
mentioned with disapprobation in Scripture 62
deceived Irenæus and other Fathers 109
Transubstantiation, what is meant by it 19
letter from Enniscorthy correspondent, with quotations from spurious writings 33
letters on 46
Trent (Council of), only twenty-four bishops could be got together to open it 53
how they avoided appearance of discussion by previous congregations 111
the bishops not unanimous in the decree putting tradition on a level with Scripture 111
its decision on the Eucharist 56
on tradition 61
on Extreme Unction 85
on prayers in an unknown tongue 89
its catechism 124
Truth, its importance 3

UNITY, how to be effected 4
Archbishop Leighton on 39

WALL (Rev.), his reasons for leaving Church of Rome 52
Walsh (Father), made to pay £170 for cursing a miller 5
Ward, W., his reason for leaving Church of England 28
Wauchop, sham Archbishop of Armagh, never acknowledged by Irish people 54
Whately (see Dublin) 56
Wilson (Rev.), his controversy with Mr. Carson 56
Word of God, is it likely that it puts astray all those that read it 15, 27
the unwritten word written somewhere 70, 109
came first 61, 67, 70, 137
why, then, was the written word given 62, 73
Writing, the means constantly employed by God to preserve his revelation 143

INDEX TO PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE,

THE MEANING OF WHICH IS DISCUSSED IN CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

	Page.		Page.
Exodus xx. 4	122, 124	John v. 39	14, 33, 51, 69, 70, 83
Psalm xiv.	70, 79	vi.	34, 48
lxxii. 6	69	xiv. 16	55
lxxxviii. 31	129	xix. 25	99
Isaiah ii. 1	104	xxi. 23	125
liv. 9	130	Acts xvii. 11	62
lix. 20	68	xx. 29	7
Ezekiel xxxvii. 26	104	Rom. xv. 4	62
Matthew v. 25	45	1 Cor. iii. 14	45
xii. 25	104	xi. 27	46
xii. 46	99	Ephes. iv. 11, 12	68
xv. 21	64	2 Thess ii. 15	77, 125
xvi. 18	55	1 Tim. ii. 5	27
xviii. 17	68	iii. 15	50
xxvi. 26	68	iv. 1	77
xxviii. 20	7, 55	2 Tim. iii. 15	62
Mark vi. 13	85	Heb. xiii. 7	69
xvi. 16	125	James v. 14	85
Luke ix. 51	64	2 Peter i. 20	78, 125
x. 16	68	iii. 16	125
xviii. 35	64	1 John i. 7	26
John ii. 4	99, 117	iv. 6	125

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Gloir do Dhia an fna hárduibh, agus fíoċáin air an talamh deaġċoil do na daoinibh.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED THE MIDDLE OF EVERY MONTH, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. I.—No. 1. SATURDAY, JANUARY 17, 1852. {Annual Subscription, 3s. 6d. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Address to our Readers	1
What is Truth?	2
The Isle of Saints	3
Instructions of St. Columbanus	3
Irishmen's Rights	4
How is Unity to be effected?	4
The Curse causeless	4
Results of Excommunication	5
Letter of Pope Pius IX.	5
Infallibility—Archbishop of Dublin	7
Does the Church of Rome really believe in its own claim to the possession of an Infallible Guide?	8
Why do the Irish Roman Catholic Priesthood decline public Discussions on religion?—A Challenge	9
Should Roman Catholic Priests have the exclusive control of education?	10
Farming Operations for January	11
POETRY.	
Erin Mavourneen	3

NOTICE.

The Catholic Layman *will be published monthly, at 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin, by Mr. W. Curry, who will receive Subscriptions and Advertisements for the Journal, and also all Communications, &c., for the Editor.*

No Advertisements can be inserted without Mr. Curry's personal approval.

The Terms of Subscription are *Three and Sixpence* per Annum, to go free by the post, *payable in advance*; or unstamped, *Two and Sixpence* per Annum.

ADVERTISEMENTS

Will be charged for according to the following scale:—

Six lines and under	£0	4	6
Above six, and under twelve	0	6	0
Every additional line above twelve	0	0	6
Half a column	1	5	0
One column	2	2	0
Whole page	5	5	0

When advertisements run beyond fifty-nine lines, 25 per cent. will be struck off.

Mr. William Cunar has respectfully to return his grateful thanks to the Nobility, Bishops, Clergy, Gentry, and his respected Correspondents in general, for the long-continued favours and confidence which he has enjoyed; and he trusts to continue to secure that patronage which it has been his privilege to possess for nearly thirty years.

. Publishers are respectfully informed, that all Books intended for Review should be addressed to the care of W. Curry and Co., Sackville-street; by whom they will be faithfully forwarded, and placed in judicious hands.

TO OUR READERS.

When a new publication issues its first number to the world, and solicits the favourable consideration of those into whose hands it may chance to fall, its readers have a right to expect some information as to its character and objects, as well as the means by which it proposes to carry those objects into effect. This expectation is most fair and reasonable; and as it is our anxious desire to conciliate the good wishes of all impartial and intelligent men, we proceed to state a few of the motives which have led to this publication, and to the choice of the title under which we appear.

And, in the first place, it is necessary to warn our readers that we propose to ourselves a more important task than merely to *amuse* the listless portion of the public, or to while away an idle hour. In the present condition of our native land—depressed, impoverished, distracted by a variety of evils—it would argue a cold and heartless indifference to its true and permanent welfare, if, possessing, as we believe we do, the means and the capability of being useful, we were to devote our own time, and that of our readers, to the gratification of idle curiosity. A story is told of a certain philosopher, in ancient times, who, despising the opinions of his neighbours, adopted the whimsical idea of living in a tub. On one occasion, when the city in which he resided was besieged by a foreign enemy, this eccentric individual commenced, one morning, to roll his tub up and down the market-place; and, on being asked his motive for this singular conduct, he replied, that he did not wish to be idle when every one around him was busy in resisting the enemy, but that he could find nothing better to do.

Now, we do not wish to imitate the example of this useless member of society, or to *roll our tub* after his fashion. We believe that we can be more beneficially employed, in endeavouring to arouse our countrymen from the state of lethargy and ignorance in which too many of them are plunged, and to apply the talents and abilities with which God has endowed them in the noblest of all pursuits—the search for truth. It is useless to attempt to disguise the fact, that Ireland has long been neglected by those whose duty and whose interest it was to have improved the minds and developed the intellects of her quick-witted and intelligent sons. Every foreign and English traveller who visits our shores is struck by the sharpness of mind and ready apprehension which prevail, even among the humblest peasantry. They cannot conceal their astonishment that a people so highly gifted by Providence, and endowed with such mental resources, should yet be sunk so low in the scale of civilization, and exhibit such lamentable proofs of ignorance and error.

It is foreign to our purpose to dwell long on this melancholy state of things, or on the causes which have contributed to make our island a proverb and a by-word among the nations of Europe. It is plain that if the natural instructors of the people—those in whom their faith and confidence were reposed—had exerted themselves as they should have done, even during the past half century, we should now witness the fruits of such exertions in the increasing spread of knowledge and industry, of peace and harmony and good-will. But they allowed each generation to grow up in the same unenlightened prejudices in which their forefathers lived. While the world around them was advancing in light and knowledge, Ireland was doomed to behold her children arrayed in bitter hostility against each other—wasting, in angry and acrimonious strife, those faculties and energies which, if rightly directed, would have commanded respect abroad, and diffused comfort and happiness at home.

In what way, then, is this evil to be remedied? If mutual distrust and ill-will prevail so extensively among us—if contentious wrangling, especially upon religious differences, has so long been the curse and bane of Ireland, how shall we commence our efforts for the cure of these fatal disorders? Now, on this point, the advice, which we see frequently put forward, both in Parliament and in the newspapers, is as follows: "Religion is an affair between each man's conscience and God: why, then, need you give yourself any trouble about your neighbour's creed? Is it not better to let each individual choose his own religion for himself, without any intrusion from others? If all parties in Ireland were content to act in this manner, and put religious differences out of sight altogether, the country would be at peace, and we should hear no more of these controversial disputes, which distract men's minds, and prevent them from attending to the more pressing and urgent business of their farms, shops, or other callings."

Now, however well-meant this advice may be, we believe that it is utterly false and delusive. We are convinced that it is *impossible* to adopt it, if we would; and that we *ought* not to adopt it, even if we could. Let us put out of sight for a moment what is going on in the Continent and America, and confine our view to the state of England and Ireland; and then ask any man of common sense, whether, in the present state of men's minds, religion can be thus quietly thrust into the back ground, as if it were of no importance whatever? It is a notorious fact that a convulsive movement of religious opinion is in progress, such as these countries have not witnessed for three hundred years. It does not exist merely in one locality, nor is it confined to a particular class of men: on the contrary, it has spread, like an electric current, to the remotest corners of the empire, and has pervaded all ranks of society. The premier duke of England in his ancestral castle, the learned professor in the time-honoured University of Oxford, the peasant in the lonely wilds of Connemara and Kerry, have alike felt its influence, and bent beneath its power. There is scarcely a newspaper published which does not contain some new fact or other bearing upon this all-important question. We are daily informed that some fresh individuals, few or many, as the case may be, have relinquished their old religious belief—that a Roman Catholic has become a Protestant, or a Protestant has become a Roman Catholic. It is manifestly impossible, therefore, to compel men to be neutral on the question of religion. We might as well attempt to stop the tide when it is sweeping across the broad Atlantic, and dashing against our shores, as to check the agitation of religious opinion which is going on around us. The circumstances of the time are entirely beyond our control—we must adapt our conduct to the position in which we find ourselves placed. Whether we will or no, men's minds are now occupied upon the question of religion, with an earnestness and intensity which is altogether unparalleled. We may, if we will, exert ourselves to guide their judgment aright, and supply them with help, to arrive at the knowledge of the truth; but it is worse than useless to endeavour to divert them from the task.

But, in the next place, we feel that it would be wrong for us to dissuade men from earnest religious inquiry, even were it in our power. It would only be a narrow and selfish mind which could deliberately profess entire indifference whether others thought rightly or wrongly on the subject of religion. If a man were in a ship in a storm, and were to say to himself—Provided I can get safe to shore, I care not whether all my fellow-passengers are swallowed up in the ocean—would not such a man be shunned, as a cold, heartless wretch? And is eternal happiness of less value than preservation from temporal danger? Can any one who has experienced in his own mind the consoling influence of well-grounded trust and confidence in God remain indifferent while he sees those around him still exposed to all the evils of doubt and uncertainty —tossed back and forwards between conflicting opinions—unable to believe one religion—unwilling to adopt another? Will he not rather be anxious, in a kindly and Christian spirit, to remove these doubts, so far as he can, and direct the inquirer to the true source of light and knowledge—to those Holy Scriptures which are given by inspiration of God, and which are able to make men wise unto salvation?

It is in this spirit, and with these feelings, that we commence the following pages, which we intend shall be mainly (though not exclusively) devoted to the consideration of some of the prominent religious questions on which the opinions of our countrymen are now so much divided. It is our hope, with God's blessing, to bring together facts and arguments taken from the best and most trustworthy authorities; and to comment on them in a spirit of fairness and candour. We shall gladly open our columns to communications from all quarters, which we may conceive it useful or desirable that the public should be made acquainted with, provided they be written in a Christian spirit, and free from everything savouring of bitterness or angry feeling; for it is our firm determination that our paper shall contain nothing at which even the prejudices of those who do not agree with us can justly take offence. We see no reason why religious discussions cannot be carried on in a kindly spirit of mutual regard. We are persuaded that there are many good and estimable men, arrayed at opposite sides, in the great struggle which is going on around us. Frail men will always be prone to think differently; but that is no argument why each party should not exert the reason which God has given him in the search for truth. On the contrary, it is rather an additional motive for each person to endeavour to satisfy his own mind that the views which he himself holds, or professes to hold, are the true ones. When opinions are diametrically opposite, it is clear that only one party can be right; and it is then of vital consequence that a man should not only be persuaded himself of the truth, but be able to give a reason for his belief. But there are other points of minor importance, on which men may lawfully differ. And there is one beneficial result which is sure to follow from calm and sober discussion, that each party will at least know what opinions his opponent really entertains, and will not attribute to him errors which possibly never crossed his mind. There are several doctrines of the utmost importance in religion, which all sincere Roman Catholics and Protestants hold in common. These may with truth be called Catholic* (*i.e.*, universal) opinions, being such as every believer in Divine revelation has held, since the time of our Lord and His apostles, and whereby Christians are now distinguished from Turks or Hindoos. Thus, even where men do not agree in convincing their opponents, each party will be more likely to appreciate the other's motives, and perceive the strength of the arguments on which he relies; and instead of setting him down as a blind, unreasoning bigot, he will concede to him the same liberty and freedom of judgment which he claims for himself.

But it may be said—Why not leave religious discussions to the clergy, whose duty and profession it is to examine into these matters? Questions of law are decided by the lawyers and judges; doctors and medical men are alone competent to decide upon the nature of diseases; why, then, should laymen trouble their heads with controversial theology? Admitting that there may be some truth in these analogies, we beg leave to differ from the conclusion which they are brought forward to support. If a man believed himself to be heir to a property, common curiosity, to say the least, would induce him to take some pains to examine into the validity of his title; and, so far as his circumstances permitted, he would naturally like to know all the facts, and at least the principal authorities which might be brought forward in support of his claim. If one lawyer said he was the rightful heir, and another lawyer was of an opposite opinion, he would seek to know what their reasons were, and why it was that they differed; and he would, therefore, lose no opportunity of acquiring the requisite information. Again, if a man was sick, and heard two doctors disputing by his bedside, as to the nature of his disease and the best mode of treatment to be used, a due regard to his own health, and anxiety for a speedy recovery, would prompt him to ask them some *reasons* for their different opinions; and he would not be satisfied with bare, naked assertions on either side. There are, doubtless, a great many subjects on which we must trust to the opinion of others; but every sensible and prudent man will like to know, for his own sake, *whom* he is to trust, and *why*. And his inquiries will be more anxiously made, in proportion to the importance of the matter about which he is engaged. If a merchant embarks all his property in any speculation; or, if a farmer devotes all the savings of his life to the purchase of a farm in the Incumbered Estates Court, both parties will make very sharp inquiries before their minds are finally made up: they will endeavour to satisfy their own minds, that they are acting like wise and sensible men; and they will not take a leap in the dark, because Mr. A. or Mr. B. orders them to do so. And, surely, where the important interests of the soul are concerned—when eternal happiness is at stake, men ought, at least, to show the same anxiety which they do about their temporal concerns. If, indeed, all the clergy, and all the doctors, and all the lawyers, were of one way of thinking, and agreed about everything relating to their respective callings, the whole question would be settled at once, and it would be useless for plain, unlettered persons to attempt to differ from them. But further, there is an additional reason which should induce Catholic laymen to satisfy their own minds upon religious points, that many of the clergy who claim the right of controlling their opinions have shown a manifest reluctance to give any help or assistance to their flocks; and we believe that this reluctance arises from a very obvious cause—viz., that, whether from lack of learning, or ability, they are *unable* to solve the doubts and difficulties of those who have recourse to their advice. We cannot help doubting the fact, that *all* Irish priests are themselves thoroughly educated in the higher departments of either religious knowledge or theological learning; and we suspect that their lack of argument is not unfrequently the cause of *some* of them so freely resorting to the curse and the blow. The anathema is, after all, a very sorry argument, and a mode rather of silencing than convincing those who entertain doubts to be removed or difficulties to be solved. In a free country, where the cry of "religious liberty" has become as familiar as a household word, it is in vain to shut one's eyes to the impossibility of confining educated and intelligent men within the narrow limits of priestly authority. Such vassalage may have suited an age when the masses of the laity could not read, and were necessarily at the command of those whose superior learning placed them on vantage ground. Far be it from us to diminish the legitimate influence of such superior qualities. We shall ever be anxious to do honour to any body of men whose lives and arguments do honour to their profession, even when we may, on what we think sound reasoning, differ from them in belief, or fail to be convinced by their reasons or authorities; but against the tyranny, the selfishness, the covetousness of ignorant men, we shall fearlessly protest and struggle, even though they affect to be armed with power from the Vatican, and are actually armed with the power of the rabble. We must, and will, strive to assert the freedom of the Irish laity from a galling yoke, which neither we nor our forefathers have been able to bear. We will not bow our heads under that yoke, nor fail to encourage others to assert their mutual independence of the mere priesthood or its assumptions. Difficult may be our path, but we shall not struggle alone, nor fail in securing the sympathy of all who have smarted and suffered under priestly thraldom. The right of educated men to study the Holy Scriptures, the fathers of the church, the decrees of the councils or ecclesiastical history, can no more be denied than their right to acquire secular learning. If the laity may read them, the laity must strive to understand them. We venture to think—and hope to be able to show practical and substantial proofs—that they can succeed in understanding them. If we go wrong, let those more learned correct us, whether clergy or laymen We shall ever be open to correction or just reproof, but shall expect the same candour and fair play which we intend and undertake to accord to others. We hope, too, to conduct our pages like gentlemen as well as Catholic laymen. Whatever reaches us, written with such objects and in such temper, we shall gladly aid in circulating, from whatever quarter it may come; but mere polemic strife, or vulgar declamation, or personal scurrility, will find no favour, and, we hope, no example, in our pages.

(*) Anciently, in the fourth century, all believers in the doctrine of the Trinity were entitled to the name of Catholic. (Vide Cod. Just. lib. I. tit. I.)—"Hanc legem (*i.e.*, qui secundum Apostolicam disciplinam Evangelicamque doctrinam, Patris et Filii et Spiritûs Sancti unam deitatem sub pari majestate et sub piâ Trinitate credunt) sequentes, Christianorum Catholicorum nomen jubemus amplecti." "We order that all who follow this rule (that is, who believe in the Deity of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, in their co-equal majesty and triune Godhead, according to apostolic teaching and Gospel doctrine), *shall adopt the name of Catholic Christians.*" And the language of the Athanasian creed (which is one of the authorised formularies of the Church of Rome) is equally clear and explicit—"This is the Catholic faith, that we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity." If the voice of antiquity, therefore, is to be heard, Roman Catholics cannot reasonably deny the title of Catholic to all who are sincere believers in the doctrine of the Trinity.

WHAT IS TRUTH?

"WHAT is truth?" said jesting Pilate, and would not stay for a reply. The great Lord Bacon wrote an essay upon this text, which goes far to prove that the love of truth is as rare a distinction as it is a happy and a glorious one.

Had it been otherwise, and Adam had not sinned, possibly mankind had not needed that a Divine Redeemer should have come into the world to bear witness unto the truth.

"To this end," said Christ to Pilate, "was I born; and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice."—John xviii. 37.

'Pilate said unto him, What is truth? and when

he had said this he went out again unto the Jews, and saith unto them, I find in him no fault at all."

Had Pilate waited for a reply, what answer would he have received? Possibly the same as that given to the woman of Samaria, who, pleading for the worship of her fathers, said to him, "Our fathers worshipped in this mountain, and ye say that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship." "Woman, believe me the hour cometh when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father. The hour cometh when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth, for the Father seeketh such to worship him. GOD IS A SPIRIT; AND THEY THAT WORSHIP HIM MUST WORSHIP HIM IN SPIRIT AND IN TRUTH."

All religions profess to afford GOD the worship of *the heart*. Any other would be an insolent mockery. All religions also profess to be led by the Spirit of God.

"Because I have spoken those things," says the Saviour (John xvi. 6.), "sorrow hath filled your hearts; but I will tell you the truth, it is expedient to you that I go, for if I go not the Paraclete (the Comforter) will not come to you; but if I go I will send him to you. I have yet many things to say to you, but you cannot bear them now; but when He the *Spirit of Truth* is come, He will teach you all truth."—John xvi. 13 (Douay Bible).

How, then, is this teaching to be secured, and what does it teach? On this do men greatly differ, and probably ever will, until the commands of St. Paul to Timothy are more generally obeyed. "I charge thee, before God and Jesus Christ, who shall judge the living and the dead, by His coming and His kingdom, Preach the word: be instant in season, out of season; reprove, exhort, rebuke in all patience and doctrine. For there shall be a time when they will not endure sound doctrine: but according to their own desires, they will heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and will, indeed, turn away their hearing from *the truth*, and will be turned unto fables."—2 Tim. iv. 1.

As laymen, however, we must not sermonize; and, therefore, return to Lord Bacon, whose admiration for truth, and success in discovering it, have stamped his name with immortality. "The poet saith excellently well, it is a pleasure to stand upon the shore, and to see ships tossed upon the sea; a pleasure to stand in the window of a castle, and to see a battle and the adventures thereof below; but no pleasure is comparable to the standing upon the vantage-ground of truth (a hill not to be commanded, and where the air is always clear and serene), and to see the errors and wanderings, and mists and tempests in the vale below, so that this prospect be seen with pity, not with pride. Certainly it is heaven upon earth to have a man's mind move in charity, rest in Providence, and turn upon the poles of truth; and however things may be, in some men's depraved judgments and assertions, yet truth, which only doth judge itself, teacheth that the INQUIRY OF TRUTH, which is the love-making or wooing of it; THE KNOWLEDGE OF TRUTH, which is the presence of it; and the BELIEF OF TRUTH, which is the enjoying of it, is the sovereign good of human nature. The first creation of God, in the works of his days, was the light of the sense, the last was the light of reason, and his Sabbath work ever since is the illumination of his Spirit. First he breathed light upon the face of matter or chaos, then he breathed light into the face of man, and still he breatheth and inspireth light into the face of his chosen."

"Awake thou that sleepest and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light."—Ephes. v. 14. If we can be instrumental, in ever so humble a degree, in leading others to see the true light more clearly than they have yet done, we shall not have written in vain; and even should we therein fail, we shall still not be without our reward, if we be ourselves led by the Spirit of Truth into a more clear and full light. The love of truth, we incline to think, claims alliance as much with the heart as with the head; no vicious man was ever a lover of it. Our reasoning faculties were not given us for the exercise of whim or fancy, but to be the active instruments of guiding us to both truth and happiness. We hold it to be a pernicious practice to enter into disputations merely for the sake of argument. Such a course, if continued long, would make a man insensible to truth, and unhinge the whole fabric of his mind. This we shall attempt to avoid; and shall ever be more anxious to agree with others than to differ, where we can do so without sacrificing truth. If we can thereby assist any of our fellow-countrymen to make progress in real knowledge, and clear away some, at least, of the clouds of prejudice which hang over the opinions of men who have not taken the pains to cultivate their reason, and steadily employ it in the pursuit of truth, we shall not have lived or *rolled our tub* altogether in vain.

A GLASS EYE.—An Emir had bought a left eye of a glass-maker, supposing that he would be able to see with it. The man begged him to give it a little time: he could not expect that it would see, all at once, as well as the right eye, which had been for so many years in the habit of it.—*Coleridge.*

ERIN MAVOURNEEN.

Remember thee! yes, while there's life in this heart,
It shall never forget thee, all lorn as thou art;
More dear in thy sorrow, thy gloom, and thy showers,
Than the rest of the world in their sunniest hours.

Were thou all that I wish thee—great, glorious, and free,
First flower of the earth and first gem of the sea—
I might hail thee with prouder, with happier brow;
But, oh! could I love thee more deeply than now?

No! thy chains as they rankle thy blood as it runs,
But make thee more painfully dear to thy sons—
Whose hearts, like the young of the desert-bird's nest,
Drink love in each life-drop that flows from thy breast.

THOMAS MOORE.

THE ISLE OF SAINTS.

THERE is a melancholy pleasure in looking back upon the past greatness of times long gone; and surely there is no feature in the ancient history of our beloved but unhappy country, on which a true Irishman can dwell with such interest and pride, as the singular reputation for learning, and advancement in Christian knowledge, which, in the first ages after the introduction of Christianity, won for it the name of *Insula Sanctorum*—the Isle of Saints. According to the concurrent and unanimous testimony of ancient writers, the Irish people were then so eminent for the study of philosophy and letters, and more especially of the Sacred Scriptures; the country was so thickly studded with schools, colleges, and religious establishments, that students from all parts flocked to it in great numbers, to prosecute both general and theological knowledge. The causes of the preference then given to an Irish education were not only the strict discipline observed in the schools of Ireland, and the knowledge of Holy Scriptures possessed by our old divines, but the character they maintained for ability in instructing others in it. We shall have other opportunities of adducing proofs of what we have here stated; but, at present, we would confine ourselves to introducing to the notice of our readers one peculiarly eminent saint, of ancient times, in Ireland—St. Columbanus—whose character is one of deep and singular interest and importance in reviewing the ancient Church history of Ireland. Mr. Carew, the Maynooth Church Historian, represents St. Columbanus (as, in truth, he was) a model for Catholics. He was born in 539, or 559, of a respectable family, in Leinster (nearly 1000 years before Luther), and from his early childhood was remarkable for applying to his studies with such diligence that he soon became a proficient in grammar, rhetoric, geometry, and the range of the Divine Scriptures. He also soon began to evince the strong influence of the latter in his heart; and finding that he was beset, when at home, by companions not calculated to promote his religious improvement, he left Leinster, and placed himself under the care of a venerable person, named Senile, Abbot of *Cluaninis*, in Lough Erne, who had a high reputation among his countrymen at that time for his singular piety and accomplishment in the study of the Sacred Scriptures. Columbanus made such good progress under the instruction of this holy man that, while yet a very young man, he wrote an exposition of the Book of Psalms, in elegant language, and composed many other pieces, profitable for communicating instruction. He subsequently became a missionary in France, and other parts of Europe, and exercised great influence over the Continental Church, by the great energy of his character, his intimacy with different kings, and the number, activity, and devotedness of his followers, and the eminence to which they attained.

We shall have occasion again to refer to this eminent individual, whom every pious student of Irish ecclesiastical history must always regard with veneration and love, even where he may find it needful to appeal from his views on certain points, to an authority more ancient and higher than he. St. Columbanus, among other good and noble qualities, was peculiarly distinguished by his honest love for Ireland, and the pride and pleasure with which, whether among Franks or Lombards, at Luxem, or at Bobbio, he ever reverted to the soil which gave him birth. For the present we have, perhaps, said enough to interest our readers in his writings, and would begin by introducing to them the translation of one of his Instructions, for which we are indebted to the valuable work of Mr. King, on the Church History of Ireland, 3rd vol., page 975.

ST. COLUMBANUS'S INSTRUCTION ON THE SUBJECT "OF JESUS CHRIST THE LIVING FOUNTAIN, AND OF COMING TO HIM FOR DRINK."—*Given as* INSTRUCTION XIII., *p.* 74, *in* FLEMING.

The preacher, though diffident of his abilities, must in faithfulness labour to the best of his power in the enforcement of Christian truth.

"Impressed with a strong sense of the misery of human life, as brought before us in the observations of every-day experience, and with solemn reverence, at the same time, for the Divine Oracles, we have been led to exhibit, in the discourses which you have already heard, however inelaborate their style, the best efforts, feeble though they be, of our humble ability; and however this way of talking on our part may haply appear superfluous in the eyes of others, yet to ourselves it seems appropriate enough that the discourse should begin with allusions of a personal nature, such as these. For it is not so much the indolence of others, as our own, that we are endeavouring to arouse. And, moreover, although to the perfect in wisdom these advances towards wisdom [which we are engaged in] may prove not entirely satisfactory, still for beginners, and poor, lukewarm creatures like ourselves, they must be regarded as unavoidable, and well adapted enough to our case. For what cannot be concealed, what cannot be kept silent, without doing harm, it is inexpedient to hide and inexpedient to hush. For this reason, therefore, it seemed to us better to speak, even in a homely style, than to observe silence. For we have judged it to be undoubtedly safer to employ our conversation on such topics as these, than on others that are either idle or frivolous.

Christ the spring of living waters, how to be approached and applied by the believer.

"Lead, then, your ear once more, brethren, dearly beloved, to our observations, as [persons] convinced of the necessity of paying attention to the lessons which you hear [on such occasions as this]. And refresh your thirst, yet not so as to extinguish it, at the waters of this divine fountain, concerning which we are now desirous to speak. Drink, yet not so as to be satiated. For the living fountain, the fountain of life, now summons us to himself and says, *S. John* vii. 37. '*Whosoever is athirst let him come unto me and drink.*' Observe what it is you are to drink. Let Isaiah inform you; let the Fountain himself inform you—*Isa.* lv. 1. *Jer.* ii. 13. '*And they have forsaken me, the Fountain of living water, saith the Lord.*' It is the Lord, then, himself, Jesus Christ, our God, that is the fountain of life, and he, therefore, invites us to himself, the Fountain, that we may drink. He drinks who loves him; he drinks who takes his fill of the Word of God; who has a perfect love for him, a perfect longing after him; he drinks who is inspired with a burning love for wisdom. Let us, Gentiles, then drink with eagerness from that [fountain] which the Jews forsook [For to us also, as well as to other Gentiles, may apply that saying about 'these who open not their mouths,' and we, too, may be exhorted to open the mouth of our inner man, to eat with anxious haste and *S John* vi. 33. eagerness *that bread which cometh down from heaven.*]

The more of Christ his people have enjoyed, so much the more will they long after uninterrupted communion with him.

In order, then, that we may eat of this bread—that we may drink of this fountain, [both of which are one and] the same Jesus Christ our Lord, (who speaks of himself as though he were to be used by us for food, [under the title of] the living bread, *which giveth life to this world*; and in like manner pointing to himself as the fountain, he saith, '*Whosoever is athirst, let him come unto me and drink,*' concerning which fountain also *Psa.* xxxvi. 9 the prophet saith, '*For with thee is the fountain of life.*' See whence that fountain flows; for it is from the same source from which the bread also descends; because it is the same one who is the bread and the fountain, the only Son, our God, the Lord Christ, whom we ought unceasingly to hunger after; and although we are eating of him in loving him, although we devour him by our longing after him, yet let us continue our longing after him, as though hungry still. In like manner, that we may always drink of him, the Fountain, with exceeding pleasure, drink of him unceasingly in the full eagerness of our longing after him, and be delighted with his grateful sweetness (for the Lord is sweet and pleasant), though we do eat of him and drink, yet let us ever still hunger and thirst for him. For this our food and drink can never be entirely consumed nor exhausted; for although used, it is not spent; though drunk of, it doth not waste; because our bread is eternal, and our fountain is ever flowing, and ever sweet. Whence the pro*Isa.* lv. 1. phet saith, "*Ho, ye that thirst, come to the Fountain.*" For this fountain is for such as thirst, not for *See S Matt.* v. 6. those who feel satiety; and therefore it is that he invites to himself the hungry and thirsty, upon whom, elsewhere, he pronounced a blessing—who are never satisfied with drinking, but the more they have swallowed, the more thirsty will they be.

The preciousness of Christ to them that receive him.

"What reason have we, brethren, to desire and seek after, and love unceasingly, that fountain of wisdom, the word of God on high, '*in whom are hidden,*' as the apostle saith, '*all Col.* ii. 3. *the treasures of wisdom and knowledge,*' [treasures] which he is inviting those that are thirsty to draw upon? Art thou thirsty? Drink [here] of the fountain of life. Art thou hungry? Eat [here] of the bread of life. Blessed are they that hunger for this bread, and thirst after this fountain. For, [though they be] always eating and drinking, yet retain they their desire to be eating and drinking still. For exceedingly delicious must be that food which is continually made use of for meat and drink, and yet is continually

the object of hungering and thirst; ever fresh upon the taste, and ever still desired, whence the royal prophet Psa. xxxiv. 8 is led to use that exclamation—'*O taste, and see how sweet, how gracious, the Lord is!*'

He is wisdom, light, and life unto his people.

"Let us then, brethren, obey this call, in which we are invited to the fountain of life, by [him who is] the life, who is the fountain, not only of living water, but the fountain, also, of eternal life, the fountain of light, and the fountain of illumination; for from him are all these things, wisdom, life, light everlasting. He is the author of life, the fountain of life. He is the Creator of Light, he the fountain of illumination. And, therefore, thinking lightly of the things that are seen, and [soaring high toward heaven, let us seek to drink like fishes, yet, as fishes endued with the height of reason and sagacity], of [that] *living water that springeth up unto life eternal.*

The preacher anxiously implores grace from on high to love the fountain of life;

"Oh, that thy summons may bring me thither to that fountain, thou God of mercy, thou Lord of goodness; that there, in company with thy thirsty ones, I, too, may drink of the living stream of the living fountain of living water! that, so charmed with its exceeding sweetness, I may abide by it for ever, exclaiming, 'Oh, how sweet is the fountain of living water, whose water never ceases springing up unto everlasting life!' Thou, O Lord, art that true fountain, for ever and ever to be desired, though [at the same time] ever enjoyed, and ever drunk of. Give to us evermore, O Lord Christ, this water, that it may be in us, also, a well of water living and springing up unto life everlasting. Great, indeed, is the boon I seek for; who can doubt it? But thou, the King of Glory, art wont to give great favours, and hast promised to give them. Nothing can be greater than thyself; and thou hast given thyself to us; thou hast given thyself for us. Grant us, therefore, we beseech thee, that we may know he object of our love; forasmuch as it is nought else beside thyself that we are seeking to have bestowed upon us. For thou art our all, our life, our light, our salvation, our food, our drink, our God. Breathe into our hearts, I pray thee, O our [beloved] Jesus, that inspiration of thy spirit, and wound our souls with thy love that every heart among us may be able to exclaim *Song of Sol.* v. 8. with truth, *Show me him that my soul loveth, for I am wounded with love.*'

and to drink of its waters, and still thirst for fresh supplies of them evermore.

"Grant, O Lord, that these wounds may be in me [For] happy is the soul that is so wounded with love. Such an one seeks the fountain; such an one drinks of it; yet while drinking, continues ever thirsty; and [at the same time] by its longing desires keeps quaffing on; it drinks unceasingly, by continuing its thirst. Thus, in its love, it is ever seeking after him; and its cure is found in submitting to fresh wounds. And, oh, that these health-giving wounds may penetrate to the inmost recesses of our souls, through the gracious operation of Jesus Christ, our God and Lord, the merciful and wise Physician, who is one with the Father and the Holy Ghost, for ever and ever. Amen."

[In our next number we hope to give a copy of the celebrated hymn of St. Patrick, the most ancient document extant in the Irish language.]

We shall ever be much more anxious to promote truth, and encourage virtue, than to command admiration, or amuse our readers by originality or fine writing. We shall, consequently, be ready and anxious to reproduce the best things we can command, whether already well known to the studious or not. The truths of astronomy and geometry are just as fresh now as they were in the days of Galileo or Newton; and, as we write for the good of others and not fame for ourselves, we can afford to smile at the fastidiousness of the pedant, or the sneer of the critic. He who would be deterred by such influences, may as well retire from the strife, and leave the field to sturdier spirits. If any of our readers, therefore, are disposed to believe in the omnipotence of literary *novelty*, let them look elsewhere than to us, to gratify their taste. Novel and effective materials for thought we hope to supply as abundantly as the native gold of California or Bathurst, but have neither time nor inclination to waste our energies on the form of the vehicle in which the precious ore is carried forth into the world. We shall make no further apology for repriating what may be already known to some, but new to a large number of our readers, and which, we hope, will give offence to none of them, as it treats of

IRISHMEN'S RIGHTS.

Every man has got his own RIGHTS, except the man that lets them be taken away from him; and it would not be hard to say what the like of such a man is, only that it is not civil to call names. Yet to have some rights, and not to know what they are, is as good as not having them at all; so I will tell you what some of an Irishman's rights are.

Every man has a right to breathe the free air of heaven, at least; and will any one deny that a man has a right to the springs of water from the earth? Who has ever been thirsty on a warm day, and felt the freshening of a good draught from the river as it flows along? Has not every man a right to that? Now, if you will attend to a story, you shall see what all this is driving at.

It was on a hot day in August—suppose we call it the 24th; that was a very hot day once upon a time—some Irish boys were working hard in a dry part of the land where there was no water. The Shannon flowed not far from them; and when they were all dried up with thirst, off they set to quench it at those waters. But they were stopped short of the banks of the river; for the only part they could come at was fenced off with a railing, made of strong posts, very high, with spikes at the top, and a deep ditch to hinder coming near. The poor fellows could see through it, to be sure; so that they could observe that the river was broad, and shone beautifully as it rolled along. There was a gate to this fence, and a priest stood inside to take care of it; but it was bolted and barred, so that nobody could get through to get at the waters of the river.

"Please your reverence," said one of the boys, "we want a drop of water: sure every Irishman has a right to a sup of the Shannon."

"Never think of such a thing," said his reverence; "you are much better without it; it is dirty water, and won't do you any good."

"Dirty or clean, please your reverence, it will save a man's tongue from burning; and the boys are all dying with drought."

"Och," cries another, "look just over the river; there are plenty of them drinking of the waters on the other side." And so sure enough there were.

"You are mistaken," said his reverence; "those are nothing but Sasenachs—such water is only fit for heretics."

"But is a poor Irish Roman to perish for thirst, then," says Pat, "and the river all flowing before him, enough to make his mouth water, if it was all dried up past watering?"

Hard as they all tried, his reverence would not open the way to the river.

"Is his reverence never thirsty himself," cried Mick, "that he has no compassion upon the throats of his flock?"

"And don't you know, Mick, that his reverence does not trouble the water when he is thirsty; seeing that he has got a regular supply of the real whiskey that has passed the exciseman, besides the occasional drops of potteen? and these last are none of the fewest."

Now, who shall deny that these poor fellows had a right to a drink of the Shannon, all large, and broad, and deep as it is, so that all the throats in Ireland would never make the sea think it was less of a river, when she kissed its broad mouth between Kerry and Clare? And yet these poor fellows were not the more like to get their right. But presently there was some one seen inside the railings, that would be trying to help the boys in their extremity of thirst. Nobody could tell how he got there; whether he scrambled over the fence, or swam from the other side, or, more likely, dropped down from heaven, sent by the holy and blessed Lord himself. He ran to the river, and dipping his hand in, he brought as much as he could in the hollow of it, and the best of good water is was: and he just handed it over to the first poor fellow that would take it; but the priest ran to stop him; and then he slipped round to the other end, with another handful of clear water; and so he slipped about whilst the priest was in a terrible passion—mad entirely. But some of the poor fellows got a sprinkling; and they that did found it so refreshing, that nothing would serve them but they must have some more; and so they went higher up, or lower down in the river, however far it might be; and never rested till they came to the place where they could stoop down and drink, and drink, and drink, so that they never thirsted again (John iv. 13, 14); while the poor fellows that stopped outside the priest's railings were left to die; for "never mind," said the priest, "I'll say a mass for their souls when they are in purgatory; and that will be better than a drop of water to save their lives now."

I was going to give an explanation of this story; but there is no occasion: for is there ever an Irishman that wants to be told what it means? and why should I waste time to tell him the meaning, when surely it's in his heart he feels what it means? And is it not the Lord Jesus Christ himself, blessed be his holy name, who has said "if any man thirst, let him come to me and drink?"—John vii. 37. Every man has a right to "take the water of life freely."

HOW IS UNITY TO BE EFFECTED?

If the members of the Church of England and Ireland are ever to be reconciled to the Church of Rome, or those of the Church of Rome to the Church of England, it is obviously to be effected by other means than exciting men's passions against one another. It is easy to foster and increase prejudice and bad feelings, either in Roman Catholics against Anglicans, or Anglicans against Romanists. *Mutual hate*, however, is as little likely to promote unity as penal laws on the one side, or curses and anathemas upon the other. It is high time that such weapons should be laid aside, as unworthy of those engaged in the pursuit of truth; much more of those anxious to follow the example of their great Redeemer, whose advent was announced as "Glory to God in the highest, peace on earth, good will towards men." Let Catholic laymen, of whatever church or form of worship they may be, at least agree henceforth to repudiate and set at nought such irrational and unchristian attempts to prevent the progress of truth, on whichever side it may ultimately prove to be; and let them teach hot-headed zealots and despotic priests, that to succeed in forwarding their respective views, they *must* yield to the enlightened spirit of the times, and follow the example of the lowly Jesus, whom they all affect to take as their model, and whose glory they desire to promote. As long as we ourselves act on these principles, we fear not what bishops or priests may do in the attempt to put us down by any other means than calm and candid reasoning. Any other attempt, we venture to foretell, will recoil upon themselves, and stimulate, rather than repress, the growing desire to know what others say and think of the momentous matters which are of common interest to all mankind; and to clear up the doubts and suspicions which will intrude on all intelligent and thoughtful minds, whether they confess them, or whether they do not. If the whole Synod of Thurles were to anathematize us, we would tell them they will fail in quenching the inextinguishable craving for light and knowledge on the questions upon which we treat. Irishmen may remain for ever attached to the Church of Rome, but, if they do, they will at least do so, not because they are *afraid* to examine, or have been dragooned into maintaining such union, but because, after examination, they have sincerely come to the conclusion and belief that there is more truth, more virtue, more learning, more piety in that church than in any other. From such a decision there would be no appeal. Such a decision would be worthy of a wise, a good, and a free nation. Such a triumph would be the greatest jewel in the tiara of the Pontiff. If he be truly the Vicar of Christ upon earth, and can be *proved* to be so, we may ourselves be reconciled to his supremacy, and die in *his* sense of the words Catholic laymen; but, until we are convinced that the Church of Rome is truly an infallible representative of Christ upon earth, we must be allowed to discuss its claims, as becomes freemen enjoying the blessings of a free press, in a free country; and to attempt to deter either us or others from using the rights of freemen will, we venture to predict, injure instead of advancing the cause of those who are mad or desperate enough to resort to such unjustifiable and worn-out means of propping up their cause. We crave the attention of those who may inconsiderately contemplate such a course to the succeeding article.

"THE CURSE CAUSELESS SHALL NOT COME."

Prov. xxvi. 2.

The era of burning men's bodies, to save their souls, has passed away for ever. Fire and faggot, we venture to believe, will never again call down the vengeance of heaven; even the voluntary Indian Suttee* seems fast passing away before the rising dawn of reason in the east. At any rate, the day is long passed when Catholics could burn Protestants, or Protestants Roman Catholics, in the equally weak and wicked attempt to *compel* all human minds to unity of belief and doctrine. If our forefathers, three centuries ago, had studied the Holy Scriptures as carefully and piously as did St. Patrick and St. Columbanus, they would have found there what would have lead them to know better. They could not have failed to find that the gracious words of the Saviour of the world savoured of a far different spirit. Blessing, not burning, was the test of his kingdom. When the Samaritan villagers would not receive him, because his face was as though he would go to Jerusalem, James and John said, "Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven and consume them, even as Elias did?" He turned and rebuked them, and said, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of, for the Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them; and they went to another village."—Luke ix. 52-56. They would have found, and others still may find, in the same Holy Scriptures, if they would but follow the holy examples of the same Patrick and Columbanus in using them, that cursing is no more in accordance with the spirit of Jesus than burning with fire on earth, or calling down fire from heaven. Blessing, not cursing, is the Divine mode of

* Such of our readers as have access to the *Quarterly Review* for September, 1851, No. 178, will find in it an interesting account of this important movement, perhaps the most remarkable recorded in Eastern annals. Within the last seven years, the Hindoos have exhibited, for the first time within historical memory, the phenomenon of *religious change*. For the benefit of such of our readers as may not have access to the original account, furnished by the late Chairman of the Committee of East India Directors, we purpose giving, in our next number, a short epitome of it, containing a brief view of this deeply interesting and almost incredible movement in Hindostan.

gaining souls. "He opened his mouth and taught them, saying, Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth. Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy. Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God. Blessed are they which are persecuted (not they who persecute) for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are ye when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake. Rejoice, and be exceeding glad, for great is your reward in heaven, for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you."—Matt. v., 2-12. They might also find that man's power to curse effectually is a mere imagination. "The curse causeless shall not come," says Solomon, Prov. xxvi. 2.* "On that day they read in the book of Moses, in the audience of the people, and therein was found written that the Amorite and the Moabite should not come into the congregation of God for ever, because they met not the children of Israel with bread and with water, but hired Balaam against them, that he would curse them; howbeit our God *turned the curse into a blessing*," "because the Lord thy God loved thee."—Nehemiah xiii. 1, and Deut. xxiii. 5. They might further find that there are times when God's judgments make desolate the earth, as well for the *priests* as the people. "Behold the Lord maketh the earth empty, and maketh it waste, and scattereth abroad the inhabitants thereof. And it shall be as with the people, so with the priest; as with the servant, so with his master; as with the buyer, so with the seller; as with the lender, so with the borrower; the land shall be utterly emptied, and utterly spoiled, for the Lord hath spoken this word. The earth also is defiled under the inhabitants thereof; therefore hath the curse devoured the earth, and they that dwell therein are desolate, and few men left."†—Isaiah xxiv. 1-6. And again—"The Lord could no longer bear, because of the evil of your doings, and because of the abominations which ye have committed; therefore is your land a desolation, and an astonishment, and a curse, without an inhabitant, as at this day."—Jer. xliv. 22. If they read further they might find, not that the priests were privileged to curse, but that even their blessings might become cursings, if they did not hear and obey his commands. "And now, O ye priests, this commandment is for you. If ye will not hear, and if ye will not lay it to heart, to give glory unto my name, saith the Lord of Hosts, I will even send a curse upon you, and I will curse your blessings; yea, I have cursed them already, because ye do not lay it to heart."—Mal. ii. 1. David, in the 109 Psalm, v. 28, gives, at any rate, advice which Catholic laymen will do well to follow, whatever course the priesthood may take. "Let them curse, but bless thou:" "When they arise, let them be ashamed. I will praise the Lord among the multitude, for he shall stand at the right hand of the poor, to save him from those that *condemn his soul*." We, for our parts, shall endeavour to follow the commands of Christ and his holy Apostles. "Bless them that curse you."—Matt. v. 44; and Luke vi. 28. "Bless them which persecute you; bless and curse not."—Rom. xii. 14. "I call heaven and earth to record this day against you" (says Moses, in Deut. xxx.), "that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing; therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live. That thou mayest love the Lord thy God, and obey his voice. And the Lord thy God will make thee plenteous in every work of thy hand, in the fruit of thy body, and in the fruit of thy cattle, and in the fruit of thy land, for good; for the Lord will again rejoice over thee for good, as he rejoiced over thy fathers. If thou shalt hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to keep his commandments and his statutes, which are *written in his book* of the law, and if thou turn unto the Lord thy God, with all thine heart and with all thy soul."—Deut. xxx. 9, 10, 19, 20. On God's conditions, and on these alone, we fervently believe there may yet be good in store for our beloved, though desolate and unhappy country. That the law of man agrees with the law of God in this matter, will appear from the next article.

RESULTS OF EXCOMMUNICATION.

On the 20th March, 1846, a trial took place at the Antrim assizes, at Carrickfergus. An action was brought by a Roman Catholic, of the name of Charles M'Loughlin, against the Rev. Luke Walsh, a Roman Catholic priest in the county of Antrim. The legal declaration contained two counts—first, that the plaintiff was a parishioner of Culfreightrin, and the defendant parish priest of that parish; and that the plaintiff, as a teacher of the Scriptures in the Irish language, and owner of a mill, had lived on terms of intimacy with, and possessed the good opinion of his neighbours, and made gain by his mill; and the defendant, intending to injure the plaintiff, &c., on the 11th August, 1844, during divine service in a Roman Catholic chapel, pronounced the plaintiff excommunicated, meaning thereby that the plaintiff was unworthy of the general society of the parishioners, and that they should not have any dealings with him. The second count set out the words in which the excommunication was alleged to be made—viz., "My curse and God's curse on Charles M'Loughlin, Hugh Shields, and John M'Cay, and on all who will work with and hold any communication with the accursed teachers of the Irish Bible." Culfreightrin is in the glens of Antrim; and Charles M'Loughlin, the miller there, was brought up as a member of the Roman Catholic Church. He was better educated than most of his neighbours, for he could read and speak the Irish language well and grammatically. He was a man of good character, and of honest and industrious habits. About the year 1843, he became an Irish Scripture teacher, and he taught many persons to read the Word of God in the Irish language. Father Walsh set about forbidding and preventing him. He tried to persuade M'Loughlin to give up teaching, but this would not do; so he threatened that he would curse him from the altar, and tell his hearers not to speak to him. He said he would put man, woman, and child from speaking to him; that they should not walk on the same side of the road with him; that he would not get a single hand's turn to do; and that he would leave his mill as dry as the road; and that this would be intimated in the chapel; and that the plaintiff would be cursed by "bell, book, and candle."

On the 11th August, 1844, the priest did as he had threatened; and all the consequences that he had spoken of actually happened. All these facts were proved to the satisfaction of judge and jury, although Father Walsh was in court, and somewhat alarmed the witnesses; but there was no hiding the truth, and the jury gave their verdict in favour of the miller, and against the priest. They fixed the damages at seventy pounds, which the priest was to pay, as well as all the costs of the action.

Father Walsh appealed to the Court of Queen's Bench in Dublin, and by this means he put off the payment of the money, and tried to cover his defeat; but after putting it off as long as he could, and letting the public attention turn to something else, the priest has quietly paid the seventy pounds damages and all the costs, which amounted to above a hundred more. This is a very important fact: and every Irish Roman Catholic may know, that the law of the land will protect him from the consequences of the cursing of the priest, whenever the priest dares to use a curse to hinder a man from reading that by which man lives—that is, every Word of God. —*See the Report of the Case in the 10th vol. Irish Law Reports, p. 19.*

LETTER OF POPE PIUS IX.

The following letter was written by the present Pope, not quite three years since, to all bishops in communion with the See of Rome. Its interest has not since diminished, for the letter itself promises further proceedings on the same subject, which have not yet appeared.

We consider this letter one of the most important documents which has issued from the Roman See for centuries past. The subject is grave, and full of difficulty; the letter purposes to make a decision pregnant with important consequences to the Church of Rome. Such a question should be most deliberately considered; and we are, therefore, not surprised that three years should have elapsed without a report from those to whom the matter has been referred by the Pope.

The reason which induces us to lay this letter before the Catholic laity is this: in a matter of such grave importance, the Pope states that he is anxious to learn, not merely the opinion of the bishops and the clergy, but the sentiments and feelings of the laity. We conceive that this desire does honour to the Pope; that it is suitable to the character in which he had the courage to stand up, in the commencement of his Pontificate, as THE GREATEST REFORMER IN EUROPE. And we know not how we can better commence our office of providing suitable and safe subjects of thought for Catholic laymen, than by calling their attention to an important subject, on which the great head of the Roman Church desires to know their opinions. Surely, when the Pope wishes to know the sentiments of the laity on any subject, it is their bounden duty to consider that subject, and form some opinion which may be expressed to him as theirs.

To aid them in forming such an opinion, we shall, in a future number of THE LAYMAN, publish some of the most important decrees which have formerly been made on this subject by popes and councils. At the present, we shall only say a few words on the grave importance and difficulty of the question.

The question whether the Blessed Virgin Mary, at or after the moment of her conception in the womb of her mother, was subject to original sin, or whether she was free from it, first arose in the Church of Rome about seven hundred years ago. Now, this letter from the present Pope tells us that this question has never yet been settled by the Apostolic See. It is clear that such a state of things is injurious to the Roman Church. It affords Protestants a ready argument against the advantage, or even the existence of an infallible judge, always able and always willing to settle all controversies as they arise. It is a favourite topic with their controversial preachers, and some of their churches at this very time are actually resounding with it. It is clear that such a state of things cannot continue when laymen begin to think. If the infallible judge do not decide such questions, men will begin to ask what he is for. This, no doubt, is the reason why Pius IX. now wishes to decide it.

And yet it is a grave question, whether the inconvenience and the mischief of attempting now to decide this matter may not be greater still. It has ever as yet been held among Catholics, that the office of TRADITION has been to hand down revealed articles of faith from the times of the apostles themselves; and that whatever has not been brought down by tradition from the apostles themselves is no part of "the faith once delivered to the saints," and cannot now be an article of the Catholic faith. Now, from the Pope's statement that this question has never yet been decided by the Apostolic See, it follows that it is not now, and never has been, an article of the Catholic faith. But if the Immaculate conception of the Virgin should now be decided in the affirmative (and the Pope's letter seems to contemplate no other decision), it will become an article of faith in the Roman Church all over the world. We do not see how, in such a case, the doctrine of the office of tradition can be maintained, or how it could then be asserted that the faith of the Roman Church continues the same in all its parts as it has been from the times of the Apostles. How shall any one then answer the Protestants when they will turn round and say (as they will), "Here is a part of your faith which was not an article of faith in your own Church yesterday, and it is an article of your faith to-day; is this faith as old as the times of the Apostles?" This is the more important, as the greatest of the Fathers, and of Roman Catholic divines in modern times, have not scrupled to affirm that the Church of Rome has no tradition upon the subject. So said St. Bernard, the last of the Fathers; and so says Bishop Milner, an English Roman Catholic Bishop, about 35 years ago, in his "End of Controversy."

We look on this with the utmost anxiety, in connection with the recent appointment of Dr. Newman, a distinguished convert from the English Church, to the office of rector of the new Catholic university. It is well known that Dr. Newman, since his conversion, has published a book, in which he not only admits, but openly avows, that the faith of the Roman Church of the present day is *not* the same as that faith which the apostles delivered to the saints, and that it is hopeless to attempt to defend it as such. We look on such admissions as full of danger. If such is to be the teaching of the new Catholic university, and if such teaching is to be countenanced by decisions of the See of Rome, we see not how the controversy with Protestants is to be sustained, or how Catholics are to be kept in that faith which they have always hitherto been taught to look upon as precisely identical with the faith which the blessed apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul, once delivered to the Church.

On the one hand, we have the great scandal of leaving so important a question still unsettled, in a Church which possesses an infallible judge, whose office it is to settle all controversies as they arise. On the other hand, see the great and appalling dangers which beset a decision, such as the Pope's letter contemplates. We no longer wonder at the three years of deliberation which have followed that letter, without any other step having been taken; and since the Pope has asked to be informed of the opinions of the laity on so grave a question, we urge upon them, while it is yet time, to make it a serious subject of thought. We shall, in our next number, give materials to enable them to do so. We desire them to take this article as an instance of the caution we shall use in submitting proper subjects for their consideration; and of the calm, dispassionate, and practical manner in which we shall treat those subjects; and, with these observations, we commend the Pope's letter to the earnest consideration of laymen.

PIUS P. P., IX.

"Venerable brethren—health and apostolical benediction. When raised at the first, certainly by no merits of our own, but by the secret counsel of Divine Providence, to the sublime chair of the Prince of the Apostles, we undertook the government of the whole Church, we feel the greatest consolation, venerable brethren, when we know in what manner, in the pontificate of our predecessor, Gregory the Sixteenth, of venerable memory, an ardent desire had wonderfully revived in the Catholic world, that it should, at length, be decreed by the Apostolic See, by a solemn judgment, that the most holy Mother of God, the most loving mother of us all, the immaculate Virgin Mary, was conceived without the original stain; which most pious desire, the petitions presented as well to the said predecessor of ours as to ourselves continually, most clearly

* The note to the Douay version, published with the authority of the Most Rev. W. Crolly, D.D., R.C. Archbishop of Armagh, and the Right Rev. Cornelius Denvir, D.D., R.C. Bishop of Down and Connor, makes the meaning still more plain—"The meaning is, that a curse uttered without cause shall do no harm to the person that is cursed, but will return upon him that curseth, as whithersoever a bird flies it returns to its own nest."

† The famine and the tide of emigration have well nigh fulfilled this prophecy in hapless Ireland.

and openly prove and demonstrate; in which the most distinguished prelates, the most illustrious colleges of the Canons, and the religious establishments, among whom is the renowned order of preaching Friars, have, with rivalry, solicited that in the sacred liturgy, especially in the preface of the Mass of the conception of the most Blessed Virgin, it should be lawful to openly and publicly pronounce and add that word 'Immaculate.' To which petitions it was agreed, with the utmost readiness, by our predecessor and ourselves. It has also come to pass, venerable brethren, that very many of your own order have not ceased to address your letters to our predecessor and to us, in which they have sought, with repeated petitions and redoubled desires, that we should be willing to define, as a doctrine of the Catholic Church, that the conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary was altogether immaculate and wholly free from all stain of original sin. Nor, indeed, were there wanting, even in this our age, men excelling in capacity, virtue, piety, doctrine, who, by their learned and laborious writings of this kind, have so illustrated this subject, and most pious opinion, that many persons wonder why this honour has not yet been decreed to the most Holy Virgin by the Church and the Apostolic See: which (honour) the common piety of the faithful so much desires should be attributed to that Virgin, by the solemn judgment and authority of that same Church and See. Indeed, wishes of this kind have been most pleasing and agreeable to us, who, even from our most tender years, have held nothing preferable, nothing more dear than to worship the most Blessed Virgin Mary with a singular piety and service, and with the most inward affection of our heart, and to perform those things which appear to be able to conduce to the greater glory of the Virgin herself, and to procure her praise, and to promote her worship. Wherefore, even from the very beginning of our pontificate, we seriously directed our cares and thoughts, even with the greatest alacrity, towards an affair of so great importance, and have not omitted to offer our most humble and fervent prayers to the best and greatest God, that he may be willing to illuminate our mind with the light of his celestial grace, by which we may be able to learn what should be done by us in this affair. We also endeavour to remain in this hope most strongly, that the Blessed Virgin, 'who has raised the highest pitch of merit above all choirs of angels, even to the throne of God,' and who has crushed under the foot of her virtue the head of the old serpent, who, 'placed between Christ and his church,' and altogether great and full of graces, has always rescued the Christian people from the greatest calamities whatsoever, and from the snares and assaults of all enemies, and has saved them from perishing, commisserating with that most ample affection of her maternal mind, with which she is accustomed, our most sad and mournful vicissitudes and most bitter necessities, labours, and distresses, will be willing, with her most present, and also her most powerful patronage with God, to turn away the scourge of divine anger with which we are afflicted on account of our sins, and to restrain and dissipate the most turbulent storms of evils by which, with incredible grief to our mind, the Church is everywhere tossed, and to convert our grief into joy. For you know full well, venerable brethren, that all ground of our confidence is placed in the most holy Virgin, since God 'has placed the fulness of all good in Mary, so that, if there be any hope in us, if any grace, if any salvation, we may know that it flows from her . . . because such is the will of him who wills that we should have all through Mary.'

"Hence, we have chosen some ecclesiastical men, distinguished for their piety, and well versed in theological study, and some of our venerable brethren, cardinals of the Roman Church, illustrious for their virtue, religion, counsel, prudence, and knowledge of divine things, and we have committed to them that, according to their prudence and learning, they should take care to examine on every side this most grave subject, and then report to us their opinion with all diligence. But while the matter stands in this position, we have resolved to follow the illustrious footsteps of our predecessors, and to emulate their example.

"Wherefore, we write these letters to you, venerable brethren, in which we by all means excite your distinguished piety and episcopal care; and again and again, we enjoin you, that each of you, according to his judgment and prudence, will take care that public prayers should be appointed and performed in his own diocess, by which means the most merciful Father of lights may think fit to pour out upon us of the heavenly light of his Divine Spirit, to breathe on us of his inspiration, that in matter of so great importance, we may be able to embrace that counsel which may pertain as well to the greater glory of his holy name, as to the greater praise of the most Blessed Virgin, as well as to the greater good of the Church militant. But we earnestly desire, that with the greatest speed with which it can be done, you will signify to us with what devotion your clergy AND FAITHFUL PEOPLE are animated towards the conception of the immaculate Virgin, and with what desire they are inflamed, that a matter of this kind should be determined by the Holy See; and especially we desire to know what you, yourselves, venerable brethren, think of this matter, according to your distinguished wisdom, and what you wish. And, since we have now conceded to the Roman clergy, that they may be able to recite the proper canonical hours of the conception of the most Blessed Virgin, recently composed and published, in place of that which is contained in the ordinary Breviary: therefore, by these letters, we give you power, venerable brethren, that, if it so please you, the whole clergy of your diocess may be able, freely and carefully, to use those canonical hours of the conception of the most holy Virgin, which the Roman clergy now uses, without being obliged to ask liberty from us, or our Congregation of Sacred Rites.

"We do not doubt, venerable brethren, but that, according to your singular piety towards the most holy Virgin Mary, you will rejoice to comply with these our desires, with all care and zeal, and that you will hasten to give us the speedy reply which we ask of you. In the meanwhile receive, as a pledge of all heavenly gifts, and especially of our benevolence towards you, the apostolic benediction, which, from the bottom of our heart, we bestow on you, venerable brethren, and on all the clergy and faithful people committed to your care.

"Given at Cajeta, this second day of February, in the year 1849, the third year of our Pontificate."

We place this letter on record in our pages, with a deepening sense of the responsibility of our undertaking. We feel that there is a contrast, a painful one, between this letter and all those letters which the Apostles wrote to the Churches. We are aware that many Roman Catholics deny that they worship the Blessed Virgin. We believe that such persons must feel hurt or shocked at hearing the head of the Roman Church avow, that his FIRST object is to promote *her* worship. One object, at least, might stand before it—namely, to promote and extend the worship of the Lord himself. We painfully feel the total omission of the name of Christ from this important letter, except in one place, which only makes the omission more striking.

These thoughts, we believe, will find a place in the minds of many Roman Catholics, jealous as all men ought to be for the honour and the purity of their Church.

But we cannot shut our eyes to the existence of this letter; and considered it must be. We shall return to it again, and we invite our readers to preserve this number of THE LAYMAN, that they may be able to refer to the Pope's letter when necessary.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-street.

No anonymous letter can be attended to. Whatever is sent for insertion must be authenticated by the name and address of the writer, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee for his good faith.

As the expense of the publication is necessarily heavy, prompt Subscriptions are earnestly solicited.

The press of important matter in this opening number has obliged us reluctantly, from want of space, to omit several highly interesting contributions of a lively character, which we hope, however, to be able to lay before our readers in our next number.

Contributors will be good enough not to consider that their communications have been disapproved of, or will not be ultimately inserted, because they do not appear immediately in our pages. The nature of our undertaking will afford an obvious explanation why delay may, sometimes, be unavoidable.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, SATURDAY, JANUARY 17, 1852.

THE time is come when the *laity* must *think* more than they have done. For good, or for evil—whether they wish it, or whether they do not—it is inevitable that the laity *must think*, and think deeply.

Many causes unite to create this necessity of thinking.

The National and other Schools of Ireland are now educating the people to exercise their minds. Formerly, to read and write was education; but *now* "education" is *to acquire a power of thinking.*

The Queen's Colleges are opening out to the middle classes a new field of intellectual education, with all the advantages that attend on intellectual power.

And if Irishmen now possess the means of attaining to the great source of all human power—the power of a rational mind—they are also under a necessity which impels them to attain to it. True-hearted Irishmen have before them a mighty task. They have to raise a prostrate country. No people have ever done this without exercising and cultivating the power of thought; for the mind is the source of man's power over the material world. To accomplish their great task, Irishmen must and will become energetic in *thought and action.* This has ever been the source and the instrument of national prosperity. Men who do not think, will not act effectively; men of action are ever men of thought.

It is the most striking character of human thought, that when once aroused to activity it grasps the greatest and noblest objects; as it ascends, it sees still greater objects arise before it, and it grasps them too. The things relating to the immortal spirit, which man feels within him; his present and his future intercourse with God; this is the highest aim of human thought. When once awakened to activity, it will, it must proceed to this great end. The spirit *must* return to God who gave it, and it will aim at understanding him, and the way to find him. Those who learn to think will, therefore, find themselves thinking about religion.

This consequence of learning to think is not a future thing; it is present with us now.

We see what numbers on both sides have changed their religion. Now, it is not every one who thinks about religion, that goes on to change it. Such multitudes of *changers* in religion do, therefore, prove that there are vast multitudes who are thinking about religion; and who can help thinking about it, when he considers all this? This is the state of things; we have not made it; we only seek to meet it.

We believe that this state of things, if it be full of hope is also full of danger. It is no light thing for a man to begin to think about doctrines which he has formerly held without thought. On the one hand, we may hope much if he think about it rightly; we may hope that, as he understands religion more, he will practise it better. If religion be true, the more we examine it, the more firmly he will believe it, the more earnestly he will practise it. And this holds out a hope, not only for the man, but for Ireland. Drunkards, swearers, thieves, idlers, are curses to Ireland, and will never help to raise her. Religion teaches men to be sober, honest, industrious; these men are the strength of a nation. And they have a promise from God, for "Godliness is profitable to all things, *having promise of the life* THAT NOW IS, and of that which is to come. A faithful saying, and worthy of acceptation." Let Ireland but lay hold on this promise in her hour of need, and her mourning will be turned into joy.

On the other hand, to think rashly or wrongly endangers faith, and may lead to infidelity.

Our object is to aid the laity in regulating and controlling that thinking about religion which is now inevitable—which is actually going on this moment; to suggest right methods of thinking, and to supply sound materials.

It is not our object to usurp, or to interfere with the office of the clergy. We reverence that office as an institution of God. But if the laity do learn to think at all (and who will say that the laity should be irrational creatures?) the laity must also learn to regulate and control their thoughts. The clergy cannot do this for the laity, any more than they can think for the laity. God did not make the laity for the clergy, but he made the clergy for the laity; and this must never be forgotten, in considering the relation in which they stand to each other. The clergy have an important office to instruct the laity; but the time is past when the clergy can

think for the laity, or take the sole control and regulation of their thoughts.

The laity need a lay organ, a voice of their own, to express their thoughts, and their feelings, and their wants. And this organ should be ever open to the clergy, to instruct and direct the laity by reason and learning.

To supply this great want, we establish our journal. We invite the laity to make it truly effectual, by letters, addressed to us, expressing their wants and their difficulties; to such letters we shall give a ready insertion. We place our pages at the disposal of the clergy, to give such direction and instruction to the laity as they may deem proper.

For ourselves, we shall act with the utmost caution and reverence, and shall be ever open to conviction. That which is Catholic, we shall never question, nor suffer to be questioned in our pages.

We believe *that* to be Catholic which Christ and his Apostles revealed to the world; and, concerning the tradition of the Catholic Church, whatever she has handed down to us from the beginning, concerning Catholic faith, that we shall ever respect.

What we ourselves shall produce as materials for thought, shall be taken, with the utmost care, from the most approved authors, from the ancient histories of the Church, especially of the Irish Church, from the noblest actions and sayings of the Catholic Fathers, from the memorials of the martyrs. This number gives a worthy instance from St. Columbanus, one of the oldest and holiest of the Irish saints.

The subjects on which laymen are *now* especially bound to think, we shall take from unquestionable authorities. Our present number gives a letter from the present Pope, in which he expresses his desire to know the sentiments of the laity on an important question.

Our task is grave and important, and we enter on it with feelings of its solemn responsibility; and may we find favour with God and man, as we shall seek to perform it faithfully, fearlessly, and reverentially.

INFALLIBILITY.

The essay which follows is not new in substance, though now presented in a somewhat modified and simplified form to our readers. We select it, not merely as coming from the pen of one of the ablest prelates of the Established Church, but as having been selected by some of the most celebrated controversialists of the present day, in the Church of Rome, as a treatise worthy of reply, which reply we purpose also to give in a future number. None, we think, can complain of the temper and spirit in which the Archbishop of Dublin's essay is written, or of want of interest in the all-important subject of which it treats. If there be really an *infallible guide to heaven*, all must admit that it is error unto death to refuse to accept its guidance: while, on the other hand, to accept as infallible a guide not really so, must be equally fatal to those who trust to it. If God has given us such a guide, he, doubtless, did so also to the primitive Church of Christ and His Apostles; and to the sacred records, therefore, both sides must ultimately appeal to decide this momentous question; and it is not to be decided one way or the other by man's wishes or *a priori* expectations. We regret that the whole of this important essay is too long to be given at once in our present number:—

THE SEARCH AFTER INFALLIBILITY.

In the Apostle Paul's farewell address to the elders [clergy] of Ephesus and Miletus, he gives them a very solemn warning, saying, "I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them. Therefore watch, and remember that by the space of three years, I ceased not to warn every one, night and day, with tears."—Acts xx. 29, 30, 31.

And it is to be observed—

I. That what he here says, is of a piece with much that we find in several of his epistles or letters. In his Epistles to the Corinthians, especially the Second, he warns them against "false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into Apostles of Christ, and ministers of righteousness," even as "Satan himself transforms himself into an angel of light"—men seeking to disparage Paul's apostolic authority, and to introduce doctrines opposed to his. "There must be," says he, "heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you."—1 Cor. xi. 19. The Epistle to the Galatians, again, is almost made up of similar cautions. The Philippians also are warned [chap. iii.], in like manner, to be on their guard against teachers who corrupted the Gospel. Cautions of the same kind are addressed to almost all the other churches to which he wrote; and both Timothy and Titus are earnestly and repeatedly exhorted to watch against the inroads of these corruptions.

The Apostle Peter also cautions the disciples against those "unlearned and unstable" persons, who "wrest," he tells them, "the Scripture to their own destruction."

The Apostle John, again, in his Epistles, is chiefly occupied in warning his hearers against those false prophets—those "wolves in sheep's clothing"—of whom his Master had prophesied, and bid his disciples beware.

And here we find Paul, in his farewell address to the elders, earnestly urging again the solemn warning of this danger, which he tells them he had been continually repeating for three years. "From among themselves," he tells them—"from the very bosom of their own Church"—men will arise teaching perverted doctrines, "to draw away [the] disciples after themselves."

Now, it might seem wonderful, or even incredible, if we had not these accounts in the Bible, that any such thing should have taken place; that in the very times of the Apostles themselves, whose authority from Heaven was proved by their miraculous powers, any false teachers should have not only arisen, but should have gained a hearing, and been able to draw away the disciples by pretending to an authority equal or superior to that of the real Apostles. And if we had not providentially possessed these accounts of the early dangers of the Church, we might have been altogether disheartened at the view of the various errors introduced into later times by men of high pretensions as religious teachers. We might have felt as if God had forsaken his Church when he withdrew from it the guidance of the inspired Apostles, and left Christians to find their safety in watchful, and careful, and honest examination of every doctrine taught. But, as it is, we see that, from the very first, this care and watchfulness were indispensably necessary to guard against the danger of false teachers introducing corruptions of the true Gospel; that even then Christians were required to be on their guard against the grievous wolves in sheep's clothing, who would enter in, not sparing the flock.

We ought not, therefore, either to wonder or be disheartened at finding Christians in all ages since exposed to the same dangers, and called on to exercise the same watchfulness, as in the very times of the Apostles themselves.

II. The second thing to be observed is the way in which Paul tell his hearers to provide against the danger.

Does he promise them that the *primitive* or early Church shall be safe from it? that no inroads of error will take place for the first three or four hundred years? On the contrary, he speaks of the danger as close at hand.

Or does he tell them that they will find their safety in *apostolic succession?* that it is miraculously provided that no teacher shall ever mislead them, who has but been regularly ordained by himself, or by those appointed by him to succeed him in the office of ordaining? On the contrary, he warns the elders that even from the midst of their own body—of their own selves—will arise men teaching a perverted Gospel, to draw away the disciples after them.

Or again, does he tell them that when any point of doubt and difficulty arises, they are to find safety in applying to Peter and to those who shall be divinely appointed from time to time as his successors and representatives, for decisions and directions that cannot be wrong? Not a word is said of any Apostle but himself; or of any one who should succeed him in the apostolic office. To himself, during his life, they would naturally apply by letter, if opportunity offered, for directions in any case of doubt that might arise. But not even any Apostle—much less any successor of an Apostle—is mentioned by Paul as the infallible guide, whom, after his own death, they were to consult.

Or does he bid them resort to some central Church—whether at Jerusalem, or at Rome, or at Byzantium—and seek there for infallible guidance?

Or does he direct them to summon a general council, or assembly of all Christians, and refer every question that may arise to the decision of a majority of its votes; with a full assurance that these should be so supernaturally overruled by the Holy Spirit as to secure them from the possibility of mistake?

No: he makes no allusion whatever to any other Church or prelate; to any successor of Peter or of the other Apostles; or to any infallible council, as their guide. But he tells them to TAKE HEED TO THEMSELVES, and to the flock they are set over; he tells them to "*watch;*" and he exhorts them to remember his own earnest warnings to them.

Now, if there *had* been provided by the Most High any such safeguard as has been alluded to—if Paul had known of any order of men, any bishop or archbishop, any particular Church, or general council, designed by Providence as an infallible guide, and a sure remedy against errors and corruptions, would he not have been sure, on such an occasion as this, to give notice of it. If, when he foresaw the peril of the Church, like that of a ship in a dangerous storm, he had known of a safe port, just at hand, and easily entered, is it to be believed that he would have never alluded to it, but have left his hearers exposed to the storms? Would he have been, in that case, "pure"—as he declares he was—"from the blood of all men?" Can any one seriously think, that against the dangers which he had been warning them of, and weeping over, for three years, he knew of a complete safeguard, and yet was so wanting in his duty—so careless of their well-being—as never to make the slightest mention of anything of the kind? To suppose this would be to suppose him destitute not only of all faithfulness in his high office, but of common prudence and good sense.

But it may be said, have we not in the Bible the promise of the Lord Jesus to his Apostles and all his true ministers, "Lo! I am with you always, even unto the end of the world?" Is not that a promise that he will always give them an infallible guide?

With respect to the meaning of that promise, one thing at any rate must be perfectly plain, that it could not refer to anything either unknown to Paul, or kept back by him from his hearers. We cannot for a moment think that the Saviour, if he had provided such an infallible guide as we have been describing, would have left his faithful and inspired servant, Paul, ignorant of it; especially at so important a time. And we have the Apostle's own solemn assurance to the ministers whom he was addressing on that occasion that he had not kept back anything of all that he knew that it was for their benefit to learn; and this was no less than the whole counsel and design of God. "I take you to record this day that I am pure from the blood of all men. For I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God. Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood. For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them. Therefore watch, and remember, that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one, night and day, with tears." From all this we may learn, among other things, how great is the mistake of those who are satisfied if they can trace up to a very early period—to what they call the primitive Church—some doctrine or practice not found in God's Holy Word; and they consider this as showing God's approbation of what may have been, after all, one of the "perverse things" introduced by false teachers, and against which Paul so earnestly warned the elders.

III. The third point to be observed is, that the exposure of Christians to these dangers, and the call upon them, both ministers and laity, for the continued exercise of watchful caution, is far from appearing to be either what we would wish, or what we would think probable in a revelation from God. It is opposed both to men's feelings and to their expectations.

To examine again and again—to think and consider—to hesitate and to make up one's mind cautiously—to be always ready to hear anything fair that can be said—and to acknowledge that, after all, we may be mistaken; all this is, on many accounts, contrary to men's natural inclinations. Some have no confidence in their own judgment, and are therefore afraid of being left in any way to its guidance; some are so proud that they cannot bear to acknowledge themselves in doubt or uncertainty; some are so indolent that they do not like the trouble of thinking and deciding; some wish to escape the anxious cares connected with such a state, and cannot bear to be in the least degree of uncertainty. And hence there is a strong prejudice or feeling beforehand in favour of any system which promises to put an end to the work of inquiry at once and for ever, and to relieve us from all embarrassing doubt and uncomfortable self-distrust. And this is done, either by setting forth the authority of an infallible Church, which is to mark out, on every point, what we are to believe and to do; thus relieving us from all trouble and anxiety, and from all necessity of acting on the Apostle's warning to "take heed to ourselves:" or, again, by putting in place of such a Church *immediate inspiration* from heaven, whether bestowed on each individual who belongs to a certain sect or party, or on some highly-gifted leader, who will communicate to his followers the messages he receives from heaven. Widely different, in many points, as these sects, and parties, and churches are from each other, they all agree in the one fundamental point just noticed. They all address themselves to that powerful principle in human nature

already noticed, the *craving for infallibility* in religious matters.

It is true that hardly any one is found who in words claims or expects to be personally infallible; still we may truly say, that there is in human nature a craving for infallibility; because it is perfectly evident, that he who is infallibly following an infallible guide is himself infallible. If his decisions on each point agree exactly with those of an authority which cannot be mistaken, then it is quite obvious that *his* decisions must be infallibly right. But this, though self-evident as soon as stated, is sometimes lost sight of in practice: a man will speak of himself as being fallible—that is, liable to make mistakes, and as having no expectation of being otherwise. But if he be quite certain that he has an infallible guide to whom he can always apply, and whom he constantly and accurately follows, his meaning must be, that he *would* be fallible *if* left to himself. But actually and practically he does consider himself infallible.

Though the gnomon [or upright part] of a sun-dial has no power in itself to show the hour, yet, when the sun shines upon it, the motions of its shadow must be as correct as those of the sun's rays which it follows. And, in like manner, *he* is infallible, practically, in his belief, who always believes exactly what an infallible church or leader believes.

This craving, then, for infallibility, inclines men beforehand to receive the pretensions, either of a supposed infallible Church, or of those who claim or who promise immediate inspiration. And, accordingly, some persons waver for a time between these two kinds of pretensions, and at last give in to the one or to the other. And, again, you may find persons changing from the one to the other, and sometimes thus changing more than once; and it might be added, that one may find instances of the same individual, himself unchanged, exposed to severe blame, at different times, not only from different persons, but even from the same; first for refusing to join the one party, and afterwards for refusing to join the other most opposed to it; both parties, much as they are opposed to each other, still always clinging to the confident expectation of finding that infallibility above spoken of. They are *inquiring* only after a way of freeing themselves from the trouble of all further inquiry. Their *care* is only to relieve themselves, in the end, from all further need of watchful care. They are like men in a ship, searching for a perfectly safe harbour, in which the helm may be abandoned, and the ship left to ride securely, without any need of watching the winds and currents, and of looking out for rocks and shoals. They hope to obtain, in all ages of the Church, that freedom from all need of watchful circumspection, which was not granted even in the age of the Apostles; for we find that even when there *were* these infallible guides on earth, Christians are perpetually warned of the danger of mistaking "false Apostles" for true.

But the flattering promise of the infallible guidance here spoken of, not only meets man's wishes, but, as observed before, his expectations also. When we allow our thoughts to run on in our mind without restraint, we are apt to think that God is as *likely* to provide for us such a guide, as we are to wish for it.

If, before they knew anything about what God has revealed in the Bible, men were asked what kind of revelation they would *wish* to obtain, and again, what kind of revelation they would think it the most reasonable and *probable* that God should bestow, they would be likely to answer *both* questions by saying, "Such a revelation as should provide some infallible guide on earth, easily found by every man; so that no one could possibly be in doubt, on any point, as to what he was required to believe and to do; but should be placed, as it were, on a kind of plain high-road, which he would only have to follow steadily, without taking any care to look around him; or, rather, in some kind of conveyance on such a road, in which he would be safely carried to his journey's end, even though asleep, provided he never quitted that conveyance. "For," a man might say, "if a book is put into my hands containing a divine revelation, and in which are passages that may be differently understood by different persons, even by those of learning and ability, even by men professing each to have earnestly prayed for spiritual guidance towards the right understanding of it; and if, moreover, this book contains, in respect of some points of belief and of conduct, no directions at all, then there is a manifest *necessity* that I should be provided with an infallible interpreter to explain this book, who shall be always at hand, to be consulted, and ready to teach me, without the possibility of mistake, the right meaning of every passage, and to supply all deficiencies and omissions in the book itself. For, otherwise, this revelation is, to *me*, no revelation at all. Though the book itself be perfectly free from all mixture of error—though all that it asserts be true, and all its directions right—still, it is no guide for *me*, unless I have an infallible certainty, on each point, what its assertions and directions *are*. It is in vain to tell me that the pole-star is always fixed in the north; I cannot steer my course by it, when it is covered by clouds; so that I cannot be certain where that star is. I need a *compass* to steer by, which I can consult at all times. There is, therefore, a manifest necessity for an infallible interpreter on earth, whom every one can easily go to, as an essential part of any Divine revelation." Such would be the thoughts, and such the feelings, of a man left to himself to consider what sort of revelation from heaven would be most acceptable, and, also, the most *probable*—the best fitted to meet his *wishes* and his *wants*. And thus are men inclined, at the outset, both by their feelings and their thoughts, beforehand, to admit such pretensions as have been above alluded to.

And it may be added that any one who is thus induced to give himself up entirely to the guidance of such a supposed infallible authority, without presuming ever after to exercise his own judgment on any point relative to religion, or to think for himself at all on such matters—such a one will be likely to regard this as the very perfection of pious *humility*—as a most reverent observance of the rule which says, "Lean not to thine own understanding;" though, in reality, it is the very error of improperly leaning to our own understanding; for, to resolve to believe that God *must* have dealt with mankind just in the way that *we could wish*, as the most *desirable*, and in the way that to *us* seems the most *probable*—this is, in fact, *to set up ourselves as His judges*. It is to dictate to Him in the spirit of Naaman, who *thought* that the prophet Elisha would recover him by a touch, and who *chose* to be healed by the waters of Abana and Pharpar, the rivers of Damascus, which he deemed better than all the waters of Israel.

But anything that falls in at once with men's *wishes*, and with their *expectations*, and which also presents itself to them with the appearance of a *virtuous humility*—this they are often found readily and firmly to believe, not only *without* evidence, but *against* all evidence.

And thus it is in the present case. The notion that every revelation from heaven necessarily requires an infallible interpreter always at hand, to explain it, without which we cannot possibly understand it—this notion clings so strongly to the minds of many men, that they are even found still to maintain it after they have ceased to believe in any revelation at all, or even in the existence of a God. There can be no doubt of the fact that very great numbers of men are to be found—they are much more numerous in some parts of the Continent than among us—men not wanting in understanding, nor altogether without thought, who, while they, for the most part, join outwardly in the religion of those about them, are inwardly entire unbelievers in Christianity, yet still hold to the notion—which, in fact, has had the chief share in *making* them unbelievers—that a DIVINE REVELATION without an INFALLIBLE INTERPRETER always at hand, to explain it to every one, is such a thing as no one would think of; and that the one without the other is an absurdity, and a contradiction.

And this notion it is, as we have said, that has mainly contributed to *make* these men unbelievers. For, when a sensible and thoughtful man has fully satisfied himself that, in point of fact, no such provision *has* been made—that no infallible interpreter, within every one's reach, does exist on earth (and this is a conclusion which even the very words of Paul, in his discourse at Miletus, which we are now considering—Acts XX.—would be alone fully sufficient to prove), when he has satisfied himself that such an explainer does *not exist*, yet still continues to think that it is *necessary*, the consequence is unavoidable, that he will at once give up all belief of Christianity. The ideas of a REVELATION from God, and of an unerring *interpreter* to explain it, being, in his mind, inseparably joined, the overthrow of the one belief cannot but carry the other along with it. Such a person, therefore, will be apt to think it not worth while to examine the reasons in favour of any other form of Christianity, which does *not* pretend to offer him an infallible interpreter. This—which he is fully convinced is absolutely required by a revelation from heaven—is by some churches *claimed*, but not *proved*, while the rest do not even claim it. The pretensions of the one, he has listened to and deliberately rejected; those of the other, he regards as not even worth listening to.

The system, then, of arguing from our own suppositions, as to the necessity of the Most High doing so and so, is likely to lead a man first to throw aside his own form of Christianity, and then to give up revelation altogether. But does it stop there? Does not the same system also lead naturally to Atheism, or the entire denial of the existence of a God? Experience shows that that consequence, which reason might have led us to expect, does often actually take place. He who allows himself to think freely as to what he *may consider* to be *necessity*, and argues from that, will be likely to find a necessity for such divine interference in the affairs of the world, as does not in fact take place. He will deem it no less than necessary, that an almighty and an all-wise and good Being should interfere to rescue the oppressed from the oppressor—the corrupted from the corrupter—to deliver men from such temptations to evil as it is impossible, from their nature, they should withstand by their own unassisted strength; and, in short, to banish *evil* from the universe. And, since this is not done, he thinks it plain, that there cannot possibly be a God, and that to believe otherwise is a gross absurdity. Such a belief he may, indeed, consider as useful for keeping up a wholesome fear in the minds of the common people; and, for their sakes, he may outwardly profess Christianity also, even as the heathen philosophers of old endeavoured to keep up the common superstitions; but a real belief he will regard as something impossible to a sensible and thoughtful mind.

It is not meant that all, or the greater part of those who hold the notion here spoken of, are Atheists. We all know how common it is for men not to go all the way, that some notion, whether good or bad, which they have taken up, would lead them; how common to argue stoutly for opinions, without seeing what must follow from them, if carried out to the end. But we are here trying to show what the *notion* itself may naturally lead to: and there have been many sad instances which prove, that the danger is real and great of its bringing men at last to be Atheists.

(To be continued.)

DOES THE ROMAN CHURCH REALLY BELIEVE IN ITS OWN CLAIM TO THE POSSESSION OF AN INFALLIBLE GUIDE?

[From the *Irish Ecclesiastical Journal*, with some additions by the Author.]

There cannot be a question that all men would naturally wish to have an universal, infallible guide in religion, to decide all controversies, condemn all heresy, and destroy all danger of error or mistake in a matter of such moment as religious faith.

We see men every day pin their faith to the skirts of teachers whom they admit to be as fallible as themselves, which of itself is a clear proof that they would gladly follow the guidance of any one who could show any plausible pretence to infallibility.

We know, also, with what wonderful facility men receive, in all ages, the pretensions of those who boldly set up to be prophets, and claim to be recipients of immediate inspiration. Witness the rapid spread of Mormonism in our own times—a religion, founded upon pretences to inspiration as shallow, and as ill-sustained by anything like real evidence, as can well be imagined.

It is not wonderful, therefore, that the pretensions of the Church of Rome to this great gift, supported as they are by bold assertion and the dogmatic teaching of centuries, should have many followers. At least the circumstance that Rome has numerous followers, is of itself no evidence that such pretensions are true. The wonder is, that there are so many who do not receive these pretensions, when we consider how ready men are to accept a claim, in itself so desirable, and which, if true, would relieve them from so much danger and responsibility. When we see men so willing to invest with all the attributes of infallibility the teachers or systems they have chosen to follow, even whilst they admit, and loudly profess to believe, that these teachers and systems are fallible, the wonder is, not that an ecclesiastical tribunal claiming infallibility should have followers, but that there should be any who refuse to accept its guidance.

When the vender of an universal medicine announces that he is in the possession of a compound capable of curing all the diseases to which mortality is subject, it is not wonderful that some men become purchasers, were it only for the chance of obtaining so great a benefit. But when a large portion of the public remain indifferent to him, as we cannot suppose them insensible to the great advantages of a medicine of universal and infallible efficacy, we are forced to conclude, either that they disbelieve the alleged qualities of the medicine, or that they had given it a trial and found it to be a cheat.

Again, if a man profess to have the power of commuting the baser metals into gold, it is not wonderful that some should flock to him, in the hope, if not the belief, that he might communicate to them so desirable a secret. But if men, suffering under debt or poverty, are found to treat his promises with contempt, we may be assured that it is not from indifference to the end proposed, but from an absolute disbelief in the powers of the alchemist, that they neglect to avail themselves of his boasted science.

But suppose we find on closer inquiry that the wife and children of the proprietor of the universal medicine are languishing at home, of some very common disease, and that he has never once thought of administering to them his panacea; or suppose we find that the great alchemist is himself starving with poverty in a garret, whilst he professes to teach others the art of converting old nails and useless brass or copper into gold, a further suspicion is created in our minds: we begin to see that the vender of the medicine, and the maker of gold, *have no faith in their own pretensions*—they are eloquent in public upon the virtues of their respective powers, in hope of obtaining money from the credulity of others, but in private, and in their own homes, they are utter disbelievers in themselves.

Now, this is exactly the case of the Church of Rome. Her divines are loud in the assertion of her claim to the possession of an infallible tribunal for the decision of all controversies; and they have many followers, because

all would be rejoiced to be under the protection of such a power, and many are content to place themselves under its guidance, as a relief to their perplexities, or to save themselves the labour of inquiry, on the chance that such pretensions may be true. But others doubt, or refuse to believe, not because they are indifferent to the claim (unless they be indifferent to religion itself), but because they are of opinion—some, that the evidences of the claim are insufficient to support it; others, that a fair and extensive trial having been made of it, it has been found to be a failure or a cheat.

But then occurs the other question. Do the advocates of this claim really believe in it themselves? Does the Church of Rome practically believe herself to possess the infallible power of deciding controversies, of which she so loudly boasts? Can we follow her to her home, and ascertain whether she administers to her own children and household the medicine of which she claims to be the sole vender? Does she apply her philosopher's stone to relieve the poverty and nakedness of her own secret chambers?

If we find that she does not—that the children of Rome are perishing of the same diseases which afflict the rest of mankind—perplexed with the same controversies, doubts, and difficulties amongst themselves, which are to be found in other communions, and, nevertheless, that they never think of seeking to their boasted infallible tribunal for a solution of their perplexities; if we find that even the infallible tribunal itself does not think it advisable to interfere for the relief of its doubting children, but, on the contrary, sits still and suffers them to fight out their controversies like other folk, then must we be convinced either that the possession of this gift of infallibility is, after all, no such great advantage, or that its pretended possessors are no real believers in themselves.

1. For example, we are taunted by Romanists with the necessary imperfections of vernacular versions of the Bible. They are, it is said, the work of men confessedly fallible; they are liable to many errors; the faithful, therefore, in reading them are reading, not the infallible Word of God, but a version of that word, made by fallible and erring men, and, therefore, fallible and erroneous like its authors.

Well, then, suppose this to be so, what more important case can be conceived for the exercise of an infallible judgment than to secure the Church from this danger by providing vernacular versions which shall be purged from all error? Yet this we are told the infallibility of Rome is unable to effect. Bellarmine, the warmest advocate of the Ultramontane pretence to infallibility, admits its failure here. He tells us that this weakness of their boasted infallibility is one cause why the Roman Church refuses to its laity, of different nations and languages, vernacular versions of the Scripture in their respective tongues—"Because (says he), vernacular languages are subject to continual change; versions, therefore, in vernacular languages, ought to be continually altered to suit them to the variations of the languages. But this would be impossible, for want of competent translators, and thus many and irremediable errors would be occasioned, since neither Popes nor Councils are able to judge of so many languages."*

So, then, on this most important point, the infallible judge is at fault, and Rome, with her boasted power of deciding all difficulties and controversies, confesses herself unable to provide her children with versions of the Bible without the very same risk of error which her divines represent as the *peculiar* disadvantage of the Protestant translator. But here we find, by Bellarmine's confession, that Popes and Council can do no better—their gift of infallibility fails them here; they can only trust, like ourselves, to the qualifications of the translators; for "they are unable to judge of so many languages." *Habemus confitentem reum.*

In what, then, is the condition of the Roman laity better than our own, in reference to vernacular versions? One version, in a language which was partially vernacular in Europe some centuries ago, is authorized and pronounced "authentic," or infallible. But this version is now as unintelligible to the great mass of the people as the Hebrew or Greek originals; and if versions of this version in the modern languages of Europe are partially and sparingly allowed, they are allowed solely on the responsibility of the individual translators; the infallible judge has carefully abstained from giving them any real sanction, and they who use them must take them, as we take ours, on the character for learning and integrity of the individual translators.

2. Again, with respect to other controversies, when we look at the internal history of the Roman communion, we do not find that its members possess any very transcendant advantages over ourselves. The Jesuits and Dominicans, the Jesuits and Jansenists, the Dominicans and Franciscans, and other great contending parties, were allowed to work out their several controversies just as they would have been allowed to work them out if they had been Protestants. No infallible authority interposed to allay the storm, to calm the virulence of party spirit, or to settle for ever on which side truth was to be found. Troublesome questions were hushed up, and troublesome individuals silenced or put out of the way by various calumnies or artifices, and sometimes by persecution or imprisonment, with even more of unjustifiable violence than is usual in other communions. And this we are told was because the questions at issue were merely matters of theological opinion, and not *de fide*, or articles of faith. They were of sufficient importance, however, in the eyes of the contending parties, to justify them in embroiling kingdoms, shedding of the blood of thousands, burning monasteries, desecrating churches, polluting the graves of saints, plundering villages, and breaking the sacred bond of unity and charity among Christians—nay, the Reformation itself is asserted by its bitterest opponents to have been the immediate consequence of one of these contests.

If, then, the infallibility of Rome is either too weak or too slow in its operation to settle such controversies as these, we may well ask, what great advantage has the Roman Church in the possession of such a power? If the infallible tribunal can only interfere in the last extremity, when an article of faith is at stake, and if it must sit still and allow all inferior controversies to grow and fester, until at length they attain to the degree of virulence which undermines the faith, it is surely not too much to say, that such a power, so limited in its exercise, but ill deserves the vaunting boasts of its zealous advocates. Nine out of ten of our most bitter controversies relate to subjects which are not *de fide*; and for these (by the showing of their own divines) we can look for no decision from Roman infallibility.

3. And yet there is one controversy still unsettled, which one would think ought to be regarded as of sufficient importance to be dealt with as fundamental; I mean the doctrine of infallibility itself. But upon this subject, all important as it is, the Roman infallible tribunal has as yet given no infallible decision. Divines are still in the dark, both as to the precise seat of the infallibility, and as to the occasions in which we are to look for or expect its interference. This, to say the least, is suspicious. Does the Roman Church really believe in her own pretended powers? Her infallible decisions (it would seem) are made for those only who refuse to receive them; but for her own children, for those who profess to believe in her infallibility, she decides nothing; not even in reference to the seat and nature of this very infallibility itself. They may have controversies amongst themselves as fierce and vehement, to say the least, as any that ever raged elsewhere; but no infallible decision is vouchsafed to calm their turbulence. If they are sound in the fundamentals of the faith, they can look for no help in minor matters, however important, from the infallible tribunal. The infallible judge meddles not with those questions which are not *de fide*. In other words, he speaks only for those who refuse to receive his decisions. He ministers no relief to the perplexities of his own children or subjects. Does Rome, then, really believe herself to be as infallible as her divines pretend?

4. One of the most important benefits to be looked for from the possession of an infallible guide in religion, to the members of the communion so privileged, would, doubtless, be a provision for infallible public instruction; the catechisms, the liturgical offices, and books of devotion, the sermons of such a communion will, certainly, we would say, be jealously guarded by the gift of infallibility, and nothing erroneous or unsound will be admitted into these mainsprings and fountain-heads of Christian life.

But when we come to examine the actual practice of the Church of Rome in these matters, we find that her supposed infallible tribunal gives her no advantage in this respect over other churches. Her catechisms are composed by fallible men, and are taught to her children by men as fallible. Her devotional offices, even the Breviary services appointed for the devotions of her priesthood, her very liturgy, ancient and venerable as it is, do not profess to have the sanction of the infallible authority. And the sermons, or public teaching of her clergy, are confessedly, like those of other communions, the private opinions of the individual preacher. What advantage, then, have the members of the Roman Church from the boasted infallibility of which they pretend to be the possessors? If an objection is made to some childish legend of the Breviary, if we detect a catechism in a manifest error, or a preacher in a palpable extravagance or falsification of some authority, we are at once told that the Church is not responsible; that the infallible tribunal has not spoken through any such medium. We ask, then, why has she not? If (as Roman doctors pretend) there be in this Church this power of detecting all error, why not cut off error at its source, by supplying the laity with infallible instruction? Does it not seem strange that a communion, possessing the high privilege of infallibility, should, in the instruction of her people, in her devotions, in her public teaching, be confessedly in no way more protected from human error and infirmity than we who have no such advantage? Either the infallible tribunal, of which she boasts, is unable to guard the laity from erroneous teaching—and in that case we may fairly doubt whether the possession of such infallibility is so great an advantage as its advocates pretend—or else the Roman Church, by her caution in this department of what would seem to be her duty, clearly betrays her secret unbelief in her pretended privilege. Rome does not really believe in her own infallibility.

5. This will be more evident if we look into the internal dissensions of that communion. We shall find, not only that the possession of a power of appeal to an infallible tribunal gives them no advantage whatsoever in calming the virulence of controversy; but that the contending parties, although both professing to believe themselves the subjects of an infallible judge, display no anxiety to obtain a final decision from him, but, on the contrary, make use of every artifice to delay or evade a sentence. The infallible tribunal itself also acts with the same caution which a synod or convocation of bishops pretending to no infallibility would naturally use, to bring matters to an amicable arrangement—leaving the question at first an open one; exhorting the belligerent parties to moderation and mutual forbearance; issuing carefully-worded decrees, nicely contrived to say as little as possible, and to give a triumph to neither party; in short, we find the same arts of prudence and policy resorted to, which other people are forced to employ, who have no prerogative of infallibility to sanction their decisions.

All this shows an inward consciousness on both sides that the boasted gift of infallibility must be used with caution, lest they who profess to submit to rather than to believe in it, should be driven to rebellion. In no part of the history of controversy within the Roman Church do we see her act, either in her head or in her members, with the bold confidence of faith in her own infallible power that we might reasonably have expected. She acts rather with the caution of a lawyer, who desires to keep up as long as possible the acquiescence of others in a legal fiction; and in this light there can be little doubt the claim of infallibility is practically regarded in the Roman communion; and contending parties avoid or delay a decision, because they know that such decision will not necessarily be the truth, although they know also that, whether true or false, they are bound to receive it as infallible.

(To be continued.)

by Todd

CHALLENGE.

WHY DO THE IRISH PRIESTHOOD DECLINE PUBLIC DISCUSSIONS ON RELIGION?

INDIVIDUAL priests may not feel sufficient masters of the controversy, and, therefore, may reasonably decline, lest they should injure what they believe to be a good cause by weak advocacy. Others may decline, because they think that, even though the cause of *truth* might be advanced, the cause of *Christian charity* might be injured by the excitement of personal feelings almost inevitably connected with an oral discussion, in which the anxiety to gain a victory, or avoid a defeat, may drive men, even of a calm mind and temper, to use arguments of which they would in cooler moments be ashamed.

These motives we honour, and accept as fair grounds, and not mere excuses, for declining oral discussion.

The discussion which we propose and challenge, is one of a very different and, we believe, a wholly unexceptionable kind. It is, that any priest or bishop of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland or England (the more able and learned the better), shall, not orally, but in print, in our pages, come forward and discuss, in a *spirit of candour and Christian kindness*, the whole controversy, not hastily, but at full leisure. We do not ask the writers *publicly* to give their names; so that, if they fail, no personal disgrace will ensue, and their Church need not necessarily suffer; and there will, consequently, be the less temptation to lose temper, or use harsh language. All we require is, that Christian temper shall be preserved on both sides; and where authorities are cited, accurate references given to the volume, page, and exact edition, that time may not be lost in searching for the passages relied on. This we engage on our side to do.

Should this challenge be accepted in the spirit of fair play in which it is proposed, we cannot but think that there is some little chance of intelligent Irishmen being able to decide for themselves which party is in the right, whichever side truth may really be on. On our side, we pledge ourselves to insist on nothing but what we may be able to prove, and shall not assume anything to be dogmatically true or false, until we have laid our grounds for such opinion before the judgment of our Christian readers. With infidels we have nothing to do, and do not propose to write for such. Nor shall we discuss matters in which the Churches of Rome and England are agreed. We shall, therefore, deem the following propositions as admitted and indisputable:—

1st. That the Old and New Testaments are the inspired Word of God. [The authority of the Apocrypha will be, of course, a subject open to discussion.]

2nd. The Doctrine of the Holy Trinity.

3rd. The Divinity and Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ.

* "Tot vero translationum mutationes sine gravissimo periculo et incommodo non fieri. Nam non semper loventur idonei interpretes; atque in multi errores committerentur qui non possent postea facile tolli, *cum neque Pontifices neque concilia de tot linguis judicare possint.*"—*Bellarmin. De verbo Dei.* lib. ii. c. 15, n. 93.

4th. That the Apostles,' Nicene, and Athanasian creeds are true expositions of Christian doctrine.

These doctrines being, as we believe, common ground on which the two churches are agreed, cannot be disputed in our pages.

What the Holy, Apostolic, Catholic Church consists of, will, of course, be a matter to be discussed, as also, in due time, each of the peculiar doctrines adopted by the Church of Rome, and disputed by that of England.

Should our challenge be declined, Catholic laymen cannot ascribe it to either of the grounds mentioned, and will, of course, be at liberty to draw their own conclusions as to the true reasons of such refusal; but *we* shall not the less steadily proceed to analyze the controversy, and show what has been said by the ablest writers on both sides, in as short and simple a manner as the subject will admit. Learned references and collateral matters we shall endeavour to keep distinct from the main body of the argument, that the train of thought and reasoning may be the better followed by any intelligent man, however previously uninstructed in such matters. To be useful, we must be clear and simple; and we think truth is always capable of being made so. To the learned, however, we shall, we hope, prove ourselves not unlearned, or unmindful of what is due to learning in others. Such matters as savour of mere erudition, or imply a deeper knowledge of the learned languages than ordinary men can be expected to possess, we shall endeavour to place in notes or appendixes, rather than embarrass the main thread of the argument with them. Thus we hope to afford acceptable aid, as well to the learned reader as to the humblest Catholic Christian who is able to read the simple truth, on which his eternal salvation must depend.

SHALL ROME HAVE THE EXCLUSIVE CONTROL OF EDUCATION?

SHALL Rome and her priesthood have the exclusive control and direction of education? For three centuries this has been the great controversy of Rome with the nations of Europe. To this end the Inquisition was established; the Society of Jesus was organized and disciplined; the Edict of Nantes was revoked. Silenced for a time by the French Revolution, and the wars consequent on that great convulsion, the same controversy has arisen again in our day, and the struggle has been renewed in every country in Europe. Rome and her priests say, that the preservation of social order, the existence of society itself, is involved in the submission of men's will and reason to their guidance and control. We, on the other hand, assert, that to stay by such means the progress of human intellect, to curb and fetter the minds of men, can be compared only to the attempt of the foolish parent, who hopes that by entire seclusion from the world, the child will escape its temptations and passions. The child becomes a man—a new and strange world, full of glittering baubles and delusive pleasures, bursts upon him unwarned and unprepared, and the suppressed volcano of his passions at once breaks out and destroys him. We say, that to prepare the mind for future conflicts and temptations, it is better to let youth traverse every field of knowledge. Let the reason be strengthened; it is the instrument which God has bestowed upon all to enable us to judge between good and evil; and to distrust its power is to reject and put to open scorn the gift of God. And, above all, we say, that to that reason of man, exercised and disciplined, must be submitted whatsoever claims to regulate his principles and control his actions. That this free, unfettered exercise of man's reason can alone secure social order, we appeal to all history to prove. Go back through the history of Europe for the last three centuries, and see if it does not teach us that every country where Rome and her priesthood have completely obtained the exclusive control of education, has not only lost that position in the great European commonwealth once enjoyed, but has become a by-word of past greatness and present degradation. Whilst, on the other hand, with inferior advantages, those countries where the Bible was free, and education was unfettered, have progressed continually in power, and in the arts and sciences. To illustrate this is our present object.

It is hardly necessary here to repeat what every student knows, that, down to the fifteenth century, the question of priestly control over education could hardly be said to have arisen. In point of fact, during the preceding ages, all knowledge was confined to the clergy. They alone had leisure and opportunity to master even the elements of learning. The close of the fifteenth century saw all this changed. The discovery of a new world enlarged the bounds of knowledge; and the invention of printing secured the spread and circulation of it. Then came the great burst of human intellect. The European nations, at one bound, seemed to have passed from childhood to manhood; and this was not confined to one or two, but extended to all.

First in this great race undoubtedly was Italy. There the light of literature had never been wholly extinguished; but the age of Leo X. saw Italy adorned with learned men; with warriors and statesmen; with the greatest painters and sculptors of modern times. Nor was the pre-eminence confined merely to the arts and sciences; her courts were the resort of the learned men of Europe; to her great universities, Padua and Bologna, flocked the most distinguished students from every country; her cities were the most prosperous and flourishing in Europe; an extensive commerce had made her merchants princes, and enabled the small republics of Genoa and Venice to cope with the most powerful monarchies. Such was Italy in the fifteenth century.

At first, Rome, not perceiving the consequences that would result from the general spread of literature and education, encouraged and aided its progress; but soon the Reformation startled her from her security. Then she saw that education and knowledge endangered her supremacy; and to meet the coming danger, the Jesuits were organized by Loyola, and sanctioned by Rome. To obtain complete control over the education of all, and to bind and subjugate the intellects of men into entire submission to Rome, was the great and paramount object of that society; and in Italy they succeeded. For three hundred years the whole education of the Italian mind has been entrusted by Rome to the Jesuits and the priesthood. For three hundred years every channel of knowledge and learning has been closed, except such as the Jesuits and priests have permitted to remain open. That such is, and has been the case, we would refer to the following passage in Farini's History (vol. I., p. 152). When speaking of the mode of government at Rome, he says—"The Sacred Congregation of Studies, composed of cardinals and of prelates, regulate public education at its discretion. The bishop is the director of instruction in each diocese; the rural dean in each municipality; and in each parish, the incumbent. It is forbidden to any one to teach publicly or privately without the license of the Sacred Congregation, or the approval of the bishop; he, too, presides at the examinations, and frames or approves schemes, regulations, and books for all schools. Every teacher is either actually chosen, or else approved by him, or by the Sacred Congregation; ecclesiastics are always preferred to laymen. In Rome the Jesuit Fathers are the sole educators of youth, and in other places they get the preference. It is forbidden to teach political economy; the studies of medicine and jurisprudence *jejune* and defective. In Bologna there was a school of music; but scientific academies, and those of arts and literature, were all under the control of the Sacred Congregation of Studies. Letters, impoverished by the censorship, and by empty academic insipidities, yielded fruit worth little to the taste and nothing for nourishment. The press was subject to a three-fold censorship—namely, to the Holy Office, by the bishops, and the government."

The above extract represents not merely what is the present position of education in the Papal States, but also what it has been for three centuries, both there and in the rest of Italy. And what has been the result? If exclusive control over education by the Romish priesthood does tend to promote true liberty, to advance the well-being of society, and secure from taint and corruption the morals of the people, what nation in Europe should present such a picture of moral elevation, happiness, and liberty as Italy, and, above all, the Papal States? And what is the case? Without commerce, without literature; her cities, many of them almost deserted; the grass growing in the streets of Ferrara and Bologna. Bologna, which, in the 14th century, could reckon up her 13,000 students, now scarcely numbers as many hundreds; her courts of justice sinks of corruption; her native sovereigns retaining the forced allegiance of their subjects by the sword, or by the aid of foreign bayonets. Such is the present political aspect of that once flourishing country. Nor does the moral condition of its people present a more favourable subject for contemplation. Niebuhr, the historian, who, as a diplomatic agent for the King of Prussia, resided for several years at Rome, thus speaks of the Italians in 1820:—"The Italians, as a nation, are walking dead men. True, we must deplore and not hate them; for unavoidable misfortunes have plunged them in their degradation, but the degradation is no less certain. Intellect and knowledge, any idea which makes the heart throb, all generous activity is vanished from the land. All hope, all aspiration, all effort, even all cheerfulness, for I have never seen a more cheerless nation."

Dr. Arnold, also, who visited Italy in 1840, thus speaks of them:—"Certainly I do greatly prefer France to Italy, Frenchmen to Italians; for a lying people, which these emphatically are, stink in one's moral nose all the day long. Good and sensible men, no doubt, there are here in abundance; but no nation presents so bad a side to the traveller as this. For, whilst we do not see its domestic life and its private fruits and charity, the infinite vileness of its public officers, the gross ignorance and the utter falsehood of those who must come in your way are a constant annoyance. When you see a soldier here, you feel no confidence that he can fight. When you see a so-called man of letters, you are not sure that he has more knowledge than a baby. When you see a priest, he may be a devotee or an unbeliever. When you see a judge or a public functionary, justice and integrity may be utter strangers to his vocabulary. It is this which makes a nation vile, whose profession, whether Godward or manward, is no security for performance. Now, in England we know that every soldier will fight, and every public functionary will be honest, and though many of our clergy may be enthusiasts, yet we feel sure that none is an unbeliever."

And again, speaking of the Papal government, he says:—"It is impossible not to be sickened with a government such as this, which discharges no one function decently. The ignorance of the people is prodigious. How can it be otherwise? The bookselling shops sad to behold. The very opposite of that scribe instructed in the kingdom of God, who was to bring out of his treasures things new and old. These scribes bring out of their treasures nothing but the mere rubbish of the past and present. I could muse long and deeply on the state of this country. Neither do I see, humanly speaking, one gleam of hope. If one evil spirit be cast out, there are but seven others yet more evil, if it may be, ready to enter. Wherefore, I have no sympathy with the so-called liberal party. They are but types of the counter evil of Newmanism. For Newmanism leads to Socialism and Socialism leads to Newmanism, the eternal oscillations of the *drunken mima*. The varying vices and vileness of the slave, and the slave broke loose; half of our virtue is gone, says Homer, when a man becomes a slave; and the other half goes, when he becomes a slave broken loose."

Such were the observations on the Italians of the present day by two of the most distinguished men who have visited that country in the present century. That the picture thus drawn is not a harsh or unjust one, we think will appear abundantly, when we cite the observations of a distinguished native writer of the present day. Farini, himself an Italian, and, as is evident from his book, a sincere member of the Roman Catholic Church, in page 72 of his work, after speaking of the establishment, by the Papal government, of certain bodies called centurions and Pontifical volunteers, proceeds thus—

"These centurions and volunteers obtained their recruits amidst the meanest and most criminal of the people. They had the privilege of carrying arms; were exempt from certain taxes, and were influenced by fanaticism, not merely political, but also religious, because certain bishops and priests enrolled and instructed them. In some towns they domineered with brutal ferocity; at Faenza, particularly, they scoured the places, in arms to the teeth, like a horde of savages in a conquered country; the police was in their hands, so that they practised insolence and excess with impunity. The country people and servants resisted their masters; they avenged the wrongs of the government, those of religion, those of their sect, and of every member of it; and they lighted up in Romagna a very hell of frantic passions. I have already told, and I sorrowfully repeat it, how the liberal sects of Romagna had begun, at an early date, to imbrue their hands in the blood of their opponents. The example was fatal; blood brought forth blood. The liberals had treacherously shed it, under the pretext of freedom and patriotism; the centurions were greedy of it for the honour of Mary, and of the vicar of Christ. Oh, may it please the mercy of God, that all parties may imbibe the persuasion that no enormity is necessary or advantageous to the cause of nations, of the masses, or of governments."

Such is the picture, given by a native writer, of the proceedings and conduct of the contending factions in the Papal States.

Again, in another passage, speaking of the government, he says, page 75—

"The Pontifical government seemed to bind bad and good in the same bundle; they said they wished to separate the chaff from the corn, but they trampled all without judgment or charity. The judicial department was not rectified, according to promise; codes were not published; an ill-patched penal statute was enacted, in which were merciless punishments for the crimes which were called treasonable, or which might be so construed. There exists a circular of Cardinal Bernetti, in which he orders the judges, in the case of liberals charged with ordinary offences or crimes, invariably to inflict the severest punishment. The judges seconded all this fierce passion, if they were of the same faction, or else did so from fear or venality. The police were all factious in some places; and an agent of police caused more alarm among the inhabitants than a highwayman. They would not let the liberals indulge in shooting, or in any other amusement; they refused them passports, pried into their families, and used force against their domiciles and persons with incessant and minute searches. Meanwhile, the administration of the public revenues remained as of old—without method, and without credit; trade, industry, and instruction suffered not only neglect, but discouragement and deterioration."

Such is the government, and such are the governed, in the States of the Church—the government, a government by Pope, cardinals, and bishops; the governed, the people who, themselves and their fathers, have been exclusively educated and brought up, from childhood, by

the Sacred Congregation of Cardinals and Bishops, and by the Jesuit fathers and teachers.

Now, we ask Roman Catholic laymen, does the picture presented by the foregoing extracts hold out any inducement to yield to the claims of Rome's priesthood? Does not the present state of Rome, and of Italy, loudly protest against their pretensions? Will it be said that political causes have produced these results? That Austrian rule has paralyzed the intellect, and destroyed the energies of Italy? That might, indeed, account for the condition of northern Italy; but how can it apply to the Papal States? There, at least, for the last three centuries, Italians have held undisputed sway; not a single foreign Pontiff ever has filled the chair of St. Peter during that period. Will it be said that it is unfavourably situated? A country lying between two great seas, the very centre of civilized Europe; the resort of travellers from every other land, with a fertile soil, and the most favoured climate. Will it be said that its climate and soil are unfavourable to the growth of manly virtue, energy, and enterprise? All antiquity proclaims the contrary. To what, then, shall we ascribe its condition? We say that it is the natural result of that exclusive priestly control over education which is now sought to be forced upon this country: we say that the degradation produced by the slavery of the body is as nothing, compared to the degradation resulting from the slavery of the mind; that there can be no love of truth, where man is forbidden to inquire what is truth; that to prohibit the exercise of man's reason in the higher things relating to "righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come," is to leave him, in all things, to the uncontrolled dominion of the passions and appetites of his lower nature. The priests of Rome, the priests of Bramah, and the priests of Mahommed, all require the will of man, in spiritual matters, to be subjected, without inquiry and without proof, to their rule and governance; but God says, "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." He does not require us to hold fast even that which is good, until we have first proved it; he does not demand our assent to the truths of the Gospel, unless that assent be grounded on and evidenced by reason. Shall we obey God or man? England, and England's Church, long since proclaimed the truth, that that faith is worthless which does not recommend itself to man's reason; that the same God who has given revelation has also endowed man with reason; and, therefore, to suffer it to be opposed to faith would be to make God a liar. Has England suffered by this appeal to reason? Is truth less regarded? Is justice less purely administered? Is morality more endangered? Is the social structure less firm? Has England's progress in arms, in arts, and sciences been retarded? Does the contrast between her present condition, and that of Rome and Italy, afford no subject for deep and earnest thought to every unprejudiced mind? If history be something more than an old almanac—if she be, indeed, philosophy teaching by examples—does she not teach us, by the example of every European nation, that a free Bible, and an unfettered education, are the only sure and solid foundations on which can rest social order, morality, and religion?

FARMING OPERATIONS FOR JANUARY.

(Extracted from the Irish Farmers' Gazette.)

Winter is far from being a season of inactivity with the farmer. It is during this season that he is engaged in turning to account the results of his labours throughout the rest of the year. His cattle, sheep, and other descriptions of stock are feeding on the roots and hay which he had provided for them, and the produce of his grain crops are being prepared for and taken to market. Besides this, there are certain preparatory operations to be performed, with a view to the coming labours of the spring. Stubble fields have to be ploughed for green crops, and grass fields for grain. We refer, of course, to the well-regulated farm. On too many farms we find that "the dead months" of the year are too truly so, not only as regards the processes of vegetation, but also in so far as the operations of the farm are concerned. The lands which had borne crops of grain during the preceding summer are allowed to remain in the same state as they were at the removal of the crops, hardened by the rains and by the continued tramping of the cattle, for whose use no store of roots had been provided. We trust, however, that the day is not far distant when such ruinous and unskilful practices shall become unknown in our island, and when the great and important *trade of farming* will be thoroughly understood by all who are engaged in it.

Ploughing Stubbles.—Although we refer to this operation at the present time, it must not be inferred that it may be delayed until this month. This should commence at a much earlier period, say in November; but as these remarks may be read by parties who have not done so at the proper time, we introduce them here. The ploughing of the stubbles, where a proper rotation of crops is followed, is preparatory to the culture of the pulse crops—beans, peas, and vetches; and of the green crops—turnips, carrots, and mangel-wurzel. On soils suited for bean culture, the portion of land intended for this crop must be ploughed first, at which time farm manure is applied and ploughed down. By so doing, a great amount of labour is saved at a period when every dry hour is precious for getting the seed deposited, where, perhaps, the season might be entirely lost if the manure was not applied until the time of sowing. Land upon which peas or vetches are to be grown ought also to be ploughed early, and may or may not be manured at this season; because the former is usually grown without much or any manure, and the latter being sown at intervals, may be manured afterwards. That part of the stubble land intended for potatoes and green crops, is next to be ploughed. The practice of manuring on the stubbles (previous to ploughing) for these crops, is followed by many farmers, and we believe that on strong soils it may be done with success, particularly where potatoes or carrots are to be grown; because in strong soils, naturally or artificially dry, the manure will not be carried away by the rains, which would be the case in light or open soils; and it is well known that potatoes are more liable to disease when planted among recently-made manure, than when planted on land which had been manured some time previously. For carrots, it is essentially necessary that the manure be ploughed in. There is one great advantage gained by ploughing in manure on lands suitable for so doing—namely, the preservation of those fertilizing parts of it which decompose and are lost, during its exposure in the yards and dung-heaps, but which are preserved in the soil.

All stubble ploughing ought to be deep, certainly not less than seven inches, and, if possible, ten inches. To turn over the latter-mentioned depth, it will be necessary to yoke three horses in the plough. Shallow ploughing is useless; and good after-crops can never be raised when this practice is followed.

The object of ploughing land for green crops at an early season is chiefly the benefit derived from exposure of the soil to the action of the frost and air, and to keep the land dry, by affording the rain an easy bed to percolate through; in consequence of this, the land becomes much more easily worked afterwards, weeds and insects are partially destroyed, and altogether it is too important an operation to be delayed beyond the beginning of this month. Winter ploughing ought never be done when the land is in a wet state, or when snow is lying. If done when in this state the benefit of ploughing is lost, the land becomes like mortar, it retains the water, and hardens so as to render the after culture much more difficult.

Ploughing Leas.—All grass lands intended to be cropped with oats ought to be ploughed early this month, if not before, commencing with the older and tougher leas. By doing so at this time, a much better covering for the seed is obtained than if the ploughing was deferred to a later period. Exposure to frost and air is also, in this case, the means by which this result is obtained. The proper size of furrow for leas is from eight to nine inches wide, by five to six inches deep. In all winter ploughing, care must be taken that surface water is not allowed to lie on the land. This will scarcely be the case on thorough-drained lands; still it is as well to prevent the possibility of water lodging on the surface, by cutting small gripes in different parts across the head ridges, and through any hollows, so that any excess of surface water may be carried quickly off into the nearest drain or ditch.

Every farmer is aware that much time is lost in ploughing short ridges; and it is, therefore, a matter of some importance that, in laying off fields, these should be as long as the general size and arrangements of the farm will admit. The following table is interesting, as it shows the comparative amount of time lost in ploughing long and short ridges. We extract this table from "Stephens's Book of the Farm"—a work from which much useful practical information will be derived:—

Ridges.	Length of ridge.	Time taken to plough one Stat. acre.	Loss of time.	Gain of time.
		h. *m.*	*h.* *m.*	*h.* *m.*
No. 1	78 yds.	11 53	1 53	0 0
„ 2	86 „	12 16	2 16	0 0
„ 3	112 „	10 35	0 35	0 0
„ 4	118 „	9 31	0 0	0 29
„ 5	170 „	10 15	0 15	0 0

The standard of ploughing in this trial was taken at 4,840 square yards, or one statute acre in ten hours. This is one instance out of many which could be brought forward, as showing the necessity of paying attention to what may appear to be *trifles*, so that expenditure in time and labour may be saved.

Spade Husbandry.—It is evident that the foregoing directions for winter ploughing are only applicable to those who have a sufficient number of stout horses to do the work properly. This the small farmer does not possess; and, indeed, in the case of small farmers generally, the possession of a horse is a great evil. It induces him to scratch over his land, rather than to give it the necessary deep ploughing, because he has not the means of working it properly; and besides this, as the horse must be maintained some way or other, it is too often the case that this is done out of what ought to be used by the family. From inability to keep them in working order, we always find horses belonging to the smaller classes of farmers to be most wretched animals, unable to drag themselves along, much less to assist in cultivating the land in a proper manner. If a beast be required by a small farmer, we would prefer using a bullock; for he can be more easily kept than a horse, will do his work as efficiently, and, when not required, can be fattened and sold, whereas the old, worn-out horse is totally worthless. For the small farmer, however, the most efficient mode of culture is by means of the spade. This simple instrument can be used under all circumstances, costs nothing for its keep, and, when properly used, is a much more efficient one in the culture of the soil than the best-appointed plough. The great importance of spade husbandry, and its complete adaptation to the case of the small farmers of Ireland, are only now beginning to be fully recognised. In allotting the size of farms, we think that they ought to be either of such a size as can be conveniently cultivated under a proper rotation of crops, by means of the spade—say five Irish acres—or that they shall be sufficiently large to give at least one pair of stout horses ample employment. There should not be any medium; for such would only cause the occupier to keep one, or, perhaps, two worthless animals, and the cultivation of such farms can never be so perfect as those cultivated entirely by spade labour, or by proper draught horses.

Manure-making.—As the cattle are housed at this period of the year, the accumulation of manure is, of course, one point to which the attention of the farmer is directed. The site of the dung-pit ought to be as convenient as possible to the cow-house and stables; and the best form is, when slightly concave or hollow, with a gentle slope to a certain point at one end. The bottom must be paved, and if the dung-pit be large, there ought to be shallow centre and cross channels, so as to permit the liquid drainings to flow towards the latter point, at which a covered reservoir or tank, for receiving these drainings, will be constructed. If the subsoil be porous, the site of the dung-pit must be properly puddled with clay previous to being paved, otherwise the liquid will escape through the soil, instead of being conveyed to the tank. The dung-pit ought to be enclosed by a wall, four or five feet high, having a gate at one end, in order to allow carts to pass in and out. Before any dung is put into the pit, the bottom ought to be covered with a layer of earth or bog-stuff, a foot or eighteen inches deep, and with weeds cut before seeding, potato haulms, or any other refuse; this will soon become a mass of rich manure. The different kinds of manure—the horse, cow, and pig dung—will then be laid equally over the whole surface, taking care that all be properly intermixed; and to facilitate this, planks should be laid in different directions, over the dung, so that there may not be any accumulation of one particular kind of manure in any one part more than in another. As the dung accumulates, a light layer of earth should be laid over all; and when this is regularly done, it will improve the quality of the heap, by preventing the escape of ammonia and other gases during the progress of fermentation, and also add to its bulk, becoming itself invaluable manure. During cold weather fermentation does not proceed so rapidly as it does at a later period of the season; still, as there is always more or less going on, it is as well to guard against loss. Sprinkling the surface occasionally with peat charcoal will also prevent undue fermentation and fix the ammonia, which will otherwise be constantly escaping. As the liquid accumulates in the tank, it may be taken out and poured over the dung, which it will not only greatly enrich, but cause it also to decompose equally, and thus burning, or *fire fanging*, as it is termed, will be prevented.

During frosty weather, the dung which has accumulated in the farm-yard ought to be carted out to the fields to which it is intended to be applied, and there made up into oblong heaps on the upper hedge ridges.

The reasons why this ought to be done are—first, the manure can be more readily brought into a proper state of decomposition in the field than in the farm-yard, by being turned, as shall be afterwards described; and next, because the getting in of the crops can be more readily carried on when the manure-heap is in the field than if it was at some distance. This is a point, however, which we find but little attended to. The manure is allowed to lie in the farm-yard until required, and then it is either insufficiently rotted, or has become burned up, and much valuable time is lost in conveying it to the field where it is wanted. For certain crops—such as beans, potatoes, and carrots—fresh dung may be carried and spread at once before the stubbles are ploughed; but when intended for mangel-wurzel or turnips, it ought to be made into the oblong heaps we have mentioned. The manner of forming these heaps is as follows:—The intended site being fixed upon, let a layer of earth be laid down, of the breadth and length which it is intended to make the heap; or, if the land has been previously ploughed, let the bottom be levelled

and broken by the spade; on this let the dung be laid down, the carts, coming in at one end, depositing their loads, and passing off at the other end, and proceeding in this manner until the whole is finished. As both ends of the heap will be sloping, it will be neeessary to make them up to the same height as the rest of the heap, by cutting the ends across at the required distance, and throwing the outer ends on top; when this is done, finish by putting a layer of earth all over the top. If it should happen that the whole heap cannot be finished at once, but that there are intervals between the different times when the dung is drawn out, then a layer of earth must be laid over the dung-heap each time the drawing is finished. During the time that the dung is being drawn out, great care must be taken that it is spread equally and not allowed to lie in lumps, and that the heap is made up as neatly as possible. When dung is not drawn out until late in spring, say within a month or six weeks of its being required, then the carts must not be allowed to travel over the heap; but the manure ought to be made up loosely, so that its fermentation may be hastened, whereas, if the carts were drawn over it, this would be considerably retarded.

Compost-heaps.—The materials for making compost-heaps may be brought forward at any spare time throughout the year; but as this is closely allied to the subject of the preceding paragraph, we shall now refer to it. The best material for mixing with farm-yard manure is peat or bog-earth; old turf fences also answer well; but wherever bog-stuff can be got, advantage ought to be taken of it to form compost-heaps, and thus to increase the manure store. The proper proportions are two-thirds of bog-earth to one-third of farm-yard dung. Let the bottom of the heap be bog-earth; upon this put a layer of manure, then another of earth, and so on till the heap is four or five feet high, covering all with earth. In a short time the mass will begin to heat, and after it has done so it may be turned and the materials carefully mixed, finishing, as at first, with a layer of earth. By saturating the heap occasionally with liquid manure from the tank, its value will be greatly increased. If a heap of earth be laid down convenient to the houses, and all house slops—such as soap-suds, &c.—poured regularly over it, a mass of valuable manure will soon be obtained.

Liquid-manure Tanks.—On small farms a sufficiently large tank may be made of a tight butt, containing 150 gallons, or, if one be insufficient, two of these butts may be set close to each other. Let a hole be dug two and a half feet deeper than the depth of the cask, and at least 18 inches wider; the bottom of the hole must be laid with a layer of properly-prepared puddled clay, ten or twelve inches thick; upon this set the cask, and then have puddle closely rammed in around the sides; the upper edge of the cask will then be eighteen or twenty inches below the surface, a sufficient depth to allow room for a covered drain for conveying the urine into the tank from the gutter behind the cows. A rough but strong covering of wooden slabs being laid over the top of the cask, a tank will be constructed which will last for several years, and contain all the liquid manure likely to be preserved at one time on a small farm. In the case of more extensive establishments, especially where the system of house-feeding is closely followed, larger tanks will be required, the sides of which will be formed of brick or stones set in mortar, and joined with cement, and carefully puddled behind each course; the sole may be either pavement or bricks laid on puddle, and the best cover is an arch; the width of the tank should not exceed six feet, for, if much wider, the arched cover will be expensive. As a regular part of the homestead, a tank should never be omitted; for there is no part of the establishment which will repay the outlay sooner.

Some modes of using liquid manure have been already mentioned, such as its application to the manure in the yard and to compost-heaps; it may also be applied as a *watering* to grass, whether pasture or when cut for soiling, and also to land in preparation for green crops, and its effects in either of these modes are often truly surprising. The quantity to be given to each Irish acre may be from 1,500 to 2,300 gallons.

Liquid-manure carts have been constructed in the form of a square or oblong wooden cistern, mounted on wheels; but the simplest and cheapest cart for this purpose is a common oil-cask, containing 120 gallons, fixed on the shafts and wheels of an ordinary cart, and having a long box, perforated with holes, attached behind. The liquid is pumped out of the tank, and enters the cask by a bung hole on the top, where there is also a funnel attached, and it flows into the trough behind, through a hole in the lower part of the back end of the cask; this hole is provided with a large spigot or a simple bung of wood. The more expensive watering-carts are furnished with an apparatus for regulating the discharge; but the simple wooden trough may be made to serve the same purpose, merely by closing up a few of the holes, should the discharge be considered too great; and when the contents of the cask is known, it is an easy matter apportioning the quantity to be given to an acre. The amount will be greater or less according to the speed of the horse, and this must be attended to; but if the horse be not pushed beyond his step, it will be found that very little difference will arise from this cause. On very small farms, where manual labour was the only means of cultivation, we have seen a small cask, mounted on a wheel-barrow frame, answering all the purposes required.

Grass Lands, intended for meadow, should be cleared early in the month of all stock, the top dressing finished, and, when thoroughly dry, bush-harrowed, cleaned, and rolled; draining finished, and the land shut up to rest.

Irrigation.—Attend to the water-meadows, and clear away all obstructions of dead leaves, silt, and other deposits, so that the water may run freely and not remain stagnant on any part. Correct the levels when necessary; and, in case of severe frost, let the water run unchanged, which will prevent the young blade from being burned up; but if the weather continues mild, change the water every third day from quarter to quarter, if there be not sufficient to cover the entire breadth at the same time. The best guide is to let off the water as soon as a scum arises, which is a good indication that the land is saturated sufficiently for the time.

Fatting Stock.—As the cattle in the stalls progress, improve the quality of the food, by giving oil-cake, barley meal, and bruised oats. Those put up early, and in good condition, will soon be fit for the butcher, and should be sold off.

Fatting Wedders, whether in the sheds or on the pastures, must not be allowed too much turnips, but should get a liberal supply of cake or meal, and good hay; turnips are cold and succulent, and, if much frosted, are injurious, causing diarrhœa and dropsical affections.

In-calf Cows, and Ewes with Lamb, should be treated so as to keep them in vigorous health, by giving moderate, yet sufficient quantities of roots and good hay, so as to avoid the extremes of being too fat or too thin. As they approach the period of casting their young, an additional quantity of succulent food should be given, yet cautiously, to promote the secretion of milk, and improve their condition.

Store Stock should not be stinted, but have a liberal supply of nourishing food, as well to keep them in fair condition as promote their growth. Keeping growing stock on short allowance will be found the least economical in the end.

General Remarks.—When not otherwise engaged, this is a good season to employ men in removing old, useless, earthen fences; and if the materials are not required, for the purpose of forming compost-heaps, as directed, they may be spread over the adjoining fields, which will be improved by thus deepening the soil. It is astonishing the great extent of valuable land which is taken up in this country with these fences: they are absolutely of no use whatever—they harbour vermin, and prove an unmolested nursery of weeds, and they take up land for which rent must be paid. When a system of house-feeding is closely followed, there are no fences required except the boundary, which may be a ground hedge, taking up very little space. In the present times, when every foot of land must be made fully productive, these abominations must be done away with.

In Two Volumes, 8vo. Price 15s. Cloth.

The Bible, The Missal, and the Breviary,

Or Ritualism Self Illustrated in the

Liturgical Books of Rome.

Containing the text of the entire Roman Missal, Rubrics and Prefaces, translated from the Latin. With preliminary Dissertations, and Notes from the Breviary, Pontifical, &c. By the Rev. George Lewis.

Edinburgh: T. & J. CLARK, and all Booksellers.

ALMANACS, ETC., FOR 1852.

THOM'S ALMANAC AND OFFICIAL DIRECTORY. 1 vol. 8vo., 8s. 6d., cloth.

POST-OFFICE DUBLIN DIRECTORY. 1 vol., 8vo. 7s.

THOM'S ALMANAC AND THE DUBLIN POST-OFFICE DIRECTORY, bound together, 13s. 6d., cloth.

Orders received and sent Post-free by

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,
9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

LADIES' POCKET-BOOKS FOR THE YFAR 1852.

CARNAN'S LADIES' COMPLETE POCKET-BOOK.
POOLE'S LADIES' SELECT POCKET-BOOK.
THE CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.
FULCHER'S LADIES' POCKET-BOOK AND POETICAL MISCELLANY.
PAWSEY'S LADIES' FASHIONABLE REPOSITORY.
MARSHALL'S LADIES' ELEGANT POCKET SOUVENIR.
MARSHALL'S LADIES' DAILY REMEMBRANCER.
MARSHALL'S LADIES' FASHIONABLE REPOSITORY.

SOLD BY
WILLIAM CURRY AND CO.,
9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

FOUR MONTHS IN ALGERIA, with a Visit to Carthage By J. W. Blakesley, B.D., Vicar of Ware, Herts; sometime Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College. With Maps and Illustrations by W. G. Linton, after Photographs. 8vo., cloth, 14s.

TOM BROWNE'S SCHOOL DAYS. By An Old Boy. Sixth Edition. Crown 8vo., cloth, 10s. 6d.

"These manly, honest thoughts, expressed in plain words, will, we trust, long find an echo in thousands of English hearts. —*Quarterly Review.*

RUTH AND HER FRIENDS. A Story for Girls. Second Edition. With a Frontispiece. Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 5s.

WILLIAM CURRY AND CO.,
9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Just Published.

The Churchman's Almanack

FOR THE YEAR OF OUR LORD 1852.

Containing a View and Historical Notice of BANGOR CATHEDRAL.—References to the Lessons for Each Day in the Year—Universities—Theological Colleges—Royal Birthdays—Sovereigns of Europe—List of Archbishops and Bishops—Her Majesty's Ministers—Houses of Lords and Commons—Courts of Law—Societies in connection with the Church—List of Members of Convocation—Rates of Postage—Stamp and Legacy Duties—Assessed Taxes—London Bankers.

On a Large Sheet, Price 2d. Small 8vo., Price 2d. Royal 8vo., 1d.

Sold by
WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,
9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

CHURCH MUSIC.

PRICE EIGHTEEN PENCE.
A Selection of Standard

Psalm and Hymn Tunes,

Of a sound and devotional character, adapted for the use of Parish Choirs and Churches. Edited and arranged by

E. H. THORNE,
Organist and Choir Master, Henley-on-Thames.

PRICE EIGHTEEN PENCE.
A Selection of

Single and Double Chants.

Edited and arranged by
E. H. THORNE.

Also, PRICE THREE PENCE,

Canticles, Divided for Chanting.

London: W. Wells Gardner, 7, Paternoster-row.

NEW WORK BY THE AUTHOR OF "PEEP OF DAY."

Just ready, 18mo., with Illustrations by Harvey, price, 2s. 6d

More Words about Jesus:

A SEQUEL TO "PEEP OF DAY."
By the Same Author.
Sold by
WILLIAM CURRY AND CO.,
9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Third Edition, revised and enlarged, cloth, 1s. 6d.

A GLOSSARY OF THE OBSOLETE WORDS AND PHRASES IN THE ENGLISH BIBLE AND PRAYER BOOK,
By Rev. JOHN BOOKER,
Vicar of Killurin.

"Every person with a Bible or Prayer-book should have a copy of this work."—Archbishop Whately.

London: Hamilton and Adams.
Dublin: Hodges and Smith.

Mrs. Alfred Gatty's Popular Works.

I.
PARABLES FROM NATURE. First Series. Sixth Edition. 16mo. With Four Illustrations, 1s. 6d. Second Series. Second Edition. 2s.

II.
WORLDS NOT REALISED. Second Edition. 18mo. With Frontispiece. 2s.

III.
PROVERBS ILLUSTRATED. Second Edition. 16mo. With Four Illustrations. 2s.

IV.
THE FAIRY GODMOTHERS AND OTHER TALES. Second and cheaper Edition. Fcp. 8vo. With Frontispiece. 2s. 6d.

V.
LEGENDARY TALES. Fcp. 8vo. With Illustrations by Phiz. 5s.

VI.
THE POOR INCUMBENT. Fcp. 1s.

VII.
AUNT JUDY'S TALES. With Illustrations by Miss Lane. Fcp. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Sold by
WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,
9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Dublin: Printed by William S. Purdon and Edward Purdon, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, Parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher, WM. CURRY 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.
January, 1852

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Sloir do Dhia añ rna hároiḃ, agur rfoṫcáin air an ṫalaṁ deaṫċoil do na ḋáoiniḃ.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED THE MIDDLE OF EVERY MONTH, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. I.—No. 2. FEBRUARY, 1852. Annual Subscription, 3s. 6d Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

PAGE.

Does the Church of Rome allow or prevent the free use of the Holy Scriptures? 13
Letter of Pope Pius VI. 14
Testimony of Roman Catholic Laymen 14
American Newspapers—Alphabet of criticism 15
The Talk of the Road 15
State of departed Souls 16
St. Patrick's Hymn, A.D. 433 16
The Harp of Ireland 18
Our Rules for Controversy 18
The History of the Immaculate Conception 19
Infallibility Part II. —Archbishop of Dublin 21
Does the Church of Rome really believe in its own claim to the possession of an Infallible Guide?—Part II. 22
Love and Loyalty 23

DOES THE CHURCH OF ROME ALLOW OR PREVENT THE FREE USE OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES?

In the last epistle written by St. Paul to his faithful friend Timothy, a short time before his martyrdom, when, as learned men have stated, he was confined in prison at Rome by the cruel Emperor Nero, it is interesting to remark one of the grounds of the unwavering hope and confidence which filled the mind of the Apostle, amidst his own sufferings and the prospect of approaching death. I am in prison (he informs him), and can now preach the message of salvation no longer. They have bound me in chains, and may put me to death, but the Word of God they cannot bind. "I labour even unto bands, as an evil-doer; BUT THE WORD OF GOD IS NOT BOUND."*

The Word of God was free! This thought consoled the mind of St. Paul, during the closing hours of this life, in which he had toiled so much to spread the knowledge of the Gospel. What has the Church of Rome done to fulfil this desire of the Apostle's heart? She has given many proofs of her reverence and regard for St. Paul. She has enrolled his name in the Calendar. She has built a magnificent church outside the walls of Rome, which is called by his name; but what has she done to circulate the epistles which he wrote, and other parts of Holy Scripture? Does the Church of Rome treat the Word of God as the Emperor Nero treated St. Paul himself? Does she throw it into prison, as it were, and place it under lock and key; or does she send it forth freely among her people? Do her bishops and clergy encourage their flocks, both by precept and example, to read and study the Bible; or do they forbid this practice as dangerous, and denounce it as heretical?

It is needless for us to dwell on the importance of this question. Every Christian layman, whether a member of the Church of Rome or not, will wish to learn, upon trustworthy authorities, how this matter really stands. If it can be shown that Fathers, and Councils, and Popes have not only sanctioned, but recommended the reading of God's Word, the Roman Catholic layman will, doubtless, gladly avail himself of this privilege, and owe us a debt of gratitude for the removal of his doubts and scruples; while Protestants, on the other hand, may, perhaps, find cause to modify the opinions which they entertain, regarding the Church of Rome, on this point; and they will see the necessity of careful inquiry, before they speak of her as being, at all times, an uncompromising enemy of the circulation of the Word of God.

For it cannot be denied that the great majority of Protestants *do* believe that the Church of Rome is justly liable to the charge of forbidding the laity to read the Scriptures—and a number of facts have been often brought forward, which seem to make the imputation very probable. "Is it not stated," they say, "in the fourth rule of the Trent Expurgatory Index, that if the Holy Bible be promiscuously circulated in the vulgar tongue, more loss than profit will thence arise, by reason of the rashness of men? Does not the fifth rule of the Spanish Index prohibit the Bible in the vulgar tongue, whether in whole or in part, whether in print or manuscript? Was not an Italian nobleman, Count Guiccardini, thrown into prison in Florence on the 7th of May last year, his only offence being that he had read the 10th chapter of St. John's Gospel to his friends? And, to come home to our own country, was it not given in evidence before the Commissioners of Irish Education Inquiry, not many years since, that in many parts of Connaught the peasant does not know what a Bible or Testament is?* And, to crown all, have not Bibles been more than once burned by the priests, in various parts of Ireland?"

Now, we do not undertake to decide upon the truth or falsehood of these various charges. For the present, we will say nothing about the state of Spain or Italy. Our object is, to ascertain what are the rights of the Roman Catholic laity in Ireland. If, as we shall presently show, Popes and Bishops have recommended the reading of the Scriptures, the burning of Bibles by a priest may prove him to be a very foolish and wrong-headed man, but it ought not to deprive the laity of their just rights. If the state of Connaught was as bad as was represented before the Education Commissioners, we may, doubtless, conclude that the priests in Connaught neglected their duty; but that is no reason why the Roman Catholic laity of Connaught should *always* be kept in the same state of spiritual darkness. We now proceed with our extracts.

In the first page of the Douay Bible, published with the express sanction of Doctor Denvir, Roman Catholic Bishop of Down and Connor, we find the following words, taken from a letter of Pope Pius VI. to Archbishop Martini:—"You judge exceedingly well that the faithful should be excited to the reading of the Holy Scriptures; for these are the most abundant sources, which ought to be left open to every one, to draw from them purity of morals and of doctrine, to eradicate the errors which are so widely disseminated in these corrupt times. This you have seasonably effected, as you declare, by publishing the Sacred Writings in the language of your country, suitable to every one's capacity, especially when you show and set forth that you have added explanatory notes, which, being extracted from the Holy Fathers, preclude every possible danger of abuse." As regards the explanatory notes added to the Douay version, we shall have a word or two to say hereafter; but with this exception, we beg to express our entire and hearty concurrence in the sentiments of Pope Pius VI., so clearly and ably stated in the foregoing extract. We honour the Pope for his frank and candid acknowledgment that the Bible ought to be left open to every one in his native tongue. The laity, according to Pius VI., ought not only to be *permitted* to read the Scriptures, but *excited* and admonished to read them. It is clear, therefore, that any Roman Catholic priest who does not exhort his flock to study the Bible neglects his duty, in the opinion of Pius VI.; and we can well imagine the severity of his censure against any priest who, by threats, or otherwise, would endeavour to deter and hinder his people from reading God's Holy Word. If the Pope's words can ever be supposed to possess authority, we ought surely to consider that his directions to one of his Archbishops, upon an important question, affecting the faith and conduct of his flock, must carry the very greatest weight; and we, therefore, consider that the declaration of Pius VI., which we have quoted above, should be almost decisive of the doctrine of the Church of Rome on this matter.

But Pius VI. is not our only authority. We can prove that the ancient Church of Rome held the same sentiments. In the sixth century, Pope Gregory the Great, one of the most eminent bishops who ever occupied the See of Rome, thus exhorts his hearers in a popular sermon—"*Study, most dear brethren, the words of God.* Do not despise the letters our Maker hath sent us. This is a great advantage that by them the soul is quickened, lest it should be benumbed with the cold of its iniquity. When we there see that just men have done valiantly, we ourselves are disposed to courage in well-doing. The soul of the reader is enkindled by the flame of holy examples."† And again, "*All our defence is contained in the Sacred Oracles;* for there are the commandments of God—there are the examples of just men. If the soul grow cold in the love of God, let it hear what is said: 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy mind, and with all thy strength.'" And again, in another passage,‡ "The Holy Scripture, as a kind of looking-glass, is set before the eyes of our mind, that our inward face may be seen by it. By it we know what in us is foul, and what is fair; by it we perceive how much we profit; by it how far we are from profiting. It declares

* 2 Tim. ii. 9 (Douay Bible.)

Appendix to first Report, pp. 488, 489

† Tom. i., col. 1,337. Paris, 1705. We beg to remind our readers of the promise we gave in our first number, that we would always give exact references to the page, volume, and edition of ancient authors—a practice to which we request all our correspondents steadily to adhere. Without some such precaution, the citation of ancient authorities in controversy becomes almost valueless, from the difficulty of verifying the reference, so as to ascertain whether the quotation is or is not accurate.

‡ Vol. i, col. 37. Paris, 1705.

the brave exploits of the saints, and provokes the weak to the imitation of them: and while it commemorates their victorious acts, it confirms and strengthens our weakness against the assaults of vice, and we are the less fearful in encounter, by seeing the foregoing triumphs of so many valiant men. But sometimes it sets before us not only their virtues, but their falls, that in the victory of the strong we may find that which we ought to imitate, and again, in their falls, that which we ought to fear." We may now appeal to Roman Catholics themselves, whether this great Pope did not think it fit that the reading of the Holy Scriptures should be left free to every man. What would he have said to the priests of Connaught, who allowed their people to grow up in ignorance of both Bible and Testament—or to those who told their flocks, that "if they read the Bible, or took it into their houses, they should be damned—that the devil was in the Bible?"* It is clear that either the Pope or the priests must be in the wrong; and we, for our part, prefer to range ourselves on the Pope's side.

But we have yet further evidence. Every Roman Catholic priest, at his ordination, binds himself to follow the *unanimous consent of the Fathers*, in the interpretation of Scripture. Now, we fearlessly assert that there is scarcely any question upon which the ancient Fathers are so unanimous as upon this, that it is the right and duty of every man to read the Word of God. At present we have only room for two or three short extracts; but we hope, in a future number, to afford our readers an opportunity of abundantly satisfying their minds on this matter.

To begin with S. Clement, who was Bishop of Rome at the close of the first century. In his epistle, directed to all the Christians at Corinth, he writes—"You have known, beloved, you have well known the Holy Scriptures; you have thoroughly looked into the oracles of God."† If the Christians at Corinth were so conversant in the Scriptures, surely the Christians of Rome, in the time of this bishop, were not forbidden to read them.

We next appeal to Origen, from whom it will be sufficient at present to produce one passage—"We beseech you not to content yourselves with hearing the word of God when read in the church, but *to apply yourselves to it at home*, and to meditate upon it day and night; for Jesus Christ is there present, as well as in the church, and they that seek him shall find him everywhere. Therefore he hath commanded us to meditate in the Law of the Lord, when we walk by the way, and when we sit in our houses, when we lie down, and when we rise up."‡

Again: what saith S. Chrysostom? "Let one of you take in hand the Holy Book, and *let him call his neighbours about him;* and by the heavenly words let him water and refresh both their minds and also his own."§

Again: in a sermon attributed to S. Augustine we find these words—"If we either read not the Scriptures ourselves, or be not desirous to hear others read them, then are our medicines turned into wounds; and then, where we might have had remedy, we shall have judgment."‖

Our extracts shall be closed for the present, by the following passage from St. Jerome.¶ He is expounding the words of St. Paul, "Let the word of Christ dwell in you abundantly, in all wisdom." On which he remarks—"Here we are taught that even THE LAYMEN ought to have the Word of God, not only *sufficiently*, but also *abundantly;* and one to instruct and to warn another." We think we may safely ask our readers, whether the pledge we gave, as to the sentiments of the Fathers, has not been already amply redeemed.

But we promised to say a word or two on the Douay notes to the Bible. They profess to be extracted from the holy Fathers, and to be added for the better understanding of the true meaning of the text. Let us examine the truth of this assertion, in the case of one important passage of the Gospels, closely connected with the question we have been considering.

In St. John's Gospel,* we read these words of our Lord, as given in the Douay version, "Search the Scriptures, for you think in them to have life everlasting: and the same are they that give testimony of me." This verse, one would think, is sufficiently plain and clear. It seems to convey an express command of our Divine Master to all his disciples to *Search the Scriptures*. But, when we look to the note, we find that we are mistaken. The verse, it seems, is an *assertion*, not a *command*. The proper translation is said to be, not "Search the Scriptures," but "You search the Scriptures, *scrutamini*, ἐρευνᾶτε," and then the Douay translators add—"It is *not* a command for all to read the Scriptures." Now, we beg leave to ask, if the proper translation of the verse be, "You search the Scriptures," why the Douay translators did not so translate the passage at once? Why did they put the wrong translation (if it be wrong) in the text, and the right one in the note, which would obviously mislead those simple readers, who would be deterred from reading the note by seeing a hard Greek word at the beginning of it? The true reason we suspect to be this, that the translators had some secret doubts in their own minds whether the translation, "Search the Scriptures," was not, after all, the true one: they, therefore, put it in the text. But yet, knowing that Protestants were fond of quoting the passage as a convincing argument for the duty of all men to read the Scriptures, they were resolved to bring forward another translation, as a foundation for their positive statement in the note, that the verse does *not* contain a command for all to read the Scriptures. Now, the Douay translators may or may not have been good Greek scholars; but we beg to think that S. Chrysostom knew Greek somewhat better than they did. He had sucked it in, as we say, with his mother's milk; it was the language in which he thought and spoke. And what is *his* explanation of the verse?† "Come," saith he in one of his homilies, "since you draw near with so much pleasure and delight to hear the Word of God, let us search into the Scriptures that have been openly read to us, and let us derive profit from thence. For since (according to that weighty exhortation (παραινεσιν) of Christ, who says—"Search the Scriptures") there is a great treasure laid up in the Scriptures, and hidden deeply in them, therefore there is need of search, in order that, learning the meaning which is concealed in them, we may thence derive much profit to ourselves." Again, in a commentary on St. John's gospel, written by the same eminent Father,‡ we find the following explanation of our text:—"Why did Christ say *Search* the Scriptures, and not simply, *Read* the Scriptures? Because the things written concerning himself in the Scriptures needed much anxious thought and attention. Therefore He *orders* (κελευει) that men should carefully dig through (διασκαπτειν) into them, in order that they may be able to find the truths which are deeply hidden in them.

Our readers can now judge for themselves whether the Douay note on this verse, "It is *not* a command for all to read the Scriptures," has been *faithfully* extracted from the holy Fathers, according to the command of Pope Pius VI. In a future number we hope to continue our extracts from the Fathers, and also to bring forward some remarkable statements, made from time to time on this subject, by the Roman Catholic Bishops of Ireland. Meanwhile, we commend to the careful consideration of all Catholic laymen the important advice given in the extract last quoted, to "dig deeply" into the Word of God.

LETTER OF POPE PIUS THE SIXTH, TO THE MOST REVEREND ANTHONY MARTINI, ARCHBISHOP OF FLORENCE, ON HIS TRANSLATION OF THE HOLY BIBLE INTO ITALIAN, SHOWING THE BENEFIT THE FAITHFUL MAY REAP FROM THEIR HAVING THE HOLY SCRIPTURES IN THE VULGAR TONGUE.*

POPE PIUS THE SIXTH.

BELOVED SON—Health and Apostolical Benediction! At a time that a vast number of bad books, which grossly attack the Catholic religion, are circulated even among the unlearned, to the great destruction of souls, you judge exceedingly well, that the faithful should be excited to the reading of the Holy Scriptures, for these are the most abundant sources, *which ought to be left open to every one*, to draw from them purity of morals and of doctrine, to eradicate the errors which are so widely disseminated in those corrupt times. This, you have seasonably effected, as you declare, by publishing the Sacred Writings, in the language of your country, suitable to every one's capacity; especially when you show, and set forth, that you have added explanatory notes, which, being extracted from the Holy Fathers, preclude every possible danger of abuse. Thus, you have not swerved, either from the laws of the Congregation of the Index, or from the Constitution published on this subject, by Benedict the Fourteenth, that Immortal Pope, our predecessor in the Pontificate, and formerly, when we held a place near his person, our excellent master in ecclesiastical learning—circumstances which we mention as honourable to us.

We, therefore, applaud your eminent learning, joined with your extraordinary piety, and we return you our due acknowledgments for the books, which you have transmitted to us, and which, when convenient, we will read over. In the meantime, as a token of our Pontificial benevolence, receive the Apostolical Benediction, which to you, beloved son, we very affectionately impart.

Given at Rome, on the Calends of April, 1778, the fourth year of our Pontificate.

PHILIP BUONAMICI, Latin Sec.

To our beloved son, Anthony Martini, at Turin.

WE sincerely rejoice to see Roman Catholic magistrates coming forward to uphold the right of the people to read the word of God; and that some Roman Catholic bishops, at least, are disposed in *practice* to encourage what they have on so many occasions professed to approve in theory. We trust there is now to be an end of anathematizing Bible readers, and that the Roman Catholic bishops, as friends of sound religious education, will form themselves into a society for the more extensive circulation of the Holy Scriptures. If they be sincere friends of reading the Bible (which certainly a considerable number of the inferior priests are not), let them come forward and circulate the Scriptures in a *cheap* form, accessible to all. These remarks have been occasioned by reading the following paragraph, which we have much pleasure in reprinting from the *Clare Journal*:—

"BALLYVAUGHAN UNION.—At a late meeting of this board, Pierce Creagh, Esq., in bringing forward a motion for the amendment of the poor-law, took occasion to say:—As I see a gentleman of the press present, I would now call upon the gentry not only of this county, but of every county in Ireland, and warn them that their country's cause must be fought on the hustings at the next election (hear). It is only by adopting a course of self-exertion and self-reliance that Ireland will ever be righted, or have justice done her. There has been, for years past, too much apathy. We yielded to what I might call a reign of terror—at all events a reign of agitation. But the people find that they have not got better, but worse and worse under this false system. They find that their rights have been bartered away by adventurers, and that they got wrong advice (hear). Why is it that the people of Ulster, with an inferior climate, with worse and poorer land, have been, even during the past years of famine, comparatively independent and prosperous, while the people of this and neighbouring province are steeped in ignorance, and suffer under privations and poverty? It is because that in Ulster the principle of self-reliance has been engrafted into the minds of the people. I find in Ulster even a Roman Catholic bishop (Dr. Denvir, we believe), aiding and printing and circulating the Scriptures among the people (hear). I find

---

* First Report of the Commissioners of Irish Education Inquiry, Appendix, p 510.
† Patr. Apos Cotel. i., p. 177.
‡ Vol. ii., p. 240, Par. 1733.
§ In Cap. i, Gen. Hom. vi., Tom. iv., p. 58, Par. 1837.
‖ Tom. v., App. col. 219. Paris, 1691.
¶ Com. in Epist. ad. Col., cap. iii., vol. v., p. 1074. Par. 1706.

* St. John, Chap. v., verse 39.
† Vide Op. Tom. 4, p. 527. Paris, 1838.
‡ Op. Tom. viii., p 279. Paris, 1836.

* A translation from the Latin original.

that he, a Roman Catholic, like myself, believing that the truths of the Catholic religion can be proved from the Scriptures.

"Mr. John Macnamara—Order, order.

"Mr. Creagh—I am not out of order. I say that so far from danger arising from the general perusal of that book, I would place it in the hands of every man woman, and child in Ireland. And my allusion to that is not at all irrelevant; because it is from that book the people of Ulster have learned the great principle and law of Providence that 'man must earn his bread by the sweat of his brow.' I say it is this knowledge that has spread both self-reliance and individual exertion among the people of Ulster, and has led them to pursue habits of industry. Is it not the reverse with the people of this part of the country? Here the people depend not on their own exertions, but on the exertions of others. They rely on dragging from the farmer and landowner all their substance, to be scattered in the shape of indoor and out-door relief among them. But their instructors have not inculcated principles of self-reliance among them; nor have they taken care to instruct them in the words of the apostle—that 'if any man does not work, neither should he eat.' They have not explained to them that the reception of outdoor relief by parties able to earn their bread is equal to robbery, which the law of the land would punish by transportation. But on this important point I do not intend to detain this meeting further, and shall defer to another opportunity speaking more at large on the subject.

"Mr. John Macnamara said—I fully agree in the greater part of the statements made by Mr. Creagh; but I dissent from that part of it where he alludes to only one Roman Catholic bishop distributing the Bible. I am now rather advanced in life, and have long had acquaintance with the Catholic clergy, and I can say they are the most active and best friends of education. I know, also, that they never prevented their flocks from reading the Bible. I know that, and I assert it without fear of contradiction (ironical cries of 'hear, hear,' from Mr. Creagh). My friend, Mr. Creagh, need not to travel to the north for a bishop. We have them in the south and west, not at all inferior to the northern clergy; and Mr. Creagh is entirely mistaken in supposing that the Catholic clergy are not the friends of education and of reading the Bible ('hear, hear,' from Mr. Creagh)."

As another step in the right direction, we rejoice to hear that three dozen of Testaments have recently been ordered for the Roman Catholic children in the Cavan Union Poorhouse, on the application of the Roman Catholic chaplain, in consequence, we believe, of the Right Rev. Dr. Browne, Roman Catholic Bishop of Kilmore, having recently visited the school, and suggested the need of the supply. This is, we understand, the second time that Testaments have been supplied to these schools at the suggestion of Dr. Browne. We only hope that the reverend chaplain will carry out the object of his respected bishop, by vigilantly enforcing their use in the schools.

NEWSPAPER READERS.

The Americans are really a very droll people. The following sketch is original in style, and, considering its source, strictly true in substance. How endless is the variety of newspaper readers, and how hard it is to satisfy their wants.

Mr. A. believes he shall discontinue his paper, because it contains no political news; while

B. is decidedly of opinion that the same paper dabbles too freely in the political movements of the day.

C. don't take it, because it is all on one side; and

D., whose opinion it generally expresses, does not like it, because it is not severe enough upon the opposition.

E. thinks it does not pay due attention to fashionable literature.

F. cannot bear the flimsy notions of idle writers.

G. will not suffer a paper to lie upon his table which ventures to express an opinion against slavery.

H. never patronizes one that lacks moral courage to expose the evils of the day.

I. declares he does not want a paper filled with the hodge-podge doings and undoings of the legislature

J. considers that paper the best which gives the greatest quantity of such proceedings.

K. patronizes the papers for the light and lively reading which they contain.

L. wonders that the press does not publish Dewey's sermons, and such other solid matter.

M. will not even read a paper that will not expose the evils of sectarianism.

N. is decidedly of opinion that the pulpit, and not the press, should meddle with religious dogmas.

O. likes to read police reports.

P., whose appetite is less morbid, would not have a paper in which these silly reports are printed in his house.

Q. likes anecdotes.

R. won't take a paper that publishes them, and says, that murders and dreadful accidents ought not to be put into papers.

S. complains that his miserable paper gave no account of that highway robbery last week.

T. says the type is too small.

U. thinks it too large.

V. stops his paper, because it contains nothing but advertisements.

W. wants it to see what is for sale.

X. will not take the paper unless it is left at his door before sunrise; while

Y. declares he will not pay for it, if left so early; that it is stolen from his house before he is up.

And, last of all, come the complaints of some of the ladies—who declare the paper very uninteresting, because it does not, every day, contain a list of marriages; just as if it were possible for the poor printer to marry people without a licence, and whether the parties will or no. But the variety of newspaper readers is too great for the present review; and "we give them up," with a determination to pursue the "even tenor of our way," in offering to the public such reading as, in our humble opinion, will prove most useful to them and interesting as possible.—*American Paper.*

THE TALK OF THE ROAD.

ONE Sunday, after chapel, Pat Dolan and Jemmy Brannan were going home from Mass; and as Pat, who was before, stopped to speak to a neighbour, Jem overtook him, and they walked on together.

"Good morrow, Jem," says Pat.

"Good morrow kindly, Pat."

And so they fell to talking of the sermon, for Father John had preached that day.

"Didn't Father John give it to the Bible readers, like himself, to day?" said Pat.

"Deed and he did, and it's he that can," said Jem.

"I wonder how Tim Finnegan and Peter Daly, that I know is reading the Bible, liked to hear him; maybe that will stop them, or maybe they will go on till Father John puts up their names before the people," said Pat.

"I don't know," says Jem, "but I see that them that takes to reading is not easily put from it. But Father John said one thing to-day that bothers me entirely; I can't see the reason of it at all."

"Now, what was that?" says Pat.

"Why, he told us," says Jem, "that any man that takes to reading the Bible will be sure to turn Protestant; and I can't come up to the raison of that at all."

"Why, man alive," says Pat, "don't you see it yourself? Isn't there Tim Daly and Mat Fogarty, and plenty more, and Johnny Connor himself, that was sexton of the chapel, that Father John trusted more than any man in the parish; and didn't they all turn Protestants when they took to reading the Bible; and what for should you be saying, that you can't understand Father John saying that, when you see it yourself as plain as the blessed sun in the sky this moment?"

"True for you, Pat," says Jemmy; "I see all that as plain as you do, and maybe a little more; for I see foreby, that it is mostly the best Catholic, and the most devotest man, and the man that minds his duty best, and the greatest arguer against the Protestants, that evermore turns Protestant, all out and out—the surest of all, once he takes to reading the Bible in earnest; none of your keeping it quiet in the bottom of the chest with the likes of them; but they'll turn readers too, and go through fire and water to get others to read, and turn Protestant, like themselves. I see that; and I don't wonder that Father John *says it;* for sure he would be blind all out not to see what every man in the parish sees. So it isn't Father John *saying it* that bothers me; but what I can't make out at all is, *why* the Bible should put every one astray, and make every one that reads it turn Protestant."

"Man alive," says Pat, "sure isn't that as plain as your hand. Why, wasn't Luther the first Protestant that ever lived, and didn't he write all the Bible himself, and why wouldn't it turn every one Protestant that reads it?"

"Sure enough, Pat," says Jem, "if that was true it would make all plain; but there isn't a word of truth in it, that's all. Sure doesn't Father John tell us that the Catholic religion is 1850 years old, and doesn't he tell us that Luther lived only 300 years ago (and I believe that's all true); and will any man in his senses tell me that the Catholic Church had never a Bible for 1550 years? Sure that doesn't stand to reason. And isn't there the Douay Bible, that the priest allows is the true one? And where did that come from? Sure Luther didn't write that too. And so, if Father John was to tell us that Luther wrote all the Bible out of his own head (and sure enough, I heard Father John once say very near that same), I wouldn't believe him; for how could Luther put it on the priests, too?"

"Don't you see, Jem," says Pat, "that you have it now? 'Twas the Protestant Bible, of course, that Luther wrote; and it's as different from the Catholic Bible as turnips is from the good old Cups (my blessing be with them and the ould times), and sure that's the reason that reading the Protestant Bible turns every one into a Protestant."

"Well, Pat," says Jem, "if that was it, I'd be quite happy and settled in my mind at once; but I doubt it isn't it, after all. Didn't I hear old John Dowd, the schoolmaster that lives over at Kilmore, the cutest and learnedst man that ever was in this country, say that he got a Protestant Bible and a Catholic Bible, and that he read them both together (and he was the boy that was fit to read two books at worst), and didn't I hear him lay it down that there wasn't a word of differ between them that signified one haporth? And that's what makes me ever more uneasy in my mind, till I get the reason why reading the Bible should make people turn Protestant. Sure now it's not easy to believe that the Word of God would put every one astray entirely. And by the same token, you told me yourself that Luther was the first Protestant that ever lived, only 300 years ago, and that there never was a Protestant for 1500 years before that. Now, if they had the Bible all those 1500 years, isn't it mighty odd if no one ever looked into it? and if they did, why did it never turn them Protestants before as well as after?"

"Maybe it was all in Latin, Jem," says Pat, "and that nobody at all could read it."

"Well," says Jem, "the schoolmaster said that wasn't it, though I don't remember how he made it out. But I'll tell you what it is, Pat, my mind's all astray about thinking why the Bible should make every one a Protestant, and set every one astray that reads it. Sure that isn't like the Word of God at all; and I can't attend to my duties the way I used to do, nor keep myself from thinking, and I be to look for something to quiet me. and it's to Father John I'll go, and ask him the reason why reading the Word of God is setting all the people astray."

"And isn't it yourself that 'ill have to flatter him neatly, and get him in the best of good humour when you go to poke him with questions like that, Jem?" says Pat. "And isn't it his reverence that'll handle you, and maybe put up your name before the people?"

"Well, Pat, I want to be satisfied in my mind, and sure I'm willing to be satisfied; and who would I go to to settle me, if I wouldn't go to my clergy? Sure, if all the boys that go astray from reading would only go to their clergy to satisfy them, and set them right, maybe it wouldn't be so bad. Any way I'm resolved to try; and maybe I'll have the telling you what he says.

And by that time Jem was got to his own door; so he says, "Good evening, Pat." "Good evening, neighbour," says Pat, "and I wish you safe from Father John."

Well, it so happened, about three weeks after, that Pat and Jemmy fell in together again, coming home from chapel, and of course they began to talk.

"And did you ever speak to Father John?" says Pat.

"Indeed I did," says Jem; "last Thursday was a fortnight he overtook me on the road, him riding and I walking; so I took off my hat to his reverence, and as he spoke to me pretty civil, I made bold to talk to him then; and says I, 'Your reverence, I hope since you came to this parish you never found me anything but a boy that always attended to his duties and was respectful to his clergy.' 'True for you,' says he, 'that's what you are.' 'Well, then,' says Jem, 'I want a bit of advice, and maybe a little instruction from your reverence; for who would I go to for it, only to my own clergy?' 'Quite right,' says he, 'if everybody did that,' says he, 'the way they used to do, the people wouldn't be going astray.' 'Well, then, your reverence,' says I, 'I'm uneasy in my mind about one thing that's disturbing me; and I'm sure your reverence would settle it in one word, and may be you'll have the kindness to do so.' 'What is it?' says he, quite pleasant-like. 'I wanted to know, your reverence,' says I, 'what is the reason that the Word of God should set everybody astray that reads it?' With that he turned round upon me as sudden as a clap of thunder, and says he, 'It's reading the Bible you are, and going to turn Protestant on me.' 'No, please your reverence,' says I, 'it's nothing of the kind.' 'You're a liar,' says he, 'and it's reading the Bible you are.' 'No, please your reverence,' says I, 'I never had a Bible in my hand in all my life, and I never heard one word read out of it good or bad (and with that he began to look more easy in his mind and more agreeable-like), 'barring,' says I, 'the bits of scraps that your reverence reads in the chapel sometimes; and sure,' says I, looking up at him out of the corner of my eye, 'that wasn't too much, any way.' 'And what more do you want?' says he. 'Only just to know,' says I, 'why it is that the reading of God's Word puts every one astray that reads it.' 'And what's that to you,' says he, 'if you don't read it?' 'Only this, your reverence,' says I, 'that I see everybody that's reading the Bible going astray and turning Protestant.' 'Sure enough,' says he. 'And it seems so unnatural-like,' says I, 'that God's own Word should set the people astray, and ruin them entirely, that I can't get my mind off thinking of it, and I can't attend to my duties for thinking, and sure if your reverence could settle my mind for me in one word, wouldn't it be the good thing for me?' 'To be sure,' says he, 'and isn't that what I am going to do in a moment?' and with that I pulls off my hat, and says he, 'Isn't it the Protestant Bible they're reading,' says he; 'that's all full of lies from beginning to end? and isn't that the reason they're going astray and turning heretics, and doesn't it stand to reason?' says he, 'Oh, then, your reverence,' says I, 'it's all because they're reading a false Bible that they are going astray

and turning heretics.' 'To be sure it is,' says he; 'what else?' 'And if the Catholic Bible wouldn't set them astray,' says I, 'I'm all right in my mind, and satisfied entirely now and evermore.' 'To be sure it wouldn't,' says he, 'when it's the right one.' 'Well, your reverence,' says I, 'just one word more; when so many of the people is turning, and,' says I, 'there's Johnny Connor, and Tim Daly, and there's ——.' 'Don't talk to me about them,' says he, 'I don't want to hear of the likes of them.' 'Well, it isn't about them, your reverence,' says I, 'but about the rest of the boys that isn't gone yet; if it's a bad Bible that's leading them astray, wouldn't it be the good thing just to give them the right one, and let them see the differ?' 'What's that to you?' says he, 'just mind your own duties, and hold your tongue.' 'But your reverence,' says I, 'it's fretting me to see the boys going, and it's unsettling my mind; and if it's the lying Protestant book that's doing it all, sure there would be nothing like the right Bible.' 'Mind your own duty,' says he, quite sudden, 'and don't be teaching your clergy; it's always the way,' says he, 'the minute you think of the Bible, you begin to teach your clergy.' 'Sure,' says I, 'it's not for the likes of me to teach anybody, let alone my clergy; but sure,' says I, 'I only want my clergy to teach me one thing.' 'What is it?' says he. 'Only this,' says I, 'is the Protestant Bible like the Catholic Bible, at all?' 'Not a bit of it,' says he, 'how could heresy be like the Catholic faith?' says he. 'Well, your reverence,' says I, 'there's many of the boys as uneasy as myself, when they see how things is going on, and the people turning Protestant; and if your reverence would only show us the two books, and let us see the difference, we would see then the reason of it all.' 'Is that what you are after?' says he, 'I'll put you from the likes of that,' says he; 'see how it will be with you,' says he, 'if I call your name from the altar!' 'And is that all the satisfaction your reverence will give me?' says I. 'Mind your duties,' says he, 'or I'll have satisfaction of you,' says he; and with that he rode off, looking as mad as you please."

"Deed and," said Pat, "if his reverence would only give us a little more satisfaction it might keep some of the boys from turning, for sure he ought to be able. But sure I told you how it would be; and what will you do now, Jem?"

"Why, I can't rest in my mind, Pat, now more nor ever, till I find out why it is that reading God's Word should put every one astray, for it seems more unnatural-like than ever; and by this blessed light, since Father John won't give me any satisfaction about it, I'll try if I can't get some time of speaking to the Rev. Mr. Owens, the parson, and I'll ask him if he can tell me any satisfaction about it. Sure I know he will speak civil to me any how; and if he can't give me satisfaction, I'll not mind anything else he says, and there's no harm done."

And so they parted for that day; and if we hear anything more of what happened, we will tell it truly.

THE STATE OF DEPARTED SOULS.

It is a solemn and deeply-interesting inquiry, to any one who has ever lost a friend, whether it is in the power of the survivor to benefit the soul that is gone, or contribute to its happiness or spiritual rest. In every age, those who have believed in the immortality of the soul have speculated on the state of those who are departed and are no more seen; and before the coming of our Lord, the greatest philosophers of antiquity had exhausted speculation upon it.

Eusebius states that "Plato (who died 350 years before Christ) divided mankind into three states:—Some who, having purified themselves by philosophy, and excelled in holiness of life, enjoy an eternal felicity in the islands of the blest, without any labour or trouble, which it is possible neither for words to express nor thought to conceive. Others, who have lived exceedingly wicked, and, therefore, seemed incapable of cure, he supposed were, at their deaths, thrown headlong into hell, there to be tormented for ever. Besides these, he imagined there were a middle sort, who though they had sinned, yet had repented of it, and, therefore, seemed to be in a curable condition; and these, he thought, went down, for some time, to hell too, to be purged and absolved by grievous torments, but that after that they should be delivered from it, and attain to honours, according to the dignity of their benefactors."

It would appear, also, from various passages in the ancient poets—for instance, Homer and Virgil—that the popular belief then was, that souls, in this intermediate state, might receive help from the prayers and sacrificings of the living; but whether the philosophers entertained a similar belief appears not to be equally clear, nor is it, perhaps, worth while to consider. We, who have the light of Christian revelation to guide us, must base our religious belief on something more substantial and satisfactory than the dreams of poetical imagination, or the philosophical speculations of Plato or Socrates. And the solemn inquiry still remains, what does the Christian revelation make known to the faithful on his momentous question? That there is a *heaven* for the holy, and a *hell* for the reprobate, is so plainly made known in the Holy Scriptures, that a child cannot doubt or mistake it. Whether there is a third place or state of being, where the sins committed here can be expurgated, either by personal suffering or the exertions of surviving friends, is the only matter capable of dispute among professing Christians, and has been for centuries, and still is, a leading point of difference between the Churches of Rome and England. We would approach this matter with the most anxious solicitude and reverence, as well as tender and sincere regard for the feelings and opinions of others on this momentous subject. Alas! who is there who does not feel conscious of failure of duty towards some one departed friend, at least, to whose happiness he would most gladly sacrifice anything which he was assured would contribute to it in the unseen world? and who can wonder that the popular belief in the efficacy of masses for the dead has been, and still is, the source of such abundant pecuniary profit to those privileged to dispose of them? The only wonder appears to us to be, that thousands of holy men, who have been ready to devote their lives to the welfare of their fellow-creatures, should not have *voluntarily* and *without pecuniary payment* consecrated their lives to the holy purpose of relieving or shortening the torments of the faithful in the intermediate state of temporary punishment, the horrors of which, as described by theologians, cannot be thought of for a moment without *shuddering*. Who can think of purgatory—its flames, its torments, its wailing spirits, and tormenting fiends—and believe that when the spirit leaves the body it will plunge into something worse than cauldrons of boiling oil and molten lead, there to burn for months, and years, and centuries, till all its sin is purged away either by suffering or the suffrages of surviving friends, and not be ready to make any sacrifice to alleviate and abridge the period of such torment? And who can believe that any pious priest could hesitate to perform as many masses as were needful for the souls of those who during life were under his guidance, merely because they were poor, or because *money* was not paid them for so doing? Much more wonderful (it seems to us) is it that the Pope, if he really has the power of freeing souls from such a place of torment, should not at once do so, after the example of him whose benefits were prophetically described as granted *freely*, WITHOUT MONEY and WITHOUT PRICE!

Surely no good man would hesitate to rescue a fellow-creature in this world from the fire in a burning house, merely because he was too poor to pay him for it, or could, without incurring the execration of all good men, pause to bargain for the price of his assistance, before he would do anything in his power to save the victim. And is it credible that they who profess to be *able*, should be really *unwilling* to terminate, or even alleviate, the sufferings of those who are gone before? Alas! however, for poor human nature (or we should, perhaps, rather say *inhuman*), the truth is not only so, but far worse. Those who have been *actually paid* for saying masses for departed souls have not always been honest enough to perform their part of the bargain. If Italian monasteries have not been grievously belied, they have not unfrequently purchased at Rome absolution for their neglect to say masses for which they had received large sums of money, on the express condition that they should celebrate them for the souls of their founders or benefactors. The first indulgence so granted in the Venetian States was to the *Servites de Madorno*, in 1645; and it is well known, that in 1723, Pope Innocent XIII., by a single rescript, freed all the Augustine monks, the Dominican friars, the Carmelites, and several other bodies from the obligation of celebrating perpetual or daily masses for certain souls in purgatory, which they had *omitted*, till the arrears became enormous, on the terms of their saying instead *one* grand annual funebral mass, during the "Octave of the Dead," in *one* of their convents in each province, each monastery retaining, nevertheless, all the money which had been paid them for perpetual masses; he thereby also permitted them, by a commission composed of the monks themselves, to compound their liabilities as to other masses, by taking the present market price of masses as the measure of their obligations. So that the poor souls who had made a good bargain and bought, perhaps, one hundred perpetual masses when they were cheap, thinking the contract was always to stand good, thus received only fifty when the market price was doubled.*

Is it possible to believe that such unholy and inhuman frauds could ever have been practised on the dead? and can it be possible that Pope Innocent XIII. can have believed that his *indulgence* to the living *really* injured the dead? If it did not injure them, it must follow, necessarily, that the masses, if said, would not have served them, either by alleviating or shortening their sufferings; and if that be so, whether purgatory be a truth or a dream, we think the traffic in masses for the dead will soon be a less profitable one, even in impoverished Ireland. We shall resume this sad and serious subject in our next, and shall enter upon its consideration by the inquiry, what were the opinions of *St. Patrick* upon this deeply important question.

* De Potter, Histoire de Christianisme, vol. v., page 297. Paris edition, 1836.

HYMN OF ST. PATRICK.

We now redeem the pledge which we gave in our first number, and present our readers with this Irish Hymn, the oldest undoubted monument of the Irish language extant, and which has never, we believe, before been printed, except in Mr. Petrie's valuable and elaborate essay on the History and Antiquities of Tara Hill, in the 18th volume of the Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy, a work of a very costly description, and inaccessible to the majority of our fellow-countrymen. It is taken from the celebrated MS. *Liber Hymnorum*, preserved in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, and also in the British Museum, London—a manuscript which, in the opinion of Archbishop Ussher, who died in 1656, was in his time a thousand years old. It is written in that ancient dialect of the Irish, called *Bearla Feine*, in which the Brehon laws, and the oldest tracts in the language, are written, and the orthography of the words varies so considerably from more modern productions, and so many of the words themselves have long become obsolete, that we have thought it may be acceptable to our readers to present them with a translation in modern Irish, carefully made by an eminent Irish scholar, for ourselves, as well as an accurate English translation, and the Latin one given by Mr. Petrie, for the satisfaction of the learned. As a record, illustrative of the religious doctrines of St. Patrick, the Patron Saint of Ireland, we think it can hardly fail of being acceptable to all, whether they believe him to have preached Christianity in Ireland by a commission from Rome or not.

To enable our readers fully to appreciate the occasion on which this ancient document was composed, we must premise, that in the year 433 St. Patrick preached at Tara before Leogaire (or Laoghaire), then the supreme monarch of Ireland, on the celebrated hill of Tara, in the county of Meath, the chief residence of the Irish kings from the first establishment of a monarchical government in this country. The national convention or parliament was then assembled in that place, for the celebration of the great national festival of Tara, called "Baal's fire." The force with which St. Patrick urged upon them the truths of the Gospel was such that, according to some accounts, the king himself became a convert to Christianity, and great multitudes of his subjects, including Dubtach, the arch-poet of the kingdom, and Conall, the king's brother, soon followed his example. Whatever may have been the immediate effect, the preaching of St. Patrick before King Leogaire, at Tara, is one of those facts on which all authorities concur, and, for the sake of brevity, we give the condensed abstract of the matter, furnished by Dr. Lanigan.

After narrating the progress of St. Patrick during the years 432 and 433, until the approach of Easter, when he determined on celebrating that festival near Tara, Dr. Lanigan proceeds thus:—"On the following day, which was Easter Eve, St. Patrick continued his journey, and arrived in the evening at a place called *Ferta-fer-feic*, now Slane. Having got a tent pitched there, he made preparations for celebrating the festival of Easter, and, accordingly, lighted the paschal fire about night fall. It happened that at this very time the King Leogaire and the assembled princes were celebrating a religious festival, of which fire-worship formed a part. There was a standing law that at the time of this festival, no fire should be kindled for a considerable distance all round, until after a great fire should be lighted in the royal palace of Temoria, on Tara. St. Patrick's paschal fire was, however, lighted before that of the palace, and being seen from the heights of Tara, excited great astonishment. On the king's inquiring what could be the cause of it, and who could have thus dared to infringe the law, the Magi told him that it was necessary to have that fire extinguished immediately, whereas, if allowed to remain, it would get the better of their fires, and bring about the downfall of his kingdom. Leogaire, enraged and troubled on getting this information, set out for Slane, with a considerable number of followers, and one or two of the principal Magi, for the purpose of exterminating those violaters of the law. It was immediately before, and in anticipation of the imminent peril in which he was placed, when approaching the stronghold of his Pagan enemies, that this remarkable hymn was composed by St. Patrick, and is said to have been sung by him and his followers as a defence against the plots that beset his path. It is familiarly known by the name of "St. Patrick's Armour" (*Lorica Patricii*), and is obviously a prayer for protection from the incantations of Druidical opponents, who were determined on his destruction, and contains many internal evidences of its having been composed at a period when Pagan notions of the power of the elements had not given way before the light of Christianity.

It is remarkable that the *Luireach Phadruig* is still remembered popularly in many parts of Ireland, and a portion of it is, to this day, repeated by the people, usually at bedtime, with the same superstitious confidence in its protecting power as, according to St. Evin, was placed in it previously to his time, in the sixth century.

The preface, which is ancient, but obviously more recent than the hymn itself, is as follows:—

Hymn of St. Patrick.

Patraicc do rono inn immun ro. In aimsir Loegaire meic Neil no rigned. Fat a denma h. dia diden co na manchaib ar nâmdib in bair ro batar in etarnid ar na cleircheib. Ocus is luirech lurro imro fri himdegail cuirp ocus anma ar demnaib ocus duthib ocus dualchib. Cech duine nos geba cech dia co n-innichem, leis i n-dia ni chairirrec demna fri a gnuis. Bid dicin do ar cech neim ocus forbas. Bid comla do fri dianbas. Bid lurech dia anmain ias n-a étrechi. Patraicc ro chan ro in tan do rata na hetarnaidi ar a chinn o Loegaire, na digred do filad chreidme co Temraig; conid annsin at chessa briathrach na n-etarnaide comtis aigo alta, ocus iarsoo ina n-diad .i. benen. Ocus fech fiada a hainm.

A Tomsuig indiu siurt tren togairm Trinoit.

Cretim Threodataid foirin oendatad in dul emaindail.

A Tomsuig indiu siurt gene Crist co n-a bathius, siurt crochta co n-a adnocul, siurt n-ereirge co frecrabail, siurt tomud do brethemnar bratha.

A Tomsuig indiu siurt grad hirurhin in urlataid aingel, hi frecrirn ereirge ar cenn fochraice. In ernaigthib huarail athraich i tairchetlaib fatha. hi friaceptaib arrtail, in hireraib fuirmedach, in endga noem ingen, hi ngnimaib fer firean.

A Tomsuig indiu siurt nime, foilsi grene, etrochta frechtai, ane thened, dene lochet, luathe gaethe, fudomna mara, tairirem talmain, cobraidecht ailech.

A Tomsuig indiu siurt de dom luamarachi, cumachta De dom chumgabail, ciall De domm imthus, forc De dom feimcire, cluar De dom eitéchi, briathar De dom eflabrai, lam de domm imdegail, intech De dom femthechtar, reiath De dom ditin, rochraite De domm anucul, ar intledaib demna, ar arlaigthib dualchet, ar irnechtaib aicnid, ar cech nduine mdur thrartar dam i cein ocus in ocus i n-uathed ocus hi rochaide.

Tocuirius etrim thra na huile nert ro fri cech nert n-amnar n-etrocar frirti dom chuss ocus domm anmain, fri tinchetla fairfache, fri dubreétu gentliuchta, fri fairrechtu heretecda, fri himcellaét n-idlachta, fri brichta ban ocus gobann ocus driuad, fri cech firr a ra chuiliu anman duini.

Crist domm indegail indiu ar neim, ar lorcud, ar badud, ar guin, conomchair ilar rocraice.

Crist lim, Crist rium, Crist im degaid, Crist inium, Crist irium, Crist uarum, Crist derrum, Crist tuathum, Crist illiur, Crist iriur, Crist i nerur.

Crist i éridiu cech duine imm imrorda, Crist i n-gin cech oen rodom labratharr, Crist in cech rurc nom dercaedar, Crist in cech cluair rodam chloathar.

A Tomsuig indiu siurt tren togairm Trinoit. Cretim Threodataid foirin oendatad in dulemain dail.

Domini ert salus, Domini ert salus, Chriri ert salus, salus tua, Domine, sit semper nobiscum.

PREFACE.

"Patrick composed this hymn. In the time of Leogaire, the son of Nial, it was composed. The cause of its composition was, to protect himself with his monks against the enemies unto death who were in ambush against the clergy. And this is a religious armour to protect the body and souls against demons, and men, and vices. Every person who sings it every day, with all his attention on God, shall not have demons appearing to his face. It will be a protection to him against every poison and envy. It will be a safeguard to him against sudden death. It will be an armour to his soul after his death. Patrick sang this at the time that the snares were set for him by Leogaire, that he might not come to propagate the faith to Temar; so that it appeared to those lying in ambush that they were wild deer, and a fawn after them, that is Benen. And *Fethfiadha* is its name."

Do suasar aniu neart tréan! guide na trinoite, creideam tri fessan acar admáil aondachta an éruitéóra ionmaine.

Do suasar aniu, neart beartha Chriri acar a baitte; neart a chroéda acar a adnaicte; neart a eireirge acar a dula ar neam; neart a tiactana do breitheamnar laé an brátha.

Do suasar aniu neárt, i n-grád Iruhin, i n-úmalóid aingel [i b'fhriotála na n-archaingel]* a raoilleactain éireirge rá óenar luaigeacta, a n-urnaigthe uasal aithrech, a trairingireact fáide, a feanmónta na n-appol, a n-dúthracht fuirmedach, a n-glaine ban, a n-gníomhaib fear firén.

Do suasar aniu neart nime, foillre gréine, gile sneachta,† aoibneas teneo, déine lasrach, luaithe gaoithe, doimne mara, fearmaigeact talman, daingne carrach.

Do suasar aniu, neart dé dom trirúrugad, cumact dé dom chongbáil, ciall dé dom threórugad, rúin dé dom fairne, cluas dé dom éirteact, briathar de dom theagarg, lámh dé dom éoraim, sligi dé rómam, sciath dé dom díden, cáirdeas dé dom anacal; ar innleadaib deamain, ar arlaéaib dubailce, ar formadaib aigneas, ar gach duine smaoineas ar mo leagad, a g-céin is a n-gar uaim, do beagán nó do mórán.

Do cuireas, trá, na huile neartara eidir mé acar gach neart naimdeamail, eutrócaireach do theagmódad dom éorr nó dom anam; a gcoinne tairingireetaib fáide raoda, a gcoinne duibreacta ragánach, a gcoinne raobreéta eircidech, a gcoinne timéeallaét iodolaét; a gcoinne pireóga ban, acar gobann, acar druad; a gcoinne gach fir do thuaillreab anam duine.

Crist dom anacal aniu, ar neim, ar lorcad, ar badad, ar guin; nó go brágaim iomad luaideacta.

Crist liom, Crist rómam, Crist am diaid, Crist ionnam, Crist rúm, Crist or mo éionn, Crist dom éir, Crist dom éli.

Crist i liur, Crist i riur, Crist i n-erur, Crist i croíde each duine do rmaoineas oram; Crist i mbéal gach duine labarras oram, Crist in gach ruil dá bréacraid oram, Crist in each cluair da gcluinrid me.

Do suasar aniu neart tréan, guide na trinóite, creideam tri seasran acar admáil aondachta an éruitéóra ionmaine.

Domini ert salus, Domini ert salus, Chriri ert salus, salus tua, Domine, sit semper nobiscum.

---

* Attendance of the Archangels.—*London copy.*

† Cnoéc orca, brightness or whiteness of the Moon.—*London copy.*

LATIN TRANSLATION.

Ad Temoriam hodie potentiam præpollentem invoco Trinitatis.

Credo in Trinitatem sub unitate numinis elementorum. Apud Temoriam hodie virtutem nativitatis Christi cum eâ ejus baptismi, virtutem crucifixionis cum eâ ejus sepulturæ, virtutem resurrectionis cum eâ ascensionis, virtutem adventus ad judicium æternum.

Apud Temoriam hodie virtutem amoris Seraphin in obsequio angelorum, in spe resurrectionis ad adipiscendum præmium. In orationibus nobilium patrum, in prædictionibus prophetarum, in prædicationibus apostolorum, in fide confessorum, in castitate sanctarum virginum, in actis virorum justorum.

Apud Temoriam hodie potentiam cœli, lucem solis, candorem nivis, vim ignis, rapiditatem fulguris, velocitatem venti, profunditatem maris, stabilitatem terræ, duritiam petrarum.

Ad Temoriam hodie potentia Dei me dirigat, potestas Dei me conservet, sapientia Dei me edoceat, oculus Dei mihi prævideat, auris Dei me exaudiat, verbum Dei me disertum faciat, manus Dei me protegat, via Dei mihi patefiat, scutum Dei me protegat, exercitus Dei me defendat, contra insidias dæmonum, contra illecebras vitiorum, contra inclinationes animi, contra omnem hominem qui meditetur injuriam mihi procul et prope cum paucis et cum multis.

Posui circa me sane omnes potentias has contra omnem potentiam hostilem sævam excogitatam meo corpori et meæ animæ, contra incantamenta pseudovatum contra nigras leges gentilitatis, contra pseudoleges hæreseos, contra dolum idololatriæ, contra incantamenta mulierum et fabrorum ferrariorum et druidum, contra omnem scientiam quæ occæcat animum hominis.

Christus me protegat hodie contra venenum, contra combustionem, contra demersionem, contra vulnera, donec meritus essem multum præmii. Christus [sit] mecom, Christus ante me, Christus me pone, Christus in me, Christus infra me, Christus supra me, Christus ad dextram meam, Christus ad lævam meam, Christus hinc, Christus illine, Christus a tergo.

Christus [sit] in corde omnis hominis quem alloquar, Christus in ore cujusvis qui me alloquatur, Christus in omni oculo qui me videat, Christus in omni aure quæ me audiat.

Ad Temoriam hodie potentiam præpollentum invoco Trinitatis. Credo in Trinitatem sub unitate numinis elementorum.

Domini est salus, Domini est salus, Christus est salus, salus tua, Domine, sit semper nobiscum.

ENGLISH TRANSLATION.

"At Tara (Temur), to-day, I invoke the mighty power of the Trinity. I believe in the Trinity under the unity of the God of the elements.

"At Tara, to-day, [I place] the virtue of the birth of Christ with his baptism, the virtue of his crucifixion with his burial, the virtue of his resurrection with his ascension, the virtue of the coming to the eternal judgment

"At Tara, to-day, [I place] the virtue of the love of Seraphim, [the virtue which exists] in the obedience of angels, in the hope of the resurrection to eternal reward, in the prayers of the noble fathers, in the predictions of the prophets, in the preaching of the apostles, in the faith of the confessors, in the purity of holy virgins, in the deeds of just men.

"At Tara, to-day, [I place] the strength of heaven, the light of the sun, the whiteness of snow, the force of fire, the rapidity of lightning, the swiftness of the wind, the depth of the sea, the stability of the earth, the hardness of rocks [between me and the force of Paganism and demons].

"At Tara, to-day, may the strength of God pilot me, may the power of God preserve me, may the wisdom of God instruct me, may the eye of God view me, may the ear of God hear me, may the word of God render me eloquent, may the hand of God protect me, may the way of God direct me, may the shield of God defend me, may the host of God guard me against the snares of demons, the temptations of vices, the inclinations of the mind, against every man who meditates evil to me, far or near, alone or in company. I place all these powers between me and every evil and unmerciful power directed against my soul and my body (as a protection), against the incantations of false prophets, against the black laws of Gentilism, against the false laws of heresy, against the treachery of idolatry, against the spells of women, smiths, Druids, against every knowledge which blinds the soul of man. May Christ to-day protect me against poison, against burning, against drowning, against wounding, until I deserve much reward.

"Christ (be) with me, Christ before me, Christ after me, Christ in me, Christ under me, Christ over me, Christ at my right, Christ at my left, Christ at this side, Christ at that side, Christ at my back. Christ (be) in the heart of each person whom I speak to, Christ in the mouth of each person who speaks to me, Christ in each eye which sees me, Christ in each ear which hears me.

"At Tara, to-day, I invoke the mighty power of the Trinity; I believe in the Trinity, under the unity of the God of the elements.

"Salvation is the Lord's! salvation is the Lord's! salvation is Christ's! May thy salvation, O Lord, be always with us."

THE HARP OF ERIN.

The harp that once thro' Tara's halls
The soul of music shed,
Now hangs as mute on Tara's walls
As if that soul were fled.
So sleeps the pride of former days,
When glory's thrill is o'er;
And hearts that once beat high for praise,
Now feel that pulse no more.

No more to chiefs and ladies bright
The harp of Tara swells;
The chord alone that breaks at night
Its tale of ruin tells.
Thus freedom now so seldom wakes:
The only throb she gives,
Is when some heart indignant breaks,
To show that still she lives.

MOORE.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st.

No anonymous letter can be attended to. Whatever is sent for insertion must be authenticated by the name and address of the writer, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee for his good faith.

As the expense of the publication is necessarily heavy, prompt Subscriptions are earnestly solicited, which our friends will observe are payable in advance. The amount may be forwarded either in postage stamps or a post-office order, payable to Mr. Wm. Curry, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

Contributors will be good enough not to consider that their communications have been disapproved of, or will not be ultimately inserted, because they do not appear immediately in our pages. The nature of our undertaking will afford an obvious explanation why delay may sometimes be unavoidable.

Press of matter in our present number reluctantly obliges us to postpone the insertion of several valuable communications, as also advertisements. The challenge in our first number has not yet been responded to.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, FEBRUARY, 1852.

We have already stated, in our first number, the manner in which we propose to deal with the important questions about which the Church of Rome and the Church of England and Ireland are divided. It is our earnest desire to lay aside all prejudices, and all party feeling, and apply ourselves to seek for truth, for ourselves and for others, and to embrace it on whichever side it may be found. We have promised, and it is our earnest desire, to do this in a spirit of candour, with our hearts prepared to embrace the truth; and in a spirit of love and charity to those who may be found to differ from us.

We have already had much reason to hope that our undertaking has been received in a corresponding spirit by men of various political and religious parties; and it is our greatest desire, in this number, at once to prepare the way for such a consideration of the subject, and to give good ground of confidence to men of all parties that we are anxious and able to consider such subjects in the spirit of impartiality, kindness, and charity, which we have proposed.

It has ever appeared to us, that one great cause of the evils which spring from religious controversy—one of the greatest reasons why it does not tend to bring men more to an agreement in the truth, is this: that, on both sides, men are too forward in charging their opponents with what they suppose them to hold, instead of taking due pains, and candidly inquiring from their opponents themselves, what they do really hold. While such a course is followed on both sides, or on either side, no real good can be expected from discussion. If I say to a man, you believe such and such follies or absurdities; and if he be conscious to himself that he does not believe those things, he thinks me either a slanderer or a fool; and he will not think himself called on to consider the arguments or reasons which I produce. And he is right; for each man knows what he himself believes in his own mind, better than any other man can know it; and no man can be called on to consider reasons for disbelieving what he himself already disbelieves.

We are persuaded that most men who are ranged on opposite sides in controversy, if they would each take pains to learn what the other really thinks, would find that they agreed with each other more than they supposed at first. And they would then be much more disposed to discuss fairly with each other, the things in which they really differed; because they could then avoid giving each other that needless and unjustifiable offence, which makes men unwilling to consider each other's arguments.

Our present object is to take out of our way such obstacles as these—to prepare for understanding each other; to lead to such a statement on both sides, as may give the greatest hope and the best opportunity of honestly considering each other's arguments about those things in which we really differ.

It is our conviction, that both parties have erred in attributing to opponents what they did not really hold; and that each party has thus been hardened against considering the reasoning of the other.

We give precedence here to Roman Catholics; we give a list of some of the things which they have been charged with holding. We ourselves give no opinion here, whether these things have been justly charged on them or not. We invite Roman Catholics to say that for themselves. We desire to know what they do really believe; and we desire that Protestants in general should understand it. We may hereafter treat in the same way some of the things which Roman Catholics charge members of the Church of England and Ireland with holding; but in this article we confine ourselves to charges made against Roman Catholics.

First. They are commonly charged with holding transubstantiation; and they who bring this charge generally undertake to say what Roman Catholics understand by transubstantiation, instead of letting Roman Catholics state it for themselves.

And they explain it thus—They say that Roman Catholics believe, that when the words of consecration are spoken over bread and wine by a priest, the whole substance of the bread is changed into the whole substance of the body of Christ, and the whole substance of the wine is changed into the substance of his blood; so that if any man should say that the consecrated bread is indeed the body of Christ, but that the substance of bread remains *along with the body of Christ*, that man is accursed.

They further charge Roman Catholics with believing (what seems quite contrary and inconsistent with the part of the charge already given above) that the *consecrated bread* is both the body *and the blood, too*, of Christ; and that the consecrated wine is not only the blood of Christ, but *the body* of Christ too. Here, Roman Catholics are charged with believing things that contradict each other; for how can the bread be changed into the body, and the wine be changed into the blood, and yet, the bread by itself be *both* the *body and* the *blood*, and the wine also be both the body and the blood? Surely there cannot be many who believe *both* of the things thus charged on them.

Again, Roman Catholics are further accused of believing, that when the bread and wine cease to exist at the words of consecration, it is not merely the body and blood of Christ which become present in their place, but Christ himself, whole and entire, which is there upon the altar. This is a great difference. Christ is not mere body and blood. There must be his human soul, and still more, there must be the Divinity itself, the very essence of the Divine nature, the very substance of God himself. It takes all this to make up "Christ, whole and entire." According to this view of transubstantiation, Roman Catholics are charged with believing, that when the priest speaks the words of consecration over the bread, that bread is actually turned into God!!

And, as if to convict Roman Catholics of holding the utmost degree of absurdity that could be imagined, they are charged with believing that all this is true of each crumb of the bread by itself; and that not only at the time of the celebration of Mass, but that this continues so in any particle that remains after Mass is over; so that if the smallest crumb fall on the ground, into the dust of the priest's feet, and lie there until next day, that crumb, lying in the dust, is "Christ, whole and entire!" It is not merely a particle of the body of Christ; it is Christ himself, whole and entire; Christ himself, his whole body, his whole blood, his human soul, his Divine substance, all lie there in the dust, under the appearance of a crumb! Such is what Roman Catholics are commonly charged with believing; and not only so, but they are accused of holding that every one who does not believe *every word* of the above is accursed.

Now, we trust that there are multitudes of Roman Catholics whose sense and reason, to say nothing of their knowledge of Scripture, and their reverence for Jesus Christ our Lord, keep them from believing such things as these. And we earnestly and indignantly protest against such a belief being charged against any individual who does not really believe it; of which each man knows best himself whether he believes it or not. We earnestly invite Roman Catholics to consider whether they do indeed believe these things; and if their conscience testify to them that they do not, we entreat them to take this opportunity of setting themselves right with Protestants, by letters directed to the Editor of this paper, stating that they do not believe these things. Surely Roman Catholics ought to wish that Protestants should rightly understand what they really believe.

There are other accusations founded on the charge of transubstantiation. As, for instance, that they worship the consecrated bread as if it were God! giving it the same worship of Latria which is due to the true God. Again, that they worship with Divine worship that very thing which they eat with their mouths.

But we must proceed with some other charges.

They are often accused of idolatry, and that of the highest kind.

They are accused of worshipping the Virgin Mary.

They are accused of praying *to her*. Not merely of asking her to pray for them, but of praying to her, and also to saints and angels.

They are accused of making her a mediator and a Saviour; and of attributing to her all that the Scriptures attribute to Christ.

They are also accused of saying that all believers in Christianity, except themselves, shall be damned for ever.

Roman Catholics are also very commonly accused of holding many doctrines and opinions, which (if they really did believe them) would make it very hard, or almost impossible, for Roman Catholics to be loyal subjects of our Queen, or honest men in their dealings towards others. Thus, they are accused of believing, that if the Pope should order them to rebel against the Queen, it would be their duty to God to turn rebels. And they are accused of believing that faith is not to be kept with heretics or Protestants; and that any promises or oaths made to Protestants are not binding.

How greatly we might increase our list of charges! but we stop here for the present. These are enough to make a beginning towards putting matters on a better and more hopeful footing between the two parties.

These are dreadful charges to bring against men: and great mischief must follow if they are not properly treated. Protestants who believe that Roman Catholics really hold these things, will, of course, be exasperated against them. Roman Catholics who feel that these things are *unjustly* charged against *them*, will be exasperated against those who make these charges. A country cannot prosper—cannot be at peace—whose children thus learn to hate one another.

Is it not a noble and a useful undertaking to seek to clear up misconceptions where they exist, and to take away hatred where it should not exist? Is not this to serve our country, and to promote its peace?

We are ourselves convinced, that there are multitudes of Roman Catholics, in every rank of society, from the highest to the lowest, who reject many or most even of the things charged on Roman Catholics. Their reverence towards Christ keeps them from what is dishonouring to him; and their integrity and good faith keep them from what is false and treacherous towards their fellow-men.

We have often heard Roman Catholics deny that they hold such things, and we have ever accepted their denial with confidence and pleasure. We trust that any Roman Catholic, who feels guiltless of any of the charges we have mentioned, will not feel hurt at our *stating* those charges in our pages. We believe that numbers of Roman Catholics are anxious for a fair opportunity of denying and repudiating such doctrines; and we desire only to give them this opportunity. We are prepared to accept such denials with a generous confidence; and we invite Roman Catholics to come forward and clear themselves of whatever they do not really hold. Above all others, we invite the Roman Catholic priesthood to come forward openly, and disclaim whatever they think is unjustly charged on their religion, and we place our pages at their disposal for the purpose.

We are prepared *to believe* every one who says that he does not hold any false or wicked doctrine which has been attributed to him, and to rejoice in the belief. Still it may be our duty to discuss with him whether his church holds it or not. While we *believe him* affirming that *he* does not hold it, it may be our duty to show that his church does hold it; that the highest authorities of his church, those authorities which are most certainly infallible, if there be any infallibility in it, have actually decided in favour of what he denies.

It is probable that this, more than anything else, has led to the undistinguishing charges made by some Protestants against all Roman Catholics, of holding doctrines that are dishonouring towards Christ and wicked towards men. These Protestants see such things decreed by the authorities in the Church of Rome, which authorities they suppose all Roman Catholics must hold to be infallible. And from this they conclude, that all Roman Catholics do believe all the things that have been thus decreed. But these Protestants are greatly mistaken, and in many ways. There are many and various opinions in the Church of Rome about what authority or decision is infallible. Oftentimes, when Protestants bring forward an authority which they suppose to be admitted as infallible, great numbers of Roman Catholics will say, and say truly, that *they* do not consider that authority infallible. And though the authority produced be such as they would generally believe to be infallible, yet when they find it pronouncing decrees plainly contrary to Scripture, and to the sense of right and wrong, they look for some distinction to show that it did not act infallibly in that case. And even when no such distinction can be found, as in the case of the Council of Trent, which all Roman Catholics are expressly bound to believe, by the Creed of Pope Pius IV., yet even in that case, there are numbers of Roman Catholics who would maintain their reverence to Christ, and their good faith and good feeling to men, at all hazard to the doctrine of infallibility. How many Roman Catholics are there in Ireland who know all the things that the Council of Trent has decreed, all the curses that it has pronounced? And if they do not even know of these things, how can they be charged with believing them?

This we believe to be the true reason why so many charges have been brought against Roman Catholics in general, which so many Roman Catholics feel to be false as applied to themselves. But we desire them to consider whether they can be blameless, while they do not take pains to set themselves right. We offer them now the opportunity of doing so; and we entreat and adjure them, by their regard to their own character, and by the love they bear to their country's peace, to vindicate themselves in our pages, to consider the charges that we have stated, and to say whether they believe these things, or whether they would admit any authority as infallible which pretends to decree such things. We look for their answer with anxiety and with hope.

THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION.

In our first number we promised to give some documents, showing the progress of the controversy in the Church of Rome, about the question, whether the Blessed Virgin Mary were conceived subject to original sin, the question about which the present Pope wrote the letter which we gave in that first number.

We wish to go as far back as we can with this history; but we cannot find so much as any mention of the immaculate conception before the year 1139 or 1140. About that time a feast had been introduced in the Church of Lyons, in France, in honour of the immaculate conception. This seems to have been the first time such a thing had ever been heard of in the Catholic Church.

The famous St. Bernard, whom Roman Catholics call "the last and greatest of the Fathers," on hearing of this, wrote a letter to the Church of Lyons (Epistle, 174), in which he says, "We can never enough wonder that some of you could have the boldness to introduce a feast which the church has not the least knowledge of, which is neither supported by reason nor backed by any tradition." He says that this feast was founded on an "alleged revelation, which is destitute of adequate authority" (ib., p. 391); he asks, "How can it be maintained that a conception which proceeds, not from the Holy Ghost, but rather from sin, can be holy? or how could they conjure up a holy day on account of a thing that is not holy in itself?" He says this feast "either honours sin, or authorizes a false holiness."*

---

* Op. Vol. i., p. 390. Paris, 1839.
"Unde miramur satis, quid visum fuerit hoc tempore quibusdam vestrum voluisse mutare colorem optimum, novam inducendo celebritatem, quam ritus Eccle-

On this important letter, Du Pin, a very learned French Roman Catholic divine, says—"Thus it may be observed that St. Bernard had no very favourable thoughts of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary."

This letter has great weight in many places; but many churches, in various countries, adopted this new feast in spite of St. Bernard; and so all Europe came to be divided about it. How bitterly the two parties contended, we shall see presently.

Now, this was surely a case that called for the judgment of the infallible judge of controversy. Yet we cannot find that he interfered to settle it. FOR THREE HUNDRED YEARS he allowed both parties to fight it out between themselves. The Dominican Friars, established about the year 1218, were all for St. Bernard; the Franciscan Friars, established ten years sooner, were all for the new feast of the immaculate conception; and these two orders spread the controversy over all Europe.

The first attempt made to settle this question was at the Council of Basil, in the year 1439, just THREE HUNDRED YEARS after the controversy arose.

We take the following from the decree passed by the council in their 26th session (Labbé and Cossart, vol. xii., col. 622):—"It is especially proper that there should be peace in questions about the holiness of her by whom peace was diffused throughout the world. Yet, up to this time, a difficult question has been made in various places, and before this holy council, about the conception of that glorious Virgin Mary, the Mother of God, and the beginning of her sanctification; some saying that the Virgin herself and her soul, for some time or some moment of time, were actually subject to original sin; others, on the contrary, saying that, from the beginning of her creation, God conferred upon her that grace in loving, by which, liberating and preserving that blessed person from the original stain, he redeemed her with a higher kind of sanctification, since the Most High himself would establish her, and the Son of God would mould her, that she might be his mother upon earth." Having thus stated the controversy, and borne witness to its long continuance, the decree says that they have considered it fully and for many years, and they go on to settle it thus:—"We define and declare that that doctrine which asserts that the glorious Virgin Mary, Mother of God, by a singular prevenient and operating grace of the Divine Spirit, never was actually subject to original sin, but was always free from all original and actual sin, both holy and immaculate, should be approved, held, and embraced, by all Catholics, as being pious and agreeable to ecclesiastical worship, to Catholic faith, to right reason, and to Holy Scripture, and that, for the future, it shall not be lawful to any one to teach or preach to the contrary."

Was not the question settled now at last, after three hundred years of hard fighting? Stop a moment! Hear the present Pope, in the letter which we published, saying—"This honour has not yet been decreed to the most Holy Virgin by the Church and the Apostolic See!" How comes it that the question was *not* settled by that decree of the Council of Basil? Alas, the infallible judge seems to be subject to like passions and failings as ourselves. The Council of Basil and the Pope quarrelled with each other. The council thought that *they* were infallible, and the Pope thought that it was *he* that was infallible.

Dr. Newman, the rector of the new Irish Catholic university, says in his late book, published since he became a Roman Catholic, that the church has not settled who it is that is infallible. Bishop Milner (a Roman Catholic bishop in England about 35 years ago) says this question is yet in dispute among them (see his book "End of Controversy," letter 12); but he says all Catholics agree that a general council, with a Pope at its head, is infallible. But, alas, the Pope and the Council of Basil were quarrelling among themselves about who should be the greatest! and so they could not agree. And the Pope refused to confirm the decree of the council; and this council now stands in the list of the Church of Rome, as "Disapproved by the Pope," and, therefore, of no force at all.

Now, the present Pope thinks that the decree of the Council of Basil was right, and should have been confirmed. The Pope of that day either thought so too, or he did not. If he did not, which Pope was right? They cannot *both* be infallible if they thought directly contrary to each other. But if he did think, with the present Pope, that the decree of the council was right, how could he refuse his consent from mere motives of personal pride and spite? Was this like "the Vicar of Christ on earth, speaking in the place of Christ?" Would Christ, then, have acted so himself in such a case?

How was the church the better *then* of having such an infallible judge? Were matters any better about this controversy afterwards? We shall see.

The next important document on the subject is a decree of Pope Sixtus the Fourth, dated about 44 years later, viz., in 1483.

This Pope complains that, although "the holy Roman Church publicly and solemnly celebrates the feast of the undefiled and always Virgin Mary, and has appointed a special and proper office on account of it, yet some preachers of various orders, as we hear, in their sermons to the people, publicly through various states and countries, have not blushed hitherto to affirm, and do not cease daily to preach ——" And what did they preach? This Pope goes on to tell: here is what they preached—"That all those who hold or maintain that that glorious and immaculate mother of God was conceived without stain of original sin, DO SIN MORTALLY, OR ARE HERETICS." But this was not all. This Pope goes on to tell more of their preaching—"That those who celebrate the office of her immaculate conception, or who listen to the sermons of those who affirm that she was conceived without stain of this kind, *do sin grievously.*"

We could have no better testimony of how bitterly this controversy raged. Just imagine a number of the preachers of the Church of Rome, in so many countries, all preaching publicly, that it was a MORTAL SIN to attend on one of the authorised services of the Church of Rome! Roman Catholics are often fond of finding out any differences or disputes that may exist in the Church of England and Ireland; but did they ever hear of any of *her* preachers publicly preaching to the people, that it was a MORTAL SIN to attend one of *her* services? Yet Pope Sixtus says, that this had been long going on, and was then actually going on, in the Church of Rome, through so many states and countries! Well might Pope Sixtus add, as he does, "From which preaching heavy scandals have arisen in the minds of the faithful; and greater scandals are, with reason, feared to arise from day to day."

Surely, if ever there was a case that called loudly for the infallible judge of the Church of Rome to interfere, and decide which side was right, this was the case. So Pope Sixtus seems to have thought; for he goes on to say—"Now we, wishing to obviate such rash darings, and the perverse assertions and scandals which may thence arise in the Church of God, SO FAR AS IT IS GIVEN TO US FROM ON HIGH." Nations attend; and listen to him whom millions believe to be the Vicar of Christ on earth—the infallible judge of all controversies! He, of whom the Synod of Thurles lately said, that he speaks in the person of Peter, and in the name of Christ. Behold, *he* is now going at last to put forth the whole strength of his infallibility and to settle this question, "so FAR AS IT IS GIVEN TO HIM FROM ON HIGH!" and what is the result? What is the decree? Which side is right? Are we not in breathless expectation to learn? Alas, for the disappointment of our expectations! Pope Sixtus merely goes on to forbid EITHER party to say that the other is wrong, under pain of excommunication; *neither party* may say that the *other* are heretics, or sinful! and why? "Because," says Pope Sixtus, with all becoming gravity,—"Because it has not yet been decided by the Roman Church and the Apostolic See!!!" Was not that a good reason to give for not *then* deciding it, when he was at the moment professing to settle the question, "SO FAR AS IT WAS GIVEN TO HIM FROM ON HIGH?" Who is not tempted to exclaim, "Away with such an infallible judge!" If he can do no better than this, in performance of his great pretensions and promises, he is no better than a shame and a reproach to Christ, whose vicar he pretends to be; to the Church, whose controversies he pretends to settle! This decree of Pope Sixtus may be found in the appendix of any of the authorized editions of the Council of Trent.

And so the controversy went on, each party authorized to hold his own opinion, neither allowed to say that the contrary opinion was heresy or sinful.

One more attempt was made to settle this great question. And now there seemed to be hope; for it was the tribunal which all Roman Catholics are bound to admit as infallible, a general council with the Pope at its head—the Council of Trent and the Pope.

But after great discussion, that infallible tribunal came to the conclusion that all they could attempt to do, was to do nothing! They passed a decree, affirming that all mankind were born under original sin, and then they added to it this—"This Holy Council, however, declares, that it is not their intention to include in this decree, where they treat of original sin, the blessed and immaculate Virgin Mary, Mother of God; *but that the constitutions of Pope Sixtus the Fourth, of blessed memory, which it renews,* are to be observed, under the penalties contained in those constitutions" (Session v.)—that is, the decree of Pope Sixtus, which we have given above. So that all the Council of Trent, and the Pope along with them, could do, was to renew the decree of Sixtus, leaving each party at liberty to hold its own opinion, and only forbidding either to call the other *heretics.*

And why could not the infallible Council of Trent and the Pope himself settle it? Historians relate, that each party was ready to resist the Council and the Pope too, if he should decide against themselves: and so they agreed in this much, that they would not have any decision, but would go on as they did before. If this were so, is it possible to think that they themselves really believed in their own claim to infallibility?

But some Roman Catholic writers give a different reason why the church never settled this question. Bishop Milner says—"The church does not decide the controversy concerning the conception of the Blessed Virgin, *and several other disputed points,* because she sees nothing absolutely clear and certain concerning

---

sæ nescit, non probat ratio, non commendat antiqua traditio?"

"Sed proferatur scriptum supernæ, ut aiunt, revelationis. Ipse mihi facile persuadeo scriptis talibus non moveri, quibus nec ratio suppeditare, nec certa invenitur favere auctoritas."

"Cum hæc ita se habeant, quænam jam erit festivæ ratio conceptionis? Quo pacto, inquam, aut sanctus asseretur conceptus, qui de spiritu sancto non est, ne dicam de peccato est? Aut festus habebitur, qui minime sanctus est? Libenter Gloriosa hoc honore carebit, quo vel peccatum honorari, vel falsa videtur induci sanctitas."

them, either in the written or unwritten word, and, therefore, leaves her children to form their own opinions concerning them." Now, if the church can find *no proof*, in either Scripture or tradition, that Christ or his Apostles taught this doctrine, it might be a very good reason for the church warning her children not to believe the doctrine at all. But it seems a very bad reason for the church to leave her children to believe *upon their own private judgment, without any help or guidance from her*, things which the church herself says *she* cannot form any opinion about, since they cannot be proved either from Scripture or tradition.

What a multitude of errors and superstitions must creep into any church which follows such a plan as this, in guiding, or rather in not guiding, her children? Surely, it would be well to teach men to believe what Christ and his Apostles taught, and nothing else.

But what becomes of Bishop Milner's reason, when the Pope now declares, in his letter, that he is willing "to define, AS A DOCTRINE OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, that the conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary was immaculate, and wholly free from all stain of original sin?" Is he going to define, as a doctrine of the Catholic Church, what that church has never yet been able to find in either the written or unwritten word? He says that he would like to do this; but it is not done yet. But he has written to every Roman Catholic bishop in the world, asking their advice, and also asking WHETHER THE LAITY WISH HIM TO DO SO. Now, we know that at the Synod of Thurles, two years and a half ago, all the Irish Roman Catholic bishops wrote to him, asking him to do this; and very probably they have told him that all the Irish laity *do* wish for it. Now, we believe that this is far from being the case. We believe that the Roman Catholic laity of Ireland do expect and require that their priests, and their bishops, and their Pope too, should teach them exactly that Gospel which Christ and his Apostles preached; and that they will not submit to the Pope defining as an article of the Catholic faith, what the church has never yet been able to find in either Scripture or tradition. We have been greatly struck by an observation made by an intelligent Roman Catholic layman, on reading the Pope's letter in our first number—"What is the Pope about?" he said; "does he want to brand us all as idolaters, as we are so often called?" This and many other such things confirm us in our opinion, that the laity are not willing to let this question be now settled as the Pope intends, and that we have done right in giving them this opportunity of expressing their sentiments, before the Pope may do it, under the notion that they all wish for it.

We cannot conclude without telling them how this question has been settled in the Church of England and Ireland. There has never been any dispute about it there, nor among any Protestants. Not that the Church does not reverence the Blessed Virgin Mary; her own song, in which she says "All generations shall call me blessed," is always sung at their evening service. But there is no dispute with them about this, because they take it to the Bible to be settled; and they go to the song of the Blessed Virgin herself, and they hear her saying, "My spirit hath rejoiced in *God* MY SAVIOUR." Now, it is only sinners who need a Saviour; and, therefore, she knew that she was a *sinner*, when she called him *her* Saviour. She knew that she needed him to save her from her original sin.

We submit it to laymen, whether it might not be well sometimes to try if they could settle a question in this simple way, by the word of God, or those who were inspired by him, instead of looking to the decision of an infallible judge, who has kept the world waiting for a decision of this question for SEVEN HUNDRED AND TWELVE YEARS.

We shall have to return again to some other points connected with the Pope's letter.

THE SEARCH AFTER INFALLIBILITY.

BY HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN.

(Continued from page 8.)

PART II.

It has been shown, that it might be fairly argued from the very passage in the Book of Acts before quoted, that there is not upon earth an infallible interpreter of the Word of God, and that God never intended that there should be; because there is no mention of anything of the kind, nor even any allusion to it, in a discourse of the Apostle Paul's in which he could not have failed to mention it, had it existed. But there are many other considerations from which the same conclusion follows:—

1. For instance; the unfitness of men in general to judge rightly of things belonging to religion, is the great reason from which is argued the necessity for an infallible interpreter. And yet this very argument destroys the main conclusion which it is brought to prove. For it allows at the outset, that men *are* fit to decide by their own judgment, that most difficult question as to the claim of any particular church, party, or person, to *be* that interpreter. Certain passages of Scripture are alleged as proving, that a certain church is the infallible guide, appointed by Providence to take the place of our private judgment, which, it is said, is incapable of deciding rightly as to the meaning of Scripture. But how am I to know that this is the true sense of those passages? If we *are fit* to judge of their meaning, then it cannot fairly be denied, that we are fit to judge of, and to understand other parts of Scripture also; and the alleged necessity for an infallible interpreter must be given up. If we are *not* capable of judging of the meaning of any doubtful passages, then, though we may allow the necessity for an unerring interpreter, we can never be sure that we have found one.

If we go, as men very commonly do, to explain exactly, according to the direction of some supposed infallible guide, and in full reliance upon him, those very passages of the Bible which are brought forward to show the necessity for such a guide, it must be quite plain that we are taking as proved, the very thing that we want to prove—we are taking his words as if they were infallible, that is, certainly true, in order to enable us to prove that he is infallible. And the same may be said with respect to those who, instead of any church of the present time, appeal to the "primitive Church," and the "consent or agreement, in opinion, of the fathers"—meaning the common belief of all right-minded writers of the first ages after the Apostles.

Whether that primitive church, and those first ages, shall extend to three hundred years, or four, five, six, or seven hundred years after Christ; and *which* of the fathers are to be enrolled among the orthodox or right-thinking; and *what are* the doctrines they taught in books forty times larger than the Bible, and capable of quite as great a variety of meanings—all these are questions to be decided, in the first instance, by those who are supposed to be unfit to judge, and who, for that very reason, are to rely entirely on an infallible guide. This is like telling them that, because they cannot steer their course without a pilot, they must make a dangerous voyage to a distant port in order to find one.

And the case is much the same with those who promise to others, or lay claim to themselves, such an inspiration from Heaven as shall make all exercise of reason unnecessary, and hinder the possibility of error. The exercise of reason is called for in the highest degree, and mistakes the most fatal are to be dreaded in deciding on the opposite claims laid before us—on the claims of those who, while they teach the most contrary doctrines, all profess alike to be under the immediate direction of the Holy Spirit, and all fail in giving proof of it, as the Apostles did, by working miracles that could be judged of by the eyes and ears, in the presence of all, whether believers or unbelievers. The alleged *necessity*, therefore, for an infallible interpreter, does, of itself, shut out from a thoughtful mind the hope of *obtaining* one. For the reason given for that necessity is such a supposed want of power in us, for judging rightly, as must equally unfit us for judging about the claims of those who offer to guide us.

Some persons have attempted to lay it down as a maxim, that we are bound to receive and believe whatever has been received and "believed *always* by *all* true Christians, in *every* place." This saying is constantly brought forward, and praised in the present day, in such a manner as seems strange and unaccountable. That whatever is believed, and always has been, by all Christians, everywhere, as a part of the Christian faith, is perfectly true; but it is a truth which cannot possibly be called in or used to settle *any question in dispute*; since it is evident, that it relates expressly and exclusively to such points as never have been disputed among Christians.

But it is probable that those who appeal—or, rather, who pretend to appeal—to this maxim, do, in reality, mean by "all," merely "all the *orthodox*," or those who think rightly. And who are the orthodox? Those, we should be told, whom *most* persons consider such; and as each would be likely to apply that term to those whose doctrines he approves, the result will be, that the belief of the *greater number* is to be the stamp or mark of orthodox or right belief; and that this again is to represent universal (or catholic) belief; and, finally, that this so-called universal belief is to be the test or measure of Gospel Truth. By this *rule*, who were the orthodox, and who the true worshippers in Israel, when Elijah alone was left of the Lord's prophets, while Baal's prophets were 450 men?—I. Kings xviii. 22.

2. Again, the necessity, we are told, is for an infallible interpreter to whom *all can easily go*. And this no church can even pretend to have provided. Supposing an infallible church to exist in the most convenient position that could be found, still it is not one Christian in ten thousand that could apply directly to its supreme governors. Each individual may, indeed, use its forms of prayer and of belief, and may think them equal in authority to Scripture; but he can be no more fit to interpret the one than the other, or to put in anything left out; he is still in want of an infallible guide to direct him how to agree exactly with his church, and to obey it. And this guide must be, to the great mass of mankind, the pastor or minister under whom each is placed. The pastor's agreement with the church must be taken on his own word. If *he* be either ignorant, or mistaken, or dishonest; if, in short, every individual pastor be not himself infallible, the Christian people, whose unfitness to judge for themselves has been all along supposed, may be as much misled as in their reading of the Scriptures for themselves.

3. Moreover, the claim to freedom from *error* and from *dissension*, if put forth by any church which claims also to include within it *all* Christians, is thereby at once destroyed. If, indeed, any one claims infallibility, on the ground of personal inspiration in himself, or in the leader he follows, he can only be met by asking him to prove, by the performance of miracles, before our eyes, that his pretensions to this inspiration are better founded than those of others, who differ from him. But when the *two* claims to freedom from error, and to universality, are *both* put forward by the same church, they mutually destroy each other, by its being impossible that these two things can exist together in the same church, at the same time. If there be any universal church, of which *all professing Christians* are members, even though disobedient members—subjects and children, even though undutiful and rebellious—then, that church is manifestly not free from *error* and *dissension*; as is plain from the differences and controversies existing among Christians, and the refusal of many of them to submit to the decrees of that church. If, again, there be any church that is free from error among its members, it is, for the same reason, manifestly not universal. We may imagine such a thing as a church, to whose dominion and decisions all Christians *ought* to submit; but, unless all *do* thus submit, it cannot properly be called *universal*.

Vain are the attempts made to get rid of this objection, by urging that all false doctrines are *condemned* by the authorities of the church, and that the guilt of schism lies upon all who do not obey them. Freedom from error, in any community, consists not in the *condemnation* of error, but in its *not existing* among the members of that community. Universality consists not in a *claim* to universal dominion over all Christians, but in the *submission* of all Christians. Otherwise there is no sect so small and inconsiderable, that might not pretend, on equally good grounds, to be the universal and unerring church. It might plead that its doctrines were received by *all* except heretics, and its supremacy acknowledged by all except schismatics: denouncing all as heretics and schismatics who did not receive these doctrines, and submit to that dominion. And this is merely saying, in other words, that all agree with it except those who disagree, and that all submit except such as refuse submission.

The claims, therefore, if so explained, come to nothing. If *not* so explained, but taken in the natural sense of the words used, they are proved to be false by undeniable and notorious facts.

From these and similar considerations, a thoughtful mind can hardly fail to see, that an infallible guide within the reach of all, such as shall take the place of all exercise of private judgment, and render unnecessary all watchful care and inquiry, and shall hinder all possibility of mistake, has *not* been in fact provided. And if he still cling to the belief of the *necessity* for such a guide, as absolutely required with a divine revelation, his road to infidelity is straight and short.

Numbers there are, no doubt, who do not follow up such principles to what they regularly lead to; many,

from want of the habit of thinking, and whose minds have not been cultivated; and others from resolutely avoiding all reasoning and all examination, because they have determined to be believers, and consider their faith to be both the more praiseworthy, and also the more safe, the less they reflect and examine. They fear the very danger above alluded to—that reasoning will lead to infidelity; and they seek to escape this danger, not by putting aside the false notion from which that reasoning sets out, but by avoiding all reasoning, and stopping all inquiry and reflection.

But this freedom from all uneasy doubt—a desire for which leads to the craving for infallibility—this, after all, is not always attained by such a plan of acting. A lurking suspicion will often remain in the mind, which a man vainly endeavours to stifle, that the *foundation* is not sound. The building, indeed, may be complete. Let it be once settled, that the Church, Sect, Party, or Leader, we have taken for our guide, is perfectly infallible, and there is an end of all doubts and cares respecting particular points. But an uneasy doubt will sometimes haunt a man, in spite of his endeavours to keep it down, and however earnestly he may deny, even to himself, its existence—whether the infallibility claimed, which is the foundation of the whole building, be really well established. A suspicion will occasionally cross the mind, however anxiously resisted, "IS THERE NOT A LIE IN MY RIGHT HAND?" And the unwillingness often shewn to examine the foundation, and ascertain whether it is really sound, is a proof, not of full confidence in its firmness, but of a lurking suspicion that it will not bear examination.

It is thus that the craving after the ease of mind produced by infallible certainty is likely to defeat its own object. Many, however, no doubt, do really enjoy the confidence of mind which they boast of, though without any sufficient grounds for it. And many, we may expect, will complain of, and find fault with, and reject, what has been here said, on the ground that it is a "cheerless" doctrine. And this charge is, to a certain extent, true. To be told to "work out our own salvation with fear and trembling," may be less "cheering" than to be told, that we have no need for any fear and trembling. When Paul "ceased not for three years to warn every one, night and day, with TEARS," it was not, certainly, because he judged this to be the most *cheering* to his people, but because he knew it to be the most for their real good, and the most conformable to truth. It was precisely because he was aware that painstaking watchfulness is less agreeable than confident and boastful ease—it was for this very reason, doubtless, that he was so diligent in these warnings, lest any of his people should be—as so many are now, and in every age—led away blindfolded by their wishes, and flattered to their ruin by deceitful teachers. It is a common error, and one which men always need to be put on their guard against, to trust to boastful promises and to lean upon pleasant and cheering hopes, without examining well whether these promises and hopes can reasonably be depended on.

But it is the part of true wisdom not to lose, in a vain search after what Providence has denied us, the advantages which it does place within our reach.

Difficult indeed it is—or, rather, impossible—for us to understand why God has dealt with man as he has. We may be unable to answer the question, why the revelation he has bestowed has not been accompanied by the gift of an infallible interpreter on earth, within the reach of all men, and hindering all possibility of doubt as to the meaning of any part of it. It may be hard to explain why, both in this and in many other most important matters also, man should have been left to act on his own responsibility, and according to the best of his own fallible judgment; exposed to various dangers, and called on for the exercise of that watchful care, which, we find, is in point of fact, often not exercised. We may be unable, in short, to understand *why earth is not heaven*—why EVIL of any kind is permitted to exist.

All this we may be unable to explain; but our inability to explain will not alter facts; and it is for us to make the best use of things as they *are*, instead of wondering or seeking to understand why they were not made otherwise.

That false humility above alluded to, the entire dependence on fallible man, must be discarded; and true humility must take its place. Instead of considering what, according to our notions, God *must* have done, or *ought* to have done, we should inquire what he *has* done; and what use we are allowed and expected to make of it.

If we inquire whether the Holy Scriptures did really come from him, we shall find proof abundantly sufficient to satisfy an honest and humble mind; but not sufficient —strange this may appear to *us*—to *force* conviction on the dishonest and proud. And if we inquire for what purposes the Scriptures were given, and how we are to make use of the gift, they will themselves abundantly teach us. They were evidently given us to enlighten the path of those who will open their eyes to the light, and take heed to their steps; but not of such as love darkness better than light, or view the light through the blackened glass of their own prejudices and inclinations, or give themselves up to be led blindfold by blind guides. They were given not to make diligence and watchful care unnecessary, but to teach us to exercise them. They abound (as we have seen) in warnings of the danger of perversions and false doctrines. And they bid Christian ministers "take heed to themselves and to the flocks committed to their care." The pastor is to study, to the best of his power, to attain to the true meaning of them himself, and to explain that meaning to his people; but with a full conviction and confession of his own fallibility.

To complain of this—to reject or undervalue the revelation God has bestowed, urging that it is no revelation to us, or an insufficient one, because unerring certainty is not bestowed also—because we are required to exercise patient diligence, and watchfulness, and candour, and humble self-distrust—this would be as unreasonable as to make light of and reject the bountiful gift of eye-sight, because men's eyes have sometimes deceived them—because men have mistaken a picture for the object imitated, or the dazzling mirage of the desert for a lake; and have fancied they had the evidence of sight for the sun's motion; and to conclude from all this that we ought to blindfold ourselves, and be led henceforth by some guide who pretends to be himself not liable to such mistakes.

The two great books—that of nature and that of revelation—which God has opened before us for our benefit, are in this respect like each other. Both are, in themselves, free from all error: but they do not give complete freedom from all possibility of error to the person who studies them. As the laws of nature are in themselves unchangeable, but yet are sometimes imperfectly known, and sometimes mistaken, by natural philosophers, so the Scriptures are in themselves infallible, but do not give infallibility to the student of them. Even by the most learned, they are in many parts imperfectly understood; by the "unlearned and unstable" they are liable to be "wrested to their own destruction."

We have, indeed, the gracious promise of God's Holy Spirit to "help our infirmities," both in respect of our faith and of our conduct; to guard us not only against *error* in doctrine or opinion, but also, no less, against *sin;* to further our growth both in *grace*, and also in the *knowledge* of the Lord Jesus Christ. And we are sure that, as far as we *are* under the guidance of that spirit, we cannot but be right both in our belief and our practice.

But how far we are in each instance thus guided we must not presume to pronounce with certainty. "It is God that worketh in us, both to will and to do" (and we may add, to judge and believe also) "of his good pleasure;" but this is given by the Apostle as a reason, not for sitting down in careless and self-confident security, but that we should "work out our own salvation with fear and trembling." And this same anxious and diligent care must be shown, among other things, in our study of God's Holy Word.

"If we say that we have no sin"—and, equally, if we say that we have no error—"we deceive ourselves:" for, whatever part of our conduct, and of our opinions, may be, in fact, perfectly right, we are not authorized confidently to pronounce that it is so. "I judge not," says the Apostle Paul, "mine own self, for I know nothing by myself"—*i.e.*, I am not conscious of any failure in my ministerial duties — "yet am I not hereby justified; but he that judgeth me is the Lord."

Let Christians, then, listen to this blessed Apostle; learn what he has taught; and attend to the warnings he has given. And let them not be persuaded by any one to think, that by doing this, they will be thrown into distressing and incurable doubts and perplexities. Let them not fear that, by forbearing to forestall the judgment of the last day—by not presuming to dictate to the Most High, and boldly to pronounce in what way he *must* have given a revelation to man—by renouncing all pretensions to infallibility, whether immediate in themselves, or derived from others—by owning themselves to be neither beyond the reach of sin nor of error (both claims are alike groundless), and by consenting to undergo those trials of watchfulness and of patience which God has appointed for them —let them not fear that by this they will forfeit all cheerful hope of final salvation, all "joy and peace in believing." The reverse of all this is the true state of the case.

As far as any one is conscious of striving, with humble prayer for divine aid, to do his best, in the way God has directed, he may reasonably hope to be preserved from all fatal errors and deadly sins; and he may trust that any mistakes into which he may have fallen, not through carelessness or perversity, but from mere error of judgment or unavoidable ignorance, will not be imputed to him as sins, but that he will "be accepted according to that he hath, and not according to that he hath not."

Those have, in reality, more to fear, who, professing to renounce all private judgment, have based their whole system of faith on human suppositions as to what a divine revelation *must necessarily* be; and who have shut their eyes to many plain warnings of our Lord and his Apostles, "to take heed to ourselves." Paul has declared, that if even "an angel from heaven preach any other gospel than that which he has delivered, let him be accursed;" and he has left us a written record of his teachings, with which to compare whatever is proposed for our acceptance as gospel truth; and thus, according to our Lord's precept, judging of the tree by its fruits. Great, then, must be the danger of those who, in fact, *reverse* this precept, and judge of *the fruits by the tree;* by at once concluding, that whatever is taught by the Holy Church, or whatever such and such a person professes to have had revealed to him from heaven, and to be moved by the Holy Spirit to utter, must be gospel truth, however contrary to God's written Word.

And as their real danger is great, so they do not always succeed even in lulling themselves into complete ease of mind. While they crave for more than God has given, and will not be satisfied without that infallible certainty of freedom from error which would cut off all need of watchfulness against error, and of inquiry after truth, they often (besides raising on a false foundation a building of error) fail also of that confident repose and peace of mind which they have aimed at. And those, on the other hand, who, in true humility, set themselves to act exactly according to God's directions, will be partakers of his promised blessings. While such Christians as have sought rather for *peace* —for ease of mind, and satisfaction—than for *truth*, will often fail both of truth and peace, those of the opposite disposition are more likely to attain both from their Gracious Master. He has taught us to "take heed that we be not deceived," and to "beware of false prophets;" and he has promised us his own peace and heavenly comfort. He has bid us to watch and pray; he has taught us, through his blessed Apostle, to "take heed to ourselves," and to "work out our salvation with fear and trembling," and he has declared through the same Apostle, "that he worketh in us;" he has bid us rejoice in hope; he has promised that he "will not suffer us to be tempted above what we are able to bear;" and he has taught us to look forward to the time when we shall no longer see as by means of a mirror "darkly, but face to face"—when we shall know, not in part, but even as we are known (I. Cor. xiii. 12)—when faith shall be succeeded by certainty and hope be ripened into enjoyment. His precepts and his promises go together. His support and comfort are given to those who seek for them in the way he has himself appointed. Let Christians, then, trust in God, and not transfer their allegiance to uninspired man. Let them search the Scriptures (like the Bereans of old), "to see whether those things be so" which they are taught: "let them prove all things, and hold fast that which is right;" and not be led away, by bold assertions and arrogant pretensions, into those corruptions of gospel truth which will always, from time to time, arise within the Church. So shall they be enabled to "take up the serpents" they will meet with; and "if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them."

DOES THE ROMAN CHURCH REALLY BELIEVE IN ITS OWN CLAIM TO THE POSSESSION OF AN INFALLIBLE GUIDE?

(From the *Irish Ecclesiastical Journal.*)

(Continued from page 9.)

The history of the controversy respecting the immaculate conception of the Blessed Virgin will strikingly illustrate the remarks which we have already made. In the beginning of the fourteenth century the famous Franciscan schoolman, John Scot, had stated the matter thus—God (he said) was able either to exempt the Virgin altogether from original sin, or to suffer her to remain under it for an infinitesimal moment, or for a longer time. God alone knows (he added) which of these three possibilities is true; but the first is *probable*, unless it be contrary to Scripture or to the authority of the Church.

The Franciscan order afterwards adopted zealously this opinion, but maintained as absolutely certain, what Scotus had only ventured to pronounce *probable;* still, however, with the proviso that it be not contrary to the Catholic faith.

The Dominicans, on the other hand, armed with the authority of St. Bernard, and of their famous doctor St. Thomas Aquinas, combated this doctrine vehemently, as contrary to Scripture and to the tradition of the Church, and, therefore, contrary to the Catholic faith.

Still the opinion of the Franciscans grew in popular favour. It had an appearance of piety which recommended it to the devout. The University of Paris formally decided in its favour; and the Council of Basle, after much debate, declared it to be a pious opinion, not contrary to Scripture or Catholic faith, and, therefore, prohibited public teaching or preaching on the other side. Pope Sixtus IV., himself a Franciscan, threw the weight of his authority into the same scale. In 1476, he published a Bull, approving a new office for Festival of the Immaculate Conception, and granting indulgences to those who recited it or assisted at it. In 1483, he issued another Bull, condemning those who called

the doctrine of the immaculate conception a heresy, and the celebration of the festival of it a sin.

The Dominicans, however, did not consider themselves in any way bound by these Bulls; and the controversy continued to rage as fiercely as ever. The annual recurrence of the Feast of the Conception was a signal for the renewal of the hostilities; and gave birth every year to scenes of the most scandalous kind. But it is remarkable, that neither of the contending parties ever thought of appealing to the supposed infallible tribunal, in whose Divine authority both, nevertheless, professed to believe. They were content to fight and argue as if they had no such unerring judge of controversies; they disputed, and lost their temper in disputing, just like other men. Is it possible, then, to suppose that they really believed themselves to be the disciples of an infallible guide?

At length came the Council of Trent; and when the doctrine of original sin was there to be discussed, the Franciscans contended that an exception should be made in favour of the Blessed Virgin, in the decree which asserted generally that the sin of Adam had passed upon all his posterity. The Dominicans, on the other hand, contended, that no such exception was necessary, because St. Paul and the holy Fathers had expressed this doctrine generally, without making any exception in favour of the Virgin. This raised a warm debate on the doctrine of the immaculate conception. The Franciscans maintained that the Church, by celebrating the Festival of the Conception, had sanctioned their doctrine. The Dominicans admitted that the doctrine had, indeed, been tolerated by the Church; but argued that there was no ground, either in Holy Scripture or in sound theology, for exempting the Blessed Virgin from the common infection of our nature.

When the existence of this dispute was made known at Rome, instead of embracing the opportunity of having it finally decided by the infallible authority of the Council, orders were given to the Papal Legates, at Trent, to reconcile the contending parties as far as possible, without giving a triumph to either. The directions were—"Not to meddle with this matter, which might cause a schism amongst Catholics; to endeavour to maintain peace between the opposing parties, and to seek some means of giving them equal satisfaction; above all, to observe strictly the brief of Pope Sixtus IV., which prohibited preachers from taxing the doctrine of the immaculate conception with heresy."*

There directions were, no doubt (under the circumstances), eminently wise and prudent; but do they not most clearly show, that the Pope did not believe his own pretence to infallibility, and knew also that his followers did not believe it? Else why not take the present opportunity of settling, by an infallible authority, a controversy which had so long disturbed the church? But to meddle in the matter—that is to say, to decide the question one way or another, might cause a schism amongst Catholics. In other words, these "Catholics," whatever they may pretend, did not really believe in the infallibility of the Pope and Council. Else why should they not desire to have the truth infallibly ascertained? and why should there be any danger of a schism, after the infallible judgment was given? No person would surely be mad enough to separate himself from the church, in consequence of a decision which he believed to be infallibly true, and to have emanated from a supernatural and divinely promised guidance. The only mode of accounting for the conduct of the Pope and of the Council, on this occasion, is to suppose that neither one nor the other really believed in the pretence to infallibility. Acting is, after all, the real test of faith; and here the Pope acts exactly as any prudent, well-advised sovereign would act under similar circumstances—endeavouring to avoid a decision that must irritate one party or the other, and in the meantime seeking to conciliate both parties as much as possible. Although he speaks boldly and loudly before the world of his infallible authority, and of the great blessing of being in a church where there is an infallible tribunal for settling all disputes, yet to "Catholics" he says nothing of all this; on the contrary, he is fully alive to the danger of a schism amongst Catholics, if the infallible tribunal should happen to give an unpalatable decision—in other words, the Pope acts as one who was fully aware that he possessed no infallible tribunal, and as knowing, also, that his "Catholics" believed nothing of the sort, and would run into schism rather than submit to the pretended authority of his infallibility, if it should happen to run counter to their private opinions.

It is impossible to have a clearer proof than this that the Roman communion do not, practically, believe in their own claim to infallibility.

Here, however, we are told that this doctrine of the immaculate conception is not of faith, and, therefore, the promise of infallible guidance does not extend to the settlement of the question.

But if the boasted gift of infallibility does not enable the Roman Church to settle such a controversy as this, the advantages of the gift are very much less than its advocates are wont to pretend. If the infallible judge of controversy is unable to decide any controversy, except one in which some vital article of faith is at stake, we are no longer secured in that communion from all error, but only from the extreme error which uproots the faith. All other controversies and errors may exist, and produce in this infallible church the same evil fruits which they have brought forth and do bring forth in other communions.

But here the real question is, whether this doctrine be of faith or not. For they who maintain the immaculate conception maintain it as of faith; whilst they who deny its truth, deny it on the ground of its being inconsistent with an article of faith. Is the infallible tribunal, then, unable to tell its children whether this doctrine is to be believed and received as of faith, or whether it is to be rejected as inconsistent with other articles of faith? For this is the question at issue.

In point of fact, the infallible tribunal has permitted its children to hold inconsistent and opposite views on this subject, and to carry those views out into inconsistent and opposite practice. On the one hand, the advocates of the doctrine (since the twelfth century) have been permitted, and even encouraged, to celebrate an annual festival in honour of the immaculate conception, and to render that doctrine the same reverence in the public service of the church and in their public teaching, as they render to the Incarnation of our blessed Lord himself. What is this but to treat it as an article of faith? And if there were any doubt that it is and must be practically so regarded, that proof would be afforded by the collect in the office for that festival, which was approved by Pope Sixtus IV. In this collect God is addressed, without any doubt or qualification, as having "prepared, by the immaculate conception of the Virgin, an habitation worthy of his Son;" and the faithful are taught to pray to the Almighty, that *as* God had preserved her from all stain, *so* by her intercession, he would grant us to come purified into his presence. "Deus qui per immaculatam Virginis conceptionem dignum Filio tuo habitaculum præparasti, concede, quæsumus, ut sicut ex morte ejusdem Filii tui prævisa, *eam ab omni labe præservasti*, ita nos quoque mundos, ejus intercessione, ad te pervenire concedas."

Here the fact of the immaculate conception is pleaded in prayer with the Almighty as an article of faith, without any doubt or hesitation. It is not possible to imagine how faith can be expressed in a more effectual manner than when it is thus pleaded before God in prayer. It is thus that the church, in the collects for the highest festivals of our religion, pleads in prayer to God the doctrines of the Incarnation, the Epiphany, the Circumcision, the Resurrection, the Coming of the Holy Ghost, the Holy Trinity, the Ascension; and it is difficult to conceive in what more solemn way our faith in an article of faith could be evidenced or expressed.

The infallibility of the Roman Church has, therefore, permitted this doctrine of the immaculate conception to be practically made an article of faith in the most solemn offices of religion, whilst, at the same time, it tolerates, in a large and influential body, an absolute denial of the doctrine. Does not this savour greatly of worldly policy, and manifestly show that the authorities in the Church of Rome do not really believe their pretended infallible tribunal to be infallible? The pretence that this doctrine is not *de fide*, will not serve their turn here, because they have practically made it to be *de fide* to a large and increasing body in their communion, by sanctioning and tolerating the Festival and Office of the Immaculate Conception.

And more than this, divines are permitted, without censure, to connect that doctrine with articles of faith in such a way that, if we receive their statements, a belief in the immaculate conception is necessary to the reception of the faith. For example:—"It is impossible to believe," says Bernardinus, of Sienne, "that the Son of God could have consented to be born of the Virgin, or to have taken upon Him her flesh, if that flesh had ever had a taint of original sin."† What is this but an assertion that the Incarnation of the Son of God is *incredible*, unless we receive with it the doctrine of the immaculate conception of the Virgin? "It is impossible," says this author, "to believe the Incarnation, unless we believe also the immaculate conception of the Virgin;" and yet this assertion is tolerated without censure in a church which continues to exercise the power of censuring all books, even by those authors who are not of its communion.

One cannot imagine a stronger form in which a doctrine can be declared to be an article of faith, than by asserting that unless it be received, the doctrine of the Incarnation is incredible. The Church of Rome has tolerated and sanctioned this assertion, and yet seeks to escape from the inconvenience of tolerating also an opposite doctrine, by pretending that the immaculate conception is only a pious belief of the Church, and not an article of faith.

And accordingly we find that as the strength of the party who were opposed to this doctrine declined, the voice of the Holy See became more and more strong in its favour. In 1616, Paul V. prohibited all preaching, lectures, or public teaching against the immaculate conception—a decree which was again renewed in 1622 by Gregory XV., who extended the prohibition to books and private conversations, reserving, however, an exception in favour of those to whom the Holy See might give a special commission to oppose this doctrine.‡

So that the infallible judge reserves to himself the power of allowing one party in the Church, by a special indulgence, to contravene and refute a doctrine, for which he appoints, at the instance of another party, a special festival with a collect, making it, for those who use that office, an article of faith. He prohibits one party from impugning, even in private conversation, this favoured doctrine, but permits the opposite party to assert and teach openly, that except it be received, the very Incarnation of our Lord is incredible.

All this shows the prudence with which, not only the See of Rome, but the Council of Trent, felt it necessary to act in this matter. The inclination of the heads of the Roman Church has always been to declare this doctrine an article of faith, *if they dared to do so*, and every day one step after another is made in this direction. A very recent Papal ordinance, directed to the Congregation of Rites, has authorised the introduction of this doctrine into the public service of the church for the festival of the 8th December, amongst the Roman Catholics of Italy, Spain, France, England, Germany, and America, who, it seems, have petitioned to be permitted to add the adjective *immaculata* to the word *conceptione*, in the proper preface for that day. This doctrine is, therefore, now practically an article of faith amongst Romanists, in all these countries, and yet the infallible judge of controversies still prudently holds back, and forbears to pronounce that an article of faith, for the whole Church, which he has permitted so large a portion of his followers to embrace as such. In a few years the party opposed to the immaculate conception will probably be extinct, and then, no doubt, we shall find that the prudence of the Holy See, when the fear of causing schism is removed, will take another turn, and a new article of faith will be added to the Tridentine Creed.

All this seems strangely inconsistent with a confident belief in the existence of infallibility. It is the same sort of tortuous and prudent policy that is usually adopted by worldly politicians who have an object to carry, and who fear to give offence to a powerful minority. One party is permitted to go the whole length of celebrating a festival, and introducing their peculiar doctrine as an article of faith into the collect and proper preface for the day. The opposite party are forbidden to preach publicly, or to provoke the hostility of their opponents by troublesome discussions, whether public or private, but receive, nevertheless, a peculiar exemption from the necessity of using any office, or celebrating any festival in which the obnoxious doctrine is assumed—nay, they receive also a private indulgence, enabling them, *in their own schools*, to teach the opposite doctrine, and all this avowedly from prudence, lest, if the infallible judge should decide in favour of one party, the other should break out into schism.

It is evident, therefore, that neither the contending parties, nor the court of Rome itself, are believers in their own pretence to the possession of an infallible tribunal.

* F. Paul Sarpi—Hist. Conc. Trid. lib. ii., c. 69.

† "Non enim credendum est quod ipse Filius Dei voluerit nasci ex Virgine, et sumere ejus carnem quæ esset maculata aliquo originali peccato"—*Sermon* 49.

‡ "Neque etiam in Sermonibus et scriptis privatis audeant asserere, quod eadem beatissima Virgo fuerit concepta cum peccato originali, nec de hac opinione affirmativo aliquo modo agere seu tractare, ea capita tam in quibus a sancta sede apostolica fuerit aliter super his specialiter indultum."—*Decret.*, A. D. 1622.

Review.

Love and Loyalty. By the Author of Irrelagh. London: William Pickering. 1851.

We understand this graceful little poem has had the honour of being presented to Her Majesty, and has been graciously received. The welfare of Ireland is evidently dear to the heart of its author, who thus pleads for Erin—

"Nor let the noble oak that stems the blast
Neglect the graceful vine around it cast,
When timely succour might its health restore,
And bid its drooping branches flourish more.
Remember, in thy glance on trophies won,
Thy conquering Wellington is Erin's son.
Around thy brow is not one laurel band,
But hath some flower transplanted from her land.
Her gallant mariners have died to keep
Thy naval flag victorious o'er the deep.
Her pulpit eloquence hath charmed thine ear;
Her manly sense thy senate paused to hear,
And in sweet interchange of kindness flown
Hast seldom failed, nor wilt thou fail her now.

. . . . . .

Through the deep waters, guided by her God,
And meekly bending 'neath his chast'ning rod,
The long afflicted hears a still, small voice
Bidding her deeply-stricken heart rejoice.
Thousands, and tens of thousands, press to know
The sovereign balm for every human woe;
The proffer of salvation, full and free;
'Weary and heavy-laden, come to me.'
Whilst Erin, heavy burdened, sorely tried,
Looks in her sorrow to the Crucified;
Casts off her mental, soul-degrading chain,
And hails the light of early days again."

New and Recent Works

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

Booksellers to the Queen,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

THE RUSSIAN SHORES OF THE BLACK SEA, IN THE AUTUMN of 1852, with a Voyage down the Volga, and a Tour through the Country of the Don Cossacks. By Lawrence Oliphant. 8vo. 14s.

RUSSIA AND THE RUSSIANS; comprising an account of the Czar Nicholas, and the House of Romanoff, with a sketch of the Encroachments of Russia from the reign of the Empress Catherine. By J. H Cole, 21st Fusileers. 2s. 6d.

THE RUSSO-TURKISH CAMPAIGN OF 1828-29; with a View of the present State of the Eastern Question. By Colonel Chesney. 12s.

THE HISTORY OF THE FRENCH PROTESTANT REFUGEES, from the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. By Charles Weiss. 8vo. 14s.

HISTORY OF THE PROTESTANT CHURCH IN HUNGARY, FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE REFORMATION TO 1850, with reference also to Transylvania. With an Introduction by Dr. D'Aubigne. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

ALISON'S HISTORY of EUROPE, from the fall of Napoleon, in 1815, to the Establishment of Military Government in France, in 1852; being a continuation of his former celebrated work. Vols. I., II., and III. 8vo, 15s. each.

CHRISTOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, and a Commentary on the Messianic Predictions. By E. W. Hengstenberg, D.D. Vol. I. 10s. 6d.

THE EARLY PROPHECIES OF A REDEEMER; from the first Promise to the Prophecy of Moses. Considered in Six Discourses. By Rev. W. De Burgh, B.D. 8vo. 5s.

EXAMINATION OF MR. MAURICE'S THEOLOGICAL ESSAYS. By Robert S. Candlish, D.D. Crown 8vo. 6s.

OUTLINES OF SACRED PROPHECY. By Rev. T. R. Birks. New Edition. 5s.

THE SCARLET MYSTERY; or, Rome Unmasked. By J. G. MacWalter. 3s. 6d.

THE LIFE OF MRS. SHERWOOD. Edited by her Daughter. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

HOPE DEFERRED, NOT LOST; a Narrative of Missionary effort in South America. With Journals of Captain Gardiner, &c. 5s.

CAUTIONS FOR THE TIMES. Edited by the Archbishop of Dublin. 8vo. 7s.

MEMOIR OF RICHARD WILLIAMS, Catechist to the Patagonian Mission. By the Rev. Dr. James Hamilton. 12mo. 5s.

A MEMOIR OF THE REV. W. B. JOHNSTON, Missionary at Regent's Town, Sierra Leone. 5s.

OF THE PLURALITY OF WORLDS. An Essay. 8vo. 8s.

FRIENDS IN COUNCIL. A Series of Readings and Discourses thereon. 2 vols. Cheaper Edition. 9s.

COMPANIONS OF MY SOLITUDE. Cheaper Edition. 3s. 6d.

THE CHEMISTRY OF COMMON LIFE. By James F. W. Johnston. Vol. I. 5s.

ALISON'S HISTORY OF EUROPE, from the French Revolution in 1789 to 1815. Cheaper Edition. Vols. I. to V. 4s. each.

DISCOURSES ON THE CHRISTIAN REVELATION, viewed in connection with Modern Astronomy. By the late Thomas Chalmers, D.D. Fcp. 2s. 6d.

THE BIBLE IN THE COUNTING HOUSE: a course of Lectures to Merchants. By the Rev. H. A. Broadman, D.D. 8vo. 5s.

STORR'S FAMILY PREACHER. Short practical Sermons for home. 4s. 6d.

CHALMERS'S DAILY SCRIPTURE READINGS. 2 vols. 10s.

CHALMERS'S SABBATH SCRIPTURE READINGS. 2 vols. 10s.

MEMOIRS OF THOMAS CHALMERS, D.D., LL.D. By his Son-in-Law, the Rev. Wm. Hanna, LL.D. 2 vols. 12s.

BRADLEY'S PRACTICAL SERMONS for every Sunday and Principal Holiday in the Year. 8vo. 12s.

BRADLEY'S SERMONS on some of the Trials, Duties, and Encouragements of the Christian Life. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

ROBERTS' PLAIN SERMONS for all the Sundays and Chief Holidays of the year. 2 vols. 10s.

ROBERTS' PLAIN SERMONS for all the Sundays and Chief Holidays of the Year. Second Series. 2 vols. 18s.

THE DOMESTIC COMMENTARY ON THE HOLY SCRIPTURES. By a Clergyman of the Church of England. 4 vols. Imp. 8vo. £2 14s.

MATTHEW HENRY'S EXPOSITION ON THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT; with numerous Maps and Illustrations. 3 vols. 4to. Whole calf. £3 17s. 6d.

WORK: PLENTY TO DO AND HOW TO DO IT. By Margaret Maria Brewster. 4s.

CYCLOPÆDIA OF UNIVERSAL BIOGRAPHY; with numerous Illustrations. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

GRATITUDE: an Exposition of the Hundred and Third Psalm. By the Rev. John Stevenson. 8vo. 6s.

CHRIST IS ALL; a Series of Tracts. By the Venerable Archdeacon Law. No. 1—8. 1d. each.

MY SCHOOLS AND MY SCHOOLMASTERS; or the Story of my Education. By Hugh Miller. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

FIRST IMPRESSIONS OF ENGLAND AND ITS PEOPLE. By Hugh Miller. 7s. 6d.

THE LONDON PULPIT. By James Ewing Ritchie. 4s. 6d.

THE NEW IRISH PULPIT; or Gospel Preacher. New series. 3s. 6d.

The PSALMS Restored to MESSIAH; a brief Commentary. By the Rev. R. H. Ryland. With Preface, by Bishop of Cashel. 6s.

LESSONS and TRIALS OF LIFE. By the Author of "Bertha's Journal." 6s.

MEMOIR OF THE LIVES OF ROBERT AND JAMES A. HALDANE. By Alexander Haldane, Esq. 8vo. 12s.

MEMOIR OF THE REV. W. H. KRAUSE, A.M., Bethesda Chapel, Dublin, with selections from his Correspondence. By Rev. C. S. Stanford. Crown 8vo. 5s. 6d.

MEMOIR OF THE LATE REV. EDWARD BICKERSTETH. By the Rev. T. R. Bicks. Cheaper Edition. 2 vols. Fcap. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

THE BUD OF PROMISE: a Memoir of Eliza H. M. Græme. By the Rev. D. Pitcairn. 3s. 6d.

THE NET IN THE BAY; or Journal of a Visit to Moose and Albany. By the Bishop of Rupert's Land. 4s. 6d.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES: THE MOSLEM AND HIS END; THE CHRISTIAN AND HIS HOPE. By the Rev. John Cumming, D.D. 1s. 6d.

LEILA ADA, THE JEWISH CONVERT: an authentic Memoir. By Osborne W. Trenery Heighway. 3s. 6d.

SELECT EXTRACTS FROM THE DIARY, CORRESPONDENCE, ETC., OF LEILA ADA. By Osborne W. Trenery Heighway. 3s. 6d.

THE BOOK AND ITS STORY: a Narrative for the Young, on occasion of the Jubilee of the British and Foreign Bible Society. By L. N. R. With an introductory preface, by Rev. T. Phillips. Fcap. 4s.

A PORTRAITURE OF THE LATE REV. WILLIAM JAY, of Bath; an outline of his mind, character, and pulpit eloquence, &c. By the Rev. Thomas Wallace. 3s. 6d.

AN APPEAL TO THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF YORK, ON THE UNCONDEMNED HERESIES OF ARCHDEACON WILBERFORCE'S BOOK, entitled, "The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist." By the Rev. J. Taylor, M.A. 2s.

PLAIN SPEAKING. First series. Being forty short, Large-type Tracts. By the Rev. J. C. Ryle, B.A. In packet. 1s.

HOME TRUTHS. First, Second, and Third Series. By the Rev. J. C. Ryle. 3s. 6d. each.

THE BISHOP, the PASTOR, and the PREACHER. Three Biographical Lectures on Latimer, Baxter, and Whitfield; with introductory preface, on some Wants of the present Day. By Rev. J. C. Ryle. *(In the Press.)*

TRACTS FOR CHURCHMEN. Seventeen Numbers. In Packet. 1s.

THE GLORIES OF MARY, from the Italian of Alphonsus Liguori; with the approbation of Cardinal Wiseman. 2s.

THE POLISH LANCER; or 1812. A Tale of Napoleon's Invasion of Russia. By Louis Rellstab. 1s. 6d.

JOHNSTON'S CHART OF THE NORTH SEA, and the BALTIC, with the Countries adjoining; and Enlarged Plans of Cronstadt and Revel. 1s.

JOHNSTON'S MAP OF THE SEAT OF WAR, in the Danubian Principalities. 1s.

JOHNSTON'S NEW MAP OF THE BLACK SEA, CAUCASUS, CRIMEA, ETC., with enlarged plans of Sevastopol and the Bosphorus. 1s.

Lately Published,

WILLET'S "SYNOPSIS PAPISMI." New Edition. Edited by the Rev. J. Cumming, D.D. Ten vols. 8vo. Price £3.

London: JAMES MILLER, 17, Berner's-street, Oxford-street, and all Booksellers.

Just Published, Fcap. 8vo., Price 2s. 6d.

I.

THE FIRST RESURRECTION: Being Comments on First Corinthians, chapter xv. By the Rev. Robert Noble, A.M., Vicar of Athboy.

II.

Fcap. 8vo., cloth, price 1s. 6d.

THE PRINCIPLES OF ELOCUTION; Compiled from "The Elements of Rhetoric, by Archbishop Whately." With considerable additions and alterations.

III.

New Edition, Fcap. 8vo., cloth, price 2s. 6d.

THE COLLECTS OF THE LITURGY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND,

Catechetically Explained, Compared with Scripture, and briefly Commented upon, with the Date and Origin of each Collect annexed. For the use of Families and Sunday Schools.

By the Rev. Charles Miller, A.B.,

With Recommendatory Preface by the Bishop of Meath.

IV.

Fcap. 8vo., Neat Cover, Price 1s.

Cloth, 1s. 6d.; Cloth, Gilt Edges, 2s.

THE TALK OF THE ROAD: Showing how Irish people talk about Irish doings, when they get a quiet place, at the back of a ditch, or under a hedge.

V.

Royal 32mo., Price One Halfpenny each.

Stories about the Mission Work in Ireland.

The Bright Side of a Dark Cloud. II. Biddy Lacey. (The Series to be Continued.)

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Just Published,

Third Edition, Price 1s. 6d.; or in full cloth, Price 2s. 6d.

POOR PADDY'S CABIN; or, SLAVERY IN IRELAND. A true Representation of Facts and Characters. By an Irishman.

London: WERTHEIM and MACKINTOSH. Dublin: WM. CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

New Cheap Edition of the

WAVERLEY NOVELS.

12mo. Fancy Boards, Price 1s. 6d. each.

This Series of the highly popular Works of Sir Walter Scott is in preparation, and will be printed from a new, clear type; each Volume containing a complete Novel. The issue will commence on the First of June, with "WAVERLEY; or 'Tis sixty years since," and be continued in every alternate month.

Subscribers' names for the series received by

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY, 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, Dublin.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher, WILLIAM CURRY, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

Wednesday, February 14, 1852.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Sláir do Dhia aṅ gna háṙduiḃ, agus síoṁcáin air an dtalaṁ deaġtoil do na dáoiniḃ.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED THE MIDDLE OF EVERY MONTH, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. I.—No. 3. MARCH, 1852. {Annual Subscription, 3s. 6d. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Sketch of the Life of St. Patrick	25
Purgatory	26
Love for the Dead	27
The Talk of the Road—No. II.	27
Conversions and Perversions	28
Irish Nationality	29
Pope Adrian's Bull to Henry II.	30
Notices of Italian and American Journals	31
The Cause of Liberty in Europe	31
Mode of Appointing Roman Catholic Bishops in Ireland	32
Historical account of the mode of Appointing Bishops in Ireland up to A.D. 1152	32
Ancient Dignity of Ireland—Council of Constance	33
CORRESPONDENCE:	
Letter on Transubstantiation	33
Catholicus on Concomitancy	34
Letter of M. V. Aylmer, Esq., on Reading the Scriptures	34
POETRY:	
Dear Harp of my Country—Thomas Moore	30
Ode for St. Patrick's Day	35
Farming Operations for March	25

SKETCH OF THE LIFE OF ST. PATRICK.

THERE are few right-minded persons who do not feel pleasure in contemplating the history of the great and good men who, in times long past, have exercised important influences upon the state and spirit of their age; and we would fain hope there are fewer still, who, in looking back upon the illustrious names that adorn the annals of their native land, do not feel a throb of national pride, or, at least, some impulse of a generous enthusiasm stirring within their hearts. We do not envy the man for whom the records of departed greatness have no attractions; still less do we envy him whose sympathies cannot be touched, even by the memories of the wise and the good who have shed a lustre upon the country of his birth. Insensibility to the claims which the illustrious dead have upon the reverence of the living is not, however, one of the faults of Irishmen; on the contrary, our national character is honourably distinguished for a high appreciation of bygone worth, and for an affectionate clinging to the traditions in which the history of our earlier saints and heroes has been enshrined and transmitted from age to age.

These reflections have been suggested by the approach of the day which, in our national annals, has been consecrated to the memory of the apostle and chief patron saint of Ireland.* During a period of more than fourteen centuries the name of St. Patrick has been honoured and cherished by every genuine Irishman. But in this, as in similar cases, the lapse of so many ages has produced the effect that, of the multitudes who regard him as identified with their nationality and religion, there are comparatively few who possess anything like an accurate acquaintance with his history, and the part which he sustained in the evangelizing of the country. Nay, more, we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that, besides the want of information which generally prevails upon the subject of the life and times of this eminent servant of God, there are also many erroneous opinions popularly entertained, whether arising from vulgar prejudices, or—as it is to be feared they have done in too many instances—from intentional misrepresentation. We have, accordingly, thought that it might be neither uninteresting nor unprofitable, upon the present occasion, to give a brief summary of those incidents in St. Patrick's life which are most important for us to know, and which, in the opinions of the learned men who have most carefully investigated the subject, are best entitled to our belief.

Sec. 1. CHRISTIANITY IN IRELAND BEFORE SAINT PATRICK.

Before entering on the personal history of Saint Patrick, it may be well to say a word relative to the religious state of Ireland prior to his mission, especially as many persons appear to think that he was in such a sense the Apostle of Ireland, that the sound of the Gospel had never reached our shores before his arrival. Now, this is a great mistake. The express testimonies of ancient writers,† together with other arguments which we cannot now stop to consider, have led Roman Catholic, as well as Protestant, ecclesiastical historians to the conclusion that Christianity was planted in this country very many years before St. Patrick's age, though how, or by whom, it is now impossible to determine. At all events, it is certain, from Prosper's words, which we shall quote in the next section, that Christian believers existed in Ireland before the mission of Palladius, the immediate predecessor of St. Patrick.

Sec. 2. MISSION OF PALLADIUS.

However, though Christianity had been, as we have just said, very early introduced into Ireland, it does not appear to have flourished much down to the beginning of the fifth century. Its professors seem to have been few in number, and confined, chiefly or exclusively, to the southern portions of the island. Accordingly, our native annalists usually begin their ecclesiastical records with the mission of Palladius, who, as we learn from the chronicle of Prosper (a contemporary writer), "was ordained by Pope Celestine, and sent as first bishop to the Scots [i. e., the Irish]† believing in Christ." This famous mission of Palladius took place A.D. 431, the same year in which the œcumenical council—that of Ephesus—was held. It is plain, from the words of Prosper just quoted, that a church already existed in Ireland, when Palladius arrived there, over which he was appointed the first, or, as some understand the Latin word *primus*, the chief bishop.‡ However, the mission of Palladius proved a complete failure. After remaining for a short time—at the most a year—in Ireland, he was obliged to retire into Scotland, where he died not long after.

Sec. 3. ARRIVAL OF ST. PATRICK IN IRELAND.

It is generally agreed on, that the year after the arrival of Palladius—namely, A.D. 432—is that in which St. Patrick first visited these shores as a missionary. It is a much disputed point whether, like Palladius, he was sent upon this mission by the Bishop of Rome, or whether he was urged solely by the impulse of his own mind to undertake it. Viewing the matter, we trust, impartially, we must confess that the weight of evidence seems to be against the former of these opinions. If St. Patrick derived his commission from the Bishop of Rome, it must have been from Celestine. But Prosper does not say a single word about such a commission; and it is highly improbable that he—the friend, the counsellor, and the panegyrist of Celestine—would mention the abortive attempt of Palladius, and wholly pass over the successful one of St. Patrick. Nor, again, is there any intimation given, in St. Patrick's own writings,§ that he received his commission from the Pope. And, indeed, two of the most learned Roman Catholic writers, Colgan and Dr. Lanigan, candidly admit‖ that the *consecration* of St. Patrick by Pope Celestine cannot be maintained, though they are, of course, unwilling to concede that his commission was not, in some way or other, derived from Rome.

Sec. 4. HISTORY OF ST. PATRICK DOWN TO THE TIME OF HIS MISSION TO IRELAND.

We may now, before proceeding to give a sketch of the missionary labours of St. Patrick, review briefly the earlier history of his life. Upon the whole of this period much obscurity hangs; and in some particulars we have little else than conjectures, more or less probable, to guide us. This is the case, first of all, with respect to the *place of his birth*. Primate Ussher, who has been followed by Colgan and most subsequent writers, was of opinion that he was born in Scotland, near the present Dumbarton; whilst Dr. Lanigan has endeavoured to prove, that his birth-place was the town on the north coast of France now called Boulogne.* Other writers have suggested different places. Amongst the rest, the claims of Wales have been lately put forward, but on the authority of comparatively recent writings. The cause of this diversity of opinion is the difficulty of now identifying the ancient names of the places that are mentioned in connection with his birth.†

As to the *date* of his birth, the year A.D. 372 is usually assigned, though in this particular, also, considerable diversity of opinion prevails.‡ His *name*, we are told,§ was originally *Succait;* but he is generally known by the Latin name of *Patricius*, or Patrick. The statement in one of the ancient lives of him,‖ to the effect that he was of Jewish origin, his ancestors having come into Britain after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, seems to have originated in a false reading of a passage in the "Confession."

From the "Confession" we learn the remarkable fact, that *his father was a deacon, and his grandfather a priest*—the former being named Calphurnius, the latter Potitus. When about sixteen years of age (i.e., A.D. 388) he was taken captive with many others, by some Irish pirates, carried into the north of Ireland, and there sold to a Pagan prince, named Milcho, who employed him in taking care of his cattle. The scene of his slavery seems to have been somewhere near Ballymena, in the county of Antrim. His affliction produced a happy effect on his mind. He tells us himself in his "Confession," "that up to the period of his captivity, he knew not the true God, but that, in the strange land, the Lord brought him to a sense of his unbelief; so that, although late, he called his sins to remembrance, and turned with his whole heart to the Lord his God, who regarded his low estate, took pity on his youth and ignorance, watched over him before he knew him, and before he could discern between good and evil protected him and comforted him, as a father his own son."

Sec. 5. HISTORY OF ST. PATRICK'S MISSIONARY LABOURS.

Having spent probably about six years in captivity, he contrived to make his escape and regain his native land. He tells us himself, in his "Confession," "that he heard a voice in a dream, which directed him to flee to a certain part of the coast, where he should find a vessel that would convey him to his home. Some time¶ after this, he was again taken captive; but this second captivity lasted only for a short time, as he was restored to his friends within sixty days. It was a few years after this that he felt himself impelled by an irresistible desire to revisit the land of his first long exile, and communicate to the benighted inhabitants the knowledge of the blessed Gospel. He thought he beheld in a vision of the night a person, named Victricius, who brought him innumerable letters from Ireland, inviting him in the name of the people of Ireland to come amongst them. This took place about the year 397. Having made up his mind to devote his future life to this mission, he immediately set about qualifying himself for it; and with this view he placed himself under the care and instruction of the celebrated Germanus, Bishop of Auxerre, in France, with whom he remained a considerable time, "eagerly applying his mind to the attainment of wisdom, and the learning of the Holy Scriptures." He is also said, though on more doubtful authority, to have spent some time with the

* It may, perhaps, be unnecessary to state, that Ireland has three patron saints—St Patrick, St Columbkille, and St Brigget.

* Tertullian, adv. Jud. c. 7. Eusebius, Dem. Evang. Lib. iii., c. 7., Chrysost. oper. iii., 71 (edit. Bened.); vid. Lanigan's Eccles. Hist. I. pp. 1—9.

† The Irish were generally called by the name of Scots in early times, especially from the fourth to the eleventh century, at the latter of which epochs there is reason to think that the country now called Scotland first received that appellation.

‡ There are other indications which seem to show that an episcopacy existed in Ireland before the arrival of Palladius.

§ On the contrary, in his celebrated "Confession," and in his epistle to Coroticus, he ascribes his mission exclusively to a heavenly call.

‖ Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. i. 191. Colgan, Tr. Thaum. p. 258.

* That Lanigan is wrong, is decisively proved by the following passage of the "Confession" (cap. 19), in which Britain and Gaul are expressly distinguished—"Unde autem possem etiam volumen dimittere illius, et pergere in *Britanniam*, etiam libentissime paratus eram, quasi ad patriam et parentes; et non id solum, sed etiam usque ad *Gallias* visitarem fratres meos, ut viderem faciem sanctorum Domini mei."

† In the "Confession" we are informed that his birth-place was called *Bonaven*. The Hymn of Fiech says he was born at a place called *Nemthur*, or (as an eminent Irish scholar thinks it should be written) *Emter*. The author of his life, in the Leabhar Breac, states he was born at *Alcluaid*.

‡ Ussher gives the above date. Colgan prefers 373. Lanigan reduces it as low as 387.

§ Æorgus' Genealogies of the Saints in the Leabhar Breac. Ibid.

‖ How long is uncertain. See Lanigan i. 185.

still more famous St. Martin of Tours, and in the renowned monastery of Lerins, acquiring stores of knowledge and experience for the great work which lay before him.

This brings us to the year 432, in which, as above said (sec. 3), he carried into execution his long projected missionary visit to our shores. If we are right in assigning the year 372 as that of his birth, it follows that he was sixty years old at the commencement of his mission. He first landed on the coast of Leinster, probably at a place now called Wicklow. But having met with violent opposition from the Pagans and their idolatrous priests—the Druids or Magi—he took ship again, and directed his course to the northern parts of Ireland—the scene of his early captivity—and landed on the coast of Down; perhaps in the bay of Dundrum; or, as Dr. Lanigan thinks, at or near Strangford. Here his preaching met with better success. His first convert was Dichu, the chieftain of that district, whose example was followed by a great many of his subjects. It was on this occasion that the celebrated chapel, called *Sabhall Phadruig*, or Patrick's Barn, was erected: being the first church founded by St. Patrick, and the spot where his mortal remains probably repose. The modern name of this interesting place is Saul.

The following year, A.D. 433, one of the most remarkable occurrences in St. Patrick's life took place—namely, his preaching on Easter-day before Leogaire, the supreme monarch of Ireland, at Tara, in the County Meath, where the national parliament was then assembled for the celebration of the chief Pagan festival. An account of St. Patrick's visit to Tara, with the hymn which he composed on that occasion, and which is known as the *Luireach Phadruig*, or Patrick's Armour, is given in our last number, to which we, therefore, refer our readers. The subsequent events of his missionary career it is, according to Dr. Lanigan, next to impossible to arrange with a sufficient degree of chronological accuracy.* After preaching throughout Meath, he seems next to have visited Connaught about A.D. 435. Having spent, it is thought, about seven years in his Connaught mission, he then visited Leinster, the province in which he had been at first so unsuccessful. Now, however, it pleased God that his labours should be crowned with success: the princes of the country embraced the Gospel with alacrity, and encouraged their subjects to do the same. Munster was now the only remaining province of Ireland where he had not made known the message of peace. It has been thought that the reason why he left Munster for the last was, that as Christianity had been already planted there, his presence was less necessary than in other parts of the island. One of the first places in Munster which he visited was Cashel, which was then the seat of the royal residence. The date of this was about A.D. 445. The king, Œngus, became a convert, and assisted St. Patrick in setting to rights the ecclesiastical affairs of his kingdom. In Munster he is supposed to have spent about seven years. Having concluded his labours there, he returned to Down somewhere about the year A.D. 452; and took up thenceforth his abode at Saul, the place where, as we have seen, he first succeeded in planting the religion of Christ. About three years after his return to the north—that is to say, about the year A.D. 455—he is supposed by many learned men to have founded the metropolitan See of Armagh.† The date, however, of this event is much disputed. Archbishop Ussher fixes it ten years earlier—i.e., A.D. 445.

Between the metropolitan church of Armagh and the Abbey of Saul, St. Patrick spent the remainder of his days, in retirement and peace. Near the close of his life he seems to have written his famous "Confession," addressed to the people of Ireland, with a view to give them an account of the motives which influenced him to undertake his mission, and the hopes which sustained him in his various trials and dangers: as also, to record the goodness of God towards himself and those among whom he had so long laboured. We may observe in passing, that this work, which there is every reason to regard as the genuine production of St. Patrick, and the most valuable extant document relating to his life, is characterized throughout by an exalted tone of piety, and exhibits an unmistakable evidence of a mind deeply imbued with a knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, and a profound sense of their supreme authority. The year of his death is uncertain. The most generally received opinion assigns for it A.D. 492 or 493. This would make his age 120 years; which accordingly forms one of the four points of resemblance remarked by certain ancient writers between him and Moses.‡ The day of his decease is undisputed—namely, the 17th of March; which day has, accordingly, from time immemorial, been observed for his commemoration. It may seem strange that the burial place of so great a saint should not be certainly known: yet, so it is. Some claim that honour for Armagh; whilst others, with more probability, maintain that he was buried in Down. The memory of the exact place of his interment must have been lost very early; for we find one of the ancient writers above alluded to,* and who wrote probably about the close of the seventh century, stating the fourth point of resemblance between St. Patrick and Moses to consist in this, that "no one knew where were his bones."

Sec. 7. TWO OPPOSITE ERRORS RESPECTING ST. PATRICK TO BE AVOIDED.

We have all along taken for granted that the various accounts which remain to us of the life of St. Patrick, though differing from each other in many points, are all correct in affirming, as they do, his actual existence and his mission to Ireland; yet a few learned men have been found who have not hesitated to assert that the whole history of his life is a fable.† Some of their reasons are plausible; but they are not strong enough to shake the historical evidence on the other side. This scepticism seems to have been nothing else than a reaction against the boundless credulity with which dark and superstitious ages received and exaggerated the marvellous stories handed down respecting the miraculous powers of the saint. Whilst, therefore, we, on the one hand, feel ourselves compelled to reject such stories as idle tales, we feel no hesitation, upon the other, in protesting against a reckless criticism, which, if pursued to its legitimate consequences, would leave the history of the past an utter blank. To such sceptics, if any such now exist, we recommend the following judicious observations of Dr. O'Connor:—"Even if all the authorities and manuscripts in which St. Patrick is expressly mentioned were destroyed, the laws of just criticism forbid that, after the lapse of so many ages, and the destruction of so many monasteries and libraries as formerly existed in Ireland before the Danish invasions, the *silence* alone of such authors as remain (supposing such silence) should be admitted in evidence to overthrow a national tradition, so universal in every part of Ireland, Scotland, and Mann, so immemorial and so incorporated as that of St. Patrick is with the traditionary usages, names, anniversaries, monastic ruins, and popular manners of the millions of Irishmen who have existed since his time."‡

PURGATORY.

We avail ourselves of this opportunity, according to the pledge given in our last number, to give our readers some extracts from a valuable work, attributed to St. Patrick, and which has been included in nearly all the collections of his works down to that of the learned Villanueva, published by Grainsberry, Dublin, 1835; and treated as genuine not only by the learned Protestant writers, Archbishop Ussher and Sir Henry Spelman, but also by Father Colgan and other eminent Roman Catholic writers, and which is, at any rate, admitted by all scholars to be a treatise of great value and antiquity. The tract we allude to is entitled "The Three Habitations," or abodes of spirits; the subject of which is so directly connected with the matter in question, that it would be somewhat strange if it did not afford a strong testimony, one way or other, upon it. We think it does afford a striking negative testimony in favour of the assertion of Protestants, that the doctrine of a belief in purgatory is not based upon a tradition as old as the times of the apostles, but is an invention of a more modern date, which men have been led into believing, partly by fear and partly by credulity, without (as we hope hereafter to prove) any adequate proof, either from the Holy Scriptures, reason, or the writings of the early Fathers, when rightly understood. At present, however, we must confine ourselves to the treatise of St. Patrick, to which we have referred: "De tribus habitaculis regno Dei, mundo, inferno."§ The first chapter (we give the translation only, as there can be no dispute about its correctness) commences as follows:—

"There are three habitations under the government of the Almighty God—the upper, the lowermost, and the middle: of these *the uppermost* is called the kingdom of God, or *heaven*; *the lowermost* is termed *hell*; *the middle* is named *this present world*, or *this earth*. The two extremes are altogether contrary, the one to the other, *and have nothing whatever in common with each other*; for what fellowship can there be between light and darkness—between Christ and Belial? but the middle hath some similitude with the extremes: whence it is that it hath light and darkness, cold and heat, pain and no pain, joy and sorrow, hatred and love, the good and the bad, the just and the unjust, masters and servants, death and life, and innumerable other such like things; of which the one part bears an image of the kingdom of God, and the other of hell. For, in this world, there is a mixture of good men and bad men together; whereas in the kingdom of God there are none bad—all are good; but in hell all are bad—none are good. And both of these places are being filled up out of the middle; for of the men of this world some are lifted up to heaven, others are dragged down to hell—namely, like are joined to like: that is to say, good to good, and bad to bad; just men to just angels, and wicked men to wicked angels; the servants of God to God, the servants of the devil to the devil; the blessed are called to the kingdom prepared for them from the beginning of the world, the cursed are driven away into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels."

He then proceeds to describe, in scriptural language, the happiness of the blessed in heaven, and the torments of the damned in hell, where there shall be "weeping and gnashing of teeth," and innumerable kinds of torture. In chapter 3 he eloquently descants on the insanity of those whom *eternal* punishment does not deter from the pleasures of the world; and whom (in the 4th chapter) he urges to resist the suggestion of Satan, and leave the "broad way" which leads to death for the "narrow path" which Christ trod before us, and which leads to life eternal. In chapter 5 he defends the prescience of God as compatible with the free agency of man; and ends this earnest and beautiful treatise by a chapter on the knowledge or the triple vision of body, spirit, and understanding, of the blessed in heaven. From beginning to end there is not contained in it the slightest allusion to any such place or state as purgatory, or to masses for the dead, or any such topic. This is admitted by Dr. Lanigan and Mr. Brenan, both Roman Catholic historians; though they try to account for it in different ways, both equally unsatisfactory to any unbiassed mind. Dr. Lanigan attempts to explain it, by saying that St. Patrick had no occasion to mention purgatory in this tract, as it is only on *permanent* habitations; in which case, however, it is obvious that the *present world*, as well as *purgatory*, would have been omitted, as no one can conceive this world to be a *permanent* habitation. Mr. Brenan suggests that, as hope is not excluded from purgatory, *purgatory* may, perhaps, be included, by the author of this treatise, under the state of happiness, or *heaven*. To this we shall venture to reply, in the words of Mr. King, in his Church History of Ireland, vol. i., p. 49:—"This is, to say the least of it, an unusually *pleasant* notion of purgatory; and one that, if generally received, might save some money to many of our poor countrymen, and dissipate, too, some of their purgatorial societies; it will hardly, however, strike our Roman Catholic friends as a very satisfactory way of meeting the troublesome silence of the treatise in question."*

We have thus redeemed our pledge, so far as the opinions of St. Patrick are concerned. We shall take occasion hereafter to call the attention of our readers to other testimonies equally important, including that of St. Leo the Great, himself one of the Popes, who was contemporary with St. Patrick, and died in 461, and who appears to have been as little acquainted with the idea of penitents paying or performing in purgatory what they had failed to pay here, as St. Patrick himself; and we shall also discuss, *seriatim*, the several passages of Scripture and the Fathers relied on by Roman Catholic writers in favour of their opinions; remembering that the burden of proving their opinions to be true fairly lies on them, and not on those who rest on the distinct revelation of heaven and hell, as to which there is no dispute. In the meantime we would crave the attention of our serious readers to the consideration of the following words of our Blessed Lord, and his holy and beloved apostle St. John, taken from the Douay Testament—"Amen, Amen, I say unto you, that he who heareth my word, and believeth him that sent me, *hath life everlasting, and cometh not into judgment*, but is passed from death into life."—5th ch. Saint John's Gospel, 24th verse. If the servant of God passeth—nay, is passed—from death to LIFE, and cometh not into judgment, how can he pass from death to the excruciating though terminable pains of purgatory? Those who *have* eternal life can suffer no intermediate punishment, judgment, or condemnation, according to the doctrine of Christ; and if any are apprehensive lest *even the blessed* should not be pure enough without purgatorial cleansing, let him read what the blessed apostle St. John says, in his first Epistle, ch. i., v. 7:—"The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from ALL sin." If that be true, what further cleansing is left for purgatory to do? and on that view and on no other, we can easily understand the glorious and comforting words of the same St. John in the Apocalyptic vision, where he writes—"Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord. From *henceforth now*, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours, for their works follow them."—Apoc. ch. xiv., 13th ver.

CREDULITY AND SCEPTICISM.—Credulity has been well defined to be "Belief without reason;" and scepticism its opposite, as—"Reason without belief." It is difficult to determine which is the more incompatible with practical common sense.

* Lanigan i., 237.
† See Lanigan i., 313.
‡ See Lanigan i., 133.

* Tirechan, whose notes on the life of St. Patrick are preserved in the Book of Armagh.
† Dr. Ledwich is the most remarkable of those who have maintained this paradox. See Lanigan i. 48.
‡ Columbanus ad Hib., No. 3, p. 59.
§ Sancti Patricii Ibernorum Apostoli Synodi Canones, Opuscula, Scholiis Illustrata. a J. L. Villanueva. Dublini, 1835. P. 280.

* As to the place called St. Patrick's Purgatory, in Lough Derg, County Donegal, which may occur to the minds of some of our readers, it never was believed by any one to have relation to the future state; and Dr. Lanigan (vol i., p. 368) states that it never was heard of till the eleventh century, 500 years after St. Patrick's time; and that it was demolished in 1497, by order of the Pope, though in some manner restored since.

LOVE FOR THE DEAD.

The grave is the ordeal of true affection. It is there that the Divine passion of the soul manifests its superiority to the instinctive impulse of mere animal attachment. The latter must be continually refreshed, and kept alive by the presence of its object; but the love that is seated in the soul can live in long remembrance. The mere inclinations of men languish and decline with the charms which excited them, and turn with disgust from the dismal precincts of the tomb; but it is thence that truly spiritual affection rises purified from every sensual desire, and returns, like a holy flame to illumine and sanctify the heart of the survivor. The sorrow for the dead is the only sorrow from which we refuse to be divorced. Every other wound we seek to heal—every other affliction to forget; but this wound we consider as a duty to keep open—this affliction we cherish and brood over in solitude. Who can look down upon the grave even of his enemy, and not feel a compunctious throb, that he should ever have warred with the poor handful of earth that lies mouldering before him?

Ay, go to the grave of buried love and there meditate—there settle the account with thy conscience for every past endearment unregarded, of that departed being, who can never more return to be soothed by thy contrition. If thou art a child, and hast ever added a sorrow to the soul, or a furrow to the silvered brow of an affectionate parent; if thou art a husband, and hast ever caused the fond bosom, that ventured its happiness in thy arms, to doubt one moment of thy kindness or thy truth; if thou art a friend, and hast ever wronged, in thought, word, or deed, the spirit that generously confided in thee: if thou art a lover, and hast ever given one unmerited pang to that true heart, which now lies cold and still beneath thy feet—then, be sure that every unkind look, every ungracious word, every ungentle action, will come thronging back upon thy memory and knocking dolefully at thy soul—then, be sure that thou wilt lie down sorrowing and repentant on the grave, and utter the unheard groan, and pour the unavailing tear—more deep, more bitter, because unheard and unavailing.

Then weave thy chaplets of flowers, and strew the beauties of nature about the grave—console thy broken spirit, if thou canst, with these tender, yet futile, tributes of regret; but take warning by the bitterness of this thy contrite affliction over the dead, and henceforth be more faithful and affectionate in the discharge of thy duties to the living.—*Washington Irving.*

TALK OF THE ROAD—No. II.

Well, a few days after Jemmy Brannan made up his mind to speak to the Rev. Mr. Owens, it happened that Jemmy and Pat Dolan were working together for a farmer; and they were filling a cart out of some manure-heaps that lay on the roadside. And, as they were working, who should come up the road but Mr. Owens himself. Now, Mr. Owens seldom passed people by without saying a word; for he was a pleasant spoken man, and Irishmen like a gentleman that speaks free and pleasant. So Mr. Owens said, "It's a fine day for the work, boys: thanks be to God for it."

"A fine day, your reverence, God be praised," said Jem, very well pleased to have Mr. Owens to speak to that day.

"It would be bad farming without the dung, boys," said Mr. Owens.

"Sure enough, your reverence, that would be bad work," said Pat; "but there's a deal of poor creatures has little dung to put on it since potatoes went."

"And without the spade or the plough, the dung is not much good," said the parson.

"I'm thinking both spade and plough will have to go deeper these times," said Jem.

"Did you ever hear of Jesus Christ digging and dunging?" said Mr. Owens.

"No, your reverence," said both the men, dropping their spades in great amazement.

"Why, did you never read of that in the Bible?" said Mr. Owens.

"No, your reverence," said Jem, "I never did."

"What Bible is it in, your reverence?" said Pat; "is it in the Protestant Bible or the Catholic Bible?"

"And which of these do you read?" said Mr. Owens.

Pat did not like to say he never read a word of either in his life, so he said nothing, and Mr. Owens went on—"I believe it is just the same in both, as I could show you if I had the books."

"Well, your reverence," said Jem, "that is just what I would like to see."

"What?" said Mr. Owens.

"The differ between the two books," said Jem.

"Well, if that is all you want to see," said Mr. Owens, "it is not much; for the 'differ' is so small you will hardly see it at all: but what makes you wish for it?"

So Jem was fairly in for the very thing he wanted; and so he said, "Your reverence, I can't make out why reading the Bible should put people astray, and make them leave the Catholic Church."

"Nor I either," said Mr. Owens. "How could it do that? It comes to us from God himself, that made the Church, and knows what is best for it."

"But sure, your reverence," said Pat, "don't we know that they that gives us the Bible, always wants us to leave the Catholic Church."

"Were the blessed apostles good Catholics—St. Peter, and St. Paul, and St. Matthew, and all the rest of them?" said Mr. Owens.

"Surely they were, your reverence," said Jem.

"And how would their writings, that they wrote to all the people that they made Catholics, how would those writings turn any man away from the Catholic Church?" said Mr. Owens.

"That's just what I want to know, your reverence," said Jem; "and I heard tell that it was the Protestant Bible that did it, and that the Catholic Bible would not do it at all; and that's the reason I wanted to see the differ?"

"I can't show you the 'differ' without the books," said Mr. Owens; "but if you and your neighbour here will come down to my house some evening, I'll put one book in your hand and the other in his, and you can read turn about, and compare them, and see the 'differ.'"

"And when will we come down, your reverence?" said Jem.

"This evening, if you like, when you leave off work," said Mr. Owens.

"With God's blessing, then, I'll go," said Jem.

So Mr. Owens had to leave them, for he had to see a sick man; and when he was gone, Jem asked Pat to go with him that evening; and Pat was not willing at first; so Jem said to him, "Sure you shall hold the Catholic Bible yourself, and you may as well come and see the end of it."

So that evening they both went up to Mr. Owens's, and he brought them both into his study, and got down the two books; and first he opened the Douay Bible, and showed them what was printed in the first page—

"APPROBATION.

"This new edition of the English version of the Bible, printed with our permission by Richard Coyne, 4, Capel-street, carefully collated by our direction with the Clementine Vulgate; likewise, with the Douay version of the Old Testament of 1509,* and with the Rhemish version of the New Testament of 1582, and with other approved English versions, we, by our authority, approve, and we declare that the same may be used, with great spiritual profit, by the faithful; provided it be read with due reverence, and the proper dispositions. Given at Dublin, 2nd September, 1829."

And then Mr. Owens showed them that this approbation was signed by "Daniel Murray, D.D.," the late Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, and he showed them this added to it—"We concur with the above approbation," signed by 24 of the Irish Roman Catholic bishops. So Jem and Pat were both satisfied that this was the right book, and Pat was more easy in his mind; for after reading this he thought it could be no harm for him to look into it; and so he kept this book in his hand, and Mr. Owens handed the other to Jem.

"Now, where would you like to read?" said Mr. Owens.

"Oh, your reverence can chose better than we can," said Jem.

So Mr. Owens opened the Church of England Bible at the First Epistle of Timothy, chap. ii. and verse 5, and Jem read as follows:—"For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus."

"Holy Kitty!" exclaimed Jem.

"Stop a minute, my friend," said the parson, laying his hand on Jem's arm; "who was Kitty?"

"Why, then, indeed, your reverence," said Jem, "I don't know, barrin she might be one of the saints."

"And will you swear by you don't know who? Do you know what our Saviour says about swearing?" said the parson.

"I suppose 'thou shalt not take the name of God in vain,' said Jem; "but what harm is it to swear by holy Kitty?"

"Is it not harm to do what Christ commands us not to do?" said Mr. Owens.

"Surely," said Jem, "there's no denying that."

"Well," said Mr. Owens, "listen to the words of Christ himself, in his own sermon on the Mount (Matthew v. 34), '*I say to you not to swear at all.*' and in v. 37, '*Let your speech be yea, yea; no, no: and that which is over and above these is evil.*' And the Apostle, St. James, in his epistle, says (chapter 5, v. 12), 'But, above all things, my brethren, swear not; neither by heaven, nor by the earth, nor by any other oath; but let your speech be yea, yea; no, no; that you fall not under judgment.' Now, I ask you, my friends," said the parson, "can it be safe for us to swear by *any* oath, when we have such directions from God about our talk?"

"Surely not, your reverence," said Jem.

"And if God has given us such directions, ought we not to keep them? and can we keep them without knowing them? Now, did you ever know this before, that Christ had given us orders not to swear by any oath?"

"I never heard it before," said Jem.

"You see, then," said Mr. Owens, "what need we have to study God's word in order that we may know what God commands us to do, or not to do. If we do not know his word, we may be continually doing the very things that make him angry. But come back to the verse you read, Jem; it seemed to strike you forcibly."

"Holy Virgin!" exclaimed Jem.

"Stop again, my friend," said the parson; "are you not doing again the very thing that your Saviour bid you not do?"

"I am, your reverence," said Jem; "but it is so hard for a man to quit, in a moment, what he was used to all his life."

"You see, then," said the parson, "what need we have to study Christ's words, and to learn them carefully that we may keep them. That is the reason that we teach the Bible to our children, that they may learn to avoid habits that are so displeasing to God, and so hard to get rid of. The Jews were told to teach them to their children; and why not to Christian children? And St. Paul praised Timothy for knowing them from a child. And you see now what need there is that the Church should teach Christ's words carefully to people; for it is not once hearing them that will do; we must read and study them again and again, to learn to keep them. And this is why we teach the Bible so much."

"But, your reverence," said Pat, "I hear Protestants swear betimes; and how comes that if they get such instruction?"

"And many," said Mr. Owens, "that heard our Saviour teach, and his Apostles too, were never the better, but the worse of what they heard. Very likely that some that heard the Sermon on the Mount went on swearing; but that was no fault of the teaching. The Church ought to teach Christ's words, whether man will hear them and do them or not. But come back to our verse: what were you going to say of it, Jem?"

"I was going to say, your reverence," said Jem (and he didn't swear this time), "if them isn't the very words that made Johnny Connor, the sexton of the chapel, turn Protestant. Sure I heard him myself, when Father John taxed him in the chapel fornent the people with reading, and wanted to take his Bible, and Johnny wouldn't give it. 'And what do you find in it,' says Father John, 'that you won't give it up?' 'I find in it,' says Johnny, 'that there is one mediator between God and men.' I mind the words well. Now Pat," said Jem, turning sharp round on Pat as he spoke, "look at your book, man, and see if the words is there; and then we will see which book set Johnny Connor astray."

"Read it again in your own book first," said the parson, "and then we will see the 'differ' exactly."

So Jem read again, "*For there is one God and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.*"

"Now, my friend, will you read?" said the parson to Pat. So Pat read, *For there is one God and one Mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus.*

"Now," said the parson, "what Bible set Johnny Connor astray?"

"Well, that's plain, anyway," said Jem; "there's but one Mediator; and the one book is as good as the other for that."

"What would you like to have next?" said Mr. Owens. So both told him to choose, for they were at a loss.

"Can you say the commandments?" said Mr. Owens.

"Yes, your reverence," said both of them.

So Mr. Owens turned to Jem, "Say the first commandment;" so Jem said, "Thou shalt have no other gods but me." Then Mr. Owens turned to Pat, and said, "Say the second commandment." "Thou shalt not take the name of God in vain."

"Is there nothing else between the two?" said Mr. Owens.

"No, your reverence," said both Pat and Jem together.

"Were you never taught that something was left out."

"No, your reverence," said they both. So Mr. Owens opened the two Bibles, and made them read what was left out in their catechisms; and Jem read first out of the Protestant book—"Thou shalt not make to thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth: Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them; for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me, and show mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments." And then Pat read out of the Roman Catholic Bible—"Thou shalt not make to thyself a graven thing, nor the likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, or of those things that are in the waters under the earth. Thou shalt not adore them nor serve them. I am the Lord thy God, mighty, jealous, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me, and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments."—Exodus xx. 4, 5, 6 (Douay Bible).

* This date, 1509, must be a misprint, for the Douay version of the Old Testament was published for the *first time* in the year 1609.

"I don't see 'images' in the Catholic Bible, your reverence," said Pat.

"And what *can* a graven thing mean, but a graven image?" said Mr. Owens.

"Never mind that, your reverence," said Jem. "I see the word '*likeness*' in *both books;* and if we must not make a '*likeness*' of anything in heaven, how can we make an image of it?"

"Now, then," said Mr. Owens, "you see what God said in his commandments, and you never knew that before."

"Well, that beats all, your reverence," said Jem, "the two Bibles is like enough; and the Catholic Bible that we don't see, and the Catholic catechism that we do see and learn, is not like at all."

"And that, too," said Mr. Owens, "in the matter of God's own commandments that he spoke himself. And how shall we know how to serve God, if we do not know his own commandments?" And here Mr. Owens showed them, in the Douay Bible, the words just before the ten commandments of God—"'And the Lord spoke ALL THESE WORDS.' Now, if God spoke all these words in giving his commandments, should not we *learn* THEM ALL when we learn the commandments? And here, you see, we should not put our trust in any church or man to teach us God's commandments, but we should look in the Bible to see what God commanded. But it's getting late," said Mr. Owens; "maybe you would come in some other night?"

"Indeed, an' we will," said Jem, "but I'd like to have the book at home."

"Which book?" said Mr. Owens. So then Pat and Jem began debating; for Pat wanted the Catholic book, for he was still afraid the Protestant book might set him astray; so at last they agreed that Jem should take the Protestant Bible, and Pat the Douay Bible, and read them together, verse about in the evenings, till they found all the "differ;" and so Jem asked the price of his book. "A shilling," said the parson; so Jem paid it, well pleased. And then Pat pulled out his shilling.

"Oh," said Mr. Owens, "this book is four and sixpence."

"Four and sixpence, your reverence," said Pat; "and sure Jem's is the purtiest book; for it has a real leather cover on it, and this is only paper; and Jem's is only a shilling."

"I can't help that," said Mr. Owens; "we can't get this book for less."*

"I see now, your reverence," said Jem, "it's the Protestants that wants the poor to have the Bible anyway, when they make it cheap." And so the parson agreed to give Pat his book for two and-sixpence, and to take it at sixpence a week; and when they were going out, Mr. Owens said—"I hope, boys, you don't think that I set you astray."

"And does your reverence not want us to leave the Catholic Church?" said Pat.

"If St. Peter or St. Paul was to preach to-morrow," said Mr. Owens, "would you listen to them? or if they wrote you a letter would you read it?"

"Surely, your reverence," said Pat, "I would."

"And would that make you leave the Catholic Church?" said Mr. Owens.

"It couldn't, your reverence," said Pat.

"Well," said Mr. Owens, "I give you the letters they wrote to you and to all. If I saw St. Peter or St. Paul, I would not ask them to leave the Catholic Church; and no more would I ask you: I want you to be such Catholics as St. Peter and St. Paul were—no more, and no less; and for that I give you their writings to read. Judge for yourselves, my friends, for you have common sense, like most Irishmen, whether they who give you St. Peter and St. Paul's writings, or they who keep them from you, are most in earnest in wanting you to be such Catholics as St. Paul and St. Peter were."

So they left Mr. Owens for that night; and if we hear of anything more, it won't be lost.

CONVERSIONS AND PERVERSIONS.

IN our opening address to our readers we remarked that publications such as this, devoted to the calm consideration of the points of religious difference amongst our countrymen, are particularly well suited to the times in which we live. Fifty or a hundred years ago such a paper would have had no chance of finding readers. The fashion then was to cry down all attempts to meddle with the religious belief of others. "Let every man," it was said, "go to heaven his own way, content himself to believe what his father or his teacher had taught him, and satisfied to let his neighbour believe in peace the creed in which *he* had been brought up." But a time has now come when this way of talking will no longer impose on any one. We know that in the religious disputes which now prevail, both parties cannot be in the right; and since both parties profess to bring us a message from God, we cannot think it a matter of small consequence, which is in the right and which is in the wrong. No doubt, it is not pleasant to question the truth of the doctrines which we have believed from childhood, and to ask ourselves, "Is it possible that we may have been mistaken in what we have so many years received as certain?" But, pleasant or not, the inquiry cannot but be profitable. If we are in the wrong, it may, perhaps, concern our eternal salvation to find out our mistake in time; and if we are in the right, it cannot but be a comfort and satisfaction to our minds to be able to give good convincing reasons for our belief.

As we began by saying, there has not been a time these hundred years at which men were better disposed than they are now in these countries to see and act on their duty of examining for themselves whether what their parents and their clergy had taught them be true or not. Very many have thus, more or less, examined for themselves; and the result has been, that they have been satisfied of the correctness of what they have been taught, and have decided on abiding by their old religion. But there are a good many more with whom such an examination ends otherwise, and who, for love of what they think truth, are willing to give up all their old opinions, even though they lose thereby the friendship of those most dear to them. But the wonder is, that these conversions take place on both sides. Protestants have become Romanists, and Romanists have become Protestants. Now, we do not mean to dispute the sincerity of either party in their change. The spirit in which this journal is conducted does not allow us to impute unworthy motives, nor are we at all disposed to do so. At first this was done commonly enough by men who cared more for their party than for truth; and those who gained nothing by their change but to be cursed, and pelted, and hooted, to be turned off from their employments, and shut out from the shops where they had been used to deal, were said to have changed their religion only for the sake of the worldly advantages they gained by the change. Now, however, this cannot much longer be said; for the number of converts is now great enough to exhaust any funds which the most liberal imagination can suppose supplied for the purpose of proselytizing. At any rate, let others act as they will, we, in this journal, are determined not to seek for truth by abusing our opponents instead of arguing with them. For the sincerity of their motives we know they must give an account to God; all we are concerned with is, what reason each can give for his change of religion. It is plain enough that when a Protestant becomes a Romanist and a Romanist becomes a Protestant, one of the two must have changed for the worse. One of them must have given up truth, to take falsehood in its stead. It is important, then, that we should hear what reasons each can give, that we may know *which is the convert and which is the pervert.*

There are some who would settle this question in a very summary manner. They say the converts who have been made to Protestantism are, for the most part, ignorant men, who have not read books of controversy on the points disputed between the churches; those who have given up Protestantism are learned men, who have been able to study what doctrines were held by the Fathers and by the primitive church, and who, no doubt, have embraced the Romish faith, because their reading has taught them that this has been held by the church from the beginning. "Ought we not, then, to attach more weight to the conversion of one such learned man than to the change of the religious opinions of a hundred uneducated peasants?" It is proverbial, however, that a man is likely to bring himself to shame who decides on a matter before he hears it; and so, in this case, we do not think it fair to come to a conclusion without hearing what each party has to say. We must not let our prejudices make us refuse to listen to the one if he has good reasons to offer, nor must we take for granted that the conclusions of him whom we think the more learned are right, unless it appears that it is his learning that has led him to these conclusions.

Of those English clergymen who were the first to go over from Oxford to Rome, Mr. Ward and Mr. Oakeley were two of the most prominent. While still professing to be members of the Church of England, both had written in defence of Roman Catholic doctrine so warmly that the one was deprived of his degrees by his university, and the other was censured by a formal decision of the ecclesiastical courts, and prohibited from performing any ministerial duties until he should retract his errors. Both, in consequence, abandoned the communion of the Church of England, at a time when several, who have since followed their example, were still professing themselves her faithful and devoted children. It is, then, no unfair choice to take Mr. Ward and Mr. Oakeley, the leaders of the movement, as samples for the rest, and to inquire in their case whether superior learning was the cause of the change in their religious opinions. Now, it is very remarkable that both these gentlemen take pains to declare their ignorance of the common controversial writings on both sides, and to profess, too, that it was not any search into the writings of the early Fathers which led to their change of creed. Mr. Ward says—"When the eyes of certain English churchmen were opened by God's grace, some twelve years ago, to discern the fearful precipice towards which religious opinion was hastening among us, they altogether eschewed the idle and ridiculous child's play of examining between rival doctrines by means of patristic and scholastic studies." And Mr. Oakeley says—"So long as the Church of England impressed my own conscience, in spite of her many anomalies, as an adequate object of loyalty and affection, I not only clung to her, but gave myself up to her without examining the question of her historical claims upon my acceptance. And so now, without knowing definitely how Rome makes out her pretensions from the history of past ages (a most interesting question, nevertheless, and one which I am delighted to think is so soon to receive elucidation), I bow myself before her, because she plainly corresponds with that type of the Catholic Church which is deeply and habitually impressed upon my whole moral and spiritual nature." In these and such like passages these writers treat the deciding of religious controversies by learned historical investigations as idle and ridiculous child's play; and they think it only necessary to inquire which religion is best adapted to satisfy their own spiritual wants. Now, it is plain, that when this line of argument is taken up, the opinion of the most refined and highly-educated man is not worth more than that of the poorest and most illiterate. Christ said of his religion, that *the poor* had the Gospel preached unto them; and he, no doubt, intended his Gospel to satisfy the spiritual wants of the many as well as of the few. And, certainly, the multitude who, within the last few years, have joined the communion of the Church of England, would say that they have done so (amongst other reasons) because her doctrines are best qualified to satisfy their spiritual wants. They would tell us, that once they were ignorant, and that so long as they quietly submitted to the rules of their Church, their spiritual guides cared not to instruct them; but that now they are encouraged to read and love the written Word of God; that once they knew nothing of the real character of the Son of God; that they were taught to regard him as a harsh and stern judge, and that his place in their affections was occupied by other mediators, through whom, they supposed, they must appease him; but that, since they have read the Scriptures for themselves, they know that there is but one Mediator between God and man, and that none other can be more loving, more compassionate, more ready to sympathize with all their feelings, or better deserving of any love they can offer him in return; that once they thought little of sin; that they imagined a few words of confession, followed by the priest's absolution, washed out the old score, and left them at liberty to begin a new one; but that now they dread sin, since they have learned to know it as the abominable thing which God hates—as that which is sufficient, if unatoned for, to plunge the whole of the human race in misery, and which nothing less than the blood of a Divine Saviour will blot out; that once they committed to the grave with shuddering fearfulness the bodies of their departed friends, believing that, even the best of them, had gone to a place of torment, there to remain they knew not how long, and giving as much money as their scanty means would allow to hasten the release of those whom they loved from that state of misery; but that now, when they follow to the tomb one who has died in Christ, their sorrow is only for their own loss; but they dread no sufferings for the departed; they believe that he whom the blood of Christ has cleansed from *all* sin has no further any debt to pay, and they listen, with joyful confidence, to the consoling words of Scripture, "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord; even so, saith the Spirit, for they rest from their labours." Now, when these men tell us that the doctrines which they have thus embraced are those best adapted to satisfy their spiritual wants, it is no answer to say, that these men are not learned; for this is a question with which learning has nothing to do. The argument is just as good in their mouths as when Mr. Oakeley and Mr. Ward tell us, that it suits *their* spiritual necessities best to listen to the voice of the Church speaking with authority, and pronouncing dogmatically on every point of doctrine, and to be spared the trouble of searching out the truth for themselves.

But in point of fact, the Irish converts to Protestantism are *more learned* than the English converts to Romanism; for they do not content themselves with the arguments just alluded to. They do not pronounce on the truth of a doctrine from its fitness to satisfy the wants of their own minds, without an appeal to antiquity. If asked, why they reject any Romish doctrine? the first answer they would give is, because they find it does not agree with the teaching of the Primitive Church. The doctrines of the Primitive Church have been handed down to us in the writings of the Apostles and Evangelists; and an acquaintance with these is the most valuable learning that a Christian can possess. Such learning the Church of England desires should be possessed by the humblest of her members. She does not ask them to believe any doctrine on her word alone; nor does she wish to keep them in ignorance, in the hope that they will be thus more ready to listen to her teaching; but she wishes them to examine for themselves, whether what she teaches be not the very same which Peter, and John, and Paul taught. And when men say that they have so examined, and have embraced her communion in consequence of such an

* We are glad to hear that the Douay Bible may now be procured at 2s. 6d., published by Simms and M'Intyre, Belfast.—ED.

examination, is not their opinion entitled to more respect than that of men who change their creed without any historical examination at all?

But we do not mean to say that the reasons given by Mr. Oakeley and Mr. Ward are the same as those given by *all* who have left the Anglican Church. And we are bound, in fairness, to consider the reasons alleged by Mr. Newman, one of the most distinguished of the number. To explain these to our readers, it is necessary to lay before them, a little more in detail, the actual state of the controversy between the churches. Protestants believe that Holy Scripture contains all things which are required to be believed, as necessary to salvation; and they resist every attempt to impose on men's consciences any doctrine, as an article of faith, if that doctrine be not found in the Bible. They hold that the great religious movement, which took place in the sixteenth century, was no more than the clearing of Christ's religion from human additions, which had been made gradually in the course of many centuries, and the restoration of the simple doctrines taught by our Lord and his Apostles. Romish controversialists, on the other hand, contended that the Scriptures do not contain *all* the doctrines revealed by our Saviour; that some were communicated, by word of mouth, by the Apostles to their converts; that these doctrines were preserved by tradition in the Church, and are to be found in the writings of the early Fathers; and they maintained that those Romish doctrines, which Protestants say have no warrant from Scripture, can, at least, be proved by this Apostolic tradition. Now, learned members of the English Church have not shrunk from meeting them on this ground too. Many of them asserted (and Mr. Newman, when a member of the English Church, constantly maintained this position) that the distinctive doctrines now held by Romanists, are no more to be found in the writings of the early Fathers than they are in Scripture; that we can trace, in church history, the origin and progress of each of these additions made to the pure faith of the Gospel. They say that none of them were made suddenly, but that they *grew* in the Church—the hints of one writer being taken up and expanded by another, and systematized by a third. And they assert that, at the Council of Trent, a number of doctrines were made articles of faith which had never been considered articles of faith before; and which had been, at best, but the unauthorized speculations of individual divines. Our readers, then, will naturally suppose, that when Mr. Newman went over to Romanism, it must have been because he discovered that he had been mistaken in these views; because by a more extended reading, he had found out passages of early Christian writers, which proved that those doctrines had been held from the beginning, which he had once maintained were later additions to the faith of Christians. Some of our readers may be surprised to hear that the contrary is the case. Mr. Newman admits still the truth of what he asserted formerly—that the doctrines now taught in the Church of Rome are not the same as those taught in the ages which succeeded the Apostles. The following sentence was written by Mr. Newman while a member of the Church of England—"That a certain change in objective and external religion has come over the Latin—nay and in a measure the Greek—Church, we consider to be a plain, historical fact; a change sufficiently startling to recall to our minds, with very unpleasant sensations, the awful words: 'Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you, than that you have received, let him be accursed.'" When Mr. Newman went over to Rome, this plain, historical fact was not denied; but he started a theory to account for it. This theory was contained in the celebrated essay on the development of Christian doctrine, which he published shortly after the change of his religion was acknowledged. In this essay he maintains that God did not intend that the form of doctrine received in the Church should be at all times the same; that he left in his Church an authority of *developing* new truths from those known before; that Catholic belief is consequently not in all ages the same, but is a constantly-growing thing: so that actually a man may be a heretic in one century for believing, what he would be a heretic in the next century for denying; and a Christian would now be a heretic, were he to believe no more than those who learned from the Apostles thought sufficient for their belief. Now, we do not purpose here to enter into any discussion as to the truth or falsehood of Mr. Newman's theory; but if any one should say—"Is it not very likely that Protestants must be wrong, when we see so learned a man, as Mr. Newman abandoning their creed?" we can answer, "his learning is on the side of Protestantism still." When Mr. Newman says that Romish doctrines are the "development" of Apostolic Christianity; and when Protestants say that they are a corruption of it: they are, at all events, agreed on this "plain, historical fact," that Romish Christianity and apostolic Christianity are two different things. Which of the two is most likely to be right is not a matter for learning to decide, but for natural reason and common sense; to these we must leave it, to determine which is most likely to be right—the man who is satisfied to believe as the earliest ages of the Church believed, or the man who professes to have found out something truer and better.

Perhaps we shall be asked, what do the authorities of the Romish Church think of the line of argument adopted by their new convert? It seems plainly inconsistent with that formerly employed by their controversial writers. People will not know what to believe if one set of defenders of their faith say, the doctrines of our Church have been in all ages exactly the same; and if another set say, God has vouchsafed to us a knowledge of truths not developed in the days of the early Fathers. And Mr. Newman's line of argument appears likely to do a great deal of mischief with those who will accept his admissions that the doctrines of Romanism are not exactly the same as those of the early Church, but who are convinced that Christians ought simply to believe the doctrines which Christ and his Apostles taught, and that they have no right to "develop" them, and make them into another gospel for themselves. Can the authorities of the Roman Catholic Church approve of so dangerous a course of argument? To this question we find it very hard to give an answer. In the preface to his book, Mr. Newman says, that on his conversion he submitted his work for the revision of the authorities of his new Church, but that they declined being responsible for it, and preferred that he should publish it just as it had been written before his admission into their Church. It is strange that the Romish authorities in England should have practised so much reserve. We would think it right that they should tell their convert whether the arguments which had induced him to come over to them were good or bad; or if they were glad to have Mr. Newman for a convert on any terms, one would suppose that they would, at least, take care that he should not damage their cause by exhibiting himself to the world as induced by unsound argument to join their communion. On the whole, then, it is natural to conclude, that the heads of the adherents of Romanism in England think the line of argument sound which Mr. Newman has adopted. And this view is confirmed by the position which Mr. Newman has held in their Church since, by his being proposed as head of the new Irish University, and by the tone of the *Dublin Review*, which is under the control of Cardinal Wiseman. In America, however, the case is different; and Roman Catholic writers there have seen very plainly that Mr. Newman's views are quite inconsistent with those which represent Catholic truth as always the same, and as handed down unchanged, by tradition, from the earliest ages. Whether Mr. Newman's views will come ultimately to be adopted in the Roman Catholic Church, we cannot predict. They profess to have an infallible judge of controversies; but on any given question, as we have shown in our last number, it is very hard to get his decision, and he generally manages to leave it unsettled *until the question has settled itself.* The present dispute seems to be one of those open questions; and Roman Catholic divines appear at liberty to maintain either that their doctrines are exactly the same as those which Christ and his Apostles taught, or that they are different and a great deal better. If one of them can persuade himself that he can find the infallibility of the Pope maintained in the writings of St. Cyprian; or the admissibility of image worship allowed in the works of the early apologists for Christianity, &c.; then he may assert that these are truths handed down by Catholic tradition from the times of the Apostles. But, in case this should prove too difficult a task, he can take Mr. Newman's ground, and assert that anything which he cannot find in the writings of the early Fathers is a late authoritative development made by the Church; and, if Protestants endeavour to prove that Saint Ignatius, or Saint Chrysostom, or Saint Augustine, did not believe any particular Romish doctrine, it is quite sufficient answer to say, that they would have believed it if they had not had the misfortune to live before that doctrine had been developed!

In conclusion, lest the object of this article should be misunderstood, we wish to explain that it is not intended as a discussion of the matters in dispute between Anglicans and Roman Catholics. All we wish to do is, to excite our readers to inquiry, by calling their attention to the great movement which is going on in the conversion of many on both sides. But then it became necessary for us to resist the prejudice which would pass by the conversion of so many hundreds to Protestantism, as the mere delusion of unlearned men. We pointed out that those who came over to the Church of England possessed the best of all learning—that most important for a Christian to possess; and we showed that those who had gone over to Romanism, either did so without any application of learning at all, or else, that their learning had led them to the very same conclusions which are held by Protestants. We say, then, that we ought fairly to consider the arguments brought forward by both parties, without allowing ourselves to be prejudiced by the idea that one of the parties is more learned than the other.

To people who adopt the latter mode of judging, we would finish by one plain question. When a priest comes over to Protestantism, who has received the best education Maynooth can give, Roman Catholics are ready to say—"That was an ignorant fellow; his opinion is worth nothing." When a Church of England clergyman goes over to Romanism, they cry—"What a learned man! how can you venture to dissent from his judgment?" If, then, Church of England clergymen are, as a body, so much more learned than Maynooth priests, is not some respect also due to the opinion of the great majority of them, who do *not* change their religion?

IRISH NATIONALITY.

There is, perhaps, no subject more exciting to the Irish mind than that of Irish nationality. It has been the dream of her most eminent patriots: the watchword of her most successful agitators. By the latter, indeed, the topic has been perverted to the worst of purposes, and the mind of the nation, distracted by the pursuit of impracticable legislative independence, has not been directed to the true objects and advantages of real nationality.

The nationality really to be desired is that which would unite all in claiming from the united legislature the adoption of those measures which would develop the great natural resources of the country; which would seek to elevate the social character of the people; and which would unite all in promoting those measures which carry for their sole recommendation the benefit which they would confer on every class of the community. The nationality which we desire to see is that which has so long distinguished the people of Scotland. There we see a people in number not one half our own, and sending to the Imperial Legislature a number of representatives, about one half the number sent from Ireland, securing to their interests a consideration and a deference that has never been accorded to Ireland. Will it be said that the existence of an Established Church is the great bar to this nationality? In Scotland we find a church voluntarily throwing off its connection with the State, and numbering among its adherents fully one half the Scottish people, and yet can there be a doubt but that all, whether belonging to the church there established, or dissenting from it, would cordially unite in forwarding any object generally advantageous to Scotland? Again, in the province of Ulster the dissentients from the Established Church are greater in number than the members of the Established Church, and yet there can be no doubt that there, too, all would cordially unite in any measure of general utility. No; the true cause, and one which, as long as it exists, will prevent the development of Irish nationality is the supremacy which the Romish priesthood habitually exercise over their laity. The Romish clergy, members of that great corporation which arrogates to itself the title of universal, and which undoubtedly does possess its votaries in every quarter of the world, have ever deemed themselves bound to promote the interests of their church rather than the particular and more limited interest of the individual nation in which they are located; often, perhaps, reconciling such conduct to their conscience by the consideration, that the greater and more important interests of the individual nation are ultimately promoted by the establishment of the supremacy of Rome. From whatever motive, however arising, no attentive reader of history can doubt that in all ages, and in all countries, the supremacy of Rome has been the governing principle of her clergy, and that, to attain and secure that supremacy, national independence and national interests have been unhesitatingly sacrificed. We will not stop here to detail the instances in which this has occurred in other countries. How in France the clergy of Rome marshalled the armies of the League, under the banner of Spain, against the most magnanimous of her princes, and, rather than submit to an heretic king, were willing to enslave France to her hereditary enemy. How in Poland, to extirpate heresy and re-establish the authority of Rome, anarchy was encouraged and the interference of neighbouring monarchs evoked until the precedent was established that soon terminated in her partition and ultimate extinction from the map of Europe; or how, in the present day, in Italy, the Romish clergy are the willing agents of Austrian despotism and French intervention. But we would dwell more at large on those instances which the history of our own country affords of the sacrifice of our independence and nationality at the altar of Papal supremacy. It was Pope Adrian's Bull that, to secure additional power and authority to Rome, first encouraged and sanctioned the invasion of Ireland by Henry II.; and from that time down to the Reformation the Roman pontiffs and the Romish clergy were the willing instruments in promoting and assisting in the subjugation of Ireland. The Reformation in England changed all this. After that event it was no longer, of course, the policy of Rome to encourage English supremacy, and thenceforth we find the Romish clergy head the resistance to English authority. But even then, in their conduct, subjugation to Rome, and not national independence, was the governing idea. Of this we have a most remarkable and instructive instance in the time of Charles I. When the great rebellion broke out in England the Marquis of Ormonde was the king's repre-

sentative in Ireland, and his great object was to unite all parties in support of the king's authority. At that time, during the weakness of the central authority, an assembly had been summoned at Kilkenny, of the Roman Catholic bishops and peers, and 250 representatives from the general body of the Roman Catholics. This assembly, consisting solely of Roman Catholics most fully represented both their clergy and the laity of that persuasion; and after much negociation, concluded a peace with the Marquis of Ormonde, by which, in consideration of certain concessions, they agreed to assist the king with all their forces. It is to be remembered, that this agreement afforded the only reasonable hope of opposing successfully an invasion by the Parliamentary forces under Cromwell, and the whole body of the Roman Catholic laity were eager and earnest in its support. In pursuance of orders issued by the assembly at Kilkenny, and by Ormonde, the peace was proclaimed in Dublin and in the camp of General Preston, while heralds had been sent to proclaim it elsewhere. But the Pope's legate, Rinuccini, interfered; determined that there should be no peace which did not guarantee supremacy to Rome and the priesthood, he induced the clergy everywhere to resist it. At Waterford and Clonmel, the heralds were prevented from doing their office. At Limerick, the chief magistrate, Sir John Bourke, was suddenly attacked by a tumultuous crowd, led on by a friar of the name of Wolfe. The mayor was wounded and the heralds dispersed. For this outrage the rioters received the thanks and benedictions of the nuncio. By his own authority he displaced the magistrates; pronounced all who adhered to the treaty guilty of perjury; caused the commissioners, and all who had been instrumental in making the treaty, to be excommunicated by his priests, whom he convened at Waterford. He suspended all clergymen and confessors who preached in favour of it, or absolved its adherents. Excommunication was denounced against all who paid any money assessed by the Council at Kilkenny, and against all soldiers who should support the peace; and he framed a new oath of association, never to submit to any peace not approved of by the congregation of the Irish clergy.

This conduct of the nuncio was in accordance with the instructions sent him from Rome; for when, at his first coming over, in his speech to the Council at Kilkenny, he had recommended fidelity first to God and religion, and next to the king, Cardinal Pamfilio, by the Pope's orders, reprimanded him, observing "that the Holy See never could, by any positive act, approve the civil allegiance which Catholic subjects pay to an heretical prince." When the peace was thus denounced by the nuncio, the northern army, under O'Neill, declared itself ready to execute his orders; and thus in a moment, all that power which the confederate Roman Catholics had so long exercised, the whole dignity and authority of their assemblies was entirely dissolved, and its leading members, notwithstanding their previous devotion to the cause, consigned to prison. A few ecclesiastics became absolute lords of the island. The nuncio made his public entry into Kilkenny with all the pomp of royalty, and all affairs, civil and ecclesiastical, were resigned to his direction. He ordered the members of the supreme council and other promoters of the treaty to be imprisoned. By a decree, issued in his own name and of his own authority, he appointed a new council of three bishops and eight laymen. In this assembly he himself acted as president; he modelled the armies, appointed the officers, and determined everything in the plenitude of apostolic authority. [The names of those thus imprisoned were Viscount Mountgarrett, Sir Lucas Dillon, Viscount Costelloe, Col. Bagnall, Mr. Thomas Tyrrell, Mr. Richard Bellings, Sir Percy Crosby, Dr. Fennell, and Mr. Wall. Lord Muskerry was confined to, and guarded in his own chamber; and persons were sent to Galway to arrest Mr. Geoffrey Browne. All these were members of the supreme council, and the most eminent among the Roman Catholic body. These names, and indeed all the facts above stated, are taken from a narrative, by Mr. Richard Bellings, who was secretary to the supreme council, and a principal agent employed by the Roman Catholics in their negociations abroad.—See Desiderata cur. Hib. vol. ii., pp. 275, 347, 375, 384.] And what was the consequence? Ormonde, rather than hand over the whole island to the rule of a Papal nuncio, delivered up his garrisons to the parliament, and a few short months saw the whole of Ireland subdued to the iron yoke of Cromwell.

We ask Roman Catholics to consider these former passages in Irish history, and to ask themselves—Has the spirit which dictated Adrian's Bull, and guided Rinuccini's movements, disappeared altogether from their clergy? Are there no indications of the same disposition to lord it over the laity and control their freedom of action? Is there nothing in the events of our time to point out to Roman Catholic laymen that there is an object dearer to the priests of their church than Irish prosperity and Irish nationality? Is there nothing to show an indisposition to see all ranks and degrees of Irishmen united in the common object of exalting the moral and social condition of her people, and a desire to thwart that interchange of social intercourse, which, forgetting difference of creed and of religious belief, would unite all in the bond of our common humanity? In our desire of promoting such an union, we do not advocate an abstinence from the discussion of those subjects which ought to be the most important in the consideration of each. On the contrary, we invite and earnestly entreat our Roman Catholic countrymen to discuss with us these differences peaceably and charitably. We invite them to the study of history, to see whether submission to Rome has tended to the temporal advantage and external prosperity of any nation. We invite them to consider the several conditions of our own and other nations, to see whether the supremacy of a Romish priesthood has anywhere aided in the development of moral and intellectual excellence. And, above all, we invite them to the study of God's own Word, to see whether the peculiar tenets which submission to Rome requires them to hold are in accordance with that word which cannot err.

S.

ADRIAN'S BULL TO HENRY II.

"ADRIAN, bishop, servant of the servants of God, to his dearest son in Christ, the illustrious King of England, greeting and apostolic benediction:—

"Full laudably and profitably hath your magnificence conceived the design of propagating your glorious renown on earth, and completing your reward of eternal happiness in heaven; while, as a Catholic prince, you are intent on enlarging the borders of the Church, teaching the truths of the Christian faith to the ignorant and rude, exterminating the roots of vice from the field of the soul, and for the more convenient execution of this purpose, requiring the counsel and favour of the Apostolic See. In which, the maturer your deliberation, and the greater the discretion of your proceedings, by so much the happier, we trust, will be your progress, with the assistance of the Lord; as all things are used to come to a prosperous end and issue, which take their beginning from the ardour of faith and the love of religion.

"There is, indeed, no doubt but that Ireland, and all the islands on which Christ, the Sun of Righteousness, hath shone and which have received the doctrines of the Christian faith, do belong to the jurisdiction of St. Peter, and of the holy Roman Church, as your Excellency also doth acknowledge. And, therefore, we are the more solicitous to propagate the righteous plantation of faith in the land, and the branch acceptable to God, as we have the secret conviction of conscience, that this is more especially our bounden duty.

"You thus, most dear son in Christ, have signified to us your desire to enter into the Island of Ireland, in order to reduce the people to obedience unto laws, and to extirpate the plants of vice; and that you are willing to pay from each house a yearly pension of one penny to St. Peter, and that you will preserve the rights of the churches of this land whole and inviolate. We, therefore, with that grace and acceptance suited to your petition, do hold it good and acceptable, that for extending the borders of the Church, sustaining the virtue and the increase of religion, you enter this island, and execute therein whatever shall pertain to the honour of God and welfare of the land; and that the people of this land receive you honourably, and reverence you as their lord: the rights of their churches still remaining sacred and inviolate; and saving to St. Peter the annual pension of one penny from every house. If, then, you be resolved to carry the design you have conceived into effectual execution, study to form this nation to virtuous manners; and labour by yourself and others, whom you shall judge most meet for this work in faith and life, that the Church may be there adorned, that the religion of the Christian faith may be planted, and grow up, and that all things pertaining to the honour of God, and the salvation of souls, may be so ordered, that you may be entitled to the fulness of eternal reward from God, and obtain a glorious renown on earth, throughout all ages."

This Bull was subsequently, and after the conquest of Ireland by Henry II., confirmed by Pope Alexander, who, by his brief, ratified the gift of Adrian, with the reservation of Peter's-pence.

DEAR HARP OF MY COUNTRY.

BY THOMAS MOORE.

[The recent death of the most popular of our national poets gives a melancholy interest to the following lines, taken from his matchless Irish Melodies. The translation is taken from the fourth number of Moore's Melodies, translated into Irish, by Dr. MacHale."]

DEAR Harp of my country! in darkness I found thee,
The cold chain of silence hath hung o'er thee long,
When proudly, my own Island Harp! I unbound thee,
And gave all thy chords to light, freedom, and song!
The warm lay of love, and the light note of gladness,
Have waken'd thy fondest, thy liveliest thrill;
But so oft hast thou echoed the deep sigh of sadness,
That ev'n in thy mirth it will steal from thee still.

Dear Harp of my country! farewell to thy numbers,
This sweet wreath of song is the last we shall twine;
Go, sleep, with the sunshine of Fame on thy slumbers,
Till touched by some hand less unworthy than mine.
If the pulse of the patriot, soldier, or lover,
Have throbb'd at our lay, 'tis thy glory alone;
I was *but* as the wind, passing heedlessly over,
And all the wild sweetness I waked was thy own.

Ponn—"Langolee."*

I.

'Cruit aṅra mo ċóire, a n-doṙċar bíḋ ṙínte,
Bíḋ ḟuar-ċuiṅ na torḋa orṫ ṕárṙǵée go tean;
Do ḋoiṅ mé ar ǵeiḃeall, ḋéir do ċuiḃṙeaċ ḃeiṫ ṙǵaoilte,
Áir do ċeuḋaiḃ aiṅ ṙǵeiṫ ǵaeḋe, ir ṙolur ṙaor-ṙaṅ.
Bíḋ ḟuaim ṙunoċ ḟeaċa do b' aeṙaiǵe 'r buḋ bíṅe,
Aiṅ búṙaċt do ċeuḋa, 'bíḋ ṙuaniṁar, ḋum ceóil;
Act bíḋir ḋo neaṁ-eólǵaċ air ṙuarcar 'r air luiṁe
Do m-briṙeaṅ an bṙón trí do ṙúǵaiǵil go póill—

II.

Slán aǵur beaṅaċt lé do biṅ-ǵaeḋil, 'ċruit ḋrom,
Só an ḃlaoiǵ ḋéiǵionaċ ḋanta, do ḋéanṙam a ḋealḃ,
Téiḃ, ir caḋail ṙaoi ṙǵáil loṅṙaċ ǵárta air do ṙuan trom,
Do b-ṕáǵaiḃ meura nior ṙcuama air do ċeuḋáiḃ ciuin' realḃ,
Má bíḋ croiḋe ǵairǵiḃ' tréaniṁair, tír-ǵráḋaiǵ nó ruairṙe ṙaoi,
D'a ǵ-corṙuǵaḋ, aiǵ eirḋeaċt lé reiṁim ar n-ḋáṅ,
Ní ṙaḃ ioṅam-ṙa act aiteóǵ neaṁ-briogṁar na luaċ-ǵaoiṫ,
Aǵur uaiṫ-ṙe do ṫáiniǵ an ṙuaim biṅ aṁáiṅ.

* *Air*—"Langolee."

ITALIAN NEWSPAPER.

We have been much gratified by receiving several numbers of a religious periodical, "La Buona Novella," published weekly, at Turin, in which a very cordial notice is taken of our Journal, and some of our articles are very kindly translated in full, in the Italian language. We cordially respond to the kind and flattering sentiments of our esteemed fellow-labourer in the cause of truth and religious freedom, and rejoice at the improving prospects of liberty and religious knowledge in the interesting country which is now the field of his labours. We hope we shall continue to be favoured with a copy of his valuable Journal.

AMERICAN PRESS.

We have also been favoured with a number of "The Irish Evangelist," devoted to the spiritual good of Irish emigrants, and published at New York, which appears to be conducted with much ability, by Mr. John Hurley, editor and proprietor. We have directed Mr. Hurley to be supplied regularly with the "Catholic Layman," and hope to be favoured in return with a copy of "The Irish Evangelist," and, if possible from the commencement.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st.

No anonymous letter can be attended to. Whatever is sent for insertion must be authenticated by the name and address of the writer, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee for his good faith.

Subscriptions are earnestly solicited, which our friends will observe are payable in advance. The amount may be forwarded either in postage stamps or a post office order, payable to Mr. Wm. Curry, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, MARCH, 1852.

THE influence which the Gospel of Jesus Christ has had upon the social and political welfare of mankind, is one of the greatest of its worldly achievements. It found the world in a fearful position: most nations known to history had been conquered by the Roman arms, and were governed by Roman officers, who purchased the office, to make what they could by plunder and extortion. The Roman empire itself, the mistress of the world, celebrated as it had been for its institutions, its civilization, its greatness, was then a vast tyranny, in which the life, the liberty, the property of every individual was at the mercy of one man. And Roman civilization did *not* hinder, but did actually promote the most flagrant public crimes. The killing of infants by their own parents, to avoid the expense of rearing them, was a usual and a *legal* practice. The favourite amusement of the most refined of the Roman ladies was to behold numbers of men fight and *kill* each other in the public theatres. If but few were killed, the spectators complained of the bad sport. The immoralities of private life, and the disregard of the marriage union, were too bad to be stated. Such was the civilization of the most civilized part of the world, without the Gospel.

From the day that the Gospel of Christ found a footing "in Cæsar's household," it warred against these scandalous crimes, and did so with success. All Christians were required to renounce the deeds of their heathen ignorance; and their example compelled the very heathens to forsake those acts.

This was the first great social triumph of the Gospel.

When the Christian empire of Rome was destroyed by heathen barbarians, and all civilization and learning seemed about to perish in the world, the Gospel of Christ again put forth its power, and saved all that was worth saving in the wreck. That Gospel brought the barbarian conquerors, in their hour of savage triumph, to learn from the conquered whatever was worth learning; and thus was civilization preserved, and by the same Divine power was it improved, in the kingdoms of modern Europe.

If the poorest, weakest, and most degraded state of Christendom, is now infinitely superior in public morals to all civilized states of the ancient heathen world, it is to the Gospel of Christ that it is owing. If any doubt it, let him look at the heathen world of the present day; look at the nations of India, and read of Juggernaut, of the burning of their widows, and the enormity of their political cruelties. The heathen world, at this day, affords no single instance of rational political liberty, or of a social condition that Christians could think tolerable.

And the Gospel has not yet ceased its triumphs. In our own day it has gone far to abolish slavery, and to destroy the slave-trade—that greatest and most crying iniquity of which mankind has been guilty.

Who, that looks on even this brief sketch, can fail to hope, that the Gospel of Christ will yet do still greater things for the social and political welfare of mankind? and the Scriptures of God confirm and authorize this hope. The Scripture tells us, that when "The knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth, as the waters cover the sea," that then "The lion shall lie down with the lamb"—that violence and oppression shall cease—"Neither shall the nations learn war any more."

In proportion as the pure gospel of Christ is fitted and intended thus to promote the happiness and welfare of mankind, so are all perversions and corruptions of that Gospel calculated to perpetuate and to increase the miseries of mankind.

It is, therefore, a subject of deep and absorbing interest, to consider how the various forms in which the Gospel has been presented to us have acted on the welfare of nations and of men. LIBERTY is the thing most essential to the progress and prosperity of mankind—slavery the most fatal to all improvement. The Gospel, therefore, tends to liberty, political as well as spiritual.

Look now at Europe, and see what a spectacle we behold! Among the great powers of Europe England alone retains her liberties! Look at France! Four years ago we saw her, as a FREE REPUBLIC, boasting as her motto, "Liberty, fraternity, equality!" Now we see her groaning under an absolute tyranny—martial law and the state of siege! Constitutional government and the liberty of the press—that best guardian of all other liberty—wholly overthrown!

Look at Austria, and we see a similar picture! Look at Hungary, at the feet of her lord! See absolutism ascendant in Prussia—all hope of Italian liberty seemingly extinct—whatever Spain had yet attained of constitutional liberty vanishing away—the small States yet nominally free, such as Belgium and Switzerland, now threatened with the extinction of liberty, and perhaps of existence.

Such is the mournful spectacle which Europe now presents to us. What freeman can but mourn over it?

One bright spot yet exists, and long may it continue! The empire to which we belong, yet stands up before the world as a NATION OF FREEMEN, the last stronghold of liberty in Europe. However little some Irishmen may love England, they cannot but admire and be proud of her in this. Like the old English warrior when he told on the battle-field of the flight or death of all his comrades whom he loved, and bore testimony to the one whom he hated—

> "That misbegotten devil, Falconbridge,
> Alone, in spite of spite, holds out the day."

And what part has the Gospel of Christ, in that form in which it is chiefly presented to Europe, taken in all this ruin of her liberties? Alas, the Papacy and the Court of Rome is banded throughout Europe with every form of absolute and tyrannical power, for the destruction of every vestige of constitutional liberty.

Who has extinguished liberty in Rome? Who has consigned the northern provinces of Italy to the iron rule of Austria? Who has taken advantage of the times to establish a law in Spain that no man shall dare to worship God there except after the fashion of Rome? Who has ordered thanksgivings to be offered up in the churches of France, for the destruction of the liberties of France? Who is now the steadfast friend and supporter of every despot in Europe? All this, the Court and Pope of Rome have done. These things cannot last, for the spirit of liberty is strong, and is growing stronger in Europe; but for the present all this is done, and it is done with the sanction, and by the help of the heads of the Roman Church.

Let not our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen hastily condemn us for bringing before them facts at which we know they will blush. We respect and honour the blushes of freemen at the fall of liberty. It is this feeling of respect that has led us into this train of thought. We have marked that Irish Roman Catholics have no sympathy with the enemies of the liberty of Europe; and it is with the single object of bringing out this striking fact that we pen this article. A little ultramontainist faction among Irish Roman Catholics, with Dr. Cullen at their head, may bid God-speed to all this; but no party of the Irish people have done so. In such matters the voice of the public press is the evidence of the feeling of the people; and we look with pleasure on the general tone of the Roman Catholic press in Ireland on this subject. With the exception of one or two organs of a foreign policy, the Irish press have not rejoiced at the downfall of liberty, or at the political part which the Roman Church is now acting in Europe. We trust we may extend this praise to a large majority of the Irish Roman Catholic priests. A few foreign priests alone in Ireland—the immediate emissaries and agents of Rome—will stand forth in the defence of her present betrayal of the dearest rights and liberties of men.

What Irishman would willingly submit to what France now submits to, and what the Pope now orders her to thank God for? Would any Irishman tolerate that the newspaper which he reads, which expresses his opinions and feelings, should be ordered, by a law of the British Government, to print nothing but what had first been submitted to the government, and approved by them? Would he tolerate that the editor of any newspaper, transgressing this rule, should be brought before a government magistrate of police (not before a jury of his country), and punished as that police magistrate should think fit? This is now the law of France and of all the great powers of the Continent of Europe. No voice can there be heard, except what the rulers please. Would Irish Roman Catholics THANK GOD for this? Yet, the heads of the Roman Church in France order Frenchmen to do so. Was there ever such a mockery of thanksgiving to God? Irishmen would not bear this for themselves; and they cannot, and do not approve of its being imposed upon others. We bring these facts before them as a solemn warning how they allow themselves to be guided in their own political conduct, or in the exercise of their political privileges, by the power that has aided in overthrowing the liberties of Europe, and which is now allied with every absolute power to prevent the revival of LIBERTY.

What Irishman's heart does not respond to that word? Who would not bid it God-speed throughout the world? We conclude with one more illustration from France—a law has gone forth in that unfortunate country, that wherever the name of "Liberty" is found inscribed on any public building, it should be erased! and workmen have been employed to fulfil this law! Let us take warning by the fall of others; let us hold fast to the liberty which we possess. And let us not neglect, above all, the true and lasting liberty, "the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free."

ON THE MANNER OF APPOINTING ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOPS IN IRELAND.

IT is admitted by all Irish Roman Catholics that two different methods of choosing bishops are both equally compatible with full communion with the Church of Rome. One is, that the person who is to be made a bishop should be chosen in Ireland, and by Irishmen, and that the Pope should issue a Bull for the consecration of that person: the other is, that the Pope himself should choose whatever person he may please, and that no Irishman should have anything to do with the choice.

This is not a question of empty speculation; it is a practical and present question. Both methods are now before the Irish people. For the last thirty-five years, at least, Roman Catholic bishops in Ireland have always been chosen by the priests of the vacant diocess, who, of course, are Irishmen. The practice has been for the priests to choose three men, of whom the Pope appointed one; so that no man could be a Roman Catholic bishop in Ireland, unless elected by the priests of the diocess. But the Pope and the Court of Rome have lately set all this aside, and have determined to take the choice of Irish bishops into their own hands, and to let no Irishman, whether priest or layman, have anything to do with it. The great step was taken a very short time since, in the case of Dr. Cullen, now Roman Catholic Archbishop of Armagh. On the death of Dr. Crolly, his predecessor, the priests of the diocess of Armagh assembled, according to custom, and elected three men for the Pope to choose out of. The Pope set aside the three names returned by the priests, and appointed, out of his own will and pleasure, Dr. Cullen, who was not one of the three. We believe that, in another case, which has since occurred, the Pope has done the same thing, showing that it is the result of a deliberate plan and design.

Now, no Roman Catholic will say that the election by Irish priests of those who were made bishops during the last forty years was heretical or improper. The change, therefore, is not made on any Catholic ground, but on some ground or design that is purely *Roman*, and not Irish. It is not the Roman Catholic religion that required the change, but simply the policy and the designs of the *Court* of Rome.

No one can say that this is of no importance to the spirit of Irish nationality. So long as the heads of any clergy are elected by natives of that country, so long the clergy itself will partake of the national spirit. But so surely as the heads of a clergy are nominated by the arbitrary will and uncontrolled choice of a foreign power (and *Rome* is surely a foreign *country)*, so surely will that clergy be divested of all national spirit, and will sink into mere tools of the power that names them.

We cannot suppose that the Pope intended to offer a needless insult to the spirit of Irish independence. This cannot be. There must be some deeper object at the bottom. We propose to show, from the history of all countries, and especially of Ireland, that it has ever been the settled policy of Rome to crush all exercise of national independence, all feeling of national spirit, in order that all may come to depend more entirely on Rome. We are not speaking now of religion, but of political and temporal control. So long as national feeling exists, so long Rome can never have the supreme control of the world which she once enjoyed, and still seeks to regain. We believe that a deep design has been laid, to subjugate all national spirit in Ireland, and to obtain for Roman agents the direction of everything in Ireland.

We appeal to daily events to confirm our view. The advantage which the middle classes may yet derive from the Queen's Colleges has been rejected by purely *Roman* influence. Had the Irish priests of the diocess of Armagh been allowed to elect their own primate, those advantages would have been secured to the Irish Roman Catholic laity, and the colleges would have been gratefully accepted by the Irish Roman Catholic bishops themselves. But rejected they were by *Roman* policy. Then an Irish Catholic university was to be established, and funds were extracted from the starving Irish. Was that university to be more "national" than Dr. Cullen's appointment? Let the selection of a rector for it answer. Dr. Newman, an English convert, known to have published since his conversion, opinions directly opposed to the Council of Trent, and to the teaching of Maynooth; *but a great friend of Cardinal Wiseman.* This appointment is published by Dr. Cullen in a letter to a French paper, the "*Univers*," with unbounded approbation. Again a Catholic Defence Association was established in Dublin, a secretary was to be appointed, but "no Irish need apply." Mr. Wilberforce, another English convert, and personal friend of Dr. Wiseman, is appointed. Dr. Cullen, indeed, was ill, and could not be present (illness will happen sometimes inconveniently, sometimes not), but no one doubts that he was concurring in the plan. Within a few weeks we have seen a joint letter from several Irish parliamentary representatives, urgently remonstrating against this course, and indignantly reclaiming against it. The *Times*, and some other papers, have treated all this as if these Irishmen were merely griping after the petty salary attached to the office. We entertain no such thoughts; we believe that these Irishmen see, like ourselves, that there is a deep-laid scheme to eradicate all feeling of Irish nationality, for the furtherance of the objects of Rome; and that Drs. Cullen and Wiseman are agents of Rome, specially selected for the work.

It may be asked, what all this is to us? and we are ready to answer the question. We are Irishmen in heart and feeling; ready and anxious to join, heart and hand, with all our fellow-countrymen, in the spirit of Irish nationality. We speak honestly, and faithfully, and kindly to our fellow-countrymen where we differ from them; but that does not make us less willing or less fit, but more willing and more worthy, to join them in Irish feeling. And when we see a large number of them, who differ from us in submitting to a foreign church, about to fall into a snare for increasing that subjection to an extent which they themselves must confess is not required by their own religious convictions, even to the extent of making their church an instrument of extinguishing in their breasts all feeling of national individuality and independence, we conceive we have a duty, arising from our common nationality, to ask them to resist the attempt. And we believe that they are ready to hear us. The proceedings we have referred to, are not acceptable to the Irish laity. We appeal to the Irish members who signed the remonstrance against the appointment of Mr. Wilberforce. We appeal to the able articles against Dr. Cullen's anti-national spirit which have appeared in the leading provincial Roman Catholic Journal of Ireland, the *Cork Southern Reporter.* We appeal to our countrymen in general, not to allow their national spirit to be brought into bondage to Rome, which the Roman religion itself does not require. We believe that they will admit our appeal; and we shall in this, and our next number, proceed to show them, from Roman Catholic authorities only, how the policy of Rome has always been to take the management of all Irish affairs out of the influence of Irish nationality; and how intimately that policy has ever been connected with the method of electing those who are to be Roman Catholic Bishops in Ireland.

HISTORICAL ACCOUNT OF THE MANNER OF APPOINTING BISHOPS IN IRELAND.

ALL students of Irish ecclesiastical history agree in distinguishing *three* periods, which are most convenient for our inquiry:—

1. From the first spread of Christianity in Ireland to the Synod of Kells, A.D. 1152, at which the Archbishops of Ireland first received palls from Rome.

2. From the Synod of Kells to the Reformation, or separation of the Church of England from the Church of Rome.

3. From the Reformation to the present time.

In the first period, Ireland had one church, and one only; independent of Rome, though living often in friendship, but sometimes in discord with her.

In the second, Ireland had one church only, growing gradually more subject to Rome.

In the third, two rival churches have existed in Ireland—one independent of Rome, the other in a subjugation to Rome, growing daily more total and hopeless.

One question is, how bishops were appointed in these various periods?

The first period we treat of solely by extracts from the writings of known Roman Catholic historians of the greatest credit, and the statements of Irish Roman Catholic bishops in late times.

I. Our first authority for the first period is the Irish History of Mr. O'Halloran—a man of learning and character, a strict Roman Catholic, and a great lover of Irish nationality.

He states (vol. iii. p. 13), "at a very early period, Christianity was preached in Ireland. The constant enmity betwixt Rome and Ireland cut off all communication between them."

"The Irish received the faith from the early Asiatic or African churches; and Palladius was, therefore, the first bishop sent from Rome to establish the *Roman* hierarchy *here.*"

(P. 23.) "Amongst the other causes of (Saint) Patrick's great influence on the people, one was, his attention to avoid whatever could alarm the national pride, or alter the established police (policy?) of the kingdom. As to the first we find no hint at a foreign supremacy during the whole of his mission."

(P. 29.) "Christian bishops were appointed to succeed the Archflamens (the heathen priests before the conversion of the Irish), *by those families only* who, being converted, had a right to the nomination."

After speaking of the opposition of the Irish Church, in the seventh century, to the order of the Roman Church about keeping Easter, he goes on to say—

(P. 42.) "From this period to the middle of the twelfth century, Rome and Ireland had no connection or correspondence."

In pages 395 and 6, describing the state of the Irish Church in the beginning of the twelfth century, he says—"The power of nominating bishops to certain dioceses was received to certain royal and noble families in the different parts of the kingdom, and to them alone . . It does not appear that the Popes ever enjoyed any direct power or authority whatever over that Church (the Irish) . . . . No proof whatever can be produced that the Popes nominated to bishoprics amongst us."

Such is the testimony of Mr. O'Halloran concerning the first period of our inquiry.

If it can be shown that he was wrong in saying that, "No proof whatever can be produced that the Popes nominated to bishoprics amongst us," we suppose some one can produce such proofs relative to the period we are speaking of, and our pages are open to any one who can produce them, as we are only anxious to promote truth.

Our next witness is Dr. Charles O'Connor—a real Irishman of the old stock, and a Roman Catholic. He says, in a note to page 43 of his third letter from Columbanus *ad Hibernos*, "It will appear evident from the Irish Annals, as well as from the letters of the Ancient Fathers, published by Ussher, in his Sylloge; and from the Lives of Columba, by Adamnan; and of Columban, by Jonas; that the Irish always appointed their own bishops, without so much as the knowledge of Rome."

Dr. O'Connor argues, that this must have been the practice in St. Patrick's time, from a letter written to the Bishops of Vienna and Narbonne, by Celestine, *who was Pope at that time*, in which Celestine says—"Observe the discipline of the Church exactly . . . Let no bishop be imposed upon any person against their consent, *but by the suffrages of the clergy, and the agreement of the gentry and people of the vacant See.*" Dr. O'Connor justly thinks, that a Pope who told the Gallic bishops that this was the "discipline of the Church," could not have claimed to appoint bishops in Ireland.

* Rome conquered England by arms; but never conquered Ireland, but this so alarmed the Irish, for fear of their being brought into the same subjection, that they became very jealous of Roman influence. England, at the Council of Constance, in 1414, reaped an advantage from the ancient preservation of Irish independence, of which a short notice will be found in our present number.

This suggests to us another argument worthy of our notice. The canon law of the Church of Rome itself, for a thousand years, directs that *every bishop should be chosen in his own province*, and does not give the Pope any right of appointing bishops.

Our next witness is one above all objection. He is Peter Talbot, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin not 200 years ago—a predecessor of the late respected Dr. Murray.

The point we bring him forward to prove is not exactly the same which the last witness spoke to, but it is one which completes the subject. Mr. O'Halloran and Dr Connor say, that the Pope did not appoint *Bishops* in Ireland up to the twelfth century. Archbishop Talbot undertakes to prove that the Pope did not make *Archbishops* in Ireland before that time.

The occasion of Archbishop Talbot writing was this—he claimed the Primacy of all Ireland for himself as Archbishop of Dublin. Dr. Oliver Plunket, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Armagh, wrote a book to prove that, as successor of St. Patrick, he was Primate of Ireland. Archbishop Talbot then wrote his book, called "Primatus Dubliniensis," to support the claim of Dublin to the Primacy, which was published in 1674.

He begins by saying,* "Primacy can be nothing else than ecclesiastical jurisdiction, greater than that of an archbishop, conferred upon the prelate of any See or state by the Supreme Pontiff . . . . But that jurisdiction cannot be conferred otherwise than by giving the pall of that order." (N.B.—The pall is a woollen garment made at Rome with some curious ceremonies; and the giving of it by the Pope is supposed to confer the authority of archbishop or primate.)

Having laid down this principle, which Roman Catholics cannot deny (though Protestants do deny it, on the ground that archbishops and primates were not made by the Pope at all in the early Church), Archbishop Talbot goes on to apply it (p. 10)†—"It appears, from St. Bernard, that the pall and primacy of St. Patrick was fabulous . . . . for he says, in his Life of St. Malachy, that to the See of Armagh, *the use of the pall, which is the fulness of honour, was yet wanting, and had been wanting from the beginning. And it seemed good in his eyes* (Malachy's). *if the Church for which he had laboured so much* (Armagh, of which he was Archbishop), *which hitherto had it not, should acquire it by his zeal and labour.* And in section 16, *he bore it sufficiently ill, that Ireland should, even as yet, be without the pall.* What, I beseech you, is *the use of the pall, what the fulness of honour*, unless it be the jurisdiction of an Archbishop, and the dignity of Primate? This was wanting from the beginning to the See of Armagh, and to all Ireland, as appears from the words of D. Bernard."‡

This does not prove to *Protestants* that St. Patrick was not Archbishop and Primate of Ireland; because Protestants are content to follow the early Church, which had archbishops and primates, not made by the Bishop of Rome. But to Roman Catholics, who hold that no man can be a lawful archbishop or primate unless the Pope make him such by giving him the pall, the proof is conclusive that, on their principles, neither St. Patrick, nor any of his successors until 1152, were Archbishops of Armagh or Primate of Ireland. And it proves (what is our concern at present), by the testimony of St. Malachy, Archbishop of Armagh, and of St. Bernard, the last of the Fathers, both of whom lived at the very time, that up to the year 1152, the Pope had never made an Archbishop or Primate of Ireland.

In page 17, Archbishop Talbot says—"St. Patrick himself never was Primate, nor even an Archbishop, since he had not the Pall."§

In page 41, he says—"I have consulted what authors I could, and I have considered the annals treating of that matter, and I here seriously declare, that I have fallen upon no author, worthy of credit, who produces even a probable conjecture, that ever at any time the See of Armagh obtained the Primacy of Ireland from the Apostolic See."

Archbishop Talbot having thus settled the claim of Armagh to the Primacy goes on to establish the claim of Dublin in page 26—

"It remains that we should prove that the Dublin pall was given by the Roman Pontiff to the city of Dublin, for this reason: because it was the chief or principal city, and the head of the Kingdom of Ireland: and at that time, too, when a pall had never before existed in Ireland."‖ And then, he brings forward the pall given to Dublin at the Synod of Kells, A.D. 1152!

Is it not enough to make an Irishman's blood boil in him to hear this Irishman, Peter Talbot, of an old and honourable and patriotic family in Ireland, this Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, deliberately maintaining, that Ireland, the Island of Saints, never had an archbishop or primate until the year 1152? and that neither St. Patrick himself, nor any of his successors, ever was a lawful primate, or even an archbishop—simply because the Pope had never made him such—which is, indeed, true.

Yet this is what all Roman Catholics must now say, unless their pride in the ancient independence of Ireland be greater than their love of subjection to Rome.

This book of Archbishop Talbot's has been carefully suppressed of late years. A copy, in Marsh's library, about twenty-five years ago, was supposed to be the only one in existence. It was stolen out of that library in the year 1828. †

But where is the use of suppressing the book while its principles are maintained? Let Roman Catholics only avow, that St. Patrick was, indeed, a lawful primate and archbishop of Ireland, by the laws of the ancient Church—*although* he was not created by the Pope—and then they may repudiate this book. But if they persist in making everything depend upon Rome, then they must repudiate St. Patrick as an archbishop, just as their own Archbishop Talbot did.

We have proved our first point—that no bishops nor archbishops in Ireland were made by the Pope up to the year 1152. We shall go on with the next period in our next number.

ANCIENT DIGNITY OF IRELAND.

The following history (which we take from the Appendix to the General Council of Constance)‡ will be interesting to Irishmen, as showing the respect which was paid to the ancient dignity of Ireland.

We must explain, that there was an ancient custom in those councils, of voting by "Nations," as it was called. Four "Nations" were acknowledged—viz., France, Spain, Germany, and Italy. These "Nations" were not "Kingdoms." Each was a collection of several independent kingdoms. We have the lists; and we find that each "Nation" comprised six or eight kingdoms, whose governments were independent of each other.

At the Council of Constance, which was held A.D. 1414, the King of England claimed that the English should be acknowledged as a separate "Nation," having a vote of their own in the Council. The King of France was very jealous at this, and ordered his ambassadors to protest against it in the Council; their protest is given in the appendix of the Council to which we have referred. The ambassadors of France insist, that England had always been reckoned part of the German "Nation" in all general councils; and they maintain that it ought to be so still; for, as England had only twenty-five bishops, it was absurd that so few should have a separate vote in the Council.

The ambassadors of the English King were heard in reply, and they do not deny either of the above statements; but they say, in answer to the fewness of their bishops, that the Irish, who had sixty dioceses, were united with them in the "Anglican Nation," and taking in the Welsh and some Scotch bishops, who joined with them, there were 110 bishops altogether. And in answer to the statement, that England had always been counted part of the German nation, and not a nation in itself, they do not deny it: on the contrary, they seem to admit that this was true; but then they quote St. Albert the Great and Bartholomæus as follows—"That the whole world being divided into three parts—viz., Asia, Africa, and Europe; Europe is divided into four kingdoms—first, the Roman; secondly, the Constantinopolitan; third, the kingdom of Ireland, which is now translated to the English; and fourth, the kingdom of Spain. From which it appears, that the King of England and his kingdom are of the most eminent and the most ancient kings and kingdoms of all Europe, which prerogative the kingdom of France cannot obtain."

Such was the defence of the ambassadors of England. They did not rest their claim upon the rights of England itself, but on her inheriting the ancient rights of Ireland; and thus England obtained dignity in Europe, and influence in Christendom, by her union with Ireland. For this defence having been heard by the Council of Constance, they decided, that England and Ireland united should rank and vote as a separate nation, thus giving them an influence in the Council which the King of France sought to prevent, and which would have been wholly lost if England had stood alone. We observe, as an appropriate acknowledgment of their obligation to Ireland, that the "Anglican Nation" was throughout represented at that Council by "Patrick, Bishop of Cork."

The rank assigned to Ireland among the kingdoms of Europe, in the above extract, may not appear so absurd if we reflect, that all the other kingdoms of modern Europe, which have any antiquity, arose out of the ruins of the Roman Empire, and can trace their origin no farther back than its decay; while Ireland, which had never been conquered by the Romans, could show the successions of her kingdom for ages before. This was, no doubt, the reason of the precedence assigned to her by St. Albert and Bartholomæus.

In the preface to Lynch's Feudal Dignities, it is stated (p. 8), that the French rolls in the Tower contain enrolments of the proceedings, on behalf of England, at the Council of Constance.

Correspondence.

ON TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

We have received the following communication, bearing the Enniscorthy post-mark. We thank our correspondent for it, and we print it with pleasure, conceiving it to be very deserving of a place in our pages. Of course, we think it also our duty, when inserting such communications, to make such observations as seem to us useful. Our correspondent will, we are sure, take this in good part; his object is evidently to promote fair and profitable discussion, and we give his communication *verbatim*:—

"15th February, 1852.

"Sir—I furnish you with the result of my reading, consequent on my receiving The Catholic Layman, and earnestly hope my extracts may be useful to your end.—I am in charity, yours,

"A Catholic Layman.

"When instituting this sacrament, our Lord himself said—'This is my body'—'The bread I will give is my flesh for the life of the world.'—John vi. 52. 'Unless you eat the *flesh* of the Son of man, and drink his *blood*, you shall not have life in you.'—John vi. 54. You say, perhaps, this bread is no other than what is used for common food. Before consecration it is indeed bread; but no sooner are the words of consecration pronounced, than from bread it becomes the *flesh* of Christ." St. Ambrose, lib. 4, de sacr. c. 4 et c. 5.

"'Whatever the Lord pleased, he hath done in heaven and on earth.'—Psa. cxxxiv. 6. Although the species of bread and wine are visible, yet faith tells us that after consecration, the body and blood of Christ are alone there."—St. Ambrose de consec., dist. 2, c. omnia.

"Each receives Christ the Lord entire in each particle; he is not diminished by being given to many, but gives himself whole and entire to each."—St. Augustine, de consec. dist. 2, c. singulis.

"'Take and divide it amongst you'—Luke xxii. 17. You see how efficacious are the words of Christ; if, then, the word of the Lord Jesus is so powerful as to summon creation into existence, shall it not require a less exercise of power to make that subsist which already has existence and to change it into another thing?"—St. Ambrose, l. 4 de sacr. c. 4.

"This change mocks the powers of conception, nor can we find any example of it in natural transmutations, nor even in the wide range of creation. The change itself is the object, not of our comprehension, but of our humble faith; and the manner of that change forbids the temerity of a too curious inquiry."—Eccl. iii. 22. 'No word shall be impossible to God.'—Luke i. 37."

Our brother layman does not seem to disclaim the doctrine of transubstantiation, as stated in the article, in our second number to which he refers, and to which we now beg our readers to look back. He rather seems to admit it, and to justify it. We might prefer that he should have disclaimed the doctrine as there stated; yet we feel that the course which he has taken is one entitled to respectful consideration, because he appeals to the Scripture and to the early Fathers; and it is our sincere desire to discuss such arguments in a reverent and candid spirit.

Our correspondent quotes his Scripture proofs from the Douay Bible, at which we do not complain. He seems to use not the modern edition, which is approved by the present Roman Catholic bishops, but the first edition, published in 1582, or some other, which does not contain the modern alterations. We make no objection to this; only we beg of him to observe, that most of the notes in the early editions have been very properly omitted in that now in use.

Our correspondent seems to think that all the words which he quotes from St. John's Gospel were spoken by

---

* "Primatus nihil aliud sit, quam Ecclesiastica jurisdictio, Archiepiscopali major, a summo Pontifice concessa Præsuli alicujus sedis ac civitatis . . . . Ea vero jurisdictio non aliter quam per ejus modi collationem Pallii concederetur."

† "Constat ex D. Bernardo, Pallium ac Primatum Patricianum esse chimericum. . . . Alit enim in vita Sancti Malachiæ (s. 10) quod sedi Armachanæ *deerat adhuc, et defuerat ab initio Pallii unus, quod est plenitudo honoris; et cunm est bonum in oculis ejus* (Malachiæ) *si Ecclesia pro qua tantum laboraverat, quem hactenus non habuerat, suo acquireret studio et labore, et sec. 16. Egre satis ferebat, Hibernios usque adhuc pallio caruisse.* Quid quæso Pallii usus? Quid plenitudo honoris? Nisi jurisdictio Archiepiscopalis, dign tasve Primat ella. Hæc defuit ab initio, sedi Armachanæ, totique Hiberniæ, ut patet ex verbis D. Bernardi."

‡ D. Bernard is the St. Bernard called by Roman Catholics "the last of the Fathers." He lived at the very time when the Pope first gave the pall to the Irish Archbishops, A.D. 1152. The words in italics are Talbot's quotation from St. Bernard; the rest is Talbot's own.

§ Primas ipsemet S. Patricius nunquam fuerit, imo nec Archiepiscopus cum pallio caruerit.

"Consului quos potui auctores, ac ea de re tractantes angules revolvi; et tamen post exactissimum scrutinium, serio hic modo testor, me in nullum incidisse auctorem fide dignum, qui vel probabilem conjecturam offerat, quod alio unquam tempore sedes Armachana Primatum Hiberniæ a sede Apostolica obtinuerit."

‖ Reliquum est ut demonstremus Pallium Dublinense concessum fuisse a Romano Pontifice civitati Dubliniensi, eo quod hæc fuerit primo vel præcipua civitas caputque Regni Hiberniæ. Et quidem tunc temporis cum nunquam antea in Hibernia Pallium extiterit."

† A copy (not placed in the catalogue) has been lately found in a press in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin. The managers of that library will do well to have it in safe keeping; there is no copy in the British Museum. One copy more is in private hands, from which our extracts are taken.

‡ Labbe and Cossart Concilia, vol. xii. col. 1737, et sequen. Ed. Paris, 1672.

our Saviour "*when instituting this sacrament.*" If he will examine this more closely, he will see that of the three passages he has quoted, these words only, "this is my body," were spoken *at the institution;* all the rest were spoken on another occasion, at least a year before the sacrament was instituted. It is, therefore, a question whether these words were spoken *of* the institution, since they were certainly not spoken *at* it. Now, it is well known that the Fathers differed about this; and the Council of Trent admits that they differed, for the Council says (Session 21, ch. 1)—"Neither from that discourse in the sixth of John, is it rightly gathered that the partaking of both kinds (bread and wine) was commanded by the Lord; *however, it (the discourse) may be understood according to the various interpretations of the holy Fathers and doctors.*" So the case stands thus: the Fathers differed about whether this discourse was spoken of the institution: we have not, therefore, "the unanimous consent of the Fathers" to interpret this Scripture. The Council of Trent and the Pope could not say which opinion was right; we have, therefore, no guidance here from the infallible judge; and so Roman Catholics and Protestants must form their opinion alike from private judgment on this question, or else they can have no opinion about it at all. We suggest to our friend this way of forming an opinion. Our Saviour said, "If ANY MAN eat of this bread HE shall live for ever." Now, our correspondent will admit that *this is* NOT *true* of the consecrated bread in the sacrament. Judas eat of that bread, and perished for ever; many a wicked man eats of it and perishes for ever; but our Saviour's words ARE true of himself as the bread of life. Therefore, we apply his words to that of which they are true, and not to that of which they are *not* true; we think that he spoke not of that bread blessed in the sacrament, but that spiritual nourishment which Christ gives to those who faithfully use that sacrament which he has appointed for them.

Our correspondent also quotes from the early Fathers, in support of that view of transubstantiation, which we invited Roman Catholics to disclaim. We treat such an argument with respect, though we do not submit to it as infallible; nor do we suppose he produces it as such; for we are sure any person of learning and candour must admit, that many errors might be supported by quotations from Fathers. Still, we give the argument a respectful consideration.

The first step in such an examination is, to inquire carefully whether the Fathers did really say what is attributed to them. We do not, for a moment, suppose that our correspondent would willingly put forward anything, as coming from Augustine or Ambrose, which he knew was not really theirs; but experience has taught us the necessity of such an inquiry; and we think he will see it himself in a new light after hearing what we have to say.

Three of his quotations out of five are from St. Ambrose. Now, Du Pin, a French Roman Catholic divine whose learning rendered him one of the best judges that ever lived of such a question as this, says, in his account of ecclesiastical writers (vol. i., fourth century, St. Ambrose)—"The works of St. Ambrose, above all the other Fathers, have been most corrupted in the ordinary editions. The Roman edition from which those that followed after were made, instead of restoring the text of this Father, hath rendered it more faulty in many places, by the liberty which the supervisors of that edition took of making alterations in it by their own authority." In quoting St. Ambrose, we should, therefore, be very careful to use the best edition, which is that made by the learned Benedictine monks.

Our correspondent, however, has quoted St. Ambrose and St. Augustin, from the Decretum of Gratian. We do not wonder at this; it was most natural for him to do so. A commission of cardinals and others was appointed, by Pope Gregory XIII., to correct the Decretum; and the Pope confirmed the book so corrected by a Bull (A.D., 1580), and made it an integral part of the Roman Canon Law. No wonder that it should be regarded as a book of high authority, on which we might safely rely. Yet it is confessed, by learned men in the Church of Rome, that Gratian was most careless and incompetent in giving the real authors of the passages he quotes. Not only this, but he quotes numberless passages from letters said to have been written by early Popes, which letters are gross forgeries. Nearly all Gratian's authorities for the supremacy of the Pope (for instance) are taken from these forgeries: and the cardinals who corrected, and the Pope who confirmed the book, took no notice of this; yet it is now admitted, to the fullest extent, by every Roman Catholic writer on the subject. It is evident, therefore, that quotations from the Decretum cannot be admitted as coming from the Fathers to whom Gratian attributes them, without some further inquiry.

Our correspondent's first quotation is taken from the Decretum, *De Consecr.*, Dist. 2, c. 55, where Gratian professes to take it from St. Ambrose, and refers to the book *de Sacramentis*, lib. iv., c. 4 and 5. The latest and best edition of the Canon Law, by Richter, published at Leipsic, 1839, 4to, has a brief and forcible note on this quotation—"*Non est Ambrosii*"—"It is none of Ambrose's." The learned Benedictine editors give a candid examination of the evidence whether this book were written by Ambrose, and decide it in the negative; among other reasons, because Ambrose never wrote in so mean a style, nor ever used the cold and childish interrogations, of which the book is full. (See Du Pin, as before referred to.) There can be no doubt that this passage was written by some obscure person in the eighth or ninth century, and that Gratian mistook it for St. Ambrose's.

The second passage which our correspondent quotes is to be found *De Consecr.*, Dist. 2, c. 74. It is taken from the same book, on the sacraments, which St. Ambrose did NOT write; at least Ritcher says in his note, that there are "things like it" in that book, for it would seem he could not find the passage itself even there. The learned Berhard, whose book on the Decretum we shall notice presently, says—"Canon 74 is not found in Ambrose, although it is praised by Gratian, under the name of Ambrose."—vol. iv., p. 108. Our correspondent gives it thus—"Although the SPECIES of bread and wine are visible," &c. We think our correspondent has made a mistake in transcribing here; the Latin word is "figura," not "species." We have looked in the splendid original edition of Eggesteyn, Argent, 1471; in the small Paris edition of 1538; in the Roman edition, corrected by the Cardinals and approved by the Pope; and in Richter; and in all the word is "figura." If any edition had "species," Richter would notice it, which he does not. The word makes a great difference: *species* might mean that there was only the *appearance, not the reality of bread:* but "figura," means that the bread is a FIGURE of Christ's body, not the body itself; and so the passage means, that when we see this *figure*, we are to take hold of the *thing itself* by faith; which is Protestant doctrine.

The third passage which our correspondent quotes, he attributes to St. Augustine: we do not know on what authority. In the place of the Decretum which he refers to, it is attributed to St. Jerome in all the editions mentioned above. But no such passage has ever been found in any of St. Jerome's works. The cardinals appointed by the Pope to correct the Decretum, say that they found it in a Missal which they attribute not to St. Augustine, but to St. Ambrose. But all who understand such matters, know how impossible it is to attribute a Missal to any individual with certainty. The learned Berhard, in his most valuable work, "In Canones Gratiani," vol. iv., p. 115 (Venice, 1777), says, "it is rather to be referred to a certain Missal;" and this is all that can be said of it with truth. We do not altogether agree in our correspondent's translation here: he says "Each receives Christ the Lord entire in each particle; the Latin is, *Singuli accipiunt Christum Dominum et in singulis portionibus totus est, &c.*—"Each receive Christ the Lord, and he is whole in each portion." We see nothing in the Latin to make us apply this to the *particles of the bread*, but to the portion of Christ which each receives at the sacrament. All receive Christ equally and wholly.

The next passage quoted by our correspondent, and attributed to St. Ambrose, is from the same place in the Decretum (c. 55), and the same place in the book De Sacramentis, from which his first was taken, of which we have already spoken.

Therefore it appears that *none* of these quotations are the genuine writings of the persons whose names they bear. All are the opinions of obscure writers in much later ages, which have been mistaken for the writing of the Fathers; but which are really of no weight at all.

We have been particular in our examination of these passages, because we think that much mischief has been done in this controversy for want of such attention. The Fathers have not had fair play, when the works of obscure and mean writers have been allowed to pass under their names. The light which the genuine writings of the early Fathers can throw upon such questions has thus been greatly obscured, and controversy has been made more dark instead of more clear. We thought it our duty to take this opportunity of pointing out such an evil; but we do it with the greatest respect to our correspondent, feeling that he had great apparent reason to rely on the Decretum as he did, and that his letter affords a truly important subject for discussion. We shall be happy to hear from him again, and, in the meantime, we trust he will re-consider our notice of transubstantiation in our last number, and inquire whether Roman Catholics are really willing to admit it, as there stated.

SC.

ON CONCOMITANCY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—As you say "We invite Roman Catholics to come forward and disclaim whatever they think is unjustly charged on their religion, and place our pages at their disposal for the purpose," I beg to stand forward in the name of thousands of Roman Catholics in Ireland, and deny boldly and explicitly the doctrine of transubstantiation as explained in your last number.

1st. Roman Catholics do *not* believe that the consecrated bread is changed into the *blood* of Christ, but they *do* believe that it is changed into his *body*, and that by concomitancy, where the body is the blood must be also. As there was nothing before consecration but bread, which cannot be transubstantiated into blood, the blood of Christ must, of course, come down from heaven to accompany the body on the altar into which the bread has been transubstantiated. Protestants will ridicule this doctrine of concomitancy, and profanely ask—"Does the body come down from the right hand of God along with the blood, or does the blood leave the body above, that it may accompany the body below?" Such questions all true Roman Catholics are not careful to answer. They merely wish to deny that there is any necessity for the divine *body* of Christ to come down from above, as the bread on the altar is really changed into that very body which sits at the right hand of God; but they acknowledge that there *is* a necessity for the blood to come down, in order to fulfil the law of concomitancy, and, therefore, they humbly, faithfully, and piously *believe* that it does so come down, notwithstanding the profane objections of the adversaries. Protestants will again absurdly and impiously inquire, "When the blood leaves the divine body in heaven, to unite itself with the body on the altar, into which the bread has been transubstantiated, does it leave that heavenly body bloodless above?" Again, permit me to say, no true and faithful Roman Catholic is anxious to satisfy such inquiries. I may, however, observe, that there is nothing absurd, but rather according to true doctrine in the belief that, although the whole blood must leave the body above to unite itself to the body on the altar, yet the whole blood still remains in the body above by the same law of concomitancy. If you will prove yourself so impartial as to insert the above, I may, perhaps, continue my observations in a following number.

And am, Sir,
Yours, faithfully,
CATHOLICUS.

It is for Roman Catholics, not for us, to say whether the above answer will satisfy *them*. It does not satisfy us.

At the same time, we beg to say that we do *not* "ridicule" the doctrine of "concomitancy," neither do we "profanely ask" the questions which our correspondent attributes to Protestants. We do not "ridicule" any doctrine of the Roman Catholic faith, nor do we assume that any doctrine *must* be false, because our reason does not comprehend *how* it can be true. But we do bring all doctrines to the test of Divine revelation, and ask whether God has revealed them; if he have, we accept them with faith.

The doctrine of "concomitancy" is thus stated by the Council of Trent:—"Sed corpus quidem sub specie panis, et sanguinem sub vini specie ex vi verborum, ipsum autem corpus sub specie vini, et sanguinem sub specie panis, animamque sub utraque, vi naturalis illius connectionis et concomitantiæ, qua partes Christi Domini, qui jam ex mortuis resurrexit non amplius moriturus, inter se copulantur, &c."

"The body of Christ, indeed (exists) under the appearance of bread, and the blood under the appearance of wine, from the power of the words, but the body itself (exists) under the appearance of wine, and the blood under the appearance of bread, and the soul under either, by the power of that natural connection and concomitancy, by which the parts of Christ the Lord, who has now risen from the dead to die no more, are connected among themselves, &c."—Sess. xii., c. 3.

However this doctrine may favour transubstantiation, and receiving in one kind only, it seems to us fatal to the mass, as a propitiatory sacrifice for sin; for according to this doctrine, the blood is *not* shed from the body, and cannot be, and yet the Scripture says—"Without *shedding* of blood there is no remission."—Hebrews ix., v. 22, Douay Bible. When Christ died on the cross, his blood *was shed*, and this was the sacrifice for the remission of sin. If his blood cannot be separated from his body in the Sacrifice of the Mass, and this doctrine of "concomitancy" affirms that it cannot; then, according to the Revelation of God, the Mass cannot be a sacrifice for "remission," for "without *shedding* of blood there is no remission."

READING THE SCRIPTURES.

WE also freely insert the following letter of Mr. Aylmer, which reached us a few days since. It will afford us an opportunity hereafter of explaining our own views more fully, when discussing those of our correspondent. He will not find that we contend for any such absurdities as that of making a *child* the arbiter of the most important truths; nor shall we contend, either, that there are no difficulties in the Holy Scriptures, or that they may not be misinterpreted. We know they must have been misinterpreted by Churches as well as children, or men could not so differ about them. To consider the subject as fully as its grave importance deserves, would much exceed the space at our command in our present number; but we hope to recur speedily to both the letter and the pamphlet of our respected correspondent; in the meantime, merely expressing our gratification at the frank and independent tone of his communication, as well as the spirit in which it is conceived. Collecting, as we do, from his pamphlet

distinctly, that he "does not put the priest above the Scriptures," and from his letter, that he is "decidedly for Scriptural education," we venture to anticipate, that however distrustful he may be of his own judgment in interpreting the Bible, his views of the right and duty of exercising private judgment will not be found to differ very widely from our own; and we are glad to find that his view of the passage in St. John, on which he comments, agrees with our own, and with that of St. Chrysostom, and not with that of St. Cyril.

"Sir—My attention has just been directed to the leading article of the last number of your periodical, on the subject of the Church of Rome allowing or preventing the free use of the Holy Scriptures.

"I confess you have treated the matter fairly enough, in showing, that the Church, both in ancient and modern times, by no means generally prohibited the reading of the Holy Scriptures—quite the contrary; but I must dissent, *in limine*, to your interpretation of the 39th verse of the 5th chapter of St. John, which I do not at all conceive to be borne out, either by the original or your translation from St. Chrysostom.

"My view of the text you will best comprehend, by my referring you to page 15 of the accompanying pamphlet;* which, at the suggestion of some friends, was published last summer.†

"There is, however, one observation which escaped my notice at the time; and which is, that there is nothing in the original text of St. John to prove that the word corresponding to '*search*' is to be taken in the imperative, or the indicative mood. If the latter, your commentary completely falls to the ground. I do not mean to contend for either, as I maintain my interpretation applies equally to *both*. We, Roman Catholics, translate it imperatively, because most of the Fathers (though not all—St. Cyril, for instance), do so; but Protestants, who disregard tradition, have nothing but the text to guide them; and hence, as Parkhurst observes, some divines of the Church of England have declared for the indicative acceptance of the word.

"The Scriptures, as a sole rule of faith, cannot be otherwise than dangerous; and their indiscriminate reading and circulation most pernicious. Open your Bible, take the three first pages that occur in either Testament, and tell me, without disguise, is there nothing in them too difficult for your comprehension? —"*Thinkest thou that thou understandest what thou readest?*"—Acts viii. 30. If you find all before you clear and easy, you may thank God for giving you a privilege which he has denied to so many thousands upon thousands of sincere believers! I am decidedly for Scriptural education, but administered in a proper and convenient form. The most wholesome food may disagree with a delicate stomach; and St. Jerome, who was so zealous an advocate for the reading of the Holy Scriptures, in his letter to Lacta respecting the education of her granddaughter, recommended her to put them into the hands of this young lady progressively, in proportion as she advanced in years, capacity, and virtue. The Jews themselves, although accustomed to, and familiar with the oriental tropes and figures of speech, yet used precaution with regard to the reading of Holy Writ. They did not allow the first chapters of Genesis, some of Ezekiel, and the song of Solomon, to be read, except by those who had attained the age of thirty years. Surely, in sober seriousness, you do not contend for making a child the arbiter of the most important truths! It is neither meet nor just, right nor available to salvation to do so. We know that 'out of the mouths of infants and of sucklings praise can be perfected,' without placing this great maintaining power within their reach. Children could cry in the temple 'Hosanna to the Son of David,' while those who were 'masters in Israel' were confounded and moved with indignation.—St. Matthew xxi. 15, 16. No doubt, *the revealed truths themselves* are to be made known as much as possible to all mankind; but it does not follow from hence that all mankind are to read, search, and be everlastingly *digging* (as you express it) at the Scriptures. Lord Clarendon, the great historian, Mr. Grey, Doctor Hey, &c., all agree, that the misapplication of Scripture was the cause of the destruction of Church and State, and of the murder of the king. So likewise, the same cause exposed the nation to great calamities in the Protestant riots of 1780. The same might be affirmed with regard to Johanna Southcote, who declared herself to be the woman of Genesis, destined to *crush the serpent's head*; and the woman mentioned in Revelations, 'clothed with the sun, and crowned with twelve stars!'

"This communication has far exceeded the limits I intended. I have occupied too much of your time; I shall cease to do so; but let me impress upon you, it is exclusively to guard against such fatal abuse, that the Roman Catholic Church prevents an indiscriminate, an independent, and puerile use of the Sacred Volume.

"I am, sir,

"Your obedient, very humble servant,

"M. V. Aylmer."

* Speech of M. V Aylmer, Esq., at the Rotundo Religious Discussion Class. 16th June, 1851.

† In this pamphlet, p. 15, the writer argues that the whole discourse in 5th chap of John has reference, *exclusively*, to the Jews, to whom it was addressed by our Saviour, on one of the festival days, and relates of course to the Scriptures of the Old Testament which were then alone extant. The Jews were in the habit of reading their Testament; and were referred to it, by our Lord for the testimony or proof of his Divine mission. We regret that we have not space in our present number to transcribe the whole of this argument. We cannot, however, omit noticing one passage in it, of which we cordially approve:—"Let us take care in what spirit and with what dispositions we read and search the Scriptures."

ODE FOR ST. PATRICK'S DAY.

This was a day for gladsome glee—
A day to every patriot dear,
But now, unused to sounds of joy,
'Tis hallowed by a silent tear.
That God would bless, be still our prayer;
We ask, at least, that Heaven will spare.

Oh! honoured be our Ocean Isle,
Of saintly deeds and faith the scene;
That thousand years have not bedimm'd
In memory's light still fresh and green;
But doubly dear for all the woe
Poured on her withered soil below.

And yet, though quenched her joys in night,
Though sunk her manliest sons in grief,
Celestial comforts pure and bright,
And guardian spirits with relief,
Can break o'er this drear, wintry state,
To cheer the dark, the desolate.

And, oh! if such communion be
The solace of our wretchedness—
If grovelling minds be raised above,
And hearts be waked from hopelessness,
Then, who will God's high hand deny,
Or say our doom is misery?

Peace be with thee, afflicted Isle!
Though dark the clouds that o'er thee lower.
May Heaven still lend its pillared ray,
To guide thee in thy drooping hour;
Thy people cheer with trust sublime,
And raise thee in his own good time!

FARMING OPERATIONS FOR MARCH.

(From the Irish Farmers' Gazette.)

Much of the weather during last month has been totally against sowing spring wheat, beans, and peas; the early part of this month should, therefore, be almost exclusively devoted to getting in the intended breadths of the above crops, as in a short time it will be getting too late for doing so, when it will be necessary to substitute some other crops, which will be attended with much inconvenience; every exertion will, therefore, be necessary, while the present fine weather lasts, to commit those crops to the ground. At the same time, in cold, backward soils and aspects, it may be safer to substitute oats for the wheat, particularly if the land be not in high condition, and well drained; and, instead of beans, potatoes may be planted, and parsnips, carrots, mangels, and other green crops, sown. If the soil be light and dry, peas may still be sown with safety.

Autumn-sown Wheat.—As soon as the land is dry enough, and that this crop has been sown in drills, it will be necessary to hand or horse-hoe between the rows, to break the winter's crust, destroy weeds, and mould the young plants. If it be intended to lay down the autumn wheats with clover and grass seeds, whether the wheat may be sown in drills or broadcast, the most suitable implement will be the harrow, which should be followed by the roller; the grass and clover seed sown lightly, but well bush-harrowed, and finished with the roller.

Oats.—In rich, well-prepared, and early soils, oats should be sown early in the month; but in cold, wet, and backward soils, it will be safer to sow by the end of this or early next month. Lea land is very frequently sown under the harrows; and, if clean, the soil deep, dry, and in good heart, and ploughed early, with a good crest or arrass, sufficient to cover the seed, is a very expeditious mode, and produces well; but if the land be foul, light, or inclined to damp, the best crops will be obtained by ploughing into narrow sets; give a stroke of the harrows up and down, sow the seed, harrow finely, and cover from the furrows, cutting them with the furrow-plough, to raise sufficient mould. The most yielding crops are produced from lea by this mode; and the land turns out more cleanly for the succeeding crops, the sods more decomposed, and the land more friable.

Barley may be sown by the end of the month. The most suitable soils for this crop are those of a gravelly or sandy nature, dry and rich. Soils of the above descriptions, having grown a well-manured green crop, are, therefore, best adapted for barley; and soils wanting the above qualities will be more profitably sown with oats, which is by far the hardiest grain we have, and not so easily damaged by bad weather at harvest time. The pickle recommended for wheat is also applicable to oats and barley, and highly useful in preventing smut in those crops.

Spring Vetches.—Sow another breadth of this valuable crop for summer soiling. Sow in the proportion of three bushels of vetches, and four to five stones of oats to the Irish acre. When well up, sow another breadth, in order to keep up a continuous succession of succulent forage. About four pounds of rape, sown along with the vetches and oats, will help to keep the former off the ground, and add considerably to the bulk of the crop.

Carrots love a deep, sandy loam, which, when well manured with well-decomposed compost, intimately mixed with it, produces this crop in the highest state of perfection. On this account, the best practice is to manure the land heavily in the autumn, and plough it in with a deep, rough furrow; it is then harrowed down as soon as thoroughly dry in the spring, cross-ploughed, well harrowed, rolled, and, if necessary, well grubbed and rolled, so as to reduce it to the finest possible tilth preparatory to forming the drills, which are then rolled, to flat their tops and consolidate them, and immediately sown. If the land has not been manured in the autumn, it may be manured at the time of sowing; but in this case the manure must be short and well decomposed, and put in the drills as is usual for turnips. Carrots may be sown from the middle of the month up till the middle of April; but the earlier the better.

Parsnips like a deep, sappy, heavy soil, not wet; and to produce a heavy crop, it should be rich and well manured with rich compost. The cultivation of the soil is the same as for carrots, and the seed may be sown at the same time; but carrots will produce better, if sown a little later than parsnips.

Cabbages.—Prepare a clean, rich, and well-manured piece of land, and pulverize it well, to sow some cabbage seeds; lay it off in three and a half or four feet beds, with eighteen-inch alleys; level the beds neatly with the back of the spade; sow the seed thinly and evenly, and cover with about an inch of fine earth from the furrows; rake the surface nicely, and when dry enough beat it well with the back of the spade, which will prevent it cracking or fissuring. The large York, Nonpareil York, and Drumhead are the best sorts to sow now, for field culture, and will produce fine plants for planting out in May and June.

Potatoes.—The experience of the last few years sufficiently proves that early planting, and cultivating only those sorts of early maturity, is the best and only security against the disease. No time should, therefore, be lost in getting in the necessary breadths. Potatoes should be planted before they begin to push forth shoots from the eye to such a degree as to cause any injury to them; when the bud is injured a secondary one has to be formed, and the strength of the tuber much weakened in supplying it with the necessary nourishment, till it is enabled to seek it by sending out its own feeders into the surrounding soil. When the land is dry and previously well prepared, which it should be by the necessary deep ploughings, harrowings, cross-ploughings, and rollings, drilling in the potatoes will be the most economical, as regards time, expense, and manure, and the produce good; but in case the land be not thoroughly dry, or that the potatoes are wanted very early, it will be much the best mode to plant the potatoes in lazy-beds, though the manure will be required in greater abundance than by planting in drills. The ease and dispatch with which the potato crop can be got in by drilling, when the land has been properly prepared, has made this mode a general favourite with all cultivators; but the benefits derivable from planting potatoes in ridges, or lazy-beds, by the deep periodical digging of the furrows, thus bringing up fresh soil from a depth below the action of the ordinary plough, and exposing fresh surfaces to the disintegrating and vivifying influence of the atmosphere, have been too frequently overlooked.

Flax.—Land intended for flax demands particular attention now. The land should have been deeply ploughed last autumn, and should, as soon as sufficiently dry, be well harrowed, rolled, grubbed, and well cleaned of all root-weeds, such as scutch, crowfoot, &c. The best soil for flax is a deep, strong loam; and rich stubble land, after wheat, oats, or barley, produces the best sample, particularly if the grain crops have succeeded lea; the seed may be sown by the end of the month, and well harrowed with a short-toned harrow, first one way, and then across, or diagonally, so as to distribute the seeds equally; finish with the roller. The proportion of seed generally sown to the Irish acre is three and a half to four bushels; but it is much safer to sow too thick than too thin. Good crops are taken after potatoes, mangels, carrots, and parsnips; but of late there is a decided opinion setting in in the north of Ireland against growing flax after turnips.

Poultry.—Select and set the eggs of the various fowl intended to increase; put no more than thirteen under the common hen. As soon as the geese eggs set last month are hatched, let the young ones have soft meat and plenty of green feeding, but do not let them have too much access to water. The same rule applies to young ducks, for which the hen is a better nurse than the duck. Collect the turkey eggs as they are produced, and put them by carefully for setting.

New and Recent Works

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

Booksellers to the Queen,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

THE RUSSIAN SHORES OF THE BLACK SEA, IN THE AUTUMN of 1852, with a Voyage down the Volga, and a Tour through the Country of the Don Cossacks. By Lawrence Oliphant. 8vo. 14s.

RUSSIA AND THE RUSSIANS; comprising an account of the Czar Nicholas, and the House of Romanoff, with a sketch of the Encroachments of Russia from the reign of the Empress Catherine. By J. H Cole, 21st Fusileers. 2s. 6d.

THE RUSSO-TURKISH CAMPAIGN OF 1828-29; with a View of the present State of the Eastern Question. By Colonel Chesney. 12s.

THE HISTORY OF THE FRENCH PROTESTANT REFUGEES, from the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. By Charles Weiss. 8vo. 14s.

HISTORY OF THE PROTESTANT CHURCH IN HUNGARY, FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE REFORMATION TO 1850, with reference also to Transylvania. With an Introduction by Dr. D'Aubigne. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

ALISON'S HISTORY of EUROPE, from the fall of Napoleon, in 1815, to the Establishment of Military Government in France, in 1852; being a continuation of his former celebrated work. Vols. I., II., and III. 8vo. 15s. each.

CHRISTOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, and a Commentary on the Messianic Predictions. By E. W. Hengstenberg, D.D. Vol. I. 10s. 6d.

THE EARLY PROPHECIES OF A REDEEMER; from the first Promise to the Prophecy of Moses. Considered in Six Discourses. By Rev. W. De Burgh, B.D. 8vo. 5s.

EXAMINATION OF MR. MAURICE'S THEOLOGICAL ESSAYS. By Robert S. Candlish, D.D. Crown 8vo. 6s.

OUTLINES OF SACRED PROPHECY. By Rev. T. R. Birks. New Edition. 5s.

THE SCARLET MYSTERY; or, Rome Unmasked. By J. G. MacWalter. 3s. 6d.

THE LIFE OF MRS. SHERWOOD. Edited by her Daughter. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

HOPE DEFERRED, NOT LOST; a Narrative of Missionary effort in South America. With Journals of Captain Gardiner, &c. 5s.

CAUTIONS FOR THE TIMES. Edited by the Archbishop of Dublin. 8vo. 7s.

MEMOIR OF RICHARD WILLIAMS, Catechist to the Patagonian Mission. By the Rev. Dr. James Hamilton. 12mo. 5s.

A MEMOIR OF THE REV. W. B. JOHNSTON, Missionary at Regent's Town, Sierra Leone. 5s.

OF THE PLURALITY OF WORLDS. An Essay. 8vo. 8s.

FRIENDS IN COUNCIL. A Series of Readings and Discourses thereon. 2 vols. Cheaper Edition. 9s.

COMPANIONS OF MY SOLITUDE. Cheaper Edition. 3s. 6d.

THE CHEMISTRY OF COMMON LIFE. By James F. W. Johnston. Vol. I. 5s.

ALISON'S HISTORY OF EUROPE, from the French Revolution in 1789 to 1815. Cheaper Edition. Vols. I. to V. 4s. each.

DISCOURSES ON THE CHRISTIAN REVELATION, viewed in connection with Modern Astronomy. By the late Thomas Chalmers, D.D. Fcp. 2s. 6d.

THE BIBLE IN THE COUNTING HOUSE: a course of Lectures to Merchants. By the Rev. H. A. Broadman, D.D. 8vo. 5s.

STORR'S FAMILY PREACHER. Short practical Sermons for home. 4s. 6d.

CHALMERS'S DAILY SCRIPTURE READINGS. 2 vols. 10s.

CHALMERS'S SABBATH SCRIPTURE READINGS. 2 vols. 10s.

MEMOIRS OF THOMAS CHALMERS, D.D., LL.D. By his Son-in-Law, the Rev. Wm. Hanna, LL.D. 2 vols. 12s.

BRADLEY'S PRACTICAL SERMONS for every Sunday and Principal Holiday in the Year. 8vo. 12s.

BRADLEY'S SERMONS on some of the Trials, Duties, and Encouragements of the Christian Life. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

ROBERTS' PLAIN SERMONS for all the Sundays and Chief Holidays of the year. 2 vols. 10s.

ROBERTS' PLAIN SERMONS for all the Sundays and Chief Holidays of the Year. Second Series. 2 vols. 18s.

THE DOMESTIC COMMENTARY ON THE HOLY SCRIPTURES. By a Clergyman of the Church of England. 4 vols. Imp. 8vo. £2 14s.

MATTHEW HENRY'S EXPOSITION ON THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT; with numerous Maps and Illustrations. 3 vols. 4to. Whole calf. £3 17s. 6d.

WORK: PLENTY TO DO AND HOW TO DO IT. By Margaret Maria Brewster. 4s.

CYCLOPÆDIA OF UNIVERSAL BIOGRAPHY; with numerous Illustrations. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

GRATITUDE: an Exposition of the Hundred and Third Psalm. By the Rev. John Stevenson. 8vo. 6s.

CHRIST IS ALL; a Series of Tracts. By the Venerable Archdeacon Law. No. 1—8. 1d. each.

MY SCHOOLS AND MY SCHOOLMASTERS; or the Story of my Education. By Hugh Miller. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

FIRST IMPRESSIONS OF ENGLAND AND ITS PEOPLE. By Hugh Miller. 7s. 6d.

THE LONDON PULPIT. By James Ewing Ritchie. 4s. 6d.

THE NEW IRISH PULPIT; or Gospel Preacher. New series. 3s. 6d.

The PSALMS Restored to MESSIAH; a brief Commentary. By the Rev. R. H. Ryland. With Preface, by Bishop of Cashel. 6s.

LESSONS and TRIALS OF LIFE. By the Author of "Bertha's Journal." 6s.

MEMOIR OF THE LIVES OF ROBERT AND JAMES A. HALDANE. By Alexander Haldane, Esq. 8vo. 12s.

MEMOIR OF THE REV. W. H. KRAUSE, A.M., Bethesda Chapel, Dublin, with selections from his Correspondence. By Rev. C. S. Stanford. Crown 8vo. 5s. 6d.

MEMOIR OF THE LATE REV. EDWARD BICKERSTETH. By the Rev. T. R. Bicks. Cheaper Edition. 2 vols. Fcap. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

THE BUD OF PROMISE: a Memoir of Eliza H. M. Græme. By the Rev. D. Pitcairn. 3s. 6d.

THE NET IN THE BAY; or Journal of a Visit to Moose and Albany. By the Bishop of Rupert's Land. 4s. 6d.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES; THE MOSLEM AND HIS END; THE CHRISTIAN AND HIS HOPE. By the Rev. John Cumming, D.D. 1s. 6d.

LEILA ADA, THE JEWISH CONVERT: an authentic Memoir. By Osborne W. Trenery Heighway. 3s. 6d.

SELECT EXTRACTS FROM THE DIARY, CORRESPONDENCE, ETC., OF LEILA ADA. By Osborne W. Trenery Heighway. 3s. 6d.

THE BOOK AND ITS STORY: a Narrative for the Young, on occasion of the Jubilee of the British and Foreign Bible Society. By L. N. R. With an introductory preface, by Rev. T. Phillips. Fcap. 4s.

A PORTRAITURE OF THE LATE REV. WILLIAM JAY, of Bath; an outline of his mind, character, and pulpit eloquence, &c. By the Rev. Thomas Wallace. 3s. 6d.

AN APPEAL TO THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF YORK, ON THE UNCONDEMNED HERESIES OF ARCHDEACON WILBERFORCE'S BOOK, entitled, "The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist." By the Rev. J. Taylor, M.A. 2s.

PLAIN SPEAKING. First series. Being forty short, Large-type Tracts. By the Rev. J. C. Ryle, B.A. In packet. 1s.

HOME TRUTHS. First, Second, and Third Series. By the Rev. J. C. Ryle. 3s. 6d. each.

THE BISHOP, the PASTOR, and the PREACHER. Three Biographical Lectures on Latimer, Baxter, and Whitfield; with introductory preface, on some Wants of the present Day. By Rev. J. C. Ryle. *(In the Press.)*

TRACTS FOR CHURCHMEN. Seventeen Numbers. In Packet. 1s.

THE GLORIES OF MARY, from the Italian of Alphonsus Liguori; with the approbation of Cardinal Wiseman. 2s.

THE POLISH LANCER; or 1812. A Tale of Napoleon's Invasion of Russia. By Louis Rellstab. 1s. 6d.

JOHNSTON'S CHART OF THE NORTH SEA, and the BALTIC, with the Countries adjoining; and Enlarged Plans of Cronstadt and Revel. 1s.

JOHNSTON'S MAP OF THE SEAT OF WAR, in the Danubian Principalities. 1s.

JOHNSTON'S NEW MAP OF THE BLACK SEA, CAUCASUS, CRIMEA, ETC., with enlarged plans of Sevastopol and the Bosphorus. 1s.

Lately Published,

WILLET'S "SYNOPSIS PAPISMI." New Edition. Edited by the Rev. J. Cumming, D.D. Ten vols. 8vo. Price £3.

London: JAMES MILLER, 17, Berner's-street, Oxford-street, and all Booksellers.

Just Published, Fcap. 8vo., Price 2s. 6d.

I.

THE FIRST RESURRECTION: Being Comments on First Corinthians, chapter xv. By the Rev. Robert Noble, A.M., Vicar of Athboy.

II.

Fcap. 8vo., cloth, price 1s. 6d.

THE PRINCIPLES OF ELOCUTION; Compiled from "The Elements of Rhetoric, by Archbishop Whately." With considerable additions and alterations.

III.

New Edition, Fcap. 8vo., cloth, price 2s. 6d.

THE COLLECTS OF THE LITURGY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND,

Catechetically Explained, Compared with Scripture, and briefly Commented upon, with the Date and Origin of each Collect annexed. For the use of Families and Sunday Schools.

By the Rev. Charles Miller, A.B.,

With Recommendatory Preface by the Bishop of Meath.

IV.

Fcap. 8vo., Neat Cover, Price 1s.

Cloth, 1s. 6d.; Cloth, Gilt Edges, 2s.

THE TALK OF THE ROAD: Showing how Irish people talk about Irish doings, when they get a quiet place, at the back of a ditch, or under a hedge.

V.

Royal 32mo., Price One Halfpenny each.

Stories about the Mission Work in Ireland.

The Bright Side of a Dark Cloud. II. Biddy Lacey. (The Series to be Continued.)

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Just Published,

Third Edition, Price 1s. 6d.; or in full cloth, Price 2s. 6d.

POOR PADDY'S CABIN; or, SLAVERY IN IRELAND. A true Representation of Facts and Characters. By an Irishman.

London: WERTHEIM and MACKINTOSH. Dublin: WM. CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

New Cheap Edition of the

WAVERLEY NOVELS,

12mo. Fancy Boards, Price 1s. 6d. each.

This Series of the highly popular Works of Sir Walter Scott is in preparation, and will be printed from a new, clear type; each Volume containing a complete Novel. The issue will commence on the First of June, with "WAVERLEY; or 'Tis sixty years since," and be continued in every alternate month.

Subscribers' names for the series received by

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY, 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, Dublin.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher, WILLIAM CURRY, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

Wednesday, March 17, 1852.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Bíoṙ do Dhia aṅ ṙna háṙduiḃ, agus ṙíoḋḋáin air an dtalaṁ deaġḋoil do na dáoiniḃ.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED THE MIDDLE OF EVERY MONTH, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. I.—No. 4. APRIL, 1852. {Annual Subscription, 3s. 6d. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
On the free use of the Holy Scriptures	37
Unity of Spirit	39
Early Fathers on Purgatory	39
The Talk of the Road—No. III.	40
Civil and Religious Liberty	41
Bible burning	41
Irish, English, and Douay versions of the Scriptures.	42
Historical Account of the mode of Appointing Bishops in Ireland from A.D. 1152 to the Reformation	43
CORRESPONDENCE:	
Mr. Aylmer's Pamphlet on Reading the Scriptures	44
Letters on Purgatory	45
Letter on Transubstantiation	46
Farming Operations for April	47

ANCIENT IRISH SAINTS AND MODERN ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOPS ON THE FREE USE OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

Our readers will remember that, in a former number, we gave extracts from the writings of some of the early popes and bishops of the Roman Catholic Church, showing the great importance which they attached to the circulation of the Holy Scriptures, both among the clergy and their flocks, and how urgently they exhorted the laity to read and study them. We now proceed to give some information regarding the opinions and practice of the ancient Church of Ireland on this important subject; and we shall then bring forward one or two declarations of the modern Roman Catholic bishops in Ireland, respecting the study of the Word of God, for the purpose of ascertaining how far they agree, how far they differ, from the sentiments of the ancient bishops of the Irish Church.

We have good reason for affirming that, so early as the fourth and fifth centuries, the study of the Holy Scriptures was generally diffused throughout the British Isles. It may be sufficient at present to quote the well-known testimony of St. Chrysostom—"Although," saith he, "thou didst go unto the ocean and those British Isles, although thou didst sail to the Euxine Sea, although thou didst go unto the southern quarters, thou shouldst hear ALL men, everywhere, discoursing matters out of the SCRIPTURE, with another voice, indeed, but not another faith, and with a different tongue, but with an according judgment."* It is, doubtless, a subject of deep regret to every person who takes an interest in the ancient history of our Irish Church, that we do not possess as much information as we could desire, respecting its state and condition during the period which immediately succeeded the first introduction of Christianity. Time, which makes such melancholy ravages in all things earthly, has laid his destructive hand with especial weight upon the literary records of our own and other countries, during those early ages. We can infer, however, even from the documents which have come down to us, and which are doubly valuable from their scarcity, that the ancient Catholic Church of Ireland was adorned by many excellent and pious men, whose learning was conspicuous amidst the darkness by which they were surrounded. Our country, as has been often remarked, bore a very high character for learning in ancient times. Strangers crowded from other lands to be educated in Ireland, looking upon it as one of the principal nurseries of religion and learning in Europe.

But the study which they prized most highly, and cultivated most carefully, was that of the Word of God; and proofs of this fact are continually afforded to us, in the lives and histories of almost all the eminent saints and pious men who adorned our ancient Church.

To begin with St. Patrick himself, to whose missionary zeal we owe the foundation of our Church. An examination of his writings will show how well acquainted he was with the text of Holy Scripture, and how fond he was of quoting it. His mind seems to have been filled with the knowledge of the Word of God, insomuch that, when he began to instruct others, the texts and language of the Bible poured forth from his lips in a copious and abundant stream.

No one can read any of the writings of St. Patrick without perceiving that he felt he had found a sacred treasure in the Holy Volume,* and that he took the Word of God for the rule of his life and conduct; that he not only studied it carefully himself, and impressed its precepts deeply on his memory, but was also anxious that others, whether men or women, should follow his example; that they to whom he preached should become familiar with the Holy Scriptures, and be able to use them profitably for their own guidance and instruction in life.

Our next authority shall be St. Columbanus (of whom we gave a brief and hasty sketch in our first number). We are told of this eminent man, that in his early youth, he placed himself under the care of a "venerable person, of high reputation among his countrymen for piety and learning, who carefully instructed him in the whole of the Divine Scriptures."† And the reverence with which St. Columbanus, in after years, mentions the Holy Scriptures, as the great foundation of his faith and practice, is evident from many passages of his writings, as, for instance, in the following one from his sermon on the Mortification of Sin—"Excepting these statements," saith he, "which either the Law, or the Prophets, or the Gospel, or the Apostles, have made to us, solemn silence ought to be observed, as far as other authorities are concerned, with respect to the Trinity. For it is God's testimony alone that is to be credited concerning God—that is, concerning himself. And this testimony concerning himself he has given, either in the Law, or in a Prophet, or in the Gospel, or in an Apostle, or, in special cases, to individuals, either by himself or by an angel."* It is very clear that the writer of this passage looked to Scripture, and to Scripture alone, for the rule of his faith, and that he deemed it needless, as well as irreverent, to refer to any other authority. And not only did St. Columbanus thus value the Word of God himself, but he earnestly recommended it to *all* Christians, that they should esteem the Scriptures as their chief riches, as we learn from the following verse of his writings—

"Sint tibi divitiæ Divinæ dogmata legis:"†

in which he repeats, under another form, the sentiments of the Royal Psalmist—"The law of thy mouth is good to me, above thousands of gold and silver."—Ps. cxviii. 72, Douay version.

It is equally certain that the Scriptures were carefully studied by the most eminent Irish saints, who came after those just noticed. We are told that the disciples of St. Columba, another most eminent Irish saint, used to support their opinions "by referring to the testimony of Holy Scripture."—Adamnam's Vit. St. Columb., p. 143, quoted in King's Ch. His., i. 320. It is recorded of St. Aidan (who died A.D. 651), by the venerable Bede, that "he endeavoured not to omit any of those duties that he had learned in the writings of the Evangelists, or Apostles, or Prophets, but to fulfil them all to the best of his ability;" and it is added, that "all who went with him, whether those who had undergone the tonsure (*i.e.*, the clergy), or the laity, were bound to employ themselves in reading the Scriptures, or learning the Psalms."—Bed. iii. 5, quoted in King's Ir. Ch. His., i. pp. 205. 320. Dr. Lanigan, the Roman Catholic Church historian of Ireland, informs us that "St. Petrocus, a native of Britain, spent twenty years in Ireland, applying himself to the study of the Scriptures, and to the acquirement of general knowledge."—Vol. i., p. 492. Of St. Finnian, of Clonard, in Meath, he tells us that "he was distinguished for his extraordinary learning and knowledge of the Holy Scriptures."—Vol. ii., p. 21. He mentions, likewise, a curious anecdote in the life of St. Senanus (who died, according to Archbishop Ussher, A.D. 544), while the saint was at Inniscarra (a place five miles west of Cork, where he built a church), "a vessel arrived in Cork harbour, bringing fifty religious persons—passengers from the Continent, whom the love of a stricter mode of life, or a desire to improve themselves in the study of the Scriptures, had attracted to Ireland;" and Colgan, the old author from whom Dr. Lanigan quotes this story, adds the remarkable words, that "*the study of the Scriptures, at that time, greatly flourished in Ireland.*"‡

Perhaps, however, it may be replied, that the study of the Word of God, spoken of in these extracts, was confined to the monks and clergy,

* Chrys. Op., Tom. iii., p. 86; Paris, 1837. See also Abp. Ussher, Religion of the Ancient Irish, Works, vol. iv., p. 243.

* In a Latin hymn, written by his nephew, Secundinus or St. Seachlin, St. Patrick is described as having found "a sacred treasure in the Sacred Volume."—Colgan, Tr. Th., p. 212. And, in describing the virtuous and chaste woman, St. Patrick himself, in his treatise concerning the abuses of the world, says—"She quickens her soul by assiduous meditations and discourses on the Scriptures."—Sanct. Patr. De Abusionibus Sæculi, ch. v., p. 264. Villaneuvas edition, 1835. "Bonis semper moribus delectatur et consentit, et *assiduis Scripturarum meditationibus* et *eloquiis animam regalat.*"

† Jonas, Vit. St. Columb., cap. 2, quoted in King's Church History of Ireland, vol. i., p. 251.

* King's Church History, vol. i., p. 299.

† Columb. in Munsat. et in Epistola ad Hunaldum. Ussher, ut supra. p. 244.

‡ Quos Scripturarum peritiæ, tunc in eâ multum florentis desiderium in Hiberniam traxerat." Lanigan, ii., pp. 2–5 King i. 323.

who may be supposed to have been familiar with the Latin Vulgate; but that it would be an erroneous inference to conclude that the knowledge of the Scriptures was diffused among all classes, young and old, in their own mother tongue. If this objection could be sustained, the argument which we have endeavoured to derive from the practice of our countrymen in ancient times would, doubtless, lose much of its weight. But we are enabled to prove, by the testimony of the venerable Bede, that the objection is altogether groundless. "The Island of Britain," saith he, "in the language of five nations, doth teach and confess one and the same knowledge of the highest truth, and of the true sublimity—to wit, of the English, the Britons, the Scots (*i.e.*, the Irish, who were anciently always called Scots,) the Picts, and the Latins."* In this passage there is a plain acknowledgment, that such as understood not the Latin might yet, in their own mother tongue, search those "Holy Scriptures, which were able to make them wise unto salvation." Bede, indeed, speaks only of Britain; but it is obvious, from the mention of the Scots, as well as from the constant intercourse which existed between the two countries in his time, that his remarks apply equally to Ireland. Nor was the study of the Word of God confined to persons of mature years; the young were diligently trained, even from their childhood, to read and learn the oracles of God. It was thus, as we have seen, that St. Columbanus was instructed, insomuch that, "while yet a very young man, he wrote an exposition of the Psalms, in elegant language, so thoroughly were the treasures of the Divine Scriptures kept stored in his bosom."† And hence we can readily understand, that our Irish ancestors may have well deserved the character given of them by Aldhelm, the old abbot of Malmesbury, in a letter written about A.D. 690, that they were "ingenious book leaders, and ready-witted arguers out of the Scriptures:" and that so late as the eleventh century, they were described by John, the son of Bishop Sulgen, as "*a nation famous for the word of God.*"‡

These examples might be easily extended to a considerable length, by the aid of the authorities from whom we have borrowed; we think, however, that we have done enough to satisfy our readers, that, in ancient times, the Word of God was prized and valued throughout the length and breadth of Ireland. There is, indeed, no circumstance in our ancient history upon which a true Irishman can dwell with more interest and pleasure, than the singular reputation for letters and advancement in Christian knowledge, by which Ireland was in those days distinguished. Not only did the light of religion and learning then shine so brightly in our land, as to attract to our shores many strangers from distant countries, but its influence even penetrated to the most remote parts of Europe. The labours of the Irish clergy were not confined to their own country; their missionaries crossed the seas to Scotland, to Britain, and to the Continent. They converted heathens; they established schools of learning; they diffused a love of letters among the Saxons and Normans. Burgundy, Germany, and other countries received their instructions; and Europe, with gratitude, confessed the superior knowledge, the piety, the zeal of the "Island of Saints."

But these happy days passed by, and darker times, alas! succeeded. Our Church surrendered the independence which she had long retained; and the authority of the Pope was formally acknowledged by the bishops and clergy of Ireland, in the Synod of Cashel, A.D. 1172. Thenceforward we hear but little of the spread of learning, or the diffusion of religious knowledge. A dark and dreary interval succeeds; until at length, in the beginning of the sixteenth century, Europe was startled from its slumbers by the progress of the Reformation. The Church of Rome took the alarm. She seems to have thought (whether rightly or wrongly, it is not now our purpose to inquire) that the reading of the Bible, in the vulgar tongue, had a tendency to draw men's minds away from herself, and towards the Reformed Churches: and accordingly we find that, from that time forward, various hindrances and obstacles to the free circulation of the Scriptures were interposed by her authority, or with her consent. Among numberless proofs of the fact, we need only refer to the history of the famous Bull, "Unigenitus." Father Quesnel published a book, in which, amongst other propositions, he ventured to assert that, "the reading of the Sacred Scripture is for all," and that, "to interdict from Christians the reading of the Sacred Scripture, particularly of the Gospel, is to interdict the use of light from the sons of light." Any unprejudiced Christian would be apt to imagine that these were sound and wholesome opinions: but Clement XI., who was then Pope, thought otherwise. He seems to have been afraid that, if the Scriptures were generally used, Christianity would be overthrown: and, to prevent such a misfortune, he published a Bull, dated September 8, 1713, in which he declared these propositions, as well as others, to be "false, captious, ill-sounding, scandalous, pernicious, injurious to the Church, seditious, impious, blasphemous, heretical," &c., and consequently "forbids any of the faithful to teach or maintain, or even to mention them, either in public or private, with any other view than to confute them," &c., which, if anybody dares to attempt, he is assured, he will draw upon himself the "indignation of God Almighty, and the Blessed Apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul."

Now, we must remember that this Bull is no ordinary document. It is at this present moment actually in force, in the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland: for when the late Archbishop Murray was asked by the Committee of the House of Commons, in 1825 (vide Report, p. 647), "Is the Bull Unigenitus received in Ireland?" his reply was, "It is." Hence it follows that, by the authority of this Bull, the Church of Rome clearly and positively *condemns* the free and unrestricted reading of the Holy Scriptures. And accordingly we find that Dr. Troy, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, did not hesitate to avow that such was the doctrine of his Church. In a letter which he wrote, dated 23rd July, 1818, and which is published in the Report of the Irish Education Commissioners (p. 46), he thus expresses his views—"Allow me, very reverend sir, on this occasion, to observe, that the Catholic Church in all ages has *prohibited* the indiscriminate use of the Scriptures, in the vulgar tongues, without note or comment; also the interpretation of them by every one's private judgment. This interpretation has been the fatal and prolific hive, from which swarms of sectaries daily issue; each one finding his religion in the Bible, which has disfigured and distracted the Christian Church since the days of Luther. Wherefore, the Catholic Church *condemns* the indiscriminate use of the Scriptures in vulgar tongues, without note or comment, and permits it only to the learned, or to the lettered of the laity."

What Dr. Troy here means by the "*indiscriminate*" use, he does not define, any more than the *degree* of learning or letters which qualifies a layman for permission from the Church of Rome to read the Holy Scriptures. The majority of mankind unfortunately require but a trifling obstacle to deter them from studying the Sacred Volume, and *incentives* are more needful than *restrictions* with reference to it. At any rate, where God has placed no restrictions, we think man has no right to impose limits or hindrances. The Scriptures were obviously written that they might be read, and if the Gospel was preached to the poor, and the poor have souls to be saved, we think it self-evident that the Gospel should be as much open to them, if able to read it, as to the most learned layman in the community.

It is possible that the strong terms used in Dr. Troy's letter, *prohibiting* and *condemning* the free use of the Scriptures, may have excited dissatisfaction in the public mind at that time, when Roman Catholics were seeking for political emancipation, and their bishops were anxious to gain a character for liberal and enlightened views. In a document published some few years after, and which was signed by all the Roman Catholic prelates of Ireland, we consequently find somewhat milder language employed. The second clause of the declaration to which we allude, and which was dated Jan. 5, 1826, runs as follows—"The Catholics of Ireland, of mature years, are *permitted* to read authentic and approved translations of the Holy Scriptures, with explanatory notes; and are exhorted to use them in the spirit of piety, humility, and obedience." As this declaration has never been revoked or modified by the same authority by which it was issued, we suppose it may be fairly taken to point out the amount of liberty which the rulers of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland are willing to allow to the laity, as regards the reading of the Word of God.

With respect to the use of explanatory notes, alluded to in the passage just quoted, it is, of course, not our intention to disparage them in general, or to deter any class of our countrymen from carefully studying learned and pious commentaries on the Word of God, as well as the Divine original. Every man is bound, we think, to avail himself of every means within his reach, whether by written or oral instruction, to arrive at the real meaning of the Sacred Volume. For this the clergy were instituted, to assist and guide the laity by their superior learning and piety. The priest, however, is not to be placed above the Bible; and where he affects to teach anything for which he is unable to show clear Scripture warrant, the laity have a right to question him closely as to the grounds of his teaching; and to require, not the mere assertion of any man or body of men, but clear and satisfactory evidence, "confirmation strong as proof of Holy Writ;" and if they value their own safety, it is but common sense and common prudence for them to do so.

We have now set before our readers the opinions of our ancient saints, and of the modern Roman Catholic bishops, on the use and circulation of the Scriptures; and they can judge for themselves which class of sentiments appear to be most reasonable, and most in accordance with God's revealed will. St. Patrick and St. Columbanus considered the Scriptures to be a sacred treasure, of which all should be invited freely to partake. Their only anxiety seemed to be, that the people should come to the fountain of the water of life, and drink, without stint or hindrance, of its refreshing streams. The Church of Rome, on the other hand, seems, by her language, to look on Scripture with a jealous and unfriendly eye. She speaks of permissions, and prohibitions, and condemnations: the learned or the lettered of the laity may be suffered to draw near, and gaze upon the oracles of God, but the unlearned or the poor are sternly repelled, and we fear, in actual practice, too often denounced as disobedient and heretical, whatever may be their natural powers of mind, or anxiety to improve themselves in religious truth. St. Paul commended Timothy

* Bede i., cap. i. Ussher, Religion of the Ancient Irish, iv., p. 243.

† "Intra adolescentiæ ætatem detentus," are the words of his biographer, Jonas.—King's Ch. His., i. p. 252.

‡ "Sed cum jam cimba volnisset adire reverctus
Famosam gentem Scripturis atque magistris."
—Lanigan, iii., p. 492.

that "*from a child* he had known the Holy Scriptures:" but it seems the Roman Catholics of Ireland are forbidden, by the united voice of the bishops of their Church, to read the Word of God, until they arrive at "mature years." In the education of youth, at least, the Holy Scriptures are to be a prohibited book, with some honourable exceptions, such as that mentioned in a former number of our journal, to the honour of Dr. Browne, Roman Catholic Bishop of Kilmore. Ireland, as we have seen, was looked upon in ancient times as "a nation famous for the Word of God;" but if the Bull "Unigenitus" is to be enforced among us—if every person who maintains that "the reading of the Sacred Scripture is for all" is to be forthwith denounced as "impious, blasphemous, and heretical," and "deserving of the indignation of God Almighty, and of the blessed Apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul," it needs but little wisdom to foresee that, in this point at least, our land will never again be deserving of its ancient renown.

Our limits warn us that we must conclude: and it is a relief to turn from the angry denunciations we have just quoted, to the sweet and touching words which that holy and ancient Father, St. Augustine, addressed to the Christians of his day—"We are brethren: why do we strive? Our Father died not intestate; he made a testament, and so died. Men do strive about the goods of the dead, till the testament be brought forth; when that is brought, they yield to have it opened and read: the judge doth hearken, the counsellors be silent, the crier biddeth peace, and all the people are attentive, that the words of the dead may be read and heard. He lieth, void of life and feeling, in his grave, and his words prevail. Christ doth sit in heaven; and is his testament gainsayed? Open it; let us read, we are brethren; why do we strive? Let our minds be pacified; our Father hath not left us without a testament; he that made the testament is living for ever. He doth hear our words, he doth know His own words; *let us read:* why do we strive?"*

Unity of Spirit in the Bond of Peace.—The devil being an apostate spirit, revolted and separated from God, doth naturally project and work division. This was his first exploit, and it is still his grand design in the world. And as the devil's work is division, Christ's work is union. He came to dissolve the works of the devil by a contrary work.—1 John iii. 8. He came to make all friends; to re-collect and unite all men to God, and man to man. This was his great project; this he died and suffered for, and this he prayed for.—John xvii. The love of our brethren is not another from the love of God; it is but the streaming forth of it, or the reflection of it. God allows, nay, commands and causes that it stream forth, remaining still in him, as in its source and centre; beginning at him and returning to him, as the beams that diffuse themselves from the sun, and the light and heat yet are not divided or cut off from it, but remain in it, while by emanation they issue from it. The love of God makes us one with God, and dwelling in the heart, enlarges and dilates it, as self-love contracts and straitens it. The bitter root of all enmity in man against God, and amongst men, against one another, is *self*—man's heart turned from God towards himself. Whence is it that wars, and contests, and mutual disgracings and despisings do so much abound, but that men love themselves, and nothing but themselves, or in relation to themselves, as it pleases, or is advantageous to them? That is the standard and rule. All is carried by interest: thence strifes, and defamings, and bitterness against one another. Nothing short of the Spirit of Christ can undo this selfishness. But let that spirit once dwell in thy heart, and to forgive a wrong, to love even an enemy, will be not only possible, but delightful. The spirit of Christ, which is all sweetness and love, so calms and composes the heart, and fills the soul with lovingness, that it can breathe nothing else. It hates nothing but sin; it pities the sinner, and carries towards the worst that love of good will, desiring their return and salvation. But as for those in whom appears the image of their Father, their heart cleaves to them as brethren indeed. No natural advantages of birth, beauty, or wit, draw a Christian's love so much as the resemblance of Christ; wherever that is found, it is comely and lovely to the soul that loves him.—*Archbishop Leighton.*

* Aug. Op., tom. iv., p. 102. Paris, 1681.

PURGATORY.

We think we may confidently appeal to those readers who have candidly perused the articles on this subject in our former numbers, to testify that we have kept our promise of discussing this momentous subject with a serious regard for the feelings and opinions of others who have been educated in an undoubting belief of the doctrine of the Church of Rome upon it. One class alone can possibly have taken offence at what we have said, even though dissenting from the views we have suggested. We mean the clergy, who not only derive a lucrative traffic from the popular belief, but must needs enjoy thereby a greater authority over that numerous class of persons who are conscious that they do not live so innocently as to be out of danger of purgatorial punishment, and who would, therefore, willingly resort to any means held out to them by their clergy to escape from it. Masses for the dead and indulgences have, no doubt, been of immense importance to the treasury of the Church, whether the laity have derived an equivalent benefit from them or not. That any class of men should take umbrage at a discussion which directly concerns their pecuniary gains, is natural enough; and we are not surprised that priests should endeavour to deter the laity from considering or discussing such a subject, if they give them credit for as much intelligence as we do, and do not feel very sure of successfully maintaining the truth of their doctrines on the calm and full discussion, to which we invited and challenged them in our first number. We write, however, for laymen who desire to read and think, and arrive at truth for themselves; and we firmly believe that every attempt to reduce them to slavish credulity previous to examination, will recoil upon those who are weak enough to resort to it.

We shall now proceed to show that the doctrine of purgatory is neither a truth founded on Scripture or reason, nor even on tradition or the unanimous testimony of the Fathers of the Church. As we commenced with that branch of our subject in our last number we shall take the Fathers first. We have already produced what we think to be a strong argument, that St. Patrick himself was not aware of it, and did not believe in its existence. That such a treatise as that on the Three Habitations should have been for so many centuries attributed to St. Patrick, whether rightly or not, proves, at least, that the views suggested in it could not have been considered heretical or unsound by the early Church of Ireland. We are the less surprised that the early Church were ignorant of this doctrine from finding that St. Leo the Great, who was himself Pope in St. Patrick's time, and whose voluminous writings have been published in two large quarto volumes, appears to have known nothing of the modern doctrine that there was any mode of expurgating, after death, what during life had been left unsatisfied, either in the way of guilt or punishment; for in his Epistle to Theodore, Bishop of Friuli, dated 10th June, 452, speaking of the penitents who had not performed all their acts of penance (or repentance), and thereby received the remission of their sins through that indulgence of God (indulgentia Dei), which cannot (he says) be obtained without the prayers of the priests, he goes on thus (chap. 3)—"But if any one of them for whom we pray unto the Lord, being intercepted by any obstacle, shall fall from the gift of the present indulgence (before spoken of), and, before he arrives at the appointed remedies, ends his temporal life, that which remaining in the body he hath not received, when he is divested of his body, he cannot obtain."* What is this but to say, that though the Lord had delivered to the Church the power of giving ecclesiastical absolution to persons who were penitent, and desirous of being cleansed from their sins (*salubri satisfactione purgatos*), that power was confined to the present life, and could not be, after death, granted even to the supplication of the priests?

Surely it is not possible to believe that St. Leo would have thus written, if he had known that there was a place where penitents and believers, who had not performed all their penances in this life, could be purged or cleansed, either by their own sufferings, or by the supplications of the clergy or of their surviving friends? St. Leo obviously knew nothing of any such doctrine as that of satisfying in purgatory what had not been paid or completed in this life; and, therefore, we conclude, that no such doctrine as purgatory was handed down by tradition from the time of the Apostles, as otherwise so great a man as St. Leo the Great could not have passed it over without distinctly noticing it. Should we have overlooked any passage in St. Leo's works which may tend to throw light upon the subject, we shall feel obliged to any among the learned who will be good enough to furnish us with a reference to it.

St. Leo and St. Patrick, however, do not by any means stand alone in the views we have expressed; for it is remarkable that several of the ancient Fathers utterly deny that the soul is capable of being purged in another world. St. Gregory Nazianzen, who died A.D. 389, was the most profound scholar of his age, and won from all his contemporaries the prize of eloquence, excelling them (to use the language of Dupin, himself a learned Roman Catholic divine) "in the purity of his words, the nobleness of his expressions, the ornaments of his discourse, the variety of his figures, the justness of his comparisons, the beauty of his reasonings, and the sublimity of his thoughts." This eminent Father of the Church was successively Bishop of Sasimi, Nazianzus, and Constantinople; and living still nearer to the times of the Apostles, could not have been ignorant of such a doctrine as that of purgatory, had any such thing been known in the Church. Most, if not all, of his works are extant (and have undergone a variety of editions), consisting of about fifty orations or sermons, besides letters and poems; and yet, so far from any reference to such a doctrine being found in his works, he, in fact, as directly and formally denies that there is any purgatory in the next life, as any writer could do in an age when the doctrine subsequently introduced was really unknown. After speaking of the scourges by which God purifies man in this life, he adds, in his xvi. Orat.—"It is better to be chastised and *purged* now (in life) than to be delivered to that torture (after death), since then shall be the time of punishment, NOT OF EXPURGATION,'* expressly contrasting the time of purgation in this life with the time, not of purgation, but of punishment, in the next. How could St. Gregory have thus written, if he knew the doctrine of the Church was, that the departed souls, even of the redeemed, must be purified in purgatory before reaching heaven?

St. Chrysostom, who died A.D. 407, was of the same opinion, for he says, in his Homily de Pœnitentia—"If the soul be purged *here* that fire shall not hurt it when it departs hence; but the soul that goes hence in sin, that fire shall receive"—meaning not the fire of purgatory, which he never names, but that of hell (Gehennæ), which he had named immediately before.†

To these we might add, but for fear of becoming tedious, St. Cyril of Alexandria, tom. iv., book 12, p. 1069: Paris, 1638. St. Cyprian De Mortalitate, sec. ii., p. 157: Oxford, 1682. St. Hilary on the 120th Psalm, p. 978: Paris, 1652; and several others.

Such was the doctrine of those early ages, when, if tradition from the Apostles ever taught Divine truths distinct from those contained in the Holy Scriptures, they could not have been unknown to the Pope and eminent Fathers we have referred to. Their doctrine was simply that which the Scriptures still teach—viz., the soul that is clear of sin by God's pardon and forgiveness, through the merits of Christ's atoning sacrifice, no fire can hurt; the soul that is not so forgiven, no fire can cleanse. Christ, in fact, does not do his work of atonement by halves—remitting the guilt, and yet leaving the punishment! Where the guilt is removed, the punishment is so likewise, temporal, as well as eternal. Tertullian, Chrysostom, Augustine, all say this; and even St. Bernard, in speaking of the completeness of the Divine pardon, says—"Some there are who forgive injury, so as not to revenge it, but still they upbraid; others there are who are silent, though somewhat remains deeply rooted in their minds, and they retain inward rancour. In neither case is there a full pardon. Far from these is the benignant nature of the Godhead—HE ACTS WITH LIBERALITY—HE FORGIVES ENTIRELY."‡

In corroboration of these views we would observe, that we can find no mention of purgation after death in any of the ancient creeds or councils, or catechetical discourses, in which the other articles of faith are set down and explained. The fifth general council which, A.D. 553, condemned Origen for his errors concerning those pains after death which he conceived restored even the damned, never mentioned any other purgatory in opposition to that which he had heretically invented, nor did any of the Fathers who disputed with Origen, mention any of the purgatory pains which the orthodox faith taught, to distinguish them from those which he erroneously had invented, as they surely could not have failed to do, if such had been *then* firmly believed by the Church. The fact is, that at a later period Pope Gregory—who died A.D. 604—though he gave considerable countenance to this doctrine, spoke of it with some doubt, not as a point even then firmly resolved by the Church, though no doubt it had, within the preceding two centuries, gained some little credit among the clergy of the west, especially among the monastic orders; and was soon after, under the sanction of Pope Gregory, eagerly seized on by the Benedictine monks, and found so

* Sancti Leonis Magni Opera, tom. I., page 605. Lutet. Paris, 1675.

Epistola 82 Ad Theodorum Forojuliensem Episcopum (A.D. 452, 10 Junii.)

Cap. iii. "Si autem aliquis eorum, pro quibus Domino supplicemus, quocumque intercepto obstaculo a munere indulgentiæ præsentis exciderit (alias excesserit-marg) et prius quam ad constituta remedia perveniat temporalem vitam humanæ conditione finierit, *quod manens in corpore non recepit, consequi exutus carne non poterit.*"

* Orat. xvi. tom. 1, pp. 304, 305.

† Chrysostomi de Pœnitentia, Homil. vi., Oper. Omn., tom ii., p. 320. Paris, 1718. Benedictine Edit. (We give the Latin translation.)

"Hic igne examinemus, verbo scilicet doctrinæ, quo minus idipsum cogimur *Gehennæ* igne. Nam purgatam animam hinc abeuntem, ille non lædet ignis; eam autem quæ cum peccatis hinc abierit ille ignis excipiet. Unius cujusque enim opus quale, inquit, sit, ignis probabit.—1 Cor. iii. 13."

‡ Bernard Sermo de Fragmentis, col. 300, Oper. ed Paris, 1586.

profitable in its operation on the people, that it soon became one of the most favoured (perhaps the most necessary) tenets of the Roman communion. We may probably, in some future number, give some specimens, from Pope Gregory's dialogues, of the mode in which he tries to establish this new doctrine—which, in fact, treats it as a discovery lately made, respecting the condition of souls after death; for which he gives a reason (somewhat singular to us, who are perusing it nearly 1300 years afterwards), that as this world was approaching to its end, men then saw more closely into the secrets of the next.*

If our readers have followed us thus far, they will scarcely be surprised to find that the Church of Rome has always felt considerable difficulty in reasoning upon this subject, and that even the Council of Trent itself, in 1563, nearly 1000 years after the death of Pope Gregory, did not venture to pronounce any definition of purgatory, much less to call it a purgatory fire, but leaves it to the prelates and priests to tell what it is, and in what extent to be believed; which appears to us, and we think it will appear to all rational men, to be rather a convenient way of evading than of satisfactorily clearing up and explaining an important doctrine, and one which, if true, it was clearly desirable to have the decision of an infallible tribunal upon, if such tribunal ever existed on earth; and we presume if it ever did exist on earth all Roman Catholics will assert that its powers must have been in full exercise at this celebrated council.

We hope to show, in our next number, that though the practice of prayers for the souls of the faithful dead, is a more ancient practice than the belief in purgatory, it is not necessarily connected with it, and properly considered affords no sufficient ground to support the doctrine held by the Church of Rome on this subject.

TALK OF THE ROAD—No. III.

WE have not lost sight of Pat and Jem yet, and perhaps our readers may like to know what we have heard. Well, a few days ago, they were setting potatoes for a farmer, working one at each side of the same ridge; and their dinner was brought to them in a tin can and a wooden plate, tied up in a cloth, and they sat down under a thorn bush to eat it; and, when they had done, Pat pulled a book out of his pocket, and Jem leaned over his shoulder, reading with him, till the bell would ring for work. And while they were reading Father John rode down the lane, and though they did not see him, for their backs were towards him, he saw they were over a book.

Now, Father John was getting mighty uneasy in his mind when he saw people reading; so he gave his horse to a boy in the lane, and he walked up quiet, till he got just at their backs, and "What book is that you're reading, boys?" says he.

"Please your reverence," said Pat, holding up the book, "it's 'The Glories of Mary,'" and very glad Pat was that time that it wasn't his Douay Bible he had in his hand.

"Oh, that's all right," said Father John, "that's a good book; where did you get it?"

"Please your reverence," said Pat, "I bought it from Judy Brannigan, down at John Dolan's wake."

"Ah, Judy is a useful woman among the people," said Father John: "she is always selling good books among them."

"And, indeed, your reverence," said Jem, "she made great brags of all she sold of this book; she says there is more of it in the parish now than all other books put together."

"So much the better," said his reverence; "there can't be too much of that book; that's a real Catholic book, and I am glad to see you reading it, boys."

And with that Father John was going away, well satisfied in his mind, when Jem stopped him by saying, "And is it true, your reverence, that the man that wrote it was made a saint by the Pope, just thirteen years ago, in the year 1839?"

"Quite true," says Father John.

"And was that the year he died, your reverence?" said Pat.

"Oh, no," said Father John, "he died more than 150 years before that."

"And why didn't they make him a saint before?" said Pat.

"Oh, it takes a long time," said Father John, "the Church is so particular."

"And didn't the cardinals at Rome read this book, and certify that there was nothing in it against faith or morals?"† said Jem.

"To be sure they did," says Father John; "he couldn't be made a saint without that."

"Well, it ought to be a good book," said Jem.

"Of course it must, when it was written by a saint of the Holy Catholic Church," said Father John; "and I am glad to see that it's such books you are reading, boys."

And with that, Father John was going away; but Jem stopped him with a question.

"Maybe your reverence would explain one thing in the book to me," said Jem.

Now, Father John was so well pleased to see Jem at this book, instead of the Bible, that he stopped to answer him; "and what is it?" said he.

"Well, your reverence," said Jem, "is Mary the mediator between God and man?"

"No," said Father John, "Jesus Christ is the mediator between God and man; but then Mary is our mediator with Jesus Christ."

"Well, your reverence," said Jem, "I find that in this book, sure enough;" and Father John seemed pleased at that; "but I find more in the book foreby," said Jem; and he looked to the page that he and Pat were at, and he read (page 257)—"I am, said Mary, the defence of all that have recourse to me, and my mercy is to them a tower of refuge, and therefore have I been appointed by my Lord the MEDIATRIX of peace BETWEEN SINNERS AND GOD." And then Jem turned back to page 252, and read, "O Mary, thy office is TO MEDIATE BETWEEN GOD AND MAN." "Is that right, your reverence?" said Jem.

"And why wouldn't it be right," said Father John, "when it's in a Catholic book, that the Holy Church approves?"

"Because, your reverence, it's in the Bible that *there is one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus;* and I don't see how both can be true."

"Didn't I say it was reading the Bible you were?" said Father John.

"And if it wasn't true when your reverence said it, it's true now anyway," said Jem.

"And if you will be reading heretical books," said Father John, "how can I help your going astray?"

"But, your reverence," said Pat, "is not that in the Catholic Bible too?"

"What do you know about that?" said Father John.

"Please your reverence," said Pat. "sure it's the Catholic Bible that I have; and sure, your reverence, that isn't a bad book."

And at that Father John looked less pleased than ever, but he was not just ready with an answer, and Pat did not want to talk much about that; so Pat went on—"But *did* the Blessed Virgin say that she was appointed the mediatrix between sinners and God? or where did she say it?"

"How do I know," said Father John, getting out of all patience at being so bothered.

"Sure, your reverence, didn't I read it out of this book?" said Jem.

"I tell you what," said Father John, turning round upon Jem, "if it's reading the Bible you are you'll soon be out of the Catholic Church, and out of that there is no salvation. Didn't I often tell you that the Bible would set you astray?"

"Well, your reverence, that's not it," says Jem; "for while I was only reading the Bible I was getting quite contented in my mind, and I was hoping I would go on reading it, and never leave the Catholic Church at all, until I came across this book, and now it's *it* that is setting my mind astray; for sure when the Bible tells me that there is only one mediator between God and man, and this book, that your reverence says is a Catholic book, says it is Mary's office to mediate between God and man; sure if I can't get some way of settling between them, it will put me astray entirely."

"I'll tell you the way," said Father John, for he was getting afraid of losing Jem entirely, "doesn't this book itself tell you that Jesus Christ is the *only mediator of Justice*? but that does not hinder Mary to be the mediator of grace and of peace."

"And, please your reverence," said Jem, "does not this book say (page 262), that Mary was '*chosen from eternity to be the mother of God, that her mercy might procure salvation for those whom the justice of her son could not save*,' and doesn't that make *her* a BETTER mediator of salvation that if she was the mediator of justice itself? and isn't that worse and worse?"

"I knew how it would be," said Father John, "when you took to reading the Bible; you're going straight out of the Catholic Church, and out of that there's no redemption, and you will never have a mass said for your soul when you're dead; and what for will you go out of the Catholic Church?"

"If ever I be driven out of it, your reverence," said Jem, "it will be for one thing only."

"And what's that?" said Father John.

"To have the Lord Jesus Christ for my saviour, and him only," said Jem.

"And who told you that there was any other Saviour in the Catholic Church?" said Father John.

"This book, your reverence," said Jem, "the 'Glories of Mary,' that your reverence says was written by a saint, and approved of by the Pope and the cardinals; this book that your reverence says can never set me astray. Sure I turned down the page when I came to it, and here it is—'*When we ask of God his graces he sends us to Mary, saying,* GO TO MARY' (page 220), and where did God say that at all, or who did he say it to?" said Jem; "and here it goes on—'Our salvation is in the hand of Mary;' and, 'he who is protected by Mary is saved; he who is not protected by her is lost' (page 221); and sure here is a prayer to her—'O pure and immaculate Queen, SAVE ME, *deliver me from eternal damnation*' (page 220); and here again—'Her mercy procures salvation for those whom the justice of her son could not save' (page 262); and is not all that making her the Savour?"

"Let alone the book," said Father John; "I'm sorry you ever came across it."

"And sure, your reverence," said Jem, "you know well there is more of this book in the parish than there is of the Bible, and many's the time I heard your reverence preach against reading the Bible, and did you ever say a word against this book? And didn't you tell me just now that this book would never set me astray, or put me from the Catholic Church, and that the Bible would put me astray from the Catholic Church? And isn't that the poor case? to say that the writings of man will keep us in the church, and that the writings of God will put us out of it? Isn't that enough to drive a man to think that it is not the Church of God at all? Isn't it——"

"Stop there, will you?" said Father John, "it's not for me to be standing here, arguing with the like of you."

"And it's not for the like of me to be talking this way with your reverence," said Jem, "only for my soul, that you say will be damned if I read the Word of God; and who will I talk to if I don't to my clergy? And sure if your reverence would only read the Catholic Bible to us, and explain it to us, that we mightn't go astray in it—if your reverence would only do that for us——"

"I'll tell you what I'll do for you," said Father John, for he was getting really angry now, "it's on the altar I'll curse you next Sunday; I'll curse you with bell, book, and candle. No man in the parish shall give you employment, no one shall buy or sell with you, no man shall work with you; and if this man digs at the other side of the ridge with you, I will curse him too; and see what your Bible will do for you then."

"Then, your reverence," said Jem, "I'll see if I can't get a blessing from God under all."

And so Father John went off to his horse (and indeed he was mighty cross to the boy that held it for him), and the bell rung for work; so Pat and Jem could not talk any more; but if they did talk afterwards, we hope to find out all about it.

The editor of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN thinks it well to say a few words of the book that Pat and Jem got hold of.

The editor believes it was first printed in English in this country, soon after the writer, St. Alphonso Liguori, with two or three others, were canonized (or made saints) by the Pope, in the Church of St. Peter, in Rome, in the year 1839. The editor believes that the first edition then published in Ireland, contained an account of St. Alphonso, having been made a saint by the Church of Rome, and also a copy of the certificate which the cardinals were required to give on that occasion, that they had read all St. Alphonso's works, and there was nothing found in them CONTRARY TO FAITH or morals.

This certificate was then taken hold of by the Protestants, to fix the doctrines contained in this book upon the Church of Rome; and this, perhaps, is the reason why all mention of St. Alphonso's canonization, and of the certificate of the cardinals, is left out of the editions since published. But the circulation of the book was not stopped; several editions have since been published in Ireland, in a very cheap form, and tens of thousands of copies have been circulated; and the editor cannot find that any priest in Ireland has ever tried to stop it, or has publicly expressed disapprobation of the doctrines contained in it. If any such case of disapprobation have occurred, the editor will be delighted to learn and to publish it.

The edition which the editor possesses is that of 1845. The title is as follows:—

"The Glories of Mary. First Part. A Paraphrase on the Salve Regina, &c., &c. Translated from the Italian of St. Alphonsus Liguori, *by a Catholic clergyman.* Dublin: Published by James Duffy, 23, Anglesea-street, 1845."

It is from this edition, as being that in most common use, that the editor has marked the pages referred to by Jem.

Some idea may be formed of the book from the titles which St. Alphonso has prefixed to his chapters. The following are a few specimens (ch. ii., sec. 1):—"MARY IS OUR LIFE, because *she* obtains for us the pardon of our sins." Where note that the Douay Bible says—"Jesus said to her (Martha), I am the resurrection and THE LIFE."—John xi. 25. And again—"Your LIFE is hid with Christ in God."—Ep. to Colos. iii. 3. And—"When Christ shall appear, WHO IS YOUR LIFE."—v. 5. But not one word in the Douay Bible about Mary being our life.

Again, St. Alphonso gives this heading to chapter 3—"Mary is the hope of all. (2), Mary is the hope of

* Dupin, Nov. Bibl. Vie de St. Gregoire I.

† It would seem that Jem must have got a copy of an edition published some years ago, in the preface of which all this was related. Everything about Alphonso Liguori being made a saint is left out of the latter editions; we wonder why.—Editor of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

sinners." Whereas the Douay Bible says—"Christ in you the hope of glory.'—Ep. to Coloss. i. 27. And again—"Christ Jesus, our hope."—1st Ep. to Timothy i. 1. But not one word in the Douay Bible of Mary being our hope.

Again, St. Alphonso puts this title to chapter 6, section 3—"Mary is the peacemaker of sinners with God." Whereas the Douay Bible says—"We have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ."—Rom. v. 1. And—"He is our peace."—Eph. ii. 14. But not one word in the Douay Bible about Mary being the peacemaker of sinners with God. This will give a fair idea of this book—"The Glories of Mary;" which all true Catholics, who read the Douay Bible, will acknowledge to be a fearful book for the Church of Rome to make herself answerable for; and to allow to be circulated unrestrained among her people.

CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

The following letter to the editor of *Saunders's News-letter*, appears to us to disclose a mode of interference with the rights and liberties of the laity, which all laymen, of whatever creed, are bound to discountenance and expose. How long is such tyranny tamely to be submitted to by Irish freemen?—

"March 30, 1852.

"Sir,—May I claim the privilege of stating, through the medium of your respected journal, some circumstances with reference to a subject, at which, as a ratepayer and a Roman Catholic, I feel myself aggrieved. On a very recent occasion there was an election for poor-law guardians in this union (Tipperary), and, as it appears, there have been abuses not corrected by the guardians who represented us last year, the ratepayers resolved to, if possible, return two respectable men (both Roman Catholics) to represent this and an adjoining district for the ensuing year, who were in the usual manner nominated. However, as there is no toleration, either in temporal or spiritual matters, allowed by the priests of the Roman Catholic Church, as I will fully demonstrate to you, four of those gentlemen not only cautioned their congregations on Sunday, from their altars, not to vote for the two independent Roman Catholics alluded to, but they went forward to canvass for the men of their choice, and in the teeth of the law called at the several houses of the ratepayers, and actually signed the voting papers for their representatives: this can, if necessary, be proved upon oath. I am happy, however, to say, that in some instances they met with the most decided opposition. Surely, conduct such as I have represented cannot, in the nineteenth century, be tolerated. You will very naturally ask, why have the priests interfered in selecting guardians and adopting this unlawful course? Simply, because there is in this district a most efficient medical gentleman very nearly connected with the candidates before referred to, who, some time ago, renounced the Roman Catholic religion, and, in order that there should be no friend or connection of his a poor-law guardian, the priests adopted this tyrannical course. I must mention, sir, the board of guardians have, up to this time, used every stratagem, if possible, to deprive this gentleman of any share under the Medical Charities' Act, and now the priests want to elect their political and religious slaves, for the purpose of more fully carrying out their views of charity, to frustrate everything that is good, and to trample under foot civil and religious liberty. Yes, sir, those gentlemen have gone the length of cautioning their congregations on Sundays from their altars not to professionally employ this gentleman, threatening us with the extinction of our liberties, and of our very existence, if we disobey their mandates. I wish to ask you, sir, is this the boasted liberty so often made use of by the demagogues who infest this beautiful country? Is this the toleration which the Roman Catholic clergy claim for themselves? Is this the peace and good will which has been instilled into the minds of those men educated at a college which the British Constitution supports? If so, the sooner there is an outburst of indignation against such absolute tyranny the better. Trusting you will, for freedom's sake, give insertion to those few observations,

"I remain, sir,

"A Tipperary Farmer.

"[This letter is authenticated.—Ed. S. N. L.]"

BIBLE BURNING.

We are so little disposed to impute the errors or misconduct of individuals to the class of which they are members, that we should not notice the following case, even though the subject of a criminal conviction in a court of justice, but from the manner in which the act has subsequently been defended, and even applauded, by a portion of the public press, to which we cannot avoid calling the attention of our readers, though convinced that many of them will feel as much disgust as we do ourselves at such a course of proceeding:—

"At the Mayo assizes, John Syngian Bridgman, otherwise John St. John, otherwise Brother John, a monk of the order of St. Francis, stood indicted 'for that he, not having the fear of God before his eyes, but contriving and intending to scandalize and vilify the true Protestant religion, as by law established within these realms, and to blaspheme the holy Gospel of God and of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, did, on the 23rd day of November, in the 15th of the Queen, at the parish of Ballyovey, unlawfully, wickedly, and blasphemously, in the presence of divers liege subjects of our Queen, set fire to, and partly consume by fire, a copy of the Holy Gospel of God, being the authorized version thereof, appointed to be read in churches, called the New Testament, and then and there holding in his hand the said New Testament, wickedly and blasphemously, in the presence and hearing of divers liege subjects, then and there pronounced and spoke with a loud voice, and published of and concerning said New Testament as aforesaid, these profane and most blasphemous words—that is to say, that "It," meaning the New Testament, "is not the Word of God, but the word of the devil—and the devil's book—Luther's Bible—or your heretic Bible," to the great dishonour of Almighty God, and in contempt of the Protestant religion, and to the great scandal of the profession thereof, and against peace,' &c. The witnesses having been heard in support of the charge, Mr. Keogh addressed the jury on behalf of the prisoner.

"Baron Lefroy (now Chief Justice) charged the jury. He said—I am anxious that this case should be confined within the limits required by the law, and shall state to you what the law is. It is for you to say whether those charges have been proved or not, and whether you are satisfied that he said he was not burning the Word of God, but the word of the devil, and whether the words were applied to the authorized version of the Holy Scriptures; and whether the burning of that book is consistent with the reverence due to that version of the Scriptures authorized by the law of the land. In this case he is indicted for burning the authorised version, but the offence is equally applicable to any other version of the Scriptures, whether it be the Douay Bible or the Rhemish Testament, and the words used would be blasphemous against either version, as showing a want of reverence for the Scriptures, because it is not the version of the Scriptures which will warrant the commission of such an offence. It is not because fallible men cannot agree upon a translation of a portion of the Scriptures that they are to be treated with this want of reverence—that because it is not a particular translation it shall be treated with such vilification. Is it to be held, that when the law of the land sanctions a certain version, and calls it the authorised version—is it to be said that any man, be his opinions what they may, shall pour contempt on it, and thus be guilty of a violation of the law? Is he to be at liberty to throw that book into the fire, and say that he shall vilify that book which the law has sanctioned? It has been said to you that this act must be done with intent, and on that the law is clear: every man is presumed to understand the consequences of his own acts. If a man can throw a book into the fire, whether it be a Douay Bible or the authorized version, and if you believe that he did not intend any contempt, then you should acquit him; but if you believe that he did burn the book and make use of the language, it will be your duty to find him guilty.

"The jury retired, and, after half an hour's deliberation, returned a verdict of guilty. Immediately on the clerk of the crown reading the verdict, Mr. Blake, crown prosecutor, said to his lordship that the crown did not wish to press for any punishment in this case, the object of the prosecutors being to put a stop to such acts. The learned baron was very glad to hear counsel for the crown say so, and trusted there would be no further acts of this kind perpetrated, and, after a brief address to the prisoner, concluded by pronouncing the following sentence—'To give bail, himself in £20, and two sureties in £10 each, to keep the peace and good behaviour of all her Majesty's subjects for seven years, and to come up for judgment when called upon, getting ten days' notice.'"

We cannot help considering this sentence a mild one; but should have anticipated that it would have put a stop to any repetition of similar conduct, had not the following comment upon it appeared in a leading article of the *Tablet*:—

"The scene to which we refer is a case of Bible-burning; and really if we had wanted an illustration of the gross enormity of our present system of swearing on the Protestant Scriptures, we should find it in this very case.

"Our readers know the tactics of the Bible-readers in these western towns; how they force their way into the houses of the peasantry, insult them by presents of heretical books and pamphlets, tempt them in every possible way to barter poverty for heresy, and to sell their religion for a mess of pottage or a joint of meat. The clergy and monks have to deal with this nuisance as well as they can; and as to too many of their flocks the worldly temptation is, in a human sense, overpowering, it becomes necessary for them to rouse up a strong popular feeling against these diabolical intruders, and make it appear, what it is, infamous for any Catholic to salute them or bid them God speed.

"One of the tricks of these seducers is with a book which they *call* the Bible—an *heretical work*, issued by heretical authorities, condemned by the Church, and *no more the Word of God than the Koran is the Word of God*; we mean, of course, the *treatise* upon which Catholic witnesses and jurors are sworn in courts of justice. The pretence is, that this book is the Word of God, and when to these poor people—(many of whom are quite as ignorant as the assistant barrister of Kilkenny)—what they suppose to be the Word of God, is brought to them by the canting varlets who seek to entrap them, the veneration for the supposed holiness of the book becomes, or may become, a step to further mischief. It is necessary, therefore, and a duty for the clergy to root out this prejudice, and to convince the people that what the Bible-readers distribute with their soup is not a holy book, but an heretical book; and they would fail grievously in their duty if they did not take some means to this end.

"The means taken at Ballinrobe, it seems, were to burn the heretical volume, and for this act the monk who officiated in the *auto da fe* was summoned by the Scripture readers before the magistrates to answer two charges—first, that of 'burning a copy of the New Testament;' secondly, that of 'profanely scoffing at the Holy Scriptures.' Now, we really don't want to have these questions of mutual annoyance discussed in the *Tablet*, if the Scripture readers would give us leave to be silent upon them; but we must say that if 'Brother John,' the defendant in that suit, was guilty of an offence, the present writer is equally an offender. He has burned a Protestant Bible, and is prepared to burn a thousand more if he can gratify his taste economically, and he heartily wishes that the whole seed, breed, and generation of them was extirpated, except, perhaps, a stray copy in a collector's library, as you sometimes find a copy of Jacob's Bœhmen's narrative of the spiritual illumination that fell upon him from the reflection of the sun upon a pewter plate. If an odd volume of the Protestant Bible took its place beside Jacob's aforesaid folio, we would not quarrel with it, but in the present state of the book market, we decidedly consider it, and are prepared to deal with it, in all proper ways, as an objectionable book.

"Having—as we fancy—set an example to 'Brother John' in this particular, we are quite ready to follow his example in another, and to do what the Ballinrobe magistrates call 'profanely scoffing at the Holy Scriptures.' If the Bible readers and other people of that demoralized though respectable class respect the consciences of the poor, it is not either our wish or our taste to speak offensively of what any other man reverences. But, when a bribing Bible reader brings 'Brother John' to the sessions—and the magistrates, espousing the quarrel, send 'Brother John' to the assizes for protecting the faith of the poor, we beg leave perfectly to associate ourselves with 'Brother John' in this particular; to scoff at the book which he scoffed at and to pronounce it—what it is—not the Book of God: not the Holy Scriptures; but a book *put together* and there circulated by some of the most active friends and servants of the *Fire King*; in other words, '*the book of the devil*.' We say this as 'Brother John' said it, not to insult any one, but to impress on the minds of some ignorant readers a *fact* it is desirable they should remember, and to confirm and uphold Brother John in his laudable endeavours to teach the truth to the poor."

As we have, from the first, determined not to allow ourselves to be led away into polemic strife from the important object of calm and candid examination of those religious differences which distract our country, by any amount of provocation, we shall abstain from making a single comment upon the above spirited expression of *determination to set the law at defiance*, and encourage the burning of all versions but the Douay. We entertain, however, a strong opinion, that so long as the Douay Bible remains unburned, and the people have the heart and courage to read it, enough will remain to enable our readers to understand and judge of our views and arguments; especially as we are ourselves in the habit of constantly quoting that version. In doing so, however, we are far from wishing to convey the idea, that we consider the Douay the most accurate translation; and we shall have occasion hereafter to show our readers, that each successive edition of the Douay Testament has approached closer and closer to the authorized Church of England version—thereby acknow-

ledging its value, even when differing from it in some particulars.

Whether the difference between the two versions of the Bible is such as to justify any one in speaking of either as "the book of the devil," and "no more the Word of God than the Koran," is a point which we hope to give satisfactory evidence of in the negative—from time to time—in our pages. We shall at present content ourselves with referring our readers to the following columns of our present number, which will enable them to judge for themselves of the amount of the difference between the two versions, in one important part of the Sacred Writings, referred to by one of our Roman Catholic correspondents, whose letter is also given in this number, as containing one of the strongest passages in favour of purgatory; and which would probably have been one of those mistranslated, if Protestant writers were really in the habit of distorting the Bible, for the purpose either of supporting their own opinions, or opposing the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church.

We are happy to acknowledge as a bright contrast to the bitter and vituperative language of the article we have above quoted, the truly liberal and candid spirit in which the Right Rev. Francis Patrick Kenrick, R.C. Bishop of Philadelphia, writes, in his introduction to his new translation of the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles of St. Paul, the Catholic Epistles, and the Apocalypse, published in 1851, at New York, in which, so far from alluding to the Protestant version in terms of hostility or disrespect, he says expressly —"In adopting occasionally the words and phrases of the Protestant version, I have followed the example of others who have from time to time revised the Rhemish translation. It is not to be regretted that whilst we point to errors which need correction, we acknowledge excellencies which we are free to imitate, thus diminishing the asperity of censure by the tribute which we willingly render to literary merit. I avail myself, however, of the testimony of those who are outside the pale of the church only by way of acknowledgment on their part, or in matters purely critical, in which they have brought their stores of erudition and their natural acuteness of mind to the vindication of the sacred text."

We so cordially agree with the learned and candid Bishop of Philadelphia, in the following eloquent and impressive passage in the same introduction, that we cannot close this brief notice without presenting it also to our readers:—

"A jot or a letter must not be taken for the law; the Word of God must be preserved in its integrity. It is treason against the Supreme Majesty to change a word in a charter under the seal of the Great King. Not without a special design of Providence the closing book of the Sacred Volume denounced woe to the man who shall take away from, or add to, the words of that prophecy—a threat which extends to all who adulterate the Word of God, changing that which should remain inviolate, though heaven and earth pass away."—P. 10.

We shall revert to Bishop Kenrick and his translation of the New Testament again.

LIMITS OF RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE.—The philosopher Locke long since most truly observed, that "man's business in this world is not to know all things, but those which concern his own conduct," and such, too, was the opinion of the profound Bishop Butler. "Not only the reason of the thing," said he, "but the whole analogy of nature should teach us, not to expect to have the like information concerning the Divine conduct as concerning our own duty. Though we are sufficiently instructed for the common purposes of life, yet it is but an almost infinitely small part of natural providence which we are at all let into. The case is the same with regard to revelation. But *what is required of us*, in consequence of this gracious dispensation [of the gospel], is a subject in which none can complain for want of information."—Butler's Analogy, part ii., ch. 5.

I. EPISTLE OF ST. PAUL TO THE CORINTHIANS. IRISH VERSION.

Caib. III.

AGUS, a ḋeaṁḃṙáiṫreaċa, níor b'féidir leamsa labairt ribh mar [ḋaoiniḃ] spioradálcha, acḋ mar [ḋaoiniḃ] colluiġe, amail naoiḋeanaiḃ a gCriosd.

2 Do bheaċaiḋ mé ris nó baine, agus ní nó bladh: óir nior b'féidir libh fós [á ġabáil cuigail], agus anois féin ní féidir libh.

3 Óir atá sibh fós colluiḋe: óir ó [atá] tnúḋ, agus imreasain, agus aimhréireaċ eadruibh, a nē nach bruiltí colluiḋe, agus nach spailín sibh do réir daoine?

4 Óir an tan a deir neach, Ar le Pól mise; agus neach eile, [Ar] le Apollos mise: a nē nach bruiltí colluiḋe?

5 Óir cia hé Pól, agus cia [hé] Apollos, acḋ na ministrí trid an chréideabhas, agus do réir mar tug an Tighearna do gach aoinneach?

6 Do plandaiġ mise, do chaiḋ Apollos an tuirse; acḋ ar é Dia tug an fás.

7 Agus an ádhaimhin ní bruil éireaċ sa te phlandaiġeas, ná fós sa te chroiteas an tuirse; acḋ a nDia do beir an fás.

8 Agus is ionann an te phlandaiġeas agus an té chroiteas an tuirse: agus do ġeubaiḋ gach aon á chuiseal do réir a shaothair.

9 Óir is comhluaḋ oibre do Dia sinne: is sibhse tseabaire Dé, agus áitreab Dé.

10 Do réir ġrás Dé tugaḋ dámhsa, do chuir mé an fondameinn, mar mhaiġistir sulmhar oibre, agus tógbuiḋ neach, eile obair air. Bíḋeadh tabharsa gach aon d'a aire cionnus tógbair ré an obair.

11 Óir ní héidir ré haoinéac fondameint ar bith eile do chur taob amuiġ do'n [fondameint] atá air na cur ceann, Éadon Íosa Criosd.

12 Agus da dtógbuiḋ aoinneac air an bfondamemrti, ór, airgead, cloca uaisle, adhmad, feur, no coṁlach;

13 Do déantar obair gach aonduine follus; óir foillreočaiḋ an lá é, do bhiġ go maḋ léir é sin ar dtseine: agus foillreočaiḋ an teine cionnus bíar obair gach éanduine.

14 Da nanaiḋ obair aonduine noc do tóġ ré air [an bfondameint], do ġeabaiḋ ré tuarasdal.

15 Ma loisgeas obair éanduine, racaiḋ a shaoċair amúġa: sibeadh saoirsiuġeas é féin; acḋ sin fós amail tré teine.

16 A nē nach bruil a fior agaibh gur sibh teampoll Dé, agus [go] gcoṁnuiġeann Spiorad Dé ionaibh?

17 Ma chuaillíġeann éinneach teampoll Dé, scriosfaiḋ Dia an té sin; óir is teampoll Dé naoṁṫa, noc ar sibhse.

18 Na mealladh éinneach é féin. Ma éiteas d'éanduine agaibh é féin do beiṫ glic sa tsaoġalsa, bíoḋ sé 'na amadán, ionus go mbiaḋ sé glic.

19 Óir is aimġlicear sé Dia glicear an tsaoġalsa. Óir atá scriubtha, gleamaiḋe sé na daoine glioca ann a sliġtib féin.

20 Agus arsis, Atá a fior aġ an dTighearna gur dioṁaoineach smuaintiġe na ndaoineaḋ glioc.

21 Uime sin na déanaḋ aoinneac maoidheaċar ann daoinib. Óir is libse na huile nēiṫe;

22 Da maḋ é Pól é, nó Apollos, nó Céphas, nó an saoġal, nó beaṫa, nó bás, nó na nēiṫe atá do láthair, nó na nēiṫe atá ċum teaċda; is libse iad uile;

23 Agus ar le Criosd sibse; agus [ar] le Dia Criosd

I. EPISTLE OF ST. PAUL TO THE CORINTHIANS. CHAP. III.

ENGLISH AUTHORIZED VERSION.

AND I, brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, *even* as unto babes in Christ.

2 I have fed you with milk, and not with meat; for hitherto ye were not able to *bear it*, neither yet now are ye able.

3 For ye are yet carnal: for whereas *there is* among you envying, and strife, and divisions, are ye not carnal, and walk as men?

4 For while one saith, I am of Paul; and another, I *am* of Apollos; are ye not carnal?

5 Who then is Paul, and who *is* Apollos, but ministers by whom ye believe, even as the Lord gave to every man?

6 I have planted, Apollos watered; but God gave the increase.

7 So then neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase.

8 Now he that planteth and he that watereth are one: and every man shall receive his own reward according to his own labour.

9 For we are labourers together with God; ye are God's husbandry, *ye are* God's building.

10 According to the grace of God which is given unto me, as a wise masterbuilder, I have laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereon. But let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon.

11 For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.

12 Now if any man build upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble;

13 Every man's work shall be made manifest; for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is.

14 If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward.

15 If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire.

16 Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and *that* the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?

17 If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which *temple* ye are.

18 Let no man deceive himself. If any man among you seemeth to be wise in this world, let him become a fool, that he may be wise.

19 For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God. For it is written, he taketh the wise in their own craftiness.

20 And, again, The Lord knoweth the thoughts of the wise, that they are vain.

21 Therefore let no man glory in men. For all things are yours;

22 Whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours;

23 And ye are Christ's; and Christ *is* God's.

I. EPISTLE OF ST. PAUL TO THE CORINTHIANS. CHAP. III.

DOUAY VERSION.

AND I, brethren, could not speak to you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal. As unto little ones in Christ.

2 I gave you milk to drink, not meat; for you were not able as yet. But neither indeed are you now able; for you are yet carnal.

3 For, whereas there is among you envying and contention, are you not carnal, and walk according to man?

4 For while one saith, I indeed am of Paul; and another, I am of Apollo; are you not men? What then is Apollo, and what is Paul?

5 The ministers of him whom you have believed; and to every one as the Lord hath given.

6 I have planted, Apollo watered, but God gave the increase.

7 Therefore neither he that planteth is anything, nor he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase.

8 Now he that planteth, and he that watereth, are one. And every man shall receive his own reward, according to his own labour.

9 For we are God's coadjutors: you are God's husbandry; you are God's building.

10 According to the grace of God that is given to me, as a wise architect, I have laid the foundation; and another buildeth thereon. But let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon.

11 For other foundation no man can lay, but that which is laid; which is Christ Jesus.

12 Now if any man build upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble:

13 Every man's work shall be manifest; for the day of the Lord shall declare *it*, because it shall be revealed in fire; and the fire shall try every man's work, of what sort it is.

14 If any man's work abide, which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward.

15 If any man's work burn, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.

16 Know you not that you are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?

17 But if any man violate the temple of God, him shall God destroy. For the temple of God is holy, which you are.

18 Let no man deceive himself: if any man among you seem to be wise in this world, let him become a fool, that he may be wise.

19 For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God. For it is written: *I will catch the wise in their own craftiness.*

20 And again: *The Lord knoweth the thoughts of the wise, that they are vain.*

21 Let no man therefore glory in men.

22 For all things are yours, whether it be Paul, or Apollo, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; for all are yours:

23 And you are Christ's; and Christ is God's

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st.

No anonymous letter can be attended to. Whatever is sent for insertion must be authenticated by the name and address of the writer, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee for his good faith.

We would request our valued correspondents, both Roman Catholics and Protestants, to limit the length of their communications, and not to discuss a variety of distinct topics in one letter.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal, which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, APRIL, 1852.

It may scarcely be necessary to remind such of our readers as have perused our pages from the commencement, that the principal object we had in view, in the establishment of such a journal, was to bring before our fellow-countrymen a fair and candid discussion of those doctrinal differences between the Church of Rome, and the Church of England and Ireland, which have too often been discussed with an asperity unbecoming those engaged in the pursuit of truth of any kind, and peculiarly unsuited to promote the cause of either Christian truth or Christian charity.

We have tried, and we trust not without success, to remember "That the servant of the Lord must not wrangle; but be mild towards all men; apt to teach; patient; with modesty admonishing them that wish the truth; if, peradventure, God may give them repentance to know the truth."—2 Timothy ii. 24, 25, Douay Bible. We say not this in the spirit of boasting, nor do we claim any credit for having abstained from using harsh language to those from whom we differ in opinion, either in whole or in part.

We merely call attention to the fact, as an encouragement to those whose learning and talents qualify them to take a part in a controversy, carried on in a mild and candid spirit, to come forward and answer, if they can, any of the positions we have already published, or may hereafter publish in our periodical. We would remind our Roman Catholic friends—and we call them so with unaffected sincerity—that it is quite as much the duty of Roman Catholics to persuade Protestants, by calm reasoning, to adopt the tenets of their church, as it is that of members of the Church of England and Ireland to persuade Roman Catholics to give up what Protestants consider the errors of the Church of Rome. Why is it that the Church of England so freely and so boldly permits and encourages discussion of the points in difference, and allows her adherents freely to read on both sides; and that the Church of Rome is so jealous of such discussions, and prohibits all books but her own? We rejoice to find that many of our Roman Catholic countrymen are beginning to be anxious to promote fair and open discussion, and support their tenets by manly arguments, as the correspondence given in our last and present numbers evinces. But we wish that discussion to be extended to the whole subject, and conducted on broad grounds; grappling with our strong points, and putting their own views in their own language, so as to let Protestants know exactly what the Roman Catholic Church believes and teaches, and for what reasons. We are quite sure that a large number of Protestants would peruse any such discussion with fairness and deep interest; and, for ourselves, we must again repeat what we asserted in a former number, that it is our earnest desire to lay aside all prejudices and all party feeling, and apply ourselves to seek for truth for both ourselves and others, and to embrace it, on whichever side it may be found.

It is in this spirit, and not that of polemic strife, that we now reprint the abstract of a challenge which we inserted in our first number, and which we believe to be of a wholly unexceptionable kind. It is, that any priest or bishop of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland or England (the more able and learned the better), shall not orally, but in print, in our pages, come forward and discuss, in *a spirit of candour and Christian kindness*, the whole controversy, not hastily, but at full leisure. We do not ask the writers *publicly* to give their names; so that, if they fail, no personal disgrace will ensue, and their church need not necessarily suffer; and there will, consequently, be the less temptation to lose temper, or use harsh language. All we require is, that Christian temper shall be preserved on both sides; and, where authorities are cited, accurate references given to the volume, page, and exact edition, that time may not be lost in searching for the passages relied on. This we engage on our side to do, and have hitherto studiously done.

Should this challenge be accepted in the spirit of fair play, in which it is proposed, we cannot but think that there is some little chance of intelligent Irishmen being able to decide for themselves which party is in the right, whichever side truth may really be on. But should it be still declined, intelligent laymen will be at liberty to draw their own conclusions as to the true reasons of such refusal.

HISTORICAL ACCOUNT OF THE MANNER OF APPOINTING BISHOPS IN IRELAND.

In our last number we proved, from undeniable authorities, that, up to the year 1152, when the Pope first began to acquire power in the Irish Church, no Irish bishop was ever appointed to his See by the Bishop of Rome.

We propose, in this paper, to show how Irish bishops were appointed from that period (1152) up to the Reformation.

As, in our last paper, we quoted only Roman Catholic authors and bishops, we shall, in this, quote only Roman Catholic laws, passed in Roman Catholic times, by kings, lords and commons, who were members of the Roman Catholic Church, in full communion with the See of Rome. The only exception we shall make is to illustrate those laws from Sir James Ware's "History of the Irish Bishops." We admit this book, (although Sir James Ware was a Protestant), 1st, because it is compiled from documents passed in Roman Catholic times; 2nd, because it is admitted as an authority by all Roman Catholic writers of learning; 3rd, because it is the *only history* of the bishops of Ireland.

Our first authority is an act passed in the Irish parliament, in the year 1454, more than 100 years before the Reformation, under Queen Elizabeth—32 Hen. VI., c. 1, Irish Statutes, vol. i., page 15:—"*At the request of the Commons*, that where divers statutes and ordinances, as well within the realm of England, *as within this realm of Ireland*, have been made against all them that sue provisions to the Court of Rome . . this notwithstanding, provisions are sued from day to other more now than before this time, ... it is ordained and established . . . . . that from henceforward all the acts, ordinances, and statutes, made against the provisors, as well in England *as in Ireland*, be had and kept in force within this land of Ireland." The act goes on to give *treble damages* (besides a fine) to all who might in future be aggrieved by "provisors."

Now, this word "provision" was the name given to a Bull from the Pope, appointing a man to a bishopric or benefice; and a "provisor" was a man who claimed a bishopric by virtue of the Pope's Bull.

The Bulls got that name from the Pope undertaking in them "to provide" bishops for the vacant sees.

It appears from this act itself, that it was not the first law passed in Ireland on this subject; for it refers to "divers statutes" previously passed in Ireland, and enacts that they shall be "kept in force." These previous acts are, probably, in the Irish parliamentary office, or among the rolls of Chancery; but as they have never been printed, we are not able to make use of them. But this statute also put into force, in Ire-

land, all statutes made in England against provisors; and as these are printed, we shall give some specimens of them. 25th Ed. III., statute 5, ch. 22, was passed in the year 1350—that is, 200 years before the Reformation. By this law, any one purchasing a "provision" to have abbeys or priories in England, "shall be out of the king's protection. And that a man may do with them as of enemies of our sovereign lord the king and his realm. And he that offendeth against such provisors (that is, injures the persons that get themselves so appointed) in body or in goods, or in other possessions, shall be excused against all people, and shall never be impeached nor grieved for the same, at any man's suit." Under this law it was held, that any one who killed one of these "provisors" was not guilty of murder in the eye of the law, and could not be punished for it. This was a law of dreadful and unjust severity against the provisors. Yet it continued in force until after the Reformation: for the 5th Eliz., c. 1, was the first act that made it unlawful to kill "provisors."

Statute 6. in the same year, upon "the grievous complaints of all the commons of the realm," against the Pope appointing bishops, &c., by provision, enacts that all persons concerned in such appointments shall be put in prison, and not delivered until they paid whatever fine the king imposed on them, and also made "full renunciation, and find sufficient surety that they shall not attempt such things in time to come."

12 Rich. II., ch. 15, was passed in the year 1388, and by it any person going out of the kingdom, to get any "provision" from the Pope, is put out of the king's protection.

By the 13th Richard II., statute 2, ch. 3, any person bringing into the realm any sentence of excommunication from the Pope against any one, for executing the statutes against provisors, was to forfeit all his goods, and incur "the pain of life and member."

The act 16th Richd. II., ch. 5, recites that the Pope had excommunicated several bishops in England for obeying these laws; upon which the Commons passed this resolution—"That the said things so attempted be clearly against the king's crown and his regalty, used and approved of the times of all his progenitors; whereupon they, and all the liege commons of the same realm, will stand with our said lord the king, and his said crown and his regalty in the cases aforesaid, and in all other cases attempted against him, to live and to die." And it was enacted again, that any person concurring in so offending against the law, should be put out of the king's protection, and forfeit all their goods.

There are some other laws of the same kind, but these are enough for our purpose.

These are the English acts which the Roman Catholic parliament of Ireland, peers, bishops, clergy, and commons (for the clergy sat in parliament then), 100 years before the Reformation, adopted and established as the law of Ireland, in the first act which we have given above. And the very first words of that act are these—"*At the request of the Commons.*" It was the Roman Catholic representatives of the Roman Catholic people of Ireland that *asked* to have these laws solemnly established in Ireland!

In the year 1467, two more statutes were passed by the Irish parliament (7 Edward IV., ch. 2 and 3), enacting that any man who *procured* dignities or benefices by Bulls from the Pope, to hold *in commendam*, should be put out of the king's protection; and that any pardon or licence granted to such persons by the king, should be void, unless it were by act of parliament. The second of these acts is also "at the request of the commons."

Another act, passed in 1495, near 50 years before the first commencement of the Reformation (10 Henry VII., ch. 5) complains of the "many debates and strifes" that had arisen from the Pope's interfering, and says, that "many of the king's true subjects, prelates and beneficers, wrongfully and by strength, be put out of their livelihood, and such persons provisors be put in their places." So we see it is no new thing to have two sets of bishops in Ireland: it was not the Reformation that brought it about; for here we see that, 50 years before the Reformation ever was heard of, there was a set of Irish bishops appointed in Ireland according to the laws of the Church and of the kingdom, and the Bishop of Rome was making another set of bishops at Rome and sending them over to Ireland, to turn out the Irish bishops wrongfully, and by force, out of their bishopries. And to meet this, it was again enacted in that statute, that all acts formerly made against provisors, either in England or in Ireland, should be "duly and straightly executed," the effect of which, as we have seen, was, that all persons so offending, should be put out of the king's protection, so that they might be dealt with by every man as open enemies in war.

We see here the spirit and the laws of our Roman Catholic forefathers. Roman Catholics as they were, it was none of their religion that they must submit to every usurpation and tyranny of the bishop of Rome. They knew how important it was to the SPIRIT OF IRISH NATIONALITY, that Irish Roman Catholic bishops should be appointed in *Ireland*. They knew that if the Pope's usurpations were once allowed to succeed, there would be an end of all liberty and law; and they resolved to resist those usurpations, and to stand together in defence of the liberty and independence of their church and country. It is for Irish Roman Catholics now, to consider how far they have degenerated, and how far they will yet degenerate more, from the spirit of their Roman Catholic fathers. Will they now suffer the Pope to nominate whoever he pleases to succeed the respected Dr. Murray; or will they insist on a successor being elected by Irishmen and in Ireland?

We have only space to give a few brief illustrations from Ware.

The first trace we find of the Pope's interference was in the See of Armagh, in the year 1202 or 1203. There was an election by the chapter, in which both candidates, LePetit and Tichhull, claimed to be rightly elected. The Pope often took advantage of such cases, and in this he interfered and appointed Eugene M'Gillivider. On this the king sent letters to all the bishops of the province, commanding them not to acknowledge Eugene as Archbishop of Armagh. Great contests followed, which lasted for several years. Two bishops, successively supported by the king, both died during the contest. In what way it was finally adjusted is not recorded, but Eugene got possession of the archbishopric about three or four years afterwards, with the king's consent. It is probable that he renounced his title under the Pope's Bull, and then was allowed by the king to hold it. This became a common practice afterwards, when the Pope pretended to make an appointment. If the king was powerful at the time, he succeeded in keeping in the person elected by the chapter and confirmed by the king. But if the king was not sufficiently powerful thus to vindicate the law, he sometimes contented himself with allowing the person nominated by the Pope to renounce his Bull, and hold the bishopric under the king. Many such documents are still in existence, or on record in history. We find this done in the case of Walter Jorse, A.B., of Armagh, A.D., 1306, and again in the case of Stephen Segrave, A.D., 1322, whose act of renunciation is in the Rymers Federa Tom. iv, page 7, in which he openly, willingly, and expressly relinquishes all clauses in the Pope's Bull prejudicial to the rights and prerogatives of the crown.

Similar cases, in this and other Sees, are too numerous to mention. On the other hand, we find cases where the person appointed by the Pope was never able to get possession at all. Thus, in 1527, Donat O'Fidabra was appointed to Armagh, with the royal assent, and at the same time one Nicholas, Canon of Armagh, was appointed by the Pope's Bull, and was consecrated by the Bishop of Tusculum in Italy, yet Donat was always counted the rightful archbishop, and no more was heard of Nicholas. And when the See was vacant in 1247 the king having notice that the Pope was about to interfere, hastened the canonical election, and no more was heard of the Pope's appointment.

Yet the Pope's interference, as the Irish acts of parliament above quoted testify, became constantly more frequent; and the kings, from inability to enforce the law, or to avoid the trouble of doing so, contented themselves with receiving a renunciation of the Papal appointment, and allowed the same person to hold the office from themselves. By this means they thought that they preserved their right entire; yet this really favoured the Pope's claim, at least he gradually turned it to his own advantage; and this appears to have been the reason that the Irish parliament took away from the king the power of granting pardons to those who accepted appointments from the Pope; for when the king accepted their renunciation and confirmed them in their See, it was legally necessary that he should pardon their breach of the law.

But, all along, THE LAW was as strong against the Pope's appointments as it could be.

We conclude this account of the law, in Roman Catholic times, by referring to the act passed in the reign of Queen Mary. King Edward the Sixth had promoted the Reformation; but when he died, Queen Mary, who was a zealous Roman Catholic, restored the supremacy of the Pope as it had existed before. But in the act which was passed for that purpose, the Irish parliament inserted a clause to this effect, that they did not intend to alter any of the rights or prerogatives of the crown in past reigns; and that the Pope should exercise only such authority as he could *lawfully* have exercised before the Reformation.—3 & 4 Phil. and Mary, c. 8, sec. 13. So that the acts against provisors remained in full force, and the Pope had no power to appoint a bishop in Ireland during the reign even of Queen Mary.

And now, on what pretence did the Bishop of Rome then strive to violate the laws of this land in Roman Catholic times? It was *not* that the laws of the land were contrary to the laws of the Catholic Church; for the law of the Catholic Church had always been, *and then was*, that the bishops should be appointed at home and consecrated by the bishops of the province.

The Pope's claim was founded on this alone, that he chose to say, in opposition to all law, both of the land and of the Church, "*We have reserved those appointments to ourselves!*" Our Roman Catholic forefathers knew the merits and the objects of this claim, and therefore they opposed it resolutely, as we have shown. It is for their sons to justify or to condemn their conduct, by following or forsaking their example.

In our next number we shall show how the Pope has acted in this matter, and how Irish Roman Catholics have acted in it, too, from the Reformation to this time.

Correspondence.

READING THE SCRIPTURES.

WE inserted in the last number of this journal a letter from a Roman Catholic correspondent, Mr. Aylmer, on the subject of reading the Scriptures. We had not time then to make more than one or two passing remarks on his communication; but we promised to return to the subject on a future occasion, and we avail ourselves of the earliest opportunity of doing so.

Mr. Aylmer's letter is important, chiefly on account of the strange misrepresentations which it contains of the views which we have advocated on the reading and interpretation of the Scriptures. We are quite sure that these misrepresentations are not wilful: but purely the result of unacquaintance with, and misapprehension of, our views. But when an educated man, like Mr. Aylmer, has fallen into those mistakes, we cannot but apprehend that they prevail widely among the members of the church to which he belongs. We, therefore, gladly avail ourselves of the opportunity which his letter affords us of correcting these erroneous notions, by stating plainly and clearly what our views are.

We would commence our remarks, however, by quoting a sentiment expressed by Mr. Aylmer, in the pamphlet referred to in his letter, because it is one which does him honour, and of which we highly approve. He says—"It (the Bible) shall ever be 'a lamp to my feet and a light to my path.'—Psalm cxviii. 105. No change of country or of climate shall rid me of it; wherever I may wander, in whatever region I may seek rest for the sole of my wearied foot—on the banks of the Rhine, the Tiber, or the Arno, it shall be my inseparable companion."

We trust, and entertain no doubt, but the writer will adhere to this pious resolution; but we would caution our friends from thence deducing a hasty inference, that even such men as Mr. Aylmer are altogether free agents in the matter, and beg to remind him that he is not a freeman. As a Roman Catholic, he dare not claim the Bible as his birthright; the privilege of reading it has been *conceded* to him by his spiritual superiors; but the same power that granted the privilege may, when it pleases, revoke it. In the Church of Rome, the priesthood have, by what we must consider a daring usurpation, set up a claim to the exclusive possession of the treasure of heavenly wisdom, and they may lock it up, and refuse access to it, whenever and to whomsoever they think fit. What say the Roman Catholic bishops and vicars apostolic of Great Britain, as quoted at page 8 of Mr. Aylmer's pamphlet? "There never was a general law of the Catholic Church, prohibiting the reading of the authorized translations of the Scriptures; but considering that many, by their ignorance and evil dispositions, have perverted the meaning of the sacred text to their own destruction, the Catholic Church has thought it prudent to make a regulation, that the faithful should be guided in this matter by the advice of their respective pastors." This means simply that a Roman Catholic may read the Bible if his priest allows him: otherwise not. And on what ground do they claim this power? The ground put forth by the vicars apostolic of Great Britain is. "that many by their ignorance and evil dispositions have perverted the meaning of the sacred text to their own destruction." Now, there is an important principle involved in this, which requires to be examined. The principle is, that a particular class of persons may assume the power of withholding a good gift of God from their fellow creatures, and justify themselves in exercising it, on the ground that the gift is liable to be abused, and that men do, in fact, often abuse it to their own destruction. We object to this, as unsound and dangerous. God himself, in his providential dealings with men, does not act on this principle. Reason is very often abused and perverted by men, to their own and other persons' grievous injury; and yet reason is God's gift to us, and one for which we ought to be most thankful, notwithstanding the awful responsibility which its possession entails upon us. The Christian religion has been charged by infidels with having been the cause of dreadful evils and atrocities; and they have made this an argument to prove that it could not have come from God: but Christians readily refute this by showing that the evils complained of arise from the perversion of the true religion by ambitious and ungodly men, and that they are not justly chargeable on the religion itself. And so, too, with regard to those things which are in our own power and which we may therefore do or forbear doing. The only true and safe principle to go on is, that we should do what is right and our duty, leaving others to bear the burden of the responsibility of their own conduct or misconduct, and trusting the consequences

to God. Thus a physician is bound to do his utmost to cure a sick person, although, from his knowledge of the man's character, he may have great reason to apprehend that he will make use of his restored health only to do mischief to himself and others. And thus, too, a statesman, if he has it in his power to educate and civilize a nation of savages, must not shrink from doing so, on the ground that they may fall into certain vices, commonly found in civilized communities, but from which savages are generally exempt. St. Paul felt his own course of duty to be plain, and that was, to preach the gospel to all classes whether they abused it or not. He says, in Roms. i. 14, 15, – "To the Greeks and to the Barbarians, to the wise and to the unwise, I am a debtor; so (as much as is in me) I am ready to preach the gospel to you also that are at Rome." And so we think is every Christian minister a debtor to put the Word of God into the hands of every one capable of reading it. His duty does not, however, end there; he is bound not only to take pains to understand that Word himself, but he is bound, also, to aid all who apply to him, or who will listen to him, to understand it. The *private* judgment advocated by Protestants, is supposed by most Roman Catholics, and among others apparently by Mr. Aylmer, to be the same as *unaided, uninstructed* judgment. We repudiate this notion, as well as the other absurdities which Mr. Aylmer attributes to us, of "making a child the arbiter of the most important truths;" or of pretending that there are no difficulties in the Scriptures. We go along with Roman Catholics to this extent, that God has given us a Church as well as a religion; that he has instituted an order of men in that Church, one of whose chief duties it is to give themselves up to the study of God's Word, and to be diligent in teaching and preaching it; and that we have the results of this gracious provision which God has made for the better understanding and more effectual operation of his Word, not merely in the sermons which we hear every Lord's day, but in the Catechisms, the Creeds, the Articles, the Liturgies, and the Scripture commentaries which exist for our guidance and edification. Every individual is bound to seek for the instruction necessary to enable him to understand the Scriptures, from every source within his reach; and every individual is also bound to do what he can to help others to understand what they read—not by invading the office of the ministry, by becoming an official expounder and preacher, but by imparting, in a private manner, any information he may possess to those who ask him, or to those who are so connected with him as to render such a course a duty. But in all this we still recognise the right of man's reason and judgment to examine and comprehend, and be convinced and believe. Protestants appeal to reason; Roman Catholics to authority. An appeal to reason assumes the right use of reason; an appeal to authority does not assume any use of reason at all. To be consistent, the advocates of this appeal to authority should be prepared to say, we believe such and such things to be contained in Scripture, not because our priests have, by their arguments and instruction, enabled us to see that they are so contained in it, but because they say they are. Now, St. Paul says, "where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty;" but the doctrine laid down above, is pure and absolute slavery. If the only thing required of us by God were to conform our outward actions to a law, then the priests might be regarded as the judges appointed by God to expound the law, and their expositions be binding. But God requires the truth of his Gospel to be believed and felt, and to influence our thoughts and motives, our will and affections; and such a sanctifying operation of the truth is inconceivable, if the office of the priesthood be, not to guide our judgment and enlighten our reason by the ordinary means employed when any other book is to be explained, or branch of human knowledge is concerned, but authoritatively to lay down the law, and to coerce our assent to their decisions. We venture to say, that we believe the priests of the Church of Rome have no royal road to that knowledge of God's Word which could qualify them, and them only, to be sound expositors of it; and that priests of either Church will be safe guides in this matter only in so far as they are spiritual-minded, learned, sensible, Bible-reading men of God. And as to the claims of the Roman Church to a power of giving the true sense of the Scriptures with infallible certainty, all we shall say is, that if she has this power, it is a pity she has never exercised it. If she might, according to her own showing, have drawn up an infallible commentary upon the Bible, and if the absence of such an unerring commentary has led so many millions into error, we ask every Catholic layman of intelligence and right feeling, is it not a shame and a reproach to her that she has never done it?

As to the text from John v., we have some further observations to make; but the length to which our present remarks have already run, obliges us to postpone them to another occasion.

PURGATORY.

In this and in the last two numbers we have laid before our readers the sentiments of some of the most eminent saints and fathers of the Primitive Church on the state of departed souls, and have given reasons for thinking that for four centuries, at least, after the time of our Lord, the doctrine of purgatory, as now held by the Roman Catholic Church, was unknown. The remarks in our last number have drawn forth a letter from a correspondent, inviting our attention to some *Scripture* evidence for the existence of purgatory. This appeal from the Fathers to Scripture is one which we cannot refuse to listen to. We very willingly confess, that if it can be proved that our Blessed Saviour or any of the Apostles, revealed, in the Holy Scriptures, the existence of such a place, we are bound to believe in it, even though St. Patrick, St. Leo, St. Chrysostom, or any other saint knew nothing about it, and however strange such ignorance would be. And we earnestly hope that many of our readers will follow our correspondent's example, and will "Search the Scriptures" for themselves, and examine what are the doctrines which *it* teaches. The following is the letter referred to:—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Sir,—Your proofs against the non-existence of purgatory will not hold good with Roman Catholics. They firmly believe that such a state exists, and their true opinion is confirmed by the following passages:—

"The work of every man shall be manifest, for the day of our Lord will declare it, because it shall be revealed in fire; and the work of every one, of what kind it is, the fire shall try; if a man's work abides [as theirs doth who suffer no purgatory], he shall receive a reward; if any man's work burn [as theirs doth who go to purgatory], he suffers detriment, but himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire."—1st Cor. iii. 13, 14, 15.

"Be thou at agreement with thy adversary betimes, whilst thou art in the way with him [that is, in this life], lest perhaps the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison [purgatory]. Amen, I say unto thee, thou shalt not go out from thence till thou repayest the last farthing."—St. Matt. v. 25, 26.

"I remain, yours, &c., "AMICUS."

Now, if the words within parentheses in our correspondent's quotations, were part of the sacred text, then indeed it would be certain that the two passages he has cited have a reference to purgatory. But these words within parentheses are no part of Scripture, but are merely the private interpretation given by "Amicus;" and we hope to show that this interpretation is not consistent with the words of the text—that it cannot possibly be received by any one who determines to interpret Scripture only in accordance with the unanimous consent of the Fathers—and, lastly, that his interpretation is not accepted by Roman Catholic divines of acknowledged authority.

To commence with the passage from Corinthians. The text asserts that the fire shall try the work of *every one*, of what kind it is; and it implies that some of the works thus tested shall abide, and some shall burn. "Amicus" asserts that the works which abide are the works of those who do *not* suffer purgatory; it is plain, therefore, from his own admission, that the fire which tries these works is not purgatorial fire. Further, the fire spoken of in the text is to *try* the work of every one; but purgatory is not a place of trial, but a place of punishment. The fire spoken of in the text is to try the *work* of every one; but the fire of purgatory is spoken of as having nothing to do with the works of men, but as exercising its power upon men's souls. We conclude, then, that the fire spoken of in the text, which *tries*, tries the *work*, and tries the work of *every one*, is not the same as purgatorial fire, which *punishes*, punishes the *souls*, and only punishes the souls of *some men*.

Thus we have shown that the interpretation of "Amicus" is inconsistent with the words of the text, and it is equally easy to show that it is not supported by the consent of the Fathers. We need only direct our correspondent to the references given by the celebrated Cardinal Bellarmine, in the chapter in which he discusses this very text—De Purgatorio, book i., chap. v. He will there see that several eminent Greek Fathers, including Chrysostom and Theophylact, supposed that the fire spoken of was hell fire: that others understood the text to refer to the fire of that conflagration in which the world shall be burnt up; but that St. Augustine and Gregory the Great interpret the text as referring to the fiery trial of tribulation which takes place in this life. Bellarmine's own opinion is singular. He considers, for nearly the same reasons as we have given, that "the fire which is to try every man's work" cannot refer to purgatory, but must be understood metaphorically; but he endeavours to maintain that the latter clause, "so as by fire," is to be understood of purgatorial fire. Thus he gives to the word fire two different meanings in the two clauses of this short passage: In the first place, where "the fire" is simply mentioned, he understands it metaphorically; and where the expression is, "*so as* by fire," he understands it literally. If any refutation of this interpretation is needed, it is sufficient to say, that however much the Fathers may differ among themselves as to what is meant by the word *fire*, they agree as to the necessity of being each consistent with himself, and give the same meaning to the word in all the clauses of the passage.

To one who has no theory to support, the words, "so as by fire," present no difficulty. They form a proverbial expression for escape from danger, not without great hazard and difficulty, like one that, when his house is set on fire at midnight, wakes and leaps out of the bed and runs naked out of doors—See St. Chrysostom, vol. ii., p. 639. Such proverbial expressions for escape from calamity may be found in other passages of Scripture.—See Amos iv. 11, Jude 23.

Thirdly. We shall show that the controversial use of this passage in Corinthians is now given up by the leading Roman Catholic writers. It is to be observed, that Scripture texts are used by Romish divines for two very different purposes. If a member of their own communion asks them to produce some texts in favour of purgatory, then it is sufficient to pick out from a concordance some passage where the word "fire," or the word "prison," occurs, and to say that in this passage purgatory is probably alluded to: but in arguing with an opponent, something more is required than a mere *possibility* that purgatory may be referred to; it is necessary to show that such is the natural and proper sense of the passage. Thus our readers will see that it is one thing, "suadere probabiliter," another, "demonstrare contra hæreticos." Now, it is in this latter controversial use that we say the passage has been given up by Romish authorities. We shall not quote Erasmus; for though he was a Romanist, and though his arguments on this passage are very convincing, yet as he was suspected of a leaning towards the reformed views, his authority has less weight. But we refer "Amicus" to the discussion given by the approved theologian, Natalis Alexander, of all the texts which relate to the doctrine of purgatory (See Diss. xlv., in Hist. 4th secoli), who, after citing at length the opinions of Chrysostom, of Theodoret, of Augustine, and of Gregory the Great, concludes that this passage cannot be used to demonstrate the existence of purgatory. And accordingly the more recent Roman Catholic controversial writers do not lay any stress on this passage. We give as an instance among their foreign divines Perrone, lecturer at the Jesuit College at Rome (see his Prælectiones Theologicæ, vol. iii.); and among English writers, Cardinal Wiseman (Lectures on Catholic Doctrine, vol. ii, p. 64), who says, "that he adverts to this passage not for the purpose of discussing whether it applies to purgatory or not," and goes on to say—"It is not essential to our belief that this text should refer to purgatory," which he surely would not have said if it was relied on as one of the strongest Scripture proofs.

On the passage in St. Matthew we need say less, because of it the best Roman Catholic writers are agreed that it has no reference to purgatory whatsoever. See the Dissertation of Natalis Alexander already referred to, and also the commentary on the passage of the Jesuist, Maldonatus, who, certainly, cannot be accused of any leaning towards Protestant views. We translate the observations on the passage of Natalis Alexander—an approved Roman Catholic theologian. "Some would understand by 'prison' purgatory, by 'farthing' 'venial sins,' which must be expiated by those who have died in a state of grace and charity before they can escape from purgatory. This interpretation Bellarmine defends by some testimonies from the Fathers, of which scarcely one is clear and express. But this place does not demonstrate purgatory, and its true meaning is very different from that which Bellarmine gives to it. 'Our adversary' is either the Divine law, which accuses us before God (as St. Augustine interprets), or else the man who has anything against us, whom we have offended and called fool [see the context], who pleads against us before God (as St. Hilary, St. Ambrose, and St. Jerome interpret); 'the way' is the time of this life: 'the judge' is Christ; the officer is the devil, whose agency God employs in torturing the damned; '*prison' is hell;* 'the last farthing' is the smallest fault, for a farthing was the smallest piece of money; so that to pay the last farthing is a proverbial expression for being punished with the utmost rigour of the law. But as to what is said, that we shall not get out until we have paid the last farthing, it is not meant that we shall get out afterwards; because, since the damned are liable to infinite punishment for every mortal sin, this is a debt which they can never pay. The word 'until,' therefore, must be taken in the same sense as in the first chapter of St. Matthew's gospel—'He knew her not *until* she had brought forth her first-born son,' whence it is not to be inferred that Joseph did know Mary after she had brought forth. And again, Psalm 109—'Sit thou on my right hand, *until* I make thine enemies thy footstool.' And again, 1st Corinthians, 15—'He must reign *until* he have put all enemies under his feet.' As, therefore, it is understood that Christ will always reign, since his enemies will be always under his feet, so in the passage—'Thou shalt not depart thence until thou hast paid the uttermost farthing'—we must understand, that the persons spoken of shall never depart from the prison, because they will be always paying the last farthing, since the punishments of sin are eternal. This is the interpretation of St. Augustine—Book i., on the Sermon on the Mount, cap. 11."

Such are the observations of Natalis Alexander on this passage; and as the best Roman Catholic divines agree with him that this text has no reference to purgatory, we think it scarcely worth mentioning, that St. Chrysostom interprets the whole passage of the dangers which may be incurred *in this life* by one who omits to be reconciled to his adversary; and understands judge, officer, prison, &c., in their most literal sense.

We think, then, we have said enough to show that the two passages which "Amicus" has brought forward are utterly insufficient to establish the doctrine of purgatory; and we would beg of him to examine further the statements of Scripture on the subject. Now, we are very certain that if the doctrine of purgatory be true, clear and explicit statements of it will be found in Scripture. Our Lord and his Apostles did not seek to make converts by concealing from them any of the sufferings to which Christians should be liable. Our Saviour exhorted those who came to join themselves to him to count the cost well beforehand: and he candidly told them that in this world they should have tribulation, and that they who had persecuted him would also persecute his followers. Now, we may be very sure that he who so faithfully acquainted his disciples with all the sufferings they should have to bear in this life would not keep secret from them any they should have to endure in the world to come.

Besides, if the Romish theory be true, the sufferings to be endured in purgatory may be much shortened by men's prayers, and penances, and sufferings in this life. If this theory be true, then it is impossible but that, among all the advice which is recorded to have been given by our Lord to his disciples, and by the Apostles to their converts, we shall find some directions as to the means of shortening or escaping these dreadful sufferings hereafter. And among the consolations which are recorded to have been given by our Lord and his Apostles to their disciples suffering under persecution, we shall surely find some mention made of the effect of those earthly afflictions in shortening the torments of purgatory. But if nothing of this kind can be found in Scripture; if the only sufferings which the believers in Christ were informed they should have to bear, were the persecutions of this life—the only terror of the Lord denounced against evil-doers were the torments of hell; if the Christians were comforted with the hope that, 'when absent from the body, they should be present with the Lord'—that 'when the house of their earthly tabernacle should be dissolved, they should have a building of God, a house not made by hands, eternal in the heavens'—that 'they who die in the Lord should rest from their labours,' then we think it is a reasonable inference, from the silence of Scripture as to such a place as purgatory, that our Lord and his Apostles did not know of its existence.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—As a subscriber to the LAYMAN, I hope you will have no objection to afford me, from time to time, some information which I am desirous of obtaining.

I have read attentively, in your last number, an article, headed Purgatory, in which you give extracts from a work attributed, you say, to St. Patrick, entitled, "The Three Habitations." Now, what I want to know from you is, to which of those habitations do children go, who may happen to die without receiving baptism? and, also, was it in a fourth habitation the soul of the Redeemer was from his death till the resurrection?

I hope you may oblige me by enlightening me on these points in the columns of the next number of the LAYMAN.

Your obdt. servt.,
WALTER PLUNKET.

Loughrea, March, 1852.

We shall always be happy to afford to our correspondent whatever information we possess or can obtain. It is a duty which we always discharge with pleasure; but we cannot undertake to give any more information upon any point than what Christ and his Apostles have given to the world. We believe that there must be a vast deal more "in the world of spirits" than Christ has thought fit to reveal to us at present: but we believe that Christ revealed to his Apostles all that it was *necessary* and *profitable* for us to know at present. And St. Paul says he kept back nothing that was profitable to us.—Acts chap. xx., v. 20, Douay Bible. Beyond what is so revealed, our only wisdom is to confess our ignorance, and to live as men who look for their Lord's appearing, when all hidden things shall be made plain.

We cannot find that Christ or his Apostles have told us the destiny of children who die unbaptized, and, therefore, we cannot pretend to know it. But we are sure that Christ knows it; and we are also sure that the Judge of all the earth shall do right. To him, therefore, we leave it; not without this ground of hope, that he "died for all" (2 Cor. chap. v., v. 14, Douay Bible), and that "He is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for those of the whole world."—1 John chap. ii., v. 2. It is enough for us that we have Christ's gracious invitation to bring our children to him. If any neglect to bring them, Christ will do what seems good to him.

Nor do we see how this question is at all plainer to those who believe the common doctrine of purgatory; for these children have immortal souls, which shall live for ever. But purgatory will not last for ever: and what place are their souls to be in afterwards? Therefore, supposing a purgatory does not solve the difficulty.

With respect to the second question—"Was it in a fourth habitation the soul of the Redeemer was, from his death till his resurrection?—we answer thus, David said, in the 15th Psalm, v. 10 (Douay Bible)—"Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell;" and St. Peter, in the 2nd chap. of Acts, tells us, that David, being a prophet, spoke this—"of the resurrection of Christ," v. 27, 30, 31. But *what place* is here meant by "Hades" or hell, has been a source of great difference of opinion among the Fathers.

We know that the spirit of man exists in the interval between death and the resurrection of the body. We know that God has it *somewhere*. We know that our Saviour spoke of Lazarus being "in Abraham's bosom" (Luke, chap. xvi., v. 22, Douay Bible); and of the rich man being "buried in hell"—same verse. This was after they were dead, and before the resurrection of the body. We know that these places were "afar off" from each other (v. 23), and separated "by a great chaos" (v. 26). We believe (with all the Fathers), that Abraham's bosom was a place of happiness, though not so perfect in glory as the state that shall follow the resurrection. We see no difficulty in supposing that it may be connected with heaven, or even as part of it, just as the hell in which the rich man was "buried" may be a part of the hell of the damned, or at least connected with it. Thus, we may easily account for St. Patrick counting only "three habitations"—namely, heaven, earth, and hell.

Now, whether "Hades," to which our Saviour went, be a name which includes the place called "Abraham's bosom," and *also* that "hell" to which the rich man went; or whether the term "Hades" is applied to the latter alone, is a question which the Scriptures do not seem to decide, and about which the Fathers, therefore, differed widely. We, therefore, think it wise not to assert anything positively, where we cannot be certain.

To either of these places our Saviour went when he "descended into hell." It may be to both. The words which our Saviour spoke, when on the cross, to the thief who was dying beside him—"This day thou shalt be with me in Paradise" (Luke xxiii. 43), are thought, with great reason, to be spoken of the place called "Abraham's bosom;" while the words, "he descended first into the lower parts of the earth" (Eph. iv., v. 9), and also the words, "he descended into hell," are thought, by many, to refer rather to the hell of the rich man. Whichever place it was, or if he went successively to both, there is no need of St. Patrick counting a "fourth habitation," because he must have looked on one of these places as belonging to heaven, and the other to hell.

Our correspondent should remember what we quote St. Patrick's work for. Simply to prove that St. Patrick did not believe in Purgatory, and that it was no part of the religion which he taught the Irish. If our correspondent means to find fault with the omission, why he is condemning the religion of St. Patrick, that is all; and making out St. Patrick a Protestant.

We think it clear that "Abraham's bosom," and the "hell" in which the rich man was buried, cannot be "Purgatory," according to the common notion; because "Abraham's bosom" was, clearly, a place of happiness; and between it and the rich man's "hell" there is fixed a great chaos (or gulf, as the Protestant Bible has it). So that they who would pass from thence to you, cannot "*nor from thence come hither.*"—Luke xvi. 26, Douay Bible. Abraham does not say to the rich man, "Pray to the Blessed Virgin," or "get the Priest to say masses for you;" but he plainly tells him—"You cannot from thence come hither." Surely that cannot be Purgatory.

ON TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Conscious that I am neither talented nor educated sufficiently to convey my thoughts on an important subject in a suitable style, I feel considerable diffidence; but as you will not expect that every layman who reads your paper will be educated, you will not ungenerously criticise a communication from one of them on that score. The subject which led to the few observations I intend to offer, is contained in an article in your paper of the 17th inst., on transubstantiation. Now, it appears to me that the communication you received bearing the Enniscorthy post mark, is conclusive on the point; and that your observations on it are sophistical. You say, that of the three passages he has quoted, these words only, "this is my body," were spoken *at the institution;* all the rest were spoken on another occasion, at least a year before the sacrament was instituted. I apprehend you mistake your correspondent, for no intelligent Catholic supposes they were; but that they had allusion to the institution is plain, for upon that occasion, discoursing of the bread of life, our Saviour propounded the doctrine of the real presence, and promised that which he afterwards did give at the institution, his *body*. If, as I think is pretty clear, you use this by way of inuendo, or insinuation, to induce an inference, that because they were not spoken at the institution, that therefore the force of the words used at the institution (which do not admit of cavil) was weakened, this you know would be a mischievous error, and well calculated to do much harm to ignorant people. Your case of Judas amounts merely to a captious objection, and, if used with a disposition to falsify, or contradict the words of Christ, it would unquestionably be blasphemy. That the case of Judas does not serve your argument, I think I will be able to show. But suppose it to apply, would it not tell with equal force against the Protestant interpretation of the text? for you must admit, that eternal life is promised to whosoever eateth Christ's flesh, which you say means that spiritual nourishment which Christ gives to those who faithfully use that sacrament which he has appointed for them. If you are right in that interpretation, then it follows that it was according to the Protestant belief Judas ate it, yet he perished: and so you founder there. True, you qualify it by saying faithfully use it; but as the words "faithfully use it," do not appear in the text, it may be inferred that they are an addition of your own. If there is any difficulty in the case, the true solution of it is found in the 1st Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians—"Therefore, whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord *unworthily*, shall be guilty of the body and of the blood of the Lord—xi. 27. But let a man prove himself; and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of the chalice—28. For he that eateth and drinketh *unworthily*, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, not *discerning* the body of the Lord—29. Therefore are there many infirm and weak among you, and many sleep—30." Judas ate unworthily, and thereby incurred judgment. It is in this light a Catholic views the subject, and proves himself, by sincere and humble confession, as prescribed by St. James; and by praying to God for grace to be truly contrite: then, with a lively faith* and an animated hope, receives the bread of life, and avoids judgment. I am, with the sincere desire for your salvation, which charity dictates, your obedient, &c. J. B.

"J. B." need fear no criticism from us, except what is intended to bring out the truth.

Our Enniscorthy correspondent appeared to us to speak of the discourse in John vi. as if delivered *at* the institution of the Lord's Supper. "J. B." is probably right in supposing that this was a mere inadvertence or oversight; but it was not the less our duty, when we published that letter, to point out this oversight, because, if we had not done so, some of our readers might have been led into error by it.

We do not distinguish the time at which that discourse was spoken, "by way of inuendo or insinuation," that the discourse *could not* have been spoken *of* the institution: but we use it to *prevent* any inuendo or insinuation that the discourse *must* have been spoken of the institution, in order that the question, whether it were so spoken or not, may be considered on its own merits.

"J. B." thinks it "plain" that this discourse was spoken of the sacrament. We have already stated, that the Fathers differed about this question; and how, then, can it be so plain to "J. B."

We must now add, that many of the most learned Roman Catholic divines have publicly maintained, that Christ did not speak of the sacrament in that discourse. Our space is brief; so we mention here, as maintainers of this opinion, only Cardinal Cusanus,† Cardinal Cajetan,‡ and Æneas Sylvius,‖ who was afterwards Pope. We could give a dozen more as high authorities. Now, is it quite plain to "J. B." that he must be right in contradicting all these? Let him remember that the Council of Trent, with the Pope at its head, could not venture to say which opinion was right; how then can "J. B.?" Is it by his "private judgment?"

Our argument was this—Christ said in that discourse "IF ANY MAN eat of this bread he shall *live for ever.*" Judas ate the bread which Christ blessed at his last supper, and that very night Judas perished for ever. The question is, did Judas eat that bread of which Christ said *if any man* eat of this bread HE SHALL LIVE FOR EVER?" We say, Judas did not eat of the bread of which Christ spoke these words: "J. B." says Judas did eat of it: which of us contradicts the words of Christ?

"J. B." thinks that we want to alter Christ's words—"If any man eat of this bread," and that we want to have it thus, "if any man *faithfully* eat of it," whereas he thinks it should be, "if any man *worthily* eat of it," as if "faithfully" and "worthily" were not pretty much the same in this case. But "J. B." mistakes us much. We do not want to put "faithfully" or "worthily," or any other word, into the words of Christ. It is "J. B." who, by his own confession, wants to add to the words of Christ, by putting in the word "worthily" where Christ did not put it. We take the words of

---

* In the most *literal* sense of the text of the institution.

† Nicolai De Cusa, Cardinalis opera. Basle, 1565. Epist. 3 de usu Communionis. Ad Bohemos, p. 838, 841.

‡ Evansel. Comm. Thomæ De Vio Cajetani. Paris, 1542, tom. 3 p. 205, b. Joannis, cap. vi.

‖ Æneæ Sylvii Piccolominei (Pius II.). Basle, 1571. Dialogus contra Bohemos Epist. lib. i. p. 672.

Christ, "*if any man* eat of this bread *he shall live for ever.*" We take the words as they are; we take Christ's own words, that he himself was that bread of life." We believe that every one who feeds on Christ as the bread of life, *every one without exception*, shall live for ever. Is not this to take Christ's words *as they are*, and to believe them? But "J. B." with his present opinions *cannot* do this. Christ says, "if *any man* eat of this bread he shall live for ever." "Oh, no!" ("J. B." must say), for many eat and perish: this is not true of ANY man, but only those who eat worthily; and so, to make it true, we must say, 'if any man eat *worthily* he shall live for ever.'" This proves that "J. B." mistakes of what bread Christ spoke, since he is driven to alter Christ's speech; and that we do not mistake, since we take Christ's words as they are. We repeat again, that when the discourse is of feeding on *Christ himself* as the bread of life, we do not want to put in "faithfully," or "worthily" or anything else; but when we speak of receiving the *sacrament* of the body and blood of the soul, *then* indeed we put in the word "worthily" or "faithfully," as St. Paul has taught us to do. For there, indeed, the distinction is necessary; for they only who eat it worthily do feed on Christ, the bread of life.

This, too, is worthy of notice, that our Saviour was *contrasting* the bread which he would give with the bread which Moses gave the Israelites from heaven—that is the manna. Our Saviour says that they that ate Moses's bread *died*, but *if any man* eat of Christ's bread, "he shall live for ever." This is the *contrast*, that *any man* who eats of this bread *cannot die;* and this *cannot* be said of the bread in the sacrament. Is this a Protestant argument? We care not; we learned it from Cardinal Cajetan, one of the greatest divines of the Roman Church! (upon John vi., tom. 3. Paris ed., 1543.)

We conclude with a passage from St. Augustine's sermon on the xcviii. Psalm (xcix., Protestant version), to which we entreat "J. B.'s" earnest attention. St. Augustine quotes the 3rd verse of the discourse in John vi.—"It is the Spirit that quickeneth (or maketh alive), but the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I have spoken unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." And St. Augustine thus explains them—"Understand spiritually what I have said, ye are not to eat this body which ye see; nor to drink that blood which they who crucify me shall pour forth. I have commended unto you a certain mystery; spiritually understood, it will quicken."

We shall be happy to hear from "J. B." again. But we advise him to keep in mind, while he is writing, that what he takes to be rank Protestantism in our pages, we may be able to show has been maintained, not only by eminent Fathers, but by the most learned cardinals and most famous divines in the Roman Catholic Church.

FARMING OPERATIONS FOR APRIL.

(*From the Irish Farmers' Gazette.*)

FROM the very fine seed-time we have lately had, it must be the farmer's own fault if his grain and potato crops are not in a very forward condition.

Oats.—The sooner in the month the breadth intended for oats is sown the better.

Barley sowing should be completed as early in the month as possible. If intended to be laid down with clover and grass seeds, the surface should be rendered as fine as possible, by the liberal use of both harrows and rollers. Immediately after sowing the barley, then sow the small seeds, bush harrow, and roll.

Flax, if not already sown, should now be committed to the earth without delay. The soil best adapted for this crop, is a rich, deep loam. The best fibre is produced after a lea corn crop, or after corn preceded by a manured crop. The land should be well pulverized and thoroughly clean; the surface rendered as fine as possible by repeated harrowings and rollings. Roll before sowing; sow the seed broadcast, by the hand, or by a drilling-machine, from which the coulters must be removed, and cover with a light harrow, drawn first one way and then across, and finish with the roller. Three and a half bushels of clean seed will sow the Irish acre; but it is better to sow too thick than too thin; the seed should be well sifted and cleaned of all foreign seed, which will otherwise vegetate, and give great trouble in weeding. There is no better crop to sow clover and grass seeds with than flax, as far as the after crop is concerned; but the manufacturers complain that the bottom part of the flax stems is much injured by clover, when luxuriant. They do not object so much to sowing carrots, in drills, which, after the flax is pulled, may be thinned and hoed.

Spring Vetches.—A breadth of land, sufficient for consumption in July or August, should now be sown. In small establishments, it would be well to make two sowings, one at the beginning and the other about the middle of the month.

Potato planting should now be finished off without delay; as a general rule, the tubers should be planted before they begin to shoot out. Those previously planted will soon be coming up, and, if planted in drills, no time should be lost in harrowing down the tops of the drills lightly, otherwise they will come out at the sides; and on their first appearance, mould them up with the double mould-board plough, which will protect them from frost, which invariably kills all the exposed potato shoots. If planted in ridges, or "lazy-beds," they should be lightly pointed over, to break the winter's crust and destroy the annual weeds, and, when just coming over the surface, a little fine earth should be raised from the furrows, and scattered over the beds, to protect the young stalks from frost.

Carrots and Parsnips.—No time should now be lost in finishing off the intended breadths of carrots and parsnips. When sown so late as the present, the seeds should be prepared beforehand, by mixing them with damp sand, and keeping them in a dark, warm place; after the first three or four days, they should be turned over daily, and, if getting dry, sprinkle the mass with a little tepid water. They should be sown as soon as they exhibit symptoms of vegetating, which will vary according to the temperature they are kept in; the period may be hastened by putting the seeds, mixed as above, in the bottom of a cucumber or melon frame, or plunging them, enclosed in a bag, in a warm dung-heap; they should be examined daily. The carrot seeds should be rubbed between the hands, to remove the little awns by which they adhere to each other, and insure their even distribution when sowing.

Preparation for Green Crops.—The preparations for the general class of green crops—such as mangel-wurzel, Swedes and other turnips, carrots, parsnips, cabbages, &c.—being the same; and presuming that the previous instructions have been attended to and followed up, as to the deep cultivation of the land by the spade or plough, during the autumn and winter, with the subsequent harrowings, cross-ploughings, and cleansings, to bring the land into a perfectly fine tilth, it is then in a proper state to receive the manure. Some open the drills first, at such distances apart as to receive the cart-wheels—that is, in every breadth of five drills; the horse walks in the centre, and the two wheels travel in the drills at either side, and the two outside drills are vacant as the carts pass along; the manure is dropped at regular distances, a man assisting to drag it out of the cart with an iron drag, made like a dung fork or grape, with the tines crooked or bent. To facilitate this operation the carts are furnished with a tilting bar, so that they be thrown up in front to the bottom, forming an inclined plane, at various angles. Men or women follow, to spread the manure equally in the drills, which are immediately closed by the double mould-board plough. This may be done equally well by the single mould-board plough, but it takes double the time. The drills are then rolled down, and the seeds sown and again rolled. Thus the work goes on very regularly and expeditiously; but this mode is open to some objections: one is, that the bottoms of the drills in which the horse and cart-wheels travel, are very much beaten, and a sort of pan or impenetrable floor formed, which, though not much affecting the potato or turnip crop, is highly objectionable with tap-rooted plants, such as mangels, carrots, parsnips, or chicory; another objection is, that from the carts turning and crossing the drills, they are much broken down and obliterated, and the manure, from this cause alone, cannot be evenly covered, and it is altogether a slovenly method.

That practised by others, and which is free from those objections, is to mark the field all over with the plough, both lengthways and across, at parallel distances of one statute perch apart, thus forming squares of a perch each; the manure is then drawn out and dropped in small, regular-sized heaps on the points where the lines intersect each other, leaving the first breadth of a perch at the side where the plough is to open the drills undunged. Men and women are then placed along the line at regular intervals, counting off to each man so many heaps, whose duty will be to take the manure with a three-pronged fork, if it be long farm-yard manure, or with a shovel, if it be compost or short manure, and deposit it evenly in the drills as the plough passes along opening them. Another plough follows, splitting the ridge and covering the manure. Each man should have his portion finished before the plough returns, opening another drill: thus there will be no necessity for the men crossing or walking on the undunged drills. The drills are then rolled down, sown, and again rolled. If the field be long, say over 20 or 30 perches, it will be necessary to lay off the centre space between every 6 or 8 perches as a cart-track, throwing off 3 or 4 lines at each side, from which the carts diverge to drop the manure. This beaten track must afterwards be ploughed up and harrowed. This method has much to recommend it. The permeability of the bottoms of the drills is much better preserved, the tap-rooted plants meet with no obstructions, the manure is laid on evenly, and the quantity per acre exactly regulated, and the men have their portions lotted out with the greatest regularity. Hence, there is no complaining, no confusion, but everything goes on with regularity and despatch.

Mangel-wurzel should be sown by the end of this or early next month. The seeds should be steeped for 48 hours before sowing, then set to drain, and dried with wood or other ashes. To produce heavy crops they require a very liberal supply of manure. The seeds should be dibbled in two or three in each hole, at 15 to 18 inches apart, in good soils and sheltered situations, and at 12 to 15 inches apart in soils not so good or sheltered, getting from 1½ to 2 inches cover; the drills must not be less than from 28 to 30 inches apart.

Sugar Beet may be sown, and in every way managed similarly to mangel wurzel.

Swede Turnip should be sown about the same time as the mangel. They do not require so much manure; but from 1½ to 2 cwt. of guano assists materially in forcing an early braird and into rough leaf, out of the reach of the fly. Sow with the drill-machine, and, when fit for thinning, hoe and single them out to the same distance apart as recommended for mangel.

Kohl-rabi should now be sown, in beds of rich, clean, and well-pulverized soil, to be ready for transplanting out in drills in May and June.

Chicory may be sown between the middle of the month and the 10th May; the land prepared in the same way as for carrots or parsnips, in raised drills, from 20 to 24 inches apart.

Cabbages.—Sow a successional breadth of cabbage seed, for planting out by the end of May or early in June, and finish planting out the general crop without delay.

Lucerne.—Sow by the middle of the month. The land should be deeply tilled, clean, and rich. Sow in rows 12 inches apart: 16 or 18 lbs. of seed will sow the Irish acre.

Saintfoin.—The soil for saintfoin should be dry and rich; the barley ground may be very profitably laid down with this crop. Sow broadcast about 4½ bushels to the Irish acre; harrow it well with a fine harrow, and roll.

Wheat.—The winter-sown wheats, if intended for laying down with clover and grass seeds, should, if sown broadcast, be now well harrowed, rolled, the small seeds sown, bush-harrowed, and rolled; if the wheat has been drilled, it should be hand or horse hoed, to destroy weeds, levelled with the drill-harrow, the seeds sown, bush-harrowed, and rolled. If the plant be too luxuriant eat it down with sheep, or mow it, then roll and harrow; but this must not be done after the seed-stems or culms begin to shoot, which would injure the produce.

Beans and Peas, if sown in rows, should now be hand or horse hoed between.

Fallows should get a good harrowing and cross-ploughing some time in the month.

Paring and Burning, where practised or requisite, should be attended to closely. Lands subject to this process yield excellent crops of potatoes, turnips, rape, &c., and good after crops of corn, after which they should get a full dressing of putrescent manure for a green crop.

Artificial Manures.—Wheat, oats, barley, and meadow lands may now be top-dressed with guano, superphosphate of lime, gypsum, salt and lime, some time mixed in compost, soot, &c., choosing wet weather for the purpose.

Meadows, if not done before, should be cleaned and rolled without delay, removing everything that may interfere with the scythe, and dig up dockings in wet weather.

The Dairy.—It will now be necessary to make up the full complement of cows for the dairy, by a careful selection of in-calvers; as they drop their calves, comfortable house-room should be provided, with a moderate supply of roots and good, sweet hay, until the rye, winter vetches, and Italian rye-grass come in. Some rock-salt in their troughs will be useful at this period.

Horned Stock should be carefully attended and well fed: this will tell, after being put to grass, in the development of bone, muscle, and flesh before the end of the season.

Fat Sheep must be kept up by a liberal supply of roots and hay, or they will fall off in condition rapidly.

Ewes, with their lambs, should have a good bite of sweet, succulent herbage, rye, clover, and rye-grass, to enable them to suckle their lambs. If they suffer now from insufficient nutriment, no after care will restore them.

Sows and Litters.—This is a good time for sows to farrow; those expected to do so should be kept confined to their styes, which should be clean, warm, and well ventilated, and be supplied moderately with good, nourishing food; and *stores* kept in condition by a full supply of food.

Manures.—Attend to the accumulation of manure; turn over, break, and mix former collections; clean out all the offices, yards, &c., and cart the manure to the headlands of such fields as are to be green-cropped; bank it up, and cover well with dry earth, to preserve the ammonia.

MISERIES OF INDOLENCE.—None so little enjoy life and are such burdens to themselves, as those who have nothing to do. The active only have the true relish of life. He who knows not what it is to labour, knows not what it is to enjoy. Recreation is only valuable as it unbends us; the idle know nothing of it. It is exertion that renders rest delightful, and sleep sweet and undisturbed. That the happiness of life depends upon the regular prosecution of some laudable purpose or laudable calling, which engages, helps, and enlivens all our powers, let those bear witness who, after spending years in active usefulness, retire to enjoy themselves.—*Jay.*

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

9', UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN,

HAVE respectfully to invite the attention of the Clergy and others to the following Editions of Important WORKS, now about to be published, and to suggest the desirableness of their taking advantage of the proposed plan of publication.

I.

REV. THOMAS SCOTT'S COMMENTARY ON THE HOLY BIBLE,

In Six volumes, quarto, price THREE GUINEAS.

This is the only edition that has, *or can have*, the benefit of the final additions and emendations of the Author. For TEN YEARS he was engaged in revising the work, and not only did the whole of the Critical and Explanatory Notes, with the Practical Reflections and the other important parts of the work, undergo a complete Revision, but upwards of FOUR HUNDRED PAGES OF LETTER-PRESS WERE ADDED, consisting chiefly of important critical remarks.

The price at which it was originally published was EIGHT GUINEAS, subsequently reduced to Six Guineas. The work will be issued to *Subscribers only*, bound in cloth, at THREE GUINEAS per copy.

Orders for copies must be accompanied with a post-office order for TEN SHILLINGS; the remaining part of the subscription to be paid on the volumes being ready for delivery, which, it is expected, will be during the autumn of the present year.

II.

CHEAP AND UNIFORM EDITION

OF

THE WORKS OF THE REV. EDWARD BICKERSTETH.

In SIXTEEN Volumes, Foolscap 8vo., containing on an average, about 300 pages in each.

The following being the Permanent Works of Mr. Bickersteth, will form the series:—

CHRISTIAN TRUTH; a Family Guide to the Chief Truths of the Gospel.

The CHRISTIAN STUDENT; Designed to assist Christians in general in acquiring Religious Knowledge.

A SCRIPTURE HELP; Designed to assist in reading the Bible Profitably.

A TREATISE on the LORD'S SUPPER. In two Parts.

A TREATISE ON PRAYER; Designed to promote the Spirit of Devotion.

The CHIEF CONCERNS OF MAN for Time and for Eternity.

FAMILY EXPOSITIONS of the EPISTLES OF ST. JOHN and ST. JUDE.

The CHRISTIAN HEARER; a Treatise on Hearing the Word.

FAMILY PRAYERS. A complete course for Eight Weeks: With Additional Prayers, suited to Various Occasions.

The SIGNS of the TIMES in the EAST; a Warning to the West.

The PROMISED GLORY of the CHURCH OF CHRIST.

The RESTORATION of the JEWS to THEIR OWN LAND; in connection with their future Conversion, and the final Blessedness of our Earth.

A PRACTICAL GUIDE to the PROPHECIES.

A TREATISE on BAPTISM: Designed as a help to the due improvement of that Holy Sacrament.

The DIVINE WARNING to the CHURCH, at this time, of our Enemies, dangers and duties, and as to our future prospects.

While the cost of Mr. Bickersteth's Works hitherto has been upwards of FOUR POUNDS, the above *uniform* Edition will be only FORTY SHILLINGS.

The issue of the Work, *to Subscribers only*, will be made half-yearly. The first delivery, of Four Volumes, will commence in June, and the whole will be completed in the autumn of 1853. For each issue of Four Volumes the Subscriber to pay TEN Shillings; but the separate Works cannot be sold, apart from the Set, at this exceedingly low price.

III.

POOLE'S ANNOTATIONS ON THE HOLY BIBLE.

THREE VOLS., IMPERIAL OCTAVO.

An edition equal to that now on sale at £3 3s.

Offered to SUBSCRIBERS ONLY till the 1st of May, at ONE GUINEA AND A HALF.

The work will be published early in June, bound strongly in extra purple cloth.

*** Subscribers are requested to forward their names to W. CURRY & Co., *immediately*, as the term of Subscription is now very limited.

WORKS SOLD

BY

WILLIAM CURRY & CO.

THE ROYAL PREACHER: Lectures on Ecclesiastes. By Rev. James Hamilton, D.D. 5s.

Memoir of the Rev. Edward Bickersteth. By the Rev. T. R. Birks. Second edition. 2 vols., 8vo. 16s.

Memoir of the Rev. Thomas Chalmers, D.D. By the Rev. William Hanna, D.D. Vols. I., II. III. Crown 8vo. Each 10s. 6d. (Vol. IV., completing the memoir, will be published shortly.)

Horæ Apocalypticæ: an Exposition of the Apocalypse. By the Rev. E. B. Elliott. 4 vols. 8vo. Fourth Edition. £2 14s.

The Expository Preacher: or, St. Matthew's Gospel Practically Expounded. By the Rev. C. Overton. 2 vols. 8vo. 15s.

Commentary on the New Testament. By the Rev. W. Dalton. 2 vols. 8vo. 24s.

Commentary on Leviticus, Expository and Practical. By the Rev. A. Bonar. New Edition. 8vo. 8s. 6d.

Light in the Dwelling: A Harmony of The Four Gospels. By the Author of "The Peep of Day." 8s.

Memoir of the late Rev. W. H. Hewitson. By the Rev. John Baillie. Crown 8vo. 5s.

Memoir of the Rev. H. W. Fox, and account of Mission in India. Third Edition. 7s. 6d.

Roberts' Plain Sermons for all the Sundays and Chief Holidays of the Year. 2 vols. 10s. 6d.

——— Village Sermons. Vols. 1 and 2, each 2s. 6d.

Blunt's Posthumous Sermons. 3 vols., each 6s.

*** All his other works may still be had.

Eight Sermons on the Nature of Faith in Christ Jesus, as Protective against Doctrinal Errors. By Rev. E. B. Moeran. Foolscap. 3s. 6d.

Rev. H. B. Blacker's Tracts—Imprecatory Passages in the Psalms. 4d. Christian Joy. 1d. Christ the only Mediator. 1d. Perfect Peace. 2d. The Prophet Jonah. 1d. Omnipresence of God. 1d. Solomon's Bride. 2d. What think ye of Christ? 1d. Ministerial Counsel. 1d. Do thyself no harm. 1d. Are we thankful? 1d.

Just Published, in Fcap., 8vo. cloth, Price 2s. 6d.

With Frontispiece and Vignette,

THE RECTORY OF GLENMURRAGH,

A TALE,

By the Daughter of a Deceased Prelate.

Dublin: SAMUEL B. OLDHAM. London: SEELEY'S, Fleet-street, and to be had of all Booksellers.

104, GRAFTON-STREET, DUBLIN.

April 16, 1852.

MESSRS. HODGES AND SMITH'S

LIST OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

I.

The Bishop of Ossory.

A CHARGE delivered to the Clergy of the United Dioceses of Ossory, Ferns, and Leighlin, in Sept., 1851, by JAMES THOMAS O'BRIEN, D.D., Lord Bishop of Ossory, Ferns, and Leighlin, 8vo., pp. 256. 4s. 6d.

II.

Rev. Thomas Knox.

REFECTIONS AND SHADOWS: a Book for the New Year. By the Rev. THOMAS KNOX, A.M., Vicar of Shankill, and Chaplain to the Bishop of Down. *Fifth Thousand.* 1s. 6d.

III.

Rev. J. H. Todd, D.D.

WYCLIFFE'S THREE TREATISES on the CHURCH. Now first edited and printed from a MS. in the Library of the University of Dublin. By the Rev. J. H. TODD., D.D., S.F.T.C.D. Square 16mo. Antique binding. 7s. 6d.

"The notes to this rare and valuable work are, in many instances, curious and interesting. It embodies his treatises on the Church, not hitherto published, and is printed in black letter, and bound in antique style."—*Kitto's Journal of Sacred Literature.*

IV.

Dr. Murray.

LOCKE'S ESSAY on the HUMAN UNDERSTANDING, abridged for Collegiate and General Use; with a Preface, a Preliminary Outline of the Plan of Locke's Work, and Notes. By JOHN MURRAY, A.M., LL.D., some time Scholar of Trinity College, Dublin. Part I. Fcap. sewed, 3s.

[Part II. *in the press.*

V.

Dr. Ellis.

IRISH ETHNOLOGY, Socially and Politically considered, embracing a General Outline of the Celtic and Saxon Races; with Practical Inferences. By GEORGE ELLIS, M.B., T.C.D. 3s. 6d.

"A clever and philosophical treatise upon a question of the profoundest speculative interest, and, moreover, of large practical importance"—*Warder.*

VI.

Rev. W. J. Thornhill.

CONFIRMATION, as Administered in the Dioceses of Dublin and Kildare. By the Rev. W. J. THORNHILL, Perpetual Curate of Redcross, Rathdrum. Sewed, 3d.

VII.

Rev. A. Irwin.

REPORT of a JUDGMENT delivered in the Consistorial and Metropolitical Court of Armagh, in the Case of Stewart *v.* Crommelin, Feb. 10, 1852. By the Rev. ALEXANDER IRWIN, A.M., Surrogate of the Diocess of Armagh. 8vo. 1s.

VIII.

Rev. Dr. Whitley.

THE LIFE EVERLASTING; or, the Holy Life, the Intermediate Life, and the Final or Consummate Life. By JOHN WHITLEY, D.D., Vice-chancellor of Killaloe. 1 vol. royal 8vo., 12s.

IX.

Rev. H. Verschoyle.

THE BOND OF PERFECTNESS, as Illustrated and Explained in the Thirteenth Chapter of First Corinthians. By the Rev. HAMILTON VERSCHOYLE, A.M., Fcap., cloth, 4s.

"Mr. Verschoyle has, in a clear and comprehensive commentary, remarkable alike for the power and beauty of its composition, achieved a result by no means easy of attainment. He has amplified the Apostle's arguments without impairing their completeness, and has illustrated the Apostle's arguments without weakening their force."—*Christian Examiner.*

X.

Profeasor Mulcahy.

PRINCIPLES of MODERN GEOMETRY; with numerous applications to Plane and Spherical Figures, and an Appendix, containing Questions for Exercise. By JOHN MULCAHY, LL.D., Professor of Mathematics, Queen's College, Galway. 8vo. cloth, 9s.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON, and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher, WILLIAM CURRY, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.
Thursday, April 15, 1852.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Sloṁ do Dhia aṁ ṗna háṗonuiḃ, agus ṗíoḋċáin air an dtalaṁ deagḋoil do na dáoinib.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. I.—No. 5. MAY, 1852. Annual Subscription, 3s. 6d. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
The Hope of the Christian	49
Prayers for the Dead	49
Hints to the Wise	50
The Talk of the Road—No. IV.	50
Search the Scriptures	51
Conversion of Rev. Richard Wall, R.C.C.	52
The Rival Archbishops	52
The Miracles of Rimini	54
The Touchstone	55
CORRESPONDENCE:	
Rev. R. A. Wilson and Rev. W. Carson on the Real Presence	56
On St. Augustine's Prayer for his Mother	58
Farming Operations for May	59

THE HOPE OF THE CHRISTIAN.

SPRING is the season of hope and promise, when the joyous year has just burst from the bands of winter, and entered on a new course of fruitfulness, and a fresh dispensation of the rich bounties of the God of providence and grace—

> "When the gay troops of woodland choristers begin,
> In joyous thought, to plume the painted wing;
> And try again the long-forgotten strain,
> In music unconfined."

On a bright day, in the early part of April, we had been sauntering through the beautiful gardens at Glasnevin, enjoying, with the songsters of the air, the glad promise of every opening flower and budding tree, and the refreshing shade of new spring leaves, and enjoying, besides, a pleasure in which they, perhaps, could not participate—the mirth and laughter of the little parties of children who played upon the green slopes that lead to its tiny river and rustic bridge. As we left this scene, refreshed and gladdened, we returned by the avenue of stately yew trees, which is one of the ornaments and celebrities of these classic grounds. They are called Addison's Yews, and, in their younger days, gave their shelter to Swift, and Steele, and Parnell, and Addison, when they visited the poet, Tickell, once the proprietor of the place. They are sacred to the memory of departed genius, wit, and fancy, and possess a deep interest to the mind of every reader of national literature. As we traversed this avenue, we came to a boundary wall—a low wall, covered with ivy, and surmounted with lofty iron railings, which divides the paradise of flowers from the city of the dead, and reveals to view the long lines of headstones in a thickly-peopled cemetery. Frequently as we have passed the spot, it ever comes upon us with a fresh surprise, a sudden unexpected change—we will not say, an unwelcome intrusion.

On the present occasion, though neither the time nor the season, nor our own frame of mind, were suitable to the mood of melancholy, but rather to the buoyancy of hope, the view that was opened to us was anything but disagreeable. The place had lately become invested with a new and deep interest in our mind—it contained the earthly remains of a dear Roman Catholic friend; and instead of turning from it with the intuitive distaste with which the child of pleasure and the man of the world turns from the funeral procession that meets him in the streets, and obtrusively tells him, "prepare to meet thy God," or with the pang of despair that wrings the heart of an anxious survivor, as he sees the grave close over the body of an impenitent sinner; we could rather look, with a sober complacency, upon the spot where lay the earthly tabernacle of one whose spirit, we believed to be at rest, and in the bosom of Jesus. Born and educated in the faith of Romanism, and never, perhaps, fully awakened to its errors or deadening tendencies, and too gentle for the field of controversy, her mind shrunk with an instinctive knowledge, or rather, a knowledge imparted by the unerring teaching of the Spirit of God, from placing her dependance upon any but Jesus. She would offer no prayers to saints or angels, nor, under the pretence of venerating, would she worship or adore them; and in her last illness, which overtook her in early life, her declared hope was in Christ crucified, and in him alone; and all her virtues, and her merits, and her ceaseless charities, were, in her eyes, but as filthy rags, sinful and vile, unless as accepted in Jesus.

We immediately left the gay gardens and made our way over to the graveyard, and wandered through its labyrinth of tombs and monuments, till we reached the place underneath which were buried the earthly remains of our departed friend. As we passed along we met at every step the *Agnus Dei*, the representation of the Lamb of God, and the appropriate motto or legend with which the monumental tablets were surmounted—*Requiescat in pace*. It was indeed in no spirit of controversy or disputation that the solemn reflection suggested itself to our mind, in the midst of ten thousands of the dead, and standing over the grave of a beloved Roman Catholic friend—what is the peace which our Roman Catholic friends are led to hope for? What is the rest which their church leads them to expect? Can it be that after the Almighty God has forgiven every sin ever committed by us as to the eternal punishment, a temporal punishment yet remains to be inflicted, which the blood of Christ has not washed and cannot wash out, but the prayers and suffrages of the faithful on earth can accomplish the remittance of? And that after the eternal punishment has been done away with, we are to be purified in long suffering, and, like the wandering spirits of the heathen poet Virgil, to be

> "Purged in fires
> "Till all the dregs are drained, and all the rust expires."

Is this the rest and the peace which the Christian church reveals to the departing servants of Christ? Is this the sleeping in Jesus in respect of which the Apostle Paul, in 1 Thess. iv. 12 and 13 (Douay Bible), desires the Thessalonians not to be sorrowful as others? or can this be the blessedness of those whom the voice from heaven (in the Apocalypse of St. John xiv. 13), desired the Evangelist to write of, "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord. From henceforth now saith the spirit, that they may *rest* from their labours, for their works follow them." Is purgatory this rest? Or was this the hope of St. Paul, when he says (2 Cor., v. 1), "For we know if our earthly house of this habitation be dissolved, that we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal *in heaven*?" Did Paul expect that on the dissolution of his earthly body, or that of his Corinthian brethren, he or they should be consigned to the fires of purgatory? Was this his confidence, as expressed in the same passage (8th verse), when he says, "But we are confident, and have a good-will to be absent rather from the body, and *to be present with the* Lord?" Was purgatory the presence of the Lord?

This surely was not the hope held forth by our blessed Lord to the dying thief on the cross, who, a moment before, had joined with the other in railing at him. The expiring thief cried to him, "Lord, remember me when thou shalt come into thy kingdom. And Jesus said to him, Amen, I say to thee, this day thou shalt be with me in Paradise" (Luke, xxiii., 42, 43.) Nor was this the prospect which the first martyr of the church, Stephen, had visibly before his eyes, when, looking up steadfastly to heaven, he saw the glory of God and Jesus standing on the right hand of God, and said, "Behold I see the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God," and with his expiring accents, he cried, "*Lord Jesus, receive my spirit.*" There was nothing of purgatory there, nor when Paul was declaring the time of his own dissolution to be at hand, did he take such a miserable dishonouring view of the mercy of God, and the sufficiency of the atoning blood of Christ. He cries, "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; as to the rest, there is laid up for me a crown of justice, which the Lord, the just judge, will render me in that day." But, it may be said, Paul was an eminent servant and martyr, and this glorious hope was not the common privilege of the humbler members of the Christian Church. But hear St. Paul himself in the concluding words of the passage—"*And not only to me but to them also that love his coming.*" So that it is a crown of justice which the Christian who loves the Lord's coming is privileged to look for, and not the fires of purgatory or hell. And why? Because *the blood of Christ cleanseth* FROM ALL SIN (1 John i. 7), and because, as St. Paul says, Romans v. 1, "Being justified therefore by faith, let us have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ;" and in 8th chapter, v. 1, "There is now therefore no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, who walk not according to the flesh."

Some of these texts suggested themselves to our mind, or, we confess, our reflections would have been mournful; we never could have thought the doctrine of purgatory anything but a cold consolation to the bereaved friend, and disparaging to the stupendous work of redemption; but having a better hope for our dear, departed friend who fell asleep in Jesus, we could joyfully enter into the spirit of the prayer of thanksgiving which the burial service of the Church of England puts into the mouth of the assembled mourners, when they return thanks to Almighty God, "for that it hath pleased him to deliver this, our dear sister, out of the miseries of this sinful world;" and in another service, when we bless God's holy name for "all his servants departed this life in his faith and fear."

We shall return to this most interesting subject again.

PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD.

WE undertook, in our last number, to show that the practice of praying for the dead, which we admit to have been very early practised in the ancient Church, offered no sufficient ground to support the doctrine now held by the Church of Rome on the subject of purgatory. It is, no doubt, true that the doctrine of purgatory includes the practice of praying for the dead; but it is quite another and different question, whether the ancient practice of prayers for the dead necessarily included or implied the existence of purgatory. To that question we shall now apply ourselves in all sincerity, and, we trust, with an ardent desire to arrive at truth, and lead others into it.

The first question is—for whom were those prayers used in the first three centuries, and what was the character of them? If we find them used for the pious and holy men whose souls, according to the belief of the universal Church, were then in heaven or paradise, such prayers obviously do not imply the existence of purgatory, and we must look for some other object in praying for the dead than a delivery of their souls from a state of suffering in any such place. It may be difficult to assign any one reason as the exclusive foundation of a practice which was not clearly referable to the Holy Scriptures; but several may be assigned, all of which seem to have conspired to foster such prayers, long before the period at which the doctrine of purgatory was generally believed, much less formally adopted by the Church. We shall refer to those reasons presently; but first inquire, whether the prayers of the pious living were, as at present, offered up for the relief or delivery of souls requiring to be cleansed in purgatory by suffering the temporal punishment due to their sins committed in their life, or whether the spirits of the blessed (who never were supposed to pass through purgatory) were also the subject of them. Upon this question there is conclusive and most satisfactory proof in the ancient liturgies of the Church, nearly all of which pray for the holy fathers, and orthodox bishops that are dead, as well as all others who had departed this life in their communion. The Liturgies of Alexandria, of Constantinople, of Theodorus, Nestorius, St. Basil, St. Gregory, and St. Cyril, all pray for the faithful dead, and especially those of the *sacerdotal* order; while that of the Church of Egypt ascribed to St. Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, and Cyril of Alexandria, and that of the Church of Constantinople, said to be St. Chrysostom's, include the Holy Fathers, the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, confessors, evangelists, and all the souls of the just who have died in the faith, especially *the ever blessed Virgin Mary*, St. John the Baptist, St. Stephen the first martyr, &c., &c. Now no one can affirm that praying for any of these and that they were centuries after their deaths in purgatory; and we must look for some other cause for mentioning them in those prayers. To explain this, it will be necessary to state, that, in the early ages, many different opinions were

held by holy men, which all conspired to encourage the practice of such prayers, but none of which opinions were ever adopted into the church and do not afford any foundation at the present day for continuing such a practice. First, some believed that all the dead in Christ would revive within the compass of a thousand years, some sooner, others later, according as they had lived better or worse lives on earth, and such persons indulged the hope that, by their prayers, they might hasten the felicity of their friends, and accordingly prayed for their speedy rising in Christ's kingdom. Others supposed that in the general conflagration of the world at the last day, all men should pass through the fire, but the better Christian any one had been, the less he would feel the torment of it, and these prayed for the dead that God would have mercy on them in that day, and not suffer them to be burnt, (not in the fire of purgatory) but in the final conflagration at the end of the world. Others believed that the souls of just persons departed went not straight to heaven, but were reserved in a certain place, where they earnestly expected, and continually wished for their absolute consummation with all the faithful in Christ's kingdom, and these prayed that God would give them ease, repose, and refreshment in the bosom of Abraham, that they might be comforted with the blessed company of the holy angels and the vision of our Saviour Christ, till the so-much-wished-for day of judgment should come. Others might be added, some of them fanciful enough; but as the question is not whether the practice of praying for the dead is either innocent, laudable, or availing, but whether it necessarily involves a belief in such a state of suffering, as purgatory is represented to be, we shall not occupy the time of our readers by a repetition of them. The Church of Rome has, long since, discontinued all such prayers for the saints and martyrs, and substituted prayers and invocations *to* them in lieu of prayers *for* them. As an example, we may mention St. Leo, whom we referred to in our last number. In the ancient missals, the church prayed for the soul of St. Leo, which, at a later period, was changed into a prayer to God, by the intercession of St. Leo, in behalf of themselves; thus, by their new doctrine making him an intercessor for us, who, by the old doctrine, was supposed to need our prayers to intercede for him. Will any one say that St. Leo the Great was in purgatory during the former period, and that it was only on his escape from thence that he became an intercessor? If not, the conclusion is plain, that praying for the dead, according to the notions of the ancient fathers, did not imply the existence of any such place as purgatory. And, however *ancient* such practices may have been, they, so far at least, must be admitted to be also *antiquated* and obsolete, according to the modern doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome. Those who follow the views of Dr. Newman will, doubtless, say, that the true doctrine of purgatory was not then *developed*—but those who, in a more orthodox manner, base their creed on primitive traditions, alleged to have been handed down from the times of the apostles themselves, will be obliged to look for some better proof of an universal belief in purgatory, in primitive times, than the practice of praying for the sainted dead in the second and third centuries. We believe that some few instances may be found in the writings of the early fathers, which afford some reason to think that they *hoped* some good might even be done to departed sinners by the prayers and oblations of the survivors; but, they are generally put forward rather argumentatively and as expressing a *pious hope* (which some even extended to those suffering the pains of hell), than as a settled tenet or doctrine of the Catholic Church, that such prayers *did* avail to relieving the departed from suffering, much less to relieving or removing them from such a place as the purgatory now received in the Church of Rome.* They appear to have amounted at most to prayers, that God would forgive them their sins, accompanied by the *hope* that they *might* impart *some* consolation and comfort to them, small though it might be; and St. Gregory himself (who at a later period gave countenance to the doctrine of purgatorial fire, as we have already stated, and who did not die till A.D. 604), teaches expressly that "this is to be believed possible only so far as little (nay the least) sins, such as *constant idle speaking, immoderate laughter*, or too great anxiety about private affairs, or in *non-essential* matters, *the error of ignorance*."† If prayers or masses for the dead were now supposed to go no further than the remission of such sins as those, we do not conceive any great confidence would be placed in them, nor any sufficient inducement to purchase these priestly offices at so large a sacrifice as is often made to obtain them. Were we to venture a speculation upon a subject so difficult as that of tracing the origin and progress of what we deem a metaphysical and theological error, we should, perhaps, say, that the practice of commemorating or praying for the faithful dead, in the course of time, led pious men into praying for sinners also, in the hope, rather than the *belief*, that some sins *might* possibly be remitted after death, and that at last by degrees the notion of purgatory arose; so that it would be more correct to say the doctrine of purgatory arose out of the practice of praying for the dead, than that prayers for the dead were founded on or originated out of the doctrine of purgatory. We do not find any of the Fathers of the first four centuries asserting that there is such a place as purgatory, much less stating that they possessed any *tradition* as to it not to be found in the written Word of God; and we beg the intelligent reader to observe, that we do not contend that the question is to be decided by the private opinions of the Fathers, or any of them, but that we refer to the Fathers merely as faithworthy witnesses of high character, of what was held and believed in their times or those preceding them. Where they refer to any tradition, we are willing to credit that such a tradition then prevailed, but their mere reasonings or opinions we must be allowed to take, just as Cardinal Bellarmine and other Roman Catholic writers take them, as the reasonings and opinions of good and learned but fallible men, who not unfrequently differed considerably from one another, more especially in the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures, to which, in the earliest ages they were constantly, if not exclusively, recurring as an authority. An instructive example may be found in the dialogues of St. Gregory the Great, already referred to, in which he bases his defence of the doctrine of purgatory not on ancient tradition, but on a construction of the passage in Matt., xii., 31, 32, wherein it is said that blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven either in this world, nor in the world to come—from which he deduces (we think erroneously), that there are some lighter sins which may be forgiven in the world to come. Had he known of an universal tradition handed down from the Apostles, is it possible that he could have omitted to refer to it as a well-established ancient doctrine, instead of trying to account for it as a new discovery, only disclosed then because the world was near its close?

* Thus St. Cyril, of Jerusalem, says—"I know there are *many* who say, what good can it do to a soul which is departed out of this life, whether with sins or without them, to be remembered in this sacrifice? But tell me, I pray you, if a king had sent into banishment some persons that had offended him, and their friends should present him with a crown of great price to appease his anger, might not the king, on that account, show some favour to the guilty persons? So do we address our prayers to God for them who are dead, though they were sinners, not by presenting to him a crown, but by offering up to him Christ, who was sacrificed for our sins, propitiating him who is so merciful *for them* and *for us*." St. Cyril died A.D. 386.—Catechesis Mystagog V. p. 228. Paris.

† Sanct. Greg. Papæ I., opera, Paris, 1706, tom II., p. 442. Dial. Lib. iv., cap. 39.—

"Ex quibus sententiis constat quia qualis hinc quisque egreditur talis in judicio præsentatur. Sed tamen de quibusdam levibus culpis esse ante judicium purgatorius ignis credendus est, pro eo quod veritas dicit, quia si quis in Sancto Spiritu blasphemiam dixerit, neque in hoc seculo remittetur ei, neque in futuro. In qua sententia datur intelligi, quasdam culpas in hoc seculo, quasdam vero in futuro posse laxari. Quod enim de una negatur, consequens intellectus patet, quia de quibusdam conceditur. Sed tamen ut prædixi, hoc de *parvis minimisque peccatis* fieri posse credendum est, sicut est, otiosus sermo, immoderatus risus, vel peccatum curæ rei familiaris, quæ vix sine culpa vel ab ipsis agitur, qui culpam qualiter declinare debeant sciunt; aut in non gravibus rebus error ignorantiæ, quæ cuncta etiam post mortem gravant si adhuc in hac vita positis minime fuerint relaxata. Hoc tamen sciendum est, quia illic saltem de *minimis* nihil quisque purgationis obtinebit nisi bonis hoc actibus in hac adhuc vita positus ut illic obtineat, promereatur."

HINTS TO THE WISE.

"Our fathers believed it, our priests believe it, a great many of our neighbours believe it, and therefore, if I believe it, I cannot be far astray."

This is a very common mode of thinking and speaking, but undeserving of the name of argument. It strikes at the root of all inquiry after truth. The beaten track is followed because it *is* beaten, though there might be many shorter and safer pathways up the mountain or across the moorland. The man enters the emigrant vessel because he sees others of his countrymen enter it, and they go in because they see him going in; and thus, without examining whether or not their ship be sea-worthy, they huddle in, not knowing whether her timbers are water-tight or unsound. But surely this is not the course that prudence would point out. The careful, diligent, active man, who is about to bring his family on board, and has a concern for the safety of his own life, will naturally look at the ship outside and examine her within, and get every information he can as to her character, ascertain if the captain be skilful and supplied with the best charts, and all other means necessary to secure a safe voyage, if it were for no other purpose than merely to satisfy his own mind that all is right. But he that takes his berth because others do so, and, when a storm is near, feels no anxiety, because his captain is on board, and many others have confided their lives to his supposed skill as well as he, should well consider that others may have embarked as rashly as himself, and that the captain having become fool-hardy *from usage to the sea*, may have run great risks for the sake of gain, or (as human passions lead men on to great blindness) for the sake of victory, should there happen to be a rivalry between his and another ship.

If men had shut their eyes on all inquiry after human knowledge, as too many Catholic laymen, we fear, have done in the case of Divine knowledge, in what a wretched plight would our world be placed? The darkness of the middle ages would be ten-fold thicker, on account of the successive incrustations of ignorance; for it is a truism, that in nature there is nothing stationary. We must either progress or retrograde. Where now would be the thousands of improvements in almost every science? It were endless to name them. The noble science of astronomy will be a sufficient illustration. For many centuries the *Ptolemaic* system was in *catholic* estimation: if men had reasoned respecting this, or rather surrendered their rights and powers of reason, as too many Roman Catholics do respecting the science of theology, where would our present knowledge of the greatness of God's universe be? Let the persecutors of Galileo answer.

But to try the matter in a simple case. Suppose a number of people to be on an island, detached from all communication with the rest of the world, and that an opinion prevailed among them that they were the only people in the earth. Suppose this opinion handed down from father to son, and in no danger of being corrupted by reason of a law, and that a stringent one, that no boat or ship should be built; so that the inhabitants are unable to put off from their island to discover whether or not there be other nations or other islands more blessed and favoured than their own. In such a case suspicions might arise in the minds of some who found pieces of foreign timber cast upon their shore, but still they must stifle such notions, for the law would tell them, and tradition confirm it, that there is no other land but theirs, and that they must not venture from the shore, or they would be inevitably lost amid the world of waters. Who can doubt that many would believe it, either through a slavish deference to the law, though based on the ignorance of its founders, or from a superstitious fear of drifting away on a shoreless ocean. And though some daring Columbus now and then should succeed in evading the coast-guard, and reach some glorious continent over the waves, no doubt still the authorities would try to persuade the poor people that such have miserably perished, and that their letters, conveyed back to their ignorant friends, were mere cheats and tricks of enemies wishing to allure some of the simple people to a similar fate. Is there nothing like this among ourselves? Let those who prefer light, and knowledge, and freedom, to darkness, ignorance, and slavery, answer.

THE TALK OF THE ROAD—NO. IV.

WELL, Father John did not curse Jem after all; at least, not this time. Maybe Father John thought it hard to take the bit out of the mouths of Jem's children; or maybe there were too many to be cursed; or maybe Father John had read the first number of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, and saw what came of the priest cursing the miller.

But Pat and Jem did not know yet that the curse was not going to be now, and so it happened, the next day, when they sat down to dinner under the thorn bush, they began to talk of it.

"And what made him so angry, entirely?" said Pat. "Sure we only wanted him to set us right; and if he would only take the trouble to teach us what is right, sure we would be willing to be taught by him, and give him every respect. And sure if we just went on as we used to do, and never offered to learn anything at all about God, or the Bible, or the Saviour of sinners, we would never get a cross word from him no more than some of the boys that thinks no more about religion than the horses and cows does; and yet Father John has nothing but a pleasant word for them; and I never see him get cross, entirely, till it's the Bible that's in it; and what's the reason he was so angry?"

"Indeed," said Jem, "that's what I'm thinking of all day; and there's something in it that's not right; for ask him what I will out of the Bible to get him to explain it to me, or set me right, its not about that thing he'll speak in his answer at all; just as if he did'nt care how far I went astray in it: but it's always the one answer he has, 'it's reading the Bible you are,' says he; that's his cry; as if the very name of it angered him so that he could not teach us anything out of it at all."

"And maybe that's just near the truth," said Pat. "Maybe it's little he knows it himself, and he's afraid to take on him to teach it."

"Well, I'd think that too," said Jem, "*only that he gets so angry about it*. For when I see that look in his face, when he hears of the Bible, it is'nt like as if he did'nt know it at all himself; its a deal liker as if he knew it too well, and that it would'nt be on his side; and sure its *that* that *would* make him angry in earnest, and nothing else that I can see."

By this time Jem was near the end of his dinner, for it was little that day, poor fellow, for he had the wife and eight children at home; and he was just going to peel his last potato, and little enough it was to keep him till night at his work, when his little son, Billy, (just four years old), comes running up the path, with his bright hair blowing in the wind, as pretty as you could see.

"Oh, what *will* I do with the childer at all, when Father John curses me?" says Jem. And with that Billy runs up to him crying, "Oh, daddy, daddy, gimme a praty."

"Be off out of that, you young thief," says Pat, "and don't be taking the dinner out of your daddy's mouth."

"Easy, Pat," says Jem, "sure if it was the last praty I had in the world, or if I'd never eat a praty again,

the darling would get it. Sure its not one of them stones off the field I would be giving him."

And so Jem took Billy on his knee, and gave him the potato.

"Well, if that does'nt beat all," says Pat; "if them is'nt a'most the very words of Jesus Christ himself!"

"What words at all?" said Jem, quite surprised at what Pat said.

"What you said about the stone," said Pat. "Sure I read it in the Douay Bible on Sunday, the purtiest words that ever I saw in the book."

"And what were they at all?" said Jem.

"Why, I haven't just got the words," said Pat, "but I could'nt get the story out of my head, if I tried. Why, Jesus Christ himself was talking to all the people* about him, and teaching them the quietest and plainest way ever you heard. You would think it was the sweetest and quietest voice that ever spoke, to read them words. And says he to all the people that was there, 'is there any one of you at all,' says he, 'standing there, and if one of his little children would come and ask him for a bit of bread, is it a stone that you'd give him?' 'And if the likes of you," says he, "bad as you are, has that heart to your children, what must your Heavenly Father be to them that comes to ask of him? Will he be any worse than you?' Well, when I saw you give the last praty, Jem, to the poor child that I was hunting off you, it just came into my heart; well, now, is that the way our Heavenly Father will do to one of us when we go to ask of him?"

"Well," said Jem, "if them words does'nt teach me more about God than ever I knew before, or ever I learned from Father John; and sure that *must* be true, surely God *could'nt* be crosser or worse in himself to me, than the like of me is to the child, but a thousand times better. Sure, if that is not a thought to make us pray to him, and put our trust in him. I would rather hear them words after giving Billy the praty, than all the words that ever I heard. Surely it was the Saviour that knew how to speak to poor people, and to teach their very hearts."

"That's just it, Jem," said Pat; "and its *that* that is maklog me take to the Bible. Sure, I expected, the first day I read it, to find it all about transubstantiation, and Decalogues, and elephants,† and all kind of hard things that I don't understand, and that every word of it would be disputing and arguefying about everything, the way the Protestants and Catholics is always going on with each other; and that there wouldn't be anything in it, at all, for poor people like me; and, sure enough, I find a great deal that it is'nt easy for me to understand; but here and there I find some of the words of Jesus Christ himself, that's so plain and so loving, and that goes into my heart so easy and so sweet, that I can't help looking out for them words whenever I am reading; and I wouldn't believe Father John, nor the bishop, nor the Pope himself, that them words could do me any harm, or be anything but good for me; for, surely, Jesus Christ was fitter, than the most learned of them all, to give the right sort of teaching for poor and ignorant people; and if Father John would only take and copy some of that teaching out of the Bible, it would be a different way with us."

"Well, now, I'll trust in God, anyway, for the praties," said Jem, "and I am not afraid now of Father John, or his curse, not even when I look at Billy. Sure Father John told me to see what the Bible could do for me; and sure I see it now! to think now that I may go to my Heavenly Father, just the way that Billy came to me; sure that's more comfort than ever I had before this day."

"And its I that am glad that the words did you good, Jem," says Pat; "and that same will make me look for more words like them in the same book; and, indeed, I'm thinking its little we know about the book, till we come to see how it fits us in things like that. Them that is only disputing about it, I'm thinking, knows nothing of the good of it at all. I'm thinking now, there's hardly a thing that we poor people do that we won't find that Jesus Christ had some words to say about that very thing; and sure that's plain teaching for poor people, anyway. Why, as I was sitting at the door last Thursday evening, reading my book, and the children playing about, and they were on for hunting the young chickens in spite of the wife, and there was the old hen majoring about, and looking as big and as grand as if she was fit to pick the heads off them, and the children daren't go near the chickens at all with her; well if I didn't come in the very nick of time to a place in the book (and sure enough I have that marked) where Jesus Christ says he only wants to gather us together just the same as a hen gathers her chickens under her wings, to take care of us, the way she does ‡ Sure that's making the very birds teach us, and isn't that plain enough for anybody?"

"Well, Pat," says Jem, "you're teaching me the way to read; and thank you kindly for it; and that's the way I'll read, for I was thinking there was a deal I wasn't fit for, and no wonder, considering how little the clergy ever instructed us about it; and now I'll look for what fits me, and let Father John stop me if he can."

"Well, its that I take to it for," said Pat; "and I suppose there's something in the book for the learned, and something for us, and that everybody may get their share; and though I read a good bit betimes, without coming to what is just for the likes of me, yet when I get it, its worth the looking, and maybe God meant just that same, that we should'nt get it without looking for, no more than anybody will dig these praties without working for them first. And if its his will, that we should get our bit by working for it, and waiting for it, maybe its just the same too with our souls. Anyway I've got enough to make me go on; and, with God's blessing, I'll keep to the reading." And so the bell rung, and Billy ran home, and we must wait till next time.

* Sermon on the Mount. Gospel of St. Matthew vii. 9; and Gospel of St. Luke xi. 11.

† Maybe Pat meant elements.

‡ Gospel of St. Matthew, xxiii. 37.

SEARCH THE SCRIPTURES.

THE unavoidable length of the comments that we felt ourselves obliged to make in our last number, upon the important misrepresentations of our views contained in the letter of our respected correspondent, Mr. M. V. Aylmer, prevented us from then adding some observations which we think deserving of serious attention, upon the controverted passage to which he alluded from St. John v. 39, "Search the Scriptures, for you think in them to have life everlasting; and the same are they that giveth testimony of me."

That we may give fair play to Mr. Aylmer, whose letter we inserted at length in our March number, we now extract from his pamphlet the argument contained in it *verbatim*. After stating that, in objecting to making the Scriptures an ordinary schoolbook, and in expecting the sense rather from the lips of the priest, he does not put the priest above the Scriptures, but is only observing that order between them which exists between the law and the judge; not distrusting the Bible, but merely distrusting his own private interpretation of it, he proceeds thus (p. 15)*:—

"I must now advert to the text so often quoted by our adversaries, from the fifth chapter of St. John, thirty-ninth verse: 'Search the Scriptures, for you think in them to have life everlasting; and the same are they that giveth testimony of me.'

"This is a chapter of the New Testament, which, I assume from the frequent quotation of the thirty-ninth verse, is familiar to the minds of all Protestants; yet there are few parts of the Scriptures, probably, which Christian readers in general are less apt to apply to its proper use and signification. Take and read it from the first to the last verse—mark, learn, inwardly digest it—and tell me in the sincerity of your inmost souls, has not the whole discourse reference *exclusively* to the Jews, to whom it was specially addressed by our Saviour on one of their festival days, when he went up to Jerusalem? Moreover, 'the Scriptures' therein alluded to, could have been but the *Old* Testament, which was then alone extant.

"This very Gospel of St. John was not written for considerably upwards of half a century after our Lord's Ascension. St. Matthew wrote about six years after; St. Mark, ten years; St. Luke, twenty-four years; the Acts of the Apostles run over a period, and give an account of the Church, for the space of thirty years. The Apocalypse was written in the Island of Patmos, where St. John was in banishment, by order of the Emperor Domitian, about sixty-four years after our Saviour's time. The various Epistles of St. Paul were written at different periods, all subsequent to our Lord's time, as well as to distinct and different people—to the Romans, to the Corinthians, &c., &c. That text, therefore, 'Search the Scriptures,' has as much reference to the New Testament, which is the better portion of the Bible—in fact, the Christian dispensation—as it could be made to have to the telescope and the wondrous arrangements of the planetary system.

"The Jews were in the habit of reading their Testament, and were referred to it simply by our Lord for the testimony or proof of his divine mission, which it abundantly contained; that is obviously the true intent and meaning of the passage. To say by it that our Redeemer intended every man, woman, and child, in after time, to read and expound the Scriptures is, in my humble judgment, as preposterous from the context, as to insist we are invited, like Peter, to come to Christ upon the waters, as a manifestation of our faith in him (St. Matt. xiv. 28, 29). I challenge any biblical commentator in the United Kingdom to put any other meaning or interpretation on this fifth chapter of St. John, thirty-ninth verse, than that which I have explained; but, leaving controversy aside, your text is replete with spiritual life and instruction. Let us take care in what spirit, and with what dispositions *we* read and search the Scriptures. The Jews, to whom this sentence was tauntingly addressed by our Saviour, were everlastingly searching the Scriptures, thinking in them to have life eternal; but, alas! they found not the testimony of Him who is 'the way, and the truth, and the life.'—St. John xiv. 6. 'He came unto his own, and his own received him not.'"—St. John i. 11.

The text, John v. 39, can be shown, Mr. Aylmer says, in two ways, not to bear on the question in debate. For, first, it may be translated, "Ye search the Scriptures," and then it is wholly inapplicable; or, secondly, admitting it to be a command, "Search the Scriptures," yet it is quite as satisfactorily disposed of by the consideration that it was addressed *exclusively* to Jews, and had respect to the Old Testament, and consequently "has as much reference to the New Testament and the Christian dispensation, as it could be made to have to the telescope and the wondrous arrangements of the planetary system." First, then, let us suppose the right rendering to be, "Ye search the Scriptures"—does it follow from this that the text is wholly inapplicable to the question in hand? Before we can conclude this, we must first decide whether our Lord meant to speak of this Bible-reading of the Jews with approbation or disapprobation. If he spoke of it with approbation, as a right thing, then it is hard to see why we should not follow their example. Will it be said that he disapproved of the practice? Let us see what sense we can make of the text on this supposition. "Ye search the Scriptures, for you think in them to have life everlasting;" but I do not approve of your doing so, and I would not have my disciples imitate you, and the reason is, that "it is these same Scriptures that give testimony of me." A very singular reason this to give why their searching the Scriptures was not a thing to be commended or imitated! Perhaps, however, the second mode of getting rid of the text may be more successful. The text had reference to the Jews; therefore, it can have no reference to Christians. What we have already said is sufficient to show the weakness of this inference. If the thing spoken of were part of that ceremonial law which Christ came to abolish, the conclusion might be less objectionable. But if it be of a *moral nature*—and such, unquestionably, reading the Scriptures is—then we would infer exactly the contrary of that inferred by Mr. Aylmer. We see in it a duty incumbent on the members of God's Church at all times; we see in it a principle of the Divine administration. The Jews were commanded, in Deut. xi. 18—"Lay up these my words in your hearts and minds, and hang them for a sign on your hands, and place them between your eyes. Teach your children that they may meditate on them, when thou sittest in thy house, and when thou walkest on the way, and when thou liest down, and risest up." This command was constantly obeyed by God's faithful servants under the first dispensation. Thus David, in the 118th Psalm, says—"O how I love thy law, O Lord! it is my meditation all the day. Through thy commandment thou hast made me wiser than my enemies; for it is ever with me. I have understood more than all my teachers; because thy testimonies are my meditation." The Scriptures were not intrusted to the *priests*, to receive from their mouths an infallibly true interpretation, and by them to be given to the people, or to be withheld from them, at their discretion. No—they were intrusted to the people at large; and St. Paul reckons this among their chief privileges. He says, Rom. iii., 1, 2, "What advantage, then, hath the Jew, or what is the profit of circumcision? Much, every way. First, indeed, because the words of God were committed to them." But is it not written in Malachi ii., 7, "For the lips of the priest shall keep knowledge, and they shall seek the law at his mouth; because he is the angel (or messenger) of the Lord of Hosts?" Certainly—such was the duty of the priests; but the very next verse tells us how they discharged it: "But you have departed out of the way, and have caused many to stumble at the law; you have made void the covenant of Levi, saith the Lord of Hosts." And Jeremiah ii., 8, testifies to the same thing: "The priests did not say—Where is the Lord? and they that held the law knew me not, and the pastors transgressed against me, and the prophets prophesied in Baal, and followed idols."—Douay version. And, if such was the case with the Jewish priests, is it not to be feared that the same neglect of their duty and unfaithfulness to their trust, and perversion of God's law, may find place sometimes among Christian priests also? Indeed, the case of the Jews tells strongly against the Romish theory in many ways.

That theory, if it were true, would imply a complete change in the principles of the Divine administration, in passing from the Jewish to the Christian dispensation. The Scriptures, formerly free to all, would be so no longer; but would be put into the hands of the priests, that they might grant or refuse the use of them at their pleasure. The right and the duty of meditating on them, and seeking, by the exercise of their reason, accompanied with prayer to God for the illumination of his Spirit to discover the wondrous things written in his law, would no longer be accorded to the laity; but they would be required to believe that a thing is so, simply because a tribunal, claiming to be infallible, declares it is so. When we consider the freedom and spirituality of the Gospel dispensation, such a change as this will appear the more strange and inexplicable. And it is impossible to believe

* Speech of Michael Valentine Aylmer, Esq., at the Rotunda Religious Discussion Class, June 16, 1851. Bellew: 79, Grafton-street.

that such a change would have been introduced *without being formally and distinctly notified.* We shall anxiously look for Mr. Aylmer's views on this subject, but think we may safely challenge the priests of the Church of Rome to produce any such notification. The contrary is apparent on almost every page of the New Testament. The Scriptures were addressed to all, and were to be read by all. St. Paul says (1 Thess. v., 27), "I charge you by the Lord, that this epistle be read to all the holy brethren." There are constant appeals to men's reason and judgment. The Bereans are commended for searching the Scriptures to see whether what the Apostles alleged from them was correct, and their reasoning valid. But it is quite unnecessary to multiply proofs of this. We shall rather notice a text frequently adduced by Roman Catholics as a set-off against the preceding authorities. In 2 Peter, iii. 16, it is written, "in which (St. Paul's Epistles) are certain things hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, to their own destruction." St. Peter is supposed here to condemn the indiscriminate reading of the Scriptures; but he only condems those who *wrest* them to their own destruction. The *preached* word was liable to be wrested and abused no less than the *written* word. The preaching of it put the persons unto whom it was preached into a state of trial, and if, through their unbelief or unstableness, or hardness of heart, the result of this trial was unfavourable to them, placing them in a state of greater condemnation, and rendering their case more hopeless than it was before, neither God nor his apostles are to blame for that. Hence we read in 2 Corinthians ii. 15, 16, "For we are the good odour of Christ unto God in them that are saved and in them that perish. To the one indeed the odour of death unto death; but to the others the odour of life unto life." We shall hope to hear from Mr. Aylmer again, as the importance of the whole subject (we do not mean the discussion on the particular text, John v. 39, which we only introduced incidentally in our February number, in making some comments upon the *notes* to the Douay Bible), cannot be overrated, and we are desirous of knowing all that can be said upon it on both sides. In the meantime, we venture to repeat what we said in our last, "Where God has placed no restrictions, we think man has no right to impose limits or hindrances. The Scriptures were obviously written that they might be read, and if the gospel was preached to the poor, and the poor have souls to besaved, we think it self-evident that the gospel should be as much open to them, if able to read it, as to the most learned layman in the community." At the same time, we equally emphatically repeat Mr. Aylmer's words, "Let us take care in what spirit and with what dispositions *we* read and search the Scriptures," which we doubt not he will agree with us should be a teachable disposition and the spirit of prayer.

CONVERSION OF THE REV. R. WALL, R.C.C.

We (*Clonmel Chronicle*) are permitted, on the highest authority, to announce the conversion of the Rev. Richard Wall, late Roman Catholic curate of Seskinan, in this diocese. The reverend gentleman has forwarded the formal resignation of his cure to Dr. Foran, the Roman Catholic bishop of Waterford and Lismore. We have been favoured with a copy of that document—a highly interesting one, remarkable for the amount of Scriptural research displayed by the writer, as well as for its peculiar simplicity and earnestness of style.

"TO THE RIGHT REVEREND DR. FORAN, R.C. BISHOP OF WATERFORD AND LISMORE.

"Tournona, Ballinamult, Parish of Seskinan,
May 5, 1852.

"REVEREND SIR—By reading and meditating on God's Holy Word I have been led to ascertain that the Church of Rome does not direct souls in the way which the Holy Scriptures command, as being the only one that leads to salvation. I, therefore, now resign unto you my mission in the ministry of the Romish Church, which I no longer recognise as the Apostolic Church of Christ.

"Whenever a Roman Catholic clergyman thinks it wise and proper to inquire into the doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome, and when, after due examination and search, he finds them opposed to Scripture, reason, and common sense, and then separates himself from the errors of Rome, he is immediately cried down, and an attempt made to hunt him down by the priests of Rome. The usual cant is, 'He is noloss to us, he is no acquisition to the place he has gone to, he has other motives for changing his religion,' &c., &c. Calumnies, lies, and abuse of every kind are heaped upon him, the public press is enlisted in the attack, and his life is oftentimes in danger from the violence of individuals who become the dupes of a tyrannical priesthood. In like manner the chief priests and rulers of the synagogue cursed, abused, and persecuted the Apostles, and all who embraced the religion of Jesus Christ. But our Saviour says—'Blessed are ye when men shall revile and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you for my sake; rejoice and be exceeding glad, for great is your reward in heaven, for so they persecuted the prophets that were before you.'—Matthew v. 11, 12.

"Whenever any one presumes to differ from or doubt the doctrines or usages of the Church of Rome she lets loose her thunders, she sends forth her anathemas and excommunications against them. But such violent and summary measures are opposed to all principles of sound legislation, whose first efforts should be to convince the mind and the understanding.

"If the Church of Rome has truth at her side, she should enter the lists of fair argument, and show that what she teaches has been revealed and commanded by the Redeemer, and that she has not substituted her own inventions. But this she cannot do. Hence her usual attempt to fetter the thoughts and stop the mouths of all sincere inquirers after truth by thunder and fury, all signifying nothing.

"Whilst a Roman Catholic clergyman continues in the communion of the Church of Rome, whilst he connives at her open disregard of the Word of God, and the illusions which he witnesses every day, there is not one word said in dispraise of him—there is not the slightest imputation cast upon his character or motives; but when the satellites of Rome see that he abandons their errors, and there is danger of exposure, they then let fly all manner of abuse at him, thinking thereby to weaken the effects of his conversion. During a great part of the time I belonged to the ministry at Rome, I took all her doctrines and decrees (as most Roman Catholics do) as inspired from above. At last I began to entertain some doubts of the divinity of those doctrines, and wished to compare them with the Word of God, to see if they accorded therewith. In order to do this, I read the Scriptures over and over most attentively. It was the Douay Bible I used. I searched to see if they declared anywhere the Church of Rome, her popes, bishops, or priests to be infallible; to see if the Church of Rome was called in the Scriptures the Church of Christ; but the inspired word is silent on all these points. I searched the Scriptures to see if I could find the doctrine of transubstantiation, or the change of the elements of bread and wine into the flesh and blood of Christ, taught therein; but there is not a single text in the whole Bible proving such a change, nor saying that bread and wine, by pronouncing a few latin words, lose their substance or accidents. I sought to find if the doctrine of purgatory was authorized by revelation but so far from the existence of purgatory being proved; by any text in Scripture, the name of purgatory is not mentioned therein.

"I enquired if auricular confession, or confession into the ear of a priest, was anywhere commanded by our Saviour or enjoined by revelation, but could not find such a practice commanded or revealed therein.

"I inquired if the pretended celibacy of the priests of the Church of Rome was commanded by Christ, or revealed in Scripture, but could not find such a command given; but on the contrary, rules for the marriage of bishops and deacons laid down by St. Paul—1 Tim., chap. iii.

"I looked through the Scriptures to see if they sanctioned the worship of images and pictures, as enjoined and practised by the Church of Rome, but I found such worship strictly forbidden by the second commandment.—'Thou shalt not make unto thyself any graven thing,' &c. —Exodus, xx. 45.

"I sought to find if the sacred code anywhere commanded or sanctioned the invocation of saints and angels, as taught by the Church of Rome, but could not find such a practice anywhere revealed, 'as Christ is our only mediator.'—John xiv.

"I inquired if the Scriptures commanded or authorized the Church of Rome to withhold the Word of God from the laity. I found that the Bible, on the contrary, recommends the perusal of the Inspired Volume to all—'That the man of God may be perfect and furnished unto every good work.'—2 Timothy iii. 17.

"I read the Scriptures to see if absence from certain meats was commanded, but could not find any one command; on the contrary, St. Paul says—'Whatsoever is sold in the shambles eat, asking no question for conscience sake'—I Cor., chap xi., v. 25. 'For every creature of God is good, nothing to be rejected that is received with thanksgiving'—St. Paul, 1 Tim. iv. 4. 'For it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer'—verse 5.

"I searched the Scriptures to see if offering up masses or the elements of bread and wine for the souls in purgatory or for the living, as Romanists say, was commanded by the Redeemer. So far from the Scriptures authorizing such a practice, it directly prohibits it, 'know. that Christ rising again from the dead dieth now no more, death shall no more have dominion over him.'—St. Paul, Rom. vi. 9.

"In reading over the Word of God, I found justification by faith in Christ Jesus inculcated in numberless passages, which I shall give in full when writing on that question.

"I could nowhere find in the sacred writings the doctrine of supererogation as taught by the Church of Rome. For the Scripture says, 'When you have done all things that are commanded you, say we are unprofitable servants.' —Luke xvii. 10.

"Being satisfied that none of the above Romish doctrines and abuses were contained in the sacred writings (or revealed Word of God), I consulted and read over attentively several controversial works, to see what the ablest advocates of the Church of Rome had to say in her defence. Being now fully convinced of the unscriptural character of the doctrines of the Church of Rome, and that they were the mere inventions of an avaricious and crafty priesthood, I at once resolve to remain no longer within the pale or communion of such a corrupt church—to separate from her errors and abuses —lest I be a partaker of her abominations.

"I request all Roman Catholics, and particularly the Roman Catholic clergy, to read the Word of God, as it is in the Bible, attentively—to compare the practices of the Church of Rome with that sacred Word; and if they don't come to the same conclusion and conviction that I have, provided that they approach the subject with unprejudiced minds, and with dispositions prepared to yield to truth, I am egregiously mistaken.

"Prejudices of long standing are not easily removed without examination and inquiry. Roman Catholics, who are in the habit for a number of years of yielding up their judgments and understanding to the dictation of the priesthood, may think it difficult to leave those blind guides. But let them read the Word of God—let them search the Scriptures, and they will find that the Spirit of Truth will descend upon them, which will conduct them unto the bosom of the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Protestant Church of Christ, as by divine and human law established in these realms.

"When convinced of the errors of Rome, let them come forward manfully—let them act boldly—let them not be afraid of incurring the displeasure of friends or relations for embracing the religion of Jesus. God will assist them in the holy work—the law of the land will protect them—their temporal concerns will be bettered and improved, as they can devote therein the valuable time that is lost in going to hear masses daily, praying for souls in purgatory, worshipping images and pictures, invoking relics and saints, and such like trash instead of adoring and invoking the Redeemer, who is the only Mediator.

"We must all admit that idolatry is one of the greatest of crimes, for by it the worship due to the Creator is transferred to the creatures.

"On the priests, then, of the Church of Rome, &c., be the guilt of drawing down upon the whole nation the vengeance of Heaven, by inducing them daily at their masses (when they exhibit the elements of bread and wine for the worship of all present) to be guilty of this enormous crime.

"Let Roman Catholics—and you, reverend sir, among the number—exercise their judgments and senses in searching the Scriptures, and they will find what a heap of rubbish the Church of Rome has piled over the Word of God, thereby concealing it from the eyes of the children of the cross, for whose instruction and perfection in every good work it is recommended by St. Paul.

"Earnestly and fervently praying that the God of Truth may open your eyes and the eyes of all Roman Catholics, and make them wise unto salvation, as he most assuredly will if you read his sacred Word,

"I remain, with all good wishes, your humble adviser,

"RICHARD WALL,
"Late Priest of the Church of Rome.

"P.S.—To my many reasons for leaving the Church of Rome, I will add that of your Vicar-General, Doctor Burke, P.P. of Clonmel, declining to 'show reason of the faith that is in him.'—1 Peter iii. 15—when challenged lately by the Rev. D. Foley, of Clonmel, which clearly proves he is unable to defend those errors and superstitions he is practising himself and teaching others."

THE RIVAL ARCHBISHOPS.

WE promised to consider in this paper how Roman Catholic bishops in Ireland were appointed after the Reformation.

The first case that meets us after the reformation is a remarkable one: it is one which drives us to consider what sort of an appointment really makes a man the true Roman Catholic bishop of a See.

In the year 1537 the Irish parliament passed laws which abolished the power which the Pope had been so long gaining by little and little. They made no new law about the appointment of bishops, because, as we showed in our last paper, the old laws were sufficient to keep that from the Pope, if only those old laws were enforced: but they made laws which left the Pope no power or authority in the Irish Church. But no change was made then, or for fifteen years after, in the *doctrine* of the church, or in its worship.

The bishops of Leinster, Munster, and Connaught seem to have joined in abolishing the power of the Pope. But Primate Cromer and the bishops of Ulster still stood up for the Pope's power against those new laws. Thus things stood, until the year 1543 (that is, for six years). In that year Cromer died. George Dowdall, who had been prior of the monastery of St. John at Ardee, and who, at the time of Cromer's death, was Vicar-general of Armagh, was elected Archbishop by the Dean and Chapter of Armagh. He was consecrated by Staples, Bishop of Meath, and by the other bishops of the provinces of Armagh, the King having issued a mandate to them to do so. This George Dowdall was a

strict Roman Catholic in doctrine, and continued so all his life; but he thought that the Pope should not have the appointment to bishoprics in Ireland; and so he willingly accepted the primacy without asking the Pope's leave. We showed, in our last paper, that long before the Reformation, the Pope had often tried to set up bishops of his own making, in opposition to bishops made in Ireland: no wonder that he should try to do so now, when he seemed in danger of losing what he had so long been struggling to grasp. Accordingly, the Pope refused to acknowledge George Dowdall as Archbishop of Armagh, and took upon himself to appoint one Robert Waucop, a Scotchman, as primate of Ireland.

It was at a critical period that this happened. The Pope was just going to hold the Council of Trent; and the Pope was greatly at a loss for archbishops and bishops for the council. It may surprise those who hear such great things of the authority of that council, that at its first meeting in the year 1545, the Pope was only able to get together *two* archbishops and *twenty-two* bishops, out of the whole Catholic world; less than the number of bishops at that time in Ireland alone! and for several sessions after, it was little better. Now this seemed so shabby a collection for a general council of the whole Catholic Church, the Pope was glad to get anything to make it look a little larger; so he made Waucop Archbishop of Armagh, and he made another man Archbishop of Upsal, in Sweden, and sent them straight off to the council, so as to make a show of four archbishops, just the number in Ireland! and some of the twenty-two bishops were of a like manufacture.

So Robert Waucop, the Scotchman, was appointed Archbishop of Armagh, and Primate of Ireland, by the Pope, and was actually acknowledged as such by the general Council of Trent. Now, which was he or George Dowdall the right Archbishop of Armagh, according to the laws of the Catholic Church? And which did the Irish Church, and the Irish people of that time consider and acknowledge as their Archbishop? These are important questions at this time. These are questions which the present Pope's late appointment of Doctor Cullen, by the Pope's sole authority, in opposition to the election of the priests of Armagh, compels us to ask and to consider.

In the first place we have to answer, that the whole Irish Church, the whole Irish clergy, and the whole Irish nation at that time, acknowledged George Dowdall as their Primate, and refused to acknowledge Waucop as having any rightful claim to be Archbishop of Armagh! We are aware that this is a bold and a startling assertion. But we make it deliberately. Who were the men who would have been most likely to acknowledge the archbishop appointed by the Pope? Was it not the bishops of Ulster, who had stood by Cromer in maintaining the Pope's authority, when the Irish parliament abolished it? Yet we see these very same bishops now refused to acknowledge Waucop, whom the Pope had appointed; nay, these very same bishops themselves consecrated George Dowdall, in direct opposition to the Pope. They had wished to preserve the Pope's authority, but now they saw that his claim was too monstrous to be submitted to; they saw that nothing would satisfy him but to reduce the Irish Church to total slavery, and that the time was come when it was necessary to assert her ancient independence. When we see those very men, those very bishops who had held out longest in support of the Pope's authority, even against parliament and the law itself, when we see these very men now actually consecrating Dowdall, we may well suppose that there was no one left in Ireland to acknowledge Waucop as Archbishop of Armagh. And the whole history of the time supports this conclusion. There is no trace in the Irish history of that time that either the Irish Church, or the Irish nation, that any Irish bishops or any Irish clergyman, or any Irish layman, ever acknowledged Robert Waucop as Archbishop of Armagh or Primate of Ireland.

We have never found any such evidence: but if any one can produce any proof that this man was then acknowledged by any in Ireland as Archbishop of Armagh, we of course will consider ourselves bound to publish it in our pages, if sent to us with proper references to the books or documents in which it is to be found.

Will any Roman Catholic *now* say that Robert Waucop was the rightful Primate of Ireland, and that George Dowdall was not? We believe that no Roman Catholic will say so. We believe that all Roman Catholic writers and historians who have mentioned Dowdall, have spoken of him as being the legitimate primate of Ireland. They must admit, then, that the man chosen at home, nominated by the King, and elected by the chapter, and consecrated by the Irish bishops, was the true and lawful bishop, although the Pope set up another out of his own authority. In other words, they must confess that the Pope had no authority to make Waucop Archbishop of Armagh. They must go further still; they must confess that the infallible tribunal of the Roman Catholic Church, the Pope and the Council of Trent together, did not know who was the true Archbishop of Armagh! that they admitted a man who was not archbishop at all, and set him in the Council of Trent, to make infallible decrees about doctrine! For it is a fact that this Waucop sat in the sessions in which the decrees of original sin, of justification, of the sacraments, were passed. Yet neither the Pope nor the council knew who was the right bishop of a see, or who was entitled to sit in the council and vote on questions of faith! An awkward fact this, about the very construction of an infallible tribunal.

But if any will say that the Pope had authority to make Waucop Archbishop of Armagh, and that Waucop was therefore the right archbishop, and that Dowdall was not, then he must say also that in the beginning of the Reformation, the whole Irish Church, and the whole Irish nation did unanimously and with one accord throw off the legitimate authority of the Pope, by rejecting Waucop and adhering to Dowdall. This is a confession which Irish Roman Catholics have hitherto been unwilling to make: yet they must either make it now, or acknowledge that the Pope had no right to appoint a Primate of Ireland; that he was claiming an authority that he had no right to possess; and that the Irish Church and people did what it was right and lawful for Catholics to do, when they rejected Waucop although appointed by the Pope.

And this brings us to the application of this history to our own times. If an appointment by the Pope himself, and a consecration at Rome by the Pope's authority, did *not* make Robert Waucop Primate of Ireland, *then* what makes Dr. Cullen Primate of Ireland *now*? Is an appointment by the Pope's sole authority, and a consecration at Rome, any better *now*? Does it give any better title *now*? Is it anything more binding on the Irish Church and people *now* than it was then? We entreat our readers to consider this question, whether Dr. Cullen's title *now* to be Archbishop of Armagh, does not rest on just the same grounds that Robert Waucop's rested on then? If the one be bad, can the other be good?

It is not we that have raised this question; the Pope and Dr. Cullen raised it when Dr. Cullen was put in by the same authority that Waucop was appointed by. What was Pope Pius the IX. about? Had he lost his senses, to try again what had once before so signally failed? Was it wise or safe, in this nineteenth century, to try to ride over the Irish Church and nation in a way that they successfully resisted in the sixteenth? Did he think that Irish independence and Irish nationality were now, at length, so utterly extinguished in the Irish heart, that the hour of his last triumph over her liberties was come? Did he think it safe thus openly to beard the Irish people with the former resistance of their nation, and dare them to it again, in that very see of Armagh, from which the Irish Church and the Irish people rejected Waucop, the Pope's nominee?

If any think that this can be safe at present, we refer them again to the able articles in the Cork *Southern Reporter*, the leading provincial organ of Irish Roman Catholics. We do respect and feel an honest pride in the true independence and nationality of that paper. We refer especially to its article on the choice of Dr. Cullen by the priests of Dublin; of which it justly says, "nor can we avoid regarding the fact as one *ominous of serious mischief*, in many ways." Of the real feeling of the Irish priests (not those of Dublin) that article says—"We cling yet to the confidence that Dr. Cullen's Roman notions are repudiated by a large proportion of the Irish Catholic priesthood;" and of the laity, it says—"As to the laity, *we are sure* that all the intelligent portion of them never will submit to that species of domination that men of Dr. Cullen's stamp would try to establish over them." Should we be very much surprised after this, if we were yet to see, in that influential organ of the Roman Catholic laity, an article on the appointment of Robert Waucop, and the example which the Irish people in that instance have left to their children?

We know of no answer that can be made to this, except that some very ignorant and reckless men have taken upon themselves to deny that Robert Waucop ever was appointed by the Pope, or ever sat in the Council of Trent. They offer no proof in support of their denial, but we can give proof of the fact. The following account is given by the Rev. Charles O'Connor, a man of great learning, and an Irish Roman Catholic priest (Columbanus, No. v., p. 50):—"What was the case of Dr. Dowdall? He was a most zealous Catholic; official to his predecessor, George Cromer; elected by the chapter of Armagh; and consecrated without the knowledge of the Pope, by a mandate from King Henry VIII., directed to Edward Staples, Bishop of Meath, in December 1543. Though he was a man of irreproachable manners and great learning, yet because he consented to be consecrated without a bull, the Pope nominated another to supersede him. This was the celebrated Robert Waucop, who, arriving in Ireland, endeavoured, in vain, to raise a party against Dowdall, and wandered among the Irish chiefs, leading a vagabond life in Ulster for several years. . . . . On Queen Mary's accession he (Dowdall) was recalled and re-established, and though Waucop was appointed by the Pope, and a man of considerable learning, who had assisted at the Council of Trent from the first session in 1545, to the eleventh in 1547, yet was he *rejected* by the Irish nation! He died at the Jesuit's Convent, in Paris, 1551, and was the *first* who introduced the order of Jesuits into Ireland."

But we do not rely solely on Dr. O'Connor, who lived so long after. We find the same account in the histories of the times. As, for instance, in Father Paul Sarpi, "Historia del Concilio Tredentino, page 144, second edition, 1629;" a similar account is given of Waucop, by Cardinal Pallavicini, who wrote his history of the Council at the request of the Pope (Hist. Concil Trident, lib. 6, ch. 5, lib. 15, ch. 13), also by Father Orleans, lib. 3, p. 85. Spondanus, another Roman Catholic historian, gives the same account (ad. an. 1546). Dr. Hugh M'Mahon, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Armagh, in the year 1728, also mentions Robert Waucop as Archbishop of Armagh, and Archbishop M'Mahon should have known also his predecessors were (Jus Primatiale Armachanum, 1728, p. 7), "and again, Spondanus, *at the year* 1546 (whom Cardinal Pallavicini cites and follows; Book 6, History of the Council of Trent, ch. 5), speaking of Robert Venantius,* Archbishop of Armagh, who was present at the Council of Trent." Mark here that M'Mahon quotes Spondanus as speaking of Waucop as Archbishop of Armagh, in the year 1546. Now, if we turn to page 19 of the Jus Primatiale, we find the following account:—"Robert Venantius (or Waucop), of whom Father Orleans, of the Society of Jesus, writes, book 3, p. 85, succeeded by the grant of Paul III. to Dowdall, in the See of Armagh, who was present at the Council of *Trent, and was acknowledged there by the fathers and declared Primate of this kingdom.*" . . . Now, observe these dates: Dowdall was made Archbishop of Armagh, in 1543; he continued to hold the See of Armagh until some time after October 20, 1550; he fled then because he would not join in reforming the Roman Catholic doctrine. He was restored again to his archbishoprie in 1553, by Queen Mary, and continued to hold it until he died, in 1558. M'Mahon had already cited Spondanus, as speaking of Waucop as Archbishop of Armagh, in 1546 (page 7); yet here (page 19) he speaks of Waucop as *succeeding* to Dowdall by the grant of Pope Paul III. Observe this, now, that Pope Paul III. died the 10th of November, 1549 (see Labbe and Cossart, vol. 14, p. 484), and Dowdall was Archbishop in 1558! How, then, did Waucop *succeed* to Dowdall by the grant of Paul the 3rd? This account of Dr. M'Mahon proves nothing but that he felt how damaging it was to his Church to admit that Waucop was appointed by the Pope, while Dowdall was actually Archbishop of Armagh.

But we have better proof still than even the high Roman Catholic historians that we have quoted. For in the records of the Council of Trent, as they are published by the highest Roman Catholic authorities on the subject, we find Waucop entered as attending the first ten sessions of the council as Archbishop of Armagh—*i. e.*, from 1545 to 1547.

The copy we refer to is the Concilia Generalia by Labbe and Cossart, two French Jesuits, a work of the highest character. (Vol. 14, page 741, &c. Ed. Paris, 1672). In the first four sessions he is entered as "Armachanus;" but in Session 5, and the following, he is entered thus—"The Rev. Lord Robert Waucop, Archbishop of Armagh, a Scotchman." This is in the year 1546. How then did he *succeed* to Dowdall? We believe that he is entered in the same way in the copy of the councils by Severinus Binius, Archbishop of Cologne, and in all the other large copies. If our readers should look in the small modern editions of the Council of Trent, they will not find Waucop's name, and we think it well to explain how this happens. The Council held ten sessions from 1545 to 1547. It ceased to meet until the year 1551, and continued to sit, at intervals, until 1563. In the first ten sessions, the names of those who sat are entered *in the proceedings of each session*. In the sessions from 1551 to the end, the names are not given in the proceedings of each session; but one list is given, at the end, of all who sat at the council from 1551 to the end. Now, Waucop did not sit in this latter period, because he died in 1551; his name is not, therefore, in this latter list. Now, the editors of the smaller editions, in order to shorten the proceedings, or perhaps to avoid showing the fewness of the names, have left out the names of the persons present at the first ten sessions, and have only printed the list of those who sat from 1551 to 1563, and thus the name of Waucop does not appear in the list printed by them. But we conceive that we have given abundant proof that he sat during the first ten sessions; and that, therefore, he did not succeed to Dowdall, but was appointed by the Pope, Archbishop of Armagh, during the time that Dowdall was really Bishop of the See, and so the question necessarily arises, "which of them was the true and lawful Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of all Ireland?"

* The Latin name for Waucop, according to the custom of those times; just as some Irishmen have an English and Irish name now, as Braddin or Fisher, M'Shan or Johnston.

POLITENESS.—Lord Chesterfield, walking along the street one day, met a drunken man of whom he wished to take the wall. "No, no," hiccuped the fellow, "I never give way to a rascal." "I always do," said his lordship, pulling of his hat and bowing as he passed.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st.

No anonymous letter can be attended to. Whatever is sent for insertion must be authenticated by the name and address of the writer, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee for his good faith. We must request our Enniscorthy correspondent to comply with the foregoing announcement.

We shall feel particularly obliged to our correspondent, "Amicus," to supply us with his name and address, which shall be treated as strictly confidential. We have heard several complaints of miscarriages of our paper through country post-offices, and are determined to call the attention of the Postmaster-General to the subject, should our paper be similarly intercepted again. Those who have been disappointed by not receiving the LAYMAN *in due course, are earnestly requested to communicate, without delay, with Mr. Curry, 9, Upper Sackville-street, on the subject.*

Subscriptions are earnestly solicited, which our friends will observe are payable in advance. The amount may be forwarded either in postage stamps or a post-office order, payable to Mr. Wm. Curry, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, MAY, 1852.

THE MIRACLES AT RIMINI, IN ITALY.

WE have, on several occasions, expressed our resolution not to attribute to any Roman Catholics, things which they themselves disclaim and disavow. We have laid down this rule for ourselves, believing, in the first place, that it is our duty, under that law of Christian charity which "hopeth all things" (1 Cor. xiii. 7, Douay Bible); secondly, because we believe that thus alone can discussion (which we seek to promote) be made an instrument of bringing out the truth, rather than a means of exciting men's passions against each other. It is our earnest desire to lead to a calm and dispassionate search after truth, and to avoid anything that can tend to inflame men's passions. We trust that we can safely appeal to our former numbers for the fidelity and sincerity with which we have pursued this course, and we believe that to this is mainly owing the favourable and kind reception which we have met with from our Roman Catholic readers.

We conceive that this course on our part both entitles and enables us to point out to our Roman Catholic readers, the things which are commonly attributed to them by Protestants, and the ground on which those things are attributed to them, in order that Roman Catholics may have an opportunity of disclaiming and repudiating those things, if they do not really believe them. And we trust that the manner in which we deal with the subject, will dispose Roman Catholics to co-operate with us, willingly and earnestly, in clearing themselves of all such things as they do not really believe.

The subject we have to bring before them in this paper, is the miracles attributed of late to certain pictures of the Blessed Virgin in Italy. We take our accounts from documents inserted in "Battersby Catholic Directory," for the year 1851.

One word about this book—the "Catholic Directory." It has an immense circulation among Roman Catholics, especially among Roman Catholic priests: it is supported by their subscriptions. In the number for 1851 (preface), Mr. Battersby calculates on 5,000 numbers being taken by Roman Catholic ecclesiastics in England, Ireland, and Scotland; and 5,000 more by laymen. He says that the publication of the Directory for that year, at the low price of 2s. 6d., was an experiment, to try if he could get this great amount of support for the work upon its own merits, and he intimates, that if he did not get such support, the price must be raised. Now, as the Directory for 1852, equal in size, has been published for the same price (2s. 6d.), we must suppose that Mr. Battersby's experiment was successful, and that he did get the support he expected. This gives great authority to the work. We cannot suppose that 5,000 Roman Catholic clergymen would give their money to circulate what they believed to be false and mischievous to true religion and to the Catholic Church. The authority of the work is further confirmed by what we learn in the title page, that "the order of the masses and vespers for every day," &c., is drawn up "by a Catholic priest, approved of for that purpose;" of course, according to the discipline of the Roman Catholic Church, that priest is "approved of for that purpose," by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, in which diocess the book is published, if not by all the Roman Catholic bishops of Ireland. This shows their opinion of the book. We are also sure, that if the Roman Catholic bishops saw in a book so widely circulated by the subscriptions of clergymen, and carrying such authority and influence with it, things mischievous to the church and to religion, or absurd or superstitious in themselves, they would take the trouble to express their opinion to Mr. Battersby, being so zealous as they are to keep from the faithful everything that can be dangerous to faith and morals; and from what we know of Mr. Battersby, we are quite sure that the slightest expression of a wish on the part of the Irish bishops or clergy, would be sufficient to induce him to omit anything that they did not approve, or were not willing to recommend to the people. All this gives considerable weight to whatever is circulated in Battersby's Catholic Directory. We admit all this candidly, however it may seem to make against us.

The document we refer to, is in that part of the Catholic Directory, headed "the Roman Register, (p. 285)." It is as follows:—

"THE MIRACLE AT RIMINI.

"The following highly interesting letter appears in the *Catolico*, of Genoa:—'During the two days I have spent in this marvellous city, I have only been occupied with the prodigy which, at this moment, *agitates all Italy*. I have passed my time either in contemplating the blessed image* or in conversing with all classes of persons, in the view of collecting certain and circumstantial details. Yesterday I saw THE MADONNA (that is the *picture* of the Virgin), whose eyes are ordinarily turned towards heaven, bend them towards the pious multitudes, by whom SHE was surrounded. This took place during the celebration of a mass, where five parishes communicated at once. We cannot precisely say that the look descended so far as the people; only it was very evident that the eyes did move downwards, and that, ceasing to direct themselves towards the vault (ceiling) of the church, they fixed themselves perpendicularly on the wall situated opposite the altar. I remarked, moreover, and many foreign priests observed also, that the physiognomy (countenance) of the Madonna habitually grave and mournful, had taken, during this mass, an expression of joy, as if she had wished to signify that she accepted the homage of all this multitude.'"

We have a few observations to make upon this letter. First, it is written by we do not know who: no name is given to it. Any one who had an object in bringing crowds to pay an offering at this chapel might have written it. Secondly, the miracle appears of a very unsatisfactory nature. The picture, it seems, was painted with the eyes turned up, as if looking at the ceiling. Now, if the picture had looked at the people, and put some expression in its look, the miracle might have had some meaning and some object. All our Saviour's miracles had some deep spiritual meaning; none of them were worked to do honour to the Virgin; but when she wished him to work a miracle, she was desired by him not to interfere. If miracles should be worked now, would it not be for the same purposes that the miracles of Christ were worked? But what sense or meaning there could be in a painted picture that was painted to look at a ceiling, staring at a wall, we are not able to understand; nor do we think it will be easily received by those who are accustomed to consider and study the meaning of the miracles of Christ. And the notion of the picture looking more joyful during the time of mass, is just what any credulous person with an excitable imagination might fancy; and we suppose it will be admitted that there are such persons in the world, and that the anonymous writer of this letter may have been one of them.

The writer goes on to give an account of how two painters, a chemist, a professor of natural philosophy, and a doctor of medicine, (all carefully selected by the Bishop of Rimini), had examined this picture, and believed in the miracle. Now, considering the great profit in money which the priests of a chapel must derive from multitudes of people coming to it, on the faith of a miracle, we are not apt to think that the bishop or persons chosen by him are the most faithworthy persons to judge of the miraculous nature of the alleged miracle. Pious frauds are surely possible; and the most satisfactory proof would be one which plainly rendered them impossible. We are not resolved to disbelieve even such miracles; but before we believe, we do ask for such proof as will oblige a sensible man to believe that the thing is really proved. We are told, indeed, that these judges, so carefully selected by the bishop, "directed themselves to the most minute investigation;" we are told too, some of the particulars of this investigation—namely, that they put the picture in different places, and moved the lights about it into different positions; and all this was thought very satisfactory, for the picture still kept winking its eyes. But we are *not* told that the picture was taken out of its frame, and any one in the chapel invited to come and look at the back of the canvas and see if there was any contrivance to make the eyes move. Without such an examination as this, we should hardly have thought ourselves justified in believing that it was really miraculous. But it is not even said that the examiners took the picture out of its frame. And this is the more remarkable, as the writer of this letter himself admits that "many imagine" that it is done by a "mechanical contrivance, like a statue with springs;" he argues that there could be no means like this in a picture, and he says that the examiners certified that there was not any such contrivance; but why did they not take the picture out of its frame, and allow any one in the chapel to examine the canvas at the back? Surely no sensible man would believe it to be miraculous, if he were not allowed to do this.

There is, however, some satisfactory evidence in this letter. In page 287, the last paragraph of the letter, we read—"It is true that, up to the present time, *the miraculous cures have not been so numerous as some reports have stated; that, with the exception of two or three*, I do not know if there have been others verified in such a manner *as to leave no doubt*. The bishop very prudently considers that he ought not as yet to publish those in regard to which depositions have been collected, because he desires to unite all the proofs by which one could infer with certainty that the diseases were incurable."

Here it is *admitted* that numbers of reports of miraculous cures by the winking picture were circulated, and that, with the exception of "two or three," those stories were so manifestly false, that there was nothing for it but to admit that they were false. We suspect that this falsehood

* The word "image" seems to be improperly used here. In the same letter (page 286), the writer says—"it is a simple canvas, painted by a certain G. Solari, of Rimini, who died in 1806."

must have been very plain indeed, when such an admission was made. But we are somewhat at a loss to reconcile this admission with another document given in page 283—"Numberless miracles are constantly taking place among those who crowd around the venerated picture: some are suddenly healed of inveterate maladies admitted to be incurable; the blind recover their sight, the dumb their speech, and paralytics the use of their limbs." Yet the writer, in page 287, admits that all these miracles, except "two or three," were downright lies! And even of those "two or three" he tells us that the bishop "very prudently" (as he says, and in which we entirely agree) considers that he ought not to publish them until he is able to give proof that the alleged diseases were really incurable.

But we have some further information. In that same page (287) we are told that the editor of a paper, called the *Armoria*, wrote to the Bishop of Rimini for *official information*, and the bishop's answer is given—"The public testimony of persons of every condition, not only of this village and diocess, but also of several cities of the Pontifical States of Tuscany, of the Lombardo Venetian kingdom, and other places, render worthy of all belief the movement of the eyes of *our holy picture* of Mary, mother of mercy, a miracle which has not ceased for fifty days up to the present hour. This extraordinary event is verified by a judicial inquiry *pursued in my palace*, and the documents and proofs of the fact will be published in due time. You must, for the moment, be contented with the universal testimony, and invite those who refuse to admit the miracle, to come here and see it with their eyes, which has been done by many persons who have returned from the place completely convinced."

Now, it strikes us as somewhat strange that the Bishop of Rimini, professing to have in his hands a judicial proof of the fact, should tell the editors of the *Armoria* that they must, for the moment, be content with the universal testimony. Seeing that one of the documents just before given (p. 283), claims this "universal testimony" for "numberless miracles" worked by the image, and the other document admits that all except "two or three" are clearly false, and that even those two or three it is not safe to publish! is not this most satisfactory evidence on which to believe? But the Bishop of Rimini begs them to be content with it "for the moment." This was in 1850. We have looked with interest to the "Catholic Directory" for 1852 for the "judicial proofs" which the bishop promised should be "published in due time," and we find nothing on the subject. So far as we can find, "the moment" for believing on false reports still continues; the proofs have never yet been published.

Now, can any one believe that if these proofs were really conclusive, they would have been concealed from the public ever since? Would not the persons concerned in the miracle have been only too anxious to publish them? And if it be the fact, as we suppose, that nothing of the kind has ever been published, is it not pretty clear that the object was to get the thing believed upon that public report which is confessed to be false, and to leave it so, upon Napoleon's maxim, that a falsehood once believed is sufficient for its purpose!

Now the question we conclude with is this—Do the Roman Catholics of Ireland believe these stories upon such evidence? Do they put these miracles, and the proof of these miracles, on an equality with the miracles of our Blessed Saviour, and the proofs of those miracles? We are satisfied that our readers will say, they do not. Well, then, can they help acknowledging that these miracles are tricks and impositions? And if so, can they account for the fact, that while these accounts are circulated far and wide among the Irish people in the "Catholic Directory," on the authority of the Bishop of Rimini himself, not one of the bishops or priests of Ireland, by whose subscriptions that "Directory" is circulated (and who are so zealous in preserving the laity from all that is dangerous to their faith and morals in the enlightened and profitable education of the Queen's Colleges), should ever have raised their voices to warn Catholics from believing the delusions which are sought to be spread among them on the authority of the Bishop of Rimini and his confederates.*

Truly the Roman Catholic laity of Ireland are called upon in such a case to vindicate their common sense and judgment from the imputation of believing or submitting to such manifest impostures, &c., and we shall rejoice to hear that they do so.

THE TOUCHSTONE.

A Roman Catholic publication, called the *Touchstone*, has recently appeared—or, at least, recently attracted notice—to which we wish to call our readers' attention.

The *Touchstone* is a very important little tract, and one whose *design*, at least, ought to be approved by every fair-minded Protestant. It is an appeal to Scripture as the "*touchstone*" by which to try what doctrines are true or false. And Scripture is the one common authority which is acknowledged by both Roman Catholics and Protestants. Now, in all subjects, the only way in which a dispute between any two persons can be settled, is to appeal to some authority which is equally acknowledged by *both* of them. When, for instance, we are endeavouring to convert a Pagan to Christianity, we would not begin by assuming the truth of the Christian Scriptures, and appealing to *them*; because this would be to suppose him a Christian already; but we must first prove that there is good reason for his believing that our sacred books contain a true history, from which it will follow that Jesus Christ and his Apostles must have really been from God; and then we may proceed to point out to him what it is that they teach us to believe and to do.

So, also, in any discussion between a Roman Catholic and a Protestant, it would be absurd to begin by assuming that the decisions of the Church of Rome and her traditions and interpretations of Scripture are to be received; because, supposing this were true, it is the very thing which Protestants deny; and if they admitted it, they would be Roman Catholics already, and not Protestants. The appeal, therefore, must be made (as is done in this tract) to the Bible itself, and to that sense of each text which both Roman Catholics and Protestants can *agree* in acknowledging.

Now, it is usually supposed that the Church of Rome discourages the general study of Scripture, and considers it as likely to lead to dangerous error, except in the hands of learned divines, or under their guidance, and with their interpretations. But the writer of this tract evidently holds another opinion: for it is plain, that in order to make the use of it that this author designed, a man should furnish himself with a Bible, and study it attentively, and especially look to the texts referred to, and the passages in which they occur, and then judge for himself as well as he can, whether they are for or against his religion.

Every one must admit that this is a fair mode of proceeding. But in this Tract, opinions are attributed to Protestants which the generality of them, at least, do not hold; and several of the texts brought forward are understood by every Protestant in a sense very different from that which is here put upon them. It has been thought advisable, therefore, to republish this tract, with its sixty supposed expositions of Protestant doctrine (which we may call sixty mistakes), to each of which we shall furnish replies, in order to explain what it is that Protestants do really hold.

ERRONEOUS EXPOSITIONS OF THE PROTESTANT FAITH, FROM THE "TOUCHSTONE."

Objection 1.—Protestants, in order to justify their new religion, affirm that before their pretended Reformation, "laity and clergy, learned and unlearned, all ages, sects, and degrees of men, women, and children, of whole Christendom, were at once drowned in abominable idolatry, and that for 800 years and more"—*Homily of peril of Idolatry* approved by the 35th and 39th articles, part 3; and, consequently, they must hold, that for all that space of time, *the gates of hell prevailed against the Church of Christ*. Their own Bible, in plain and express terms, declares the contrary. St. Matthew, xvi. 18. *Upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.*

Reply.—Protestants *do* not hold that before the Reformation there were no pure worshippers of God: "that all the laity and clergy, &c.. &c., were at once drowned in abominable idolatry." The Vaudois Church resisted that idolatry.

The meaning of the Homily is that idolatry was *generally prevalent*; when "*children of all ages*" are expressly mentioned in the Homily as exposed to this evil, it is plain it could not be meant, that infants were actually *practising* idolatry.

Protestants do *not* infer from this passage of St. Matthew, that errors and abuses would never creep into the Christian Church, but that they would not prevail to *destroy* it. By the "gates of hell," is here meant the *power of death*; for the word hell is here, and in many places of Scripture, the translation of the original word "hades," which signifies the grave, or place of the departed.

Those who have so misunderstood our Lord's prediction, may correct their mistake by referring to many things written by the Apostles. For example, when Paul was taking his final leave of the elders of Miletus and Ephesus (clergy), he warned them (Acts xx.) "that grievous wolves would, after his departure, enter in among them, not sparing the flock," and also, that "even from among their own selves (the clergy) men would arise, speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them." So that this apostle of our Lord (and it is the same in other parts of the apostolic writings), predicted that grievous error would creep into that church, against which, nevertheless, his Lord declared "the gates of hell" should "not *prevail*."

Objection 2.—Protestants maintain that for many hundred years before *Luther*, there was no church upon earth, with which a Christian might lawfully join in communion; that all were notoriously gone astray from the purity of the Gospel; and, consequently, that Christ, who is the *way*, the *truth*, and the *life* (St. John xiv. 6), was not with any church before the Reformation, because they were all gone astray from the *way*, the *truth*, and the *life*. Their own Bible assures us that this could never be. St. Matt., xxviii., 19, 20. "Go teach all nations, and lo. I am with you always, even to the end of the world."

Reply.—Protestants do *not* maintain this; for it is well known that there have always been faithful worshippers of Christ, who protested against the errors of the Romish Church, and preserved pure the apostolic faith—as the church of the Vaudois, a body of Christians, among the mountains of Piedmont, who never fell into the errors of the Church of Rome.

Objection 3.—Protestants teach, that the *spirit of truth* was not promised to the church of Christ, to be with her teachers *for ever*, and to *guide them into all truth*.

Their own Bible, in clear and plain terms, contradicts this their assertion (*St. John*, xiv. 16, 17), *I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you* FOR EVER, *even the* SPIRIT OF TRUTH. And, *St. John*, xvi. 13, *When he, the spirit of truth is come, he will* GUIDE YOU INTO ALL TRUTH.

Reply.—Protestants *do* believe that the spirit of truth is promised to be with Christ's church for ever, leading both teachers and taught into all truth, through the ordinary means of his divine grace, one of which means is the right use of Scripture; but not as conferring infallibility on any church or set of teachers since the apos-

* It is not merely the Bishop of Rimini that is implicated in these transactions. The document which we have quoted from page 283 brings in the following persons:—"The Bishop of Pesaro; the Prolegate of the province of Pesaro and Urbino; the delegate of Forli; Vicars-general, an inquisitor (it seems there *are* such persons in Italy), three vicars of the Holy Office, and many other persons whom we pass in silence attest the fact. We would mention among others, the Commissary-general of the Four Legations, who came from Bologna, where he resides, to Rimini, saw the miracle, *venerated most devoutly, and more than once, the august picture*, and gave in honour of it a beautiful chalice, &c." All these are persons in high office in the Roman Church in Italy. It would seem as if all his Holiness' officials are working to try and get Catholics to believe these pretended miracles, of which, as far as we can see, they have not yet ventured to publish the judicial proofs.

tles, whose teaching was accredited by the extraordinary manifestations of the Spirit—*i. e.*, by miracles.

OBJECTION 4.—Protestants assert that the church of the living God is not *the pillar and ground of truth*, but may, and often does, uphold damnable errors.

Their own Bible expressly declares, 1 *Tim.* iii. 15, that *the church of the living God is the pillar and ground of the truth*, and, consequently, cannot uphold damnable errors.

REPLY.—Protestants certainly do deny that this passage—whatever it means—does or can allude to the Church of *Rome*, since the church in which Timothy was to "know how he ought to behave himself," was that of which he was bishop—*i. e.*, Ephesus, and not *Rome*. But Roman Catholics are accustomed to take it for granted that whatever is said in Scripture concerning "the church" must apply to the Church of *Rome*; and hence the above mistake. They should prove this assumption by Scripture.

But with respect to the passage here quoted from the Epistle to Timothy, the sense of it evidently depends on the *punctuation*; and some of the ablest divines are convinced that there should be a full stop at "Church of God," and then the succeeding sentence will run thus: "A pillar and ground of the truth, and without controversy great is the mystery of godliness:" which mystery the apostle proceeds to state was, God manifest in the flesh, &c., &c. And every scholar must admit that the words of the original Greek will bear that sense as well as the other.

(To be continued.)

Correspondence.

THE REAL PRESENCE.

WE insert the following able correspondence between the Rev. R. A. Wilson, of Glasgow, and the Rev. W. Carson, of Waterford, with which we were favoured last month, but which reached us too late for insertion in our last number:—

Abercromby-street, Glasgow,
February 18, 1852.

REV. AND DEAR SIR—Mrs. F. has enclosed to me a communication received from you, containing what you consider three unanswerable difficulties to the Catholic doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the blessed Eucharist. I regret I did not receive them when in Waterford, as time and opportunity were then at my disposal. However, I shall be happy at any time to steal a few moments from the press and hurry of my daily duties, to answer or explain any difficulty which you may be pleased to propose, and trust you will dispassionately read and study my reply. I am likewise fully satisfied that you may make whatever honourable use you may please of them. I say honourable, because should you please to give them publicity at any future time, I should request that my answers should not be curtailed, even as to a sentence, inasmuch as the duties of the Glasgow mission are so incessant, that I shall never, perhaps, have a fair opportunity to say all I might wish; and, therefore, there will be nothing said which will not be to the point, whilst I must, necessarily, omit much which might be added with benefit. Your first objection is substantially as follows:—

Paschasius, in the year 831, was the first person who wrote a treatise on transubstantiation. He was opposed by Raban Maur, a Catholic Archbishop, and by Heribald and others. Although you have not drawn your conclusions from these premises, I premise I am justified in anticipating it, by saying, therefore, the doctrine of transubstantiation dates from Paschasius, in the ninth century.

Reverend sir, Paschasius did not write a treatise on "transubstantiation;" but (A.D. 818) he wrote one on the body and blood of Christ, in which he advanced no new doctrine, but merely gave the doctrine of the universal Church in the 9th century. His words are, and I beg of you to consider them attentively—"Although some err through ignorance, yet no person, as yet, has publicly called into question what the whole world believes and confesses." "Quamvis ex hoc quidam de ignorantia errent, nemo tamen est adhuc in aperto, qui hoc ita esse contradicat *quod totus orbis credit et confitetur.*" And, again, he says—"Let him who would contravene this truth, consider what he does against his Lord, and against *all the Church of Christ*. It is, therefore, a most grievous crime to pray with all, and not believe what truth teaches, and what *all the Christians of the universe profess.*" "Videat qui contra hoc venire voluerit, quid agat contra ipsum dominum et contra *omnem Christi ecclesiam*. Nefarium ergo scelus est, orare cum omnibus et non credere quod veritas ipsa testatur et *ubique omnes universaliter verum esse fatentur.*" Now, it is not denied, even by Protestant writers, that Paschasius maintained, during life, a character eminent both for sanctity and learning, and I, therefore, dispassionately put the question—Is the above the language of a man broaching a new theory on a most vital point of Catholic doctrine? or should not Paschasius have been absolutely demented in asserting, in the face of the world, that the belief in the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the Eucharist, was the universal faith of Christianity at the moment he was writing, when, in reality, it was nowhere believed, but was merely his own private speculation. I have no doubt, reverend sir, but that you will acknowledge the full force of this observation, if you bestow due attention to the testimony which I have above adduced.

You say that Paschasius was opposed by Raban Maur and others. Now, reverend sir, I admit it, for the sake of giving you all the advantage you can desire, although you must be aware, that neither Catholics nor Protestants agree as to the precise doctrine of the opponents of Paschasius. The manuscript epitome of William of Malmesbury joins Amularius, Heribald, and Raban, in the same opposition to the true Catholic doctrine, but accuses them of being Stercoranists, and, therefore, implying an error as opposed to the doctrine of the Sacramentarians which you hold, as it is opposed to the doctrine held by the Catholic Church. But, suppose, as I said, for the sake of argument, that their opinions favoured your doctrine with regard to the blessed Eucharist, what follows? Therefore, persons holding communion with the Catholic Church in the ninth century were at liberty to call in question the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the blessed Eucharist. Reverend sir, this conclusion is not justified by the premises. The Church of Lyons, in the celebrated Three epistles, accused Amlarius "of poisoning the faith of Catholic France, by writings full of error and strange opinions," and declares that his writings should be *burned*, and in the year 838 the errors of Amularius and of his followers, Raban and Heribald, were again condemned by a synod of Bishops, held at Cressy. Therefore, reverend sir, it was not a matter of indifference in the ninth century to deny the real presence of Christ in the blessed Eucharist; but as the doctrine of Raban had but few supporters, it was allowed to die a natural death, not without having been reprobated, as I have shown, but without causing any great commotion in the church. John Scot revived the controversy in the middle of the ninth century, but he found no partizans, and again it died with him, and remained dead until the eleventh century, when it was revived by Berengarius, and as soon condemned by a synod convoked at Rome, by Leo the ninth, in the year 1050, and in the following year by the synod of Versailles, at which the work of Scotus was consigned to the flames, in execration of its heretical doctrine. Berengarius made a public retractation in another council, held at Turin, in the year 1055, and again in a synod of 113 bishops, convoked at Rome in the year 1059, from the various kingdoms of Europe. His retractation was sent by order of the synod to the various countries of Europe, for the purpose of repairing the scandal which the publicity and noise of his errors had given, and the heresy was thus, for the present, cut off in its very bud. Now, reverend sir, Paschasius announces publicly what was the *universal belief* of his age. The Church of Lyons, the synod of Cressy, and all the subsequent synods and councils held in Italy, France, and Germany, confirm his statement; wherefore I conclude, and I hope you will candidly say very justly, that the doctrine of the real presence was really the universal doctrine of the Christian church in the ninth and subsequent, as well as preceding centuries; and that if a few in the ninth century disputed the doctrine, they, by doing so, went against the *universal faith* of the Christian Church, and thereby incurred the severe animadversion and condemnation of the Catholic churches and bishops of the age in which they lived. In fine, that in proportion as the error of a few became more likely to do injury to the Catholic faith, in proportion did the church increase her energies to repress those evils, by condemning the errors themselves; causing the books containing the objectionable doctrines to be burned in abhorence of them, and multiplying synods and councils until it terminated in the œcumenical Council of Trent.

But, reverend sir, I must not pass by another point in the proposed difficulty on which you seem to lay peculiar stress. You say Paschasius first wrote a *treatise* on transubstantiation in the year 831. Reverend sir, I do not suppose that you mean to assert the existence of *a treatise* as essential to the belief in transubstantiation; you might as well argue that the sun did not give light for some thousands of years, because so long no learned treatise appeared on the nature and properties of light. You certainly do not mean this. Then, I suppose, you mean by the word *first*, that Paschasius was the first to teach the doctrine of transubstantiation. If so, please open St. Cyril's works, and bear in mind that this holy Bishop of Jerusalem lived 500 years before Paschasius. You will find in his Fourth Catechism for catechumens, in language written expressly for the purpose of communicating instruction to beginners, the following discourse:—"When Christ himself has said of the bread, this is my body, and of the chalice, this is my blood, who will dare to doubt? Formerly he changed water into wine, and will we consider him unworthy of being believed when he changes wine into his blood? Judge it not by the *taste* but by faith. What seems to be bread is not bread, and what seems to be wine is not wine, although it may seem such to the taste; but it is the blood of Christ." Reverend sir, what do you call this, if it be not the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation? Open St. Ambrose, and you will find the following (Lib. de Initiandis, cq., No. 48)—"Perhaps you will say, how can you assert that I receive the body of Christ, when *I see something else?* If the word of Christ was able to bring into existence what before did not exist, how much more easily is it not able to change things which are into what they are not?" Again, reverend sir, I ask, is not this transubstantiation? It would be superfluous to multiply testimonies. If, however, you require more, equally explicit, I shall be happy to supply you with them; but from what I have adduced, it is evident that, even if Paschasius were the first to write a *treatise* on transubstantiation, he was not certainly the first to teach and believe in the doctrine implied by it. It would likewise throw upon you, reverend sir, the extremely difficult task of explaining how it is that the eastern heretical churches separated from the communion of Rome since the beginning of the 5th century, and as opposed to her doctrines fully as much as is the Church of England since the Reformation, have become imbued with this Catholic tenet of the real presence of Christ in the blessed eucharist, which, nevertheless, Eutychians, Nestorians, and Arminians, as well as Greeks, defend and teach. Did they, too, receive it from the Latin monk?

In your second difficulty, you say, "the seventh general council held in Constantinople in the year 754, decreed that the sacrament was a commemoration, not a sacrifice." Allow me, reverend sir, to correct an historical mistake into which you have fallen. There was no general council held in Constantinople in the eighth century, and, consequently, I know not where to look for the decree to which you allude. Catholics are not wont to confound the idea of a sacrament with that of a sacrifice, nor to say that the sacrament is the sacrifice; nevertheless, making the proper allowance for your want of correct information on this point, I shall be happy to be informed of the name of the council you refer to, the number of the decree, and the year when celebrated, so that I may be able, with accuracy, to refer to this (at least to me) novel decision.

Your third difficulty states, that the doctrine of transubstantiation was not an article of Catholic faith until the decision of the Council of Trent. Reverend and dear sir, you completely mistake the power of councils with regard to Catholic faith. The Catholic Church has her faith prior to the convocation of a council; nor is it in the power of any council, general or particular, to make that which previously was not contained in the body of Catholic faith, become, by its decision, an article of faith. The entire power of the church, assembled in council, as regards faith, is merely to declare that to be really contained in the Catholic faith which was contained from the beginning—which the church believed and taught from the beginning. Disputes and doubts affecting individual persons, places, or churches, sometimes render the true faith of the church obscure in those places, and the obscurity is removed by the universal church represented in council, which is not affected by local doubts or difficulties, but which has in its decisions the promised assistance of the Holy Ghost. In the fourth century the Council of Nice declared that the Son was consubstantial with the father, and anathematized whoever would deny the doctrine; but would you, reverend sir, thence infer, that the consubstantiality of the Father and Son was not contained in the deposit of Christian faith, or was not believed by the Church of God from the very foundation of Christianity? Apply this to the Council of Trent and you will have a case precisely parallel.

I remain, reverend dear sir, with sincere respect,
Yours truly in Christ,
R. A. WILSON.

John's-Hill, Waterford,
March 11, 1852.

REV. AND DEAR SIR—I beg to acknowledge your letter of the 18th ult. I regret time did not permit me to answer it immediately.

You commence your letter by saying, "Mrs. F. has enclosed to me a communication received from you, containing, what you consider, three unanswerable difficulties to the Catholic doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the blessed Eucharist." This statement is not quite correct. The following are the facts of the case.

I had, on several occasions, conversations with Mrs. F. on the points of controversy between Roman Catholics and Protestants. I stated to her, on one of these occasions, that I was prepared to show her religion to be a novel one, and to point out certain dates about which the various errors crept into the church. She asked me to give her such a date for the doctrine of transubstantiation. I wrote at the time, and partly from memory, the few hurried lines you received. She told me she would show them on the following day to some of the Waterford priests, and demand from them an answer; but, I suppose, they were not able to give her one, and, as a *dernier resort*, she forwarded them to you. Nor am I surprised at this, as a few days previously she had informed me, that not one of the Roman Catholic clergymen in Waterford was able either to write or preach a sermon—controversial or otherwise; and assigned this as a reason for their not

answering our sermons published in the newspapers, though repeatedly challenged to do so; and for their bringing down from Dublin, Drs. Cahill and O'Connell, to preach for them on controversy. A strange confession coming from your sister!—Doubtless she had it from you!

You have fully stated the premises of my first objection; but the conclusion is not the one intended to be drawn from them. They were not meant to prove that the doctrine of transubstantiation dates from Paschasius, or that he was the first to teach the doctrine; nor did I undertake to point out any *precise* period at which this error began, or name *any* particular person who introduced it. Paschasius, as Bellarmine confesses, was the first to systematize the doctrine of transubstantiation, and he found the materials at his hand, among the many and gross conceits which possessed the minds of men in that dark and barbarous age. The fact is that no error of the Romish system was brought in at once; but springing from the corrupt soil of the human heart, each arose insensibly and by slow degrees, as a young plant grows up from the seed, strengthening and spreading, till at length it fixes its roots deep in the earth, and sheds its noxious influence far and wide. We cannot, therefore, point out the precise period when these errors first began, no more than a man can tell the time his hair began to be gray, or his garments to be old. Only by comparing what the Church of Rome is now with what she was in the apostolic and primitive ages of the church, we perceive that many gross corruptions have been introduced. Slowly and imperceptibly, in the midnight darkness of the world and the church, they arose, and were shaped and moulded by degrees, as men's minds were prepared to look upon them, till each monster received its perfect form from the plastic hands of the Council of Trent. The gradual way in which the doctrine of transubstantiation was brought into the church, has been well described by a learned writer of the present day—"Men first, in spite of our Lord's warning, that the spirit only quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing, began to fancy that Christ's flesh, as such, had the power of giving life, then that Christ's body was present in the bread, or that the bread by some mysterious change became, to all intents and purposes of giving life all *one* with Christ's body; and, lastly, that it was not bread at all, but Christ's body hidden under the appearance of bread." Thus broached, as a matter of opinion, it was then brought in by power, and lastly, by authority, decreed into an article of faith.

Paschasius was the first to write an express work on the subject of transubstantiation, the title of which was, "Concerning the body and blood of Christ;" and this is of itself a plain presumption against its primitive antiquity. But, add to this, that he was at once opposed by Rabanus Maurus, Heribald, Scotus, Ratramn, and others—that no sooner was the doctrine openly and publicly advocated, but it met with the most determined opposition, that the first attempt to put it forward as a necessary part of Christian faith, received the most unqualified reprobation from men of high repute in the church, some of whom have been canonized by the Church of Rome, and all of whom have been acknowledged by Bellarmine to be acute and learned men; and is not the conclusion from these premises plain, that the doctrine was a novelty, unknown in the pure and better ages of the church, and that even in the ninth century, it was at most, only a disputable doctrine, and could not have been the *universal* faith of the Christian Church—a doctrine of *universal* belief.

You claim for this doctrine a universal consent; but how can that be, when it met with the most decided opposition? That is a strange *universal* consent, to a doctrine which consists in its being believed by all except those who reject it! Nor is it any answer to this to say, that the opinions of those who opposed it, were condemned; any censure upon them, does not remove their opposition, for the absence of any evil does not consist in its being censured when it arises, but in its not arising at all. The fact still remains, that men in communion with the Church of Rome, of high reputation in it for their learning and abilities, never condemned in their own age, which is the point in dispute, and never condemned by any general council antecedently to the Council of Trent, gave the most determined opposition to the first attempt to fix the doctrine on the church, and branded it as a novelty unknown in its purest and best ages. It will avail nothing to call Ratramne and the others heretics, because they opposed an *almost* universal opinion. The burden of proof lies upon you, to show that they were not members of the church, for if they were, then the church did not generally hold the doctrine of transubstantiation. But if it be said, that Ratramne was not a Catholic, because he opposed this doctrine, then the same must be proved with regard to Augustine and the other Fathers whom he quotes, and whose opinions he shows inconsistent with it.

You speak as if we Protestants denied the *real* presence of Christ in the Eucharist; now, we hold it as firmly as you; we even assert, that "the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's supper;" the point in dispute between us is, whether Christ's real presence in the eucharist is *spiritual or corporeal.*

Before, then, I show that the passages you bring forward from the Fathers do not prove transubstantiation, and give some quotations from them against that doctrine, it would be well to lay down clearly what transubstantiation is.

As you have mentioned the recantation of Berengarius, we cannot do better than refer to the form prescribed for him, as of course it must, be esteemed a correct account of the doctrine of your church. He was required to declare at a council held in Rome, under Nicholas II., in the year 1058, "that the bread and wine, after consecration, are not only the sacrament, symbol, or figure, but also the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and are sensibly not only in a sacrament, but in truth, handled and broken by the hands of the priests, and crushed by the teeth of the faithful (fidelium dentibus atteri)."

The Council of Trent is yet more precise. I refer you to canons 1, 2, 3, 4, "On the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist, session 12."

Canon 1. "If any one shall deny that the body and blood, together with the *soul and divinity* of our Lord Jesus Christ, and, therefore, entire Christ, are truly, really, and substantially contained in the sacrament of the most holy Eucharist, *and shall say that he is only in it as in a sign, or in a figure, or virtually, let him be accursed.*"

Canon 2. "If any one shall say that the *substance* of the bread and wine *remains* in the sacrament of the most holy Eucharist, together with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and shall deny that wonderful and singular conversion of *the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood*, the outward forms of the bread and wine still remaining, which conversion the Catholic Church most aptly calls transubstantiation, let him be accursed."

Canon 3. If any one shall deny that in the venerated sacrament of the Eucharist, *entire Christ is contained in each kind, and in each several particle of either kind, when separated*, let him be accursed."

Canon 4. "If any one shall say that, after consecration, the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ is only in the wonderful sacrament of the Eucharist in use whilst it is taken, and not either before or after, *and that the true body of the Lord does not remain in the hosts or particles which have been consecrated*, and which are reserved or remain after the communion, let him be accursed.

Again, I refer you to the Catechism of the Council of Trent, I quote from the edition printed at Venice, in the year 1582:—

"But now the pastors must here explain, that not only the *true* body of Christ, and whatever appertains to the true mode of existence of a body, *as the bones and nerves*, but also that *entire* Christ is contained in this Sacrament."

Again, I refer you to the Roman Missal. Amongst the rubrics we read "of the defects that may occur in the celebration of masses"—

"If the consecrated host disappears, either by some accident—as by the wind—or by a miracle, or if *it be taken by any animal*, and cannot be found, then let another be consecrated."

Again—"If the priest vomits the Eucharist, if the accidents appear entire, let them be reverently taken, if there be not nausea."

In those documents, it is asserted that the substance of the bread and wine, immediately after consecration, undergoes a change, and are not merely symbols or figures, but the actual, real, and identical body of Christ, which suffered upon the cross; nor is this all, not merely is it asserted that the material bread and wine are converted into the material body and blood of Christ, but that material bread and wine are converted into the immaterial soul, and not only into the immaterial soul, but into the essential divinity of Christ. The assertion is, that in the mass "There is really, and truly, and substantially present, the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of Jesus Christ." And not only so, but that a whole Christ, body, soul, divinity, bones, and nerves, is present in the bread and in every particle of it, and in the wine, and in every drop of it; so that, were you to divide the bread or wafer into a thousand different crumbs, or the wine into a thousand different drops, each crumb or each drop would still contain the nerves, bones, sinews, body, soul, and divinity of Jesus Christ; or if the wafer received by the communicant, into the mouth, should break into smaller pieces, each separate fragment, however small, becomes a separate, entire Christ. Still further, that an animal, as it is expressed in the Roman missal, or a mouse, as was defined by Greg. II. (Direct inquisit: part 1, No. 15), may run away with and eat the host—*i.e.*, the Lord Jesus, body, blood, soul, divinity, bones, and nerves; and, lastly, that a priest may vomit him. Oh, who can listen even to this simple statement without feelings of indescribable horror? This is the very creed of your church, not distorted, not exaggerated in a single point, but expressed in the very terms of your own formularies—that the consecrated wafer becomes the very body, blood, soul, divinity, bones, and nerves of Jesus Christ—*becomes God*—that a mouse may run away with and eat that God, the God of heaven and earth—the Redeemer, the Lord of Hosts—that mighty Being who arched the heavens—who gemmed the firmament with ten thousand stars—who controls the whole machinery of the universe—before whom angels veil their faces as they cry, "Holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, who was, and is, and is to come." "Be astonished, oh, ye heavens, at this, and be horribly afraid, yea, be very desolate, saith the Lord."

The passages you have adduced from the writings of Cyril and Ambrose, speak of the consecrated elements as the body and blood of Christ, but does this prove transubstantiation? If so, then the Church of England holds that doctrine when she asserts that "the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's supper." You must show *in what sense* they are the body and blood of Christ, whether carnally or spiritually. How St. Cyril, of Jerusalem, the very writer you quote, understood it, is evident when he says—"With all assurance let us partake as of the body and blood of Christ, for, under the *type* of bread, his body is given unto thee; and under the *type* of wine, his blood is given unto thee; that so thou mayest partake of the body and blood of Christ, being one body and one blood with him." (Cyril, oper. Cat. xxii., mystag. iv., sec. iii., Fol. Bened., Edit. 1720.) How St. Ambrose, the other writer you quote understood it, is evident when he says, "Make this ascribed oblation reasonable and acceptable, which is the *figure* of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ."—(Ambros. ope. Tom ii., De Sacrament, lib. iv., cap. 5, fol. edit.. Bened., 1690.) How St. Augustine, one of the most celebrated doctors of the church, who flourished in the fourth century, understood it, is evident when he says, in his epistle to Boniface the bishop—"If the sacraments had not some resemblance to these things of which they are the sacrament, they would not be sacraments at all, but from their resemblance they often take the name of the things themselves, so then, *after a certain sort*, the sacrament of the body of Christ is the body of Christ, and the sacrament of the blood of Christ, is the blood of Christ." Again, St. Augustine writes—"The Lord when he gave the *sign* of his body, did not doubt to say, this is my body; and again, in the history of the New Testament, so great and so marvellous was the patience of our Lord, that, bearing with Judas, though not ignorant of his purpose, he admitted him to the banquet, in which he commended and delivered to his disciples *the figure* of his own body and blood."

You seem to lay great stress upon the words of Cyril, "Judge it not by the *taste*, but by faith," and yet, this is so far from proving transubstantiation, that it is in perfect accordance with the doctrine of the Church of England, when she declares that the faithful only receive the body and blood of Christ, but that all others are guilty of his body and blood. Again, you have underlined the words of St. Ambrose—"How can I receive the body of Christ, when I see something else?" but this would prove him as much a Protestant as a Romanist, for we, too, as I said before, hold, that the the body of Christ is received by the faithful in the Lord's supper.

Again, the passages which you have adduced, speak of a change having taken place in the elements after consecration; but this will not answer your purpose, unless you also show the *kind* of change implied; we admit that some of the Fathers speak of a mysterious change having taken place in the elements, but we altogether deny that that change was of that *kind or character* above described as transubstantiation. It rests with you to show that it is a corporeal or carnal change, but from other parts of their writings we can prove to demonstration that such a doctrine never entered into their minds.

The first I shall adduce is from Clement, of Alexandria, who lived in the second century, and whose name carries great weight in the Church of Rome. His words are as follows:—

"Inasmuch as Christ declared, that the bread which I give you is my flesh, inasmuch as flesh is irrigated by blood, therefore the wine *is allegorically called blood.* For the word is allegorically designated by many different names, such as meat, and flesh, and nourishment, and bread, and blood, and milk; for the Lord is all things for the enjoyment of us who have believed in him. Nor let any one think that we speak strangely, when we say that milk is *allegorically called* the blood of the Lord, for is not *wine* likewise *allegorically called* by the same appellation? The Scripture, therefore, has named wine a *mystic symbol* of the holy blood." And, again—"Be well assured that Christ himself also partook of wine, inasmuch as he also is a man. He, moreover, blessed the wine, saying, Take, drink; this is my blood, the blood of the vine. The consecrated liquor of exhilaration, therefore, *allegorically* represents the word, who poured himself out on behalf of man, for the remission of sins."

Again, Cyprian writes as follows:—

"We have found out that it was a mixed cup which our Lord offered, and that it was wine which he called his blood."

Again, St. Augustine writes—"Christ instructed his disciples and said unto them, It is the Spirit quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life; as if he had said, *understand spiritually* what I have spoken—You are *not* about to eat this identical body which you see; and you are *not* about to drink this identical blood, which they who crucify me will pour out; on the contrary, I have commended a certain sacrament to you which will vivify you, if spiritually understood." It would be superfluous to multiply testimonies; if, however, you require more, equally explicit, I shall be happy to supply you with them.

In the second place, you have undertaken to correct an historical mistake into which you say I have fallen. You state there was no general council held in Constantinople in the eighth century. I would advise you for the future, when you undertake to correct mistakes, to take care that you do not fall into a more grievous one yourself, for there was a general council held in Constantinople in the eighth century. "Making the proper allowance for your want of correct information on this point," I proceed to inform you, that it was called by Constantine, in 754, at Constantinople, to whom, it appears, the furious tribe of image worshippers, in derision, had given the name of Copronymus. It was composed of eastern bishops. It condemned the worship and use of images. This council, I am aware, is not acknowledged by Roman Catholics, any more than the authority of the second commandment, because it had not received the sanction of the see of Rome; nevertheless, its testimony is of great value on the subject in dispute, as showing that the Trentine doctrine of transubstantiation was not universally received or believed in the early ages of the Christian Church. It maintained that "Christ chose no other shape or type under heaven by which to represent his incarnation, but the sacrament which he delivered to his ministers for *a type and effectual commemoration, commanding the substance of bread to be offered*, which did not in any way resemble the form of man, that no occasion might be given for bringing in idolatry."

In regard to the third difficulty, you state that I have mistaken the power of a council which is only to declare or authoritatively set forth as true, any point of doctrine, so that what before might have been disputed or doubted without danger, becomes now *necessary* to be believed, and heresy to dispute or doubt.

According to your own definition, then, till it becomes an article of faith, it is a disputable doctrine which may or may not be held by those who remain in communion with the Church of Rome; and, therefore, since the doctrine of transubstantiation was not declared an article of faith till the Council of Trent, the belief of the doctrine was not essential till then, and those who denied it must not be considered as heretics. Between this and the Council of Nice there is no parallel, for almost immediately on the promulgation of Arius's opinions, the Council of Nice assembled, and those opinions were declared heretical. Arius first put forward his erroneous views in 318, and in 325 the council condemned them, an interval only of seven years; but the doctrine of transubstantiation was disputed, fiercely disputed, from the time of Paschasius in the ninth century, and not terminated as you yourself have stated till the œcumenical Council of Trent in the 16th century. Therefore, transubstantiation was not till then a doctrine of the church, or a necessary part of Christian faith. Indeed the celebrated Breerly says: "complete transubstantiation (*i.e.*, both for form and matter), was not determined until the last Council of Trent in the year 1560."

But think not that it is through the decrees of councils, or the testimony of the Fathers, or the writings of fallible men, however pious or however learned, that we alone attack the doctrine of transubstantiation. We have a more powerful weapon than any of them, and that is the sword of the Spirit—the Word of the living God.

I know you will shrink from Scripture, for as Scotus (4 Sent. d. 11, q. 3), says—"There is no passage of Scripture so express as evidently to compel the admission of transubstantiation, without the declaration of the church;" or, as Biel says (in Can. Miss. lect. 40), "It is nowhere found in the canonical Scriptures;" or, as Cardinal Cameracensis says—"Transubstantiation cannot be proved from Holy Writ;" or, as Cardinal Cajetan says—"There does not appear out of the Gospel anything to compel us to understand these words literally, namely, 'This is my body;' and, truly, that presence in the sacrament, which the church holds, cannot be proved by these words of Christ, unaided by the declaration of the church."

You hold that when Christ, at the last supper, took the bread and cup into his hands, and said, "This is my body," "This is my blood," these words are to be taken in their most strict and literal sense, and, that, therefore, the bread did actually become changed into the Saviour's body, and the wine into his blood. But if you will abide by this literal interpretation, you must carry out the principle much further than you do. We know, from 1 Cor. xi. 25, and from St. Luke, that our Lord said, "This cup is the New Testament in my blood." Have I not, then, as good reason for asserting that the cup is transubstantiated into the New Testament as you have for saying that the bread and wine are transubstantiated into the body and blood of our Lord?

But from the words of our Lord, immediately after consecration, we learn that no transubstantiation had taken place; for he calls the consecrated element "the fruit of the vine"—"But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom."—Matt. xxvi. 29.

Moreover, it was when our Lord was celebrating the Passover with his disciples, that he instituted the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Now, it was customary among the Jews for the head of the family to pronounce over the Paschal Lamb the words "This is the Lord's Passover;" as the head of the family he, too, must have pronounced over the Paschal Lamb, the words, "This is the Lord's Passover." The disciples knew the lamb was not really the passover, but that it was a sign, emblem or memorial of it, and when, immediately after the commemorative supper he institutes the Christian sacrament, and uses the same form of phrase respecting it, which a few moments before he had used respecting the Jewish sacrament, and says of the bread and wine, "This is my body broken or given," "This is my blood shed," it is impossible his disciples could have understood him otherwise than as implying, "This is the sign, emblem, or memorial of my body broken, and of my blood shed."

And such a way of speaking is quite common, and often used by our Lord himself. He declared, "I am the door," "I am the vine," "I am the shepherd." He was not literally a door, a vine, or a shepherd, but he was figuratively what they were literally. The Apostles had often heard our Saviour speak thus before, and they would naturally understand him to be speaking so then.

Nor do they afterwards put another meaning on his words. In his first epistle to the Corinthians, St. Paul five times successively calls that bread which was consecrated, and which our Saviour calls his body.

We conclude, therefore, that the figurative is in this case that in which our Saviour's words must be understood. But to say that his words are to be taken in any other sense than that in which those who heard him would naturally understand him, is what I think none would venture to say, except those who have been carefully trained up to believe it such.

I am, dear sir, sincerely and faithfully yours,

WM. CARSON.

ST. AUGUSTINE'S PRAYER.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—In the last number of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, p. 45, you conclude your answer to "Amicus" with the words—"This is the interpretation of St. Augustine, book the 1st, on the Sermon on the Mount, cap. ii." In both the last numbers you have quoted the Holy Fathers as entirely against the doctrine of purgatory. I trust you will not refuse me, who am a very unskilled controversialist, a privilege which you have given and kindly promised to other Catholic laymen.

Then, let me suppose that you adduce the most powerful array of quotations, from the Holy Fathers, against the Catholic doctrine of purgatory, and that I, on the other hand, do adduce only one, from one only of the ancient Fathers of the Church. What then? The inference naturally must be, that such holy Father was not orthodox. I then, sir, refer you to the confessions of St Augustine, book ix. chap 13; and, at the same time, I beg leave to quote the following, from the above, for the attentive perusal of your readers.

The following then is the sublime and elequent prayer of the great and truly orthodox St. Augustine for the repose of his mother's soul:—"And, now, my heart being cured of that wound, [sorrow for his mother] I pour out to thee, my God, in behalf of her, thy servant, a very different kind of tears, issuing from a heart awed by the contemplation of the dangers of every soul that dies in Adam. For, although she, being revived in Christ, even before being freed from the flesh, and having lived so as that thy name is much praised in her faith, and virtues, yet I dare not say that no word came out of her mouth contrary to thy command, from the time thou didst regenerate her by baptism. I then, putting aside her good deeds, for which I give thanks with joy, *entreat thee at present, for the sins of my mother*, forgive them, O Lord; forgive them, I beseech thee, enter not into judgment with her," &c., &c.

With your permission, sir, I will use the right of "private judgment" and that of "reason" as to the above passage.

I need not now inquire, nor is it necessary, whether *Monica* died a saint or not. From the above passage, at least, it would seem that her *son*, St. Augustine, who *knew her many virtues*, was somewhat uneasy as to the *repose* of her soul in the other world. In your first article on purgatory, page 39, of the last CATHOLIC LAYMAN, you say "Christ, in fact, does not do his work of atonement by halves—remitting the guilt, and yet leaving the punishment! Where the guilt is removed the punishment is so likewise, temporal as well as eternal. Tertullian. Chrysostom, *Augustine*, all say this." Now, sir, why did St. Augustine entreat the mereiful Saviour, who "does not do his work of atonement by halves," for St. Monica's sins? When her spirit quitted its remnant of clay, it was judged, and found either sinless or sinful—if the former, heaven, if the latter, hell was her reward. In either case, praying for her, or remembering her at the "altar," according to her own request, previous to her death, would be an idle and silly performance. Yet, it strikes me, that St. Augustine held a different doctrine; therefore, he continued to pray for her, and to remember her at the altar, hoping that the holy and all-saving sacrifice would atone for her human weakness and defects during life; for who can be sure that, during life, they have sufficiently satisfied the Divine justice?

Like St. Augustine, I shall, sir, until better instructed, continue to pray for the faithful departed.

And have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

A CATHOLIC.

Loughrea, April 24, 1852.

We find some things in our correspondent's letter that we must agree with, and something which we must ask him to consider again.

We agree with him, that if we "adduce the most powerful array of quotations from the Holy Fathers against the Catholic doctrine of purgatory, and that he, on the other hand, do adduce only one, from one only, of the Ancient Fathers of the church—what then? The inference naturally must be, that such Holy Father was not orthodox." If our correspondent had said—"Was not orthodox *in this point*," we would have thought his argument generally correct. Yet, even so (seeing that he has quoted only *one* Father), a regard for truth would prevent our urging this argument too far against him. There may be cases, and there are, in which it would be easy to bring more Fathers in favour of an error than against it. Let Roman Catholics only show that the doctrine of purgatory is taught in Scripture, and we will accept the opinion of one Father in its favour, although ten should be against it.

We must ask our correspondent to consider again the following passage of his letter:—"WHEN her spirit quitted its tenement of clay, *it was judged*, and found either sinless or sinful; if the former, heaven; if the latter, hell was the reward. In either case, praying for her, or remembering her at the 'altar,' according to her own request, previous to her death, would be an idle and silly performanee. Yet it strikes me that St. Augustine held a different doctrine."

Now, it strikes us so too; though, perhaps, not exactly in the same way; and it may strike our correspondent, as it does us, when he considers it again. He seems to think that St. Monica received her final judgment, either for heaven or hell, as soon as she departed from this life; and before St. Augustine prayed for her. For he goes on to say that, notwithstanding this judgment, St. Augustine continued to pray for her. We cannot see what room our correspondent leaves here for purgatory. If Monica must needs go either to *heaven* or to hell, as soon as she left this life, and before St. Augustine had time to pray for her, what time was there for her to go to purgatory at all? Did St. Augustine pray for her *after* she was *in hell?* We notice this, as showing how hard it is for Roman Catholics to write on this subject at all, without making admissions that overthrow purgatory altogether.

But we regard truth alone, and not victory; and we will help our correspondent out of this difficulty. In the Nicene creed, which he and we believe alike, it is said of Christ, "He *shall* come *again* with glory *to judge* both the quick and the dead." The judgment of all who have died since Christ first came, shall take place when Christ comes again into this world as judge. Therefore, St. Monica is not yet judged; she is still waiting for the judgment of Christ when he shall come, at the great day.

This gives a very different meaning to St. Augustine's prayer; but to show what that meaning is, we must give the prayer more fully than our correspondent, "A Catholic," has given it. We do not at all suppose, that he meant to give it wrongly; we are sure that he found it in some book just as he has given it, and that he thought it stood just as St. Augustine wrote it. But the book misled him; and we shall therefore give, as St. Augustine wrote it, marking with brackets, the parts omitted in "A Catholic's" letter.

"But now, with a heart cured of that wound . . . I pour out unto thee, our God, in behalf of that thy servant, a far different kind of tears, flowing from a spirit moved by the thoughts of the danger of every soul that dies in Adam. And although she, having been made alive in Christ, even while not yet released from the flesh, so lived that thy name should be praised in her life and conversation, yet, I dare not say that, from the time that thou didst regenerate her by baptism, no word came out of her mouth contrary to thy command. [And it was said by thy Son, The Truth, 'Whosoever shall say to his brother, thou fool, shall be in danger *of hell fire*.' And woe be even to the commendable life of

men, if, laying aside mercy, thou shouldst examine it. But because thou art not extreme in seeking out what is done amiss, we faithfully hope to find some place of pardon with thee. But whoever reckons up his real merits to thee, what does he reckon to thee except thy gifts? Oh, that men would know themselves, and that he that glorieth would glory in the Lord.] I therefore, [Oh, my praise and my life, God of my heart,] laying aside for a while her good deeds, for which I give thanks to thee with joy, do now beseech thee, for the sins of my mother, [hearken unto me, I entreat thee by the medicine of our wounds, who hung upon the tree, and now sitting at thy right hand maketh intercession to thee for us. I know that she dealt mercifully, and from her heart forgave her debtors their debts; do thou also forgive her debts, whatever she may have contracted in so many years, since the water of salvation.] Forgive, O Lord, forgive, I beseech thee; enter not into judgment with her. [Let thy mercy exalt itself over judgment, since thy words are true, and thou hast promised mercy unto the merciful; which thou gavest unto them to be, thou who wilt have mercy upon whom thou wilt have mercy, and wilt have compassion on whom thou wilt have compassion. And I *believe thou hast already done what I ask*, but accept, O Lord, the freewill offerings of my mouth."]

We have thus filled up the gaps in our "Catholic" correspondent's quotation. We cannot give the whole (for it is too long), but we give one sentence more, which plainly shows the nature of the prayer—"Let none sever her from thy protection: let neither the lion nor the dragon interpose himself by force or fraud, for she will not answer that she owes nothing, lest she be convicted and seized by the crafty accuser; but she will answer that her sins are forgiven her by him, to whom none can repay that price, which he who owed nothing, paid for us."

Before we proceed to examine this prayer, let us remind our correspondent that the article in our last number, upon which he writes, was upon purgatory, not upon prayers for the dead. Any prayer for the dead which has nothing to do with purgatory, cannot be brought against that article.

Now, mark first the *nature* of the sins respecting which St. Augustine prayed. They are offences of the tongue, of which Christ has said, that they who commit them shall be in danger of *hell fire* (see the first passage in brackets). St. Augustine, therefore, was not praying for his mother's delivery from the pains of purgatory, but that she might not be condemned to hell. Remember that Monica is not yet judged. St. Augustine prays that, when judged, she shall not be condemned to hell. It is evident that he had no thought at all of praying that she might be released from what she was suffering at that time—there is no hint of such a thing in his prayer. Yet this is what any one who believed in purgatory would certainly have prayed for. Our correspondent, indeed, says that St. Augustine "was somewhat uneasy as to the *repose* of her soul in the other world." But he is plainly mistaken in this; St. Augustine says no such thing, but in the words which our correspondent did not quote (we are sure because he did not know of them), St. Augustine says the very contrary—"*I believe thou hast* ALREADY *done what I ask*." If St. Augustine believed that God had *already* granted everything he thought it necessary to pray for, for his mother, how could he possibly be uneasy about the repose of his mother's soul? No, but looking forward to the future judgment, St. Augustine well knew that if God should try every word of hers by his strict and holy law he would find enough to condemn her, and he therefore prays that God would have mercy in that day. And what was the ground of his hope that God would hear this prayer? It was this, *that before Monica died* she was entitled to this forgiveness, though not by her own merits, yet by the PROMISE of Christ. "I know (he says) that she dealt mercifully, and from her heart forgave her debtors their debts." And again, "THOU HAST PROMISED mercy unto the merciful." And he marks that it was God (and not herself) who had worked in her this spirit of mercy and of love, this title to receive mercy from him. And God who worked mercy in her, had promised to give her mercy in the day of judgment, and on this ground, and on this ground only, he prays God to perform that promise, and to give her the mercy which he had promised. Do we any longer wonder that he should say? "I believe thou hast already done what I ask;" well might St. Augustine believe it, since he knew that everything which he had asked, God had bound himself by promise to do. Let us confine ourselves to the same rule, let us pray only for what God has promised, and we may believe that it is done already. But what has such a prayer to do with purgatory? Some one must show a promise from God about purgatory before we can thus pray about it.

Let us suppose such a prayer as this—"Thou, O Lord, hast promised, that so surely as Jesus died and rose again, so surely shall he bring with him, when he comes again in glory to this world, the souls of all that now are asleep in him. Perform this promise, O Lord, perform it; hasten that glorious day; bring these souls with thee, and do to them all that thou hast said." Here is a prayer for the dead, which few Protestants will condemn as sinful. And why? because it is simply calling upon God to fulfil his promise, and to do what he has said, and what he surely will do. If any Protestant hesitate about the lawfulness of such a prayer, it is simply because prayers for the dead are so abused by those who pray *contrary* to God's promises and Word. Let "Catholics" only lay aside all prayers for what God has given no promise (for this is the great principle, that no prayer can be the prayer of faith, no prayer can be acceptable to him, unless it has his promise to rest on). Let Catholics lay aside all prayers for the dead that go beyond or contrary to the promises of God. Let them lay aside all prayers that deny the mercy of Christ, all prayers that dishonour the full efficacy of the blood of Christ; let them do all this, and confine themselves to prayers that rest on his express word and promise; prayers for what he will accomplish whether they pray or not; prayers to which they can add in faith, as St. Augustine did—"I believe that thou hast already done what I ask"—and there will soon be little difference among Christians about prayers for the dead.

Our correspondent concludes his letter with a solemn question—"Who can be sure that, during life, *they* have sufficiently satisfied the Divine justice?" We have no difficulty in answering, that *none* can be sure of; all should be sure of the contrary. But St. Augustine, in his prayer, points out a remedy, of which we may be sure also—"She will not answer that she owes nothing . . . but she will answer that her sins are forgiven her by him to whom none can repay that price which he who owed nothing paid for us." St. Augustine thought the Divine justice, which we cannot satisfy, was satisfied by that ransom.

FARM OPERATIONS FOR MAY.

(From the Irish Farmer's Gazette.)

Barley.—From the protracted drought, we are well aware that much of the barley land has remained unsown, in the expectation of timely rain to enable the teams to turn up and pulverize the land to the necessary degree of fineness, to insure an even braird. Some partial showers have already fallen, which we trust have been taken advantage of; and would earnestly urge those who have not yet sown this grain, not to lose a moment in doing so. The land should be rendered as loose and friable as possible, and the seed sown quickly on the fresh-turned earth, so as to retain as much of the natural moisture of the land as possible. Steeping the seed, to hasten the period of germination, will be of much service; but it will require careful watching, as, in warm, close weather, it may germinate in a couple of days; but, in cool weather, with harsh, north or north-eastern winds, it will take much longer. As soon as symptoms of germination are apparent, the seed should be committed to the earth without delay.

Mangel wurzel.—Last month we gave the general details necessary in the preparation of the land for this crop, as well for the generality of green crops, to which we refer our readers; if not sown already, no time should now be lost in getting in the several varieties of this crop, the most valuable of which are the long red, globe red, and orange globe, and for the manufacture of sugar, the Silesian or sugar beet. The seeds should be steeped in soft or manure water for 48 hours, and afterwards mixed with fine sand, and kept in a dark place, frequently turned and moistened, to promote germination, and sown upon the first appearance of vegetating.

During the past year the cultivation of *sugar beet* has been strongly urged, by various parties, as a highly remunerative crop. We have always expressed our doubts on this subject; and we find that the results of our past experience, in the growing of this particular variety of the beet tribe, have been fully borne out by the elaborate experiments made by Mr. Kelly, of Portrane, detailed in his communication to "the Committee of the Agricultural Museum, Royal Dublin Society," which appeared in the FARMERS' GAZETTE of November 8, 1851. From this important document we find that the difference in the money value, per acre (Irish), between sugar beet and yellow globe mangel amounted to the sums of £12 4s. 2½d. in favour of the latter, and that red globe mangel exceeded the sugar beet in value, per acre, by £14 1s. 4½d. With these results before us we cannot recommend the cultivation of the sugar beet as a remunerative crop. We have also this serious objection against its cultivation for the purpose of being converted into sugar—namely, that if such was carried into effect, we would have the manure producing crops—that is, the green crops—carried off the farm, while it is very doubtful whether they would be replaced by an equal supply of manure; and thus the effects of the potato system of cultivation would be again introduced amongst us.

Further, much complaint has been made by parties, who have grown the article last season, some of them extensively, at the company not being ready to receive the roots till a late period of the season, thus entailing much loss and dissappointment to the grower; and we find from a recent advertisement for tenders, that the period of delivery is to be at the option of the company, from the begining of October till the end of March, thus throwing the entire loss arising from evaporation, decaying roots, and expense of storing, &c., on the farmer, besides being confined to one market, and having his money locked up at a time when he should have it to meet his numerous demands. Again, according to Professor Sullivan's recent pamphlet, the largest roots do not contain saccharine matter in proportion to the smaller ones by so great a difference as nine per cent. This is a point to which we formerly adverted. Last season in reply to, and to neutralize our arguments, as to the heavy cost entailed on the producer in delivery, it was asserted that there were drying stations to be established to cure the root, to save the great cost of long and heavy carriage to the farmer, the loss of storage, and enable the company to manufacture the sugar throughout the year; but we have heard nothing of it since. These matters will tend very much, we fear, to the detriment of the company, who will, if persisted in, be obliged to become producers. We think it right to make the above observations, which we imagine are correct; if in any point we have erred we are open to conviction: at the same time we must say that we are informed, by good authority, that a most excellent article is produced at Mountmellick, and trust it may be found cheap and remunerative to all parties, as well as good.

Swede turnips, like the mangels, should be sown as early as possible in the month, and for which the same preparations are necessary and suitable, except that they do not require so heavy a dressing of manure; steep the seed in soft or manure water for 48 hours, set them to drain, and dry them with wood or other ashes. Sow a liberal quantity of seed to allow for the ravages of the fly; if not attacked they are easily hoed out, which to insure a full crop will be much better and cheaper than sowing again; to insure a full and even braird clean and very fine tillage is necessary; rolling and dusting at night with fine quick-lime before they come up and till well established in rough leaf, are the best preventives of the fly.

White Globe or Norfolk Turnips, when required for early sheep feeding, a breadth of white turnips may be sown by the middle of the month, which will come in by September, and be of great service.

Dale's Hybrid and Aberdeen Turnips may be sown from the middle to the end of the month.

Carrots and Parsnips will now require much careful attention, in hoeing and weeding; if sown early, and their progress strong, they will require thinning by the end of the month.

Chicory may still be sown till the 10th of the month. For details, see operations for last and preceding months.

Spring Vetches.—Breadths suitable to the consumption of the above valuable soiling crop should be sown once a fortnight. Mix the vetches with about one-fourth of oats, and about 4lb. of rape; it adds considerably to the bulk of the provender, and serves to keep the vetches off the ground.

Rye and Winter Vetches.—The former will be coming into use early in the month; the latter, at later periods. As fast as they are consumed the land should be turned up and prepared for turnips.

Cabbages—The early-sown spring cabbages may now be drawn from the seedbeds, and transplanted in the fields, the land having been previously well prepared and liberally manured. A good method is to prepare the land in drills, just as if for turnips, and plant in the crown of the drills. Cabbages, planted out this month, will be fit for consumption in September and October.

Kohl Rabi, sown in beds, the last or preceding month, will be fit for transplanting out in the same way as the cabbages mentioned above, some time this or early next month. When this crop is not planted out but sown at once in the drills like turnips, no time should be lost now in doing so.

Flax should now be carefully weeded; the weeders (women and children are best) should proceed on their hands and knees facing the wind. Flax should be weeded when from 3 to 6 inches high, not more.

Buckwheat.—The land for this crop should be thoroughly pulverized and clean, and should not be sown till all danger from frost is over, which may be about the middle of the month. It is cultivated for the seed, for soiling, and for ploughing in as green manure. For the first, two bushels of seed to the Irish acre should be sown; and for the two latter from three to four bushels may be sown. It is a good crop to lay down land to pasture or meadow with.

Hemp.—Sow early in the month, in rows about two and a half feet apart. About three bushels of sound heavy seed will sow the Irish acre.

Wheat, if too luxuriant, should now be eaten down with sheep, or mown, harrowed, and rolled; but these operations should be performed before the culm or seed stem begins to shoot up, after which it would be injurious to do so. Wheat and other autumn-sown crops should now be thoroughly weeded, and if sown in drills the horse and hand hoes, with drill grubbers, should be passed between them.

Beans will now require horse and hand hoeing.

Potatoes, if planted in time, will now require hoeing, cleaning, and moulding, if in drills; if in ridges or lazy-beds, clean, and add a little fresh earth from the fur-

rows, except those intended for very early use. These latter should be cleaned but not earthed, as that operation, although adding to the bulk of the crop, retards their coming to maturity.

Paring and burning should be proceeded with upon all favourable opportunities; there is no better preparation for turnips, rape, and late potatoes; and more will be done in cleansing foul land in one season, by this mode, than in three or four of the usual modes of cropping.

Grass Lands.—New pastures should be eaten close, to keep the plants from shooting up seed stems, which weaken them, and, to promote tillering, covering the surface quickly, and produce a close sward.—*Sheep pastures* should be eaten close and bare, but lands designed for heavy horned stock, should be allowed to produce a good bite before they are stocked. It will be advisable to mow rich or rank spots, which the animals refuse to eat; they will greedily devour the young growth, though, if unmown, they may refuse it all the season.

Ewes and Lambs should have a short, sweet bite. Dag and trim the ewes of all foul wool on the tail, legs, udders, &c. Guard against the attacks of the fly, by removing the maggots as soon as possible, and strewing a little finely-powdered white lead on the spot, which will soon heal the excoriated skin; never remove any of the wool, which makes the flock look ragged. Wash the entire flock by the end of the month, in a clean, running stream, and when thoroughly dry, but not before, have them shorn; they should be accommodated with a thoroughly clean pasture, after being washed, till shorn, free from clayey naked banks, which would dirty the wool.

Wedders.—Fatting and store stock will now require extra care. Examine their feet and remove all loose or overgrown portions of the hoof, loose skin, &c., to prevent lameness; and, if necessary, anoint with butyr of antimony. The transition from winter keep to the young succulent grass frequently causes a laxative state of the bowels, in which case bleed and give Epsom salts, from one to two ounces, according to size and strength; and if the disease continues obstinate, give a tablespoonful, morning and night, and oftener, if necessary, of the following mixture:—One ounce prepared chalk, half an ounce of catechu, and half an ounce of powdered opium, mixed with half a pint of peppermint water.

The Dairy will be in full and profitable operation some time this month. Let the cows have sufficient nourishing, succulent food. Be careful that they are not turned to grass before they have a full and sufficient bite, and let them not undergo sudden changes of weather to chill and throw them into ill health, and consequent loss of milk. Pay attention to the dairy, and insist on the most scrupulous cleanliness, both in person and the utensils, and everything connected with the dairy.

Calves.—Early ones may now be turned out to grass in warm, well sheltered paddocks, where they may be fed. Linseed meal or porridge may be gradually substituted for part or the whole of the milk, which is sometimes an object after the calf is three weeks or a month old.

Pigs.—Fat pigs should be disposed of before the month commences, and all others kept in store condition. Green clover, vetches, &c., may be given them in their yard, or if a clover field can be exclusively devoted to this stock, they will be maintained in health, strength, and good growing condition, till the end of the season, when food more adapted for fattening comes in plentifully.

Naked fallows should get a turning this month, previous to which they should be well harrowed and hand-picked.

Corn Crops and Meadows.—This is a good time to top-dress the corn crops and meadows with guano, fermented bones, soot, lime and salt, or other artificial manures.

Soiling.—Rye, vetches, Italian rye-grass, clovers, Lucerne, saintfoin, &c., will now be rapidly coming into use for house-feeding the stock. Cut close that none be wasted. Keep under-cover for six hours after cutting before using, that the more watery particles be evaporated, and avoid heaping too much together to prevent fermentation. Top-dress the lucernes, clovers, rye-grass, &c., immediately after cutting, with rich compost or liquid manure.

Poultry.—Pay attention to the young chickens; let them have a warm, sunshiny, sheltered place to walk in, with free access to green and insectiferous food. Set more clutches of those most desirous of increasing. Feed young turkeys on boiled nettles, chopped fine, mixed with well-boiled potatoes, or, in lieu of those, with some good oatmeal. Keep them carefully from damp. Attend to the young goslings, they require soft feeding; and allow both them and young ducks free access to water in fine weather, but keep them away from it in damp, wet weather, or many may be lost from cramp.

Odds and ends.—Keep the drainers at work where necessary; cut and draw home turf for fuel; keep down weeds; turn and pulverize compost heaps, and collect manures, this month.

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

BOOKSELLERS TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE LORD LIEUTENANT,

HAVE respectfully to invite the attention of the Clergy and others to new Editions of the following Important WORKS, now in course of preparation, and to suggest the desirableness of their taking advantage of the proposed plan of publication.

I.

SCOTT'S COMMENTARY ON THE HOLY BIBLE,

In Six volumes, quarto, price THREE GUINEAS.

The price at which it was originally published was EIGHT GUINEAS, subsequently reduced to Six Guineas. The work will be issued to *Subscribers only*, bound in cloth, at THREE GUINEAS per copy.

Orders for copies must be accompanied with a post-office order for TEN SHILLINGS; the remaining part of the subscription to be paid on the volumes being ready for delivery, which, it is expected, will be during the autumn of the present year.

II.

CHEAP AND UNIFORM EDITION

OF

THE WORKS OF THE REV. EDWARD BICKERSTETH.

In SIXTEEN Volumes, Foolscap 8vo., containing, on an average, about 300 pages in each.

While the cost of Mr. Bickersteth's Works hitherto has been upwards of FOUR POUNDS, the above *uniform* Edition will be only FORTY SHILLINGS.

The issue of the Work, *to Subscribers only*, will be made half-yearly. The first delivery, of Four Volumes, will commence in June, and the whole will be completed in the autumn of 1853. For each issue of Four Volumes, the Subscriber to pay TEN Shillings: but the separate Works cannot be sold, apart from the Set, at this exceedingly low price.

III.

POOLE'S ANNOTATIONS ON THE HOLY BIBLE.

THREE VOLS., IMPERIAL OCTAVO.

An edition equal to that now on sale at £3 3s.

Offered, to SUNSCRIBERS ONLY, at ONE GUINEA AND A HALF.

The work will be published in June, bound strongly in extra purple cloth.

*** As the term of subscription for the above works will very shortly expire, intending Subscribers are respectfully invited to forward their names *immediately* to

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,
9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

WORKS SOLD

BY

WILLIAM CURRY & CO.,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-ST., DUBLIN.

THE ROYAL PREACHER: Lectures on Ecclesiastes. By Rev. James Hamilton, D.D. 5s.

Memoir of the Rev. Edward Bickersteth. By the Rev. T. R. Birks. Third edition. 2 vols., 8vo. 16s.

Memoir of the Rev. Thomas Chalmers, D.D. By the Rev. William Hanna, D.D. Vols. I., II., III. Crown 8vo. Each 10s. 6d. (Vol. IV., completing the memoir, expected next week.

The Expository Preacher: or, St. Matthew's Gospel Practically Expounded. By the Rev. C. Overton. 2 vols., 8vo. 15s.

Commentary on Leviticus, Expository and Practical. By the Rev. A. Bonar. New Edition. 8vo. 8s. 6d.

Memoir of the late Rev. W. H. Hewitson. By the Rev. John Baillie. Crown 8vo. 5s.

Memoir of the Rev. H. W. Fox, and account of Missions in India. Third Edition. 7s. 6d.

Roberts' Plain Sermons for all the Sundays and Chief Holidays of the Year. 2 vols. 10s. 6d.

——— Village Sermons. Vols. 1 and 2, each 2s. 6d.

The One Primeval Language; traced experimentally through Ancient Inscriptions; including the Voice of Israel from the Rocks of Sinai. With a Harmony of Alphabets. By the Rev. Charles Forster. 8vo. 21s.

No Condemnation in Christ Jesus; as unfolded in the eighth chapter of Romans. By Octavius Winslow, D.D. Post 8vo. 7s. Just published.

Voices of the Dead. By the Rev. John Cumming, D.D. Foolscap. 7s. Just published.
With Voices of the Day and Night. Just published.

Barnes' Notes on the Book of Revelation. 4s. 6d. Just published.

Nineveh and its Palaces. The Discoveries of Botta and Layard, applied to the Elucidation of Holy Writ. By Joseph Bourmi. 8vo. With 236 Illustrations on Wood. 6s. Just Published.

The Saxons in Ireland; or, Rambles of an Englishman in Search of a Settlement in the West. Cheaper edition. 5s.

Ireland's Miseries. The Grand Cause and Cure. By the Rev. Dr. Dill. Foolscap. 3s. 6d. Just Published.

Leila Ada, The Jewish Convert. An Authentic Memoir. By Osborne W. Trenery Heighway. 3s. 6d.

Handel's Visit to Dublin; with Incidental Notices of his Life and Character. By Horatio Townsend, Esq. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

A Journey to the Tea Countries of China, with a Notice of the Tea Plantations in the East Indies. By Robert Fortune. 8vo. 15s.

Plain Sermons on Subjects Practical and Prophetic. By the Reverend A. M'Caul, D.D. Fcap. 6s. 6d.

Life of Dr. Gordon, abridged from "The Christian Philosopher Triumphing over Death." 18mo. 1s. 6d.

Bishop of Ossory's Speech, delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Church Education Society, April 15, 1852. 8vo. 1s.

Discourses on some of the Most Difficult Texts of Scripture. By the Reverend James Cochrane. Fcap. 5s.

A Smaller Classical Dictionary of Biography, Mythology, and Geography. By William Smith, L.L.D. 8vo. With 200 Wood Engravings. 10s. 6d.

Just Published, No. I., Demy 8vo., Price 2s. 6d.

"THE FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW."

THE range of subjects discussed in the Review will be wide and comprehensive, embracing all the various departments of Literature contained within, or bordering upon, the territory of Scriptural truth; and it will be similar in its features to the *Princeton Review*. The *Review* will be published quarterly. Each number will contain, on an average, TWO HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FOUR pages.

Subscribers are requested to forward their names to WILLIAM CURRY & Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON, and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher, WILLIAM CURRY, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

Saturday, May 15, 1852.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Sloip do Dhia añ pna hápduiḃ, agur píoḃcáin aip an dtalaim deaġċoil do na dáoiniḃ.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED THE MIDDLE OF EVERY MONTH, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. I.—No. 6. JUNE, 1852. Annual Subscription, 3s. 6d. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
The Rule of Faith	61
Is the Church of Rome justified in withholding the Eucharistic Cup from the Laity?	63
To whom should we pray?	64
The Curé and the Bishop—from the French	64
The Blessing of Literature	66
Use of the Fathers	66
The Touchstone (continued)	68
CORRESPONDENCE:	
Is the Doctrine of Purgatory taught by the early Fathers?	69
Mr. Aylmer's rejoinder to our observations on Searching the Scriptures	69
Farming Operations for June	71

THE RULE OF FAITH.

"What must I do that I may be saved?"* This is the great question which it behoves every one, to whom the sound of the everlasting Gospel has come, to ask himself, and to which every creed professes to supply an answer. To examine which of these answers is most in accordance with the revealed will of God, is the bounden duty and the inalienable privilege of every man. It is true that all Christian Churches, the Roman Catholic as well as the Reformed, agree in accepting, in a general way, the answer given by the Apostles, Paul and Silas to the above question—viz., "Believe in the Lord Jesus and thou shalt be saved and thy house." But when it is further inquired, in what does this belief consist? What are the doctrines which form essential and indispensable parts of the religion of Jesus? Where are these doctrines to be found? What, in short, is the *rule* by which our belief or *faith* is to be guided? No sooner are these additional questions proposed, than a wide diversity of opinion at once becomes apparent, and the characteristic difference between the Church of Rome and the Reformed Churches, especially the Church of these kingdoms, comes into view. The grand fundamental distinction between the Roman Catholic and the Protestant religion consists in this very point, that whilst Protestants maintain that a full and perfect rule of faith is contained in the Scriptures, and that, consequently, these furnish, in and by themselves, a sufficient basis for all doctrines necessary to salvation, the Church of Rome holds that the Holy Scriptures are *insufficient* by themselves, and that we must admit, in addition to them, a second source, from which some essential articles of faith are derived—viz., Tradition; and that this second source is of *equal authority* with the first, and *independent* of it. The following are the authoritative statements of the Church of England and the Church of Rome, respectively, on this subject. The Church of England declares, in her sixth Article, that "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite as necessary to salvation." The Council of Trent, on the other hand, in the Decree concerning the canonical Scriptures, passed in its fourth session, "receives and venerates *with equal sentiments of piety and reverence* all *the books*, as well of the Old as of the New Testament, and also *the traditions* pertaining both to faith and morals, inasmuch as they [*the traditions*] either came from the mouth of Christ himself, or were dictated by the Holy Spirit, and have been preserved by unbroken succession in the Catholic Church."† Accordingly, Cardinal Bellarmine, who reduces the controversy between [Roman] Catholics and Protestants [whom he calls heretics] to two points, is quite correct when he says: "The first is, *we* assert that all necessary doctrine, concerning faith and morals, is not expressly contained in the Scriptures: and, therefore, we maintain that, beside the *written* word of God, there is, moreover, needed the *unwritten* word—that is to say, divine and apostolical traditions." But *they* [Protestants] teach that all things necessary for faith and morals are contained in Scripture, and, therefore, that there is no need of the unwritten word."†

Now, before proceeding any further, it is necessary, in order to avoid misapprehension, to understand clearly what is meant by the word *tradition*, in the sense in which alone it is rejected by the united Church of England and Ireland. Tradition, then, as here employed, denotes *a divine revelation concerning matters of faith* or morals, *not contained in the written word of God*;‡ but equally certain, equally divine, equally to-be-reverenced, and consequently, equally obligatory with Scripture itself. In other words, Scripture and Tradition are co-ordinate, independent, and equally venerable sources of doctrine: either of which without the other is not sufficient for salvation. It is in this sense—as an authority upon matters of faith equal to and independent of Scripture—that the Church of these realms rejects tradition. There are other senses of the word, as we shall see hereafter, in which that Church receives with due respect the authority of ancient tradition. It must also be carefully observed, that the reason why Protestants reject traditions relating to matters of faith, is not *merely* because such doctrines are not contained in Scripture, but because there neither is nor can be certain evidence that they proceeded from our Lord or his inspired messengers. We know perfectly well that a doctrine is, in itself, neither more nor less the word of God for being written or unwritten. We are fully aware that the doctrines now contained in Scripture were, for some time, unwritten traditions.§ We are, consequently, quite prepared to receive, as authoritative and obligatory, any unwritten tradition, *provided* it can be shown by *unquestionable proof* to be derived from an inspired origin. We unhesitatingly repeat, that if any doctrine, not contained in Scripture, be offered to us by the Church of Rome, and be, at the same time, *authenticated as incontestibly as Scripture is*, we will not refuse to accept it as part of our creed. But until it be shown that there *are* divine and apostolical traditional doctrines, not expressly or implicitly contained in Scripture; that, in accordance with the famous rule of Vincentius of Lerins, a clear, unbroken, universal belief of such doctrines has prevailed in the Church, during all ages, from the first; until this be shown, we dare not expose ourselves to the fearful anathema pronounced by the Apostle St. John, in closing the canon of the Bible, against those who presume to make unauthorized additions to the word of God—"I testify to every one that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book; if any man shall add to these things, God shall add to him the plagues written in this book."—Apoc. xxii. 18.*

Having thus explained the *nature of the controversy* between Protestants and Roman Catholics respecting the rule of faith, we may now proceed to examine, as much in detail as our limits will permit, the arguments adduced on both sides, with a view to ascertain on which side reason and Scripture are to be found. The question at issue is one of the highest moment, involving as it does the very basis of our faith; so that its discussion may well bespeak the serious and patient attention of every one who is alive to the importance of being able, before men and before the Searcher of hearts, to give a reason of the hope that is in him. We propose, then, to devote the remainder of the present article to a brief statement of some of the arguments on which Protestants rely in support of the position that Scripture alone, without Tradition, is sufficient for all the essentials of salvation. These arguments may be classed under the four following heads:—*Firstly*, The nature and the design of Scripture. *Secondly*, The testimony of Scripture to its own sufficiency. *Thirdly*, The inadequacy of oral tradition, as a vehicle for the transmission of doctrinal truths. *Fourthly*, The testimony of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church.

I. Scripture is the word of God, and was written by his authority. The Council of Trent "receives all the books as well of the New as of the Old Testament, because that one God is the *author* of both."—Sess. iv. The New Testament Scripture was written, then, not *casually*, or by the momentary impulse of the Evangelists and Apostles, but in accordance with the deliberate will and design of God. Some Roman Catholic divines,† indeed, in order to deduce an argument from the *occasional* origin of the books of Scripture against its being designed as a complete standard of faith, insist much on the fact that we nowhere read in Scripture of our Lord's *commanding* the Evangelists or Apostles to *write* the truths which they were commissioned to *preach*. But, without dwelling on the obvious tendency of this assertion to undermine the great truth of the inspiration of the New Testament, it is sufficient to observe that it contradicts not only the spirit [See Luke i. 3, 4; 2 Pet. i. 15; Is. xxx. 8.], but the letter [See Apoc. i. 11] of Scripture: and that it is at variance with the declaration of the Council of Trent, just quoted, and with the express statements of several of the ancient Fathers.‡ Now, for what imaginable purpose could the New Testament have been written by the will and direction of God, except for preserving to all future ages an authentic record of his revealed word? Roman Catholics deny that Scripture was intended to be a *judge in controversy* or to *teach* the Gospel.§ They show abundantly that many have made an *evil use* of Scripture, and have attempted to support their errors by its words.‖ The question, then, returns with still greater force—Why did God command the Scripture to be written? No other reason can be assigned than that just stated—viz., to *preserve an authentic record of His revelation*. But if this be so, it will be very difficult to account for *only a part* of this revelation having been thus perpetuated;

* Acts xvi. 30, Douay Bible, from which all our Scripture quotations are made.

† "Omnes libros tam Veteris quam Novi Testamenti, necnon traditiones ipsas, tum ad fidem tum ad mores pertinentes, pari pietatis affectu ac reverentia suscipit et veneratur [sc. Tridentina Synodus]."

* This distinction between divine and apostolical traditions is founded on the decree of the Council of Trent above quoted—divine traditions denoting those proceeding from Christ himself; apostolical, those proceeding from the Apostles, under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. The latter, however, as coming from an inspired source, may also be termed divine, and are so designated by some Roman Catholic divines—*e.g.*, Perrone, Loc. Theolog. Para. ii., sec. 2.

† Bellarm. de verbo Dei., Lib. IV., cap. 3. This famous writer informs us further, that when his Church speaks of the unwritten word, or Tradition, in contradistinction to the written word, or Scripture, it is not meant that traditional doctrines are *nowhere* written, but only that they were not written by their *first authors* (l. c cap 2). The early Fathers of the Church are supposed to have committed these traditions to writing, from which *mode of conveyance* they have been designated, in the Decree concerning Purgatory, passed in the 25th Session of the Council of Trent, "the ancient *tradition of the Fathers*" (antiqua Patrum traditio). A catalogue of the Fathers, whose writings are looked upon as the principal depositaries of the unwritten word, is given by Cardinal Baronius in his Ann. Eccles., tom. I., p. 412—418. This limitation, however, of dogmatic tradition to doctrines recorded by the earlier Fathers, having been found to be an embarrassing restriction, has been abandoned by the more modern Roman Catholic theologians.

‡ Protestants do not, of course, reject traditions *so far as they agree with* Scripture. But, on the other hand, we deny that such *inherent* traditions, as they have been termed, are necessary to those who admit the authority of Scripture. If Scripture be once allowed to be inspired, its testimony is amply sufficient without them. It is quite true that the general consent of the early Christians, as to the truth of any doctrine, that of the atonement, for instance, is a strong *collateral* proof *of the matter of fact* that the inspired preachers of the Gospel taught that doctrine, and that our Scriptures, which contain it, are genuine. But this consent does not *make* the doctrine true: its truth depends solely on its being revealed by God.

§ Dr. Milner, indeed, following Bellarmine, appears to have thought that Scripture was, by far, the less important of the two, or rather not at all essential. "The Christian doctrine and discipline," he says, "might have been propagated and preserved by the unwritten word, or tradition, joined with the authority of the Church, though the Scriptures had not been composed, however profitable these most certainly are." &c.—End of Controv. Let. 2. The passage of Irenæus, which Dr. Milner quotes in connection with this remark, we shall notice hereafter.

* This is one of the great arguments of Roman Catholic theologians in favour of Tradition; and they taunt Protestants with inconsistency, in receiving one set of oral traditions whilst they reject another. The answer, however, is obvious. We receive the traditions recorded in the Bible, because they were recorded by persons divinely commissioned and inspired to do so. We reject all other doctrinal traditions, because, if they existed whilst the Bible was being written, they must have been designedly omitted by the inspired penmen as unnecessary.

† Bellarmine, de Verb. Dei, iv. 3. Milner, End of Controv., Let. viii. Trevern, Disc. Amic. i. 180.

‡ Thus, for instance, Irenæus says (Cont. Hær. lib. iii. c. 1.), "Which [Gospel] they [the Apostles] then indeed *preached*; but afterwards, *by the will of God handed down to us in the Scriptures*, to be the pillar and ground of our faith"—(quod [evangelium] tunc quidem præconiaverunt [Apostoli], postea vero per Dei voluntatem in Scripturis nobis tradiderunt, fundamentum et columnam fidei nostræ futurum). St. Augustine also says (de Cons. Evang. lib. i., c. 35), "Whatsoever he [our blessed Lord] *wished us to read* of his actions and words, this he *commanded to be written* by them [his Apostles] as if by his own hands"—(quicquid ille de suis factis et dictis nos legere voluit, hoc scribendum illis tanquam suis manibus imperavit).

§ Tourneley, Prel. Theol de Eccl. Christi, i. 291, sq.; Bailly Tract. de Eccl. Chr. i. 291, sq.

‖ Milner, End of Contr. let. viii.; Delahogue, de Eccles., p. 90.

especially as most Roman Catholics admit that the Old Testament Scriptures contain the *whole* of the extant revelations made by God during the elder dispensation.* That some truths should be committed to writing, whilst others equally necessary (according to the Roman Catholic view) were left with totally unequal evidence,† is such an interruption of the general harmony of the divine proceedings, and of the special analogy just noticed with respect to the Old Testament, that we cannot admit its probability without positive and clear evidence that it was God's design to transmit His revelation by these different channels. Vague assertions about the *possibility* of doctrines equally necessary being intended to be conveyed by totally different and unequal vehicles will not suffice. In the utter absence, then, of anything like positive proof of so startling a proposition, we must conclude the *sufficiency* of Scripture from its *existence*. And when we further call to mind that Scripture does make very particular mention of many things which are admitted to be not essential to salvation, such as several rites and temporary regulations, the improbability of the omission of any *necessary* articles of faith is rendered still more apparent.

II. We come next to the evidence which Scripture itself bears to its own sufficiency. Between Roman Catholics and Protestants there is no dispute as to the authority of the parts of the Bible from which this evidence is taken; so that the testimony of Scripture on its own behalf is here admissible. But, on the other hand, both sides have appealed to the evidence of Scripture on the subject before us—Roman Catholics maintaining that it bears witness to its own *insufficiency*, whilst Protestants assert the very reverse. We shall quote at present a few of the many passages adduced by the latter, reserving for subsequent consideration those referred to by Roman Catholics.

Deut. iv. 2—"You shall not add to the word that I speak‡ to you, neither shall you take away from it."

Josh. i. 8—"Let not the book of this law depart from thy mouth; but thou shalt meditate on it day and night, that thou mayest observe and do all things that are written in it: then shalt thou direct thy way, and understand it."

Ps. xviii. 8 (xix. 7 in Prot. vers.)—"The law of the Lord is unspotted [Hebrew, *perfect*], converting souls."

John v. 39—"Search the Scriptures,§ for you think in them to have life everlasting; and the same are they that give testimony of me."

Rom. xv. 4—"For what things soever were written, were written for our learning, that through patience and the comfort of the Scriptures we might have hope."

2 Tim. iii. 15-17—"And because from thy infancy thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which can instruct thee to salvation, by the faith which is in Christ Jesus. All Scripture, inspired of God, is profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice. That the man of God may be perfect, furnished to every good work."

The above and similar passages undoubtedly assert or imply the necessity, perfection, and sufficiency of the *written* word of God, without the aid of Tradition either as a supplement or an interpreter. It may, indeed, be said, as it has been, that some of them relate only to the Pentateuch, and all of them to the *Old* Testament; and that, consequently, if they establish the sufficiency of Scripture, they prove the Old Testament, and even the five books of Moses, to be sufficient without the New Testament, and, therefore, prove too much. We answer, that the inference which we deduce from such passages as the above is *not* that the partial and gradual revelations which it pleased God to make, from time to time, before the advent of the Messiah, are perfect and sufficient in the sense of superseding the necessity of a fuller and more complete manifestation of the Divine will: this would be a contradiction in terms: but our inference is that, in the case of every partial revelation, including the entire of the Old Testament, the *written* word is declared to be, alone and exclusively, necessary and sufficient for *all the purposes which God designed such partial revelations to fulfil*; and we conclude, by analogy, that the same is true of the final and complete revelation made under the Christian dispensation. The utter *silence of Scripture*, in the above and kindred passages, respecting *unwritten* revelation, is the strongest evidence that no such thing was recognised by Moses, Joshua, David, our Blessed Lord, or St. Paul. This conclusion is fortified when we recollect that *Scripture*, and it *alone*, is appealed to in the Bible as the *criterion of truth*. Thus, in the Old Testament the appeal was "To the law and to the testimony. And if they speak not according to his word, they shall not have the morning light."—Is. viii. 20. And in the new, we read that the Bereans "were more noble than those in Thessalonica, who received the word with all eagerness, daily searching the Scriptures whether these things were so."—Acts xvii. 11. But we may state the case still more strongly. The Scripture is more than silent upon this subject. Tradition is occasionally mentioned, but almost always *with disapprobation*.* Thus our Lord says to the Pharisees (Mark vii. 8, 9)—"For leaving the commandment of God, you hold the tradition of men. Well do you make void the commandment of God, that you may keep your own tradition." It is not a sufficient answer to say, that the traditions here condemned are either repugnant to God's law or frivolous, and, therefore, have nothing in common with the divine traditions committed to the custody of the Catholic Church. For although it is quite true that the Pharisaical traditions here condemned were either repugnant to God's word or frivolous; still it is equally true that the Pharisees maintained their *divine* origin, asserting that they were the unwritten word of God, handed down from the time of Ezra, through the Doctors of the law and the members of the Great Synagogue; and so represented them as a supplement to the written word. Yet our Blessed Lord reprobated them in the most unqualified terms, and *that*, too, on the broad ground that they were traditions of *men*, as contradistinguished to the commandments of *God*. Had it been his intention to leave a portion of His own revelation to the safe keeping of oral tradition He would surely have taken occasion here to obviate an almost unavoidable prejudice against such a mode of transmission, arising from His own words, by making that distinction between true and false traditions which Roman Catholics are here compelled to call to their aid. There are, lastly, a number of texts which plainly intimate that the object of committing the word of God to writing was that men should not be left to the vagueness and uncertainty of oral tradition. Thus St. Luke tells Theophilus—"It seemed good to me also, having diligently attained to all things from the beginning to *write* to thee in order, most excellent Theophilus, *that thou mayest know the verity of those words* in which thou hast been instructed"—Luke i. 3, 4. St. John also says—"But these are written, that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing you may have life in his name."—John xx. 31. Again, when St. Peter knew that he was near his end, he wrote his second Epistle, in order, as he himself expresses it, "That after my decease also you may often have whereby you may keep a memory of these things."—2 Pet. i. 15.‡ (See also Is. xxx. 8, and the other passages referred to below.)

III. But what is the reason why Scripture discountenances oral traditions, or, at least, omits all allusion to them as co-ordinate authority with the written word? This brings us to our third argument, in support of the Protestant principle of recognising the sufficiency of Scripture alone—namely, the inadequacy of oral tradition as a means for safely transmitting doctrines.§

That oral tradition is, generally speaking, a most precarious vehicle for the accurate transmission even of *facts*, which are capable of being most fully known, every one readily admits. Much more is this the case with respect of *opinions* or *doctrines* which, almost inevitably, receive some colouring in passing through the minds of those who report them. It is notorious that the most honest and trustworthy hearers of the self-same words will often vary materially from each other in the report which they give of them, even under the solemn sanction of an oath, almost immediately after they have been uttered. How vastly this inherent uncertainty is increased by the numerous sources of error arising from lapse of time, distance of place, prejudice, interest, and soforth, it is needless to dwell on. Some of these evils, connected with oral transmission, no amount of care can guard against or remedy. It may, accordingly, be safely asserted, that it would require a *continued miracle* to preserve, for any length of time, traditional doctrines from even undesigned corruption. Is it, then, conceivable that God would permit important truths, affecting the eternal welfare of His creatures, to be exposed to the inevitable dangers attending such a mode of conveyance as this:‖ especially as there exists a comparatively safe and unexceptionable* vehicle, of which His inspired messengers were expressly directed to avail themselves in the case of other essential verities?

But, it may be said,† God *did* permit the primitive religion, for many centuries, to be handed down solely by tradition (the art of writing being unknown till the age of Moses); why, then, may not the same be the case, to some extent, under the Christian dispensation? Now, we might reply to this, that there is no certain evidence of the art of writing being totally unknown until the time of Moses, and, consequently, of oral tradition being the sole vehicle by which the primitive revelations were transmitted. But, even admitting the assumed fact, we answer, that, without presuming to inquire into all the reasons why God saw fit to intrust His early revelations to the keeping of oral tradition, there were circumstances connected with the patriarchal times which conferred upon them peculiar advantages for the safe transmission of unwritten truths, and such as never could be shared by subsequent ages. The *truths* themselves were few and elementary; and the *long lives*‡ of the patriarchs served as a check on the dangers arising from successive oral communication, by furnishing a kind of *permanent standard*, by which it was possible, at all times, to adjust these truths. And yet, under a combination of favourable circumstances which never again can recur, tradition then proved an utterly inadequate means for the unimpaired transmission of divine revelation. Notwithstanding, that God kept up the memory of Himself, by *repeated* revelation—to Enoch and Noah—we find that so universally was religion corrupted in the age of Abraham (only a few centuries after the Flood), that it was necessary to make a new revelation to him.§ This again was repeated to his immediate descendants, Isaac and Jacob; and yet, in the interval between the death of Joseph and the mission of Moses (only a few generations), the faith again appears to have been corrupted, if not lost.‖ Here, then, was a trial of oral Tradition under the most favourable circumstances that can be conceived, and a complete proof of its inadequacy to preserve inviolate the sacred deposit of divine truth Just as the earlier revelations were themselves partial, and, compared with the subsequent ones imperfect, so was the mode of transmitting them also permitted to be imperfect. This is quite in accordance with the principle of gradual progression, which we can trace in all God's dealings with us. St. Paul tells us that the law of Moses was "our pedagogue in Christ" (*i.e.*, our schoolmaster, to bring us to Christ); and, in the same way, we may conclude, God designed that the imperfections of oral tradition should be fully proved, and that on this account, it was permitted to be preliminary and introductory to the safer and more perfect mode which He himself substituted for it, when He imparted a new and fuller revelation to Moses. With His own finger he *wrote* the ten commandments, brief and simple as they were, on tables of *stone*, in order that they might remain imperishably recorded.¶ Having thus solemnly initiated the future vehicle of divine truth, He commanded Moses to commit to writing all the other precepts which He vouchsafed to communicate. The Book of the Law, thus written, was deposited in the most sacred part of the sanctuary (Deut. xxxi. 26), and most carefully guarded as a treasure of inestimable value. Thus, then, by God's own ordinance, Scripture was substituted for Tradition, although, as it has been well observed, there were many circumstances connected with the Mosaic law which gave it peculiar facilities for being orally handed down.** In a similar manner, during the prophetical period, the prophets were repeatedly directed to commit to writing the messages with which they were charged. Thus we read (Is. xxx. 8)††—"Now, therefore, go in and note it diligently in a book, and it shall be in

---

* From the allusions which occur in various passages of the New Testament to Jewish traditions, not contained in the Old Testament, it has been inferred by some Roman Catholic controversialists (*e.g.* Perrone Loc Theol., Para. II., sec. ii., c. 1), that under the old dispensation, no less than the new, tradition was a co-ordinate authority with Scripture. This inference, however, is rather insinuated than broadly stated.

† Roman Catholics cannot fairly deny that the combined evidence of Scripture and tradition is stronger than that of tradition alone If the latter were sufficient by itself, we can hardly suppose that Scripture, which is exposed to such grave inconveniences as they allege, would have been employed at all.

‡ The correct translation of the word here rendered *speak* is *command*, as the Protestant version has it, and also the Douay itself at Deut. vi. 6. The reason why the Douay translators here adopted the former term may be collected from Bellarmine, who, on the assumption that the original word means *speak*, argues that this passage applies only to the *unwritten* word!

§ See the remarks on this text in our second number, page 14.

‖ For a full discussion of these and kindred passages, see Whitaker, Disputation on Scripture, Quest. vi. chaps. xiv. xv.

* The instances of a contrary kind shall be noticed hereafter.

† See the Note in the Douay Bible on Matt. xv. 9.

‡ The common objection urged by Roman Catholics against the use of these texts in the tradition-controversy—viz., that they prove too much—does not lie against the inference which we have drawn above.

§ It will be observed that, in what follows, the word tradition is employed in a different sense from that in which we have hitherto used it. Heretofore it was taken to denote the *doctrine* handed down (doctrina tradita); here it means the *mode* of its *transmission* (traddendi modus).

‖ It may be asked, How do we know that God does not guarantee their safe transmission by the performance of a perpetual miracle? This is, in fact, the Roman Catholic solution of the difficulty. It is sufficient, at present, to answer, that such an exhibition of miraculous power, for the attainment of an end which might be compassed by the employment of ordinary means, is directly opposed to an admitted law of the Divine administration, viz. Economy in the use of miraculous agency.

* Roman Catholic objections to Scripture, derived from the various abuses of it, are not legitimate grounds of exception.

† This is a favourite argument with Roman Catholic divines—*e.g.*, Bellarmine, Milner, and Delahogue.

‡ Two persons—Methuselah and Shem—might have conveyed the primæval revelation from Adam to Abraham.

§ We learn, from Josh. xxiv. 2, that Abraham's fathers were idolators. We know, from Gen. xxxi. 19, 30, that his nephew, Laban, was one.

‖ The exact religious state of the Israelites, at the time of Moses' mission, it would be difficult to ascertain. From the intimation, however, given in Exod. iii. 13, we may safely conclude that their knowledge of God was, at least, very much dimmed and obliterated.

¶ Some learned men have thought that *alphabetic* writing was entirely unknown down to this period; and that it was now miraculously communicated for the very purpose of furnishing a safe and permanent medium for the transmission of God's word.

** It is sufficient to notice *first*, the circumstances of terrific grandeur which accompanied the promulgation of the law on Mount Sinai, and which from their very nature, were calculated to produce a powerful and lasting impression. *Secondly*. The various rites and anniversary festivals instituted in commemoration of the giving of the laws, or illustrative of its various provisions. *Thirdly*. The fixing the chief seat of the religion in a single locality. *Fourthly*. The establishment of a divinely instituted priesthood, whose sole business it was to provide for the due observance and perfect conservation of the religion. *Fifthly*. The continuance of visible characters of God's miraculous presence—especially the *Shechinah*, or cloud of glory over the mercy-seat and the oracular responses given by the *Urim* and *Thummim*.—See Bp. Burnett on the 6th Art.

†† See also Is. viii. 1; Jer. xxxvi. 2 28, 32; Hab. ii. 2.

the latter days for a testimony for ever;" where it is to be observed, the reason of the injunction is also given—namely, that the words which the prophet delivered might be preserved for future generations. Accordingly, we know nothing—and the fact is a remarkable one, considering the partiality of the later Jews for oral tradition—of the teaching of any of the prophets, save only what is handed down to us by *written* tradition—viz., the Scriptures of the Old Testament.

If, then, it pleased God to permit a trial to be made, under the most favourable possible circumstances, of the adequacy of oral tradition as a means of securely handing down His revelations; if, upon the total failure of this experiment, He himself introduced, and expressly commanded the continuance of a new and more perfect mode of conveyance; is it reasonable to suppose that in the last, the most perfect, and the only universal revelation of His will, designed for all times and all nations, He would sanction even a partial return to the defective and precarious mode of transmission, which, by His own express injunctions, had been for many centuries discontinued? The bare statement of such a supposition is sufficient to show its utter improbability.

But we are here met by the assertion* that the objections to Tradition, based upon the inherent uncertainty of oral communication, and the unavoidable disturbing influences to which it is exposed, do not apply to the tradition for which Roman Catholics contend. They hold, it is said, that the unwritten word was committed not to any particular fallible individuals, but to the bishops and the whole body of the Catholic Church, to which Christ himself imparted the character of infallibility and indefectibility. In other words, the channel through which the divine and apostolical traditions are transmitted, is secured by the great Head of the Church from every possible danger. The statements of the 20th Article of the Church of England, respecting the authority and office of the Church, are also sometimes brought against Protestants to prove that they virtually admit the Catholic Church to possess the power here claimed for her.

Our limits preclude us at present from doing more than noticing the above so-called unassailable bulwark of Tradition; but we hope, in our next number, to return to the subject, and to complete our proof that the Church of England is justified in asserting, that "Holy Scripture containeth *all* things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an Article of Faith, or be thought requisite as necessary to salvation."

IS THE CHURCH OF ROME JUSTIFIED IN WITHHOLDING THE EUCHARISTIC CUP FROM THE LAITY?

This is a grave question, and one in which laymen, for whom we write, have a deep interest. If receiving the holy Eucharist be the most solemn duty of the Christian religion, enjoined upon all his faithful disciples by the Saviour himself, the receiving it *aright* must be a matter of the utmost moment; and an avoidable error in it can be little short of *sacrilege*. In expressing this opinion we are doing no more than eminent popes have themselves done, and are almost using their very language.

Pope Gelasius I., who did not die till A.D. 496, expressly says, that to minister the communion in one kind is open sacrilege—"We have found that some, having received only the portion wherein is the holy body, abstain from the cup of the sacred blood; who, without doubt (forasmuch as I know not with what superstition they are taught), should receive the *whole sacrament, or be kept from the whole*; because the *division* of one and the same mystery cannot come without *great sacrilege*."†

And Pope Leo the Great (to whom we have already referred on another important subject) in treating of the Manicheans, writes thus:—"They withdraw themselves from the sacrament of our salvation. With unworthy mouth they receive Christ's body; but they altogether refuse to *drink the blood of our redemption*, which things we would advertise you of, that both such men may be manifested by these tokens unto you, and also that they, being brought to light, may be *thrust out of the church* by sacerdotal authority."‡

This denunciation of two eminent popes will, no doubt, startle many of our readers, who are, doubtless, under the conviction that the practice of reserving the sacramental cup for the clergy alone is as ancient as the earliest traditions of the Church, and based upon the divine authority of either our Blessed Lord himself, or, at least, of his immediate Apostles. Is it not asserted by the Church of Rome that all the doctrines and usages of the church are derived either from the written Word of God, or traditions derived from the earliest age of Christianity? Do not most Roman Catholic laymen believe that they are so? Whether they are, in this instance, so derived and so supported, is the question we wish to inquire into, and get at the real truth about. We believe we may, without fear of contradiction, commence by stating, that all parties agree that our Blessed Lord instituted the Eucharist under *two* kinds. St. Matt. xxvi. 26—"And whilst they were at supper, Jesus took bread, and blessed and brake, and gave to his disciples, and said: take ye and eat; this is my body. And taking the chalice he gave thanks, and gave to them, saying: "Drink ye all of this. For this is my blood of the New Testament, which shall be shed for many unto the remission of sins." It would appear that our Lord laid greater emphasis on the participation of the cup, by enjoining them *all* to drink of it, than on that of the bread, which he distributed, not with a general injunction, such as "take ye *all* and eat," but with this simple precept, "take, eat; and as St. Matthew reports him to have said, "drink ye ALL of this," so St. Mark (xiv. 23) relates that "they *all* drank of it," which shows the strict observance of the command, and the importance attached to it in the minds of the holy Apostles, who, it must be recollected, were indisputably under the unerring guidance of the Holy Spirit himself; who, if errors or abuses were to arise in his Church in after ages, doubtless, in his infinite wisdom, foresaw them, and was thus particular, with a view to their prevention. We venture to assert, that there is not a single passage in the Holy Scriptures which affords any safe ground for a contrary practice, for we consider it by no means clear that the *breaking of bread*, spoken of in such passages as Luke xxiv. 30, Acts ii. 42, Acts xx. 7, at all refers to the Eucharist, any more than Mark vi. 41, Matt. xiv. 19, Mark viii. 6, when our Lord blessed and brake the loaves and gave them to his disciples long before the institution of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. To *break bread* was a phrase familiar to the Jews, and implied a distribution of it, meaning no more than sitting at meat with them; and such passages, therefore, afford no argument for withholding the sacramental cup from all but the clergy.

We are nearly as confident that there is nothing in the early Fathers to countenance what Pope Leo and Pope Gelasius so expressly and strongly condemned; but, on the contrary, we mean to show, that in the primitive ages of Christianity, the laity were in the habit of complying with our Lord's injunction, by receiving the Eucharist in both kinds.

St. Jerome tells of the "body of our Lord being carried in a basket, and the blood in a glass vessel, to relieve the poor."* St. Basil says, "that it is good and profitable to partake every day of the blessed body and blood of Christ."† And where he treats of the peculiar virtues of Christians, he asks—"What is proper to him who eats the bread, and drinks the cup of Christ?"

St. Chrysostom draws no distinction between the priest and the laity; but compares all Christians in general with the Israelites—"As thou eatest the body of Christ, so did they manna: as *thou drinkest* the blood of Christ, so did they water out of the rock."‡ Again—"It is not now as under the Jewish law, when the priest partook of several things from the altar which the people did not: *there is no difference between the priest and the people* when we come to receive the holy mysteries, for one body and *one cup* is offered to *all*."§

It would be easy to multiply testimony on this point from the Fathers, but it appears to be needless, and we prefer proceeding at once to show the true origin of the modern practice of the Church of Rome, and the date of its final ratification, which did not take place till the Council of Constance, A.D. 1414. The doctrine of communion in one kind had, about two centuries before, begun to be agitated by the clergy; and towards the middle of the 13th century, St. Thomas Aquinas, so distinguished for scholastic subtleties, reduced it to a tangible shape, and first proposed the question, as *a subject of disputation*—viz., whether it was allowable to take the body of Christ *without* the blood, as it was customary with many churches to do so—at the same time admitting that, according to the custom of the *ancient* church, all persons, as they partook of the body, so they also partook of the blood."‖

Cardinal Bona admits that, from the origin of the Church to the 12th age, Christians, *at all times and in every place*, communicated under the species of *bread* and *wine*.¶ And Cardinal Bellarmine (De Euch. lib. iv., c. 4) virtually admits the same thing, when alleging the *excuse* for the change—viz., "that the inconvenience became more and more apparent as the multitude of communicants increased, and so the *custom* under both species gradually *ceased*."

The nature of the inconveniences, and also the justification pleaded by the Church of Rome for sanctioning, at the Councils of Constance and Trent, what Pope Leo the Great and Pope Gelasius considered *sacrilege*, and deserving of *excommunication*, are both deserving of observation. The former we think futile in the extreme, indeed so trifling, that nothing but a dark and superstitious age could have considered them grave enough to justify a departure from primitive usage, based upon the express commands of our Lord himself. Will our readers believe that, among the *inconveniences* referred to, as justifying the change, were the following? To avoid the risk of spilling the wine, and the indecency which arose of communicants dipping their beards into it; lest the wine kept for the sick should turn sour; or some persons should not be able to bear its smell and taste, and the like!

We might well smile at such trifling excuses for departing from the established usage of many centuries, did we not think, with Pope Gelasius, that to depart from an express command of our Divine Master, touching the most solemn ordinance of his holy religion, and to establish a new practice at variance with it, is too like open rebellion against Christ to be treated lightly, even though the Council of Constance, A.D. 1414, ventured to oppose its authority to that of the Divine Founder of the institution. Did the Council of Constance deny that our Lord so instituted it? So far from it, the decree of that council sets out with acknowledging "that Christ instituted and administered this blessed sacrament to his disciples in both kinds, of bread and wine . . . . and admitting, that in the primitive Church the faithful received it in *both* kinds;" and yet goes on to sanction by its authority the very reverse. To show that we are not misrepresenting the decree of the Council of Constance, we think it right to subjoin, in a note, an accurate copy of it in the original Latin, of which the following is a translation:—

"Whereas in some parts of the world there are some who presume rashly to assert that Christian people ought to take the sacrament of the Eucharist under both species of bread and wine, and that the laity should communicate not only under the species of bread, but also under the species of wine; also that they should receive it after supper, or at least not fasting, &c., &c.: hence it is, that this present sacred general council, lawfully congregated, in the Holy Spirit, at Constance, taking care to provide for the safety of the faithful against this error, after mature deliberation of those learned in both divine and human law, *declares, decrees, and defines* that, although Christ did institute this venerable sacrament after supper, and administered it to his disciples under each species of bread and wine, nevertheless, *notwithstanding this* (*hoc non obstante*) the laudable authority of the sacred canons, and the approved custom of the Church, has held, and does hold, that this sacrament should not be consecrated after supper, nor received by the faithful except fasting, unless in case of infirmity, or other necessity, by law or the Church conceded and admitted. And as this *custom* was reasonably introduced to *avoid some dangers and scandals*, although, in *the primitive Church*, this sacrament was received by the faithful under each species, *henceforth* let it be received by those consecrating it under each species, but by *the laity* only under the species of bread, &c. Whence, since a custom of this sort was reasonably introduced by the Church and holy Fathers, and has been very long observed, let it be taken for *law*, which it is not lawful to disapprove, or to change at pleasure without the authority of the Church. Wherefore to say that to observe this custom or law is sacrilegious, or unlawful, ought to be deemed erroneous, and those pertinaciously asserting the contrary of the foregoing, ought to be *repelled as heretics*, and *severely punished* by the diocesans of the place, or their officials, or the *inquisitors* of heretical depravity, in the kingdoms or provinces in which anything shall happen to be attempted or presumed against this decree, according to the canonical and lawful sanctions wholesomely framed in favour of the Catholic faith, and against heretics and their adherents."

---

* See Perrone, Loc. Theol., pars ii. sec. 2, cap. i.

† Comperimus autem quod quidam, sumpta tantum modo corporis sacri portione, a calice sacrati cruoris abstineant. Qui proculdubio, (quoniam nescio qua superstitione docentur obstringi) aut integra sacramenta percipiant, aut ab integris arceantur: quia divisio unius, ejusdemque mysterii sine grandi sacrilegio non potest provenire.—Gelas in Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1661. Decret. Grat. Tert. Pars. de Consecr. Dist. ii. cap. 12. Col. 1168.

‡ Abdicant enim se sacramento salutis humanæ. Ore indigno Christi corpus accipiunt: sanguinem autem redemptionis nostræ haurire omnino declinant. Quod idcirco vestram volumus scire sanctitatem, ut vobis hujuscemodi homines his manifestantur indiciis, et notati et proditi a sanctorum societate sacerdotali auctoritate pellantur."—Leon. Mag. Op. Lut. 1623. Col. 108. Serm. iv. de quadrag.

* Cum in nonnullis mundi partibus, quidam temerariè asserere præsumant, populum Christianum debere sumere Eucharistiæ sacramentum, sub utraque panis et vini specie suscipere, et non etiam sub specie panis, sed etiam sub specie vini, populum laicum passim communicent, etiam post cœnam vel alias non jejunum, &c., &c., hinc est quod hoc presens concilium sacrum generale Constant, in spiritu sancto legitime congregatum, adversus hunc errorem saluti fidelium providere salagens, matura plurium doctorum, tam divini quam humani juris, deliberatione præhabita, declarat, decernit, et diffinit, quod licet Christus post cœnam instituerit, et suis discipulis administraverit, sub utraque specie panis et vini, hoc venerabile sacramentum, tamen hoc non obstante, sacrorum canonum auctoritas laudabilis, et approbata consuetudo ecclesiæ servavit et servat, quod hujus modi sacramentum non debet confici post cœnam neque a fidelibus recipi non jejunis, nisi in casu infirmitatis, aliorum necessitatis, ajure vel ecclesia concesso vel admisso. Et sicut hæc consuetudo ad evitandum aliqua pericula et scandala est rationabiliter introducta, quod licet in primitivis ecclesiis hujus modi sacramentum reciperetur a fidelibus sub utraque specie, postea a confidentibus sub utraque, et a *laicis* tantummodo sub specie panis, suscipiatur, &c. Unde cum hujusmodi consuetudo ab ecclesia et sanctis patribus rationabiliter introducta, et diutissime observata sit, *habenda est pro lege quam non licet reprobare*, aut sine ecclesiæ auctoritate pro libito mutare. Quapropter dicere, quod hæc consuetudinem aut legem observare, sit sacrilegum aut illicitum, censeri debet erroneum: et pertinaciter asserentes oppositum præmissorum

* Qui Corpus Domini, canistro vimineo. Sanguinem portat in *vitro*.—Epist and Rust Monach. Hieron, op. ep. xcv. Tom. iv. Pars. ii. Col. 777, 778.

† Basil, op. col. iii. p. 267. Par. 1839, vol. ii. p. 415.

‡ St. Chrysostom, op. Hom. xxiii. in 1 Cor. vol. x. p. 202, Par. 1732.

§ St. Chrysostom, op. Hom. xviii. in 2 Cor. Ibid. p. 568.

‖ Secundum antiquam ecclesiæ consuetudinem omnes sicut communicabant corpore, ita et communicabant sanguine. Thos. Aquin. pars 3. Qu 80, Art. 12.

¶ *Semper enim et ubique* ab ecclesiæ primordiis usque ab sæculum duodecimum, sub specie *panis* et *vini* communicaverunt.—Rer. Liturg. lib. ii. c. 18.

We may have, hereafter, to notice the wars in Bohemia and elsewhere, which followed upon this memorable decree; by which the Church, by his own authority, ventured to abrogate and make void an express command of our Blessed Lord and the acknowledged practice of the primitive Church, on no stronger grounds than a *custom* introduced by *reason*, to avoid *some* dangers and scandals which they did not venture to define, though its framers clearly foresaw the opposition which would be made to such a decree, even in that dark age, and by men who did not deny transubstantiation; and, therefore, invoked the whole powers of the Church and Inquisition to punish as *heresy* any attempt to disobey it. We shall also show how vain were their daring and tyrannical attempts (even when subsequently ratified by the anathemas of the Council of Trent) to compel the whole of Christendom to substitute a custom of the Church in place of a command of its Heavenly Founder, given nearly 1,500 years before—depriving the laity of a sacred right, in order to increase the dignity of the priesthood. Probably, as there is no one point in which the Church of Rome has acted more visibly contrary to the Gospel than in this, so, we think, there is not any one thing which has raised a greater opposition to her, or made more men forsake her communion than this memorable and daring decree. The subject is one of deep interest to every follower of Christ, whether Roman Catholic or Protestant, and more especially to *laymen*, for whom we write, and whose privileges are deeply involved in the controversy. At present, until some graver reasons can be shown for varying from an express command of our Divine Master and the acknowledged practice of the primitive Church, than those above referred to, we shall only ask, whether it was those who disobeyed the Council of Constance, or the Council of Constance itself, who were really guilty of sacrilege, according to the solemnly-expressed judgments of Popes Gelasius and Leo the Great, to which we have already referred our readers?

TO WHOM SHOULD WE PRAY.

THERE is nothing so wonderful but that we cease to be astonished at it, if it is a thing which we do, or see done, every day. When first the electric telegraph or the daguerreotype was talked of, it sounded like a jest to hear of messages being sent hundreds of miles in a few seconds, or of pictures being painted by the sun; and yet, now thousands employ these wonderful inventions as a matter of course, and no doubt in a few years it will almost cease to be a subject of occasional remark how wonderful these inventions are. The very cattle who pasture by a line of railway, and who, at first, are frightened to distraction at the noise of the passing trains, gradually become so accustomed to it that they scarcely lift their heads from grazing when a train rushes by.

Now, of all the wonderful things which we daily see taking place, without wondering at them, there is, perhaps, none which, when we think of it, contains more to astonish us than *prayer*. When a man is suffering under any distress which neither he nor other men are able to relieve, nothing is more natural or more common than to offer up a prayer to Almighty God for the removal of the affliction. The same man, perhaps, would be too shy to ask a small favour of another man of rank a little higher than his own, or, if he required a favour from one very much his superior, could not venture to speak until he had obtained an introduction from some one likely to have influence with him. And yet, a moment's thought must show how infinitely above him is He whom he addresses so naturally, and often so thoughtlessly. Each of us is but one among millions of inhabitants of the earth; this earth itself but one among millions of worlds, each probably as densely peopled as our own; is it not wonderful, then, that creatures so insignificant as we are should have boldness to address the maker and governor of all things? But the wonder is increased when we remember that we are *sinful* creatures, and that we who are so ready to ask God for favours, have no right to expect anything at his hands save the penalties due to his offended justice. If, notwithstanding all this, our nature tells us that God has made prayer our instinct and our necessity, we must ask, has he not provided some means to calm that awe and dread which would deter us from approaching him? has he not, perhaps, appointed some being to mediate between us and him, some being not too highly exalted above our nature, but one who we may be confident can sympathize in our sufferings and our frailties?

Now, the Church of England and the Church of Rome are agreed on this, that God *has* provided such a mediator as we are speaking of; and that in the person of his own Son. He is both God and man, and is thereby peculiarly suited to be the object of our devotions. As God, he has infinite power to assist all his suppliants; as man, he has given proofs of love to us and of readiness to sympathize with us, sufficient to give us confidence in his willingness to help us. And his willingness to help us is not matter of conjecture or of inference; he has *promised* that the petitions shall be granted which are presented to the Father in his name.

But though, on this point of doctrine, the two churches are agreed, there is a great difference as to the manner in which it is practically received by the members of both communions. We have, in our previous numbers, spoken of the importance that each Christian who is able should study for himself the written Word of God. Any who neglects to do this, even though he may be rightly informed as to the doctrines contained in Scripture, runs the risk of not having them impressed on his mind in the same relative importance which they hold in the Bible. For example, we believe that the doctrine that our Blessed Lord was perfect man, although a doctrine which no Christian will formally deny, is one which forms no part of the *practical* creed of those Roman Catholics who are not familiar with the Bible. It is as God that such a one almost exclusively regards our Saviour; as the future judge of mankind, who shall hereafter appear, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on those who know not God. It is no wonder, then, that, from dwelling exclusively on this awful side of our Lord's character, they should well nigh cease to look on him as the mediator through whom we are to draw nigh to the Father, and that they should seek for other mediators, through whom we may approach to *him*. Another circumstance which contributes to produce the same effect is the fact, that the ordinary pictorial representations of our Lord relate, for the most part, only to the two extreme points of his sojourn on earth. He is commonly pictured either as an infant in his mother's arms, or as in the agonies of death on the cross; and as neither of these representations bring him before the mind as one ready to hear and answer the requests of his people, those who have not some other means of studying his character are in danger of losing sight of some of the most important practical lessons taught us by our Saviour's incarnation.

But very different is the case of those whose knowledge of our Lord's nature is derived from the Gospel narratives, and who, consequently, have read not merely of the beginning and the end, but of *all* his life; who know that he is represented by the evangelists as perfect man, taking part in all in which man may without sin engage; censured by the self-righteous of his day for the readiness with which he would enter any scene of innocent festivity; yet still more ready to enter as a comforter and help into the house of sickness or of mourning; and as he called himself, the friend of his disciples, their teacher, their counsellor, their intercessor. It is perfectly impossible for any one who has thus studied the character of Jesus Christ when he was on earth, and who believe that he is the same now, to suppose that he will consider the distresses of his suppliants beneath his attention, or to imagine that they can find other intercessors more compassionate, or more patient, or more forgiving. It is remarkable that it is recorded on several occasions, in the Gospels, that our Lord heard the petitions which those about him would have had him spurn, and dealt mercifully with the sins which his disciples would have had him punish. For example:—Luke xviii. 35—43. Mark x. 13—14. Luke ix. 51—56. Matt. xv. 21—28, which we give verbatim from the Douay Bible.

"*Luke* xviii. 35 to 43.

"Now it came to pass, when he drew nigh to Jericho, that a certain blind man sat by the wayside begging:

"And when he heard the multitude passing by, he asked what this meant.

"And they told him, that Jesus of Nazareth was passing by.

"And he cried out, saying: Jesus, Son of David, have mercy on me.

"And they that went before rebuked him, that he should hold his peace: but he cried out much more: Son of David, have mercy on me.

"And Jesus standing, commanded him to be brought unto him; and when he was come near, he asked him,

"Saying: What wilt thou that I do to thee? But he said: Lord, that I may see.

"And Jesus said to him: Receive thy sight; thy faith hath made thee whole.

"And immediately he saw, and followed him, glorifying God. And all the people, when they saw it, gave praise to God."

"*Mark* x. 13, 14.

"And they brought to him young children, that he might touch them. And the disciples rebuked them that brought them.

"Whom when Jesus saw, he was much displeased, and saith to them: Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God."

"*Luke* ix. 51 to 56.

"And it came to pass, when the days of his assumption were accomplishing, that he steadfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem,

"And he sent messengers before his face; and going, they entered into a city of the Samaritans, to prepare for him.

"And they received him not; because his face was of one going to Jerusalem.

"And when his disciples, James and John, had seen this, they said: Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come done from heaven and consume them?

"And turning, he rebuked them, saying: You know not of what spirit you are.

"The Son of Man came not to destroy souls, but to save. And they went into another town."

"*Matt.* xv. 21 to 28.

"And Jesus went from thence, and retired into the coasts of Tyre and Sidon.

"And, behold, a woman of Canaan, who came out of those coasts, crying out, said to him: Have mercy on me, O Lord, thou Son of David: my daughter is grievously troubled by a devil.

"Who answered her not a word. And his disciples came and besought him, saying: Send her away, for she crieth after us;

"And he answering, said: I was not sent but to the sheep that are lost of the house of Israel.

"But she came and adored him, saying: Lord, help me.

"Who answering, said: It is not good to take the bread of the children and cast it to the dogs.

"But she said: Yea, Lord; for the whelps also eat of the crumbs that fall from the table of their masters.

"Then Jesus answering, said to her: O woman, great is thy faith; be it done to thee as thou wilt; and her daughter was cured from that hour."

We have added the last passage because it is the only one in the Gospels where the disciples appear to have been more ready to do a work of mercy than their Lord; and yet, when we examine the history, we find that the disciples' intercession proceeded, not from compassion but from selfish impatience, to get rid of the woman's importunities, while our Lord's first refusal proceeded not from want of compassion, but from a desire to draw her forth to fuller exercises of faith, which he was about richly to reward.

The case, then, stands thus:—It is true that, weak and sinful as we are, we might naturally find it difficult to come with any confidence to present requests to our justly offended God; but it is also true that God has, in his mercy, anticipated the difficulties which it was natural for us to experience, and has presented to us the human nature of Christ as a tangible object for our affections to take hold of, and through which we might be brought near to God. It is certain that God has made him known to us as our intercessor, as perfectly able to hear every request made to him, able also to grant it, and full of love and willingness to help all who seek his aid, as having also *promised* to grant requests made in his name. Now, if all this be true, can anything be more perverse than, notwithstanding all, to fly to other mediators, to whose intercession no promise has been given, with regard to whom we have no certainty (nothing beyond doubtful conjecture) whether they can know that we are addressing them at all, and no certainty that, if they do hear, they are able to procure the fulfilment of our requests; and who, we may also be sure, are infinitely inferior in love and compassion towards us to him who gave his life for our sakes? And it must be remembered, that recourse to such other mediators is admitted on all hands not to be divinely appointed. The Church of Rome herself only asserts that it is *permitted* us (not commanded) to seek the intercession of the saints; and the Roman Catholic who shall resolve from this day forth to offer prayers to none but God, would violate no precept of his church. It would surely, then, seem to be the safest way to direct all our prayers to him to whom we are commanded to pray, and who has promised to hear our prayers; rather than to those to whom we have no command to pray, and with regard to whom it is doubtful whether they can hear our prayers or not.

We have thus given some reasons for thinking that it is *needless* for any one who believes the doctrine of our Lord's incarnation to seek for any other intercessor. We hope in our next number to show that the directing our prayers to others is worse than merely useless, that it is productive of mischievous practical consequences.

THE CURÉ AND THE BISHOP.

(*Abridged from the French.*)

IN a retired village in France there lived, not long ago, a good curé, in the midst of two or three hundred parishioners. One Sunday, when returning from saying the mass, he was reflecting upon the little benefit his people could have derived from it, he came upon a dozen of them, who were chatting together before the door of the church. It occurred to him that a familiar conversation with these simple country people might be more useful to them than chaunting vespers to them in Latin; so he stopped in the midst of them, seated himself on a stone, and leaning his two hands on the top of his walking-stick, he said, in a good-humoured tone—

"Tell me, John, are you a Christian?"

---

tanquam hæretici arcendi sunt, et graviter puniendi per diœcesanos locorum, seu officiales eorum, aut inquisitores hæreticæ pravitatis in regnis seu provinciis, in quibus contra hoc decretum, aliquid fuerit forsan attentatum aut præsumptum, juxta canonicas et legitimas sanctiones, in favorem Catholicæ fidei, contra hæreticos et eorum fautores, salubriter ad-inventas.—Labb. et Coss., vol. xii., p. 99, &c., Par. 1672.

"Why, yes, Mr. Curé," replied John, quite astonished.

"And how did you become a Christian?"

"How! Why, because you baptized me, when I was quite little, and so I am a Christian."

"Well, but my good fellow, do you think that that thief whom the police arrested, last month, on the highway, and who was condemned yesterday to ten years at the galleys, for having stolen 8,000 frs. from our notary—do you think that robber was a Christian?"

"Certainly not."

"Yet, like yourself, he had received baptism when he was a child. You see, therefore, it is not merely baptism that makes a Christian. And you, George, are you a Christian?"

"Yes, I am."

"And why?"

"Because I've made my first communion."

"Well, you have heard speak of Cartouche?"

"Yes; sometimes."

"Was he a Christian?"

"No; he was a robber, like Maudrin."

"Yet, my friend, both Cartouche and Mandrin had received their first communion. You see, therefore, that the communion does not constitute a Christian."

Our worthy peasants looked at each other, as if they did not know what their good curé was at.

He continued—"Mr. Schoolmaster, you can better inform me, I dare say, what renders you a Christian?"

The schoolmaster, persuaded the curé had selected him to decide the difficulty to the satisfaction of all, was, for a moment, greatly flattered to hear himself thus appealed to; so, after having coughed and cleared his throat, he replied—"I am a Christian:

"1st. Because I go every Sunday to mass.

"2ndly. Because I go to confession every month.

"3rdly. Because I observe the penances imposed; I recite my Pater Nosters; I keep the fasts, Lent, and all the rest."

"Your answer is longer than the others (the pedagogue looked well pleased with this commencement), but it is worth no more (the schoolmaster made a grimace); for you know," continued the curé, "that all hypocrites, who trade in religion, all go to mass, fast, recite their Paters, observe their penances; yet these hypocrites are not Christians."

The auditors were all taken by surprise; every one feared to be questioned. A child, about ten years of age, who was present, alone remained unconcerned. It was to this child the curé now addressed himself, "Tell me, little Joseph, what must one do to be a Christian?"

"Sir, we must love God and be very good."

"Blessed art thou, Heavenly Father," exclaimed the pastor, "because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes.—*Matt.*, c. 11. Yes, my friends, that which constitutes the Christian are the feelings of his heart. He who has faith in Jesus Christ, as having obtained for him forgiveness of his sins, and who, being thus pardoned loves God with all his heart, and loves his neighbour as himself, he is a Christian. In two words, religion does not consist in ceremonies performed by our feet, our hands, or our months; it consists in the faith and love of our hearts to Jesus Christ."

Here the curé ended the conversation, and withdrew. His words, which had so completely astonished our good peasants, will not so much surprise the reader, when he is told that the curé had for some time past devoted himself to reading a large book which he had inherited from an uncle, and that this study, in which he was seen to be engaged morning and evening, preceded and followed by prayer, had more than once caused the good man to forget his Breviary, and had modified his religious opinions. He thought he saw in his church more than one thing which was not good, but not being yet quite clear about it, he continued at the same time to read his book and to say the mass. But this time he had wounded the self-esteem of the schoolmaster, who, to revenge himself, reported the aforesaid conversation to the vicar; he, wishing to have the curé's post, wrote to the bishop, and the Thursday following the curé received from his superior, who was at the same time his uncle and his friend, the following letter—

"My dear Nephew, and Brother in Jesus Christ, I have been told that, last Sunday, you held in your church a conversation, the consequence of which will be to bring into contempt all the holy practices of our church, and to place the salvation of man beyond the influence of the priest. You must feel how dangerous such doctrines would be: I wish, therefore, to believe that your words were ill-understood or misrepresented, and that, without doubt, you meant to say that all these practices ought to be accompanied by the sentiments of the heart, but that practices and sentiments are equally necessary; that if faith and repentance be necessary on the part of the believer, the intervention of the priest is not less necessary to receive that faith, to accept that repentance, and to render of avail the sacraments of Baptism, of Confirmation, of Extreme Unction, &c., without which there can be no salvation. I hope that you will be able to answer me in this sense; and also to explain yourself thus in your next exhortation at Mass. —I salute you," &c.

The curé read and re-read this letter; he found in it something which hurt both his heart and his understanding—yet he did not quite know how he would reply to it—he did not reply; he waited, and during this time it was perceived that he shut himself up oftener in his study to pray and read his great book, as might be perceived from that part of his garden towards which his window looked. At length, after some weeks of study, he sent an earnest and respectful reply, which, however, was so far from satisfying the bishop that, three days after, he sent one to take our curé's place, and invited the curé to come and spend some weeks with him. The bishop was a respectable old man, sincere and of good faith. No doubts had ever arisen in his mind against the authority of his Holy Mother Church; therefore, as a respectful and submissive son, he had subjected his body to its most minute observances; his health had even suffered thereby: ever seeking an internal peace which he could not find, experiencing the want of assurance of his salvation, he added pilgrimages to fasts: to pilgrimages hair-cloth next his skin, all which had greatly fatigued his body, without tranquillizing his soul. He was always asking himself, whether he had done sufficient to gain heaven, and he trembled at the thought that he was still, perhaps, some steps off, perhaps, at the threshold—yet still liable to fall into hell! Then fresh abstinences, fresh fears, and thus life flowed away; divided between the sufferings of his body and the anguish of his mind. The reader can understand from this the end he had in view, when he summoned the poor curé; he hoped to bring him back to opinions more conformable to his church, from which he saw he was rapidly wandering. The curé obeyed the invitation of his bishop, who said nothing to him at first, but received him with kindness. The next day, to be free from interruptions, the bishop set off with him into the country, where there were no witnesses, except three or four children, who were minding a flock at a little distance. During a walk in the park, he entered at length on the subject. "Tell me, my dear nephew, where did you pick up these new doctrines, so opposed to those of the church? Must not Satan have suggested them to you?" "No, my lord, it was the Bible." "That is then the reason, that you have distributed in your parish a hundred copies of this book, as I am told." "My lord, I did not think I could do wrong in placing before the eyes of the faithful the word which God has addressed to all." "But do you not perceive that the common people cannot understand this book, which ought only to be read and explained by the priest?" "No, I do not see that, I find, on the contrary, that God has judged that *all* can comprehend it, since he has enjoined the reading of it to *all*; for Jesus said to the Jews—'Search the Scriptures,' and the Psalmist has said—'The law of the Lord is perfect, restoring the soul; the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple.'—Psalm xix. Moses desires the king to read the law every day of his life. He says to all the people—'Put my word in your hearts, bind it on your hands, inscribe it on your houses.' St. Luke commends the inhabitants of Berea, because they compared the preaching of St. Paul with the word of God. St. Paul, when writing his epistles to the different churches, does not address himself solely to the priests, but he says—'To you, who are at Rome;' 'To all those who are in Achaia.' If all the Israelites in the time of Moses, all the Jews in the time of Jesus Christ, all the inhabitants of Rome and of Achaia might read the Bible, I do not see why all the Christians of our day should not read it also."

"But do you not know," replied the bishop, "that the Bible is obscure, and cannot be understood by all."

"You shall judge," said the curé, smiling. He made a sign to the children who were tending the flock to approach, and when these children, of from ten to twelve years old, had ranged themselves in a semicircle before the bishop, the curé said to the youngest—"My child, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, and with all thy mind!' Do you understand me?"

"Oh! yes, Mr. Curé, we must love the blessed God."

"And you, my child, listen—'There is none righteous: there is none that doeth good.' Do you understand?" The child cast down his eyes; he had so well understood the words that his conscience had at once applied them to himself, and as he had just been striking one of his companions in a quarrel, he replied—

"It was he who began; he gave me a kick also."

"It was your fault," said the other.

"No," said a little girl, "it was both of them."

"Well, my little friend," said the curé, "listen—'Christ has died for our sins; there is no more condemnation for those who are in Christ; believe in the Lord Jesus and thou shalt be saved.' What does that mean, my child?"

"It means that God will pardon our sins if we look to Jesus Christ."

"Now, you," said the curé to the fourth, "listen—'If any man lack wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to all men liberally.' 'Pray without ceasing.' What do these words mean?"

"Stay; that means that we must pray to God to make us good."

"Quite right, my children; fight no more, love Jesus Christ, who died to obtain the pardon of your sins; ask God to make you good, and you will go to heaven." The children went off quite delighted.

"Well," said the curé to his bishop, "it appears these children understood my words."

"That is not surprising," said the latter, "they were so simple."

"Yet, these words, so simple, are precisely those of the Bible; and if these children can understand them, it is to be supposed their fathers and mothers would understand them also."

"Yes; but all the pages of the Bible are not as clear as those you have quoted."

"I grant it; but even if the simple believer had only understood these four passages out of the whole Bible, would it not be enough to make it worth his while to read it? Besides, experience and good sense unite to prove, that after the Bible has been read with prayer for some time, the most simple reader will soon find an easy passage help him to understand another less clear; that which he has mastered will help him to understand what still remains to be learned, and thus difficulties are gradually cleared away. When a friend addresses a letter to us, of which some words are indistinct or blotted, we do not on that account reject the sheet of paper; we read it a second and a third time, until what precedes and what follows enable us to understand the illegible words."

"But," answered the bishop, rather embarrassed how to get rid of these reasonings, "is it not better to submit the Bible to the interpretation of councils, whose decisions are directed by the Holy Spirit, according to the promise of Jesus Christ?"

"But," returned the curé, without hesitation, "why should the Holy Spirit, who can direct the decisions of councils, not direct also the mind of the simple believer, who implores it with humility? For this promise of Jesus Christ was not made to Councils only, but to *all* whom the Lord shall call."

"But, then, if each one may pretend to read the Bible, you will have as many creeds as individuals; while, in submitting the Bible to the interpretation of councils, we should have one uniform faith."

"I do not believe it; for how will uniformity be better attained by reading the decrees of councils than by reading the Bible? Will it be more easy to understand the Latin of the Council of Trent than the Latin of the Vulgate? No; but the priest is there to interpret to the simple believer the decrees of the council. But even so, will it be more easy for the believer to understand the French of his curé from the pulpit, than the French of De Sacey, in the translation of the Bible? Be it Latin for Latin, or French for French, I would rather read the text than the commentary. The Bible is worth more than the explanations, unless we pretend, that when God speaks, men know better what he means to say than he does himself, and that men have more capacity to make themselves understood."

"Finally," said the bishop, with some impatience, "what do you mean to conclude from all this?"

"I conclude that, since the Bible is the Word of God, every man is bound to go and draw from that Word the rule of his faith and conduct, without any one having the right to impose any other upon him; and that, if the simple believer ought to listen to his pastor, it is only so far as the pastor speaks conformably to the Bible. Then, the faith of the Christian will be an enlightened faith, and so much the more firm, as it shall be more intelligent. Then the Christian will be able to say in his conscience, that he obeys God rather than man, since he draws from the book which all Christian communions (the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman Church also) are obliged to recognise as the source of all religion, as the Word of God. Is it not at the source that the water of a rivulet is most limpid and clear? Does not every step it flows through the clay and mud of this earth contribute to pollute it? Well, in the same way, will not religion be most pure at its source, in the mouth of God, and will not every step made in passing from mouth to mouth tend to corrupt it? Give, therefore, the Bible to the people, and they will then understand that it is not mere vain ceremonies that can save the sinner, but the blood of Christ alone, and the renewal of the heart by the Holy Ghost." The curé spoke with so much warmth, that the bishop saw he should never succeed in making him abandon this new course by mere persuasion. He brought into play, therefore, turn by turn, the fear of hindering his advancement in the church, the menaces of the condemnation of Rome, &c. But all was useless; the curé always returned this answer—"Show me by the Bible that I am mistaken, and then I shall be ready to submit."

And he bore with resignation all the petty persecution raised against him. A few months later, the bishop fell seriously ill: he grew worse day by day: the fear or rather the certainty of an approaching death, doubled his terrors, as to the uncertainty of his salvation. He tried to re-assure himself, and wondered he was not able. In vain did he repeat to himself

that few saints had submitted to austerities so severe and so numerous as he; his conscience still reminded him of sin, and made him fear that he had not yet performed penances enough to expiate his faults before him "who is of purer eyes than to behold evil." In this state of trouble, he recalled to mind the peace, the calm which the curé seemed to enjoy while he was with him; and the thought that that peace of mind was, perhaps, the fruit of his new religious convictions, gained strength in his mind. In the prospect of death, people care little for the opinion of the world, which they care so much for in the time of health: the bishop, therefore, sent for his nephew, and told him that he desired to converse with him on serious subjects. The curé came to the dying man. When the bishop saw him enter, he said—"You are welcome; take a seat, and let them leave us alone for a few minutes." When all had withdrawn, the curé, after closing the door, sat down by the bed of his uncle, who said in a sad and solemn voice—"My dear friend, I have no time to lose, and, therefore, without any disguise, I come to the point at once. You know my life, you know that I have acquitted myself, and scrupulously, in the duties of my religion, and yet, I confess, in the prospect of appearing before God, even after having received the holy sacrament for the last time, I tremble at the thought of presenting myself at the tribunal of my Judge! Some overpowering voice within me tells me that I am not ready to appear, and I feel I do not enjoy, in my dying hour, that Christian calmness which can see death approach without fear, and even welcome it with joy. I have observed in you, my dear brother, this precious peace, and even when harassing you for your doctrines, I was internally struck by the composure which they produced in your soul. Oh! tell me quickly, I entreat of you—how did you obtain it?"

"I can tell you," replied the curé, "for I have been myself in the state of mind in which I now find you. In examining my life, I discovered each day new imperfections; the more I tried to live holily, the more I felt sin weigh on my conscience. If I performed a good action in the eyes of the world, I felt that it was bad in the sight of God, because vanity or pride had always some share in it. If I forced myself to make a resolution in the sight of God, at the moment when I was deciding to do good, I found some interested motive also, urging me to it, and thus polluting it. Finally, I came to hate myself. I held life in horror, and what increased my terrors was, that I found, in reading my Bible, such declarations as these: 'The wages of sin is death!' 'Cursed is every one who continueth not in all things written in the book of the law to do them!' 'Whosoever shall have kept the whole law, and yet have offended in one point, is guilty of the whole.' One day I thought I should lose my senses, and, in despair, I cast myself on my knees, striking my breast, and exclaiming, O my God! take pity on me, I am a great sinner; what must I do, what must I do to be saved? I rose, and opening my Bible, I cast my eyes on it, and there I found the very words I had just uttered, 'What must I do to be saved?' Struck by this coincidence, I hastened to read the words which followed. It was precisely the reply to my question, thus—'BELIEVE IN THE LORD JESUS CHRIST AND THOU SHALT BE SAVED.' Believe, and thou shalt be saved, said I. What! it is sufficient to believe! I thought I must have misunderstood. I re-read these words, and I found again and again, 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved.' In order to throw light on this thought, I looked at other passages in my Bible, which treated of the same subject, and which were indicated by references. I found a great number of which the sense always was, 'Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, thy sins shall be pardoned, and thou shalt receive eternal life.' I confess, however, that this faith which was required of me, this salvation so freely offered me, all this was at first in my head, without reaching my heart, when one day the words of the Gospel, 'BY GRACE ARE YE SAVED,' fell like light into the depth of my soul. Grace! oh! now I understand, cried I; I was condemned to hell, like a felon to the scaffold, and when ready to perish, my King sends me a pardon. I understand—I owed my Master a heavy debt of sins, and my God has cancelled them. I owe it to his grace. Now, I understand this word. How sweet it is, how powerful to chase from my heart all fear! Now, whether I die or live, I am saved! What love my God has shown for me; and now that I am saved by his grace, what love I must have for him. How delightful to do his will! How willingly will I sacrifice myself to his service and to the good of my brethren, who know not yet what this grace is—the pardon, the love of God! Grace! this word encompassed all my soul, and since then an ever-increasing peace has spread itself through my heart. I experienced the reality of that promise of Jesus, 'My peace I give unto you, not as the world giveth, give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid.'—John xiv. Since then I have known no greater happiness than labouring to do the will of my God. Without doubt, I still fall into sin frequently, but I never rise without trembling; and without gaining, even from those falls, new strength by which to stand firm for the future. Since that time, I have been full of an ardent desire to make known this good news to my brethren; and I am happy, indescribably happy, when I see my words fall on a heart well prepared, and another soul escape hell by turning to the Saviour."

"But, my dear brother," interrupted the bishop, moved by these words of fire—"Who guarantees you that that assurance of your salvation which you believe you experience is truly a reality, ratified in heaven by God himself, and that it is not purely the fruit of your imagination?"

"I have, as a guarantee, the witness of the Holy Spirit, which I bear in my heart, and which made St. Paul say—'That the Spirit of God witnesseth with his spirit that he was adopted of God.' I know that the world may tell me that this is also the fruits of my imagination. But what matters it what the world says and thinks? It is sufficient for me, to feel it is otherwise. I say to all, ask God for his Spirit to enlighten you, and you will obtain it to sanctify you. If people put my counsel in practice, they soon find the truth of it, and I thank God for it. If they believe me not and mock me, I am not the less assured of my salvation. I pray for the unbeliever, and I always hope for him: I know that God can convert him, even at the last hour. Yes, my dear uncle, it is not in yourself that you must look for your salvation—your works, always imperfect, can never give you security. You need a Saviour, powerful, perfect, holy; you need Jesus Christ the Son of God, God manifest in the flesh. It is only with such a support that you will no longer fear to fall, and such an advocate with God, that you will be assured from condemnation." During the following days, the two friends had several other conversations. The bishop grew weaker and weaker, but at the same time his soul seemed to gain new strength; he listened much more than he spoke. He made his nephew read to him different parts of the New Testament, amongst others, the Epistle to the Romans, and that to the Galatians. At length, one Sunday evening, as his nephew, kneeling at the foot of his bed, concluded a prayer in these words:—"My God, we look not to ourselves, nor to our works, but solely to Jesus Christ to save us"—The bishop raised his eyes to heaven, and pronouncing these words—"Amen, Lord, amen," he breathed forth his last sigh.

ROUSSELL.

THE BLESSING OF LITERATURE.

Many who have not the advantage of wealth or high standing in society, are apt to repine at their situation—to regret that they are debarred from much refined and intellectual intercourse; but this deprivation is in a great measure ideal; there is an intercourse far more intelligent than that of any living society whatever—the great commonwealth of letters—which knows no distinction of persons, admits of no adventitious superiority, where everything is rated at its real value, and reduced to its legitimate standard. Whatever may have been the rank of authors, the wealth or consequence attaching to their living persons, they exact no further homage; they are entertained without expense, dismissed without ceremony; they are at once our preceptors, masters, servants; they come or go at our bidding; they speak or are dumb at our pleasure. We open the book, its eloquence streams upon us; we close the leaves, it is instantly sealed in silence. We have the best thoughts of the best men in the best possible form; we benefit by a close communion with great and shining characters, without being annoyed by the foibles and eccentricities, which appear to be more particularly inherent in genius. Had we lived in the same time, and possessed the intimacy of Dr. Johnson, we should have been shocked to find that, with all his intelligence and strength of mind, he was contracted in principle, insolent and overbearing in argument. We should have blushed for the tarnished honour of our common nature, to think that so great a mind as Addison's could have been meanly jealous of contemporary worth. And as we all know, poor Goldsmith amidst innumerable follies and foibles, was so great a glutton of praise that he considered the applause bestowed upon a rope-dancer unjustly diverted from himself; and, in the presence of Dr. Johnson and several others, actually broke his shins in a clumsy attempt to prove he could surpass him. In books are treasured up the matured fruits of the greatest and most cultivated minds; they contain the pure and condensed intelligence of the human mind, without any proportionate alloy of its passions and weaknesses. Thus the noblest conceptions of our nature are preserved in the odours of language, as formerly the bodies of the great and noble were embalmed in perfumes. In reading history, for instance, we participate in the actions of the illustrious dead, and exchange with pleasure the dull monotony of our own existence for the glorious achievements and enthusiasm of theirs. Under the pen of the historian, the events of time undergo a refining and condensing process; it retains all that is worth preserving—the kernel, without the husks or shell. We thus engage in war without the peril of a wound, and accompany the voyager without encountering the dangers of the seas.—*Professor Calvert's Lecture on Reading, delivered in the Mechanics' Institution, Liverpool.*

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We beg to acknowledge the communication of "Catholicus," bearing the post mark of Kingstown. We have only been prevented by press of matter from already redeeming our pledge respecting the reply to His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin's essay, entitled "The Search after Infallibility," which appeared in our first and second numbers. The subject is one of the greatest importance; and "Catholicus" will not find that we shall shrink from the fullest discussion of both sides of the question.

We have received a letter in reply to the Rev. W. Carson, of Waterford, from the Rev. R. A. Wilson, of Glasgow, the great length of which rendered it impossible to insert it in our present number; also several other communications which we are obliged to omit for want of space. We would earnestly request all our valued contributors, both Roman Catholic and Protestant, to limit the length of their communications, so as not only to prevent disappointment to themselves, but increase the facility of insertion in a periodical so limited in space as the CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st.

No anonymous letter can be attended to. Whatever is sent for insertion must be authenticated by the name and address of the writer, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee for his good faith.

Subscriptions are earnestly solicited, which our friends will observe are payable in advance. The amount may be forwarded either in postage stamps or a post-office order, payable to Mr. William Curry, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal, which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, JUNE, 1852.

ON THE USE OF THE FATHERS.

THE number of letters which have already been written to this journal by Roman Catholics is a fact not only gratifying to ourselves, but important, as showing that educated and intelligent Roman Catholic laymen are sensible of the necessity of discussion, and that they are disposed to enter upon it with those who come forward to discuss in a fair and candid manner. We conceive it to be our duty to endeavour, calmly and reasonably, to lead this discussion into the most useful and practical direction, by appealing to men's reason and sober judgment.

It has struck us rather forcibly, that while our Roman Catholic correspondents do generally profess to be men of humble station and without learning, they show a much greater readiness to appeal to "the Fathers" than to the words of Christ, and the teaching of his Apostles. We, therefore, think it right to call attention to "the use of the Fathers," and we entreat our Roman Catholic readers to give a candid consideration to what we have to say. We must be brief; but we will endeavour to give a brief illustration, which may throw some light on the subject.

We are sure that none of our readers will say that the Fathers knew the truth better than Christ or the inspired Apostles. All Roman Catholics admit that every one of the Fathers was liable to fall into error, while the Apostles were divinely secured from all error. Is it safer or better to appeal to those who may err, or to those who cannot err?

The utmost that can be said is, that *we* may understand the Fathers better than the Scripture, and learn more easily from them. And this we will examine.

We have a vast collection of books, written by bishops, clergy, and Catholic laymen, of the first twelve centuries. All these commonly go under the name of "the Fathers." A man of great

learning, and who could give his whole time to it, might manage to read these books through in his lifetime. But it may be fairly said, that a priest in charge of a parish could not do so (even if he could get the books, which not one in a thousand can), much less can a layman, who has the business of this life to attend to.

The Bible is one small book, translated into English, which the poorest man can have. "The Fathers" are a thousand ponderous folio books, in Latin and in Greek, of which not one man in a thousand can see even the outside. Which may we more easily hope "to read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest?"

Again—in these thousand books there is a vast deal which goes under the name of "the Fathers," which is rank forgery: Other people wrote them in later times, and fathered them upon the Fathers. For instance, we have more than fifty Decretal Epistles, or letters, which profess to be written by the thirty-eight earliest Popes or Bishops of Rome. If these letters had really been written by those Popes, they would have been truly important. But they are, every one, FORGERIES! No Roman Catholic writer of credit can now be found who would venture to say that any one of those Popes ever wrote one word of them. This is now so universally confessed that it is needless to stop to prove it; but if ever the proof be wanting, we have it ready.

Yet it is certain that, for many hundreds of years, those Catholics who professed to learn from the Fathers, rather than from the Bible, did all believe that those letters were really written by the Popes whose names they bear, and did mainly rely upon them for learning the Catholic religion. And to such an extent did this delusion go, that Gratian's Decretum (a book written in the twelfth century, and which is still a main part of the Canon Law of the Church of Rome) relies chiefly on these forged letters to prove the authority of the Pope over the Catholic Church. Was not this an awful delusion for Catholics to fall into? Can any man in his senses believe that those Catholics who took these "forged letters" for their guide, had a better chance of finding truth than if they had searched for it in the words of Christ, and in the teaching of his Apostles?

In the last three hundred years, learned men (most of them Roman Catholics) have done much in detecting some forgeries; and up to the present day, writings which have not hitherto been questioned, are, from time to time, proved to be forgeries; affording ground for believing that much of what still passes for genuine may yet appear to be forged; and this in the decrees of Councils, as well as in the writings of Fathers. For instance, the decrees of the earliest Council that conferred general powers on the Bishop of Rome—viz., the Council of Sardica, A.D. 347—have never yet, that we know of, been challenged as forgeries, and yet we are persuaded that any fair jury of twelve men, hearing and considering the evidence that could be brought forward, would pronounce those decrees palpable forgeries. We invite learned Roman Catholics to consider and discuss this question.

Again—besides all this, there is, in what are commonly called the works of the Fathers, a vast proportion that never was written by the Father whose name it bears. After printing was invented, search was made in libraries, and monasteries, for all the works of St. Augustine, for instance. Everything which was then *supposed* to be written by him was published together as a collection of his works. In later times, the labours of learned men (and in this the Benedictine monks have been distinguished) have proved that a vast number of these works were never written by the Fathers to whom they were at first attributed. An instance of this has already appeared in our third number, in which the book "De Sacramentis," is quoted by "A Catholic Layman," as giving the judgment of St. Ambrose, but which we have shown, from the testimony of Du Pin and the Benedictine monks, was never written by St. Ambrose. These writings are *not forgeries*, because there is no reason to suppose that the persons who wrote them intended to pass them as the works of the Fathers whose names they now bear. We call these works "spurious, and of no authority:" they were commonly written by obscure persons: we know not who; and in much later times. All these spurious works are still generally published among the works of the Fathers whose names they bear, but generally with notes by the editors, stating whether they consider them genuine or spurious. But, notwithstanding all that has yet been done in distinguishing them, there is still among the printed works of almost every Father of chief importance, a considerable proportion of which the editors cannot say, with any certainty, whether the Father wrote those works or not. And how are we to know what the real opinions of that Father really were, upon the whole, until we know whether he did or did not write these books?

Again—to have anything like certain knowledge of their opinions on many subjects, we must not only read the works of all the Fathers, but we must read all the different editions of their works. This increases the labour, three or four fold; and yet it is often necessary. For instance, if we read the works of St. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, A.D. 250, in the edition published by Manutius, a learned Roman Catholic, printed at Rome in the year 1563, we shall find, in the Treatise on Unity, sec. 3, the words here marked in italics:—"*Primacy is given to Peter, that the Church of Christ may be set forth as one;*" and again—"*He who deserts the See of Peter, on whom the Church is founded*, is he assured that he is in the Church?" But if we read the edition published by Morellus, at Paris, A.D. 1564, these words are not in that treatise at all; and if we look a little farther, we shall find that Baluzius, another learned Roman Catholic, in the edition which he prepared, declared that these words were put in by somebody else in later times, because no such words are found in the ancient manuscripts of St. Cyprian's works.*

There are, at least, ten or a dozen different editions of St. Cyprian's works, most of which (published by Roman Catholics) have not these words. Now, if we do not know certainly whether St. Cyprian wrote these words or not, how can we be certain what St. Cyprian's opinion was about the primacy of St. Peter? This is but a specimen of the difficulties which we meet with in the works of the Fathers.

But suppose we had got all these books, and read them all, and ascertained what was really written by the Fathers; and compared all the editions of each (all of which no man can hope to do), should we then have a certain rule? No; we should have a great amount of Catholic truth, a great heap of errors, and a great mass of contradiction all heaped up together, out of which we should still have to choose what was true; and we should want some other rule besides the writing of the Fathers, to select what was Catholic, and reject what was erroneous. Can any one deny this? Can any one give us the name of any one Father of whom we may take all that he has written as certainly true? Certainly no Roman Catholic will answer for the truth of all that any one Father has written. Will any Roman Catholic subscribe to all that St. Cyprian wrote about baptism, or St. Augustine about predestination, or St. Chrysostom about Purgatory, or Origen about hell? Will they answer for all that St. Jerome wrote, or Tertullian or Optatus, or, in fact, for any one Father?

Hear the description given by St. Vincent, of Lerins (A.D. 434), of Origen—"In whom were very many gifts—so rare, so singular, so wonderful, that any one would easily judge at the beginning that faith was to be given to all his assertions. For if *life* gives authority, in him were great industry, great modesty, patience, endurance. If *birth*, or *learning*, what more noble than him who was born at first in a house illustrious for martyrdom, and afterwards deprived not only of his father, but his property too, for the sake of Christ? He so far progressed in the straits of holy poverty, that he was often afflicted for the name of the confession of the Lord. . . Such was the force of his capacity—so profound, so acute, so elegant—that he far excelled all. Such a force of doctrine and splendour of all learning, that there were few things in divine learning, and almost nothing in human, which he had not perfectly attained. Who among Christians did not venerate him almost as a prophet, and as the chief of the philosophers?" And even the heathens were struck with his great character, for St. Vincent goes on—"And even that impious Porphyry says, that he himself, when a boy, attracted by the fame of that man, had travelled to Alexandria, and there had seen the old man, truly such and so great as one who had builded for himself a citadel of universal learning."—Commonitorum, sec. 17.

All this was true of Origen. And would we desire any greater character of one whom we should take for a guide? Yet St. Vincent gives us this character of Origen, only to warn us the more strikingly against taking any Father for our guide. For Origen fell into the heresy of teaching that unbelievers and infidels, and those who die impenitent in the most heinous sins, after burning in hell for a time, shall then be saved with Christ for ever. And, strange to say, it is no uncommon thing now-a-days to hear those self-called "Catholics," who leave the Scriptures to take the Fathers for their guide, quoting this acknowledged heresy of Origen as a proof that purgatory is a "Catholic doctrine!"

"And as Origen among the Greeks (says St. Vincent), so Tertullian is judged the chief of all we have among the Latins; . . . and he also was a great temptation in the Church;" and the following passage has been quoted from Tertullian in support of purgatory, by the great Cardinal Bellarmine himself, the chief of Roman controversialists—"Why should you not think that the soul is both punished and cherished in Hades in the meantime, while it is expecting either* judgment, through a certain practising or whitening of it?"—Liber i., c. 7 & 10. Very clear in favour of purgatory certainly, and written, too, at the beginning of the third century, only (what the Cardinal does not tell) it is the judgment of a heretic, not of a Catholic; for when Tertullian wrote that passage (De Anima, c. 58, Rigalt, ed. Paris, 1675, p. 306) he was a believer in a wretched fanatic, called Montanus, who professed to be the Holy Ghost, the Comforter that was to come! And in this very chapter, Tertullian thus proves his doctrine—"For the Paraclete (the title by which his followers spoke of the fanatic Montanus) most frequently set forth this." Is not this a fine proof of Catholic doctrine? the ravings which Tertullian had heard from a wretched fanatic who called himself the Holy Ghost! Such is the proof which Bellarmine himself produced for the doctrine of purgatory: such is, indeed, its origin; for this is the earliest mention of that doctrine which could be found

* Baluzius did not live to publish this. It was published by the Benedictine monks who restored these words into the text, but kept in the note of Baluzius, stating that it was an interpolation.

* Of the just or of the unjust.

in "the Fathers." Now, how are plain and unlearned men to weed out all such errors from the works of the Fathers? Is it by the help of Cardinal Bellarmine, the greatest controversialist which the Roman Church has produced, that they can hope to do it?

Again, it is admitted by Roman Catholics that all private speculations and opinions of the Fathers are of no weight. It is only where they deliver the actual faith of the Church in their days, that they speak with any authority. How much of what is commonly quoted from the Fathers belongs to their own individual speculations and fancies, every one who has examined carefully such quotations, well knows; but how are unlearned men to make this distinction?

But it will be said that the Church of Rome appeals only to the "unanimous consent" of the Fathers—that is, that she relies upon them only when they all agree, and disregards them when they differ. Now, we are not going to speak with disrespect of the unanimous consent of the Fathers. Far from it; we know that all the Fathers, and the whole church from the beginning, have all consented unanimously in all the articles of faith contained in the ancient Catholic creeds: in the Apostles' Creed, in the Nicene Creed, and in the Athanasian Creed. We join in that same consent; and we glory and rejoice in doing so, and in this consent we hope to live and die; and while we do this, we trust that we hold the Catholic faith. But any unanimous consent among the Fathers, in any article of faith not contained in these creeds, we have never found. It is nothing new or strange to say this. It was felt and confessed by the Fathers themselves: "which ancient consent of Holy Fathers is not so carefully and diligently to be both sought for and followed, in every small question of the Divine law, but only, or at least especially, in the Rule of Faith" (*i.e.*, the Catholic Creed.)—St. Vincent Com., ch. 28. It is senseless to dispute about the authority which should belong to any such consent, until we know *whether there be any such consent.* This ought to be brought to the test. We here solemnly call upon the Roman Catholic bishops of Ireland, and upon the Roman Catholic priests of Ireland, upon all and each of them, to bring forward any other article of faith, in which they can show any such unanimous consent of the Fathers. Let them take any one of the twelve articles which Pope Pius the Fourth added to the creed of the Roman Church fifteen hundred and sixty-four years after Christ; let them tell us any one of those twelve new articles of which they will undertake to show that it is supported as an article of faith by "the unanimous consent of the Fathers." If they will undertake to answer this challenge, we undertake that the subject shall be fairly and candidly considered in our pages. If such a unanimous consent *can* be shown for any one of those twelve new articles of faith, it will be a fair question *then* to consider what degree of authority should be allowed to such a consent. But if no Roman Catholic priest or bishop will venture to answer this challenge, or to point out any one of those articles, for which they can undertake to produce such a "unanimous consent of the Fathers," we may fairly conclude that the thing is impossible; that no consent of the Fathers can be found in any articles of faith, except those contained in the ancient Catholic creeds.

Why should not the Roman Catholic bishops and priests do this that we propose? They boast of having converted many Protestants of learning, and candour, and sincerity. If it was by fair argument, and discussion, and proof, that they have converted them, why should they not hope to convert the conductors of this journal to all the same opinions, by the same means? But there is a still more urgent reason for the Roman Catholic priests and bishops doing what we now call upon them to do. Discussion is now going on among the Roman Catholic laity, and their priests and bishops cannot safely disregard it. We warn them that what we now write will be read by THOUSANDS of Irish Roman Catholics. If no answer to our challenge be given, those thousands of Roman Catholics will easily understand that no answer *can* be given. Will the bishops and priests allow so many thousands to be led astray, if it be in their power to set them right? How can they justify such negligence before God or man?

Our readers will remember that we have not shrunk from any discussion upon "the Fathers" that has been proposed to us; nor do we now shrink from it. But a regard for truth leads us to state clearly what authority we attribute to "the Fathers." We do not consider ourselves bound (no Roman Catholic does) to believe everything that has been said by any "Father:" we do not take any Father, or any number of Fathers, as the rule of our faith, or as an infallible authority; because we know that "the Fathers" were men of like passions and infirmities as ourselves; and we know that there have been errors in the Church in the days of the Apostles themselves and in all succeeding times, and that the greatest and best of the Fathers have left us a warning (as Christ himself did) to call no man master on earth; they have left us this warning in their writings, and also in their example, having each of them fallen into errors himself. But we do join in consent with the Fathers, so far as their consent has been shown to the world; because we bring that consent to the Word of God, and examine, confirm, and establish it by that Word.

We do not reject the use of the Fathers. They are not our rule of faith; but they are most valuable witnesses of the faith in their own day: valuable to confirm us in the faith they held; and above all value in enabling us to convict of novelty all errors which have arisen in the Church since their times. We shall give an example in our next number of the "use of the Fathers" in this latter respect; and meantime we entreat our Roman Catholic readers to examine what we have now said, and to consider for themselves whether they can more reasonably hope to learn the true Catholic faith, by comparing the ancient Catholic creeds with the Word of God, or by searching each for himself the thousand volumes of "the Fathers," with all their errors, all their speculations, all their forgeries, all their editions, and with all the appeals that have been made to their most flagrant errors by Cardinal Bellarmine himself.

THE TOUCHSTONE.

(Continued from page 56.)

OBJECTION 5.—Protestants maintain, that God has not made any promise to his Church, that *his Spirit* should never depart from her; and that *his words, which he at* first *put in her mouth* (that is, *the faith and doctrine at first delivered to the saints*) should *never depart from her mouth* through all generations.

Their own Bible, in plain terms, delivers this promise (*Isaiah*, lix. 20, 21)—*The Redeemer shall come to Zion, &c. This is my covenant with them, saith the Lord; my Spirit which is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and for ever.*

REPLY.—Protestants do *not* maintain this. They do *not* deny "that God has made a promise *to his Church* that his Spirit should never depart from her;" but they differ from Roman Catholics on the point what that Church is. They deny, as has been shown before, that by *the Church* is ever meant the Church of Rome. And if Roman Catholics abandon that point, and assume, that though Rome was not at first the Church of Scripture—that she took her rise along with other—but that she is *not* the one Church recognised by God, and that her future development being foreseen, *to her* the promises were given, we reply, that this is mere assumption, and an assumption which might equally well be made, and has been made, by others; for it is well known that, besides many other communities of Christians reckoning themselves churches, there is the Church of Constantinople, or Greek Church—a community of very large extent. The members of the Greek Church are computed at about fifty millions; comprising, besides the Greeks, nearly all the subjects of the vast Russian Empire, and most of the Christian subjects of the Turkish Empire. They deny that they were ever subject to the Romish Church, and condemn it for claiming authority over them as strongly as the Church of England does.

Now, Protestants indeed deny the claim, both of the Greek and Romish Churches, to universal supremacy. But if any Protestant alters his opinion on this point, and is convinced that there must be some one community on earth whose laws and rules are entitled to the obedience of all Christians, his next question must be, *what* and where is that Church which he is to obey? Which of these rival claimants—the Greek or the Roman? And this question cannot, it is plain, be decided by the bare assertion of either of the claimants themselves; the appeal must be either to the actual possession of miraculous gifts proving those claims, or to the plain words of Scripture.

Now, the gifts we *see* they have not; the more intelligent among them would not rest upon them as evidence; and Scripture, as we have seen, says nothing at all about either Church. And we might fairly expect that on this point the declarations of Scripture should be particularly plain, so that no man of common sense need be in the least doubt on the matter; for if, as Roman Catholics allege, the supremacy and infallible authority of their church was appointed *on purpose* to settle all disputes, we may be sure that our Lord, had such been his design, would not have left them in any doubt as to the authority they now refer to. He would never have left it a *disputable point where* men were to go to settle all disputes.

OBJECTION 6.—Protestants, to justify *Luther* (who, when he first began to set up the Protestant religion, stood alone against all the bishops and clergy upon earth), deny that there is any command in Scripture to *hear the Church* or submit to her decisions; or that such as, like *Luther*, stand out against the established doctrine of the whole church, are thereby condemnable before God.

Their own Bible, in plain words, teaches them another lesson (*St. Matt.* xviii. 17)—*If he neglect to hear the Church, let him be to thee as a heathen and a publican.*

REPLY.—The case here spoken of—Matt. xviii.—is one of offences of private persons against each other, not of any questions of doctrine. The individual supposed by our Lord to have committed the trespass against his brother, was, first, to try private remonstrance, and then lay the case before the public assembly. Whether a Jewish or a Christian assembly be here meant, it is a case of private and personal injuries, in which no one thinks a Church an infallible tribunal.

But the Church in the text probably meant the particular synagogue with which the man might be connected. If he who had committed the trespass refused to hear the decision of his own church or synagogue, then he was to be—*to the person he had injured and to all the members of that Church*—as "a heathen man or a publican"—cut off, that is, from their communion; but the Jews, in our Lord's time, claimed no authority to punish any one for *being* a heathen or publican. To excommunicate—that is, to exclude from her communion—is all the right which the Church of Rome, or any other religious community, can have over its unruly members: Scripture acknowledges no other.

OBJECTION 7.—Protestants will not allow that there is any necessity of adhering to *the pastors and teachers* of the Church, in order to be maintained in *unity* and *truth*; and preserved from being *carried about with every wind of doctrine by the slight* of heretics.

The Bible expressly declares (*Ephes.* iv. 11, 12, &c.), that Christ has not only given apostles and prophets, and evangelists, but also *pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ, till we all come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, under a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ. That we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine by the slight of men; but, speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ.* And *St. Luke* x. 16.—*He that heareth you* (the pastors of the Church) *heareth me: and he that despiseth you, despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me.* And *Hebrews* xiii. 7, &c.—*Remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the word of God, whose faith follow—Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. Be not carried about with divers and strange doctrines.* Ver. 17.—*Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves.* If *Luther and Calvin* had hearkened to these Divine lessons, the Protestant religion would never have had a being.

REPLY.—Protestants *do* acknowledge the use of pastors and teachers in preserving unity of *ordinances*, and in *assisting* to maintain true doctrine in their respective churches. But they hold these pastors and teachers to

be *fallible* men, whose doctrine must itself be tried *by Scripture*, and tried thus by the members of their own flocks, according to their several ability. Such were, in the Jewish Church, the "Scribes," who, as our Lord said, "sat in Moses' seat," but who were, of course, not to be listened to when they (as He declared) "made the Word of God of no effect through their traditions."

Our Lord's words (Luke x. 16) were addressed to the hearers of his own inspired followers, and do not apply to ordinary teachers.

In Heb. xiii. 7, the Apostle expressly gives Christians a test by which to try the doctrines even of their teachers. "Jesus Christ"—as preached by his inspired messengers—"the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever."

Now, we know no authentic record of that teaching except the Scriptures. The apostolic teaching as recorded for us in the Bible is, therefore, our test; and if Calvin and Luther had not made use of that, to try by it the doctrines of "those who bore rule over them," we confess that the Protestant *Reformation* "would never have had a being," though our *religion* would have still been taught in the Bible, whether men attended to it or not. But *general* commands to obey our pastors no more imply that we are to obey them in everything, without using our own judgments, than general commands to obey magistrates or parents imply that we should comply with *their* will when they require us to do wrong. We should *obey* both pastors and magistrates so far as we can without *disobeying* God.

OBJECTION 8.—Protestants deny that God has promised that the children of the Church should, in all ages, *fear* the Lord, and *flourish in righteousness and abundance of peace, as long as the sun and moon shall endure*. Because they will have it, that the whole Christian Church, before their Reformation, was fallen from her allegiance to God.

Their own Bible, in plain terms, contradicts this their assertion (Ps. lxxii. 5, 7)—*They shall fear thee as long as the sun and moon endure, throughout all generations. In his days* (that is, after the coming of Christ) *shall the righteous flourish, and abundance of peace, so long as the moon endureth.*

REPLY.—Protestants do *not* deny, but affirm that there always have been, and always will be, faithful worshippers, children of Christ's Church, who have feared the Lord, and shall do so "as long as the sun and moon endureth." And no one but a very ignorant Roman Catholic would pretend that his own church had always flourished in *righteousness and peace*; since everyone acquainted with history is aware that, for many ages, it was distracted by divisions, had even rival Popes, and was overrun by a general corruption of morals.

(To be Continued.)

Correspondence.

SIR,—I want to come to the point about the doctrine of purgatory. I want to know, once for all, if it *was* or *was not*, the doctrine of the Church of Christ in the first ages? Let us take the first *three centuries* to begin with. I call upon some learned Catholic layman, or Catholic priest, to publish the opinions of the Fathers, who lived in those three centuries, in favour of purgatory. And I call on you, sir, to publish anything of this kind that may be sent to you. I hope our priests will see that it is essential that this should be done, in order to counteract the effect of your articles; and I hope that you will see that the fair play which you profess requires that you should publish it.

I hope that some Catholic more learned than me will have the charity to come forward and do this, for I have not been able to do it myself.

I remain, your obedient,

A CATHOLIC.

P.S.—I hope you will insert this letter in every number of your paper, until a satisfactory answer appears.

We insert this letter willingly; and consider ourselves bound to insert any answer, which gives references, according to our rule. It is not usual to publish letters more than once; but the question which this letter puts is so important, that we will publish it in *three* numbers of the LAYMAN, to see if an answer can be got. But we could not undertake to publish it until a satisfactory answer (which we suppose means an answer giving passages from those Fathers in *favour* of purgatory) appears: for we are inclined to believe that we should, in that case, have to go on publishing it for ever. We believe that not a single sentence can be quoted from the Fathers of the three first centuries in favour of purgatory. But we think our correspondent's letter may provoke some one to send to us what the Fathers of those centuries have said *against* purgatory, in which there will not be the same difficulty.

SEARCH THE SCRIPTURES.

WE have much pleasure in inserting the following letter from Mr. Aylmer. We are anxious to show our respected correspondent that we are willing to consider fairly all he has to say; and, therefore, as his letter is rather discursive, and embraces a great variety of topics, we have numbered the paragraphs, and, at some sacrifice of space, propose to give a separate answer to each, prefixing some general remarks, which we think necessary to place our views in a true light.

SIR,—The April number of your journal contains, at pages 44 and 45, a rather lengthened notice of my letter to you in the month of March last, together with some allusions to my pamphlet on reading the Holy Scriptures.

Your present May number, at pages 51 and 52, resumes the latter subject, especially in reference to my view of the 39th verse of the 5th chap. of John.

You have so very fairly transcribed the whole of my argument, almost in juxta-position with your own remarks, that, I assure you, sir, I am quite satisfied to leave the controversy between us on its own merits, and to abide by the decision of a discerning public.

(1) I perceive, however, you wish me to say whether our Lord, in the particular text (St. John v. 39), "meant to speak of this Bible reading of the Jews with approbation or disapprobation."

I am clearly of opinion, from the context, that our Saviour *neither* intended to commend or condemn the Jews on this head; but simply referred to it as one, it was to be supposed, most satisfactory to them, for the testimony or proof of his Divine mission, which it abundantly contained.

(2) In passing from the Jewish to the Christian dispensation, it is to be observed, that it was not a *written* law which was divinely prescribed for our guidance; but the *teaching* of the Apostles and their successors. The *unwritten* word was the first rule of Christianity.

(3) St. Irenæus, one of the most distinguished of the early Fathers of the Church, and a disciple of the great St. Polycarp, in his third book against heresies,* chap. iv., thus expresses himself as to the error of pretending that the reading of the Scriptures is absolutely necessary to know what we ought to believe and practise, in order to work out our salvation:—"If the Apostles had not left us the Holy Scriptures, should we not be *equally bound* to follow and be guided by the *traditions* which they had intrusted to those to whom they had committed the charge of the Churches which they had founded? Many barbarous nations, who have received the faith in Jesus Christ, have been guided by this rule; preserving, *without paper and ink*, the truths of salvation written in their hearts by the Holy Ghost, keeping traditions with the utmost care, and believing, through Jesus Christ the Son of God, in one God, creator of heaven and earth, and all that which exists therein. Those men, who have thus embraced the faith *without witnesses*, perhaps, may be esteemed barbarous without literature; but with regard to doctrine, religious practices, morals, and faith, they are wise, perfect, and acceptable to God: living in justice, wisdom, and chastity."

From this extract of the writings of so learned a doctor of the Church, one sees that there were multitudes of Christians, in the early ages, who had attained a complete knowledge of the articles of our faith, and a high degree of spirituality—"Made rich in Jesus Christ in all utterance and in all knowledge" (1 Cor. i. 5), though they had never read a syllable of the Sacred Volume.

(4) I must here dissent from your proposition, that the reading of the Scriptures is unquestionably of a "*moral nature*." I am sure, for the sake of your fair readers, you will not require me to cite book, chapter, and verses in the Old Testament to negative your assertions. But, perhaps, you may be of those who think that such and such narratives, because they are to be found in Scripture, are *not* of an immoral nature; to say so, in my humble opinion, is to aver that a wild beast springing from a thicket into a hermitage becomes harmless and tame.

(5) The "locking up" (as you express it), under peculiar circumstances, "*of the treasure of heavenly wisdom*," I consider anything but "*a daring usurpation*," it is, in fact, but an obedience to the command of Christ himself, who forbade his Apostles to "cast pearls before swine" (St. Matt. vii. 6)—"that is to say" (observe some of the most eminent commentators of the Churches of England and Rome), "expose not the sacred truths and mysteries of the Gospel to the raillery of profane libertines and hardened Atheists—apply not the promises to the profane." The transcendent excellency of Christ and his grace, made known and offered in the Gospel, is compared to a *pearl of great price*.—Matt. xiii. 46. (6) At all events, "usurpation" or otherwise, I am quite certain you will agree with me, that it is by no means so great an exercise of authority as that *binding and loosing*, that discretionary power of *forgiving and retaining sins*, which, as *Christ's legates*, the priesthood unquestionably, according to God's Word, possess.—St. Matt. xviii. 18, St. John xx. 23, 2 Cor. v. 18, 19, 20.

(7) I now join issue with you, and affirm, on Scriptural grounds, that the priests *are* to be regarded as the judges appointed by God to expound the law, and their expositions to be considered binding.—Ezekiel xliv. 24, Mal. ii. 7, St. John xv. 27, Acts viii. 26, and subsequent verses. (8) It is manifest that, since the *dead letter* cannot speak for itself, the Christian law, without a *living interpreter*, can be no rule of faith. No legislature ever made laws without providing judges and magistrates to explain and enforce them; for if we were to be exercising *private judgment*, where would be the end of litigation and dispute? (9) The word of God consists not in the letter of Scripture, but *in the spirit and meaning*, of which, according to St. Paul, the priests are the "*fit ministers*."—2 Cor. iii. 6.

Insist not, therefore, on the *written* Word of God *alone*. (10) Our Blessed Lord, as I before intimated, never *wrote*, or commanded his Apostles to *write* anything. (11) "In these days (God) hath spoken, '*not written*,' to us by his own Son."—Heb. i. 2. Christ did not say to his first missionaries, Go, write and distribute Bibles to all nations; but, *Go, teach all nations* (St. Matt. xxviii. 19. (12) He did not say, He that readeth or heareth the Scripture heareth me; but he that *heareth you* heareth me.—St. Luke x. 16. He did not say, He that will not read the Scripture; but, He that will not *hear the Church*, is to be considered as a heathen and a publican.—St. Matt. xviii. 17.

For these reasons, I contend for a two-fold rule of faith consisting of Scripture and tradition, and most certainly an interpreting authority in the Church. (13) You cannot, observes St. Jerome, make your way into the Scriptures, without having a guide before you to show you the road; and what better selection could be made than from amongst those to whom "it hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost (Acts xv. 28) to decide?" (14) St. Paul, in his second Epistle to the Thessalonians, exhorts them to "stand fast, and hold the *traditions* which they have learned" (2 Thess. ii. xiv.); and, moreover, in the next chapter, charges them to withdraw themselves from every brother walking disorderly, and not according to the *tradition* which they have received.—2 Thess. iii. 6. The same Apostle praises the Romans (chap. vi. 17), because they kept "that form of doctrine" into which they had been delivered. Confirmatory of this, he writes to Timothy (2 Tim. i. 13) "to hold *the form of sound words* which he had heard of him in faith."

I cannot regard Holy Scripture as the be-all, end-all, and *sine qua non* of religion, inasmuch as all necessary points of Christian Doctrine were taught and believed for many years *before* any part of the New Testament was written. Besides, where do you leave the fact that, for nearly *fifteen centuries*, until the invention of printing, the whole Scripture was little better than a sealed book to the great Christian community? (15) To tell me, therefore, that the Bible is the sole rule of faith, is to advance a monstrous absurdity, and to state we were without any rule of faith for several hundred years! To preach to a man that he must take his faith from a book he is unable to read, is as preposterous as to advise a cripple to run for his life! Is it to controvert this you assert, at top of page 52, that "the Scriptures were addressed to *all* and were to be read *by* all," because St. Paul (1 Thess. v. 27) charges the Thessalonians, that his first short five-chapter epistle to them should be read, not by, but *to* all the holy brethren? (16) From these observations, or, indeed, from anything I may write on the subject, I most sincerely hope you will not conclude that I either distrust or depreciate the Holy Scriptures. I hold my Bible in the highest estimation; I profess it to be the pure oracles of God, and that we are rather bound to lose our lives than to concur any way to its profanation. My intention is to give evident proof that tradition, and the instruction of pastors, are as sufficient to make good Christians now as in the first ages of Christianity. (17) St. Augustine, in the fifth century, thought precisely as St. Irenæus in the second; and although the immediate cause of his own conversion was the incidental reading of a passage in St. Paul's Epistles, yet he says "that a man, animated with faith, hope, and charity, and guided by the decision of his pastors, is in no need of Scripture, unless he had the charge of teaching others. I would not believe the Gospel if the authority of the Church did not move me thereto."

I have already stated, in a former communication, that I am decidedly for Scriptural education, but administered in a proper and convenient form. I now say what indeed may be as clearly inferred from my pamphlet, that the reading of the Holy Scriptures, when attended with the spirit of humility, *steady faith*, without which it is impossible to please God (Heb. xi. 6), and unreserved deference and docility to the decisions or interpretations of the Church, *cannot be too much recommended*. Further than this I cannot cede one *iota*. The Sacred Volume should never be made an ordinary school-book, nor the key of heaven to an unlettered craftsman.

(18) You have inquired where the true sense of the Holy Scriptures is to be found, which the Roman Church professes to enjoy; but which you assert she has never published.

* Vid. Opera S. Irenæi Dom. Massuet's edition. 1710. Likewise "Hist. Litteraire de la Ville de Lyon."

To which I reply, that the sense in which the Catholic Church has held, and does hold the Holy Scriptures, can be best ascertained—in fact, is embodied—in the decrees of her general conncils, which were convened from the beginning, not (as stated untraly) to make new creeds, but to condemn new heresies; and, in doing so, have given, and set forth in detail, the Church's sense and interpretations of such portions of Scripture as, from time to time, were heretically relied upon, and advanced against Catholic doctrine. (19) There never was a heresy but what was alleged, by its authors and promulgators, to be grounded on Scripture; and by its condemnation the Church has publicly given her sense of Scripture. Here I should observe, that there are debatable texts of Scripture, as well as debatable questions in theology, which as they do not interfere with, or bear upon any particular article of faith, have no ways been left open by the Church for the disputations of schoolmen, and the varied researches and interpretations of the learned. This is the theory and practice of the Church of Rome on the subject, containing within itself, like the British Constitution, a beautiful combination of freedom and of salutary restraints. (20) It were well had Protestantism generally adopted a similar rule; it would have preserved unto you, not alone uniformity of worship, but, alas! what are by no means your distinguishing characteristics—ONE BODY and ONE SPIRIT, ONE FAITH, ONE BAPTISM.—Ephesians iv. 45.

(21) Most true is your proposition, that the BIBLE is the religion of the Protestant; but are all Protestants *alike* in their religion? Have we not Protestants of the Church of England and Ireland, Protestants of the Church of Scotland, Armenian and Calvinistic Protestants? To profess yourself a Protestant is to speak quite *indefinitely* without explaining the particular *kind* to which you belong. When I hear of a Danish or Swedish Protestant, I know, of course, that he is a person whose religion is the BIBLE; but the Bible as explained *in the confession of Augsburg*. When I am presented to a Protestant of the Church of Holland, I am satisfied that the BIBLE is his religion; but as expounded by the *Synod of Dort*. In like manner, a Protestant of the United Church of England and Ireland has his religion of the BIBLE, in conjunction with the Litargy, and Thirty-nine Articles; while the Non-Episcopalian Protestants of the Church of Scotland have their "Bible, kirk, and plaid belief." Thus, the plague of schism is upon all your convocations; and, it is quite obvious, the BIBLE does not enable "*you all to speak the same thing: or to be perfect in the same mind, and in the same judgment.*"—I Cor. i. 10.

(22) This brings me now to speak of "the *private* judgment advocated by Protestants," which you are rather displeased at my supposing "to be the same as *unaided, uninstructed* judgment."—April number, page 45. You have, therefore, repudiated this notion in connection with Holy Writ, which I am really very glad of, as St. Peter, in his second epistle, pointedly tells us to understand, that no "prophecy of Scripture is made by *private* interpretation."—1 Cap. 20, 21. But, sir, unless you strangely confound the exercise of individual rights, how can you explain a *private* opinion to be one formed and entertained by *another*? If I convert you to my way of thinking, we hold the same judgment in *common*; it is not the result of any act of privacy or independence on your part, no more than a blind man trusts to *his own eyes* when he follows a guide. If we obey the injunction of the Apostle, and "subject our *understandings* in obedience to faith" (2 Cor. x. 5), do we not sacrifice *private* judgment?

(23) You say, "Protestants appeal to reason; Roman Catholics to authority."—Middle of page 45, April number. Which is the safer and more *Scriptural* course to adopt? You further add, that "an appeal to reason assumes the right use of reason;" that is mere assumption, coming with a very bad grace from one who—near the bottom of the preceding page 44—avows that *reason is very often abused and perverted by men, to their own and other persons' grievous injury!* But did our Saviour approve of, and recommend this Protestant appeal to reason? In the sixteenth chapter and eighth verse of St. Matthew's Gospel, I read as follows:—"And Jesus said, why *reason* ye within yourselves, O ye of little *faith!*" "Why *reason* ye these things in your hearts."—St. Mark xi. 8. Again, in the 8th chapter, 17th verse—"Why do you *reason*? have ye your hearts yet hardened?" "And the Scribes and Pharisees began to *reason*, saying: Who is this who speaketh blasphemies? Who can forgive sins but God alone?"—St. Luke v. 21. Thus much for Protestant reason: now for Roman Catholic authority. "And it came to pass, when Jesus had fully ended these words, the people were in admiration at his doctrine: for he was teaching them as one having *authority*, and not as the Scribes and Pharisees."—St. Matt. 28, 29. "Then calling together the twelve Apostles he gave them power and *authority*," &c., &c.—St. Luke ix. 1, 2, and subsequent verses. "Exhort and rebuke with all *authority*."—Titus ii. 15. "For if also I should boast somewhat more of our *authority*, which the Lord hath given us unto edification, and not for your destruction, I should not be ashamed."—2 Cor. x. 1. I really deem it quite unnecessary to multiply Scripture proofs of the power and authority which Christ gave to his Church—"the pillar and ground of truth."—1 Tim. iii. 15. That the first Christians did appeal to, and acknowledge their belief of such authority, will appear by the Acts of the Apostles, chapter 15, verse 2:—"They determined that Paul, and Barnabas, and certain others of the other side, should go up to the Apostles and priests unto Jerusalem." After much disputing, they (Apostles and priests), as a teaching body, determined the point, declaring that their decision was the decision of the Holy Ghost:—"It seemeth good to the Holy Ghost and to us," &c., &c.—Verse 28. And this decision was obeyed as a decree of heaven.

I suppose it is upon the plea of the Bible only, to the exclusion of Church authority, that our streets and highways are filled with placards and handbills, offering different sums of money as a reward for the discovery and production of any passage of Scripture requiring us to believe such and such doctrines, or to comply with such and such observances.

(24) In the spirit of kindliness, will you permit me, through your columns, to ask the gentlemen of the Irish Church Missions why it is that, contrary to the clear and express command of God in Scripture, they keep the Sunday holy instead of *Saturday*, which is the Sabbath of Holy Writ? There are the Old and New Testaments for you, and give me the text from either of them authorizing the change. By what dispensing power do you take an oath on that book wherein it is positively commanded by Christ to "Swear not at all?"—St. Matt. v. 34. How do you reconcile your law of divorce with the New Testament, and "*Marry her that is put away?*"—St. Matt. v. 32; St. Mark x. 9, 10, 11, 12.

(25) There are Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, duly set forth in the Book of Common Prayer. The wealth of all the Rothschilds would be vainly offered for a direct Scripture proof of some of these—that is to say, to prove them from *Scripture alone*. In this Book of Common Prayer look at the fourteenth Psalm: now, open your own version of the Bible, and read that fourteenth Psalm; you will find seven verses in the "*Bible only*," while in the Book of Common Prayer—same Psalm—you have *eleven!* If there be not a discrepancy between your Bible and your Prayer-book—*an "adding to the Word of God"*—I leave those who run to decide.

(26) Where in Scripture is to be found the Table of all the Fasts and Feasts that are to be observed in the Church of England throughout the year, *many of them holidays for saints and angels?* You speak of the word "transubstantiation" not to be found in Holy Writ. Show me in your *sole rule of faith* the words "trinity" and "consubstantial," yet these I find in your creed and liturgy as well as my own. Now, neither you, sir, nor the Irish Church Missions' Society can give a satisfactory answer to all this without retracting what you have said against the Church's authority, and pulling down the proud idol of *private judgment*. It is on the very principles you ridicule and condemn when Popery is in question you must convict the Jew and Dissenter when they come in your way.

I remain, Sir,
Your obedient, very humble servant,
M. V. AYLMER.

72, Lower Baggot-street, June, 1852.

There are few controversies which might not be much shortened if the disputants would always take pains to ascertain what are the exact doctrines held by their opponents. In the present case we find, in Mr. Aylmer's letter, much that is irrelevant, and which we are persuaded he would have left out, had he been more exactly informed as to the nature of the points in dispute between us. This one advantage at least, we hope, will follow from the institution of this journal, that intelligent Roman Catholics will have an opportunity of learning what are the doctrines held by the members of the Church of England; and, on the other hand, should we inadvertently misrepresent the views of Roman Catholics, we shall cheerfully lend our columns to the correction of our mistakes.

As to the rule of faith, then, Protestants and Roman Catholics agree, that what must govern our belief is the teaching of our Lord and his Apostles. They agree, moreover, that it is the duty of the Church to preserve the truths communicated by our Lord, and to make them known to her members; and for this purpose both the Church of England and the Church of Rome employ nearly the same means. Not to speak now of the use of creeds, and such like formularies, the principal of these means is the setting apart a fixed order of men, whose duty it is to instruct the people in God's truth. As to the advantages of oral instruction, there is no dispute between us. There is, at least, as much of sermons and catechizing in the Church of England as in the Church of Rome. And we believe that a layman may learn all that is necessary for his salvation from his priest, without going further, *if* that priest rightly fulfil his duty, and if he teach the doctrines of our Lord, without any mixture of human error. So far we are agreed. But the point of difference arises, if a layman asks his priest, how am I to know that such and such a doctrine, which you teach me, was taught by our Lord? Where is the teaching of the Lord and his apostles recorded? To this question a priest of the Church of England is taught to answer (see 6th Article)—"Every doctrine which it is necessary to your salvation to believe is contained in the Holy Scriptures. You are at liberty to examine them for yourself, and to satisfy yourself that the doctrines which I have taught you are to be found there." The priest of the Church of Rome will reply—"It is true that *some* of the teaching of our Lord is recorded in the Bible, but not all. The Church possesses, besides, the unwritten Word of God; and you are *not* at liberty to examine what I teach you in her name. If you presume to test the accuracy of her doctrines by comparing them with Scripture, you will commit a grievous sin, and be, besides, in imminent danger of being led into error."

It must be explained (see Bellarmine de Verbo Dei Lib. 4, cap. 2), that when the Church of Rome speaks of the unwritten Word of God, it is not to be understood that that word is *nowhere* written, but only that it is not written in the Scriptures. For instance, we do not suppose that Mr. Aylmer maintains that there is any doctrine which it is necessary to his salvation to believe, which *now* rests on oral tradition alone, and which is not to be found written *in some book or other*. We suppose he must acknowledge that, if the Christian doctrines had been left to be handed down to us from the time of the Apostles, by word of mouth alone, they would have been in great danger of being corrupted; but he will tell us that the belief of Christians has been, from time to time, recorded by learned doctors and fathers of the Church. To their writings, and to the decrees of councils, he will refer us, if it be asked where are we to find the unwritten Word of God. We see, then, that, strictly speaking, the question between Protestants and Roman Catholics is not "the written word *versus* oral tradition;" but the difference is, Protestants say, all doctrines necessary to salvation, have been, through the providence of God, committed to writing, by divinely inspired Apostles and Evangelists: Roman Catholics say, that some of these doctrines have been written down by Apostles and Evangelists, and others by fallible men.

In discussing this question, it is plainly irrelevant to declaim about the advantages of oral instruction, and the possibility of man's learning all the truth by word of mouth alone; for the point at issue is not whether oral instruction be a good thing, but how its correctness shall, in the last resort, be tested.

There was in a certain city a town clock of considerable antiquity, said to have been constructed by a first-rate maker. There were, however, in the town several who asserted that this clock had, in the course of years, got more than an hour astray, and who demanded that the clock should be compared with the sun-dial, and corrected accordingly. But the corporation asserted that their clock was infallible, and, moreover, that it did accurately agree with the sun-dial. And, in order to silence all objectors (whose eyes, they said, must have been dazzled, when they fancied there was any difference between the dial and the clock), they locked up the garden in which the sun-dial was, and only allowed a few to enter, and that only on condition that they should promise beforehand to maintain that the clock and the dial did accurately agree. And when the objectors requested to be indulged with a sight of the dial, that they might satisfy themselves that the clock was right, the corporation replied—"How absurd it is of you to maintain that the sun is what regulates the true time. According to you no one can know the hour at night, or on a cloudy day. We hold that a blind man may know the hour very correctly by hearing our clock strike, but you must maintain that if he cannot see the dial, he can never know the hour at all." But, of course, the others replied—"All this talk is quite beside the question. We think a good clock a most useful thing, if it be kept to the right time. And we all carry watches ourselves. But we are very sure that the only way to keep a watch or clock right, is to have it constantly regulated by the sun; and we suspect that, if you knew your clock to agree with the dial, you would not have such an objection to our making the comparison."

Having made these general observations on the subject of Mr. Aylmer's letter, we now proceed to examine it in detail.

(1) He commences with some remarks on the text (John v. 39)—"Search (or ye do search) the Scriptures." On the question which way this text ought to be rendered, we would call Mr. Aylmer's attention to the fact, that the Roman Church has never ventured to translate it into English otherwise than as a command—SEARCH THE SCRIPTURES. This is the more remarkable, because the note in the present Douay Bible shows an earnest wish that the people should *not* understand it as a command! Yet, among the thousands of alterations which have been made, from time to time, in the Douay translation, the Roman Catholic bishops have not ventured to alter this text. They still retain the *command*, Search the Scriptures.

The note to which we allude has been *but lately* put into the Douay Bible. The earliest edition in which we have found it is that of the New Testament, corrected

by Dr. M'Mahon, and authorized by Dr. Troy, in 1803. In the old edition (Rheims, 1582) the note ran thus—"Our Master referreth them *not to the reading only, or learning them without book* * * * * *but to the deep search of the meaning and mysteries of the Scripture.*" Now, it may be asked, when the Romish bishops became dissatisfied with this note, and altered it into an entreaty that no one would understand the text as a command, how did it come to pass that they did not alter their translation, and *that* when they did not scruple to correct the translation of so many other passages? The reason was, because they knew that the first translators had rendered the passage in accordance with the opinion of the best Greek Fathers, who spoke the language of the New Testament from their childhood, and must be admitted to be competent judges of the meaning of a Greek word. We give a quotation from St. Chrysostom, the greatest of all the Greek Fathers, and on comparing it with the note in the edition of 1582, to which we have referred, the reader can have no doubt that these translators were guided by his authority in adopting the version, "Search the Scriptures." He says (see 41st Homily on St. John's Gospel)—"Wherefore Christ, when he referred the Jews to the Scriptures, sent them *not to a mere reading, but a careful and considerate search*; for he said not '*read* the Scriptures,' but '*search* the Scriptures;' * * * * He *bids* them now dig down with care, that they might be able to discover what luy in the depth below."

On this text, however, Mr. Aylmer exercises his private judgment, in a manner which many Protestants would not have courage to imitate; and, notwithstanding the authority of the Greek Fathers and the Irish Roman Catholic bishops, prefers the rendering, "Ye search the Scriptures." In our last number we consented to waive the question whether Mr. Aylmer is right in this opinion. It is sufficient for our argument if the Jews were right in searching the Scriptures. We ask him accordingly—"Did our Saviour approve or disapprove of the conduct of the Jews in searching the Scriptures?" To this question we have not got a satisfactory reply. Mr. Aylmer tells us that our Lord's words—"Ye search the Scriptures"—do not express either approbation or condemnation of the Jews' conduct in so doing. It is true, perhaps, that these words do not *express* that our Lord approved of the conduct of the Jews in searching the Scriptures; but we think that the context *implies* it plainly. At all events we call upon Mr. Aylmer to tell us plainly, does he think the Jews were wrong in searching their Old Testament Scriptures? We cannot think that he will venture to say they were. But if he admits that the Jews were not wrong in this search, our argument proceeded thus.

We asked for some proof that Christians are not to read the Scriptures which are given them, as freely as the Jews were permitted and taught to read theirs. The early Christians *had been* Jews. As such they were used to daily reading of their Scriptures. When Christians, they would, naturally, read what the Apostles wrote, unless they were forbidden. We therefore said—"It is impossible to believe that such a change would have been introduced, *without being formally and distinctly notified.* We shall anxiously look for Mr. Aylmer's views on this subject; but think we may safely challenge the Priests of the Church of Rome to produce any such notification" And as Mr. Aylmer has, certainly, produced no such notification, we now refer him to the fact, that St. Paul wrote his epistles to *all* the believers in the Churches he addressed. He directs his letters, not to the bishops or to the clergy exclusively, but to the faithful brethren. Now, can it be supposed that the persons to whom he directed his letters were not allowed to read them? Must they not (in the absence of all directions to the contrary) have thought themselves as well entitled to read these letters—ay, and as much bound to read and learn them—as they had been to read the Old Testament while Jews?

(2) Mr. Aylmer seems to think that there was a striking difference, in this respect, between the Jewish and Christian revelations, in that the latter was an unwritten revelation for some years, while the former was given in writing from the first. With the exception of the ten commandments, this is an error. Moses did, indeed, write what was said to him at Sinai (Ex. xxiv., v. 4), and he read it to the people, but did not give the book either to them or the priests. While he lived (for 40 years) it was, "Hear, O Israel;" but when he came to die, he wrote all that he had said, and gave the book in charge to them.—Deut. xxxi., v. 9 and 26. So while the inspired Apostles lived, they declared with authority what Christ had said to them; and, after their death, their writings were looked upon as the great depository of their revelation.

Mr. Aylmer says, that "it was not a *written* law which was divinely prescribed for our guidance, but the *teaching* of the Apostles." These two things ought not to be contrasted; for the question is, how the teaching of the Apostles is made known to us; and we hold that the teaching of the Apostles is altogether contained in the written word, and that it is by means of that word alone that we can learn with certainty that any particular doctrine was taught by the Apostles. Mr. Aylmer's argument is, in fact, "They who heard the Apostles with their own ears could tell with certainty what were the doctrines taught by them, without any appeal to Scripture; therefore, we, 1800 years after, can also tell with certainty, what the Apostles taught, without any use of their writings." Need we point out the fallacy of this argument? We shall presently show from whom Mr. Aylmer borrowed it.

(3) He then quotes a passage from Irenæus. We hope, in a future number, to lay before our readers the views of St. Irenæus as to the sufficiency of Scripture; but we shall not here lengthen remarks already too long. The passage quoted by Mr. Aylmer presents no difficulty to any one who has read our preliminary remarks. We do not deny that any one may attain by oral instruction alone (if his teacher instruct him rightly) a complete* knowledge of the doctrines of the Christian faith.

We believe that we are bound to use every means in our power to arrive at a correct knowledge of the truths which Christ has given us. If the Holy Scriptures had not been left us, we might have learned, through uninspired channels, a few of the leading facts of our religion; but does this prove that now, that God *has* given us the Scriptures, we should be justified in neglecting to obtain, by their means, a more perfect knowledge of the truth? If God had given us no eyes, we might have been able to grope our way about; but this is no reason why we should refuse to use our eyes, now that he has given us them.

We have just said that any one may obtain a knowledge of the truth by oral instruction, *if* his teacher instruct him rightly. The limitation is necessary, because the very book of Irenæus, to which Mr. Aylmer refers, is directed against a set of heretics who did give oral instruction to their followers, but who, unfortunately, taught them wrong. Irenæus himself explains to us the reason why he was forced to have recourse to arguments from tradition. These heretics, it seems (Adv. Hær. Lib. iii. 2), "when reproved from the Scriptures immediately began to accuse the Scriptures themselves, as if they were not correct, nor of authority, and as if they were ambiguous; and *as if the truth could not be discovered from them by those who were ignorant of tradition;* FOR THAT THE TRUTH WAS NOT DELIVERED IN WRITING BUT ORALLY." Does Mr. Aylmer recognise this argument?

(4) Mr. Aylmer "dissents from our proposition, that the reading of the Scripture is unquestionably of a moral nature." He mistakes our meaning. We meant that "reading" is a moral, not a ceremonial duty: that it was not one of those ceremonies and observances which ceased with the Jewish ritual, but that reading and searching God's written revelation to man is a duty springing from man's relation to God.

Mr. Aylmer supposes us to have said, that the *things* contained in Scripture are moral, and not immoral. We did not say so; because we never questioned this ourselves, nor supposed that any other Christian did. *Here* we leave our reason, and believe that God knows better what is good for man than we know. And it is with grief and astonishment that we find Mr. Aylmer, understanding our proposition as he did, taking the opposite side, and prepared to say, or to insinuate, that the Bible is "immoral!" and that a regard to morality should prevent females reading it. Will he force us to turn to the books in which Roman Catholic priests are educated for the confessing of females?

We believe that adultery is an immoral act; but we believe that God's command—"thou shalt not commit adultery"—is moral; and, on the same principle, we maintain the morality of all Scripture. Mr. Aylmer himself maintains (and here we thank him for it) that it was exclusively of the Old Testament that Christ said—"Search the Scriptures." Yet it is the Old Testament he considers too immoral to be read. And, perhaps, Mr. Aylmer would say that it was of the Old Testament, too, that St. Paul said this—"ALL Scripture, inspired of God, is profitable to learn, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice."—2 Tim. iii. 16. We heartily regret this part of Mr. Aylmer's letter; but we fear that those who would restrain the Scripture, do often lose their reverence for it more than they suspect themselves.

(5) Mr. Aylmer justifies that which he says we call the "locking up" of Scripture, by the express command of Christ himself—"Neither cast ye your pearls before swine."—Matt. vii. 6. We adopt the text and the principle. Christ's ministers and faithful people are not to persist in speaking of Gospel mysteries, to those who hear only to mock and scoff. But we do not see how the command is fulfilled by the Church forbidding such men to read. Will *they* refrain from reading, *because she* forbids them?

In claiming a more general reading for Irish Roman Catholics, our question with those who oppose us may be rather of detail than principle. What are the facts? Is the Bible read, or possessed, by one in twenty of Irish Roman Catholics? Are the nineteen in every twenty "swine?" Are they "profane libertines" and "hardened Atheists?" If they be such, we would not give them "pearls," save in the hope that their present guidance only had made them such. But we deny the fact. The priesthood boasts of the faith and morals of the Irish Roman Catholics: and we believe that they have a zeal for God, though not according to knowledge. If those nineteen in twenty who are at present without the Bible, be not such as are unfit to receive the "pearl of great price," then we call on Mr. Aylmer to aid us in stimulating them to acquire it.

(6) Mr. Aylmer speaks of "the *discretionary* power of forgiving and retaining sins." We take this to be one of the worst popular errors prevailing among Roman Catholics. But we deny that such a doctrine is taught by the best divines of the Roman Catholic Church. *They* say that the power is NOT *discretionary*; that the priest can forgive only whom God intends to forgive, and bind only those whom God intends to bind. Mr. Aylmer must have heard of the "Clave errante;" that the priest's act, if contrary to what God intends, is of no effect whatever; and if the priest cannot bind whom God intends to loose, or loose whom God intends to bind, still less can he withhold the Scriptures from those whom God intends should read—since we read of no power at all being given to him to withhold the Scriptures.

[Our reply to the remaining paragraphs of Mr. Aylmer's letter is in type; but we are compelled, from want of space, to postpone it till our next number.]

* It should be noticed, however, that the only doctrines communicated by tradition, of which Irenæus speaks, are such as are contained in the Apostles' Creed, and on which Protestants and Roman Catholics do not differ.

FARMING OPERATIONS FOR JUNE.

(*From the Irish Farmers' Gazette.*)

Turnips.—Finish the sowing of Swedes as early as possible; after the 10th, it will be getting late for them, when Dale's hybrid or the Aberdeen varieties should be substituted, the sowing of which should be vigorously prosecuted during the month, and finished, if possible, by the end of it—beginning with the fallows, and finishing with those lands which have borne crops of vetches and rye, as they get cleared. The order in which the different varieties should be sown is as follows:—1st, Swedes; 2nd, hybrids; 3rd, Aberdeens; 4th, white turnips, which kind may be extended into the middle of July.

Hoeing Turnips.—The earlier-sown turnips will have come into rough leaf some time during the month, after which they must be horse-hoed, hand-hoed, and singled out. These operations should follow each other closely, the great error in turnip culture being not thinning in time, when the plants are drawn up weakly, and otherwise injured. The distances apart to which the plants should be thinned out, under different circumstances, require much judgment and practical experience. In deep, naturally-rich loams, and sheltered aspects, Swedes will require a distance of from fifteen to eighteen inches, plant from plant; under less favourable circumstances, twelve to fifteen inches apart. As it is not desirable to grow the softer kinds large, as by so doing they do not grow firm and compact at the heart, twelve to fourteen inches apart will suffice for hybrids and Aberdeens; but the large white kinds must be grown within nine or ten to twelve inches apart, to insure a compact, nutritious root. After the plants are thinned out to their proper distances, the hoes and grubbers should be kept constantly going, to destroy weeds and pulverize the soil, till the crops are so much advanced as to be injurious to trespass amongst them.

Mangels and Sugar Beet will also be ready for thinning. The same rules that we laid down for Swede turnips are perfectly applicable to mangels. Should there be any blanks or misses in the Swede or mangel crops, they may be readily made up, at the time of thinning, by carefully transplanting some of the strongest plants. To insure success, refresh the spots to be transplanted, by turning over the soil, a few inches deep, with the spade or small three-pronged fork. Cut off the largest of the leaves, preserving the short and partly-developed ones at the heart; dip the roots in an adhesive puddle, composed of fine, rich earth and cow or sheep droppings, and dibble them in, taking care that the roots are not doubled up, but that they go down perpendicularly. The plants should not be inserted deeper than they originally stood, or they will not bulb well, but grow to tops. Moist, dropping weather is the best for this work, and the plants will require a little water till they are well established. A little guano, forked in before planting, or watering with liquid manure afterwards, will assist them greatly.

Carrots and Parsnips should be hand-hoed and singled out early in the month; thin them from nine to ten inches apart, plant from plant, in the rows, and in a few days put the horse-hoe and grubbers through them, which continue at intervals, to eradicate weeds, and keep the land loose and friable, till the crops shut them out.

Beans in drills, if early sown, will be in flower and well advanced; notwithstanding, if it has not been done before, the crop should get its final horse-hoeing, and the double mould-board plough run between, which may be used without injury, by attaching a whipple to the nozzle of the plough, &c., so as to elevate the swings, and prevent their switching the bean-stalks.

New and Recent Works

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

Booksellers to the Queen,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

THE FIRST RESURRECTION: Being Comments on 1 Cor. chap. xv. By the Rev. Robert Noble. (Immediately.)

THE DOMESTIC COMMENTARY ON THE HOLY SCRIPTURES. By a Clergyman of the Church of England. 4 vols. Imp. 8vo. £2 15s. 6d.

CHRISTOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, and a Commentary on the Messianic Predictions. By E. W. Hengstenberg. vol. 1. 10s. 6d.

INCIDENTS OF TRAVEL IN CENTRAL AMERICA, CHIAPAS AND YUCATAN. By the late John Lloyd Stephens. With numerous Engravings. 8vo. 12s.

GRATITUDE: an Exposition of the Hundred and Third Psalm. By the Rev. John Stevenson. 8vo. 6s.

THE BIBLE IN THE COUNTING HOUSE: a course of Lectures to Merchants. By the Rev. H. A. Broadman, D.D. 8vo. 5s.

LEILA ADA, THE JEWISH CONVERT: an authentic Memoir. By Osborne W. Trenery, Heighway. 3s. 6d.

SELECT EXTRACTS FROM THE DIARY, CORRESPONDENCE, ETC., OF LEILA ADA. By Osborne W. Trenery, Heighway. 3s. 6d.

THE BUD OF PROMISE: a Memoir of Eliza H. M. Græme. By the Rev. D. Pitcairn. 3s. 6d.

THE RUSSO-TURKISH CAMPAIGN OF 1828-29; with a View of the present State of the Eastern Question. By Colonel Chesney. 12s.

THE RUSSIAN SHORES OF THE BLACK SEA, IN THE AUTUMN of 1852, with a Voyage down the Volga, and a Tour through the Country of the Don Cossacks. By Laurence Oliphant. 8vo. 14s.

PROGRESS OF RUSSIA IN THE WEST, NORTH, AND SOUTH. By David Urquhart. 1s. 6d.

THE RUSSIANS OF THE SOUTH. By Shirley Brooke. 1s.

TURKEY AND CHRISTENDOM: An Historical Sketch of the Relations between the Ottoman Empire and the States of Europe. 1s.

RUSSIA AND THE RUSSIANS: comprising an account of the Czar Nicholas, and the House of Romanoff, with a sketch of the Encroachments of Russia from the reign of the Empress Catherine. By J. H. Cole, 21st Fusileers. 2s. 6d.

THE BOOK AND ITS STORY: a Narrative for the Young, on occasion of the Jubilee of the British and Foreign Bible Society. By L. N. R. With an Introductory preface, by Rev. T. Phillips. Fcap. 4s.

WORK; or Plenty to Do, and How to Do it. By Margaret Maria Brewster. 12mo. 4s.

MY SCHOOLS AND MY SCHOOLMASTERS; or, the Story of my Education. By Hugh Miller. post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

THE HISTORY OF THE FRENCH PROTESTANT REFUGEES, from the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. By Charles Weiss. 8vo. 14s.

HISTORY OF THE PROTESTANT CHURCH IN HUNGARY, FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE REFORMATION TO 1850, with reference also to Transylvania. With an Introduction by Dr. D'Aubigne. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

THE CROSS AND THE DRAGON; or, the Fortunes of Christianity in China, with Notices of the Secret Societies of the Chinese. By J. Kesson. Post 8vo. 6s.

D'AUBIGNE'S HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION. Vol. V.—Subject:—"The Reformation in England." 8vo. 12s.

D'AUBIGNE'S HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY. Five vols. in One. 8vo. Cloth, 8s., Gilt Edges, 9s.

THE NET IN THE BAY; or Journal of a visit to Moose and Albany. By the Bishop of Rupert's Land. 4s. 6d.

INCIDENTS IN THE LIFE OF OUR SAVIOUR, ILLUSTRATIVE OF HIS DIVINE CHARACTER AND MISSION. By Rev. A. L. R. Foote. 6s.

THE WORDS OF JESUS. By the Author of the "Faithful Promiser." In Cover, 8d.; Cloth. 1s.

THE PSALMS RESTORED TO THE MESSIAH: A Commentary on the Book of Psalms. By Rev. R. H. Ryland. With a commendatory notice, by the Bishop of Cashel. 6s.

THE GREAT SACRIFICE. By Rev. John Camming, D.D. 2s. 6d.

THE COMFORTER. By Rev. J. Cumming, D.D. 2s. 6d.

CHRIST OUR PASSOVER; or, Thoughts on the Atonement. By the Rev. John Cumming, D.D. 2s. 6d.

THE TENT AND ALTAR: Sketches of Patriarchal Days. By Rev. Dr. Cumming. 9s.

MEMOIRS OF THOMAS CHALMERS, D.D., LL.D. By his Son-in-Law, the Rev. Wm. Hanna, LL.D. 2 Vols., 12s.

MEMOIR OF THE LATE REV. EDWARD BICKERSTETH. By the Rev. T. R. Birks. Cheaper Edition. 2 vols., fcap. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

MEMOIR OF THE LIVES OF ROBERT AND JAMES A. HALDANE. By Alexander Haldane, Esq. 8vo. 12s.

MEMOIR OF THE REV. W. H. KRAUSE, A.M., Bethesda Chapel, Dublin, with selections from his Correspondence. By Rev. C. S. Stanford. Crown 8vo. 5s. 6d.

THE SUCCESSFUL MERCHANT: Sketches of the Life of Mr. Samuel Budgett. By William Arthur, A.M. 2s. 6d.

LIVES OF THE QUEENS OF ENGLAND. By Miss Strickland. New and Revised Edition. With numerous Portraits. Vols. I., II., III., IV., post 8vo, 7s. 6d. each. (To be completed in 8 monthly volumes.)

MEMOIR OF THE REV. JOHN PYE SMITH, D.D., LL.D. By John Medway. 12s. 6d.

DAILY BIBLE ILLUSTRATIONS: The Apostles and Early Christian Church. By Dr. Kitto. 6s.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES; THE MOSLEM, AND HIS END; THE CHRISTIAN AND HIS HOPE. By the Rev. John Cumming, D.D. 1s. 6d.

NUNS AND NUNNERIES. Two Lectures. By the Rev. Hobart Seymour. 1s. 4d.

THE MYSTERY SOLVED; or, Ireland's Miseries; the Grand Cause and Cure. By the Rev. Marcus Dill, D.D. 2s. 6d.

THE HISTORY OF ENGLAND, from the Invasion of Julius Cæsar to the end of the Reign of George II. By Hume and Smollett. With Continuation to the Accession of Queen Victoria. By the Rev. T. S. Hughes. Vol. i. 4s. (To be completed in 18 monthly vols.)

ST. PATRICK AND THE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH IN IRELAND. By the Rev. W. P. Walsh. Third Edition. 6d.

THE NECESSITY FOR AN INTERMEDIATE SYSTEM OF EDUCATION BETWEEN THE NATIONAL SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES OF IRELAND. By the Rev. Professor M'Cosh, D.D., Queen's College, Belfast. 6d.

THE ART OF QUESTIONING; or, a Short Analysis of the Interrogatory Methods of Instruction, designed for the use of Teachers, Pupil Teachers, and Monitors. By W. T. Young, T.C.D. 1s. By post, 1s. 4d.

PHILIPS' MAP OF THE FRONTIER PROVINCES OF TURKEY, RUSSIA, AND AUSTRIA, THE BLACK SEA, &c., with a detailed Map of the River Danube, showing the Fortified Towns, &c., along its course. In case. 1s.

PHILIPS' CHART OF THE MEDITERRANEAN, with detailed Plans of the Bays of Gibraltar, Genoa, Marseilles, &c. 1s.

PHILIPS' CHART OF THE NORTH SEA AND THE BALTIC, with detailed Plans of Cronstadt, Revel, &c. 1s.

JOHNSTONE'S MAP OF THE SEAT OF WAR in the Danubian Principalities, the Black Sea, &c. 1s.

JOHNSTONE'S CHART OF THE BALTIC, with enlarged plans of Kronstadt and St. Petersburgh. 1s.

WYLD'S MAP OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE, THE BLACK SEA, AND THE FRONTIERS OF RUSSIA AND PERSIA. Coloured, 2s. 6d.; mounted and in case, 4s. 6d.

WYLD'S CHART OF THE NORTH SEA AND THE BALTIC. 4s.

WYLD'S CHART OF THE THEATRE OF WAR, on an enlarged scale. 3s. In case, 5s.

WYLD'S PLAN OF CRONSTADT, with its Fortifications and Batteries. 1s.

Lately Published,

WILLET'S "SYNOPSIS PAPISMI." New Edition. Edited by the Rev. J. Cumming, D.D. Ten vols., 8vo. Price £3.

London: JAMES MILLER, 17, Berner's-street, Oxford-street, and all Booksellers.

Just Published, No. II., Price 6s.,

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND QUARTERLY REVIEW.

CONTENTS:

I. Convocation.
II. American Painters.
III. Prophet and Seer.
IV. Life Assurance.
V. Cholera and its Causes.
VI. Cathedral Reform.
VII. Tractarianism in London.
VIII. Russia, its Power and Prospects.
IX. Quarterly Journal of Facts and Progress.
X. Literature of the Quarter Classified and Reviewed.

London: Sampson Low and Son. Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY AND CO., 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET.

Just Published, New Edition, Price 2s. 6d.,

THE COLLECTS OF THE LITURGY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND,

Catechetically Explained, Compared with Scripture, and Briefly Commented upon, with the Date and Origin of each Collect annexed. For the use of Families and Sunday Schools.

By the Rev. Charles Miller, A.B.,

With Recommendary Preface by the Bishop of Meath.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY, 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET. London: Wertheim and Mackintosh.

Just Published,

Second Edition, with additional Facts and Anecdotes, in limp cloth, 1s. 6d., or in cloth, 2s. 6d.,

POOR PADDY'S CABIN; or, SLAVERY IN IRELAND. A true Representation of Facts and Characters. By an Irishman.

"We could desire nothing better for the British Empire, and indeed for the interests of mankind everywhere, than that 'Poor Paddy's Cabin' may have a circulation as extensive as Mrs. Stowe's beautiful narrative. The story on which the incidents are engrafted is in the highest degree interesting and gratifying, and it would do more good within the British Islands, if found in every hand, than even 'Uncle Tom's Cabin' has done for the cause of Negro Emancipation in the New World!"—*Standard.*

London: WERTHEIM and MACKINTOSH. Dublin: WM. CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Just Published, Price 3d.,

CHILDREN IN HEAVEN: A Sermon to Children, preached in Trinity Church, on Thursday, January 5, 1854. By the Rev. John Gregg, A.B.

II.

Price Twopence.

GOOD TO BE DONE, AND WHO SHOULD DO IT: A Sermon preached in Trinity Church, on Sunday, January 1, 1854. By the Rev. John Gregg, A.B.

III.

Price Twopence.

A CURE FOR CARE: A Sermon preached in Trinity Church. By the Rev. John Gregg, A.B.

IV.

Price Twopence.

THE WAY OF ESCAPE: A Sermon preached in Trinity Church, on Sunday evening, January 1, 1845. By the Rev. John Gregg, A.B.

V.

GOOD NEWS FOR THE POOR: A Sermon preached in Trinity Church, on the 11th December, 1853. By the Rev. John Gregg, A.B.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher, WILLIAM CURRY, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

Thursday, June 17, 1852.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Glóir do Dhia aṅ ṛna háṛduiḃ, agus ṛíoḋċáin air an ċalaṁ deaġċoil do na dáoiniḃ.

Luke II. 14.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. I.—No. 7. JULY, 1852. { Annual Subscription, 3s. 6d. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

PAGE.

One Guide or Two? 73
The Talk of the Road—No. V. 74
The Two Farmers of Ballintubber 74
Reasons of Mr. John Kennedy, of Nenagh, for Leaving the Church of Rome 76
Reply to Mr. Aylmer's Letter on Reading the Holy Scriptures (concluded) 77
Use of "the Fathers" in Proving the Novelty of Errors . . 79
Anonymous Challenge, Kilkenny 80
CORRESPONDENCE:
Is the doctrine of Purgatory taught by the early Fathers? . 80
Rejoinder on St. Augustine's Prayer for his Mother Monica—By a Catholic 82
Farming Operations for July 83

ONE GUIDE OR TWO?

We shall commence with a story, which our readers may believe or not as they please. Last summer, on a walking tour in Switzerland, we met, on one of the mountain passes, an English friend, escorted by two guides. As the pass was neither difficult nor dangerous, we had the curiosity to ask why he had provided himself with a second guide. "Why," said he, "I started with this honest Swiss, who has the character of being thoroughly acquainted with every path in this district; but on the way I picked up this Frenchman, who has a great deal more to say for himself; tells me a great many stories, of which the Swiss knows nothing; and who assures me, besides, that he knows the whole country so well that I may implicitly trust to his guidance." "Well, then," said we, "if you like your new guide so much the best, why did you not send back the first?" "I was going to do so," said he, "but the Frenchman advised me not, telling me that the Swiss really deserved his character, and that no one can be better acquainted with the entire country." "Then," said we, "we suppose your two guides always agree." "I don't know what to say to that," replied he. "There have been several times that I imagined the Swiss wanted to lead me a different way from that which the Frenchman was taking me. However, the latter assured me that I was mistaken, and that it was merely that I did not understand the Swiss guide's *patois*, but that, in reality, they were both perfectly agreed." "Then," said we, "if you are quite sure you can trust the Frenchman, you had better get rid of the other; for if the two agree, he is of no use to you; and, by seeming to disagree with the other, he only makes your mind uncomfortable, and renders you uncertain whether the Frenchman is leading you right."

Without pledging ourselves that all this literally happened, we may ask our readers to receive the moral which we want to draw from our story—namely, that when we have to employ the services of a guide at all, we are not better off with two than with one good one. If our two guides agree, it is the same thing as if we had but one; and if they disagree, it is plain that we can only follow one of them.

What we have said has been intended to prepare the way for the consideration of one of the principal controversies between the Church of England and the Church of Rome—namely, Has God given us a single or a double rule of faith? Our readers are aware that the Church of England maintains that God has given us a *single* rule of faith—viz., Holy Scripture—which, according to her, contains all things necessary to salvation; the Church of Rome holds that God has given us a *double* rule—namely, Holy Scripture and tradition—and she asserts that the written and the unwritten word of God are both guides of equal authority, and to be listened to with equal reverence. Now, we shall attempt to prove that the system of a double rule of faith is one which in practice cannot work; and that, if tradition is to be our guide, Scripture is useless, if not mischievous.

We need no better proof of this assertion than the conduct of the Church of Rome herself. Though she professes to have two guides, in practice she employs but one of them. Her advocates cannot help admitting, in theory, that God has given us the Scriptures, and that he must have intended them to serve as a rule of faith; but when they are teaching their people, instead of sending them to the Bible to learn their faith there, they think it sufficient to acquaint them with the tradition of the Church. For those who know this, they maintain that the Bible is altogether unnecessary, and there are no passages from the Fathers which they have more pleasure in quoting than those (such as Mr. Aylmer has referred to in the last number) where any of them have asserted that it is *possible* for a man to know every saving truth without having read the Holy Scriptures. On this possibility the Church of Rome has acted. Among her laity ignorance of the Bible is not the exception but the rule; and it is only where they have come much into contact with Protestants, that it is possible to find many of her lay members well acquainted with it. In this country, where Protestants have exerted themselves so much to circulate the Scriptures, Roman Catholic priests have had an obvious motive for emulating their exertions—namely, in order to show that they had an equal regard for the Book which God has given, and were not afraid to let their people read it; and yet in this country it will not be denied that a vast majority of the Roman Catholic laity are wholly ignorant of the Bible. And this ignorance is far deeper in countries where Protestants have but little influence; and we suppose that it would be possible to find ten Roman Catholics in this country acquainted with the Scriptures, for one that could be found among the same number of persons in Spain or Italy. It is not our object now to find fault with this state of things. The only conclusion we wish to draw is this: that if the Roman Catholic theory be true—if God has left us tradition as our rule of faith, which tradition the church preserves and teaches without any risk of error, then we do not want the Scriptures as our rule of faith, and it is quite unnecessary for us to read them.

But, we will go farther; and we say, that if the Roman Catholic theory be true, the reading of the Scriptures is likely to be mischievous. A saying is attributed to a celebrated Roman Catholic divine, that it would have been better for the Church if the Scriptures had never been written. We are quite aware that no church is bound by the sayings of one of its members, however eminent. A Roman Catholic may answer if pressed by an injudicious speech of Cardinal Hosius, or Cardinal Bellarmine, just as a Protestant would answer if taunted with an injudicious speech of Luther or Calvin, and may fairly say, "The speech was a hasty and an unwise one, and I am by no means bound to defend it." Our motive for quoting here the saying we have just cited, is merely that it expresses in a concise and striking form what we believe to be the legitimate consequence of the Roman Catholic theory of tradition. For let us suppose that theory to be true, and let us examine of what advantage the Scriptures are, considering in succession the three possible cases which may arise.

First, there is the case of that large body of persons of whom we have already spoken, who have learned the tradition of the church, but who have never opened the Bible. These persons, it is plain, have, practically, but a single rule of faith. To them Scripture is useless; their case is the same as if it had never been written. And they are not worse off, but may, without the Scriptures, know everything necessary for their salvation.

Secondly, let us consider the case of those who, having been taught the traditions of the church, afterwards compare them with Scripture, and believe that they find them to agree with it. Now, whatever intellectual gratification these persons may derive from reading the Bible, their religious position is not more advantageous than that of their unlearned brethren; for they will have learned no saving truth from the Bible, which the church will not have taught them already. There are several Roman Catholics (our correspondent Mr. Aylmer, for example) who approve of reading the Scriptures, if it be done in a spirit of reverence and submission to the teaching of the church. Now, we say, these persons have also, practically, but a single rule of faith. In the illustration with which we commenced, we supposed that the Frenchman allowed the traveller to bring the Swiss along with him, and to converse freely with him; only, if any doubt should arise as to the right way, no matter what he might imagine the Swiss to say, it was the Frenchman's directions which were to be followed: such a traveller might have had two *companions*, but he had only one *guide*. And so they who read the Scriptures, but only on condition of finding in them the doctrines taught by the church's tradition, do indeed use the Scriptures, but they do not use them as a rule of faith. The church's tradition is their rule, and with that rule the apparent sense of Scripture must be squared.

These two classes of persons, then, have, practically, but a single rule of faith, and are not better off in this respect than if the Bible had never been written. But, let us now pass on to the third class of persons; those who read the Scripture, and who cannot be persuaded that the church's doctrines agree with it. Any Roman Catholic must admit, that such cases, unfortunately, do arise. Many of their divines have asserted, that almost all heresies have arisen from the reading of the Bible. Does it not follow, then, that while the first two classes of persons would not have been worse off if the Bible had never been written, this third class would have been far better off had it never been written?

We shall find still greater reason for coming to this conclusion if we actually compare the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church with the Bible. We say distinctly, that if the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church be true, then the reading of the Scriptures will be certain, in a great majority of cases, to lead a man into error. For example, let us suppose that the Blessed Virgin is justly entitled to the honours paid her in the Roman Catholic Church—honours so great that, in Italy and other countries, she is even more eagerly and more fondly worshipped than her Son—still we believe that a student of Scripture will be almost inevitably led to doubt of the propriety of the worship which his church approves. It will be impossible for him to peruse the meagre accounts given in the New Testament of this so prominent an object of Catholic reverence and worship—to read the brief, frigid (some might even think harsh) speeches of Christ to her—to contemplate the silence of the Apostles, who do not even once mention her name in their epistles—without having the idea suggested, that it was never intended that we should pay her such homage as the Church of Rome demands for her, and without feeling suspicious that the New Testament disowned it, and knew nothing about it.

Again, how must the mind of a devout adherent of the Pope be unsettled—what a shock must be given to his deep reverence for the spiritual head of the church, and his conviction of his undoubted inheritance from the prince of the Apostles of his august prerogatives, when, on examining the Scriptures, he finds no trace of such a personage as the Pope in the sacred page, the title of Bishop of Rome never whispered, no hint given that Peter was ever even there?

Or, again, when a member of the Church of Rome reads the Scriptures, and finds that in all the New Testament not a single mention occurs of any torment to be endured by the righteous after death; and that the Apostles, who so honestly told their converts of all the tribulation they must expect in this world, carefully concealed from them the probability that they should have to bear sufferings in the next—nay, led them to hope for immediate rest from their labours, when released from this troublesome world, and gave them to understand, that when absent from the body they should be present with the Lord—must he not be strongly tempted to doubt the tradition of his church on the subject of Purgatory? And if that tradition be true, will not the reading of the Scriptures have been likely to shake his belief in a capital article of faith?

How many passages of Scripture are there which appear to condemn decisively an adoration paid to images, which the church considers lawful? How many passages which seem to speak of Christ as the only mediator and intercessor? And how completely does the whole Testament seem to ignore those thousands of other intercessors whom the tradition of the church has made known to us?

It would be easy to lengthen this list of points of

apparent disagreement between Romish tradition and the Bible. Let the reader, however, only consider the doctrines we have referred to. We are not here disputing but that the Church of Rome may be right on all these points, and that her doctrines may be in some way reconciled with Scripture: all we say is, that there certainly *appears* to be some disagreement; that many thousands who have read the Bible, with earnest prayer to be directed to the truth, have come to the conclusion that, on these subjects, the doctrine of the Church of Rome does not agree with the Bible—nay, we may add, for ourselves, that if on these subjects we are mistaken, the Scriptures are the cause of our error. We are convinced, then, that if the doctrines of the Church of Rome be true, the reading of the Scriptures is decidedly mischievous, and that it would have been far better for the church had they never been written.

But now comes the difficulty for the Romish theory. God *has* caused the Scriptures to be written; he surely knew what was best for his church. Are we to suppose that he gave a "revelation" which requires to be carefully concealed? or, that the words of our Saviour and his Apostles were recorded by the Spirit of God only to mislead thousands of those who read them?

For what purpose are we to imagine that the Scriptures were written? Would God have given them to his church as a guide, if he had already provided her with another guide, safer and better? For Roman Catholic divines continually remind us, that oral tradition was *first*. Now, in the illustration with which we began, we were obliged, in order to make our story probable, to suppose that the traveller had set out with the guide who spoke most obscurely and who had the least to tell; it would have been absurd if we had represented him as taking a second guide, who could tell him nothing but what his first guide told him plainer and better. We ought, however, to have done this, in order, accurately, to illustrate the theory of the Church of Rome. According to her, the church's tradition embraces all the doctrines of Christianity, and teaches them, without possibility of error: and to this guide *was added* the Bible, which only contains some of these doctrines, and teaches them in such a way as to be likely (more likely than not) to be misunderstood.

The conclusion, to which the preceding reflections have irresistibly led us, is, that if the teaching of the Church of Rome be true, the Scriptures would not have been given. But the Scriptures have been given; therefore, the teaching of the Church of Rome is not true. In fact, we have reason to think, that the system of having two guides does not answer in practice. We have found that the Church of Rome, which proposes to have two guides—Scripture and tradition—finds it necessary, in practice, to silence one of them. We are led, therefore, to believe, that God has given us a *single* rule of faith; and when we ask what that rule is, since we find that Protestants and Roman Catholics are agreed that the Bible is the rule of faith, although they are not agreed whether anything else is, we cannot hesitate to take that for our guide whose infallibility all confess—Let it be the lantern unto our feet, the light unto our paths.

TALK OF THE ROAD—No. V.

We hope our readers will be glad to hear what Pat and Jem were talking about since. Well, as they were walking home from their work, not long since, Pat asked Jem, "What do you find in the reading now, Jem?"

"Why," says Jem, "my mind was running on that story about the stone and the praty. You mind what you told me about what our blessed Saviour said about it, and it made me think so different of the great God from anything I ever could think before, and it made me *feel* so different like to him, that I took to reading that place over and over. And sure if I had any doubt about reading the Bible, the reading of that story over and over makes me feel in my heart, that reading God's book is a blessed thing to us poor creatures. And then, when I was reading, the next verse stuck in my mind, and this is it—'Ask and it shall be given to you; seek and you shall find; knock and it shall be opened to you. For every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened.' And them words is in my mind, night and day; and there's something I understand, and something I don't."

"Well, tell us about that," says Pat.

"Well," says Jem, "I see plain enough about asking, for sure that is praying to our Father in heaven; and doesn't that say, that if we pray to him, he will answer our prayers. And sure is not that the great thing for the like of us? Well, I see, too, about *seeking*. If we look to know God, we *will* come to know him; and where would we seek for him, if we didn't in his own book? Sure I have found more about him *there* than ever I learned before. But there's one thing I can't make out at all, and that's about *knocking;* sure that would be at some gate or door like, that seemed closed agen us; but if we don't know *what the door is*, how can we get to knock at it; and if we don't knock at it, how will we get it open? And I can't make it out at all, and I'm seeking for it, day and night, and thinking maybe will I find it, if I seek."

"Deed and I can help you then," says Pat, "and it's easy to find; for sure I came on it last Sunday, when I was reading the 10th chapter of St. John's Gospel; and though I didn't take heed, as you did, to what our Saviour said about knocking, still I came on the answer."

"And what is it at all?" said Jem.

So Pat repeated the verse (John, ch. 10. v. 6., Douay Bible) where Christ says, "I AM THE DOOR, by me if any man enter in he shall be saved."

"Well if that isn't the very thing," said Jem, "sure I'll never go to work at the Squire's again without thinking of that."

"And why so?" says Pat.

"Don't you know," said Jem, "that big wall round the place, and how would I ever get in without the door in it? and sure isn't that it entirely, when Christ says he's the door? It means *the way in*, and that there's no stop when the door is open. See the good now of our talking together on the road about the reading. One thing sticks to one person, and another to another; and when we put them together, just see how they fit!"

"Well that's true, anyway," says Pat "but I doubt there's many a one striving to enter in by the Blessed Virgin and the saints, and how will they be? isn't that like making *her* the door? and, deed, I tried that long enough myself; for sure I never was told it was wrong, or got any teaching to learn me better, till I took to reading. But how will it be at all?"

"Is there anything about that in the Bible?" says Jem. "Is there anything in it nt all for praying to the Blessed Virgin?"

"Well, I don't know," says Pat; "if it's in it I havn't come to it yet."

"Nor I, neither," says Jem; "nor nothing like it. But sure it's hard for me to say that it's *not* in the Bible; for there's a deal in it that I havn't read yet, a deal more than what I have read; and how can I go to say that it isn't in that?"

"That's true enough," says Pat, "its easy enough sometimes to know that a thing *is* in the Bible, but it's mighty hard for ignorant creatures like us to know that a thing is *not* in the Bible. If the priests would only teach us the Bible, and show us what is in it, and what isn't."

"Well Pat," says Jem, "if the things *was* in it, I suppose they would, and glad enough too; but if the things they teach us *isn't* in it, how would it be expected they would tell us *that*, or help us to know it? and that makes me think there is things they teach us that isn't in the Bible at all.

"Well, I mind, now," said Pat, "that I heard Father John preach a sermon against the Protestants, and he said they were heretics because they did not pray to the Blessed Virgin and to the saints and the angels. And I mind he didn't say it was in the Bible; but still he showed us the reason of it; 'for,' says he, 'if you wanted anything of the Queen, sure,' says he, 'it isn't to the Queen you would be going yourself,' says he, 'but you would try and get some one she cared more about than she did about you; and wouldn't your own sense tell you,' says he, 'that it would be better for you to get some great lord or lady to speak for you, than to be putting yourself on her?' Well, now," says Pat, "doesn't all that stand to reason?"

"Well, I mind that sermon, too," says Jem, "and I thought a deal of it then, but I don't now; for I was thinking it over since, and it doesn't stand to reason at all, when you come to look into it; for sure the Queen, God bless her, is only a woman like another after all; and how could she have every one going to herself? Sure she would be fairly worried out of her life, if that was the way. Why, in the time of the famine, sure that was so sore on us, was there man, woman, or child in this parish that wouldn't have gone straight to the Queen, God bless her, if they could only get at her? but how would it be with her, if all Ireland was going to her at wonst, to say nothing of England? Sure she could only talk to one at a time, just like any other; and that's the reason she must have other people for us to speak to, and to speak for us to her. But, sure, that isn't the way with God: sure it couldn't put him out if all the people in the world were praying to him at wonst. So you see it doesn't agree at all when you only come to look into it. And if I could go to the Queen at once, what would stop me? Sure if she was only *to see* little Billy, and him hungry, and asking me for a praty, when I had none to give him, sure if she could only see that *herself*, wouldn't it be better for me than if all the lords and ladies in Ireland were talking to her about me. Sure, don't we know that it's seeing that is believing? Don't the quality hear enough about us, and the distress that the poor is in? Sure, they see enough of it in the newspapers to know all about it, but that does no good; but if one of them comes into our houses, and *sees* the want there, then, sure enough, they give us help. So you see, Pat, it's better for us always just to get to the sight of them if we can, instead of leaving it to others to tell them about us. Now, if God sees what we want himself and if he's able and willing to hear us all, if we were all praying together, without any trouble to himself, why wouldn't we go to himself? Sure it doesn't stand to reason at all, that because the Queen can't see everything and speak to everybody herself, that God can't? And if matters is so different with God and the Queen, it's not common sense for Father John to be telling us that our own sense ought to make us do to God what *has* to be done to the Queen, only just because she is like another body, and no greater in herself than one of ourselves. I would go straight to her, *if I could*, and why wouldn't I go straight to God if I can?"

"Well Jem," said Pat, "there's reason in that, sure enough, only I didn't see it before; and sure enough I would spake to the Queen afore the relieving officer or the inspector, if I could, and have more hope in it. But how will we get to know at wonst, if the Bible says anything about praying to the Virgin Mary, or getting her to offer our prayers to God, and to intercede with him for us? For I want to know that, and it would be long to wait till we get all the Bible read through."

"Well, that's what I want to know," said Jem, "and I can't be easy till I get to the knowledge of it. For sure the more I read in the Bible about God's goodness to them that ask him, the harder it seems not to know rightly the right way to ask him. Sure I feel every day more and more, that it can't be right with me till I know how to pray to him in the way that it will please him to hear; and the more I read about him, the more call I feel for praying to him in a way I never did yet, and it's a hard case not to be sure of the right way."

"Why would'nt we ask Mr. Owens?" said Pat, "sure he told us to go back to him any time we pleased, and we did'nt go to him yet, and why won't we ask him about this?"

"Sure that's it," said Jem, "and its early yet, and what's to hinder our just going down to him now; maybe he will just show us what we want in the Bible, and settle us at once: sure enough let us try."

So off they went to Mr. Owens, and if we can find out what passed, our readers shall have it in the next number.

THE TWO FARMERS OF BALLINTUBBER.

There was great joy among the people of the little village of Ballintubber, when it became known, for certain, that their new landlord, the young Lord Kilmarty, was coming to reside among them. It was many years since they had seen the face of a resident landlord. The property had belonged to Mr. Sherwin, an old gentleman, who had lived all the latter part of his life on the Continent; for his debts were so great, that he could not show himself in this country. The whole management of the estate had been left to his agent, Mr. Grip; and how he treated the tenantry, Mr. Sherwin did not care, provided the money, which he expected, was regularly sent over to him. You will guess that much was not done for the improvement of the land, or for the comfort of the people; and, indeed, any one who walked through Ballintubber, would say that it was hard to find a more wretched place, or a more neglected set of inhabitants.

So, when Mr. Sherwin died, and the property passed into the hands of Lord Kilmarty, there was not much sorrow in Ballintubber. They could not well change for the worse; but Lord Kilmarty was known to be very rich, and to be one who would not be forced, by his own necessities, to deal hardly with his tenants: and, besides, there were some who said that they knew him by character, and that he was a very kind man, and a good friend to the poor. All that the people of Ballintubber ventured to hope at first was, that Lord Kilmarty might change his agent, and that they should get rid of Mr. Grip. It would take me too long to tell what reasons they had for not liking him: but I know that he had no one's good word, and that if you could believe all the stories that were told of him, the sooner Lord Kilmarty sent him about his business the better. However, a couple of months after Mr. Sherwin's death, there was a great stir in the village. Workmen were employed in putting the great house to rights, which had been for years going to rack and ruin. By-and-by, furniture and servants were sent down from Dublin; and it was told that the young lord himself was to follow as soon as the place was ready; not to pay them a visit now and then, but to settle for good and all in Ballintubber. The evening he came down, you would have thought the people had all gone mad for joy. They did not ring the bells, because they had not got any to ring, but bonfires large enough to roast an ox were blazing in every direction, and the shouting and hurrooing were such as you never heard the like of. And when their young landlord made them a short speech, thanking them for the welcome they had given him, and promising to live among them, they all went home as happy as if their fortunes were made. A few days after, they were pleased to hear that what they all wished had come to pass, and that Mr. Grip was no longer the agent; but when they asked who was to be his successor, they were not a little surprised to learn that Lord Kilmarty had said that he intended to be his own agent.

"Let him try it for a little while," said Mr. Grip, "I am thinking he'll get tired of it before long." At all events, the young nobleman in the first instance

went to work like a man. He had a good knowledge of the best methods of farming; and early and late he was to be seen going about his estate, visiting his tenants' houses, examining what improvements were required, and giving them whatever advice he thought they wanted. They all said that a freer-spoken, civiller gentleman, they had never met. He was not the least bit proud or high in himself. And they thought it mighty odd, for Mr. Grip was so haughty in his manners, that when a poor man spoke to him he would hardly give him a civil answer, and they had expected that, as Lord Kilmarty was a much greater man than Mr. Grip, he would be ten times as hard to speak to. But they found it just the contrary. For the landlord was a great deal more agreeable to deal with than ever the agent used to be; he was fond of his joke, and had something pleasant to say to everybody.

However, the truth must be told, that after the first novelty was over, many of the people began to be a good deal disappointed in the expectations they had formed of their new landlord. The fact was, that many of them expected more than any ten men could satisfy. They seemed to fancy that they were not to stir a hand for themselves, but that their landlord was to clothe them, and feed them, and even to put the food into their mouths. Lord Kilmarty very soon put a stop to any such unreasonable expectations. He let it be seen that his rule was to help those who would try to help themselves; and when he had to find fault with any of them, for the neglected state in which he found their holdings, he did not give them much encouragement if they wanted to throw all the blame on their former landlord. For instance, one day, he was looking at Dan Kelly's farm, by the river, and was remarking to him many things which were not as they should be. Now, Dan Kelly, who was a very well disposed man, though somewhat lazy, and a little too apt to be led by other people, began to make excuses.

"Oh, your honour, if we had always had a landlord like your lordship—but Mr. Sherwin never came near us; and as for Mr. Grip, we only wished he was along with Mr. Sherwin."

"Don't tell me of Mr. Sherwin or Mr. Grip," said Lord Kilmarty—"was it Mr. Sherwin that made that great hole in your thatch, which is enough to set you all floating the next fall of rain, or was it Mr. Grip's business to mend all these gaps in your fence, through which I see your neighbour, Pat Callaghan's cows, come to get their share of your fine meadow—for a fine meadow it would be, if the stones and the weeds were picked out of it.

Besides the good-humoured war which Lord Kilmarty waged in this way against the indolent habits of some of his tenantry, another subject of disagreement was, the best mode of conducting farming operations. I told you before, that Lord Kilmarty had given a great deal of his attention to the science of agriculture, and he came down full of plans for improvement in the manner in which he saw his tenants' farming was carried on. But a great many of them steadily set their faces against the new-fangled ways which their landlord was trying to bring in, and said, that what had been good enough for their fathers and grandfathers, was good enough for them. It was only by a good deal of patience, and by taking them very quietly, that Lord Kilmarty got on. He set them an example of the best system on the lands which he farmed himself, and after the first disappointment was over of some of those tenants who expected him to work miracles for them, they began to feel that he was really trying to do them good, and to be willing to follow his advice. Mr. Grip's prophecy was not fulfilled. Three or four years passed by, and Lord Kilmarty did not yet appear tired of being his own agent, and he might be seen as busy as ever in looking after his estate. The face of the property showed a great change since the day he had first come down. And nowhere was their a greater improvement to be seen, than in the farms of Dan Kelly and Pat Callaghan, of whom mention has been made just now. In Mr. Sherwin's time, they had been always in distress, and their whole farm bore a poverty-stricken appearance. Now, everything about their place looked thriving and flourishing. Their meadows by the river side, produced crops of grass twice as heavy as they formerly used to be; and any one who saw their cattle and the ricks near their house, would have pronounced them very well to do in the world. With all this, their rents were now paid to the day. When Lord Kilmarty came into the property, he had to forgive them a year's arrear of rent. He soon made known that he intended to adopt a new plan with his tenants. Formerly the rent had been fixed at the highest sum the tenants could be got to bid, but then, many of them did not find it as easy to pay these sums as to promise to do so; they were always in arrear, and, consequently, kept in perpetual terror by Mr. Grip. Lord Kilmarty told them, that he wished his tenants to be able to live by their farms; he fixed their rents at a fair rate, and he was ready to give them every reasonable assistance, but then, he expected them to be punctual in paying what they had agreed with him for. And when they had made trial for some time how Lord Kilmarty's system worked, the most of them were ready to acknowledge that it was the best after all.

However, four or five years after Lord Kilmarty had got possession of the estate, he was obliged by very important law business to go over to London. He could not exactly tell how long he might be detained there; but he hoped that it would not be very long. You may be sure the tenantry were sorry to lose him, and the more so because many of them were afraid that he would make Mr. Grip his agent while he was away, for there was no one else at Ballintubber whom he could well employ. Dan Kelly asked him the question a few evenings before he left, as he had come down by his and Pat Callaghan's farm taking leave of them all, "who was to manage the estate while he was away?"

"Well," said Lord Kilmarty, "as I hope not to be very long away, I don't see why I may not go on managing it myself still. Mr. Dormer, the attorney, will be down from Dublin at the proper time to collect the rents; but if there is anything you want done for you, you must write to myself. Now that we have the penny postage, it won't break you to send me a letter if it should be necessary; and whatever you ask that I find right and reasonable, I will give directions to have done for you."

"Troth," said Pat Callaghan, "it is we that won't want to trouble your lordship. Your lordship has done everything for us that we could expect, and we'll be sure to have the rent punctual for Mr. Dormer when he comes."

However, Lord Kilmarty said that circumstances might occur which might render it necessary for them to write to him; so he wrote down on the paper the right way of directing of a letter to him, and left it with them, promising that he would attend to their letters, and also that he would return from London whenever his business should permit. Pat and Dan thought this very kind of their landlord, but they resolved to show him, if they could, now that they had been set going, how well they could go on of themselves. For, ever since they had begun to thrive they had learned a decent spirit of independence; and they hoped that when the young nobleman came back, they would be able to show him everything prospering as well with them as when his eye had been constantly on them. But in these hopes they were sadly disappointed. The winter after Lord Kilmarty had left them was the severest ever remembered at Ballintubber, and it lasted so long that they thought they were not have any spring at all. The little river that was usually so peaceable, at one time this season came tearing down in such floods as had not been known within the memory of man. It was all very well for those who lived on the high grounds, but poor Pat Callaghan and Dan Kelly, whose farms lay low by the river, were great sufferers. It was one very blustering night, after Dan had been kept awake till late, listening to the storm and rain, and thinking how well it was he had a better roof over his head than when first Lord Kilmarty saw it. Not very long after he had dropped asleep he was awakened by the cackling of the fowls, and on getting up found the room all afloat, and the river outside running like a mill-race. He tried to go out, but the night was too dark and the storm was too great for him to be of any use. When morning came out he could see all the mischief which had been done. The stream had torn and swept away property of all kinds. It was only a wonder their houses had escaped. Two of his few cattle had been drowned, and a fine rick, which he had been keeping up, expecting that the prices would be better before he need sell, was carried down the river for a mile. Pat Callaghan did not lose so much as Dan Kelly, though he lost more than he could afford; but he was not a strong man, and he had to bear so much wet and cold, that he got a bad attack of rheumatism, which left him unable to work for a long time. As the time of paying their rent came near, at which they had been once expecting to have had so much pride in showing their punctuality, they found, on the contrary, that they could not be ready with their rent. And, more than that, they were very badly off besides; so that, even if the rent was forgiven them, they saw it would be a hard matter for them to live, to say nothing of working their farms. Many a talk the two men had together on the change in their affairs; and Dan Kelly said one day, as he had said, indeed, often before—

"Well, if Lord Kilmarty was at home, we would not be tried this way. I'll be bound he'd help us over our present difficulties, and put us in the way of doing for ourselves, as we were doing before this winter.

"Why, then," said Pat—and a bright thought seemed to strike him—"What is to prevent us letting Lord Kilmarty know now the way we are in? Did not he tell us to write to him if anything went wrong with us? and I don't think we need wait for matters to be much worse than they are."

Dan was at first a little afraid of this proposal. He said that he did not know where was the paper which Lord Kilmarty left with his directions on it; but Pat Callaghan brought it out from where he had put it, safe in the box under his bed. Then Dan said he was no scholar; but Pat knew that he could write as well as himself, which was not very well, to be sure.

Then Dan said he had got no paper, and, as Pat was not better off, the conversation ended in their both going together to Mr. O'Reilly, the schoolmaster, who was teaching their children, and who had given them a helping hand before, when they had happened to want to send a letter to a friend. For Mr. O'Reilly was a good-natured man and obliging, though it was said in Ballintubber that he was able to sack the Provost of Trinity College in learning. Mr. O'Reilly gave them the paper very willingly, asking them, however, who they were going to write to; but when they said it was to Lord Kilmarty, he pushed up his spectacles on his forehead and stared at them as if they had seven heads.

"Cock you up," said he, "and so nothing less than writing to a lord would serve you. Why, then, and do you think he would be bothered reading a letter from the likes of you? And, even suppose he did, what do you know about the way a lord ought to be written to? Did you ever write to one in your life before? A pretty letter you'll make of it. I would give sixpence to see how it would look on a silver dish when his lordship's footman brings it into him."

"Well," said Dan, "my mind misgave me, when Pat talked about writing to his lordship, that it was but a sorry hand we would make of it; but you see, sir, we are in distress, and if we thought his lordship would attend to our letter, it might set us right in the world again."

"I dare say," said Mr. O'Reilly, "that when his lordship knows your state, he will give you help if you don't give him offence; but you cannot tell what affront he might take at such a letter as you could send him, since you do not know how to write it with proper forms of respect."

"I am sure," said Pat, "his lordship knows that we all respect him, and I don't think he'd be the man to take offence at a poor man's ignorance; but, Mr. O'Reilly, you are a learned man and a scholar, and if you would write the letter for us to his lordship, you would put us both under great obligation."

"Ahem," said Mr. O'Reilly, somewhat mollified by this request, "no doubt, a letter written with judgment and discretion would have a different effect from one that you would write yourselves. I have written letters to some of the first gentry in Ireland, and though I have addressed epistles to none of the nobility, I am sure I could indite such a letter to his lordship as would succeed with him, if he was likely to give any attention to your affairs. But my opinion is, that no matter who writes the letter, Lord Kilmarty has many better things to think on, than on two poor farmers of Ballintubber. So, if you will be ruled by me, it is not to Lord Kilmarty you will send the letter, but to Mr. Harris."

"And who is Mr. Harris?" cried both the men together.

"Mr. Harris," replied Mr. O'Reilly, "is Lord Kilmarty's English steward; and I have it from those that have a right to know, that he can do what he likes with his lordship, and that if you have his good word, you may make sure your petition is as good as granted. So, write your letter to Mr. Harris; he is not a nobleman, and he will not be above reading a poor man's letter, and getting his master's promise to do what you want."

"But," said Dan, "we don't know where Mr. Harris lives, or how we are to direct to him."

"Why, then, you omadhaun, where could he live except with Lord Kilmarty? At all events, if you direct your letter to Lord Kilmarty he will take care that Mr. Harris gets it."

All Dan Kelly's objections were now overcome; but Pat Callaghan, who was more obstinate, exclaimed—

"A purty roundabout plan that would be: we are to send the letter to Lord Kilmarty, and then he is to find Mr. Harris, and give him our letter, and then Mr. Harris is to tell his lordship our requests. Now, if his lordship is so good-natured as to have our letter sent to Mr. Harris, why wouldn't he be good-natured enough too to read it if it was written to himself?"

Mr. O'Reilly was going to speak, but Pat went on—

"And more than that," said he, "here's now near five years that we know Lord Kilmarty, and a kinder and more thoughtful gentleman no one could wish to see; he was never too proud to speak to us when he was here, and it will be newly come to him if he is too proud to read our letters now; and Dan Kelly heard him as well as myself, one of the last evenings he was here, when he told us if ever we were in trouble, to write to him, and he would be sure to do for us whatever was right and proper: and he showed us how to direct to him, so that there is no doubt but our letters will get safe to him; but this Mr. Harris I never heard of before this blessed evening; and even if he gets our letters, how do I know whether he will care for us, men that he never saw? So, Mr. O'Reilly, Dan Kelly may do what he likes, but I won't go to a man I don't know, away from the man that was always kind and good to me."

When Pat answered out so hot and stout, Mr. O'Reilly lost his temper.

"And isn't it great presumption," said he, "in an ignorant man like you to go against your betters; to go setting up your own judgment against the advice of one that was schoolmaster in this parish before you

were born? What reason have you to suppose I would recommend you to do what is bad for you?"

"Why, then," said Pat, "you may be *my* better, but Lord Kilmarty is *your* better, and you ought not to be offended if I mind what he said to me more than what you're telling me." And off Pat went, leaving Mr. O'Reilly in a rage.

"Mark my words," said he to Dan, "that neighbour of yours will come to no good. I never saw good come of people rejecting the advice of those that are wiser than themselves; he'll give offence to his lordship, and you'll see him turned out of his farm one of those fine mornings. I hope you will not be so foolish as to follow his example."

"No, sir," said Dan, "but I would like to know from whom you heard all about Mr. Harris?"

"Do you think," said Mr. O'Reilly, "I am bound to tell you how I came by all my knowledge? And do you think you could understand if I was to explain it to you? It ought to be enough for you that I tell you, and you need not ask any more questions. But will you take my advice, or will you not?"

"I will, sir, and thank you kindly," said Dan.

So the two letters were written and sent, Pat's to Lord Kilmarty, and Dan's to Mr. Harris, and both the neighbours waited anxiously to see what would be the result of the application.

They had only about a fortnight to wait before something came of it, for a strange gentleman made his appearance in the village. First they thought it was Mr. Dormer come to collect the rents, but it turned out to be some kind of surveyor or engineer, and they found he had been sent by Lord Kilmarty to examine what could be done to prevent the river from damaging their property again, as it had done that winter.

Dan went up with the news to Mr. O'Reilly. "Well, now," said he, "are you glad you took my advice? Take my word for it you never did a better day's work in your life than when you wrote that letter to Mr. Harris; if he takes you up you are a made man; and now what I would recommend you to do is, to write him another letter, thanking him for what he has already done, and asking him to be sure to speak to Lord Kilmarty about this next gale of rent you have to pay."

Dan thought this very sensible advice, and he sent off the letter accordingly; and he thought to himself, "It is lucky for Pat Callaghan to come in for some of the benefit of the work Mr. Harris is going to get done on the river, but I wonder how he will be off when Mr. Dormer comes for the rent."

It was not many days before Mr. Dormer himself arrived, and Pat and Dan went up with anxious hearts to settle with him. Pat had been the first to go, and Dan met him as he was coming away, with joy in his face.

"Look here," said he, "here is the receipt for the last half year's rent; Lord Kilmarty wrote word that I was to be forgiven the whole of this gale. I did not venture to expect more than that he would forgive me some, and give me time for the rest."

This gave Dan great courage going in to Mr. Dormer, for he thought, "If so much was done for Pat, who had no one to speak for him, what will be done for me who have Mr. Harris to back me?" So in he went; but he felt rather awkward when, after he had told his name to Mr. Dormer, the latter only said—"So, I suppose you are come with your rent.

"Please your honour," said he, "this has been a very hard winter with us, and I was in hopes Lord Kilmarty would have written to you about me."

"Do you mean to say you have not brought the rent?" said Mr. Dormer; "I have got your name down on my list here as a very strong farmer, well able to pay; but there are a great many of you scheming fellows, with plenty of money in the savings' bank, but when you come to your landlord, you have nothing for him but excuses."

"I am no schemer, sir," said Dan; "all the neighbours can tell you what I lost in the floods this last winter; and there's my neighbour, Pat Callaghan, that did not lose more than me, and he has been forgiven all his rent; I think it a very hard case that his lordship should put differences between us."

"I had his lordship's directions to forgive him his rent," said Mr. Dormer, "and I have had no directions about you; I can only go by the directions I get, and I advise you to have your rent ready for me next month, when I'll be going this way again, or else maybe it'll be the worse for you."

So Dan went away feeling very cross and vexed, and up he went to Mr. O'Reilly to tell him his story. Mr. O'Reilly was very much surprised, and he said—

"You may be sure there is some mistake; Mr. Harris must have spoken about you, and Mr. Dormer must have excused Pat Callaghan by mistake, instead of you. You had better write over again to Mr. Harris, and tell him the way you are in, and ask him to have the mistake rectified."

"Do you think that was the way, sir?" said Dan. "Well, I'll do as you bid me; only I can't put out of my head what Pat says, that I can't expect Mr. Harris, that never saw me, to care as much for me as Lord Kilmarty, that knows me well?"

"Well," said Mr. O'Reilly, "there's no harm in your having two strings to your bow; and you may write another letter to Mr. Thomson, the butler, that was very civil to you when he was over here with his lord; I dare say he'll speak a word for you to his master."

So the two letters were sent, and Mr. O'Reilly saw no more of Dan for two or three weeks, until one evening he saw him coming up to him, with a very long face.

"Well, Dan, I suppose you have had letters from England?"

"Sorra the letter," said Dan: "but, instead of that, there's worse happened to me than ever."

"What worse?" said Mr. O'Reilly.

"There's Mr. Grip, the taring villain, has seized my cow for poor-rates—the only cow I had left since the floods—and would not take any excuse or put off—bad luck to him! and Pat Callaghan has had his rates paid by Lord Kilmarty; and he says it serves me right for not writing to his lordship himself; for, he says, his lordship is not a man to be led by his servants, but that he does what he considers right himself, and that it is better for me to write to him now—better late than never, sir, if you approve of it."

"Indeed, I don't approve of it, Dan," said Mr. O'Reilly, "and I gave you my reasons before; it is all very well for your neighbour, Pat Callaghan, now; but you'll find, in the end, he did not better himself by his impudence in going troubling his lordship with letters."

"But what am I to do, sir," said Dan.

"I'll tell you," said Mr. O'Reilly, "it might be that his lordship would not mind his servants; but do you think he'd refuse to listen to his mother? So what we'll do is, we'll write a letter to the old countess; and, I think, Pat Callaghan won't say that she hasn't got any interest with her son."

Dan liked this plan very much; but when he came home, and told Pat what he had done, Pat only shook his head at him.

"I thought," said he, "that to-day at last you'd have been brought to write to himself; and it is to his mother you are going! She may be a very good woman, for all I know; but how can she know who you are? or what can she care for you? And you know well that Lord Kilmarty both knows and would benefit you."

Dan was vexed at this, and said—

"You'll find, before long, you're in the wrong box. Expecting to get his lordship's favour, and talking disrespectfully about his mother! To be sure she'd know all about me. Do you think his lordship would keep secrets from her? and, in course, he'd have told her who I was, and all about me."

"I am not talking disrespectfully of her," said Pat, "but I think this, that if his lordship cared enough about you to be talking about you to his mother, he'd care enough about you to grant you a small petition; and, what's more, I know this, that when he went away he did not say, when you are in trouble write to Mr. Harris, or to Mr. Thomson, or write to my mother; but he said, write to myself; and I'll go by what he told me, and not by what Mr. O'Reilly tells me."

Well, not to make my story too long, no more came of this application than of the others. Dan had not his rent ready for Mr. Dormer when he came round again, and Mr. Dormer had no directions to release him; and I don't know what he would have done, only that he had got word that Lord Kilmarty was to be back soon; so he let the whole matter lie over for his lordship himself to decide on.

When his lordship came home, and, after a few days, walked down by the river, he was grieved to see things looking so much worse than he had left them. Pat's farm was beginning to come round; but Dan's, which had always looked the best before, was now in great wretchedness. Dan came to him, and told him all his story—what losses he had, and how Mr. Dormer had pressed him for the rent, and how Mr. Grip had seized his cow, and how Pat Callaghan had been forgiven, and nothing was done for him.

"But," said Lord Kilmarty, "Pat Callaghan, wrote to me as I bid him, but I never had a line from you. I left you well off, and how was I to know you were in any trouble?"

Then Dan told him how Mr. O'Reilly had advised him against writing to him, and had made him write to Mr. Harris.

"I never had a servant of the name," said Lord Kilmarty.

"But, my lord, how could I think Mr. O'Reilly could be mistaken? It was he taught me to read, and only for him I would not have been able to read the directions your lordship left me, and so I thought I could not be wrong in following his advice now."

"Not even when his advice was contrary to the advice I had given you myself?" said Lord Kilmarty.

"But what did you do when you did not hear from Mr. Harris?"

Why, then, my lord, I wrote to Mr. Thomson, the butler, that I got acquainted with when your lordship was over here before."

"Thomson is not with me now," said Lord Kilmarty; "he is with my sister, in Yorkshire, and I suppose he never got your letter; and even if he had, I think you might have paid me the compliment to think you would be likely to find as good a friend in me as in him. But what next?"

"Why then, my lord, I wrote to your lordship's mother, and I hope she spoke to you for me."

"My mother," said Lord Kilmarty, "has never been in Ireland in her life, and probably never heard your name. I see you are sorry now for your mistakes; you have suffered enough by them, and I hope to have you set well a-going again; but take this piece of advice in future—*Whenever you can get the master to listen to you, never tell your story to the man.*"

CONVERSION OF MR. J. KENNEDY, OF NENAGH.

WE condense some of the most interesting reasons given by this persecuted gentleman for abandoning Rome, and becoming free, as addressed to the *Nenagh Guardian*:—

"SIR—As several false and malicious reports, concerning my reasons for leaving the Church of Rome, have been put into circulation, I beg leave, through your columns, to lay before the public a true and accurate statement of the reasons which led me to take so important a step. I will mention nothing but plain facts, and let any one of the priests who are here named contradict me if they can.

"Now, I can confidently appeal to the clergy and townspeople of Nenagh, as to whether I ever neglected my religious duties; I heard mass daily, often three times in one day; I was always regular in my attendance on the ceremonies of the Church of Rome. I did not interfere one way or the other in the late Nenagh chapel differences. I believe I and two others were the only men in the town who, for weeks, went to the chapel after it was opened, and for which I was grossly insulted. What, then, brought about the change in my views? I observed in some of the printed reports, which I happened to read, of the controversial sermons preached here last year by Protestant ministers, constant reference to the Douay, or Roman Catholic Bible, in support of their arguments. I thought this very odd, and so, having recourse to a Bible approved of by Dr. Denvir, of Belfast, I read for myself, and to my great amazement soon found out many things in it which I knew were contrary to the Church of Rome. I then bought another Roman Catholic Bible, approved of by the present Cardinal Wiseman; but I found they both agreed in being contrary to the Church. I then went to confession to the Rev. Mr. Connellan, and told him some of my doubts, and amongst the rest, why the cup was not given to the laity, as commanded by our Lord? He told me the Church dispensed with it. I asked for what reason? He replied, 'To avoid inconveniences in giving communion to the sick.' He then gave me absolution, and I received the sacrament; but my mind not being satisfied, I still continued reading the Bible.

"When the Jesuits were preaching in Nenagh, I paid great attention to their sermons. Moreover, I went to confession for the jubilee, and having selected the best confessor I heard of, I told him my doubts, and mentioned that I had stood sponsor for my grandchild, the son of Mr. Edward Bourke, of Conece, in the county of Galway, who was baptized in the Protestant Church of Woodford. But he only desired me to go to my last confessor. But I said to myself—Mr. Connellan has already failed to satisfy my doubts. So, some days after, having to go to Dublin, I went to John's-lane chapel and heard two masses. I saw the bishop, and heard his mass. I then selected the most pious and talented of the priests there, and confessed to him. I told him my doubts, and how I could not but suspect I was not in the true Church. I mentioned the fact of the Church of Rome excluding the second commandment from so many of her catechisms; the taking away the cup from the laity; that the Pope did not appear to me to be following God's commands in slaughtering his subjects, in order to retain temporal power. 'I think,' said I, 'God never ordered his Church to put any one to death.' He then got quite angry with me, and said, 'why should I dare to doubt respecting a Church which had stood for eighteen centuries?' 'Mahometanism,' I replied, 'was nearly as old, and yet an error.' He then asked me did I belong to Dublin or the country? and on my telling him to the country, he desired me to go and pray certain prayers, and to banish such thoughts out of my mind, and to come to confession the following day. I did so, and told him I could not succeed, but promised to do my best. He then asked me could I not get my grandchild christened by a priest? I said I could, as I knew my daughter would not disoblige me. He laid it as imperative on me to get the child christened again, and so gave me absolution, and I got the sacrament.

"I returned home and continued to read the Roman Catholic Bible, and I saw by it more clearly every day that I had been educated and was living in error. I told several friends of my doubts, and it was talked of through the town. The Rev. Mr. Nagle called on me on Friday, the 5th May last; and, not finding me at home, he said he would call again at two o'clock. I was accordingly sent for and waited his return. He came, and after the usual courtesies—and I must say he has in this respect advantages that many priests I know

do not possess—he told me he heard a report that I was about to abandon the church, and that he called as he knew it was a falsehood, and wished to contradict it. I replied that if he could, on good authority, show me anything to controvert the written Word of God, I was satisfied; otherwise I would abandon the Church of Rome. 'On what grounds?' he asked. 'It shuts out of view the second commandment,' I replied, 'takes away the cup from the laity, and promises to make saints on earth, sends them up to heaven, whether God wills or not, and gets me and such foolish wretches as me to adore them, and sets up their images in places of worship, contrary to God's express command—Deut. xvi. 21, 22.' He asked me had I been speaking to any Protestant on the subject? I said, 'No; that I never heard a sermon from a Protestant, nor ever spoke on the subject to a minister or Scripture-reader.' 'Now, as to relative honour,' said he, 'did you not read how Christ pointed to the image on the coin, and said, "Render to Cæsar the honor due to him."' 'And is relative honour, therefore, to be paid to saints?' said I: 'no, on the contrary—that means, give to the world what belongs to the world, and to God what belongs to him.' He then referred to the age of the church—its miracles and tradition. I told him we had tradition for fairies, and that I would believe the written Word of God before all the men on earth. 'So,' said he, 'you are forsaking your religion on your own authority, without consulting any person.' 'I am,' I replied, 'on the authority of the written Word of God. Is it not said plainly of the Church of Rome in St. John's Apocalypse, xviii. 4—And I heard another voice from heaven, go out from her, my people, that you may not be partaker of her sins, and that you receive not of her plagues? and,' I said, 'Mr. Nagle, just look at your prayers to saints, and calling the Virgin Mary our life, our sweetness, our hope, robbing God of the honour due to him alone. And sure it was only the other day at Thurles that, in obedience to Dr. Cullen, they declared her immaculate conception. So they know more about her now, eighteen centuries after her death, than the Council of Trent 300 years ago, or the holy Fathers of the early church. And, Mr. Nagle, had you not some sort of a doll or wax figure in the chapel on Good Friday last; and were not the ignorant people told that every one who kissed it would have seven years' indulgence. And look at these catechisms out of which I have been taught, and not a trace to be found in them of the second commandment. And why was it left out, let me ask you? And look at this scapular book; I will show you from your own Bible that it is a glaring falsehood—and why do you permit such things? And lastly, why won't you let the people read the Bible for themselves?' 'Is it to have them all like you?' he said. 'Well, but,' said I, 'is it on the Bible that the church is laid, or is it not?' He said it was, 'but, for all that, you are the most presumptuous man I ever knew, to leave our church on your own single authority.' 'Well,' I said, 'I will not go to mass nor church on Sunday next; I am still open to conviction; show me anything that will satisfy my mind, and I will willingly stick to that church I was fond of.' He then went away, and I continued for some time in a woeful state, thinking of the many bright stars, monks, and nuns, apparently of the purest life in the church, besides so many Protestant clergymen of rank and education, going to the Church of Rome. Then I prayed fervently to God to teach me the truth, and keep me from error, and going to my Bible I came on these passages:—'Now the spirit manifestly saith, that in the last time some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to spirits of error and doctrines of devils, speaking in hypocrisy, and having their conscience seared; forbidding to marry, and to abstain from meats; which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving by the faithful, and by them that have known the truth—1 Tim. iv. 1-5.' Well, thought I, one thing is clear, this can't mean the Protestant Church; for they don't forbid to marry, nor prohibit the use of meats; and thus, at least according to the Apostle, they seem to *know the truth*. I read also in Gal. i. 8—'But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach a gospel to you beside that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema.' This the apostle emphatically repeats in the 9th verse. And where, thought I, can I find with certainty the Gospel which the apostle preached, but in the written Word of God? and surely if I hold by that, I can't go wrong.

"Now, I ask my townspeople to remember that I am not young, being now fifty-five years of age—that my family are settled in life—that I never was considered ambitious nor arrogant: what made me, then, expose myself voluntarily to insult and violence? Nothing but the eternal salvation of my soul, for which I am alone accountable. And if the parties who now assail me knew the happiness and peace of mind I now enjoy, it's not pity they would feel for me, but envy.

"They then broke nearly all the glass in the windows of the house I reside in, and it grieved me to see two Roman Catholic clergymen passing by laughing at the wreck. But it is well known that violence is always the argument they use to deter the people from seeing and using the light which God in his mercy bestows upon them in his word. But what pained me most of all was, to see my aged brother, Lieut. Kennedy, shedding bitter tears and telling me I was going to damn my soul; that the Church of England was raised on Luther, as every Roman Catholic is taught to believe, and as I believed myself for many years, though now, thank God, from reading his Word, I known the difference.

"But I have also been looking a little into the history of the church; and I was very much shaken by the following circumstance:—The priest in John's-lane Chapel made me promise, before he would give me absolution, to have my grandchild again baptized by a priest; and yet he swore on the Gospels of God, at his ordination, that he did 'undoubtedly receive and profess all things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred canons and general councils, and particularly by the holy Council of Trent.' And in the fourth canon of that very council it is thus decreed—'Whoever shall affirm that baptism, when administered by heretics, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, with the intention to do what the church does, is not true baptism, let him be accursed.' What will the priest in St. John's-lane Chapel, in the city of Dublin, say to this?

"And, then, when I came to understand all the contradictions of God's Word that the Church of Rome teaches and practises, what opinion could I have of the craft and wickedness of trying to keep me, and all other Roman Catholics in ignorance that there are such contradictions? Then I plainly saw why no one was encouraged by the priest to read even the Douay Bible, and some were forbidden to read it, and others told that it was too hard for them to understand it, though the mass, and prayers in Latin are not too hard. I thank God, from my very heart, that, after being so long without it, I at last undertook to study it, whereby I discovered how opposed it is to a great deal of what the church teaches; and how the glorious tidings of free and full pardon through Christ my Lord had been concealed from me, and how that, and the purifying influence of the Holy Spirit were put aside by the false doctrines about penances and purgatory. I once thought to serve God like a slave, so much work did I go through, for fear of his anger. Now, seeing his great love to me, and the wonderful salvation he offers to me by the means of so great a sacrifice—that of his own Son once offered on the cross, whereby 'he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified,' my chief desire is to serve him like a son, willingly, out of humble affection and heartfelt gratitude.

"JOHN KENNEDY."

REPLY TO MR. AYLMER'S LETTER ON READING THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

(Continued from page 71.)

(7) Mr. Aylmer joins issue with us on the scriptural proof that the priests were to be regarded as "the JUDGES authorized by God to expound his law, and their exposition to be considered BINDING." He quotes Ezek. xliv. 24, which clearly refers only to *temporal* or *criminal* causes (in which the Jewish priests were judges), and not to controversies in religion. He quotes next Mal. ii. 7—"for the lips of the priest shall keep knowledge." Now, in the article he refers to, we have already quoted the next verse (8), in which God says to those very priests, "but you have departed out of the way, and caused many to stumble at the law." Mr. Aylmer takes no notice of this, but still claims verse 7 as binding us to whatever the priests say; so we now refer him to verse 9, in which God goes on to say—"Therefore have I also made you (the priests) contemptible, and base before all people." Now, granting, as we do, that the priest's lips should keep knowledge, and that the people should seek it at his mouth, yet when God says that when those priests went astray he himself made them to be despised by the people, is that a proof that God intended that the people should take as binding whatever the priest said, whether right or wrong?

How comes it that they who profess to have an infallible interpreter of Scripture, do always misapply Scripture, and wrest it so strangely, while they who are fallible are thus able to correct them? We shall explain this another time.

Mr. Aylmer also refers to John xv. 27—a text expressly limited to the testimony of those who had been with Christ from the beginning—*i.e.*, his twelve Apostles. How does this apply to priests now?

He quotes also Acts viii. 26. This was the case of a man reading for himself with the Bible in his hands, and confessing that he found it very hard to understand without some one to guide him. A minister of the Gospel (not a "priest," for he was only a deacon) was sent to him, not to take the book away from him, because he could not understand it, but to help and instruct him in reading. Is this most like the practice of the Roman Catholic priests, or of the clergy of the Church of England and Ireland now?

(8) Mr. Aylmer next calls the Scripture "a dead letter," unable to speak for itself. We confess we do not understand this, nor can we perceive what there is to prevent any man who has eyes, and knows how to read, from obtaining, by perusal of the "letter," a knowledge of the "spirit and meaning." On his next point we think we may come to an agreement. We agree with him that, as in civil affairs, there are not only laws but also judges, whose business it is to explain those laws, so God has provided us not only with a written Word, but also with a distinct order of men, whose business it is to explain that Word. Only we do not believe that every priest is infallible, and we suppose neither does Mr. Aylmer. The rule of faith is the written Word and not the priest's teaching (for the written Word is the rule by which the correctness of the priest's teaching is tested), just as, in civil matters, the rule is the law of the land and not the decision of any judge. The decision of an able judge on a doubtful point is regarded as an authority, but is not absolutely binding on his brethren; and if a judge decide plainly contrary to the law, other judges would regard his ruling without any respect at all.

(9) Mr. Aylmer asks—"If we were to be exercising private judgment, where would be the end of litigation and dispute?" We acknowledge that, when fallible men exercise private judgment, there must be risk of error, and consequently room for dispute; and we might have fancied that God would have made a world into which it should be impossible for error to enter. But we know that he has not done so. We *must* exercise our private judgment, if on no other question at least on this, whether we will use our private judgment on other questions or not. Mr. Aylmer, in the exercise of his private judgment, has arrived at the conclusion that the Church of Rome is infallible, and that he must submit his judgment to her in all religious matters: but in so judging we are convinced he has not escaped error; and this very discussion makes it clear that he has certainly not escaped litigation and dispute. Why God should have left his creatures liable to error is a difficulty which we shall undertake to explain when Mr. Aylmer has accounted for the existence of sin in the world, and has given a satisfactory explanation why earth is not heaven. At any rate we must not refuse to employ the faculties which God has given us, in the hope of avoiding some inconveniences with which the use of them is attended. To give up private judgment, in the hope of avoiding litigation and dispute, is the same as if a man should cure his corns by cutting off his legs.

(10) Mr. Aylmer next says—"Our Blessed Lord never wrote or commanded his disciples to write anything." This assertion he has unwarily copied from Dr. Milner (End of Controversy, letter 8); but that is not true, may immediately be seen by referring to Apocalypse or Revelations, chap. 1, and verses 11, 19. But even supposing that we had not been able to show that Jesus Christ had commanded his Apostles to write anything, what then? Will Mr. Aylmer venture to say that the Apostles wrote the Scriptures by accident or out of their own heads? He knows that his Church holds, that the writers of that Sacred Volume were moved by the Holy Ghost. And as he certainly holds the doctrine of the Trinity, he must believe that what they wrote, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, was written in obedience to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ.

This is really the question on which the whole controversy turns; for if the Apostles wrote the Scriptures according to the promptings of their human wills, then it would be very credible that some of the Christian doctrines might be contained in their writings, and others in the writings of uninspired men. But if we believe that the Holy Spirit directed the formation of the canon of Scripture, then the only account we can give of the reason why the Scriptures were given is, that they were intended to preserve, free from the insecurity of oral tradition, in a permanent form, all the essential doctrines of the Gospel. And it is difficult to believe that this work was left imperfect, and that there are any doctrines which God did not see fit to embody in his word and yet which it is necessary for us to believe. It was to escape this plain inference that Dr. Milner was led to assert that Jesus Christ never commanded his Apostles to write anything; and to insinuate (for he dared not to express it) that the Apostolic writings are a mere fortuitous collection of humanly suggested compositions.

(11) Mr. Aylmer quotes Heb. i. 2—"God hath spoken (not written) to us by his Son." The verse before is, "God who . . spoke in times past to the fathers by the prophets." Did not this apply to the writing of the prophets as well as their spoken words? So St. Peter (1 Ep. iii. 16) says of Paul's epistles, "*speaking* in them of these things." Would Mr. A. infer from that that St. Paul delivered his epistles by word of mouth, and did not *write* them?

(12) Mr. Aylmer says, Christ "did not say, He that readeth or heareth the Scriptures," &c. We refer to Apocalypse, chap. i. v. 3, where Christ did say of that book, confessedly the most difficult in the Bible, "*Blessed is he that readeth* and heareth the words of this prophecy."

(13) Mr. Aylmer's quotation from St. Jerome, having no reference given, is not admissible.

(14) We come now to the texts, 2 Thes. ii. 15, 2 Thes. iii. 6, Rom. vi. 17, 2 Tim. i. 13. It is necessary to remark, that the word tradition is ambiguous. It is used both to express "*doctrina tradita*" and also

the "*modus tradendi*." It is in the former sense that the word occurs in St. Paul's writings; it is in the latter sense alone that it becomes a subject of controversy. We all agree that we are bound to believe the "doctrine delivered" by St. Paul to his converts, but we differ on this question, how this doctrine has been handed down to us. The texts quoted by Mr. Aylmer afford no proof that there were any doctrines delivered by St. Paul to the churches, which are not now to be found in the written Word of God. Will Mr. Aylmer tell us *any one thing* which St. Paul delivered to those Churches, which the Church of England and Ireland does not hold now? If he can, we hope that he will; if he cannot, how can he expect us to believe more than we do?

(15) Mr. Aylmer's observations on the case of persons who could not read, have been answered in our prefatory remarks. Such persons must, no doubt, to a certain extent, depend on the guidance of their better educated brethren; but still they are not altogether without some means of forming a judgment for themselves. The other day the newspapers asserted that several English brewers were in the habit of putting a certain poisonous ingredient into their beer. What was a common man to do? How was he to know whether the beer he was offered was poisonous or not? Why, he might soon learn that the accused brewers had challenged full investigation, and had submitted their beer to be tested by the most eminent chemists, who had prononnced it to be free from any noxious ingredient. And he would consider this quite satisfactory, although quite ignurant of chemistry, and unable to test the beer for himself. But now suppose any brewer had refused to submit to investigation, and had declared his beer to be so superlatively good that he could not permit any chemist to test it, then would not one have a very strong suspicion that there was some ingredient not exactly what it should be! And so, in like manner, we think that an unlearned man of common shrewdness, will see that it is wiser to follow the guiding of the Church which invites all who are able to compare its teaching with God's Word rather than that of the Church which will not permit its doctrines to be examined into at all.

(16) Mr. Aylmer assures us that he does not depreciate the Scriptures, but holds his Bible in the highest estimation; we believe that this is sincerely his *intention*. But we cannot forget that all those who have done most to depreciate the Scriptures, have made the same protestations, many of them with, perhaps, as much sincerity: Mr. Aylmer *may* be depreciating it without intending it. He goes on to state his object, "to give evident *proof* that tradition and the instruction of pastors are *as sufficient* to make good Christians now as in the first ages of Christianity." He had already said that these means were effectual (which we admit, there being then teachers inspired by the Holy Ghost) *before* the Bible was written. If tradition and teaching are *as sufficient* now (when there are no inspired teachers, and tradition has been so corrupted), the Bible is as unnecessary now as before it was written, and might never have been written at all. If this will not teach men to disregard it, we know not what would.

Is Mr. Aylmer satisfied with the *present extent* of Scripture reading and Scriptural education among the Roman Catholics of Ireland? If he be not, can he expect to promote its progress by such arguments as these? But if he be satisfied with it, can he suppose that St. Chrysostom, St. Augustine, or the other Fathers, would have been satisfied with it? We are sure they would not.

(17) We come next to Mr. Aylmer's reference to St. Augustine. We have before had occasion to observe that it is quite impossible to reason satisfactorily on the meaning of an ancient author, if merely given a single passage from his works, without an opportunity of comparing it with the context. We have, therefore, made it a rule constantly to protest against second-hand quotations, and against quotations without references. In this instance Mr. Aylmer has put two distinct passages of St. Augustine together, and has given a reference* which only applies to the latter. We might, therefore, be excused from saying anything as to the former part. But we must remark that the limiting clause, "unless he has the charge of teaching others," tells far more in our favour than the rest of the passage tells against us. For we have already admitted the possibility of a man, *if rightly instructed*, attaining a knowledge of saving truth without a personal study of the Scriptures; but we have said the test, whether the instruction be right, must be a comparison of that instruction with the written Word. Now, if the Romish theory be true, a priest may dispense with a personal study of the Scriptures just as well as a layman. "For a priest is bound to follow the teachings of the Church, and, if he teach her 'traditions,' he will guide himself and his people right, even though he have never opened the Bible. And, on the other hand, a priest, who should exercise his private judgment on the doctrines of the church, and should test their truth by comparing them with the written Word, would be, no less than a layman, in danger of going astray." But, it is plain, from the passage quoted by Mr. Aylmer, that St. Augustine, when stating, as low as possible, the obligations to a personal study of the Scriptures, never dreamed that a priest could be excused from it. He evidently felt, that one who had the charge of teaching others, could only keep his teaching right, by constantly comparing it with God's written Word. We hope, in an early number, to show, by other quotations from St. Augustine, that we are right in this statement of his views respecting the Scriptures.*

In the second passage quoted, St. Augustine says, that we believe the Gospel moved by the authority of the church. And this statement is true, if rightly understood. But it must be observed, as Dr. Milner points out (see End of Controversy, letter xiii.), that when we say we receive the Scripture on the authority of the church, we mean the church considered as a *credible*, not as an *infallible* witness; otherwise, he acknowledges we should fall into a vicious circle in attempting to prove the authority of Scripture by the infallibility of the church, and the infallibility of the church by the authority of Scripture. St. Augustine himself elsewhere shows that the evidence on which he believes the genuineness of the Scriptures is the same in kind, as that on which the genuineness of other books is proved.—See Contra. Faust. xxxii. 21, "Si quæritis a nobis, nos unde sciamus Apostolorum esse istas literas, breviter respondemus, inde nos scire, unde et vos scitis illas literas esse Manichæi." And that the testimony of the church was only *one* of the arguments on which St. Augustine received the Scripture, the reader will find, by consulting his Confessions vi. 5. One of his arguments will scarcely be adopted by those who think with Mr. Aylmer—*Eoque mihi illa venerabilior et sacrosancta fide dignior apparebat auctoritas, quo et omnibus ad legendum esset in promtu.*

Mr. Aylmer tells us, that he approves of the reading of the Scriptures, if done with unreserved deference and docility to the decisions of the church. He will allow men to look at the dial, provided they firmly make up their minds to maintain, at any rate, that the clock is right. We are sure Mr. Aylmer is right in approving of Scripture reading, but we doubt his being consistent. For our part, we confess, that if we believed the Roman Catholic theory, we should think that the less the Scriptures were read the better. If we must maintain the clock to be right, why perplex ourselves by looking at the dial, more especially if the majority of those who do look at it arrive at the conclusion that the clock is wrong? (See our article—One Guide or Two?—p. 73.)

(18) Mr. Aylmer makes the decrees of general councils the interpreter of Scripture; he mentions this alone, and, of course, he believes in no other; we ask him to consider—

1st. Dr. Cullen and the Pope will pronounce this rank heresy, as bad as any Protestant can be guilty of. "St. Peter's successor" is their interpreter of Scripture, though not Mr. Aylmer's; and they will never tolerate his denial of their interpreter.

2nd. Mr. Aylmer, in No. viii. appears to think an *ever-living* interpreter necessary; yet, when we look at his interpreter, we find there has not been any in the Catholic Church for three hundred years. For so long it is since a general council of the Roman Church was held; and it may be three hundred years more before they venture to hold another.

3rd. Who is to "interpret" the Council of Trent? Does Mr. Aylmer know all that has been done about that by the Popes? and what a puzzle it has proved, at least as great as interpreting the Scripture!

4th. What are the general councils? Can Mr. Aylmer give us a *certain and unquestionable* list of them? If he can, we entreat him to do so. If he can not, how are we to find this rule?

(19) Mr. Aylmer says, there never was a heresy that did not profess to be founded on Scripture. We reply, that there have been very many, founded on the rejection of one or several of the books of Scripture.

(20 & 21) In reply to what Mr. Aylmer says of the differing opinions of some who call themselves Protestants, we have to say—1st, that (with the exception of Socinians and some others, whom *we* do not look upon *as Christians*, though they *call themselves* Protestants) we know of no difference among any Protestant bodies about *articles of faith*, equal to that between Mr. Aylmer himself, on one side, and his Primate and his Pope on the other, about the interpreter of Scripture. *They* will tell him that their claim, which he evidently rejects, is an article of faith.

2nd. That we are not answerable for the opinions of those who separate from us; but is he equally unconcerned in the opinions of the head of his own church, whom he professes to consider the Vicar of Christ on earth?

(22) Mr. Aylmer is glad that we repudiate the notion that "private judgment" is the same as "*unaided, uninstructed* judgment." We do repudiate it. We believe that God has given us sufficient means of understanding the Scripture; and we dare not reject those means. We believe that an undying church, instituted by Christ himself, and a teaching ministry, derived and continued from his institution, are important means. And we, in our turn, will be glad (and we yet trust that time may come) when Mr. Aylmer will repudiate the notion that the "private judgment" which he already, to some extent, does exercise, is absolutely subjugated by God to the *ipse dixit* of priests who have caused many to stumble.

We consider the text he has quoted here—2 Peter i. 20—inapplicable, for it treats of how prophecy was "*made*" [Douay translation; "fit," Latin version], and the word "private," as both the Greek and Latin show, is not opposed to "public," or the authority of the Church, but refers to the man himself who delivered the propheey, as distinguished from the Holy Ghost who spoke in him.

Mr. Aylmer next argues, if we understand him rightly, that a man cannot exercise his private judgment if the results of his judgment coincide with that of other people. This seems to have been hastily written, and not to require an answer. It is surely unnecessary to point out that several men, reasoning rightly, may, by an exercise of their private judgment, arrive independently at a common conclusion.

(23) Neither do we think that Mr. Aylmer will, on reflection, require us to give any answer to the collection he has made of passages from the Scriptures in which the words reason and authority occur; not one of which is relevant to any point in dispute between the Churches of England and of Rome. We approve of Scriptural arguments; but we cannot consider that it is a proper mode of arguing to hunt up from a concordance texts in which certain words occur, without examining the context, and the whole bearing of the passage.

(24,25,26) The conclusion of Mr. Aylmer's letter is principally taken up with an enumeration of sundry points, which he challenges us to prove from the Holy Scriptures. In the topics which he has put together he has confused questions which it is necessary to keep distinct. Bellarmine divides traditions into Divine, or Apostolical, and Ecclesiastical. The first alone are in question, when the controversy is concerning the rule of faith; and the Church of England doctrine concerning them is stated in her sixth article. The latter relates to the rites and ceremonies of the church; and the Church of England doctrine concerning them is stated in her thirty-fourth article, "On the Traditions of the Church." Her statement in the sixth article is, that all Divine and Apostolical traditions are contained in the Bible, and that nothing is to be received as an article of faith, *the belief in which is necessary to salvation*, unless it be contained in Holy Scripture. Her statement in the thirty-fourth article is, that every national church has authority to ordain, change, and abolish rites or ceremonies, provided that all things be done unto edifying, and that individual members of such a church must not break ceremonies thus approved by common authority. When, therefore, Mr. Aylmer (26) asks for a Scripture proof of the Church of England table of fasts and feasts, he plainly confounds Apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions. That St. Peter's day is to be kept holy, is not an article of faith, the belief in which is necessary to salvation; and, therefore, the Church of England is not bound in consistency to maintain that this can be proved from the Scriptures: it is but a matter of church discipline, which the church might abrogate if she pleased.

The observance of the Lord's Day rests, also, on the same authority, as far as the Scriptures are silent on the subject. It can, however, easily be shown from Scripture that, in weekly commemorating the resurrection of our Lord, the Church has not acted arbitrarily, but has followed the example of the Apostles. With regard to the abolition of the Jewish Sabbath, the Scriptures are not silent; they not only speak of the abrogation of all the Mosaic law, but they especially declare that this particular part of it is not binding on Gentile Christians.—See Colossians ii. 16.

It is not by tradition, but by our natural reason, that we know that the words of our Lord—"Swear not at all"—are directed against vain and rash swearing, and not against those solemn appeals to God, on lawful occasions, the use of which is *commanded* in the Old Testament (Deut. vi. 13); just as it is not by tradition, but by natural reason, that we know that the words used by our Lord, on the same occasion—"Resist not evil"—were not intended (as the Quakers suppose) to forbid the use of lawful self-defence.

(21) Mr. Aylmer makes a strange mistake when he

* This reference was omitted in our last number. It was, St. Aug. Contra Epist. Fundamenti, c. 5.

* Since the above was written, we have been able to put our hands on the passage of St. Augustine (De Doctrina Christiana, lib. i. c. 39) from which we doubt not Mr. Aylmer's citation is taken. An examination of it confirms us in our conviction of the absolute necessity of verifying every quotation before arguing on it. The words, "and guided by the decisions of his pastors," do not occur in the passage we have referred to. St. Augustine does not seem to be speaking of the case of an illiterate man depending on the decisions of his pastors, but of the case of a man originally built up in faith, hope, and charity by the Scriptures, and yet able to retain these graces without the continued use of the Bible. He alludes specially to the case of solitaries dwelling without books in the desert. And it cannot be inferred from this passage, that St. Augustine supposed that a Christian living in society (a father of a family, for example) who might be called on to instruct others, could dispense with the use of the written Word.

speaks of our law of divorce, which allows of the "marrying her that is put away." The fact is, our law of divorce does *not* allow the separated parties to marry. And it is by no means our business to discuss the merits of acts of parliament, which have occasionally been passed in particular cases, giving divorces of a nature which the Ecclesiastical Courts of the Church of England refuse.

We do not reject "transubstantiation" because the *word* is not found in the Scriptures. If Mr. Aylmer can prove us the doctrine from Scripture, we shall not quarrel about the word. We adopt the words "Trinity" and "consubstantial," because they express distinctly and concisely the Scriptural doctrines, as opposed to the Arian corruptions; but we do not say that the use of these words is essential to salvation, for we know that in the first two centuries, there were thousands of saints who, indeed, held the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity, but who died before these words, "Trinity" and "consubstantial" were introduced.

(25) Mr. Aylmer denies that all the thirty-nine articles can be directly proved from Scripture. We have again to remind him that it is only *articles of faith*, the belief of which is necessary to salvation, which we assert to be exclusively contained in Holy Scripture. All the thirty-nine articles do not relate to such articles of faith; but those which do, we receive because we believe them capable of Scriptural proof.

The only point in Mr. Aylmer's letter which it now remains for us to notice, is the fact that the Prayer Book version of the 14th Psalm (as well as the Roman Catholic versions) contains three or four verses more than are found in the common authorized version. It should be mentioned, however, that those verses are found elsewhere in the Bible. It is plain that the revisers of the Church of England Liturgy did not consider this transposition a very important variation, or they would not have retained in the Prayer Book the use of the more ancient translation of the Psalms. Roman Catholic divines, however, have fastened on this trifling disagreement with earnestness almost ludicrous; and while not scrupling to allow the Scriptures to remain unknown to the majority of their laity, speak as if they believed that the awful curses denounced against any who should presume to add to the Word of God, were incurred by a copyist who should *misplace* a verse or two in his transcription.

With regard to these verses the state of the case is this:—The verses in question are not now found, we believe, in any copy of the Hebrew. They are found in most copies of the Septuagint Greek translation. Accordingly they do not appear in the Bible version, which was made directly from the Hebrew; they do appear in the Prayer Book version, which (like modern Roman Catholic versions) is a translation of a translation. Now, it is a curious critical question, whether it be more likely that those words have dropped out of all copies of the Hebrew, or that they have been inserted into some copies of the Septuagint. But it is not an important religious question, because the words are confessedly inspired, being used by St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans, chap. iii. Even, then, if we suppose that the Prayer Book version errs, *in company with those of the Church of Rome*, we must admit that the error is a very unimportant one, and that, if the Church of Rome had been guilty of none more serious, we should not have been justified in leaving her communion.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Finding it impossible, from its great length, to insert the letter of the Rev. R. A. Wilson, we have forwarded it to the Rev. W. Carson, to whom it was addressed.

We have to apologize also to several valued correspondents for postponing communications addressed to ourselves, but which we hope to print in our next number.

In reply to our Kingstown correspondent, we beg to say that we have applied to the Rev. Dr. Murray, of Maynooth, for permission to reprint his reply to the Archbishop of Dublin's essay on Infallibility; should we obtain his leave, we purpose commencing the subject in our next number.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st.

No anonymous letter can be attended to. Whatever is sent for insertion must be authenticated by the name and address of the writer, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee for his good faith.

Subscriptions are earnestly solicited, which our friends will observe are payable in advance. The amount may be forwarded either in postage stamps or a Post-office order, payable to Mr. Wm. Curry, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal, which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, JULY, 1852.

THE USE OF "THE FATHERS" IN PROVING THE NOVELTY OF ERRORS.

In the course of our remarks on the use of the Fathers, in our last number, we stated our opinion, that the Fathers were "above all value in enabling us to convict of novelty the errors which have arisen in the church since their times," of which we undertook to give an example in our next. We now proceed to fulfil our promise; and take as our instance the doctrine of praying to saints and angels.

It is admitted by all learned Roman Catholic conversialists, that saints and angels were not prayed to nor invocated under the Old Testament dispensation. It is also generally admitted by them, that praying to saints and angels is not taught in the New Testament. We give one instance of the latter admission, from Salmeron, a very learned Jesuit—"The Scriptures which were made and published in the primitive church, ought to found (or to lay the foundation of) and to explain Christ, who by the *tacit* (or *silent*, which *admits* that the Spirit did *not say it*) suggestion of the Spirit, did bring the saints with him; and *it would have been a hard matter* to command this to the Jews; and to the Gentiles, an *occasion would be given thereby* (that is, by teaching the worship of saints and angels in the New Testament) to think *that many gods* were put upon them, instead of the multitude of gods whom they had forsaken."—Salmeron, in 1 Tim., cap. 2, disput. 8.

We think the learned Jesuit has, in the above passage, very fairly admitted and accounted for the fact that this doctrine was not taught in the New Testament; and we fully agree with him, that it would, if contained in the Sacred Writings, have been a great stumbling-block to the Jews, who were taught to worship God only, and also that the Gentiles would have taken it as a plain approbation of their former practice of worshipping dead men. But supposing the doctrine itself to be a true doctrine of the Gospel (and such Salmeron supposes it to be), we are at a loss to know how the Apostles could thus agree to hide it, for fear of creating offences, and teaching actual idolatry. This does not seem to have been the practice of the Apostles. They did not hide the doctrines of the Gospel, for fear men should take offence at them. Nor did they fear that the true Gospel of Christ should make men idolaters. Nor do we see how this notion of their concealing such doctrines, upon such reasons, can be reconciled with St. Paul's declaration to the Ephesians (who had been heathens and idolaters)—"I have kept back nothing that was profitable to you, but have preached it to you, and taught you publicly, and from house to house" (Acts, ch. 20, v. 20, Douay Bible; and v. 27—"I have not spared to declare unto you ALL the counsel of God." Now, if St. Paul *preached* this doctrine of praying to saints and angels to these heathen idolaters, "from house to house," it would have produced all the evils of idolatry, which Salmeron admits would have followed from teaching it in the New Testament Scriptures; and if St. Paul did *not* teach it to them, it is clear he did *not* think that it was *profitable* for them, or that it was any part of "the counsel of God."

But our present business with it is this:—It is agreed on both sides, that this doctrine is *not* taught in either the Old or the New Testament, and, therefore, that it is not taught in the Bible at all. Therefore, if it *was* part of the Apostles' doctrine, it has come down to us by tradition *alone*. Here, then, comes in "the use of the Fathers;" for we suppose it will be admitted, that if the Fathers, for FOUR HUNDRED YEARS after Christ, have never mentioned this doctrine, except to condemn and to censure it, and to show that it was not *then* any part of the faith of the church—it will be admitted that this doctrine has *not* come down *through them* from the Apostles, but that it must be an invention of later times.

We propose, therefore, to illustrate this "use of the Fathers" of the first four centuries after Christ by showing what they have said of this doctrine.

Our first witness is St. Ignatius, the martyr. He was known in the early church by another name, "Theophorus." This was a Greek word, signifying—"carried by Christ." Some have related, that he took this name from having been one of the children whom Christ took up in his arms and laid his hands upon and blessed; we know not whether this is true, but *it is possible*, for he was made bishop of the important See of Antioch by the Apostles, about the year 70 (40 years after the death of Christ), and he suffered death for the confession of Christ, about the year 110. In his epistle to the Philadelphians, written shortly before his death, we find these words—"Ye virgins, have *Christ alone before your eyes*, and his Father, *in your prayers*, being enlightened by the Spirit."*

Now, this is not the doctrine which is taught to "virgins" in the Roman Church of this day; they are taught to keep the Blessed Virgin and "St. Joseph," and many others, *before their eyes in their prayers*.

St. Polycarp, a disciple of St. John, and Bishop of Smyrna, also suffered martyrdom about the year 147. In the ecclesiastical history of Eusebius, we have an epistle written by the Church of Smyrna, giving an account of his death. They relate that the Jews insisted that his dead body should not be given up to the Christians, for fear "they should begin to worship this man." On which the epistle observes—"Being ignorant that it is not possible that we should ever forsake Christ, who suffered for the salvation of all who shall be saved of the whole world, OR THAT WE SHOULD WORSHIP ANY OTHER. For him, indeed, we worship, as being the Son of God; but the martyrs we deservedly love, as the disciples and followers of our Lord."—Euseb. Ed. Valesii, Mogunt. 1672. Book iv., ch. 15.

The great Athanasius, writing against the Arians (Oratio III.) says—"No man would pray to receive anything from the Father, *and the angels, or any other creatures*, neither would any man say, 'God and the angels give me this.'" If St. Athanasius had lived in these days, he might have learned differently. "God and the Blessed Virgin preserve me," or "God and the angels protect me," is not now thought amiss; yet Athanasius says that no Christian in his day would have said such a thing.

And even those Fathers of whose errors we are warned, are useful in this inquiry. For instance, Origen, whom (on the authority of St. Vincent) we have held up as a warning, agrees in condemning this doctrine—"All prayers and

* We do not undertake to affirm that these words were written by Ignatius. The words are in the old copies of his letters, received as true for centuries; but they are not in the new editions of that letter, since the discovery of the Alexandrian Codex. We would not quote the words at all, but for this reason: If the words were *not* written by Ignatius, they were put into his works in later times by some one else. Now, whenever this was done, it was clearly not thought to be contrary to the doctrine of the church at that time. If a denial of the Trinity had been put into Ignatius's writings, every one would have said—"Ignatius could not have written that;" but the church did *not* say it of the words in question. So, in fact, this makes the proof stronger; for it shows that these words were not considered contrary to church doctrine when inserted *later* times, if it were so.

supplications, and intercessions and thanksgivings, are to be sent up unto God, the Lord of all, *through the High Priest*, who is above all angels, being the Living Word and God. For *to call upon angels*, we not comprehending the knowledge of them, which is above the reach of man, *is not agreeable to reason*."—Origen, Lib. 5, Tom. 1, p. 580. Tertullian, too, whom St. Vincent also holds up as a warning, holds the same doctrine, in a book written while he was a Catholic (Apolog. ch. 30. Ed. Rigalt, p. 27. Paris, 1675); he says—These things "I may not pray for from any other but from him of whom I know I shall obtain them, because both he it is who alone is able to give, and *I am he to whom it belongs to obtain them*." Clearly Tertullian did not hold the doctrine, that it belonged to the saints and angels to obtain his petition for him. And yet, neither Origen nor Tertullian were ever, in their own times, or we believe since, accused of error or heresy for writing the above, which, doubtless, they would have been, had they not expressed truly what the church at that time believed upon the subject.

Even the heretics who separated from the church in those days, are witnesses that they never heard of this doctrine. Novatian, who separated from the church, and established a new sect, about the year 248, held for the most part the same doctrine as the church. He wrote a book in defence of the Divinity of Christ, in which he thus argues—"If Christ be only man, how is he present whenever he is called upon, since this is not the nature of man, but of God, that he can be present in every place? If Christ be man only, why is a man invoked as mediator in our prayers, since the mediation of a man is judged ineffectual to affording salvation? If Christ be only man, why is our hope placed in him, since hope in man* is called cursed?"—(Novat. in Trin., c. 14. In Tertullian's works, as above quoted, p. 715.) Of course we do not quote this as if whatever Novatian said must be true; we do not so rely on even the most orthodox Fathers. But we have quoted those orthodox Fathers above mentioned, to show that they did not know of any such doctrine of the church in their day as praying to saints and angels, and, therefore, that it cannot have been handed down *through them* as an Apostolic tradition. We quote Origen and Tertullian to show that even erring Fathers knew nothing of it. We quote Novatian to show that separatists from the church knew nothing of it. In this respect, they are all useful witnesses, and as such we use them. Even forgeries may confirm this proof. If the passage which we have quoted as Ignatius's be not really his—if it were forged in later times, and fathered upon him, this only proves that in that later time, whenever it was, even the forger had not learned to dream of Christians keeping angels and saints before their eyes in their prayers.

We have yet one point more to illustrate. We spoke in our last article of the *speculations* of individual Fathers. These, too, may be a valuable proof that the things they so speculated about were no part of the church's doctrine or faith in their days. This brings us to Gregory Nazianzen, who wrote his first invective against Julian about the year 364—"Hear, O thou soul of great Constantine, IF THOU HAST *any understanding of these things*." And again, in his funeral oration (Oratio 11) for Gorgonia—"IF THOU HAST any care of the things done by us, and IF holy souls receive this honour from God, that they have any feeling of such things as these, receive this oration, &c." Can any one believe that Gregory would have written thus, if he believed it to be a part of *the faith of the church* that holy souls do really hear what we address to them? He ventures to address them as one who does not know, and cannot tell, whether they hear or not; and this very address is the strongest proof that it was *not the faith and belief of the church* in his day that the souls do hear when we call upon them.

We have now gone over *every passage* in the Fathers of the *first four centuries*, that relates to this subject. There is no shadow of grounds to suppose that, up to the year 364, any one of them ever dreamed of praying to saints or angels. Every one of them who alluded to the subject, up to that year, did so only to censure and condemn it; and the first who inclines to it at all shows us, by the way he does it, that he does not do it in conformity with the faith of the church.

If we have passed over any passage, in the Fathers of these four hundred years which gives any support to prayers to saints or angels, we suppose some one can show it. It is our conviction that no one can; and, if so, are we not entitled to ask, how can any one believe that prayer to saints or angels was "a tradition of the Fathers," during these four centuries? And if it gradually arose *in later times*, how can it be an "apostolic tradition," or part of the Apostles' doctrine? Is not this a fair instance of "the use of the Fathers," in convicting of novelty the errors that have arisen since their days?

We trust that our readers will now see that if we refuse to take "the Fathers" as the rule of our faith, it is *not* because we suppose them to be unfavourable to the doctrines we hold; neither is it because we are unwilling or unable to use them aright, as helps for discovering the truth; but simply because we will not use an unsound rule of faith, even in support of truth; because, in things of such vast importance to the souls and the faith of men, we feel constrained to seek only for a sound, an infallible rule of faith, for ourselves and for others.

* See Jeremiah, ch. 17, v. 5, Douay Bible, to which Novatian seems here to have referred.

KILKENNY—ANONYMOUS CHALLENGE.

THE following challenge, without any name to it, or any clue to the person who wrote it, or any direction in what way an answer could be given to that person, was slipped under the house door of a Scripture reader in Kilkenny. It has been sent to us, in hopes that the answer may reach the person who gave it. We trust that Roman Catholics, generally, will not approve of so mean a way of giving a challenge. Let those who can discuss the subject come forward and do so like men, in the light of day, and they will be fairly and honestly met:—

"CHALLENGE.

"May 18, 1852.

"It will not be denied but that the Church of Rome was once a most pure, excellent, flourishing, and mother church.—Rom. i. 8, chs. vi. and xvi. White's defence of his way, pp. 43, 44. King James in his speech to the Parliament. Whittaker in his answer to Dr. Sand, 2 Demonstrat. Falkin, c. 2, 2 Thess. s. 7, Reynolds in his fifth conclusion.

"This church could not cease to be such; but she must fall either by *Apostasy*, *Heresy*, or *Schism*.

"I. Apostacy is not only a renouncing of the faith of Christ, but the very name and title of Christianity. No man will say that the Church of Rome had ever such a fall, or fell thus.

"II. HERESY is an adhesion to some private and singular opinion or error in faith contrary to the generally-approved doctrine of the church. If the Church of Rome did ever adhere to any singular or new opinion, disagreeable to the commonly-received doctrine of the Christian world, I pray satisfy me as to these particulars—viz., 1st—By what general council was she ever condemned? 2nd—Which of the Fathers ever wrote against her? 3rd—By what authority was she otherwise reproved? for it seems to be a thing very incongruous that so great a church should be condemned by every one that hath a mind to condemn her.

"III. SCHISM is a departure or division from the unity of the church, whereby the bond and communion held with some former church is broken and dissolved. I fever the Church of Rome divided herself by *schism* from any other body of faithful Christians, or broke communion, or went forth from the society of any elder church, I pray satisfy me as to these particulars: 1st—Whose company did she leave? 2nd—From what body did she go forth? 3rd—Where was the true church which she forsook? Pause on these three words; for it appears a little strange to me that a church should be accounted schismatical, when there cannot be assigned any other Church different from her, which from age to age since Christ his time has continued visible, from which she departed.

"To the Bible Readers

"at James's-street, Kilkenny."

I. The challenger thinks there cannot be apostasy from the faith of Christ without renouncing "the very name and title of Christianity." Take the Socinians, who "deny the Lord that bought them." These men do not renounce "the name and title of Christianity;" and, therefore, according to this challenger, they have not apostatized from the faith of Christ! And we suppose they are still Catholics! We do not wonder that this challenge was given in the dark, so that it could not be answered.

II. The challenger evidently thinks that the majority of professing Christians, at any one time, *must* be Catholics, and the minority heretics—as if the truth of doctrine depended on counting heads. It is hardly worth while to answer this, except by counting heads, to convict the challenger himself of heresy. For Rome is in a minority at this day. To acknowledge the Pope is with her an article of faith at this day—and the whole Greek Church, including all the Churches of the vast empire of Russia, as well as Greece and Turkey, all the Churches of England, America, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, &c., and all Protestant sects, reject her, far exceeding in number those who obey her.

But it is not true that we must follow the majority. A great Catholic doctor (acknowledged as such by the Church of Rome herself), St. Vincent of Lerins, who wrote his "Commonitory against Heresy" in the year 434, undertakes to tell us what we should do "if some new infection goeth about to corrupt, not a little part, *but the whole Church*"—ch. 3. And he gives us an instance of it too in ch. 4—"When the poison of the Arians had now infected *not a little part*, but well nigh *the whole world*, in such sort that (*almost all* the bishops of the *Latin* tongue deceived, partly by force, partly by fraud) men's minds were covered, as it were, with a mist, what in so great a confusion was to be followed? *Then*, whosoever was truly a lover and a follower of Christ, by preferring ancient faith before new error, was untouched with any spot of that infection."

The same argument which makes the challenger a Romanist now, would have made him AN ARIAN then!

We adopt St. Vincent's conclusion, "to call those *anathema* which teach otherwise than once hath been received, was never otherwise than needful, is everywhere needful, and ever shall be needful."—See Gal. ch. 1. v. 8, 9, Douay Bible.

And this is true, although error should be in the majority, as Arianism was then.

The challenger asks, by what general council was the Church of Rome ever condemned? We answer, by the general Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, which condemned any one who should afterwards make a new creed, which the Church of Rome did in 1564; and many other instances we could give.

He asks—"Which of the Fathers ever wrote against her?" We answer, *all of them*. For there is, perhaps, not one of the Fathers that has not written against some or all of the errors that she now holds.

III. If the Church of Rome, in the Apostles' days had refused to hold Christian communion with the Church of Corinth, or any other Church, she would plainly have been guilty of schism. She now refuses to hold communion with the Greek Church (which is as old as herself), the English (nearly as old), and all those we have mentioned above. If she has no just cause for this refusal, she is guilty of schism now. And what is the cause? The English Church is willing to hold communion with the Church of Rome, in all the articles of the ancient Catholic creed, which has come down from the Apostles' times; and in all other things that are lawful by God's Word. The Church of Rome will hold no communion with the English Church or the Greek Church, unless they will profess the Creed of Pope Pius IV., made 1500 years after Christ. Which is guilty of the schism? If, in the Apostles' days, the Church of Rome had brought out the Creed of Pope Pius IV., and refused to hold communion with any Church that held to the Apostles' Creed, and that alone, would she not have been guilty of schism? And is she not guilty of schism *now*, for doing the same?

Correspondence.

IS THE DOCTRINE OF PURGATORY TAUGHT BY THE EARLY FATHERS?

SIR—I am just after reading, in your last number, a letter, from an anonymous correspondent, requesting some Catholic priest or layman to publish the opinions of the Fathers, who lived in the three first centuries, in favour of Purgatory.

I at once proceed to meet the wishes both of yourself and correspondent; with all due regard, however, to the limited space afforded by your periodical.

I do approve of persons going back to *first* principles, and slaking their thirst for knowledge in those fountains which are near its source.

1. To begin at the beginning: I find it recorded, in

the second Book of Machabees, xii. 43 (I am not *now* quoting this as Scripture, but what, at all events, you must admit it to be, an authentic *historical testimony*), that Judas Maccabeus, "making a gathering, he sent twelve thousand drachms of silver to Jerusalem for sacrifice, to be offered for the sins of the dead, thinking well and religiously concerning the resurrection." It is added, in the 46th verse—"It is, therefore, a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from their sins." From this it is evident, that the solemn usage of praying for the dead was the same among the ancient Jews as among the early Christians, and Roman Catholics of the present day. Before I gratify you, therefore, with reference to the Holy Fathers on this subject, let me pointedly inquire why it is that Christ, who sedulously condemned the fabulous inventions and superstitions of the Pharisees, did not as decidedly censure this portion of the public worship of the Jews?

I must have a direct answer to that question.

I can discover no such condemnation, either on the part of our Saviour or his Apostles, in the New Testament; but can trace in all the most ancient liturgies of the Christian Church a solemn commemoration of the dead.

Now, to lay before your readers the quotations you so much require from the early Fathers:—

2. (Third Century)—TERTULLIAN (Quintus, Septimus, Florens.), one of the most learned men of the Primitive Church, who lived between the years of 160 and 230, says—"Among the APOSTOLICAL TRADITIONS received *from our fathers*, we have oblations for the dead on the anniversary day." *De Corona Militis*, p. 209. In his treatise on Monogamy, chapter 10, page 555, he thus advises a widow—"Pray for the soul of your departed husband, entreating repose to him, and participation in the first resurrection—making oblations for him on the anniversaries of his death."

3. (Third Century)—St. CYPRIAN (second century)*—"*Our predecessors* prudently advised that no brother departing this life, should nominate a churchman his executor; and should he do it, that no oblation should be made for him, nor *sacrifice* (?) offered for his repose, nor prayer in his name offered in the church"—Epist. l., page 2.

4. (Fourth Century)—EUSEBIUS, styled the Father of Ecclesiastical History, and who lived between the years 257 and 339, thus writes describing the funeral service of Constantine the Great:—"In this manner did Constantius perform the last duties in honour of his father. But when he had departed with his guards, the ministers of God, surrounded by the multitude of the faithful, advanced into the middle space, and, with prayers, performed the ceremonies of Divine worship: the prince reposing in his coffin, and the people, in concert with the priests, not without sighs and tears, *offered up prayers to heaven for the repose of his soul*, in this manifesting the most acceptable service to a religious prince. The deceased emperor was thus admitted to a participation in the religious rites, the *mystic sacrifice* (?) and holy suffrages of the faithful."—*Eusebius De Vita Constant., Lib.* 2.

5. [Fourth Century] St. CYRIL—"There (in the Sacrifice of the Mass) we pray for the holy Fathers and the bishops that are dead; and, in short, for all those who are departed this life in our communion; believing that the souls of those for whom the prayers are offered receive very great relief, *while this holy and tremendous victim lies upon the altar* (?)"—*Catech. Myst.*, 5 *pages* 297, 298. *Read prior and subsequent to this quotation.*

6. [Fourth Century] St. CHRYSOSTOM (your favourite scriptural advocate)—"It is not in vain that oblations and prayers are offered and alms given for the dead. So has the *Divine Spirit ordained* that we might mutually assist one another."—*Homil.* 21. NOT WITHOUT REASON WAS IT ORDAINED BY THE APOSTLES, THAT IN CELEBRATING THE SACRED MYSTERIES (?) THE DEAD SHOULD BE REMEMBERED."—*Homil.* 3, *in Epist. ad Philip.*

7. [Fourth Century] St. EPHREM, of Edessa, in a work entitled his Testament (*tome* 3, *page* 294, *Edit. Vossii.*, *page* 371, *Edit. Oxonii*) thus clearly and *scripturally* expresses himself on the subject:—"My brethren, come to me, and prepare me for my departure, for my strength is wholly gone. Go along with me in psalms and in your prayers, and please constantly to make oblations for me. When the thirtieth day shall be completed, then remember me; *for the dead are helped by the offerings of the living.* Now, listen with patience to what I shall mention *from the Scriptures.* Moses bestowed blessings on Reuben after the third generation (Dent. xxxiii. 6); but, *if the dead are not aided, why was he blessed?* Again, if they be insensible, hear what the Apostle says:—"If the dead rise not again at all, why are they then baptized for them?"—1 *Cor.* xv. 29.

8. I shall abstain from giving you long quotations from ORIGEN (Homil. 6, in Exod, tome, 2, page 148; as likewise, Homil. xvi. in Jerome tome. 3); from ARNOBIUS, of Sicca, in Numidia; saints BASIL and ANNAOSE, all in favour of the doctrine of Purgatory, as a place of temporal punishment or purgation after death, where some souls are detained, but relieved by the prayers and alms of the faithful, especially by the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass.

You may observe, in the foregoing extracts, that where the words—"*Sacrifice*," "*Holy and tremendous Victim*," "*Mystic Sacrifice*," *and* "*Sacred Mysteries*—occur, I have inserted a note of interrogation to simply inquire what do they mean, if not the Sacrifice of the New Testament, or Catholic Sacrifice, anciently so called (*Chrysostom Serm. de Cruce et Latrone*), the word "MASS" not having been introduced for a couple of centuries afterwards.

I fear I have made too great an inroad on your space, in showing that the Fathers of the three and four first ages concur in opinion as to the existence of an intermediate state; many of them interpreting a remarkable passage of St. Paul (1. Cor. iii. 13, 14, 15) as denoting expressly some region of purgation for the soul. I shall now conclude with a quotation not from the Greek or Roman Fathers, but from one of the elders of your own church, which so completely embodies the sentiments of Roman Catholics on the subject, that I cannot but offer it to the serious consideration of your readers. Bishop FORNES, on *Purgatory*, thus expresses himself:—

"Let not the ancient practice of praying, and making oblations for the dead, be any more rejected by Protestants as unlawful. It is a practice received throughout the universal Church of Christ, which did ever believe it both pious and charitable. Many of the Fathers were of opinion, that some light sins, not remitted in this life, were forgiven after death, by the intercession of the Church in her public prayers, and especially those which are offered up in the celebration of the tremendous mysteries; and it is no absurdity to believe so. The practice of praying for the dead is derived, as Chrysostom asserts, from the Apostles."

Your most obedient,
WARNER CHRISTIAN SEARCH.

We willingly publish the above letter, trusting that it will tend to bring out the truth as to whether the doctrine of Purgatory was known in the first three centuries.

We must first remind the writer what the question is which he has undertaken to answer. Our correspondent. "A Catholic," in our last number (page 69, first column), asked that some one would bring forward all the proofs of Purgatory that could be found in the writings of the Fathers of "*the first three centuries.*" Now, it is clear that nothing can be a fair answer to this, but what is taken from writings of the first three centuries. The object of the person who made this call was to learn if the doctrine of Purgatory was held during the first three hundred years of Christianity. It is a poor answer to say that it was held in after times. Such an answer is, in fact, a *confession* that Purgatory was *not* believed for the first three hundred years, and cannot be proved from the writers of that time.

Now, every one will see that the writer of the letter which we have printed above is a man of learning, that he is one who would be well able to give proofs from the Fathers of the first three hundred years, if any such proofs could be given. Yet, what does he do? He gives *seven* proofs (besides others which he says he could give, but which he does *not* give), and of the *seven* which he gives, *only two* (the second and the third) belong to the three first centuries. To make this plain, we have prefixed to each the century to which it belongs, marked thus, [ ]. The writer has acknowledged, near the end of his letter, that he takes his proofs from the *fourth* century as well as the *first three*, but he has not given our readers any means of judging how many of his proofs are taken from the first three, and we have, therefore, taken the above method of pointing it out; and the result is, that *only two* of his proofs have anything to do with the question whether Purgatory was believed in the centuries in question.

Now, if we succeed in showing that those two do *not* prove that the doctrine of Purgatory was held by the Church, it will then be established that Purgatory was unknown to the Christian Church for 300 years; and, of course, it follows that no such doctrine was taught by the Apostles, and that it must be an innovation of men in later times.

For convenience of reference we have also numbered the proofs which he gives.

The writer of the above letter, "Warner Christian Search," takes his first proof from the Book of Maccabees. Now, the writer of this book was *not* one of the Fathers of the first three centuries; he was a Jew, who lived about 200 years before our Saviour came into the world.

On this "W. C. Search" pointedly inquires "why it is that Christ, who sedulously condemned the fabulous inventions and superstitions of the Pharisees, did not as decidedly censure this portion of the public worship of the Jews? I must have a direct answer to that question." And a very direct answer we will give. The book of Maccabees was *not* any "portion of the public worship of the Jews." The Jews never acknowledged that book as Scripture, given by inspiration of God. And it was no part of our Saviour's office to correct every error that had ever been written in a book by any Jew.

But what have the Fathers of the first three centuries to do with the book of Maccabees? Did *they* consider this book to be inspired Scripture? We know that the Church of Rome pronounces it to be inspired Scripture; but we know, also, that the Church of the first three hundred years did not consider it inspired Scripture. We know that the Fathers did believe in all the books of the New Testament; and every passage in those books which is against Purgatory is good proof that they did not believe in Purgatory. But how can it be a proof that they believed in Purgatory, because something like Purgatory (for it was not plainly Purgatory) is found in an old Jewish history, which those Fathers did not believe to be inspired Scripture at all?"

1. We come now to his proofs from the writers of those centuries. The first he quotes is Tertullian. We are rather surprised that he should venture to do so. Did he not read our leading article, in last number, on "The use of the Fathers?" We showed there that Tertullian became a heretic, and left the Catholic Church to become a believer in a wretched impostor, called Montanus, who professed to be the Holy Ghost himself! We then quoted a passage from Tertullian which speaks expressly of Purgatory. "W. C. Search" does not venture to quote *that* passage, while he thinks it worth his while to quote two passages from Tertullian which makes no mention of Purgatory at all! Why was this? Cardinal Bellarmine himself, the greatest of Roman controversialists, did quote that passage as a proof of Purgatory. Why did not "W. C. Search?" Was it because we had spoiled that passage for him, by showing that in that very chapter Tertullian professes to have received that doctrine from the impostor Montanus? But should not this have been a warning to him to be careful how he quoted proofs from Tertullian? Should he not, at least, have looked to see whether the books which he quoted were written while Tertullian was a Catholic, or after he became a heretic? Now, the fact is, that both the passages which "W. C. Search" quotes from Tertullian (and he quotes only the two) are both taken from books written by Tertullian *after* he became a Montanist and a heretic! And the latter of those books "De Monogamia," was written expressly to defend the Montanist errors against the Catholics!!

But what was the doctrine of Tertullian himself *while he was a Catholic?* Did "W. C. Search" never read this? "Since it stands firm about the resurrection of the dead, grief for the dead is idle, and the impatience of grief is idle. . . . . and *we do injury to Christ* when we do not contentedly accept their being called away by him, *as if they were to be pitied.*" Do not Roman Catholics *pity* those who are suffering excruciating torments for ages in Purgatory? They do pity them, since they pay money to get them out. If Tertullian had believed this about them, could he have helped pitying them? Yet he affirms that to pity them who are called away is *to do an injury to Christ!* Surely Tertullian was no believer in Purgatory when he wrote that. But, telling us about Purgatory, after he had become a heretic, he tells us where he had learned it—from the impious Montanus. Is it not strange that men who call themselves Catholic should turn away from what Tertullian believed while he was yet a Catholic, and preach to us only the deadly heresies he fell into after he had left the Catholic Church? Is not this a striking proof of the dangers *they* run into who forsake the Scriptures to follow "the Fathers" as their rule of faith? Why do they not quote to us Mahomet and the Koran? Mahomet believed in Christ, and he believed also in his own inspiration. Tertullian (after he became a heretic) believed in Christ, and believed also that Montanus was the Holy Ghost, and gives us the doctrines which Montanus taught. Why not quote Mahomet to us as well as Montanus?

After what we have said of the books of Tertullian, which "W. C. Search" quotes (de Corona, and de Monogamia), it is needless to inquire whether the passages quoted do really allude to Purgatory or not. In fact, they do not; the first passage speaks only of offering for the dead; it will appear, farther on, that this does nothing to prove belief in Purgatory. The second passage is wrongly translated by "W. C. Search;" he gives it, "entreating *repose* to him;" the Latin word is "*refrigerium*," and means "refreshing." Now, those who never believed in Purgatory do believe that the souls of the faithful which are with Christ *are refreshed* by Christ; and if they, knowing, as they do, that Christ has promised to refresh them, and does refresh them if they pray to him to perform his promise and to refresh them, how can that prove that they believe in Purgatory? But it is needless to go on with this; for we acknowledge that Tertullian believed in Purgatory after he became a heretic; but we find that he himself confesses that he learned this doctrine, not from Christ, but from that false and impious impostor, Montanus. Any one who chooses can take this heresy of Tertullian to himself in spite of us; but we trust that, after what we have now written, they will not easily impose it on

* Our correspondent is mistaken (we suppose accidentally) in stating Cyprian to have lived in the second century. We have in sertel (third century) which he, perhaps, intended.

our readers, and we trust that "W. C. Search" will not impose it on himself.

2. The other writer whom "W. C. Search" quotes from the first three centuries, is Cyprian. He quotes the following passage from his first epistle—"Our predecessors prudently advised, that no brother departing this life should nominate a churchman his executor; and should he do it, that no oblation should be made for him, nor sacrifice offered for his repose, nor prayer in his name offered in the church."

We never correct translations through mere pedantry; we take them as they stand, however doubtful, unless they suggest a meaning that the writer never intended. The word "repose" is taken by Roman Catholics to express relief from torment; we, therefore, object to that word being put in, when it is not a certain translation of the original. "W. C. Search" has put it into his translation from Tertullian, when the proper word is refreshment; he has also put it into his quotation from Eusebius, when there is no word to answer to it in the Greek; and he puts it into Cyprian here, when it is at least a doubtful translation. Cyprian's words are—"pro dormitione ejus;" this may mean, "upon falling asleep," or "on his death," at least as well, if not better, than "for his repose." Which of these meanings was really intended by Cyprian, we leave to be judged of from what we shall presently quote from him.

There are serious reasons for doubting whether Cyprian ever wrote these epistles at all. It is possible that they are the works of a forger, in later times. But we waive this question altogether; and we take these epistles as if they were written by Cyprian; and we proceed to inquire whether his having written that passage is any proof that he believed in Purgatory. It is clear that there *is no mention* of Purgatory in that passage. If oblations and prayers might reasonably be offered for the dead, from some other motive than to free the soul from Purgatory, then St. Cyprian and the Church in his time *might* have offered them from that other motive; and then the passage would give no *proof* of Purgatory at all. That there may be *other* motives, we have already shown in various articles on Purgatory, to which we refer our readers; but it is not necessary to introduce them here, because we can prove, out of St. Cyprian's own mouth, that he did not believe in Purgatory at all; and then, it will be clear that, when he speaks of oblations and prayers for the dead (if this passage were really written by him), it *must* be on *some other* account than to get them out of Purgatory; and here it is to be observed, that we are not going to quote from St. Cyprian's epistles, but from his treatises, which we *know* were *really* written by him. Hear, then, what he writes in his treatise "*De Mortalitate*," which was written to comfort and sustain his people, when multitudes around him were dying of the pestilence—"*Already* heavenly things are succeeding to earthly, and great to small, and eternal to transient. What place is therein this for anxiety and solicitude? Who, amid these things, is tremulous and mournful, except him in whom hope and faith are wanting? It is for him to be afraid of death who hath not willingness *to come to Christ;* and for him to be unwilling to come to Christ, who does not believe that he *has begun to reign with Christ;* for it is written that the just lives by faith. If thou art just and livest by faith, if thou truly believest in God, why dost thou not embrace that *call to Christ* which is given to thee, as one who *will be with Christ*, and secure of the promise of the Lord? and for that thou art delivered from the devil, *make thyself joyful* in the deliverance . . . . . Simeon cried out and said:—'Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word, for my eyes have seen thy salvation;' *proving surely*, and *bearing testimony*, that THEN for the *servant* of God is peace, THEN free and tranquil rest, WHEN, rescued from those turmoils of earth, we gain the port of rest and eternal security." "This pestilence as to Jews and heathens, and Christ's enemies, is a plague; so *to the servants of God, it is departure to their salvation*. . . . the righteous are called *to their refreshing*, the unrighteous hurried into punishment." "We ought not to put on the garb of black *here*, while they have *already* taken on them white raiment *there*." "Shutting out our dread of death, and thinking of the deathlessness which comes beyond it . . . when the day of our own summons comes, going without delay, and with a ready mind, *to the Lord* who calls us . . . Let us embrace the day which *makes over each of us to his own resting-place;* which, after rescuing us hence, and ridding us of the chains of earth, places us back in Paradise, and in the heavenly kingdom." Was all this said by Cyprian to persons who he thought were just about to drop into the flames of Purgatory, to burn there in torments for thousands of years? Is it possible to think that the man who preached this was a believer in Purgatory? If "W. C. Search" still thinks so, let him listen to this, taken from St. Cyprian's address to Demetrius, written on the same occasion—"Once gone from hence, there is no more place for repentance; *no satisfaction can be accomplished;* it is *here* that life is *either* lost or saved; it is here that eternal salvation is provided for, by the worship of God and fruit of faith." Is not this plain speaking? Did this man believe in making satisfaction in Purgatory?

What answer is it to all this, to say that Cyprian "offered" and "prayed" for the righteous departed? Suppose that he did (of which we are not sure), but suppose he did, *was it done to get them out of Purgatory?* or was it not rather a thanksgiving for their deliverance out of every misery, and for their admission to rest and peace? Why, the Church of England and Ireland does this; she never celebrates the Holy Sacrament without offering this prayer to God—"We bless thy holy name for all thy servants departed this life in thy faith and fear."

We have now gone over all the witnesses that "W. C. Search" has brought for Purgatory from the first three hundred years of the Christian Church. They are *only two!* One of them believed it only after he left the Catholic Church and became a heretic; the other, who was always a Catholic, never believed it all.

We are entitled now to take it as established that this notion of Purgatory was no doctrine of the Gospel or of the Church for THREE HUNDRED YEARS. Whenever it came in afterwards, it was an invention of men.

This great fact does not rest on the above proof only: we have it confessed by the greatest men among the Roman Catholics themselves. We have room here for only two. The ablest opponent the English Reformation had at its rise, was Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, and he says, in his eighteenth article against Luther, "for some while it was unknown; *it was late known to the Universal Church.*" The most learned defender the Roman Catholic doctrine has in these countries *now*, is Dr. Newman, lately made *Rector of the Irish Catholic University;* and he says, speaking of later ages than we are now inquiring about, "as time went on, the doctrine of Purgatory WAS OPENED *upon the apprehension* of the Church"—Essay on Development, p. 417. We may be sure these men would never have made such admissions, unless they were well convinced that such attempts as that of "W. C. Search," to prove Purgatory from the early Fathers, was utterly hopeless.

We have purposely omitted the proofs which "W. C. Search" has brought from the fourth century, because they are no answer at all to the question whether Purgatory can be proved from the writings of the *first three* centuries. Our business in this article is to examine *that question by itself.* We shall, however, examine them further on some other occasion. In the meantime, we ask our readers, and "W. C. Search," to observe, that we have fully answered all that has been produced, from the first three hundred years. If "W. C. Search" can produce any further proof, within the three centuries, our pages are still open to him to do so. If he cannot, the call of "A Catholic," in our last number, to all Roman Catholic bishops and priests, to come forward and supply the proof, is still open to them. If none can do it, our readers will agree with us, that Purgatory was not the doctrine of the Christian Church for at least THREE HUNDRED YEARS. And, in the meantime, in order to give the letter referred to full publicity, in accordance with our promise, we insert it a second time in our present number, as follows:—

PURGATORY.

SIR—I want to come to the point about the doctrine of purgatory. I want to know, once for all, if it *was* or *was not* the doctrine of the Church of Christ in the first ages. Let us take the first *three centuries* to begin with. I call upon some learned Catholic layman, or Catholic priest, to publish the opinions of the Fathers, who lived in those three centuries, in favour of purgatory. And I call on you, sir, to publish anything of this kind that may be sent to you. I hope our priests will see that it is essential that this should be done, in order to counteract the effect of your articles; and I hope that you will see that the fair play which you profess requires that you should publish it.

I hope some Catholic more learned than me will have the charity to come forward and do this, for I have not been able to do it myself.

I remain your obedient,
A CATHOLIC.

ST. AUGUSTINE'S PRAYER—PURGATORY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I congratulate myself on having been the humble instrument of getting *you*, even in any shape or form, to pray for the dead. As a Catholic I rejoice thereat, and hope that more than a *few* Protestants will be found to join you in a formula of prayer which, as far as it goes, I look upon to be rather Catholic. It cannot, I trust, be possible that your Protestant readers will feel hurt at seeing you so beautifully condense St. Augustine's prayer, or for adopting and throwing so much light on so truly ancient and Catholic a tradition.

No prayer that Catholics use denies the mercy of Christ, goes beyond or contrary to the promises of God, or repudiates the all-saving efficacy of the Redeemer's blood. Did I believe, or could I imagine, that praying to the saints to intercede for us with God, or that to remember the faithful departed in our prayers, derogated in the least from the merits of Christ, I would not address my prayers to the saints, nor pray for the repose of the faithful departed; but the fact is, we Catholics believe, and are taught, that in doing both we acknowledge solely the merits of Christ, since it is through him, and in him, we are in the enjoyment of the "communion of saints."

I did not, in my first letter to you, say or *seem to think* that St. Monica received her *final* judgment as soon as she departed this life. I will now be more explicit; the church teaches me, and I believe her teaching, that each soul undergoes a *particular* judgment immediately after death, and is rewarded by a just God according as it is found guilty of mortal or venial sin, or of not the least stain of venial sin. If defiled by sin—that is, mortal sin—the soul is lost for ever; if defiled by venial sins, such as St. Augustine felt apprehensive, lest his mother, though a saint, might have died guilty of, some purgation would be required, in order to fit that soul for the enjoyment of the beatific vision. Venial sins are those for which St. Augustine "*hoped to find some place of pardon with God*," who is infinitely just. If a soul depart this life free from the least stain of venial sin—that is, if it preserve its baptismal innocence through life—the full enjoyment of heaven, and of seeing God face to face, is the lot of that happy soul. Such was not the case since Adam fell till Christ died on the cross, and opened the gates of heaven, till then shut against fallen and lost man.

In the early ages the Catholic Church has not used the term Purgatory, as far as my reading leads me to think, nor have the early Fathers; but they and the church offered up prayers and oblations for the faithful departed. In your article, headed "Prayers for the Dead," in the number of the LAYMAN which is now before me, you acknowledge that, in the ancient liturgies, prayers were offered up for the dead. Now, I ask, why did not the persons who composed said liturgies confine themselves to merely returning thanks to God for having admitted into heaven the persons mentioned in these liturgies? Evidently because they could not be sure that they were in a full and perfect state of bliss; and any diminution of that is a punishment, or a purgation. Thus it is that I connect prayers for the dead and Purgatory. Therefore, it was that St. Augustine prayed for his mother's sins after her death, although he knew and "believed that God had already done what he asked"—that is to say, had insured her salvation and eternal happiness.

You collect a few opinions, held, as you state, by "holy men in the early ages of the church," about prayers for the dead, but none of which were ever adopted into it. Their rejection or non-adoption is no surprise, as the church was always on its guard against heretical or anti-scriptural opinions, no matter whether coming from holy or unholy men. But when, subsequently, the Catholic Church has defined the object of praying for the dead, you entirely reject her authority. You quote and endeavour to make light of the words of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, and St. Gregory the Great, the former of whom flourished A.D. 386, the latter 218 years later. You say, "There may be cases, and there are, in which it would be easy to bring more Fathers in favour of *an error* than against it." Do you mean, sir, an error in a point of faith? If such be the Fathers, or if you show that they have taught heresy, I shall begin to be on my guard against them; but when I see St. Cyril, St. Augustine, and St. Gregory in favour of a doctrine settled by the Catholic Church, I shall, as a Catholic layman, continue to believe in the doctrine of Purgatory.

Hoping that this will reach you in time for publication,

I am, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
A CATHOLIC.

Loughrea, June 5, 1852.

We are glad that our correspondent sees less to condemn, and more to approve, than he expected in our doctrine. We trust that this will always be the result of that fair discussion which we seek to promote.

But our correspondent is not correct in supposing that *he* has brought us to the views we expressed. We have said no more than has been often said by the best and wisest of the Church of England and Ireland. The writer of our former article on St. Augustine's prayer for Monica would have written the same, at any time for twenty years past, or since he could form an opinion on the subject.

Nor can we allow our correspondent to suppose that we agree with him farther than we really do. We believe that the prayer of faith (which alone is acceptable to God) may be founded upon any of the promises of God. We believe that whatever God has promised to do, we may lawfully call upon him to do, either for ourselves, or for any others, who are one with us in Christ. But here we stop. "Show us the promise of God." We cannot pray for the souls in Purgatory, because we have no promise from God on which to found such a prayer. On the contrary, we know that God's blessed promises leave no room for such a prayer; and, therefore, it is not a prayer founded on the promises of God, but on the inventions of men; and, therefore, it cannot be the prayer of faith, or acceptable to God. If "A Catholic" thinks differently, we call upon him

to show us a PROMISE FROM GOD *to let souls out of Purgatory in answer to our prayers.* When he shows us such a promise, then we will offer such a prayer. Until he shows us such a *promise* (which, of course, he cannot do) he has no right to suppose that our opinions about prayer give ANY support to prayers for souls in Purgatory.

He says, that "no prayer that Catholics use denies the mercy of Christ, goes beyond or contrary to the promises of God, or repudiates the all-saving efficacy of the Redeemer's blood." In this we widely differ from him. We know that the Church of Rome not only allows, but encourages men to use prayers that offend in all these points. We ask his opinion of the following prayers:—"O Mary, thou hast to deliver me from Purgatory; thou hast to conduct me to Paradise;" "Open to us, O Mary, the gates of heaven, since thou hast the keys; nay, thou thyself art, as the holy Church calls thee, the gate of heaven." Will he tell us upon what promise of God these prayers are founded?

But we go further, and say, that *all* prayers for the relief of those supposed to be suffering in the flames of Purgatory do offend in all these points. First, such prayers are against the mercy of Christ. For why do souls suffer such tortures? Either those tortures are NECESSARY or not. If they be necessary, what is the necessity? We suppose all who believe in Purgatory will say, "it is necessary to make them fit for the enjoyment of heaven, for which they could not otherwise be fit." Now, if this were so, prayers that they should be excused such suffering would, simply, be prayers that they should *not* be made fit for heaven! All such prayers do, therefore, suppose that these sufferings are *not necessary*, but that these souls *may* be made fit for heaven *without* these sufferings. Well, then, what are these sufferings for, if souls *can* be fit for heaven without them? Is not this as much as to say that God tortures them for his pleasure, and not for their profit? Prayers to let them off the suffering necessarily imply this; and such prayers deny the mercy of Christ. Secondly, *all* such prayers are contrary to, and go beyond the promises of God, until some one can show a promise from God to deliver souls out of Purgatory upon our prayers. Show us such a promise. Thirdly, all prayers which suppose that souls must needs be cleansed from sin, by being burned in the fire in Purgatory, do repudiate *the all-saving efficacy* of the Redeemer's blood, which St. John tells us *cleanseth us from* ALL *sin*"—1 John i. 7, Douay Bible. If it be true that there be some sins that cannot be cleansed, except by being burned out in the fire for thousands of years, then it is false that the blood of Christ can cleanse *from* ALL *sin*. And does not this doctrine repudiate the *all-saving efficacy* of the blood of Christ? Strange that it should be the *venial* sins that the blood of Christ *cannot* save, and which only ages of burning can cleanse.

We do not follow our correspondent into the question whether Purgatory was held by the Fathers, because we have already shown, in this number, that it was not held in the Church for three hundred years. We refer him to our observations upon the letter of "Warner Christian Search."

Our correspondent seems to be satisfied that his prayers for souls in Purgatory are the same as St. Augustine's prayers for Monica. Now, we will give him a simple method of trial, which will convince him of the contrary. Let him mark these words in St. Augustine's prayer—"I know that thou hast already done what I ask." These words are most suitable in St. Augustine's prayer, else he would not have put them into it. Now, let our correspondent take any prayer for getting souls out of Purgatory, which he himself or any other Roman Catholic uses, and let him put those words into that prayer, and see if the words do not turn the prayer into such nonsense, that he will be ashamed ever to use it with those words in it.

Will any one venture to furnish us (for publication) with a prayer for getting souls out of Purgatory, *with those words of St. Augustine's prayer in it?* If none will venture to commit such an absurdity, is it not clear that prayers for getting souls out of Purgatory must be totally different in their nature from St. Augustine's prayer for Monica? Until some one shall furnish us with such a prayer we shall decline to discuss further St. Augustine's prayer for Monica, as giving any authority for prayers for getting souls out of Pugatory.

SIR—I cannot allow the next number of your journal to issue without correcting the following misstatement of yours, which I find in the centre of the first column, page 71, of your present June number:—

"On this text (John v. 39.), however, Mr. Aylmer exercises his private judgment in a manner which many Protestants would not have courage to imitate; and, notwithstanding the authority of the Greek Fathers and the Irish Roman Catholic bishops, prefers the rendering—'Ye search the Scriptures.'"

I prefer no such thing; but, in my letter of the month of March last (see March number, page 35, first column), distinctly stated what, fearlessly of contradiction, I now reiterate, that there is nothing in the original text of St. John to prove that the word corresponding to "*search*" is to be taken in the Imperative, or the Indicative mood. *I do not mean to contend for either*, as I maintain my interpretation applies equally to *both*. We, Roman Catholics, translate it imperatively, because most of the Fathers (though not all—St. Cyril, for instance) do so; but Protestants, who disregard tradition, have nothing but the text to guide them; and hence, as Parkhurst observes, some divines of the Church of England have declared for the indicative acceptation of the word.

I subjoin the correction of a few typographical errors which appear in the publication of my letter in this month's number, and remain, sir,

Your obedient, very humble servant,
M. V. AYLMER.

72, Lower Baggot-street,
23rd June, 1852.

ERRATA.—Page 69, column 2, line 55 from top, *for* "without *witnesses*" *read* "without *writings*." Page 70, column 1, line 17 from top, *for* "*No ways*" *read* "*always*." Same page and column, 29th line from top, *for* Ephesians iv. "45" *read* "4 and 5." Same page and column, 18th line from bottom, *for* St Mark "xl. 8" *read* "ii. 8." Same page and column, 8th line from bottom. *for* St. Matt. "28, 29" *read* "vii. 28, 29." Same page and column, last line, *for* 2 Cor. "x. 1" *read* "x. 8." Same page, middle of second column, *for* "*convict*" the Jew and Dissenter *read* "*convert*."

FARMING OPERATIONS FOR JULY.

From the Irish Farmers' Gazette.

THIS, in most districts, will be the principal month for cutting meadows and saving hay. We cannot too often impress on our readers the great necessity of preserving the saccharine and nutritious juices as much as possible, which consists in cutting the principal grasses when they are at prime, and before they begin to form woody fibre, tedding it out by hand immediately after the scythe, gathering it into windrows or lap-cocks before the dews begin to fall; to keep airing it, and increasing the size of the cocks gradually each day, so as to allow of the free expulsion and evaporation of the superabundant sap, and preserve the colour and concentrate the juices; to avoid, as much as possible, cutting in wet weather, or, at least, while the grass is saturated with rain; and to keep the ground constantly well raked up and clean, that it may have the advantage of the earliest sunshine and wind to evaporate it to dryness, it being impossible to save hay well if the ground it is to be spread out on be wet. Mowers always object to leave off cutting when it rains, as they find it much easier to cut when the grass is saturated with wet than when it is dry; but the owner suffers in the quality of the article and the expense of saving, as grass cut wet, if dry weather does not follow to allow of its being tedded out, soon gets yellow at the under side; but if cut dry, it keeps its colour much longer, if wet should come on before it can be tedded out. Meadows should be cut close to the ground, not only on account of the advantage received by the next crop, as the aftergrass never thrives well if not mown close, but the bottom portion of the grass weighs more heavily, and yields more in quantity than the upper parts. Plenty of hands should be engaged for haymaking, particularly in catching weather, as between times there will be various occupations to employ them profitably, particularly hoeing, weeding, and thinning the green crops, which come in now opportunely, and must be attended to; no time should be lost, after the hay is properly seasoned, in carrying and securing in ricks, instead of tramping it in field-cocks, by which much loss and waste in quantity and quality will be prevented.

Weeds will now be quickly springing up in every direction, and should be as quickly extirpated by hand and horse hoeing, &c., amongst the green crops, and by the scythe in the pastures and along the ditches and hedge banks, and docks and thistles pulled out of the corn crop; they make a large addition to the manure heap, and may be profitably used in bedding down the stock in the sheds and yards; but for such purposes they should be cut before flowering. If they are allowed to seed, they should be burned, as adding them to the manure or compost heaps will only tend to increase and perpetuate their species; and instead of lessening their numbers, multiply them, making their extirpation, year after year, more difficult.

Turnips.—The sowing of turnips should be finished off as early as possible in the month, and the hoeing and thinning of those already sown vigorously proceeded with. Swedes will require a distance apart of from 12 to 15 inches in good medium soil; and in deep, rich, sheltered aspects 18 inches apart. Dale's hybrid and Aberdeens, 12 inches; and the large, white, softer kinds, 9 to 10 inches apart. This is a good time to make up blanks by Swedes.

Mangel-wurzel and sugar beet should be thinned out to the same distances apart as Swedes, under the like circumstances; they will require grubbing and horse-hoeing between the rows, at least twice during the month, to keep the soil light and friable, which should be repeated till the crop closes in so that further interference would be injurious. Blanks may now be made good by transplanting.

Carrots and Parsnips should be horse and hand hoed, and, if forward, for the last time by the end of the month, previous to which they should be carefully looked over, and if more than one plant has been left at the proper distance, it should be removed, and all such plants produced from seeds which have vegetated since the last thinning should be removed also.

Rape should be hoed and singled out as soon as sufficiently high, and before they begin to have the effect of drawing each other up weakly; they may be left at 10 to 12 inches apart, every way, giving the crop on the richest soil the largest space.

Chicory.—Continue cleaning and hoeing between the plants, till the crop closes so much as to be injurious to trespass through it.

Potatoes, if planted early, cannot be gone through henceforth without injury; but if the stalk will admit of it, giving them a final earthing with the double mould-board plough will be of service.

Peas and Beans, in early localities, and if sown early, may be ready for harvesting by the end of the month. The peas may be mown, or cut with a hook, and rolled into bundles left to dry, and turned over daily, till ready to carry and stook. The beans are best cut with a hook, and tied into small sheaves with straw bands, and set up to dry in stooks, and when dry enough they should be carried and stacked.

Bere will be ready for harvesting some time in the month; it should be cut before it is dead ripe, and bound and stooked immediately. This is a crop that comes away so early as to admit of a stolen crop of stone turnips or rape to be taken off profitably.

Flax should be pulled as soon as ready, which will be when the seed pods are changing from a green to a brown colour, and the stalk has become yellow for about two-thirds of its height; but if any of the crop is lying or lodged, it should be pulled at once, and kept by itself. If the crop is uneven in length, the longest must be pulled first, and kept separate from the secondary growth; but if there is not much of the latter quality, it will not be worth the expense of pulling it. The flax, as it is pulled, should be kept even at the roots ends, like a brush, and if intended to be rippled in the field, which is the most approved practice, the handfuls, as they are pulled, should be laid across each other diagonally, to be ready for rippling. The apparatus is very simple. The ripple consists of a row of iron teeth screwed into a block of wood, and may be made by any handy blacksmith.* It is to be taken to the field, where the flax is being pulled, and screwed down to the centre of a nine-feet plank, resting on two stools. The ripplers may either stand or sit astride at opposite ends. They should be at such a distance from the comb as to permit of their striking it properly and alternately. A winnowing-sheet must be placed under them, to receive the bolls as they are rippled off; and then they are ready to receive the flax just pulled, the handfuls being placed diagonally, and bound up in a sheaf. The sheaf is laid down at the right hand of the rippler, and untied. He takes a handful with one hand, about six inches from the root, and a little nearer the top with the other. He spreads the top of the handful like a fan, draws the one-half of it through the comb, and the other half past the side; and by a half-turn of the wrist the same operation is repeated with the rest of the bunch. Some, however, prefer rippling without turning the hand, giving the flax one or two pulls through, according to the quantity of bolls. The flax can often be rippled, without being passed more than once through the comb. He then lays the handfuls down at his left side, *each handful* crossing the other, when the sheaf shall be carefully tied up and removed. The object of crossing the handfuls so carefully, after rippling, when tying up the beets for the steep is, that they will part freely from each other when they are taken to spread out on the grass, and not interlock, and be put out in their even order, as would otherwise be the case. If the weather be dry, the bolls should be kept in the field, spread on winnow-cloths, or other contrivance for drying; and, if turned, from time to time, they will win. Passing the bolls first through a coarse riddle, and afterwards through fanners, to remove straws and leaves, will facilitate the drying. If the weather be moist, they should be taken in-doors, and spread out thinly and evenly on a barn floor, or on a loft, leaving windows and doors open, to allow a thorough current of air, and turned twice a-day. When nearly dry, they may be taken to a corn-kiln (taking care not to raise it above summer heat), and carefully turned until no moisture remains. By the above plan of *slow* drying, the seed has time to imbibe all the juices that remain in the husk, and to become perfectly ripe. Flax ought not to be allowed to stand in the field, if possible, even the second day; it should be rippled as soon as pulled, and carried to the water as soon as possible, that it may not harden.

* The best ripples are made of half-inch square rods of iron, placed with the angles of iron next the ripplers, 3-16ths of an inch asunder at the bottom, half an inch at the top, and eighteen inches long, to allow a sufficient spring, and save much breaking of flax. The points should begin to taper three inches from the top.

New and Recent Works

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

Booksellers to the Queen,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

ALFORD'S GREEK TESTAMENT, with a Critically Revised Text Marginal References, and Commentary. New Edition. Vol. I., much enlarged, 32s. Vol. II, 28s. (Vol III in preparation.)

HISTORY OF THE PROPAGATION OF CHRISTIANITY. By the Rev. William Browne, M.D. 3 Vols. 8vo. 36s.

KINGDOMS OF THE GENTILES, AND THE CHURCH OF THE HEAVENLY CALLING. Post 8vo. 5s.

MEMOIR OF THE REV. JOHN JAMES WEITBRECHT. By his Widow. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

SUNNY MEMORIES OF FOREIGN LANDS. By Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe. 2 vols. Post 8vo. 12s.

A MILITARY TOUR IN EUROPEAN TURKEY, THE CRIMEA, AND ON THE EASTERN SHORES OF THE BLACK SEA; including Routes across the Balkan into Bulgaria, and excursions in the Turkish, Russian, and Persian provinces of the Caucasian Range. By Major General A. F. Macintosh. 2 vols. 21s.

THE RUSSO-TURKISH CAMPAIGN OF 1828-29; with a View of the present State of the Eastern Question. By Colonel Chesney. 12s.

TURKEY, RUSSIA, THE BLACK SEA, AND CIRCASSIA. By Captain Spencer. With Coloured Illustrations and a Map. 6s.

LIVES OF THE EMPEROR OF RUSSIA, NICHOLAS I.; AND THE SULTAN OF TURKEY, ABDUL MEDJID KHAN. By the Rev. Henry Christmas. 2s. 6d.

THE RUSSIAN SHORES OF THE BLACK SEA, IN THE AUTUMN of 1852, with a Voyage down the Volga, and a Tour through the Country of the Don Cossacks. By Lawrence Oliphant. 8vo. 14s.

ALISON'S HISTORY of EUROPE, from the fall of Napoleon, in 1815, to the Establishment of Military Government in France, in 1852; being a continuation of his former celebrated Work. Vols. I., II., and III. 8vo. 15s. each.

A HANDBOOK FOR TRAVELLERS IN TURKEY; describing Constantinople, European Turkey, Asia Minor, Armenia, and Mesopotamia, with Maps and Plans. 10s.

NARRATIVE OF A JOURNEY THROUGH SYRIA AND PALESTINE, IN 1851 AND 1852. By C. W. M. Van de Velde. 2 vols. 8vo. 30s.

THE HISTORY OF THE FRENCH PROTESTANT REFUGEES, from the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. By Charles Weiss. 8vo. 14s.

HOPE DEFERRED, NOT LOST; a Narrative of Missionary effort in South America. With Journals of Captain Gardiner, &c. 5s.

ON THE PLURALITY OF WORLDS. An Essay. 8vo. 8s.

MORE WORLDS THAN ONE. The Creed of the Philosopher, and the Hope of the Christian. By Sir David Brewster. 6s.

LECTURES DELIVERED IN THE BETHESDA CHAPEL, DUBLIN, BY THE LATE REV. W. H. KRAUSE. Edited by the Rev. C. S. Stanford. Vol. I. 5s.

THE WARRANT OF FAITH; or a Handbook to the Canon and Inspiration of the Scriptures. By Rev. Robert Whytehead. 6s. 6d.

THE WORKS OF THE LATE REV. ALEXANDER CARSON, LL.D. Vol. III. Containing all his works on the Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. 5s.

EXAMINATION OF MR. MAURICE'S THEOLOGICAL ESSAYS. By Robert S. Candlish, D.D. Crown 8vo. 6s.

THE LAND OF SINIM; or, China and Chinese Missions. By the Rev. William Gillespie. 5s.

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY; with an Inquiry into the Causes of its Inefficiency: with a especial reference to the Ministry of the Establishment. By the Rev. Charles Bridges, A.M. Eighth Edition; corrected and enlarged. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

AN INQUIRY INTO THE ORGANIZATION AND GOVERNMENT OF THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH. By Rev. Albert Barnes. 2s.

CLAUDE, THE COLPORTEUR. By the Author of "Mary Powell." 7s. 6d.

ISRAEL IN EGYPT; or, the Books of Genesis and Exodus. Illustrated by Existing Monuments. Fcap. 8vo. 6s.

THE TWO NATURES OF A BELIEVER, as they are Revealed in Scripture, and Evidenced by Experience in the work of Regeneration and Sanctification. By a Layman. 3s.

VESTIGES OF THE DIVINE VENGEANCE IN THE DESTRUCTION OF SODOM AND GOMORRAH. By W. E. Tayler. 3s.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND ERASTIANISM. By J. R. Pretyman. 7s. 6d.

JESUS TEMPTED IN THE WILDERNESS. By Rev. Adolphe Monod. 2s. 6d.

SABBATH MORNING READINGS IN THE BOOK OF LEVITICUS. By the Rev. Dr. Cumming. 5s.

THE ECLIPSE OF FAITH; or, Visits to a Religious Sceptic. Fifth Edition. 5s.

THE CONVENT AND THE MANSE. By Hyla. 1s. 6d.

QUICKSANDS on FOREIGN SHORES. Edited by Mrs. Whately. 3s. 6d.

GRATITUDE: an Exposition of the Hundred and Third Psalm. By the Rev. John Stevenson. 8vo. 6s.

SYNONYMS of the NEW TESTAMENT. By Rev. Richard Chenevix Trench. 5s.

A SELECTION of ENGLISH SYNONYMS. Edited by Archbishop Whately. 3s.

ON THE STUDY of WORDS. By Rev. Richard C. Trench. 3s. 6d.

ON THE LESSONS in PROVERBS. By Rev. Rd. C. Trench. 3s.

THE BOOK AND ITS STORY: a Narrative for the Young, on occasion of the Jubilee of the British and Foreign Bible Society. By L. N. R. With an Introductory preface, by Rev. T. Phillips. Fcap. 4s.

THE DENS of LONDON: Notes and Narratives of a Six Years' Mission among them. By R. W. Vanderkiste. Cheap Edition. 1s. 6d.

HOME TRUTHS: being Miscellaneous Addresses and Tracts. By the Rev. J. C. Ryle. 3rd Series. 3s. 6d.

PLAIN SPEAKING. First series. Being forty short, Large-type Tracts. By the Rev. J. C. Ryle, B.A. In packet. 1s.

KATHERINE ASHTON. By the Author of "The Experience of Life." 2 Vols. 12s.

THE LAMPLIGHTER. With Illustrations. 3s. 6d. Cheaper Edition, 1s. 6d.

POOR PADDY'S CABIN; or, Slavery in Ireland. 1s. 6d. and 2s. 6d.

SHADOWS OF THE FUTURE; or, the Real Antichrist. The destinies of Rome, Constantinople, and Jerusalem. The World's Confusion, and the Coming Restorer. 6d.

WERTHEIM'S PACKET OF THIRTY TRACTS, assorted. Second series. 2s.

LIFE OF CARDINAL RICHELIEU. By J. Robson. With illustrations. 3s. 6d.

SCHAMYL AND THE CIRCASSIANS. By K. R. H. Mackenzie. 1s.

THE LADY'S COMPANION TO THE FLOWER GARDEN. By Mrs. London. Sixth edition. 7s.

THE FRUIT, FLOWER, AND KITCHEN GARDEN. By the late Patrick Neill, LL.D. Fifth edition. 5s.

WANDERINGS AMONG THE WILD FLOWERS: How to see and how to gather them. By Spencer Johnson, M.D. With 173 engravings. 5s.

A POPULAR HISTORY of BRITISH FERNS, comprising all the Species. By Thomas Moore. Coloured Illustrations. 10s. 6d.

POPULAR FIELD BOTANY: A Familiar History of Plants. By Agnes Catlow. With 20 coloured plates. 10s. 6d.

A POPULAR HISTORY of BRITISH SEA-WEEDS, with Notices of some of the Fresh-water Algæ. By Rev. D. Landsborough. 10s. 6d.

THE SEA-WEED COLLECTORS' GUIDE: Containing plain instructions, for collecting and preserving. 2s. 6d.

HANDBOOK of ANGLING: teaching Fly-fishing, Trolling, Bottom-fishing, and Salmon-fishing. By Ephemera. 5s.

THE SEASIDE BOOK: being an Introduction to the Natural History of the British Coasts. By W. H. Harvey, M.D. New Edition. 5s.

A BOOK for the SEASIDE. With numerous Engravings. 3s. 6d.

WAKEMAN'S HANDBOOK OF IRISH ANTIQUITIES. 5s.

BLACK'S GUIDE BOOKS for TOURISTS; with Road Maps and numerous Illustrations:—
I. England, 10s. 6d. II. Scotland, 8s. 6d. III. Ireland, 5s.

BLACK'S GUIDE TO DUBLIN AND THE WICKLOW MOUNTAINS. 1s. 6d.

BLACK'S GUIDE TO KILLARNEY AND THE SOUTH. 1s. 6d.

TWELVE VIEWS OF THE PICTURESQUE SCENERY IN IRELAND. In elegant enamelled cover. 1s.

JOHNSTON'S MAP OF THE SEAT OF WAR, in the Danubian Principalities. 1s.

JOHNSTON'S NEW MAP OF THE BLACK SEA, CAUCASUS, CRIMEA, ETC., with enlarged plans of Sevastopol and the Bosphorus. 1s.

JOHNSTON'S CHART OF THE NORTH SEA, and the BALTIC, with the Countries adjoining; and Enlarged Plans of Cronstadt and Revel. 1s.

8vo. boards, price 14s.

THE INSPIRATION OF HOLY SCRIPTURE, its Nature and Proof. Eight Discourses preached before the University of Dublin. By William Lee, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College.

Dublin: JAMES M'GLASHAN, 50, Upper Sackville-street.
London: RIVINGTONS, Waterloo-place.

Lately Published,

WILLET'S "SYNOPSIS PAPISMI." New Edition. Edited by the Rev. J. Cumming, D.D. Ten vols. 8vo. Price £3.

London: JAMES MILLER, 17, Berner's-street, Oxford-street, and all Booksellers.

Just published,

New Edition, Royal 4to., cloth, price 5s. 6d.,

THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN,

Vol. I, with complete Indexes.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY AND CO., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London: WERTHEIM AND MACKINTOSH, Paternoster-row.

Just Published, Fcap. 8vo., Price 2s. 6d.

I.

THE FIRST RESURRECTION: Being Comments on First Corinthians, Chapter xv. By the Rev. Robert Noble, A.M., Vicar of Athboy.

II.

Fcap. 8vo., cloth, price 1s. 6d.

THE PRINCIPLES OF ELOCUTION: Compiled from "The Elements of Rhetoric, by Archbishop Whately." With considerable additions and alterations.

III.

New Edition, Fcap. 8vo., cloth, Price 2s. 6d.

THE COLLECTS OF THE LITURGY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND,

Catechetically Explained, Compared with Scripture, and Briefly Commented upon, with the Date and Origin of each Collect annexed. For the use of Families and Sunday Schools.

By the Rev. Charles Miller, A.B.

With Recommendatory Preface by the Bishop of Meath.

IV.

Fcap. 8vo., Neat Cover, Price 1s.;
Cloth, 1s. 6d.; Cloth, Gilt Edges, 2s.

THE TALK OF THE ROAD: Showing how Irish people talk about Irish doings, when they get a quiet place at the back of a ditch, or under a hedge.

V.

Royal 32mo., Price One Halfpenny each.

Stories about the Mission Work in Ireland.

THE BRIGHT SIDE OF A DARK CLOUD.
BIDDY LACY.
FLOWERS TRANSPLANTED.
THE SHORES OF LOUGH CORRIB.
THE FIRST SCHOOLS IN CLIFDEN.

(The Series to be continued.)

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY AND CO., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London: WERTHEIM AND MACKINTOSH.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON, and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher, WILLIAM CURRY, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

JULY, 1852.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Θlóιρ vo Ohια añ γna háγvuiḃ, agur γíovḋáin aιγ an vtalaṁ veaġ̇ṫoil vo na váoiniḃ.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED THE MIDDLE OF EVERY MONTH, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. I.—No. 8. AUGUST, 1852. Annual Subscription, 3s. 6d. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Novelty of the Roman Catholic Doctrine of Extreme Unction	85
Talk of the Road—No. VI.	86
Shall Rome have the exclusive control of Education—Spain	88
Trial, at Turin, of Signor Amedeo Bert, Vaudois Pastor, translated from the Italian	88
Elections—a Dialogue	89
The Irish Elections	90
Archdeacon Stopford to the Roman Catholic Bishop of Meath	92
CORRESPONDENCE:	
Warner Christian Search on 2 Maccabees xii. 43	94
What is Purgatory?	95
Indulgences—Rev. R. Spring to the Roman Catholic Bishop of Ross	95
Farming Operations for August	95

NOVELTY OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC DOCTRINE OF EXTREME UNCTION.

Among the many arguments on which the Church of Rome relies, and which she makes use of, both to confirm the attachment of her own members, and to attract converts within her pale, we believe that there is scarcely any one more effectual for her purpose than the claim of *exclusive antiquity*. It is continually asserted by her controversial writers, that the doctrines and discipline of the Church of Rome are as ancient as the first preachers of the Gospel, and have been handed down, pure and unchanged from their times; and Protestants are repeatedly taunted with the *novelty* of their creed, and accused of departing from the rites and practices of the primitive Church. In our own country especially, the influence of this argument or assertion can scarcely be exaggerated. No one who is familiar with the language and ideas of the Irish peasantry, can fail to be impressed with their deep reverence for antiquity, and the value which they consequently attach to every object, sacred or secular, which has been, as it were, consecrated by time. Nothing is more common than to hear the humbler classes of Roman Catholics speak of the "*auld* Church" as being alone possessed of the true faith: and they feel a kind of proud satisfaction in clinging to a creed which, as they conceive, has preserved its purity unsullied throughout the lapse of ages, and has been transmitted to them, unaltered and uncorrupted, from the times of the apostles themselves.

Now, we freely admit the truth and soundness of the *principle* which lies at the bottom of these feelings and convictions. It is this—that Christianity is a Divine revelation, proceeding from God as its first author, and proclaimed to mankind by his messengers; and that, therefore, the nearer we can ascend to the source, the more likely we are to find the doctrines of Christianity in a state of purity. But if this be so, it obviously follows that *all* Christians, whether they be Roman Catholics or Protestants, ought to be anxious to learn how far the faith which they profess be *indeed* the primitive faith which was taught by Christ and his Apostles. We are as zealous upholders of antiquity, when rightly understood, as the most devout member of the Church of Rome; and this very point is one of the chief grounds of our controversy with her. We assert that she has *not* handed down the pure Catholic faith, but that she has overlaid it, from time to time, with more or less modern corruptions of her own invention. We assert that she can produce no adequate warrant from Scripture, no support from primitive antiquity, for many of her most important rites and doctrines. If we can establish these assertions to the satisfaction of our readers, we may safely leave it to their discernment to decide whether she really possesses that "venerable antiquity" to which she lays such exclusive claim; or, rather, whether she is not justly liable to the heavy censure denounced by St. Paul against those who "depart from the faith."—1 Tim. iv. 1.

In illustration of the truth of the foregoing remarks, we propose, at present, briefly to examine the doctrine of extreme unction. This is one of the rites of the Roman Catholic Church which, from its connection with the solemn season of death, and from the influence which it is believed to exercise on the state of the departing spirit, is a subject of deep interest to all her members. To be deprived of "the rites of the church" is looked upon by them as the greatest misfortune which can befall a dying person; and hence the threat of withholding these rites is, as recent events have proved, one of the most efficacious weapons which can be used by the ministers of the Roman Catholic Church, when they wish to coerce the conduct of any individuals among their flocks. When any person is at the point of death, his friends and relations spare no pains to secure the presence of the priest, in order that he may administer extreme unction to the dying man; and when once this task has been accomplished, their minds are happy, and the sick man departs in peace.

But, perhaps, the inquiry may arise in some minds, what is the origin of extreme unction? Is it commanded in Scripture? Did this custom always exist in the Church? Does this rite bestow any real benefit upon him who receives it? These are points on which every sincere Roman Catholic ought to be anxious for information; but on which, nevertheless, his religious instructors are not always either willing, or, perhaps, able to clear up any doubts that may arise. And yet, considering the very great importance which Roman Catholic priests attach to this sacrament of their church; considering, moreover, that their possession of an infallible head ought to be a never-failing remedy for any doubts and difficulties that may arise; taking these things into account, one would naturally expect to find clear and consistent replies to all the foregoing questions in the works of the eminent divines of the Church of Rome. But, alas! when we come to consult them, we find nothing but contradictions and inconsistencies, as we shall now proceed to prove.

And first, as regards the institution of this supposed sacrament:—Roman Catholics and Protestants are both agreed that every true sacrament of the Christian Church must have been instituted and appointed by Christ himself—nay, the Council of Trent has denounced an anathema against any person who presumes to believe otherwise.* Hence, if extreme unction be really a sacrament, some mention of its institution by Christ ought to be found in the Gospels. But we may search in vain for any such command; and this fact is admitted by most Roman Catholic writers. In one of the popular catechisms of that church we find the following passage:—†

"Q. What is the fifth sacrament? A. Extreme unction. Q. When did Christ institute it? A. *The time is uncertain*; some think it was instituted at his last supper; others, that it was done between his resurrection and ascension."

This is also the statement of Dens, who writes as follows:—‡

"Q. Was this sacrament immediately instituted by Christ? A. St. Thomas answers in the affirmative. This is collected from the Council of Trent, which teaches that it was promulgated by S. James; therefore he judges that it was not instituted by him, but immediately by Christ. Q. When did Christ institute it? A. The time is uncertain; yet it is very likely that he instituted it after his resurrection." Bellarmine simply states (without assigning any authority) that the institution is to be *inferred* from the passage in S. James v. 14. Now, let our readers consider the full extent of these admissions. If any question is raised about baptism or the Lord's Supper, we can point to the very passage in the Gospel histories which records the institution of each of these sacraments, and we can quote the very words of our Blessed Lord, enjoining the perpetual use of them in his Church. But with regard to extreme unction, no such command exists. The time of institution, we are told, is *uncertain*. Some writers fix on one period of our Lord's history, and some another: but all their guesses are alike destitute of a shadow of foundation from Scripture. Is not this fact of itself sufficient to make any thoughtful person *doubt* whether extreme unction be really a sacrament at all?

In the declaration of the Council of Trent respecting extreme unction, there is one word, the history of which is too curious to be omitted, inasmuch as it proves the uncertainty and vagueness which existed in the minds of the learned doctors who composed the council, regarding the origin of this supposed sacrament. The decree of the Council of Trent states, that extreme unction was "Instituted by Christ, *insinuated* in St. Mark, and promulgated by St. James."*

The passage in St. Mark's Gospel, here referred to, is as follows (chap. vi. 13)—"And they (*i.e.*, the Apostles) cast out many devils, and anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them." Now, we are informed by the historian of the Council of Trent,† that the assembled divines at first boldly stated in their decree that the sacrament of extreme unction was *instituted* in this passage of St. Mark; but a divine who was present remarked, that this rite could not have been then performed by the Apostles, because they were not made priests until the last Supper; and were, therefore, incapable of administering extreme unction when they were first sent forth by our Lord. This meddling theologian disconcerted the sacred synod. The holy Fathers, embarrassed by the inconsistency, began to look about for some way of ridding themselves of this contradiction. Extreme unction, said this infallible assembly, was not instituted, but merely *insinuated* in St. Mark, and afterwards published in St. James. Thus the unction of the evangelist became, in the hands of these wise and learned divines, an insinuated sacrament. This fact proves very plainly the confusion and perplexity in which the Council of Trent felt themselves to be involved, when they attempted to bring forward Scripture proof for the institution of this supposed sacrament.

But we have not yet done with the inconsistencies of Roman Catholic divines on this subject. Maldonatus, a Jesuit, and one of their most learned commentators on Scripture, in writing on the before-quoted passage of St. Mark, asks—"If the sacrament of extreme unction be not here, where is it?" This question is not asked without reason; and yet, according to the confession of some of the greatest divines of the Church of Rome, the unction in St. Mark was *not* sacramental, or for the healing of the mind, but for the health of the body only. This was the opinion of Cardinal Cajetan and Cardinal Bellarmine, who recites other great authorities on the same side.‡ And any unprejudiced person, calmly reading over the words of the evangelist—"they anointed with oil many that were sick *and healed them*"—would obviously come to the same conclusion. Why, then, was Maldonatus so very anxious to find the sacrament of extreme unction in this passage of St. Mark? He well knew that the divines of his church had generally denied the unction which the Apostles used in St. Mark to be a sacramental unction, and that they had laid the stress of their cause upon St. James; but he saw the obvious inconvenience of this course; for the same unction being plainly spoken of in both places (as we shall see presently), those writers who give up one passage in effect give up both, and thus leave their sacrament without any testimony of Scripture at all.

We now come to the well-known verse of St. James, which the Council of Trent declared to be the promulgation of the sacrament of extreme unction. It runs as follows (James v. 14, 15, Douay Version):—"Is any man sick among you? let him bring in the priests of the church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man: and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven

* Conc. Trid. Sess. 7, can. 1.—"Si quis dixerit, sacramenta novæ legis non esse omnia a Jesu Christo Domino nostro instituta, anathema sit."

† Abridgment of Christian Doctrine, pp. 88, 89. Belfast, 1833.

‡ Dens Theol., tom. vii., pp. 2, 3.

* Can. 1. decr. Con. Trid., Sess. xiv, cap. 1.—"Instituta est autem sacra hæc unctio infirmorum tanquam vere et proprie sacramentum Novi Testamenti, a Christo Domino nostro, apud Marcum quidem *insinuatum*, per Jacobum autem promulgatum."

† *Vide* Father Paul Sarpi, lib. iv., § 15

‡ Bellarm. de Extr. Unc., c. ii.—"Illa unctio, quæ ab apostolis fiebat, referebatur solum aut præcipue ad curationem morbi corporalis; ut ex eo loco patet, unde etiam sanabantur omnes qui tum inungebantur; sacramenta autem per se ad animam pertinent, ad corpus per accidens aut certe secundario."

him." [N.B.—The Greek word here translated priests is πρεσβυτερους, which properly signifies "elders."] The first thing to be determined in this passage is the true meaning to be attached to the words—"The prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up." If they stood alone, no person would hesitate to admit that they refer to a miraculous cure to be wrought upon the sick person spoken of in the previous verse. "The Lord," it is said, "shall raise him up." From what? Obviously from his bed of sickness. The word used by St. James (ἐγερεῖ) is the same as that spoken by our Lord himself, when he effected the miraculous cure of the impotent man recorded in St. John's Gospel, ch. v. 8, and addressed him thus:—"*Rise*, take up thy bed and walk." So far, therefore, the object of the anointing spoken of by St. James is manifestly identical with that practised by the Apostles when they were first sent ont by our Lord. St. Mark informs us, as we have already seen, that the Apostles "anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them." St. James (one of those same Apostles, be it remembered), in the passage just quoted, orders a sick man to send for the elders of the Church, who were to pray over him and anoint him with oil: and he adds that "the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up." The object aimed at in both cases is clearly the same—namely, the recovery of the sick person, which was to be accomplished by the exertion of the miraculous powers then vouchsafed by the Lord to certain members of his church, in accordance with his own parting words (S. Mark xvi. 17)—"These signs shall follow them that believe. In my name they shall cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover." These miraculous gifts were not bestowed upon all Christians alike, nor could they be exerted on all occasions. If an indiscriminate gift of healing all diseases was possessed by the Apostles and their cotemporaries, it is manifest that they might all have been alive to this day. There must have been some inward movement of the Spirit of God upon the mind, before any person could feel confident that a miracle could be wrought through his instrumentality; and this is the meaning of the "prayer of faith" spoken of by S. James, which one or more of the elders, moved by the Spirit of God, were to make for the recovery of the sick person, in full persuasion that the Lord, who gave the inward impulse to perform the miracle, would complete his own work, and restore the sick man to health.

The words of St. James, therefore, plainly refer to the miraculous cure of diseases, of which the anointing with oil was the outward sign. The same sign, as we have seen, was used by the Apostles generally for the same object; and even our Lord himself sometimes condescended to accompany a miraculous cure with some outward sign, as, for example, when he anointed the eyes of the blind man with clay—John xi. 6. But St. James goes on to add, "and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him." Now, we frequently read in Scripture that bodily diseases were inflicted by God as a punishment for some sin. Thus, in the Old Testament, King Uzziah was stricken with leprosy for offering sacrifice in the sanctuary, and Gehazi, the servant of Elisha, was visited with the same disease for lying, and covetousness. We read, too, in St. John's Gospel, that our Lord thus addressed the impotent man, whom he had cured—"Behold, thou art made whole; sin no more, lest a worse thing come unto thee." And St. Paul writes to the Corinthians, who had profaned the sacrament of the Lord's Supper—"For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep."—1 Cor. xi. 32. In cases such as these, therefore, when the sickness was inflicted as a bodily chastisement for sin, the healing of the disease was a testimony that God forgave the sin. Thus, for example, when our Lord cured the man sick of the palsy (Matt. ix. 2, 6, 7), he addressed him thus—"Son, be of good cheer, thy sins be forgiven thee;" and, in this case, it deserves to be especially noted that the miracle was wrought as a proof that the sins of the sick man were forgiven—See verses 5, 6.

We have entered at some length into an explanation of this passage of St. James, because, when rightly understood, it affords no countenance whatever to the pretended sacrament of extreme unction. The anointing prescribed by St. James was to be administered to persons who were not to die, but to be raised up from sickness; it was primarily intended for the miraculous cure of diseases, and, therefore, was to last only so long as the Lord vouchsafed the gift of miracles to his Church; and the recovery of the sick man was to be the sure and certain token of the forgiveness of sins promised by the Apostle. But that the anointing recommended by St. James cannot be the same as the extreme unction of the Roman Catholic Church, is evident from the following considerations:—St. James directs that the sick person should be anointed in reference to his cure; but the priest anoints him while in the agonies of death, when there is no prospect of recovery, and never administers this unction while there appears any hope of life. The Apostles order this anointing for the cure of the body; but the Church of Rome applies it principally for the cure of the soul, concerning which St. James gives no directions: for what is said of the forgiveness of sins is to be referred to faith and prayer, and not to the anointing. The anointing which St. James recommends was only applied in some cases, perhaps very few; but the Church of Rome uses it in all cases: therefore, St. James's unction, and the extreme unction of the Church of Rome, are two very different things.

Again, when we come to examine the effects which the great Roman Catholic divines ascribe to extreme unction, we find ourselves involved in the utmost confusion and perplexity. "It remits mortal sins," says Dens.* "It is not to be understood of mortal sins," says Faber.† "It remits venial sins," says the Catechism of the Council of Trent;‡ and it adds a reason, "for mortal sins are taken away by the sacrament of penance." "No," says Thomas Aquinas, "this is not true; it does not take away venial sins, but only the remains of sin."‖ "Yes," says the Council of Trent, "it takes away both venial and mortal sins, for it wipes away all remains of sin."§ Thus nothing but perplexity seems to attend us in almost every step that we take in investigating the opinions of Roman Catholic divines regarding the effect of this rite. Where, we may well ask, is the great benefit Roman Catholics derive from their boasted possession of an infallible head, if it cannot enforce even the semblance of unity and consistency in the account which their divines give of what they refer to as one of the most important sacraments of their church?

We have seen that the words of the Apostle James related to the healing of the sick, or to their restoration to health, and that they furnish no authority for anointing the dying, solely with a view to their departure. There is reason to think that the practice of anointing the sick was superstitiously continued after the miraculous powers of healing had ceased; but of its being considered a sacrament, to be administered to the dying for their spiritual benefit, we read nothing for many centuries after Christ. There is no mention of it in Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, or Cyprian, or in any of the writers of the first centuries, who wrote frequently and plainly of the discipline and sacraments of the Church. Four hundred revolving years ran their ample round, and left no trace of this sacrament. The ancient Fathers have treated freely of the two sacraments which have always been recognised in Christ's Church; Baptism and the Lord's Supper meet the reader's eye in almost every page of their works. But extreme unction, wonderful to tell, is never mentioned. This ceremony which, in modern days, is said to remit sin, and strengthen the soul of the dying, and to be almost indispensable to salvation is nowhere spoken of. This was a woeful and vexatious omission in the good Fathers, and has put modern Roman Catholic divines to a sad puzzle. Bellarmine and Archbishop M'Hale endeavour to excuse the ancients for omitting the history of this sacrament in their works, by alleging their want of occasion. The cardinal and archbishop for once are right. The early Christian authors had no opportunity for mentioning such a sacrament; for, in plain truth, such a sacrament did not then exist.

Pope Innocent the First, who flourished so late as the fifth century, is the earliest witness adduced on the Roman Catholic side of this question. Decentius, Bishop of Eugubium, in Italy, had occasion to consult the pontiff on this subject, who returned the following answer:—"The diseased faithful may be anointed with consecrated oil of chrism. This ointment may be used, not only by priests, but by all Christians, who may anoint not only themselves, but also their friends. But the chrism may not be poured on penitents, for it is a kind of sacrament."¶

We request the reader's particular attention to this reply. Pope Innocent says that *not only priests, but all Christians may anoint themselves as well as their friends.* The Church of Rome *now* says, that extreme unction can only be administered by a priest, and anathematizes all who believe otherwise. Pope Innocent calls this rite, "a kind of sacrament." The Council of Trent denounced a terrible anathema against any person who should presume to deny that extreme unction was a true and proper sacrament instituted by Christ. Surely, we have here abundant proof that the Roman Catholic Church now holds a doctrine altogether different from that which it held in the time of Pope Innocent the First, and that, therefore, it cannot be the immutable, and infallible church which it professes to be.

There are various other interesting points on this subject, to which we cannot now advert, but to which, on some future occasion, we may, perhaps, invite the attention of our readers.

---

* Peccata mortalia remittit.—Dens 7, 18.

† Non intelligitur de peccatis mortali.—Faber ii., 259.

‡ Peccata venialia remittit.—Cat. Trid. 195.

‖ Aquinas iii., 565. Faber ii., 259.

§ Cujus unctio delicta, si qua sint adhuc expianda, ac peccati reliquias abstergit.—Conc. Trid. Sess. xiv., cap. 2.

¶ Innoc. Ep. I, n. 8—"Sancto oleo chrismatis non solum sacerdotibus, sed omnibus uti Christianis licet, in sua aut suorum necessitate inungendo. Pœnitentibus autem istud infundi non potest, quia genus est sacramenti.

TALK OF THE ROAD—No. VI.

So Pat and Jem went straight to Mr. Owen's house, and he brought them into his study.

"Well, boys," said Mr. Owens, "did you read anything of the books, and how do you like them?"

"We like them well, your reverence," said Jem, "for they teach us more about God than ever we knew before, and they teach things that ought to make us love him, if we have any heart to him at all."

"And do you find much difference in the books?" said Mr. Owens, turning to Pat.

"Nothing to speak of, for so far, your reverence," said Pat; "there's words here and there not just the same; but for the *meaning*, there's no differ to signify, that I see yet."

"There are some differences, though," said Mr. Owens, "that will surprise you very much when you come to them, for some of them are just the very contrary of the difference you might expect to find in the two books. But I will tell you about that some other time, for I would rather hear you speak now, if you have anything to ask me about what you find in the books."

"That's just it, your reverence," said Jem; "we want to ask you about the right way of praying to God; for sure when we see what he says to them that pray to him, it's a poor thing not to know the right way."

"Well," said Mr. Owens, "it is a good thing when reading the Bible makes us ask questions like that; but if you could explain your difficulty a little more, I might know better how to help you."

"Well, your reverence," said Pat, "we want to know if the likes of us, poor creatures, may just go straight to God, and pray to him ourselves, without anybody to speak to him for us, or if we must get somebody to speak for us and offer our prayers to him—somebody that he will be more willing to listen to than to ourselves."

"That's a very important question," said Mr. Owens, "and the answer is very plain; we are sinful and fallen creatures, not fit in ourselves to speak to a God, who is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity; and, therefore, we have no reason to hope that our prayers will come up to him at all, unless somebody that a holy God can listen to should offer up our prayers to him, and intercede with him to accept our prayers."

"Why, your reverence," said Jem, "sure the Protestants don't believe that!"

"A man who does not believe that," said Mr. Owens, "cannot be a Christian, and so we need not talk about his being a Protestant. But we do believe it, and it lies at the root of our religion, and all our prayers to God are founded on it."

"And so," said Pat, "your reverence thinks it good to get the Blessed Virgin, and the angels, and the saints to speak for us to God, and get him to hear our prayers?"

"No," said Mr. Owens, "I did not say that we were to get them to speak for us; we should be sure to get some one that we know can hear us, and that we know God will hear."

"And who will we get, your reverence," said Pat, "if we don't get them to speak for us?"

"Maybe your reverence means," said Jem, "the verse that we read here in the two books, the last night we were here."

"That's just what I mean," said Mr. Owens; "and, now, do you remember what it was?"

"I do, your reverence," said Jem; "it was just this—'There is one God, and one mediator of God and man—the man Christ Jesus.'"

"Well," said Mr. Owens; "we think that if we go to God without that mediator, that we have no right to believe that God will accept our prayers; but if we have that mediator to intercede for us, and offer up our prayers to God, and ask him to receive them, then our prayers will be accepted by God; and before we go any farther," said Mr. Owens, "let me show you, out of the Douay Bible, why we think so." So Mr. Owens turned to the following passages and read them—"I am the way, and the truth, and the life; no man cometh to the Father but by me."—John xiv. 6. "Amen, amen, I say to you, *if you ask the Father anything in my name*, he will give it you."—John xvi. 23. "Jesus is entered into heaven itself, that he may *appear now* in the presence of God *for us*."—Hebrews ix. 24. "He is able also to save for ever, them that come to God by him; always living to make intercession for us."—Heb. vii. 25. "I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not."—Luke xxii. 32. "And not for them (the Apostles) only do I pray, but for them also who through their word shall believe in me."—John xvii. 20. "So here you see," said Mr. Owens, "if we want to come to God in prayer, we must come through Christ, who is the way; and we must pray in the name of Christ, if we want our prayers to be granted; and then Christ makes intercession for us, that our prayers may be heard, and he prays *for* all who believe in his Word." So you see," said Mr. Owens, "we do not want for somebody to pray for us, and to intercede with God to hear our prayers; we have one who is able and willing to do it; and if we want our prayers to be heard

we must offer them up through his intercession—that is, we must ask him to speak for us, and to offer our prayers to God."

"And may we ask the saints and angels to do it at all, your reverence?" said Pat.

"That's a thing that God must know better than we can," said Mr. Owens. "I have showed you, out of the Douay Bible, that we have great promises to those who pray through Jesus Christ, and ask him to intercede for them. But did you find, in the Douay Bible, any promise to those that pray through the Virgin Mary or the saints?"

"Your reverence," said Jem, "that's the very thing we want to ask you; neither of us has found the like of that in the Bible; but we haven't read all the Bible, and it will take us long to do it, and maybe it is in that part that we haven't read; and we just want to know if there is anything in it at all about asking the Blessed Virgin and the saints to pray for us."

"Well," said Mr. Owens, "I think it would be better you would ask some one else that question; for if *I* say there is no such thing in the Bible, you will think, maybe, that it is because I am a Protestant that I say so, or because I do not understand the right sense of it; and so, perhaps, you would not believe me."

"And who will we ask, your reverence?" said Pat.

"Of course, you will ask Father John," said Mr. Owens. "If he can show it to you in the Bible, of course he will: and if *he* cannot show it to you in the Bible, then you will be *sure* that it is *not* there; and may be you would not be sure merely for my telling you."

"Well, your reverence," said Jem, "that would be the right way; only I doubt it would not do at all."

"And why not?" said Mr. Owens. "Sure your clergy ought to be ready to tell you whether the things they teach you are in the Bible or not."

"They ought, your reverence," said Jem; "sure enough, that is true; but, then, that is just the thing we durstn't ask them at all."

"And why not?" said Mr. Owens.

"Why, your reverence," said Jem, "if it was in the Bible, that would be all right; and I'm thinking Father John would be ready enough to tell us if it was in it; but if it's *not* in it, your reverence, wouldn't I be in the queer way to be asking Father John to tell me out of the Bible what's not in the Bible at all? Isn't that what *would* anger him? And how do I know but what he might curse me from the altar, and leave me without a bit to put into the childer's mouths? So I would rather take your reverence's word for it. Is there anything in the Bible for asking the saints and angels to bring our prayers to God for us?"

"Well," said Mr. Owens, "in that case I must answer you. There is not one word in the Bible, from beginning to end, to tell us to ask either saints, or angels, or the Blessed Virgin, to pray for us; but a great deal to tell us that we want nobody but Jesus Christ to offer our prayers to God. Just listen to this," said Mr. Owens, "'Having, therefore a great High Priest, who hath passed into the heavens, Jesus, the Son of God.' . . . 'Let us go, *therefore*, WITH CONFIDENCE to the throne of grace; that we may obtain mercy, and find grace in seasonable aid.' Here, you see," said Mr. Owens, "our having such a High Priest is sufficient to warrant us to pray *with confidence* for the mercy and grace we want; and if that is enough to make us pray *with confidence*, what room is there for anything more? And more than that," said Mr. Owens, "I can tell you, that the Roman Catholic books, that argue for asking the saints to pray for us, do never give any proof for it out of the Bible; and, of course, if they could give proof out of the Bible, they would."

"And what proof *do* they give for it, your reverence?" said Jem.

"The proof they give is this," said Mr. Owens:—"they say that the Bible tells us to pray for each other, and to ask each other to pray for us. And so far they are right, for the Bible does teach us to do that; and then they say, would it not be better still to ask the angels and the saints in heaven to pray for us? But that is an invention of their own; for the Bible does *not* say that."

"Well, your reverence," said Pat, "I would like to hear more about that; sure there's my brother, that went to Australia, if he was here now, I would rather ask him to pray for me than anybody at all; he was the good brother, and he used to read the Bible betimes, afore any of the other boys thought of reading it; and though he was not so attentive to his duties as some of them, he was the best Christian at all; and sure I would be glad I could only ask him to pray for me; and if he was in heaven, wouldn't he care for me still? and wouldn't his prayers be better still?"

"Well," said Mr. Owens, "I hope our friends in heaven do remember us, as we ought to remember them; and it may be that they still pray to God for us; but we can say nothing at all about that, because God has not told us anything about it; and no one else could tell us anything about it. But I do not see how you, as a Christian, could ask your brother, in heaven, to pray for you, the same as you would if he was standing beside you."

"Well, if your reverence could show me the differ," said Pat.

"Where is he now?" said Mr. Owens.

"In Australia, your reverence," said Pat.

"That is just at the other side of the world," said Mr. Owens. "If you could make a hole straight down into the ground, and dig it about eight thousand miles deep, it might come out at the other side, near about where he is; it is a long way," said Mr. Owens.

"It is, your reverence," said Pat.

"And you would like to ask him to pray for you?" said Mr. Owens.

"I would, your reverence," said Pat.

"Well, then," said Mr. Owens, "just go down on your knees here, this moment, and call upon him to pray for you."

"Oh, your reverence," said Pat, "sure I couldn't do that."

"And why can you not do that?" said Mr. Owens.

"Because, your reverence, he can't hear me," said Pat.

"Would it not be a great sin to do it?" said Mr. Owens.

"It would, your reverence, not a doubt of it," said Pat; "and I dursn't do it at all."

"But you would ask your brother to pray for you, if he was standing here beside you?" said Mr. Owens.

"I would, surely, your reverence," said Pat.

"But it is quite a different thing to call upon him to pray for you while he is in Australia?" said Mr. Owens.

"It isn't like it at all, your reverence," said Pat.

"And if you got a letter to-morrow," said Mr. Owens, "to say your brother was dead, would that be the same as if he was standing here beside you?"

"No indeed, your reverence," said Pat; "nothing like it."

"And if you then went down on your knees," said Mr. Owens, "and called on him to pray for you, which would that be the most like—asking his prayers while he was standing beside you, or calling on him while he was in Australia?"

"It would be a deal more like asking while he was in Australia?" said Pat.

"Well," said Mr. Owens, "the only reason the Roman Catholics can give for praying to the saints in heaven to pray for us, is this, that it is just the same as asking our friends beside us to pray for us. Now, you see it is not the same, but quite different; it is just like praying to our friends on earth in a way that no Christian durst do, for fear of making God angry with us. Tell me now," said Mr. Owens, "would you go down on your knees and call on the present Pope, Pius the Ninth, who is at Rome, 1,000 miles off, to pray for you?"

"No, your reverence," said Pat; "no Catholic would do that."

"Would it not be very wicked and sinful if they did?" said Mr. Owens.

"It would, your reverence," said Pat.

"Would it not be putting the Pope in the place of God to suppose he could hear what you said?" said Mr. Owens.

"Well, I think it would be very like it," said Pat.

"If you spoke ever so loud, the Pope could not hear you," said Mr. Owens.

"He could not, your reverence," said Pat.

"And if he knew of your prayer at all," said Mr. Owens, "it could only be because he knew the thoughts of your heart."

"Nothing else, your reverence," said Pat.

"Can you speak loud enough to be heard in heaven?" said Mr. Owens.

"I cannot, your reverence," said Pat.

"Well, then," said Mr. Owens, "if the saints hear your prayers, it can only be because they know the thoughts of your heart; and is that not putting them in the place of God, for Solomon says to God—'Thou only knowest the hearts of all the children of men?'" and here Mr. Owens showed them the words in the Douay Bible—3 Kings, ch. viii., verse 39.

"And is there nothing in the Bible, your reverence," said Pat, "for praying to the saints or angels?"

"Nothing at all," said Mr. Owens; "and if there was, you may be sure Father John would show you that much of it; but he would not like you to come upon these words of Jesus Christ—'*The Lord thy God shalt thou adore, and Him only shalt thou serve.*'"—Matthew iv. 10.

"Well, your reverence," said Jem, "now it comes to my mind that I learned a catechism at the big school I learned to read in, that was kept by the monks, or the Christian Brethren, as they call them; and in that catechism, it was took out of the Bible that St. John, the Blessed Apostle, did worship an angel; and sure St. John would not do it if it was wrong; but I disremember what part of the Bible they took it out of."

"I will show you the catechism and the place in the Bible, too," said Mr. Owens. So he took down off the shelf a little book, called "AN ABRIDGMENT OF THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE, with proofs of Scripture, on points controverted, by way of question and answer. Composed in 1649, by H. T., of the English College at Douay. *Now revised by the* RIGHT REV. JAMES DOYLE, D.D., and prescribed by him to be used in the united Diocess of Kildare and Leighlin. Dublin: printed by Richard Coyne, 4, Capel-street, printer, bookseller, and publisher to the Royal College of St. Patrick, Maynooth, 1846." So Mr. Owens read out of the title page. "Is this the book?" said Mr. Owens.

"It is, your reverence," said Jem; "and is that the Doctor Doyle that was Roman Catholic Bishop of Kildare?"

"The very man," said Mr. Owens, "and he was the most learned and clever man that has been a Roman Catholic bishop in Ireland for many years; and you see he revised this book himself, and ordered it to be used in his diocess; and that is the way you came to learn it. And now let us look for the Scripture proof for praying to angels, and you may be sure this book will give the best proof that can be got in the Bible." So Mr. Owens turned to page 52, where it speaks of the lawfulness of worshipping saints and angels. "Question—How prove you that?" "Answer—First, out of Joshua, ch. v., verses 14 and 15, where Joshua did it—'I am Prince of the Host of the Lord, SAID THE ANGEL to Joshua, and Joshua fell flat on the ground, and adoring, said, what saith my Lord to his servant?" And here Mr. Owens bid them observe the words—"*said the angel* to Joshua;" and then he turned to the place in the Douay Bible, and showed them that this person who spoke to Joshua is not called *an angel* at all, but in the second verse of the next chapter, he is called THE LORD; so it was the Lord, and not an angel, that Joshua worshipped. And then Mr. Owens read the rest of the same answer in Dr. Doyle's Catechism. "Secondly, Apocalypse, chapter xxii., verse 8, *where St. John did it* (though the angel had once before willed him not to do it, in regard of his apostolical dignity, chap. xix, v. 10), and I fell down, saith he, to adore before the feet of the angel, who showed me these things." And then Mr. Owens stopped; and Jem waited for a minute; and then he said—"And did the Blessed Apostle fall down to worship the angel?"

"He surely did," said Mr. Owens.

"And what does your reverence say to that?" said Pat; "does not that make it out to be right to worship the angel?"

So Mr. Owens said nothing at all; but he took the Douay Bible, and opened it at the place that the catechism refers to (Apocalypse, or Revelation, xxii. 8), and bid Pat read it; and so Pat read—"And I, John, who have heard and seen these things. And after I had heard and seen, I fell down to adore before the feet of the angel, who showed me these things."

"Well, your reverence," said Pat, "is not that the very thing that is in the catechism?" and Pat looked as if he thought, now, that Mr. Owens was only imposing on them, when he told them there was nothing in the Bible for worshipping angels, and that maybe the priests had the Bible on their side after all.

"And what do you say?" said Mr. Owens turning to Jem.

"What can I say," said Jem, "when St. John worshipped the angel."

"Read the next verse," said Mr. Owens to Pat.

So Pat read—"And *he* said unto me, SEE THOU DO IT NOT, for I am thy fellow servant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them that keep the words of the prophecy of this book. ADORE GOD."

"You see now," said Mr. Owens, "when St. John went to worship the angel, the angel warned him not to do such a thing, and told him to worship God."

"Well," said Jem, "if that does not beat all! Now I know what I wanted."

"What is that?" said Mr. Owens.

"That there is nothing in the Bible for worshipping angels," said Jem; "for sure if there was any proof at all of it there, they would not have to go in such a bare-faced like way to take a proof out of the very place that bids us not do it."

"That is enough for me, too," says Pat; "it's surely *not* in the Bible."

"One word more," said Mr. Owens. "You see in the note in the Douay Bible, on chap. 19, v. 10, it says, that maybe the angel only said it out of modesty, on account of the dignity of St. John as Apostle. That may lead you to think that though the angel was ashamed to let an apostle worship him, yet he would have let you or me adore him easy enough. So now, Pat, look back to the last verse you read, and see *why* the angel would not let St. John worship him."

"Because he was his fellow-servant, your reverence," said Pat.

"And is the angel fellow-servant to any one else?" said Mr. Owens.

"To all them that keep the words of the prophecy of this book," said Pat.

"Well," said Mr. Owens, "you see that if we keep the words of this prophecy, we, too, are forbidden to worship the angel, by the very same reason. And mark this, too," said Mr. Owens; "the question in Dr. Doyle's catechism is about worshipping SAINTS as well as *angels*; but the answer offers *no proof for praying to saints*, not even so bad a one as it gives for angels; so you may well think there is nothing in the Bible for worshipping saints."

"Well, your reverence," said Pat, "we have got what we wanted this night anyway."

And so they were going away, but Jem stopped. "Your reverence," said he, "if the blessed Apostle was going to do what was wrong, why was that put in the Bible?"

"To show us," said Mr. Owens, "how great the temptation is to worship other beings beside God; and to show us what need all men have to watch against a sin that even an apostle might fall into, if he was not warned; and to show us, too, that we might not follow even an apostle against the words of Christ—'The Lord thy God shalt thou adore, and him only shalt thou serve.'"

"I see now, your reverence," said Jem; "and I see *it's no use* to pray to angels, when the angel knows his duty better than to take our prayers. Sure enough we must worship God only."

"And remember, too," said Mr. Owens, "that if we want to be heard, we are to pray in the name of Jesus Christ, and trusting to him as our mediator, and then we have his promise to hear us."

SHALL ROME HAVE THE EXCLUSIVE CONTROL OF EDUCATION?

In a former number of this publication we put to Roman Catholic laymen the important question, whether it was for the advantage of this country, morally and politically, that the Romish priesthood should obtain the exclusive control over the education of the laity. We endeavoured to point out to them that the answer to that question should be determined by the actual results which had followed from their success in securing this great object of their policy in other countries; and we cited the example of Italy to show that there, at least, degradation, moral and political, had resulted from their success. The argument, however, which we then urged must, to a great degree, depend, not on the example of one nation or one country, but on the uniformity of results that have flowed from the same causes; and the country to which we would next call our readers' attention is Spain.

Among all the great nations of Europe, there is not one in which the domination and control of the Romish priesthood has been carried to such an height of power and exclusiveness as in Spain. The birth-place of Dominick and Ignatius Loyola, of Francis Xavier, and Alphonsus Liguori, the four most memorable saints canonized by Rome in modern times, her rulers influenced by their spirit, were ever ready to compel submission to Rome by the power of the sword. From her ports issued forth the invincible Armada that was to destroy heresy in England, and her armies were arrayed by the side of the forces of the League, to crush the Huguenots in France. For the education and instruction of the Spanish people in the dogmas of Rome, an ecclesiastical establishment had been created and endowed, which numbered in its ranks at least one-thirtieth of the whole population of the country; and the teaching and control of this vast army of ecclesiastics was enforced by the dungeons and *autos da fe* of the terrible Inquisition. No book unsanctioned by that tribunal could circulate in Spain; and so jealous was it of the slightest contamination of heresy, that even the epithet of "learned," applied to a heretic author, by the most orthodox of their own writers, was rigorously expunged, lest it should be supposed that any heretic was rightly called so. In Spain, then, at least, the Roman Catholic Church had full and complete sway over the national mind; and if her teaching does, indeed, produce as its fruit that righteousness which the inspired wisdom of Solomon tells us exalteth a nation, what country in Europe—what nation in the world—should have attained the same height of moral and political grandeur, and retained it, as long as the Spanish monarchy?

In contrasting the past and present condition of the Spanish monarchy, we will avail ourselves of the eloquent description given by Mr. Macaulay, in one of his brilliant essays. After describing the vast extent and power of the Spanish empire in the sixteenth century, when the Spanish monarch ruled over the whole Peninsula, over Naples and Sicily, over Holland, Flanders, and Franche Comte, and when a boundless empire in America poured its treasures into her bosom, and every neighbouring nation trembled for its independence, he thus proceeds:—"The ascendancy which Spain then had in Europe was, in one sense, well deserved. It was an ascendancy which had been gained by unquestioned superiority in all the arts of policy and war. In the sixteenth century, Italy was not more decidedly the land of the fine arts, Germany was not more decidedly the land of bold theological speculation, than Spain was the land of statesmen and of soldiers. The character which Virgil has ascribed to his countrymen might have been claimed by the grave and haughty chiefs who surrounded the throne of Ferdinand the Catholic, and of his immediate successors. That majestic art 'regere imperio populos,' was not better understood by the Romans, in the proudest days of their republic, than by Gonsalvo and Ximenes, Cortes and Alva. The skill of the Spanish diplomatists was renowned throughout Europe. The sovereign nation was unrivalled both in regular and irregular warfare. The impetuous chivalry of France, the serried phalanx of Switzerland, were alike found wanting when brought face to face with the Spanish infantry. In the wars of the New World, where something different than ordinary strategy was required in the general, and something different from ordinary discipline in the soldiers—when it was every day necessary to meet, by some new expedient, the varying tactics of a barbarous enemy, the Spanish adventurers, sprung from the common people, displayed a fertility of resource, and a talent for negociation and command, to which history scarcely affords a parallel."

Such was the eminence attained in the arts of war and government by the Spaniards of that age; nor were they wanting in the liberal arts and sciences. Prescott, in his history of that period, observes:—

"The Castilian scholars of that age may take rank with their illustrious contemporaries of Italy. They could not, indeed, achieve such brilliant result in the discovery of the remains of antiquity, for such remains had been long scattered and lost amid the centuries of exile and disastrous warfare consequent on the Saracen invasion. But they were unwearied in their illustrations, both oral and written, of the ancient authors; and their numerous annotations, translations, dictionaries, grammars, and various works of criticism, many of which, though now obsolete, passed into repeated editions in their own days, bear ample testimony to the generous zeal with which they conspired to raise their contemporaries to a proper level for contemplating the works of the great masters of antiquity, and well entitled them to the high eulogium of Erasmus, that 'liberal studies were brought, in the course of a few years in Spain, to so flourishing a condition as might not only excite the admiration, but serve as a model to the most celebrated nations of Europe." The Spanish universities were the theatre on which this classical erudition was more specially displayed. Academies of repute were to be found in Seville, Toledo, Salamanca, and Alcala, and learned teachers were drawn from abroad by the most liberal emoluments. At the head of those establishments stood the illustrious city of Salamanca. Such was its repute, that foreigners as well as natives, were attracted to its schools, and at one time 7,000 students were assembled within its walls. Nor was this devotion to literature confined to the pursuits of classical literature; the same historian adds:—"A similar impulse was felt in the other walks of knowledge. Jurisprudence assumed a new aspect under the learned labours of Montalvo. The mathematics formed a principal branch of education, and were successfully applied to astronomy and geography. Valuable treatises were produced on medicine, and on the more familiar practical arts, as husbandry, for example. History, which, since the time of Alphonsus X., had been held in high honour and more widely cultivated in Castile than in any other European state, began to lay aside the garb of chronicle, and to be studied on more scientific principles." Nor did this literary ardour and progress fail in producing the more permanent works of genius. Soon appeared that wonderful work of genius that has made the name of Cervantes and the achievements of Don Quixote familiar to every nation in Europe. Then, too, Calderon almost rivalled in fertility of intellect our own immortal Shakspeare. To these might be added a host of other names which rendered the Spanish literature of that day a worthy rival of that contemporaneous literature of England, which boasted the great names of Shakspeare and Spenser, of Bacon and Raleigh. But while the English literature of the Elizabethan era was but the glorious dawn of that bright day of literature and science of which we have not yet seen the close, the Spanish literature of the same period was only a meteor light which shot up brightly, indeed, at first, but having long since passed away, has only made the succeeding darkness more gloomy and intense. For two centuries Spain has not produced a single name eminent in literature or science. Alone, of all the nations composing the great European confederacy, Spain has sent no contribution to the numerous and various discoveries of modern times. The names of Newton, Laplace, Liebnitz, Tycho Brache, Kepler, and Gassendi, show that science has had its votaries in every part of Europe, except the Spanish peninsula. To the Spanish mind the discoveries of Newton brought no light; for they were the discoveries of an heretic, and therefore could not enlighten an orthodox son of the Roman Church. Those universities which the piety and liberality of Isabella founded or enlarged, have all disappeared, save Salamanca; and that celebrated seat of learning, like Spain herself, exhibits only the melancholy decay which has come over all Spanish greatness. A modern traveller, speaking of it, says—"The days of its collegiate glory are long since past by, never to return. Its walls are now silent, and grass is growing in its courts, which were once daily thronged by at least 8,000 students—a number to which, at the present day, the population does not amount."

Nor has it been only on the literature of Spain that blight and decay have fallen. Where is now the mighty empire, on whose vast possessions the sun never set, and at whose greatness the other nations trembled? The sixteenth century saw Holland revolted and independent. The middle of the seventeenth century saw Portugal assert its independence; whilst Flanders and Franche Comte were wrested from the Spanish crown, to increase the strength of France. The close of the same century saw the whole of the Spanish monarchy pass under the dominion of the grandson of Louis XIV.; and for the next century, Spain was but an humble satellite, following, in peace and war, the politics of the French court. One-half of the nineteenth century has now passed. It has seen Spain rescued from French invasion by the bayonets of an heretic army. It has seen almost the whole of the vast empire in America throw off their allegiance to the mother country, and establish independent republics. Whilst Spain itself, for the last twenty years, has been the prey of anarchy and civil war, to be succeeded only by the domination of a successful military adventurer. No wonder, then, that all modern travellers unite in mourning over the sad lot of Spain. Struck, as they all are, with the wonderful advantages of a country intersected by great rivers, defended by noble mountains, rich with the most productive mines; having ports looking on every sea, and blessed with a climate fitted for every production—advantages which had made it, when under the dominion of the Romans and the Moors, a garden of plenty and delight—when they see the picture of neglect and desolation—moral and physical—which the greater part of the Peninsula presents, the face of nature, and the mind of man dwarfed and curtailed of their fair proportions; their inherent fertility allowed to run into vice and luxuriant weeds; the energies of her people misdirected; their capabilities for all good converted into elements powerful only for evil—no wonder they should mourn and lament over the change that has come over the fair vision, and abhor and denounce the blighting superstition which, for centuries, has placed the ban of its curse on all knowledge and all learning, which did not pander to its exclusiveness. Yes, to preserve to Spain an exclusively Roman Catholic population, to have none but Roman Catholic judges, and a Roman Catholic army; to permit access to no literature except Roman Catholic literature, was the grand object of political wisdom in Spain. Philip II. declared that he would rather lose all his dominions than be the sovereign of a single heretic. For this the Jews were banished, the Moors were expelled, and the Protestant heretics of Holland driven into a successful rebellion. In truth, Spain affords the most striking example of the effects which this system will produce, when it is pursued consistently through all its practical consequences to inquisitions and acts of faith. The progress of all nations necessarily depends upon activity of mind, and upon the advancement of knowledge. The arts of navigation and war, the results of the most profound and sublime searches of science, can never long flourish when knowledge is not ardently and boldly cultivated by many minds. A priesthood who claim exclusive control over the education of the laity, soon usurp a jurisdiction over sciences the most remote from their own peculiar province, and forbid their cultivation.

It is no wonder that no mathematician should have arisen in Spain, after the fate which Galileo experienced from the Inquisition in Italy. Spain had not, and still wants engineers, because she had no mathematician; and she had no mathematician because she had an Inquisition. She could not profit by the discoveries of foreign nations in the arts and sciences, because the Inquisition and Index Expurgatorius excluded all literature that did not recognise the infallible right of Rome and her priests to dogmatize on all branches of human learning and knowledge.

The void created by the expulsion of the Jews and the Moriscoes might have been supplied by the natural progress of population; but what could revive the spirit, the curiosity, the sense of security, the ardour of mental enterprise, which had been extinguished by the example of their expulsion? To give the Church of Spain and its priests entire and complete control, the mind of the people was emasculated; and the government which, at their instance, made the exercise of the understanding penal, soon found itself without statesmen, without officers, and without seamen, and fell into that state of wretched debility which is but a just retribution for its cowardly intolerance.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE TRIAL OF SIGNOR AMEDEO BERT, VAUDOIS PASTOR OF TURIN.

[Translated from the original Italian.]

He was summoned by the editor of a paper called the *Ultramontana* (which is considered to be the organ of the Jesuits), on account of an article he had written in another paper, answering a calumnious attack upon the Protestant faith.

On Saturday (10th July, 1852), I was conducted to the Audience-hall of the tribunal, and made to seat myself on a bench which had been occupied a few minutes before by five or six felons, who had received condemnation, and were led away by the carbineers as I entered. I remained for five hours, upon this seat of the guilty.

My article was immediately read aloud, in which, after giving a sketch of the Lutheran reformation, I said—

"From that epoch the Protestant worship was received by many people who were wearied with the ceremonial and spiritual yoke of Roman Catholicism, and eager for a religion not of human policy or corrupt and false doctrine, but of the pure and divine religion of the Gospel. Hence it is that millions of Protestants are found in the world—and with them progress and civilization in the highest degree. And the reformation of the sixteenth century would certainly have made still further conquests (since its object was only to free men from the yoke of superstition, and to conduct them to religious liberty), but for the obstacles of imperial absolutism, the Inquisition, and the order of Jesuits. So powerful were these obstacles that, after the first part of that century in which so many abandoned Romanism, the religious movement stopped, and, except a few individual conversions, Rome retained all the nations which had not already deserted her. The number of Protestants did not materially increase. The truth, therefore, did not make progress, nor did liberty and civilization; for political institutions cannot improve, in any important degree, till both the people and their rulers understand their true interests—till, in short, the principle is everywhere recognised that religion is a thing of conscience, and not to be interfered with by governors, except so far as to preserve public order.

"We must confess, however, that the ignorance and coarse-mindedness of the people in general serve to instigate their spiritual rulers to keep them in religious slavery, so that they—innocent and imbecile instruments of the pride, avarice, and other passions of those rulers—bind chains round themselves, and, instead of seeking to enjoy the inestimable blessings of religious liberty, and a faith of their own, they prefer believing without reflection whatever they are told.

"It is also true that, in the present state of Europe, many nations are (apparently) unable to do without a religion of pomp and ceremonies, and that, according to the opinion of many, if they should lose such a religion, they would fall into infidelity, being unfit to raise themselves to a purer and more spiritual faith.

"But have Protestants a different disposition from Roman Catholics? Are not all men brethren? Was not the Gospel, in its most spiritual form, adapted in the earlier ages to both east and west? Surely, then, what is good for one nation is good for another. Therefore, the spiritual Christianity which Protestants now profess may become the religion of the Italians, since they have no less natural inclination for the truth than any other nation. The Gospel is Catholic, is universal: let it then be Catholic for all people."

This extract finished, the criminal counsel accused me—

1st. Of having excited contempt for the religion of the State, by saying "that the people were wearied with the ceremonial and spiritual yoke of Roman Catholicism, and eager for a religion not of human policy, and corrupt and false doctrines."

2ndly. Of having said "that the Roman Catholic religion was opposed to civilization, saying that in the present state of Europe," &c.

3rdly. Of having proclaimed it "a religion of ignorance," saying that "a spiritual Christianity might become the religion of the Italians."

Having made numerous digressions upon the lights and influence of Catholicism, and the respect due to it, he concluded by urging that I should be condemned to two months' imprisonment, and a fine of four hundred livres. The President then asked if I had anything to say in my defence.

I rose and said—That I had chosen an advocate to defend me legally; I had, therefore, nothing to say, except that I had been aimed at by the ultra-Catholic journals, in the falsest accusations, which pointed me out as a rationalist, a man without religion, &c.; so that it might well be said—"If such be the shepherd, what must be the sheep?" That I paid no attention to all this as long as I was alone in the cause, knowing that a public man cannot satisfy all, and that his duty is simply to continue in the way of conscience and loyalty. But when his religion is attacked—when the morality of his flock is called in question—then he ought no longer to be silent; silence becomes a crime. Wherefore, after six or seven months of abuse and vituperation against us, I took my pen to enlighten the public, whose business it was to pronounce judgment. One thing was certain, that as soon as the Vaudois were authorised by the government to erect their church in Turin, a torrent of insult and calumny was poured forth against them by the journals of the ultra-Romanists, and that I was bound to reply, not with a view of irritating them, or throwing contempt on their religion, but merely to neutralize the injurious effect which might result from so much abuse of us. We, the Waldenses, were citizens of the State; our worship was not only *tolerated* but *protected*, and we had a *right* to be respected.

For the rest, I was, indeed, convinced of the truth of my religion, but without intolerance; my writings and sermons, and even the accused article, breathed a spirit of charity, and recommended Christians, of various persuasions, to have no strife but in love, knowledge, and good works. That I did not believe that any magistrate could really condemn me; but I was ready to submit respectfully to any penalty it might be thought needful to inflict, for as the Waldense ministers are bound to preach obedience to the law, so they ought to set the example of it; and if they have transgressed, it is just they should be punished.

The Advocate Jecchio, minister of public works, and my counsel, now spoke:—

He observed—First, that the Waldenses have a right to a church in Turin for public worship, which had been authorized by the ministry alone, without a meeting of the Chambers. That, if public worship is sanctioned, it follows that it is both a right and a duty for the pastors to spread their faith both orally and in writings, and to combat contrary opinions; this does not involve a *scandal* against the State religion. That no attack against it had been made by Signor Bert, and nothing even said which could be subversive of the decisions of the Council of Trent.

That, on the other hand, the Romanist journals had put forth the most scurrilous abuse of Protestantism, and it was the duty of Signor Bert, both as a Protestant and as a pastor, to repel attacks which came even from the bishops of the State.

He then proceeded to read some extracts from the journals in question:—

The *Armonia* journal expressed itself thus, in the number for the 22nd of August, 1851:—

"The Protestants, then, will have their temple at Turin, and there all that is perverted in the capital will congregate, to hear preaching in which will be propounded all that is most poisonous against Catholicism."

"What is the Protestant religion but the fruit of northern sophisms, the worship of audacity and lasciviousness, which spring up amongst the Germans?"

"A Protestant temple at Turin: this is to call the stranger amongst us—to call down the refuse and scandal of Germany; it is to throw open our State to barbarian and intolerant sects, to degrade the dynasty of Savoy, whose highest merit it is to have combatted these barbarian and ruinous doctrines. It is, in short, an insult to our statutes, to Italy, to our King."

In the number for the 28th of February, 1852, are found these expressions:—

"The Protestant religion only aims to persecute and kill whatever does not follow it. If any Protestant is merciful, this is not the fruit of Protestant doctrines, but of a mind naturally disposed to good, and formed by study and education; or, more frequently, it is the result of fear; they dare not put forth in all their fulness the doctrines which are brooding in their hearts, until they feel themselves strong enough to defend by force of arms what their pen expresses."

Nearly at the same time the *Echo of Mont Blanc* expresses itself as follows:—

"The erection of a Waldense Church, at Turin, is an intrigue prepared, not with the view of raising up a place of prayer and religious instruction, but to create a focus for disorder and demoralization."

"The only dogma of the Protestants is, to kill the Pope and the King."

"The Piedmontese people do not deserve such an insult as that of allowing Protestantism to exist at their side." "Wherever it (Protestantism) penetrates, all it does is to spread ruin and bloodshed over the country." "To admit Protestantism is to approve the preaching of every kind of folly, disgraceful wickedness, and monstrosity."

The *Catholico* of Genoa says, amongst other things, that

"The government, in authorizing the erection of the Waldense temple at Turin, contaminated the capital with that abominable opprobrious worship."

And, finally, passing over much more abuse and continued revilings, this is the manner in which the Lord Bishops of the State, in their protest to his Majesty against the erection of the new temple at Turin, have expressed themselves on the subject of the Waldense religion—

"Vanity, ignorance, love of novelty, and immorality, have availed themselves of the erection of the temple to scandalize good Catholics, to spread everywhere indifference on religious matters, and conduct the people by little and little to Atheism, the final, necessary, and fatal consequence of the spirit and mind of Protestantism."

The Advocate then proceeded to observe that M. Bert, in the accused article, had, indeed, narrated the corruption, the ignorance, and the abuses of the Romish religion, and especially in the times of Luther, on the occasion of the sale of indulgences; but these are things of public notoriety, and Signor Bert was not guilty in saying what every one knows. Not that the Christian religion—the infallible Word of God—can *itself* be corrupted; but fallible men ruin and corrupt, in their speeches and writings, even the religion of the Lord.

That, finally, Signor Bert is well known for his moderation and tolerance—which is shown even in the article in question. He then demanded that I should be acquitted free of all cost; but the tribunal, before deciding on my case, determined to consider the cause of the editor of the journal, who had inserted an article in the same number of the "Progresso," written by a so-called *Ugo Belfiore*, on Roman Catholic prayers, images, and worship of the saints; for which he, like me, was prosecuted.

In fact, this Ugo Belfiore (an Italian and Roman Catholic emigrant) had unmasked, with much spirit, first, the absurdity of prayer in a language not understood by the people; secondly, the impiety of worshipping the saints, which is only the old Pagan folly restored, under another name, in Romanism; thirdly and finally, the gross superstition with which God is represented by images, while a worship is paid to the images themselves, as if there was something Divine and adorable in them.

The counsel for the editor then proceeded to speak. He first dwelt on the injustice of having waited eight months before proceeding to the public prosecution of the two cases; for such productions are good or bad according to the tide of public opinion at the moment. These two articles, which might be acquitted eight months ago, *because they were conformable to the then state of public opinion*, might now be condemned, merely because that public opinion had somewhat changed.

Secondly, For the rest, nothing had been written inconsistent with the respect due to the State religion; for even the Council of Trent had declared that the Church might substitute the vulgar tongue for Latin in prayers and preaching, if it seemed to her a good and desirable thing.

Thirdly, As to the worship of saints, the Council of Trent willed that men should have recourse directly to God, in the name of Jesus Christ, as a just and Christian practice; for God is not like the princes of this world, who have representatives through whom access to them is obtained. Many abuses on this point prevailed, and Belfiore had pointed out some of them; but the Council of Trent had exhorted men to destroy abuses, and had also commanded that no images should be made of the Most High, and no superstitious veneration paid to any, as if they had any virtue in themselves. Belfiore was, then, in accordance with the real desire of the Church of Rome.

The counsel then demanded, as Jecchio had done, that his client should be acquitted.

At the end of half an hour, the following sentence was pronounced by the tribunal:—

"Whereas, though in the article, entitled 'Is the new Waldense Temple a School of Immorality?' some strong expressions may be found, it appears that the author was excited to them by the *outrages* poured forth by the press against the Protestant religion—of which he is the pastor—in this capital; but no expressions can be found which contain any direct or indirect attack on the religion of the State; and with regard to the article, entitled 'Prayer according to the Romish Church,' although it is innocent of the imputed crime (of aggression against the State religion), still the offensive comparison between our religion and that of the pagans, and the degrading remarks on some of the saints, are likely to occasion scandal,

"Therefore, the Pastor Amadeo Bert and the Editor (the Advocate Grassi) are declared not guilty of the imputed scandal, and acquitted, free of cost; but the editor (in consideration of the offensive words in the said article [*Belfiore's*]) is condemned to five days' arrest and fifty-one lire fine."

I consider that the cause of liberty of conscience has thus gained an important victory. If we had written these articles in Naples, Rome, or Tuscany, we should have been sent to the galleys. . . . . The five hours I spent at the bar of the accused were, for me, five hours of real happiness. I thank the Lord for it, with all my heart; and hope I may ever be enabled to defend our cause, in Piedmont, with moderation, truthfulness, and freedom, and be ready to suffer any penalty, if I can but be favoured to promote, more and more, the sacred cause of civilization through the Gospel.

THE ELECTIONS—A DIALOGUE.

John.—Tom, did you give your vote for Father M—— at the election?

Tom.—I don't quite understand what you mean, John; surely the priest did not stand for the county?

John.—No, Tom, I did not mean that; but did you not hear that Father M—— told us all, the Sunday before the election, that we were to vote for him, and for God, and for our holy religion; and that if we did not, we should be despised and shunned in this world, and eternally miserable in the next? and said that he would not give the rites of the Church, when they were dying, to any that voted against his man; and, after mass, he said—Let those that intend to vote for ——— and heaven, go to the right, and those that are going to vote for ——— and hell, go to the left; and afterwards sent men round to all the boys' houses, to tell us not to dare to vote for any one but Mr. ———; and the men told us that we might look sharp if we voted any way but the way he wished; for, if we did, we had better not show our faces in the market at C——, and, coming winter, perhaps, our corn and hay would be burned, and, maybe, our houses too; and you know they smashed the windows of two or three that they were in

doubt of, by way of earnest as to what they would get. You were a bold man, if you set Father M—— at defiance after such warnings as them!

Tom.—And yet, John, they call this *freedom* of election and *independence* of votera. Did you see the address that the priest's man stuck up on the chapel gate? What was the heading of it?

John.—Why, I think it was—"To the *Independent* Electors," &c.

Tom.—Just so. But it is a queer kind of independence, to have our windows smashed, our stacks set on fire, afeard to show our face in the markets or fairs, hunted in this world, and damned in the next, unless we do as the priest orders; *you* don't call this freedom and independence, do you, John?

John.—Why, not exactly; but, then, surely the priest must know who is the best man.

Tom.—Why must he? What is the use of parliament giving us a right to vote, if we dare not give it to whom we like? The parliament had better at once have given all the poor people's votes to the priest, if they can ruin a man in this world and send his soul to hell in the next, for exercising his right to vote as he wishes himself.

John.—Well, Tom, there seems some truth in what you say; it does seem very strange that a man should be damned for voting for this man or that.

Tom.—Why, John, to tell the truth, my notion is, that these so-called liberal men are always the greatest tyrants. The priests get men returned that will play their game. It's little such priests care about the souls of their flocks, as they call them, or about their religion either, I'm thinking; it is their own interests they look to; they make the members that they have sent to parliament vote as they please; I hear tell that they are called the Pope's Band, or Priests' Brigade—they get acts passed which seem to give power to us, poor people, but it is because they think that they can drive us like a flock of sheep to the hustings to vote as they please.

John.—Well, Tom, there's no denying what you say. Very little, I believe, they do care for us, except for what they make by us; but what can we do? We never could stand the country, if we went against them; they would make it too hot for us.

Tom.—That wouldn't be, John, if every one had the courage to give the priest his mind, the way Ned C—— did. Do you remember what Ned C—— said when the priest told him he *must* vote for his candidate?

John.—I do, well. He said he would vote for whom he pleased, that the law gave him his vote to use as he liked, and that if his reverence would mind his *religion* more, and *politics* less, it would be better for himself and the country.

Tom.—And what did the priest say?

John.—What could he say, when it was the truth? He turned it off and said that it was his *religion* that he was *asking* the vote for; and seeing he could get no good of Ned, he went off to bully some one else.

Tom.—Now, John, let me ask you this question, What is the charge that the priest brings so often against the Protestant religion?

John.—That it depends on Acts of Parliament; or, as he says, it is "the Parliament religion."

Tom.—Well, now, and what does our own depend upon? If you do not vote so as to get a man in, that you do not know, and don't care for, you are to be ruined in this world, and damned in the next; is this religion? Do you call it religion, to make the eternal salvation of a man's soul depend upon giving a vote this way or that? Do not let us talk about the Protestant religion depending upon acts of parliament. No Protestant minister ever said that a man would be damned if he gave his vote to this man or that. Now, John, you have told me what the priest said at the chapel: you have told me that he said that our religion depended upon members of parliament; that men should have their houses in flames in this world and their souls in flames in the next, if they did not vote with him; now, let me tell you what the Scripture reader said to me the other day. We talk very friendly together, though I call myself a Catholic. I said to him—Well, Mr. ——, how will the election go? Well, Tom, he replied, I hardly know; I hope, however, that our Heavenly Father will so order things that peace may be preserved, and that such measures may be passed as will insure the happiness and welfare of our country; my prayer is—"That God may so order the course of this world by his governance, that his Church and people may be able to serve him in all godly quietness."

"Why," said I, "you seem to care very little about the election."

"No, Tom, you are mistaken," says he, "I care about everything that may bring happiness or misery to our country; and I hope the providence of God may so order it, that those who are sent to parliament may legislate for the honour and happiness of our Sovereign and our country."

"I wish, Mr. ——," said I, "that our priest took things as quietly; he says that our religion depends upon the election and the parliament."

At that he smiled and said—"And I begin to think he's right, Tom. The religion of the Church of Rome is the religion 'of this world.'—John xviii. 36. It seems it must be maintained by violence, falsehood, fire, and sword. The priests feel this, and therefore they are stirring themselves so in this election. The weapons of the Church of Rome seem to be curses, threats, sticks, and stones. The weapons of our religion are the truths, and arguments of Scripture.—2 Cor. x. 4. Our religion—that is, the religion of the Gospel—is not 'of this world.' It does not depend upon such things as an election. It does not depend upon Acts of Parliament. It depends upon the Gospel of Christ, and therefore we can afford to be more quiet on such occasions. But as you have said so much of the election that the priests are so violent about, I will tell you of one kind of election that I feel very anxious about. The election which the priest seeks to carry will soon be over, and priests, candidates, and voters will soon be removed to another world, to give an account of all they have done in this. But the election which I am so anxious about, is one which our religion does really depend upon."

"Pray, Mr. ——," said I, "what election is that?"

"It is, Tom, the 'election of God.' God sent his only beloved Son into the world that men might be saved; my business is to proclaim this blessed truth, to persuade men to embrace the Gospel. I cannot *make* them do so—that is out of my power—God alone can do that; God, the Holy Ghost, can alone lead men's hearts to embrace the Gospel. 'No man can come to the Son except the Father draw him.'—John vi. 44. To elect is to choose, and the Father hath chosen those whom he leads by his Spirit to believe on his beloved Son, that they may be saved. This is the election on which real happiness in this world and in the next depends. My business is to try and persuade men to embrace the offer of God's mercy in Christ. If I succeed in this, and that I see them living by the rule of the Gospel, loving God and man—'bringing forth the fruits of righteousness, which are by Jesus Christ, to the praise and glory of God'—then I hope I have evidence that God hath chosen them unto eternal life. When I see a man giving evidence of a 'work of faith, and labour of love, and patience of hope in our Lord Jesus Christ, in the sight of God and our Father' (1 Thess. i. 3-4), then I can say, as St. Paul does, that 'I know his *election of God*,' because the Gospel has come to such 'not in word only but in power, and in the Holy Ghost.' This, Tom, is the election that I feel interested about. Have you any interest in this election?"

"I do not know, sir," said I; "I never so much as heard of it before. It is little that the priests care about this sort of election; but I see it's more concern to us than elections for the county."

"Yes, Tom, it is of *very* great importance," said he. "It is all very well to revile the Protestant religion; but I would ask you as a sensible man, to tell me, which religion seems to you to be most according to truth, and most agreeable to the character of a Holy God? The religion which is dependant upon a vote for a member of Parliament; the religion that would send a man to hell if he did not vote as his priests wished; or the religion which, while it would thankfully accept the outward peace which good government gives, declares that its business is to lead souls to God, to fit them for heaven, and to labour to produce in them that faith and those good works which give good evidence that they have the 'election of God.' Which election do you think concerns the honour of Christ and the safety of our souls the most—the election for the county or the election of God? And which do you find the priests of the Church of Rome most anxious about?"

Mr. —— and I then parted; but, to tell you the truth, John, I could not get what he said out of my head. I think there is a deal in it, and don't know what to think of our religion. There is so much violence, lying, threatening, and cursing, that it does not seem like the religion of the Lord Jesus, which proclaimed—"Glory to God in the highest, on earth peace, good will towards men." I really do not know what to think; what do you say, John?

John.—Why, Tom, I say nothing, but I have my thoughts about it as well as you; and so they parted.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We have received Mr. Aylmer's letter, which shall be inserted in our next.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville st.

No anonymous letter can be attended to. Whatever is sent for insertion must be authenticated by the name ond address of the writer, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee for his good faith.

Subscriptions are earnestly solicited, which our friends will observe are payable in advance. The amount may be forwarded either in postage stamps or a Post-office order, payable to Mr. Wm. Curry, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal, which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, AUGUST, 1852.

THE IRISH ELECTIONS.

IT is not our habit to engage in party politics, and it is not our intention to do so now. Advocates as we are of civil and religious liberty in the truest sense, we disclaim all desire to influence other men's actions, except by setting before them principles which they themselves may think fit to govern their conduct.

We write of the late elections in Ireland, not for the purpose of personal or individual censure, but to induce our brother Catholic laymen calmly to consider the principles on which many of those elections have been conducted, and to judge for themselves whether those principles be suitable for a free state and a Christian people. It is the principles we seek to discuss, and we use the facts only to show what the principles are.

The most striking fact in the Irish elections has been the manner in which the Roman Catholic clergy have interposed to control the choice of the electors. We feel that little proof of the fact is required, as most of our readers must be well aware of it from their own observations.

The Roman Catholic clergy have claimed for themselves the right of choosing the representatives, wherever they had any chance of being able to effect it by any means.

It would be ridiculous to give long proofs of so notorious a fact; so we give but a few—"Meath, *in her priesthood*, sat in calm council, and selected as her representative," &c. (letter of the Rev. Mr. Kelsh, a priest in Meath—*Tablet Newspaper*, July 31). Here it was the priests *only* who met to choose the representative; and "Meath" is said to have made the choice, as if it were the exclusive right of the priests to act for Meath, the laity having nothing to do but to obey, and, therefore, not being consulted in the matter. And accordingly we find Mr. Lucas and Mr. Corbally both acknowledging the power by which they were returned in the following words:—

"For sending him (Mr. Lucas) to parliament, *the bishop and clergy of Meath* deserve and enjoy the gratitude of the Catholics of the empire."—*Tablet*, August 7.

"The number of votes recorded in his (Mr. Corbally's) favour amounted nearly to two thousand, *and for those he was indebted to the bishop and the Catholic clergy.* . . . . . If it had not been for the clergy HE WOULD HAVE BEEN BEATEN."—Speech at Meath election, *Tablet*, July 31.

Take again the great County of Tipperary:—

"It is well known that it is the priests of Tipperary, *and the priests alone*, who can and will gain a triumph over the enemies of freedom, *in this great county*, at the coming election."—*Tablet*.

And Archbishop M'Hale, at the Galway election, expressly recognises and approves of it—

"No doubt the clergy of Ireland are very much responsible for their share in the result of the contests now waging though the land."—*Tablet*, July 24.

The means taken to carry into effect such elections are equally notorious. The priests having made their choice, were prepared to maintain that their choice was the choice of God, and that it was an offence against God to vote against their men.

We give one or two instances at random of the manner in which the priests have used their spiritual powers to force their candidates on electors.

An influential priest at Tralee is reported to have said:—

"Let me suppose one of THESE WRETCHES (those who would not vote as he bid them) prostrated by sickness—suppose the hand of death heavy upon him, and

a messenger come to me to attend him in his dying moments. If there were no other priest in the way I would be bound to go. I dare not refuse to attend. But I confess *I would be sorry in my heart* to be called on to attend the death-bed of such a being. . . . . *I could have no hope of converting a heart so hardened, so lost to every sense of duty and religion, as to vote in support of those who would trample on the Lord of Hosts.*"

We have no doubt that Father M—— would attend, with the usual alacrity of a Christian minister, at the death of any person guilty of *any other sin*, and would not be without hope of converting him. Such dreadful sentences are reserved for political disobedience to the priests at elections.

In the town of Westport the following placard was carried in a procession at which many priests were present :—

"Whoever votes for a supporter of Lord Derby's government votes for the massacre of his countrymen, *the violation of the house of God*, AND THE POLLUTION OF THE BODY AND BLOOD OF HIS REDEEMER."

We should not quote such placards as the work of priests, were they not countenanced by the highest authority. At the Galway election Archbishop M'Hale spoke as follows :—

"If you wish that your chapels should be wrecked, that your priests should be flung into prison, that THE GOD OF HEAVEN, under the form of bread and wine, should be exposed to blasphemous insult, as he was on a late occasion, you will support Lord Derby's government."

Of course all this refers to the party fight at Stockport. Lord Derby is accused of getting up that fight. It is an old and a good rule, that when any persons are suspected of having wilfully contrived a wicked action, it should be considered *who could profit by that act, and who has taken advantage of it.* Those are the persons most likely to have instigated it ; and not the persons whose interests it was most likely to injure. Now, mark this ; scarcely a priest who spoke at the late elections but brought forward this party fight as the most effectual thing to support his cause. Not one supporter of Lord Derby's government did so. We challenge attention to this. Every one said that this occurrence was the *most injurious thing that could have happened* for Lord Derby—that it was just the thing to give a handle to his enemies, and to do him no good. By every rule of common sense, if any one was to be suspected of getting it up, or instigating it, it was those who have been so industrious in using it as their chief instrument in carrying out their views at the elections. For ourselves, we think the angry passions of ignorant men are the proper explanation of such scenes ; and we make no doubt that the guilty on both sides will be impartially punished by the law. In the meantime the occurrence has been made use of by the priests as a handle for putting forward all their spiritual power for controlling men's political conduct.

"For such a one and God ;" or, "for such another and the devil," were cries too well known at these elections to need our giving instances here. Nor can any one doubt by whom these cries were raised.

But it was not spiritual terrors alone which the priests sought to make use of. The priest above referred to also said, at Tralee—

"If there be a Catholic elector in this borough, who *will dare to go forward and register his vote for the enemy*, pass him by with scorn and contempt. Let him fester in his corruption. . . . . *Assemble in a body to-morrow*, go to those unfortunate wretches, *and make them acquainted with the consequences of their guilt.*"

Our readers need not be told that the "consequences" which a Roman Catholic elector would be led to expect from a visit of an infuriated rabble, thus urged on by a priest, would be gross insult, personal danger, loss of business, or employment, or livelihood. An election mob is not sent to a man's dwelling to preach to him, but to put him in terror of his life and property. We might easily multiply instances of this, but let the following description of the duties of a priest at the elections suffice. It is taken from a letter published by Mr. Lucas in the *Tablet*, of July 10, page 437, column 3 ; and no one knows better the duties of a priest, on such occasions, than Mr. Lucas, the member for Meath :—

"The priest will have not only to exhort, and entreat, *and* COMMAND *his people* to vote for the POPULAR candidates, but he must bring the voters together, and go with them to the polling places, and watch over them at the tally-rooms *like a sentinel* (why not 'collar them like a bailiff?'). . . . . The priest *must be* THE CUTTER AGENT !!"

We should hardly believe this either if we did not find it in the *Tablet*. But without this they could not have succeeded.

Our readers are no doubt familiar with the odious cry of "Orange Catholic," which, in many places, has been set agoing by the priests themselves. It is no light thing in Ireland to be held up to the people as a traitor of the vilest description. Such a cry is more likely to put a man in fear of his life, than to convince his conscience.

On the *means* which have been thus used, we have but one observation to make here. If the priests *believed* that the Roman Catholic laity were really willing to be guided by them, the priests would never use such arguments as these. To those who were ready to be guided by priestly advice at elections, the priests would give *advice only*, and would give it in the most agreeable manner. When a priest uses *spiritual terror* to make electors vote as he wishes, that priest feels and knows that *nothing less* than spiritual terrors will make the elector vote in the way required. When the priest calls in the aid of a mob, and uses the fear of insult and ruin to make men vote as he wishes, then that priest knows that *even his spiritual terrors* will not be enough. Let those who have suffered under this treatment take comfort from this. Priests have used such weapons only from a despairing feeling of their own decaying influence and power. The extent to which the priests have used such weapons, shows how many of the Roman Catholic laity are ready to assert their political freedom. Such weapons may obtain a seeming victory for a time, but in reality they hasten the advance of freedom.

The extent to which the priests have endeavoured to be masters of this election, may be partly judged of from the number of cases in which priests have come forward on the hustings as proposers or seconders of candidates. The following list may give some idea of it :—

List of Roman Catholic Priests, proposers, seconders, or CANDIDATES (!) *at the late elections.*

Rev. Dr. Walsh	... Carlow Borough.
Rev. P. Daly	... Galway Borough.
Very Rev. Dr. Burke	... Clonmel Borough.
Rev. Mr. Corcoran	... Cork County.
Rev. D. O'Rafferty	King's County.
Rev. William O'Malley	
Rev. D. Burke	Tipperary County.
Rev. J. Morris	
Rev. Mr. Laffan	
Rev. Mr. Flynn	... Waterford County.
Very Rev. Dean Dawson	... Leitrim County.
Rev. Mr. Lalor	... Carlow County.
Rev. Mr. Kelly	Meath County.
Rev. Mr. Power	
Rev. Mr. Ennis	
Rev. Mr. Fitzpatrick	... Queen's County.
Very Rev. Dean Burke	Mayo.
Archdeacon M'Hale	
Rev. Mr. Egan	
Rev. Mr. Hickey	
Archdeacon Fitzgerald	Limerick County.
Rev. Mr. M'Quaid	
Rev. Mr. Dowling	
Rev. Mr. Coghlan	Westmeath County.
Rev. J. Redmond	
Rev. P. Devereux	Wexford County.
Rev. J. Macklin	... Galway County.
Rev. Wm. Lynch	Clare County.
Rev. Mr. M'Quaid	
Rev. P. Brennan	... Monaghan County.
Rev. M. Keeffe	Kilkenny County.
Rev. Mr. Aylward	
Rev. J. Brahan	... Limerick City.
Rev. E. M'Gaver	... Longford County.
Rev. D. Noone	... Sligo County.
Rev. Mr. Barmon	Louth County.
Rev. Mr. Loughran	
Rev. Mr. Trainor	
Rev. Pat Crane	
Rev. Thomas Doyle	New Ross.
Rev. J. Crane	
Rev. John Reilly	... Athlone.
Rev. Dr. Kieran	... Dundalk.
Rev. Dr. M'Ennery	... Kerry County.
Rev. John Falvey	... Cork City.

And that the highest sanction should not be wanting, Archbishop M'Hale himself proposed candidates at two county elections—Galway and Mayo. This list is taken from the *Tablet* newspaper. It is not complete, because in uncontested elections the proposers and seconders are often not recorded ; and in several such cases priests did probably come forward. Yet it shows *forty-seven* instances ; and if complete, the number would probably much exceed *fifty*. We believe this could not be paralleled in the history of any former election in Ireland. The number of priests who were speakers at election meetings is past calculation. In Meath, for instance, the priests seem to have been the only persons who had the privilege of speaking on such occasions. No respectable Roman Catholic in the county would do the work.

Of the exertions of the priests in the polling booths, on the roads, and in the streets, in forcibly dragging electors in the opposite direction to that in which they would have gone, if left to themselves, we need say nothing, as our readers must have seen it themselves.

Where such scenes did not take place at elections, the reason will be found rather in the circumstances of the place than in the character of the men. Whenever it *could be* attempted it *has been* attempted, and in every case to the full extent to which it could safely be carried ; wherever it was *not* tried, it was evidently impossible to try it. The writer of this has, with regret, seen those whom he was accustomed to look on as the most respectable members of the priesthood, taking as violent a part as the most violent.

The number of Englishmen whom the priests have returned for Ireland (and that too, in places where Irish Roman Catholics of distinguished sincerity and ability sought the representation), is a fact which should not be overlooked. Observe the following instance from the speech of Dr. Kieran, at the Dundalk election (*Tablet*, July 17, p. 463, col. 3) :—

"The very reverend gentleman then referred to the candidature of Mr. Gartlan *upon whose talents and character he passed a high eulogy*, and appealed to him *to retire and make way* for Mr. Bowyer."

And for what reason ?

"That gentleman," continued Dr. Kieran, "*although an Englishman*, had been *recommended by the highest ecclesiastical authority* in England and Ireland."

Meaning, of course, the English Cardinal Wiseman. This was the sole ground. Mr. Bowyer was first appointed member for Dundalk, by Cardinal Wiseman, and Mr. Gartlan, the Irish solicitor, who defended O'Connell in the state trials, although he had publicly pledged himself to go to the poll in spite of all opposition, dared not to do so before an *Irish* constituency, because the *English* Cardinal had forbidden it !!

We have often warned the laity that Drs. Cullen and Wiseman have instructions from the Pope to use every means to break down the spirit of Irish nationality, and bring it into total subjection to Rome ; and here we have a striking proof of the truth of our warning.

On the whole, who can fail to see that a desperate effort is being made, on the part of the priesthood, to choose the representation of Ireland themselves, and to leave nothing but obedience and submission to the laity ?

And for what purpose is this done ? Some men seek to be returned to parliament from mere

vanity. *It is not from this motive* that the priests seek to return our members; they are too wise, and too well directed by their superiors, to pay such a price as this election has cost them for the mere vanity of showing their influence.

Only consider what it has cost them—in Meath, for instance. It is well known that the Roman Catholic Bishop of Meath, in speaking of the duty of electors, at a public dinner, in the town of Oldcastle, was told by a Roman Catholic gentleman, of station and influence, "that if that was the gospel that his lordship preached, the sooner they heard another gospel the better." And when that gentleman retired from the table, several others rose up, and followed him. It is well known that another Roman Catholic gentleman has said, that the expression "surpliced ruffians" was coming true! It is well known that, in the Chapel of Athboy, on Sunday, July 24th, when the priest preached on those who dared to vote for Grattan, five or six Roman Catholics, distinguished for their birth, their intelligence, or their influence, rose up, and left the chapel, and have said that they would not return to it. It is well known that *all* the influential Roman Catholics of Meath, and a great body of the middle class, are indignant and disgusted at the interference of the priests at that election.

This was too high a price to pay for mere vanity, and it was not for mere vanity that it was incurred. The state of Europe tells the object; the priesthood are everywhere grasping at political power, as their last resource. The Pope is kept upon his throne by foreign politics and foreign bayonets, and the Jesuits are everywhere striving for political power. It is so in Ireland, too. If the priesthood can return their own members, they become a political power in the country; and they feel that in their present critical position, the most desperate efforts must be made, the greatest dangers must be risked to accomplish this last hope against an impending fall.

This is the great fact of the Irish elections, and we ask "Catholic laymen" to consider the principle it involves.

On that night when our Blessed Lord was about to found his kingdom in his own blood, he had occasion to correct his apostles for coveting for themselves that kind of power which political rulers possess; and he said to them—"The kings of the Gentiles lord it over them; and they that have power over them are called beneficent, BUT YOU NOT SO."—Luke xxii. 25, Douay Bible. They were not to covet nor to possess the power of temporal or political rulers.

That same night when Pilate asked him about his kingdom, he answered—"My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world my servants would certainly strive, that I should not be delivered to the Jews, but now my kingdom is not from hence."—John xviii. 36. Political power is the power of the sword; because it rests upon the sword. In every country there are men who would overthrow the existing government of that country if they could, or if they dared. Any government that is not prepared to defend itself against such men by force will quickly perish. We happily do not *see this so plain* in England; but if we look over Europe, we see plainly that all political power depends on the sword for its support. But our Saviour says, there was to be nothing of the kind in his kingdom, because HIS KINGDOM IS NOT OF THIS WORLD. All political power exercised by Christ's ministers in that capacity, and by that title, is, therefore, at variance with the essential nature of Christ's kingdom upon earth.

We do not forget that clergymen are citizens too; and *in that capacity* may lawfully exercise their fair share of political power. Had the priests confined themselves to voting as electors—had they confined themselves to using such persuasion with other electors as their superior intelligence might give them, we should not have had one word to say against it. But when they claim to have a right *in the character of priests of Christ, by that title and in that capacity*, to overrule and govern the political conduct and political privileges of other men, then we say that, claiming to be priests of Christ, they are subverting the kingdom of Christ; they are confounding, and destroying, and denying its true and essential character; they are building up for themselves a kingdom of this world, which is not the kingdom of Christ; they thrust him from his kingly throne, to rule themselves in baser seats.

These directions of Christ concerning his kingdom may account for a fact which is proved by the experience of the world, however contrary it may be to any expectation which we might otherwise have formed—namely, that political power, in the hands of the ministers of Christ, has ever taken the form of the most oppressive and hopeless of human tyrannies. Men did, not unnaturally, expect that it would be otherwise. The world indulged a hope that they whose passions were regulated by a higher power, whose aims were directed to man's greatest good, whose minds were sanctified by a more immediate inspection of the Most High, would be more fit than any others to have the direction of this world, more likely to prove benefactors of mankind, than any others who could exercise authority upon them. And the expectation, perhaps, was natural. Yet it has ever been disappointed. We do not speak now only of the priests of Rome; we speak of the Primitive Church in its purest days, of the reformed Churches of all Protestant sects, heretical or not, and we affirm that the possession of political power, of the powers of this world, by any of them, has ever shown a constant tendency to degenerate rapidly into the worst form of tyranny.

We glory in the conviction that the Gospel has conferred the greatest political benefits on mankind. Even in our own days, we know that it has shown its mighty power in humanizing political institutions: it has abolished slavery in most Christian countries, and has well nigh abolished the slave trade from the face of the earth. But these things have ever been done when Christ's ministers assumed no political or earthly power to themselves.

Wherever they have sought to become what Christ warned them that they should not be—wherever they have attempted to turn his kingdom into a kingdom of this world—they have proved anything but benefactors to mankind.

We need look no farther for an instance than to Rome itself. *There* the experiment of Christ's ministers, assuming to themselves the temporal and political power, has had the fullest and the fairest trial, and the clearest result. The history of Rome, for centuries, has been, and now is at this day, one long-continued contest of tyranny on the one hand and rebellion on the other, which we ourselves have seen break out into the flames of civil war, and which we now see compressed by the most hateful tyranny that can oppress a nation—her own rulers supported by foreign bayonets, and resting upon them alone. But the Papal Government, being infallible, is beyond repentance; and instead of now providing a free government for her Roman subjects, is seeking to grasp in her own hand the political rule of all other countries; and hence the scenes that we have witnessed at our Irish elections.

There is no remedy for this, but that our countrymen should learn that Christ declared that his ministers should not be so—that his kingdom should not be of this world. Let us learn to believe in the kingdom of Christ, not merely as it shall be hereafter in the world to come, but as it now is in this present world. It is a kingdom that waxes strong, and confers blessings on man, by using no human powers, but trusting solely upon him who was its founder, and who alone can be its keeper and defence. But let it once stretch forth the arm of flesh for its own defence, and its inherent power is departed with its real character; then none but Christ himself can heal the wounds that arm of flesh inflicts; and we learn to curse the hand that dares to mix up what God has made distinct and separate.

In the spread of this true knowledge of the nature of Christ's kingdom upon earth, we place our only hope for the safety of our earthly kingdom. In proportion as the people learn this, the priests will have to acknowledge and submit to it in their conduct.

WE reprint the following able letter from the *Meath Herald*, as it seems to be written with a desire to avoid hurting the feelings of Roman Catholics, who are guiltless in the matter. We shall, of course, publish the answer when it appears.

TO THE RIGHT REVEREND DR. CANTWELL.

RIGHT REVEREND SIR—If a general election be often a time of passion and folly, it is often succeeded by a time of reflection and regret.

I have waited until the time of passion may be over, and the time of reflection come, to address you on an important question respecting the teaching of your church, that naturally arises out of the late election for Meath, and which now forces itself upon our notice.

It is not my intention to trouble you on the political view of the late election. Your own reflection, now that the heat of the contest is over, may lead you to doubt whether your victory be worth what it has cost.

It is true, the county of Meath is made for the present a close borough, to which you can nominate whom you please, however flagrantly your nominee may misrepresent the feelings of the county. Yet even such a power may be purchased too dearly.

If you reflect upon the feelings you have called forth in the minds of all the leading Roman Catholics of this county—Prestons, Barnwells, Husseys, Farrells, Cruises, Plunketts, Delanys, and a whole host of respectable Roman Catholic electors of the middle class—you may well say, "One more such victory, and I shall be undone!"

If you consider the lesson you have given to Protestants, that no services rendered to your church and cause can secure the gratitude of yourself and your clergy,

If you consider how you have divorced the cause of your church from all association with the names that shed a lustre upon Irish history,

If you consider what a wound you have inflicted upon the just national feelings of Irishmen in your election of a nominee to be forced upon this county,

If you consider the effect which the conduct of yourself and your brethren for the last two years has had upon English Roman Catholics, in making the Emancipation Act a nullity in England, Scotland, and Wales (from all which but one Roman Catholic has been returned), thus depriving them of their fair and just share in the representation of the country,

If, I say, you consider all this, in a time of solemn reflection, you may well doubt whether you have not paid too high a price for the privilege of returning, as member for Meath, a man who will be a mere cypher in parliament, powerless to redress the real grievances of the country, because no possible British minister will dare to accept his support—powerless to advance even the interests of your church, because his very presence in parliament will be the most fatal argument against it.

If you had witnessed the scenes that passed in Kells at this election—if you had seen the filthy and disgusting insults to which all respectable Roman Catholic voters were subjected—if you had seen the filthy treatment bestowed at his own door, on that Roman Catholic in Kells whose charity and exertions for our poor have been most admirable (Mr. Flood's political opinions and mine are sufficiently different to make this just testimony to his worth above all suspicion)—you would tremble to think how nearly the violation of political gratitude is connected with the extinction of all private gratitude, all social virtue, all sense of civil liberty, everything that makes a people worthy of respect or admiration.

If you had seen your priests, some acting as check clerks in public polling booths, some like constables or bailiffs in the streets, seizing by the collar Roman Catholic voters at the door of the tally-room which they wished to enter, and dragging them with violence through the street to the tally-room which they wished

to avoid, you would tremble to think how you had lessened the respect of the people for a sacred character and calling.

Or if you could now hear how every respectable Roman Catholic in Kells expresses his deep disgust at such doings, and such scenes, you would fear lest this desperate effort to over-ride everything good and honourable in the feelings of your own people, may not prove the last fatal blow to your political power. Be assured, Right Reverend Sir, that multitudes are now inquiring whether religious liberty can be really supported by a system of civil tyranny in the hands of spiritual men; multitudes are now inquiring why politics should not be left to the laity; and many Roman Catholics are considering whether the clergy, of all persuasions, should not be restrained by law from taking part in elections, except only by giving their own votes. It is not for me to interfere with the consideration which Roman Catholics around me are giving to this subject, except by venturing to offer the willing consent and support of the clergy of my own Church to such a law, as it may apply to ourselves.

But the political view of this election is not the chief subject of my present address to you. I had no political interest in this election. I gave my vote, against my own political feelings, only to manifest my sympathy with those independent Roman Catholic electors whose conduct commands the sympathy and respect of all honourable men.

The question arising out of this election, on which I now require you either to speak or to be silent, is the teaching of your church upon political obligations—the teaching of your church upon solemn oaths—whether you use them as instruments of fraud, or as pledges of integrity! whether you teach men to violate them or to observe them!

It is a question which it behoves the people of this empire to understand; it is a question which must mainly influence the now wavering judgment of your own people upon the merits of the teaching of your church; it is a question upon which your speaking or your silence will be equally instructive.

Let me now show you how this question arises.

There was an electioneering meeting held in Kells, on Sunday, June 13, to give Mr. Lucas an opportunity of stating the principles on which he sought to be member for Meath.

Mr. Lucas was introduced to the meeting by the Rev. N. M'Evoy (your representative in Kells) as "the tried and trusted advocate of *every principle* dear to the hearts of the entire prelacy and priesthood of the land." If the keeping of oaths was a principle dear to the prelacy and priesthood, of course Mr. Lucas would be an advocate of that principle. Mr. M'Evoy said further—"Let them but send to parliament fifty or even forty members pledged to oppose any and every government that will not make tenant right and the abolition of the Church establishment cabinet questions."

When Mr. Lucas spoke, he said "the next thing Father M'Evoy drew my attention to is the subject of the Established Church * * * By the blessing of God in heaven, I will never rest nor cease my exertions, as long as I am in any position to exercise any public functions whatever, until that accursed monopoly, the Established Church, BE CUT DOWN BY THE ROOT." And how this was to be done he explains further on; when speaking still of the same subject he says—"We must try to put your discontent into the form of an ACT OF PARLIAMENT; at least, we will have a good fight for it."

There is no mistake, Sir, about this, for it was published by Mr. Lucas himself, in his own paper, the *Tablet*, of June 21st. And you will not deny that Mr. Lucas goes to parliament, as member for Meath, pledged to use his vote and influence, as a member of parliament, for the total overthrow of the Established Church; and that this is one of the chief grounds upon which you and your priests have returned him. Of course, sir, you read the *Tablet*, and so you were well aware of all this. Your priests were well aware of this too, for I believe more than twenty of them were present and heard it; and one of them, the Rev. Mr. Kelly, of Kilskire, in speaking after Mr. Lucas, said "he believed, in his inmost soul, in the sincerity of his (Mr. Lucas's) promises, and his ability to carry them out." You yourself wrote a letter to Mr. Lucas two days after that speech was delivered (which letter is also published in the *Tablet* of June 21), in which you thus state your directions to your priests, "after maturely weighing the talents, HONESTY, and efficacy of the various candidates, ... It is I conceive the duty of the clergy to explain their views to the electors of their respective parishes," &c., and you express your own "cordial concurrence" in their choice of Mr. Lucas. It is, therefore, clear that you and they have chosen Mr. Lucas as member for Meath upon this, as one of the chief grounds of your choice, that he is prepared to vote in parliament for an act for the total abolition of the Irish Church establishment, and for the confiscation of its property; and so far from denying this, you and others will perhaps wonder why I take so much pains to prove so plain a fact.

Now mark what follows; you send him to parliament, with the declared object of doing this.

What is the next step?

On the first day on which Mr. Lucas presents himself to sit in the House of Commons, he is to take the oath on condition of which the Emancipation Act admits Roman Catholics to parliament, of which the following is a part—

"I DO SWEAR that I will defend to the utmost of my power the settlement of property within this realm as established by the laws; *and I do hereby* DISCLAIM, DISAVOW, AND ABJURE *any intention to subvert the present* CHURCH ESTABLISHMENT *as settled by law within this realm*: and I do solemnly swear, that I never will exercise any privilege to which I am or may become entitled, to disturb or weaken the Protestant religion or Protestant government in the United Kingdom; and I DO SOLEMNLY, IN THE PRESENCE OF GOD, profess, testify, and declare, that I do make this declaration and every part thereof in the plain and ordinary sense of the words of this oath, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatsoever; SO HELP ME GOD."

"By the blessing of God in heaven (says Mr. Lucas in Kells) I will never rest nor cease my exertions until the Established Church be cut down by the root, and we must put this in the form of an act of parliament."

"I do hereby disclaim, disavow, and ABJURE any intention to subvert the present Church establishment, as settled by law within this realm—SO HELP ME GOD." So SWEARS Mr. Lucas in parliament.

What follows next? Which is Mr. Lucas *to keep*—his *promise* to the priests in Meath, or his *oath* to God in parliament?

This, Right Reverend Sir, is the question which I put to you. Mr. Lucas's conscience is in the direction of you and your priests. You and your priests obtained this promise from him. You and your priests send him to parliament to take this oath. It rests with you, his spiritual guides, either to reconcile the promise and the oath, or to instruct him which he is to keep and which to violate.

What direction will you give him in the matter?

In a religious point of view the question you have to decide is no light one. "We who worship the one true and living God, to whom all things are known, who can neither deceive, nor be deceived; when we call HIM to witness the things which we assert or promise, with what zeal, with what religion, with what care ought we to look to it, that the oath which we give shall be holy and inviolable?" It is no light thing before God to make such an oath an instrument of fraud and deceit.

In a political point of view your decision on this question will also be of great importance; it is no light thing to disclose to your fellow-subjects in this empire, that no oath which you and your representatives can take can be any security for your good faith in what you swear.

You are also aware that an inquiry is pending into the doctrines which are taught to the Irish priests at Maynooth. You are aware that the books out of which they are taught in that college contain direct authorities for violating such oaths. You are aware that the defence which will be made for the college is this, that although this doctrine is contained in those books, yet the priests who are instructed out of those books do not adopt or practise this doctrine of violating oaths, or do not apply it to the oath in question. But if it should appear that the bishop and the priests of a whole diocess do sanction Mr. Lucas in violating this oath, and not only that, but send him to parliament pledged to them to violate it, what will this defence avail?

I enter on this subject with reluctance. You are aware that many Protestants consider the violation of oaths made to heretics to be a systematic part of the Roman religion. I have never treated it as such. I know, indeed, how far it is authorized in the books which are of greatest authority in your church. I know that it is THE LAW OF YOUR CHURCH that such oaths are to be violated. All this I know well. But I never could think of charging such a wicked doctrine on Roman Catholics in general, because I know many Roman Catholics who would scorn to adopt such a doctrine, even on the authority of their church. I cannot forget that Lord Fingal, Lord Arundel, and many other Roman Catholics, have declared that this oath is binding on their conscience, and have acted accordingly. Among the upper and middle classes of Roman Catholic electors in Meath, I am convinced that the great majority will be horrified at the thought of Mr. Lucas taking this oath FALSELY under the sanction of yourself and your priests.

Out of respect for them, I have heretofore avoided even discussing this subject. But I can do so no longer. You and your priests are, in fact, in sending Mr. Lucas to parliament, pledged to violate this oath; we are, therefore, forced to inquire whether you will now direct him to abandon this pledge or to violate this oath. We are forced to inquire whether it be indeed the doctrine of the Roman Catholic bishops and priests in Ireland that solemn oaths taken to those whom you call heretics are to be violated. If it shall appear that you do indeed adopt and sanction such a principle, it will be of practical importance to know it, for although nine-tenths of the Roman Catholics of Ireland will honestly disavow such a doctrine, yet you have showed us that you and your priests may yet be able to choose as representatives those few Roman Catholics who are willing to submit their consciences to the direction of priests in this matter.

What, then, are the directions which you are prepared to give to Mr. Lucas? Will you tell him that his pledge is impossible to be kept, and that he must abandon it? Or will you instruct him that it is lawful for him to swear that he has no intention of subverting the Established Church, in order that by taking that oath he may get into a position to subvert it with effect?

If you answer that you cannot and will not give so wicked an advice, I am ready to accept your answer with confidence, and will look for the result with interest in Mr. Lucas's conduct.

If you do not give this open answer (and any other open answer you surely will not venture to give), I can only gather your secret instructions to Mr. Lucas from the public law of your church.

I find it thus laid down in the canon law of the Church of Rome—"An oath taken contrary to the interests of the church does not bind;" and the reason is thus stated—"because those which are attempted contrary to the interests of the church, are not to be called oaths, but rather perjuries."—Decret. Greg. lx. liber ii. Tit. 24, ch. 27. Of course it is the interest of the Church of Rome that is here meant. And you would probably consider it contrary to the interest of the Church of Rome, that Roman Catholic members should swear in parliament that they will not subvert the present Church establishment. So you have the highest authority, even the law of your church, for saying that this oath does not bind.

But what is to be done with a person who takes an oath knowing that the thing which he swears is unlawful? The canon law seems to answer this too—"Juransscienter illicitum, non indiget absolutione, sed tenetur illud non observare;" "he who knowingly swears an unlawful thing does not lack absolution, but is bound not to observe it."—Chap. 18, same title. I suppose this cannot mean that taking an unlawful oath *does not need or require* absolution, but rather that the person who takes such an oath is not to be left without absolution, but is to be absolved, provided he promise not to be bound by the oath. Thus, although you consider the oath unlawful in itself, yet if Mr. Lucas *knowingly* takes such an oath, you are to give him absolution, *provided he will break it.*

This, Sir, appears to be the law of your church upon the subject, and when you send a man to parliament publicly pledged to violate the oath which he is to take there, we must presume, unless you disavow it, that you are prepared to act upon this law.

Let me here remind you that the question is not what is to be done by a man who has taken an unlawful oath, believing it to be lawful. There may be some very few cases, in which such an oath ought not to be kept, when a man discovers that that oath which he believed to be lawful and which he intended to keep at the time he took it, is indeed unlawful. But this is not Mr. Lucas's case. *He has not taken the oath yet.* He has time enough to consider, and you have time enough to instruct him, whether the oath is lawful or unlawful. If the oath be unlawful, or contrary to the interest of your church then your own canon law says it is *a perjury* TO TAKE *it;* but if it be lawful, then, when taken, it would be a perjury to break it. The question is, will you sanction his taking a wicked oath, an oath which your own law says it is a perjury to take—will you sanction his doing this as a means of deceiving heretics, and violating the solemn conditions of the Emancipation Act, or will you sanction his breaking a lawful oath?

If you will not do either the one or the other, I submit that you must instruct him that the pledge which he gave at the meeting at Kells is unlawful and cannot be kept.

If you should give him no direction on the subject, I submit that you are answerable for the sin of allowing him to keep his pledge and violate his oath.

If you should be silent on the subject, it must be supposed that you *will not* condemn this use of oaths, while you *cannot* defend it. In that case Roman Catholics may be led to doubt how far they can trust in the religious teaching of those who cannot venture to avow and defend their doctrine on the plainest moral obligations.

I trust you will not suppose that I put forward this subject of the oath, to turn away discussion from the merits of the Irish Church. You will remember that, three years ago, in a published correspondence which I had with the Rev. Mr. Kelly, of Kells, I invited him to discuss with me which church was descended from St. Patrick—which is entitled to the allegiance of the Catholic people of Ireland. The Rev. Mr. Kelly did answer that letter; but on this subject he was silent. I wrote another letter, which I sent to you, in which I invited any priest in your diocess to discuss this subject. No one has since ventured to do so. I still invite you to nominate any of your priests to discuss with me the merits of the Irish Church in the way I then proposed. Until you answer this, you cannot suppose that I wish

to avoid discussion on the subject in parliament or anywhere else.

But the subject of this letter is to call on you to declare the doctrine of your church on oaths, and political obligations—to say whether you consider it lawful to take an oath against the interest of your church (*the taking of which* your own law pronounces to be perjury), with no intention of keeping that oath, but taking it solely as a means of deceiving others.

And let me again remind you of the awful position in which Mr. Lucas stands—pledged to you and to your clergy to do this, and sent by you and your clergy to parliament to do it.

Surely, if ever a bishop was called on to direct any man's conscience, you are called on to direct Mr. Lucas in this.

I have the honour to be, Right Reverend Sir, your obedient servant,

EDWARD A. STOPFORD,
Archdeacon of Meath.

The foregoing letter was probably written before the following was published, which we take from Mr. Lucas's speech at the declaration of the members at the Meath election, as published in the *Tablet*, July 31, page 494, col. 2, which we add here, as it shows Mr. Lucas's own understanding of the grounds on which he is sent to parliament—"If we remain true *to the principles on which we have been sent into parliament*—if we keep the principles of Sharman Crawford's Bill, *hostility to the Established Church*, AND THE ABOLITION of that odious monopoly," &c., &c. This puts the view taken in the foregoing letter, of Mr. Lucas's position, beyond all question.

Correspondence.

IS THE DOCTRINE OF PURGATORY TAUGHT BY THE HOLY FATHERS?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—In my letter on the above subject, which appears in your publication of this month, I did not, as you are pleased to represent, quote the book of Maccabees as SCRIPTURE, but as an authentic *historical testimony* deposing to *a fact* which cannot be denied, that the practice of praying for the dead was the same among the ancient Jews as among the early Christians and Roman Catholics of the present day (read fourth paragraph of my letter).

I did not state the Book of Maccabees was any portion of the public worship of the Jews, or that they ever acknowledged that book as Scripture, given by inspiration of God; but I boldly affirmed that *prayers for the dead* formed part and parcel of the public worship of the Jews; and I now reiterate my inquiry, why such a practice did not meet the censure and condemnation of Christ and his Apostles?

That is the question to which I expect a direct answer, and not whether the Book of Maccabees be apocryphal or otherwise.

With respect to your observations on my quotations from some of the Fathers of the three and four first centuries, I leave your readers to exercise their private judgment and arrive at their own conclusions. I just beg, however, to observe, that you take no notice whatever of some of the early Fathers declaring the practice of praying for the dead to be of APOSTOLICAL TRADITION. St. Chrysostom is decisive on the point (*Homil.* 3, *in Epist. ad Philip*), and (*in Homil.* 21) states the solemn usage to have been ordained by the DIVINE SPIRIT.

WARNER CHRISTIAN SEARCH.

July, 1852.

On the above letter we wish to say, in the first place, that it is our most earnest desire to do the fullest justice, and to act with perfect candour towards those who enter into discussion in our pages. Above all, we desire never to misrepresent their arguments. We should be unworthy of their contributions if we did. We are liable to mistake the point of an argument unintentionally; and in such a case we shall always be ready to acknowledge and correct our error, and thankful for the opportunity of doing so.

In this instance we have mistaken "W. C. Search's" arguments from the Book of Maccabees; and he has given us the opportunity of answering more to the point; and we gladly avail ourselves of it.

The argument is this—"Although we should regard the second Book of Maccabees merely as an account, written by an uninspired historian of fair character and credit, even in that view it is a sufficient testimony that the Jews did actually practise prayers and sacrifice for the repose of departed souls, just as the Roman Catholic Church does now; and that this was part of the public worship of the Jewish Church in our Saviour's time; and, since he did not reprove the Jews for this, his silence must be taken as admitting it to be right." We trust that "W. C. Search" will think the above a candid statement of his argument; and we acknowledge it deserves a better answer than we have yet given it. And we now offer the following answer—

We agree to take the writer of this book as a historian worthy of that credit which is given to historians of fair character; but we do not acknowledge him to be infallible through Divine inspiration, and "W. C. Search" does not require us to admit this.

Before we can rely on this writer's "historical testimony," we must know exactly what his testimony is. We cannot be bound by an erroneous translation; the writer wrote in Greek, and we must look to the Greek which he wrote, to learn his testimony with accuracy.

We look anxiously for the most authentic copy of the Greek, and we have no hesitation in adopting, for this purpose, an ancient manuscript, belonging to the Pope, which is carefully preserved in the Pope's library, in the Vatican. This book is, at least, 1200 years old, if not more. There is no copy that can compare with it in point of authority, except the Alexandrian Manuscript now in the British Museum; and the two copies agree in the place in question, and every other Greek copy of Maccabees agrees with them too; so we have no room to doubt what the writer did really write in the Greek. And we are able to make use of that valuable manuscript in the Pope's library, because an exact copy of it was printed in the year 1587, by the authority of Pope Sixtus the Fifth.

We now give an exact translation from the Greek as then published by Pope Sixtus; and we place beside it the translation in the Douay Bible, that our readers may compare the two. 2 Macc. xii. 43, &c.:—

DOUAY TRANSLATION.	CORRECT TRANSLATION.
43. And making a gathering he sent twelve thousand drachms of silver to Jerusalem, *for sacrifice to be offered for the sins of the dead*, thinking well and religiously concerning the resurrection.	43. And having made a preparation of two thousand drachms of silver, according to a collection man by man, he sent to Jerusalem *to offer a sacrifice on account of sin*, acting altogether well and correctly, reasoning concerning the resurrection.
44. (For if he had not hoped that they that were slain should rise again, it would have seemed superfluous and vain to pray for the dead.)	44. For if he did not expect that the slain should rise, it would have been superfluous and trifling to pray for the dead.
45. And because he considered that they who had fallen asleep with godliness had great grace laid up for them.	45. Then seeing that a most excellent reward is reserved for those falling asleep with piety, *a holy and pious thought. Wherefore concerning the dead, he made atonement, to be loosed from sin.*
46. *It is, therefore, a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from sins.*	

We have printed in Italics the places in which the difference is important; and we give here the corresponding Greek words, that those learned in that language may satisfy themselves which translation is correct. In v. 43, the Greek words are, Προσαγαγειν περι αμαρτιας θυσιαν. In ver. 46, ὁσια και ευσεβης ἡ επινοια. ὁθεν περι των τεθνηκοτων την εξιλασμον εποιησατο, της αμαρτιας απολυθηναι. We appeal to all Greek scholars if we have not translated this correctly.

Observe, now, in v. 43, the historian does *not* say in the Greek (what the Douay version is thought to say), that Judas Maccabeus offered the sacrifice *for the benefit of the dead*. He says *nothing* of the dead; he only says, that it was offered on account of sin.

Observe, next, in v. 46, what the writer says about *a holy and pious thought* is not spoken of what follows (as the Douay translation makes it appear), but of what goes before. Every Greek scholar will see that it is *impossible* to connect these words in the Greek *with what follows*. It was the belief in a reward for those who die the death of the righteous, that the author of this book called a holy and pious thought.

Observe, lastly, that the Douay Bible, in v. 46, again applies the benefit to the *dead*—"to pray for the dead, that *they* may be loosed from sins." But the writer in the Greek does not say so. He does not say that *the dead* might be loosed; he does not *say who* were to be loosed, but he says that Judas made an atonement concerning, or on account of, the dead; he does not say *for* the dead, for then he would have written υπερ, whereas he has written περι, concerning the dead; and he does not say that *they* should be loosed, but "to be loosed," which might be for Judas himself, and for others, if living: *for if the sins of the dead had brought the living under sin*, an atonement would be required *for the living, because of the dead*.

We observe here that "W. C. Search" has argued only from v. 43 & 46; he has not referred to v. 44. We, therefore, answer here only from the verses he relies on, and we will consider v. 44 separately.

From verses 43 and 46, *rightly translated*, our answer is clear. The sacrifice was offered, and the atonement was made, not for the dead, but for the living.

It is a fact that, according to the law of Moses, the sin of those who were slain had brought guilt upon the whole nation of the living, which required to be atoned for by sacrifice, according to the Jewish law.

We have a clear instance of such a case in the Book of Joshua, ch. 7, v. 1—"But the children of Israel transgressed the commandment, and took to their own use of the anathema. *For Achan*, the son of Charmi, &c., took something of the anathema, and the Lord was angry against *the children of Israel*." Here observe that *one man only* committed the sin, and it was unknown to the rest, for he hid the thing in the ground (v. 21), and yet it brought God's anger on the whole people.

Now, the sin on account of which Judas Maccabeus offered sacrifice, was exactly of the same kind. "They found under the coats of the slain some of the donaries of the idols of Jamnia, which the law forbiddeth to the Jews."—2 Macc. xii. 40. This was the anathema, or accursed thing, which they, like Achan, had taken; and in the same way it brought God's anger on the nation.

And the punishment was like in both cases. In Achan's case, the people, after a succession of victories, in which none of them were killed, were put to flight before their enemies, and many of them killed, because of what Achan had done. Just so Judas Maccabeus, after many victories, met with a check, and some of his soldiers were killed; and when they came to bury them, they found the reason, that they had taken of the cursed thing.

There was this difference in the two cases—In Achan's case, the guilty man was not killed. The atonement consisted in putting him to death, by God's command; but there was sacrifice too, for all his sheep and oxen were burned—Joshua vii. 24, 25, 26. But in the case before us, the idolaters were slain. Judas, therefore, could not make atonement for the guilt that had been brought upon the nation, by putting them to death; and it was his duty to look to the law of Moses and see what atonement was directed for such a case. This he would find exactly prescribed in the Book of Leviticus, chapter iv., from verse 13 to 31 inclusive. In those circumstances it was the duty of Judas Maccabeus to have such a sacrifice offered at Jerusalem, not for the benefit of the dead, but *that the living might be delivered from the sin or guilt* which the wickedness of the slain had brought upon the whole people. And on looking back to the correct translation which we have given of verses 43 and 46, it will be seen that every word is exactly suitable to such a sacrifice: for instance, when Judas provided the sacrifice, by a "collection made man by man," it was evidently that each of the people should contribute to the atonement, which was made for the people as a whole: if the sacrifice had been for the benefit of the dead, it would have been enough to collect from those who desired to give.

This is the true account of what is related in those two verses, because this is what Judas was bound to do, according to the law of Moses, *which was the only rule that it was lawful for him to follow in that matter*. "W. C. Search" will, no doubt, acknowledge that Jews were strictly bound by the law of Moses, both as to the manner of offering sacrifice and the purpose for which it was to be offered; excepting only in the case of persons inspired and directed by God, which no one supposes was the case with Judas.

Now, we have shown that, according to that law, it was his duty to offer that sacrifice for the living; and we have shown that the two verses on which "W. C. Search" relies, *when rightly translated*, are most appropriate to that sacrifice which the law required for the living, and that these verses do *not* say it was for the dead. Now, can "W. C. Search" show us, *from the law of Moses*, that it was Judas's duty to offer sacrifice for the dead? We urge this upon him. If he *cannot* (and we know he cannot) will he not agree with us that Judas offered his sacrifice *according* to the law, and not contrary to the law, seeing that Judas was bound by that law, and was a most strict observer of it?

We have now given a full answer, as respects those two verses which "W. C. S." argues from. We will now go on and consider v. 44, which he has not introduced into his argument.

"W. C. Search" has laid it down most plainly that, for the purpose of this discussion, the writer of that book is to be considered as an uninspired historian of fair character and credit. As such we consider him. It is a rule in judging of all such historians, that a great difference is to be made between the *facts* which the historian relates and his own reflections upon those facts. The one may be most correct, and the other most erroneous. The difference is greater still between the actions which the historian records, and the historian's guess, for it can be little more than a guess, at the secret thoughts which led the actor to do what he did. "W. C. Search" must surely have observed the importance of this distinction, in reading even historians of the highest character and credit.

The highest praise an historian can obtain is, that he keeps the facts which he records distinct from his own reflections on those facts—that he does not allow his own reflections to influence the account of the facts.

The writer of this book has done it admirably. He evidently connected in his own mind this sacrifice with the dead, rather than with the living; yet where he relates the sacrifice—v. 43 and 46—he does not say it was for the dead; he describes it exactly as it was, in the true translation. Verse 44 is not the relation of the fact, but his own reflection on the fact, which may be right or wrong, without injury to his character for fidelity as an historian.

We are, therefore, to consider this verse not as the relation of a fact, but as the inference which he drew from the fact he relates.

Now, how could the writer of this book know the secret thoughts of Judas's mind? How could he know that Judas was *thinking* of the resurrection? If the writer was inspired he *could* know it; but if he was only an uninspired man, it could only be a guess.

Now, we are prepared to affirm that this writer was wrong in supposing that Judas offered this sacrifice with any regard to the resurrection of those who were slain. And, still more, we are prepared to expect that "W. C. Search" himself will, on reflection, agree with us that the writer was wrong in this (though, perhaps, not on exactly the same grounds that we think so). Now, let "W. C. Search" mark this; the men who died on that occasion died in *mortal sin*. They carried in their clothes the proofs of their *idolatry*; perhaps in hopes to have the protection of the heathen gods in the battle; but, whatever their motive, their sin was idolatry, which was a mortal sin. "W. C. Search" will not deny this. Even the note on the Douay Bible acknowledges the sin of which they were guilty to be a mortal sin, which cannot be denied, if we look to Deuteronomy vii., 25, 26. That note in the Douay Bible supposed these men might be excused through ignorance; but how could any Jew be ignorant that heathen idolatry was a mortal sin? what Jew could be ignorant that heathen idols were the accursed thing? Let "W. C. Search" mark this; if that sacrifice was offered *for the dead*, it was offered for those that WERE KNOWN AND PROVED TO HAVE DIED IN MORTAL SIN.

Let "W. C. Search" now look back to this sentence in his letter from above, in which he brings this history as a proof "that the practice of praying for the dead WAS THE SAME among the ancient Jews as among the early Christians, and Roman Catholics of the present day." If that history of the Maccabees prove anything at all of the practice of the Jews about prayer and sacrifice for the dead, it prove that they prayed and sacrificed for those who died in mortal sin, that they might be loosed from their sins. Do "Roman Catholics of the present day" pray and offer sacrifice for those who die in mortal sin, that they may be loosed from their sins? "W. C. Search" will tell us that *they do not*—that they consider this a wicked and heretical doctrine; and that it is condemned by their church as such. How, then, can he tell us that this history proves that the practice of the Jews was the same as theirs?

We have only to add one word on "W. C. Search's" argument from the silence of Christ. To make the argument of any force it would be necessary that the practice in question should be shown to have been a *constant* part of the public worship of the Jews—that is to say, that they practised it *always* and *continually* as a part of their public worship. If it was a thing done *only once*, 163 years before Christ, *and not repeated from day to day continually*, then our Saviour's silence concerning it is no approbation, any more than his silence about any other act of the Jews, in *former times*, is an approbation of it. Now, the history of it, even as it is given in the Douay translation, does not profess to speak of what was done always and from day to day among the Jews, but only of what was done on that particular occasion. But we need not insist further on this; if the history proves anything of the practice of the Jews in our Saviour's time, it proves that their public worship then comprised prayer and sacrifice for those who died in mortal sin, that they might be loosed from their sins. Will "W. C. Search" say that our Saviour, by his silence, or any other way, approved of this? If He did, why did the Church of Rome condemn it now, as she certainly does?

We now appeal to "W. C. Search" whether this be not conclusive proof that the reflections which the writer of this book of 2nd Maccabees makes on the facts which he records are uninspired, and subject to error? Will he now maintain that the opinion of this writer, contradictory as it is not only to the doctrine of the Gospel, but even to the teaching of the Church of Rome, must needs be inspired? We add nothing to this, but that the writer of this book is allowed to have been a Greek, and, as such, may have had no opportunity of witnessing the public worship of the Jews. See Acts xxi., 28, 29.

The writer of this has been compelled to consider this subject in a brief space of time, and under a great pressure of other business. He now thanks "W. C. Search" for having forced him to do it. He feels it to be practical proof to himself of the value of the discussion and researches which this journal was intended to promote, and which "W. C. Search" has efficiently promoted; and he trusts that "W. C. Search" will now feel that the writers in this journal desire rightly to understand and to do full justice to the arguments of opponents, that they are ready to acknowledge an error when they have committed it, and that they are anxious only for a fair discussion of important questions, with a view to the promotion of truth.

We must be brief on the remainder of this letter. "W. C. Search" says—"With respect to your observations on the quotations from some of the Fathers of the three and four first centuries, I leave your readers to exercise their private judgment, and arrive at their own conclusions." Our answer was this—that quotations from *the three first centuries only* were applicable to the letter which "W. C. Search" undertook to answer—that he brought only two witnesses *from these three centuries* for the doctrine of Purgatory—of whom he had to say, "One of them believed it only after he left the Catholic Church; the other, who was always a Catholic, never believed it at all." We refer our readers back to that article for the proofs we gave (July number, pages 81 and 82); and we join with "W. C. Search" "in leaving it to our readers to exercise their private judgment, and arrive at their own conclusions."

"W. C. Search" complains that we did not take notice of all the passages which he quoted. We beg to repeat the reason that we then gave—"We have purposely omitted the proofs which 'W. C. Search' has brought from *the fourth century*, because they are no answer at all to the question, whether purgatory can be proved from the writings of the *first three* centuries. Our business in this article is to examine that article by itself. We shall, however, examine them (the proofs from the fourth century) on some other occasion." It was our intention to have done so in this number, but having to insert this reply to his present letter has prevented us; but we hope to perform this promise in our next number.

WHAT IS PURGATORY?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—You have been discussing with some of your correspondents, in the last number, whether the early Fathers believed in a Purgatory; but perhaps it may be well first to come to an agreement what Purgatory is. Your Loughrea correspondent, who signs himself "A Catholic," says, that anything short of absolutely perfect bliss is a punishment or purgation. If this be the test, it is easy to prove not only that the Fathers believed in Purgatory, but that the Church of England believes in it too. For she distinctly teaches in her Burial Service that we cannot have our perfect consummation and bliss until we have it in body and soul, when the soul is re-united to the body. But she also teaches that the souls of the faithful departed are in joy and felicity, and so differs from Romish divines, who teach that the majority of the faithful departed have to suffer torments equal to those of hell in severity, though not in duration. When, therefore, I ask whether the early Fathers believed in a Purgatory, what I want to know is, whether they believed that the souls of the faithful departed were in a state of joy or felicity, or in a state of torment; but I do not ask whether they imagined that the faithful departed are all at once admitted to the highest happiness which they shall ever attain; for I know that they agree with the Church of England in teaching that they are not. Can, therefore, any of your correspondents tell me of any Father, of the first three centuries, who teaches that there is a Purgatory (meaning thereby a state of torment) for the righteous after death? But it will be irrelevant to produce quotations showing that those Fathers prayed for the dead, since this fact only proves that they supposed these souls not yet to have attained to perfect happiness, which is not denied. As long as one's happiness admits of any doubt there is room for prayer. Prayers for the dead, then, only prove a Purgatory in your Loughrea correspondent's sense of the word—namely, a state something short of absolutely perfect happiness; but I want to see the passages produced, if such there be, which prove that either the Apostles or their successors believed in a Purgatory in the sense of a place of torment.

I remain, yours,
A TRUE CATHOLIC.

INDULGENCES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Cape Clear, July 24, 1852.

SIR,—The following respectful letter was addressed, on the 16th of June, to the Right Rev. Dr. KEANE, R. C. Bishop of this diocese (Ross). As I have not yet been favoured with an answer, perhaps you, sir, cannot employ your pen more acceptably or profitably, for the edification of your numerous Roman Catholic readers, than by giving the required information. Your reading appears so extensive, and you seem to have access to so many good authorities, that you will probably not have much difficulty in doing so. As you will, doubtless, state fully and fairly the Roman Catholic notion of such matters, you will be pleased to add something of the grounds on which Protestants refuse to avail themselves of a provision said to be replete with such wonderful blessings. Should the bishop still condescend to answer my humble communication, you and your readers shall have the full benefit of what he says. But if he should not, he may, notwithstanding, deem the learned statements of the editor of so widely circulated a paper as the CATHOLIC LAYMAN not entirely beneath his notice; so I think it would be only fair and respectful to send to his address, at Skibbereen, a copy of the number in which the accompanying letter shall appear with your remarks.

To satisfy him that, in writing to him as I have done, I have been acting in deference to the high authority of a Pope, I beg to call his attention to Pope Leo's Bull for the observance of a jubilee, in the year 1825, in which that pontiff says—"To you, therefore, venerable brethren, patriarchs, primates, archbishops, *bishops*, it belongs *to explain with perspicuity* the power of indulgences." Moreover, the great advantage which the Church of Rome boasts of possessing over other Christian communities is that of having a "*living, speaking* tribunal" to refer to in every case of uncertainty or doubt. In each *diocese* I presume that speaking tribunal to be the *bishop*, no higher (such as councils or Popes) being accessible to ordinary inquirers; and if he, when referred to, *refuses* to "speak," what good is he, or how does he maintain, on that head, the pretensions of his church?

I am, sir, your very obedient servant,
EDWARD SPRING.

"TO THE RIGHT REV. DR. KEANE, ETC., ETC.

"RIGHT REV. SIR,—A late number of a Roman Catholic newspaper (*The Limerick and Clare Examiner*), publishes a document 'read aloud by the Rev. Mr Synan, P.P.,' in St. Michael's Chapel, Limerick, on Sunday, the 6th instant, in which it is stated that 'the Pope has granted an indulgence of seven years, and as many forty days, to all the faithful of Christ who, with a contrite heart, shall visit a cross lately erected in the yard of that chapel, and recite seven Ave Marias, in honour of the seven dolours of the Blessed Virgin Mary; and that 'this indulgence may be gained every day.' Also, that the Pope has 'granted PLENARY indulgences' upon the performance of other conditions in connection with a visit to the same cross, 'which indulgences can be applied to the souls in purgatory.'

"As I presume there can be no question about the *authenticity* of this document, may I take the liberty of seeking to be informed respecting its meaning, by you, right reverend sir, as the chief representative, in this diocese, of the high ecclesiastical personage by whom the specified favours are said to be bestowed? I assure you that, in doing so, I am not actuated by any motive of impertinence, but wish to get, from one whom I can regard as competent authority, information in a matter which I don't understand. Upon the subject of Papal indulgences I have frequently consulted the writings of both Protestants and Roman Catholics, and from none that I have met have I been able entirely to satisfy myself as to all that is contemplated by them, or the precise nature and extent of the benefits which they are designed to confer.

"What, therefore, I now respectfully ask you to tell me is, First—what *exactly* is meant by 'an indulgence of seven years and as many forty days.' Secondly—whether by the words, 'this indulgence may be gained every day,' I am to understand that the benefits may be multiplied by the number of days (be they many or few) on which the cross is visited, and the other conditions performed. Thirdly—what are the precise benefits designed to be conveyed by a Plenary indulgence. And fourthly—how it is intended we should understand the expression, 'which indulgences can be applied to the souls in Purgatory.' In addition to my other queries, may I ask you what are 'the seven dolours of the Blessed Virgin Mary,' and how are they understood to be honoured by the 'recital' of 'seven Ave Marias?'

"It is right I should inform you that any information you may be kind enough to favour me with, I shall feel at liberty to use as I think proper, and remain, right reverend sir, your very humble servant,

"EDWARD SPRING,
"*Curate of Clear.*"

[We feel obliged to our reverend correspondent for the foregoing communication, and, should the Right Rev. Dr. Keane decline to furnish him with the information he desires, we shall endeavour to do so from authentic sources in our next number.]

FARM OPERATIONS FOR AUGUST.

Barley should be cut when the straw, in its entire length, assumes a bright gold colour, and the ear bends down gently. The grain should be allowed to get firmer than wheat, but not too ripe, as it does not then produce so fine a coloured sample, and will not bring so good a price in the market, for malting purposes. When in a fit state, it should be cut expeditiously, bound in small sheaves, and stooked, as there is no grain so easily damaged by wet. If the weather be fine and dry, the stooks need not be capped or hooded for a day or two; but, after that, capping will be necessary, to preserve the colour.

Turnips, mangels, carrots, and parsnips require great care and attention in the hoeing, thinning, and weeding, with the frequent use of the grubbers and pulverizers till the crop has grown so much as to shut out all further operations.

IN A FEW DAYS WILL BE READY,

The SEVENTH and Concluding Volume of

"THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN."

4TO. PRICE 5s. BOUND IN CLOTH, LETTERED.

DUBLIN: WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY.
LONDON: WERTHEIM AND CO.

Of whom may also be had

THE "CATHOLIC LAYMAN," VOLS. I. TO VI.

PRICE 5s. EACH, CLOTH.

*** These are nearly out of print, and parties wishing to complete the Work are requested to send their orders without delay.

COMPLETE IN TWO VOLUMES,

Price 1s. 6d. each, Cloth,

THE TALK OF THE ROAD:

SHOWING HOW IRISH PEOPLE TALK OF IRISH DOINGS WHEN THEY GET A QUIET PLACE AT THE BACK OF A DITCH, OR UNDER A HEDGE.

REPRINTED FROM THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

DUBLIN: WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,
9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET.

ILLUSTRATED AND ATTRACTIVE JUVENILE WORKS.

Price 7s. 6d. each. Illustrated.

Our Favourite Fairy Tales. By H. W. Dulcken. With 300 Engravings.

The Charm of Entertaining Knowledge.
Arabian Nights' Entertainments.
Tales of Woman's Trials. By Mrs. S. C. Hall.
Gulliver's Travels. New Edition. 200 Illustrations.
The Instructive Picture Book. Coloured Plates. Fcp.
The Charm of Interesting Stories.
Planché's Twenty-four Fairy Tales.
Grimm's Household Stories.

Price 7s each. Illustrated.

The Bush Boys; or, Adventures in Southern Africa. By Captain Mayne Reid.
The Young Yägers. A Narrative of Hunting Adventures in Southern Africa. By Captain M. Reid.
The Desert Home; or, English Family Robinson By Capt. Mayne Reid
Ran Away to Sea. A Boy's Sea Story.
The Forest Exiles; or, Perils of a Peruvian Family amid the Wilds of the Amazon. By Captain Mayne Reid.
The Boy Hunters; or, Adventures in Search of a White Buffalo. By Captain Mayne Reid.
The Young Voyageurs; or, Adventures in the Fur Countries of the Far North. By Captain M. Reid.

Price 6s. 6d. Illustrated.

Erie; or, Little by Little. A Tale of Roslyn School. By F. W. Farrar.

Price 6s. each. Illustrated.

Mayhew's Wonders of Science.
Sidney Grey. A Tale of School Life.
Mayhew's Peasant Boy Philosopher.
Memorable Women. By Mrs. Crosland.
Peter Parley's Tales about Animals.

Price 5s each. Illustrated.

Æsop's Fables. Translated into Human Nature. By C. H. Bennett. Coloured. 4to.
The Children's Bible Picture Book. 80 Engravings.
The Motherless Boy. By Miss Brewster.
Sporting in both Hemispheres. By J. Dewes.
The Four Sisters; or, Patience, Humility, Hope, and Love.
Memoirs of Great Commanders. By James.
School Days of Eminent Men. By J. Timbs.
Bertram Noel. A Story for Youth. By E. J. May.
Kingsdown Lodge. By E. J. Worboise.
The Boy's Book of Industrial Information. 365 Engravings.
The Boy's Own Sea Stories.
The Children's Picture Book of English History. 50 Engravings.
The Wars of the Roses. By J. G. Edgar.
A Boy's Book of Modern Travel and Adventure. By M. Johnes.
Outlines of Creation. By E. Noyce. 400 Engravings.
The Young Middy. By F. C. Armstrong.
Dashwood Priory; or, Mortimer's College Days.
Saxelford. A Story for Boys.
Louis's School Days. A Story for Boys.
Little Mary's Treasury.
The Heroes of Asgard.
Northcote's Original and Selected Fables.
Edgar's History for Boys.
Frank Wildman's Adventures.
The Children of the New Forest.
Richelieu's Life. By W. Robson.
Lillian's Golden Hours.
The Little Savage By Marryat.
Life of Julius Cæsar.
Gay's Fables.
Edgar Clifton; or, Right and Wrong.
Funny Books, with Coloured Plates.
The Playmate.
Edgar's Boy Princes.
Parley's Annual for 1859.

Price 4s. 6d.

Memorable Events in Bible History. 300 Engravings.

Price 3s. 6d. each. Illustrated.

The Young Exiles. By Bowman.
Lionel Fitzgibbon and his Parrot.
The Evening Bell. Tales from the German.
Clara Melville. A Tale.
Common Objects of the Country. By Rev. J. G. Wood.
Bella Sandford. A Tale. By J. C. Armstrong.
Life of Christ, for Children.
Stories of the time of Richard the Second. By W. P. Dunster.
St. George and the Dragon. 10 coloured Engravings.
Boldheart, the Warrior. 10 coloured Engravings.
Sandford and Merton.
Dawnings of Genius.
The Castaways. By Anne Bowman.
Voyage and Venture; or, Narrative of Perils by Sea and Land.
The Christmas Tree for 1859.
Happy Hours: a Story for Children. By Cuthbert Bede.
Wolf's Fairy Tales.
Esperanza; or, The Home of the Wanderers.
Great Cities of the Ancient World.
Great Cities of the Middle Ages.
Guizot's (Madame) Popular Tales.
————Moral Tales.
————Young Student.
Travels of Rolando.
Sketches and Anecdotes of Animal Life.
Celebrated Children.
John Railton.
Evenings at Home.
Island Home; or, The Adventures of Six Young Crusoes.
Swiss Family Robinson.

ILLUSTRATED BOOKS FOR THE SEASON.

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY.

WORDSWORTH'S WHITE DOE OF RYLSTONE. Illustrated by Foster from original and authentic views of the localities mentioned in the Poems. Square crown 8vo., cloth, 18s. Morocco, by Hayday, 26s.

WORDSWORTH'S POEMS. Selected and edited by the Rev. R. A. Willmott. Beautifully illustrated. 1 vol. 4to., 21s., cloth.

GOLDSMITH'S POEMS. Edited, with Life of Author, by the Rev. R. A. Willmott. Illustrated with 40 Plates, by Foster, and 60 Ornamental Designs, by Noel Humphreys, printed in Colours, with a gold line border. Beautifully bound in cloth, 21s.

BYRON'S CHILDE HAROLD'S PILGRIMAGE. New Illustrated Edition. Splendidly bound, price 21s., cloth.

POETRY AND PICTURES FROM THOMAS MOORE. 80 Illustrations. Cloth, elegant, 21s.

MOORE'S IRISH MELODIES. The Music printed with the Words. The Symphonies and Accompaniments by Sir John Stephenson, Mus. Doc. 1 vol., cloth, 31s. 6d. Half morocco, 42s.

MOORE'S HARMONISED AIRS FROM THE IRISH MELODIES. Arranged for Two, Three, and Four Voices. Imperial 8vo. 25s, half morocco.

CONEYBEARE AND HOWSON'S LIFE AND EPISTLES of St. Paul. Comprising a complete biography of the Apostle, and a translation of his Epistles, inserted in chronological order. 4 Steel Plates and numerous Woodcuts. 2 vols. square crown 8vo. 63s., morocco antique.

THE MERRIE DAYS OF ENGLAND. Sketches of the Olden Time. Illustrated by 20 large Engravings, and numerous Ornamental Initial Letters, &c. 21s.

WORDSWORTH'S GREECE: Pictorial, Descriptive, and Historical. A New Edition, carefully revised. Royal 8vo. Price 28s., cloth.

THOMPSON'S SEASONS. Illustrated. Elegantly bound in Cloth, price 14s. Morocco, by Hayday, 21s.

GEORGE HERBERT'S POEMS. Illustrated by Birket Foster and Noel Humphreys. In a rich Elizabethan Cover. 18s., cloth.

THE CHRISTIAN YEAR. Illuminated in the style of the Ancient Missals. Morocco antique, 63s. Cloth, 25s.

THE SCOURING OF THE WHITE HORSE; or, The Long Vacation Week of a London Clerk. By the Author of "Tom Browne's School Days." With numerous Illustrations, by Richard Doyle. Beautifully printed on toned paper. Bound in extra cloth, 8s. 6d.

THE DESERTED COTTAGE. By Wordsworth. Illustrated. Price 7s. 6d. Elegantly Gilt.

THE COURTSHIP OF MILES STANDISH, and Other Poems. By Longfellow. Illustrated. 7s. 6d., cloth, elegant.

MILTON'S COMUS. Thirty Illustrations. Small 4to. 7s. 6d., elegantly bound.

RHYMES AND ROUNDELAYS IN PRAISE OF A COUNTRY LIFE. Adorned with many Pictures. Price 21s., richly bound.

ODES AND SONNETS. With 24 Illustrations, by Birket Foster, and 60 Ornamental Designs, by Sleigh. The whole engraved and printed with Tints by Dalziel. Small 4to., 12s. 6d., cloth.

REV. MR. ELLIS'S THREE VISITS TO MADAGASCAR during 1853 to 1856. With Notices of the People, Natural History, &c. Illustrated. 8vo. 16s.

REV. MR. KING'S TOUR THROUGH THE ITALIAN Valleys of the Alps, and all the Romantic and less frequented "Vals" of Northern Piedmont. Illustrated. 8vo. 18s.

RAWLINSON'S HISTORY OF HERODOTUS. Vols. I to 3. Maps and Woodcuts. 18s. each.

"CURRY AND RICE" (on 40 Plates); or, The Ingredients of Social Life at "Our" Station in India. By Captain Atkinson, Bengal Engineers. With Descriptive Letterpress. Large 4to. Price, 21s.

CARLYLE'S (THOMAS) HISTORY OF FREDERICK THE GREAT. Second Edition. Vols. I and 2. 40s.

SOUTHEY'S (ROBERT) LIFE OF CHARLES WESLEY. New Edition. 2 vols. 12s.

DAYS OF OLD: Three Stories from Old English History for the Young. By the Author of "Ruth and her Friends." I. Caradoc and Deva: a Story of the Druids. 2. Wulfgar and the Earl: a Story of the Anglo-Saxons. 3. Roland: a Story of the Crusades. With a Frontispiece by W. Holman Hunt, engraved by Linton. Imp. 8vo., printed on toned paper, 5s.

THE HEROES: Greek Fairy Tales for my Children. By Charles Kingsley, Rector of Eversley. 1. Perseus. 2. The Argonauts. 3. Theseus. New and cheaper Edition, with Eight Illustrations engraved by Whymper. Imp. 16mo., beautifully printed on toned paper by Clay, and bound in extra cloth, with gilt edges, 5s.

AGNES HOPETOUN'S SCHOOL AND HOLIDAYS: The Experiences of a Little Girl. By Mrs. Oliphant, Author of "Margaret Maitland," &c. Imp. 16mo., bound in extra cloth, 6s.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher, WILLIAM CURRY, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.
AUGUST, 1852.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Glóir do Dhia añ ṗna háṗuiḃ, agur ṡíoḋċáin air an ḋṫalaiṁ deaġ-ṫoil do na ḋáoiniḃ.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. I.—No. 9. SEPTEMBER, 1852. { Annual Subscription, 2s. 6d. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
The Two Ships	97
Talk of the Road—No. VII.	98
What Scripture tells us of the Blessed Virgin Mary	99
The Rev. Professor Murray, of Maynooth, versus the Archbishop of Dublin, on Infallibility	100
The Irish in America	103
The Touchstone (continued)	104
Notes and Queries	107
CORRESPONDENCE:	
Mr. Aylmer—Are the Decrees of General Councils the sole Interpreter of Scripture?	105
Warner Christian Search on 2 Maccabees xii. 43—46	106
Farming Operations for September	107

THE TWO SHIPS.

Some weeks ago an amusing story was told in the newspapers, of a certain traveller who was on his journey in the United States, and who wished to go from New York to Boston. He proceeded to the quay, and embarked on board a steamer which was ready to sail, supposing that it would bring him safely to his journey's end. The next morning he went on deck, and asked one of the sailors when the vessel would arrive at Boston. "Bless you, sir," was the man's reply, "we are going to Liverpool!" The dismay of the unfortunate traveller may easily be conceived; and when he had time to reflect coolly on the cause of his mishap, he could only blame his own folly and carelessness in not making the necessary inquiries before he set out on his voyage.

Let us suppose, however, that the traveller, on proceeding to the quay, found *two* ships there, each of which professed to be bound for the port he wished to reach. In this case, if he were a prudent man, and the voyage long and difficult, he would naturally make some inquiries of the captains or crew of the two vessels, before deciding in which of them he would embark. And suppose he were informed that the two ships, on leaving the harbour, would pursue directly opposite courses; and that all the statements made to him respecting the nature of the voyage, its dangers, and its probable termination, were entirely different and contradictory—in such a case the perplexity of our friend the traveller would, of course, be very much increased. It would not be a sufficient reason, for example, that he should embark in one of the vessels, because he saw many of his friends and neighbours crowd on board, without any questions or previous inquiry. Nor would he, if a man of sense and firmness, be much influenced by the loud and clamorous assertions of any of the crew, that, if he went on board the rival vessel, he would certainly be lost. But he would endeavour, if possible, to learn for himself how the case really stood. He would inquire, perhaps, if a chart or map of the voyage could be procured; and, with this before him, he would examine which of the conflicting accounts bore the greatest appearance of truth. And if one of the two captains were to call our friend into his cabin, and spread out the chart on the table, and explain to him that he intended to sail his vessel in the course pointed out by the map; while the other captain refused to give him any satisfaction, and told him that he had no business to meddle in such matters—that it was very great presumption in him to ask any questions at all, and that he ought to leave the matter in his hands—that the map was of little or no use, and that, for his part, he went by other rules, and steered by other directions—if this was the manner in which the traveller was treated, it is more than probable that, in the end, he would embark on board of that vessel which the authority of the map, and his own well informed and deliberate judgment, pointed out as the one most likely to arrive safely at her journey's end.*

Our readers will probably have already guessed the application which we are about to make of the foregoing illustration. Our two ships, in short, may serve to exemplify the Protestant and Roman Catholic Churches. Both profess to follow a safe and certain course to that happy land that all are anxious to reach at the close of the present life. The choice between them must be made by all, for death will quickly overtake the youngest and strongest; and to live without any religion at all must inevitably lead to hopeless and everlasting ruin. Now, if the Church of Rome and the Church of England both followed the same course, and steered in the same track, it might, perhaps, not be very material to which Church men belonged. But here lies the difficulty. The two Churches, as all our readers are, of course, aware, are at variance upon many of the most important landmarks of the Christian voyage, while upon some their views are diametrically opposed. The Bible is the chart which God has mercifully provided for men's guidance, in order to enable them to shape their course aright among the rocks and quicksands of life. Both Churches acknowledge its authority; but the use which they make of it is very different. The Church of England appeals to it on all occasions, and follows no other guide; the Church of Rome, on the contrary, relies upon tradition, and asserts that she has an infallible pilot at the helm, who cannot possibly go wrong. The Church of England invites all persons to search the Bible for themselves, and compare her doctrines with the revealed Word of God. The Church of Rome condemns the exercise of private judgment, and either forbids her members to read the Scriptures, or tells them that they must interpret it exactly as she commands. In the one Church there are two sacraments, in the other there are seven. The Church of England holds the doctrine of justification by faith only; the Church of Rome teaches works of supererogation. The one Church believes in purgatory and uses prayers for the dead; the other Church rejects both as human inventions, unwarranted by Scripture. The Church of Rome addresses prayers to the Virgin Mary and to the saints, and sanctions the use of images. The Church of England believes, with St. Paul, that "there is but one Mediator between God and man" (1 Tim. ii. 5), and that the Almighty is a jealous God, who "will not give his glory to another, neither his praise to graven images" —Isaiah xlii. 8. It would be endless to specify all the points of difference; but even from this brief sketch it is evident that the two Churches hold doctrines which are not only different, but almost opposite—that the paths which they respectively follow are, in fact, "wide as the poles asunder."

By what principle, therefore, are we to decide? It is plain that both Churches cannot be right. The one steers north, the other south; if the one vessel arrives safely at its destined port, those who embark in the other run great risk of making shipwreck of their faith and hopes. If the point were to be decided by bold and confident *assertions*, the Church of Rome would probably triumph; for she condemns all those who differ from her to perdition, and declares that out of her pale there is no salvation.* But the controversy is too important to be settled in this way; in a matter of such consequence every prudent man will ask, not what is *said* on either side, but what can be *proved*. The question which every Catholic layman, anxious solely for the cause of truth, and his soul's salvation, ought to put himself, therefore, is this—What are the marks of a true Church of Christ? How am I to know whether the Church of England or the Church of Rome is the Church to which I ought to belong, and in which I ought to live and die? In the following remarks we hope to afford our readers some hints which will help them in this inquiry.

In every question, the first thing to be settled is, the meaning of the words we use. Many of the controversies which have arisen upon religious subjects would have been avoided, if men had agreed beforehand upon the precise signification of the terms which they employed in their arguments. Now, the first place in which we find the word "Church" made use of is, of course, the New Testament, where it very frequently occurs: and it is here used in two different senses, which it is important to keep distinct. It is applied, in the first place, to the whole collective body of true Christians, who have existed, or who ever shall exist in the world. Thus, for example, we read that "Christ loved the Church and gave himself for it, that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing" (Eph. v. 25.), and St. Paul speaks of "the general assembly and Church of the first-born, which are written in heaven."—Heb. xii. 23. It is applied, in the second place, to a particular congregation of professing Christians, assembling in one place for the purpose of Christian worship; or to a collection of such congregations in a particular city or district. Thus, St. Paul, in his epistles, salutes "Nymphas, and the Church which is in his house."—Col. iv. 15. "Priscilla and Aquila, and the Church that is in their house."—Rom. xvi. 5. "Archippus and the Church in thy house."—Philem. 2. He speaks also, generally, of "the Churches of the Gentiles" (Rom. xvi. 4); "the Churches of God which in Judea are in Christ Jesus" (1 Thess. ii. 14); "the Churches of Macedonia" (2 Cor. viii. 1); and St. John, in like manner, speaks of "the seven Churches in Asia," the Church of Ephesus, the Church of Smyrna, &c.—Rev. i. 11. The collection of these particular local Churches makes up the general Catholic Church, as it exists in the world at any one particular time; and which includes all those persons on the face of the earth who profess to believe in Christ, and who acknowledge him to be the Saviour of mankind. Every particular Church which professes the true faith and worship of Christ, is a true Christian Church, and would be a true Church, though there were no other Church in the world. The Christian Church at Jerusalem, for example, was obviously a true Church before the Church of Rome or any other Church was planted. The Catholic Church embraces all the true Christian Churches in the world, which have all the same nature, and possess the same essential character.

It is plain, therefore, that before we can form any clear idea of the Catholic Church, we must, in the first place, know what it is which makes a Church to be a true, particular Church. We must have some notion of water, for example, before we can form any idea of the sea or the ocean. It is acknowledged, both by Protestants and Roman Catholics, that in the true Church only there is the true faith, true remission of sins, and a true hope of eternal salvation.* But the question is, how are we to know whether any particular Church is a true Church or not? If it be, it belongs to the one Catholic Church of Christ, and its members are in the way of salvation. Now, the answer which the Church of England gives to this question is set forth with much brevity and simplicity in her 19th Article—"The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the sacraments duly administered, according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same." This statement has, at least, the merit of being clear and unambiguous. If the doctrines of any Church be in accordance with the Word of God—if the Scriptures be faithfully read and preached to the people, and the sacraments administered in their integrity, as the Lord appointed them, then the Church of England pronounces such a Church to be a true Church, and to belong to the Catholic Church of Christ. These are points on which the simplest and most unlearned Christian, who has his Bible in his hands, can in some measure judge for himself. The Church of England does not ask him to follow his religious instructor blindly and unInquiringly, or to risk his hopes of future happiness upon the word of any man, or any set of men. She invites him to use the reason which God has given him upon the most important of all subjects—the search for truth.

* We are sensible, also! that our Irish emigrants too often neglect such wise inquiries and precautions; and embark in vessels without any care at all to learn whether they are sea-worthy or properly provided. Many ship-owners are, in consequence, very careless what sort of vessels they provide, and the result is, that thousands of our countrymen perish annually by shipwreck, by disease, and grievous sufferings; all of which might have been avoided, if Irish emigrants to America were as careful and prudent in the choice of a ship as English emigrants are in going to Australia.

* Vide Creed of Pope Pius IV., § 15—"Hanc veram Catholicam fidem extra quam nemo salvus esse potest."

* Vide Bellarmine *de Notis Eccl.*, cap. 1—"Omnes enim confitentur in sola vera Ecclesia esse veram fidem, veram peccatorum remissionem, veram spem salutis æternæ."

She urges him to compare her doctrines with the statements of Scripture; she desires him to examine for himself whether the pure Word of God is preached, and the sacraments duly administered to her people, and then soberly and deliberately to decide whether he can safely commit himself to her guidance.

Very different, however, is the course which the Church of Rome adopts upon this vital subject. She cannot venture to appeal to Scripture, or to admit that men have a right to judge for themselves, and to compare the doctrines of the Church with the Word of God. She avoids as much as possible giving an answer to the question, "What is *a* true Church?" and substitutes for it a very different inquiry, "Which is *the* true Church?" And the reason is obvious. The Church of Rome resolves every question by the authority of the Church. Her divines assert that we must receive the Scriptures, and the interpretation of them, and the whole Christian faith and worship, *from* the Church;* and therefore we can know nothing of religion until we have found the Church—that is, until we have ascertained which is the true Church. According to this mode of proceeding, we must find out the Church before opening the Bible at all; for if Scripture be appealed to, it is a plain acknowledgment that we can know and understand the Scriptures without the authority or interpretation of the Church, which undermines the very foundation of the Roman Catholic system.

It is evident that before we can settle the question, "Which is the true Church?" there are two other questions which must be previously answered—namely, whether there be a true Church or not? and, if there be, what is it? The first inquiry, then, which we may address to Roman Catholics is, how they will prove that there is a Church without the Scriptures? They will reply, perhaps, that the Church is visible, for we see a Christian Church in the world; but we may ask them in turn, what is it which we see? We see a company of men, who call themselves a Church; but surely the fact of men's *calling* themselves a Church does not *make* them one. A Christian Church must have a Divine origin and institution, it must have a charter, to which it can appeal in proof of its claims; and this charter can only be found in the Scriptures—the authority of which must be established, and the sense of which must be understood, before we can know what a Church is.

Whether there *is* such a thing as a Church or not must, therefore, be decided by the Scriptures, and the Scriptures alone. And further, we must judge of a *true* Church by its holding the true Scripture faith; for this is the only way in which we can find out what a true Church is. It is plain that these questions cannot be settled by the authority of the Church, without the aid of Scripture; for, as we have said, it is Scripture alone which assures us that there is a Church; and it is evident that we cannot rely on the authority of a Church, before we know whether she exists at all, and how she is to be known. In order to be satisfied on these points, we must obviously have recourse to Scripture; and we must examine it for ourselves, in order to learn its sense and meaning. In short, men must judge for themselves in order to find a Church; and when they have done this, the authority of the Church comes too late. If, on the other hand, we must believe the Church before we can believe or understand the Scriptures, we must believe the Church before we can possibly know whether there be a Church or not. This is a fallacy which runs through all the statements of Roman Catholic divines on this question. In order to bring in their favourite principle of Church authority, they always take for granted that there *is* a Church, which they can never prove without the aid of Scripture; and then they attempt to give some marks whereby to know *which* is *the* Church; which, as has been well observed, is like giving marks whereby to know some particular unicorn, before we know whether there be an unicorn in the world or not, or what kind of animal it is.

Roman Catholic writers are fond of dwelling on the obscurity of Scripture, and the difficulty of ascertaining from it alone the chief articles of the Christian faith; and from hence they would infer that the authority of the Church is necessary, in order to decide what is the true faith. But here we must still return the same answer as before, that we cannot have recourse to the authority of the Church, without knowing which is the true Church; and the true Church cannot be known without knowing the true faith; for no Church is a true Church which does not profess the true faith. This is the rule long since laid down by Lactantius, to discern the true Church by the true religion—"That Church alone," saith he, "is Catholic, which retains the true worship of God."† And St. Ambrose makes a remarkable declaration to the same effect—"They do not possess the inheritance of Peter who do not possess the faith of Peter."‡ It is, indeed, a strange and unreasonable course to resolve all our faith into the authority of the Church, as if the Church were to be the first object of our faith in religion; whereas it can be proved that we must know and believe most of the articles of the Christian faith before we can know whether there be any Church or not. The order observed in the Apostles' Creed is a plain evidence of this; for all those articles which are before the Holy Catholic Church must, in order of nature, be known before it. That there is a God, who made the world; that Jesus Christ is the only begotten Son of God, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, was crucified, dead, and buried, and rose again; that there is a Holy Ghost—all this must be believed; and then we may add the Holy Catholic Church, but not till then; for the Church is a society of men for the worship of God, through the faith of Jesus Christ, by the sanctification of the Holy Spirit, which unites them into one mystical body; so that we must know God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, before we can know what the Catholic Church means. And is it not strange, therefore, that our faith must be founded on the authority of the Church, when we must first know all the great articles of our faith before we can know anything about a Church? This inverts the order of our creed, which, according to the principles of the Church of Rome, should begin thus:—"I believe in the Holy Catholic Church, and, upon the authority of that Church, I believe in God the Father Almighty, and in Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Ghost." The absurdity of such a principle becomes obvious as soon as it is put into words.

Our readers have already seen the short and explicit answer which the Church of England gives to the inquiry—What are the marks of a true Church of Christ? But when we turn to Roman Catholic divines for a reply to the same question, the answer we receive is indeed curious. Cardinal Bellarmine, who is their greatest writer, takes good care to say nothing about the Scriptures; and no wonder, for, according to him, the Scriptures derive all their authority from the Church's sanction. Nor will he venture to tell us what it is which makes a Church a true Church; for this would have obliged him to say something about the true faith, which, according to his principles, must be learned solely from the Church. But to make amends for these omissions, he enumerates no less than *fifteen* marks or notes whereby we may discern *the* true Church.† Our limits will not now permit us to enter upon a full examination of these notes; we must content ourselves with one or two brief remarks. Among Bellarmine's notes are the following:—1. The name Catholic. 2. Antiquity. 3. Long continued duration. 4. Multitude of believers. 5. Confession of adversaries. 6. Temporal felicity. 7. Sanctity of doctrine. If these notes are of any value at all, they ought to be applicable to the true Church at all periods of its history. Now, if ever there was a true Christian Church on earth, it was during the twenty years which elapsed from our Lord's ascension to the death of the Apostle Paul. Let us apply Bellarmine's notes to the Church of that age. Did it bear the name Catholic? No: the word Catholic, as applied to the Christian Church, was not known for some centuries. Again, how could the Church in the Apostles' days possess either antiquity or long continued duration, when it had only been established a few months or years? It is a new idea that truth must live a long time in the world, and, as it were, come of age, before it can be acknowledged and believed. How can a "multitude of believers" be an unfailing mark of the true Church when we are informed in Scripture (Acts i.), that shortly after our Lord's ascension, the number of the disciples was only one hundred and twenty? As to the "confession of adversaries," we know, on the same inspired authority, that the early Christians were "everywhere spoken against" (Acts xxviii. 22), and that their enemies charged them with "turning the world upside down."—Acts xvii. 6. "Temporal felicity" is, perhaps, the very worst note of the true Church that could possibly have been selected; for the early Christians, as every one must be aware, were objects of the bitterest persecution. St. Paul, who partook largely in these sufferings, describes the Christians as being "made a gazing-stock, both by reproaches and afflictions" (Heb. x. 33)—nay, this eminent Apostle writes of himself, that "he was made as the filth of the world, and the offscouring of all things."—1 Cor. iv. 13. As regards "sanctity of doctrine," we readily allow that this is, and ever has been, a most essential mark of the true Church; but how can Bellarmine make any use of this mark, until he has first given us some means of knowing what is, and what is not, pure doctrine, independently of the Church? Whereas, on the contrary, he declares, in the most express terms, that the distinctions between vice and virtue, the very foundation of all morals, can be annulled and altered by the Church's will! Our readers will, perhaps, scarcely believe that such a monstrous assertion could ever have proceeded from the pen of this great champion of Romanism, unless we cited his own words. They are as follows:—"If the Pope, through mistake, should command vice, and forbid virtue, THE CHURCH WOULD BE BOUND TO BELIEVE THAT VICE IS GOOD AND VIRTUE EVIL, UNLESS SHE WOULD SIN AGAINST CONSCIENCE"!!!* According to this maxim, if the Pope were to command a man to steal, or to tell a lie, or to forbid him to honour his parents, the man would be bound, in conscience, to obey! Did Bellarmine, when he wrote the above sentence, ever reflect upon our Blessed Lord's severe reproach to the Jewish teachers of his day—"Ye have made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition?"—Matt. xv. 6.

We hope on a future occasion to return to this subject; meanwhile, we would earnestly commend to our Roman Catholic readers the words of that pious and eminent Father, St. Augustine, when speaking of the Donatists, who claimed to be the only true Church in his time—"Let them show me their church, not in the councils of their bishops, not in the writings of disputers, not in the miracles and prodigies of which they boast, but let them show it me in the ordinances of the Law, in the predictions of the Prophets, in the songs of the Psalms, in the preaching of the Evangelists, and in the canonical authorities of the Sacred Books. *This is our foundation, to which we inviolably attach ourselves, reposing only upon this Scripture, which is come from the Prophets and Apostles.*"†

TALK OF THE ROAD—NO. VII.

PAT and Jem have been so busy reaping they had little time to talk, but we have heard something of them. But before we tell it, we would like to say how they came to be hired, for we think it would be good for every farmer and labourer in Ireland to know.

They went, like the rest of the boys, before five o'clock in the morning to the big tree, in the town near them, and a couple of farmers were going to the big tree too to look for men. One was Mr. Nulty, a fine, free-spoken man, with a pleasant face, and a thriving man he is too. The other was old Mr. Barnes, who ought to be more of a gentleman than Nulty, for he was come of a good family in the country, and he had a property of his own that he farmed; but he was a hard man, and what the Irish called "an ould nigger." And the two fell in on the road; and Mr. Barnes began to grumble, "and its enough to fret a man," says he, "so it is, to be giving them fellows twenty pence a day."

"Why," said Mr. Nulty, "I paid my men twenty-two pence yesterday, and I paid it willing." And so old Mr. Barnes stopped and faced round at Nulty.

"You have paid it willing?" says he.

"Yes, I did," said Mr. Nulty, "and I always do; for I find that willing wages makes willing men."

"Ay," said Mr. Barnes, "that's the way you're always raising the wages on us."

"I find it cheaper, as well as pleasanter," said Mr. Nulty; "and I'll bet you sixpence I had my reaping cheaper yesterday than you had."

So when they came to calculate, they found Mr. Nulty had got his reaping done one-and-sixpence an acre cheaper, at twenty-two pence, than Mr. Barnes had at twenty pence.

"I learned that from a farmer in England," said Mr. Nulty; "he paid his men twelve shillings a week; and when I came to count what his men did, I found he had his work done cheaper than I had here at tenpence a day; and since that, I find that better wages buys labour cheaper. And it stands to reason; for if men find a fair advantage in being good labourers, they will strive to become better still. So I give a penny or twopence more than another, and get the best men; and that makes them better still, and willing men into the bargain."

But Mr. Barnes only grumbled the more, and would not give in; and when they were near the tree, Mr. Nulty stopped to speak to a neighbour, and Mr. Barnes went on to the tree, where Pat and Jem were standing among the boys. So Mr. Barnes said—"Boys, I'll give eighteen pence to-day, though its a deal too much."

"Oh, sir," said Pat, "sure you would not be that hard on poor fellows that's often without work, and has nothing but the big tree to depend to."

"Well," said Mr. Barnes, "try if you can make any more out of the tree." And he went on as if he would not hire them.

"Oh, the hungry beggar," said Tim Reilly, who was standing by.

So Mr. Nulty came on, and "Boys," says he, "I want thirty men, and I'll do what is fair; will you come?"

"That we will, sir," said Pat, "and leave the wages to yourself, and do our best."

And they all said the same, for every man knew

---

* Conc. Trid. Decret. de Edit. et usu sacr. libror.—"Si quis autem libros ipsos integros cum omnibus suis partibus, prout in ecclesiâ Catholicâ legi consueverunt, et in veteri Vulgatâ Latina editione habentur, pro sacris et canonicis non susceperit, anathema sit". . . (ib) "Sancta Mater Ecclesia, cujus est judicare de vero sensu et interpretatione Scripturarum sacrarum."

† "Sola Catholica ecclesia est, quæ verum cultum retinet."—*Lactant. Divin. Instit.* lib. iv. cap. 30.

‡ "Non habent Petri hereditatem, qui Petri fidem non habent."—*Ambros Opera.* tom. iv. col. 391, H. Paris, 1661.

† Other writers have gone beyond Bellarmine in this matter. Socolovius has reckoned up twenty notes of the Church, and Thomas Bozius *one hundred!* Vide Gerhard, *Locor. Theol.* tom. v. de ecclesia.

* "Fides Catholica docet, omnem virtutem esse bonam, omne vitium esse malum, si autem Papa erraret præcipiendo vitia, vel prohibendo virtutes, teneretur ecclesia credere vitia esse bona, et virtutes malas, nisi vellet contra conscientiam peccare."—*Bellarm. Opera, De Rom. Pon.*, lib. iv., cap. v., Tom. I., Col. 315, H. Colon, 1615.

Mr. Nulty's way; and so Mr. Nulty chose his thirty men, and Pat and Jem among them. And when he got on his horse, he says—

"Now, boys, handle yourselves, and let me see what you'll do, for men are getting mighty scarce in this country; and they will be scarcer yet than ever they were; and we will have to take to the English fashion before long, and every man will have to learn to do double work for double wages, all the year round; and the sooner the better; for that will be better in the end for both master and man."

So he rode off, and his men after him, as fast as they could; and more farmers came in, and wages rose to two shillings; and old Mr. Barnes waited to the last, and had to give two shillings, and got the worst men in the place, and men that would not even be as willing for him as for another.

So Pat and Jem started together, for they had a mile to walk.

"And sure enough," says Jem, "the boys are getting mighty scarce, where there once was plenty; I wonder did the like ever happen in the world before?"

"Well, now," says Pat, "I mind our Saviour Jesus Christ speaking of the labourers being mighty scarce in harvest when he was upon earth."

"Well, I mind that, too," says Jem, "for I read about it; and now I wonder," says he, "what that meant; he said, sure enough, there was a great harvest, and not half people to reap it. And was it the oats he was meaning? For ever since that day we were talking about the stone, and the praty, and the hen, I'm still thinking, when our Saviour talked of the like of them things, he was meaning something else that we ought to learn, and just taking a plain way to teach us."

"Well, I believe that's true, surely," said Pat; "but what could he mean about the harvest, and nobody to cut it?"

"I mind now," says Jem, "that I read that the harvest is the end of the world, and the angels are the reapers. But how could that be, that there were no labourers? Sure it can't mean that God has not angels enough to do what he wanted."

"It couldn't be that," said Pat; "but what can it be?"

So they turned it every way, and could make nothing of the harvest that wanted hands to cut it. And by this time they were at Mr. Nulty's field, for they walked fast.

"So," says Pat, "I wish I had my Bible with me, and we would try and make it out at dinner time."

"Well I have mine," said Jem, "for it is small and handy, and fits in my pocket, so we will try it at dinner time."

And so they turned to, and did their best for Mr. Nulty. And as soon as they got through their dinner, Jem took out his Bible, and they began to look for it.

"I have it here," said Jem, "it's the last two verses of the 9th chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel;" and so he read—"Then saith he unto his disciples, the harvest truly is plenteous, but the labourers are few; pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he will send forth labourers into his harvest."*

"Now try," said Pat, "and find out where he was, and what he was doing, and then maybe we will see the meaning."

So Jem looked back a bit in the chapter. "I have that too," said Jem; "he was preaching the Gospel (v. 35), and when he saw the great crowd of people he had compassion on them, because he saw they were like sheep that had no one to look after them; and then he said it was a fine harvest, only the labourers was very few."

"Surely, then," said Pat, "the people was the harvest. But who were the labourers?"

"Stay now," said Jem, "I see a mark in the side of the page to look to St. Luke (chap. x. ver. 1, 2). And there they found that our Lord sent seventy of his disciples to go before him into every city, and tell the people about the kingdom of God (v. 9); and then he said to them, 'the harvest truly is great, but the labourers are few.'"

"I see it now," said Pat, "the labourers were them that were to tell the people about Christ, and the kingdom of God. Sure isn't it all plain now? Isn't there plenty of people in this field that knows as little about Christ as we did before we took to the reading; and maybe if any one would take the trouble to teach them, they would be as glad as ourselves to learn, for sure there is a deal of the boys that's not satisfied with Father John's ways, and that would be willing to learn better: and would'nt that be the fine harvest? And isn't it the harvest that's losing for want of men to save it?"

"Well, if that isn't true," said Jem; "but where's the labourers? I wonder how it would be if the readers that I hear is about Ballycarny, was to come down this way and try the people here? but sure enough that sort of labourers is few."

"Dead and I think there is many would listen to them ready enough," said Pat, "if they came in to their houses, in a quiet way, of an evening."

"And couldn't we get some of the neighbours to read with ourselves of an evening?" said Jem.

"Why, then, I think we might, easy enough," said Pat, "and a good thing it would be; but, then, wouldn't Father John soon come to hear of that, and wouldn't he destroy us entirely? Why, even Mr. Nulty would hardly dare to employ us, if Father John was to give orders against it on the altar."

"Why, then," said Jem, "if the biggest thistle in Ireland was standing for'nint me to day, I wouldn't stop reaping for fear of pricking my fingers. And if ever we put our hand to Christ's harvest, we will have to face the thistles too; and if we go on reading ourselves, it will come to that sooner or later; and maybe, as Mr. Nulty says of double work, the sooner the better."

"Ay," said Pat, "there's a verse that troubles me often of late, where our Saviour says, that if we are ashamed of him before men, he will be ashamed of us before the angels of God; and, sure, that should make us face thistles and all. But do you think," says Pat, "that we will ever see such a harvest of people in Ireland?"

"It's my opinion," said Jem, "it's coming fast; and, if the readers come down this way, you'll see."

So the bell rang, and they were off to their work; and when evening came, Mr. Nulty paid them two shillings and two pence a man, for he always gave the height of the wages, and a little more; and very thankful his men were, and so was Mr. Nulty, for not a man in the parish had his reaping as cheap by the acre that day.

* As Pat had not his Douay Bible at hand, we have compared all the verses in the two Bibles, and find the sense and meaning the same, only there is a little difference in some of the words.

WHAT SCRIPTURE TELLS US OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY.

Our readers are familiar with the place which the Blessed Virgin occupies in the theological system of the Church of Rome. She is described as "the gate of heaven," "the queen of angels," "the star of the morning." The late Pope Gregory XVI. declares, that in the midst of the greatest calamities he ever recognised her as his patroness and protectress; that she is our only confidence—nay, the entire ground of our hope; the mother, sovereign, guide, mistress of all men. Or, to quote a still later document—"True Catholics," says the Cardinal De Bonald, "pray no longer, in some sort, to Jesus, except through Mary. For them there are no festivals without her; we might say, that apart from her there is no more hope for them. Her name is found incessantly on their lips, and her image in all their hearts. The church, far from opposing, applauds these bursts of filial piety. From his tempest-tossed bark Peter turns his looks constantly to the star of the sea. It seems that God has given over his omnipotence to his mother." And if our readers call to their recollection the pastoral letters of the present Roman Catholic bishops to their flocks, they will see that the cardinal's statement is perfectly true—"Her name is found incessantly on their lips." We believe that it is impossible to find any such document, of moderate length, in which the Blessed Virgin's name is not mentioned; scarcely one of which a considerable portion is not occupied with expressions of devotion to her, and exhortations to their people to love and reverence her.

Now, we propose to enable our readers to judge whether the Blessed Virgin occupied the same place in the thoughts of the primitive Christians which she holds in the teaching of the Church of Rome. We begin with the writings of our Lord's apostles and evangelists, as they are recorded in the Holy Scriptures. "No doubt," a Roman Catholic will suppose, "the writings of the apostles cannot fail to contain innumerable expressions of their ardent love and devotion to the mother of God; no doubt, in their letters to their flocks, they must repeatedly have taught them the advantages and importance of addressing their prayers to her who is 'our only hope,' and of securing her intercession with her Son." Well, we shall not take upon ourselves to say that there is no such thing in the Bible; but we shall put our readers in a position to judge for themselves. We print from the Douay Testament *every* passage in which the Blessed Virgin's name is mentioned, after the first accounts in the gospel of the particulars of our Saviour's birth, and we leave it to the reader to say whether the Apostles entertained the same sentiments, with regard to the Blessed Virgin, which are held by modern Romanists, by Gregory XVI., or the Cardinal de Bonald.

If we have inadvertently omitted any passage in the New Testament in which her name is mentioned, we shall be happy to print it in our next number, if any of our readers will point out to us our omission. We believe, however, that our list is complete.

We recommend our readers to begin by reading over the accounts of our Saviour's incarnation and birth, given in the first two chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel, and in the first two of St. Luke's Gospel. It would take up too much space to reprint these chapters here; but any one who reads these chapters (which contain the history of the Virgin, during the early part of our Lord's life), together with the passages we give (which contain all that is told of her afterwards), will, we believe, have read all that Scripture records or teaches concerning her.

Matthew xii. 46, &c. "As Jesus was yet speaking to the multitude, behold his mother and his brethren stood without, seeking to speak to him. And one said to him: Behold thy mother and thy brethren stand without, seeking thee. But he answering him that told him, said: Who is my mother, and who are my brethren? And stretching forth his hand towards his disciples, he said: Behold my mother and my brethren. For whosoever shall do the will of my Father that is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother."

The same story is given, nearly in the same words, Mark iii. 31, Luke viii. 19.

Matthew xiii. 54 tells us that the people who heard our Lord's teaching wondered, and said—"How came this man by this wisdom and these mighty works? Is not this the carpenter's son? Is not his mother called Mary, and his brethren James, and Joseph, and Simon, and Jude? And his sisters, are they not all with us? Whence then hath he all these things?"

See also Mark vi. 3, and John vi. 42. "Is not this Jesus the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know?"

Luke xi. 27. "As Jesus spoke these things a certain woman from the crowd, lifting up her voice, said to him: Blessed is the womb that bore thee, and the paps that gave thee suck. But he said: Yea, rather, blessed are they who hear the Word of God, and keep it."

John ii. 1. "And the third day there was a marriage in Cana of Galilee: and the mother of Jesus was there. And Jesus also was invited and his disciples to the marriage. And the wine failing, the mother of Jesus saith to him: They have no wine. And Jesus saith to her: Woman, what is it to me and to thee? my time is not yet come. His mother saith to the waiters: Whatsoever he shall say to you do ye. Now there were set there six water-pots of stone, according to the manner of the purifying of the Jews, containing two or three measures apiece. Jesus saith to them: Fill the water-pots with water. And they filled them up to the brim. And Jesus saith to them: Draw out now and carry to the chief steward of the feast. And they carried it. And when the chief steward had tasted the water made wine and knew not whence it was, but the waiters knew who had drawn the water, the chief steward called the bridegroom, and saith to him: Every man at first setteth forth good wine, and when men have well drank then that which is worse. But thou has kept the good wine until now. This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee: and he manifested his glory, and his disciples believed in him. And after this he went down to Caphernaum, he and his mother, and his brethren, and his disciples; and they remained there not many days."

John xix. 25. "Now there stood by the cross of Jesus, his mother, and his mother's sister, Mary of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene. When Jesus therefore saw his mother and the disciple standing whom he loved, he saith to his mother: Woman, behold thy son. After that he saith to the disciple: Behold thy mother. And from that hour the disciple took her to his own."

These are the only passages which we can find in the Gospels relating to our Lord's mother. The book of the Acts of the Apostles contains all that is known of the history of the Christian Church, for about thirty years after the crucifixion. In this book the only mention we can find of the Blessed Virgin is—

Acts i. 14. "All these [viz., the Apostles] continued with one accord in prayer with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his brethren."

The Douay Testament contains fourteen letters written by the Apostle Paul—viz., one to the Church of Rome, two to that of Corinth, one to the Churches of Galatia, one to the Church of Ephesus, one to that of Philippi, one to that of Colosse, two to the Church of the Thessalonians, two to Timothy, one to Titus, one to Philemon, and one to the Hebrews. *In all these fourteen letters we have not been able to discover a single mention or allusion to the Blessed Virgin.*

We find next in the Testament the Catholic Epistle of St. James the Apostle. But neither does he make the least mention of the Virgin.

There next occur two Epistles by St. Peter; but this great Apostle not only gives no injunctions to invoke the Virgin Mary, but he does not once mention nor allude to her.

The Testament next contains three Epistles written by St. John the Apostle, to whose special care our Lord had committed his mother: but this Apostle is as silent with respect to her as the rest.

There is also an epistle written by the Apostle Jude, and in this, too, there is not a word concerning the Virgin.

The Roman Catholic must find it singular that in twenty-one letters, some of them long ones, containing all that the providence of God has allowed to be transmitted to us of the instructions given by the Apostles to their flocks, there should be no instructions to invoke

the Blessed Virgin—nay, no mention of the name of her who is now described as the only refuge of sinners. The last book of the New Testament is the Apocalypse, supposed to have been written by the Apostle St. John at the close of his life, and in which we ought to expect to find anything necessary to be believed and practised, which had not been recorded in the previous part of the canon of Scripture. In this book, however, we are equally unable to find any mention of the Blessed Virgin.

We have now laid before our readers everything we can find in Scripture on the subject of the Blessed Virgin. We make no comment on these passages, but invite our readers to compare them for themselves with the teaching of the Church of Rome on the same subject. On a future occasion we may, perhaps, give an account, in like manner, of the doctrine of the Fathers of the first three centuries with regard to her.

INFALLIBILITY.

In the early numbers of this paper we reprinted in full an essay on this subject by the present Archbishop of Dublin, and stated our intention of giving the reply in a future number. The press of correspondence and other original matter has hitherto obliged us to postpone that reply, for which (as we have already done) we beg again to apologize to our readers, and proceed now to perform our promise, by giving them, in a condensed form, the substance of by far the ablest answer which has come to our notice—that of the Rev. Patrick Murray, D.D., Professor of Dogmatic and Moral Theology in the Royal College of St. Patrick, Maynooth.*

We think it very satisfactory that an answer to Dr. Whately should have been undertaken by a gentleman of acknowledged ability, and holding so high an official position as an accredited teacher in the church; and we cannot but commend the temperate and courteous tone in which it is written, as well as the tact and ability of the writer. Whether he has succeeded in proving what he professes to have shown—viz., that the Archbishop "has completely failed in his argument against the doctrine of infallibility"—we must leave to our readers to judge, after perusing the arguments which we now lay before them; or, what would be still better, the original essays themselves, which we would strongly recommend to every one interested in this important controversy.

THE ARCHBISHOP'S ARGUMENT.

Such of our readers as are in possession of his grace's essay (for which see our first and second numbers), will remember that its leading argument is substantially as follows:—

St. Paul, in his farewell address to the elders of Ephesus and Miletus (Acts xx. 29-31), gives them a very solemn warning (repeated in several of his epistles) that after his departure false teachers should arise, and even from among themselves (from the bosom of their own Church), who should teach perverted doctrines to draw away the disciples after them, against whom he calls on them to *watch*, and to remember that, by the space of three years, he ceased not to warn every one, night and day, with tears.

If we had not these accounts in the Bible, the archbishop observes, that it might seem incredible that any such thing should have taken place, or that false teachers should have been permitted to gain a hearing, or have been able to draw away the disciples from the faith; and we might have been disheartened, and felt as if God had forsaken his Church, in leaving Christians to find their safety against such false teachers in watchful, careful, and honest examination of every doctrine taught; but from these passages we see, that from the very first, this care and watchfulness were indispensably necessary to guard against the danger of false teachers introducing corruptions of the true Gospel; and that, even then, Christians were required to be on their guard against the grievous wolves in sheep's clothing, who would enter in, not sparing the flock. "But how does St. Paul," continues the Archbishop, "tell his hearers to provide against this danger?

"Does he promise them that the *primitive* or early Church shall be safe from it? that no inroads of error will take place for the first three or four hundred years?

"Or, does he tell them that they will find their safety in *apostolical succession?* that it is miraculously provided that no teacher shall ever mislead them, who has but been regularly ordained by himself, or by those appointed by him to succeed him in the office of ordaining?

"Or, does he tell them that when any point of doubt and difficulty arises, they are to find safety in applying to Peter and to those who shall be divinely appointed from time to time as his successors and representatives for decisions and directions that cannot be wrong? Not a word is said of any Apostle but himself: or of any one who should succeed him in the apostolic office. To himself, during his life, they would naturally apply by letter, if opportunity offered, for directions in any case of doubt that might arise. But not even any Apostle—much less any successor of an Apostle—is mentioned by Paul as the infallible guide, whom, after his own death, they were to consult.

"Or, does he bid them resort to some central Church—whether at Jerusalem, or at Rome, or at Byzantium—and seek there for infallible guidance?

"Or, does he direct them to summon a general council, or assembly of all Christians, and refer every question that may arise to the decision of a majority of its votes; with a full assurance that these should be so supernaturally overruled by the Holy Spirit as to secure them from the possibility of mistake?

"No: he makes no allusion whatever to any other Church or prelate; to any successor of Peter or of the other Apostles; or to any infallible council, as their guide. But he tells them to TAKE HEED TO THEMSELVES and to the flock they are set over; he tells them to '*watch;*' and he exhorts them to remember his own earnest warnings to them.

"Now, if there *had* been provided by the Most High any such safeguard as had been alluded to—if Paul had known of any order of men, any bishop, or archbishop, any particular Church, or general council, designed by Providence as an infallible guide, and as a sure remedy against errors and corruptions, would he not have been sure, on such an occasion as this, to give notice of it? If when he foresaw the peril of the Church, like that of a ship in a dangerous storm, he had known of a safe port, just at hand, and easily entered, is it to be believed that he would never have alluded to it, but have left his hearers exposed to the storms? Would he have been, in that case 'pure'—as he declares he was—'from the blood of all men?' Can any one seriously think, that against the dangers which he had been warning them of, and weeping over, for three years, he knew of a complete safeguard, and yet was so wanting in his duty—so careless of their well-being—as never to make the slightest mention of anything of the kind? To suppose this would be to suppose him destitute not only of all faithfulness in his high office, but of common prudence and good sense. And yet, if any such provision really had been made by the author of our faith, it is utterly inconceivable that the Apostle Paul should have been—and that, too, on such an occasion as this—left in utter ignorance of its existence.

"Whatever may be the precise meaning of our Lord's promise—'Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world'—it is, at least, perfectly clear what it could *not* mean; it could not relate to anything either unknown to Paul, or kept back by him from his hearers. All that he knew, and that it was for their benefit to learn, he had, as he solemnly declares, taught to them, and this was no less than the whole counsel and design of God. 'I take you to record this day that I am pure from the blood of all men. For I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God. Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood. For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them. Therefore watch, and remember, that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one, night and day, with tears.' From all this we may learn, among other things, how great is the mistake of those who are satisfied that they can trace up to a very early period—to what they call the primitive Church—some doctrine or practice not found in God's holy Word; and they consider this as showing God's approbation of what may have been, after all, one of the 'perverse things' introduced by false teachers, and against which Paul so earnestly warned the elders."

The archbishop then proceeds to observe "that the exposure of Christians to those dangers, and the call upon them, both ministers and laity, for the continued exercise of watchful caution, is far from appearing to be either what we would wish, or what we would think probable in a revelation from God. It is opposed both to men's feelings and to their expectations.

"To examine again and again—to think and consider—to hesitate and to make up one's mind cautiously—to be always ready to hear anything fair that can be said—and to acknowledge that, after all, we may be mistaken; all this is, on many accounts, contrary to men's natural inclinations. Some have no confidence in their own judgment, and are, therefore, afraid of being left in any way to its guidance; some are so proud that they cannot bear to acknowledge themselves in doubt or uncertainty; some are so indolent that, they do not like the trouble of thinking and deciding; some wish to escape the anxious cares connected with such a state, and cannot bear to be in the least degree of uncertainty. And hence there is a strong prejudice or feeling beforehand, in favour of any system which promises to put an end to the work of inquiry at once and for ever, and to relieve us from all embarrassing doubt and uncomfortable self-distrust. And this is done, either by setting forth the authority of an infallible church, which is to mark out, on every point, what we are to believe and to do; thus relieving us from all trouble and anxiety, and from all necessity of acting on the Apostle's warning to 'take heed to ourselves:' or, again, by putting in place of such a church *immediate inspiration* from heaven, whether bestowed on each individual who belongs to a certain sect or party, or on some highly-gifted leader, who will communicate to his followers the messages he receives from heaven. Widely different, in many points, as these sects, and parties, and churches are from each other, they all agree in the one fundamental point just noticed. They all address themselves to that powerful principle in human nature already noticed, the *craving for infallibility* in religious matters.

"It is true, that hardly any one is found who in words claims or expects to be personally infallible; still we may truly say, that there is in human nature a craving for infallibility, which inclines men beforehand to receive the pretensions, either of a supposed infallible church, or of those who claim or who promise immediate inspiration. Accordingly, some persons waver for a time between these two kinds of pretensions, and at last give in to the one or the other. Again, you may find persons changing from the one to the other, and sometimes thus changing more than once: and it might be added, that one may find instances of the same individual, himself unchanged, exposed to severe blame at different times, not only from different persons, but even from the same; first, for refusing to join the one party, and afterwards for refusing to join the other most opposed to it; both parties much as they are opposed to each other, still always clinging to the confident expectation of finding that infallibility above spoken of. They are *inquiring* only after a way of freeing themselves from the trouble of all further inquiry. Their *care* is only to relieve themselves, in the end, from all further need of watchful care. They are like men in a ship, searching for a perfectly safe harbour, in which the helm may be abandoned, and the ship left to ride securely, without any need of watching the winds and currents, and of looking out for rocks and shoals. They hope to obtain, in all ages of the Church, that freedom from all need of watchful circumspection, which was not granted even in the ages of the Apostles; for we find that, even when there *were* these infallible guides on earth, Christians are perpetually warned of the danger of mistaking 'false apostles' for true."

DR. MURRAY'S ARGUMENT.

After some preliminary remarks, and referring to Archbishop Whately's observations upon the craving for infallibility in religious matters as a powerful principle in human nature, and to the Protestant doctrine of the all-sufficiency of Scripture as the sole rule of faith, containing all that is necessary to be believed or followed to make men wise unto salvation, Dr. Murray proceeds thus:—

"Now, if this theory of the sufficiency of Scripture be true, and if the temptation to admit an infallible authority be such as Dr. Whately describes it, then no light presumption would exist that a specific admonition against a danger so imminent—so deeply rooted in human nature—so peculiarly, because of its own nature, permanently, and incurably, fatal to sound doctrine—would have been given by our Lord or his Apostles, and would have been pretty clearly recorded in Scripture. The presumption becomes infinitely stronger when we consider that there is a number of passages in both the Old and New Testaments, which (I take for granted Dr. Whately would admit) seem, at first sight, to imply something very like what we call infallibility. Such are those texts of the prophecies in which the Church of the New Law is represented as for ever so pure and glorious, ever finally triumphant over all her enemies, ever beloved of God and protected by him. Still more distinct and emphatic are the passages of the New Testament, wherein it is said that the invisible enemies of the Church should never prevail against her (Matt. xvi. 18); where our Lord promises to be with his Church

* Published by Gerald Bellew, 79, Grafton street; Dublin, 1852; in the third volume of a series of essays, chiefly theological, originally entitled the Irish Annual Miscellany.

It was our intention to have reprinted this essay *verbatim*, as we had done that of Archbishop Whately; but on application for permission to do so, were referred by Dr. Murray to his publisher, Mr. Bellew, who refused such permission in terms less courteous than we should have expected, giving us, at the same time, unlimited power to *abuse* Dr. Murray's essay (which, we suppose, was without Dr. Murray's authority, and are not likely to avail ourselves of), and cautioning us against giving, even by way of extract, more than one-fourth of the essay in question. It is not, therefore, our fault, which we hope our readers will observe, that we do not give the *whole* of Dr. Murray's reply in his own words.

all days—that is, permanently, without ever deserting her for a single moment—even to the end of the world (Ibid. xxviii. 20); where he promises that the Paraclete, the Spirit of truth, shall be given to the Apostles, and be with them, and abide *in* them *for ever*, and teach them *all* things and recall to their memory all things which *he had revealed* (John xiv. 16, 26—xvi. 13); where the inspired Apostle calls the Church the pillar and the prop of truth.—1 Tim. iii. 15, &c.

"I am not now asserting (though I firmly believe) that these texts prove the infallibility. All I assert is, that they furnish some very plausible grounds for that doctrine. Taking this, therefore, into account, together with the danger arising from 'the craving after infallibility,' a very strong presumption arises, that, according to the Protestant doctrine on the sufficiency of Scripture, some corrective should have been furnished in some parts of the Sacred Volume. As the texts of the Old Testament, which seem to promise a temporal king in the Messias are sufficiently explained by the many striking passages which clearly foretell a suffering Messias, and which, therefore (especially when joined with the evidences furnished by the Gospel), compel us to interpret the pictures of temporal glory and power as but types, sensible and earthly images of the spiritual kingdom which is not of this world.

"Of course, I do not insist on the preceding as if it *proved* anything decisively: only as Dr. Whately is so very much given to this sort of presumptive *a priori* reasoning (I mean *a priori* in reference to dogmatic proof), it is not useless to show that we, too, are not wanting in presumptive arguments."

After these preliminary remarks, Dr. Murray thus proceeds:—

"But I am delaying too long from the examination of Dr. Whately's argument on the text of St. Paul—a text which, I suppose, he would say, furnishes the required corrective. Let us see.

"I. The argument may, for facility of examination, be put in the following form:—

"If Christ had established any infallible authority on earth for defining articles of faith and settling controversies, St. Paul (to whom, of course, such an institution would have been known) would surely have referred thereto as a means, or *the* means, of overcoming the dangers which he warns against. Nor would he have confined himself to exhorting the elders to watch over themselves and their flock, to remember his own earnest warnings, &c., as if these were their only means of safety. But St. Paul does not say one word about such authority; on the contrary, he confines himself to the exhortations just stated. Therefore no such infallible authority was established.

"ANSWER.

"I deny the two first propositions; and, in direct and absolute contradiction to them, assert that, supposing an infallible authority to have been established, in the *first* place, St. Paul was in no way called upon to refer to it as a security against the evils described by him, and that he did point out the only real means of security; that, in the *second* place, it would have been idle and beside his purpose to refer to it; and that, in the *third* place, such reference would have been in the highest degree inexpedient and pernicious.

"*First.* The object of the Apostle's address in no way required that he should make any reference whatever to the infallible teaching of the Church.

It is plain from the repeated assertions of St. Paul that those whom he was addressing had received from him full instruction in the whole body of the Christian doctrine, and in the economy of the Christian dispensation. They, therefore, had no need to recur to an infallible tribunal to learn for the first time what they had already known before, or to learn more fully and distinctly what they had previously received but partially and obscurely. St. Paul had taught every one of them—taught them night and day, through their houses, for three years—had taught them the whole counsel of God; withheld nothing that was profitable. The instruction was perfect; their knowledge was complete; they needed no further teaching from any tribunal, fallible or infallible.

"The case, then, which St. Paul contemplates, was not that of danger from their ignorance or want of information, still less from 'any point of doubt or difficulty arising' as to what was or was not taught by him—that is, as to what was, or was not revealed doctrine.

"This is made, if possible, still plainer by the words in which he describes the very case, and the *only* case, he contemplates. Their danger was from 'ravening wolves,' from men 'not sparing the flock,' from men 'speaking perverse things,' and trying thereby 'to draw disciples after them.' Mark his words—'Take heed therefore to yourselves and to the whole flock wherein the Holy Ghost has placed you bishops, to rule the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood. *For* I know this, that after my departure *ravening wolves will enter in among you, not sparing the flock.* And of your own selves shall rise men speaking *perverse things* to draw away disciples after them. *Therefore watch*,' &c. (v. 28, &c.)

"That is to say, the danger was from undisguised heretics and schismatics, endeavouring to corrupt their faith ['speaking perverse things'], and to break the unity of the Church ['to draw disciples after them'].

"This was the enemy they had to combat. How, then, were they to meet and defeat him? By flying to an infallible church, an infallible council, or an infallible see? For what purpose? To learn the true doctrine, to learn whether they were to embrace the perverse teaching? But all this they had already learned, and learned from an infallible Apostle. They had received the whole counsel of God, each one of them; nothing had been withheld.

"They already *possessed* the treasure of sound doctrine. The danger to which they were afterwards to be exposed, and of which the Apostle forewarns them, was the danger of *losing* this treasure. Their duty was to *preserve* it. And now I assert, that the means pointed out by St. Paul were *the* means and the *sole* means of fulfilling this duty: the means whereby Christian bishops and other pastors through all time are to protect themselves and their flocks against the assaults of heresy and schism. Another infallible authority could only repeat and evolve the instructions here laid down. Listen:—

"'*I have not spared to declare unto you all the counsel of God.*' You have now the whole body of Christian doctrine from a divinely commissioned and infallible authority: you require not now to seek any more, to be taught over again.

"'*Ravening wolves will enter in among you*,' &c. When I am gone, the unity and faith of the Church will be assailed among you. I warn you of the danger. As the homely proverb has it—*Forewarned, forearmed.*

"'*Take heed to yourselves—watch.*' What mean these weighty words? What means Christian watching against the snares and attacks of the devil and his ministers? It is not as the watching for an indifferent event, as for an eclipse of the moon, or the arrival of a pageant. It is watching for the coming of an enemy, who, if he finds you unprepared to resist him, will capture and slay you. It is a practical watching; a watching with your spiritual armour on; a watching in faith, and humility, and prayer, and the practice of all virtues—for by such weapons only are *these* 'ravening wolves' defeated. You need not run here or run there to look for the truth of Christ: you have received it from me: it is within you: keep it, and these are the means of keeping it: *Take heed to yourselves—watch.*

"'*I commend you to God and to the word of his grace, who is able to bind up*,' &c. God's grace will strengthen you to overcome the dangers I foretell: ask it: adopt the means of securing it: trust in it.

"'*Keeping in memory*,' &c. For three years have I laboured among you, teaching every one of you, teaching all the counsel of God. Forget not my labours and instructions: keep them before your minds: in the recollection thereof you will see the deformity of perverse teaching, and fly from it.

"'*Take heed.....to the whole flock, wherein the Holy Ghost hath appointed you bishops to rule the Church.*' You are the pastors of the people. It is the duty of pastors to watch over the flock, to protect them. Your pastoral vigilance is a divinely appointed means of saving them from the inroads of heresy and from all sin.

"'If, in our own day, St. Paul were to come down on earth to warn the bishops of any country against approaching trials—*e.g.*, against a new heresy on the Divinity of our Lord, what fuller and more apposite instruction could he give them than he gave at Ephesus—even in the hypothesis of a permanent infallible authority? Should he direct them to direct themselves to that authority? For what purpose? To teach them more clearly and surely the Divinity of Christ? But this they, by the hypothesis of the case, already know and believe most firmly; as the ancients at Ephesus knew and believed most firmly all the counsel of God. To settle a controversy? But, by the hypothesis, there is no controversy except the deadly controversy between the Church and heresy; as the controversy foretold by St. Paul was to be only between the Church on one hand and the ravening wolves on the other. To teach them how to preserve the orthodox faith in themselves and their flocks? But no infallible church need be consulted to learn this, St. Paul has given the lesson once for all. Not he alone, nor he on this occasion only. It is written in the plainest characters on every page of the Gospel—'*Watch and pray that ye enter not into temptation.*' It is in every catechism: it is one of the simple elements of Christian morals: it is a Christian 'household word:' children learn it with the first rudiments of faith. No new appeal to infallible authority is necessary for Christian bishops to learn it. Yet *it* is all that is necessary for them to know, and for all to know, in order to overcome the dangers foretold by St. Paul.

"'In a word, the function of infallible authority, as such, is to 'PRESERVE,' define, propose, teach sound doctrine, and proscribe erroneous doctrine. They already possessed the whole of the sound doctrine in its purity. The danger to which they were to be exposed was that of falling away from the truth, of losing the grace of faith. That grace is to be preserved, like every other by avoiding the occasion of sin, by watching and prayer, and pastoral supervision. These are the means established by God, and no other.

"This is enough. It is, therefore, evident, in the *first* place, that, supposing a perpetual infallible tribunal to have been established, St. Paul was in no way called upon to refer those whom he was addressing to such tribunal, or to any tribunal whatever, as a preservative against the perils described by him.

"*Secondly.* From what has been said, it is equally evident that it would have been idle and impertinent in St. Paul to have made any such reference. For recourse to an infallible tribunal is not the means, nor in any way a part of the means, of overcoming the dangers in question.

"*Thirdly.* Such reference would have been not only useless, but positively pernicious.

"For 1°. As recourse to a NEW judgment of the infallible tribunal is not a means of overcoming the danger, to refer thereto, for such a purpose, would have been to turn men's attention from the true means of meeting and subduing temptation, to false and inefficient means. It would be like recommending the officers of a beleaguered garrison to send a deputation to the Queen in parliament assembled, to know whether they should desert to the enemy. They require no authority to tell them that their duty is to fight the enemy and beat him back, but in no case to desert to him. Or it would be as if one, after telling a traveller that there are wolves in the quarter he is entering, and after describing the animals' appearance so minutely that there is no possibility of mistaking it, should conclude by saying—'You will surely meet "ravening wolves" on your journey; and when you do meet them, I would counsel you to send your servant to a competent judge in the next village, to know whether the animal is really a wolf and really mischievous.' Meantime the wolves pour down and kill all before them. The true advice would be—'Keep a sharp look out over yourself and your attendants, and trust to the accuracy of your aim and the goodness of your rifle'—*Take heed: watch.*

"2°. Such reference would imply that a new sentence or definition of the infallible authority was needed. That is, it would imply a direct contradiction to St. Paul's own repeated assertions, that he had communicated to them the fulness of divine truth.

["It may be said that, although the generation of ancients addressed by St. Paul had been fully instructed, and, inasmuch as the sure means of preserving the knowledge thus communicated were pointed out to them, they could not, without grievously sinful neglect, ever after lose any part of the deposit of faith; yet, in after times, under the pressure of persecution or from other causes, the knowledge of men might become imperfect, and doubts and difficulties might arise, that would require the intervention of an infallible tribunal to settle, if such tribunal existed.

"To this I answer, 1°. Though the warnings and instructions of the Apostle are in their general sense applicable to all times and places, yet the specific danger which he here foretels is manifestly one that was to occur not long after. For he says, '*after my departure* ravening wolves will enter in;' a form of words which could not with propriety be used to designate a far distant event. And he immediately adds, as if to impress on them more strongly the proximity of the evil—'And *of your own selves* shall arise men speaking perverse things.' We learn accordingly from his epistles to Timothy, who was at the time Bishop of Ephesus, that these 'ravening wolves' did actually appear during that generation and very soon after his own departure. 'Having faith and a good conscience, which some rejecting have made shipwreck concerning the faith. Of whom is Hymeneus and Alexander,' &c.—1. Tim. i. 19, 20. 'Thou knowest this that all they who are in Asia, are turned away from me; of whom are Phigellus and Hermogenes.'—2 Tim. i. 15. St. Paul *might have* contemplated a general case, the general fortunes of the Church in after ages; but he *did not* contemplate except a particular case, and shaped his admonitions accordingly.

"From the fact just established, a fresh, distinct, unanswerable argument presents itself against Dr. Whately's proof, which may be thus briefly stated.]

"An infallible authority—namely, that of St. Paul and the other Apostles—was actually living, speaking, teaching, defining, at the very time when the dangers foretold by St. Paul were to occur and did occur. But St. Paul does not refer to this infallible authority as a means of providing against those dangers. Therefore he did not think it necessary to refer to an infallible authority, though existing, as a means of providing against those dangers.

"2°. St. Paul, as I have already shown, is not contemplating the case of *bona fide* doubts and disputes within the Church. He was, therefore, in no way called upon to prescribe what was to be done in such case. The case before him was altogether different; his instructions are confined to it.

"More might be said, but let this suffice. Dr. Whately's palmary argument, therefore, from the silence of the Apostle, so far from being 'alone fully sufficient to establish' the fallibility of the Church, leaves that dogma quite untouched, has no force whatever against it, of any kind, in any degree."

EDITORIAL REMARKS.

In presenting to our readers, side by side, the arguments of his Grace the Archbishop of Dublin and the Rev. Professor of Theology at Maynooth, and making some remarks upon the latter, it is of course right to hold in mind that neither his Grace nor Dr. Murray purport to give *all* the arguments on their respective sides of the much controverted but most important question, whether God has given to mankind, in addition to a Divine revelation of his will, a living infallible tribunal, to guide them to the right interpretation of it. Neither of the essays have gone into the general question in the way of proof or reply; and it is but fair to the Rev. Dr. Murray to observe, that he expressly guards against the supposition that he proposes to go into the general question, which, however, in p. 82, he holds out a hope that he will hereafter do, by entering fully into what he calls *the Catholic proof;* a task which we should gladly see well executed, and which we doubt not—if executed by Dr. Murray—would prove as interesting to every sincere inquirer after truth, as it would be important to the Church at large, if any such proof could be given as to deserve the name suggested by the learned professor.

Dr. Murray, for the present, however, expressly confines himself to an examination of Dr. Whately's proof *against* infallibility, or at least "what is entirely new therein, or put forward in a new form."

In order to appreciate the real weight of either the attack or the defence, it will be proper to invite the attention of our inquiring readers a little more minutely to the interesting passage in the Acts of the Apostles, ch. xx., out of which *this* controversy originated.—St. Paul was at Miletus, in Asia, on his way from Macedonia to Jerusalem, where he was anxious to be, if possible, on the day of Pentecost, and, therefore, not having leisure to revisit Ephesus (which was then the most important church in that part of Asia), but being anxious to take a final leave of the Ephesian Church, knowing "that they should see his face no more," he from Miletus sent to Ephesus and called the elders of that church, whom, in v. 28, he states had been made by the Holy Ghost overseers (*i. e.*, bishops) of the flock, to feed the Church of God, and addressed to them the solemn exhortation and warning from which Archbishop Whately selected the text on which he bases his argument. We shall give the passage in full from the Douay Bible.

ACTS xx. 15.

15. And the day following we came to Miletus.

16. For Paul had determined to sail by Ephesus, lest he should be stayed any time in Asia. For he hasted, if it were possible for him, to keep the day of Pentecost at Jerusalem.

17. And sending from Miletus to Ephesus, he called the ancients of the church.

18. And when they were come to him, and were together, he said to them; You know from the first day that I came into Asia, in what manner I have been with you for all the time.

19. Serving the Lord with all humility and with tears, and temptations which befell me by the conspiracies of the Jews;

20. How I have kept back nothing that was profitable to you, but have preached it to you, and taught you publicly, and from house to house.

21. Testifying both to Jews and Gentiles penance ("repentance," English version) towards God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ.

22. And now behold, being bound in the spirit, I go to Jerusalem, not knowing the things which shall befal me there.

23. Save that the Holy Ghost in every city witnesseth to me, saying: that bonds and afflictions wait for me at Jerusalem.

24. But I fear none of these things, neither do I count my life more precious than myself, so that I may consummate my course, and the ministry of the word which I received from the Lord Jesus, to testify the gospel of the grace of God.

25. And, now, behold I know that all you, among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God, should see my face no more.

26. Wherefore I take you to witness this day, that I am clear from the blood of all men.

27. For I have not spared to declare unto you all the course (English version, "counsel") of God.

28. Take heed to yourselves, and to the whole flock, wherein the Holy Ghost hath placed you bishops (English version, "overseers"), to rule the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.

29. I know that after my departure ravening wolves will enter soon among you, not sparing the flock,

30. And of your own selves shall arise men speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them.

31. Therefore watch, keeping in memory that for three years, I ceased not with tears to admonish every one of you night and day.

32. And now I commend you to God, and to the word of his grace, who is able to build up, and to give an inheritance among all the sanctified.

33. I have not coveted any man's silver, gold, or apparel, as

34. You yourselves know: for such things as were needful for me and them that were with me, these hands have furnished.

35. I have showed you all things, how that so labouring you ought to support the weak, and to remember the word of the Lord Jesus, how he said, "It is a more blessed thing to give rather than to receive."

36. And when he had said these things, kneeling down he prayed with them all.

37. And there was much weeping among them all; and falling on the neck of Paul, they kissed him.

38. Being grieved most of all for the word which he said, that they should see his face no more. And they brought him on his way to the ship.

Now.

1. We think it must be plain to any candid reader of the Apostle's address, that the thing which chiefly moved him to these earnest exhortations to "watch and remember," was a sense of the dangers to which the Church at Ephesus would be exposed upon *his removal* from them. It was the prospect of the approaching withdrawal of him—*a living infallible guide*—which moved him to make such a pathetic appeal to the *fallible pastors*, to whom he was now as he supposed, for the last time, committing the flock which he had gathered. It is not reasonable, therefore, to suppose that, upon such an occasion, he was thinking merely of the danger to which the pastors would have been exposed under all circumstances, and whether he was present or absent. He could not have been thinking merely of temptations under which they might lie to a *wilful* rejection of what *they knew* to be his doctrine—a wilful separation from what *they knew* to be the Catholic Church—a wilful setting at nought of what *they knew* to be Apostolic authority. Nor, indeed, would the remedy which he prescribes for the dangers which he *did* foresee have been any remedy against such dangers as we have just alluded to, and which seem to be the only ones thought of by Professor M. To REMEMBER the Apostle's doctrine would, it is manifest, be no safeguard against wilfully and knowingly rejecting or falsifying that doctrine. On the contrary, that doctrine could not have been *wilfully and knowingly* rejected or falsified except it had been *remembered*.

But there was plainly a danger perceived by him to which (1) the pastors here addressed would be *peculiarly* liable in the Apostle's *absence*, and (2) against which the remedy prescribed by St. Paul would be an *appropriate remedy*—namely, the danger of, through heedlessness, forgetting some part of those large expositions of the whole counsel of God which the Apostle had made to them. There manifestly *was* in his view a danger that, after the Apostle's departure, his doctrine might be first partially *forgotten* and then *misrepresented;* and such a danger could only be guarded against either (1) by the pastors diligently *remembering* every point of his doctrine in its true sense; or (2) by their having, when any question arose, recourse to some infallible guide who could assure them what the Apostle's doctrine really had been.

Even in the Apostles' lifetime, upon occasion of their *temporary absence* from churches they had founded, we find that several doubts arose about the *meaning* of their doctrine, and that several points of it were forgotten and misrepresented. See particularly 2 Thess. ii. 1, 2, 3, 5; 1 Cor. vii. 1; and compare John xxi. 23, and 2 Peter i. 12—15; Jude 3. And in such cases it appears that the Apostles themselves interposed by *writing*, to set the churches right. And, indeed, we find the Apostle Paul, after this very address, writing an epistle to this same Church of Ephesus, to remind them of his doctrine; but as time went on, and the absence of the Apostles was not merely temporary but perpetual, it is plain that such dangers would be vastly increased.

Now, according to Roman Catholics, there *was* a *remedy* provided for the dangers thus likely to arise from that infirmity or remissness on the part of the pastors which St. Paul, in this passage, looks forward to with so much apprehension—namely, a living infallible guide, maintained constantly in the Church, to supply their deficiencies. And the difficulty which Dr. M. has to meet—and which we humbly conceive he has not met, but only shuts his eyes to—is, why, under such circumstances, St. Paul did not mention or allude to that remedy.

2. And this will be still more evident if we consider that the warning of the Apostle is addressed to these elders, not in their personal capacities, but as officers of the Church. The danger which the Apostle is contemplating is not so much guilt that might be contracted by these men individually, through a breach of their duty, as the damage which might accrue to *others* by their remissness: that so "grievous wolves might enter in, *not sparing the flock;*" and that "of their own selves should men arise speaking *perverse* things—*i.e.*, giving a distorted statement of the Gospel—to draw *away the disciples after them.*" What he was mainly anxious about, therefore, must have been, maintaining the orthodox faith among the people over whom the Holy Ghost had made these men bishops.

Now, he had, as we have seen, before his mind the thought of the possibility of these very bishops losing, through remissness, the memory of some of the things which he had taught them, since, otherwise, it would have been puerile to exhort them so pathetically to "WATCH AND REMEMBER." He had, therefore, fully before his mind the very case in which a living infallible guide would be most necessary, and in which an appeal to that guide would be most advisable; and yet he says not a word of such a guide, or of any reference to him.

These elders, in short, are supposed by Dr. M. to have been *fallible men*, placed in circumstances of imminent danger, and having on one side *fallible* means of preserving the Apostle's doctrine in their own *private memories* of his words, and their *own private judgment* of the *meaning* of those words, and of the just *references* to be drawn from it; but, on the other, an *infallible* guide at hand, by consulting whom they might at all times be set right. And the apostle is represented as distinctly recognising their infallibility, and the fallibility of the means which they had of themselves for preserving the tradition of his doctrine; and yet spending his whole time in exhorting them to a diligent use of those *fallible* means, without dropping a hint of the *infallible* guide, who could at any time rectify their mistakes or supply what they had forgotten; and all this, while his great subject of anxiety was the preservation of the knowledge of the true faith in the flock committed to their care!

The Apostle is, in fact, represented by Dr. Murray as saying—"Hitherto *I* have been able to give you guidance and direction; but hereafter, though there will still be continued to the Church at all times the same infallible guidance, so that even, if all the Apostles were now scattered and slain (which is a thing likely enough), yet still the infallible director would continue. Notwithstanding all this, you, in dealing with the errors which are likely to be introduced, even by bishops themselves, however mischievous or however subtle, do you trust to your own fallible private recollection of my teaching, and to your own fallible private judgment of its meaning, for it would be '*idle* and *pernicious*' to think of consulting, in such cases, the infallible guide, who is, however, quite necessary for the Church, and will be perpetually maintained in it." Now, can any one suppose that this is a rational account of the Apostle's conduct?

3. Again, the elders whom the Apostle was addressing, were what the law would call a kind of body corporate, *a body having a succession.* They were an order of teachers intended to subsist, as an order, to the end of the world. Now, in a solemn charge to such a body of men, one's thoughts are naturally carried on from the present individuals to their successors. And not unreasonably; because we commonly hope that the principles and rules of acting, once fixed in such a body, will be carried on and transmitted through its whole succession. There is seldom a total sudden change in the members of such a body. But the old members fall off, and new ones come on gradually, one by one; so that the whole line has an appearance of continuity; and the new members may be expected to be influenced by the old ones, and to *inherit*, as it were, the instruction which *they* received.

Hence the Apostle would naturally feel that, in addressing these elders, on their duty after his removal, he was laying down maxims to regulate both them *and their successors.* It was, we know, the duty of these bishops not only to teach the laity, but to continue their own order; and he must have hoped that the solemn charge, which he was then delivering to them, would be fondly cherished in their recollections, and repeated by them to those who should come after. He was now leaving his last legacy of warning to a *permanent body* of teachers, for their direction, under very dangerous circumstances, and in a time of persecution, when some changes in the members of that body might speedily be looked for. It would be strange, therefore, if his mind were not carried on to view them under this aspect, and address, in them, their successors also; and, therefore, *very strange* that, speaking under such circumstances, to such a body, he should say nothing of the infallible guide, supposing such to exist.

(For continuation see page 104.)

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We have been obliged by press of matter to postpone the insertion of several volued contributions, already in type, and beg to apologize to our Celbridge correspondent for our delay in noticing his communication.

Mr. Power's letter reached us too late for our present number, but shall be inserted in our next.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st.

No anonymous letter can be attended to. Whatever is sent for insertion must be authenticated by the name and address of the writer, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee for his good faith.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, SEPTEMBER, 1852.

We have on several occasions directed the attention of our readers to the mighty movement that is now agitating the minds of men, on the subject of religion. It was natural that we should do so, for it was this which called our journal into existence, and it is this which gives it any interest that it possesses. We have looked at the great movement of religious opinion, candidly and dispassionately. We have not attempted to conceal the real facts, but rather have aimed at showing them just as they really are. We have not pretended that the changes in religion which thus arise, are all upon one side; on the contrary, we have repeatedly called attention to the remarkable fact, that each side succeeds in making converts from the other—converts remarkable either for their number or their importance.

In the introductory article in our first number we said:—

"It is a notorious fact, that a convulsive movement of religious opinion is in progress, such as these countries have not witnessed for three hundred years. It does not exist merely in one locality, nor is it confined to a particular class of men; on the contrary, it has spread, like an electric current, to the remotest corners of the empire, and has pervaded all ranks of society. The Premier Duke of England in his ancestral castle, the learned professor in the time-honoured University of Oxford, the peasant in the lonely wilds of Connemara and Kerry, have alike felt its influence, and bent beneath its power. . . . We are daily informed that some fresh individuals, few or many, have relinquished their old religious belief—that a Roman Catholic has become a Protestant, or *a Protestant has become a Roman Catholic.*"

In the article on "Conversions and Perversions," in our third number (March), we put it in the same light:—

"The wonder is, *that these conversions take place on both sides; Protestants have become Romanists*, and Romanists have become Protestants."

And if we have thus fairly stated the facts, with perfect impartiality, we trust we have also dealt with those facts in a calm and Christian spirit. Immediately after the passage above quoted, we went on thus:—

"Now, we do not mean to dispute the sincerity of either party in their change. The spirit in which this journal is conducted, does not allow us to impute unworthy motives, nor are we at all disposed to do so. . . . Let others act as they will, we, in this journal, are determined not to seek for truth in abusing our opponents instead of arguing with them; for the sincerity of their motives, we know that they must give an account to God. All we are concerned with is, *what reason each can give* for his change of religion."

We trust we have never, in any instance, lost sight of this rule of conduct which we then proposed to ourselves.

It was this great stirring of the opinions and minds of men that brought our journal into being; and, feeling that our undertaking is the child of such a mighty movement of opinions, it is natural that we should call attention to its facts.

Here we must necessarily, though unwillingly, take a more partial view (in the present article) of this movement. While hundreds in England, chiefly from the clergy and the higher classes of society, have joined themselves to the Roman Church, in Ireland it has been wholly different. We have already, in the article on "Conversions and Perversions," in number 3, considered the comparative importance of the conversions which have taken place in the two countries; and our present object is to direct attention to the facts as they exist in Ireland.

That there is a great stir going on, and that thousands, and tens of thousands, are actually changing their religion in Ireland is a notorious fact. And here we may repeat an observation we have made before, that where there are so many changers in religion, there must be a vast multitude more who are thinking about religion.

This striking fact is now admitted on all hands. The *Dublin Evening Post*, a paper no way favourable to Protestantism, thus spoke of it November 11, 1851:—

"We learn from UNQUESTIONABLE CATHOLIC AUTHORITY, that the success of the proselytizers, *in almost every part of the country*, and we are told *in the metropolis*, is beyond all that the *worst misgivings could have dreamt of*. There is not only *no use in denying these statements*, but it would be an act of treachery to the best interests of the Catholic Church to conceal them, or even to pass the matter over as a thing of no great moment."

The *Tablet* is the newspaper of Dr. Cullen and the Roman Catholic priests and clergy; and the *Tablet* of Nov. 8, 1851, thus speaks:—

"We repeat that it is not Tuam, nor Cashel, nor Armagh, that are the chief seats of successful proselytism, but this very city (Dublin) in which we live."

The fact must have been very notorious and undeniable, when it is thus confessed by the leading Roman Catholic newspapers. Of course they would deny such a thing if they could.

We have lately learned a fact, upon good authority, which shows how this movement is extending. Dr. Plunket, the Bishop of Tuam, has held confirmations through the diocese of Tuam, in each of the years 1849, 1851, 1852. In those three years he has confirmed in the faith of the Church of England and Ireland, in that one diocese alone, no less than TWO THOUSAND FOUR HUNDRED AND FOURTEEN converts from the Church of Rome! and this is steadily increasing; for the number confirmed by him this year is larger than in either of the former years, being *eight hundred and forty-one.*

This gives us some idea of the work that is going on. The number of converts is, of course, much larger than the number of converts confirmed; and the number who are thinking and inquiring about religion must be vastly greater than the number of converts.

We hear two opposite accounts of the nature and extent of this movement. Some say that all these persons are bribed: and that only for the bribes there would be no converts at all. Others say that only for the fear that the people are in, at the consequences of changing—the fear of losing employment, and becoming "marked men" among the people—the number of converts would be tenfold greater.

We confess we have no faith in accounting for all this by bribery. We know of no funds for the purpose; and we do not think so ill of the Irish Roman Catholics, as to believe that thousands of them could be found in a single diocese to sell their religion and their souls for paltry bribes. We think this story of the bribes an unjustifiable slander on the people of Ireland. We know that the penal laws did not get the Irish Roman Catholics to change their religion; and we do not believe that money will be any more successful. Surely no Roman Catholic will be offended at our expressing such an opinion!

It appears to us that the plain and practical way of testing the different reasons which are given for these conversions is, to inquire what the Irish Roman Catholics do, when they go to a place where they are at liberty to do as they please, and where it is not pretended that any bribery is used.

Our readers will at once remember how many Irish Roman Catholics have gone to America; and we are sure will be anxious to learn whether they continue Roman Catholics there. And it so happens that we can answer this by the testimony of a witness whose testimony nobody can question. The Rev. Mr. Mullen, Roman Catholic Curate of Clonmellon, in Westmeath, is known as a man of great ability, and great zeal for his Church. This Roman Catholic clergyman was sent by the bishop of his church to America, on a special mission, about a year since. While there his natural activity and love of Ireland led him to examine closely into the condition of the Irish Roman Catholics who have gone to America. He wrote home a letter telling how he found things; and this letter was published in the *Freeman's Journal*, a Roman Catholic newspaper, about the end of last April. No one can suppose that such a man would give a worse account of Irish Roman Catholics in America than truth required him to give. We, therefore, may rely upon his testimony; and we give his statement as he gives it himself:—

"Is there to be no voice raised that will keep the people at home, and thus save *millions* from spiritual destruction? *I say millions*; here are my facts:—

"The present population of the United States is about 15,000,000, and of these the Catholic Church claims only 1,980,000.

"From the year 1825 to 1844, 1,250,000 left Ireland, one million of whom came to America; the proportion of Catholics among them may be fairly estimated at 800,000. Since that period to the present, the numbers who emigrated here from Ireland, at the lowest calculation, were 1,500,000; and, taking the Catholics as above, we will have in nine years 1,200,000.

"A large number (say half a million) came from Germany, some from Italy, France, Belgium, and other countries, during the last ten years, half of whom were Catholics, say 250,000.

"Twelve years ago America had a Catholic population (according to Dr. England, Bishop of Charleston) of 1,200,000. Calculating the increase of this number by births, at the very small number of 500,000 and adding for converts in the larger cities and towns 20,000, we will have the following total:—

"Catholic emigrants from the year 1825 to 1844	800,000
"Catholic emigrants from the year 1844 to 1852	1,200,000
"Catholic emigrants from other countries	250,000
"American Catholic population 12 years ago	1,200,000
"Increase by births since ...	500,000
"Number of converts	20,000
"Number who ought to be Catholics ..	3,970,000
"Number who are Catholics ...	1,980,000
"Number lost to the Catholic Church	1,990,000

"Say, in round numbers, TWO MILLIONS!"

Incredible as this statement may seem, it is impossible to doubt its correctness; for surely nothing but the clearest evidence could bring such a statement from a priest in whom the Irish Roman Catholic bishops place such confidence, as to intrust him with so important a mission.

It is clear, from this statement, that three-fourths of the Irish Roman Catholics, who have gone to America in the last twelve years, have ceased to be Roman Catholics there.

There is no charge of bribery there. Such a charge would, indeed, be absurd; for the whole public revenue of the United States, if applied in bribing converts, would not be sufficient to bribe such numbers. No such wholesale system of bribery could be practised without being discovered; if discovered, or even suspected, the Rev. Mr. Mullen would not have failed to have held it up to the righteous execration of the civilized world. Mr. Mullen makes no charge of the kind; and, therefore, we may be satisfied that no shadow of ground exists for saying that all these changes are effected by bribery.

Here we see what Irish Roman Catholics do where no bribes are offered to them, but where they are simply at liberty to do as they please.

Why should we be surprised if some thousands, or tens of thousands, are doing the same thing at home? Why should we say that it *must* be bribery here, when so many more do it there, where there is no bribery at all?

Let us refrain from slandering our fellow-

countrymen; and let us consider what other reason can be given for it.

We have found, in the *Tablet* newspaper of the 31st of last July, a letter, written by a Roman Catholic missionary priest, employed among the Irish Roman Catholics in America, *during those very twelve years of which Mr. Mullen speaks;* and this missionary thus undertakes to account for it:—

"I declare it as my own experience of twelve years in the western missions, *and I appeal for its truth to every missionary*, of longer or shorter experience, the fact that apostasies from the faith of St. Patrick is owing, with scarcely an exception, to the *want of religious instruction in which these unfortunate people were literally raised.* . . My humble advice, therefore, *to those whom it may concern*, IN IRELAND, is, teach all the children, and many, very many of the adults, *the Christian doctrine.*"

We think this explanation is not far from the truth; but we do not think that it is the truth.

We never heard of a multitude of men changing their religion while they continued in stupid ignorance. It is when men's minds begin to work, that these things happen. When men attain to the first and hardest step in the path of knowledge—namely, the knowledge of their own ignorance—then they will take some active step in the search for truth. We met with a remarkable instance of this not long since. WE SAW an address, signed by 243 Roman Catholic heads of families, in a parish in the west of Ireland, and presented by them to the Protestant clergyman of that parish. We shall never forget the simple and forcible statement it contained —"*We find that we have lived in ignorance, and that we are like to die in the same.*" And they asked him to build them a church, and to give them instruction. Their request was complied with, and they now learn from him the Word of God.

It was not their ignorance that led them to this, but the DISCOVERY they had made of their ignorance.

We have now shown, from unquestionable testimony, what is going on in Ireland and in America. In such a state of things discussion and inquiry is essential and inevitable. Our journal was established to afford a means of this discussion; and the manner in which Roman Catholic laymen have come forward for such discussion in our pages, is not the least remarkable sign of the times.

It has been our endeavour heretofore, and will be for the time to come, to conduct this discussion as sincere lovers of truth, and in a spirit of Christian love towards all our fellow-countrymen.

THE TOUCHSTONE.

(Continued from page 69.)

OBJECTION 9.—Protestants to justify their revolt from the Old Church, affirm, that she had revolted from God, and that God Almighty had cast her off.

Their own Bible assures them that God Almighty has made a solemn oath, that this should never be (*Isaiah* liv. 9, 10)—*As I have sworn, that the waters of Noah should no more go over the earth; so I have sworn that I would not be wroth with thee* (the Church) *nor rebuke thee. For the mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed, but my kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed, saith the Lord, that hath mercy on thee.* Where it is worthy our notice, that this whole chapter is acknowledged, by the contents prefixed to it in the Protestant Bible, to have been spoken of the *Gentile Church*, to which St. Paul himself applies the first verse of it—*Gal.* iv. 27.

OBJECTION 10.—Protestants, to justify their revolt from the Church, pretend that God Almighty's *covenant of peace* with his Church was not *everlasting*, and that he did not promise that *his sanctuary should be in the midst* of his Church *for evermore.*

Their Bible, in plain terms, contradicts both parts of this their assertion (*Ezek.* xxxvii. 26), where God Almighty, after having promised by his prophet the coming of Christ, and the establishment of his kingdom —that is, of his Church—tells us, *Moreover I will make a* COVENANT OF PEACE *with them. It shall be an* EVERLASTING COVENANT *with them: And I will place them, and multiply them, and will* SET MY SANCTUARY IN THE MIDST OF THEM FOR EVERMORE.

REPLY TO 9 AND 10.—Protestants do *not* affirm these things. They hold that, though the Christian Church had fallen into grievous and damnable errors, it had never wholly revolted from God; nor do they believe that the Almighty had ever cast her off. On the contrary, they believe that God's Spirit never abandoned his Church since the fundamental points of Christianity were maintained, and the means of knowing God's will were preserved among Christians. Otherwise, the Reformation—which was not any new revelation, but merely an assertion of the doctrine contained in the acknowledged Scriptures—could not have taken place. Just so God had not *deserted* the Church of Israel, amidst all its corruptions, as long as the means of salvation were preserved, and there was ever so obscure a remnant who used them. This abiding of God's Spirit, then, is the "*covenant of peace*" which he promised by his prophet to make with his Church—this is the "*sanctuary*" which he has set in the midst of them for evermore."

OBJECTION 11.—Protestants deny that Christ's Church upon earth is always visible; because they will have it, that for many ages, before their religion came in, there was no true *visible* Church upon earth.

Their Bible, in many places, expressly assures us, that Christ's Church is always *visible;* comparing it to *a mountain upon the top of mountains*, exposed to the view of *all nations flowing unto it—Is.* ii. 1, 2, 3, &c., and *Micah* iv. 1, 2. *To a great mountain filling the whole earth.—Dan.* ii. 35. *To a city set on a hill which cannot be hid.—St. Matt.* v. 14.

REPLY.—Protestants do not deny that Christ's Church is, and always has been *visible* (see reply 10), but they hold that this visible church consists, and has always consisted, *of various communities or churches*, acknowledging one and the same *invisible Governor*, and called one in reference to him—the Lord Jesus Christ—whose "body," this collective assembly, is called in Scripture, and concerning which the prophet said—"All nations shall flow into it." And accordingly they find Paul addressing epistles to several distinct churches, without giving any hint of their being all subject to Rome. He says nothing of the kind either in his Epistle to the Romans, or in his epistles to other churches. And the Apostle John, in the Book of Revelations, addresses seven churches in Asia as distinct communities, subject only to their Divine Master.

OBJECTION 12.—Protestants maintain, that the whole Church of Christ is not in one only society or religion; but that many different sects, divided from each other in faith and communion, may nevertheless all belong to the Church of Christ.

Their Bible plainly teaches the contrary, in which our Saviour tells us (*St. John* x. 16)—*Other sheep I have which are not of this fold* (viz., the *Gentiles*, who were then separated from the *Jews*), *them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be* ONE FOLD AND ONE SHEPHERD. And *St. Paul* (*Ephes.* iv. 4, 5)—*There is* ONE BODY, *and* ONE SPIRIT, *as you are called in one hope of your calling, one Lord,* ONE FAITH, *one baptism.* Nor, indeed, is it possible, according to the Scripture, that the Church of Christ should subsist, if she were split into many sects, divided from each other in faith and communion: *For every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand.*—Matt. xii. 25.

REPLY.—Protestants do indeed maintain (see reply 11 and 7), that the Church of Christ is made up of different churches divided in respect of ordinances, but united in all fundamental points of faith, and therefore belonging to the "*one fold*," under "one Shepherd—Jesus Christ.

The quotation from Matt. xii. 25, 26, seems to have nothing at all to do with the subject of *divisions* in the *Christian Church.* It was an answer to those persons who were attributing the miracles of Christ—especially the casting out of devils—to Satan. If Satan allows his ministers (our Lord argued) to do the things belonging to the kingdom of God—"if Satan cast out Satan," he is divided against himself, "how shall then his kingdom stand?" for (v. 25) "every city or house divided against itself shall not stand."

(To be continued.)

DR. MURRAY ON INFALLIBILITY.

(Continued from page 102)

It may possibly appear somewhat startling to our readers, that so eminent a Roman Catholic theologian as the Professor of Theology at Maynooth, should have declared, in the passages we have quoted *in extenso* from his essay in another column, page 101, that *watchfulness* and *prayer* are *the means* and the *sole* means, of "preserving the treasure of sound doctrine, when once possessed; and consequently, that the silence of St. Paul, with respect to the existence of an infallible authority, as a preservative against the evils of heresy and apostasy, arose simply from the fact, that to have referred to an infallible authority, as a security against the evils described and apprehended by St. Paul, would have been not only idle and impertinent, but actually pernicious.

"It is written," says Dr. M., "in the plainest characters, in every page of the Gospel, '*Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation.*' This is one of the simple elements of Christian morals; no new appeal to infallible authority is necessary for Christian bishops to learn it. The danger to which they [*i.e.*, those who already possessed the whole of sound doctrine in its purity] were to be exposed, was that of falling away from the truth—of losing the grace of faith; and that grace is to be preserved, *like every other*, by avoiding the occasion of sin, by watching and prayer, and pastoral supervision. These are the means established by God, and no other," therefore, "it would have been idle and impertinent in St. Paul to have made any reference to a perpetual infallible tribunal, for recourse to a perpetual infallible tribunal is not *the* means, nor *in any way a part of the means* of overcoming the dangers in question."—pp. 37, 38.

With every word of this we can agree with Dr. M., and have no doubt but Archbishop Whately and all sound Protestant divines would do so too; and if this be sound Roman Catholic theology, and consistent with the doctrine of infallibility, as held by the Roman Catholic Church, we must admit that Archbishop Whately's argument from the silence of St. Paul is greatly (so far as it is designed against the Church of Rome) weakened, if not answered, by Dr. Murray's reasoning. It is, however, we think, something new to find an accredited teacher of the Church of Rome asserting that prayer and watchfulness are *the* means and the *sole* means of preserving and transmitting in their integrity the doctrines of religion, when once they have been delivered in their fulness; in other words, that, for the prevention and avoiding of *heresy* or *schism*, an appeal to a living infallible guide on earth is not only useless, but injurious; the chief boast and pride of the Church of Rome having hitherto been that by its infallibility, and that alone, unity can be secured to the Church or schism prevented; and however the authorities of the Irish Roman Catholic Church may be induced to wink at Dr. Murray's argument, as a convenient mode of reply to a difficult Protestant objection, we are disposed to believe that the Roman Catholic Church will never consent, in real truth, to allow her members to treat her boasted infallible authority as superseded or needless, and to substitute for it the mere exercise of watchfulness and prayer (which every one can practise for himself); nor is it likely, we think, that the Roman Catholic laity will consider that they derive much benefit or relief from risk and anxiety in following the teaching of an infallible guide, if they are once convinced by Dr. Murray that they must, after all, still rely exclusively upon *watchfulness and prayer* as the *sole* means of continuing in the true faith (just as if they were Protestants and had no such infallible guide to trust to as a preservative against error).

That Dr. Murray, himself, does not, however, feel quite sure of the Catholicity of such a doctrine, and is anxious to leave himself a loophole to escape by, if needful, is evident from the same page (38) of his essay, in which it will be observed that he defines the function of infallible authority to include *preserving* sound doctrine, as well as defining, proposing, and teaching it. These are his words—"The function of infallible authority, as such, is to *preserve*, define, propose, teach sound doctrine, and proscribe erroneous doctrine." To be consistent with his argument, his sentence ought to have run thus—"The function of infallible authority, as such, is *not to preserve but* to define, propose, teach," &c. The passage as it stands is, in fact, contradictory of his whole argument; for if one of the functions of an infallible authority, as such, be to *preserve* sound doctrine, recourse to it would at least be *a part* (and, if so, surely a most important part) of the means of overcoming the danger of falling away from the truth, and losing the grace of faith, which Dr. Murray, in the very same page, expressly denies to be the case. Is it not, therefore, plain, that Dr. Murray is obliged either to exclude "preserving sound doctrine" from the functions of an infallible church, as he virtually does in this argument, or to admit that his reply to Archbishop Whately is wholly inconclusive and illogical? And before going further, we call on Dr. Murray to answer this plain question, suggested by his own inconsistent statements—does the function of an infallible authority, as such, *include* or *exclude* the *preserving* sound doctrine? And upon what authority does he so define it either in one way or the other? We confess, however, at the same time, that we do not see that Dr. Murray would get over the difficulty, even by correcting his definition, and excluding from it the word "preserving," for it is also part of his definition of the functions of infallible authority, as such, to "*proscribe erroneous doctrine*," and how it will be possible to hold *that*, while at the same time asserting that it is not any part of its functions to "preserve sound doctrine," and still more, how it can be part of its functions to "*teach*," and no part of its functions to "*preserve*" sound doctrine, exceeds our powers to conceive; and if there be any such infallible tribunal authorized to *teach* sound doctrine, and *proscribe* erroneous doctrines, such a tribu-

nal would obviously be the *most* effectual, as we believe the majority of Roman Catholics believe it actually *to be* the *only* effectual *preservative* against "falling away from the truth," and, therefore, would be such a means of *preserving* truth as St. Paul could not have been silent about when warning the Ephesians against the perils he described, and which Dr. Murray calls the "danger of falling away from the truth, and losing the *grace of faith*."

We don't accuse Dr. Murray here of *intentionally* resorting to ambiguity of language (an expedient too commonly and sometimes successfully resorted to by controversialists), but we think he has here unintentionally fallen into it. What are we to understand by the words "the grace of faith" in the passage we have just quoted? Does he mean a personal grace existing in an individual? It is, indeed, true that this grace, the personal Christian grace of faith, is to be preserved by prayer and watchfulness. But what has this to do with the present question? The Apostle was not speaking of "faith" as a grace or state of mind, but of "faith" in the objective sense, as *the truth to be believed;* and if Dr. Murray uses the word "faith" as it is a grace or state of mind, his argument is irrelevant—but if he uses it as meaning the "whole" body of "Christian doctrine," the "whole counsel of God" of which St. Paul was speaking, and which he so emphatically had just stated "that he had not spared to declare it to them," then Dr. Murray is reduced to assert that an infallible tribunal is of no value whatever in preserving "the whole body of Christian doctrine" or else to admit that St. Paul either was ignorant of it, or designedly but unaccountably omitted to mention the most complete safeguard and preservative against error, a divinely commissioned infallible Church, which if any such existed would be, as Archbishop Whately argues, "to suppose St. Paul destitute not only of all faithfulness in his high office, but of common prudence and rationality."

But Dr. Murray attempts to get out of the difficulty by making an assertion of which he seems to us to have given no semblance of proof. He says (p. 34) the danger was from *undisguised* heresies and schismatics, endeavouring to corrupt their faith ("speaking perverse things"), and to break the unity of the church ("to draw disciples after them").

This, surely, is a grave error in Dr. Murray's reasoning. What ground has he for limiting the danger to that from *undisguised* heretics? Was not that from *disguised* heretics far greater? Can Dr. Murray really think the "ravening wolves" here spoken of by St. Paul to be different from the "false apostles, *deceitful* workers, transforming themselves into apostles of Christ and ministers of righteousness," whom he speaks of in 2 Cor. x. 13—even as "Satan himself transforms himself into an angel of light"—or different from those "wolves *in sheep's clothing*" against whom our Lord warns his hearers. Were these, too, undisguised heretics? In what age of the world, we would ask, did *undisguised* heretics appear, and who were they, and how was it that they succeeded? Was it of *undisguised* heresies and schismatics St. Paul was speaking when he exhorted the same Ephesians (4 ch., v. 14) in these words—"That we be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind by the *sleight* of men, and *cunning craftiness* whereby they *lie in wait to deceive?*" Can we possibly suppose any false teacher undisguisedly avowing himself to be a heretic, and openly speaking "perverse things," and trying thereby to induce men to become his disciples? Was it from teachers who should come in the open way, as "undisguised heretics," that St. Paul apprehended so great danger, as to have warned the Ephesians night and day with tears to *watch* and take heed unto themselves? Was it not obviously against *disguised* and *unsuspected* heretics that they were not only to combat but to *watch?* Has not the principal danger in all ages been from these? and was it not in order to *detect* and *unmask* those disguised and deceitful false teachers of perverse things, who were "to arise among themselves," that St. Paul was warning them so earnestly—men who would gloss over and misinterpret Holy Scripture and apostolical teaching, and attribute to the Apostles what they never said or wrote as part of their Divine teaching, and against whose subtle craftiness it would ever require the greatest watchfulness to guard themselves? It was not merely against ravening wolves from without, but against *wolves in sheep's clothing within* that the Ephesians were to guard; and what means could be so proper to detect those disguised heretics as that same infallible tribunal, whose function it is, according to Dr. Murray himself, to "*proscribe*" erroneous doctrine, and expose and punish heresy? And yet St. Paul is wholly silent concerning it.

Dr. Murray represents the Apostle as anxiously warning the elders against palpable and open dangers, which any one could see, and saying nothing of those subtle ones which are always the most dangerous. He represents this skilful and honest pilot of the church as warning the crew, whom he was forced to leave in the hour of peril, to take care of the cliffs and promontories which they could plainly see with their own eyes, and yet saying nothing of the sunken rocks and hidden shoals which lay in their course, and which might easily escape their notice. Is this natural or credible?

And when Dr. M. specifies in particular the denial of Christ's divinity as one of the errors which fallible pastors are quite competent to deal with effectually, is it not odd he should not have remembered that this was the very point which the *first General Council* was assembled to decide upon?

But Dr. Murray, after basing his whole argument on the *assumption* that the ancients of the Churches of Miletus and Ephesus (who had enjoyed the benefit of St. Paul's personal teaching, and learned the whole counsel of God, each one of them, from him as an infallible Apostle) were the persons exclusively addressed by St. Paul on this remarkable occasion (a position which, we think, we have already disproved), was too acute not to perceive that this was not a point likely to be conceded without proof, and he therefore thinks it prudent to show that he had not altogether overlooked it; and alludes to it, in p. 40, as if it were a matter, however, of trifling moment, and easily disposed of. See the paragraph marked with brackets in p. 101.

Here we join issue with Dr. Murray, and beg to dissent from what he calls "the fact just established" as a fact not established at all; for though we agree with him that "the warnings and instructions of the Apostle are in their general sense applicable to all times and places," we think he has altogether failed in establishing that the specific danger which he here foretells is *manifestly* one that was to occur not long after. What is his argument to establish this? The whole of it is this—"For he says, *after my departure* ravening wolves shall enter in," "and of your own selves shall arise men speaking perverse things." Now, observe, St. Paul does not say, "*immediately* or *shortly* after my departure," nor allude to any particular time or event, but uses words which, with perfect propriety, might be used to designate either an event or a series of events which were not to happen until after his death—events quite as likely to happen fifty years after his death as a few years after it. What is it but this—"While I remained with you, to teach and warn you day and night with tears, you had me, of course, to refer to on all occasions of difficulty, but after I am gone, as you can no longer refer to me, keep an anxious watch against false teachers, who will try to mislead you"—a practical exhortation, which would surely be as applicable, if not more applicable, to their successors than to themselves. Were the exhortations of uninspired philosophers, such as Socrates or Aristotle, ever considered as addressed to their immediate disciples alone, and not understood as equally applicable to all their followers? And how much more the words of an inspired Apostle, who had the acknowledged power of working miracles in confirmation of everything he taught? And which of his hearers could have limited the caution of St. Paul as applying exclusively to the natural lives of those to whom he spoke, merely because, in addressing such a class as the ordained pastors of the Church, he used the phrase "of your own selves," instead of the synonymous one "of your own body?" The fact that during the life of Timothy, who was then Bishop of Ephesus, Hymeneus and Alexander, Phigellus and Hermogenes "made shipwreck concerning the faith"—*i. e.*, apostatized from Christianity—assuredly affords no additional proof that St. Paul *exclusively* confined his warning to those who actually heard him; and until some better proofs than those given by Dr. Murray shall be produced, we cannot consent to treat it as "*a fact established*" that though St. Paul *might* have "contemplated a general case (the general fortunes of the Church in after ages), he *did not* contemplate any except a particular case, and, *therefore*, shaped his admonitions accordingly." On the contrary, we must continue to hold that St. Paul selected this occasion for addressing truths of general importance to the whole Church of God, especially when we see that his companion, St. Luke, writing under Divine guidance, thought this address was a suitable one to form a part of what was to be delivered down, for the benefit of all after ages, in the Holy Scriptures, and be received as an authoritative part of the Gospel of the grace of God, which St. Paul "received of the Lord Jesus," and was commissioned "to testify," not to the Ephesians only, but to the whole Gentile world. If this be the fact, and his words be admitted to be applicable also to the Church in after times, when (to use Dr. Murray's own words), "under the pressure of persecution or from other causes, the knowledge of men might become imperfect, and doubts and difficulties might arise that would require the intervention of an infallible tribunal to settle, if such tribunal existed," the silence of St. Paul as to the existence of any such tribunal, is not only unexplained by Dr. Murray, but the Archbishop's primary argument, as Dr. Murray calls it, is, we think, left quite untouched and unanswered. It appears, indeed, to us that Dr. Whately so shaped his objection, that no other reply was possible, except that which Dr. Murray has attempted to give, but which has led him unavoidably into an admission at variance with the doctrines of his Church—an admission which, if it means anything, amounts to this—that *an infallible authority is unnecessary for the transmission of Divine truth*, inasmuch as when Divine truth has been once fully given to a church, infallibility is no longer requisite, even as a means for the prevention of disputes, or detection of heresy; the *sole* means of preserving the treasure of sound doctrine being, "watching and prayer, and pastoral supervision," which are obviously as open to the members of the Church of England which denies, as to those of the Church of Rome which asserts the existence of an infallible guide and judge of controversies. On the whole, however we may admire the ingenuity and boldness of Dr. Murray, and appreciate his temper and courtesy as a controversial writer, we think his attempt at replying to Archbishop Whately's essay has not only failed, but is one of the most distinct and explicit abandonments of the *necessity* for an infallible Church which we have yet met with in any Roman Catholic writer.

Correspondence.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I am really much surprised you should assert, in page 78 of your July number, middle of second column, that I make the decrees of General Councils the sole interpreter of Scriptures; that I mention this *alone*, (!) and, of course, that I believe in no other.

How can you reconcile such a proposition with the 7th paragraph of my letter, top of page 69, and 3rd column of June number, wherein I expressly affirm that the clergy are to be regarded as the judges appointed by God to expound the law, and their expositions to be considered binding? Ezekiel xliv. 24; Mal. ii. 7; Acts viii. 26, and subsequent verses; 2 Cor. iii. 6.

I certainly do say that the sense in which the CATHOLIC CHURCH has held, and does hold, the Holy Scriptures, can be *best* ascertained—in fact, is embodied—in the decrees of her General Councils, which were convened at different periods to condemn various heresies; and, in doing so, have necessarily given, and set forth in detail, the Church's sense and interpretation of such portions of Scripture as from time to time were heretically relied upon, and advanced against Catholic doctrine.

That I deem perfectly satisfactory and consistent, in reply to the oft-repeated question of where the true sense of the Holy Scriptures is to be found, which the Roman Church professes to enjoy, but which, it is alleged, she has never *published*.

Your commentary, in this particular, resembles very much the wailing of a man under the discipline of a drummer. You are neither pleased with the interpretation of priests nor councils, and wish to be left all to yourself.

Will you give me leave to ask, by what authority you next proceed to excommunicate from the Protestant fold Socinians and *some others* (?) whom *you* do not look upon as *Christians*, though they *call themselves* Protestants? Have they not as clear a right to exercise their private judgment, and protest as you? How can you write that you know of no difference among any Protestant bodies about *articles of faith*, when there are essential differences between the United Church of England and Ireland, and what, by Act of Parliament, is styled the Protestant Presbyterian Church of Scotland? You state that your church law of divorce does *not* allow the separated parties to marry; if so, why are such married by clergymen of the Church of England, not only as ministers, but likewise as principals?

You make a distinction between religious observances &c., &c., and *articles of faith*, to which I readily accede, and am most happy to have elicited; I only pray you to extend the same indulgence to Roman Catholics, and not everlastingly be calling on them for Scripture proof of such and such religious practices and observances, which are matters of individual predilection, and not of general or Catholic belief.

You conclude by observing, that if the Church of Rome had not been guilty of serious errors, you would not have been justified in leaving her communion. Whether the Church of Rome has erred in its teaching is but a matter of opinion; whether it is the church founded by Christ and his Apostles, and, in despite of powers and principles, enjoys a perpetuity, is a matter of fact. The living Church, in direct descent, is the test and confutation of all false churches.

For a moment, and for the sake of argument—admitted it has become corrupt, what justification is that for your separation from her fold? I challenge you to produce a Scriptural authority for dissent. Dissent is nowhere recommended in the New Testament; quite the contrary. The Church of Galatia was corrupt; St. Paul, nevertheless, did not exhort its members to separate from, or come out of it, but to remedy its abuses. The Church of Corinth was corrupt; the Apostle acted in the same way with respect to it. The Jewish Church was corrupt, exceedingly corrupt in our Saviour's time, yet he, whom if we follow we walk in the fulness of light, so far from separating from it, attended on its ministrations, paid its charges, inculcated obedience to its ministers; in a word, exhibited the example of a scrupulous regard to its ecclesiastical authority. When the Corinthians had a mind to introduce something like

schism and dissent into Christianity, St. Paul thus rebukes them—"*Is Christ divided?*"—1 Cor. i. 13. Nor should Christ's fold be so; but one, under one shepherd.

I remain, sir,

Your very obedient,

M. V. AYLMER.

July 31, 1852.

We would be most unwilling to misrepresent Mr. Aylmer's opinions, and most anxious to correct any mistake, if we have made one. We are not yet sensible that we have done so; but if Mr. Aylmer can show us that we have, we will make the fullest amends.

It is true we did say "Mr. Aylmer makes the decrees of General Councils the interpreter of Scripture; he mentions this alone, and, of course, he believes in no other." Mr. Aylmer asks us did we not observe that he had said before, "the priests are to be regarded as the judges appointed by God to expound the law, and their expositions to be considered binding?" We did certainly observe this; but, then, we know that Roman Catholics differ very much about the sense to be put upon these words; some very ignorant men speak as if everything that any one priest may say, is to be received as gospel, infallibly true. Other Roman Catholics, who have more knowledge, treat this doctrine with as much contempt as Protestants do, and admit it to be clearly false; these say that when we speak of the expositions of priests as binding, it can mean only what all priests agree in teaching, and not what each individual priest may say. And when we come to ask how we are to know what teaching all priests do agree in, we find two different answers; one party tells us that we are to read what priests have written, to search all their books, to find out all their opinions, and then to form our judgment, of what they agree in. Now, we confess that our experience makes this the most impossible task that ever was imposed upon mankind. *Suppose that we even could* find out, *in this way*, what all the priests in the world at the present day do agree in, it would not only cut out much which Mr. Aylmer would keep in, but we should not even then be at the end of the question; for, what if we should find, as we certainly should in many cases, that the priests of a *former* age thought differently? Truth must be the same in all ages. Let us take an example to illustrate this method. Does the discourse of St. John's Gospel, chapter 6, apply to the Holy Sacrament or not? There is no question concerning the interpretation of Scripture, of greater practical importance in the controversies of this day. Will Mr. Aylmer show us how we are to ascertain the general sense of all the priests of the present day upon this? We ask him just to try and tell us how we can ascertain this? Will he try? And *if he could*, what if we should be able to show that the greatest and most learned priests of his own church, in ages not long past, taught the very opposite?

It is the absolute impossibility of finding out the general agreement of all priests *in this way*, that has led the wisest and most learned men of his own church to say, that we are to look for the authoritative exposition of priests only in the decrees of General Councils.

There are three different senses in which the judgment of priests is held binding:—

1st. What any priest may say.

2nd. The general agreement of priests, gathered in some vague way, no one can tell exactly how.

3rd. The solemn judgment of priests laid down in General Councils, so that the world may have some chance of finding out exactly what it is.

Those who hold that the judgment of priests is binding, consider themselves at liberty to hold any of these three opinions. If we should, at any time, mistake the sense in which any individual holds the judgment of priests binding, some allowance ought to be made for us, seeing that Roman Catholics differ so much among themselves about the sense of these words.

We gave Mr. Aylmer credit for the last of these opinions, as being the least opposed to common sense, and that which is most commonly adopted by learned and wise men in his own church; and if we have erred in supposing that this was the sense in which he used the words, we do not think this should be any ground of offence to him.

We think his own words led us naturally to think that this was his meaning. Here is what he said:—"You have inquired where the true sense of the Holy Scriptures is to be found, which the Roman Church professes to enjoy, but which you assert she has never published. To which I reply, that the sense in which the Catholic Church has held, and does hold, the Holy Scriptures, can be best ascertained—in fact, is embodied—in the decrees of her General Councils." Now, if he had *only* said—"Can be *best* ascertained," we should have understood him to imply that there might be *other* binding expositions, which were *not* contained in the decrees of Councils; but when he adds that the church's sense of Scripture is "embodied" in those decrees, we understood him to say that the whole authoritative exposition which priests have to give, is all contained in the decrees of Councils. If we have mistaken his meaning, it was this led us astray.

If he will now say that there are *other* expositions of priests, which are not contained in the decrees of General Councils, but which are yet to be considered binding, we beg that he will tell us 1st, what they are; 2nd, where they are to be found; 3rd, how we are to know them; 4th, where they have been published. We would beg of him, and of every one else who may read this paper, to try and produce SOME ONE INSTANCE of an exposition of priests, of any one passage of Scripture, which exposition is not depending on the decree of a Council, and yet is binding; and to tell us on what principles it is binding.

Can any one give us such an instance?

We suspect that when Mr. Aylmer considers this more carefully, he may be content to fall back on the sense we put on his words, and to grant that there really is no possible way of ascertaining the binding exposition of priests but by their formal decree in a Council.

This is certainly the most plausible sense to put on the binding authority of priestly expositions. Yet even this Mr. Aylmer may find too large to be maintained.

For instance, will he accept all the decrees of the General Councils of Constance and Basil? Are they all binding? Can he venture to answer this?

Or will he be bound by all the decrees of the four first General Councils? Can he venture to answer this—yes, or no?

Or will he be bound by all the decrees of the second Council of Nice? All these are difficult questions for him; but we must leave them for the present. If he will now tell us in what sense, and to what extent he considers the expositions of priests binding, and how we are to ascertain those which are binding, we will take care not to misrepresent his opinion.

Mr. Aylmer next asks—"By what authority you next proceed to excommunicate from the Protestant fold Socinians and some others whom *you* do not look upon as *Christians*, though they call themselves Protestants?"

We reply—1st. Socinians deny the essential doctrines of the Gospel, as they are plainly laid down in Holy Scripture.

2nd. They deny those doctrines as laid down in the Catholic creeds, which certainly contain the faith of the Catholic Church.

We, therefore, cannot acknowledge Socinians as our brethren in the faith of Christ, and in his Church.

Will Mr. Aylmer deny that these reasons are sufficient? If he will deny it, can *he* show any reason for rejecting Socinians that will be plainer, simpler, and more sufficient?

Mr. Aylmer says—"That there are essential differences in articles of faith between the Church of England and Ireland, and the Presbyterians in Scotland." If this were so, it would be no part of our business to defend those who differ from us *in articles of faith*. But we are not at all aware that it is so; and we must ask Mr. Aylmer to explain in what *articles of faith* they differ from us.

The prohibition against marrying a woman who is put away (Matthew v. 32), evidently applies to one who is put away *contrary* to Christ's command. No marriage with one *so put away* has ever been sanctioned, that we know of, by English law. Can Mr. Aylmer venture to say that no marriage with one put away contrary to Christ's command, has ever been sanctioned by the Roman Church?

Mr. Aylmer admits our distinction between articles of faith and religious observances, &c.; and says—"I only pray you to extend the same indulgence to Roman Catholics, and not everlastingly be calling on them for Scripture proof of such and such religious practices and observances," &c. We think Mr. Aylmer is under a mistake; it is true we call for Scripture proof of the creed of Pope Pius—that is, of the *articles of faith* of the Roman Catholic Church. With respect to religious practices and observances, which are not of general or Catholic belief, we only require that they shall not be contrary to Scripture. Let Mr. Aylmer look back through our journal from the beginning, and see if we have not limited our demands to this. He himself has called for Scripture proof of the calendar of the English Prayer-book! Why should he charge us with everlastingly doing what we have not done, and he has done?

Mr. Aylmer relies upon the mere fact of the succession of the Roman Church, as sufficient to condemn those who leave her, because her doctrine is corrupt. Does Mr. Aylmer not know, that the succession of the Greek Church from the Apostles *is a fact quite as undeniable as the succession of the Roman Church?* Does Mr. Aylmer think that the *succession* of the Greek Church is sufficient to prevent any one leaving her communion on account of corrupt doctrine? The succession of the Church of England and Ireland is as clear as either the Roman or the Greek.

Mr. Aylmer says—"You conclude by observing, that if the Church of Rome had not been guilty of serious errors, you would not have been justified in leaving her communion." We acknowledge that we used an incorrect expression. The Church of England and Ireland has not refused to hold communion with the Church of Rome; we have always professed our readiness, and our desire, to hold communion with her in all things lawful by the Word of God, the Catholic creeds, and the decrees of the General Councils of the universal church. The Church of Rome has refused to hold communion with us, unless we will do things which God forbids, and profess things which he denies; and, on our declining to do these things, *the Church of Rome has withdrawn her communion from us.* We wish it could be otherwise; but the guilt of separation rests with her, not with us.

Mr. Aylmer maintains, that a church becoming corrupt is no justification for separation from her. He illustrates and proves it thus—"The Church of Galatia was corrupt; St. Paul, nevertheless, did not exhort its members to separate from, or come out of it, but to remedy its abuses." We submit that this is precisely what has been done in the Church of England and Ireland.

But does that instance of the Church of Galatia prove that separation from a Church can never be lawful? Was not this said to the Galatians—"Though *we* or an angel from heaven preach a gospel to you, besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema."—Gal. i. 8, Douay Bible. The Church of Galatia was at that time preaching "another gospel."—Verse 6. Of course the Apostle's desire and command was *to reform* the Church of Galatia, by correcting its abuses and removing its corruptions; and happily this was done. But if the Church of Galatia had refused to be reformed, and had persisted in preaching another gospel, were not all faithful Christians in that church bound, by the Apostle's command, to count that Church of Galatia, *anathema*, or *accursed?*

We trust Mr. Aylmer will find nothing objectionable in the temper in which we have replied to him. It is our earnest desire to understand his arguments, and to give them the fairest consideration.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

2 MACCABEES xii. 43, 44, 45, 46.

SIR—Notwithstanding that you are justly esteemed one of the most erudite *Celtic* paleographers of the present day, yet I must object to your translation, from the original Greek, of the above verses from the 12th chapter of the 2nd Book of Maccabees.

As every Greek copy of the Book of Maccabees agrees with that valuable and ancient manuscript in the Vatican library, as well as with the Alexandrian manuscript now in the British Museum, to both of which you have referred, I am happy to find we can have no controversy about the original; but the "*correct translation*" with which you have favoured your readers, in this month's number of the LAYMAN, is not exactly in accordance with that generally received by Protestants, and totally at variance with the reading and interpretation of a scholar and divine whose works stand high among those of British theologians.

Within the last day or two I have had the satisfaction of finding my view and argument on 2nd Maccabees confirmed by no less an authority than Bishop JEREMY TAYLOR, who was not only an Irish prelate of great renown, but likewise one of the early Vice-chancellors of our University. This learned doctor, in his *Lib. of Proph.* i. 1, sec. 20, n. 11, p. 345, thus expresses himself:—

"We find, by the Maccabees, that the Jews did pray and make offerings for the dead, *which appears by other testimonies*, and by their form of prayer, still extant, which they used in the captivity. Now, it is very considerable, that since our Blessed Saviour did reprove all the evil doctrines and traditions of the Scribes and Pharisees, and did argue concerning the dead and the resurrection, yet he spoke no word against this *public practice*, but left it as he found it, which HE who came to declare to us all the will of his Father, would not have done if it had not been innocent, pious, and full of charity."

Now, on referring to my former writing, your readers will perceive that this is precisely what I advanced, and the force of which you endeavoured to avoid by a translation which I can in no way admit to be correct.

Judas Maccabeus, be it recollected, was not only the chief, but the most virtuous and zealous high priest of all the priests and doctors attached to the service of the Temple and of the whole Jewish nation, and would certainly have neither introduced nor directed any such offering for the dead, if *contrary* to the Mosaic law. Judas Maccabeus it was who instituted and celebrated the festival of the restoration of *all* the sacrifices at the Temple for eight days; and the learned translator of Josephus's works (the late Rev. Wm. Whiston, A.M., Cambridge) is of opinion, with many others, that this is the festival commemorated in the gospel, John ii. 23, to which our blessed Saviour, we are told, came up to Jerusalem on purpose to bear a part in the solemnization of it.

In conclusion, I re-assert, and upon scriptural authority (Ecclesiasticus vii. 37; 1 Cor. xv. 29), that prayers for the dead formed a *constant* part of the public worship of the Jews; and that the baptisms or legal purifications, which the Jews likewise used for the dead, demonstrate their belief that the dead receive spiritual aid from the devotion of the living.

WARNER CHRISTIAN SEARCH.

August 28, 1852.

In the above letter, "W. C. Search" denies the accuracy of our translation of the Greek copy of the Book of Maccabees. "W. C. Search" does *not* point out *in what* our translation is wrong. We presume that he would have done so if he could. To leave him no excuse for not doing so, we give here the Greek of the whole passage, and the translation of it, as given in our last number:—

43. ποιησαμενος τε κατ' ανδρολογιαν κατασκευασματα εις αργυριου δραχμας δισχιλιας, απεστειλεν εις Ιεροσολυμα προσαγαγειν περι αμαρτιας θυσιαν, καλως και ασταιως πραττων, υπερ αναστασεως διαλογιζομενος.

44. ει γαρ μη τους προπεπτωκοτας αναστηναι προσεδοκα, περισσον αν και ληρωδες υπερ νεκρων προσευχεσθαι

45. ειτ' εμβλεπων τοις μετ' ευσεβειας κοιμωμενοις καλλιστον αποκειμενον χαρισητριον, οσια και ενσεβης η επινοια. οθεν περι των τεθνηκοτων του εξιλασμον εποιησατο, της αμαρτιας απολυθηναι.

43. And having made a preparation of two thousand drachms of silver, accordiog to a collection man by man, he sent to Jerusalem to offer a sacrifice on account of sin, acting altogether well and correctly, reasoning concerning the resurrection.

44. For if he did not expect that the slain should rise, it would have been superfluous and trifling to pray for the dead.

45. Then seeing that a most excellent reward is reserved for those falling asleep with piety, a holy and pious thought. Wherefore concerning the dead, he made atonement, to be loosed from sin.

Now, let "W. C. Search," or any one else, show us what Greek word in the above passage we have translated wrong, and how it ought to have been translated. If no one can do this (as we know they cannot) what use is there in saying that our translation is wrong?*

What reason does "W. C. Search" give for denying the correctness of our translation? Nothing but this, that (*as he says*) Bishop Jeremy Taylor has quoted and explained the passage as "W. C. Search" does. Now, suppose that Bishop Taylor had quoted the Douay translation, without even looking at the Greek, will that prove that we have translated the Greek wrong?

But we have more to say upon this quotation from Bishop Taylor. "W. C. Search" thus introduces it:—"Within the last day or two I have had the satisfaction of finding my view and argument on 2nd Maccabees *confirmed by no less an authority* than Bishop Jeremy Taylor. . . . This learned doctor, in his Liberty of Prophesying, sec. 20, n. 11, p. 345, *thus expresses* HIMSELF."

Now, it is quite true that the passage which "W. C. Search" thus introduces and quotes is found in that work of Bishop Taylor to which "W. C. Search" refers; and it is quite true that this passage agrees with "W. C. Search's" argument; but it is quite false that this argument is *confirmed* by Bishop Taylor's *authority*, or that Bishop Taylor "*thus expresses* HIMSELF."

"W. C. Search" has left out certain words of that passage, as it stands in Bishop Taylor's "Liberty of Prophesying" (the book which "W. C. Search" refers to for it). Bishop Taylor put in a parenthesis of *three words*, and "W. C. Search" left them out! It is for us to supply them; thus—"We find (SAYS THE ROMANIST) in the history of the Maccabees;" so Bishop Taylor wrote it; but on looking back to "W. C. Search's" letter, our readers will see that "W. C. Search" left out the words, "says the Romanist," and instead of them he asserts, "this learned doctor *thus expresses* HIMSELF."

Thus Bishop Taylor *expressly states* that he is only reporting to us *what the Romanists say for themselves*, and "W. C. Search" LEAVES OUT this express notification, and gives us the passage as *Bishop Taylor's own judgment* in the matter!

What can we say to such dealing as this? All we can say to it is this, that we find in the writings of the leading Roman Catholic controversialists, what appears to us very like a systematic employment of falsehood and fraud, to make authorities *appear to be for them* which are directly against them. We shall give in our next number some other instances of the way in which the principal Roman Catholic controversialists have quoted the authority of Bishop Taylor with similar unfairness.

In dealing with such a system we have no argument but to expose its falsehood, and to leave it to the consciences of Roman Catholics who sincerely seek for truth to consider for themselves, as they regard the salvation of their own souls, whether they can expect to be guided into truth by those who seek to lead them by such means.

We beg "W. C. Search" distinctly to understand that we do not at present charge him with falsehood or fraud. He may be able to show that he has only been deceived, and not a deceiver in this matter. We know that most Roman Catholics take their authorities, not from the authors themselves, but from extracts given in modern Roman Catholic books of controversy, and thus they are often deceived. If "W. C. Search" did really consult Bishop Taylor's own book, and did himself cut out the words, "says the Romanist," he is without excuse, and must bear the blame himself; but if he took his quotations from any modern Roman Catholic book which had already left out the words, we must hold him excused from any intention of falsehood, and will only ask him to mark in future how apt such books are to deceive him. Or if he can tell us of any modern edition of Bishop Taylor's "Liberty of Prophesying" in which those words are omitted (telling the date of that edition, and where it was printed), we shall also hold him excused; though this will not support his argument, because those words are in all the editions published by Bishop Taylor himself during his lifetime. We do not know of any such modern edition, nor do we suppose that such a one exists.

But we remind "W. C. Search" that, in order to have the benefit of this excuse, *he must tell us from what book he took his quotation*; and we now call upon him, in justice to his own character, to tell us the name of the book from which he took this quotation. If he do not answer this, he must bear the blame himself.

The other arguments in his letter require but little notice. He tells us that the festival for which our Saviour is said to have gone up to Jerusalem, in the Gospel of St. John, ch. 2, v. 23, was a feast established by Judas Maccabeus. We cannot believe this, for this simple reason, that the Apostle himself, in the very verse to which "W. C. Search" refers, tells us expressly that that feast to which our Saviour went up was the feast of the passover or pasch; and we suppose that "W. C. Search" will not ask us to believe that the passover was instituted by Judas Maccabeus. "W. C. Search" probably intended to refer to 1 Macc., ch. 4, v. 59, and to John, ch. 10, v. 22. But this festival had nothing whatever to do with sacrifice or prayer for the dead.

"W. C. Search," in the above letter, quotes the Book of Ecclesiasticus as Scripture. Now, in "W. C. Search's" letter, in our last number, he took us to task for saying that he had quoted the Book of Maccabees as Scripture, and affirmed that he had quoted it only as a historical testimony, and required us to meet his argument on this ground. Surely he must know that the Book of Ecclesiasticus has no more claim than the Book of Maccabees to be *inspired Scripture*.

"W. C. Search" also quotes 1 Cor. chap. 15, verse 29. We ask him does the Church of Rome now practise "baptism for the dead," in the sense which he now seeks to put upon that verse? Would not the Church of Rome now say that to practise what he thinks to be the true sense of that verse, would be an impious blasphemy? How comes it that they, who profess to have an infallible guide to the true sense of Scripture, so often quote Scripture in a sense directly opposed to their own infallible guide?

We shall give in our next number the instances we have promised of the fraudulent appeal to Bishop Taylor's authority, which the chief Roman Catholic controversialists are so fond of making. In the meantime, we call on "W. C. Search" to clear himself from this imputation, by telling us the name of the book from which he quoted the passage, which he gives from Bishop Taylor's "Liberty of Prophesying."

* We have but one trifling correction to make ourselves; the word ειτ' at the beginning of verse 45, which we have translated "then," might be better translated "farther," or "besides," which would improve the sense. (For this use of the word see Heb. xii. 9, where it is translated *furthermore* in the authorized, and *moreover* in the Douay translation.) Verse 44 being a parenthesis, and marked as such in the Douay Bible, verses 43 and 45 are thus connected so as to give the

Notes and Queries.

Can any one explain why, in the Roman Catholic creed, the creed of Pope Pius the Fourth, the word "AMEN" is put in the middle and not in the end? Or is there any other instance in the Catholic Church, since it began, of this word *Amen* being put in the middle of either a profession of faith or a prayer, and not at the end of it?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

"A Friend to Truth" wishes to know if he be correct in saying that the Church of Rome does not allow the sacrament of Extreme Unction to a criminal that is to be executed?

FARM OPERATIONS FOR SEPTEMBER.

HARVEST operations will be the chief employment during the month; and notwithstanding the previous inclement weather, the present has turned out very propitious, the change has come in time to save much corn that was in a very doubtful and hazardous way; and from all we can see or learn, the present harvest promises to be, if anything, over an average one, if the present fine weather continues.

Harvesting.—Proceed vigorously in cutting the corn crops, as they get matured. Avoid cutting while the crop is wet with rain, in this state it will not be fit to bind, particularly if there be much grass or weeds amongst it, and it will be hazardous to leave it in *ledge* on the ground. Seize, therefore, every opportunity to cut at once. The stooks will be the better of not being capped, if the weather holds dry; but on the approach of rain, lose no time in doing so. When thoroughly seasoned carry to the haggard, stack and thatch without delay. Field-stacking should be avoided as much as possible, much waste attends it, and much loss of time; the frequent handling of the sheaves shed the grain; if wet weather comes on, many of the stacks will take the wet and be much injured, and brought into the haggard in a bad state, besides being attended with much expense. We would, therefore, strongly recommend carrying the corn out of the stook to the haggard. Any sheaves not fit to bring home to-day will be fit to-morrow or the next day. The days are longer, the weather finer than further on in the season, and all things conspire to make this mode the most economical in every way

Ploughing.—As soon as the corn is reaped, it should be stooked in rows, at wide intervals, to allow of the stubbles being ploughed up at once. If the stubbles are weedy, the land should be pared with the skim plough, or horse-hoe, harrowed well, the weeds gathered and burned, and the ashes scattered before ploughing; this, if timely executed, will save much after labour, cost, and trouble.

Wheat should be sown this month on the fallow lands, where the system is practised, or on potato land when the crop has been taken out; this, however, greatly depends on the state of the land, which should be neither too wet nor too dry; if in either extreme, time must be given till, by the timely fall of some rain, the land possesses the proper degree of consistency, if too dry; and, on the other hand, to dry off sufficiently, if too wet.

Rye should be sown early in the month, whether intended for a grain crop for soiling, or for supplying the ewes with an early bite; it is a most valuable crop for the two latter purposes, it supplies a bite before anything else, and gives the earliest soiling crop.

Winter Vetches may be sown any time in the month, and is a most valuable succulent soiling crop; though sown at the same time it does not come into use as early as the rye; the rye is past use for soiling when it shoots, but the vetches are not in their prime till they begin to pod, they are then most nutritious; from their trailing habit it is necessary to sow a little rye with them, or, better still, some winter oats, which help to support the vetches, and add considerably to the bulk of the provender.

Bere should also be sown early in the month, it is a most useful grain, ripening before any other, and giving a supply for bread at the most critical time of the year, between the old and new: it makes an excellent household bread.

Winter and Russian Beans may be sown between the middle of this and the middle of next month. The land should be clean, in good tilth, and well manured; the beans may be sown either broadcast and harrowed in, or in drills from 2½ to three feet apart. When the land is clean the broadcast sowing is allowed to produce the heaviest crop; but if the land be dirty, drilling gives a great facility for summer cleaning, and in this case it is truly a useful and profitable *fallow* crop.

Winter Dun Oats.—This grain has now got universally into repute and has proved itself an excellent and remunerative crop, having, in many instances, superseded wheat. It should be sown early in the month; in fact, as soon as harvest operations will allow. It should be sown in dry weather, never in wet. That sown in dry weather will be several barrels more productive per acre, than that sown in wet.

Winter or Black Barley may be sown any time between the middle of this and the middle of next month. It is a very productive crop; but its malting properties have not been sufficiently tested.

Cabbage sown in July will be fit to plant out this month, the land should be both deeply tilled and well manured; in field culture any of the modes proposed for planting rape will be found suitable.

Parsnips may be sown any time during this or the succeeding month; the land should be deeply tilled, well pulverized, and well manured with rich compost, which should be well incorporated with the soil, to produce fleshy, clean roots.

Sheep.—Breeding ewes should now be selected, and by the end of the month some of them admitted to the tup. *Lambs*, and the culled ewes, should be kept on the best and most nutritious pastures, so as to promote the growth of the lambs, and fat the ewes for market.

Pigs.—Stores should now be put up to fatten: food of all sorts and offal being abundant. They will be the better of being let to roam about the haggard and corn fields, to eat up the fallen grain, which may otherwise be wasted, unless there be a plenteous stock of poultry to let out for that purpose. Let them out in the day time, but house them early in the evening, giving a good evening meal, and good dry bedding.

Odds and Ends.—Plash and lay hedges, scour out dykes and water-courses; repair roads; cart home dry bog-stuff to litter the byres and stables with, and as a base to build manure-heaps on; cart home turf for fuel, and limestone to the kilns to burn for manure; turn

New and Recent Works

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

Booksellers to the Queen,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

ALFORD'S GREEK TESTAMENT, with a Critically Revised Text, Marginal References, and Commentary. New Edition. Vol. I., much enlarged, 32s. Vol. II., 28s. (Vol III., in preparation.)

HOOK'S CHURCH DICTIONARY. Seventh Edition. Revised and corrected. 16s.

EVENINGS WITH THE ROMANIST. By Rev. Hobart Seymour. 8s. 6d.

THE BIBLE HANDBOOK: an Introduction to the Study of Sacred Scripture. By Joseph Angus, D.D. 5s.

HELPS TO THE THOUGHTFUL READING OF THE FOUR GOSPELS. By Henry Stebbing, D.D. 8s.

THE PULPIT FOR 1854. Sermons by eminent living ministers. Vol. I., containing a hundred and three Sermons. 7s. 6d.

NARRATIVE OF A JOURNEY THROUGH SYRIA AND PALESTINE, IN 1851 AND 1852. By C. W. M. Van de Velde. 2 vols. 8vo. 30s.

THE HISTORY OF THE FRENCH PROTESTANT REFUGEES, from the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. By Charles Weiss. 8vo. 14s.

HOPE DEFERRED, NOT LOST; a Narrative of Missionary effort in South America. With Journals of Captain Gardiner, &c. 5s.

ON THE PLURALITY OF WORLDS. An Essay. 8vo. 8s.

MORE WORLDS THAN ONE. The Creed of the Philosopher, and the Hope of the Christian. By Sir David Brewster. 6s.

THE PILGRIM IN THE MISSIONS; or GOSPEL HUSBANDRY. By H. Smith, Esq. 4s. 6d.

OUR FATHER; or Jesus teaching to Pray. An Exposition of the Lord's Prayer. By Rev. Samuel Garrett. 2s. 6d.

HELPS AND HINTS FOR BIBLE READERS: Being practical comments on some of the most remarkable passages in the New Testament. By the Rev. Nicholas J. Moody. 3s. 6d.

SCRIPTURE AND THE PRAYER-BOOK IN HARMONY. England's Church and Handbook of Common Prayer, and Articles, the Scriptural antidote of Sacerdotalism and Schism. By Rev. A. R. Faussett. 3s. 6d.

MINISTERING CHILDREN; a Tale dedicated to Childhood. 5s.

ISRAEL IN EGYPT; or the Books of Genesis and Exodus, illustrated in existing monuments. 6s.

THE WARRANT OF FAITH; or a Handbook to the Canon and Inspiration of the Scriptures. By Rev. Robert Whytehead. 6s. 6d.

THE WORKS OF THE LATE REV. ALEXANDER CARSON, LL.D. Vol. III. Containing all his works on the Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. 5s.

EXAMINATION OF MR. MAURICE'S THEOLOGICAL ESSAYS. By Robert S. Candlish, D.D. Crown 8vo. 6s.

THE LAND OF SINIM; or, China and Chinese Missions. By the Rev. William Gillespie. 5s.

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY; with an Inquiry into the Causes of its Inefficiency: with an especial reference to the Ministry of the Establishment. By the Rev. Charles Bridges, A.M. Eighth Edition; corrected and enlarged. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

AN INQUIRY INTO THE ORGANIZATION AND GOVERNMENT OF THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH. By Rev. Albert Barnes. 2s.

CLAUDE, THE COLPORTEUR. By the Author of "Mary Powell." 7s. 6d.

VESTIGES OF DIVINE VENGEANCE IN THE DESTRUCTION OF SODOM AND GOMORRAH. By W. E. Tayler. 5s.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND ERASTIANISM. By J. R. Pretyman. 7s. 6d.

JESUS TEMPTED IN THE WILDERNESS. By Rev. Adolphe Monod. 2s. 6d.

SABBATH MORNING READINGS IN THE BOOK OF LEVITICUS. By the Rev. Dr. Cumming. 5s.

THE ECLIPSE OF FAITH; or, Visits to a Religious Sceptic. Fifth Edition. 5s.

GRATITUDE: an Exposition of the Hundred and Third Psalm. By the Rev. John Stevenson. 8vo. 6s.

SYNONYMS of the NEW TESTAMENT. By Rev. Richard Chenevix Trench. 5s.

A SELECTION of ENGLISH SYNONYMS. Edited by Archbishop Whately. 3s.

ON THE STUDY of WORDS. By Rev. Richard C. Trench. 3s. 6d.

ON THE LESSONS in PROVERBS. By Rev. Rd. C. Trench. 3s.

THE BOOK AND ITS STORY: a Narrative for the Young, on occasion of the Jubilee of the British and Foreign Bible Society. By L. N. R. With an Introductory preface, by Rev. T. Phillips. Fcap. 4s.

THE DENS of LONDON: Notes and Narratives of a Six Years' Mission among them. By R. W. Vanderkiste. Cheap Edition. 1s. 6d.

HOME TRUTHS: being Miscellaneous Addresses and Tracts. By the Rev. J. C. Ryle. 3rd Series. 3s. 6d.

PLAIN SPEAKING. First series. Being forty short, Large-type Tracts. By the Rev. J. C. Ryle, B.A. In packet. 1s.

KATHERINE ASHTON. By the Author of "The Experience of Life." 2 Vols. 12s.

THE LAMPLIGHTER. With Illustrations. 3s. 6d. Cheaper Edition, 1s. 6d.

POOR PADDY'S CABIN; or, Slavery in Ireland. 1s. 6d. and 2s. 6d.

SHADOWS OF THE FUTURE; or, the Real Antichrist. The destinies of Rome, Constantinople, and Jerusalem. The World's Confusion, and the Coming Restorer. 4d.

WERTHEIM'S PACKET OF THIRTY TRACTS, assorted. Second series. 2s.

THE ACQUITTANCE IN FULL. Tracts for Ireland. By Fidelis. 6d.

SCRIPTURE ITS OWN AND BEST INTERPRETER. By X. Y. 4d. by post 6d.

MANNA FOR THE PILGRIM; for each morning of the Month, from the writings of the Rev. W. H. Hewitson. 8d.

THE RUSSIAN SHORES OF THE BLACK SEA, IN THE AUTUMN of 1852, with a Voyage down the Volga, and a Tour through the Country of the Don Cossacks. By Lawrence Oliphant. 8vo. 14s.

ALISON'S HISTORY of EUROPE, from the fall of Napoleon, in 1815, to the Establishment of Military Government in France, in 1852; being a continuation of his former celebrated Work. Vols. I., II., and III. 8vo. 15s. each.

TURKEY, RUSSIA, THE BLACK SEA, AND CIRCASSIA. By Captain Spencer. With Colored Illustrations and a Map. 6s.

MEMOIR OF THE REV. JOHN JAMES WEITBRECHT. By his Widow. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

SUNNY MEMORIES OF FOREIGN LANDS. By Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe. 2 vols. Post 8vo. 12s. Cheaper Editions, 2s., 1s. 6d., and 1s.

THE EXPERIENCE OF LIFE. By the author of Amy Herbert. 7s. 6d.

PASSAGES FROM THE DIARY OF A LATE PHYSICIAN. By Samuel Warren, Esq. Cheaper Edition. 5s. 6d.

TEN THOUSAND A YEAR. By Samuel Warren, Esq. 2 vols. Cheaper Edition. 9s.

HARD TIMES; for these times. By Charles Dickens. 5s.

MOWBRAY'S TREATISE ON DOMESTIC AND ORNAMENTAL POULTRY; a partial guide to the History, Breeding, Rearing, Feeding, Fattening, and General Management of Fowls and Pigeons. By L. A. Meall. With numerous Coloured Illustrations. 8s.

THE LADY'S COMPANION TO THE FLOWER GARDEN. By Mrs. Loudon. Sixth edition. 7s.

THE FRUIT, FLOWER, AND KITCHEN GARDEN. By the late Patrick Neill, LL.D. Fifth edition. 5s.

WANDERINGS AMONG THE WILD FLOWERS: How to see and how to gather them. By Spencer Johnson, M.D. With 173 engravings. 5s.

A POPULAR HISTORY of BRITISH FERNS, comprising all the Species. By Thomas Moore. Coloured Illustrations. 10s. 6d.

POPULAR FIELD BOTANY: A Familiar History of Plants. By Agnes Catlow. With 20 coloured plates. 10s. 6d.

A POPULAR HISTORY of BRITISH SEA-WEEDS, with Notices of some of the Fresh-water Algæ. By Rev. D. Landsborough. 10s. 6d.

THE SEA-WEED COLLECTORS' GUIDE: Containing plain instructions, for collecting and preserving. 2s. 6d.

HANDBOOK of ANGLING: teaching Fly-fishing, Trolling, Bottom-fishing, and Salmon-fishing. By Ephemera. 5s.

THE SEASIDE BOOK: being an Introduction to the Natural History of the British Coasts. By W. H. Harvey, M.D. New Edition. 5s.

A BOOK for the SEASIDE. With numerous Engravings. 3s. 6d.

WAKEMAN'S HANDBOOK OF IRISH ANTIQUITIES. 5s.

BLACK'S GUIDE BOOKS for TOURISTS; with Road Maps and numerous Illustrations:—
I. England, 10s. 6d. II. Scotland, 8s. 6d. III. Ireland, 5s. Wales, 5s.

BLACK'S GUIDE TO DUBLIN AND THE WICKLOW MOUNTAINS. 1s. 6d.

BLACK'S GUIDE TO KILLARNEY AND THE SOUTH. 1s. 6d.

BLACK'S GUIDE TO THE SHANNON AND WEST OF IRELAND. 1s. 6d.

DOYLE'S TOURS IN ULSTER; a handbook to the Antiquities and Scenery of the North of Ireland. With numerous Illustrations in tints, and Maps, &c. 8s. 6d.

CHART OF THE RAILWAY FROM DUBLIN TO BELFAST. 1s.

FRASER'S HANDBOOK FOR DUBLIN AND ITS ENVIRONS, with Maps, &c. 2s.

DUBLIN: WHAT'S TO BE SEEN, AND HOW TO SEE IT. By W. F. Wakeman. 1s.

TWELVE VIEWS OF THE PICTURESQUE SCENERY IN IRELAND. In elegant enamelled cover. 1s.

JOHNSTON'S MAP OF THE SEAT OF WAR, in the Danubian Principalities. 1s.

JOHNSTON'S NEW MAP OF THE BLACK SEA, CAUCASUS, CRIMEA, ETC., with enlarged plans of Sevastopol and the Bosphorns. 1s.

JOHNSTON'S CHART OF THE NORTH SEA, and the BALTIC, with the Countries adjoining; and Enlarged Plans of Cronstadt and Revel. 1s.

Lately Published,

WILLET'S "SYNOPSIS PAPISMI." New Edition. Edited by the Rev. J. Cumming, D.D. Ten vols. 8vo. Price £3.

London: JAMES MILLER, 17, Berner's-street, Oxford-street, and all Booksellers.

Just published,

New Edition, Royal 4to., cloth, price 5s. 6d.,

THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN,

Vol. I, with complete Indexes.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY AND Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London: WERTHEIM AND MACKINTOSH, Paternoster-row.

Fcap. 8vo., Neat Cover, Price 1s.;

Cloth, 1s. 6d.; Cloth, Gilt Edges, 2s.

THE TALK OF THE ROAD: Showing how Irish people talk about Irish doings, when they get a quiet place at the back of a ditch, or under a hedge.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY AND Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London: WERTHEIM AND MACKINTOSH.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON, and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher, WILLIAM CURRY, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

SEPTEMBER, 1852.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Gloir do Dhia aṅ gna hárduiḃ, agus síoḋáin air an dtalamh deaġḋoil do na dáoiniḃ.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. I.—No. 10. OCTOBER, 1852. { Annual Subscription, 3s. 6d. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

	Page
The Rule of Faith—Part II.	109
A few Words on the Jubilee	111
Doctor Briccono's Visit to Ballintubber	112
St. Chrysostom and Emigration	114
The Nature and Use of Indulgences—Invitation to Dr. Keane, R.C. Bishop of Ross	115
What Tradition tells us of the Blessed Virgin Mary	116
CORRESPONDENCE:	
Why the Scriptures say so little of the Virgin Mary	117
Rev. George Reade on John ii. 4.	117
On the Rule of Faith, by an Inquirer—Lost Books of Scriptures	118
W. C. Search and Bishop Jeremy Taylor	119
On Kingstown Harbour—By Patrick Murray, of Westmeath	119
Farming Operations for October	119

RULE OF FAITH.

(Continued from p. 63.)

In our June number we stated some of the arguments on which the United Church of England and Ireland relies in support of her Rule of Faith. We showed in the first place, that, from the very *nature and design* of Holy Scripture, it is in the highest degree probable that *it* contains *all*, and not merely some, of the truths necessary to salvation. We adduced, in the second place, a few of the numerous passages in which the Bible bears testimony to its own sufficiency. The third head of our proof related to the inadequacy of oral tradition as a vehicle for the unimpaired transmission of doctrinal truths. So obvious and indisputable, indeed, is this last point, that Bellarmine, and, after him, many of the ablest Roman Catholic controversialists maintain, that by the *unwritten* word of God it is not meant that the word is written *nowhere*, but that it was not committed to writing by the Apostles and other inspired men who first preached it; that, although not recorded by inspired penmen, it is to be found deposited in the writings of the early Fathers of the Church, and embodied in the acts and definitions of General Councils. It soon however, became apparent that this basis of Tradition was not sufficiently large and stable for the vast superstructure which it was made to sustain. With respect to the ancient Fathers it was undeniable that, upon the one hand, some even of the most eminent of them had put forward assertions clearly at variance with fact and Scripture (1), so that any dogma resting on their authority alone must necessarily be attended with some degree of uncertainty: whilst, upon the other hand, the closest examination of their writings failed to detect any clear recognition upon their part of the characteristic doctrines of the modern Church of Rome. Again, in reference to General Councils, it was equally incontrovertible, in the first place, that, "forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed by the Spirit and Word of God, they may err, and sometimes have erred even in things pertaining to God" (2): and, in the second place, that the acts of the universally-acknowledged Œcumenical Councils are utterly silent about any *essential* doctrines, the proofs of which are not to be found in Scripture. The *written* evidence of Christian antiquity being thus found to furnish insufficient proof of such doctrines, it became absolutely necessary to call in the aid of the great "living witness," the infallible Church, by whose interposition every embarrassing difficulty is easily conjured away. Thus, then, in addition to, or rather instead of, the troublesome realities of documents which cannot be tortured into yielding a sense that their authors never intended them to convey, we are presented, whenever it is convenient to do so, with the pleasing vision of an ever-flowing stream of Church tradition, traversing with unsullied purity the foul corruptions of many a century of darkness, ignorance, and crime (3): of a sacred deposit transmitted unimpaired, from age to age, by an undefined and abstract community, the individual members of which are admitted to have been subject to the ordinary infirmities of humanity. The most eminent Fathers, the holiest Popes, the greatest and most pious Bishops assembled in the most legitimate Councils, have all confessedly erred in matters of greater or less moment, but this, we are called upon to believe, does not, in the least, invalidate the authority of the Divine Traditions which have been transmitted through them, and other less distinguished members of the Catholic Church. Nay, we are told, it is not even necessary that the Church of any particular age should be conscious of the inestimable value of the verities committed to her keeping. It is quite competent to the Church or its equally infallible Head upon earth, whenever a fitting occasion occurs, to elevate to the rank of an article of faith any of the truths of which she was before the unconscious depositary (4). Truly, the infallibility of the Church has many an arduous duty imposed upon it; but we question if, in the whole range of its Herculean labours, it has a more difficult task to sustain than this, scil. to impart to dogmas, which, if judged by the ordinary rules of evidence, are either wholly unconnected with Christian antiquity, or, at best, have a very questionable parentage there, the character of *Divine truths*, communicated by the lips of our Lord himself or his inspired messengers: especially when these dogmas are not only (as is supposed) *independent* of Scripture, but actually *opposed* either to its letter or its spirit. If, then, doctrines of faith concern a man's eternal welfare, and if with respect to them mistake no less than wilful error may be fraught with infinite danger, it is surely the solemn duty of every Roman Catholic to pause and satisfy himself that in resting his faith in dogmas, not proveable by Scripture, upon the assumed infallibility of the Church, he may not in reality be building, like the foolish man in our Saviour's parable, his house upon the sand—"The rain fell, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and they beat upon that house, and it fell, and great was the fall thereof."—Matt. vii. 27 (5).

The fourth class of arguments by which we proposed to establish the grand principle of the sufficiency of Holy Scripture for salvation, is the recorded testimony of the Fathers and Doctors of the Catholic Church. The consent of so many of the most distinguished ornaments of the

(1) One or two well-known examples of this may not be uninteresting. Irenæus, the famous Bishop of Lyons, towards the close of the second century, states, as a positive fact, that our Lord's public ministry took place between the fortieth and fiftieth year of his age. This assertion he defends, partly by inferences from John viii. 57, 58, but chiefly by an appeal to the *testimony of the elders who had met John in Asia, and had heard the fact from him and from others of the Apostles.*—Contr. Hær. ii. 22. But if this assertion, vouched for by what seems to be such unimpeachable testimony, be true, then the whole Christian world, of earlier and later ages alike, is mistaken, and the chronology of the New Testament becomes involved in inextricable difficulties. Can Roman Catholics adduce any dogma, not contained expressly or by implication in Scripture, which is supported by an appeal to Apostolic authority more positive and more circumstantial than that by which this false assertion of one of the earliest of the Fathers is sustained? Again, it is well known that most of the early traditions preserved by Irenæus were contained in a lost work of Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, who had seen and heard the Apostle John, and who, as he himself tells us (Euseb. E. H. iii. 39), took particular pains to inform himself of the authenticity of what he reports. The following is a specimen of the discourses of our Lord, concerning His kingdom, which that work contains:—"The days shall come in which vines shall grow, each vine with ten thousand boughs, each bough with ten thousand branches, each branch with ten thousand twigs, each twig with ten thousand grapes, each grape containing twenty-five measures of wine. And when any of the saints shall take a bunch, another [bunch] shall cry out—'I am a better bunch, take me, through me bless the Lord.'"—Irenæ. Contr. Hær. v. 33. If it be little short of blasphemy to ascribe such words to Him who spake as never man spake, is it not equally plain that we are bound to feel deeply grateful to God for having provided us with a *written* standard of truth, by which the traditions extant even in the immediately post-apostolic age may be tested? The last instance, in illustration of this subject, to which we shall read, is the Epistle attributed to the Apostle Barnabas. If, as several of the early Fathers—including Origen, Clem. Alex, Eusebius, and Jerome—believed, Barnabas were the author of this work, no stronger evidence can be adduced of the danger of admitting any addition, from *whatever* source, to the written oracles of truth; because it contains so much at variance with sober reason and the acknowledged Word of God, that we cannot, upon any sound principles of criticism, admit its inspiration. On the other hand, if it be a forgery, it yet imposed on some of the most learned and critical of the Fathers; and what presumption is there that some or all of the (non-Scriptural) traditions, or traditional interpretations of Scripture, for which Apostolic authority is claimed, may not be derived from sources just as little entitled to credit as this pretended Epistle of Barnabas?

(2) Art. xxi. of the Church of England.

(3) Baronius gives a fearful description of the darkness and wickedness of the tenth century, of which the following passages may serve as a specimen:—"A new age begins, which, from its asperity and barrenness of good, has been wont to be called the iron age; from the deformity of its overflowing wickedness, the leaden age; and from its poverty of writers, the dark age. Standing on the threshold of which we have deemed it necessary to premise something, lest the weak-minded should be at all scandalized if he should at any time happen to behold the abomination of desolation in the Temple. . . . . The case is plainly such, that scarcely any one can believe—nay, scarcely ever shall believe—except he see it with his own eyes and handle it with his own hands, what unworthy, foul, and deformed—yea, moreover, execrable, and abominable things the sacred Apostolic See, upon whose hinge the universal Catholic Church turns, has been compelled to suffer. . . . . Oh, shame! oh, grief! how many monsters, horrible to be seen, were intruded by them [secular princes] into that seat which is to be reverenced by angels? How many tragedies were consummated? With what filth was it her fate to be besprinkled, who was herself without spot or wrinkle? With what stench to be infected, with what loathsome impurities to be defiled, and by these to be blackened with perpetual infamy?" (Novum inchoatur æculum, quod sua asperitate, et boni sterilitate ferreum, malique exundantis deformitate plumbeum, atque inopiâ Scriptorum appellari consuevit obscurum. In cujus limine constituti, præfari aliquid necessarium duximus, ne quid scandali pusillus animo patiatur, si quando videre contigerit abominationem desolationis in templo. . . . . Est plane ut vix aliquis credat, immo nec vix quidem sit creditarus, nisi suis ipse inspicist oculis manibusque contrectet, quam indigna, quamque turpia atque deformia, execranda insuper et abominanda sit cocta dati, sacrosancta, apostolica sedes, in cujus cardine universa Ecclesia Catholica vertitur. . . . . Quot tunc ab eis, proh pudor! proh dolor! in eandem sedem angelis reverendam, visu horrenda intrusa sint monstra? Quot consummatæ sint tragediæ? Quibus tunc ipsam sine maculâ et sine rugâ contigit aspergi sordibus, pntoribus infici, inquinari spurcitiis, ex his perpetuâ infamiâ denigrari?"—*An. Eccles. An.* 900. And, again, the same historian writes—"What was then the face of the holy Roman Church? How most foul! when harlots, at once most powerful and most base, ruled at Rome; at whose will sees were changed, bishops were presented, and—what is horrid to hear, and unutterable—pseudo-Pontiffs, their paramours, were intruded into the See of Peter, who are enrolled in the catalogue of Roman Pontiffs only for the sake of marking the times." (Quæ tunc facies sanctæ ecclesiæ Romanæ! quam fœdissima! cum Romæ dominarentur potentissimæ æque ac sordidissimæ meretrices, quarum arbitrio mutarentur sedes, darentur episcopi, et quod auditu horrendum et infandum est, intruderentur in sedem Petri earum amasii, pseudo-Pontifices, qui non sint nisi ad consignanda tantum tempora in catalogo Romanorum Pontificum scripti.—*Ann. Eccles. An.* 912.) When so eminent a Roman Catholic historian as Baronius was compelled to make such admissions as the above, we may well give thanks to the great Head of the Church that the faith once delivered to the saints has not been left to the safe custody of Church Tradition.

(4) A remarkable instance of this is furnished by the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, which is, at length, about to be declared by the successor of St. Peter an Article of Faith.—*Vide* CATHOLIC LAYMAN, No. ii., p. 10. So difficult, indeed, is it to discover many of the peculiar tenets of the Roman Catholic religion in the writings or traditions of the earlier ages of the Church, that recourse was had, so early as the time of the Council of Florence (1438), to the theory of *development* in order to escape from the charge of introducing novelties into the dogmatic teaching of the Church. This theory was revived in more modern times, by the Jesuit Petavius, and in our own day has been advocated by the celebrated Bavarian professor, Möhler; and still more elaborately and boldly by Mr. Newman. How far Mr. Newman's doctrine is received by the Church to which he now belongs is uncertain. Dr. Wiseman and the *Dublin Review* warmly espouse it: whilst, on the other hand, the highest authorities of the Roman Catholic Church in America denounce it as subversive of the Catholic faith, and of revelation itself. Peter himself has not yet spoken.

(5) The general question of the infallibility of the Church is one into which we cannot, of course, enter here. That important controversy which has already been touched on, will be hereafter discussed at length in this Journal.

Church during a long succession of ages, beginning with the immediately post-apostolic times, is regarded by us, Protestants, as a valuable corroboration of the conclusion which, however, we deem sufficiently established by the testimony of Scripture itself, and by the reason of the case.* But to Roman Catholics, who professedly rest much of their belief on the authority of the Fathers, the argument now under consideration ought to be conclusive. We say, then, that a chain of evidence, bearing on the supreme importance and sufficiency of the *written* Word of God, can be drawn out from the works of the great Church-Fathers, proving incontestably that the doctrine of the modern Church of Rome, regarding the *insufficiency* of Scripture, and the co-ordinate authority of an *independent* Tradition, was utterly unknown to the ancient Church either of the East or West. To exhibit all these testimonies in detail would far transcend our limits; we shall, therefore, content ourselves with adducing a few of them as specimens of the whole.

We begin with IRENÆUS, the Bishop of Lyons, and the disciple and friend of Polycarp, who again had been the companion and disciple of the Apostle John. This Father represents the opinion of both the Eastern and Western Churches towards the end of the second century. Disputing against the Gnostic heretics, who denied the perfection and sufficiency of Scripture, and maintained that the truth could not be discovered from it by those who were ignorant of Tradition (6), Irenæus says—"We ought to leave such things as these to God, who also made us, most rightly knowing that *the Scriptures indeed are perfect*, as having been dictated by the word of God and his Spirit" (7). Again—"For we have become acquainted with the dipensation of our salvation through no others than those through whom the Gospel has come to us; which they then indeed preached, but afterwards, by the will of God, delivered to us in *the Scriptures, to be the foundation and pillar of our faith*" (8). The last phrase, it will be remembered, is the very one applied by St. Paul to the Church—1 Tim. iii. 15. Irenæus, accordingly, here distinctly implies, that it was by the custody of the Sacred Scriptures that the Church was to sustain her office as "the pillar and ground of the truth." Once more—"Read diligently *the Gospel* given unto us by the Apostles, and read diligently the prophets, and ye shall find the general mode of action, and *the whole doctrine*, and the whole passion of our Lord predicted in them" (9).

We come next to TERTULLIAN, who flourished a few years later than Irenæus—that is to say, about the end of the second century. This great writer, whom Vincentius of Lerins pronounces (Commonit., c. 24) to be, "apud Latinos facile princeps," thus expresses himself regarding Scripture, when arguing against the heretic Hermogenes, who maintained the eternity of matter—"I adore the fulness of Scripture, which manifests to me the Creator and his works. . . . But whether all things were made of some pre-existent matter, I have as yet nowhere read. Let the shop of Hermogenes show that it is written. *If it is not written, let them fear that woe which is destined for them that add or take away*" (10). Again, when disputing against the heretic Marcion, he says—"*I do not admit* what you bring forward of your own, *extraneous to Scripture*" (11).

The next witness whom we shall cite is AMBROSE, the famous Bishop of Milan, who flourished cir. A.D. 374. This eminent Father recognised no authority as co-ordinate with and independent of Scripture—"How," he says, "can we use those things which we find not in Scripture?" (12) And again—"I read [in Scripture] that he [Christ] is the first, I read that he is not the second; let those who say he is the second, *prove it by reading*" (13).

Contemporaneously with Ambrose lived JEROME, unquestionably the most learned theologian of the Western Church. He thus expresses himself respecting the grounds upon which his belief was founded—"As we deny not those things that are written, so we *reject those things that are not written*" (14). The instance which he gives is peculiarly worthy of attention, when taken in connection with the various purely traditional notions entertained by the Church of Rome of the Virgin Mary—"That God was born of a virgin *we believe, because we read it*. That Mary married after she gave birth to Him, *we do not believe, because we read it not*" (15).

A few years later—that is, towards the close of the fourth century—we come to AUGUSTINE. The writings of this Father have been always held in the highest esteem in the Western Church, and the Church of Rome, in particular, has ever regarded them with especial reverence. What then is Augustine's opinion on the point under discussion? "In those things," he says, "which are plainly laid down *in Scripture, all things are found which embrace faith and morals*" (16). Again—"Whatsoever ye shall hear thence—*i. e.*, from Scripture—let this savour well with you: *whatever is extraneous to it reject*, lest ye wander in a cloud" (17). Again—"Wherefore if, concerning Christ, or his Church, or anything else whatsoever pertaining to your faith and living, I do not say we (who are not to be compared to him, who said—'Although we,' &c. —Gal. i. 8), but even, as St. Paul adds, '*an angel from heaven were to preach to you aught besides* (præterquam) *what you have received in the* legal and evangelical *Scriptures* [the Old and the New Testamenta], *let him be accursed*" (18). It should be particularly observed, that Augustine is here not condemning the inculcation of doctrine *contrary* to Scripture, but *in addition* to it ("*præterquam quod in Scripturis accepistis*") (19). Will any candid Roman Catholic say, that the above is the language of one who believed, as the Council of Trent teaches (20), that there are Church-traditions, respecting faith and morals, not contained in Scripture, and which are to be received with the same sentiments of piety and virtue as the Scriptures themselves? If more evidence be required, the same Father elsewhere says—"Those things, however, which appertain to the investigation and preserving of *true religion, Divine Scripture is not silent about*" (21). Again, speaking of the confutation of heresy, he says—"There can be no *proof of true Christianity, nor* can there be any *other refuge of Christians* wishing to know the truth of the faith, *except the Divine Scriptures.*"* And to quote no more, writing against the Donatists, he says—"*Let them demonstrate their Church*, if they can, not by discourses and rumours of the Africans, not by Councils of their own bishops, not by the writings of any disputants whatsoever, not by deceitful signs and wonders, against which we have been prepared and warned by the Word of the Lord, but by the words of the one Shepherd himself, and all *the canonical authorities of the Sacred Books*" (22). This remarkable passage is deserving of all attention from Roman Catholics.

Such are a few of the testimonies of the early Latin Fathers in favour of the Rule of Faith for which Protestants contend. When we turn to the Eastern Church we find, if possible, even stronger statements upon the point.

CLEMENT of Alexandria, celebrated as one of the founders of the famous school of Alexandria, and the master of the renowned Origen, thus writes towards the close of the 2nd century—"They who are ready to labour for what is most excellent, will not desist in their search after truth *till they obtain demonstration from the Scriptures themselves*" (23).

ORIGEN, the successor of Clement, in the beginning of the 3rd century, says—"In the two Testaments every word that appertaineth unto God may be sought and discussed, and out of them all knowledge of things may be derived. But *if anything remains which Divine Scripture does not determine, no other third Scripture ought to be received to authorize knowledge* . . . but let us commit to the fire what remains—that is, let us reserve it for God. For God has not willed that we should know all things in the present life" (24). Could Origen have written thus if he had entertained the opinions put forward by Bellarmine respecting Tradition, which obviously represent it as a *third Scripture*? Again, —"Wherefore it is necessary for us to call the Sacred *Scriptures* to give evidence: for our meanings and *interpretations, without these witnesses, have no credit*" (25).

HIPPOLYTUS, the martyr, a contemporary and friend of Origen, and a disciple of Irenæus, thus writes—"As he who would desire to exercise the wisdom of this world cannot otherwise attain it, unless he read the dogmas of the philosophers: so whosoever of us will exercise *piety towards God* can learn it *from no other source than from the Divine Scriptures*" (26).

ATHANASIUS, the famous Bishop of Alexandria, in the beginning of the fourth century, expresses himself as follows:—"The holy and divinely-inspired *Scriptures are sufficient* for the enunciation of truth" (27). Again—"These [canonical books] are the fountains of salvation, so that he who thirsts may be satisfied with the oracles contained in them; *in these alone the school of religion preaches the gospel*; let no man add to or take from them" (28). These are the words of the man who spent his life in controversy with the Arians, and who was the great head of the Catholic party at the Œcumenical Synod of Nice. He obviously knew nothing of Traditions which were at the same time necessary to salvation and not contained in Scripture.

---

* Augustine thought as we do on this subject of patristic authority. "Other authors," he says, "however excellent their sanctity and learning, I read so as not to credit their assertions merely because they say thus: but because they have been able to persuade me, either by means of those Canonical authors, or by probable reasons, that their statements are not repugnant to truth."—August. ad. Hieron. t. ii. 15. Ed. Bened.

(6) "When they [the heretics] are confuted out of the Scriptures they turn round and accuse the Scriptures themselves, as if they were not accurate, nor of authority, and because they are ambiguous, and *because the truth cannot be discovered from them by those who are ignorant of Tradition: for that the truth was not delivered in writing but orally.*". (Cum enim ex Scripturis arguuntur, in accusationem convertuntur ipsarum Scripturarum, quasi non recte habeant, neque sint ex auctoritate, et quia varie sint dicta, et quia non possit ex his inveniri veritas ab his qui nesciant Traditionem: non enim per literas traditam illam, sed per vivam vocem.—Cont. Hær. Lib. iii. c. 2). It is scarcely necessary to direct attention to the truly remarkable resemblance here exhibited between the respective positions taken up by the Gnostic heretics and Irenæus upon the one hand, and those occupied by Roman Catholics and the Church of England on the other.

(7) Cedere hæc debemus Deo qui et nos fecit, rectissime scientes quia Scripturæ quidem perfectæ sunt, quippe a Verbo Dei et Spiritu ejus dictæ—Cont. Hær. Lib. ii. c. 47.

(8) Non enim per alios dispositionem salutis nostræ cognovimus, quam per eos per quos Evangelium pervenit ad nos: quod quidem tunc præconiaverunt, postea vero per Dei voluntatem in Scripturis nobis tradiderunt, fundamentum et columnam fidei nostræ futurum.—Lib. iii. c. 1.

(9) Legite diligentius id quod ab Apostolis est evangelium nobis datum, et legite diligentius Prophetas, et invenietis universam actionem, et omnem doctrinam, et omnem passionem Domini nostri prædictam in ipsis.—Lib. iv. c. 34. The meaning obviously is, that in the Gospel the general tenor of our Lord's actions and the whole of his doctrines were exhibited; whilst the prophets predicted all the circumstances connected with his passion.

(10) Adoro Scripturæ plenitudinem quæ mihi et Factorem manifestat et facta. An autem de aliqua subjacenti materia facta sint omnia, nusquam adhuc legi. Scriptum esse docent Hermogenis officina. Si non est scriptum, timeat *Væ* illud *adjicientibus aut detrahentibus* destinatum.—Tertull. Adv. Hermog. c. 22.

(11) Non recipio quod extra Scripturam de tuo profers. De Carn. Chris. c. 7.

(12) Quæ in Scripturis sanctis non reperimus, ea quemadmodum usurpare possumus?—Ambr. Offic. Lib. i. c. 23.

(13) Lego quia primus est, lego quia non est secundus. Illi qui secundum aiunt, decepti lectione.—De Inst. Virg. c. 2.

(14) Ut hæc quæ scripta sunt non negamus, ita ea quæ non sunt scripta renuimus. Hieron. adv. Helvid. Tom. iv. pars. ii. p. 141.

(15) Natum Deum esse de Virgine credimus, quia legimus. Mariam nupsisse post partum non credimus, quia non legimus —l c.

(16) In iis, quæ aperte in Scripturâ posita sunt, inveniuntur illa omnia quæ continent fidem moresque vivendi.—August. de doctr. Christ. Lib. ii. c. 9. T. iii., 301. Ed. Bened.

(17) Quicquid inde audieritis, hæc vobis bene sapiat: quicquid extra est respuite, ne erretis in nebula.—August. Serm. de Pastor, c. xi., T. v., 238.

(18) Proinde sive de Christo, sive de ejus Ecclesia, sive de quacunque alia re quæ pertinet ad fidem vitamque vestram, non dicam nos (nequequam comparandi ei qui dixit *Licet si nos*) sed omnino (quod secutus adjecit) *si angelus de cælo vobis annuntiaverit præterquam* quod in Scripturis legalibus et evangelicis accepistis, anathema sit.—August. Cont. Petilium, Lib. iii., c. 6. T. ix., 301.

(19) The Rhemish translators correctly render the Greek παρ' ὃ in the 8th and 9th verses by "besides." But whilst they felt themselves constrained to follow the Vulgate version (præterquam quod, præter id quod) they take care to inform their readers, in their note, that, according to St. Augustine, what St. Paul here condemns is "such teaching as is contrary and dissagreeing to the rule of faith." Now, this remark is not only at variance with the words of Augustine above cited, but even to the very passage of that Father, to which they themselves refer, where he says—"qui autem *prætergreditur* fidei regulam, non accedit in via, sed recedit de via."—August. Tract. in Johan. xcviii. 7. We may add, that Theophylact and Œcumenius, in their commentaries on this passage of the Galatians, are also directly opposed to this Rhemish gloss. With respect to the Greek παρ' ὃ there seems to be no doubt that the correct translation is *besides* or *more than*, as the Rhemish translators themselves render it again in Rom. xii. 3,

(20) See the Decretum de Can. Scrip., quoted in our June number, p. 61.

(21) Quæ tamen pertinent ad veram religionem quæreudam et tenendam, divina Scriptura non tacet.—August. Ep. 42.

* "Nulla probatio potest esse veræ Christianitatis, neque refugium potest esse Christianorum aliud, volentium cognoscere fidei veritatem, nisi scripturæ sacræ."—August de Pastorib. c. 12., t. ix., 279.

(22) Ecclesiam suam demonstrent, si possunt, non in sermonibus et rumoribus Afrorum, non in conciliis episcoporum suorum, non in literis quorumlibet disputatorum, non in signis et prodigiis fallacibus, quia etiam contra ista verbo Domini præparati et cauti redditi sumus, sed in ipsius unius Pastoris vocibus, in omnibus canonicis sanctorum librorum auctoritatibus.—August. de Unit. Eccles., c. 16., T. ix., 871. This is quite in harmony with what he says in the 3rd chap. of the same treatise—"Nolo humanis documentis sed divinis oraculis sanctam ecclesiam demonstrari."

(23) ἀλλ οἱ πονεῖν ἕτοιμοι ἐπὶ τοῖς καλλίστοις οὐ πρότερον ἀποστήσονται ζητοῦντες τὴν ἀληθείαν πρὶν ἂν τὴν ἀπόδειξιν ἀπ' αὐτῶν λάβωσι τῶν γραφῶν.—Clem Alex. Strom. lib. vii. p. 889, Ed. Potter.

(24) "In hoc bidno puto duo Testamenta posse intelligi, in quibus liceat omne verbum quod ad Deum pertinet requiri et discuti, atque ex ipsis omnem rerum scientiam capi. Si quid autem superfuerit, quod non Divina Scriptura decernat, nullam aliam tertiam Scripturam debere ad auctoritatem scientiæ suscipi . . . . Sed igni tradamus quod superest, id est, Deo reservemus. Neque enim in præsenti vita Deus scire nos omnia voluit."—Origen, Homil. v., in Levit. T. ii. 212.

(25) "Quapropter necesse nobis est Scripturas sanctas in testimonium vocare: sensus quippe nostri et enarrationes, sine his testibus, non habent fidem."—Orig. Hom. i. in Jer.

(26) "Quemadmodum enim, si quis vellet sapientiam hujus sæculi exercere, non aliter hoc consequi poterit, nisi dogmata philosophorum legat; sic quicunque volumus pietatem in Deum exercere, non aliunde discemus quam ex Scripturis sacris."—Hippolyt. Adv. Noetum, ch. ix.

(27) Αὐτάρκεῖς μὲν γάρ εἰσιν αἱ ἁγίαι καὶ θεόπνευστοι γραφαὶ πρὸς τὴν τῆς ἀληθείας ἀπαγγελιαν.—Athanas. Cont. Gentes, t. i. 1. Ed. Bened.

(28) Ταῦτα [βιβλία] πήγαι τοῦ σωτηρίου, ὥστε τὸν διψῶντα ἐμφορεῖσθαι τῶν ἐν τούτοις λογίων· ἐν τούτοις μόνον τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας διδασκαλεῖον εὐαγγελίζεται· μηδεὶς τούτοις ἐπιβαλλέτω, μὴ δὲ τούτων ἀφαιρείσθω. Ex festali Epistola xxxix., t. ii., 962.

Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, in the middle of the fourth century, after having given a summary of the doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit, says, that he will now prove it in detail from Scripture—"For," he adds, "concerning the divine and holy mysteries of the faith, *even the most casual remark ought not to be delivered without the Sacred Scriptures.* Do not implicitly believe me saying these things to you unless you receive proof of the statements from the Sacred Scriptures"(29). Again, speaking of the mode of the divine generation not being revealed in Scripture, he says—"*Why*, then, do you *busy yourself about what the Holy Spirit has not written* in the Scriptures?"(30)

Basil the Great, Bishop of Cæsarea, and one of the most profound theologians of his age (cir. A.D. 370), thus writes—"Believe those things that are written; the *things which are not written, seek not*"(31). And again—"It is *a manifest falling away from the faith*, and a charge of arrogance either to reject anything of what is written, or *to introduce anything of what is not written*"(32). We shall quote one passage more, as Basil is one of the authorities on whom Roman Catholic divines rely most, in support of Tradition. "Let, therefore, the inspired Scripture arbitrate between us; and *the sentence of truth* shall be *adjudged to those with whom are found doctrines consonant to the Divine oracles*"(33). From these words it appears, that according to Basil, Scripture and the Divine Oracles are one and the same thing; and that in every question their authority is supreme.

Theophilus, Bishop of Alexandria, towards the close of the fourth century, believed it to be "an *instinct of the devil* to follow the sophisms of human minds, and *to think anything Divine without the authority of the Scriptures*"(34). Roman Catholics will, of course, assent to the first clause of this sentence; but could the Tridentine Fathers, who asserted the existence of Divine traditions not contained in Scripture, fairly subscribe to the second?

Gregory, Bishop of Nyssa, and brother of Basil, declares—"Forasmuch *as this is supported by no testimony of Scripture, we will reject it as false*"(35).

Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria, in the beginning of the fifth century, to the very same effect asks—"*That which Holy Scripture hath not said, by what means*, pray, *shall we receive* and reckon it among those things that are true?"(36) The force of the last two passages cannot be evaded by saying that they relate to things with which Tradition had nothing to do (37). The writers would scarcely have expressed themselves so absolutely, had they been aware of the existence in their own day of a source of proof equally certain and authoritative as Scripture, and yet independent of it.

Chrysostom, the famous Bishop of Constantinople, towards the close of the fifth century, thus speaks of the Holy Scripture—"*Look for no other teacher; thou hast the oracles of God*, none teaches thee like these"(38). Is there any doubt here as to the sufficiency of Scripture? And again—"*He who useth not the Scriptures*, but climbeth up some other way—that is, cutteth out for himself another and an unlawful way—he *is a thief*"(39). Roman Catholics think it enough to reply, that Chrysostom is here speaking of Antichrists and heretics. Certainly; but speaking of Antichrists for is not adhering solely to Scripture condemns them heard of the existence in the Church. Had he or they tions not contained in Scripture, would Divine traditured thus to apply the words "ἀναβαίνων ἀλλαχόθεν?" have ven-Once more—"Wherefore, I exhort and beseech you all, *leaving aside what this man or that man thinks* concerning these things, to *learn all* these things *from the Scriptures*"(40).

The above passages, taken from some of the most eminent writers of the first five centuries, may serve to convey a general idea of the light in which Holy Scripture, as the ultimate and sufficient basis of all essential truth, was regarded by the early Church. The ingenuity of controversialists has, in various ways, endeavoured to elude the direct force of some of those statements; but the general impression which they leave upon every unbiassed mind, no sophistry or special pleading can efface. Nor will that impression be impaired even after we have brought forward (as we shall do, when stating the Roman Catholic side of the argument) other passages from the same or different Fathers, in which the use and authority of Tradition are dwelt on. For it will, we trust, appear perfectly obvious, *first* that the Tridentine notion of Tradition, as an authoritative source of essential truths not contained in Scripture, was utterly unknown to the ancient Church; and, *secondly*, that even with respect to *inhesive* truths (*i.e.*, doctrines either expressly or implicitly contained in Scripture), the first and last appeal was made to the *written* Word, the evidence of Church-Tradition being referred to either as subordinate and simply corroborative; or else in controversy with heretics, who questioned the authenticity of the orthodox Scriptures; or, finally, under other very special circumstances.

But the chain of evidence in favour of the Protestant rule of faith does not terminate with the fifth, or indeed with any, century of the Church's history. We have upon our side the testimony of some of the greatest theologians of every age. For instance, Johannes Damascenus, the great oracle of the Eastern Church in the eighth century, thus writes—"All things that are delivered to us by the Law, the Prophets, the Apostles, and the Evangelists, we receive, acknowledge, and reverence, *seeking for nothing beyond these*" (41). In the beginning of the 15th century, the famous Gerson, Chancellor of the University of Paris, and the most learned man of his time, thus expresses himself—"In the examination of doctrines, the first and chief thing to be attended to is if the doctrine be conformable to Holy Scripture, since *Scripture* has been delivered to us, as *a sufficient and infallible rule*, for the government of the whole ecclesiastical body and its members, to the end of the world. It is, therefore, such an art, such a rule or exemplar, that *any* other *doctrine which is not conformable to it* is either to be *rejected as heretical*, or is to be accounted altogether suspicious, or not appertaining to religion"(42). This is precisely the doctrine of the Church of England in her sixth article.

Nay, more, it is an unquestionable fact, that in the Council of Trent itself, the opinions of the prelates were not unanimous respecting the famous decree, so often referred to, which placed Tradition on an equality with Scripture. The Bishops of Fano and Chioggia especially protested against this decree; and the latter went so far as to exclaim that it was impious to elevate Tradition to the level of Scripture(43). Even in that very assembly, whose avowed object was to condemn the so-called heresies of the Reformers, there were found men honest and bold enough to proclaim and defend what had been the unquestioned doctrine of the Catholic Church during many ages, and had never ceased to be held by many of its greatest ornaments. Roman Catholics, and even Protestants themselves, seem to take it for granted, as a matter of course, that the decrees of the Council of Trent were passed with the full concurrence of all its members, and that the characteristic dogmas of the modern Church of Rome were then regarded as established verities, which only needed the authority of the Church to sanction them as essential to salvation. The fact, however, is far otherwise: many of those dogmas were then open questions, about which great diversity of opinion existed. But as any appearance of such diversity, in the formal decisions of the Council, would have furnished the "heretics" with a powerful argument against what they maintained to be innovations on the doctrines of the Primitive Church, it was arranged that, before each session, general "Congregations" should be held, in which the decrees to be proposed should be discussed, and the opinions of the prelates taken upon them; it being understood that whatever was decided upon by the majority, in those preliminary meetings, should be passed in the following session, with the unanimous consent of the Council, the dissentient minority tacitly acquiescing in the previous decision (44). Such was the mode in which Tradition was placed upon a level with the written Word of God by the *unanimous* consent of the Catholic Church, as represented by the "Sacred, Œcumenical, Synod of Trent."

We have now closed the case on the part of the United Church of England and Ireland. We have given a very brief, and, we are fully conscious, a very imperfect sketch of some of the arguments by which the sixth article of that Church may be vindicated. We have endeavoured to state the case with all fairness, not as mere advocates, but as honest and earnest inquirers after the truth. In the same spirit we shall proceed, in a future number, to exhibit the Roman Catholic side of the question, and to adduce our reasons for excepting to the proofs which the ablest divines of that communion have alleged in support of the Tridentine "Decree concerning the Canonical Scriptures."

A FEW WORDS ON THE JUBILEE.

It has lately been made public in the newspapers, that "a jubilee" was granted last November, by the present Pope, and has commenced in Dublin on the first of this month. To understand fully the nature of the benefits supposed to be conveyed by a jubilee, it is necessary to be acquainted with the doctrine of indulgences. On this subject we purpose elsewhere to give some explanation (see p. 115); but it may also be interesting to our readers if we give a short historical account of the jubilees that have already taken place.

Whatever be the benefits conferred by a jubilee, it appears that the church did without them for thirteen centuries, since the first jubilee of which we have any authentic account was granted by Pope Boniface VIII. in the year 1300. In that year a report got into circulation, whose authority could not be ascertained, but which was soon extensively believed, that it was an ancient law of the church that those who devoutly visited St. Peter's church, in the years which terminate centuries, merited thereby indulgences for a hundred years. So many strangers came to Rome, we are told, in consequence of this rumour, that the Pope was moved to inquire into the matter. He obtained the testimony of four aged persons to the truth of the report; one of whom, being of the age of 107, testified that when he was a child, in the year 1200, his father had gone up to Rome, and lived there as long as his means permitted, and that on his return he had told him, if he lived to the year 1300, to be sure also to go up to Rome, to enjoy the same spiritual advantages. By this evidence the Pope professed himself convinced, and published an epistle deciding that in every centennial year those who should

(29) δεῖ γὰρ περὶ τῶν θείων καὶ ἁγίων τῆς πίστεως μυστηρίων μηδὲ τὸ τύχον ἄνευ τῶν θείων παραδίδοσθαι γραφῶν . . . . μηδὲ ἐμοὶ τῷ ταῦτά σοι λέγοντι ἁπλῶς πίστευσης. ἐὰν τὴν ἀπόδειξιν τῶν καταγγελλομένων ἀπὸ τῶν θειῶν μὴ λάβῃς γραφῶν.—Cyril. Hierosol. Catech. iv. 17.

(30) τί τοίνυν πολυπραγμονεῖς ἃ μηδὲ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον ἔγραψεν ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς—Ib. xi. 12

(31) τοῖς γεγραμμένοις πίστευε, τὰ μὴ γεγραμμένα μὴ ζήτει.—Basil. Hom. xxix. Adv. Calumn. S. Trin. The Benedictine editors (t. ii. 611) put this into the Appendix of spurious passages; but it contains nothing that cannot be paralleled from contemporary writers (*e. g.*, Cyril), and from Basil himself, as in the next extract.

(32) φανερὰ ἔκπτωσις πίστεως καὶ ὑπερηφανίας καταγορία ἡ ἀθετεῖν τι τῶν γεγραμμένων ἢ ἐπεισάγειν τῶν μὴ γεγραμμένων.—Basil de Fide, c. i., t. ii., 251. Ed Bened.

(33) ἡ θεόπνευστος ἡμῖν διαιτησάτω γραφή. Καὶ παρ' οἷς ἂν εὑρεθῇ τὰ δόγματα συνῳδὰ τοῖς θείοις λόγοις, ἐπὶ τούτοις ἤξει τῆς ἀληθείας ἡ ψῆφος.—Basil. Ep. 80, t. ii., p. 901.

(34) Ignorans [Origenes] quod dæmoniari spiritus eveet instinctus sophismata humanarum mentium sequi, et aliquid extra scripturarum auctoritatem putare divinum."—Theoph. Alex. Ep. Paseh. ii.

(35) Cum id nullo scripturæ testimonio fultum sit, ut falsum improbabimus.—Lib. de Cognit. Dei, cit. ab Euthymio in Panoplia, pars i. tit. viii. n. 4.

(36) ὃ γὰρ οὐκ εἴρηεν ἡ θεία γραφή, τίνα δὴ τρόπον παραδεξόμεθα, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀληθῶς ἔχουσι καταλογιούμεθα;—Cyril Alex. Glaph. in Gen. lib. ii.

(37) Perrone loc. theol. pars ii., sec. ii., c. i.

(38) μηδὲ περιμείνῃς ἕτερον διδάσκαλον· ἔχεις τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ. οὐδείς σε διδάσκει ὡς ἐκεῖνα.—Chrysost. Hom. ix. in Ep. Coloss.

(39) ὁ γὰρ μὴ ταῖς γραφαῖς χρώμενος, ἀλλὰ ἀναβαίνων ἀλλαχόθεν, τουτέστιν ἑτέραν ἑαυτῷ καὶ μὴ νενομισμένην τέμνων ὁδόν, ἑλίπτης ἐστίν.—Chrys. Hom. lix. in Joh.

(40) διὸ παρακαλῶ καὶ δέομαι πάντων ὑμῶν, ἀφεντές τι τῷ δεῖνι καὶ τῷ δεῖνι δοκεῖ περὶ τούτων, παρὰ τῶν γραφῶν ταῦτα ἅπαντα πυνθάνεσθε.—Chrys. Hom. ix. in Coloss., cap. 3.

(41) Πάντα τὰ παραδεδόμενα ἡμῖν διά τε νόμου καὶ προφητῶν καὶ ἀποστόλων καὶ εὐαγγελιστῶν δεχόμεθα καὶ γινώσκομεν καὶ σεβόμεν, οὐδὲν περαιτέρω τούτων ἐπιζητοῦντες.—Joh. Damasc. de Orthod. Fide, c. i.

(42) "Attendendum in examinatione doctrinarum, primo et principaliter, si doctrina sit conformis Scripturæ . . . . quoniam Scriptura nobis tradita est tanquam regula sufficiens et infallibilis, pro regimine totius ecclesiastici corporis et membrorum, usque in finem sæculi. Est igitur talis ars, talis regula vel exemplar, cui se non conformans alia doctrina vel abjicienda est ut hæreticalis, aut suspecta, aut impertinens ad religionem prorsus est habenda."—Gerson, de Exam. Doctr. pars. ii. con. 1.

(43) "This equality [ac. of Scripture and Tradition] was not approved of by some, and especially by Bertano (Bishop of Fano). For, he argued, although both might proceed from God, from whom all truths are ultimately derived, yet it did not follow that everything true should be regarded with the same veneration as the Sacred Scriptures. That, inasmuch as some traditions had failed, it was obvious that God was unwilling that so much stability, and, consequently, so much veneration, should be attributed to them as to Scripture. Nachianti, Bishop of Chioggia, foreigned still more bitterly against an equality of this kind, Traditions being considered by him not as Divine revelations but as [human] laws, the weight of which he deemed inapportable. He exclaimed, when the question of their universal adoption was proposed, that that equality between the Sacred Writings and Traditions appeared to him impious." Pallavicino Istoria del Concil. di Trento. Lib. vi. cap. 3, 4. The other bishops, more true to the principles of their Church, heard this protest, we are told, with wonder and horror; and, accordingly, he who had dared to vindicate the supremacy authority of Holy Scripture was compelled to acquiesce in the decree which directly denied it.

(44) "The 8th of February, Cardinal del Monte [afterwards Pope Julius III.], held a congregation, wherein he desired the Fathers of the Council to remember the prayer he had formerly made to them, not to give their opinions anew in the sessions, upon the decrees that were published there; since those decrees, having been passed in the congregations by a majority of voices, this would only serve, as he had formerly told them, to *give the heretics an occasion of talking*, when they should see that *the decrees that were published in the sessions were contradicted by the Fathers of the Council themselves.*"—Du Pin. Eccles. Hist. 16th cent. Vol. III. Lib. iii. ch. 1. In the discussions which took place in the subsequent congregations respecting the four articles that were extracted from Luther's writings, Antonio Marinari, a Carmelite, with reference to the first of these articles expressed himself of opinion that Traditions should not be spoken of at all, and that "it would be better to imitate the ancient Fathers, who had always made use of Scripture alone, except in cases of necessity, without ever daring to put Tradition in competition with it."—P. Sarpi. Hist. du Conc. de Trente Liv. ii. ch. 46. Edit. Courayer. Cardinal Pallavicino attempts to throw discredit on this statement of Sarpi, but there seems to be no just ground for calling it in question.

confess and lament their sins, and should devoutly visit the church of St. Peter and St. Paul, at Rome, should receive a plenary indulgence.

An unfortunate circumstance, however, for the credit of the story is, that no mention is made of these centennial indulgences by any writer previous to 1300. Now, the influx of strangers which in those days a jubilee brought to Rome, was far beyond that which the Crystal Palace brought to London last year, with this difference, that the ordinary population of London, at present being many times the ordinary population of Rome in those days, the effect produced by the concourse of strangers at Rome would be far more noticeable. It is incredible, therefore, that if, in the year 1300, such an event had taken place as the proclamation of a plenary indulgence (and, as a necessary consequence, an immense throng of visitors to Rome), no mention should have been made of the fact by any writer of the time—just as incredible as that no writer of the year 1851 should make any mention of the great Exhibition. Accordingly we find Roman Catholic writers now very cautious about positively ascribing an earlier date to the first jubilee (although they are glad to insinuate that there were jubilees before 1300), and rather treat all inquiry into the date of the first jubilee as more curious than important. (See Introduction to the Instructions and Devotions for the Forty Hours' Adoration, published last month, with the approbation of Dr. Cullen.)

And yet it suggests some useful reflections, if we suppose that Pope Boniface was mistaken in the belief which he yielded to the story of the old gentleman, whose father had had the forethought to advise him how he should act if he lived a hundred years more. Such a mistake is not inconsistent with the received theory of the infallibility of the Pope; for even those who hold that he is infallible as to *doctrine* do not hold that he is *always* infallible, or that he is free from danger of error as to *facts*. It is true that the doctrines of the Christian religion all relate to matter of fact, and to such facts, too, as our natural powers cannot discover. But, however, it is supposed that when a Pope undertakes to decide, for example, whether the Blessed Virgin was conceived without sin many centuries ago, then he is free from danger of error; but that if he ventures to pronounce on what took place in his own city, only a hundred years before, then he is liable to mistake. Perhaps the truth is, that his mistakes are more easily exposed in the latter case than in the former. If he makes a mistake as to an event 100 years ago, many can contradict him; but if he pronounce wrong on an abstruse point of doctrine, he is tolerably free from all chance of detection.

This story may also give us an idea what dependence can be placed on oral tradition. Some people find it hard to conceive that the tradition of the church, in matters of doctrine, could ever alter, or that people could ever be persuaded to receive any new doctrine as if handed down to them from their fathers. But if people could be imposed on as to a fact that occurred in their own city a hundred years before, and made to believe (contrary to fact) that a remarkable assemblage had then been held among them, how much easier would it be to deceive them as to the antiquity of an abstruse point of doctrine, concerning which few of them, probably, had ever troubled their heads?

To return to the history of the jubilee. We have seen that Pope Boniface VIII. appointed the next recurrence of the jubilee at a distance of 100 years. People, however, were too impatient to wait so long. Doubtless the lodging-house keepers and shop-keepers of Rome were not disinclined to reap such another golden harvest as they had done in the year 1300. Accordingly, a little before the year 1350, very specious arguments were urged on the then Pope, Clement VI. He was reminded, that if jubilees were held only every 100 years, the shortness of human life is such, that numbers would be born after the end of one jubilee and die before the commencement of another, without having ever participated in the benefits of one. Convinced by this argument, and also by the fact that the jubilees were held among the Jews at intervals of every 50 years, Clement ordained that jubilees should be held in future every fifty years, and that the first, under the new rule, should be in 1350.

"The proclamation was diligently published in every part of Christendom, and excited an incredible ardour for the pilgrimage. During a winter of unusual inclemency the roads were thronged with devout travellers, many of whom were compelled to pass the night without shelter or nourishment, in the fear of robbery and the certainty of extortion. The streets of Rome presented, for some months, the spectacle of a vast moving multitude continually flowing through them, and inexhaustibly renovated. The three appointed churches were thronged with successive crowds, eager to throw off the burden of their sins, and also prepared to deposit some pious offering at every visit.

"The streets were perpetually full, so that every one was obliged, whether on foot or on horseback, to follow the crowd, and this made the progress very slow and disagreeable. The holy napkin of Christ was shown at St. Peter's, every Sunday and solemn festival for the consolation of the pilgrims. The press then was great and indiscreet; so it happened that sometimes two, sometimes four or six, even twelve, were found there crushed or trampled to death.

"It is affirmed, that from Christmas to Easter, not fewer than one hundred thousand strangers were added to the population of the pontifical city; for as many as returned home after the comfort of the prescribed ceremonies were replaced by pilgrim bands, and those again by others, in such perennial abundance that, even during the late and unwholesome season of the year, the number was never reduced below two hundred thousand. Every house was converted into an inn, and the object of every Roman was to extort the utmost possible profit from the occasion; neither shame nor fear restrained the eagerness of their avarice. While the neighbouring districts abounded with provisions, the citizens refused to admit a greater supply than was scarcely sufficient to satisfy, at the highest expense, the simplest demands of the pilgrims. And thus those devotees, after surmounting all other difficulties, were at length delivered over to be starved as well as plundered by the inhabitants of the holy city."

We have given these details that the reader may have an idea what kind of a thing a jubilee was in those days, and that he may be able to judge whether it is likely that such an event would leave no trace on contemporary records.

It may be imagined that the return of an event which brought such temporal advantages to the people of Rome, and such spiritual blessings to its visitors, should be anxiously looked for, and that even fifty years should be thought too long to wait for it. Accordingly, Pope Urban VI. ordained that jubilees should be held in future, three times, instead of only twice in a century. The first under the new rule was proclaimed for the year 1390. Urban VI. did not live to preside over it, but it was held under his successor, Boniface IX. Again great multitudes presented themselves at Rome, unmoved by distance and expense, and even by the personal dangers which awaited them from the bandits of the mountains, or from the partizans of the rival Pope; for it must be told that at this time, and for many years after, the world beheld the strange spectacle of two Popes dividing the allegiance of Christendom, and each anathematizing the other and his adherents. Such a schism must have greatly affected the numbers of pilgrims to Rome, and made them much fewer than they would have been, had Boniface been acknowledged by the whole Christian world; but Boniface found a remedy for this. It was he who invented the *secondary* jubilee—such, namely, as that which is now offered to the citizens of Dublin. Hitherto the benefits of the plenary indulgence could not be obtained without a visit to Rome; Boniface first sent his emissaries among all the nations by whom he was acknowledged, with commission to sell the plenary indulgence to all indiscriminately for the same sum which the journey to Rome would have cost them. The change is ascribed, even by respectable Roman Catholic writers, to the avarice of the Pope, who became so prodigal of his indulgences, refusing them to none who paid for them, that he brought the article into contempt. But, notwithstanding, we can see a good reason for the change, for why should the benefits of plenary pardon of sin be confined to those who had it in their power to visit Rome? Why might not other Christians, whose strength, or means, or circumstances did not allow them to take a long journey, be admitted to the same privilege?

We have not space to tell how the jubilee was held again in Rome ten years after, in the year 1400, with larger concourse than before; how some of those who attended it perished miserably by the pestilence which then laid waste the holy city; and how others, whose resources were exhausted through their devotions and their sufferings, when they applied for aid to the apostolic coffers, were dismissed them with a cold and contemptuous refusal. Nor shall we tell how the interval between the times of its celebration was finally reduced, by Paul II., to period of twenty-five years.

Why it may not be held still oftener it is not easy to say; for if the treasure of the church be inexhaustible, the Pope need have no scruple to throw it freely open at all times. We have seen that all the changes which have been yet made, have tended to reduce the intervals at which jubilees have been held. Boniface VIII. thought it enough to throw the treasures of the church unreservedly open once every hundred years; but his successors found that they might safely exercise the same indulgence, first every fifty years, then every thirty-three years, then every twenty-five years. Boniface VIII. only granted these privileges to those who would visit Rome; his successors, to those of other nations—at first, who could afford to pay; but, at present, without any direct payment for the indulgence, to those who give alms, according to their means, and subscribe, besides, to the Society for the Propagation of the Faith. Still, even at an interval of twenty-five years, how many there are who, being of too tender years to profit by one jubilee, die before the announcement of the next? Or how many there are who, having even profited by one jubilee, run up afterwards a new account of sins, which never find a similar opportunity of remission? As long as man is liable to daily sin, the remedy he requires for the pardon of sin is one which must be applicable at all places and in all times.

Perhaps some future Pope may discover, that God has been more merciful than man in this matter, and that, not at intervals of 100, or 50, or 33, or 25 years, not at Jerusalem exclusively, or at Rome, but everywhere, and at all time, the blood of Jesus Christ our Lord cleanseth from all sin.

DOCTOR BRICCONE'S VISIT TO BALLINTUBBER.

PERHAPS some of you may remember a story I told you a couple of months ago, about two farmers of Ballintubber, and may care to hear something more of your friends, Pat Callaghan and Dan Kelly. What I have now to tell happened a few years after the things I told you of in my last story, and about ten years after the Ballintubber property had come into Lord Kilmarty's hands. If any one who had known the place in Mr. Sherwin's time, could see it now, he could hardly believe it to be the same place. I called it a little village in my last story; but now it had come almost to deserve to be called a small town. Where there had been before but a couple of lines of miserable cabins, ornamented with immense dung heaps, and separated by a road broken up with dirty puddles, through which you could hardly step your way, there was now a clean, well-paved street, with a number of slated houses, looking as neat as possible. Among them were some handsome shops, which showed that the ideas of the people of Ballintubber had become much more lofty, and their wants more numerous since we last heard of them. There was Mr. Martin the grocer, who sold, not only tea, and coffee, and sugar, but soap, and candles, and rope, and cordage, and paper, and pens, and ink, and gunpowder, and brushes, and tin kettles, and all manner of odds and ends you can think of. Then, if you wanted to clothe yourself from head to foot, you might do it at Mr. O'Carroll's, and your wife, too, in the bargain. Very handsome things Mr. O'Carroll had to sell; and he boasted that Lady Kilmarty confessed that she could not get better in Dublin (for I should not forget to tell you that there was now a young Lady Kilmarty; Lord Kilmarty had brought her home with him, about three years before, and a very good lady she was). Well, and there was Mr. Jones the apothecary, who had found it worth his while to set up a shop in Ballintubber; and, people said, was doing a very good business. It was not that the place was more unhealthy than it used to be; quite the contrary. Since Lord Kilmarty had had it better drained and kept more clean, there had been much less of agues and fever, with which they had formerly been a good deal troubled. Still it seems that there was work enough, not only for old Dr. Brady, who had lived at Ballintubber since Mr. Sherwin's time, but also for the young dispensary doctor, Dr. Farrell, who had come since. And, besides, there were many who, like Dan Kelly, when there was sickness in their families, seldom troubled either of these doctors; but just got some doctor's stuff from Mr. Jones.

However, at the time I am now talking of, Mr. Jones was nearly relieved, on a sudden, of all his customers, by a great Italian doctor, who one day unexpectedly made his appearance at Ballintubber. An immense sensation was made in the little town by the singularity of his appearance, and the manner of his entry. I don't know that I have ever seen any one like him in this country, though I have abroad. He was dressed in a splendid black robe, enriched with ornaments, of which Mr. O'Reilly himself could not tell the meaning. He came in a kind of caravan, or close carriage, such as travelling showmen carry their shows about in; and he was attended by three servants, dressed in a style of such magnificence as had never been seen before in Ballintubber. They had always thought Lord Kilmarty's liveries the height of grandeur; but they thought his lordship's livery looked no better than a workhouse uniform compared with the brilliancy of the new comers. The caravan took up its station in the fair-green quietly enough; but then the doctor sent his servants about the town, performing on instruments of music, and halting from time to time, while the leader of them addressed the people on the wonderful powers of his master, and circulated handbills among them. They had soon a crowd after them. First came the children, attracted by the music; for they had seldom heard anything finer than a stray barrel organ, which occasionally, at long intervals, made its way down there; so that you may imagine such a military band as made its appearance now was something to be wondered at. And the grown people were soon not ashamed also to follow the procession. And their curiosity was still more strongly excited when they heard the speeches of the chief servant, and read the handbills which he distributed. These bills ran somewhat as follows:—

GOOD NEWS FOR BALLINTUBBER,
ARRIVAL OF THE
CELEBRATED ITALIAN PHYSICIAN,

THE WORLD-RENOWNED
SIGNOR BRICCONE,
THE INFALLIBLE DOCTOR;
WHOSE MEDICINES ARE INVARIABLY ATTENDED WITH NEVER-FAILING SUCCESS!!!

Abandon the poisons with which ignorant quacks have been dosing you: those who take their so-called medicines must inevitably, sooner or later, perish from the pernicious consequences, for Doctor Briccone is in possession of .

THE ONLY SURE ROAD TO HEALTH!!!

Then followed a list of marvellous cures performed by the doctor, of which I may have more to tell you presently. Such tempting announcements as these could hardly fail of being successful. The people ran together from all sides; the crowd swelled like a snowball, and by the time that the procession had made the circuit of the place there was hardly a soul left in Ballintubber, and there was such an assembly before the doctor, on the fair green, as you could hardly match at the busiest hour of the fair day. It was a fine summer evening when our two friends, Dan Kelly and Pat Callaghan, had finished their work, and they didn't pretend to be wiser than their neighbours; so there they were on the fair green, too, and, what's more, their wives and children also, from Tim Callaghan, who was a fine, likely lad, able to do a good day's work himself, to little Mary Kelly, who was so young that she wanted to lay violent hands on one of the brass instruments, when the men had stopped playing, and cried because her mother would not allow her to keep it. So when the doctor had got all the people together, he made a speech to them to something like the following effect:—"I am glad to see so many of you assembled here this evening, my good people. It makes me think that you will be grateful to me for the trouble I have taken on your account. Here I am, after having travelled thousands of miles, and all for your good. I wished that the people of this country should share in the benefits which I have conferred on Italy, and France, and Spain. My heart bleeds when I think how many of you must have suffered from cruel diseases; how many a family must have struggled with hunger while its poor father has been laid on a bed of sickness ("That was our case this time five years, Pat, acushla," said Biddy Callaghan to her husband), how many an unfortunate creature is now lying in its cold grave that might have been saved, if I had been able to come sooner among you. And what help have you had in your troubles? A set of ignorant impostors, who call themselves physicians, who don't know how to cure you, and who give you, when you are sick, poisons which must be fatal to you in the long run."

The doctor was going on with much violent abuse of the regular physicians of the place, but Pat Callaghan, who never wanted for pluck, spoke out:—

"I will not hear Mr. Jones run down in that manner, for I know him to be a very knowledgeable man, and very good he has been to me." And then others of the people took courage, and Dr. Farrell and Dr. Brady had friends to speak in their favour. But Dr. Briccone was not in the least disconcerted. "Listen to me, good people," cried he. "I don't in the least blame you for speaking up for those whom, in your ignorance, you think your friends. But if you will stay awhile I will prove to you, and make it quite clear to you, that you have been mistaken, and that these doctors of yours have been going on a system which cannot possibly be right. Tell me now, do you suppose that God Almighty intended that people should always be racked with pain and plagued with diseases, without any hope of recovery from them? or do you think that he has been merciful enough to provide medicines by which men may be cured of their sicknesses?"

"Oh," said Pat, "no doubt he has, glory to his name. It would be a bad world all out if, when one got sick, he could never get cured again."

"Very good," said the doctor; "you see that if God sends us diseases, he sends us cures too; and there's not a disease in the world that he has not provided a remedy for. But answer me this, what good would his providing a remedy be if he did not put us in the way of knowing what it was? Suppose now that you," said he, singling out Dan Kelly, "were on the flat of your back, with a bad sickness; and suppose there was an herb that would cure you in five minutes, what would you be the better of it, if you did not know what it was or where it was to be found?"

"Sorra much," said Dan.

"Or suppose that your friends went by guess-work, trying first one medicine and then another, on the chance that maybe they might hit on the right one?"

"They might be trying a long time," said Dan.

"Don't you see then," said the doctor, "it stands to reason that God would not put cures for all your complaints in the world, without also providing some one able always to tell you what the right cure is? If the world was full of excellent medicines they would be of no use to you, unless you had some one able to point them out to you; you see, then, that it is *necessary* that there should be some one always at hand to be consulted and ready to tell you, without the possibility of mistake, what the right cure for your sickness is—not one who should go by guess-work (like your doctors here, who, for the most part, guess wrong), but one who should always *know with certainty* how to make you well."

"I don't think the doctors here are so bad," said Pat Callaghan. "I'll always say that my little Julia owed her life, under God, to Mr. Jones's care, last autumn."

"I don't say," said Mr. Briccone, "that they might not make one cure now and then. The fact is, that they have got one or two of my medicines, and as far as that goes they are all right; but the greater part of my cures they know nothing about, and they give you poison instead, which will be sure to bring all that trust in them to the grave. However, to come back to what I was saying—I have showed you that *what you want* is not a doctor who should be groping in the dark, even if he were right, now and then, by accident, but one who should know with certainty what he was doing, and who should be *always* able to tell how to cure you. Now, can you tell me are your doctors here always in the right, and are they able to tell how to cure every disease that comes among you?"

"Well," said Pat, "I must own they can't; for when the cholera was here, scores died in spite of them, and I remember it was said that the doctors were at their wits' end, and could not tell what to make of it."

"Exactly," said the doctor. "There now you see the difference. Now, the reason I am called the infallible doctor is, that I *always* know the right cure. I am never puzzled. I never have any doubt or hesitation. The moment I see a patient, if God's time has not come to take him, I can tell what will make him well again."

"Well, sir," said Pat, "you have made it plain enough that this is the kind of doctor we want; and I believe you are right in saying that it is not to be supposed God would give us medicine without sending us some one who could show us how to use it. But how are we to know that you are the right person, that you are the real infallible doctor?"

To this question the doctor began by telling them a story of a celebrated physician long ago, whom every one acknowledged to be always right then, and who, he said, lived in the same town from which Dr. Briccone came; and, consequently, that it was plain he must be his genuine successor, and be in possession of all his cures. I cannot repeat to you exactly what he said, for he did not seem to make out his case very clearly, and I suppose he thought so himself, for he soon tried a new tack:—

"If I am not the infallible doctor," said he, "I defy you to say who is. Did you ever hear of any one claiming to be so but myself? Does Dr. Brady pretend to be always right? or Dr. Farrell? or Mr. Jones? You know very well they dare not say so. Then, as I have made it plain to you that there must be an infallible doctor somewhere, and as no one but myself ventures to say he is the person, you cannot have any doubt in trusting to me. I am known all over the world. I sell 700 millions of my pills every year. I have agents in every place you can think of. And will you go and prefer to me creatures like Mr. Jones, that no one ever heard of outside the town of Ballintubber? Another point I wish you to mind is, that my medicines are the same everywhere. Wherever you are, at Paris or Madrid, or at Rome or Lisbon, if you tell your complaint to one of my agents, they will always give you the same medicine. They never differ with each other. Dr. Briccone's medicines are always the same. Now, tell me honestly, can you say the same for your doctors? Even in your little town, do your doctors agree among themselves?"

"In troth they don't," said Dan Kelly, "for when Mr. Jones could not cure my Kitty, this time two years, he advised me to call in Dr. Farrell, and Dr. Farrell said that what Mr. Jones had been doing was quite wrong, and he prescribed quite a different set of medicines. And I have heard that Dr. Brady and Dr. Farrell are dreadfully jealous of each other, and that Dr. Farrell says Dr. Brady's method of practice is out of date, and that Dr. Brady says there is more harm than good in Dr. Farrell's new-fangled remedies."

"Out of date!" said Dr. Briccone. "No wonder; they are always changing. I never change; I sell the same pills now my father and my grandfather sold before me. But here, you see, even in this little place, where you have only three medical men, they cannot agree together; and what would you say if you could know the varieties in the medicines used by all the different physicians in England and Ireland? and, much more, if you could know how totally different the medicines used on the Continent are? Why, half the medicines they use abroad they never hear of here; and if you were to take a prescription, written by a physician here, to an apothecary abroad, he could not tell how to make it up, and the chances are that he might never have heard of some of the medicines mentioned in it. The fact is, *truth is one, errors are numberless*; and when once people abandon Dr. Briccone's infallible pills, there is no knowing what quackeries they will take up with; they fall into the hands of a set of impostors, each of whom has his own nostrum, but no two of whom agree with each other. There is no end to the absurdities people fall into when they forsake my infallible medicines. There are parts of England where people expect to be cured by being breathed on by a piebald horse, or by eating fried mice, or drinking toad broth, or by using charms made of hanged men's bones; while others lose their faith in doctors altogether, and imagine there is no use in medicine at all."

"This doctor seems a very sensible man," said Dan Kelly to Pat Callaghan. "I wonder is it safe to take his medicines?"

"Safe!" cried Dr. Briccone, who overheard him; "I will show you that it is far safer to trust to me than to any one else. I defy any of the doctors here to say that my medicines will be certain to do you injury."

"Why, as I was running here," said Pat Callaghan, "I was stopped by Mr. Jones, who asked me where I was going; and when I told him, he said I was a fool to go listen to a quack who wanted to sell me bread pills at a shilling a dozen."

"Listen to that, good people," said Dr. Briccone. "There you hear what the utmost malignity of my enemies ventures to say of me. Even Mr. Jones, whose interest it is to cry me down as much as possible, does not venture to charge me with selling anything worse than bread pills; he does not venture to say my medicines are unwholesome. Now, I tell you *his* medicines are poisons. So now judge which is the safest to trust to. I tell you, if you take his medicines, you will undoubtedly be poisoned. He does not dare to say that if you take my medicines you will be the worse of them. So it is quite clear that it is safer for you to come to me than to go to him. Now, it does not become me to speak but my servant there will tell you what wonderful cures I have performed."

So then Dr. Briccone sat down, and the servant began his history of his master's miraculous remedies. First his stories, though marvellous enough, were not altogether out of the way; but when he found the people swallow these readily, he told them some such tremendous whoppers as I hardly know how to repeat. I should tell you that Dr. Briccone did not appear to listen to what his servant was saying; and if he was asked whether any particular story, told by the servant, was true, he would answer in a dignified way:—"I cannot be expected to remember every cure I perform. My servant is a very honest man; I would keep no one about me that was not, and I dare say you can trust him. And if I did not perform the particular cure you ask about, you may be sure of this, that I have performed others just as wonderful." However, as the stories, of which I will give you a specimen or two, were printed on the doctor's handbills, and circulated with his approval, I suppose it is fair to consider him answerable for them.

"Look at these pills," said he; "these are what the doctor uses in all cases of palsy. If a person has lost the use of his limbs for years, one box of these pills is sure to make him walk as well as ever."

After telling some cases of the cures of men who had been bedridden for years, he went on to say:—

"Some years ago, in France, there was a man, named Denis Parry, who had been formerly cured by our pills, but in the time of the troubles there, he was condemned to death, and his head was cut off. Well, his wife put two or three of my master's pills into his mouth, and up he got, and walked as well with his head in his hand as ever he had done with it between his shoulders. And, for all I know, he might be walking to this day; but when he had gone a mile, or perhaps it might be a little more, the pills were shaken out, and fell down through the hole in his neck; then he lay down in the place where he was, and there you may see his tomb to this day."

At this story there was a general exclamation.

"Don't be surprised at this," said the servant; "I have other stories to tell you far more surprising than this. You must know that my master had a great magazine of these pills in a house in the same country where Jerusalem is. Since that time he has learned never to keep so many of them together in the same place, but then he did not know there was any danger. Well, these pills have so much virtue in conferring the power of motion, and there were so many of them together, that the whole house where they were, moved off. It took its flight across the seas, and it did not fix itself until several of the pills were shaken out; then it settled down in Italy, where it is to this day."

"Thunder and turf," cried Pat Callaghan; "did mortal ever hear the like of that? That's more than ever I could believe."

"You need not believe it if you don't like," said the servant. "My master's pills will cure you all the same whether you do or not. But would you believe your own eyes? Well, I saw it with my own eyes. I lived near that house in Italy for a year; and these men here (pointing to the other servants) can testify that they saw it as well as myself. But the best proof I can give you is, that thousands have visited the house, and they (who have the best right to judge whether the story be true or not) have left such presents behind them there, that if the house was inclined to move off again, my master could ballast it with the guineas it has brought him in."

There was no disputing such evidence as this. The sale of the pills went on merrily, and at nightfall the crowd poured back to Ballintubber, well laden with Dr. Briccone's medicines, and leaving a good deal of their loose cash behind them. For though the doctor had come among them from motives of pure benevolence, yet it appeared that all his plans tended very much to the filling of his own pockets. And, indeed, he owned that the chinking of the money in his purse was quite essential to the efficacy of his medicines. Dan Kelly was among the largest of his purchasers. Pat Callaghan was very much disposed to believe in him too, but he was a more cautious man. He had a long talk with the doctor at the end of his public speech, and he thought he would like to have a talk with Lord Kilmarty too, before making up his mind. So next morning, at the hour that he knew Lord Kilmarty was in the habit of coming out to walk about his farms, Pat steered his way up towards the great house, and sure enough he did not fail of meeting his lordship.

"Good morning, Pat," said he.

"Good morrow kindly, your lordship," said Pat.

"Well, Pat," said he; "I hear you had great doings last night. Were you down on the fair green with the rest?"

"Why, then," said Pat, "if that was not the very thing that I wanted to have a talk with your lordship about, and to know what your lordship's opinion was; for I was there sure enough; and I think I never heard a finer spoken man than this new doctor that's come here; and he made it clear to me that he was the only man that could cure myself and all my family of whatever sicknesses we had; but still I thought it better not to deal with him until I heard what your lordship would say about him."

"Well, Pat," said Lord Kilmarty, "I'd like to hear how he made this clear to you."

"Why, my lord, you know neither Dr. Brady, nor Dr. Farrell, nor Mr. Jones, can say that they are always certain of being right in the medicines they order; and when they meet a strange case they are often in doubt, and, perhaps, they don't agree with each other; but this doctor says that he is never in doubt, and that his medicines never fail, and that his agents never disagree with each other, but sell the same pills all the world over."

Lord Kilmarty smiled, and said—"Why, I thought, Pat, you were too sensible a man to trust to any man just because he gave himself a good character. Is it common sense of you to think that he must be a better doctor than your old friend, Mr. Jones, just because he talks bigger and brags louder, and will not own that he may happen sometimes to make a mistake?"

"But, my lord," said Pat, "if this is not the real infallible doctor that never makes a mistake, who else can it be? for I never heard of any one else but himself that claimed to be the man."

"Why," said Lord Kilmarty, "what makes you think that any doctor is infallible?"

"That is what he showed us, my lord," said Pat; "that the Lord would never have sent medicines into the world, without providing some one who could tell us where to find them; and that he would not leave our health and our lives depending on guess-work, and on doctors that were not certain how to make a right cure."

"Pat," said Lord Kilmarty, "do you see the eagle's nest in the cliff above there? I wish you would spread your wings and fly there, and bring down the young birds."

Pat did not open his wings, but he opened his eyes instead.

"Because," continued Lord Kilmarty, "wings must be a very useful thing to have; and I am sure you must have got a pair; for do you think that the Almighty would give wings to crows, and sparrows, and tomtits, and not give a pair to you, that they would be of so much more use to?"

"I take you now, my lord," said Pat; "but, with submission, the case is very different. For though wings would be very pleasant to have, still we can do very well without them; but one's health is a matter of so much importance to us, and it is such ruin to a poor man to be laid upon a bed of sickness, that I think it stands to reason that if God was merciful enough to provide a way for us to get well, he would not fail, also, to give us a certainty of finding it out."

"I am quite sure of this," said Lord Kilmarty, "that it would be a very pleasant thing never to be sick, or else to be quite sure of getting well again at once, if one did ever get sick; but I fear this would be too much happiness for this world. What I meant, talking to you about wings, was, to show you that we had no right to conclude that God *has* given us such and such things, merely because we think they would be very useful to us. We have no right to set up ourselves as God's judges, or to dictate to him how he ought to have made us, or to imagine that he *must* have dealt with us in the manner we could *wish* as the most desirable. If we had such a certain way of recovering from sickness as you speak of, perhaps we should be careless about avoiding sickness, and taking proper care of our healths. And if we were to indulge our conjectures, we should have fancied there would be no such thing as sickness in the world at all."

"Well, my lord," said Pat, scratching his head, "I don't know what to say again your lordship; but I find it hard to get out of my head, but when God sent us medicines he would be sure to send us also an infallible doctor, to tell us with certainty what the right medicines are."

"Perhaps," said Lord Kilmarty, "you may be able to get this into your head, that you might also say, that if God had given us an infallible doctor, he would also have given us a way of knowing, with certainty, who the real infallible doctor was—some better way of knowing than merely to see who bragged most. For you must know that though Dr. Briccone does sell a great many of his pills, there are a great many more people, and those very sensible men, who don't believe in him at all, and say that he is no more infallible than you or I; and, so far from that, that his pills are very unwholesome. I grant you, that if he could prove that he performed those miraculous cures he prints in his handbills, then we might have some reason for trusting him; but his own friends only laugh at these stories, and you see he is very cautious about pledging himself to them. So I may ask you what's the use of God's sending an infallible doctor into the world, when he does not give us an infallible way of finding him out? And," continued Lord Kilmarty, "as you are guessing what it is likely God would do, I will guess this, that if he did send us an infallible doctor, the man so favoured with wisdom would not be a profligate and abandoned character. Now, I know something of this Dr. Briccone's history, and I can tell you that his life, at times, has been so loose and immoral that I would be ashamed to tell you the particulars of it."

"I think, my lord," said Pat, "you must have heard these stories from some of the doctor's enemies."

"Enemies!" said Lord Kilmarty, taking a newspaper from his pocket, "not at all. See here this advertisement from Mr. Baron, one of the doctor's agents, who puffs off his pills as well as any man alive; and look here, he confesses that, some years ago (ay, when the doctor was a middle-aged man), he was a monster of iniquity! To be sure, he has reformed his life somewhat now; but at the time I am speaking of he sold his infallible pills, and Mr. Baron says they had just as much virtue as now."

"Well, but," said Pat, "after all, is it not safer for me to take the doctor's pills? for he has made me afraid of being poisoned by Mr. Jones, and I don't hear that Mr. Jones says as much harm of him."

"Yes, you sensible man," said Lord Kilmarty. "Surely, it is safe to trust to the man that brags the loudest of himself, and says the most harm of his rivals. But as for the safety of these pills, I wish you would get me a few of them, and I will have them analyzed by a good chemist, and then I will tell you whether they are harmless or not."

"I can't do that, my lord," said Pat; "for the doctor says that his pills must be swallowed without examination; and that it would ruin their virtue if any one was to try to find out what is in them. And he will not give them to any one who does not promise to use them without attempting to examine what they are."

"That looks very suspicious, my friend Pat," said Lord Kilmarty; "I think if he knew there was no harm in them he would not have such an objection to their being examined."

"Well, I might think so, my lord," said Pat, "only for this:—You see he has seven thousand agents in different parts of Europe, and I can't think that they would all agree in selling the same pills unless they knew that they had none but wholesome ingredients."

"But," said Lord Kilmarty, "you have just told me the very thing that makes this agreement of his agents a fact of no value at all. Your doctor made the most of the differences between the regular physicians, and yet you know that it is only in very difficult and uncommon cases that they have any doubts or differences. In all the common sicknesses that may happen to you, you will find they all follow the same method. Now, this is an agreement which will give you some confidence. When Dr. Brady and Dr. Farrell tell you that Mr. Jones is treating you quite right, you have good reason to think that he is; for you know that they are judging for themselves; they are not in league with Mr. Jones, and, perhaps, they might be well pleased enough if they could show that he was going wrong. So when you find all the regular physicians agree, you have good reason for thinking them in the right. But now, when Dr. Briccone's 7,000 agents all agree in selling the same sealed packages of pills, which they must not examine for themselves, and cannot even tell what is in them, they have no better warrant for the pills being good than that they heard Dr. Briccone say so; and their agreement does not make you a bit more sure of their virtue than you were when you heard him praise them yourself."

Pat had a good deal more conversation with Lord Kilmarty, and the end of it was, that he determined on sticking to Mr. Jones, in spite of all Dr. Briccone's big words. But for all that, Dr. Briccone drove a very good trade at Ballintubber. I cannot say that he had much success in curing any of the diseases I ever heard of before; but he frightened the wits out of the people by telling them of a new and dreadful disease that would come upon them shortly. He described so vividly the pains this disease would cause them, the violent purgings, and the hot burnings, which he swore would equal the torments of hell, that the people, and especially the women, were half mad with fright, and came in crowds to purchase his remedies against this dreadful disease. These remedies principally consisted of pills, which Mr. Jones asserted were only bread, but which Dr. Briccone was positive were quite another thing.

He had other remedies, indeed, but they were very nauseous and disagreeable. He praised very much those people who would take them. But to those who disliked them (what struck me as very funny) he sold licences to do without taking them: and he promised that by merely looking at a pill-box, or by seeing a man take a pill, they should get as much benefit as if they had taken so many bottles of his medicine. For you must know that Dr. Briccone asserted, that those who took more of his medicine than their health required did not injure their stomachs by it, as you might imagine, but, on the contrary, laid in a stock of extra health, which he had the power of selling to his other customers. I suppose these remedies must have had great virtue, for I never heard of any one suffering from this new disease. However, they paid Dr. Briccone very well, and he has a shop open in Ballintubber for the sale of them to this day.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We beg to apologize to Mr. Power for postponing his letter till our next. Want of space obliges us also to postpone several other valued communications. If our correspondents would recollect the limited space of our columns, when forwarding letters or articles, it would prevent much embarrassment and disappointment.

We beg to thank J. D., J. F. G., Rev. J. H. S., and Rev. J. W., for their obliging suggestions.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st. No anonymous letter can be attended to. Whatever is sent for insertion must be authenticated by the name and address of the writer, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee for his good faith.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal, which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, OCTOBER, 1852.

DURING the last month our thoughts have dwelt continually on the subject of our last article in this part of our paper. A people, the most ancient, perhaps, now in Europe, journeying by HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS across a mighty ocean, to seek new homes in the far west wilderness of a new world—alike for the distance of the journey, and the multitude of travellers, this vast movement stands unparalleled in the history of mankind.

And of us who remain, who has not sent some loved one of their hearts and homes to join that mighty band of exiles on the homeless sea and distant shore? Who has not seen or felt the partings, when the aged parent has blessed his long and much-loved child on setting out upon that long journey that anticipates the solemn separation of the grave? Which of us has not sought himself, or seen those round him seek, the long-wished-for letter that brings some little tidings of those we shall see no more on earth, but by taking ourselves the long, long journey that they have taken? Who has not witnessed the wasting grief of those who seek for months and years the never-coming letter, until the despairing conviction comes, that those whom we have loved we shall hear of no more on earth, till the sea shall give up its dead?

Such are the trials, deep and great, of a whole nation on its journey to a distant world. Such

must be the consequences to individuals, of the mighty movements of a people.

But along with this, we see a mightier movement still. As if it were not enough for a nation to leave its ancient land and cross the world, there must be a movement as great in the very mind and soul of the nation; as if it were not enough to abandon its ancient home unless it should abandon the religion of its fathers too. The proof of the fact we gave in our last number, from the Rev. Mr. Mullen, Roman Catholic curate of Clonmellon, who thus states the result of his inquiries on the spot—"THE FAITH HAS DIED OUT IN MILLIONS." God forbid that we should trifle with such a fact, much less triumph over it. It is a solemn and a fearful fact. If the mind swells with deep emotion at the thoughts of a nation without a home, struggling across the ocean and the wilderness, how much more awful and solemn is the thought, that in religion too, that nation is wandering more hopelessly, without an aim, and without a guide! And is it anything short of this to say—"The faith has died out in millions?"

We dare not trifle with such a fact. We dare not use it for a political purpose, as Mr. Mullen has done. We dare not use it to triumph over a church whose people have thus wandered. One thought, and one only, fills our minds in contemplating facts so great and so terrible, and that thought is, how the wandering of the Irish people in religion may be ended, so that in their pilgrimage through the wilderness of this world, their souls at least may be at rest.

That fearful fact which Mr. Mullen has disclosed, is proof that there has been something wrong with the Irish people. We anxiously avoid drawing any conclusion from it that is not strictly just. Were we to treat this fact in any party or sectarian spirit, we should be unworthy to propose a remedy. We have no right to say that this great falling off of the Irish people is any proof that their religion is false. Peoples and nations have forsaken true as well as false religions. But we are bound to say, that there has been something wrong. If their religion was true, then these people were not properly taught and grounded in it. That, at least, is a conclusion we must come to. And this conclusion is confirmed by the positive testimony of an American missionary priest, who has spent twelve years among the emigrants. That testimony, too, we gave in our last number, as we found it in the *Tablet* newspaper—"It is owing, with scarcely an exception, to the want of religious instruction in which these unfortunate people were literally raised." We trust and know that this was not so with all. But we fear it was true of a vast number. The truth must be told. With a vast number while in Ireland, the priest was their religion: they left their religion to him, and he was content to let them do so. For the religion of the heart and soul they had not learned it; and he had not taught it to them. The priest had been himself their religion; and when left without a priest, they were without a religion; and so "the faith died out." Such a religion as this will ever fail in the time of trial. But if these men had had their religion in their hearts—if they had been taught to understand and to believe for themselves, their faith would not have failed in the day of trial, and the storms and troubles of this world would have strengthened and established it the more.

Who has not seen the self-denial and self-devotion of the very poorest of our people, in providing the necessaries for those who go? Who has not seen them strip themselves to absolute destitution to provide sea-stores for a son, or a brother, or a sister, who was about to go? And can we be indifferent to provide the bread of life which alone can sustain their spiritual life, for those who go?

It was while we were continually revolving such thoughts in our minds, and thinking what that sea-store should be, that would keep their faith from "dying out" upon their voyage, that we happened to take up the sermons of St. Chrysostom, Archbishop of Constantinople, that great preacher of the Catholic Church. We knew how he has spoken of the storms and the troubles of our pilgrimage on earth, and how he shows where to look for strength and comfort. We know that he preached *fourteen hundred and fifty years ago*, and that he would give us no modern disputes or cavils. And we read thus:—

"What saith he? *Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly*—that is, the teaching, the doctrines, the exhortation, wherein he says that the present life is nothing, nor yet its good things; for if we consider this, we shall *yield to no hardship whatever. Let it dwell in you, he saith, richly*—not simply dwell, but with great abundance. Hearken ye, as many as are worldly, and have the charge of wife and children. Now, to you, too, he commits especially the reading of the Scriptures, and that not to be done lightly, nor in any sort of way, but with much earnestness. . . . He said not simply, let the word of Christ be in you; but what? *Dwell in you, and richly, in all wisdom, teaching and admonishing one another.* . . . . And tarry not for another to teach thee, for thou hast the Scriptures of God. No MAN CAN TEACH THEE AS THEY; *for he, indeed, often concealed much for vainglory's sake and envy.* Hearken, I entreat you, all ye that are careful for this life, and *procure books that will be medicine for the soul.* If ye will not any other, *yet get you at least the New Testament*, the Acts of the Apostles, the Gospels, *for your constant teachers.* If grief befall thee, dive into them as into a chest of medicines; take thence comfort of thy trouble, be it loss, or death, *or bereavement of relations;* or rather dive not into them merely, but take them wholly to thee; keep them in thy mind. *This is the cause of all evils*, the not knowing the Scriptures. We go into the battle without arms, and how should we come off safe? Well contented should we be if we can be safe with them, let alone without them." (Homily 9, on Coloss. ch. 3, vs. 16, 17.)

We here ask every Christian man to consider this. If every Irish emigrant had followed this advice, would the faith have "died out in millions?" Has it not been thus, with a great multitude of emigrants, that they went into that most trying battle of life, emigration to a foreign land, *without these arms*, and so their faith "died out?"

But here we find some comfort in thinking of many of our countrymen. We know that multitudes of them had heard of the Scriptures here, and did take these arms with them. Many have gone for this very purpose, that they might freely read the Word of God. It is likely that they may have cast off many a superstition, and many a doctrine which they cannot find in Scripture; but may we not hope that they have found the medicine of their souls? Father Mullen says nothing of these. He may have counted them heretics, or he may have thought this just as bad, or worse, than if the faith had died out in them: but would St. Chrysostom, or can any Christian man think so?

This, then, is our advice to emigrants and the friends of emigrants; yet not our advice, but St. Chrysostom's. Emigrants get yourselves Bibles, or at least the New Testament. Emigrants' friends, provide them with this store of medicines for the soul. Let not the faith die out in them, in the long, weary wandering that lies before them. Ask the priest for the book; if that fail try the parson.

Oh, what a comfort, in the long, long weary days at sea, when nothing but the watery waste and cloudy sky appear, to learn to call on Him, and trust in Him, who, for our hope and comfort, has passed through every scene of trial we can know, has walked upon the troubled water, and bid the stormy waves be still, that in the tempest's loudest roar his people's cry should ever be—"We perish; save us, Lord!"

INDULGENCES.

WE have postponed, for some time, responding to the letter of the Rev. Edward Spring upon this subject, in the hope that the Right Rev. Dr. Keane, Roman Catholic Bishop of Ross, would have relieved us from the necessity of doing so, by publishing an authoritative explanation of the matters inquired after by Mr. Spring. As, however, we are informed that Dr. Keane has not noticed the Rev. Mr. Spring's letter, we shall endeavour to state, fully and fairly, the Roman Catholic doctrines upon this subject, with a view to eliciting a fair discussion and inquiry into their truth or error. The universal jubilee granted by the present Pope, in his encyclical letter, dated 21st November, 1851, renders the subject, at the present time, of more than usual interest to every sincere and candid inquirer after religious truth. "To convey a true idea of what is meant by the Church of Rome by the grant of an *indulgence*, it will be necessary," says Dr. Bouvier, Bishop of Maus, in his work upon the subject (which has gone through six editions, the last published in 1836), "to have a clear idea of the punishment due for sin. After the guilt and eternal punishment due for sin have been remitted, by repentance and the sufferings of Christ, there still remains a debt of *temporal* punishment due to God's justice, on account of the sin, which debt must be expiated either here or hereafter. This is laid down as an article of faith, in express terms, by the Council of Trent (Sess. 14, Can. 12), and it was on this principle that the ancient Penitential Canons were founded, imposing a penance of three, seven, ten, fifteen, or twenty years' fasting on bread and water, privations, and humiliations, to continue during a man's whole life, and *all this for one sin!* And it was never thought that such penances, or atonements, ever exceeded the measure of God's justice."* Not, be it remarked, in regard to the *guilt* or *eternal* punishment due to it, both of which are admitted to be already remitted, by God's mercy, through Christ's death, on repentance or penance of the sinner, but entirely in respect of the debt of *temporal* punishment supposed to be still unexpiated, either by Christ's sufferings or the penitence of the offender. *Penances* of this kind, as they were imposed and enforced by the church, so of course they could be remitted and relaxed by the church; and the relaxation of such penances is called an *indulgence*, plenary or partial, as the pardon of a condemned criminal may be complete or a mere commutation of his sentence, by remitting a portion of it. This power of the church to remit sentences of penances enjoined by the Penitential Canons *in this life*, and which really existed and could be actually enforced against the offender, was assumed as extending to the next life also. The same writer, whom we have already quoted, thus lays it down, p. 12:—"Every indulgence presupposes sin; so that if a person had committed no sin he should have no need of an indulgence; and whereas, after the guilt and eternal punishment, which have been remitted by the sacrament of penance, there remains, in general, a temporal punishment, which sinners should suffer either in this life *or in the next*, to satisfy the Almighty and to expiate their sins, an indulgence remits part of this punishment or atonement; and indulgences do not only remit part of the temporal punishment, which the sinner should suffer in this life, but also abridge the punishment in purgatory, when a person has not entirely atoned for his sins."

We have also before us a work printed by Richard Grace and Son, 45, Capel-street, Dublin, entitled "Indulgences Granted by Sovereign Pontiffs to the Faithful, collected by a Member of the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences in Rome, translated into English with permission of Superiors," in which the definition of an indulgence is thus given, page v.—"An indulgence is the remission of the temporal punishment which generally remains due to sins already forgiven in the sacrament of penance, as to the guilt and eternal punishment. This remission is made by the application of the merits and satisfactions which are contained in the treasures of the church. These treasures are the accumulations of the spiritual goods, arising from the infinite merits and satisfaction of Jesus Christ, with the superabundant merits and satisfactions of the Blessed Virgin Mary, of the holy martyrs, and of the other saints, which ultimately derive their efficacy from the merits and satisfactions of Christ, who is the only mediator of redemption. These CELESTIAL TREASURES, as they are called by the Council of Trent, are committed, by the Divine bounty, to the dispensation of the church, the sacred spouse of Christ, and are the ground and matter of indulgences. They are infinite in reference to the merits of Christ, and cannot, therefore, ever be exhausted."

We believe no Roman Catholic writer will object to the foregoing statements of the nature and objects of indulgences; and our readers will at once perceive that we are not about to charge their church with the presumption (not unfrequently attributed to it by Protestants who have not carefully examined the subject) of granting to any one a licence to commit sin with impunity, by forgiving, by anticipation, sins not yet committed. An indulgence is never supposed, by any well-informed Roman Catholic, to forgive sin at all, but only to remit the punishment—the temporal, or rather, the temporary punishment of the sin, as contradistinguished from the eternal punishment—the punishment of hell.

Indulgences, says the same Dr. Bouvier (Abridgment,

* See the Abridgment of Bishop Bouvier's work, entitled "A Dogmatical and Practical Treatise on Indulgences, for the use of the Clergy and Laity. By a Parish Priest; page 3. Printed by John Coyne, 21, Cook-street, Dublin, 1832.

p. 13), are of different sorts—viz., plenary, partial, and jubilee.

A plenary indulgence is a relaxation of all the temporal punishment which remained to be undergone by a person who has already performed a reasonable penance. It is called plenary, being entire and without reserve.

A partial indulgence is a relaxation of part of the temporal punishment due for sin. An indulgence of forty days, or seven years, for example, remits so much of the pain of purgatory as would be remitted by the actual performance of a penance of so many days or years, according to the ancient Penitential Canons of the church.

We take the description of a jubilee from an equally authentic source.

"A jubilee signifies a plenary indulgence in its most ample form, granted at different periods by the Sovereign Pontiff, to those who, either residing in the city of Rome or visiting it, perform there the *visitations of the churches* and other prescribed works of piety, prayer, fasting, and alms deeds, with confession and communion, which are always enjoined for the giving of this indulgence, in order to facilitate the return of sinners to God by the last-mentioned exercises of religion. Most extensive powers are acceded by the Supreme Pontiff to all approved ministers of the sacrament of penance, a principal object of which indulgence is not only to encourage Christians to a closer union with, and a livelier sense of their dependence, in spiritual matters, on the *Supreme Pontiff*, who governs them as Christ's vicar on earth, but principally to induce them, by holding out every possible encouragement to pray to God, and perform works of piety *in those places, and under those circumstances*, which shall be most acceptable to God, and most conducive to their own spiritual advantage."*

Having thus explained the meaning of the words, we next proceed to show what are the benefits stated to result from gaining a plenary indulgence. We cite the same authority before referred to (Indulgences Collected by a Member of the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences at Rome, p. x.)—"If a person laboured with all his power to make satisfaction, and complied with the requisite conditions, and if he were truly penitent, and so well disposed as to gain the full effects of a plenary indulgence, should he die immediately after, his soul would suffer nothing in purgatory, but would go directly to heaven. The same may be said of the faithful departed. Whenever, in their favour, we fully gain a plenary indulgence, which is applicable to them, the soul to whom the indulgence is especially applied, if it be in purgatory, that moment is liberated from the painful flames, and is received into glory, *provided the Divine justice designs to accept it* in her favour."

Having thus answered, from authentic Roman Catholic works, the principal questions asked by Mr. Spring (reserving for a future number the rest), we proceed to add something (as he desires) of the grounds on which Protestants refuse to avail themselves of a provision said to be replete with such wonderful blessings."

Those reasons will ultimately resolve themselves into one or other of the two following—viz., either, 1st, that indulgences are chimerical; or, 2nd, that they are positively injurious.

We intend not to approach this subject in any other spirit than that of candid discussion, to which we invite the best efforts of our respected Roman Catholic correspondents to support those doctrines of their church, and open the eyes of Protestants to their error (if such it be) in resisting the benefits which Roman Catholics believe to result from such indulgences. If Protestants be in error on the point, it is surely the duty of Roman Catholics to *pity* rather than to *anathematize* them; and we can conceive no more imperative duty, on the part of a Christian bishop or priest, than to afford pious and candid Protestants every light in their power to lead them into truth, remembering that, although some men may be inclined to take things for granted, without proof, others cannot do so, and require proof before they can adopt, as true, propositions not in themselves self-evident.

The latter class, when invited to partake of the blessings alleged by Roman Catholics to flow from indulgences, naturally and not unreasonably ask for proof—*probable* proof, at least, if not *positive*—that they are not chimerical, but founded in reality.

Now, for a man to arrive at such a result, we think that it will scarcely be denied that the following points ought to be proved or fairly established:—

1st. That God, when he pardons the *guilt* of sin, and releases the sinner from the *eternal* punishment due to it, still leaves the sinner *unpardoned* as to *temporal* or *temporary* punishment, to work out his own pardon, either during life or after death, before he can seek the benefit of the remission of his guilt, and of the eternal punishment due to it.

2nd. That this temporal or temporary punishment can be commuted, or compounded for, by acts not partaking of the nature of punishment or suffering.

3rd. That the acts or supposed merits of one human being can be transferred to another, so as to satisfy the Divine justice in respect of that *punishment* which remains due, after the merits of Christ have blotted out the *guilt* and expiated the *eternal* punishment due to it.

4th. That superfluous merits or satisfactions of Christ and eminent saints, are laid up in a celestial treasury, to be laid out for those that want them, to make up the deficiency of their own personal endurance of the temporary or temporal punishment due to those sins whose *guilt* has been forgiven them.

5th. That the Pope has the power of dispensing this treasury either with or without the aid of the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences at Rome, in favour either of the living who comply with the condition he imposes, or in favour of the faithful dead who are suffering in purgatory this temporal punishment.

Each of these points we propose seriously to discuss in their turn; but, as with the Rev. Mr. Spring, we should rather hear the best Roman Catholic arguments from "a living, speaking tribunal," than subject ourselves to the charge of understating them, we would earnestly solicit the Right Rev. Dr. Keane, or some other able and learned bishop of the Roman Catholic Church, to furnish us with the best proofs that exist on the foregoing points, which we shall gladly print in our pages, and treat with all the respect which the importance of the subject and the dignity of his office deserve at our hands. But should he still decline "to explain, with perspicuity, the power of indulgences," neither he nor our Roman Catholic readers will have a right to complain, if we proceed, in our next number, to consider the force of the best reasons we have been able to find, in Roman Catholic controversialist writers, in support of the doctrine and practice in question.

A copy of the Rev. E. Spring's letter, which appeared in our August number, and of this article, has been forwarded, in a respectful letter, to the address of the Right Rev. Dr. Keane, Roman Catholic Bishop of Ross, Skibbereen.

WHAT TRADITION TELLS US OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY.

No. 1, THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS.

IN our last number we laid before our readers all the passages we could find in the New Testament where the Virgin Mary is spoken of. We think it is likely that many of our readers were surprised to see how few there were; and that even of these few passages in in which her name is mentioned, in the historical part of the New Testament, two seem designed to check any excess of veneration for her, and to point out to Christians that the blessedness which she enjoys is only that which may be shared by any faithful follower of our Lord. "Whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother." Blessed is the womb that bare our Lord; but he has said, "Yea, rather, blessed are they who hear the Word of God and keep it." Very striking, too, is the fact, that not a single mention of the Virgin Mary occurs in any of the letters of the Apostles which has been handed down to us.

Now, we do not mean to argue this question on Protestant grounds. A Protestant holds that the providence of God has preserved, in the Holy Scriptures, everything taught by our Lord and his apostles which it is necessary for us to believe or practise, and that of such teaching there is no other authentic record. When, therefore, he finds that the Scriptures do not say a syllable as to any advantages to be gained by offering our prayers through the mediation of the Virgin, and that, on the other hand, they speak of our Lord as the only mediator, he inquires no farther; for he cannot suppose that, did such a way of access to God exist, the Scriptures would have been silent on a subject so important to our faith and practice. However, as we have said, we are content to examine into this subject on Roman Catholic grounds, and if any good evidence can be produced by *tradition* that our Lord and his apostles recommended their followers to offer their prayers through the Virgin Mary, we are willing to attend to it. It must, of course, be kept in mind, that the value of a tradition constantly diminishes with the number of hands it passes through before being recorded. Thus courts of law will listen to anything a witness says he saw or heard himself, but they will not receive "hearsay evidence," as to what other people told him took place; still less will they receive the hearsay of a hearsay; and even in common conversation we should not yield much belief to a story if we had no better authority for it than that our informant heard it from Mr. A., who was told by Mr. B. that he had heard Mr. C. who had heard somebody else say that such and such a thing took place. So, then, if we are told by any one who lived in the time of the apostles, that they taught any particular doctrine, such a witness is worth being listened to; if we are told so by one who lived 50 or 100 years after their death, the evidence is, of course, of something less value; and when we come to people who lived 500 years after the apostles, we give our readers a very simple test how much their evidence is worth. It is now only 125 years since the death of George I. (not a very long time to carry a tradition through), and yet, if we had no printed books to tell us what took place in Ireland during his reign, we think that it is little enough we should learn on the subject from the reports of our fathers and grandfathers. Four hundred years ago Henry the Sixth was King of England. If our readers will endeavour to find out how much they can learn with certainty, by tradition alone, of what took place in Ireland in his time, then they will know exactly of what value is a tradition four hundred years old.

Having said this much to enable our readers to judge of the comparative dependence to be placed on the writers whom we shall quote, we proceed to lay before them in order all that we can find in the early Christian writers concerning the Blessed Virgin. And as the number and length of the books which we have to examine increase, it becomes of course more difficult to be certain that we are leaving out nothing. All that we can say is, that we shall *designedly* leave out nothing that is of importance to this question; that we shall assist our own reading by examining the writings of those Roman Catholic divines who have quoted all that they could find in the works of the early Fathers calculated to do honour to the Virgin; and that, if after all, we should omit to insert any such testimony in its proper place, we shall cheerfully insert it, if pointed out to us by our readers.

Before proceeding to uninspired writers, we wish to make some further remarks on the fact, that no mention is made of the Virgin Mary, in any of the apostolic epistles. On the grounds which we are now arguing we admit that this silence will not prove demonstratively, that they did not entertain those views of the Blessed Virgin which are held by the Church of Rome; but it will at least show that she did not occupy a very prominent place in their thoughts. If there be any subject which a friend has never mentioned to us, in any conversation we have held with him, we cannot be quite sure that he knows nothing of this subject, but we may conclude, that it is not one that is constantly in his thoughts, or on which he is very anxious that we should be informed. So we can at least see that modern Romanists, "who have the Virgin's name ever on their lips," do not in this respect at all resemble the apostles, who have left us twenty-one epistles without one allusion to her. It would require us to look through a great many pastorals of Romish bishops, now-a-days before we could find twenty-one which do not in some place mention the Virgin Mary. Since our last article was published, a pastoral, issued by the present Pope, has appeared in the Dublin papers. When we saw it, we at once looked through it in search of the never-failing paragraph in honour of the Blessed Virgin; and sure enough there it was, in the following terms:—

"And that God may be made more accessible, and give ear to our prayers, let us raise our hearts and hands to his most holy mother, the Immaculate Virgin Mary. We could not find protection more powerful or more effectual with God. She is to us the most tender of mothers; our firmest reliance, and the very spring of our hopes; since she asks nothing which she does not obtain, and her prayer is never refused."

Now, we would ask our readers, did the apostles think the same? And if they did, why did they never mention the Blessed Virgin? We could understand their silence on an important subject; but could they write twenty-one letters without once speaking of the "very spring of their hopes," or once pointing out to their readers where they could find "protection the most powerful and the most effectual with God?"

But perhaps it may be said, although nothing of this kind appears in the *letters* of the apostles, there was much of it in their *conversation*, which has been handed down to us by those who heard them. Well, let us see. We take up the collection of writings, commonly known as "the Apostolic Fathers," and we proceed to examine and report what we can find therein on the subject we are discussing.

The first work in this collection is an epistle ascribed to the Apostle Barnabas, the companion of St. Paul in his travels. We need not here dispute whether or no this letter was really written by Barnabas, because the work is undoubtedly one of high antiquity. *But in it there is not a single mention of the Blessed Virgin Mary.*

We have next two epistles purporting to be written by Clement, one of the first bishops of Rome, and supposed to be the same as the Clement mentioned by St. Paul (Phil. iv. 3)—"Clement, my fellow-labourer, whose name is in the book of life." Of these two epistles learned men generally consider the first to be genuine, the second not to have been written by Clement, although an ancient document; but both epistles agree in this, that there is not a syllable in either about the Virgin Mary.

We next come to a collection of epistles by Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, who suffered martyrdom about seventy years after our Lord's death. Concerning these epistles there has been much dispute, as it is now generally confessed that much that was, for a long time, passed off as Ignatius's was not, in reality, written by him. And though the majority of learned men agree in accepting what are called "the seven shorter epistles" as genuine, there are others who maintain that some of

* "Instructions and Devotions for the 40 hours' adoration ordered in the Churches in Dublin, during the Jubilee of 1852, published with approbation of the Most Rev. Dr. Cullen (Roman Catholic), Archbishop of Dublin." James Duffy, 7, Wellington-quay, Dublin, 1852.

these are not genuine, and that the rest have been extensively interpolated. This is a controversy, however, with which we need not meddle; for in all that has been ascribed to Ignatius there is not a word of any prayer or invocation being addressed to the Blessed Virgin.

In Ignatius, however, we do find the *name* of the Virgin Mary. In opposition to those who denied that our Lord was truly man, he asserts, in three or four places, that our Saviour was born of Mary (see Ephesians, cape. 7, 18, Trallians, cap. 9, Smyrna, cap. 1), but without any further ascription of glory to her. He also entertained a singular opinion that our Saviour was born of an *espoused* virgin, in order that his birth might remain unknown to the devil. See Ephesians, cap. 19—"Now the virginity of Mary, and her bringing forth, was kept in secret from the prince of this world, as well as the death of our Lord." Beyond these passages we find no further mention of the Virgin, and it will be seen that there is not a trace of a prayer or invocation addressed to her.

There is extant an epistle to the Philippians, by Polycarp, who died about 400 years after our Saviour's death, *but he does not once mention the Virgin's name.*

The acts of the martyrdom of both Ignatius and of Polycarp are equally silent as to the Virgin, nor did these martyrs think of addressing their dying prayers to any save our Lord.

Lastly, we have got a production of great antiquity, called "The Shepherd" of Hermas. Here, too, there is no mention of the Virgin of any kind. But this writer has very plainly declared to us what was the sole ground of *his* hope—

"If you wish to enter into any city, and the city be surrounded by a wall, and have but one gate, can you get into that city except by its gate? As, then, there can be no entrance into that city save by its gate, so is there no entrance into the kingdom of God except by the name of his Son." And again—"The gate is the Son of God, who is the sole access to God. None, therefore, shall enter to God but by his Son."

We have now laid before our readers the result of a search through the most ancient uninspired remains of Christian antiquity. These writings contain much on the duty of prayer, on the subject matter of our prayer, and the object of it: but this topic never appears to have suggested the Blessed Virgin to their minds, nor do they speak of any mediator but him whom St. Paul asserts to be the only mediator between God and man.

Now, what inference are we to draw from the silence of these Fathers? We have to thank a correspondent (see below) who, in a letter which has reached us since the foregoing was written, has given us our choice of several ways of accounting for it. We may say, with the first writer he cites, that they said so little about her, in hopes that their readers might think the more of her; or else, with Carthagena, that the best way of commending her excellency was to say nothing about it. But, for our own part, we believe that Canisius has hit off the true account of the matter, and that they said nothing only because they knew nothing of doctrines which were not delivered in their time, and which, if revealed at all, were only revealed in later ages.

In our next number we shall proceed to the writers of the second century. We shall inquire whether any new revelations about the Virgin were made in their time, or whether any of them had more courage than the evangelists, and ventured to undertake a task, the greatness and difficulty of which, according to Aloysius Novarinus, deterred the sacred writers from meddling with it.

Aloysius Novarinus says:—"I believe the evangelists, being oppressed with the greatness and difficulty of the thing, abstained from meddling with that which by no labour or skill of theirs they could perform: wherefore, like skilful painters, they drew a vail, that under the covering and shade of silence, we might conjecture the more concerning her, because they had expressed nothing."—Umbra Virginis, p. 58.

Canisius, a man of vast learning, and one of the founders of the Jesuits, companion in the vast undertaking of the illustrious Ignatius, founder of that order, says:—"It is a heinous error to deny at this time so many things concerning Mary and her dignity, which, though not taken notice of in the Scriptures, nor presently delivered in the time of the apostles, yet have been revealed by God to the later ages as certain, and at length recommended as such by the church."—Lib. 4, de Deip., c. 22.

Posa says:—"By this silence we are told that there is nothing written in the gospels, nothing in the law and prophets, which does not, after a manner, appertain to Mary."—Elucidar. Liber. 2, tract 7, c. 1.

And again—"If you would comprise, in short, what is more largely diffused in Scripture, know that Mary is the sum and brief of them all."—Ibid. Tract 6, c. 1.

Carthagena—"It is a contrivance of the Divine wisdom; because this silence does commend her excellency more fully than the most eloquent tongue can do."—De Arcan. Deip. L. 2, Hom. 2.

Suarez—"Christ being known, and his faith enough established, her excellencies could not be unknown or hid."—Præfat ad Tom. 2, in 3 partem.

Sherlog, the Jesuit—"It was necessary for us to know that Mary was the mother of Christ. This the evangelists sufficiently declared, and this her honour being manifested, the rest might be collected therefrom, though they said no more."—Antelog. 3, in Cantic., p. 142.

Georgius Gallicanus—"The field of her praises is wide and immense, and therefore God would leave every man at liberty to say of her what he pleased."—Marial, p. 3.

Doubtless, sir, you thought you had made a great and most original discovery, that the Bible tells us little or nothing about the Blessed Virgin. Yet you see it is no more that Roman Catholic divines have known for some hundred years! And they see in the fact an argument exactly opposite to what you see in it. They think that the less the evangelists have told us about Mary, the more they intended that we should know about her. And was it not your duty to have known and stated their answers to your argument?

ONE WHO LOVES TO HEAR BOTH SIDES.

We readily insert our correspondent's letter; and if any other answers or explanations from eminent Roman Catholic divines should be sent to us, we will, of course, publish them.

We admit that the authors cited in the above letter are, some of them at least, among the most eminent in the Roman Catholic Church. We have only one further observation to make on them—if Roman Catholic divines approve so highly of the silence which the evangelists and apostles observed about Mary, if they think it so much for her honour, why do they not follow that example, and say as little about her themselves?

Correspondence.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I am surprised that you should have published an article showing how little the Bible tells us of the life of the Blessed Virgin, without having noticed, at the same time, the answers that eminent Roman Catholic divines have given to such statements. Did it never strike you that a fact so notorious as the silence of Scripture about the Blessed Virgin, *must* have engaged the attention of learned Roman Catholics, and that they must have accounted for it? And would it not have been fair to have inquired *how* they accounted for it, instead of following the too common plan of everlastingly repeating the same old objections, without ever noticing the answers that have been given to them a hundred times over?

The Scriptures, you say, tell us little or nothing about the Blessed Virgin; they are wholly silent about her from the time of our Lord's ascension. Quite true, sir; but learned Roman Catholics have noticed the fact as well as you, and have accounted for it, and shown its bearings; and I call upon you, if you are really actuated by the spirit of fair play which you profess, to give their answers, which I here subjoin.

The learned author of the Pomœrium says:—This omission "was to excite the devotion of the faithful more towards her, that they might more greedily inquire after her actions, her life, and death."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

DEAR SIR—In your very excellent article, "What Scripture tells us of the Virgin Mary," you quote John ii., from the Rhemish version—"What is it to me and to thee?" Now, Holy Scripture does not tell us that, but conveys a rebuke—"What have I to do with thee?" That this is the true rendering here, the enclosed fourteen quotations will, I think, prove, even to Roman Catholics, as the same original is in all these cases, and the same vulgate, the Rhemish agreeing with them and us in thirteen out of the fourteen; and then, to support their system of Mariolatry, deviating from all. If the Rhemish be right in the fourteenth case, it must be wrong in the other thirteen, or *vice versa*, if the Douay and Rhemish be right in agreeing with the original and all versions in the thirteen cases, it must surely be wrong in deviating from all in the fourteenth.—Yours, faithfully,

GEORGE H. READE, *Inniskeen Rectory.*

JUDGES xi. 12.

Original	מה לי ולך
Septuagint version	τι ἐμοι και σοι.
Vulgate do	quid mihi et tibi.
Douay do	what hast thou to do with me.
Authorized do	what hast thou to do with me.

2 SAMUEL (2 Kings) xvi. 10.

Original	מה לי ולכם
Septuagint	τι ἐμοι και ὑμιν.
Vulgate	quid mihi et vobis.
Douay	what have I to do with you.
Authorized	what have I to do with you.

EZRA (Esdras) iv. 3.

Original	לא לכם ולנו
Septuagint	ουχ ἡμιν και ὑμιν.
Vulgate	non est nobis et vobis.
Douay	you have nothing to do with us.
Authorized	ye have nothing to do with us.

MATTHEW viii. 29.

Original	τι ἡμιν και σοι.
Vulgate	quid nobis tecum.
Rhemish	what have we to do with thee.
Authorized	what have we to do with thee.
Syriac Peschito	ܡܢ ܠܢ ܘܠܟ

considered nearly of equal authority with Greek.

JOEL iii. 4.

Original	מה אתם לי
Septuagint	τι ὑμεις ἐμοι (MS. Alex. και).
Vulgate	quid mihi et vobis.
Douay	what have ye to do with me.
Authorized	what have ye to do with me.

JOSHUA xxii. 4.

Original	מה לכם ליהוה
Septuagint	τι ὑμιν κἀι κυριῳ.
Vulgate	quid vobis et Domino.
Douay	what have you to do with the Lord.
Authorized	what have ye to do with the Lord.

2 SAMUEL xix. 22.

Original	מה לי ולכם
Septuagint	τι ἐμοι και ὑμιν.
Vulgate	quid mihi et vobis.
Douay	what have I to do with you.
Authorized	what have I to do with you.

1 KINGS (iii) 17, 18.

Original	מה לי ולך
Septuagint	τι ἐμοι και σοι.
Vulgate	quid mihi et tibi.
Douay	what have I to do with thee.
Authorized	what have I to do with thee.

2 KINGS (iv.) 3, 13.

Original	מה לי ולך
Septuagint	τι ἐμοι και σοι.
Vulgate	quid mihi et tibi.
Douay	what have I to do with thee.
Authorized	what have I to do with thee.

LUKE viii. 28.

Original	τι ἐμοι και σοι.
Vulgate	quid mihi et tibi.
Rhemish	what have I to do with thee.
Authorized	what have I to do with thee.

MARK v. 7.

Original	τι ἐμοι και σοι.
Vulgate	quid mihi tecum.
Rhemish	what have I to do with thee.
Authorized	what have I to do with thee.

MARK i. 24.

Original	τι ἡμιν και σοι.
Vulgate	quid nobis tecum.
Rhemish	what have we to do with thee.
Authorized	what have we to do with thee.

LUKE iv. 34.

Original	τι ἡμιν και σοι.
Vulgate	quid nobis et tibi.
Rhemish	what have we to do with thee.
Authorized	what have we to do with thee.

JOHN ii. 4.

Original	τι ἐμοι και σοι.
Vulgate	quid mihi et tibi.
Rhemish	what is it to me and to thee!!
Authorized	what have I to do with thee.

Inniskeen, 18th Sept., 1852.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Having received several numbers of the LAYMAN, I have read much to enable me to arrive at just conclusions, relative to the different topics discussed in its pages since its first publication, particularly the article on "The Rule of Faith," in your June number, page 61, where you state—"We are, consequently, quite prepared to receive, as authoritative and obligatory, any unwritten tradition *provided* it can be shown, by *unquestionable proof*, to be derived from an inspired origin." Now, to show that unquestionable proof is my object, as well as to give proofs for several other points of Catholic belief, disputed by the members of the Established Church, and which are, one with the other, intimately connected. That the proofs hereafter given are not the *only* ones in Scripture in favour of my arguments, I do not pretend; they are the result of *my own* Scriptural research. Nor do I wish it to be inferred that I enter the field as a *controversialist*; my earnest desire is rather that some competent person may take up the subject, which I am very imperfectly able to touch on, and see your observations on the different texts quoted. In the most friendly spirit, then, I assert that

The Bible is NOT *the only Rule of Faith; that perpetual succession of lawful pastors is preserved in the church* (in the person of the Pope); that *that church cannot err in its doctrinal teaching*; and that it is, consequently, *infallible*.

Some of the proofs adduced for and against which I give in juxtaposition. Of course, I leave you to multiply the texts against these points of doctrine.

Roman Catholics maintain that—	Protestants, that—
We have not in the world extant divers books of prophetical Scriptures; for no fewer than 20 books of the prophetical penmen of the Holy Ghost haveperished, as thelearned Contzen has proved in his preface on the "Four Gospels." This assertion of Contzen is proved, as far as is necessary, by the following texts:—Joshua x. 13—"Is not this written in the book of Jasher?" (I quote from the *authorized version*.) Again, 1 Kings iv. 32—"Solomon spoke three thousand proverbs, and his songs were three thousand and five." Next, 1 Chron. xxix. 29.—"The acts of David, first and last, are written in the Book of Samuel, the Seer, and in the book of Nathan, the Prophet, and in the Book of Gad, the Seer." Again, 2 Chron. ix. 29, mention is made of the "Books of Nathan, the Prophet, and the Prophet of Abijah, and the visions of Iddo, the Seer, and chap. xii. 15, "In the Book of Schemiah, the Prophet, and Iddo, the Seer, concerning genealogies," which seems to be a different book from his Book of Visions, as above mentioned; and chap. xiii. 22, mention is made of the "Story of the Prophet Iddo," and chap. xx. 34, of the "Book of Jehu, son of Hanani;" and xxxiii. 19, we find mention of the works of "The Sayings of the Seers," &c., &c. Where are these prophets' books now? Yet we know from Scripture that what was said by those books was said by prophets—"That God spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets.—Heb. i. 1. "That prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but the holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."—2 Peter i. 21. All these texts go to prove that we have not now *entirely* the whole *written* Word of God; and that the apocryphal books (acknowledged, in the VIth. Article of Church of England, to be read by the Church "for *example of life* and instruction of manners") are *canonical*; for "the holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost!" St. Paul further proves that we have not the whole written Word of God; for, 1 Cor. v. 9, he says—"I wrote to you in an epistle." Where is this epistle? Hence we say, give us *all* the sacred prophetical writings ever written, and we will abide by the *written* Word of God as "the sole Rule of Faith."	"These are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the son of God; and that believing you may have life in his name."—John xx. 31, D.B. This Roman Catholics also believe. "With meekness receive the engrafted Word, which is able to save your souls."—St. James i. 1, D.B. That the "engrafted word" *is* the *now written* Word only, the above text does not prove. Nor is it proof against the belief of Roman Catholics in the *spoken* as well as the now written Word of God—*Tradition* as well as *Scripture*. That Moses, who was the first Scripture writer, was not born till about the year A.M. 2,400, may be deduced from his own history of Genesis. So long, therefore, was the world without any Scripture. Scripture, then, could not be the *only true* Rule of Faith. By what Rule of Faith, then, was Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, guided, and Sarah, Rebecca, &c.? Was it not by the *Tradition*, &c., of their Church—in either case *not written?*

(The remainder of this letter being very long, and relating to a different subject, we are compelled to postpone our observations on that part until next number, and we think it better that that part of the letter should appear along with our observations. This letter is signed

"AN INQUIRER, Celbridge."

The above letter is written in a spirit which claims the most respectful and candid consideration. We regret much that the various demands on our space, rendered us unable to insert any part of it sooner. Even now, we cannot go into its minuter particulars, but we trust a consideration of its general principles will suffice.

We take first the sentence—"*The Bible is not the only Rule of Faith.*"

When we affirm that "the Bible is the Rule of Faith," we simply refuse to admit, as articles of the Christian faith, things which are not contained in Scripture, and cannot be proved from it. And this, *not* because we would refuse to *hear* apostles, or other ministers who succeeded them, declaring by word of mouth what God had revealed to them, but because we find proof of the fact, that the apostles did not teach any other articles of faith than those which they have written of in the Scriptures.

This proof appears to us to be twofold—1st. We find no *other* articles of faith (besides those found in Scripture) which can fairly be said to have been held by the Church as articles of faith, from the time of the apostles to this time. 2nd. We find a positive and general testimony in the early Church, that they had not received any other articles of faith than those about which the apostles wrote in Scripture.

Our correspondent thus states what it is that constitutes and proves "a true apostolical tradition"—namely, that it should be "handed down by a full *unanimous* report of all Catholic nations, attested by their universal practice and uniform doctrine."

We agree to this as a fair definition of "apostolic tradition," provided it be understood of a tradition so held by the Church *from the time* of the apostles to this time. And we expect that our correspondent will admit that a doctrine held among Christians now, *even universally*, if that doctrine were *not held* by the early Church as a part of the faith, has no claim to be an *apostolical* tradition. *However universal* a doctrine may *now* be, yet if no part of the Christian faith in the early ages, it is no part of the faith *now*—it is not apostolical.

It does not concern us to inquire whether any doctrine, universally held by the Church in all ages, must infallibly be true, or whether a doctrine so held *might* possibly have been false: for this plain reason, this is *not* the question between us and Roman Catholics. We admit and hold that every doctrine which has, in fact, been held as a part of the Catholic faith in all ages, IS TRUE, and is to be found in Scripture. The *practical* question between Roman Catholics and us is simply this—"Has the Church in all ages from the beginning held, as articles of faith, other doctrines which are *not* in Scripture, and *cannot* be proved from it?"

If Roman Catholics are really prepared to oppose our view on this great question, we should expect them to do something of this kind—to produce the creeds and confessions of faith of the ancient Church, and show us that those creeds contain articles of faith which are not contained in Scripture, and cannot be proved by it; or, if they cannot do this, at least to produce some of the great doctors and lights of the ancient Church, who have said that the public creeds and confessions of faith in the Churches did *not* contain all the ARTICLES OF FAITH which the apostles delivered to the Churches founded by them.

Nothing of this kind have we ever seen done or attempted. We earnestly entreat our correspondent to be "an inquirer" in this, and to try if he can find any answer of this kind.

On the other hand, *we* take *all* the creeds or public professions of faith which the early Church has left us, and we find nothing in them that our adversaries themselves do not confess to be in Scripture also, and provable from Scripture. 2nd. We produce without end the great doctors of the early Church, all testifying that these creeds contain the whole Christian faith. 3rd. We produce an equal testimony of doctors that the Scriptures contain all the articles of the faith which the apostles preached.

This we believe to be a true statement of the real question at issue between us and the Church of Rome, and of the evidence that should decide it. But if any one can show anything to the contrary, we are open to conviction.

We come now to the consideration of the difficulties which our correspondent feels about it:—

1st. We have not the whole of the Scripture, for many books have been lost.

Any force which this argument contains, must be something of this kind:—"There *may* have been other articles of Christian faith contained in those lost books; and in that case, by confining ourselves to those articles of faith which are to be found in the existing Scriptures, we *may* be giving up other articles of faith which were in the lost books only."

Let it be observed here, that none of our opponents have ever ventured to affirm that this is actually so. No one undertakes to say that there really were any other articles of the Christian faith in those lost books, but only that *perhaps* there were.

Now, supposing it were so, we do not see how the Church of Rome would be any better off in this respect, unless she could say that her tradition has preserved the articles of faith which were in those lost books; but this no Roman Catholic has ever pretended to say. So we do not see how tradition supplies this loss at all.

But the real question is—"Is it at all *likely or probable* that these lost books did contain any articles of Christian faith which are not in our present books of Scripture?"

Here we observe, that all those lost books were books of *the Old Testament* (that is, if they really were inspired books). It is true that one passage is quoted to show that one epistle, written by St. Paul to the Corinthians, has been lost. That passage is 1 Cor., ch. v., v. 9—"I wrote to you in an epistle." Our correspondent has taken this, as a great many others have done, as if it necessarily referred to some epistle *previously* written by the Apostle; and if this were so, there would have been an epistle to the Corinthians, which is now lost. But this is clearly a mistake. There is evidently a mistake in the translation. The *indefinite* article "an" is clearly a wrong translation. It should, at least, be the *definite* article "the;" thus—"I wrote to you in *the* epistle." And this definite article is very often used in Scripture for the demonstrative pronoun "this." We give only those instances which are *most* to the point. Col. iv. 16, the Douay Bible translates the same definite article "THIS epistle." Again, in 1 Thes. v. 27, "THIS epistle." Again, 2 Thes. iii. 14, "THIS epistle." Why, then, may it not be "THIS epistle" in the place in question, 1 Cor. v. 9?

A still stronger case is Romans, c. xvi., v. 22 (Douay Bible)—"I, Tertius, who wrote THIS epistle, salute you in the Lord." Will any Roman Catholic say that the Greek word here translated "this" must refer to a former epistle which the apostle wrote to the Romans, and that, therefore, we have lost one Epistle to the Romans too? Why, then, cannot the same Greek word be translated "this" in the Epistle to the Corinthians?

This last passage (Rom. xvi. 22) is still more forcible, because it also contains the same word, "wrote," in the very same tense. It clearly should have been translated—"I, Tertius, *who have written* this epistle," he being St. Paul's scribe in writing it. In the same way, the very same words in 1 Cor. v. 9 should be translated—"I *have written* to you in *this* epistle," referring to what he had already said of the fornicator in v. 2—"that he might be taken away from among you," which plainly implied that they were not to keep company with him. The apostle goes on, in the tenth verse, to explain what this command did *not* mean—viz., not *every* fornicator; and in verse 11 he explains what was really the meaning of what he had written, to this effect—"But now I have written to you, not to keep company," &c. Where mark, 1st, the words, "I have written," are still the same word, and the same *tense*, translated "I wrote" in verse 9; and, 2nd, the word "now" does not, either in Greek or English, always mean to contrast the present time with the past time. We may say to a person, "Now, I tell you this," without at all implying that we have told him something else at a former time: we may and often do use that expression about a thing of which we have never spoken before. We have such a use of the same Greek word and the same English word, in Hebrews xi., v. 15 and 16—"If they had been mindful of that country from which they came out . . . . But now they desire a heavenly country;" where "*now*" does *not* mean, "they desire at this time;" but it is just as much as if the apostle had said—"But now I tell you it was the heavenly country they then desired, and not the earthly."

So the apostle's meaning, in 1 Cor. 5, v. 9, 10, 11, is simply this—"I have written to you in this epistle, not to keep company with fornicators. But I don't mean every fornicator. But now I tell you the exact meaning of what I have written, every fornicator that is called a brother (*i.e.*, a Christian), with such a one to keep no company."

To confirm this translation, we appeal to tradition. We say it is the general tradition of the ancient Church that the apostle wrote *only two* Epistles to the Corinthians; and, therefore, he *cannot* have written *another* to them before the *two* that we have. All the ancients who have left us lists of what the apostles did write, speak of only two epistles written by him to the Corinthians. This is a point on which the tradition of the Church is the *proper evidence*, and we invite those who are so fond of tradition to decide *this* point by tradition.

Hence it appears that the *only proof* offered, that one of the books of the *New* Testament has been lost, utterly fails, and there is no proof at all of any such thing. We have, therefore, to consider the "lost books" as belonging only to the Old Testament.

Now, supposing for the present that these lost books were really inspired Scripture (which we will consider again), but supposing now even that they were, is there any reason to suppose that those books contained any *other* "articles of the CHRISTIAN faith" besides those articles of faith which we find in the New Testament?

Now, we ask our "Inquirer" to consider, in which Testament does he expect to find "the articles of the *Christian* faith," in the Old or in the New? Who was it that revealed and declared to the world the doctrines of the Gospel, and the articles of the Christian faith? Was it not Christ and his apostles? Well, then, in the words of Christ and his apostles, and in their writings, we expect to find the articles of the Christian faith, and not in the Old Testament writings, which were finished 300 years before Christ came.

We do not undervalue the Old Testament. There are many things to be learned by us besides "articles of faith." In the Old Testament we learn much of the character and the dealings of God, and we learn there, too, the corruption of human nature. In the Old Testament, too (when rightly explained by the New), we find many glorious prophecies concerning the Gospel, and the doctrines of the Gospel, which serve to throw great light on the New Testament. The Old Testament was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ: in the New, Christ and his doctrines are revealed to us. This we are bold to affirm (and we expect no Roman Catholic will contradict it)—that there is no article of Gospel faith prophecied of in the *Old* Testament which is not declared and revealed in the *New* Testament. Take any book you please of the Old Testament—Joshua, for instance, or Judges, or the Proverbs, or even the evangelical prophet Isaiah—and tell us WHAT article of the Christian faith we would now be without, if that book had been lost? And if this be so, with the whole of the Old Testament *that we have*, what show of reason can there be for supposing that we have lost any article of the Christian faith by the loss of any other books of the Old Testament, if any have really been lost?

Our correspondent's letter suggests to us another argument on this subject.

He says:—"Our Lord, in expounding to his apostles ALL the prophets, must have included those prophetical writings not now extant." Well, if he did, we trust we still have, in what those apostles taught, any articles of Christian faith contained in those books, although the books themselves be lost. If those books did contain such things, and if those books be now lost, all that either the Church of Rome or we can now do is, to seek for what the apostles taught. What they wrote in Scripture we *know* is their teaching. If any one can show us that anything *else* taught by the apostles has been handed down to us by the Catholic *Church* from the times of the apostles themselves, so that we may be sure that it really came from them, let them show us this too, and we have already expressed our readiness to believe it. Does not our "Inquirer" now see that this is the only thing that *ought* to convince us that we are wrong—namely, to point out to us *other* articles of faith, and to show us that these have really been handed down from the apostles themselves? Yet this is the very thing that we do *not* find in his letter. Nothing will direct his own inquiries better than trying to convince us of our errors. Let him try and tell us, then, what articles of Christian faith, besides those contained in Scripture, we ought to believe. Let him show us *what these articles are*, and what the proof is that the apostles taught them.

To return to the lost books. What *proof* is there that the lost books in question were really inspired by the Holy Spirit? *None* of the places that mention these books *say* that they were inspired. We know that the apostles themselves, in their inspired writings, quote books that were not inspired. But it will be said, some of these books were written by "prophets." We grant that: but were prophets *always* inspired? We have good ground for believing that they were not: that they *sometimes* spoke as the Holy Ghost moved them, and at other times spoke as other men do. We believe this is agreed on all hands. Is there any better reason to believe that they always were inspired as soon as they took a pen in their hands? We see no reason to believe this. "A prophet" might write a letter, just as other men wrote one, and that letter was not inspired. "A prophet"—*i.e.*, one who was sometimes inspired—might write a book of history, and that book might not be inspired. There was certainly, at that time, a way of knowing what speeches or what writings of a prophet were inspired. The prophets knew the difference themselves. And the difference could be proved to other men, while the power of working miracles existed, and while the High Priest could inquire of God in the tabernacle.

The question is, did the Jews, while they had these means of knowing, count these books inspired? We reply that there is *no evidence* that the Jews, while they had these means of knowing, ever counted any books inspired besides those which we now have of the Old Testament. We invite inquiry about this.

But when were these books lost? This may throw some light on the question.

We think our correspondent has succeeded in proving that no prophetical books were lost *before* our Saviour's time. He says—"Our Lord, in expounding to his Apostles *all* the prophets (see Luke xxiv., verse 27), *must* have included those prophetical writings not now extant." We think this conclusive proof that none had been lost before that time. The question is, have any books then existing been lost since? Now this is clearly not the case. Josephus, a very learned Jew, who was born before our Saviour died, tells us what sacred books the Jews then had: he says they had only twenty-two which were counted inspired; they had other books, he says, which were not of the like authority. Now, taking the twelve lesser prophets as "one book" (which we know that the Jews did), this exactly agrees with the books we now have. It is impossible to bring into that number all the books our correspondent reckons up. Either, then, these books were not counted inspired in our Saviour's time, or they were lost before his time. In either case we have the inspired books of the Jews, just as they stood in our Saviour's time. If he found no fault with those books, as they then stood—if he did not blame the Jews for not having all the inspired books they should have had (and we know that he did not)—if he was content to take those books as they then stood, without asking for more or less, surely we may do so also. What better authority can we have than His in such a question?

We are, therefore, satisfied to take the books of the Old Testament as our Saviour took them, and the books of the New Testament as the tradition of all Christians has handed them down to us; and as far as this argument goes, we see no shadow of reason for believing them to be insufficient.

Nor do we see any reason, so far, for going to tradition for more articles of faith, until some one can show any such articles, with proof that the apostles preached them.

We now call to our correspondent's recollection a passage of his own letter—"Hence, we say, give us *all* the sacred prophetical writings ever written, and we will abide by the written Word of God as the sole Rule of Faith."

Now, if we have shown him that we have all the sacred writings of the Old Testament as our Saviour had them, and was content to take them; and, further, that we have all the sacred writings of the New Testament, that ever were heard of by the Church on earth, is not this enough?

And even if it were not, if any books had been lost out of the Old Testament, yet since at least we have all in which we could have any expectation of finding "articles of Christian faith," is not this all that we can require?

We trust, then, that our correspondent will now perform what he promised, and abide "by the written Word of God as the sole Rule of Faith."

We could not deal lightly with this argument about the lost books of Scripture. It has taken up so much room, we must leave the remainder of this letter for the next month.

"W. C. SEARCH" AND BISHOP JEREMY TAYLOR.

"Warner Christian Search" has to explain, that he took the passage referred to in Bishop Taylor's work of Liberty of Prophesying, not from any edition of the original, but from a controversial treatise on Purgatory, by a Roman Catholic writer.

"W. C. S." begs further to add, that he has since consulted Doctor Taylor's work itself, and finds the quotation to appear, with the words ("SAYS THE ROMANIST") in a parenthesis. There is no writer, among Church of England theologians, whose works are so erroneously appealed to, and whose views on certain doctrines are so misrepresented as Bishop Taylor.

"W. C. SEARCH."

Sept. 24, 1852.

P.S.—You forget to observe upon some of the early Fathers—St. Chrysostom, for instance—declaring the practice of praying for the dead to be of APOSTOLICAL TRADITION.

We suspected that "W. C. Search" took his quotation at second hand from some Roman controversial writer who had given the passage without these words; and we find by his letter that he did so, though he does not give us the name of the writer who deceived him, as we think he was bound, in fairness, to have done, when we invited him to clear himself, by telling us the name of the book, so that others might be put on their guard against it. We regret that he has not done so; and, once more, we call on him, as he regards his own character for honesty and truth, to tell us from *what* book he took his quotation from Bishop Taylor, otherwise, though we are quite willing to believe that it was not "W. C. S." himself that committed the fraud in the quotation about the Maccabees, we cannot exculpate him from the charge of screening from exposure the writer who did so.

We have not forgotten our promise of commenting on "W. C. Search's" passages from the Fathers of the fourth century, which he has cited as in favour of Purgatory; and we have already in type an article upon the subject, which press of matter precludes us from inserting in our present number.

KINGSTOWN HARBOUR.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Please your honour, I read the CATHOLIC LAYMAN regular, for the master lends it to me; and since you are so kind in printing letters, maybe you would take one from a poor man like me.

The master sent me to Dublin last week, with cattle that was going to Liverpool, for the herd was ill. And because I never was in Dublin, he told me to take a day to look about me, and he wouldn't stop the wages. So, sure enough, I went down to Kingstown by the railway, and my! what a place it is! All them ships, and the steam vessels, all fizzing and buzzing, and seeming in such a hurry to be off, and the big stones, and the bright bonnets, and the party faces, and all the cars, and the fine houses, and what isn't there? And them big walls running straight out into the sea, and, my! the stones in them walls! and every wall ten times as wide as the street before my door! And if I didn't see a big iron chest let down into the sea, and two men in it, going down to their work at the bottom of the sea as pleasant as I'd go to dig praties; and may I be happy if there was a bottom to the chest!

And while I was walking about looking at it all, I met a mighty pleasant looking gentleman, and I made bold to speak to him; and "please your honour," says I, "how long were they making all this place?" And so he answered me quite pleasant, and, says he, "I believe they are fifty years making it anyway." "Fifty years!" says I, "and isn't it done yet?" "No, indeed," says he, "and I don't see much signs of its being done." "And when will it be done, your honour?" says I. And with that he stopt short in his walk, and seemed to be considering for a bit, and, says he, "The parliament allows ten thousand pounds a year," says he, "for finishing it, and it is my opinion, that it never will be finished till that is stopt." "Well, tear and ages," says I, "maybe that's just the way with my father's soul," says I; for the thought just came across me all in a minute. "What do you mean?" says he. "Why," says I, "I'm paying ten shillings a year, for these six years past," says I, "to Father D—, for getting my father's soul out of purgatory," says I; "and maybe its just the same way, that he'll never get out till that's stopt," says I. And with that he considered again a bit, and says he, "Did Father D— never say to you, I needn't take any more money from you, for your father's soul's out?" "No, 'deed, didn't he, your honour," says I. "And did you never hear," says he, "of Father D— saying that to any one else?" "I never heard of the like of that, your honour," says I. "Well," says he, "maybe you're right enough, and maybe your father's soul is like enough to Kingstown harbour," says he; "maybe while you go on paying for the job it won't suit them to finish the job; and maybe when you stop paying, there won't be anything to finish the job with; and maybe it won't be worth their while to finish the job at their own cost," says he.

So, your honour, I don't know what to do at all, or whether to go on paying, or to stop; and I thought I would just write to your honour, that seems so knowledgeable, and ask if you ever heard of a priest saying to a poor man that came with money for masses, "I needn't take that, my man, for your father's soul's out before this." So waiting your honour's answer, I remain your humble servant to command,

PAT MURRAY, *of Westmeath*.

If any of our correspondents can report such a case as Pat Murray wishes for, we shall be happy to publish it, as we do not happen to know of such a case ourselves. Our correspondent need hardly have gone to Kingstown to see a chest without a bottom, where the lower places are concerned. We suspect there is no bottom to Father D—'s chest; and we are pretty sure there is no bottom to p———y itself.—ED.

FARMING OPERATIONS FOR OCTOBER.

(*From the Irish Farmers' Gazette.*)

The Dun or Winter Oats, Black Barley, Bere, and Rye should be sown as early in the month as possible; if not already got in, advantage should be taken of dry weather, and while the land is dry to get in these crops, particularly the Dun oat. By so doing, a considerable saving of seed will be effected, as if farther advanced in the season, and the land wet, considerably more seed will be required (see operations for last month).

Winter Vetches, either alone or mixed with oats or rye, should be sown immediately, where not sown last month, so as to insure a strong braird before the frosts set in.

Russian or Winter Beans should, if possible, be got in before the middle of the month. This hardy and productive variety, is fast superseding most other kinds to a great extent.

Parsnips, if sown this month, in tolerably dry, but well-tilled and well-manured land, come in early, and produce heavy crops.

Rape sown in the summer months may be still transplanted in the stubble land, as directed last month.

Early Cabbages sown in July last should now be transplanted in well-cultivated and well-manured land, if wanted early.

New and Recent Works

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

Booksellers to the Queen,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

ALFORD'S GREEK TESTAMENT, with a Critically Revised Text, Marginal References, and Commentary. New Edition. Vol. I., much enlarged, 32s. Vol. II., 28s. (Vol III., in preparation.)

HOOK'S CHURCH DICTIONARY. Seventh Edition. Revised and corrected. 16s.

EVENINGS WITH THE ROMANIST. By Rev. Hobart Seymour. 8s. 6d.

THE BIBLE HANDBOOK: an Introduction to the Study of Sacred Scripture. By Joseph Angus, D.D. 5s.

HELPS TO THE THOUGHTFUL READING OF THE FOUR GOSPELS. By Henry Stebbing, D.D. 8s.

THE PULPIT FOR 1854. Sermons by eminent living ministers. Vol. I., containing a hundred and three Sermons. 7s. 6d.

NARRATIVE OF A JOURNEY THROUGH SYRIA AND PALESTINE, IN 1851 AND 1852. By C. W. M. Van de Velde. 2 vols. 8vo. 30s.

THE HISTORY OF THE FRENCH PROTESTANT REFUGEES, from the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. By Charles Weiss. 8vo. 14s.

HOPE DEFERRED, NOT LOST; a Narrative of Missionary effort in South America. With Journals of Captain Gardiner, &c. 5s.

ON THE PLURALITY OF WORLDS. An Essay. 8vo. 8s.

MORE WORLDS THAN ONE. The Creed of the Philosopher, and the Hope of the Christian. By Sir David Brewster. 6s.

THE PILGRIM IN THE MISSIONS; or GOSPEL HUSBANDRY. By H. Smith, Esq. 4s. 6d.

OUR FATHER; or Jesus teaching to Pray. An Exposition of the Lord's Prayer. By Rev. Samuel Garrett. 2s. 6d.

HELPS AND HINTS FOR BIBLE READERS: Being practical comments on some of the most remarkable passages in the New Testament. By the Rev. Nicholas J. Moody. 3s. 6d.

SCRIPTURE AND THE PRAYER-BOOK IN HARMONY. England's Church and Handbook of Common Prayer, and Articles, the Scriptural antidote of Sacerdotalism and Schism. By Rev. A. R. Faussett. 3s. 6d.

MINISTERING CHILDREN; a Tale dedicated to Childhood. 5s.

ISRAEL IN EGYPT; or the Books of Genesis and Exodus, illustrated in existing monuments. 6s.

THE WARRANT OF FAITH; or a Handbook to the Canon and Inspiration of the Scriptures. By Rev. Robert Whytehead. 6s. 6d.

THE WORKS OF THE LATE REV. ALEXANDER CARSON, LL.D. Vol. III. Containing all his works on the Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. 5s.

EXAMINATION OF MR. MAURICE'S THEOLOGICAL ESSAYS. By Robert S. Candlish, D.D. Crown 8vo. 6s.

THE LAND OF SINIM; or, China and Chinese Missions. By the Rev. William Gillespie. 5s.

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY; with an Inquiry into the Causes of its Inefficiency: with an especial reference to the Ministry of the Establishment. By the Rev. Charles Bridges, A.M. Eighth Edition; corrected and enlarged. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

AN INQUIRY INTO THE ORGANIZATION AND GOVERNMENT OF THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH. By Rev. Albert Barnes. 2s.

CLAUDE, THE COLPORTEUR. By the Author of "Mary Powell." 7s. 6d.

VESTIGES OF DIVINE VENGEANCE IN THE DESTRUCTION OF SODOM AND GOMORRAH. By W. E. Tayler. 3s.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND ERASTIANISM. By J. R. Pretyman. 7s. 6d.

JESUS TEMPTED IN THE WILDERNESS. By Rev. Adolphe Monod. 2s. 6d.

SABBATH MORNING READINGS IN THE BOOK OF LEVITICUS. By the Rev. Dr. Cumming. 5s.

THE ECLIPSE OF FAITH; or, Visits to a Religious Sceptic. Fifth Edition. 5s.

GRATITUDE: an Exposition of the Hundred and Third Psalm. By the Rev. John Stevenson. 8vo. 6s.

SYNONYMS of the NEW TESTAMENT. By Rev. Richard Chenevix Trench. 5s.

A SELECTION of ENGLISH SYNONYMS. Edited by Archbishop Whately. 3s.

ON THE STUDY of WORDS. By Rev. Richard C. Trench. 3s. 6d.

ON THE LESSONS in PROVERBS. By Rev. Rd. C. Trench. 3s.

THE BOOK AND ITS STORY: a Narrative for the Young, on occasion of the Jubilee of the British and Foreign Bible Society. By L. N. R. With an Introductory preface, by Rev. T. Phillips. Fcap. 4s.

THE DENS of LONDON: Notes and Narratives of a Six Years' Mission among them. By R. W. Vanderkiste. Cheap Edition. 1s. 6d.

HOME TRUTHS: being Miscellaneous Addresses and Tracts. By the Rev. J. C. Ryle. 3rd Series. 3s. 6d.

PLAIN SPEAKING. First series. Being forty short, Large-type Tracts. By the Rev. J. C. Ryle, B.A. In packet. 1s.

KATHERINE ASHTON. By the Author of "The Experience of Life." 2 Vols. 12s.

THE LAMPLIGHTER. With Illustrations. 3s. 6d. Cheaper Edition, 1s. 6d.

POOR PADDY'S CABIN; or, Slavery in Ireland. 1s. 6d. and 2s. 6d.

SHADOWS OF THE FUTURE; or, the Real Antichrist. The destinies of Rome, Constantinople, and Jerusalem. The World's Confusion, and the Coming Restorer. 4d.

WERTHEIM'S PACKET OF THIRTY TRACTS, assorted. Second series. 2s.

THE ACQUITTANCE IN FULL. Tracts for Ireland. By Fidelis. 6d.

SCRIPTURE ITS OWN AND BEST INTERPRETER. By X. Y. 4d. by post 6d.

MANNA FOR THE PILGRIM; for each morning of the Month, from the writings of the Rev. W. H. Hewitson. 8d.

THE RUSSIAN SHORES OF THE BLACK SEA, IN THE AUTUMN of 1852, with a Voyage down the Volga, and a Tour through the Country of the Don Cossacks. By Lawrence Oliphant. 8vo. 14s.

ALISON'S HISTORY of EUROPE, from the fall of Napoleon, in 1815, to the Establishment of Military Government in France, in 1852; being a continuation of his former celebrated Work. Vols. I., II., and III. 8vo. 15s. each.

TURKEY, RUSSIA, THE BLACK SEA, AND CIRCASSIA. By Captain Spencer. With Coloured Illustrations and a Map. 6s.

MEMOIR OF THE REV. JOHN JAMES WEITBRECHT. By his Widow. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

SUNNY MEMORIES OF FOREIGN LANDS. By Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe. 2 vols. Post 8vo. 12s. Cheaper Editions, 2s., 1s. 6d., and 1s.

THE EXPERIENCE OF LIFE. By the author of Amy Herbert. 7s. 6d.

PASSAGES FROM THE DIARY OF A LATE PHYSICIAN. By Samuel Warren, Esq. Cheaper Edition. 5s. 6d.

TEN THOUSAND A YEAR. By Samuel Warren, Esq. 2 vols. Cheaper Edition. 9s.

HARD TIMES; for these times. By Charles Dickens. 5s.

MOWBRAY'S TREATISE ON DOMESTIC AND ORNAMENTAL POULTRY; a partial guide to the History, Breeding, Rearing, Feeding, Fattening, and General Management of Fowls and Pigeons. By L. A. Meall. With numerous Coloured Illustrations. 8s.

THE LADY'S COMPANION TO THE FLOWER GARDEN. By Mrs. Loudon. Sixth edition. 7s.

THE FRUIT, FLOWER, AND KITCHEN GARDEN. By the late Patrick Neill, LL.D. Fifth edition. 5s.

WANDERINGS AMONG THE WILD FLOWERS: How to see and how to gather them. By Spencer Johnson, M.D. With 173 engravings. 5s.

A POPULAR HISTORY of BRITISH FERNS, comprising all the Species. By Thomas Moore. Coloured Illustrations. 10s. 6d.

POPULAR FIELD BOTANY: A Familiar History of Plants. By Agnes Catlow. With 20 coloured plates. 10s. 6d.

A POPULAR HISTORY of BRITISH SEA-WEEDS, with Notices of some of the Fresh-water Algæ. By Rev. D. Landsborough. 10s. 6d.

THE SEA-WEED COLLECTORS' GUIDE: Containing plain instructions, for collecting and preserving. 2s. 6d.

HANDBOOK of ANGLING: teaching Fly-fishing, Trolling, Bottom-fishing, and Salmon-fishing. By Ephemera. 5s.

THE SEASIDE BOOK: being an Introduction to the Natural History of the British Coasts. By W. H. Harvey, M.D. New Edition. 5s.

A BOOK for the SEASIDE. With numerous Engravings. 3s. 6d.

WAKEMAN'S HANDBOOK OF IRISH ANTIQUITIES. 5s.

BLACK'S GUIDE BOOKS for TOURISTS; with Road Maps and numerous Illustrations:—
I. England, 10s. 6d. II. Scotland, 8s. 6d. III. Ireland, 5s. Wales, 5s.

BLACK'S GUIDE TO DUBLIN AND THE WICKLOW MOUNTAINS. 1s. 6d.

BLACK'S GUIDE TO KILLARNEY AND THE SOUTH. 1s. 6d.

BLACK'S GUIDE TO THE SHANNON AND WEST OF IRELAND. 1s. 6d.

DOYLE'S TOURS IN ULSTER; a handbook to the Antiquities and Scenery of the North of Ireland. With numerous Illustrations in tints, and Maps, &c. 8s. 6d.

CHART OF THE RAILWAY FROM DUBLIN TO BELFAST. 1s.

FRASER'S HANDBOOK FOR DUBLIN AND ITS ENVIRONS, with Maps, &c. 2s.

DUBLIN: WHAT'S TO BE SEEN, AND HOW TO SEE IT. By W. F. Wakeman. 1s.

TWELVE VIEWS OF THE PICTURESQUE SCENERY IN IRELAND. In elegant enamelled cover. 1s.

JOHNSTON'S MAP OF THE SEAT OF WAR, in the Danubian Principalities. 1s.

JOHNSTON'S NEW MAP OF THE BLACK SEA, CAUCASUS, CRIMEA, ETC., with enlarged plans of Sevastopol and the Bosphorus. 1s.

JOHNSTON'S CHART OF THE NORTH SEA, and the BALTIC, with the Countries adjoining; and Enlarged Plans of Cronstadt and Revel. 1s.

Lately Published,

WILLET'S "SYNOPSIS PAPISMI." New Edition. Edited by the Rev. J. Cumming, D.D. Ten vols. 8vo. Price £3.

London: JAMES MILLER, 17, Berner's-street, Oxford-street, and all Booksellers.

Just published,

New Edition, Royal 4to., cloth, price 5s. 6d.,

THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN,

Vol. I, with complete Indexes.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY AND CO., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London: WERTHEIM AND MACKINTOSH, Paternoster-row.

Fcap. 8vo., Neat Cover, Price 1s.;

Cloth, 1s. 6d.; Cloth, Gilt Edges, 2s.

THE TALK OF THE ROAD: Showing how Irish people talk about Irish doings, when they get a quiet place at the back of a ditch, or under a hedge.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY AND CO., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London: WERTHEIM AND MACKINTOSH.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON, and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher, WILLIAM CURRY, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

OCTOBER, 1852.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Gloir do Dhia aṅ ṛna háṛduiḃ, agus ṛíoṁṫáin air an dtalaṁ deaġṫoil do na dáoiniḃ.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED THE MIDDLE OF EVERY MONTH, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. I.—No. 11. NOVEMBER, 1852. {Annual Subscription, 3s. 6d. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
Henry the Eighth—the Reformer	121
Doubts and Difficulties—Ideas of a Hindu.	122
Talk of the Road—No VIII.	123
Pope Pius V.—Catechism of Council of Trent.	124
The Touchstone (continued)	124
Bishop Jeremy Taylor and Roman Catholic Controversialists	125
A Few Words about Prayers in an Unknown Tongue.	126
Reformation in Northern Italy—The *Univers*	127
Religious Persecution in Tuscany—The Madiai	128
CORRESPONDENCE:	
Mr. Collette on the Silence of Scripture respecting the Blessed Virgin Mary	128
On the Immaculate Conception, by a Lover of Accuracy	128
On the Lost Books of Scripture, by a Lay Convert from the Church of Rome	128
Celbridge Inquirer's Letter continued)	129
Answer to Notes and Queries, by a Friend to Inquiry	130
The Power of the Priest—in a Country Post-office	130
Farming Operations for November	131

HENRY THE EIGHTH—THE REFORMER.

We suppose our readers often heard what a great reformer Henry the Eighth was, and how much the Protestant religion in England was indebted to his zeal and to his conjugal fickleness, and how, on each change of his wife, he went a step further from the true faith and a step deeper into Protestantism. This, we know, is a favourite topic with a certain class of teachers, who, having all the learning on their own side, are apt to take liberties with the facts of history. In answer to such men it is useless to say, it is otherwise written in such and such an history; for they will readily reply, that it is either a Protestant history, or if written by a Roman Catholic, that he was an Atheist in disguise or a fool. We have felt the force of the seeming paradox, that nothing is so fallacious as figures, except facts. In controversy this is peculiarly so; for an unscrupulous controversialist can furnish an array of facts, judiciously selected from contemporary writers, and apparently well authenticated, to prove anything, and may blacken the character of any man, whether he be a Luther, a Melancthon, a Calvin, a Cranmer, a Pascal, or a Howard; he can even condemn them out of their own mouths, by a simple transposition of words spoken on one occasion and applied to another wholly different; or by extracting a passage from an author which the author meant to put into the mouth of an adversary, for the purpose of exposing and confuting its error; while the uncandid controversialist, by quoting the passage simply as that of the author, makes it be supposed that he advocates the very error which it is his express design to confute. We are sorry to say that this *iniquitas quotationis* is too common a trick among men who profess to deal with sacred things; it is too convenient a plan of proving anything of anybody, out of his own mouth, to be abandoned from the mere risk of occasional detection. Our readers may see one example of this deceptive style of argument in another column of this paper, p. 125, relating to the writings of the celebrated bishop, Jeremy Taylor, and if they desire to see another striking instance of the same artifice, let them take up the discussion between Father Maguire and the Rev. W. Pope, in Dublin, in the year 1827—a book in the hands of many of our readers, and, perhaps, known to all of them. Turn to p. 153, and to p. 202 (Edition published by R. Coyne, 1827), and you will see how that skilful and much applauded defender of the Roman Catholic faith, Mr. Maguire, in order to prove the infallibility, unity, and purity of the Roman Catholic Church, and that it, therefore, needed no reformation, brings forward the weighty testimony of Sir Edwin Sandys (a sturdy Protestant of the reign of Queen Mary), and cites a long passage from his works, as testifying his opinions in favour of Mr. Maguire's views; whereas, on the passage being examined, it turned out to be (and Mr. Maguire was constrained publicly to confess it so to be) Sir Edwin Sandy's statement of the allegations of Roman Catholic ecclesiastics of his day in support of their own system, which he afterwards proceeds to demolish in his downright manner, so that Mr. Maguire, by means of this dishonest manœuvre, was able to adduce as a witness for the purity and infallibility of the Church of Rome the man who describes the state of the Church of Rome to be such that "what in some other places even a loose person would be ashamed to confess, these priests and friars refrain not openly to practise." The instances which Sir Edwin Sandys gives are not suitable for publication in such a journal as this, nor, indeed, for the general eye; but we may well wonder at the cool effrontery with which the writings of dead men are sometimes dealt with, to answer the purposes of the moment, and those of Sir Edwin Sandys to prove the purity of the Church of Rome; and when we find a wary priest, in the presence of a learned adversary and an enlightened auditory, venture upon such a piece of falsification as this, what may we expect of the candour and fairness of the quotations of provincial controversialists who have no mixed audience to criticise, and no Mr. Pope to correct?* Even poor Henry the Eighth is not safe in their hands; his temper and his conjugal infidelity, perhaps, have not been misrepresented; his eccentricities in religion and in love may not be exaggerated; but, at all events, there is one thing certainly in which he has been scandalously misrepresented, and which it is our present purpose to rescue his memory from the imputation of—that is, Protestantism; for we venture to affirm, there never was a more unfounded accusation brought against any man than to say that Henry the Eighth was not, from first to last, a sincere and thorough-going Roman Catholic, and that he did not hold and maintain, even with a *burning fiery* zeal, all the distinctive doctrines of the Church of Rome.

In order to prove this, we need not go back to Henry's more juvenile freaks, when he entered the lists of controversy against the great Reformer himself, Luther, and obtained from Pope Leo X. the harmless soubriquet of Defender of the Faith. Nothing, perhaps, would have ever forfeited this mark of Papal approbation of the royal controversialist, had not the influence of the Emperor Charles constrained the then Pope, Clement VII., to withdraw his consent and dispensation from the divorce of Queen Katherine. This took place A.D. 1529. It was two years afterwards, 1531, that Henry claimed the title of protector and supreme head of the Church and clergy of England. He afterwards married Anna Boleyn, and, in the year 1534, the final breach with Rome took place, and Henry abjured the supremacy and authority of the Pope. But do these facts warrant the assertion that Henry VIII. was the founder of the Protestant religion? Was Henry the advocate of Protestant doctrine, or the author of, or the participator in, the Protestant so-called heresies? Fortunately there remains on record a document which defies all attempts at falsification—a record so public, notorious, and trustworthy that its testimony is beyond impeachment and above being tampered with. This record of the religious sentiments of Henry VIII. is no other than an act of parliament passed by the King, Lords, and Commons of England with the consent of the whole of the clergy of England assembled in convocation, A.D. 1539, and when Henry was in the height of his contumacy towards Rome. It was then that the Act of the Six Articles was passed.

The act is the 31st Henry VIII., c. 14—"An act for abolishing of diversity of opinion in certain articles concerning religion." This famous, or rather infamous, statute recites the great advantage of uniformity, and the mischief of diversity of opinion in religion, and proposes to arrive at this desirable end in true pope and rouncil fashion. The Six Articles are as follows:—

"1st. That in the most blessed sacrament of the altar, by the strength and efficacy of Christ's mighty word (it being spoken by the priest), is present really, under the form of bread and wine, the natural body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ, conceived of the Virgin Mary, and that after the consecration there remaineth no substance of bread or wine, nor any other substance but the substance of Christ, God and man." This is no doctrine of the Protestant Church, and, therefore, it was not Henry the Eighth who restored the doctrine of the commemorative and spiritual nature of the sacrament of the Lord's supper.

"2nd. That the communion in both kinds is not necessary, *ad salutem*, by the law of God, to all persons, and that it is to be believed, and not doubted of, but that in the flesh, under the form of bread, is the very blood, and with blood, under the form of wine, is the very flesh, as well apart as though they were both together." We doubt if the Council of Trent ever gave so clear and distinct an exposition of the dogma of the communion in one kind and the exclusion of the laity from the cup, contrary to our blessed Lord's own institution of the sacrament, as did Henry the Eighth in this article.

"3rd. That priests after the order of priesthood, received as afore, may not marry by the law of God." This is not, certainly, Protestant doctrine, more than it is the example set by St. Peter, the first of the Popes—as Roman Catholics will have it—who is under grave suspicion of being guilty of having a wife.

"4th. That vows of chastity, widowhood by man or woman, made to God advisedly, ought to be observed by the law of God."

"5th. That it is meet and necessary that private masses be continued and admitted in the King's English Church and congregation, as whereby good Christian people, ordering themselves accordingly, do receive both godly and goodly consolations and benefits, and it is agreeable also to God's law." Neither is this any part of the Protestant faith, which holds that Christ died once for the sins of the whole world, and that his work is *finished*.

"6th. That auricular confession is expedient and necessary to be retained and continued, used and frequented in the churches of God." This was not one of the principles of the Reformation, nor in conformity with the directions of the Sacred Scriptures, which enjoin us to confess our faults to one another, not to a priest or minister. So far we see that Henry VIII. was a bad Protestant, but a faithful adherent to the doctrines of the Church of Rome, however refractory he may have proved in discipline and in denying the supremacy of the Pope.

That he held the main tenets of the Church is beyond doubt; and that he was a zealous propagandist of them will appear from the style of discipline which he applied in their favour.

Section 5 of the act ordains that all offending against the first article, as to the real presence, shall be adjudged heretics, and "*every such offender and offenders shall therefore have and suffer judgment, execution, and pains of death, by way of burning*, without any abjuration, clergy, or sanctuary, and forfeit everything."

Section 6 enacted, that offenders against the other five articles, by preaching or teaching, should be adjudged felons, and suffer pains of death, as in case of felons (that is, by hanging), without any benefit of clergy.

Section 7 enacted, that offenders against the last five articles, by word or writing, were to be adjudged, for the first offence to forfeit all their property for life; and for a second offence were to suffer as *felons by death*.

Section 9 declares, that if any man, which is or hath been a priest, shall keep company with a wife, he shall suffer as a felon (that is, by death), whereas (by section 10) if the priest kept company with any other woman, he only forfeited his goods for life.†

It may, however, be said, all this was the tyranny of Henry VIII., and not the act or instigation of the Roman Catholic Church. We have repeatedly read this bold apology for the enormous cruelties of the Inquisition, and the barbarities practised to propagate the faith of Rome—that they were not dictated or countenanced by the church, but were the independent actions (as the imprisonment of the Madiais for reading the Bible is naively thrown upon the Duke of Tuscany) of the civil power. And, accordingly, all the cruelties of Henry VIII. and Queen Mary are disposed of as acts of state, and not as instances of religious perse-

* Father Maguire is not the only Roman Catholic controversialist of eminence who has misrepresented Sir Edwin Sandys. Mr. French, too, a Roman Catholic barrister, at the celebrated discussion with Dr. Cumming at Hammersmith, in 1839, was detected by Dr. Cumming in similar misquotations.—See Hammersmith Discussion, p. 899.

† This statute continued in force during the entire reign of Henry VIII., but was repealed in the reign of Edward VI.

cution. Here again we must rescue the memory of Henry VIII. from more than his deserved share of obloquy. He has enough to answer for; but in his legislation he only copied the example of earlier Roman Catholic times, of a Roman Catholic prince acting on the solicitation of Roman Catholic bishops. We refer the reader to the act, 2 Henry IV., c. 15. (A.D. 1400)—an act concerning heresies, reciting that a new sect of heretical preachers had arisen, and that the diocesans cannot by their jurisdiction spiritual, without the aid of his Majesty, sufficiently correct the said false and perverse people, "ON THE PRAYER OF THE PRELATES, it is enacted, that none shall preach without license, and any offender against the act shall be arrested by the diocesan, and imprisoned and fined; and any person refusing to abjure, or relapsing, shall be delivered to the sheriff, who *then before the people, in an high place do to be burnt, that such punishment may strike in fear to the minds of others.* So that such wicked doctrines nor its authors shall be in any wise suffered." Here is the plan of conversion carried out by a Roman Catholic prince *at the prayer* of Roman Catholic prelates; and yet it is said by Dr. Milner, "that if Queen Mary was a persecutor, it was not in virtue of the tenets of her religion that she persecuted." No, because the church disclaims the power of punishing heretics: she only prays the secular arm to execute the vengeance she prescribes, and yet she affects to be guiltless of the blood of all the Protestant martyrs. Even Henry the Eighth revolted from the loose cruelty of this act, which left the matter at large, and every man exposed to the penalties of heresy, as defined by the bishop; and there was a degree of justice in Henry the Eighth first defining what should be deemed heresy, by which, as he says, the ignorant might escape being ensnared.*

Thus far we have shown that Henry the Eighth was a bad patron of Protestant doctrines, and in the close of his life, and three years before his death, we find him directing cruel prohibitions against the cardinal principle of the Reformation—the free circulation of the Bible.

The 34 Henry VIII., c. 1 (A.D. 1542), after enacting various restrictions on the use of the Scriptures in English, enacts, that no women, nor artificers, prentices, or journeymen, serving in the degree of yeomen, as under, husbandmen, nor labourers shall read the Bible or New Testament, in English, *to himself*, or to any other, privately or openly, upon pain of imprisonment. This must certainly have been the precedent forwarded to the Duke of Tuscany for his guidance.

Why, then, reader, is it that Henry the Eighth is set down as the founder of the English Protestant Church? Do you not see that the best way to injure a cause is to associate with it men of infamous character, if you cannot blacken the characters of its real leaders or associates? Both plans have been resorted to with equal perseverance, whether to vilify a Luther, a Calvin, or a Cranmer, or to prejudice a Reformed Church by setting forth as its patrons the most reprobate of men. The intrinsic value of the argument itself, that a religion is false because some of its professors are like Simon Magus or Judas Iscariot, is nothing; but the weight which it carries with the unreflecting is considerable, and therefore it is that to which the Church of Rome most sedulously applies itself; especially as it is one that can be supported by facts, manufactured and fabricated after the fashion of Mr. Maguire at the Dublin controversy, or Mr. French at that of Hammersmith. When the priest has no better argument against the religion of Protestants than that Henry the Eighth was its founder, or that Luther held conferences on theology with the devil, we trust our readers will regard them with suspicion, or at least with caution, and examine for themselves the foundation on which they rest.

* But one of the first statutes of the reign of Queen Mary (1 Mary, c. 6) was to revive this dreadful enactment, and under its comprehensive and deadly powers she swayed the sceptre, or rather the sword, of orthodoxy during her entire reign.

DOUBTS AND DIFFICULTIES.

OUR readers may rely on the truth of the following anecdote, which recently appeared in print, from an authentic source: we may add, that we ourselves have heard its accuracy confirmed by the testimony of a gentleman in the civil service of the East India Company, who was, for many years, resident in India:—

"A native gentleman in Tinnevelly, holding one of the highest situations under government which a native may hold, himself related to me the following story of an interview which he had with a Roman Catholic priest, in the house of a merchant residing at Tuticorin. In the course of the conversation, the priest highly commended the public spirit of this native gentleman, who was then, at his own expense, building a noble bridge across the river, between Palimcottah and the town of Tinnevelly; and suggested the propriety of his taking a further step, and becoming a Christian; asking him, whether he had never formed any intention of doing so. 'Well, sir,' said my native friend, 'I have thought about it at times, and I don't know what I may do before I die; but you must not, in that case, suppose that I should become a Roman Catholic.' 'Why not?' inquired the priest, and asserted the exclusive claim of the Church of Rome to be called Christian. This not being assented to, the priest again asked why he would not become a Roman Catholic, 'Oh, sir,' said the native, with the usual politeness of his countrymen, 'I do not wish to assign a reason; it might be offensive to you.' 'Oh, no,' rejoined the priest: 'you need not fear that: tell me freely what your difficulty is.' 'Then,' said the native gentleman, 'if you must know it, it is simply this: I see no advantage whatever in giving up one form of idolatry for another.' 'Idolatry,' was the reply:—'you do not mean to say we are idolaters?' 'Well, sir, I can arrive at no other conclusion: have you not images of the Virgin Mary, and Jesus Christ, and the saints, in your temples, as we have our gods; and cars upon which you drag them about at your feasts, as we do; and do you not bow down before them in your worship, just as we bow before our images?' 'True,' said the priest, 'we have those images, and use them in our worship, but we do not worship *them:* we worship only the sacred persons whom they represent.' 'Well,' said the Hindu, 'that explanation, after all, does not remove the difficulty; for do you think that I, an ignorant Hindu, as you would say, am so foolish as to imagine that the idol which I worship, and which I know was made by the stone-mason of the place, is the god himself? Oh, no! I don't worship the idols—I worship only the sacred persons whom they represent; and so, after all, I don't see any great difference between us; and to tell you the truth, I am resolved that if I should ever give up idolatry, I will give it up entirely, and worship God according to your Bible, which, I believe, forbids image worship altogether."

It is a true saying—

> "If thou would'st thy faults discover,
> View thyself with other's eyes."

Our Roman Catholic friends, when they read the above extract, may imagine for the moment that they are looking through a pair of Hindu spectacles at their own religious rites and services; and when they find a Hindu native gentleman, himself confessedly an idolater, roundly asserting that they are no better than his countrymen, we can well conceive that the first feeling in their minds will be one of scornful incredulity. "What!" they will say, "our church, the true Catholic Church, which has a college in Rome for the propagation of the faith, under the eye of the Pope himself—our church, which yearly sends forth hundreds of missionaries to every part of the earth, to convert the poor, blind, ignorant heathen from the worship of false gods to the faith of the Gospel of Christ—our church herself guilty of open and manifest idolatry, the most grievous offence which can be committed against Almighty God! The thing is too absurd to be believed."

We can fully enter into these feelings; and we are confident that our Roman Catholic readers will thank us for giving them an opportunity of carefully considering both sides of a question which hitherto, perhaps, may never have been brought before their minds, but which, we freely admit, is one of the very greatest importance. We approach this subject with the most anxious desire to avoid all harsh and irritating expressions. Truth, and truth alone, is the one object we have at heart.

In the first place, we need scarcely stop to prove, that idolatry is a great and awful sin; upon this point, at least, both Roman Catholics and Protestants are agreed. The Word of God uniformly uses the strongest language in warning its readers to beware of any approach to this sin. St. Paul reckons idolatry among those works which shall exclude whosoever doeth them from the kingdom of heaven (Gal. v 21). He charges the Corinthians to "*flee from idolatry*" (1 Cor. x. 14); and St. John classes idolaters with murderers and whoremongers, all of whom "shall have their portion in the lake burning with fire and brimstone."—Rev. xxi. 8. It is plain from these and other passages, that if the enormity of this sin be so great in the sight of God, every pious Christian will carefully shun all such actions and expressions as may have even the *appearance* of leading to idolatry. St. Paul warns the Thessalonians not only to abstain from sin, but "from all *appearance of evil* refrain yourselves."—1 Thess. v. 22. In this, as in some other cases, a man may fall into sin through ignorance or inadvertence: he may not know or reflect that a custom in which he has been trained from childhood is really idolatrous, and contrary to God's Word; but as soon as his error has been pointed out to him, he is called upon, by every motive of Christian obedience, to repent of it and abandon it without delay.

Some of our readers, however, may be ready to ask—What is the exact nature of the sin of idolatry, and in what does it consist?

Now, in the first place, we must be careful not to confound idolatry with the worship of false gods. The word is, indeed, often used in this sense now; but at present we are to inquire into the meaning which it bears in Scripture, where the sin of idolatry is forbidden. In its proper and literal meaning, idolatry signifies *the worship of images* (1). There may be images of false gods as well as images of the true God; but it is important to observe, that the Bible has but one word to describe the religious worship paid to *any image;* and further, that one and the same word is used to designate an image of a false god and an image of the true God. In proof of this fact we need only refer to the history of the golden calf (Ex. xxxii. 4, 5). By this calf Aaron intended to represent the Deity, "who had brought Israel up out of the land of Egypt." (*Vide* Nehemiah ix. 18—"Yea, when they had made them a molten calf and said, This is thy god that brought thee out of Egypt.") When the calf was made, Aaron "proclaimed a feast unto the LORD (Jehovah.)" The calf, therefore, was intended to be an image not of a false God, but of the true Jehovah. Yet, St. Stephen, in the Acts, calls this calf an idol (εἴδωλον). "They made a calf in those days, and offered sacrifice to the *idol*."—Acts vii. 41. And St. Paul, in reference to this history, charges the Israelites with idolatry for worshipping this image of the true God. "Neither become ye idolaters," saith he, "as some of them, as it is written, The people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play."—1 Cor. x. 7. We must remember, therefore, that (although the word is occasionally used in a somewhat wider signification) the primary and proper Scripture meaning of idolatry is, the worship of an image.

We now come to consider the important passage of Scripture in which God has been pleased to make known to us his will in regard to the worship of images.

We know from history that several of the most civilized nations in ancient times, whose only guide was the light of reason, considered it no sin to make images of their gods, or to worship them; but we who have the Word of God in our hands ought to look to it, and to it alone, as our rule in this matter. Now, this rule is fully and plainly set forth in the second of the Ten Commandments (Exodus xx. 4; Deut. v. 8)—"Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth. Thou shalt not bow down thyself unto them, nor serve them; for I, the Lord thy God, am a jealous God"(2).

This commandment plainly contains three distinct clauses, or prohibitions, against the use of images or pictures in connection with religious worship. Firstly, the making of them is forbidden: "thou shalt not *make* unto thee any graven image, or likeness." Secondly, outward reverence is forbidden: "Thou shalt not *bow down* unto them." Thirdly, inward adoration is prohibited: "Thou shalt not serve (or *worship*) them." And the reason of this whole commandment is emphatically added—"I, the Lord thy God, am a *jealous* God;" or, as the same reason is elsewhere more fully stated by the prophet Isaiah, "I am the LORD, that is my name: and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise to graven images."—Isaiah xlii. 8. God's hatred of image worship is here stated so plainly and distinctly, that there scarcely seems any possibility of evasion. In fact, we do not see how stronger or more express words could have been employed by the Divine legislator, in order to prevent the possibility of image worship, in any form or upon any pretext whatever.

And now, if we turn to the authorized formularies of the Church of Rome, we shall, doubtless, find them to be equally express in denouncing a sin which is so plainly condemned in the second precept of the Decalogue. But, alas! we soon discover our mistake. The eleventh article of the Creed of Pope Pius IV., which is the most authentic summary of the Roman Catholic faith, runs as follows (3):—"I most firmly assert, that

(1) The Latin Vulgate (which is the authorised version of the Scriptures in the Roman Catholic Church) translates εἰδωλολατρεία by "simulacrorum servitus," the service or worship of images (*Vide* Col. iii. 5). The Greek word, as every scholar knows, is derived from εἴδωλον (an image), and λατρεία (worship).

(2) *Vide* the CATHOLIC LAYMAN for March, pp. 27, 28, where some remarks are made on the difference between the Authorised Version and the Douay translation of the Second Commandment. The difference is but trifling, and turns chiefly upon two words. 1. The Hebrew פסל is rendered by the Douay Version "graven thing," instead of "graven image." Gesenius, who is confessedly the greatest Hebrew authority in modern times, translates the word by "simulacrum sculptile," which exactly agrees with the Authorised Version. 2. The Douay translators render לא־תשתחוה (thou shalt not bow down to them, *Auth. Ver.*) "thou shalt not *adore* them." But the primary meaning of the verb שחה, as given by Gesenius, is, "to bow oneself down, to prostrate oneself before any one out of honour;" and our Roman Catholic readers may satisfy themselves that this translation is correct by referring to the following passages, where the same Hebrew word is thus translated in the Douay Version. In Genesis xxvii. 7, we read, "Abraham *bowed down* before the people of the land" (Heb. וישתחו) Genesis xxxvii. 7, "Your sheaves, standing about, *bowed down* before my sheaf" (Heb. תשתחוין). Genesis xlviii. 12 Joseph *bowed down* with his face to the ground" (Heb. וישתחו). These examples, *taken from the Douay Version itself, are enough to* prove that the clause of the Second Commandment ought to be translated, as it is in the Authorized Version, "Thou shalt not bow down to them."

(3) Firmissimè assero, imagines Christi ac Deiparæ semper Virginis, necnon aliorum sanctorum, habendas et retinendas esse: atque eis debitum honorem ac venerationem impertiendam.—*Symb.* Pii. iv., § 11.

the images of Christ, and of the Mother of God, always virgin, and of other saints, are to be had and retained, and that to them due honour and veneration is to be given."

This is, indeed, a sad and melancholy contrast! The word of God says—"Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image." Pope Pius IV. says—"I most firmly assert that images are to be had and retained." The Almighty declares—"Thou shalt not bow down unto them or worship them." The Church of Rome asserts that "due honour and veneration" is to be given to images. What may be the precise nature or amount of this "due honour and veneration" is not indeed stated; but those who are familiar with the customs prevalent in Roman Catholic countries, and especially in Italy, must have a painful recollection of the universal prevalence of image worship, avowedly, and without disguise. Nay, the very language of the Creed of Pope Pius IV. would almost lead us to expect as much. In it Roman Catholics are taught to believe in God "with a firm faith" (*firma fide*), but "to assert most firmly" (*firmissime*), the lawfulness of image worship. Thus, the Church of Rome, if we are to believe the language of this Creed, teaches her members to believe *more firmly* in the lawfulness of image worship than in the existence of God himself! Is this the manner in which she practically trains them "to abstain from all *appearance* of evil?" We fear that, with the creed of Pope Pius IV. in our hands, and the practice of the great majority of Roman Catholics before our eyes, we cannot acquit the Church of Rome of criminal negligence, in not guarding her followers, by adequate means, against the plain and open breach of the Second Commandment.

We know, of course, the plea by which the practice of image worship in the Roman Catholic Church is usually defended—namely, that the worship, whatever it be, which is paid to the image, passes on to the being whom the image is intended to represent. We shall hereafter take occasion to point out the great difficulties and objections which stand in the way of this theory, and which have been acknowledged even by Roman Catholic divines; but at present we may observe that the plea—such as it is—leaves the greater part of the charge we have made unanswered. The Second Commandment, as we have seen, distinctly forbids three things—viz., the making of images for religious uses, the bowing down to them, the inward adoration of them. Now, we cannot tell what passes in a man's mind as he offers up his prayers before an image. His thoughts may, for ought we know, be directed to Christ or the Virgin Mary, or they may rest directly on the image itself; but his outward gestures are open to observation; and when we see him bowing down before the image, and addressing religious reverence to it, we cannot but conclude that he is either ignorant of, or that he altogether rejects the plain command of Almighty God—"Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image—thou shalt not bow down to it, nor serve it."

And there is one fact which seems to prove very conclusively that the heads of the Church of Rome are quite conscious that their practice of image worship cannot stand the test of Scripture—namely, the almost universal omission of the Second Commandment from the popular Roman Catholic catechisms.* Why, we may well ask, are the Roman Catholic clergy so anxious to keep back the knowledge of the existence of this commandment from the children whom they instruct, unless they are afraid that doubts will be excited in their young minds by the sight of images in their churches and chapels, if they should discover that the Word of God expressly condemns *all* image worship? When the Almighty gave the Ten Commandments to the Israelites, "he wrote them upon two tables of stone" (Deut. v. 22), and he charged the people "to teach them *diligently* unto their children."—Deut. vi. 7. Every jot and tittle of these laws ought to be held in the highest reverence. If we feel any regard for what the Almighty has commanded, surely the words which were written by the finger of God himself ought to be carefully treasured up in the memory, and implicitly obeyed by all, whether young or old. And yet, in the common Roman Catholic catechisms, the Second Commandment is either wholly omitted, or else cut down to one small fragment! We again ask, *why* is this done? The Church of England is not afraid to teach *her* children all the council of God. She does not dare to mutilate the solemn words which the Lord saw fit to make known to his people in such a miraculous manner. The authorised catechism in the Prayer-book of the United Church of England and Ireland contains the whole Ten Commandments without curtailment or alteration. *That* Church, at any rate, is not afraid of the light.

We have seen that the Creed of Pope Pius IV. declares that "due honour" is to be given to images; and that the Council of Trent makes the same assertion.† But what is this "due honour?" Why did not the learned Fathers of the Council, or the infallible Pontiff, leave more precise directions upon this point? Their silence, we apprehend, proceeded as much from fear of betraying the weakness of their cause as from any other motive: for this is one of the knotty points relating to the worship of images which, however it may be decided, must, according to Roman Catholic divines, inevitably lead to idolatry, as we shall now proceed to prove. In the theology of the Church of Rome, *Latria* is the name given to the worship which is due to God alone. Let us suppose that there is an image of Jesus Christ before us; the question is, are we to worship this image with *Latria*, or are we not? No, says Bellarmine, we are not; and here are his reasons*:—"No image is to be worshipped properly with that worship which the thing represented is worshipped by; for *Latria* is a worship proper to God; but no image, upon account of relation, or any other way, is God. Therefore, that worship doth not belong to it. Again, either the Divine worship, or *Latria*, which is given to the image relatively for another, is the same with that which is given to God, or an inferior worship. *If it be the same, the creature is equally worshipped with God, which certainly is idolatry. For idolatry is not only when God is forsaken, and an idol worshipped, but when an idol is worshipped together with God.* If it be an inferior worship, then that is not *Latria*, for that is the highest worship." Thus far Bellarmine. On the other side, Vasquez, a Jesuit, a man of as great reputation and ability as Bellarmine, decides exactly the opposite way—namely, that *we are* to worship the image with *Latria*.† "For," saith he, "if an inferior worship be given to the image, distinct from that which is given to the thing represented, *he that so gives it incurs the crime of idolatry*, for he expresses his submission to a mere inanimate thing, that hath no kind of excellency to deserve it from him."

We may now put the question to our Roman Catholic readers, what are they to do? If they worship the image of Jesus Christ with *Latria*, they are guilty of downright idolatry, according to Cardinal Bellarmine, for they are giving to an image that worship which is due to God alone. If they do *not* worship the image with *Latria*, they are worshipping it for its own sake, by which, according to the Jesuit Vasquez, they incur the crime of idolatry. We see, then, that if they worship the image at all, in no possible way can they avoid the crime of idolatry according to the opinion of the most eminent Roman Catholic divines. Here then, surely, is a question, if there be any, upon which the infallible guidance of the Supreme Pontiff is needed, in order to save faithful members of the Church of Rome from falling into deadly sin. But what say the Council of Trent and Pope Pius IV.? They reply, as we have seen, that "due honour" is to be given to the image—in short, they leave the difficulty where they found it! Where, we may well ask, is the boasted unity of Roman Catholic divines upon one of the most important articles of their faith? Where is the benefit which they derive from an infallible head, if it cannot help them out of a difficulty which nearly touches their eternal salvation, and which has been acutely felt by the greatest champions of their creed?

We make no pretensions to infallibility; and yet we venture to think that we can give our Roman Catholic friends safer advice than either Pope Pius IV., Cardinal Bellarmine, or the Jesuit Vasquez. It is simply this, to abstain altogether from the practice of image worship, which, even according to the statements of its most illustrious advocates, is encompassed with such awful perils. The sin of idolatry is too great, that we should rashly venture upon any practice which may, however unwittingly, lead us into such a grievous transgression against the honour and majesty of Almighty God.

We have not space at present to enter on an examination of the arguments by which the practice of image worship has been palliated or defended, nor to trace the history of the rise and progress of this corruption of the primitive faith. We hope, however, to take an early opportunity of returning to the subject; and we shall then present our readers with such an extraordinary picture of the inconsistencies, vacillation, and contradictions of Popes and Councils upon this matter, as may well startle the most stubborn believer in the unity and immutability of the Church of Rome.

* *Vide* The Abridgment of Christian Doctrine, the Italian Catechism, called "Dottrina Christiana" (Rome, 1836), and other catechisms, *passim*.

† *Vide Conc. Trid. Sess.* xxv. Imaginibus debitum honorem et veneretionem impertiendam.

* *Vide* Bellarm. *de Imag.* lib. ii. cap. 24; vol. ii. pp. 330, 331. Colon. 1615

† *Vide* Vasquez in *Thom. disp.* iii. 103; q. 25, art. 3, c. 9.

TALK OF THE ROAD—No. VIII.

"Oh, Jem, where have you been all this time?"

"Why, Pat, I got a job down to Roscommon, to drive up some cattle, and I only got back last night," said Jem.

"Well, it's I that's wishing to have a talk with you, Jem," said Pat.

"And what is it about?" said Jem.

"Why, sure the readers is come!" said Pat.

"Ah, where are they come?" said Jem.

"Why, into the very town of Kilcommon itself," said Pat.

"Well," said Jem, "if that doesn't beat all! didn't I think, if ever they came down this way, it would be in some quiet, out-of-the-way place like this they would come, where, maybe, some of us would let them in of an evening unknownst; but what will they do in Kilcommon at all?"

"Well, then, it's there they've come," said Pat, "right into Father John's month, and facing all the blackguards in Kilcommon; and of all the work ever you see, it's in Kilcommon it is."

"Tell us all about it: will you?" said Jem.

"Well," said Pat, "I looked for a job in Kilcommon last week, for there was nothing to be got here, and, sure enough, I saw the readers the first day they came into the town. And they didn't go about like any readers ever we saw going through the country before; but just like men going about their business in a fair, or in a market—going straight forenent them, into every house, one after the other, and passing none, and talking to the people as open as day, and telling them they had souls to be saved, and that the Word of God, and nothing else, was able to save their souls."

"Well, how did the people take it all?" said Jem.

"Why, then, they took it quite pleasant," said Pat; "they seemed all to be took of a sudden, and it looked so open, they could see no harm in it, and the people were all mighty civil to them; and when I followed them a while after dinner, I saw that there was a deal of the people that were well pleased to talk to them."

"Well, and what was Father John doing at all?" said Jem.

"Why, the next day," says Pat, "Father John comes down just the same way, and goes into every house the readers were in the day before, and 'Where's the books and papers the Ranters left with you?' says he. Well, and sure enough, many of the people that was glad enough to speak to the readers the day before, was just cowed when they saw Father John forenent them, and handed up their books, looking for all the world as if they were going to do penance; and some of them that I knowed took the books, said they never got any; and there was some said out that they liked the books, and found no harm in them, and they weren't going for to give them, and old Jemmy Neal says, says he, 'Sure it's only about Irishmen's rights,' says he; 'and aren't we going to have any rights at all?' says he."

"And what were the readers doing that day?" says Jem.

"Why," said Pat, "they began before Father John was out, in another part of the town; and all the time Father John was going over one street, they were going about in another, as pleasant as ever."

"And didn't Father John go after them to where they were," said Jem.

"Indeed, didn't he," said Pat; "and I was wondering why, for I saw the town-sergeant come and tell him where they were, and he didn't go after them a bit; and so I went to see what they were doing, and sure enough they were walking about as bold as you please, and a real clergyman with them, and he with his Douay Bible in his hand, saying he only wanted to tell the people what was in that, and that if he met Father John he would hold his own tongue, and only hand the book to Father John, and ask him to read some of that, and explain it to the people. And sure enough I didn't wonder that Father John kept out of the street he was in, for that would be new work for Father John."

"Well, and how did it end at all?" said Jem.

"Why, it just went on the same way till Saturday," said Pat; "the readers getting in to all the houses quite pleasant, for no one liked to put them out, and Father John running about at the far end of the town, for fear he would meet them; and so it went on till Saturday night. Well, on Sunday morning, says I to myself, I'll just go into the chapel at Kilcommon, where I wasn't, sure enough, for long enough, and I'll hear what Father John has to say about it. Well, of all the scolding and cursing that ever you heard a priest give at the altar it was the terriblest. First he fell on the Ranters, and the Swaddlers, and the Soupers, and the Jumpers, and the unbaptized heathens, and the cockatrices, and the goose-stealers, and a deal more names he had for them; and, sure enough, I wondered why he called them goose-stealers (for them's as decent men as you would see, more like gentlemen than Father John, with all his bad language); till I saw him turn round to some old women that wor in the chapel, and says he, 'Now, you ould women there, mind to look after your geese,' says he, 'for these Soupers are so fond of soup,' says he, 'that when the bacon's out, it's stealing your geese they'll be,' says he, 'to make soup of.' Well, thinks I to myself, says I, if that's all you have to say against reading the Bible, the readers will have the town yet, thinks I; and with that he went on to Mr. Owens for fetching the readers, and of all the bad names that ever was called, he had the baddest for him. And, says he, when the cholera was in Ireland, their clergy, says he, that's married and has wives, says he, all presented a petition to the Protestant bishop, says he, that they mightn't go to the cholera hospital, says he, but let the Protestants die like dogs, says he. And thinks I to myself that's enough any way; for when I was lying ten days in the cholera hospital, didn't I see Mr. Owens, that has a wife, there three times a day, and never set eyes on Father John,

if it would keep me out of hell, let alone Purgatory? and I saw plain enough there was plenty forby me that considered that. Well, then he came to Mrs. Owens, and if he hadn't the horridest names for her that ever you heard, it's a wonder; and when he got just black in the face with abusing her, it's a fiend out of hell I was going to call her, says he; and, sure enough, I saw many a poor creature that seemed ashamed to hear Mrs. Owens called that way, for it's she that's good to the poor. Well, then he went on to tell them what to do to the Ranters; and if they would not throw dirty water on them, and gather on them in the streets, and hoot them, and sweep up the puddles in their floors in their faces with the besoms, he'd call them on the altar next Sunday, and put the curse of God and his curse on them, and never give them the rights of the church as long as they lived; and so that was Father John's sermon at the blessed altar."

"Well, and what became of it a Monday?" said Jem.

"Why, then, sure enough, I went to see," said Pat; "and what should I see when the readers came up the street, but up comes Brady, the jammer, with a big hand-bell that Connor, the bell-man, rings in the street when there is an auction: and Brady, the jammer, comes up the street, ringing his bell, and gathering all the blackguards in the street, and sure they *are* the bad set in Kilcommon, and up he goes to the readers as they were going into a house; and of all the screeching, and cursing, and bad language, and ringing that ever you heard, it beat all."

"And how did the readers take it all?" said Jem.

"Just as pleasant as you please," said Pat; "they had a word to answer for everything, and were never put out, no more than if they were ringing bells themselves all their lives."

"Well, and did the people let them in?" said Jem.

"How darst they," said Pat, "when such a mob was riz on them; but I saw that a deal of them did not like it at all, and went out and listened to the readers and the clergyman quite quiet. But, oh, the jammer: when the clergyman would offer to speak a word to the people, he'd go and ring his bell up at our ear with one hand, and when that was tired with the other hand, at the other ear, screeching himself black in the face; and then the clergyman would say, holding up the Douay Bible in his hand—'Is it your own Bible that you hate, that you treat it that way? Why don't your priest come himself, and show if the book is a bad one?' And, indeed, when the people saw how pleasant and quiet the readers behaved, they thought it bad work, and out comes ould Sally Smith, and says she to the jammer, 'Is that what you're at, and isn't it yourself that would sell the priest next for a glass of whisky?' And, indeed, I heard after that, that the jammer was hired by Father John, and that he had a pound to put the readers out of Kilcommon, and no cure no pay. But that's the way it is; and what will come of it, I don't know at all."

"Well, Pat," said Jem, "I'm thinking that if the priest has nothing to say agen the Bible, but dirty water, and mud, and shouting, and the ringing of a bell, he'll never put it out of Kilcommon that way. Sure all the boys must see, when they come to think of it, that their religion is in a bad way, when the priest has nothing else to say for it."

"Well, indeed, I'm thinking that's true," said Pat; "but we'll see, and who knows but the readers and the Bible will have Kilcommon yet?"

POPE PIUS V.—CATECHISM OF COUNCIL OF TRENT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I have often been surprised that the vast majority of Roman Catholics, believing themselves to possess an infallible guide, do not more generally refer to the original documents, which alone contain, with certainty, its true teaching. It rarely happens that they go beyond the instructions of their particular spiritual guide, whose fallibility they do not, in theory, deny; but whom yet they thus elevate, in practice, into their only infallible standard. It cannot be expected that all priests should be equally well informed, or should take the same views of their church's doctrines, scattered as they are over so many ponderous and difficult volumes. Hence arise the greatest differences amongst individuals, which seem completely to mar the practical utility to be derived from a common authoritative standard. An instance of this occurs to me as a good example, not that it appears to a Protestant to be on a point of any vital importance, but because it is much insisted on by eminent Roman Catholic divines, and yet seems to be a palpable inconsistency.

The 4th and 5th verses of the 20th chapter of Exodus, which form the Second Commandment in the Protestant version, and which, though very frequently omitted in catechisms, are yet acknowledged by the Roman Catholic Church as part of the first precept, have lately provoked no small controversy. Our translation is objected to as a wilful perversion; and it is argued that we have introduced the words "graven *image*" improperly, and to uphold our heretical views on that subject. To those who remember that the next word is "similitude," or "likeness," it would seem of little moment, as this must include an image; but it is not so treated, and if worth a very warm attack, it deserves a just defence. Dr. Dixon, whose name derives unusual importance from his recent elevation to the Roman Catholic Primacy, published a work, some few months since,* in which he devotes a chapter to the meaning of the two verses, and bases much of his argument on the Protestant mistranslation, or introduction of the word *image*. Dr. Doyle, in his "Abridgment of Christian Doctrine,"† distinctly attributes great weight to this view. The Douay Bible represents the careful opinion of many of the greatest biblical students, and was specially revised by Dr. Murray, and is, therefore, to be taken as the exponent of their opinion on this point, and translates the words in question "*graven thing*."

The only translation usually referred to, as stamped by the Roman Catholic Church with the attribute of infallibility, is the Vulgate, in which the word "sculptile" is used, which leaves the controversy open, or rather favours the Douay version. It appears to me, however, that there is another, even (if possible) more authoritative, and certainly more decisive. The Catechism of the Council of Trent has been usually received as the undoubted expression of the church's doctrines, and, if not infallible, has never had its accuracy impeached by Roman Catholic divines. This, too, has been commonly referred to in Latin, and does not, therefore, advance the controversy a step. But, fortunately, I find that there were two editions promulgated simultaneously, both from the Papal press at Rome,‡ both with the same authoritative approval of Pope Pius V., and both in the year 1567. On an inspection of the two, there is no reason to pronounce one of more authority than the other; the one is in Latin, the other in Italian; and, if a preference should be given to either, it should be to that which was in the native language of those who drew it up, and which was, therefore, incapable of error from ambiguity or misunderstanding. Turning, therefore, to the 375th page, we find the commandment thus rendered:—

"Non ti farai alcuna *imagine scolpita*," &c., and farther on, "non le adorerai, ne *le honorerai*."

I need hardly translate words so obvious and unmistakable—"Thou shalt not make thee any *sculptured image*." And, again—"Thou shalt not adore them, nor shalt thou *honour* them." The first needs no comment, and the second expression is no less valuable; for no words are so frequently translated in different forms, and so often disputed, as those that express different kinds of forms of worship. The infallible declaration, therefore, that images are not even to receive a religious *honour*, seems to me to have been wholly overlooked by Roman Catholic controversialists. As to the introduction of the word "images," it suggests this inquiry—Are Dr. Doyle, Dr. Murray, and Dr. Dixon right, and was Pope Pius V. wrong? And, if not, then did not these three learned divines teach incorrectly, on what they said was important? This will surely show that no Roman Catholic should rest satisfied with the mere *ipse dixit* of his priest, however learned, but should refer to the documents which alone he believes infallible.

One word on a feature in this authoritative edition, particularly as it is one that may have tended to cause this very error. The oversight was most natural; for, without a very careful perusal, this text is not likely to be discovered at all. The verses that are given, as constituting the ten commandments, are printed in very large type, quite distinct from the rest of the book, and with a commendable prominence; but this fourth verse, the Protestant second commandment, is omitted in that place and type, though those before and following appear; and any reader would naturally imagine that it did not form any part of the ten commandments. However, some pages afterwards it is introduced in the commentary, so that it cannot be said it is wholly omitted; but it is so done as not to attract notice, nor to appear a part of the commandment; and not even being placed as a quotation, between inverted commas, it might escape the notice of any reader, who was not previously aware that it was both a verse in the Bible and an integral portion of the Decalogue. If this verse escaped the observation of such learned men as the three divines I have named, I may well imagine that I may happen to be the first to now place this important translation before the public.

FONTIUM PETITOR.

* A General Introduction to the Sacred Scriptures. Duffy, 1852.
† R. Coyne, Dublin. 1846. 49.
‡ Both in Trinity College Library.

THE TOUCHSTONE.

(Continued from page 104.)

OBJECTION 13.—Protestants commonly teach that people of all religions may be saved, even Pagans, Jews, or Mahometans, that believe not in Christ, nor receive his Gospel.

Their own Bible, in clear and express terms, condemns this error (*St. Mark* xvi. 16)—*He that believeth not* (the Gospel) *shall be damned*. Acts iv. 12—*Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is no other name* (but the name of *Jesus*) *under heaven given unto men, whereby we must be saved. St. John* iii. 36—*He that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him.*

REPLY.—It is plain that the persons here spoken of are such as had *had the Gospel preached to them;* which some of them received, and others, to their condemnation, rejected.

As for such Pagans as have lived and died without ever having heard the Gospel, no Protestant Church presumes to decide how *they* will be judged; because Scripture gives us no information on the subject.

But that Protestants consider it a matter of great importance to make known the Gospel to Pagan nations is sufficiently proved by the toils and dangers and sufferings which many of their missionaries encounter in that work, and in the zeal and liberality shown by others in sending out and supporting such missionaries.

OBJECTION 14.—Protestants teach that it is not necessary to salvation to embrace the faith and communion of the true church.

Their own Bible teaches the contrary, when it tells us (*Acts* iv. 47) *that God added daily to the church such as should be saved*. And (*Isaiah* lx. 12) *that the nation and kingdom that will not serve* (*the church*) *shall perish.*

REPLY.—The passages, it should be observed, make no mention whatever of the *Church of Rome*. Protestants do hold that the Gospel promises are limited to those who are members of the Church of Christ—namely, the universal church—which consists of *all believers* in Christ throughout the whole world. But they do not admit the supremacy claimed by the Church of Rome and by the Greek Church; each of which calls itself *the* only "true Church," and the "Catholic Church," and demands submission from all Christians. Let any one try such claims by the TOUCHSTONE of Scripture, according to the professed design of this tract. Protestants will admit the claims of the Church of Rome if any passage can be found, either in the Epistle to the Romans, or in any other part of Scripture, describing the Church of Rome as supreme over all Christians, and as possessing an authority which all are bound to submit to. A doctrine so very important as this would be, if true, would surely have been mentioned by the Apostles had they known of any such. But we find them, on the contrary, always speaking of each of the churches—of Ephesus, for instance, and Corinth, and Thessalonica, &c.—as perfectly independent of anyone on earth, except the apostles themselves.

OBJECTION 15.—Protestants look upon it as uncharitable to say that *heresy* is a damnable sin, or that *heretics* are in a state of damnation.

Their own Bible (*Gal.* v. 20) expressly reckons *heresies* amongst those sins of which it pronounces, *that they who do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God.*

OBJECTION 16.—Protestants are of opinion that no man shall be damned for following a wrong religion, if he really judges it to be right, whether he have taken sufficient pains to inform himself of the truth or no.

Their own Bible expressly tells them (*Prov.* xvi. 25), *There is a way that seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death.*

REPLY to 15, 16—If you read through the Prayer-book of the Church of England, including the Thirty-nine Articles, you will find no such declaration. And as for what any private individual, Roman Catholic or Protestant, may declare as his own private opinion, this, be it right or wrong, is not to be regarded as a decision of his church.*

The same observations will apply to the 16th objection. But no Protestants deny what the Apostle says at Gal. v. 19 20, 21, concerning the sins which are there enumerated, among which, along with heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, and many others, they find *idolatry*—that is, adoration of images.

But Protestants do not, in general, presume to pronounce of any individual sinner that he is inevitably doomed to final perdition, and that it is impossible for the Almighty to pardon him; because God alone can perfectly know what opportunities each man has had, and what temptations he has been exposed to. And no Protestant Church has ever put forth any such declaration as that contained in objection 16.

If a passage could be cited, from the works of any individual Protestant writer, declaring it as his belief that it is a matter of indifference whether a man have taken due pains to inform himself of the truth or no, this would prove nothing against any other Protestants. But we do not believe that even any one such passage could be found.

OBJECTION 17.—Protestants, to justify their wide notions of salvation in any religion, falsify the Scripture, by forging a text, nowhere to be found, even in their own Bible—*viz., that a remnant of all shall be saved.*

Their own Bible loudly condemns this forgery (*Rev.* xxii. 18, 19)—*I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this Book, if any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, &c.*

* See Eighteenth Article of Church of England.

Reply.—This is altogether a mistake. If you read through all the formularies of the Church of England, and of any other Protestant Churches, you will find no such notions taught, nor any such pretended text cited.

Objection 18.—Protestants will have the trial of spirits to be made only by the *written word*, and not by the *living voice* of the pastors of the Church, or by adhering to them or their authority.

Their Bible prescribes a different rule (1 *John* iv. 6)—*He that knoweth God heareth us* (the pastors of the Church); *he that is not of God heareth not us: by this we know the spirit of truth and the spirit of error.*

Reply.—The Apostle John and the other Apostles of the Lord were divinely inspired, and proved their immediate commission from heaven by the miracles they wrought. Protestants hold themselves bound to hear *them*, which they do by studying their writings which have come down to us, and comparing with these whatsoever is taught by uninspired men.

You may observe that, in order to condemn Protestants for their procedure, it was found necessary to foist in the words "the *pastors of the Church*," which is not in the Bible.

If any "pastors of the Church" teach doctrines at variance with what an Apostle has taught in his writings, it is plain that to follow *them* is *not* to "hear the Apostle," but to be led by the spirit of error.

Objection 19.—Protestants reject *unwritten traditions*.

Their Bible expressly recommends them (2 *Thess.* ii. 15)—*Brethren, stand fast and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word or our epistle.*

Reply.—Protestants are aware, as, indeed, every one must be, that of things that are reported—i.e., *traditions*—some are true and some false, and some have a mixture of truth and falsehood. The test that they apply is Scripture—the very touchstone recommended in this tract.

Any tradition that is confirmed by Scripture they receive as genuine; any that is at variance with Scripture they reject; and any that is neither confirmed nor contradicted by Scripture, they leave at large, to be believed or rejected by each man according to his own judgment.

As for those who had themselves heard Paul preach, they would be likely, if attentive hearers, to remember correctly what he taught. But those who heard their report of it, and those again who heard the report of these, and so on through fifty or a hundred intermediate reporters, would be likely to depart somewhat from the correct statement of the Apostle's preaching. And, moreover, crafty persons might designedly introduce something into their reports, to serve some purpose of their own; even as the Pharisees, in our Lord's time, had "made the Word of God of no effect through their *tradition*."

And it is remarkable that almost the only tradition mentioned in Scripture as having gained currency among Christians, during the life-time of the Apostles, had even then become falsified—*John* xxi. 23—"Then went out this saying abroad among the brethren, that that disciple should not die."

To guard against such danger in future ages, the Apostles committed their doctrines to *writing;* and the Scriptures which they have left us serve as a *touchstone* to try what traditions are to be trusted and what not.

Objection 20.—Protestants take for their rule of faith *the Scripture*, as *interpreted* by their own *private* judgment.

Their Bible tells them (2 *Pet.*, i. 20) *that no prophecy of the Scripture is of private interpretation.*

Reply.—The passage here quoted from St. Peter is not inconsistent with the Protestant view of the right of *private* judgment in the interpretation of Scripture. For it relates not to the doctrines, precepts, or histories of Scripture, but to its *prophecies;* and the sense of it seems to be, that a prophecy is not—like a precept or narrative—to be interpreted from the very words in which it is written, but is to be explained from the *event* which fulfils it. Thus, the ancient prophecies concerning the death and resurrection of the Christ were not understood, either by the Jews generally or by the disciples of Jesus, till after their fulfilment; and then we read of his "opening their minds to understand the Scriptures, saying, Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer and to enter into his glory."

And with respect to the right which the Romish Church arrogates to itself of supreme authority, both in the interpretation of Scripture and on other points, Protestants may feel assured that if St. Peter, as Romanists pretend, had been the supreme ruler on earth of the Christian world, and had appointed that the Bishops of Rome should hold the same rule for ever after, he would not have failed to state it in this his very last epistle, written when he was expecting soon to be removed from this earth, and for the express purpose of reminding his converts of what it was most important for them to remember and observe.

Objection 21.—Protestants maintain that the Scripture is clear, and plain to be understood; and that the unlearned run no risk in reading and interpreting it.

Their Bible assures them (2 *Pet.*, iii. 16) that in the Scripture *are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest to their own destruction.*

Reply.—This passage from St. Peter is misquoted. The Apostle is speaking of St. Paul's epistles, *in which*, he says, "are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, *as they do also the other Scriptures*, to their own destruction." But he does not, on this account, dissuade any of his converts from reading them; he only reminds them that, "seeing they know these things before," they are to beware lest, being led away with the error of the wicked, they fall from their own steadfastness. It was, therefore, some moral fault (self-conceit, and want of humility, perhaps) which caused these "unlearned and unstable" persons to wrest the Scripture to their destruction.

(To be continued.)

MANNER IN WHICH ROMAN CATHOLIC CONTROVERSIALISTS QUOTE BISHOP JEREMY TAYLOR.

In our September number we had to offer some comment on a letter written to us by "Warner Christian Search," on 2 Maccabees, ch. xii. See page 107.

We had, then, to observe on the use which "W. C. S." made of a passage quoted from Bishop Jeremy Taylor. "W. C. S." gave this passage as Bishop Taylor's own judgment—"His learned doctor . . . THUS EXPRESSES HIMSELF." We showed that Bishop Taylor had *not* thus expressed *himself*, but had only told us what Roman Catholics say for *themselves*. We showed that he had marked this by the words, "says the Romanist," which words "W. C. Search" had left out, to make it appear as if Bishop Taylor was giving *his own* opinion.

Knowing, as we do, that this is not a solitary instance, but a common practice of many Roman Catholic controversialists, to maintain their cause by dishonest quotations from writers of great name and character (as if there was no chance of being able to defend their cause by truth), we then promised to give other instances in which Roman Catholics had dishonestly quoted Bishop Taylor, in order that our readers may see what hope they can have of being guided into truth by such men as seek to defend their cause by the arts of falsehood.

We take our first instance from a discussion, held at Hammersmith, near London, in the year 1839, between Dr. Cumming on the side, and Daniel French, Esq., barrister-at-law, a Roman Catholic, on the other. We quote from the edition published by Hall & Co., London, 1851.

Mr. French thus introduces his quotation from Bishop Taylor:—

"Listen, also, to that renowned doctor of the Protestant Church, Dr. Jeremy Taylor—a man who, if splendour of genius can atone for the enormous crime of omitting to embrace that truth which shone so vividly in his eyes, will not be destitute of a very large reward in the kingdom of heaven."—P. 382.

Mr. French concludes his quotation thus:—

"This, I say, is a noble concession made to truth, in a disinterested hour, by Dr. Jeremy Taylor—a man whose perspicacity and wisdom shone so luminously amid the stupor of surrounding error. Oh! such words as these are, indeed, worthy of the mind that uttered them."—P. 383.

The words should have been truly and fairly stated. But before we give the words, to let our readers judge of this for themselves, we must tell the *purpose* of the words.

The book, called the "Liberty of Prophesying," was one of the most remarkable books ever published. It was the FIRST book ever published in the world expressly for the purpose of establishing religious liberty. Dr. Jeremy Taylor published this book to persuade mankind that they ought not to persecute men on account of their religious opinions. And there is no denying that it is a great glory and a lawful boast of the Church of England and Ireland, that a bishop of that Church (he was a bishop in Ireland) was the first person that ever wrote a book with this noble object. This led him, of course, to consider what religions which are false can have to say *for themselves*—whether they have such plausible reasons as might deceive well-meaning men, so that we should rather pity than persecute them for being deceived. Where, observe, it is not the *truth* of this doctrine that is in question, but whether those who hold it are to be persecuted or tolerated.

In section 20, he considers the case of Roman Catholics, whether Protestants should persecute or tolerate them. It is from this section that Roman controversialists take all their false quotations from Bishop Taylor in favour of their religion.

The "heading" of the section is as follows:—"How far the religion of the Church of Rome is tolerable"—that is, whether this religion is to be tolerated or proscribed and persecuted. This in itself would be enough to show any fair man that the subject of the discuss on was *not* the truth of this religion.

The commencement of the chapter states this plainly—"Now, concerning the religion of the Church of Rome, ... we will proceed another way, and *not* consider *the truth or falsity of the doctrines;* for that is not the best way to determine this question concerning permitting their religion or assemblies. Because that a thing is not true is not argument sufficient to conclude that he that believes it true is not to be endured." But he proposes to consider the reasons by which Roman Catholics are "abused" (or deceived), in order to argue from that that though their religion be false, they are yet to be tolerated and not persecuted; and for that purpose he goes on to state what the Roman Catholics say for themselves.

What can we say to the honesty of a man who, after reading this, gives these arguments as Taylor's own proofs or admissions of the truth of their doctrines? Yet this is what Mr. French does, and all other Roman controversialists who quote Bishop Taylor as confirming their doctrines by his own opinions.

Mr. French quotes the passage which immediately follows Bishop Taylor's declaration, that he was *not* considering the truth of Rome's doctrine, and says that this is Bishop Taylor's "concession made to truth!" Is this fair and honest?

But this is not all. It was not enough to *hide* the *object* with which Bishop Taylor wrote this passage; it was necessary, also, to change and alter the passage in several important particulars, in order that it might seem to bear that sense which Mr. French wished, instead of the sense that Bishop Taylor intended; and Mr. French makes all these changes and alterations without scruple. To show this, we print the passage in parallel columns, as Bishop Taylor wrote it and as Mr. French changed it.

MR. FRENCH'S QUOTATION.	BISHOP TAYLOR'S WRITING. (This is the conclusion, and not the beginning, of the passage, as it stands in Bishop Taylor.)
"These following considerations may very easily persuade persons of much reason and more piety, to maintain that which they know to have been the religion of their forefathers, which had actual possession and seizure of men's minds and understandings before the opposite professions had a name; as, first, its doctrine having had a long continuance and possession of the church, which, therefore, cannot easily be supposed in the present professors to be a design, since they have received it for so many ages, and it is not likely that all ages should have the same purposes, or that the same doctrines should serve the several ends of divers ages. Secondly—its long prescription, which is *such an advantage* that it cannot with many arguments be retrenched; as relying upon these grounds, to wit, that truth is more ancient than falsehood, and that God would not, for so many ages, forsake his Church, and leave her in error.	"And here first I consider, that those doctrines that have had long continuance and possession in the church cannot easily be supposed in the present professors to be a design, since they have received it from so many ages, and it is not likely that all ages should have the same purposes, or that the same doctrine should serve the several ends of divers ages. "But, however, long prescription *is a prejudice, oftentimes so insupportable* that it cannot, with many arguments, be retrenched, as relying upon these grounds that truth is more ancient than falsehood, that God would not, for so many ages, forsake his church, and leave her in an error.
(This passage Mr. French cut out, because it showed plainly what Bishop Taylor's meaning was.)	. . . . . "But this consideration is to be enlarged upon all those particulars, which, *as they are apt to abuse the persons of the men, and amuse their understandings*, so they are instruments of their *excuse;* and by making their errors to be invincible, and their opinions, THOUGH FALSE, yet *not criminal*, make it also to be an effect of reason and charity *to permit the men a liberty of their conscience*, and let them answer to God for themselves, and their own opinions; such as are the beauty and splendour of their church; their *pompous* service; the stateliness and solemnity of the hierarchy; their name of 'Catholic,' which they *suppose* their own due, and to concern no other sect of Christians; the antiquity *of many of their doctrines;* the continual succession of their bishops; their immediate
"Again, the beauty and splendour of that church, their *solemn* service; the stateliness and magnificence of their hierarchy; the name of Catholic, which they *claim* as their own due, and to concern no other sect of Christianity; the antiquity *of their doctrine:* the continual succession of their bishops; their immediate derivation from	

the apostles; their title to succeed St. Peter, *whose personal prerogatives were so great.*

[Omitted without notice.]

"The honorable expression concerning this church *from many eminent bishops of* other inferior Sees, which, being old records, have obtained a credibility.

"The multitude and variety of people which are of their persuasion;

[Omitted.]

apparent consent with *elder ages in matters doctrinal;* the advantage which is derived to them *by retaining the doctrine of the church of ancient times.*

[Cut out, of course]

the great consent of one part with another in that which *they* affirm to be *de fide.* The great differences which are commenced among their adversaries, abusing the liberty of prophesying unto a very great licentiousness; their happiness in being instrumental in converting divers nations. The advantage of monarchical government.

[Omission without notice,]

and the benefit which they daily enjoy by it; the piety and austerity of their religious orders of men and women; the single life of their priests and bishops; the riches of their church; the severity of their fasts and other their exterior observances; the great reputation of *their bishops* for faith and sanctity; the known holiness of some of those persons whose institutes the religious persons DO *now imitate and follow; their miracles;*
[omitted, the reader will see why;]
the casualties and accidents that have happened to many of their adversaries.

[Omitted.]

The oblique acts and indirect proceedings of *many* of those who have departed from them; and, among many other things, the name of heretics and schismatic, which they [see the words omitted] fasten upon all that disagree with them."

[Mr. French places this sentence first.]

[Mr. French, of course, cut out this passage altogether, as not at all suitable for his purpose.]

derivation from the apostles; their title to succeed St. Peter; *the* SUPPOSAL *and* PRETENCE *of his personal prerogatives;* the advantage which the conjunction of the imperial seat with their episcopal hath brought to that See; the flattering expressions *of minor bishops*, which, by being old records, have obtained credibility; the multitude and variety of people which are of their persuasion; apparent consent with antiquity in many ceremonials which other churches have rejected; and a PRETENDED and sometimes an apparent consent with SOME *elder ages in* MANY *matters doctrinal;* the advantage which is derived to them *by entertaining* SOME *personal opinions of the fathers, which they, with* INFINITE CLAMOURS, SEE TO BE CRIED UP *to be a doctrine of the church of that time:* the great consent of one part with another in that which MOST *of them* affirm to be *de fide;* the great differences which are commenced among their adversaries, abusing the liberty of prophesying unto a very great licentiousness; their happiness of being instruments in converting divers nations; the advantages of monarchical government, the benefit of which, *as well as the inconveniences (which, though they feel, they consider not)* they daily do enjoy; the piety and the austerity of their religious orders of men and women; the single life of their priests and bishops; the riches of their church; the severity of their fasts and their exterior observances; the great reputation of *their* FIRST *bishops* for faith and sanctity; the known holiness of some of those persons whose institutes the religious persons PRETEND TO IMITATE; *their miracles*, FALSE OR TRUE, SUBSTANTIAL OR IMAGINARY; the casualties and accidents that have happened to their adversaries, *which, being chances of humanity, are attributed to several causes, according as* THE FANCIES *of men and their* INTERESTS *are pleased or satisfied;* the temporal felicity of their professors; the oblique arts and indirect proceedings of *some* of those who departed from them; and, amongst many other things, the names of heretic and schismatic, which they, *with infinite pertinacity*, fasten upon all that disagree from them; these things, and divers others, may, very easily, persuade persons of much reason and more piety to retain that which they know to have been the religion of their forefathers, which had actual possession and seizure of men's understandings before the opposite professions had a name; and so much the rather, because religion *hath more advantages upon the fancy and affections* than it hath upon philosophy and severe discourses; and, therefore, is the more easily persuaded upon such grounds as these, *which are more apt to amuse than to satisfy the understanding.*"

Well might Mr. French cry out—"a noble concession by Dr. Jeremy Taylor!" So it is, as Mr. French has manufactured it; but is it so as Bishop Taylor wrote it? If so, why need Mr. French have altered it? What would be said of a lawyer, like Mr. French, who should thus manufacture his proofs, in pleading a cause in a court? And was the question Mr. French was then discussing less deserving of a regard to truth?

But, after all, Mr. French felt in a difficulty. If so great a man as Bishop Taylor did really thus prove that the religion of Rome was true, how came it that Bishop Taylor never became a Romanist? Hear Mr. French's answer (page 383)—"I can give you one satisfactory reason for it. There are few men who have a contempt for earthly lucre, disregarding the silver and the gold, and all chance of worldly prosperity. *Scarcely had a month elapsed after writing that* when he was promoted to a bishopric of Ireland, and *from that moment* he drew forth his pen with the utmost virulence against the Catholic religion." What will our readers say to this, when we tell them that that book was first published by Bishop Taylor in 1647, FOURTEEN YEARS before he was made a bishop, and that it was republished by Bishop Taylor himself in 1664, three years *after* he was made a bishop!

We shall presently give Bishop Taylor's own answer to those who tried to use that book as Mr. French has done; but first we must examine another great Roman Catholic controversialist who has quoted Bishop Taylor. This was Dr. Milner, a Roman Catholic bishop in England, who lived about thirty-five years ago, the author of a book called "The End of Controversy," a favourite text book still with those who argue on that side. In part 3, letter 36, Bishop Milner says—"The celebrated Bishop of Down, Dr. Jeremy Taylor, reasons with equal fairness where he says—"The object of their (the Catholics') adoration in the sacraments, is the only true and eternal God, hypostatically united with his holy humanity, which humanity they believe actually present under the veil of the sacrament. And if they thought him not present, they are so far from worshipping the bread, that they profess it idolatry to do so. This is demonstration that the soul has nothing in it that is idololatrical; the will has nothing in it but what is a great enemy to idolatry." Dr. Milner gives this as Bishop Taylor's own reasoning, HIS OWN demonstration that it is not idolatry to worship the host. But Bishop Milner treated Taylor much as Mr. French has done: he, too, cut out of the middle of the passage these words—"If their confidence and fanciful opinion hath engaged them upon so great a mistake, as without doubt it hath. . . ."

But Bishop Milner must have known well, that in that very chapter Bishop Taylor had protested that he was *not* going "to consider the truth or falsity of the doctrines," but only whether the men who hold such doctrines should be tolerated or persecuted in a Protestant state. To excuse the men as much as he could, in order to gain toleration and safety for them, Bishop Taylor stated their own arguments, to move Protestants to pity, not to persecute, those who were deceived by such arguments. And Bishop Milner was not ashamed to represent these arguments as Bishop Taylor's own reasoning on the matter!

But we have Bishop Taylor's own answer to such quotations from this book. He published a second edition of it in his "Polemical Discourses," in 1657, ten years after its first publication, and in the preface of that late edition he says—"If any one made ill use of it, it was more than I allowed or intended to him; but so *all kindness may be abused:* but if a criminal be allowed counsel, *he would be scorned* if he should avow his advocate as the *real patron* of his crime, when he only says what he can *to alleviate the sentence.*" This is Bishop Taylor's *own* answer to those who quote his book as Dr. Milner, Mr. French, and the nameless writer who deceived "W. C. Search" have done!

But even this was not enough. About the year 1664, a Roman Catholic controversialist, John Sergeant, tried again to use this book of Bishop Taylor's in the same way, and Bishop Taylor answered him thus, in the introduction to the second part of his "Dissuasive from Popery"—

"There are some of your propositions for which there is no probable reason or fair pretence in the world: nothing that can handsomely or ingeniously deceive a man; such as is your half communion, worship of images, prayers not understood, and some others . . . But it seems 'J. S.' knows my mind for this; and in my 'Liberty of Prophesying' my own words (he says) will, 'beyond all confute, evince it, that they have probabilities, and those strong ones too.' But now, in my conscience, this was unkindly done, that when I had spoken for them what I could, and more than I knew that they had ever said for themselves, and yet to save them harmless from the iron hand of a tyrant and unreasonable power,* to keep them from being persecuted for their errors and opinions, that they should take the arms I had lent them for their defence, and throw them at my head! But the best of it is, though 'J. S.' be unthankful, yet the weapons themselves *are but wooden daggers*, intended only to represent how the poor men are cozened by themselves; and that, *under fair and fraudulent pretences*, even pious, well-meaning men, and men wise enough *in other things*, may be abused; and though what I said was *but tinsel and pretence, imagery and whipt cream*, yet I could not be blamed to use no better than *the best their cause would bear:* and yet, if that be the best they have to say for themselves, their probabilities will soon be outbalanced by one Scripture testimony urged by Protestants, and 'thou shalt not worship any graven image' will outweigh all the best and fairest imaginations of their Church. . . . . 'J. S.' might, if he pleased, have considered that I did not intend to make that harangue to represent that the Roman religion had probabilities of being true, *but probabilities that the religion might be tolerated.*"

We leave it to our readers now to judge—1st, of the *honesty* of those who quote Bishop Taylor in support of Romanism; 2nd, how hard it must be to find arguments in its favour, when its defenders have to go to Bishop Taylor for them, and have to use such arts to try and represent him as speaking in its favour; and, 3rd, what hope they can entertain of being guided into truth by those that use falsehood and fraud to keep men in the religion of the Church of Rome.

* Bishop Taylor means Cromwell.

A FEW WORDS ABOUT PRAYERS IN AN UNKNOWN TONGUE.

'Oir an dé labhrar a dteanguidh [coimhdighe] ní pé daoinibh labhrar pé, acht pe Dia: dír ní duigeann éanduine [é]; bíodh go labhrann pé fúinduimhrad ran priopruidh; Acht an dé do ghní páisdeadóireacht ar pé daoinibh labhrar pé [dum] pollamnuighthe, [dum] teagairg, 7 [dum] cómhfurtachta. An dé labhrar a dteanguidh [coimhdighe] ar é péin pollumnuighear pé; acht anse do ghnípáisdeadóireacht pollamnuighidh pé an eagluir. [Agur] anoir, a dearbhraithreacha, da dtigidh mé dhagaidh ag labhairt pé teanguidh, creud é an pocar do dheanad dhíbh, muna labhra mé rith a bhfoillsiughadh, nó a neolar, nó ab-páisdeadóireacht, nó a dteagairg? Tuilleadh eile fós na néide gan anam do ghní puaim, már píob nó claidheach, muna ndéanna riad eidirdhealughadh ann a ngachúis, cionnus do gheabthar a fhios creud fíntear dír an bhfoh nó dír an gclaidhfidh? Mar an gcéadna má beir an tromra puaim neimhdhinte uadh, cia ullmhcochar é péin dum catha? Ar dímluid rin ridhre, muna labharthaoi bhriathra fódhuighriona trér an dteanguidh, cionnus aitheontar an nidh labhartar? dír ir dá an naidhe labheorar rith. Acháid, (do réir mair thabla ann), an oiread rin do ghnéithibh gothan na dhúthan, 7 ní [bhuil] éanghúth dhíobh gan déill. Uime rin muna dtuigthe me bhfuil an gótha, biaidh mé barbartha ag an té labhrar agus [biaidh] an-té labhrar barbartha agumpa. Uime rin an té labhrar a dteanguidhe [coimhdighe] guidheadh pé go madh éidir leir nídh-eidirdhinnidhadh. 'Oir má ghní upnuighe a dteanguidh [coimhdighe], do ghní mo prioprad upnuighe, gidheadh atá mo thuigsi neamhthorthach. Creud eile maitheadh? do dheana mé upnuighe rir an priopruidh, gidheadh do dheana mé upnuighe rir an dtuigsi mar an gcéadna: do dheana mé ceol rir an priopruidh, ach fós do dheana mé ceol rir an dtuigsi. Nó má beir tú buidheachar rir an priopruidh, cionnus a dhéanuidh an té atá a náit an tuata Amén pé breith buidheachair thuigsi, 7 nach fear dó creud a deir tú? Oir go deimhin ar maith leapar tuga buidheachar, gidheadh tí fágail neach eile a pollamnughadh. beirim a buidhe pém' Dia, gur mó labhruim do theanguidh ná rith uile; Gidheadh do b'fhéidir leam túig focail maille rem thuigsi do labhairt fa neagluir, dum daoineadh eile do theaguirg mar an gcéadna. na deid nile focail a dteanguidh [coimhdighe]. A dhearbhraithreacha, na bígidh bur leinn a dtuigsi: acht a dtaoth bhrochlóine bígidh bur leinn, gidheadh a

ocuigpo bigió poippo. Cèv an cóó acá ainbreapac bloó ainbpéapac.

Editor—If any of our friends do not understand the above, upon the first reading, we advise them to look it over again carefully; and if they be not thereby edified, let them then consult St. Paul's 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, chap. xiv., in some known tongue, for a satisfactory explanation.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

The letter of Mr. Power is in type, but our want of space and its great length oblige us to postpone it. We would earnestly request our valued correspondents, both Roman Catholic and Protestant, to limit the length of their communications, which would not only prevent disappointment to themselves, but greatly increase the facility of insertion in a periodical so limited in space as the Catholic Layman. *We would suggest that a variety of distinct topics should not be discussed in one letter, if the object be to facilitate discussion and really elicit truth.*

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st.

No anonymous letter can be attended to. Whatever is sent for insertion must be authenticated by the name and address of the writer, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee for his good faith.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, NOVEMBER, 1852.

We beg to inform our readers that it is our intention, at the close of the year, to supply such of them as have preserved the Catholic Layman with a neat title-page and index for the year 1852, free of expense. A few back numbers, to complete sets, may still be had, on application to the publisher; price threepence each.

Among the many proofs afforded by the last few years of the extent to which religious inquiry has seized upon the minds of the present generation, perhaps there is none stronger than the movement that has grown up in Northern Italy for ecclesiastical reformation. Hitherto a certain degree of silence has been observed with reference to it, we presume because it was thought unadvisable to excite hostility by a premature disclosure of the extent to which that movement had gone. But as the "*Univers*," the paper which, in France, is the recognised organ of Ultramontanism, has, in a recent article, called the attention of its readers to the subject, there can be no longer any object in withholding from our readers the facts which have come to our knowledge.

Some years ago, we understand, a few clerical students, at an Italian university, devoted themselves, earnestly and diligently, to the study of the Bible. Afterwards, having entered upon their duties as priests of the Roman Catholic Church, they drew their teachings solely from the Holy Scripture, and passed by, in silence, those pretended traditions which could not be traced to the primitive Church, by which men had corrupted its holy precepts. Their preaching soon won its way to the hearts of their Italian congregations, and filled to overflowing the churches in which their ministry was exercised. Soon other priests in their neighbourhood began to inquire by what charm these young men had succeeded in attracting such large congregations; and finding that the wonderful spell employed was the simple preaching of the Gospel, as taken from the Holy Scriptures, they were induced first to listen, then to study, and at length to pursue the same course themselves. Gradually the circle widened, and a movement, which had commenced with two or three, now comprised hundreds. Impressed deeply with the difficulties of their position—feeling strongly that all great changes, to be healthy and enduring, should proceed from within rather than from without—these men have worked diligently for some years to spread around them the knowledge of true religion, and in this manner to prepare the minds of their flocks for the rejection of those innovations which the Church of Rome has so largely introduced. Believing that so long as they were permitted to preach the pure Gospel to their people, they might conscientiously retain their position as ministers of the church in which they had been brought up, they have not renounced communion with the Church of Rome, and still indulge the hope that the spread of the knowledge of the truth will lead all to join heartily in that reformation which they are so anxious to effect. It was under these circumstances that they sent over one of their number to London, for the purpose of consultation with members of the Church of England. To that application it appears that the following reply has been made:—

"To the most honourable Priests and Deacons of the Catholic Church of Lombardy and Venice, followers of the most pure doctrine of Holy Writ, and of the ancient Fathers, some priests of the Reformed Anglican Church, greeting in Christ:

"Our soul was filled with unspeakable joy when we learned, both from your letters, which your interpreter and friend, our honourable colleague, the Abbe Cassiano di Col, professor of theology, gave us to read, as also from his own lips, what progress the restoration of the Catholic doctrine had made amongst you. The principal and continual object of all our thoughts is to lead back the minds of men to the Holy Scriptures and to the customs of the most ancient churches. This is why we deem it of the highest importance that there should be elsewhere distinguished personages, whose sentiments coincide with our own on this point, and whose desires and labours should be consecrated to do that which our ancestors believed, willed, and performed three centuries since. We are convinced that it is by divine inspiration that, without aid from without, without having received our counsel, without any participation on our part, without our even being aware of it, you have spontaneously entered into the same path of salvation as ourselves, professing, like us, veneration for the Scriptures, respect for the Catholic Fathers, and moderation in the work undertaken, to renew the state of the church, discipline, and faith.

"Not to make our letter unnecessarily long, we shall content ourselves with pointing our three pricipal things which demonstate how perfectly united we are with you in the same sentiments (*sampsukoito euphronountes*).

"We believe, then, what you confess yourselves—

"1. That the best interpreter, in the explanation of the Holy Scriptures, is the primitive church, which faithfully extracted the Catholic Church from the canonical books of the Old and New Testament, and which has defined and consecrated, for the perpetual use of the faithful, the rule of faith in the three symbols of the Apostles, of Nicea, and Athanasia.

"2. Secondly, as regards the performance of Divine worship and the sacred rituals, we believe that the diverse churches, offsprings of the universal Church, ought one and all to study the most ancient liturgies, and, after purging them of all the errors which the lapse of time might have introduced, after abolishing the useless ceremonies, and having re-established all the practices of the primitive worship, appropriate, without delay, those liturgies to the usages of our time, and put them in every country into a vulgar tongue.

"3. Finally, we believe that every rightly constituted church has always preserved three orders of ordained ministers—bishops, priests, and deacons; and that these three orders, descending from the Apostles themselves in uninterruped series, have always been, by Divine goodness, transmitted and continued in the midst of the faithful.

"This is why, most reverend sirs, we entertain an ardent desire to behold always maintained between the evangelical truth and the apostolic institutions that concord, that harmony of tendencies, which founded the Anglican Churches and caused them to flourish. May it please the most merciful God to ordain that you may renew the primitive purity in such guise, that love of innovation may not take root in the republic, and that there may not be seen in the Church schismatics, heresiarchs, rationalists, nor atheists. Follow the doctrine, the worship, and the government (*politeia*) of the primitive Church, in such manner as not to give any just grounds of suspicion to the civil magistrates nor to the people any occasion of creating disorder. Should it ever come to pass that Northern Italy, that land so fruitful so rich, so illustrious in intellectual works, in works of art, and in works of piety, in which respect it is surpassed by no other country—if it should ever come to pass that, mindful of its ancient glory, and extirpating the two weeds which have grown up in pseudo-Catholic Rome—superstition and infidelity—it should return fully to the Gospel of Christ, oh! then, what joy for the only Church, yours and ours!

"Given at London, at the London College, on the 15th of March, 1852.

"William Hale Hale, A.M., Archdeacon and Canon of the Cathedral Church of London.

"John Sinclair, A.M., Archdeacon of Middlesex.

"Richard William Jelf, S.T.P., Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, and President of the College of London.

"Alexander M'Caul, S.T.P., Prebendary of the Metropolitan Church, and Professor of Hebrew at King's College.

"Richard Burgess, B.D., Prebendary of the Metropolitan Church of London, and Curate of Chelsea.

"John David Glennie, M.A., Secretary of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge."

Upon this letter *The Univers* thus comments—

"It is not long since that the actually reigning Sovereign Pontiff gave serious warnings to Italy respecting the underhand efforts made by heterodoxy to establish itself among us, and thereby to deprive us of the unity of the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman faith, perhaps the only blessing, but certainly the greatest, which remains to us. The most clear-sighted of our Pontiffs have, on various occasions, repeated those same warnings, and have endeavoured to point out their great importance. Some honest-minded men, however, would only behold in them the effects of a panic; and on their side, the seducers, in their perfidious hypocrisy, made them the objects of their calumnies, and have represented them as dictated by a cunning knavery. Numerous facts, nevertheless, bring with them daily the conviction that those fears are but too well founded, and assuredly the one most worthy of attention is that revealed by the document of which we subjoin the tenor. It will be seen that, among the most distinguished members of one of the most remarkable and edifying clergies of Italy, there are some who have endeavoured to establish relations with an assembly of Anglican dignitaries, and who receive the communications of that society with a view to operate a religious reform in Italy similar to that affected in England three centuries since. Can anything be more clear or peremptory? At the foot of this document, accompanied with their Christian names and titles, are affixed the names of those who thus offer a hand to the Italians to aid them in this pious work. As regards the names of those to whom it is addressed, they are inscribed in a book in which we are not allowed to read. But the names of the apostates, and of those who betray the faith, will resound in a terrible manner at the day of judgment.

"We have the certitude that this document is authentic, and yet we hesitated about making it public. After mature reflection we decided to do so. It is never useless to convince of the reality of danger those who are exposed to be its victims, those who are to be put upon their guard, and especially those whose duty it is to take efficacious steps to obviate it. On the other hand, it must not be thought that such measures are taken without urgent necessity, and it is, therefore, of importance to make known the facts which modify and justify them. And we are of the opinion that there is nothing better suited to attain that object than the publication of a document which enables us to place our finger, as it were, upon the danger which threatens us, and which is much nearer to us than many too confident persons are willing to believe."

In the above document, and bitter comment of the *Univers* upon it, we have a striking and satisfactory evidence of the extent and importance of this Italian movement; and may we not hope, that if not stayed by the interference of the temporal power, ere long a truly national reformed Italian Church may arise, retaining in its organization, in its ritual, and in its discipline those distinctive characteristics which suit the warm and impassioned inhabitants of a southern clime; drawing its doctrines and its teaching, pure and unadulterated, from the living fountain of God's Word, and leaving for ever the broken cisterns of man's creation? With such a church we could, indeed, unite in the bonds of brotherhood. And there may then be that real unity among Christian Churches, for attainment of which so many have sighed in vain; not such a forced unity as that of Rome, which, as in the monstrous productions of nature, binds the living to

the dead; but that unity which arises from a common faith and a common object—a unity which finds its strongest bond in the pursuit of the same object, through diversity of means. It is such an union as this that might exist between us and a reformed Italian Church. And if such were established, although unwilling to mix up any mere political speculation with such a subject, we may be excused if we add the hope, that the establishment of a reformed National Church would be but the forerunner of the re-admission of Italy, free and united within itself, into the great brotherhood of independent nations.

We are sure our readers will cordially respond to the sentiments contained in the letter of Mr. Leyne to Sergeant Shee, which we reprint, as an act of justice to the character and feelings of the educated Roman Catholics of Ireland. The case referred to is that of Francesco and Rosa Madiai, at Florence, which has excited so much public attention, and appears to have been simply as follows:—

They are husband and wife, and, though of irreproachable character, were arrested on the 17th of August, 1851, on the charge of being Protestants, and, as such, reading the Bible, and endeavouring to induce others to do the same; and the charge was summed up by accusing them of impiety and proselytism. On these charges they were at length brought to trial, on the 4th of June, 1852 (having been detained in prison, unheard, during the whole of the intervening period), and were found *guilty* of having read the Scriptures, and of worshipping God in a way not prescribed by the Church of Rome. There was no suspicion or imputation of moral or political criminality attaching to the case. The public prosecutor frankly declared at the trial that there was no such accusation whatever, and that the prosecution was wholly and avowedly for their opposition to the religion of the Established Church of Tuscany. Upon this charge the Madiais were condemned by the Corte Regia of Florence, the husband to 56 months of imprisonment with hard labour, at Volterra, and the wife, to 45 months' imprisonment, with three years more of police surveillance. And this sentence, on appeal, was affirmed by the Supreme Court of Florence.

Mr. Leyne's spirited letter is as follows:—

"TO SERGEANT SHEE, M.P.

"Upper Buckingham-street, Dublin,

"October 29, 1852.

"SIR,—I ask permission to address you a few words in reference to an occurrence which took place at the Catholic Conference in the Rotundo on yesterday.

"I was present on a ticket furnished to me as a member of the public press, and, therefore, could take no part in the discussion of any topic brought before the conference, else I should have yielded to my desire to remark upon the allusion you made to the case of the Madiai.

"As a Catholic and an Irishman, I was delighted at your bold and vehement denunciation of the barbarous tyranny of the Grand Duke of Tuscany. I was glad that at this moment, and in that Catholic assembly, one Irish representative had the manliness and honesty to express sentiments so just and noble.

"It is, indeed, an abominable and impious doctrine that men are to be imprisoned for religious opinions, and chastised for maintaining any form of doctrine, or for reading any work bearing on religious questions. But the notion that it is a crime for any man to read the Word of God in his private house is a theory so false, foul, and unholy, that one can only wonder how it can gain supporters amongst the followers of any religion who have for three centuries battled against persecutions and proscription of the exact nature of the oppression you denounced. The Catholics of Ireland hold no such intolerant faith.

"It surely was not a greater tyranny for the British Government to prohibit the exercise of the Catholic faith in Ireland than for this black despot of the South to forbid his subjects the privilege of reading the Scriptures in their homes for their own private edification. The old penal laws form an exact precedent for the intolerant Cour Royale of Florence.

"It has been argued, I understand, in justification of the conduct of the Duke of Tuscany, that, as a Catholic Sovereign, he had a perfect right to prevent the circulation of the particular book for the perusal of which the Madiai have been subjected to penalties. I know not whether this teaching be a heresy, but it is a startling and monstrous dogma—one which would justify, in an extended application, the bloody propagandism of Mahomet or of Cromwell, and strip conscience of all privilege and volition. As a Catholic I refuse to swallow it. If a Catholic rob me, I hand him over to justice—if he assault me, I will defend myself. If a Catholic prince use despotic power and trample upon a people, are we to be told that the church will sanction the tyranny because the aggressor is a Catholic? Sir, it is a libel on Catholic truth, and a disgrace to people to have such abominable tenets paraded as the teaching of the church.

"Believe it, sir, that the genuine opinion of every man in Ireland who loves liberty, political and religious, goes with you upon this question.

"No statement of this case that has been brought before the public disproves the fact you represented.

"And I trust in God that, as long as Ireland is Catholic, we shall ever steadily hate the odious doctrines which justify religious persecution, and that men shall be found honest and courageous enough to condemn the acts of the tyrant, whether Catholic or Protestant, and to express sympathy with his victims.

"I have the honour to be, sir, your faithful servant,

"M. R. LEYNE."

(From the *Cork Southern Reporter*.)

"Every friend of liberty will read with pleasure the manly, energetic speech of Sergeant Shee. His noble denunciation of the outrageous violation of the principle of civil and religious liberty, in the case of the Madiais, will find an echo in the hearts of all who love freedom and hate oppression. It was absolutely necessary that some person in the Conference should, on the part of the Catholics of Ireland, proclaim to the world their detestation of the tyranny perpetrated at Florence in the name of religion. Sergeant Shee did the thing at the right time and in the right way. Though the editor of the *Tablet* had the baseness to stand up in an assembly met to promote religious equality, and defend the crime of the Tuscan Government, no one can charge the Catholics of Ireland with participating in his odious opinions. He stands alone. We could almost wish to see him in some country where his own principle of toleration could be applied to himself. This man is doing all he can, and very effectually too, to bring the Catholics of Ireland into discredit and disgrace."

Correspondence.

THE SILENCE OF SCRIPTURE RESPECTING THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY.

SIR—Your correspondent, "One who loves to hear the Truth," is surprised that you should have published an article showing how little the Bible tells us of the "life of the Blessed Virgin." He admits that a fact so notorious as the silence of Scripture about the Blessed Virgin has engaged the attention of learned Roman Catholics, and that they have accounted for it. Your correspondent's words are remarkable—"The Scriptures, you (Mr. Editor) say, tell us little or nothing about the Blessed Virgin Mary; they are wholly silent about her from the time of our Lord's ascension. Quite true, sir; but learned Roman Catholics have noticed that fact as well as you, and accounted for it," &c., &c. He then quotes several passages from Roman Catholic writers, which entirely bear out his assertion, that the Scriptures really do say little or nothing of the Blessed Virgin Mary. With this conclusion neither you (Mr. Editor) nor I are prepared to combat. But, unfortunately, on this, as on many other questions, amongst Romanists themselves, opinions are divided. I do not recognise among the list furnished by your correspondent any *canonized saint* or Pope. St. Bonaventure, a canonized saint, who holds a prominent place in the Romish calendar, writes—"Omnes scripturæ loquuntur de ea."—*Serm.* 13 *in Hex.* This passage I find quoted with the greatest approbation in Saint Liguori's "Glories of Mary"—thus "the *whole of* the Sacred Scriptures speak in praise of Mary." The words "*in praise*" are our interpretation; the original passage as given by Bonaventure, is inserted in a note at foot of the page. Now, the authority of Liguori is undoubted. We know that all his works, and the "Glories of Mary" in particular, underwent twenty years' strict examination by the most competent authorities of the Church of Rome, being the "Secret Congregation of Rights," of which the Pope is president. They unanimously declared that *not one word of his writings was worthy of censure.* According to Saints Bonaventure and Liguori, the Pope, and all the sacred college, "the whole of the Sacred Scriptures speak of her"—plain contradiction to the assertion of the authorities quoted by your correspondent.

The edition of Liguori from which I quote is, or ought to be, of the very greatest authority; it is the only edition which bears the *signature* of authority; the date is 1852, and purported to be "printed for the Redemptorist Fathers of St. Mary's, Clapham" (p. 6); and CARDINAL WISEMAN thus recognises this edition—"We hereby approve of this translation of the 'Glories of Mary,' and *cordially recommend it to the faithful.* Nicholas, Cardinal Wiseman, Archbishop of Westminster, given at Westminster, on the Feast of St. Alphonsus de Liguori, 1852."

I now leave your correspondent to reconcile as he best may these contradictory statements.

I am, sir,

Your most obedient servant,

October 19, 1852. C. H. COLLETTE.

THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Allow me to correct a mistake which you have made in your last number, page 109, where you say that "the dogma of the immaculate conception has been at length declared, by the successor of St. Peter, to be an article of faith." This is not the case. You were probably deceived by the facts, that the church observes a festival in honour of the immaculate conception, and that she makes mention of it in her prayers; and also, that the present Pope has taken into consideration the propriety of affirming the doctrine more solemnly. But, as far as I am aware, he has not yet done so, and the doctrine is but matter of pious belief, and is not yet an article of faith. It is, perhaps, natural that you Protestants should be careless in this matter; but a Catholic knows that it is extremely important to be accurate in observing the time when any doctrine becomes an article of faith; for, previous to that time, it may be doubted or denied without mortal sin. We all know for example, that St. Bernard is now a saint in heaven, although he opposed this very doctrine of the immaculate conception; but any one who shall deny it after it has once been made an article of faith by the successor of St. Peter would, no doubt, be guilty of damnable sin.

I am, Sir, &c.,

A LOVER OF ACCURACY.

We cheerfully insert this letter, as we have always promised to insert any corrections of misstatements which we may inadvertently have made. The sentence for which our correspondent takes us to task was, perhaps, incautiously worded; but if he will turn to p. 23, he will find that we have proved that, even though the doctrine be not yet formally declared an article of faith, the authorities of the Church of Rome have *practically* made it *de fide* to a large and increasing body in the communion, by sanctioning the festival and office of the immaculate conception.

We have no space here to discuss the question whether the church can make any doctrine *now* an article of faith which was not always so. According to the Roman theory, it would seem as if certain parts of the road to heaven got choked up in the course of ages, and as if the church is obliged occasionally to post "no thoroughfare" on the paths by which saints of old made their way to glory. We believe that it cannot be so necessary to our salvation to believe any doctrines of which the Christians of the first centuries were ignorant, or which they did not know that they were bound to believe. But, as we have said, we cannot discuss this question here.

ALLEGED LOST BOOKS OF SCRIPTURE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—As a constant reader of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, I think it strange that a Roman Catholic "Inquirer" would make so strange a statement as to say that there are twenty books of the Holy Scripture lost. He even surpassed the great Roman Catholic luminary, Doctor Cahill, who could tell the people of Liverpool, in June last, of only seventeen lost books (See M'Cabe's *Telegraph*, 12th June last). I believe, had the doctor read the last number of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN before he delivered his speech, the number would have been still smaller; but I am still astonished that Dr. Cahill and the "Inquirer," Celbridge, men of no small knowledge, would be so little acquainted with the Douay Bible, &c.; for they say that the following books are lost: That of Samuel, Nathan, Gad, Ahias, Iddo, Jeremias, and Jehu, &c. But I would ask them who wrote the book of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles? I do not know what might be their answer, but I know the answer that the Douay annotators give. See the preface to the 1st Book of Samuel, 1st Book of Kings, and the 1st Book of Chronicles, Douay Bible, which explicitly show that these books were not written at one time, nor by one man, but refer to the above-named prophets as being the writers. It is true, the preface to the 1st Book of Chronicles says that the present Books of Chronicles are not the ancient Chronicles, or words of the days, &c.; but the writer has to acknowledge, at the end, that they are the same books, only revised and abridged by Ezra. Now, Ezra is the acknowledged arranger of the canon of Scripture (*i.e.*, the Old Testament)—an opinion which the Jews have always maintained, and in which the Christian Church has universally concurred. Dr. Prideaux, Dean of Norwich, gives a full and learned account of the work which Ezra is admitted to have performed. "Ezra," says the doctor, "corrected all the errors which

had crept into previous copies, through the negligence or mistake of transcribers; he collected together all the books of which the Holy Scriptures then consisted, and disposed them in proper order, settling the canon of Scriptures for his time; he added, in several places throughout the various books, what appeared necessary for illustrating, connecting, or completing them, wherein he was assisted by the same Holy Spirit by whose influence they were at first written. He changed the old names of places, grown obsolete," &c. So I believe the Books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles were divided into sections, before Ezra's revision, every section or part, each part bearing the writer's name; in proof of which I would refer the "Inquirer" to the first Book of Samuel. There we are told that Samuel is the writer as far as the 25th chapter, &c.; so it is reasonable to believe that Ezra, in his revision, would leave out those names, and unite the sections into consistent volumes, &c., to the end that they might be the better preserved, for the "grass withereth, the flower fadeth, but the Word of our God shall stand for ever."—Isaiah xl. 8. Again, "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass than one tittle of the law to fail or fall."—Luke xvi. 17. I would sincerely hope that the "Inquirer" would meditate over these things, and charitably consider the whole matter; and I firmly believe that he will come to the same conclusion as his well-wishing and humble friend in Christ.

A CONVERT FROM THE CHURCH OF ROME, AND A LAYMAN. C—Y.

THE LETTER OF "AN INQUIRER."

(Continued from our last Number)

That the *traditions* of the Church, then, as well as the written Word of God, are to be accredited, appears to me by the following:—

That our Lord attached importance to the writings of the prophets is clear from Luke xvi. 31—"And he said to them, if they hear not Moses and *the prophets*, neither will they believe if one rise again from the dead;" and, xxv. 27—"And beginning at Moses and *all* the prophets, he expounded to them in *all the Scriptures* the things that were concerning him." Now, our Lord, in expounding to his Apostles all the prophets, must have included those prophetical writings not *now* extant. That the Apostles could not have taught their disciples (and successors) any other doctrines than those received by them; and that, by perpetual succession of lawful pastors, these doctrines—*traditions*—could not be vitiated by the church, and, therefore, to be received by us with equal reverence as the now written Word of God, I shall endeavour to show as far as I can. It will be evident, from the following texts, that the church could not err in what she taught and teaches (I, of course, argue not for her in secular *infallibility*); and, hence, that she must be *infallible*; and if so, how reject her traditions?

1st Thess. ii. 13—"When ye received the word of God, which ye *heard* of us, ye received it not as the *word of men*, but (as it really is) the word of God;" therefore a very fit Rule of Faith, even before it was written? Rom. xvi. 17—"Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which you have learned;" where as yet he had *written* nothing to the Galatians, for where is any such writing? St. Paul also says (Gal. i 6)—"I marvel that so soon you are removed from him who called you into the Grace of Christ unto another gospel"—removed, I say from the faith I delivered, which was true, though *not* a written gospel; and, in verse 8 he says—"Although we or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you than that you ye have received let him be accursed." The Galatians *received* at the time nothing in writing; they had all by *oral tradition*, and yet in verse 9 he says, more vehemently—"As we have said before, so I say now again, if any man preach any other gospel unto you than that you have received, be he accursed." But how, it may be asked, do we know that the traditions which *we have now* are apostolical? (I make no distinction between divine and apostolical tradition.) I answer, that a true Apostolical tradition is handed down by a full *unanimous* report of all Catholic nations, attested by their universal practice and *uniform* doctrine. What is thus delivered is the doctrine of the church diffused, and therefore infallible. Upon this ground alone you and we receive such and such Scripture as canonical, and such and such copies of the Scripture as authentic. The churches *unity* of doctrine all over the world goes also far to prove the infallible source whence she derived her traditions. How explicit are these texts! Psal. lxxxix. 4—"I have made a covenant with my chosen, I have sworn to David, my servant, thy seed will I establish *for ever*, and I will build up my throne to all generations." All which is verified in Christ only, who, in his church (Luke i. 32) "hath given him the seat of David, his father, and he shall reign in the house of Jacob *for ever* and of his kingdom there shall be no end." What a promise of everlasting perpetuity to his church! And, lest anyone should think that his promise might be made void by any sins of hers, or to be made only on condition of their walking in his commandments, we find in the same Psalm, 27, 37—"And I will put him, the first begotten, high above the kings of the earth; I will keep my mercy unto him for ever, and my testament faithful unto him. I will put his seed *for ever and ever*, and his throne as the days of heaven. But if his children shall forsake my law (this cannot possibly be of the elect), and will not walk in my judgments; if they will profane my justices, and not keep my commandments, I will visit their iniquities with a rod, and their sins with stripes." He does not threaten that he would allow them to fall into *doctrinal error;* but "my *loving kindness* I will not *take away* from him, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail. My covenant will I not break, nor the thing which is gone out of my lips. Once have I sworn in my holiness, if I lie to David, his seed shall continue for ever, and his throne as the sun in my sight, and as the moon *perfect* for ever." Observe how *perfect* the church was to be preserved, and, consequently, incapable of *error!* The above promises were made of Christ, "the son of David, the son of Abraham."—Matt. i. 1.

Isaiah is full to this purpose. Chap. xlix., 14, 16—"And Zion said, our Lord hath forsaken me, and our Lord hath forgotten me. Why can a woman forget her infant, that she will not have pity on the son of her womb? And if *she should forget*, yet *I will not forget thee*. Behold I have written thee in my hands." And liv. 9, 12—"As in the days of Noah is this thing to me, to whom I swore I would bring in no more the waters of Noah upon the earth: so have I sworn not to be angry with thee, nor to rebuke thee. For the mountains shall (sooner) be moved, and hills tremble; but my mercy shall not depart from thee, and the covenant of my peace shall not be moved, said our Lord, thy miserator. Poor little one, *shaken with tempest*, without all comfort, behold I will *lay thy stones in order* (to withstand any tempest), and will found thee in sapphires, and I will put the jaspar stone for thy munitions." And, again, lv., 15—"I will make thee the pride of worlds, a joy unto generation and generation." That the church would be made the *pride of worlds*, &c., and allow error to creep into it, would be incompatible with the foregoing word of God. "Iniquity shall be no more heard in thy land, waste and destruction in thy borders, and *salvation* shall occupy thy walls, and praise thy gates." What more salutary than to be confident of the church in which *salvation* is certain? Verse 20—"Thy sun shall go down *no more*, and thy moon shall not be diminished, because the Lord shall be unto thee an *everlasting light*, and the days of thy mourning shall be ended." How could the church have *dark* ages (when error is said to have crept into it) while the Lord himself promised to be to her an everlasting *light*? Here infallibility, therefore, is proved from Scripture, as clearly as a mathematical proposition whose solution is *indirectly* obtained.

To multiply more proofs I think is unnecessary: a few more, however, and I have done. Is. lxii. 3, 6—"Thou shalt be a crown of glory in the hand of our Lord, and the diadem of a kingdom in the hand of thy God. Upon thy walls, Jerusalem, I have placed *watchmen* all the day and all the night; for ever they shall not hold their peace." What clearer proof of the *visibility* of the church, in her watchman and pastors; and v. 12—"Thou shalt be a city sought for and not *forsaken*." How *forsaken* would God's church be if he allowed her to teach error! Again, Jer. xxxiii. 17, 18—"There shall not fail David a man to sit on the throne of Israel, and of the priests and Levites, there shall *not fail* before my face a man to offer holocausts, and to burn sacrifices, and to kill victims all days." Behold, a succession of *lawful priests* still offering sacrifices—expressed by the priests and sacrifices as were then only known; and "If my covenant with the day can be made void with David my servant, that there may not be of him a son (a vicar or vicegerent) to reign in his throne, and the Levites and priests my ministers." Yea, v. 22—"Even as the stars in heaven cannot be numbered, and the sand of the sea be measured, so will I multiply the seed of David, my servant, and the Levites my ministers." The church is above shown to be *visible*, and governed in *perpetual succession by lawful pastors*; here, a son (or vicar) to *reign* in David's throne. Why, then, refuse to admit the *visible head* of the church to be Christ's vicar on earth? And how vast Christ's Church when compared to the "stars in the heaven," and the grains of "sand of the sea!" This passage does not countenance that the Church of Christ could be "a small fold," as the *Vaudois Church* must have been, at least in my opinion.

The points at issue being fundamental ones, you will pardon me if I go a little farther; indeed, my letter has already extended beyond what I first imagined. I will, therefore, draw to as speedy a close as possible. We find Dan. ii. 44, "In the days of those kingdoms the God of heaven shall raise us a kingdom that shall *not be dissipated for ever;* and this kingdom shall not be delivered to another people, and it shall consume all the (idolatrous) kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever in the *quality* of a kingdom." How, unless having a VISIBLE HEAD? To govern this kingdom (the church) "He gave some apostles, some prophets, and other some pastors and doctors," &c., until we meet all in the *unity* of faith, which will not be till the world's end.—Ephes. iv. 11.

How can we doubt the truth of the doctrines by those taught, when in addition to this passage, our Lord himself saith to his apostles (Matth. xxxiii., 20)—"Behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world?" As the Apostles were not to live to the end of the world, it is evident that Christ meant both them and their lawful successors. Therefore, a lawful succession of pastors must needs, in all ages, to the end of time, be found in the church, at least without any considerable interruption, as the foregoing texts also fully prove.

In what other than the ROMAN CHURCH, *then, is this perpetual succession found?* This visible head we designate by the name of Pope—a significant name when its etymology is ascertained to mean "Father."

One text more, and I conclude for the present. That God seems to glory in the multitude of those who confidently resort to the church, as a mistress of assured truth, to be instructed by her, Isaias says (ii. 3.)—"Let us go to the mountain of our Lord, and he will teach us his ways, and we shall walk in his paths, and he shall judge among the nations." Here is a court or tribunal erected in his church to decide controversies. Whose decision is final unless that of a *judge?*

On all these texts I leave you, sir, and the public to decide; and again requesting that you will not look on this as emanating from me in any other than the *most friendly feeling*,

I remain, sir, yours, &c.,
AN INQUIRER.

Celbridge, June 24, 1852.

If the Celbridge "Inquirer" had read more carefully what we have written about tradition and Scripture, he might have left out some of his letter.

In our article on the "Rule of Faith," in our number for June, on which the "Inquirer" comments, we said—"We know perfectly well that a doctrine is in itself neither more nor less the Word of God for being written or unwritten. We are fully aware that the doctrines now contained in Scripture were for some time unwritten traditions. We are, consequently, quite prepared to receive as authoritative and obligatory any unwritten tradition, provided it can be shown, by unquestionable proof, to be derived from an inspired origin."

We do not see how it is any answer to this to bring forward 1 Thes., c. 2, v. 13, and many other passages of Scripture, to prove that what inspired Apostles *spoke* was of as great authority as what they *wrote*. That, surely, is no proof against what we have said.

What we want to know is this—Are we sure that what the Pope and the Roman Church say now *was said* by the Apostles? We do *not* insist on its being shown to us that the Apostles *wrote it*. If any one can show us that they *said it*, that will be enough for the argument in hand. What we want is proof of the fact that they said it; we do not want proof that their saying it was as good as their writing it; though even on that point we may have something to say hereafter. For instance, take this article of the Creed of Pope Pius IV.:—"I confess that *under one kind only* (*i.e.*, bread or wine alone) whole and entire Christ, and a true Sacrament, is taken and received." We know that the Pope, and the Council of Trent, and the modern Roman Church do say this. WE KNOW, also, that the Roman Church, for 1200 years, did *not* say it (see our June number, page 63). We want to know, "Is this an apostolical tradition?" Can any one give us proof that the Apostles said this? We do not ask for proof that they *wrote* it; we *know* they did not write it. But if any one can prove to us that they *said* it, we are willing to admit that it is true. If no one can give us that proof, we will not believe it.

Is it any answer to this to tell us that what the Apostles *said* is as good as what they wrote? Admitting that, we ask for proof that they did say this; and no one attempts to give us such proof. This is the actual state of the question.

The only proof that the "Inquirer" offers is taken from some of the prophecies, Psalm lxxxix. 4, and Luke i. 32. On these, the "Inquirer" observes—"What a promise of everlasting perpetuity to his church!" Now, we believe in the everlasting perpetuity of Christ's Church. But this is not the question between us and the "Inquirer." We trust the Church of Christ may be perpetual, although the Bishop of Rome, and some other Italian and Spanish bishops, may have fallen into errors at Trent. There was once a church in Africa, the church of Augustine and Optatus, containing, perhaps, 2,000 bishops. That church has ceased to exist centuries ago. Yet; Christ's Church is perpetual. Were all Italy and Spain to become Mahomedan or heathen, like Africa, surely Christ would still have a church on earth. And if the total destruction of the Italian Church would not destroy the perpetuity of Christ's Church, much less can her errors do so.

The "Inquirer" quotes, also, Psalm lxxxviii. 31, Douay Bible ("Inquirer's" reference is not correct)—"If his children shall forsake my law, and will not walk in my judgments—if they will profane my justices, and not keep my commandments, I will visit their iniquities with a rod, and their sins with stripes." Does this prove that they *cannot* forsake his law, or depart from his commandments? It seems to us rather to

prove that they can. Will the "Inquirer," or any one else, say that the Popes have never departed from God's law, or refused to walk in his judgments? If any one will venture to say this, we will answer him by printing some extracts from Cardinal Baronius, the most approved historian of the Church of Rome.

Our "Inquirer" relies very much on the prophecies of Isaiah. We will not follow him into all his passages. We ask for proof that these prophecies were intended to apply to the church in her present state. We know that the Church of Christ is to exist hereafter in a glorified and triumphant state. We know that there are many prophecies which describe her as she shall be in that state. But the "Inquirer" seems to forget this entirely; and every prophecy which he finds about her he applies to the church in its present state, without considering to what state it was intended to apply.

He quotes Isaiah liv. He does not quote verse 7—"For a small moment have I forsaken thee, but with great mercies will I gather thee." With God 1000 years are but as a day, and it is no more, in comparison of the eternal destiny of his church. Will "Inquirer" say that the church cannot err, during the time, long or short, of which this verse speaks? He quotes verse 12—"I will lay thy stones in order, and found thee in sapphires, and I will put the jasper stone for thy munitions." We ask him to compare this with Apocalypse, or Revelation, ch. xxi., v. 19, &c., and consider to what state of the church this prophecy is to be applied.

Again, he quotes Isaiah, ch. lx., v. 18, as describing the *present* state of the Church of Rome—"INIQUITY shall be no more heard in thy land, waste and destruction in thy borders; and salvation shall occupy thy walls, and praise thy gates."

Is Rome without *iniquity*? Have her own historians never said that many successive Popes were monsters of iniquity, who filled her city and her land with their crimes? and was this the time of which the prophet said —"Iniquity shall be no more heard in thy land?" Or was there no waste or destruction in her borders, when, but two years ago, Rome was besieged and taken by a French army?

Does not "An Inquirer" see that if these prophecies were indeed spoken of the Church of Rome, in her present state, they prove that she is *without sin*, as well as without error? If these prophecies prove that the Pope cannot err, they prove also that he cannot sin. We believe all Roman Catholics will admit that he can sin, like other men; and in admitting this they admit that these prophecies are not spoken of him.

Again, he applies verse 20 to the Roman Church in her present state—"Thy sun shall go down no more, and thy moon shall not be diminished, because the Lord shall be unto thee an everlasting light, and the days of thy mourning shall be ended."

The whole of this verse evidently applies to one and the same time, whenever that time shall be. Do the last words refer to the *present* or a *future* time?

We answer this from two encyclical letters, one published by Pope Gregory XVI., in 1832—"We come now to another *most abundant source of evils*, with which *we grieve to see the church afflicted*;" the other, that of Pope Pius IX., dated 21st November, 1851, announcing the new Jubilee—"In the midst of the incessant and painful solicitudes with which *the calamity of the times overwhelms us*, ... it is for us no slight subject of sorrow to behold what *a sad and lamentable spectacle is presented by our holy religion*, and civil society, *in those calamitous times*." Does the Pope grieve thus over the church in that time of which the prophet said, "the days of thy mourning shall be ended?"

We think not; we think that these are the days of mourning, and so thought Pope Gregory XVI., and we see from the above that Pope Pius IX. thinks so too. And so we take it for certain that these prophecies relate to a future, and not to the present state of the church. And comparing this verse of Isaiah with Apocalypse, or Revelation, ch. xxi., v. 23, we find that this prophecy is to be accomplished in the New Jerusalem; and we find, from v. 4, that the time shall be when "God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and death shall be no more, nor mourning, nor crying, nor sorrow shall be any more, for the former things are passed away."

Sad would it be, indeed, for the Church of God, if she could hope for no better fulfilment of these glorious prophecies than what can be found in the present condition of the Church of Rome.

The "Inquirer" seems to apply to the priests of the Roman Church, Jeremiah xxxiii. 18—"To kill victims all days." Will he tell us what victims they KILL? If they kill none, what claim have they to this prophecy more than we?

He asks why we will refuse to admit the Pope to be Christ's vicar on earth, when Jeremiah, in the place referred to above, says, that David shall never be without "a son (a vicar or vicegerent) to reign in his throne." We answer, simply because St. Luke tells us, ch. i., v 32, that Christ himself is that son, who shall reign in the throne of David for ever. And, therefore, we cannot consent to the "Inquirer" putting in "a vicar or vicegerent" into that prophecy, and into that throne, out of his own head.

He reminds us of Daniel's prophecy, that the kingdom of Christ shall last for ever, and asks—"How, unless having a visible head?" We cannot see that it is beyond the power of Christ to govern his spiritual kingdom without the help of a man to take his place. Christ tells us that his kingdom is not of this world. Why, then, *must* it be governed like the kingdoms of this world? Christ also tells us, "The kingdom of God is within you." Christ has also promised that he himself will dwell in us. We think that Christ dwelling within us is the only proper head of his kingdom, which is within us. *How* can any *man* be the head of that kingdom?

Lastly, he quotes Isaiah ii. 3, saying that *the Lord* shall judge among the nations. That seems to us a good reason for looking to the judgment of the Lord, and seeking for it in his Word. Can he show us where it is said that the Pope shall judge amongst the nations?

We return to the instance we have selected. Did the Apostles say that "whole Christ" was contained in the bread by itself, and also in the wine by itself? We do not ask for proof that the Apostles *wrote* this. We are content to take the proof that they *said* it. Who will give us such proof? And are we expected to believe without proof?

This cannot be proved to us by taking prophecies that describe the church when the days of her mourning shall be ended, and applying them to the days when the Popes themselves are mourning over the afflictions of the church. Let us have proof of the fact that the Apostles *said* this, and we will believe it. Will "An Inquirer" believe it, when he can find no proof of it at all?

We hope our correspondent will receive and consider what we have written as emanating from the same friendly feeling which he expresses towards us at the close of his letter. Would that a like spirit guided all controversy, "with all humility and mildness, with patience, supporting one another in charity, careful to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace." —Ephesians iv., 2 and 3, Douay Bible. "We are all brethren: why should we strive?"—St. Augustine, Op. Tom. iv., p. 102.

ANSWER TO NOTES AND QUERIES.

THE following appears in the September number of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN:—

"NOTES AND QUERIES.

"Can any one explain why, in the Roman Catholic creed, the Creed of Pope Pius the Fourth, the word 'AMEN' is put in the middle, and not at the end? Or is there any other instance in the Catholic Church, since it began, of this word *Amen* being put in the middle of either a profession of faith or a prayer, and not at the end of it?"

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

"A Friend to Truth" wishes to know if he be correct in saying that the Church of Rome does not allow the sacrament of Extreme Unction to a criminal that is to be executed?"

To the first I beg to observe, that in the Roman Ritual, the profession of Catholic Faith, somewhat erroneously called the creed of Pope Pius the Fourth, commences with the NICENE CREED and at the conclusion thereof (the Nicene Creed) the word "AMEN" is put after the last sentence—"the life of the world to come. *Amen*"—as it is to be found in the Book of Common Prayer, and, of course, whenever the Nicene Creed is recited. The remainder is a profession of faith more explanatory and in detail, in which the word *Amen* does not occur *at all*—beginning, middle, or end

"A Friend to Truth" is informed, that had he consulted the general catechisms for the use of schools, he would have learned that the sacrament of Extreme Unction is administered only to such as are in danger of death by *sickness*: consequently, that neither a criminal about to be executed, nor a soldier going to battle is a fit recipient of this sacrament.

One good turn deserves another; will you, therefore, do me a favour in kind, by answering a note and query of my own?

In two late numbers of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN I perceive you have been ingeniously taking a correspondent of yours to task touching the Roman Catholic interpretation of Scripture. This induces me to inquire, among the different interpretations of the Bible put forward by Protestantism, since the Reformation, which is the *true* one, or *where* I can find the sense in which the Protestant Church has held and does hold the Holy Scriptures?

Believing that such an interpretation is somewhat inconsistent with *private judgment*, of which you are so great an advocate, I should not have asked the question at all, were it not that I have it upon the authority of Mr. Napier, in the House of Commons, May 21, 1852, that "*the Church of England has now become an active and living interpreter of God's Word.*"

All very good; but where is its true sense of the Holy Scriptures to be found. Has it ever been *published*?

A FRIEND TO INQUIRY, BECAUSE IT ELICITS TRUTH.

Our correspondent says—"The remainder (of Pope Pius's Creed) is a profession of faith, more explanatory and in detail."

Of *what* is it *explanatory*? Of *what* does it give the details? Is it of the Nicene Creed? If not, what does it explain? This question will probably be treated more at large in future numbers.

To the last question we reply—The Church of England and the Church of Rome do not make *the same claim* as interpreters of Holy Writ. The Church of England claims to be authorized, as an interpreter, to assist men to understand, by aiding the exercise of their own reason. In questions of faith she interprets by the Catholic Creeds, which are the genuine testimonies and tradition of the Church of all ages. She admits no other articles of faith but these. She admits no one to her communion who does not receive these articles. She condemns all interpretations of Scripture contrary to these. In other matters relating to religion, she interprets Scripture by her catechism, her articles, her formularies, the teaching of her authorized ministers. She claims authority thus to interpret, and she claims an attentive hearing, in a tractable spirit; but she does not want any man to submit to these interpretations further than she convinces his understanding.

But the Church of Rome claims a greater authority, of interpreting Scripture, at least in *some* things. She claims a power of interpreting some passages of Scripture so as to make other articles of faith which are not in the ancient Catholic Creeds: she demands us to believe these interpretations, whether the reasons which she gives convince our understandings or not: and she tells us that we shall be damned to all eternity, as heretics, if we do not believe them. In answer to this, we ask her—*What* THESE *interpretations are, and where they are to be found*? and she cannot or will not tell us. We think this a fair question to put to her, and we beg for an answer.

The Church of England does not claim to do *this*, or profess to have done it; and we, therefore, think it unfair and absurd to ask *her* to show where she has done it.

THE POWER OF THE PRIEST.

MR. EDITOR—I live in the west of Mayo, where they say the priest used to be able to turn boys into foxes and hares; but I'm not such a fool as to believe he can do so now; and indeed, I myself was by when one of the *turncoats* dared him to *turn him* into a goat, and his reverence rode off in a passion, and never made even an offer at it. The *jumper* grinned when he saw him sticking the spurs into his old horse, though it was no laughing matter in my mind, in these parts, to grin at a priest for not being able to work a miracle off-hand that-a-way; and many's the stout boy that not long ago would have run far enough before facing a priest, and I'm feared the jumper will hear of it yet. But what I want to know from you, Mister Editor, is what *you* think is the power of the priest, and whether his *curse* really does people any harm, and particularly whether my reading your paper *against his orders* is any harm. I used to get it myself at the office, when it first came down here; but all of a suddent it was stopped, though I've often thought that it was the priest that stopped it, and not the friend (whoever he was, good look to him), that found me out to be fond of reading on both sides and sent it to me, I am sure for nothing but friendship. My reason for thinking that it was the priest that stopped it is that the day after I enquired for it, and was told there was none *that turn* for me by the post-master, who is a cousin of Father ——, Peggy Malowny, who is the servant girl that attends to the childer at the house, and is a cousin of my own, showed me a torn cover with my name on it, which she found at the back of the grate in the little parlour behind the shop, where Father —— and two friars had been sitting together, examining the directions of the letters, and maybe taking a peep at the inside of an odd one or two, where they thought it good for the souls of the boys that hadn't gone to confession lately. Now, Mr. Editor, maybe they wrote "*refused*" on my paper, and that without the post-mistress telling any lie, I'll be bound the friars tould her; for sure enough she *refused* to give me the paper, which, no doubt, is all as one as my *refusing* to take it. Peggy tells me, that in making up the bag betimes, she sees papers sent back to Mr. Curry, in Sackville-street, with "*refused*" written on them; and maybe it is only themselves that refuse to give them to the lawful owner, for whom it was sent. I suppose you guess that the post-master and mistress goes to mass regular, and the priests and friars are most particular in their attention to them once a month, at any rate; maybe, however, it doesn't do any great good to them after all to be playing false in that way; for, sure, doesn't it make the boys more greedy to get it wherever they can get a lone, or a sight of it unknownst to the priest? And I can tell you, Mr. Editor, I never rested till I made out a friend who shows it to me regular, "be-

hind the bush," as they say; and maybe "stolen milk" is the sweetest, and there is no use calling milk *poison*, when all the world understands the differ. And I can tell you I know plenty of lads who was taught to read and write in the national school, that reads the LAYMAN as well as me, and don't we discuss it together; and think it is no wonder that the priests won't answer till the Greek and the Latin, and other languages too, which puzzle us entirely to make out what they mane. By the same token I don't think our priest, or his cojutor either, knows as much Greek as would fit on a sixpence, and it's much aisier, no doubt, to *curse* the boys as read your paper (and a civil spoken paper it is, in my humble judgment), than to prove purgatory out of the ould fathers of the three centuries, as you begged them to do, twiste over, if not three times itself. But that brings me back, and I beg pardon for wandering from what I want to know. Do you *really* think the priest's curse does people any harm, or is it just like the ould threat of the foxes, and hares, and goats that they used to be threatening the people with when they found the lash of the riding whip was not enough to regulate them to their minds, and bring the boys to *raison*, as Father O'Sullivan used to say in ould times, when he'd ride in among them at the fairs and other gatherings where there was a bit of a row? Jem O'Driscoll says he doesn't believe the priest's curse signifies a button, unless the boys are themselves willing to carry it out agen one another, which I'm hoping they're beginning not to like as well as they used, when party fights was so common among them, and the bit of land was worth fighting for, which, werrasthrue it has never been since the potaties went to the bad; and, Mr. Editor, I am myself very nearly of Jem O'Driscoll's mind in the matter, only just I'm doubtful whether it wasn't the priest's cursing the people that made God curse the potaties, which it's as plain as my face, (and sure enough I'm as ugly as I need be at any rate, since I got the bating at Castlebar three years ago last August), it's as plain as my face that God did *curse* the potaties for some raisin best known to himself, and maybe it might be to punish the priests for keeping back the Bible from them as wanted it badly, and is now gone to Americy, to be free to do what they like, and read what they like. I don't myself think the boys is the worse of the cursing; but my notion is, that the priests is a dale worse, though they're no doubt doing their best to conceal it, and keep a good coat on their backs for dacency and a good appearince. I beg your pardon humbly, Mr. Editor, for troubling you with this; but when you printed Pat Murray's letter about Kingstown Harbour, which pleased all the boys here very much, specially as they'd often paid themselves for their father's souls (heaven be their bed!), I thought maybe you'd like to know about the post-office and the friars in the back parlour.—Your humble servant to command,

TIMOTHY M'D———

P.S.—Don't forget to answer me whether you really think Jem Driscoll is right or not about the cursing.

We beg T. M'D——— to borrow from his friend the first number of our paper, in which he will find our ideas in full on the subject of priestly cursing, both as to its sinfulness and inefficacy; and though we cannot insure them against violence from the priest's followers, we can assure T. M'D. and his friends that the priest's *curse* will do them no other harm, and they need not fear God's curse, if they do nothing to break the law of God, as laid down in the Holy Scriptures. He will also find, in the same number, an accurate report of a trial at the Antrim assizes, on the 20th of March, 1846, before the late eminent Judge Burton, where a miller, named Charles M'Loughlin, recovered £70 damages, and above £100 costs, against a Roman Catholic priest, for cursing him from the altar. We shall, at an early opportunity, call the attention of our readers to another reported law case, where £125 damages was recovered against a Roman Catholic bishop, at the Lifford assizes, for excommunicating from the altar one Philip Boyle, which, we are assured, has put a stop to such proceedings in that part of the country ever since.

If any of our readers, who shall be cursed by their priests for reading the LAYMAN, would have the courage to try the effect of the *miller's remedy*, we will venture to foretell the priests will leave them alone for the rest of their lives. We feel obliged to Mr. M'D. for his suggestions as to the post-office; and having received several similar hints from other parts of the country, we have lodged a complaint before the General Post-office authorities on the subject, and have been assured of their active co-operation in detecting and punishing the offenders under the Post-office Offences' Act (1 Vict., c. 36), which subjects to *fine* and *imprisonment*, with or without *hard labour* and *solitary confinement*, any one who shall, for any purpose, *destroy*, *detain*, or *delay* any newspaper, or other printed paper whatever, sent by the post, or who shall aid, counsel, solicit, or endeavour to procure any other person to do so.

It is high time that *back parlour* proceedings should be put a stop to, though we have reason to believe that Roman Catholic postmasters, in general, know their duty better than to allow *any one* to induce them to lend themselves to such illegal and arbitrary interference with her Majesty's post-office establishment.

INDULGENCES.

WE had hoped that Dr. Keane, or some other learned Roman Catholic divine, would have responded to our invitation to furnish our readers with an authoritative explanation, from "a living, speaking tribunal," of the points necessary to establish that the blessings said to flow from indulgences are not chimerical, but founded in reality; but regret they have not done so.

We have not space, in our present number, for inserting the results of our own reading and thinking upon the subject, but have not forgotten our promise to consider, at the earliest opportunity in our power, the force of the best reasons we have been able to find in Roman Catholic controversialists in support of the doctrine and practice in question.

FARM OPERATIONS FOR NOVEMBER.

Wheat—Good and seasonable weather for sowing wheat has much influence on the crop, and, with the best farmers, from the latter end of September and during October is considered the best seed season, particularly in light, rich soils; but hitherto the necessity of permitting the potato crop full and sufficient time to come to maturity has been the cause of wheat not being generally sown in Ireland until this month, and, therefore, farmers considered themselves particularly fortunate in getting in the wheat crop any time during the month of November. We would, however, much rather see the wheat sowing concluded within October, the ground is in much better order, not so much saturated with wet, and much less seed will be required; it will tiller more evenly, and be more early in for the sickle—advantages of the utmost importance to the farmer, besides leaving the present month so much more at liberty to the different other farming operations necessary to the advancement of the spring's work. We would, therefore, impress upon our friends the necessity of losing no time in finishing wheat sowing, where that operation has not been performed, ample directions for which have been given in the preceding month.

Winter Vetches may still be sown, provided the soil be not very wet; they are best sown in beds from 6 to 8 feet wide, and a little manure will be necessary; about 4 bushels of seed will sow an Irish acre; 3 or 4 stones of rye may be sown with it, or the same quantity of the Don or winter oats.

Rye, Bere, or Winter Barley may also be sown any time this month, either for a soiling crop, usually called stolen crops, or to stand for seed; from 16 to 20 stones will sow an Irish acre, according as the land is poor or rich.

Beans and Peas.—The Mazagan or Russian bean and gray or hog peas may still be sown any time during this month. For directions see last month's operations.

Parsnips and Early Cabbages.—No time should be lost in finishing the sowing of parsnips, to come in early next July, and transplanting early cabbages, where those necessary operations have not been completed last month.

Stall-feeding.—If the cattle intended for fatting were not put up for this purpose last month, no further time should be lost in doing so; the loss in condition consequent on a fortnight, or even week's delay will throw the cattle back a month or six weeks in coming to maturity, and will be severely felt by the feeder, in not having the command of the market at the proper time. The cattle, to be profitable in stall-feeding, should be put up in good, warm, and thriving condition, which will not be the case if left out any longer this cold, stormy weather; they will lose more flesh in a night than can be put on in a week. When first put in, they should be sparingly fed on the white or inferior class of turnips or cabbages, keeping the better, or more keeping sorts—hybrids, Aberdeens, Swedes, and mangels—for the last, in the order above named, increasing the quantity as they get accustomed to the food. In feeding, the best rule is to feed three times a day—at 8 in the morning, 12 at noon, and 5 in the afternoon, giving each beast as much roots as it can cleanly consume. The troughs should then be cleaned out of all unconsumed food, and 3 or 4 lbs. of sweet hay given each, when they should be left at rest and undisturbed till the hour comes for the next feed. The unconsumed food, whether roots or hay, should be given to the store or young cattle, which will greedily eat it up, and nothing be lost. As to the quantity necessary, a beast weighing between 6 and 7 cwt., when finished, will consume, on an average, from the time of putting up until finished, about 1½ cwt. of roots daily, and at the commencement about ¼ cwt. of hay; but as it progresses to maturity, the quantity of hay consumed will be less and less, till in the end it will not amount to over 10 or 12 lbs.; but they will consume the usual quantity of roots till they finally leave the stalls fatted. Cattle thus fed, on roots and hay alone, will be, according to the condition they are put up, finished from the latter end of February to the middle of March; but if they be allowed a little bruised oats, barley, linseed-meal, or oil-cake, the period of fatting will be much shortened.

Sheep may also be housed and fed on roots and hay; and will pay well for their keep, both in flesh and wool; besides, quantities of the richest manures will be made. Breeding ewes and stores should be allowed a little hay and salt, and lambs should get an allowance of turnips and hay.

Milch cows should now be housed at night, and a few hours in the yards, or a dry paddock, should be all the liberty they should be allowed. If let out in the fields they only poach the land, which is very injurious, if tender, and the manure dropt is lost. Their food should be cooked, consisting of cabbages, turnips, mangels, parsnips, carrots, chopped hay or straw, and the tailings of wheat, oats, or barley.

Stores should be kept close in the house, if there be room, or in good, well-sheltered yards, with open sheds. Remember, dry lodging and generous keep are necessary to insure and develope good form, which will, in the end, command the greatest returns.

Pigs for fatting should now have abundance of cooked food. We take it that, for some time to come, pigs will be the best paying stock—much better than either beef or mutton—and their increase should be particularly encouraged. Turnips, mangels, carrots, parsnips, bean and pea meal, &c., to which may be added some chandlers' greaves, will pay better in feeding this stock than in any other way they can be disposed of; they should be kept perfectly dry, comfortable, and clean, and, as a rule with every animal to be fatted, the troughs, &c., should be carefully cleaned out immediately after the animals have satisfied their appetites.

Roots.—By the end of the month, Aberdeen and Swede turnips, mangels, parsnips, and carrots will be sufficiently matured, and should be carefully taken up and stored, as directed last month.

Potatoes should now be planted, to come into early use. We have nothing to add to last month's directions; but that, as a question has arisen upon the propriety of planting them in lazy-beds or drills, we would recommend both combined; the lazy-beds will undoubtedly give the driest winter lodging to this now more than ever valuable esculent; and we would recommend the beds to be formed from four to six feet wide. Form shallow drills across the beds, 18 inches asunder; drop the potato sets, of which the small sized whole ones are the best, in these drills, twelve inches set from set, covered with a little earth; then place some manure over them, so as that the manure and potato sets may not come into actual contact, and cover them well up out of the furrow, still preserving the raised drill shape, which should be pulled down a little with a rake early in the spring, before the shoots begin to protrude; or to keep over the manuring till spring. A great deal of the desired success depends on the state of the weather at planting, which should be dry.

Grass and Meadow Lands.—Continue to manure grass and meadow lands with either composts, previously prepared, farm-yard manure, bones, marl, or gravel.

Odds and Ends.—Thrashing should go on unceasingly, in order to have fresh straw for the cattle, which will do much better on that which is fresh and sweet than on that which is stale and musty. Admit the water to the irrigated or watered meadows, which should be constantly watched, so that the water flows constantly, freely, and evenly over the surface, without stagnation on any portion, and see that the discharging drains are unobstructed. Draining and subsoiling should be particularly attended to when the weather is open, as it is upon the proper execution of all the details respecting this modern improvement that good farming depends; much money is uselessly—nay, viciously—thrown away on these works, for want of the necessary and strict supervision. Keep the plough constantly at work in favourable weather. *Grass land* and old lea cannot be broken up too soon, in order to secure as much as possible of the ameliorating influence of the winter's alternate frosts and thaws, and the rotting and closing of the sods, and heavy clay lands should be ploughed up now with a full and deep furrow, for the same reason, more particularly as frost prevents cohesion in such lands, and heat promotes it. *Coppices* should be cleansed, and timber felled, and planting proceeded with. This is also the proper time to pull down old, useless, crooked fences; mix them with lime, and convert them into rich heaps of compost, form new fences, and plash and repair old ones. When not ploughing, keep the horses at the cart gathering manure, road-scrapings, rich headlands, loamy sand, or bog-stuff, for composts; turn over old compost-heaps; quarry, and draw home, or to the kiln, limestone; also turf, and, when to be had at a reasonable distance, culm, to have at hand for burning the lime as wanted. Repair gates and road-ways; thatch and otherwise repair the roofs of out-offices, and lay up harrows, scufflers, horse-hoes, and such implements as may not be wanting till next season, under cover from the weather, first cleaning and putting them in a proper state of repair.

Dean Swift says, that "he never knew any man rise to eminence who lay in bed of a morning;" and Doctor Franklin, in his peculiar manner, says, "that he who rises late may trot all day, but never overtakes his business."

New and Recent Works

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

Booksellers to the Queen,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

THE RUSSIAN SHORES OF THE BLACK SEA, IN THE AUTUMN of 1852, with a Voyage down the Volga, and a Tour through the Country of the Don Cossacks. By Lawrence Oliphant. 8vo. 14s.

RUSSIA AND THE RUSSIANS; comprising an account of the Czar Nicholas, and the House of Romanoff, with a sketch of the Encroachments of Russia from the reign of the Empress Catherine. By J. H Cole, 21st Fusileers. 2s. 6d.

THE RUSSO-TURKISH CAMPAIGN OF 1828-29; with a View of the present State of the Eastern Question. By Colonel Chesney. 12s.

THE HISTORY OF THE FRENCH PROTESTANT REFUGEES, from the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. By Charles Weiss. 8vo. 14s.

HISTORY OF THE PROTESTANT CHURCH IN HUNGARY, FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE REFORMATION TO 1850, with reference also to Transylvania. With an Introduction by Dr. D'Aubigne. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

ALISON'S HISTORY of EUROPE, from the fall of Napoleon, in 1815, to the Establishment of Military Government in France, in 1852; being a continuation of his former celebrated work. Vols. I., II., and III. 8vo. 15s. each.

CHRISTOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, and a Commentary on the Messianic Predictions. By E. W. Hengstenberg, D.D. Vol. I. 10s. 6d.

THE EARLY PROPHECIES OF A REDEEMER; from the first Promise to the Prophecy of Moses. Considered in Six Discourses. By Rev. W. De Burgh, B.D. 8vo. 5s.

EXAMINATION OF MR. MAURICE'S THEOLOGICAL ESSAYS. By Robert S. Candlish, D.D. Crown 8vo. 6s.

OUTLINES OF SACRED PROPHECY. By Rev. T. R. Birks. New Edition. 5s.

THE SCARLET MYSTERY; or, Rome Unmasked. By J. G. MacWalter. 3s. 6d.

THE LIFE OF MRS. SHERWOOD. Edited by her Daughter. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

HOPE DEFERRED, NOT LOST; a Narrative of Missionary effort in South America. With Journals of Captain Gardiner, &c. 5s.

CAUTIONS FOR THE TIMES. Edited by the Archbishop of Dublin. 8vo. 7s.

MEMOIR OF RICHARD WILLIAMS, Catechist to the Patagonian Mission. By the Rev. Dr. James Hamilton. 12mo. 5s.

A MEMOIR OF THE REV. W. B. JOHNSTON, Missionary at Regent's Town, Sierra Leone. 5s.

OF THE PLURALITY OF WORLDS. An Essay. 8vo. 8s.

FRIENDS IN COUNCIL. A Series of Readings and Discourses thereon. 2 vols. Cheaper Edition. 9s.

COMPANIONS OF MY SOLITUDE. Cheaper Edition. 3s. 6d.

THE CHEMISTRY OF COMMON LIFE. By James F. W. Johnston. Vol. I. 5s.

ALISON'S HISTORY OF EUROPE, from the French Revolution in 1789 to 1815. Cheaper Edition. Vols. I. to V. 4s. each.

DISCOURSES ON THE CHRISTIAN REVELATION, viewed in connection with Modern Astronomy. By the late Thomas Chalmers, D.D. Fcp. 2s. 6d.

THE BIBLE IN THE COUNTING HOUSE: a course of Lectures to Merchants. By the Rev. H. A. Broadman, D.D. 8vo. 5s.

STORR'S FAMILY PREACHER. Short practical Sermons for home. 4s. 6d.

CHALMERS'S DAILY SCRIPTURE READINGS. 2 vols. 10s.

CHALMERS'S SABBATH SCRIPTURE READINGS. 2 vols. 10s.

MEMOIRS OF THOMAS CHALMERS, D.D., LL.D. By his Son-in-Law, the Rev. Wm. Hanna, LL.D. 2 vols. 12s.

BRADLEY'S PRACTICAL SERMONS for every Sunday and Principal Holiday in the Year. 8vo. 12s.

BRADLEY'S SERMONS on some of the Trials, Duties, and Encouragements of the Christian Life. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

ROBERTS' PLAIN SERMONS for all the Sundays and Chief Holidays of the year. 2 vols. 10s.

ROBERTS' PLAIN SERMONS for all the Sundays and Chief Holidays of the Year. Second Series. 2 vols. 18s.

THE DOMESTIC COMMENTARY ON THE HOLY SCRIPTURES. By a Clergyman of the Church of England. 4 vols. Imp. 8vo. £2 14s.

MATTHEW HENRY'S EXPOSITION ON THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT; with numerous Maps and Illustrations. 3 vols. 4to. Whole calf. £3 17s. 6d.

WORK: PLENTY TO DO AND HOW TO DO IT. By Margaret Maria Brewster. 4s.

CYCLOPÆDIA OF UNIVERSAL BIOGRAPHY; with numerous Illustrations. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

GRATITUDE: an Exposition of the Hundred and Third Psalm. By the Rev. John Stevenson. 8vo. 6s.

CHRIST IS ALL; a Series of Tracts. By the Venerable Archdeacon Law. No. 1—8. 1d. each.

MY SCHOOLS AND MY SCHOOLMASTERS; or the Story of my Education. By Hugh Miller. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

FIRST IMPRESSIONS OF ENGLAND AND ITS PEOPLE. By Hugh Miller. 7s. 6d.

THE LONDON PULPIT. By James Ewing Ritchie. 4s. 6d.

THE NEW IRISH PULPIT; or Gospel Preacher. New series. 3s. 6d.

The PSALMS Restored to MESSIAH; a brief Commentary. By the Rev. R. H. Ryland. With Preface, by Bishop of Cashel. 6s.

LESSONS and TRIALS OF LIFE. By the Author of "Bertha's Journal." 6s.

MEMOIR OF THE LIVES OF ROBERT AND JAMES A. HALDANE. By Alexander Haldane, Esq. 8vo. 12s.

MEMOIR OF THE REV. W. H. KRAUSE, A.M., Bethesda Chapel, Dublin, with selections from his Correspondence. By Rev. C. S. Stanford. Crown 8vo. 5s. 6d.

MEMOIR OF THE LATE REV. EDWARD BICKERSTETH. By the Rev. T. R. Bicks. Cheaper Edition. 2 vols. Fcap. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

THE BUD OF PROMISE: a Memoir of Eliza H. M. Græme. By the Rev. D. Pitcairn. 3s. 6d.

THE NET IN THE BAY; or Journal of a Visit to Moose and Albany. By the Bishop of Rupert's Land. 4s. 6d.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES: THE MOSLEM AND HIS END; THE CHRISTIAN AND HIS HOPE. By the Rev. John Cumming, D.D. 1s. 6d.

LEILA ADA, THE JEWISH CONVERT: an authentic Memoir. By Osborne W. Trenery Heighway. 3s. 6d.

SELECT EXTRACTS FROM THE DIARY, CORRESPONDENCE, ETC., OF LEILA ADA. By Osborne W. Trenery Heighway. 3s. 6d.

THE BOOK AND ITS STORY: a Narrative for the Young, on occasion of the Jubilee of the British and Foreign Bible Society. By L. N. R. With an introductory preface, by Rev. T. Phillips. Fcap. 4s.

A PORTRAITURE OF THE LATE REV. WILLIAM JAY, of Bath; an outline of his mind, character, and pulpit eloquence, &c. By the Rev. Thomas Wallace. 3s. 6d.

AN APPEAL TO THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF YORK, ON THE UNCONDEMNED HERESIES OF ARCHDEACON WILBERFORCE'S BOOK, entitled, "The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist." By the Rev. J. Taylor, M.A. 2s.

PLAIN SPEAKING. First series. Being forty short, Large-type Tracts. By the Rev. J. C. Ryle, B.A. In packet. 1s.

HOME TRUTHS. First, Second, and Third Series. By the Rev. J. C. Ryle. 3s. 6d. each.

THE BISHOP, the PASTOR, and the PREACHER. Three Biographical Lectures on Latimer, Baxter, and Whitfield; with introductory preface, on some Wants of the present Day. By Rev. J. C. Ryle. *(In the Press.)*

TRACTS FOR CHURCHMEN. Seventeen Numbers. In Packet. 1s.

THE GLORIES OF MARY, from the Italian of Alphonsus Liguori; with the approbation of Cardinal Wiseman. 2s.

THE POLISH LANCER; or 1812. A Tale of Napoleon's Invasion of Russia. By Louis Rellstab. 1s. 6d.

JOHNSTON'S CHART OF THE NORTH SEA, and the BALTIC, with the Countries adjoining; and Enlarged Plans of Cronstadt and Revel. 1s.

JOHNSTON'S MAP OF THE SEAT OF WAR, in the Danubian Principalities. 1s.

JOHNSTON'S NEW MAP OF THE BLACK SEA, CAUCASUS, CRIMEA, ETC., with enlarged plans of Sevastopol and the Bosphorus. 1s.

Lately Published,

WILLET'S "SYNOPSIS PAPISMI." New Edition. Edited by the Rev. J. Cumming, D.D. Ten vols. 8vo. Price £3.

London: JAMES MILLER, 17, Berner's-street, Oxford-street, and all Booksellers.

Just Published, Fcap. 8vo., Price 2s. 6d.

I.

THE FIRST RESURRECTION: Being Comments on First Corinthians, chapter xv. By the Rev. Robert Noble, A.M., Vicar of Athboy.

II.

Fcap. 8vo., cloth, price 1s. 6d.

THE PRINCIPLES OF ELOCUTION; Compiled from "The Elements of Rhetoric, by Archbishop Whately." With considerable additions and alterations.

III.

New Edition, Fcap. 8vo., cloth, price 2s. 6d.

THE COLLECTS OF THE LITURGY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND,

Catechetically Explained, Compared with Scripture, and briefly Commented upon, with the Date and Origin of each Collect annexed. For the use of Families and Sunday Schools.

By the Rev. Charles Miller, A.B,

With Recommendatory Preface by the Bishop of Meath.

IV.

Fcap. 8vo., Neat Cover, Price 1s.

Cloth, 1s. 6d.; Cloth, Gilt Edges, 2s.

THE TALK OF THE ROAD: Showing how Irish people talk about Irish doings, when they get a quiet place, at the back of a ditch, or under a hedge.

V.

Royal 32mo., Price One Halfpenny each.

Stories about the Mission Work in Ireland.

The Bright Side of a Dark Cloud. II. Biddy Lacey. (The Series to be Continued.)

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Just Published,

Third Edition, Price 1s. 6d.; or in full cloth, Price 2s. 6d.

POOR PADDY'S CABIN; or, SLAVERY IN IRELAND. A true Representation of Facts and Characters. By an Irishman.

London: WERTHEIM and MACKINTOSH. Dublin: WM. CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

New Cheap Edition of the

WAVERLEY NOVELS.

12mo. Fancy Boards, Price 1s. 6d. each.

This Series of the highly popular Works of Sir Walter Scott is in preparation, and will be printed from a new, clear type; each Volume containing a complete Novel. The issue will commence on the First of June, with "WAVERLEY; or 'Tis sixty years since," and be continued in every alternate month.

Subscribers' names for the series received by

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY, 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, Dublin.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher, WILLIAM CURRY, 9, Upper Sackville street, Dublin.

NOVEMBER 16 1852.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Sloin do Dhia an fna hárduib, agus fíodáin air an dtalamh deagdoil do na dáoinib.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. I.—No. 12. DECEMBER, 1852. Annual Subscription, 2s. 6d. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

	Page
The Great Western Schism	133
The Divine Oracles—The Written Word	144
What Tradition tells us of the Blessed Virgin Mary. No II.	135
The Rule of Faith (continued). Part III.	138
A Bit of a Sermon	138
Modern Miracles—The *Catholic Guardian*	139
Rev. John Aldworth, on the Circulation of the Douay Version of the Scriptures	139
The Fathers of the Fourth Century—Purgatory	140
CORRESPONDENCE:	
Mr. Edmond Power, on the Law of Divorce, Purgatory, &c.	141
On Roman Catholic Catechisms, and the Use of Graven Images, by Fontium Petitor	142
Idolatry among the Hindoos, by a Retired East Indian	143
Farming Operations for December	143

THE GREAT WESTERN SCHISM.

In the work on Vulgar Errors, which was written a couple of hundred years ago, by the learned physician, Sir Thomas Browne, we find an elaborate discussion of the question whether it be true that a man has one rib less than a woman. He argues that though it be true that God made Eve out of one of Adam's ribs; and though it may be concluded thence that Adam had ever after one rib less than his wife, yet that it does not follow that this defect was perpetuated in his posterity; since we observe that men with one eye have children with two; cripples have children perfect in their limbs; and so on. He pursues this argument into detail, into which we need not follow him. For he also states a fact which, we should have imagined, might have saved him all further trouble—namely, that by inspection of their skeletons, it appears that men and women have each precisely the same number of ribs. In the present day we should think it a waste of time and ingenuity to expend laborious arguments on a question which might be decided by the evidence of facts. We think, however, we may derive from it a useful hint for the most profitable manner of conducting our controversies. We have already, in several articles, discussed questions as to how it is *likely* that God would have dealt with his Church; whether, for instance, God would be likely to provide Christians with infallible safeguards against all possibility of religious error, or whether he would leave it necessary for us, in order to judge rightly in religious matters, to expend the same thought and care which we have to employ in the affairs of this life. But perhaps it may be well to turn sometimes from abstract discussion to facts. Instead of debating what course of dealings with his Church Scripture and reason make it likely that God would pursue, it may be well occasionally to examine how God actually *has* dealt with it. For this purpose we intend to give, now and then, sketches from Ecclesiastical History, which will serve to test the correctness of our other arguments. We do not intend, however, to go into minute points, which have been the subjects of dispute between Roman Catholics and Protestants, but mean to confine ourselves to the great facts which are admitted by historians of all persuasions. And the better to secure our impartiality, we shall be careful to state nothing for which we have not the authority of Roman Catholic historians.

In the article on the jubilee, which appeared in our October number, we had occasion to mention incidentally that there were, at the time of the third jubilee, two rival popes claiming the allegiance of the Christian world. It may interest some of our readers, then, if we tell something about the origin of this state of things, and how it was terminated; or, in other words, if we give a short sketch of the history of that long-continued division among Christians known by the name of "the Great Western Schism." To tell the story in all its details would require a large volume; but the chief facts may be briefly summed up. For fifty years, two or more Popes disputed with each other the honour of being the rightful successor of St. Peter; and the claims of the contending parties were so evenly balanced that the nations of Christendom were tolerably equally divided between them: very respectable Roman Catholic writers maintain that it is still impossible to decide with certainty which party was in the right: Saints working miracles are said, by Romanists, to have been numbered among the adherents of either Pontiff: and, finally (we quote from the Jesuit Maimbourgh), even a general council, which had the aid of the Holy Ghost to enable them to decide infallibly which was in the right, was unable to solve the question, and was obliged to have recourse to its authority, instead of availing itself of its knowledge. For the Council of Constance did not venture to decide which of the rival Popes was the true one; but by virtue of its authority deposed them all, and elected a new Pope of its own.

The commencement of the great schism dates from the year 1378, from the death of Pope Gregory XI. For seventy years before that time the papal chair had been occupied by a succession of French Popes, who, to the great dissatisfaction of the people of Rome, had removed their residence from that city to Avignon, in France. And as the French Popes had for the most part nominated French cardinals (with whom lay the election of the new Pope), it seemed likely that this state of things would continue. But it so happened that, a little before his death, Pope Gregory had been induced to remove to Rome, chiefly by the persuasion of Catherine of Sienna, who has been since canonized as a saint, and who is remarkable as having had (according to her own account, at least) the marks of the Saviour's wounds imprinted on her body, although, to spare her modesty, no eyes but her own were ever able to see them. The Pope did not long survive his removal to Rome; and on his death-bed, having a presentiment of the evils which were to ensue, he called his friends together, and solemnly cautioned them to beware of men or women who, under the appearance of religion, spoke visions of their own devising, since that he himself, seduced by such visions, had been led to reject the rational counsel of his friends, and had drawn the Church into imminent danger of a schism.

Sixteen cardinals (of whom but four were Italians) entered the conclave, to proceed to the election of Gregory's successor. Previously, however, the chief magistrates of Rome had presented them with a remonstrance, pointing out to them the miseries which Rome had suffered from the absence of its spiritual head. "The sacred edifices were left without roof, or gates, or walls; the abode of beasts, which cropped the grass off their very altars. The faithful were no longer attracted to Rome, either by devotion or by interest; so that there was danger lest the unfortunate city should be reduced to a vast and frightful solitude." As the only remedy for these evils they demanded the election of a Roman or, at least, an Italian Pope, adding some threats as to the extremities to which the people might proceed, if disappointed in their just expectation.

The cardinals received still plainer hints, to the same effect, after they had actually entered on their deliberations. Their place of meeting was surrounded by a tumultuous mob, which at length burst even into the recess of the conclave. They threatened the cardinals with personal violence if they ventured to elect a foreign Pope—they would set fire to the place—they would tear them in pieces—"they would make their heads redder than their hats;" and they kept up a constant cry, "We must have a Roman for a Pope, or, at the very least, an Italian." At first the cardinals answered boldly, that their choice must be directed by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and not by popular menaces; and that if they made an election constrained by violence, the Pope so chosen would not be a real Pope, but an intruder. At length, however, they gave way, and elected an Italian, who took the name of Urban VI. The cardinals at first seemed well content with what they had done, and sent round to the different states of Europe the customary notification of the choice which they had made. Perhaps had the new Pope given no cause of complaint, they might have continued to acquiesce in the election which had been forced upon them. But Urban VI. had scarcely been seated on his throne when he began to inveigh bitterly against the vices of the prelates, their simony, their injustice, their exactions, and their scandalous luxury. In a short time he had made himself so unpopular that the cardinals determined to take advantage of the violence which had attended his election, in order to declare him unlawfully chosen. When, therefore, the summer heats gave them a good excuse for withdrawing from Rome they retired to Anagni, and there commenced their proceedings against Urban. They began by putting forth a public declaration, describing the tumults which had taken place at the election of Urban; stating that they had only chosen him in the persuasion that, seeing the circumstances under which he was elected, he would in conscience have refused the Pontificate. But that, on the contrary, forgetful of his salvation, and burning with ambition, he had assented to the choice; that under the effect of the same intimidation he had been enthroned and crowned, and assumed the name of Pope, though he rather merited that of apostate and Antichrist. They then anathematized him as a usurper, and invoked against him all aids and succours, divine and human.

Before proceeding, however, to the election of a new Pope, the cardinals thought it desirable to obtain the co-operation of the Italians, who, as we mentioned before, were members of the Sacred College. But, how were they to be got to join in opposition to their countrymen? The cardinals hit on an ingenious method. They separately gave to each of them a secret promise, in writing, that he himself should be the object of their new choice! The device was successful. The Italian cardinals kept their secret from each other, and repaired to meet their brethren, each confident that he was to be elected Pope. But they had no sooner entered into conclave than they discovered that they had been all alike imposed on; for a Frenchman was immediately chosen, who assumed the title of Clement VII.

We pause here in our narrative for the present. Next month we intend to go on to tell how Christians were perplexed between the claims of the rival Popes, and how the whole of Europe was divided in their allegiance between them; how the two Popes excommunicated each other and his adherents; and yet how these anathemas are stated, by respectable Romish writers, to have done no harm to anybody, and how saints flourished and worked miracles in the ranks of both parties; how the schism lasted for a period of about fifty years, and how it was eventually composed.

We shall conclude, for the present, with one practical inference from the whole story. Romanists bring forward specious arguments to prove that it is necessary that there should be, at all times, in the Church, a living and speaking judge of controversies; and they contend that if there were not, Christ's promise to be ever with his Church would have failed. But now, whatever interpretation theory may put on the promises of our Lord, the *facts* we have brought before you show that the Romish interpretation cannot be the true one; for the great schism lasted longer than the period ordinarily assigned for a "generation" of men. A young man, who had barely arrived at maturity at the death of Gregory XI., might have died at a respectable old age before the schism was finally healed. And such a man, during the whole course of his life, must have been uncertain where to seek for an infallible guide in controversies. There were at that time two who pretended to be the successor of St. Peter, and the most important religious advice given by them was, that each of them assured him that by acknowledging his rival he should be excluded from the pale of the Church, outside of which there is no salvation. And in this advice respectable Roman Catholic authorities are of opinion that both the Popes were wrong.

Well, then, what we say is this: It is no use to a man to know that there is somewhere or other one able to guide him infallibly right, if he cannot tell who that infallible guide is. And it is poor comfort to him to be told that the Church had an infallible guide in former ages and that it will have one in future ages, if there be no guide to be found while he is alive. If, then, God could leave his Church, for thirty years or fifty, without a head, or uncertain who that head was, he might just as well leave it in the same state for 300 years or 500; and whatever is meant by the promise,

that the gates of hell shall not prevail against the Church, we may be sure of this, that it does *not* mean that the Church shall always have a visible head, whose religious teaching may be implicitly followed.

THE WRITTEN WORD.

THERE is reason to believe that neither Protestants nor Roman Catholics are fully aware of the strong grounds that exist for considering the written Word of God to be the appointed depository of his revelation to man. It may, therefore, be profitable to both to set before them some of the many authorities in favour of an appeal to the written Word of God, and to nothing else, as containing all God's revealed Word, both as to faith and practice.

We shall begin by taking a view of the various ways in which God has revealed himself at different times.

It was to be expected that when God made man in his own image—made him a reasoning, intelligent, responsible being—he would not leave him without intimations of his will, but would reveal himself in such ways as should seem best to his infinite wisdom.

At first God spoke plainly, audibly, directly to his creatures. Thus he spoke to Adam in the garden, both before and after the fall. Thus he spoke to Cain, to Noah, to Abraham, to Isaac, to Jacob. They were left in no doubt that God spoke to them, and that what they heard was the word of God.

Thus he spoke to Moses at the burning bush, in the land of Egypt. In all the revelations of his will, with regard to the deliverance of his people, He spoke to him face to face; so that Moses could say—"The Lord has appeared and spoken to me, and I speak in his name."

In the same way God spoke directly to both Moses and to the people in the wilderness. He, with his own voice, in the hearing of the people, spoke the Ten Commandments at Mount Sinai.

The people, we read, were so overpowered by this terrible exhibition of God's glory that they prayed that he might not speak to them directly, but through his servant Moses (Ex. xx. 19)—"They said to Moses, Speak thou with us and we will hear; but let not God speak with us, lest we die."

The Lord then took Moses into the mount, and revealed to him the law and the statutes which he was to make known to the people. And at this time our God gave an intimation of the way in which, in future times, he proposed to make his creatures acquainted with his unchanging mind and will, and to have it ever preserved and kept before them. He bore his testimony to the use of having his will—what he declared to his people—committed to writing, that it might be as permanently fixed and secured, for their instruction, as it was permanently fixed in his own mind. As Moses tells us (Deut. ix. 10)—"And the Lord delivered unto us two tables of stone, written with the finger of God, and on them was written according to all the word which the Lord spoke with you in the mount, out of the midst of the fire, in the day of assembly."

What a testimony is here had, from God himself, as to the value of having that committed to writing which it is his will, and for the good of man, to have preserved and kept in memory. If ever there were words likely to be remembered, and treasured up in men's minds, they were the Ten Commandments. The circumstances of their delivery, the solemn awfulness of the occasion, the Divine person who spoke them, their shortness, and yet their importance, all conspired to have permanently fixed them in the memory. Yet, the God who spoke them wrote them with his own finger on two tables of stone, and, in consequence, the Church has them, not as they might have been remembered, and handed down by tradition, but as our God delivered them.

After God, according to the desire of the people, had ceased to speak directly to them the other statutes and judgments, but had given them to Moses, who was to make them known to them, the Lord said unto Moses (Ex. xxxiv. 27)—"Write thou these words: for after the tenor of these words I have made a covenant with thee and with Israel."

Thus was written, by God's express direction, what is often referred to as the "Book of the Law of the Lord." And it is to be remarked, that now was the first case in which an opportunity was given for instruction by tradition—*i.e.*, God speaking to one, and that person delivering what he had heard to another. If any one might have been depended upon for accurately remembering and faithfully delivering what had been said to him, it would have been Moses. But it was not God's intention to have his law to be transmitted by tradition from one person to another—from one generation to another. He had his law written for their learning, and for its safe and continued preservation as he had originally delivered it. And this book of the law was to be used as the storehouse and depository of God's revelation. So we read (Ex. xxiv. 3, &c.)—"Moses came and told the people all the words of the Lord, and all the judgments, &c.; and Moses wrote all the words of the Lord." And having offered sacrifice, "he took the book of the covenant, and read in the audience of the people, and they said, All that the Lord hath said we will do, and be obedient."—Verse 7.

This reading of the written law was not to be done this once and no more. We read (in Deut. xxxi. 7, &c.)—"Moses called unto Joshua, and gave him a charge; and Moses wrote this law, and delivered it unto the priests, the sons of Levi, which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, and unto all the elders of Israel. And Moses commanded them, saying, At the end of every seven years, in the solemnity of the year of release, in the feast of tabernacles, when all Israel is come to appear before the Lord thy God in the place which He shall choose, thou shalt read this law before all Israel in their hearing. Gather the people together, men, and women, and children, and thy stranger that is within thy gates, that they may hear, and that they may learn and fear the Lord your God, and observe to do all the words of this law: and that their children, which have not known anything, may hear and learn to fear the Lord your God as long as ye live in the land, whither ye go over Jordan to possess it."

The history informs us that Joshua obeyed the directions given by Moses (Jos. viii. 30, &c.)—"Then Joshua built an altar unto the Lord God of Israel in Mount Ebal, as Moses, the servant of the Lord, commanded the children of Israel, as it is written in the book of the law of Moses, &c. And he wrote there upon the stones a copy of the law of Moses, which he wrote in the presence of the children of Israel. And all Israel, and their elders, and officers, and their judges, stood on this side of the ark and on that side, &c. And afterwards he read all the words of the law, the blessings and the cursings, according to all that is written in the book of the law. There was not a word of all that Moses commanded which Joshua read not before all the congregation of Israel, with the women and the little ones, and the strangers that were conversant among them."

Hence it is abundantly evident that, at the setting up of the Jewish dispensation, the written Word was the depository of God's revelation. It, and it alone, contained all that the people were to believe and to do. It will be found that there is equally conclusive evidence that it continued to be so to the end of that dispensation. Moses, looking forward to the time when the people would desire to have a king set over them, gives this direction (Deut. xvii. 18)—"And it shall be, when he shall sit upon the throne of his kingdom, that he shall write him a copy of this law in a book, out of that which is before the priests, the Levites. And it shall be with him, and he shall read therein all the days of his life, that he may learn to fear the Lord his God, to keep all the words of this law and these statutes, to do them," &c. We find King David thus charging his son Solomon (1 Kings ii. 3)—"Keep the charge of the Lord thy God, to walk in his ways, to keep his statutes, and his commandments, and his judgments, and his testimonies, as it is written in the law of Moses, that thou mayest prosper in all that thou doest and whithersoever thou turnest thyself."

Had the kings of Israel and Judah continued to be guided by what was written in the law of Moses, the state of the nation would have been very different from that which appears in their history; but the book of the law was not consulted—it was kept out of sight; at length it was lost, until, by God's help, it was found in the time of Josiah (2 Kings xxii. 11)—"And when Shaphan the scribe read it before the king, he rent his clothes, and said, Great is the wrath of the Lord that is kindled against us, because our fathers have not hearkened unto the words of this book, to do according to all that is written concerning us." This book was acknowledged to be the rule by which they ought to have been guided.

Looking farther into their history, the captivity will be seen to have been brought as the judgment of God upon the people, for having transgressed the law which he gave them; and when, in his undeserved mercy, they were brought back to their land, they will be found acknowledging the written law to be the rule to which they should refer. We read (Neh. viii.)—"And all the people gathered themselves together as one man into the street that was before the water-gate, and they spake unto Ezra the scribe to bring the book of the law of Moses, which the Lord had commanded to Israel; and Ezra the priest brought the law before the congregation, both of men and women, and all that could hear with understanding, upon the first day of the seventh month; and he read therein before the street that was before the water-gate, from the morning until mid-day, before the men and the women, and those that could understand; and the ears of all the people were attentive unto the book of the law; and Ezra the scribe stood upon a pulpit of wood, which they had made for the purpose; and Ezra opened the book in the sight of all the people; so they read in the book in the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the meaning." No one can read the history of the children of Israel and not see that, without doubt, under the Jewish dispensation, even though there was a hierarchy especially appointed of God, his written Word was still his ordained storehouse of truth, to be appealed to and received both by priests and people, and the appointed guide by adhering to which his people were to be kept in the right way, both of practice and faith. As the Apostle James said (Acts xv. 21)—"For Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every Sabbath-day."

The question, then, presents itself—Was a change introduced when our Lord brought in his gracious dispensation?

The first word we hear from the lips of our Lord, when entering on his ministry, was (Mat. iv. 4), "*It is written*," giving his sanction to the authority of the written Word. One of the first acts we hear recorded of him was to go into the synagogue on the Sabbath-day, and to stand up to read (Luke iv. 17)—"And there was delivered unto him the book of the Prophet Isaiah; and when he had opened the book, he found the place where it was written, 'The spirit of the Lord is upon me,' &c.; and he began to say unto them, 'This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears.'" Again (Luke x. 26)—"A certain lawyer stood up and tempted him, saying, Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? He said unto him, What is written in the law? how readest thou?" Luke xvi. 29—"Abraham said unto him, They have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them; and he said, Nay, Father Abraham, but if one went unto them from the dead they will repent; and he said unto them, If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead." John v. 39, &c.—We have our Lord saying to the unbelieving Jews, "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me; for had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me, for he wrote of me; but if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?" Mark vii. 5, &c.—"The Pharisees and Scribes asked him, Why walk not thy disciples according to the tradition of the elders, but eat bread with unwashed hands? He answered and said unto them, Well hath Isaias prophesied of you hypocrites, as it is written, This people honoureth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me; howbeit in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men"—"making the Word of God of none effect through your tradition, which ye have delivered." Our Lord uniformly pointed out the error of those who thought to serve God according to the tradition or commandments of men, whilst he gave the whole sanction of his authority to God's Word preserved in writing, saying, "What is written?"

It may be well to notice one text, the only one that sounds as if by it our Lord gave his authority to another depository of truth besides the Scriptures (and which is often quoted for that purpose), when he condemned the man who should refuse to hear the Church—Mat. xviii. 5. If that text is examined it will appear that the matter to be referred to the Church was not a matter of God's revelation, either as to faith or practice, but a matter in dispute between man and man—"If thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone. If he shall hear thee thou hast gained thy brother; but if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them tell it to the Church; but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican." The Church (whoever may be intended by that title) is to be the umpire to decide a matter in dispute between brethren. This is consistent with what St. Paul says (1 Cor. vi. 2.)—"If the world shall be judged by you, are ye unworthy to judge the smallest matters? Know ye not that we shall judge angels? how much more things that pertain to this life?" There is not a text than can be quoted in which our Lord sends the inquirer after God's revealed mind and will to any company of living men for information—in which he says to him who asks, ', What shall I do to inherit eternal life? what shall I do to be saved?" "Hear the Church;" but he has said, "Search the Scriptures"—"they have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them."

Nor were things altered when the Lord had ascended into the heavens, having first desired his disciples to "go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things which he had commanded them, and promising to be with them always to the end of the world."

The Apostle John, at the end of his Gospel, says—"Many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book; but these are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, and that believing ye might have life through his name." The Apostle Paul says that he was not taught by man, but by the Lord Jesus Christ. He, then, if any man, might appeal solely to his own inspiration and expect everything he said to be received upon his authority, yet he is found always magnifying the Scriptures. When making his defence before Felix (Acts xxiv. 14), he says—"I worship the God of my fathers, believing all things that are written in the law and in the prophets." And before Festus and King Agrippa (Chap. xxvi. 22)—"I continue unto this day witnessing both to small and great, saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come." In Rom. iv., when he would prove the doctrine of justification by faith, he says—"What saith the Scripture?" Rom. xv. 4.—"Whatsoever things were written

aforetime were written for our learning, that we, through patience and comfort of the Scripture, might have hope," &c. 2 Tim. iii. 14—"Continue in the things which thou hast learned, and hast been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned them; and that from a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works."

We trust that the mass of Scriptural evidence to which we have above referred may lead our readers, whether Roman Catholics or Protestants, to the saving conviction, that the Holy Scriptures are intended, by that God under whose inspiration they were written, and by whose providence they have been preserved, to contain and to present to man that revelation of his will the knowledge of which must lead to their salvation and to his glory; and that it was intended that the instruction of his Church and people should be carried on through the means of the Bible; and we hope that some, at least, may be led by it to value "THE BOOK" more than they have ever done—to refer to it as conclusive authority on all points of religion—and, like the noble Bereans of old, "Search the Scriptures daily whether these things are so."

WHAT TRADITION TELLS US OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY—No. II.

JUSTIN MARTYR, TATIAN, ATHENAGORAS, THEOPHILUS, IRENÆUS.

In our September number we laid before our readers all the passages we could find in the New Testament where the name of the Blessed Virgin is mentioned; and as none of our Roman Catholic correspondents have been able to point out that we have omitted any, we may take for granted that our list was complete. We found, then, that the whole number of those passages was very much less than we should have expected; that several of them are exactly such as the writers would have inserted, if it had been their express object to prevent future ages from carrying their veneration of the mother of our Lord to excess; and that nowhere in the New Testament does there occur an instance of the sacred writers either addressing prayers to the Blessed Virgin themselves, or of their exhorting their converts to implore her intercession. And we called your attention to the fact that her name is not once mentioned in any of the twenty-one apostolic epistles. We do not know in the least how this fact is to be accounted for, if we are to suppose that the sacred writers regarded the Blessed Virgin (as Romish authorities do now) as "their only confidence," "the entire ground of their hope." Certain it is that Roman Catholic bishops nowadays don't think it right to write long letters to their flocks without bringing in the Virgin's name. (Since our last remarks were published, for example, a pastoral was issued to the Roman Catholics of Dublin, half of which was taken up with her praises.) We gave insertion to a letter in which a correspondent furnished us with explanations, given by Roman Catholic divines, of the silence of the sacred writers concerning her; but we leave it to our readers to say whether there was one satisfactory explanation among the whole of them.

We went on then, in the October number, to examine what *tradition* tells us of the Blessed Virgin. We went through all the genuine remains of what are called the Apostolic Fathers, and we found that the earliest uninspired Christian writers said just as little (or less) about her than the apostles and evangelists themselves. Her name is certainly not found incessantly on *their* lips.

We are now come to the middle of the second century—more than one hundred years after the death of our Lord. We pointed out to you, in our last article, that a tradition is but of little value if it cannot be traced nearer than a hundred years to the source whence it claims to be derived. For example, Dean Swift is not dead much more than a hundred years, and was one of the most popular men in Dublin in his day; and yet a very moderately-sized sheet of paper would contain all the *traditions* that could be collected in Dublin now about the dean; and if any one of these traditions were to ascribe to the dean opinions inconsistent with what we know of him through his published writings, no man of sense would attach the least credit to it.

However, though we acknowledge that the value of tradition becomes less and less the farther we go from the fountain head, we believe that it will be very useful to continue our examination of what the early Christians wrote concerning the Blessed Virgin; and, accordingly, we purpose to continue the subject in this and in some future articles: for we shall be enabled to judge, if the worship of the Blessed Virgin was not handed down by tradition, how it *did* take its origin; and we shall find reason to believe that Mr. Newman is quite right in maintaining that the Roman Catholic doctrine was not handed down, in its present form, by tradition, but that it was *developed*, in the course of time, by Christian writers. The hint dropped by one was taken up and expanded by another—what was in one man's mouth a mere rhetorical flourish, became in another's a dry statement of facts—until, at last, doctrines assumed a form which would astonish no one more than some of the very writers whose sayings are cited in support of them.

We shall give our readers the means of judging whether this be not so with regard to the doctrine of the worship of the Virgin. And while we intend, in the course of these articles, to lay before our Roman Catholic readers all the passages from the Fathers which the most eminent divines of their church have ever urged in defence of this practice, it will be satisfactory to them to know, that if the result of the examination be to convince them that this practice cannot be traced to any apostolic tradition, still they will not have contradicted anything which their church has decided. The first work published by Mr. Newman, on joining the Roman Catholic communion, in effect, gives up tradition as a ground for Romish doctrine, and claims for the church the power of making discoveries in the Christian religion, and of *developing* doctrines which the Christians of the apostles' days knew nothing about. And since these views of Mr. Newman's have never been condemned by Roman Catholic authorities, but he is, on the contrary, in high favour with the dignitaries of his new church, our readers are safe in concluding that there will be nothing heretical in their believing that the worship of the Blessed Virgin was unknown to the apostles and their converts, however it may have been developed since, some way or other.

The first author whose writings we shall examine in this article is JUSTIN MARTYR. He was born in Palestine, of heathen parents—became well informed in the Grecian philosophy—was converted to Christianity when of mature age, and then wrote in its defence—was one of the most learned of the very early Christian writers, and eventually suffered martyrdom about the year, A.D., 165. The writings of Justin, which are still extant, are of considerable extent, and contain some important information as to the Church of his time. In particular, he gives some interesting details as to the public services of the Church, and as to the manner in which the sacraments of baptism and of the eucharist were then celebrated. But in no one of his works is there the slightest trace of prayers addressed either to the Blessed Virgin or to any other saint, whether for direct assistance or for intercession.

As it is part of our plan, however, to furnish you not only with all that can be urged from the Fathers in defence of prayers to the Blessed Virgin, but with any passages we can find where she is extolled, and her praises dwelt upon by the Fathers, we give the only passage of this nature we can find in Justin's writings, only remarking that a Roman Catholic writer of the present day would scarcely have said so little in the course of 240 folio pages. Justin, then, in commenting on the fact that our Saviour was born of a virgin, was led to remark how fit it was that, as it was by means of a woman (namely, by Eve's eating the forbidden fruit) that sin entered into the world, so likewise the instrumentality of a woman should be employed in the plan for our redemption, that so disobedience might be destroyed in the same manner in which it was introduced into the world—

"For Eve being a virgin, and incorrupt, having received the word from the serpent, brought forth transgression and death: but Mary the Virgin having received faith and joy (on the angel Gabriel announcing to her the glad tidings, that the Spirit of the Lord should come upon her, and the power of the Highest overshadow her), answered, Be it unto me according to thy word. And of her was born he of whom we have shown that so many Scriptures have spoken: he by whom God destroys the serpent, and angels and men resembling (the serpent), but works a rescue from death for such as repent of evil and believe on him."

This is the strongest passage in all Justin in praise of the Blessed Virgin; and you will observe, that the notion of offering prayers to her is not once suggested by it, and that nothing is said of her except what Protestants are ready to admit. It is scarcely necessary to remark, that in this parallel between Eve and the Virgin Mary, Justin merely institutes a comparison suggested by his own ingenuity, and that he does not pretend to be communicating any doctrine not contained in Scripture, handed down to him by his predecessors. Justin merely makes the remarks which his own reason suggested on the facts contained in Scripture; but he does not pretend to be adding any facts of his own to those already recorded in the Bible. This passage from Justin, although it has no doctrinal importance, is interesting in an historical point of view, because this comparison which Justin suggested, between Eve and the Virgin Mary, was one which greatly pleased some of the succeeding Fathers; and we shall see how some of them improved on it.

The folio volume in which the Benedictine editors published the works of Justin Martyr contains besides writings in defence of Christianity, composed by TATIAN, by ATHENAGORAS, and by THEOPHILUS, who all likewise lived in the second century. We shall not weary you by going separately through each of them; but will cut the matter short by telling you at once, of all three, that there is not a word of the Blessed Virgin in any one of them. Not but that there were opportunities, when any one whose mind had been in the habit of dwelling on the thoughts of the Virgin would not have been silent about her. For instance, Tatian compares the habits of the females celebrated by the Grecian poets with those of the Christian virgins. But these ancient Christian writers not only do not (as Romanists do now) make out opportunities of speaking of the Virgin, whatever be the subject in hand, but they are silent about her, even when a natural opportunity for speaking about her presents itself.

We shall conclude this article with an examination of those parts of the writings of IRENÆUS which bear on our subject. This eminent Christian writer was born in Asia Minor and was one of the most eminent bishops of Gaul at the latter part of the second century. Much of his writings has been lost; and his principal work (against heresies) has only come down to us in a Latin translation, merely fragments of the original Greek having been preserved. There has been enough left, however, to enable us to pronounce with sufficient certainty on the doctrine taught by Irenæus, and to gather this, at least, from his total silence on the subject, that no prayers were in his time offered by orthodox Christians to the Blessed Virgin or to any other of the saints; for nothing of the kind is to be found in any of his writings which have reached us. Of passages in his works where the Virgin's name occurs, there are only two or three remarkable enough to be worth quoting—

"When Mary was hastening to the admirable miracle of the wine, and wishing, before the time, to participate in the compendious* draught, the Lord, repelling her unseasonable haste, said—Woman, what have I to do with thee?"—Adversus Hæreses iii. 18.

It is plain that, in this passage, Irenæus speaks of the haste with which our Lord's mother urged him to the performance of the miracle of the change of water into wine as something censurable, and that he did not conceive it necessary to maintain that she was free from all tincture of sin or error.

In the other two passages to which we allude, Irenæus takes up the comparison which Justin had instituted, between the Virgin Mary and Eve, only adding of his own some further speculation as to the happy meeting of the two in Paradise. The following are the passages. To avoid all cavil we adopt the translation of Messrs. Berington and Kirk, whose work is the storehouse from which modern Romish controversialists draw their citations from the Fathers—

"As Eve having Adam for a husband, but being still a virgin, becoming disobedient, became the cause of death both to herself and to the whole human race; so also Mary, having her predestined husband, but being nevertheless a virgin, being obedient, became the cause of salvation both to herself and to the whole human race. And thus the knot of Eve's disobedience was untied through Mary's obedience; for what the virgin Eve tied through unbelief, the Virgin Mary unloosed through faith.—Adv. Hæreses iii. 33.

"As she (Eve), through the discourse of a (fallen) angel, was seduced, so as to flee from God, having transgressed his word; so Mary, through the discourse of a (good) angel, was evangelised so as to bear God, being obedient to his word. And if Eve disobeyed God, yet Mary was persuaded to obey God, that the Virgin Mary might become the advocate of the virgin Eve. And as the human race was bound to death through a virgin, it is saved through a virgin, the scales being equally balanced—virginal disobedience by virginal obedience."—Adv. Hæreses v. 19.

The only correction we have to make in the preceding translation is in the word translated advocate, which, there is every reason to believe, should rather be translated consoler or comforter. The original Greek is lost, as mentioned above; but there is little reason to doubt that the word employed must have been a derivative of παρακλέω, that being the word for which the Latin "advocare" is a constant equivalent. For example, Tertullian (Cont. Marcion iv. 14) translates the words "to comfort those that mourn" (Isaiah lxi. 3)—"advocare lugentes." And, if this be so, the passage would simply refer to the consolation which Eve would find in seeing the damage repaired which had been caused by her sin, and in meeting with her whose seed had bruised the serpent's head.

But let us waive this point; let us suppose that "advocate" is the exact translation of the word; and let us grant, moreover, that Irenæus was in possession of authentic information that the Virgin in heaven pleads for Eve: does it follow that she can hear our prayers, addressed to her while we are on earth? If we had a brother in a distant country, and even if we believed that he was likely to pray for us, we should have no right to pray to *him* to offer up his supplication on our behalf; and we find, in point of fact, that whatever be the sense of this rhetorical passage, and whether or not

* In this obscure expression Irenæus alludes to a former remark of his, that the ordinary operations of nature, whereby the water which falls from heaven is transmuted by successive changes, first, to the sap of the vine, then to the juice of the grape, and so to wine, were, in the miracle of the change of water into wine, compressed into a compendious form; the same thing being done in a few minutes which, in the ordinary course of nature, requires a whole year.

he thought the Virgin's advocacy likely to benefit Eve, there is no trace of Irenæus, or any of his contemporaries, asking her intercession for himself.

But it is most important of all to observe, that in these two passages Irenæus does not pretend to deliver a tradition. We can see plainly that the invocation of the Virgin *grew* in the church—that it was not handed down. We have seen Justin first draw a comparison between the injury caused the world by the instrumentality of Eve and the benefits derived through that of Mary: we have now seen Irenæus take up the same comparison, and embellish it with some rhetorical remarks of his own. But he does not pretend to be in possession of any new facts not contained in the Scriptures; and, notwithstanding the exalted tone of a few sentences in a large work, he never once alludes to any custom among Christians of asking the Virgin's intercession.

We shall have to go down to much later writers before we shall succeed in discovering any trace of such prayers; and when we do at length come to them, we shall find that it is not in tradition that they take their origin. When one writer ventures to speculate on the dignity to which the Virgin is exalted, and the degree of favour which she probably enjoys, another adds something of his own, and conjectures much as to the value of her intercession; then another prays that God may hear the prayers which he trusts she is offering for him; until at length petitions are directly addressed to her, requesting her intercession or her assistance, notwithstanding that there is confessedly no command, either of Scripture or of the Church, that we should offer such prayers, and though there is no promise that God will make such petitions known to her.

Whatever be the value of these speculations, we hope, in these articles, by tracing exactly what each writer had learned from his predecessor, to make it appear that they originated in the *private judgment* of persons more or less eminent in the Church, and not either from Scripture or tradition.

We cannot, however, take leave of Irenæus without noticing the illustration he affords how Roman Catholics (while they treat the authority of Fathers as decisive when it makes for them) feel no scruple in rejecting their statements when they do not approve of them. For want of any better passage in the writings of the early Fathers, Roman Catholics are very fond of putting forward Irenæus's comparison between the Blessed Virgin and Eve, as if it were sufficient to connect with the times of the apostles the adoration of the Blessed Virgin practised in the fifth century. And, yet, we have shown that there is not only no mention in this passage of any practice of invoking the Virgin Mary in the time of Irenæus, but that, also, the whole passage expresses merely the writer's own views, and not any tradition which he had received from his predecessors. But how Roman Catholic advocates would have triumphed if Irenæus had stated, that he had heard, from those who had heard the apostles speak, that the Church ought to offer prayers through the mediation of the Virgin. And, yet, they reject, without ceremony, statements which he *does* put forward on this very authority. For example, Irenæus tells us that he had received it from those who had heard it from the very hearers of the apostles, that our Lord lived on this earth to old age, or, as he explains it, to about fifty years of age. One would suppose that this was a point in which tradition was not likely to go wrong; and, yet, the Benedictine editor, very properly, absolutely refuses belief to this tradition of Irenæus, and prefers the received opinion that our Saviour suffered about the thirty-fourth year of his age. He tells us, that "the reasons which Irenæus gives for his opinion are very weak, and that the argument is not better than the rest, that the saint had received this statement from his predecessors; for that we do not know who those predecessors were, nor whether they might not have been mistaken, and that one of them (Papias), whom Irenæus names, was a man of but feeble judgment."

Again, Irenæus strongly maintains the doctrine of the Millenarians, that our Saviour is hereafter to reign on earth for 1,000 years; and about twenty pages from the comparison between Mary and Eve, he tells us (see CATHOLIC LAYMAN for October, p. 109, note 1), on the authority of those who had heard it from John, the disciple of our Lord, that Jesus had used the following words:—"The days shall come in which there shall be vines, each vine having ten thousand shoots, and each shoot ten thousand branches, and each branch ten thousand twigs, and each twig ten thousand clusters, and each cluster ten thousand grapes, and each grape shall produce twenty-five measures of wine; and it shall come to pass that when any of the saints shall take a cluster, another cluster shall exclaim, I am a better cluster, take me and with me bless God. . . . . And when Judas the traitor asked the Lord, How shall such creatures be made? the Lord replied, They shall see who shall come in those days."

Notwithstanding this the Benedictine editor has no hesitation in rejecting the Millenarian doctrines, and pronounces them blemishes which the saint contracted from too great veneration for his seniors We quite agree with the learned Roman Catholic in believing that our Lord never spoke the words here imputed to him, nor any like them; and we infer that Irenæus lived too long after our Saviour's death to be implicitly believed as authority for ascribing any doctrine to our Lord or his apostles of which the Scriptures are silent. And it is thereby demonstrated, on the admission of Roman Catholics themselves, that we are not warranted in concluding that our Lord or his disciples taught a particular doctrine, because that doctrine was maintained by a canonized saint of the Church, not even though that Father should assert it to have been derived by direct tradition from one of the apostles, and not even though he should have written less than a hundred years after that apostle's death. We shall know, therefore, how far we are constrained to admit statements of writers who lived at a greater distance from the apostles, and who do *not* pretend that the doctrines delivered were derived in a direct line from them.

RULE OF FAITH.

(Continued from p. 111.)

FOLLOWING the method which we proposed to ourselves in discussing the question of the Rule of Faith, we shall now proceed to the examination of the arguments by which Roman Catholics endeavour to prove that Scripture, or the written Word, is insufficient without the aid of Tradition, or the unwritten Word. Before, however, entering on this examination, we desire to make a few remarks supplementary to those which we have already put forward on the Protestant side of the question.

That Holy Scripture comprises all things necessary to salvation, both as regards faith and morals, is proved by the very *nature of its contents*. With respect to the objects of our faith, it tells us of the existence and providential government of God; of his justice, wisdom, holiness, and power. It tells us, that "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him may not perish, but may have life everlasting."—John iii. 16. In Scripture, and in it alone, is contained all that we know of the life and death of our Redeemer. There is not one saying or one miracle of his, innumerable as they were (John xxi. 25), preserved in any authentic record but the canonical Books of the New Testament (1). The Scripture also reveals to us the existence of the third person of the blessed Trinity, and the part which he sustains in the great work of man's redemption. The duties which we owe to the Eternal Father, the Eternal Son, and the Eternal Spirit, respectively, are all clearly laid down in Scripture, and nowhere else. Again, with respect to morals, all the great principles by which man, in his individual and social capacity, should be guided, are simply and clearly defined. There is, indeed, no formal and elaborate system of ethics; but there are—what, in a practical point of view, is infinitely more valuable—living examples, principles exemplified in action, which appeal to the hearts and consciences of every single-minded reader of the Bible.

When from the internal evidence afforded by Scripture itself we turn to the testimony of the primitive Church, the grand truth of the sufficiency of the written Word again meets us. We have already reviewed in detail some of the passages of the early Fathers bearing upon this point, and they might easily have been multiplied. As the result of the whole investigation, it appears "that *there never yet was any Catholic Father* that did *affirm* in terms, or in full or equivalent sense, *that the Scriptures are defective* in the recording anything necessary to salvation, but they all unanimously taught the contrary" (2). The alleged instances contravening this assertion we shall presently consider.

Another important decision of the early Catholic Church, on this matter of the sufficiency of Scripture, is preserved to us in the *creeds*, or summaries of faith, which were then drawn up, and were looked upon as embodying all the vital doctrines of Christianity. Now, in these creeds there is not a tittle contained which is not either directly, or by necessary consequence, derived from Scripture. Roman Catholics are fond of appealing to Jerome and Augustine as patrons of Tradition. Now, let us hear what these Fathers say respecting the Apostles' Creed, which is nothing more than an epitome of the New Testament doctrines. Jerome says—"The symbol of our faith and hope which was delivered by the Apostles, is not written in paper and ink, but in the fleshly tables of our hearts. After the confession of the Trinity, and of the unity of the Church, *the whole, or every sacrament* [*i. e.*, mystery] *of the Christian religion is concluded with the resurrection of the flesh*" (3). Augustine says—"It [the Creed] is short in words, but great in sacraments. It confirms all men with the perfection of believing. . . . . Whatsoever was prefigured in the patriarchs, declared in the Scriptures, foretold in the prophets—of God who was not begotten, of the Son of God who is the only begotten of God, or of the Holy Spirit, &c.—*the whole of this the Creed briefly contains in itself*" (4). Again, he says—"It is the Rule of Faith—the short, the certain rule—which the Apostles comprehended in twelve sentences, that the believers might hold the Catholic unity, and convince the heretical pravity—the *comprehension and perfection of our faith.*"(5) The men who penned these passages could hardly have believed the imperfection and insufficiency of the written Word, of which the Creed is but a brief outline. The same may be said of Pope Leo the Great, who thus writes—"The short and *perfect confession* of the Catholic symbol is consigned in so many sentences of the twelve apostles, is so furnished with celestial ammunition, that all the opinions of heretics may be cut off with that sword alone"(6).

Again, the opinion of the ancients, as to the sufficiency of Holy Scripture, is expressed by the very term which they employed to designate the genuine works of the inspired writers, scil, the *canonical* Scriptures. The word *canon* (*κανὼν*) properly signifies a line or rule, and is sometimes applied to the tongue of a balance. Thus, then, the canonical books form the Divine rule, by which we ascertain whether we are walking in the straight paths of God's commandments; the standard by which we conform ourselves to the Divine will; the test by which we examine ourselves whether we are in the faith (7).

Nay, more, the very *enemies* and persecutors of primitive Christianity bear testimony to the fact, that the Scriptures were then universally recognised as the sole depository of its essential truths. It was against the doctrines contained in *Scripture* that the Pagan adversaries of our religion directed their assaults, conceiving that if they overthrew them, no others remained in reserve. The Emperor Diocletian thought that if he could succeed in destroying the *books* of the Christians, the victory of heathenism would be complete, believing justly that they were the ark in which the whole of the new religion was deposited.

Lastly, so irresistible is the evidence in support of the position that Scripture contains all things necessary to salvation, that Bellarmine himself is forced to admit it, whilst he reserves for tradition the more recondite doctrines which were suited to the more perfect—"They [the Apostles] preached not to the people all things, but those which were *necessary* to them, or profitable, but other things they delivered apart to the more perfect."—De Verb. Dei. iv. c. 11. (8)

Moreover, against the Roman Catholic Rule of Faith—Scripture *and* Tradition, considered as co-ordinate

(1) The absurd stories told in some of the uncanonical gospels do not deserve a moment's serious attention.

(2) Jer. Taylor, *Dissuasive*, p. 192, Oxf. ed. 1836.

(3) Hieron. Epist. ad Pammach. t. iv. p. 323.

(4) August. Serm. 131. de tempore (al. Serm. 212), t. v. app. 397.

(5) August. Serm. 181. de temp. t. vi. app. 278.

(6) Leo. M. Ep. 13. (al. 27.) ad Polch. August. We are not concerned with the error (as it is now generally considered) pervading all the above quotations—namely, that the Apostles themselves composed the creed called by their name. It may, however, furnish an additional illustration of the uncertainty of oral Tradition.

(7) This rule, Chrysostom observes, admits neither addition nor subtraction, otherwise its character as a rule is destroyed. *ὁ κανὼν οὔτε πρόσθεσιν οὔτε ἀφαίρεσιν δέχεται, ἐπεὶ τὸ κανὼν εἶναι ἀπόλλυσι.* — Chrysost. Hom. xii. in Phil. iii.

(8) This distinction refers to the famous Roman Catholic theory of the *Disciplina Arcani*—viz., that the Apostles, in addition to the truths which they publicly preached and committed to writing, communicated to their successors a number of unwritten doctrines, which were to be kept secret from the uninitiated Jews and Gentiles, and from the catechumens of the Church. This theory, which is really borrowed from heathen philosophy (in which the common, or *exoteric* doctrines were distinguished from the more recondite, or *esoteric*), was adopted by the Church of Rome in later times, in order to account for the perplexing fact of the silence of ecclesiastical antiquity respecting the peculiar doctrines of her creed. These doctrines, we are told, were really held since the days of the Apostles; but were kept secret, as hidden mysteries, not to be divulged to any but such as were initiated and duly prepared to receive them. The great expounder of this celebrated theory was Scholastrate, librarian of the Vaticae, whose work on the subject appeared in 1685. It is also worth observing, that a sect of *ancient heretics* (Valentinians) *held a doctrine precisely similar to the Roman Catholic theory* just described. They maintained, as we learn from Irenæus (c. Hær. Lib. i. c. 25), that "*Jesus* in mystery spake to his Disciples and Apostles some things in secret and apart, and enjoined them to transmit those things to them that were worthy." And we learn further, from Augustine (Tract 97. in Johan. t. iii. 738) that in support of this doctrine the heretics quoted John xvi. 12, the very text made use of, for the same purpose, by Bellarmine and all other Roman Catholic theologians. Tertullian likewise notices (de Præscr. Hæret. c. 25) the theory that the *Apostles* kept back some of the truths revealed to them, and did not impart them alike to all Christians. He condemns it in the most pointed manner, applies to it the name of madness (dementia), and regards it as a pure invention of the Gnostics, devised for the purpose of throwing an air of mysterious grandeur around their monstrous fictions, and supported by the grossest misrepresentations of Scripture. He informs us (1. c. cap. 23) that their scriptural proof was based on 1 Tim. vi. 20, the very passage which the Rhemish translators employ to prove that "the whole doctrine of Christianity was given unto the holy bishops to keep, and not to laymen." These striking resemblances between modern Romanism and ancient Gnosticism are well deserving of the serious attention of every reflecting Roman Catholic.

and independent sources of doctrinal truths—we found a number of objections to lie, arising from the inherent imperfections of tradition as a vehicle for transmitting doctrines; from the analogy of the Old Testament Scriptures; from the discouragement given, in the New Testament, to the attempt made by the Pharisees to put their traditions on a level with the written Word, &c. We must now add this very important consideration, that whilst in *theory* the Church of Rome makes Tradition a Rule of Faith only *equal* to Scripture, in *practice* she raises it *far above* Scripture; or, to speak more truly, makes Tradition the *sole* rule. For she represents (as we shall presently see) the *written* Word, not merely as requiring *explanation*—which in many places it certainly does—but as being so *ambiguous* and *perplexed* as to be a sealed book to the majority of Christians. The *unwritten* Word, on the contrary, she considers as containing (besides many *new* doctrines) *fully* and *clearly* what the *written* Word contains *imperfectly* and *obscurely*. On these principles it is very natural and reasonable that the imperfect and obscure should give way to the perfect and the clear, and that Scripture should become, as it has been made, the *vassal* of Tradition. Such a conclusion, however, causes Protestants to revolt from the premises from which it logically follows.

We have now to consider what the Roman Catholics themselves have to say in defence of the Rule of Faith promulgated by the Council of Trent. In order not to be misled by arguments irrelevant to the subject, we must again request the attention of our readers to the sole point at issue—viz., whether articles of faith, not contained expressly or implicitly in the New Testament Scriptures, were promulgated by our Lord, or his divinely-commissioned messengers; and have been, as such, preserved either in the writings of the early Fathers, or in the Acts of General Councils, or in any other trustworthy documents; or else have been transmitted to us by the living stream of Church Tradition.

We ask, then, first of all, *do any such Traditions exist*, and what proof have we of their genuineness? If we adopt, as a test of the latter, the famous criterion proposed by Vincentius of Lerins—"that which has been received *at all times, in all places, and by all persons*"—then it is certain they do *not* exist. It is, we repeat, undeniably certain that, with the exception of the doctrines contained in the canonical books of the Bible, there is not a single instance of an *essential* doctrine that can pretend to a clear, universal recognition by all ages and all churches. Indeed, modern Roman Catholic controversialists have given up the application of this test, and inform us that Vincentius' rule has been misunderstood; for that, while it is quite certain that whatever has been always, everywhere, and by all received, is Catholic truth, the converse is not true—viz., that nothing can be received as a Catholic verity which does not fulfil these conditions (9). Other tests of Apostolic Traditions have been proposed by Bellarmine and his followers, which either ultimately resolve themselves into that of Vincentius, or else are plainly insufficient for the proposed end. Thus, Bellarmine's fourth criterion (De Verb. Dei, iv. 9) is to the effect, that when the doctors of the Church, either assembled in Council or writing it in their books, affirm something to have descended from Apostolical authority, it is to be held as such (10). As an instance of the first kind, he mentions the worship of images, which was decreed by the Deutero-Nicene Council (A.D. 787)—a decree, it must be observed, in support of which no Father of the first three centuries could be quoted; which contradicted the decree of another General Council, that of Constantinople (A.D. 754); and which was directly opposed to the opinions of many Fathers of the Church, including the explicit injunction of Pope Gregory the Great (11). Bossuet, again, knowing the impracticability of *tracing* the Traditions of his Church to the source from which they are said to come, has ingeniously converted the very uncertainty of their origin into an argument for their *Apostolical* origin. He says (Exposit. de la Doctr., &c., ch. xviii)—"A most certain mark that a doctrine comes from the Apostles is, when all Christian Churches embrace it, without its being in the power of any one to show *where it had a beginning*" (12). Now, with respect to the latter part of this criterion, it is enough to say, that as we *do* know the beginning of all the doctrines recorded in the New Testament; and as this very *knowledge* is a sufficient ground for our receiving them; so our admitted *ignorance* of the source of the so-called Apostolical Traditions, is a sufficient reason for our refusing to receive them as such. The former part of Bossuet's criterion—namely, that "*all* Christian Churches *embrace* them"—is a *petitio principii*; for it refers to things which all Protestant Churches reject, and many of which have never been received by the Eastern Church.

If, then, the ablest advocates of the Church of Rome are unable to direct us to a single safe, not to say infallible, criterion (other than the records of Scripture), by which we may be able to distinguish genuine Apostolical Traditions from those which pretend to be such, what are we to think of the Tridentine decree which anathematizes those who presume to question the Divine origin of the Traditions which that Church adopts? Does the modern Church of Rome profess to know more upon the subject than the ancient Catholic Church, in the age of Tertullian and Augustine? Yet neither of these Fathers was acquainted with an infallible rule for distinguishing the true from the false. Tertullian admits that mere *custom* sometimes attached to a practice the authority of an Apostolical Tradition (13). Augustine maintained that the communicating of infants was an Apostolical Tradition, in which opinion, however, he is followed neither by Roman Catholics nor Protestants. It is unnecessary to enumerate in detail the various opinions and practices which, in different ages of the Church's history, have passed, more or less generally, for Apostolical Traditions, and which were subsequently suffered to fall into oblivion. The inference from the whole is, however, as inevitable as it is important—namely, first, that even were the *existence* of Apostolical Traditions subject to no doubt, they must be useless to *us*, as we have no means of *knowing* them when we find them; and, secondly, that it is most dangerous to accept, as articles of faith, any dogmas which rest *solely* on so precarious a basis as Tradition, in any of its forms.

Let us, however, consider in detail the arguments adduced by Roman Catholic theologians in proof of their Rule of Faith—Scripture, with Tradition as a supplement and interpreter.

I. *First*, then, they urge that the unwritten Word of God existed before the written Word, and that the Church, to which the unwritten Word was committed, is more ancient, more visible, and more apparent than Scripture. It was not, they truly observe, till some years after the ascension that even the first of the Gospels was written, whilst many years elapsed before the Apostolical writings were all complete. During this period, the inspired Gospel missionaries preached, the Church existed, and in her living, oral teaching the religion of the Gospel was embodied. Why, then, it is urged, should the mere fact of committing *some* of the doctrines, so promulgated and so preserved, to writing, supersede the authority of the unwritten Tradition and oral teaching of the Church, which existed before a word of Scripture was written (14)? Now, we do not deny that the unwritten Word was prior, in point of *time*, to the written, and so was the *first* Rule of Christianity. As nothing was recorded, so far as we know, during the life of our Saviour, the doctrines which he taught were, during *that* period, so many *Divine Traditions*. In fact, the history of our Lord's life and teaching *could not* have been written during his life-time, because that history was not yet finished. The great scheme of salvation which he came to work out was not complete till after his resurrection, his ascension, and the descent of the Holy Ghost. Again, it was not *necessary* for some time after his ascension, whilst the eye-witnesses of his miracles and hearers of his discourses were still alive, and, above all, whilst the Church enjoyed the actual presence of his divinely-commissioned disciples, to call in the aid of writing in support of oral Tradition: so that the doctrines which he taught *remained* for some time Divine *Traditions*. However, before a sufficient interval had elapsed to cause the purity of the original deposit to be impaired by the detrimental influence inseparable from unwritten Tradition, the Evangelists were specially commissioned and supernaturally empowered (in addition to their other extraordinary gifts) to place upon permanent record whatever it seemed fit to the Holy Spirit to perpetuate. Soit was also with respect to the other New Testament writings. The Gospel was first *preached* by the Apostles to the various churches, and afterwards, upon such occasions as the Divine Spirit saw fit to avail himself of, the Acts, the Apostolical Epistles, and the Apocalypse were penned, under the direction of that Spirit, embracing so much of doctrine, of moral teaching, and of fact as He saw would be necessary and sufficient for the faith and edification of the universal Church (15), in all future ages. Meanwhile, the doctrines which they taught were so many *Apostolical Traditions*. Henceforward, by the manifest appointment of God himself, his *written* Word, which we hold to be identical with these Divine and Apostolical Traditions, in all things essential to salvation, became the Rule of Faith. Scripture, then, does not supersede Divine and Apostolical Tradition, but is itself that Tradition, preserved in the only form upon which we may safely rely. And the inference, that because the Church is more *ancient* than Scripture, *therefore* Scripture *depends* upon the Church, obviously rests upon a false assumption—namely, that the authority of Scripture, as such, is grounded solely on the fact of its being *written*; whereas it is wholly derived from its being the *Word of God*. The writing of the Word is not an *essential* condition of its existence, though it is a very useful means, if not a necessary condition, of its continued preservation and diffusion. St. Paul, doubtless, calls the Church "the *pillar* and *ground* of the truth" (1 Tim. iii. 15); but the Church itself is based upon the Word of God, preached by Christ's appointed ministers—"Built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone" (Eph. ii. 20): whence, as we have already seen, Irenæus calls the Gospel the pillar and foundation of the Church (16). The Church is, therefore, posterior to the Word, though not to the *writing* of the Word. This Word committed, by the wisdom of God, to writing, has been consigned by Him to the custody of the Church, which is charged with the ministerial duty of preaching the same; but as it has been well remarked (17), it is as preposterous to affirm that Scripture owes its authority to the Church as it would be to say that a royal writ *depends* for its validity on the keeper of the great seal; or that the power of the monarch is *derived* from the herald who proclaims his accession to the throne. And lastly, as to the assertion that the Church is, at least was in early times, *more visible* than Scripture, surely, though this were granted, it would not in any way follow that the Scripture *derives* its authority from the Church. The following illustration has been employed (18) to show the real amount of the dependence of Scripture upon the Church in the respect under consideration:—A sign upon a road shows a traveller the way to a city; the sign is more visible than the city, but it does not *make* the city; and if it were destroyed, the city would still remain; and when the traveller arrives at the city, the city proves itself to be the place indicated by the sign, and so proves the credibility of the sign. Thus the Christian Church, it is true, directs us to Scripture, but she does not *make* Scripture, nor *give* authority to it; but, on the contrary, Scripture gives authority to the Church, and proves the truth of her testimony concerning it.

But though, as we have said, the *written* Word of God became, after the completion of the New Testament Scriptures, the Rule of Faith, yet it is no part of the doctrine maintained by Church of England Protestants that the Church's functions, in regard to the Word of God, were thenceforth entirely abrogated. She became "a witness and keeper of Holy Writ" (Art. xx.), just as the Jewish Church was the depositary of the oracles of God under the elder dispensation.—Rom. iii. 2. The teaching of the Catholic Church, in respect to all the essentials of salvation, was thenceforward limited, as

(9) "Ostendimus hunc et non alium sensum esse objecti canonis, nempe illud quidem esse Catholicum *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus* retentum est; ast non e converso, ita ut nihil admitti debeat uti fidei dogma Ecclesiæ Catholicæ quod non semper nec ubique neque ab omnibus fuerit admissum."—Perrone, Loc. Theol., Part II. sec. ii. cap ii. It was quite necessary that so stringent a criterion should be abandoned, when such doctrines as Communion in one kind and Transubstantiation were elevated to the rank of articles of faith.

(10) Augustine's opinion respecting the authority of a General Council to determine articles of faith differs very essentially from that of Bellarmine. In support of the much-disputed term ὁμοούσιος, the Catholics urged the authority of the Council of Nice, which adopted it; whilst, on the other hand, the Arians relied on the Council of Ariminum, which rejected it. Augustine, however, thus expresses himself on the subject—"Neither should I allege the Council of Nice, nor you that of Ariminum, prejudging, as it were, the question. I am not bound by the authority of the one, nor you by that of the other. By the authority of *Scripture* witnesses, not peculiar to either of us, but common to both, let fact contend against fact, cause against cause, reason against reason."—(Sed nunc nec ego Nicænum, nec tu debes Arimineuse, tanquam præjudicaturus, proferre concilium. Nec ego hujus auctoritate, nec tu illius detineris: Scripturarum auctoritatibus, non quorumque propriis, sed utrisque communibus testibus, res cum re, causa cum causa, ratio cum ratione, concertet.—August, c. Maximin. Arian., lib. iii c. 14.) This is identical with the doctrine laid down by the Church of England in her twentieth Article—"Things ordained in them [General Councils] as necessary to salvation have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they are taken out of Holy Scripture."

(11) In the ninth epistle of the seventh book (al. Lib. ix. Ep. cv.) of his Epistles, addressed to Serenus, Bishop of Marseilles, he advises that images should be retained, but that the people should be *prohibited from worshipping them*. (Tua ergo fraternitas et illas (sc. imagines) servare, sed ab earum adoratu prohibere debuit.)

(12) This criterion of Bossuet's agrees with Bellarmine's third (De verb. Dei, iv. 9), and both are taken from Augustine (Contr. Donat. Lib. iv. c. 22)—"Quod universa tenet Ecclesia nec Conciliis institutum, sed semper retentum est, non nisi auctoritate apostolica traditum rectissime creditur." Now, without discussing the soundness of this test, even in the fourth century, we may fairly ask, can it be safely transferred to the nineteenth?

(13) "Si legem [sc. Scripturarum] nusquam reperio, sequitur ut traditio consuetudine morum hunc dederit, habituram quandoque apostoli auctoritatem ex interpretatione rationis."—Tertull. de Corona Militis, cap. iv.

(14) "Jesus Christ having laid the foundation of his Church by preaching, the *unwritten* Word was consequently the *first* rule of Christianity; and when the writings of the New Testament were *added* to it, its authority was not *forfeited* on that account."—Bossuet, Exposition de la Doctrine, &c., ch. xviii. The word "added" involves a *petitio principii*, as it implies that a necessary *part*, at least, of God's Word, as delivered by Christ and his Apostles, was *not* recorded in the New Testament. Now, this cannot be taken for *granted* in arguing with those who invariably *deny* it.

(15) Not merely the laity, or uninitiated part of the Church, as Bellarmine maintains—rather inconsistently, it is true, inasmuch as the laity are not competent to read the Scriptures.

(16) στῦλον καὶ στήριγμα τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.—Iren. c. Hær. iii. 2.

(17) Wordsworth, canon of Scripture, p. 17.

(18) Wordsworth, l. c. p. 15.

that of the Jewish Church had been, in the minutest particulars, to the points contained in the *written* Word. She was entrusted with no secret, reserved doctrines, to be orally committed to an initiated few, and by them to be communicated to the many, in suitable proportions, according to particular times and circumstances. This notion, really borrowed, as we have before said, from Paganism (19), was introduced into Christianity by the priestly caste, in times long posterior to the purer ages of Christianity. The duties of the Church, in respect to the Word of God, we repeat, were not superseded, but only restricted and defined, when that Word was committed to writing. Her proper business then was to testify to the *fact* that such and such documents were written by men universally or generally reputed to be inspired for that purpose; to preserve inviolate the sacred deposit committed to her care; and faithfully to preach and maintain the doctrines contained therein (20). Nay, more, when the title-deeds of man's salvation were thus formally drawn up, and the terms of the new covenant placed upon eternal record, safe from the influences of time and change, the value of the *independent, contemporary testimony* of the Catholic Church (during the age of her purity, and whilst the teaching of the Apostolic missionaries was still fresh in the memories of men) to the great *doctrine* contained in the charter of man's redemption did not all at once cease. On the contrary, there were two cases in which the living Tradition of the Apostolic Churches was then appealed to as an authoritative exponent of Gospel doctrine. One was when copies of the New Testament Scriptures, or of some portions of them, were not, from some cause or other, to be obtained (21). In this case the oral testimony of these whose evidence might be relied on, as to the contents of the written documents, was unavoidably resorted to: just as, in the absence of a deed which is known to exist, but which cannot be directly consulted, trustworthy collateral evidence, as to its contents, might be admitted; subject, however, to the correction of the original document, whenever it might be produced. The second case in which Tradition was appealed to in the early Church was, when the Catholics disputed with heretics, who denied the authenticity of the Church Scriptures, maintaining the superior authority of their own Tradition. In this case the Catholics met them on their own ground, and opposed to the asserted Tradition of the sectaries the genuine Tradition of the Apostolic Church of highest eminence and most unimpeachable succession. But it is surely needless to remark that neither of these cases finds its parallel in the controversy before us; for, blessed be God, the written Word, in its integrity, is now accessible to all who wish to obtain it; and Roman Catholics, as well as Protestants, regard the canonical Scriptures as the Word of God.

(To be continued.)

A BIT OF A SERMON.

MR. EDITOR,—I am a young man, lately come from a country town were I was trying to earn an honest livelihood by taking short-hand notes for the ——— *Chronicle*, of lively scenes at petty sessions, speeches at agricultural meetings, and the like, which I am now so quick at doing that I thought I might, perhaps, better myself by coming to Dublin, where I have now been three weeks looking for employment. The other evening, sauntering about the town with nothing to do, having applied in vain to the principal newspaper offices (which, alas I were all pretty well provided already with reporters of all kinds), I was led out of curiosity to drop into —— Church, where I found a well-known controversial preacher in the middle of a very animated sermon. I had never been in the way of hearing a controversial sermon before; and being a stranger, there was no chance of my being reported as a heretic for listening to what I heard. Instinctively I pulled out my note-book and pencil, and took down verbatim what I heard. I was too late for the reverend gentleman's text, and I suppose lost the first half, at least, of his discourse, but what I did hear I venture to send you, hoping that you may; in return, either give me something to do in the way of my business, or recommend me to some of your friends, some of whom may, perhaps, have been present at the sermon, and therefore able to judge of the correctness of my note of it. I could not help being struck with the earnestness and strong common sense of the reverend gentleman, and shall not fail to go to hear him again.

Your obedient servant,

TERENCE MULVANNY.

[EDITOR—The reporter does not state the name of the reverend preacher, but probably many of our readers will be at no loss to guess at it. The report, we have no doubt, is a correct one, and is verbatim as follows]:—

"What is the use of his having reason if he does not use it?

"When I was in Connaught I said to the people, 'Boys, people see queer things when dust and flies get into their eyes. Would it not be a grand thing to shut our eyes, and then the dirt and flies would not get in? They said to me, 'Oh, sir, we would not like that at all.' I said, 'A man nourishing himself will eat and drink too much. What do you think if you would pay somebody for eating and drinking for you, and keep your mouths shut? When I was young I used to run and leap, and get falls, and sometimes hurt myself very much. Would it not be better not to walk or leap, and then you would not endanger your life? Honest, sensible men said to me they would not like that at all. And here, will sensible men let others learn for them, and hear for them, and read for them, and not read, and hear, and learn for themselves? Roman Catholics say their Church is the Catholic Church. How can a part be a whole? Surely the Roman Church is only a part of Christians. Now, I go to a Roman Catholic, and ask him to point out any prayer in the Church of England service that is wrong,—that is not according to Scripture. He cannot. But bring your book to me, and ask me, 'Can I find any prayer that is not according to Scripture? and I will prove that there are. You call the Virgin Mary, 'refuge of sinners, our life and hope.' Christ is that. That is contrary to Scripture. I grant that the whole Church of Christ—that is, the Catholic Church—could not teach error; and therefore the Roman Catholic Church is not the Catholic Church. The whole Catholic Church could not embrace, as necessary to salvation, that which only began some centuries ago; whereas the Roman Catholic Church does that from head to members: therefore the Roman Catholic Church is not the Catholic Church, is only a corrupt branch, if a branch at all, of the universal Church. I do not believe it to be the Catholic Church; because it was not always, it is not now, nor ever will be in every place, and there are many branches of the Catholic Church now in the world with as much pretensions as the Church of Rome. There is the Greek Church, the Abyssinian Church, the Syrian Church, and there are Churches in the valleys of the Alps that all protest against the pretensions of the Church of Rome just as we do.

"But, my dear brethren, whether we openly belong or not to the Catholic Church, it does not follow, if we do, that we shall be saved. But if we belong to Christ Jesus by a living faith and by a living love, and if our confidence is placed in him, if there is truth in God's Holy Word, we 'shall not perish, but have eternal life.' When a man came to St. Paul and said, "What shall I do to be saved?' He did not say, 'Believe in the supremacy of the Pope of Rome.' There was no Pope at Rome, or no Church at Rome at that time. Did he send him to the Virgin Mary, and say, 'Believe in Mary?" No, he did not. Did he say, 'Do penance for your sins?' No. What did he say? The question was, 'What must I do to be saved?' Was it a mere man answered him? No, an inspired Apostle. 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.' Is that the Roman Catholic doctrine? No, it is the Holy Ghost's doctrine. What is it? Is it this—You cannot be saved unless you believe in transubstantiation? They not only say this, but they swear it—Unless you believe in transubstantion, unless you believe in the seven sacraments, unless you embrace the doctrines of the Church of Rome, you cannot be saved. The Roman Catholic bishop swears this—'I, N. N., do, at this present, freely profess and sincerely hold this true Catholic faith, without which no one can be saved, and I promise most constantly to retain and confess the same, entire and inviolate, with God's assistance, to the end of my life.' This is the oath at the end of the twelve novel articles of the Church of Rome. Blessed be God, that is not true. That is the Roman Catholic doctrine. It is not the Catholic doctrine, it is not God's doctrine, it is not Christ's doctrine. Christ's doctrine is, 'He that believeth on the Son of God hath everlasting life,' shall not be condemned, 'shall not come into condemnation.' 'There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus.' 'Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature.' Who said that? Christ. What else did he say? 'He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved.' 'Oh,' says the Church of Rome, 'not at all. If he does not believe in the supremacy of the Pope, if he does not believe in every article in the Roman Catholic creed, he cannot be saved.' Ah, my friends, that is man's doctrine; but give me the Judge, the Master, the Lord, the great God, who says—'My sheep hear my voice and I know them, and they follow me, and I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish, neither shall any one pluck them out of my hand.'

"Oh, my countrymen, come and use the reason that God has given you. We are determined, with God's blessing, to maintain the truth; and be it known unto you, that as Rome has come and made, I grant you, a manly assault on England, we will stand against that assault, even unto the death. Let her summon her mightiest weapons—reason, and antiquity, and Scripture, and history; we have the same well-pointed, burnished weapons in our arsenal, and we will present our breasts to the front of the fight; and if she can produce the strongest reason, and the clearest Scripture, and the most ancient testimony, may God give her the day. If the Church of Rome be more according to reason, and Scripture, and ancient truth, may she sweep off the face of the earth every vestige of error on it. And if we be more according to reason, and Scripture, and antiquity than her, may God grant us the day. It is the interest of every man that God's truth should prevail and that man's reason should be free. I am open, I trust, to correction. If you give me reason for believing any thing, I will believe it. If a man proves to me that Mahomedanism is true, I will become a Mahomedan; if a man proves to me that the Jews are right, I will become a Jew; if a man proves to me that the heathens are right, I will become a heathen. As I said in starting, if a man proves to me that two and two make five, I will believe it; *but he must prove it.* To believe it without proof is only the act of a fool, just as too many of our Roman Catholics do. I will show you why you are forbidden to pry into anything. You will see one particular newspaper in general circulation. Why so? Because it supports its own side. Why, an honest man would read both sides. You will see books on their table all of one side; they will not read the other side at all, and yet they call themselves free. Then, again, look at the Church of Rome: how is it maintained now? The Pope of Rome would not allow a Protestant church inside the walls of Rome; he had all the schools, the colleges, the churches; he had all the cardinals, the bishops, the vicars, the monks and nuns, all to his heart's content, a very happy, blessed people; he was going about pouring his blessing upon them; candles lighting, great and wonderful things doing. How did the people of Rome act? They were sick of him; they cast him out of Rome; they obliged him to put on a servant's livery, and escape from Rome, they were so sick and disgusted with what is called the Vicar of Jesus Christ. The Roman Catholic people themselves were so disgusted, so sick of him who pretends to be the Vicar of Jesus Christ—'our Lord God, the Pope,' as they call him—that he was obliged to run away at the back of a coach. And how is he kept there now? By fraternity, liberty, equality? No; by cavalry, infantry, artillery. The Pope is maintained as the head of the Roman Catholic Church, how? By cavalry, infantry, artillery. The Pope is kept in Rome, how? By the decrees of councils, by preaching, by praying, by penance? No. What else? Cavalry, infantry, and artillery. Now, is that the way the Lord Jesus Christ rules as head of the Church? Is he upheld by cavalry, infantry, artillery? No; when Peter, in a passion, cut off the ear of the servant of the high priest with a sword, our Lord said—'Put up thy sword into its sheath, for they that take the sword shall perish by the sword.' And yet the Pope took every Italian sword; and when he could not get Italian swords he drew other swords, he drew the swords of ten thousand of the French soldiers, and now he is kept up by cavalry, infantry, artillery. That is the way that your head of the Church, or Vicar of Jesus Christ, proves that the Roman Catholic Church is the Catholic Church; not by argument—that failed; not by history—that failed; not by praying to the Virgin—that failed, but by the thunder of the cannon, and the point of the bayonet, and the edge of the sword, and the strength of the French arm; whereas the weapon of our warfare is truth, and it must prevail. Look at heretical England. Go to Liverpool, and the large counties of England. A soldier is a curiosity; in London a soldier is a curiosity; and you must go to the Horse Guards to see their broad, long swords and terrible cuirasses. But go to France and Roman Catholic countries, and you will see hundreds of swords, and lances, and bayonets all bestirring, to keep the rickety body together; and does this look like the Church of Christ? 'Go ye,' said our Lord, 'make disciples of all nations.' How? Baptizing them; that was the way—'teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.' With the point of the sword? No. With what else? With the tongue speaking, with the pen writing, and with the life living. That is the mark of the Church of Christ.

"Oh, may God grant that our people may know Christ to be the Prince of Peace, and not an earthly warrior; may they wield the sword of the Spirit, the Word of God, and not carnal weapons; may they look to Christ, and not to the strength of man, that we cannot depend on; and may God give us his blessing now and for ever."

(19) Roman Catholics attempt to support their doctrine of the Disciplina Arcani by the authority of Clement of Alexandria; but he lends no sanction to it, as the present Bishop of Lincoln has unanswerably shown.

(20) "With respect to the *New* Testament, the primitive Church of Christ exercised a fourfold office—first, that of a contemporary witness to its genuineness and authenticity; next, that of a guardian of its integrity; next, that of a herald, by public reading and interpretation of it in her religious assemblies, and by diffusion of copies of it into all parts of the world; and, finally, that of a judge, by vindicating its Divine character, and by distinguishing it from all suppositious writings claiming to be inspired, and by visiting their authors with severe spiritual penalties."—Wordsworth I. c. p. 20.

(21) The cost of materials and transcription rendered copies of the Sacred Books very scarce and valuable. They were usually preserved in the places set apart for worship, under the custody of the clergy. Under such circumstances, we can easily imagine cases in which it would be impossible, or very difficult, to appeal directly to the written Word.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-street. Communications from Mr. Collette, Philalethes, and others, have been received, but necessarily postponed for want of room.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber.

We beg those kind friends by whose subscriptions and contributions we have been supported during the past year, to remember that the subscriptions for the ensuing year are payable IN ADVANCE, and may be forwarded to Mr. Curry, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin, by Post-office orders, or postage stamps. Those who wish the paper to be continued should do so without delay.

We beg also to remind our readers that it is our intention to supply such of them as have preserved the CATHOLIC LAYMAN with a title-page and index for the year 1852, free of expense. A few back numbers, to complete sets, may still be had, on application to the publisher; price threepence each.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, DECEMBER, 1852.

Some months ago (in our May number) we called the attention of our readers to the alleged miracles at Rimini, in Italy; and having stated, from Roman Catholic authorities, the evidence on which they claim the assent of the faithful to their authenticity, we concluded with a question which we hoped that some of our intelligent Roman Catholic correspondents would have enabled us to answer—

"Do the Roman Catholics of Ireland believe these stories upon such evidence? Do they put these miracles, and the proof of these miracles, on an equality with the miracles of our Blessed Saviour, and the proofs of those miracles? If not, can they help acknowledging that these miracles are tricks and impositions? And if so, can they account for the fact, that while these accounts are circulated far and wide among the Irish people in the 'Catholic Directory,' on the authority of the Bishop of Rimini himself, not one of the bishops or priests of Ireland, by whose subscriptions that 'Directory' is circulated (and who are so zealous in preserving the laity from all that is dangerous to their faith and morals in the enlightened and profitable education of the Queen's Colleges), should ever have raised their voices to warn Catholics from believing the delusions which are sought to be spread among them, on the authority of the Bishop of Rimini and his confederates? Truly, the Roman Catholic laity of Ireland are called upon, in such a case, to vindicate their common sense and judgment from the imputation of believing or submitting to such manifest impostures, and we shall rejoice to hear that they do so."

We had hoped that Mr. Aylmer, Mr. Warner Christian Search, or some other of our educated correspondents, would have come forward either to defend or to repudiate these alleged miracles. One thing is plain, that they are either genuine miracles, worked by the mighty power of God, or vile impostures, invented by the knavery of men. A neutral or unimportant matter none can allege them to be; and taking place in the present day, in the heart of Italy, they must either confirm or shake the faith of thousands in the Church of Rome, for whose benefit they were, doubtless, effected, whether they be genuine or whether they be not. A more important inquiry we can scarcely propose to any inquirer after religious truth, and we again call the attention of our correspondents to it.

Our attention was recalled to the above subject by a friend placing in our hands a number of "The Catholic Guardian," published Feb. 1, 1852, in which the writer gravely attempts to prove the truth of transubstantiation by referring to the extraordinary miracles which authors of the first character (?) assert to have been wrought in support of it. The following extract is a sample of them:—

"Nicholas Serrarius relates, that when the Wickliffites first began to attack this dogma of the faith, in 1408, the following miracle took place:—

"A priest, called Henry Otho, was one day saying mass, in Durn, in the diocess of Wurtzburg, and, through his *want of caution*, upset the chalice, and the sacred blood was spilled all over the corporal. It appeared at once of the real colour of blood, and in the middle of the corporal was an image of the crucifix, surrounded with several other images of the head of the Redeemer, crowned with thorns. The priest was terrified; and although some other persons had already noticed the accident, he took up the corporal and laid it under the altar-stone, that it might decay in some time, and nothing more would be known about it. God, however, did not wish that such a miracle should be concealed. The priest was at the point of death, and remorse of conscience troubled him even more than the agony he was suffering; he could bear it no longer, but confessed all, told where the corporal was concealed, and then died immediately. All was found to be as he stated, and God wrought other miracles to confirm its truth. The magistrates investigated the whole affair with the greatest caution and deliberation, and sent an authentic account of it to the Pope, and he published a brief, dated the 31st March, 1445, inviting all the devout faithful to ornament and enlarge the church honoured by so stupendous a miracle.

"Thomas Treter relates the next miracle. Some Jews bribed an unfortunate Christian servant woman to procure a consecrated Host for them, and when they got it, they brought it into a cavern, and cut it in little bits on a table with their knives, in contempt of the Christian faith. The fragments immediately began to bleed; but instead of being converted by the miracle, they buried them in a field near the city of Posen, and went home. A Christian child soon after, who was taking care of some oxen, came into the field, and saw the consecrated particles elevated in the air, and shining as if made of fire, and *the oxen all on their knees, as if in adoration.* He ran off at once, and told his father; and when he found the fact to be as the child stated, he gave notice to the magistrates and the people. Crowds immediately followed him to the place, and all saw the particles of the sacred Host shining in the air, and the oxen kneeling in adoration. The bishop and clergy came at once in procession, and collecting the holy particles into the pixes, they brought them to the church. A little chapel was built on the spot soon after, which Wenceslaus, King of Poland, converted into a sumptuous church, where Stephen Damaleniski, Archbishop of Goesen, attests that he saw the sacred fragments stained with blood.

"Tilman Bredembach relates that there lived in England, in 1384, a nobleman of the name of Oswald Mulfer; he went to his village church one Easter, to receive his paschal communion, and insisted on being communicated with a large Host. The priest, fearful of his power, if he denied him, placed the large Host on his tongue, but in the very act the ground opened under his feet, as if to swallow him, and he had already sank down to his knees, when he seized the altar, but that yielded like wax to his hand. He now, seeing the vengeance of God overtaking him, repented of his pride, and prayed for mercy, and as he could not swallow the Host—for God would not permit him—the priest removed it, and replaced it in the tabernacle; but it was all of the colour of blood. Tilman went on purpose to visit the place where this miracle happened: he saw, he says, the Host tinged with blood, the altar with the marks of Oswald's hands, and the ground into which he was sinking still hollow, and covered with iron bars. Oswald himself, he says, now perfectly cured of his pride, fell sick soon after, and died with sentiments of true penance."

For the present we abstain from discussing whether Nicholas Serrarius, Thomas Treter, or Tilman Bredembach are writers of the first character or not, or whether the alleged miracles above narrated are worthy of belief, or on a par with the more modern wonders of Rimini. Our present inquiry, and, of course, the preliminary one, is a more practical one, and confined to the mere matter of fact—Are such miracles as these really believed in by the intelligent and educated classes of Roman Catholics in Ireland, or are they ranked by them among *pious frauds*, winked at by those in authority, as a short cut to the edification of the vulgar? We reserve our reasonings until we are better instructed upon the matter of fact. What do educated and pious Roman Catholics in Ireland really think or believe upon this subject?

We cannot close the first year of our labours without expressing our sincere satisfaction at the cordial reception which our pages have met with from all classes of our fellow-countrymen. We commenced those labours by undertaking to maintain the right of educated men to study the Holy Scriptures, and to discuss freely those differences which unfortunately exist among us; and we further undertook that such discussion should be carried on in the spirit of candour, fair play, and mutual good will. We look back with pride to the practical proof afforded in our pages that it is *possible*, even in Ireland, to conduct controversy on both sides with earnestness and ability, without degenerating into the vulgar declamation of polemic strife, or descending to personal scurrility. If truth and unity are ever to be attained, we feel more assured than ever that it will be through controversy, carried on in a mild and Christian spirit. In such a spirit we are, under God's blessing, determined to persevere. We hope, also, as we proceed, to render our labours not only accessible, but intelligible, to a still larger class of our fellow-countrymen, who are anxious to think for themselves, independently of priestly thraldom. We have been disappointed but in one point—that we have not been able to induce any Roman Catholic priest to reply to a single article which has appeared in our columns. We inserted a friendly challenge, in our first number, and repeated it again and again, to any priest or bishop of the Roman Catholic Church, in Ireland or England, to come forward and discuss, not orally, but in print, in our pages, in a *spirit of candour and Christian kindness*, the whole controversy. We announced that we did not require the writers *publicly* to give their names; so that, even if they failed, their Church need not necessarily suffer. We now ask our readers why not a single Roman Catholic priest has accepted our offer, and entered the field against us, while it is notorious that not a few of them have endeavoured to put us down in ways which, probably, they would be ashamed to avow? Why is this? We think our readers will scarcely believe that they *despise* our efforts, or think us their inferiors in learning or powers of thought. If truth be on their side, and they feel convinced that it is so, why should they not boldly come forward to defend it, and prevent their flocks from being misled by what must be sophistry and untruth, if their views are the right ones? We are still ready to receive their communications; and all we require is, that Christian temper should be preserved; and where authorities are cited, accurate references given to the volume, page, and exact edition, so that time may not be lost in, perhaps, a vain search. This we have always ourselves done, and shall continue to do, with scrupulous fidelity, being anxious only for one thing—the attainment of truth—and deeply convinced that nothing is greater than truth, and that ultimately it must and will prevail.

A copy of the following letter having been forwarded to us, we think it deserving of publication. We greatly regret that the arrangement contemplated in it was not carried into effect. We can conceive nothing more desirable for promoting a calm and dispassionate inquiry after truth than that the clergy of the two Churches should enter into amicable proceedings of this kind; and we heartily regret that the Rev. Mr. O'Mullane did not proceed with what he at first agreed to.

This letter raises a serious question, whether "the index of the Council of Trent" be in force in the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland. Some have affirmed that it is, others that it is not. This is a question which Roman Catholics in Ireland should wish to have cleared up: we invite communications on the subject. It will be

better to publish the index itself, in connection with communications which throw light upon it.

"TO THE INHABITANTS OF THE PARISH OF GLANWORTH.

"DEAR FRIENDS—You are, perhaps, aware that recently a prospect presented itself that, by the mutual co-operation of the Roman Catholic clergyman of the parish and myself, an arrangement might be made, whereby the Roman Catholic translation of the inspired Scriptures might be brought within the reach of each of you; and thus you might possess, and search for yourselves the Sacred Volume. I regret that this expectation of co-operation for your benefit has been frustrated, by the Roman Catholic curate, on Saturday last, declining to carry out the plan we had agreed on a fortnight before. The reason which he assigned to me for this was, that I had in view 'ulterior objects, and a cunning design;' alleging that such was evident, from my expressed intention of providing also for sale the Protestant translation of the Bible. I cannot see how the exercise of my unquestionable right to supply to any who desire to purchase it a Protestant Bible should interfere with any benefit to be derived from the dissemination of the Roman Catholic version also. That I have 'ulterior objects' in view, in endeavouring to place the Bible within your reach, is no 'cunning design,' but an open and a candid one. My primary object simply is, that you should come to the knowledge of what the prophets, and evangelists, and apostles of our Lord taught and recorded. And my final aim is, that, through the knowledge of the truth, your souls may be saved in the great day of the Lord.

"That Mr. O'Mullane would persevere in his expressed intention of sanctioning the circulation of his own version of the Scriptures, I hardly expected. It would be a boon too large and liberal for Rome to confer—permission to purchase cheaply and unrestrictedly even their own version, without note or human comment. But in what position does his withdrawing from the arrangement leave the matter? Personally, Mr. O'Mullane has exhibited the liberality of his own sentiments, and has marked his opinion of the unreasonableness of withholding the Bible, by disavowing all opposition to the reading of the Romish translation of the Scriptures. You have, therefore, I conclude, his permission for obtaining and reading it, when and where you can. But the open sanction to its indiscriminate sale he is not permitted by his Church to give. Witness the 4th rule of the Index of the Council of Trent, and various other authorities. Opposition, therefore, between the Church of Rome and the Word of God is palpable: there is no mistake about the matter. Romanism and Scripture cannot stand together; one must yield the place; and Rome is determined she will not; and, therefore, if she can, the Bible must. However inconvenient it may be, surrounded by Protestant light and liberty, to avow this principle, it is evident that practically she acts on it; and withholds, as far as in her lies, from the people she can influence, a knowledge even of her own translation of the Word of God.

"Have you ever read the declaration of the Saviour, in the Gospel of St. John, iii. chap. 19 v. (Douay version)—'This is the judgment, because the light is come into the world, and men have loved darkness rather than the light: for their works were evil. For every one that doeth evil hateth the light and cometh not to the light, that his works may not be reproved. But he that doth truth cometh to the light, that his works may be made manifest, because they are done in God.'

"And again, John v. 39—'Search the Scriptures, for you think in them to have life everlasting; and the same are they that give testimony of me.'

"And St. Paul, in his 2nd Epistle to Timothy, 4th chap., 15 to 17 verse—'From thy infancy thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which can instruct thee to salvation by the faith which is in Christ Jesus. All Scripture inspired of God is profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice, that the man of God may be perfect, furnished to every good work.' And Isaiah chap. viii. 20—'To the law rather and to the testimony. And if they speak not according to this word they shall not have the morning light.'

"Reading these plain statements of Christ our Lord and his apostles and prophets, can you reconcile the strenuous opposition which the Church of Rome exhibits to the free circulation of the Scriptures with a consciousness that her doctrines will bear comparison with the testimony of that word? No, dear friends; Rome knows well that her system and Scripture are irreconcilable, and THEREFORE she withholds the Scriptures from the mass of her people. Witness the fact, that the Bible is a contraband article in Italy. Witness the fact, that in Ireland the Bible is an unknown book among multitudes of Roman Catholics; and when the Word of God is spoken of, they often conceive the expression to refer to their own Prayer Book. Witness the shrinking from the performance of his late agreement, by the Roman Catholic curate of this parish, as well as his declining my proffered challenge to a fair and public discussion of our respective principles. Watch, and note whether any measures will be adopted for bringing your own version of the Bible within your reach.

"But Mr. O'Mullane further urged as a reason for withdrawing from the arrangement, that I would take occasion to speak to you on religious subjects. Well, what if I do? The freedom of speech of a British subject, and a Protestant minister, does not depend on his sanction to the circulation of the Bible; nor can his withholding that sanction seal my lips. One might suppose that if your principles be in accordance with the Word of God, a knowledge of that Word would fortify you against any attempt to overthrow those principles. I cannot see how withholding the Bible can weaken my cause, unless the Bible be in my favour. If, indeed, as I allege, the testimony of the Bible be a confirmation of the principles he fears I would disseminate among you, all is plain enough. But what *is* made plain? That Rome is necessitated to keep the people in ignorance of the Scriptures, that she may keep them in communion with herself.

"One subject more I must allude to. Mr. O'Mullane, in our recent conversation, attempted to work upon my fears. He warned me against speaking to you on religious subjects, on pain of your scorn. Scorn and insult my Master suffered for the truth's sake, and he has taught me, 'the servant is not greater than his master.' 'It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master, and the servant as his Lord. If they have called the good man of the house Beelzebub, how much more them of his household. Therefore fear them not; for nothing is covered that shall not be revealed, nor hid that shall not be known. That which I tell you in the dark, speak ye in the light, and that which you hear in the ear preach ye upon the housetops,' &c., &c.—John xv. 20, and Matt. x. 25, &c. But Mr. O'Mullane hinted at more substantial matter of apprehension. He little knows the provision which the Bible makes to prepare the Christian for all contingencies in the path of duty. He must surely have forgotten—when he warned me thus 'as a friend'—that there is another 'Friend who sticketh closer than a brother,' and who had previously warned me thus—'I say unto you, my friends, be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. But I will *forewarn* you whom ye shall fear: Fear him which, after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, fear him.'

"Mr. O'Mullane has warned me of scorn, and hinted at more serious consequences. I hold him answerable for either insult or injury, should such be offered. But such I do not anticipate. My experience of your uniformly friendly and courteous demeanour assures me that harmony and good feeling must continue to prevail between us, unless there be a strong stimulus applied to alter the genuine tendencies of your naturally kindly feelings. You will not consider me 'an enemy because I tell you the truth.'

"In conclusion, allow me to assure you of the entire cordiality with which I desire the promotion of your best interests, and of my studious endeavour to avoid all approach to personal offence; while I speak the truth, it is in love; and surely you have too much manly and honourable feeling to think evil in your hearts of an honest man who candidly and faithfully speaks his mind in the language of a gentleman and the spirit of a Christian minister.

"One request I must earnestly make of you—Ask God, for Jesus Christ's sake, to give to you and to me his Holy Spirit—that by him all prejudice and ignorance may be removed, in whichever quarter they may exist; that we may each be guided or preserved in the knowledge, and belief, and love of the truth; and that our precious souls may be saved through Christ for ever. I am, Dear Friends, your faithful servant in Christ,

JOHN ALDWORTH.

"Rectory, Glanworth, 9th August, 1852."

WARNER CHRISTIAN SEARCH AND THE FATHERS OF THE FOURTH CENTURY ON PURGATORY.

IN our number for June we published a letter from "A Catholic," asking that some one would publish in our paper the testimonies to the existence of purgatory which the Fathers of the first *three* centuries have left us.

This letter was answered, in our number for July, by "W. C. Search," who mixed up in his answer the Fathers of the three first centuries and the Fathers of the fourth century also. We then answered the proofs which "W. C. Search" gave from the Fathers of the three first centuries; and we stated our reason why on that occasion we confined ourselves to what he had brought from those three centuries—viz., because those only could be any answer to the letter to which he undertook to reply.

Our readers will remember, or, if not, by looking back to our number for July, page 82, column 2, they will see the result of our examination of the authorities which "W. C. Search" produced from the three first centuries. The result of our examination of them was as follows:—"We have now gone over all the witnesses that 'W. C. Search' has brought for purgatory, from the first three hundred years of the Christian Church. There are *only two!* One of them believed only after he left the Catholic Church and became a heretic; the other, who was always a Catholic, never believed it at all. We are now entitled to take it as established that this notion of purgatory was no doctrine of the Gospel of the Church for *three hundred years.* Whenever it came in afterwards, it was an invention of men."

To this no reply has been made: no one has attempted to question our proofs as to those two witnesses; and no one has attempted to bring any other witnesses from the first three hundred years. We are, therefore, entitled to consider the above statement as unanswerable until some one can be found to answer it.

At that time we left out "W. C. Search's" proofs from the *fourth* century, because they had nothing to do with the letter he undertook to answer; but we said that we would consider them separately on some other occasion, and we now propose to do so.

Here we ask our readers to refer to "W. C. Search's" letter, which they will find in the CATHOLIC LAYMAN for July, page 87, column 1. In the paragraph marked 4 "W. C. Search" quotes, from the historian Eusebius, the account of the Emperor Constantine's funeral. [We hope our readers always preserve the back numbers of the LAYMAN to refer to; but in case any do not, we here reprint this part of "W. C. Search's" letter.]

"In this manner did Constantine perform the last duties in honour of his father. But when he had departed with his guards, the ministers of God, surrounded by the multitude of the faithful, advanced into the middle space, and with prayers performed the ceremonies of Divine worship: the prince reposing in his coffin, and the people in concert with the priests, not without sighs and tears, *offered up prayers to heaven for the repose of his soul*, in this manifesting the most acceptable service to a religious prince. The deceased emperor was thus admitted to a participation in the religious rites, the mystic sacrifice and holy suffrages of the faithful.—Eusebius de Vita Constant., lib. 2."

The place from which this is taken is the *fourth* book, c. 71, and not the *second* book, as referred to by "W. C. Search."

We have already said that we never correct translations through mere pedantry. There is much in the above that is wrong, but we correct only what affects the argument. "W. C. Search" has marked these words in italics—"*offered up prayers to heaven for the repose of his soul.*"

We have already observed how fond Roman Catholics are of putting in the word "repose" where the writer never put it. The Greek has no more than this—"Offered up prayers for the soul of the emperor." Even this might as well be translated differently—"offered up prayers for the *life* of the emperor." It might as well be translated of prayers offered for the life of the living Emperor Constantius as for the soul of the dead Emperor Constantine. But we are willing to take it as if it meant the latter; and then the question will be, whether these were prayers for a soul in purgatory or thanksgiving for a soul in heaven. And here we must observe, that "W. C. Search," for some reason of his own, leaves out a passage from the *middle* of his quotation, without giving any notice that he does so. And part of what he leaves out is as follows:—That God thus gave to Constantine "the things which were desired by him—a place in the memorial of the Apostles—the habitation of a thrice blessed soul, having equally glorified him with the appellation of the Apostles." Thus, it appears that the nature of this service was simply joining the Emperor Constantine in the same memorial, or remembrance, which they made of the Apostles themselves! Whether this were rightly done, or whether it were not rather a flattery of the deceased emperor to please the living one, is not the question here; but surely it can be no testimony that they who did this believed that the soul of Constantine was in purgatory! Were the Apostles, then, in purgatory? And when those flattering priests joined Constantine in the remembrance which they made of the Apostles, does that prove that they thought Constantine's soul was in purgatory?

Let it be remembered that this passage is none of our seeking; it is one of the proofs that "W. C. Search" brings for purgatory in the fourth century, because there was no better to be had.

The passage appears to us very strong, indeed, the other way; for the Emperor Constantine, though he had some good points, was far from being a holy man. If, then, there had been such a place as purgatory, he was a very fit person to go there; and since these priests never dreamed of his going there, it is clear they could have no notion of such a place.

"W. C. Search" next quotes St. Cyril of Jerusalem, also of the fourth century, as follows—"There (in the Sacrifice of the Mass*) we pray for the holy Fathers and the bishops that are dead; and, in short, for all those that are departed this life in our communion; believing that the souls of those for whom the prayers are offered receive very great relief (it should be *advantage*) while this holy and tremendous victim is upon the altar—Catech. Myst. 5, pages 297, 298. Read prior and subsequent to this quotation."

We have read as directed, and we find that all this is

* These words are "W. C. Search's," not St. Cyril's.

said of patriarchs, prophets, APOSTLES, and MARTYRS, *as well* as of holy fathers and bishops, and of all who died in our communion. Were *all* these in purgatory? Surely the Church of Rome at the present day will tell "W. C. Search" that the apostles and martyrs were never in purgatory at all. Hence it is clear, that commemorations which were made for *apostles* and *martyrs, as such* as for all other faithful departed, could have nothing to do with purgatory. Does the Church of Rome include apostles and martyrs now in her purgatorial prayers? Does she not say that it would be an heretical impiety to do so? Clearly, then, these "commemorations" were not purgatorial.

"W. C. Search" thus quotes St. Chrysostom—"Not without reason was it ordained by the Apostles that, in celebrating the sacred mysteries, the dead should be remembered." "W. C. Search" points this in capital letters; and, of course, he thinks it of great force to prove purgatory. Does he not know that the Church of England and Ireland remembers or commemorates the dead in the very same way, at every celebration of the holy communion? "We also bless thy holy name for all thy servants departed this life in thy faith and fear." Why does he not quote this as a proof of purgatory? The Church of England and Ireland "remembering the dead" should surely be as good a proof of purgatory as St. Chrysostom "remembering the dead."

"W. C. Search's" quotation from St. Ephraim is not proved to be written by him. It is, in all probability, a forgery. The passages of Scripture quoted in it are enough to prove this; for he could hardly have given interpretations of Scripture so manifestly false. And even if this passage had really been written by him, it would not prove that he believed in purgatory. On the contrary, in his 12th Discourse, he affirms, "that there is no middle between hell and the kingdom of heaven."

No. 8. "W. C. Search" says, he *abstains* from quoting Origen. We are not surprised at this, as we have already shown that Origen's opinion on the subject is counted heretical by the Church of Rome itself.

"W. C. Search" says he also *abstains* from quoting Arnobius, of Sicca. We do not wonder at this either, as we know that Du Pin, the most learned man the Roman Catholic Church has had in that kind of learning, has given us this character of Arnobius, of Sicca—"It must be confessed that he did not perfectly understand the Christian religion when he wrote these books."—Eccles. Hist., vol. i., p. 147. Dublin, 1723.

He also *abstains* from quoting Basil and Ambrose. We do not wonder at this either; for we expect to be able to answer on them, too, when they are quoted.

"W. C. Search" concludes by quoting Bishop Forbes, of the Church of England; forgetting that Bishop Forbes never believed in purgatory, and that, therefore, his having used the expressions that he did is only a further proof that such expressions may be used by those who did not believe in purgatory; and that, therefore, those expressions have a different meaning.

The great mistake that runs through all such proofs of purgatory is this, that whenever Roman Catholics read of *any* prayers for the dead, or *any* commemoration of the dead, they always take for granted that it *must* be for getting the souls of the dead out of purgatory, even though the writers themselves say that it is for a totally opposite purpose. We have often exposed this fallacy in the LAYMAN, and no one as yet ventured to answer upon it. Is it not a striking fact that in all the proofs, such as they are, which "W. C. Search" brings from the Fathers of the first four centuries for the doctrine of purgatory, that purgatory itself is not so much as *mentioned once* in any of them? *Could* this be so if they really believed in such a place? Is it likely that Roman Catholics *now*, for the space of 400 years together, should never so much as *mention* purgatory once in any of their writings? Yet this is what we find in the early Church. Hence it is that Roman Catholic controversialists now, in trying to prove purgatory from the first four centuries, are obliged to rely on places which make no mention of purgatory, but are forced to rest their case on "commemorations for the dead," even though such commemorations, as in the case of Constantine, were clearly intended for souls supposed to be already in heaven.

We wish Roman Catholics would look at this fairly, and at once get rid of the absurd notion, that such remembrances of the dead are any proof of purgatory.

To enable them to do this the better, we quote here a case that has recently occurred. We have, in the *Freeman's Journal* newspaper, of April 2, an account of a solemn High Mass offered on that day for the late Dr. Murray, who had died on that day month. A sermon was preached at this very High Mass by the Rev. Mr. Meagher, P.P. of Rathmines; and how did this sermon begin? It began thus:—"With the holy dead *all is well*. St. Laurence has but embraced *in heaven* the last and greatest of his successors, and *conducted him ere now*, let us trust, *to his place in the quires of everlasting jubilee*: yes, *with the holy dead all is well*. . . Your city has lost a bishop, but has gained an *additional patron and advocate in the skies*." Now, it is clear that Mr. Meagher, when preaching this sermon at this High Mass, did not think it at all necessary to believe that the person for whom that Mass was offered was then in purgatory. Now, if the Rev. Mr. Meagher, in preaching thus, at this High Mass, had been openly contradicting the doctrine of the Church of Rome, in the presence of all the clergy and people of Dublin, would he not have been censured? We know that his preaching was not censured, but approved by all who heard him, both lay and clerical. Will any priest or authority of the Roman Catholic Church in the diocess of Dublin now pretend to say that the soul of Dr. Murray was in purgatory when that Mass was offered for him? Here, then, we have a plain and undeniable proof that the offering of sacrifice, and the making a solemn commemoration for a dead person, is no proof at all that the dead person is in purgatory. Well, then, when we read of any sacrifice or commemoration for a dead person, in the early Church, what right has any Roman Catholic to say that this is proof that that person was in purgatory, and that such sacrifice or commemoration could not be for any other purpose than getting the soul out of purgatory? We see plainly, in this instance, the falsehood and the fallacy of the argument. If the Church of Rome now thinks that there are *other reasons* for offering her sacrifice and making her commemoration now *for souls that are not in purgatory*, much more might the early Church offer her very different sacrifice, and make her commemoration for souls that she never believed to be in purgatory. How absurd, then, for any Roman Catholic now to say that sacrifice and commemoration for the dead *cannot be for any other purpose* besides getting the soul out of purgatory! Yet it is only by relying on this gross absurdity, contradicted even by their own practice at this present day, that any Roman Catholic can attempt to bring any other shadow of proof for purgatory from the early Church!

We commend this argument to the consideration of "W. C. Search;" and, until some one can answer it, we trust we shall hear no more of such *proofs!* for purgatory from the early Church.

Correspondence.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—In reading the CATHOLIC LAYMAN of July and August last, several matters therein seriously engaged my attention, each of which I shall consider in order; and, first of all, your reply to Mr. Aylmer's question, regarding the second marriage of "her that is put away." I am sure you answer candidly, and state fairly, the law of the land and the practice of your Church in these cases. But, then, another question naturally arises: the sincere inquirer after truth will be inclined to ask, how can the law of the land be at variance with the discipline or law of the Church? Is it not the same power that gives efficacy to both? Is not the Sovereign of England, *pro tempore*, the supreme head of the Established Church in Great Britain and Ireland? And no act of parliament can be considered the law of the land without the royal assent and signature of such Sovereign. These, or such like questions, every person inquiring after the truths of this religion will propose to himself. You say, the "ecclesiastical courts of the Church of England refuse these divorces." Then we are to understand that "the ecclesiastical courts," &c., do not acknowledge the acts sanctioned by the spiritual head of these courts. This does not show "the whole body fitly joined and compacted," &c. (Eph. c. iv. v. 16), nor does it indicate that the Church which ought to be "one body and one spirit" (Eph. c. iv. v. 4.), is careful to "keep the unity of the spirit"—Eph. c. iv. v. 3. Is it not, moreover, a fact, that in every case of a second marriage of "*her that is put away*," a clergyman of the Reformed Church is always found to administer the ceremony of such marriage? This appears to be a very strange feature in the Reformed Church, and one which ought to be shown as reconcilable to Gospel precept.

In page 81, July number, you ask—"What have the Fathers of the first three centuries to do with the Book of Maccabees?" That these Fathers have something to do with this book, may be seen in Clement Alexand., Stromat. Lib. 1; Cyprian, Lib. 2; Epist. 3 and 55 ad Cornel; and Origen, Lib. 6, page 290, et seq.; Euseb. Hist. Eccles. Again, with respect to purgatory, you ask—"What was the doctrine of Tertullian himself while he was a Catholic?" But in the interpretation of the passage which you quote from him, to prove what this doctrine was, I suspect you have made a serious mistake, to which I beg to call your attention. The words of Tertullian, cited by you, prove nothing, either for or against purgatory. When he says "grief for the dead is idle, and the impatience of grief is idle," he uses plain, unequivocal words, which cannot be misunderstood. He does not say that prayers for the dead are idle, or that sacrifice and alms for the dead are idle; and when you prove that "grief for the dead, &c., and the impatience of grief," &c., may be understood for prayers and sacrifice, the passage will bear your interpretation, but not till then. Tertullian does not affirm, as you state, that to pity them who are called away is to do an injury to Christ; but he says, "we do an injury to Christ when we do not contentedly accept their being called away by him, as if they were to be pitied." Saint Nilus fully explains the nature of that grief which Tertullian deprecates, and which the Christian Church discountenanced in all ages. He says—"To be grieved, to weep, to fast immoderately for the death of a relation, indicates unbelief and the want of hope. He who believes that he shall rise again from the dead will feel comfort, will return thanks to God, will change his tears into joy, will pray that he (*the dead person*) may obtain eternal mercy."—Lib. i., epist. 311, t. xi., p. 116.

In page 82 you reject the word "*repose*," which "W. C. S." puts into his translation of the passage he quotes from Tertullian; you blame him for using the same word again in Cyprian, "when it is, at least," you say, "a doubtful translation;" yet strange, you have not removed the doubt. "Upon falling asleep" is, at best, an *obscure elucidation*, and in perfect keeping with your notion of "*refrigerium*."

I request you will show from Scripture the progressive gradation of the felicity of the blessed in heaven.

Cyprian's words—"*non offerretur pro eo, nec sacrificium pro dormitione ejus celebraretur*"—evidently denote actions subsequent to the time of his (*excedens*) departing this life, and can leave no doubt as to their precise meaning.

The same Cyprian is still plainer in Epist. 52, page 72, where he says—"It is one thing to be cast into prison and not to go out till the last farthing be paid, and another to receive at once the reward of faith and virtue; one in punishment of sin to be purified by long suffering and purged by long fire (or, as some have it, *diutine*), and another to have expiated all sins by previous suffering."

Concerning the doctrine of purgatory, as taught by the Catholic Church in the third century, nothing can be plainer than the words of Origen.

His words are as follow:—"For if on the foundation of Christ you have built not only gold, and silver, and precious stones, but also wood, and hay, and stubble, what do you expect when the soul shall be separated from the body? Would you enter into heaven with your wood, and hay, and stubble, to defile the kingdom of God; or, on account of these incumbrances, remain without, and receive no reward for your gold, and silver, and precious stones? Neither is just. It remains, then, that you be committed to the fire, which shall consume the light materials; for our God, to those who can comprehend heavenly things, is a consuming fire. But this fire consumes not the creature, but what the creature has himself built—wood, and hay, and stubble. It is manifest that, in the first place, the fire destroys the wood of our transgressions, and returns to us the reward of our good works."—Hom. 16 in Jerem., T. iii., p. 232. For more on this same subject read Hom. 6 in Exod., page 148. Hom. 14 Lev. page 259.

In page 94, August number, your distinction between περι and υπερ is rather far-fetched, and will not stand the test of strict criticism; but waiving this for the present, we pass to your "*correct translation*" of the Vatican text, which, notwithstanding the importance you attach to it, proves very little, if anything, in your favour. Περι των τεθνηκοτων, you are found to render "*concerning the dead*," or "*on account of the dead;*" not a word about the living. There is as much said in the text about the unborn as there is about the living; and yet you say—"The sacrifice was offered, and the atonement was made, not for the dead, but for the living." You adduce the case of Achan as a precedent, in which you say—"There was sacrifice offered, too; for all his sheep and his oxen were burned." As *ex parte* statements prove nothing, I shall, if you permit me, place all the incidents of Achan's death before the reader. *Approved version*, Joshua vii. 24—"And Joshua, and all Israel with him, took Achan, the son of Zerah, and the silver, and the garment, and the wedge of gold, and his sons, and his daughters, and his oxen, and his asses, and his sheep, and his tent, and all that he had; and he brought them into the valley of Achor." Verse 25—"And all Israel stoned him with stones, and burned them with fire, after they had stoned them with stones."

For an holocaust consisting of victims such as those mentioned in the 24th verse above, you have neither precedent nor precept, in the law of Moses. Joshua had no order from God to offer sacrifice. The Lord said to him—"Neither will I be with you any more, except you destroy the accursed from among you."—Joshua vii. 12. No more was required, no more was done. Observe, the Lord does not call all Israel accursed; but he says, except you destroy the accursed, &c. The fourth chapter of Leviticus is next to be considered. Verse 2—"If a soul sin through *ignorance*," &c. Verse 3—"If the priest that is anointed do sin, according to the sin of the people," &c. Verse 13—"And if the whole congregation of Israel do sin through ignorance, and the thing be hid from the eye of the assembly," &c. Verse 14—"When the sin which they have sinned against it is known, then the congregation shall offer," &c. Verse 22—"When a ruler hath sinned and done something through *ignorance*," &c.

On a cursory perusal of the fourth chapter of Leviticus, it is easy to perceive that it relates solely to accidental sins, or sins committed by mistaking the laws, or the proper sacrifices and ceremonies, as ordained by Moses, for which they were bound to offer sacrifice

when they saw their mistake. It is, therefore, necessary to show that Judas was guilty through ignorance, and participated in the sins of the slain. Neither does the sacrifice of *Hezekiah* (2 Chron. xxix, 21, 22, &c.), nor that of Ezra (viii. 35), bear any analogy to the sacrifice offered by Judas. In fine, there is not in the whole of the law of Moses any command to offer sacrifices of expiation for Israel on account of the idolatry of individuals. Idolaters were ordered to be stoned (Deut. xvii. 5): no other conditions annexed; no sacrifices prescribed.

I think from what I have here stated, it is plain, that if Judas offered sacrifice for the living, he did not offer that sacrifice in conformity with any prescript or ordinance contained in the law of Moses, and, therefore, the inference aimed at in your "*correct translation*," and which you made to depend solely on the adventitious support of that law, must, consequently, fail, not having the authority of such law to support it.

I will not now say anything about the right of Judas to offer sacrifice for the dead; but I will say, that the Jewish synagogue, both before and at the time of our Saviour, did practise praying for the dead.

I need not prove it; a clergyman of the Church of England does* it for me—*Johnson*, "*Unbloody Sacrifice*," page 292. Speaking of the practice of the primitive Church on this point, he says—"They seem to have learned this practice from the synagogue; for it is certain the Jews, in and before our Saviour's time, did use it"—*prayers for the dead.*

I think it necessary to remark, that it does not appear that Achan was guilty of idolatry. "When I saw," says he, "among the spoils a goodly Babylonish garment, and 200 shekels of silver, and a wedge of gold of fifty shekels weight, then I coveted and took them."—Joshua vii. 21. The sins were alike, you admit; therefore, the others coveted the donaries of the idols, and took them; they did not worship them. The writer does not say they did. And in Deut. vii. 25, 26—"Thou shalt not desire the silver or gold that is on them, &c., *lest* thou *be snared therein*, &c.; *lest* thou be a cursed thing like it." The word *lest* is here worthy of some consideration.

In the foregoing I have been actuated solely by a spirit of candour and impartiality; a question of such grave importance as that of religion should thus only be discussed.

Hoping your will excuse my lengthy epistle,

I remain, sir, yours sincerely,

EDMOND POWER.

In consequence of the difficulty we find in making room for long articles, the length of the preceding letter obliges us to endeavour to be brief in the remarks with which we accompany it. We regret this the less, however, as the subjects of which it treats have been so fully discussed in our pages before.

In a letter from Mr. Aylmer, published in our June number, into which our respected correspondent contrived to introduce a great variety of topics, he asked us how we reconciled with the New Testament our law of divorce, which permitted to marry her that is put away. The point being very irrelevant to the subject we were discussing, we thought it enough at the time to correct his mistake in supposing that there is any such *law* of divorce. Mr. Power now presses us with the divorces occasionally granted by the legislature, in cases of adultery. And without admitting, as he seems to require, that the connection of the Church of England with the State makes her responsible for every act of parliament to which the Sovereign gives assent, we have no hesitation in conceding that our Church does regard such divorces as valid, and that her ministers do not scruple to remarry parties so divorced. But the prohibition against marrying her that is put away (Mat. v. 32) evidently applies only to one who is put away *contrary* to Christ's command; and our Lord makes the special exception, "saving for the cause of fornication." We believe, indeed, that there are few subjects on which it would be more easy to prove that "the Church of Rome has erred" than in her theory that "marriage is a sacrament," and the deductions which she has drawn thence (in spite of our Lord's words) as to the absolute indissolubleness, in every case, of the marriage bond—a theory the strictness of which has been more than neutralized by her practical facility in the far more objectionable measure of annulling marriages *ab initio*. More important subjects of controversy have hitherto prevented us from devoting an article to this point. We hope, however, to be able to do so at no distant time.

Next in order to matrimony, Mr. Power is so ungallant as to take purgatory. A correspondent of ours had begged to be furnished with any passage in which the Fathers of the first three centuries spoke of purgatory. "W. C. Search" replied by a quotation from the Maccabees; at which we very naturally exclaimed—"What have the Fathers of the first three centuries to do with the Book of the Maccabees?" If Mr. Power wishes to take occasion of this question to discuss the canon of Scripture, we need not be afraid to meet him, only that we think it convenient to keep distinct separate subjects of discussion. There is no point on which the Council of Trent stands more plainly opposed to facts than in its decision which includes the Apocrypha in its canon. Our Lord and his Apostles used the same Old Testament canon as the other Jews of their time. St. Paul, who counts it one of the greatest privileges of his nation, that to them was committed the oracles of God, never accused them of unfaithfulness in this high trust. And it is demonstrable that the canon of the Jews of that time did not include the Apocrypha. Accordingly, some of the most learned of the Fathers do not include it in their canon. But when we shall have occasion to appeal to their testimony, we do not mean to quote them in the fashion used by our correspondent—"Clement Stromata, Book i., Eusebius Ecc. History." &c., which is much the same as if one was to quote Hume's History of England, without mentioning volume or page.—a mode of quotation which ought never to be adopted by any one who is willing that his references should be verified.

As to the remainder of Mr. Power's letter, we shall not continue to discuss further any of the questions which turn on the most correct way of translating different passages of ancient writers. In every dispute there must be a last word; and we are content to invite any readers who are competent to judge, to turn back to our previous articles, to which Mr. Power has referred, and then judge between us. But as to the great questions at issue, something more may be said.

Much of Mr. Power's letter is expended in bringing passages in proof of purgatory which, in point of fact, only prove that prayers for the dead were commonly practised in early times. We have already exposed this common fallacy (see p. 49). We showed that the primitive prayers for the dead did not proceed on the supposition of there being a purgatory, and that they were offered for the Blessed Virgin and the saints, who no Romanist now would assert were ever in purgatory. We pointed out (p. 59) that many were of opinion that, before the final judgment of the great day is pronounced, it is right to pray that our friends may then obtain mercy, even though we have reason to believe that God has already done what we ask, and that they are already acquitted in his sight; and we added, that prayers for the dead were offered because the happiness of the faithful departed is believed to admit of increase, as it certainly is incomplete as long as the soul is separate from the body. But Mr. Power himself has incidentally furnished us with the strongest proof that prayers for the dead do not necessarily imply a belief in purgatory. When he was anxious to give proof that the Jews practised prayers for the dead, he offers us, instead of quotations from ancient authors, the assertion of Mr. Johnson, in his "Unbloody Sacrifice." We cannot allow that the mere assertion of a strong advocate of prayers for the dead can be allowed to take the place of proper proofs; but the mere fact that there have been men professing warm attachment to the doctrines of the Church of England, who have advocated and practised prayers for the dead, is sufficient to show that such prayers by no means involve the belief in the doctrine of purgatory.

In our last number we exposed the practice of passing off Church of England divines as supporters of Romish doctrines, by the help of garbled quotations, completely misrepresenting the opinions of the writers appealed to. And we strongly suspect that, had Mr. Power seen with his own eyes the passage in Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice which he cites, he would not have thought it fair, to say nothing about the sentences immediately before it. They run as follow:—

"The ancients did not use these prayers as if they thought of a purgatory: 'tis certain that this last is a modern invention, in comparison with the oblations and prayers offered by the primitive Church in behalf of their deceased brethren. They did not allow prayers to be made for such as they thought ill men, either as to principles or practice. They prayed for the Virgin Mary, apostles, patriarchs, and such as they believed to be like them."

The quotation given by Mr. Power, which seems most directly to apply to purgatory, is from Origen. We wonder he did not say from *Saint* Origen. If our readers should ask why the name saint is not commonly given to this excellent man and laborious writer, they will be told that it is because of several heretical notions which are to be found in some of his writings. Some of these relate to this very point, of the state of the soul after death. For Origen had picked up from the Platonists opinions as to the possibility of a purification of souls after death, which led him to conclude that the torments of hell would have a purifying influence on the souls of the wicked, and would, therefore, not be eternal—a notion for which he was justly condemned by the early Church. We doubt whether Mr. Power has done the Church of Rome a service by his attempt to trace the doctrine of purgatory to this source.

Lastly, with regard to the passage in Maccabees, we shall not enter further into the question of diversities of translation. Mr. Power seems not to have exactly understood the object of our reference to the case of Achan. Even if the sacrifice of Judas were offered for the dead, we have already showed that prayers for the dead by no means imply belief in a purgatory. But we said that there is every reason to think that that sacrifice was offered not for the dead, but for the living. The case of Achan proved, that the sin of individuals might bring ruin on the whole people. But the sin of the soldiers of Judas could not be atoned for by the people (as the sin of Achan was) by their putting the idolaters to death (Deut. xvii. 5), since these soldiers were dead already. A devout Jew, then, would find, in his law, no more appropriate guide for his conduct, under the circumstances, than that contained in Leviticus iv., and would naturally offer sacrifice, to avert from the living punishment for the sins for which, he feared, they had involuntarily become responsible. This, at least, is a rational account why Judas should have offered sacrifice for the sake of the living; but we defy any one to produce, in all the law of Moses, the slightest warrant for the offering sacrifice for the benefit of the dead.

In our remarks on Mr. Power's letter, we hope we have endeavoured to aim at the same "spirit of candour and impartiality" by which he has laudably expressed his own desire to be actuated.

* One correspondent seems to think an assertion and a proof the same thing.—ED. C. L.

ROMAN CATHOLIC CATECHISMS—THE USE OF GRAVEN IMAGES.

SIR—In your last number I pointed out how readily mistakes and inconsistencies arise in the opinions of Roman Catholics, from their neglecting to consult the original documents, which should alone have with them an infallible authority. I would now call your readers' attention to a misunderstanding arising from the same cause, connected, also, with the same subject, that of the second Protestant commandment, and the cause of no little irritation between the members of the two creeds.

This misunderstanding is two-fold—Protestants taking the manuals of instruction in most ordinary use, and sanctioned by ecclesiastics of rank, as representing the doctrine of the *Church*; and finding the second commandment wholly omitted, or extremely mutilated, somewhat hastily conclude that Roman Catholics reject a verse apparently not very favourable to their doctrine about images. On the other hand, Roman Catholics are indignant at being supposed capable of suppressing an admitted portion of the Decalogue, and offer an explanation of its practical omissions as inconsistent with the doctrine enunciated by their own Church as is the accusation they seek to refute. I think a reference to their acknowledged standards will show that both are alike mistaken. The Roman Catholic Church neither rejects this verse, as Protestants often fancy, nor considers it to have no distinct or additional force, beyond that conveyed in the first commandment, as Roman Catholics suppose, when they account for its frequent omission by saying, that its insertion would be useless and superfluous, and a mere repetition of the First Commandment in different words.

I need hardly say, that this important verse appears in every Roman Catholic edition of the Bible, and cannot, therefore, be supposed to be rejected by them; but it is also expressly declared to be binding on all Christians by the Catechism of the Council of Trent. This is so obvious, on the perusal of its exposition of the Decalogue, that it is not necessary to do more than refer to the passages.* The main point is, therefore, whether it can be omitted on the ground of its conveying no precept, or forbidding no sin, not already enjoined or forbidden in the third verse. I am not discussing at all the view that Protestants, or others exercising their own judgment on the passage, would be likely to arrive at; but I wish to elicit that interpretation which has been made for Roman Catholics, to which they are bound to submit, and in accordance with which they should deal with this fourth verse.

It is to be remembered that the Catechism of Trent, though professing to treat the two verses as forming but the one commandment, yet found it almost inevitable to expound them separately; and after commenting on the first—"Thou shalt not have strange gods before me"†—proceeds to explain the additional meaning of the second—"Thou shalt not make thee any sculptured image . . thou shalt not adore them, nor honour them."‡ Under the latter head it shows that the entire precept points to a "*two-fold* manner" in which the "majesty of God can be vehemently offended;" the *first* consists in worshipping images in the grossest form of idolatry, by making them actual divinities—and this may fairly be included in the injunction to have no "strange gods;" but the *second* is the impious attempt to express in form or colours the image of the true God. This is a command not at all included in the first, nor to be deduced from it by reason—if that were allowed—as a corollary might be from a proposition. I do not say that this is the whole of the true meaning to be gathered from the fourth verse; but it is an interpretation plainly put on it by a binding Roman Catholic authority, and manifestly showing that they held it to contain a prohibition of a sin—important, for by it "the majesty of God" would be "vehemently offended"—and a sin not elsewhere denounced in the Decalogue.

* Original Edition, Rome, 1567, pages 398, 399, 403, and 415.
† Same, page 403.
‡ Original Italian edition. Rome, 1567.

That such was their mind is clear from the subsequent passages, where they prove, enforce, and limit the exact effect of this "*prohibitory part of* the precept."* No effort of reason, without revelation, could know, with certainty, that it is forbidden to show out honour for the true God by raising statues in his name; to man it would seem but a fitting and just tribute to his sacred majesty. If it was thought necessary that the finger of God should write on the tables of stone the injunction not to take his name in vain—which our ideas of the respect due to his awful attributes might have led us to think superfluous—how shall we venture to omit, as unimportant, the fourth verse, which guards us against a sin into which our reason and nature would rather lead us than serve as any natural protection?

It seems an irresistible conclusion, that the Roman Catholic Church has decided it to be, at least, a distinct and important part of a precept of the Deity, and, though they do not adopt our interpretation, they give it sufficient importance to make its omission, by individual priests and teachers, an unwarrantable breach of their doctrine, as it certainly appears a violation of the frequent injunction applied to these very verses—"Thou shalt not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it."†

As to the fact that this omission is common and usual, it is only necessary to ask for any of the cheap catechisms, in ordinary use among the masses, to be satisfied that the practice of the generality of priests has ventured to differ from the declared theory of their Church. I am not aware of any catechism in Italian that gives this fourth verse, for the translation of the Trent Catechism is not in use among the laity. German catechisms, of very large size, omit it also; and in France the commandments are usually taught in couplets, of which the following are the first:—

"1. Un seul Dieu tu adoreras, et aimeras parfaitement.
2. Dieu envain tu ne jureras, ni autre chose pareillement."

The only Irish one that I have seen with a translation makes the same omission,‡ and there are abundance in the English that follow the example. Is it surprising that Protestants give an unfavourable construction to so general a suppression, and is it not strange that Roman Catholics will not refer to the true standards of their faith, instead of allowing such perversions of their own doctrines?

FONTIUM PETITOR.

* Dr. Donovan's Translation, page 360. Coyne, Dublin.
† Deuter. iv. 2.
‡ Published by the College of the Sorbonne. Paris, . . .

IDOLATRY AMONG THE HINDOOS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—The anecdote, told in your paper for November, of the reply of a Tinnevelly Hindoo gentleman to a Roman Catholic priest forcibly reminded me of a question which I often asked myself, many years ago, when I first went to India—viz., "What is Idolatry?" that sin so universally denounced in the Bible. This question was suggested by the fact, that while idols were conspicuous in every Hindoo temple, and "under every green tree" by the road side, and while the Brahmins themselves were to be seen prostrated before them, they all, when questioned, declared they *did not worship idols*, but that they *bowed down* before them as the representatives of the absent deities, to whom, in reality, their homage was addressed.

This reply of the Brahmins, connected with the fact that the idolatry of Hindoos is considered in Europe an admitted fact, led me to examine the account given in the 32nd chapter of Exodus, of the first great apostasy of the Jewish nation, when they made the golden calf; and there I was struck with the expression, in verse 5, "to-morrow is a feast to *Jehovah*." The golden *calf* was, therefore, no new god, but intended as the *representative* of the Holy One, who had "brought them out of the land of Egypt;" for in the 8th verse, this power is attributed to their idol, though, as the people themselves well knew, that idol was not in existence, *as an idol*, when their deliverance from Egypt took place; they could not, therefore, have imagined that *this calf* had brought them out of Egypt. The nation were hardly so besotted as to think that; but they held it to be the visible representation of that power which had delivered them from Egyptian bondage.

The belief held by many, that the calf was supposed to be a god distinct from the true, as Baal or Moloch, and that the Israelites, in making it, had determined to change the supreme object of their worship, may have arisen from the expression, in the first verse, "make us gods," and that in the fourth verse, "these be thy gods;" but the word translated "gods" in both these passages is the same—אלהים—mentioned in the first chapter of the Book of Genesis as *the Creator* of heaven and earth; and it is with reference to this plural noun that Aaron, in the fourth verse, uses the plural pronoun "these," which would evidently be inapplicable to the single object (the calf) to which he was pointing.

The gross, material worship of a lifeless idol (such as Europeans, who have not lived in an idolatrous country, suppose to exist there) is rarely acknowledged, except by the poorest and most ignorant classes of the people. The Brahmins, to a man, repudiate anything so senseless, and even the lower classes are ashamed often to acknowledge it; while, at the same time, their dread of and reverence for their idols discovers itself on many occasions. Nor need this be a matter of surprise; for acts of power, motion, and knowledge are often attributed to these lifeless blocks, which, *if true*, would naturally obtain for them the greatest reverence. Thus, on one occasion, in a Bramin's house, in the town of Hoobly, in Western India, an earthen image was produced, very slowly and gradually. First a foot appeared (this was shown to the astonished populace, by the Bramin, as what had occurred during the previous night, *while he slept*); after a few days another foot was found beside it; and gradually legs grew on these; and, in the course of months, a perfect image of Vishnu appeared—*self-created*. Can we wonder if the populace worshipped such an image?

Europeans generally receive these and similar tales with such undisguised derision, that Hindoos seldom venture to tell them the stories which are current among themselves of miraculous cures performed by images, and of the acts of locomotion and supernatural power which are attributed to most of the idols throughout India; but these, remarkable as they are, are fully equalled by the tales generally current of Christian images in Papal Europe. To say nothing of ancient stories, that of the image of the Virgin Mary, at Rimini, in Italy (referred to in a former number of your paper), which moves its eyes (commonly called the winking image), is a matter of the present time. I have heard that this story was strongly reprobated by M. de Silvour, the Archbishop of Paris, as injurious to religion, and calculated to bring it into contempt. Whether the *Pope* is otherwise minded, or whether he has favoured the world with his infallible opinion, or decided that the miracle was true, perhaps some of your readers may be able to say. In the town of Tournay, in Belgium, there is, in one of the churches, an image of the Blessed Virgin, whose face is *quite black*. So unusual an appearance excited the curiosity of a gentleman of our party who was looking at the church, and he asked the sextoness the cause. She replied, that on one memorable occasion, when Tournay was besieged, that image of the Virgin had advanced to the ramparts, and, by catching the balls of the besiegers in her apron, had saved the town; but that the powder of the cannon had blackened her face as we saw it. The visit to Tournay which I here narrate occurred many years ago; but I conclude that "the *black virgin*" is there still. For *the story* which the sextoness told the priests would not be responsible; but for *the state of the image* they surely are, as it must have been coloured by their permission: and when images perform such prodigies of valour who can blame the people for worshipping them?

The charge of idolatry was one brought against the Romish Church, at a very early period, by Mahomed and his followers; and the contempt which they exhibited towards *the cross* was solely as an object of *worship*. They believed, too, that the Blessed Virgin was the third person of the *Trinity;* and though this was evidently an error, even in the corruptest ages of the Church, yet it shows Mahommedans considered that she received Divine honours from the Christians with whom they came in contact.

A friend of mine in India had a Mahomedan servant, with whom he used to converse freely on religious matters. This man once classed the prevailing religious systems of India as follows:—The Hindoos and the Portuguese *worship images;* the English and the Mohamedans *worship God.*"

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
A RETIRED EAST INDIAN.

Nov. 27, 1852.

FARM OPERATIONS FOR DECEMBER.

(*From the Irish Farmers' Gazette.*)

Wheat.—We should hope that the greater portion of the seed wheat has been committed to the ground long ere this. Where that has not been the case, no exertion should be spared in doing so without delay; in no case should it be deferred till after Christmas, as after that period it will be getting late to sow any of the winter varieties.

Beans and Peas may still be sown; the best variety of bean to sow now is, the Russian, or the Heligoland, for the feeding of stock; the best for human consumption are, the early Mazagan and long pod.

Peas chiefly used in feeding stock are, the gray maple, Pennsylvanian, and strawberry; for human food, the early Charleton, early Hotspur, double-blossomed May and marrow-fat peas are best.

Storing Roots.—Take every advantage of dry weather, in pulling and storing Swedish and Aberdeen turnips, mangels, parsnips, and carrots, before they encounter severe frosts. Roots, particularly turnips and mangels, intended for late keeping, are much more injured by frosts than most people imagine; for, although no injury is perceptible to the eye, their keeping properties are much injured when exposed to severe frosts. The site chosen for their storing should be cool and dry, and the best aspect is that facing the north, as, when much exposed to the east or south, early sprouting is the consequence; whereas, if the northern sides of walls, ditches, or plantations are chosen, their sprouting or vegetation is prevented, as long as it is possible, next season. Roots intended for storing till a late period should be taken up very carefully, and the leaves wrenched off by the hand; the crowns will thus remain uninjured, which will be scarcely possible if those employed to trim them are allowed to do so with a sharp-cutting instrument. The tap-roots should not be cut off, neither should the outer bark or skin of the roots be cut or bruised; the roots may be packed on the ground in longitudinal heaps, about six feet wide at the base, and tapering up, about six feet high, to a single root at top. It will be of much service if some branches of brushwood are placed in layers through the roots; they will prevent them slipping and tumbling down, which without this contrivance is a fertile source of annoyance. Parsnips and carrots will be much benefitted by being packed in pit or river sand. After the roots are packed as above described, they should be well thatched. Roots may also be packed in cool, dry sheds or cellars, and in caves or pits, where the subsoil is dry. Stored as above, any of these roots will keep till an incredibly long period in the spring.

Milch cows should be kept closely in the house, with the exception of about an hour for exercise, during which time their byres should be made clean and comfortable; their food should be generous, for which they will amply pay. Alternate feeds of cooked and raw food are much the best—the cooked in the morning and at night, the raw at mid-day. Cattle thus taken care of are much more profitable than leaving them starving and shivering at the backs of ditches, or poaching the land, in fruitless endeavours to pick up a sufficiency of food, to say nothing of the inhumanity of the system.

Young stock should also be well and carefully housed and fed; they require an abundant supply of nourishing food—as much, or more so, than those full-grown—to be profitable to their owners; it is a ruinous system to keep stock on cold, bleak pastures; and the improving farmer who has once shaken off the sloth and indifference which too often characterize the generality of our brethren, and put his stock on better and more careful keep, finds—in their altered appearance, and the prices obtained at the early summer fairs—so amply remunerated, that he will hardly be tempted to return to old habits.

Pigs.—There is no description of stock to which cleanliness, warmth, and good keep are more essential at this season than fatting pigs, stores, and breeding sows, more particularly as we are under the impression that pigs, for some time at least, will be the best paying stock. Cooked turnips, cabbages, parsnips, carrots, mangels, with a liberal allowance of pea, bean, and oatmeal, or barley-meal, will not be lost on the pigs, but pay a liberal per centage.

Digging.—On small farms this is the time to dig all land not under crop; dig deeply and roughly, so as to expose as great a surface as possible to the ameliorating influence of the winter's frosts and thaws. In wet or in drained ground, the land can be dug in ridges, and in dry land it can be dug out without ridges; but in either case, deeply and roughly, not scratching it in the usual old, slovenly manner. It may remain so until the sowing time, when, if intended for grain, it may be sown and harrowed in without any further preparation. But the mode of digging that we most commend is, to throw up the land as it is dug into high and narrow drills, similar to those made for turnips. This mode can be adopted whether the land is in ridges, or with a plain surface without furrows; the advantages of this method are, that a greater surface is exposed to the frost, snow, and air; it lies so high, that it is quickly dry, and if intended for corn will break down early in the spring in the best possible condition; but if intended for a root crop the advantages are still greater; for if the land is thrown up into drills, 27 or 28 inches asunder, in the spring, there is no more to be done than deposit the manure in the drills as already formed, and split them with the spade, covering the manure from both sides, when the drill is formed again for the reception of the seed, whether parsnips, carrots, mangels, or turnips, &c. Care should be taken in the digging to pick out all scutch-grass and root weeds.

Odds and Ends.—Keep draining, digging, subsoiling, and gathering manure, for without a liberal use of manure the draining, &c., will be of little avail; therefore, gather and manufacture manure by every means in your power; let nothing be lost. Remove all crooked, useless, and cumbersome fences, and form new ones; cut down, plash, and lay all overgrown fences. Keep the flail, or thrashing-machine, busy, so as to have fresh and clean straw before the cattle. Scour and clean out all open ditches and ponds. Cut and bruise furze, which is an excellent food for horses or cows, when it can be obtained. Repair and paint implements, where required, and let the well-regulated labour of those dependent on him, and a clean, comfortable farm-yard, be the careful farmer's pride and pleasure.

New Works Just Published,

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY & CO.,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

FAITH IN GOD AND MODERN ATHEISM COMPARED IN THEIR ESSENTIAL NATURE, THEORETIC GROUNDS, AND PRACTICAL INFLUENCE. By James Buchanan, D.D. 2 vols., 8vo. 21s.

STIER ON THE WORDS OF THE LORD JESUS. 2 vols., 8vo. 21s.

CHRIST AS MADE KNOWN TO THE ANCIENT CHURCH: an Exposition of the Revelation of Divine Grace, as unfolded in the Old Testament Scriptures. By Robert Gordon, D.D. 4 vols., 8vo. £2 2s.

THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL ESSAYS. Reprinted from the *Princeton Review*. Royal 8vo. 10s. 6d.

METHOD OF THE DIVINE GOVERNMENT, PHYSICAL and MORAL. By the Rev. J. M'Cosh, LL.D. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

TYPICAL FORMS AND SPECIAL ENDS IN CREATION. By the Rev. Dr. M'Cosh, and George Dickie, M.D. 7s. 6d.

LECTURES ON THE HISTORY OF ANCIENT PHILOSOPHY. By the late W. A. Butler, M.A., Professor of Moral Philosophy in T.C.D. 2 vols., 8vo. 25s.

HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN CHURCHES AND SECTS, FROM THE EARLIEST AGES OF CHRISTIANITY. By Rev. J. B. Marsden. 2 vols., 8vo. 28s.

THE LETTERS OF JOHN CALVIN, compiled from the original MSS., and edited with Historical Notes, by Dr. Jules Bonnet. Vol. 1, 8vo. 10s. 6d. To be completed in 4 vols.

THE NATURE OF THE ATONEMENT, AND ITS RELATION TO REMISSION OF SINS AND ETERNAL LIFE. By John M'Leod Campbell. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

PILGRIMAGE FROM THE ALPS TO THE TIBER; or, the Influence of Romanism on Trade, Justice, and Knowledge. By Rev. J. A. Wylie, LL.D. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

SINAI AND PALESTINE, IN CONNECTION WITH THEIR HISTORY. By Arthur Penryhn Stanley, M.A. 8vo. 16s.

THE EPISTLES OF PAUL TO THE CORINTHIANS; with Critical Notes and Dissertations. By Arthur Penryhn Stanley. 2 vols. 24s.

PROPHECY VIEWED IN RESPECT TO ITS DISTINCTIVE NATURE, ITS SPECIAL FUNCTION, AND PROPER INTERPRETATION. By Patrick Fairbairn. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

"THE LAW OF THE LORD IS PERFECT:" a series of Practical Lectures on the 19th Psalm. By the Rev. J. W. [illegible]se 5s.

CREATION'S TESTIMONY TO ITS GOD; or the Accord[illegible] Science, Philosophy, and Revelation. By The[illegible] 6s.

SERMON[illegible]ES; or Scripture confirmed by Geology [illegible]ck M'Causland. 5s.

TE[illegible]IKA [illegible]r, NEW ZEALAND AND ITS INHA[illegible]; illustrating the Origin, Manners, Custo[illegible]s. Religion, &c., of the Natives; the N[illegible] Productions, &c., of the Country, and i[illegible] gards Christianity, &c. By the Rev. R[illegible]or. 8vo. 16s.; with coloured plates, 21s.

JOURNAL OF A DEPUTATION SENT TO THE EAST, BY THE COMMITTEE OF THE MALTA PROTESTANT COLLEGE, IN 1849. 2 vols., 8vo., 12s.

DISCOURSES AND SAYINGS OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST. Illustrated in a Series of Expositions. By John Brown, D.D. 3 vols., 8vo. 30s.

EXPOSITORY DISCOURSES ON THE FIRST EPISTLE OF THE APOSTLE PETER. By John Brown, D.D. 2 vols. 21s.

DISCOURSES SUITED TO THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER. By John Brown, D.D. 8vo. 8s.

THE RESURRECTION OF LIFE; an Exposition of 1 Corinthians, xv. By John Brown, D.D. 8vo. 8s.

THE TYPOLOGY OF SCRIPTURE, viewed in connection with the whole series of the Divine Dispensations. By Patrick Fairbairn, D.D. 2 vols., 8vo. 18s.

THE GOSPEL IN EZEKIEL. Illustrated in a series of Discourses. By the Rev. Thomas Guthrie, D.D. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

GOD REVEALED IN THE PROCESS OF CREATION, AND BY THE MANIFESTATION OF THE LORD JESUS. By James B. Walker. 2s. 6d.

CHAMBERLAIN ON THE NATIONAL RESTORATION AND CONVERSION OF THE TWELVE TRIBES OF ISRAEL; or, NOTES ON SOME OF THE PROPHECIES BELIEVED TO RELATE TO THE TWO GREAT EVENTS, &c. 8vo. 14s.

ALLIN'S PROPHECIES RELATIVE TO THE RETURN AND RESTORATION OF THE TWELVE TRIBES TO THE LAND OF PALESTINE, TOGETHER WITH THE SETTING UP OF MESSIAH'S KINGDOM ON MOUNT ZION, DURING A PERIOD OF 1,000 PROPHETIC YEARS. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

MAYNOOTH, ITS SAYINGS AND DOINGS; or, THE REPORT OF THE MAYNOOTH COMMISSIONERS ANALYSED AND TESTED, IN LETTERS TO THE EARL OF HARROWBY. By the Rev. R. J. M'Ghee. 2s. 6d.

SERMONS ON THE CREED OF POPE PIUS IV., preached in St. Thomas's Church, Dublin. By the Rev. John Nash Griffin. 8vo. 8s.

BEECHER'S PAPAL CONSPIRACY EXPOSED; or, the ROMISH CORPORATION DANGEROUS TO THE POLITICAL LIBERTY AND SOCIAL INTERESTS OF MAN. 3s.

KENNARD'S CONTROVERSIAL CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE REV. PAUL MACLACHLAN, Roman Catholic Priest at Falkirk. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

MEMOIR OF ADELAIDE L. NEWTON. By the Rev. John Baillie. 5s.

FOOTSTEPS OF ST. PAUL. By the author of "Morning and Night Watches." 5s.

MINISTERING CHILDREN; a Tale, dedicated to Childhood. By the author of "Visits to the Poor." 5s.

AN ENGLISH-IRISH DICTIONARY. By Rev. Professor Foley, T.C.D. 8vo., 8s.

DIGEST OF EVIDENCE ON THE SYSTEM OF NATIONAL EDUCATION IN IRELAND, BEFORE THE HOUSE OF LORDS. By Rev. Dr. Trench. 8vo. 6s. 6d.

THE PRINCIPLES OF ELOCUTION; compiled from "The Elements of Rhetoric, by Archbishop Whately." With Additions, &c. 1s. 6d.

CATECHISM ON THE COLLECTS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. By the Rev. Charles Miller. 2s. 6d.

ST. PATRICK'S CATHEDRAL; a Tale of the Sixteenth Century. Is. 6d.

A BRIEF VIEW OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, FROM THE EARLIEST PERIOD TO THE PRESENT TIME. By the Dean of Cork. Is.

FOOTPRINTS OF A FAITHFUL SHEPHERD: A Memoir of the Rev. Godfrey Massy, B.A., Vicar of Bruff, and Hon. Sec. of the Limerick Protestant Orphan Society; with a sketch of his times. By the Rev. Dawson Massy, M.A. 5s.

THE SOUTHERN CROSS AND THE SOUTHERN CROWN; or, THE GOSPEL IN NEW ZEALAND. By Miss Tucker, 3s. 6d.

ABBEOKUTA; or, SUNRISE WITHIN THE TROPICS: an Account of the Yoruba Mission. By Miss Tucker. 3s. 6d.

THE RAINBOW IN THE NORTH: a Short Account of the First Establishment of Christianity in Rupert's Land. By Miss Tucker. 3s. 6d.

CHRISTIANITY IN TURKEY: a Narrative of the Protestant Reformation in the Armenian Church. By the Rev. H. G. O. Dwight. 5s.

THE INTERMEDIATE STATE, AND CHRIST AMONG THE DEAD. By Val Ulrich Maywahlen, D.D. 3s. 6d.

PRESCOTT'S HISTORY OF THE REIGN OF PHILIP THE SECOND, KING OF SPAIN. 2 vols. 12s.; cheaper edition, 6s.

THE PAPAL CONSPIRACY EXPOSED; or, THE ROMISH CORPORATION DANGEROUS TO THE POLITICAL LIBERTY AND SOCIAL INTERESTS OF MAN. By Edward Beecher, D.D., Boston. With Preface by Rev. Dr. Begg. 3s.

RELIGION IN COMMON LIFE. A Sermon preached before Her Majesty the Queen and His Royal Highness Prince Albert by the Rev. John Caird (and Published by her Majesty's command). 1s.

HOME TRUTHS. Being Miscellaneous Addresses and Tracts. By the Rev. J. C. Ryle. Fourth Series. 3s. 6d. *** The first Three series, in cloth, and all the tracts to be had singly.

EZEKIEL AND THE BOOK OF HIS PROPHECY An Exposition. By Patrick Fairbairn, D.D. vo.. 10s. 6d.

AN EXPOSITION OF OUR LORD'S INTERCESSORY PRAYER. With a Discourse on the Relation of our Lord's Intercession to the Conversion of the World. By John Brown, D.D. 7s.

A HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH DURING THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES. By the Rev. J. J. Blunt. 8vo. 9s. 6d.

FIVE YEARS IN DAMASCUS; including an account of the History, Topography, and Antiquities of that City: with Travels and Researches in Palmyra, Lebanon, and the Hauran. By the Rev. J. L. Porter. 2 vols. 21s.

CONTROVERSIAL CORRESPONDENCE between the Rev. Paul MacLachlan, Roman Catholic Priest in Falkirk, and R. W. Kennard, Esq., London. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Rev. John Baillie. 5s.

MEMOIR OF C. H. V. BOGATSKY. Author of "The Golden Treasury." 2s.

EMBLEMS FROM EDEN. By the Rev. James Hamilton, D.D. 1s. 6d.

THE VICTORY WON: A Brief Memorial of the Last Days of G. R. By the author of "Memoir of Captain Vicars." 1s. 6d.

SERMONS IN STONES; or, Scripture Confirmed by Geology. By Dominick M'Causland. 3s. 6d.

THE TONGUE AND THE TEMPER: A Lecture delivered before the Young Men's Christian Association in the Rotundo. By Rev. A. M. Pollock. 3d.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF SCRIPTURE. Suggested by a Tour through the Holy Land. By Horatio B. Hackett. 6s. Cheaper Edition. 1s. 6d.

SYNONYMS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By the Rev. Richard Chenevix Trench. 5s.

SERMONS by the late Rev. Dr. Chalmers. Complete in 2 vols. 12s.

The Rev. John Howe's Works.

New Edition of the Works of the Rev. John Howe, A.M. With a Life, by Henry Rogers. Edited by the Rev. W. H. Goold, D.D.

This work will be characterised by many improvements over any previous edition, and will contain much of the author's hitherto unpublished. It will be completed in nine volumes 8vo., of about 550 pages each: price, to Subscribers, £2 7s. 6d.; or, if 2,000 names are entered before the vols. go to press, the price will be reduced to £2 2s.

*** Messrs. Curry and Co. have opened a Subscription List, and will be glad to receive the names of intending Subscribers as early as possible. Detailed prospectuses to be had.

Rev. John Gregg's Lectures.

Price 2d.,

YOUNG MEN:

A Sermon preached in Trinity Church, on Sunday, February 17, 1856.

Just published, Price 2d.

WOMEN:

A Lecture delivered in Trinity Church, on Thursday, February 28, 1856.

Second Thousand, Price 2d.,

MOTHERS:

A Lecture delivered to Mothers, in Trinity Church, on Thursday, January 10, 1856.

Second Thousand, Price 3d.,

THE STORY OF STORIES:

A Sermon to Children, preached in Trinity Church, on Thursday, January 3, 1856.

Dublin: William Curry and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London: Wertheim and Macintosh.

Society for Protecting the Rights of Conscience in Ireland.

President—His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin.
Honorary Secretary—The Rev. Cadwallader Wolseley.
Treasurer—W. Hogan, Esq.
Office: 37, DAWSON-STREET, DUBLIN.

Any information which may be required respecting the Society or its operations may be obtained on application to the Secretary, by letter directed to the Office.

THE

Female Missionary Intelligence,

and

Record of the Proceedings

of the

Society for the Promotion of Female Education in China, Africa, and the East,

Will in future be published by William Curry and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin, on the 1st of each month. Price 1s. per annum; by post, free, 2s.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher, WILLIAM CURRY, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin
DECEMBER, 1852.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

VOL. II.

JANUARY TO DECEMBER,

1853.

DUBLIN:
PUBLISHED BY WILLIAM CURRY & CO.,
9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET.
LONDON: WERTHEIM AND MACINTOSH,
24, PATERNOSTER-ROW.

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

VOL. II.

1854.

INDEX TO VOLUME II.

Page

Absenter bishop, who was the first? 1
Absolution, what kind used in Church of England 20
Priest's absolution presupposes God's absolution .. 28
Adrian VI. (Pope), his doctrine as to the power of the keys .. 28
describes in strong language the corruption of the Roman Catholic Church—Pope and all 121
maintains that a Pope may assert heresy by his decretals, and that many Popes have been heretics 86
Aerius a different person from Arius 68
Alexander VI. (Pope), his character compared with that of Henry VIII. 122
notable for simony, cruelty, and lasciviousness .. 123
was the Church of which he was the head free from "spot, wrinkle, or any such thing?" 129
Ambrose (St.) his comment on Matt. xii. 46. 41
did not believe the Virgin Mary to be free from sin .. 41
on image worship 32
America, religion in 140
Apocrypha, its claims to a place in the canon of Scripture discussed 111, 125
it is admitted by Roman Catholics that it was not counted as Scripture by the Jews 112
nor by twenty ancient Christian writers who have left us lists of canonical books 112
Aquinas, his reasons for giving "Latria" to the cross .. 33
his interview with Pope Innocent IV. 6
Arnobius, on image worship 32
Athanasius, did he stand alone? 131, 142
Augustine (St.), expiscated by the Catholic Layman .. 130
principles laid down by him in his controversy with the Donatists, applicable to modern controversies 79, 130
his opinions as to the Church visible and invisible .. 113
on image worship 32
Auricular Confession (see Confession)
Azorius, his doctrine as to the kind of worship to be given to an image 10, 110

Baptism of bells 16, 32
Bellarmine, his forcible description of the corrupt state of the Church of Rome before the Reformation 121
his Scripture arguments for relic worship answered .. 65
thinks it imprudent to rely too much on the efficacy of indulgences.. 7
gives a notable argument why we should submit without proof to the obligation of confession, because the duty is so disagreeable, that no doubt our ancestors must have had some proof for it, or they would not have submitted to it 39
In what sense we pray for the saints to help us .. 30
Bells, baptism of 16, 32
early use of, in Ireland 45
Berengarius, where was the Church in his time? .. 10, 81, 104, 130
will any Roman Catholic now stand by the doctrine of the Council that condemned him? 82, 105, 130
Bernardinus, his blasphemous language respecting the Blessed Virgin 94
Bible, the Authorized Version and the Douay compared 49, 61, 73, 85, 99, 111
difficulty of understanding it not an argument for not reading it, according to St. Chrysostom .. 18, 118
poverty, in his opinion, not a reason for being without it 118
written by plain men, for plain men 118
easily intelligible in all necessary points .. 18, 118
the early Church of Rome meant it to be read by the unlearned, or they would not have translated it for them 119
read by the unlearned in St. Peter's time .. 116, 125
the Roman Catholic doctrine of the use of it, as given by Cardinal Wiseman 62, 76, 86
proposed plan for correcting it, so as to make it speak Romanism 116
Bigotry, what is it? 25
goes hand and hand with credulity 25
origin of the word 25
Bishop, first non-resident 1
forbidden by Councils to migrate from one see to another 2
Blood, Mr., his letter on image worship, and on the phrase "Theotokos" 93
Blood absolutely forbidden by the Jewish law, and forbidden also by the Apostles to their converts 74
did the Apostles then think they drank blood every time they partook of the Eucharist? 74
Bonald (Cardinal de), discourages the publication of the Roman Catholic Bishop of Grenoble's story of a miraculous appearance of the Blessed Virgin 43
hints that false miracles and false indulgences are published as a means of making money 43
Books, what allowed and what prohibited in Church of Rome .. 94
Branagan's letter on Lady Day 47
Brian's letter on the Index Expurgatorius 94
Bourdeaux Testament, its fraudulent translations 29
Bulls, Papal, when *ex cathedra* 3

Callistus, Pope, his scandalous life and his heretical opinions .. 109
Canon of Scripture, when framed 17
how far it rests on Church authority 17
internal evidences for it.. 18
claims of the Apocrypha to a place in it discussed 111, 125

Page

Caterpillars cursed by Roman Catholic bishops 27
Catholicus, his answer to Fontium Petitor 68
Celibacy of clergy, dialogues on 13, 50, 75
not the practice of the ancient Irish Church .. 51, 87
vows of celibacy not expedient 21
not an apostolic custom 21
Chrysostom (St.), censures severely some of the conduct of the Blessed Virgin Mary 41
his language respecting the Word of God and the duty of every Christian to study it 18, 118
Church, its visibility, discussed 9, 81, 104, 113
its infallibility, discussed 3, 85, 99, 109, 121, 127, 129
Church of Rome not immutable 98
Circle in which Romanists travel between the Church and the Bible 63, 133
Clement of Alexandria makes no mention of prayers to the Virgin Mary in any of his writings 41
Clement of Rome, his alleged letter to St. James 138
had he the right to instruct the Apostles 138
Clement VII. (Pope), released the King of Spain from his oath, and from his promise not to get himself released from his oath 136
Clergy, peculiar doctrines of Romanism tend to exaltation and enrichment of 1
celibacy of, discussed 13, 21, 50, 51, 75, 87, 140
Coarbs, what? 51
Collette (Mr.), on image worship and miracles 32
on the Douay Bible 73
Confession, private, to a priest, not commanded in Scripture .. 20
cannot be proved to be of Divine institution .. 38
history of auricular 53
letter on 47
confession to God alone, for many ages, thought sufficient 38
what kind used in Church of England 53
the *enforcement* of periodical auricular confession a peculiarity of modern Romanism 53
Confirmation, is it spoken of in Scripture? 8
is it a sacrament? 56
Controversy, how conducted by Roman Catholic priests .. 16
how it was conducted at Council of Trent 26
conducted in the same style by Roman Catholic editors and others 124
Councils, what Councils are general and infallible nobody can tell 116
one general and infallible Council gave a list of General Councils, which nobody believes to be accurate .. 116
Creeds, what Church has got the old creeds .. 10, 142
has the Church of Rome made a new creed rather than give up her new errors 143
Curse, a Pope's curse held by Romish authorities to do no harm to anybody 4
is a curse a prayer to the devil? 26
if a curse be a prayer to God to do mischief, let those who curse show that their prayers have power to do good .. 26
did the Apostles curse those who persecuted them .. 27
our Lord's command about cursing 27
the curse on the caterpillars 27
Cyprian (St.), exposure of a perversion of his words in support of Purgatory 68

Death-bed, what religion best there 92
Devotion, are its ends answered in the Church of Rome? 110, 123
Discussion, why Roman Catholic priests shrink from it? .. 79
Divorce, practice of Church of England with respect to .. 34
Donatist controversy, its bearings on Roman Catholic controversy 79, 130
Douay Bible, its variations 61
corrected from Protestant Bible 61
and coming still nearer to it 74
its translators say in the preface that we could do very well without a translation of the Bible 49
uses in its notes, the authority of what are now confessed to be forgeries 138
its translations of the word sacrament 42
" " penance 85
" " priest 99
Donbi, Romanism the religion of 5

Education, national, Romish authorities divided among themselves as to 98
Epiphanius and the veil 50
on prayers for the dead 93, 105
his opinion of Origen 56
Equivocation practised without scruple by a Roman Catholic prelate 42
Erenachs, what? 51
Eucharist, texts relating to, discussed 8
words of institution, how to be interpreted 22
Roman Catholic interpretation not literal 46
compared with the Passover 74
Evidences, works on, why disapproved of by Roman Catholic priests 103
Excommunication of a parishioner costs a Roman Catholic bishop £125 damages 6
of the caterpillars 27
Extreme Unction discussed 20
Eyre, land of 126

Page

Faith and credulity 103
Fathers and grandfathers 70
Fear, the mainspring of Roman Catholic and other false religions 123
Fisher (Cardinal's) confession of modernness of doctrine of Purgatory 68
Fontium Petitor, letters from 22, 46, 106
Foundation of the Church, according to Council of Trent, not Peter, but what he believed 22
Fowler, Mr., his controversy with Lockhart 92
Frauds, pious, and the Bourdeaux Testament 29
" " and the Bishop of Grenoble 43

Golden legend 97
Good works, does one gain by sharing them with others? .. 65
made easy in the Church of Rome 110
real and false 123
Grenoble, Bishop of, imposture patronized by him 43
Gasteen's, Denis, Letters 70, 94, 117

Hades, what and where? 23
Heart, Christianity the religion of the 66
Hell, where was our Saviour's soul after his burial? .. 23
Henrietta Maria, her letter to Wentworth about St. Patrick's Purgatory 37
Henry VIII. a Romanist in doctrine to the day of his death .. 122
though a bad man was a saint in comparison of Pope Alexander VI. 122
Heretics, ought they to be extirpated with the sword? 13, 19
Hiereus, the name given in New Testament to Jewish, not Christian, ministers 82, 99
Hippolytus and the Church of Rome 109
Holy water discovered in the Bible by the author of the Touchstone 31

Images, what is the "due honour" with which they should be worshipped 10, 33, 44, 45, 110
did the Heathen believe that any Divinity resided in their images? 21, 33
the same apologies offered for Heathen image worship as are now used by Roman Catholics .. 21, 33
Immutability of Church of Rome discussed 98
Index prohibitorius and expurgatorius 110
what meant by the latter 94, 111
and the Bible 116
India, Christianity in 35, 87, 107
Indulgences, no foundation for, in Scripture or antiquity .. 6
held by many to be pious frauds, in the time of Thomas Aquinas 6
a prudent man would do well, according to Bellarmine, not to rely too much on them 7
offered for prayer to Jesus, Mary, and Joseph .. 30
Infallibility of Church, proofs from ecclesiastical history for, considered 85, 99, 109
proof from Scripture 121
" from reason 129
difficulties of finding where Romish, resides 3, 86
certainly not in the Pope 86
importance of the doctrine 126
silence of Scripture as to 127
does the Church of Rome *in fact* possess it? 143
a doctrine subversive of Christianity 133
Intolerance of the Romish Church surpasses all other intolerance 126
Intention, doctrine of 4, 8
Internal evidences for Christianity and for Romanism 69, 80, 92
Invocation of saints not commanded 98
may lead to idolatry 95
texts regarding 44
Irenæus, did he believe in the supremacy of the Church of Rome? 100
Irish clergy, in early times did not practise celibacy, but handed down their office from father to son 51, 87

Jeroboam, though he did not worship an idol, was condemned for worshipping the true God under the form of an image 10
Jesuits, exposure of their doctrines by Pascal 91
Jewell's challenge to Roman Catholic doctors 49

Kelsh, Mr., his calumnies on the Catholic Layman .. 56
Keogh, Mr., his charges on the Protestant Bible 112
invitation to him to prove his words 113
Keys, power of the 27
Kilpatrick, Catholic Layman in 70, 94, 116
King, Mr., his translation from St. Chrysostom 118

Lady Day, observed 4th April, 1853 39
and Good Friday 47
why no day this year 53
our, of La Salette 43
Latin, is there any good reason why prayers should be said in that language in countries where it is not spoken .. 143
Latria, given to the cross 10, 33
Latria, dulia, and hyperdulia, how the distinction is practically observed 30
Liberius, Pope, yielded to the Arians, and a general council along with him 142
Liberty, civil and religious 19

Page

Lies, character of Irishmen for telling them, how kept up by the priests 91
Lying, is it a mortal sin 16
Longhmanagh, Fair of 26
Lockhart, Mr., his controversy with Mr. Fowler 92
Luther, if he stood alone, so did Athanasius .. 131, 142
are we his followers? .. ..
where was our religion before him? 142

Mac Manus, Mr., his letter on internal evidences of Romanism 69, 80, 92
M'Carthy and the nunnery, their case 73
M'Corry, Mr., his tract on the question, Was St. Peter at Rome? 97
Madiai, their history and sufferings 13, 27
Marleys, the 77, 89, 101
Marriage, is it a carnal state? and if so, is it a sacrament? .. 14
Metairie v. Wiseman, how the plaintiff was treated for presuming to go to law with a priest 15
Milner, his remarks on the importance of adopting a right rule of faith 8
admits that some Popes have disgraced themselves by their crimes .. ..
Miracles, no authentic account of St. Patrick having wrought any 134
Missionaries, their doings in India 35
Monasticism not the life of devotion 124
Mortmain, law of 1, 15, 42
Mother of God, history of the title 93

National education, disagreement between Roman Catholics on this subject 98
Nectarius, change made by him in practice of confession .. 55
Nicholas I., (Pope) his letter stating that up to his time no council had published a list of the Canon of Scripture .. 126
Nicholas II., (Pope) made Berengarius subscribe to a statement which no Roman Catholic will now stand by 82, 105, 130, 143
Nice, second Council of, its decree concerning the worship of images 10
Non-residence of Clergy forbidden by councils and Fathers .. 1
Nunneries 73
St. Liguori's account of the reasons why many enter them 94
Numbers not a test of truth 40

Origen, a heretic 106, 131, 142
introduced notions of purgatorial torment into the Christian Church 56, 67, 105
Oaths, how the Popes dispensed with their obligation .. 136
O'Mara, Mr., his letter on prayers in Latin 143

Pascal, his history 91
Passover and Eucharist 74
Patrick, St., his translation, and the rival bone-findings .. 63
hymn in praise of him 134
worked no miracles 134
did not receive his commission from the Pope .. 134
never makes mention of the blessed Virgin .. 134
his zeal in making the Scriptures known 134
history of his Purgatory 82
Paul, St., omits to tell his converts of the true (?) guide to truth 4
Persecution in Hindostan 107
Peter, St., if ever Bishop of Rome, was constantly non-resident .. 2, 97
did he keep a curate? 2
if Bishop of Rome, set an example of giving up a poorer see for a richer 2
the duties of a Bishop incompatible with those of an Apostle 2
if not Bishop of Rome, what becomes of the Pope's supremacy? 2
which does Bishop of Antioch or of Rome inherit his infallibility? 4
difficulty of finding his successor 4
proved to have been at Rome by Father M'Corry, out of the Golden Legend 97
had a wife, and perhaps a daughter 15, 140
what he would have said if offered money for taking souls out of Purgatory? 32
what remedy he suggests for the difficulties of Scripture .. 125
three Evangelists, at any rate, say nothing of his being the Rock of the Church 34
Philalethes, his letters 9, 81, 104, 129
Pictures, the two 64
Pilgrimages, how useful if one image have as much virtue as another 21
Pious frauds 7, 28
Pius IX. condemns freedom of education, liberty of the press, and the right of men to worship according to their conscience 19

Page

Popes, some, according to Dr. Milner, have disgraced themselves by their crimes 3
may, according to Romish authorities, be heretics, and establish heresy by their decrees 3, 86
Popes Zephyrinus and Callistus were heretics .. 109
Pope Honorius a Monothelite 3
Liberius subscribed to Arianism 142
Alexander VI. not a Saint! 122
how it is to be known when the Pope speaks *ex cathedra* 3
advantage on the Pope's side (according to Pope Pius II.) when he disputes with Councils 3
specimen of a Pope's curse 4
testimony of Roman Catholic authorities that it did no harm to anybody 4
what powers the Popes claim 19
what letters the early ones *did* write 137
how the letters they ought to have written, but didn't, were written for them some centuries afterwards .. 137
not infallible, unless it be right to exterminate heretics .. 19
Post-office Offences Act 7
Power, Mr., his letters 33, 56, 67, 82, 93, 105, 141
of the Keys 27
Prayers for dead, why used in ancient Church 68
their origin 68
Prayers to saints, what kind lawful, according to Bellarmine .. 30
Priest, scriptural meaning of the word, as applied to the Christian ministry 99
in what character he celebrates Mass 106
Private judgment, we *must* use it 95, 121
Protestant Bible not a corrupt version of the Holy Scriptures 46, 61, 74, 85, 99, 111
Proxy religion 124
Purgatory, if merely penal, what becomes of the sacrifice of Christ? 32
what is it? 143
if it makes fit for heaven, why pay money to get our friends out before they have had the full benefit of it? 11, 32
a heathen doctrine described by Virgil 58
why the duration of it is left uncertain 124
did the Fathers of the first three centuries believe in it? 56, 105
is it a state or a place? 143

Questions, important, for Roman Catholics 5

Relics, Old Testament arguments for worshipping them considered 44, 65
Repentance and penance 25
Ridley on the Lord's Supper 58
Rock of the Church—silence of three Evangelists as to St. Peter 34
St. Patrick's claims to the title 134
the text, how interpreted by Council of Trent .. 21
Rourke, Mr., his letter on infallibility 128, 142

Sacraments, texts in support of Romish five, considered 84, 56
confer grace, and yet it is a holier state to be without one of them than with it 34
can they be performed without an officiating priest? and if not, was marriage a sacrament before the council of Trent? 34
how many there are 9
their number *insinuated* in Scripture, according to Peter Dens 9
time of instituting the Romish five confessed to be uncertain 9
who first counted seven 9
on the word, used in Douay Bible 42
Secundinus, his hymn in praise of St. Patrick 134
Sacrifices, what now offered 9, 99
of the Mass 57, 83
Church of England doctrine as to 58
only one for sin 57
Saints' days observed, on what authority .. 93, 106
Scapular, is it a good way of salvation? 65
Sacrificing priests, not now in the church 82
Schism, Great Western, history of 4
Scripture, St. Chrysostom's arguments for reading it considered 118
Cardinal Wiseman's arguments against reading it considered 62, 76, 86
its difficulties no argument against studying it 18, 118
plain in all essential points (according to the testimony of the Fathers) 18, 118

Page

Scripture proofs offered by Roman Catholics, not believed by themselves to be good ones 92
Sidrach on image worship and miracles 21, 45
Simon Magus and St. Peter 97
Sin, and the remedy for it, ... 78
how much the blood of Christ cleanses from .. 140
is there occasion for Purgatory to cleanse us better .. 140
Slavery and freedom 104
Spain, intolerance of the Romish Church in 136
Station, what passes at a 102

Talk of the Road .. 18, 29, 39, 53, 65, 78, 90, 102, 113, 124, 138
Tariff, the Priests' 30
Taylor, Mr., of Weybridge, who got his money 42
Tanistry explained 51
Temper, why those who believe on little grounds are apt to lose it 25
practical illustration of this 115
Tertullian, makes no mention of prayers to the Virgin .. 41
his commentary on our Lord's refusal to go out to her .. 41
mutilated quotation from him as to Romish supremacy .. 100
Theotokos, history of the title 93
Touchstone, the 8, 20, 31, 44
Transubstantiation 46
Trent, Council of, in vain attempted to settle the question of Pope's supremacy 3
arguments used there against the doctrine of intention .. 5
its canons, concerning confession 38
what they pronounced the foundation of the Church .. 22
calmness with which their discussions were conducted .. 26
how the two Bishops pulled each other's beards .. 26
the results obtained by this process infallibly dictated by the Holy Spirit 26
Truth and error—line between 7
numbers not a test of 40

Unity of the Church of Rome, how maintained in France at present 43
" " how in Ireland 98

Venial sins 16
Virgin Mary, were prayers offered to her in early Church .. 41
did the Fathers think she ever sinned? 41
and the Holy Ghost 90, 106
never mentioned by St. Patrick 134
Visibility of the Church discussed 9, 81, 104, 113
Voragine, Jacobus de 97
Vows, in what case not binding 20

Ward's errata of the Protestant Bible 61
condemned by Roman Catholics themselves 85
Wessel, his statement about indulgences 6
Willson, of Skibbereen, his polite letter 115
Wiseman, Cardinal, how he got possession of old Carré's money 15
did not like to tell he was to get Mr. Taylor's too .. 42
his skill in equivocating 42
on Bible reading 62, 76, 86

INDEX TO PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE,

THE MEANING OF WHICH IS DISCUSSED IN CATHOLIC LAYMAN, VOL. II.

	Page.		Page.
Exodus xiii. 19	65	Acts ii. 24	23
Deut. iv. 15, 16	10	viii. 14	58
xxxiv. 8	65	1 Cor. vii. 32, 33	21
Isaiah xi. 10	65	x. 16	8, 46, 47
Malachi i. 10, 11	9	xi. 24	58, 8
Matthew xii. 12, 32	32	Ephes. v. 23	34
x. 7	57	26	121, 131
xii. 46	41	32	43
xii. 32	32	1 Tim. iii. 2, 15, 16	122, 21
xvi. 19	27, 34, 45, 121	Heb. ix. 25	57
xviii. 17	10, 27, 122, 126	xiii. 7, 17	10, 82
xix. 6	34	James v. 14, 16	20, 47, 53, 57
xix. 13	58	1 Peter iii. 18	32, 143
xxvi. 26, 28	8, 22, 46, 75	2 Peter iii. 15	125
Mark xiv. 23	22	16, 17, 18	19
John vi. 51	8	Revelations i. 17, 18	27
xx. 21	20, 27, 34	iii. 7	23
xx. 23	28	xvii. 7	47

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Glóir do Dhia añ pna háirdiuib, agur síodcáin air an dtalaim deagtoil do na daoinib.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. II.—No. 13. JANUARY, 1853. {Annual Subscription, 3s. 6d. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
The Dead Hand—Mortmain	1
Who was the first Absentee Bishop?	1
Where is it?—a Colloquy	2
The Great Western Schism—No. II.	4
The Doctrine of Intention	5
The Effects of Excommunication	6
A few words upon Indulgences	6
Friendly advice to Country Postmasters	7
Address to our Readers	7
The Touchstone (continued from vol. I., p. 135)	8
CORRESPONDENCE:	
Did our Saviour institute Seven Sacraments?	9
On the Visibility of the Church, by Philalethes	9
The Sin of Jeroboam, by a Lover of Truth	10
On the Douay Bible, by Mr. O'Reilly	11
From Mr. M. Dolan on the Benefits of Purgatory	11
Farming Operations for January	11

THE DEAD HAND—MORTMAIN.

THERE is no subject which we think ought to be urged more frequently on the attention of Roman Catholic laymen than the obvious tendency which the leading doctrines and rules of discipline, by which the Roman Catholic Church differs from the other professing Christian Churches, have to promote and extend the power and influence of the clergy, and to enrich the great ecclesiastical corporation of which they are members. And when they remember that the same body which derives such power, influence, and wealth from those doctrines and that discipline, as far as they can, stifle and forbid all inquiry into and discussion of them, it surely should excite suspicion in their minds that the origin and foundation of those doctrines and rules will not bear investigation and discussion.

In the ordinary transactions of life, this undoubtedly would be the result. Take, for example, a familiar instance. If the heir to a large estate was told that his father had made a will limiting and restricting the rights the law would otherwise have conferred upon him; that, by that will, the possession of his father's inheritance was subject to conditions, and clogged with limitations, which nothing but the clearest expression of intention on the part of the parent would induce a court of law to give effect to; that, instead of becoming his own master at the age which the law recognises as the age of discretion, he was to remain in tutelage and under the control of guardians during all his natural life; that his conduct and actions throughout the whole of his existence were to be regulated by their wishes and directions. Would he not, in such a case, examine most scrupulously the authenticity and construction of that will? Would he not subject it to investigation, and test its legality? And if, on demanding inspection of the instrument imposing such restrictions on him, he was to be told by those in whose possession the will was, and who claimed to be the guardians appointed by it, that he should not be allowed any opportunity of making such investigations; what, we ask, would be his course under such circumstances? Would any man, in such a case, tamely acquiesce in the claims put forward by the alleged guardians? Would he quietly resign those rights which the laws of his country bestowed upon him, and yield implicit belief to the assertions of those whose interest it was to keep him in tutelage and ignorance? On the contrary, would he not vehemently suspect that the alleged will had no real existence, or was, at least, erroneously interpreted? Now, if such would be our conduct in the ordinary transactions of life, why do we not apply the same reasoning and the same inferences to spiritual matters? We all, in the words of Scripture, are heirs of God and joint-heirs of Christ; heirs of that will and testament delivered by God the Father through his Son, and sealed by his blood—joint-heirs of that eternal life revealed in that will. The Church of Rome and her priests say they are the appointed guardians and interpreters of that will; and, as they interpret it, the joint-heirship to eternal life is limited and controlled at the will and pleasure of themselves as guardians; and when the disinherited layman asks to see and inspect the will in question, these self-constituted guardians indignantly refuse to satisfy his curiosity.

We ask, therefore, Roman Catholic laymen, ought not this refusal to excite their suspicions as to the real contents of the will and testament of their Heavenly Father? Are they willing to resign their birthright at the bidding of those who say that birthright belongs only to those who submit in all things to their rule and governance? And when they find that every one of those doctrines, and all those rules of discipline which other churches reject as not contained in that will, tend materially to promote the power, influence, and wealth of those self-constituted guardians, surely the suspicion created by their refusal to allow free interpretation of the will assumes new force and increased strength, and ought to be removed only by the clearest and most unimpeachable evidence. That such is their tendency we will now endeavour to show, and for that purpose will notice more in detail some of the principal of them.

In ecclesiastical government and discipline the most marked difference between the Church of Rome and that of England may be found in the forced celibacy of the clergy, and in the recognition and encouragement of monasteries and nunneries. By the former of these the clergy are severed from all those ties which would otherwise bind and connect the clergy with their lay brethren. To the individual so severed the exaltation of the church is the only object of ambition. Shut out from the ordinary affections and charities of social life, his existence is wrapt up in that of the corporation to which he belongs. Is he pious? His piety hopes for the spread of religion through the extended dominion of the church. Is he ambitious? His ambition can only be gratified by the supremacy and exaltation of that body to which he belongs. Is he selfish and self-indulgent? That selfishness and self-indulgence finds its easiest gratification in the increased wealth and importance of the same body. Take, again, the institution of monasteries and nunneries. Their vows are vows of poverty; but that vow is only as to the individual member, and does not interfere with the acquisition of wealth by the society of which he is a member; and when we remember the age at which persons become members of those institutions, the class of society from which alone novices are sought, it would be, perhaps, impossible to devise institutions more calculated to accumulate wealth; and such, indeed, practically has been their effect in every country and in all past ages of the world.

Again, if we take the distinguishing doctrines of the Church of Rome in matters of faith, the result is the same. It is hardly necessary to point out how materially the doctrine of the infallibility of the church tends to exalt the clergy, who are the only recognised agents in disclosing and interpreting its infallible decrees. For though, theoretically they may say that the infallibility resides in general councils, or in the Pope himself, or in the received tradition of the church, practically the teaching of the individual priest, claiming, of course, to be in conformity with the doctrines of their church, and forbidding inquiry and discussion by the laity, is put forward by each with a claim to infallibility. Again, in the doctrines of purgatory, of confession, and of priestly absolution, not only is the priest exalted, but who does not see that, in them, unfailing sources are opened up for pouring into the coffers of the church the wealth of weak and frightened sinners? Tell the weak and pious devotee that the remission of his sins is in the hands of his priestly adviser—that by his absolution the pains of purgatory may be alleviated and abridged. His piety tells him that, notwithstanding all his prayers and all his desire to serve God, he is still but an unprofitable servant; and with all this consciousness of sin about him, is it likely that, at the approach of death, he would resist the exhortation to bestow his goods on those who would use them for the alleged good of his soul? Nor are the same doctrines less effectual with the profligate and worldly-minded. Tell such a one, when the approach of death warns him that he is soon to leave those pleasures and riches which constitute his happiness in this world, that his condition in a future state depends on the bestowal or withholding of the last rites of the church, and then suggest that his peace with God may be made by the devotion of that wealth he can himself no longer enjoy to so-called pious uses. Every feeling of his selfish and hardened heart is enlisted in favour of such a disposition of his goods. That very selfishness which never hesitated to sacrifice the interests of others to the gratification of his own desires, or the advancement of his own interest, will now make him sacrifice the temporal interests of those nearest and dearest to him to that which is now paramount in his thoughts—namely, his spiritual safety.

We might extend these observations more at length; but we have noticed them in this brief manner as an introduction to a document to which we hope to call the attention of our readers more in detail in succeeding numbers. We allude to the recent report, presented by the Mortmain Committee to the House of Commons. In that remarkable mass of evidence we have numerous instances of the practical workings of the Roman Catholic system. There we will find detailed how unscrupulously the emissaries of Rome pursue, with calumny and persecution, those who dare to dispute her claims to universal obedience. How indefatigably she prosecutes her great object, of bringing all matters, whether spiritual or temporal, under her guidance and control. How the vow of obedience and poverty becomes the instrument of extorting from the unhappy devotee that property, all claim to which was supposed to have been renounced on admission within the walls of the convent. And, above all, there will be found numerous and well-established cases, in which the weak and aged, in the very hour of dissolution, at the instigation of their spiritual advisers, and in many instances by their intervention, in actually framing the necessary documents, have forgotten the claims of relations and friends, and have impoverished their own families, in order to swell the wealth and promote the objects of the Romish Church. We hope to proceed with this subject in our next.

WHO WAS THE FIRST ABSENTEE BISHOP?

IN the first article of our first number, which formed the prospectus of our periodical, and, as it were, struck the key-note to which our other articles were to be attuned, we spoke of the misfortunes of Ireland, and the way to remedy them, as a subject which should engage our especial attention. It may, perhaps, then have struck some of our readers as an omission, that we, in our last volume, have not said a word about absentees. To give a dissertation on absentee landlords, however, would but ill harmonize with the other topics of our paper; so we hope our readers will be satisfied if we give them instead a few of our thoughts on absentee bishops.

It seems plain enough, that if an absentee landlord be a bad thing, an absentee bishop is even worse. The meaning of the word bishop is an overseer; and what supervision can be exercised by one who is habitually absent? How can one far removed from them keep a watch over the faith and morals of his flock? And if, even with modern facilities of communication, a non-resident bishop must be felt to be one who neglects his duty, what must have been the case in ancient times, when penny-postage, and railroads, and electric telegraphs were unknown, and when such things had not been imagined, even in fairy tales? Accordingly, the practice of non-residence was almost unknown in the primitive church; and there exist both canons of councils and sayings of Fathers condemning anything resembling it. "Having read the Scriptures," says St. Athanasius (Apol. i.), "you know how great an offence it is for a bishop to forsake his church, and to neglect the flocks of God." Pope Paschal II. says, in his 22nd epistle—"Bishops ought to be disentangled from secular cares, and take charge of their people; and not to be long absent from their churches." Even in later times, the second Lateran Council enjoins (Can. 10)—"That churches be not committed to hired ministers; but that every church, which has the means, have its own proper priest." And, again, the third Lateran Council directs

(Sess. 13)—"When a church, or the ecclesiastical ministry, be to be committed to any man, let such a person be found out for this purpose who can reside upon the place, and discharge the cure by himself; but, if it be done otherwise, then let him who has received lose that which he has taken contrary to the holy canons."

In after times, however, we know that the corrupt practice prevailed of a bishop wholly absenting himself from his see, enjoying, indeed, its revenues, and taking rank according to its dignity; but either wholly neglecting its duties or else discharging them by some hired substitute. It would be a pleasure, surely, at least, if we could find out who was the first to set an example of such neglect of duty, and if we could brand him with perpetual infamy. Full of these thoughts we took up, as our most trustworthy guide, Cardinal Baronius, the famous Roman Catholic ecclesiastical historian; and though, no doubt, there did not seem much use in looking at the early volumes, still, for fear of passing over the first delinquent, we thought it best to begin at the beginning. One of the first things that attracted our attention, as we glanced through the history of the first century, was the heading of the pages which were marked with the year of the Lord, the year of the emperor's reign, and also the year of the pontificate of the reigning Pope, St. Peter being the name of the Pope which first met our eye. On examining when his popedom commenced we found that he is stated to have taken possession of the See of Rome A.D. 45, in the second year of the Emperor Claudius, resigning then the bishopric of Antioch, which he had held for seven years before. He is stated to have been Bishop of Rome for twenty-five years—a length of time which no succeeding Pope has equalled; so that it has become a customary address to a newly elected Pope, "Thou must not expect to see the years of Peter." When we read this, it struck us how much less strict the rules of the church were in the apostles' time than they became shortly afterwards; for it was reckoned, in the primitive ages, a discreditable thing for a bishop to migrate from one see to another, and more especially from a poorer to a richer. Several of the Fathers inveighed against the practice, as a kind of spiritual adultery (giving up a poorer wife for a richer); and the same practice has been condemned by several councils—Nice, Chalcedon, Antioch, Sardica, &c. Thus Pope Leo I. decreed (Ep. 84, c. 4)—"If any bishop, despising the meanness of his city, seeks for the administration of a more eminent place, and upon any occasion whatsoever transfers himself to a greater people, he shall not only be driven out of the see which is anothers, but he shall also lose his own." Surely Pope Leo, and the other popes who made similar decrees, ought not to have been so severe, if they had only recollected how their own predecessor, St. Peter, had obtained the Bishopric of Rome by abandoning the See of Antioch, which he had formerly held. Doubtless, however, the apparent irregularity of this proceeding must be accounted for by the fact, that the discipline of the church was not so strictly maintained in the apostles' time as in the purer ages that succeeded them!

Let us, then, pass on from the question how St. Peter obtained the See of Rome, to examine how he administered it. And it is a curious fact, that though we read a good deal in Scripture both of St. Peter and the city of Rome after the year A.D. 45, we do not once read of the two being together. We read of St. Peter being at Jerusalem (Acts xv. 7) or at Antioch (Gal. ii. 11), where St. Paul "withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed." There is reason to think that he was in Corinth (1 Cor. i. 12) and (as St. Epiphanius also agrees) in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, to which places he directed his general epistle (1 Peter i. 1). Many are also of opinion that his general epistle was written from Babylon, in Assyria (1 Pet. v. 13); but there is no Scripture evidence that he ever was in Rome. Of course we do not, like some Protestants, bring forward these passages as proving that he *never* was in Rome, but only that he did not constantly reside there. Again, when we read of the city of Rome in the New Testament, we have good grounds for thinking that St. Peter was not there. St. Paul directed to the Church of Rome one of his longest epistles; but among the numerous salutations which he sends at the end to the Roman Christians, by name, there is not one mention of St. Peter; and, indeed, we can scarcely doubt but that, if the Roman Church had enjoyed at the time the benefit of an inspired apostle residing among them as their bishop, St. Paul would have directed his letter to some church that wanted it more. Again we are told (Acts xxviii. 30) that St. Paul resided for two years at Rome; and we know that during that time he wrote several letters (*e.g.*, Epistle to the Galatians, the Ephesians, the Philippians, the Colossians, to Philemon, and the second to Timothy); but though in these he sends several salutations from the Roman Christians, by name, to those whom he addressed, St. Peter's name does not once occur. In particular, St. Peter could not have been at Rome when St. Paul wrote (Col. iv. 11) respecting Tychicus, Onesimus, Aristarchus, Marcus, and Justus—"These *only* are my fellow-workers unto the kingdom of God which have been a comfort unto me." Or, again, when he wrote (2 Tim. iv. 11)—"Only Luke is with me." Or, again (2 Tim. iv. 16)—"At my first answer no man stood with me, but all men forsook me: I pray God that it may not be laid to their charge."

We were happy to find that, in inferring from these passages that St. Peter was not constantly resident in Rome, we had the support of Cardinal Baronius, who also gives very satisfactory reasons for his absence; for it must be remembered that St. Peter was an APOSTLE, and, as such, "it was his duty not to stay in one place, but as much as it was possible for one man to travel over the whole world, to bring those who did not yet believe to the faith, and thoroughly to establish believers." (Baron. Ann. lviii. sec. 51.) The Acts also contain full accounts of the earlier parts of St. Peter's apostleship; but in those days (Acts ix. 32) he is spoken of as passing through all quarters, and it is not likely that he got lazier as he got older. And we have in St. Paul a specimen of the work of an apostle. He says (Romans xv. 19), that from Jerusalem, round about to Illyricum, he had fully preached the Gospel of Christ; and even this did not satisfy him, for he designed (v. 24) going to Spain besides. Surely we cannot think that St. Peter was less active in doing apostles' work. Baronius gives us to understand that St. Peter left Rome at the commandment of the Emperor Claudius, that all Jews should depart from Rome; and, however strange it may seem that a Christian bishop, noted for courage, should abandon his see at the command of a heathen ruler, there can be no doubt that St. Peter was well employed when he was away. Baronius enumerates (p. 537) the names of a variety of churches which claim to have been planted by St. Peter or his disciples—Mauritania, Numidia, Britain, all Italy, Gaul, Spain, Africa, Sicily, and the adjacent islands. "How," says he on another occasion (An. xxxix. p. 272), "could he who had the care, not of one city only, but of all Christendom, who was bound to provide for all, to visit all, if he could, to instruct, to admonish all—in short, to feed the *whole* flock intrusted to him—how could he (and especially in times when the Christian faith was everywhere assailed, both by Jews and Gentiles)—how could he be confined within the limits of one city, however dignified, and not rather (as St. Luke testifies he did) go round and visit all the churches?"

Nothing can be more satisfactory than this. The cardinal has clearly proved that St. Peter's duty, as an apostle, made it impossible for him to confine himself to a residence at Rome. But, then, a perplexity remains. Why did St. Peter undertake the office of Bishop of Rome when he must have known that his higher engagements, as apostle, must prevent him from discharging the duty of bishop to a particular church? For St. Paul, we know, who says he had the care of all the churches, never fettered himself by undertaking the lower office of bishop of a particular see. What could have induced St. Peter to act differently? It could not have been because the office of Bishop of Rome was the highest place in the church, because every one agrees that the See of Rome had not this dignity before St. Peter became its bishop; nor could it be the *title* of bishop of the metropolis, for St. Peter, who had the title of apostle, needed not to covet any other; and we know that in his epistles he never calls himself Bishop of Rome. And, surely, we cannot think that his inducement was *money*, and that he took possession of the revenues of the richest see, paying a curate for doing his duty; for it is remarkable that some early authorities speak of Linus or Clement as Bishop of Rome at the very time that Baronius represents St. Peter to have filled that see.

Altogether we closed the volume in very disagreeable perplexity. There was no use in searching through its pages for any later examples of absentee bishops, if any of those who, in after ages, neglected their sees, could plead with truth that St. Peter had set them the pernicious example.

But when we reflected on the matter, we said, No, the thing is impossible. We must have been imposed on. St. Peter must have been calumniated. He never could have undertaken an office the duties of which he did not mean to fulfil. And he never could have thought that a bishop could discharge his duties without residing among his people. No doubt, if he ever was at Rome (or wherever he was), apostolic authority must have superseded episcopal, and the advice of the inspired apostle must have been implicitly followed in the government of the church. But knowing, as he did, that his apostolic commission required him to travel about constantly, he could never have accepted an inferior office, the duties of which required him to remain constantly in the same place. And the story of his having been Bishop of Rome must have originated in the emulation which existed among the ancient churches, all of whom were anxious to head their list of bishops with the most venerable name they could find. And, after all, there is as ancient authority to connect the name of St. Paul as that of St. Peter with the appointment of the first Bishop of Rome.

There is, however, one serious objection to our settling the question in this way. St. Peter's having been Bishop of Rome is one of several things which must be proved before we can establish the Pope's supremacy and infallibility. And if it should appear that St. Peter was not Bishop of Rome, down will come the whole theory of the Pope's supremacy, just like a house of cards when you pull the bottom cards away. Can any of our Roman Catholic readers tell us how we are to avoid this very disagreeable consequence?

WHERE IS IT?—A COLLOQUY.

AN inquirer after truth was lately discussing theology with a reverend convert from the Protestant faith to the Church of Rome. Transubstantiation, Purgatory, the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Invocation of Saints, and the worship of the Blessed Virgin Mary formed, of course, subjects of great interest in the discussion; but it is not our present object to repeat what was said on either side on any of those interesting subjects; and we shall take up the discussion at the point on which the reverend convert to the Church of Rome ultimately was induced to take his stand, in acknowledging that he had not become convinced of any of the peculiar tenets of Rome by reasoning or reading upon them, but took them all on trust, as matters resolved and settled by the infallibility of the church whose tenets they are.

Inquirer.—But, reverend sir, assuming, for the sake of argument, that it were possible for me to lay all my doubts and difficulties at the foot of infallibility, as you seem to have done, will you come to the practical point, and tell me *where it exists*, that I may find it and avail myself of it? There may be a physician able to heal my sickness of the body, but if I know not where to find him his skill will remain useless to me, and my sickness remain unhealed; and, in the same way, supposing that this infallible tribunal exists *somewhere*, for the solution of my doubts, it will remain utterly useless unless I know where to find it, in order to avail myself of it and cast my difficulties at its feet. Where is it?

Father M.—It is in the church, speaking by its infallible head—the Pope.

Inquirer.—How am I to be assured of that? I have always heard it is said to be *somewhere* in the church; but I know that much difference exists among theologians in the Church of Rome as to the precise *somewhere*. One class of them is said to hold that infallibility resides in the popes; a second class that it resides in the councils; and a third class asserts that it is not in either of them separately, or in both conjointly, but that it resides diffused through the church generally. These several classes of theologians always seem to argue very ably in proving that their adversaries are wrong, but to reason very weakly and defectively when endeavouring to establish their own views; and I, therefore, am anxious to learn which of those systems you have found your belief on as the true one.

Father M.—The French divines formerly held that infallibility resided in general councils and not in the popes; the Italian divines hold that it resides in the popes and not in councils; there seems to be a leaning now everywhere in favour of the popes; and, for my own part, I hold it to be in the popes.

Inquirer.—It seems a strange thing that if there be a *certainly* infallible tribunal, there should be any *uncertainty* as to where it is, or in what it consists. If your doctrine of the Pope's infallibility be the true one, it was, of course, always true of every true Pope since the days of St. Peter, and one would think would have been universally acknowledged in all ages. What say you to the Council of Basle, which was composed of a crowd of bishops and clergy, who came together from all parts of Europe, and yet decreed, in its 33rd session, that "none of the faithful did ever doubt of this truth—that the Pope, in things belonging to faith, was subject to the judgment of the same general councils." And in session 38, "that the council has an authority immediately from Christ, which the Pope is bound to obey."* Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini (who was afterwards a Pope himself, Pius II.), advocated that opinion in that council, in many learned and eloquent speeches, and sarcastically but acutely attributed the numbers on the Pope's side to this *good* reason—"that the Pope disposeth of benefices, but the councils give none."

Father M.—You forget that the Council of Basle was opposed by the Pope, Eugenius IV., and that, when Æneas Sylvius became Pope himself, he changed his opinion, and published a Bull of retractation, declaring that as Æneas Sylvius he was a damnable heretic, but as Pius II. he was an orthodox pontiff!

Inquirer.—I am not ignorant of those singular facts; but you must allow me to say, that a matter so stiffly contested among themselves by Roman Catholic divines gains but little strength from either of them. That popes should ambitiously contend for superiority is natural enough, though some of them have disclaimed the title of Universal Bishop, if they are not misrepresented. But I cannot consent to take any Pope's word for his own infallibility, as that is the very matter to be proved.

Father M.—Whatever differences may have existed in the church, there is, nevertheless, very high authority in favour of the Pope—Baronius, Bellarmine, Albertus Pighius, Hosius, Canus, Aquinas, Cajetan, Pallavicini,

* Nec unquam aliquis peritorum dubitavit summum Pontificem, in his quæ fidem concernunt judicio eorundem concilliorum universalium esse subjectum.—Conc. Basil, decret. p. 117. Concilium habet potestatem immediatè à Christo, cui Papa obedire tenetur.—Conc. Bas., ses. 38., p. 101.

Alphonsus Liguori, and many others, are all of that opinion.

Inquirer.—But are not Alphonsus de Castro, Launoy, Gerson, Laurentius Valla, Tostatus, Du Pin, Bossuet, Erasmus, and many others of the contrary? I am, therefore, at a loss to know how such a matter can be considered settled by authority; and I apprehend the Council of Trent itself, with the Pope at its head, was unable to solve the enigma, and ultimately separated without any canon concerning it, though the discussion upon it lasted for several months, and a variety of proposed canons, relating to the Pope's supremacy, were drawn up, showing that the sole cause of their silence was the impossibility of coming to a common understanding upon it. In the absence, therefore, of an authoritative decision on this important point, on such a great occasion, where obviously the Pope, bishops, and legates would have decreed it, and were anxious to do so if they could have come to any agreement about it, an inquirer is driven to form an opinion for himself on the matter; and I confess the most plausible opinion, as to the seat of infallibility, supposing an infallible tribunal to exist, at times seems to me to be, that it rests on the decrees of general councils, when ratified and confirmed by the Pope: and if I can venture to judge from what I have heard from some educated men of your profession, few discreet Roman Catholics recognise *either* Popes or councils alone as incapable of error, and attribute infallibility only to both united—that is, to decrees of councils ratified by the Pope."

Father M.—I think your informers are scarcely aware of the difficulties into which such a doctrine would lead them. Supposing, for a moment, that both councils and popes have been wrong in each claiming independence and superiority over the other, and that the theory of your discreet (Roman) Catholics is the true one—that it is only the decrees of general councils, when confirmed by the Pope, that are really infallible—how do they get over such difficulties as the following—If the Pope's confirmation be necessary to the validity of a decree of a general council, must it not be asserted that it is the Pope and not the council that is guided by the Holy Spirit? Yet Catholics have always affirmed that general councils, lawfully called, have an infallible guidance of the Holy Spirit in framing their decrees. If they have not, what are they but the opinions of fallible men, like that of the majority of any other deliberative body? If it be, however, admitted that the Holy Spirit assists and guides the *Council*, how is it possible that the *Pope* can differ from its decrees? Can the Pope disannul what the Holy Spirit approves? Or can the Holy Spirit guide the Pope to reject the same thing which he has led the Council to receive and decree? If the Holy Ghost assists and guides *both* Pope and Council, the Pope *must* ratify what the Council has decreed, or the Holy Spirit must contradict himself, which is impossible. It seems, therefore, plain that the ratification of the Pope cannot be a mere *condition*; it is *everything*, or it is a mere *form*. It is, no doubt, true that the Council of Basle decided that they were above the Pope, and that they actually deposed Pope Eugenius, in 1439, who would not admit or confirm their decrees. You ask which was right, the Council or the Pope? In my opinion the Pope was right; and that Council could not have had the assistance and guidance of the Holy Spirit; for, if so, how would it be possible to believe that the subsequent refusal of the Pope to confirm the decree should deprive the council, *ex post facto*, of the guidance and assistance of the Spirit which had guided them to make it? It seems, therefore, plain that this mixed theory is not the correct one, and it was such difficulties as this, no doubt, that led such eminent controversialists as Cardinal Bellarmine to the conclusion—"Infallibility does not come partly from the Pope and partly from the council, but wholly from the Pope."†

Inquirer.—You seem, however, to forget that it is "the church," in its aggregate capacity, that God has promised to be with to the end of the world, not with any particular portion of it alone. And that God did not treat the Pope as "the church," is, I think, self-evident to any one conversant with the history of the Popes. Dr. Milner, in his "End of Religious Controversy," admits enough to convince any one who will venture to use his reason at all in matters of religion, that God has not always been with the Popes, and that some of them were but sorry representatives of Christ upon earth. "I, as well as Baronius, Bellarmine, and other Catholic writers," says Dr. Milner, "have unequivocally admitted that some few of our *pontiffs have disgraced themselves by their crimes, and given just cause of scandal to Christendom*, but the credit of our cause is not affected by the personal conduct of particular pastors." This may be true within certain limits; but it at least shows that God has not been always with the Popes, and, therefore, that the Popes, unassisted by councils at least, cannot safely be trusted by Roman Catholics as infallible. General councils, as solemn assemblies of the bishops of the church, may, with more plausibility, be supposed to represent the church in its aggregate capacity, and, as such, to be under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and therefore infallible, as *guided by that Spirit* into all truth. No doubt there is difficulty in that theory (as you say), and popes have never admitted the supremacy of councils, but have often claimed it to themselves as their own prerogative, as vicars of Christ upon earth; but there have been often, as every reader of history knows, rival "vicars," who excommunicated and anathematized each other without mercy, and whose claims it would be difficult, or impossible, for the most impartial historian to decide between even now, much less when the heat of party feeling and conflicting interests were roused and in full force. Truth and piety do not seem to have been affixed to the chair of Rome more than to any other; and that the Papal State has not been exempt from the ordinary causes of error and impiety—ambition, avarice, and luxury—many ages have testified and complained. And in such times, at least, how is it possible to believe that the Pope was the sole, infallible guide?

Father M.—It was never held that the Pope was in all things infallible, and some of them may have erred, both in faith and virtue; but still Christ has promised never to desert his church; and I think there is less difficulty in admitting the Pope to be infallible than in believing councils to be so, or deciding between contending popes and councils, both of whom cannot be right, when they differ. Were I to go into the Scriptural argument, to prove the primacy of St. Peter and his successors, I think you would admit that the weight of argument is all on the side of the Pope.

Inquirer.—I should be very glad to hear you on those points when you are at leisure; though I am not ignorant of what has been said by learned writers on these subjects; and I even confess that it sometimes appears to me that if I could believe that infallibility exists anywhere, but in the Holy Scriptures (which are infallible, because inspired of God), the preponderance of argument between the three parties is in favour of the Papacy. Most of these arguments seem to be derived from something connected with St. Peter, derived from some word spoken to him, or some promise made to him, or some supremacy supposed to be in him; and, therefore, seem to point to something in the popes, as succeeding him, rather than to anything in councils

Father M.—I am very glad to find an inquirer of your earnest views disposed to agree with me on this point; it is one on which the order to which I belong—the Society of Jesus—holds very decided opinions.

Inquirer.—But supposing that this matter was settled, and all difficulty removed from my mind on the point—which I am far from saying is the case—it appears to me that a further difficulty immediately arises—namely, how is it to be ascertained when the Pope delivers himself infallibly? It is admitted by all parties that some popes have erred, that some were even heretical,* and that even, in the case of orthodox popes, they sometimes speak fallibly and sometimes infallibly. There are many Papal Bulls directly opposite and contradictory to other Papal Bulls. The difficulty, then, is, what is the test to distinguish between the fallible Bulls and the infallible Bulls?

Father M.—Nothing can be easier. When the Pope utters his decision *ex cathedrâ*, there is no doubt of the infallibility of the decision.

Inquirer.—I am aware that the Pope is said, by theologians of your school, to be infallible whenever he utters a decision or issues a Bull *ex cathedrâ*; but still it is necessary to learn how we are to ascertain a decision *ex cathedrâ* from a decision *not ex cathedrâ*.

Father M.—Nothing can be easier. There are certain essential requisites characteristic of a Bull *ex cathedrâ*, and without which it cannot be received as *ex cathedrâ*. They are seven in number; and but that I fear to weary you by the detail, I should be happy to enter into them.

Inquirer.—I feel deeply interested in so important a matter; pray do me the favour of detailing them, without any apprehension that they will weary me.

Father M.—Well, then, the first thing necessary is, that, before composing and issuing the Bull, the Pope should have opened a communication with the bishops of the universal church; that in such communication he should ask their prayers to the Almighty, that the Holy Spirit might fully and infallibly guide him, so as to make his decision the decision of inspiration. Secondly, it is necessary that, before issuing such Bull, the Pope should carefully seek all possible and desirable information touching the special matter which is under consideration, and which is to be the subject of his decision. He should be specially careful to possess himself of all available information from those persons who are residing in the district affected by the opinion called in question, and who are found faithful therein; so that the Pope may have all the requisite information for an infallible decision from the very district in which the opinion, on which the decision is sought, had its origin or existence. The third requisite or essential is, that the Bull should not only be formal, but authoritative, and should claim to be authoritative; it should not be issued merely as the opinion or judgment of the Pope, in his personal capacity, but as the decisive and authoritative judgment of one who was the head of that church which is the mother and mistress of all churches, to whom all Christendom owe subjection and allegiance, and who is the living voice of infallibility, and who, as such, has the power and authority to pronounce infallibly the decision required.

Inquirer.—My dear sir, you are assuming rather more than I am prepared to grant without proof, when you assert so dogmatically so many things about the Church of Rome; but I wish to hear the remainder of your seven requisites or essentials, so pray be good enough to go on.

Father M.—The fourth is, that the Bull should be promulgated universally—that is, that it should be addressed to all the bishops of the universal church, in order that, through them, its decisions might be determined and made known to all the members or subjects of the whole church. The Pope is the fountain head of all episcopal jurisdiction, so that there can be no episcopal jurisdiction but from the Pope; and as episcopacy is the only channel through which every grace flows to the church, so it is necessary that the Bull containing the decision of the Pope be addressed to all the bishops of the universal church.

Inquirer.—You will not suppose me to admit that the Pope is the fountain of all episcopal jurisdiction; and I apprehend it would be easy to show, from the proceedings of the Council of Trent, that no such tenet was admitted in that council; but I postpone giving you my ideas upon that matter, and I pray you to go on with your remaining requisites.

Father M.—The fifth requisite is, that the Bull should be universally received—that is, that it should be accepted by all the bishops of the whole church as an authoritative and infallible decision—that, after promulgation by the Pope, it should be accepted and promulgated by all the bishops as authoritative and infallible, or at least should be simply accepted by them without formal promulgation, or tacitly permitted by them without opposition, which is held to be a sufficient acceptance in a legal sense.

Inquirer.—It appears to me, that your first, second, and fifth requisites are matters very difficult to be ascertained. How am I to inform myself whether the Pope opened a previous communication with the bishops to obtain their prayers, or whether he sought and obtained all the required information before he proceeded to issue the Bull, according to your first and second requisites? The fifth seems equally difficult to be ascertained. Indeed, I scarcely know anything more difficult to ascertain with satisfaction than whether any given Bull was received and promulgated, or simply received without promulgation, or only permitted without opposition in any given country. Some are received in Spain, and are rejected in France—and some are received in France which are rejected in England and Ireland—and some are rejected in all these, and yet are said to be accepted in Italy; and the assertions made on all sides upon this fact are so contradictory that I know nothing so difficult to be determined satisfactorily. This 5th requisite opens a prodigious sphere of inquiry and disputation. However, pray complete your remaining particulars.

Father M.—The sixth is one of immense importance, more absolutely essential than any I have yet named. It is this—The matter in question, to be the subject matter of the Bull, must be one touching faith or morals—that is, it must concern the purity of faith or the morality of actions.

Inquirer.—That seems very reasonable; but I apprehend that the Church of Rome has strained "faith and morality" to include all matters of fact, even matters of history, wherever they seem to bear upon any question of "faith" or "morality." Witness the celebrated controversy between the Jesuits and the Jansenists, where the point at issue was the matter of fact, whether the opinions condemned by both parties were really contained in Bishop Jansen's book "Augustinus," which Pope Alexander VII. declared they were in a Bull, dated 1657, though the Jansenists denied that they were so in point of fact, and no one but the Jesuits could ever find them there. Pray, however, pardon this interruption, and, as our time is nearly exhausted, proceed with your seventh requisite.

Father M.—The seventh and last condition is, that the Pope should be free from all exterior influences, so as to be under no exterior compulsion or constraint. The Bull of Pope Liberius possessed the other essentials, but this last was wanting; that Pope acted under com-

* The late learned Charles Butler, the eminent Roman Catholic lawyer, in his book of the Roman Catholic Church (Letter x., p. 122, edition 1825), says "In spiritual concerns the Transalpine opinions ascribe to the Pope a superiority and controlling power over the whole church, should she chance to oppose his decrees, and, consequently, over a general council, his representative. They likewise ascribe to the Pope the extraordinary prerogative of *personal infallibility*, when he undertakes to issue a solemn decision on any point of faith—the Cisalpines affirm that in spirituals the Pope is subject, in doctrine and discipline, to the church, or to a general council representing her. They affirm that a general council may without, and even against the Pope's consent, reform the church. They deny his *personal infallibility*, and hold that he may be deposed by the church, in a general council, for heresy and schism."

† Tota firmitas conciliorum legitimorum est a Pontifice, non partim a Pontifice partim a concilio.—De Pontifice, Art. 4, c. 3.

* Pope Liberius avowed Arianism; Pope Honorius was a Monothelita.

pulsion, under a fear of his life, and, therefore, as he was not free, his decision could not he regarded as *ex cathedrâ*. The Bull thus issued was full of error.

Inquirer.—This is another point which may be, to one at a distance from Rome, very difficult of ascertaining. How am I, or any one in England, to ascertain, with anything like moral certainty, whether the Pope, at the issuing of any Bull, was really under exterior influences, or perfectly free, even if it was issued at the present day? But the difficulty must be enhanced a thousand-fold when the inquiry concerns some Bull issued centuries ago. I am afraid your tests are scarcely available for practical use, and I entreat you to tell me how to get over so many uncertainties.

Father M.—My dear sir, nothing can be easier; you have only, in such cases, to go to the bishop, and ask him whether the bull was *ex cathedra* or otherwise.

Inquirer.—Oh! I see, and I suppose, if I can't get at the bishop, the parish priest will do as well. If the whole results in this, I might better relinquish the search after infallibility altogether, and at once use my own sense and judgment, however fallible, and compare the Bull with the Holy Scriptures rather than be left in such a maze of uncertainties, heaped one upon another, with no better guide than a man like myself, admitted to be fallible, and having, perhaps, some interest in deceiving me into the belief of a doctrine on which he, perhaps, depends for his livelihood. I shall be happy, however, to renew our conference on another opportunity; at present accept my thanks for all the trouble you have taken for my enlightenment—farewell.

THE GREAT WESTERN SCHISM.—No. II.

WE have had occasion, in our last volume (see p. 7), to bring before our readers Scriptural proof of the fact that, even in the apostles' days, teachers of error existed, and *that* even among the clergy of the Church; but that when the apostles warn their converts against the danger of being misled by such false teachers they tell them of no infallible safeguard against it. They say nothing of general councils whose decisions shall be miraculously secured from error; nor of any central church whose guidance may be implicitly followed; nor of any successor of St. Peter who shall supply Christians with unerring directions. Their only advice to their followers is to *watch*, to take heed to themselves and to the doctrine which had been delivered to them.

Modern Romanists, however, have discovered a compendious way of arriving at truth, a way of which we find no traces in the records of the apostolic age. Their plan is not to judge of the Church by its doctrine, but to judge of the doctrine by the Church which teaches it. And when they find Protestants pursuing the ancient method of testing whether a doctrine be true, by heedful comparison of it with the doctrines which the apostles are recorded to have delivered, they taunt them with the uncertainty of their process. They say, whether such and such a doctrine be true is, after all, but a matter of *opinion*; but that we are in communion with the successor of St. Peter is a matter of *fact*.

It is an obvious reply that this matter of fact, as it is called, together with the consequences supposed to follow from it, involves several very doubtful matters of opinion. It is matter of opinion whether St. Peter possessed privileges distinct in kind from those enjoyed by the other apostles, so that he alone of them was to transmit his infallibility to successors; it is matter of opinion whether St. Peter were ever Bishop of Rome; and, since St. Peter is said to have been Bishop of Antioch as well as of Rome, it is matter of opinion whether the Bishop of Rome necessarily exclusively inherits from him the office of infallible guide to the Christian Church.

But it might be supposed that, if all these points could be once comfortably settled, then we should be released from the necessity for all that care and watchfulness which the poor Christians of the apostles' times were obliged to employ—if we only adhere firmly to the doctrines of the Bishop of Rome, we shall, without any further investigation, be sure of being in the right. We are tempted to congratulate ourselves on having so simple a rule for attaining religious truth, and only to wonder how St. Paul should have so inexcusably omitted to have mentioned it to those whom he was cautioning against error.

But, alas, even this simple rule, "to adhere to the Bishop of Rome," has its uncertainties too; for we have first to determine who the real Bishop of Rome is. Now, in all the time between the third century and the Reformation, not a century has passed in which there has not been a schism in the church on this very point, and in which Christians have not been perplexed between the contending claims of different pretenders to the Romish See. We commenced in the last number a history of one of those schisms, commonly counted the 29th (!) of them, but not the last of them. It was, however, the greatest and most memorable of them, both for its duration, its extent, and its damaging effects on the Papal claims. It differs, too, from other schisms in this—that in other cases, but not in this, Roman Catholic divines are now 'pretty well agreed as to which of the rival claimants had right on their side, and as to which of the parties of their adherents are to be branded as schismatics. Even in these cases, however, it is a great mistake to suppose that, because a matter is plain to us now, it was equally plain at the time. Let us suppose that Roman Catholics are right in maintaining, that our Lord cannot possibly have made it necessary for Christians to search for truth by a toilsome investigation through the inspired records of his teaching, but that he must have afforded them a safe, and a shorter way to it; and what are we to think of the case of a man who has endeavoured to adopt this shorter and safer way, who has been only anxious to adhere to the Roman Pontiff, but who has, unfortunately, chosen the wrong one? He may have exerted in his choice of a right Pope as much care and watchfulness as Protestants think it necessary to spend in their choice of the right doctrine; he may have followed the opinion of some of those in whose learning and piety he had the most confidence; he may have had a considerable number of his contemporaries on his side: but, perhaps, some hundred years after his death, it may be discovered that the question which had perplexed him was an easy one; and that, though he had but the one thing to decide—who was the true Pope—he had decided it wrong, and had, in spite of all his care, wandered from the true fold, outside of which there is no salvation.

But the case of the great western schism is peculiar in this, that high Roman Catholic authority can still be produced in support of the claims of each of the rival popes, or at least in support of the opinion, that either of them might have been safely followed. This last is certainly the most charitable opinion, yet we doubt whether a Romanist can adopt it consistently; for the two pretenders could not have been both real popes. Either, therefore, the Christian world was for years without a Pope, or else one of the two was the genuine Pope, and the other was an impostor. Surely, then, it will not be said that it was a matter of indifference which of the two a Christian adhered to. The real reason why Roman Catholics have been so anxious to make out that there was safety on both sides is, that it is not pleasant for them to be obliged to confess that, with all their anxiety to find a rule which shall deliver Christians from all uncertainty, and all possibility of going wrong, their rule was one which set the half of Christendom in a fatal mistake for the space of several years. We shall prove, at all events, from contemporary documents, that the question—which was the true Pope—was one which Christians were at the time held bound to decide rightly, as they valued their everlasting salvation.

You will remember that we told you in the last number how the cardinals first chose Urban as their Pope; how they afterwards gave out that this choice, having been made by compulsion, and in terror for their lives, was invalid; and how they selected Clement as the true Pope.

The following are extracts from a circular issued by the cardinals soon after (see Baluzius Vitæ Pont. Aven. ii. 847):—"To all the faithful in Christ, the cardinals—bishops, priests and deacons—of the Holy Roman Church send greeting in the Lord. Having been appointed watchmen by the Lord God of Hosts, and occupying the highest post next after the Roman Pontiff, we are bound vigilantly to point out to the faithful the dangers which threaten their souls, and the snares and attacks of the enemy. Whereas, therefore, we have learned for certain, that that seducer, Bartholomew, formerly Archbishop of Bari, falsely calling himself Pope, has, as another Antichrist, sent certain false prophets to different parts of the world, whom he alone has constituted cardinals, together with some other defenders of his wickedness, in order that, by false persuasions and crafty suggestions, they may seduce the Christian people, and may cause them, *to the eternal damnation of their souls*, to adhere to the aforesaid apostate: and whereas, on this account, our most holy lord, Pope Clement VII., has desired us, who have perfect knowledge of this matter, to instruct the faithful concerning it: and whereas it pertains to none others than us, next after our most holy lord, Pope Clement VII., to inform the faithful who is the true Pope, therefore, we beseech you all, in Jesus Christ, *for the safety of your souls*, to adhere to the same lord, Clement," &c., &c.

Here, you see, it is taught plainly enough, that the adherents of Urban perilled their salvation; and there certainly appears great show of reason in what the cardinals said—viz., That if any doubt should arise as to who the true Pope was, no one could be fitter than the cardinals (who are the next highest authority to the Pope) to decide it; and it is hard to think that any man went fatally wrong who believed him to be the Pope whom the cardinals proclaimed as such.

However, as we do not wish to give you merely one side of the question, we shall give you an abridgment, on the other hand, of Urban's Bull denouncing Clement, which will be found in full in Raynaldus's Continuation of Baronius, An. 1378, p. 41:—"Since lately the vineyard of the Lord of Hosts—that is, the Holy Roman Church—has been compelled to heave deep groans, because the sons of her womb which she had brought up and raised from a lowly station to the highest dignities—viz., those children of iniquity and perdition, Robert, &c. [here the anti-Pope and his cardinals are enumerated]—have attempted to rend the seamless robe of the Lord, and have not only involved themselves in the bands of sin, but, being given over to a reprobate mind, *have endeavoured to draw others with them to destruction*; therefore, we who, by the Divine clemency, have the care of the aforesaid vineyard, have deemed it right, in the might of the Most High, to rise up and proceed against them and certain others of their favourers, as follows." Having then enumerated the offences of which Clement and his party had been guilty, in denying the authority of Urban, the latter proceeds:—"Wherefore, being unable, without grievous remorse of conscience, to tolerate any longer such wickedness, we decree that Robert [and Co.] have been and are schismatics, and apostates, and conspirators against us, and blasphemers, and to be punished as heretics; and we excommunicate and anathematize them, and we depose them from their cardinalships, and from all other ecclesiastical dignities, and we declare them incapable of holding any in future, and we deprive [certain of their lay supporters] of all their dignities, and of the order of knighthood; and we confiscate all the goods of the aforesaid condemned persons, both moveable and immoveable, and we declare their persons detestable and infamous, and that they ought to be taken by the faithful and kept in close prison and under safe custody until we command further on the subject."

"Further, we excommunicate any person who shall knowingly commit any of the bodies of the aforesaid to ecclesiastical sepulture; from which excommunication he shall not be absolved until he have, with his own hand, disinterred and cast out from ecclesiastical burial the bodies of the aforesaid.

"Further, we command every faithful person, of whatever rank—be he king, or queen, or emperor, or of whatever other dignity, even if he be cardinal of the Holy Roman Church—that he do not knowingly receive any of the aforesaid condemned persons into his city, camp, lands, or possessions of any kind; and that he do not carry, or suffer to be carried, to any of the aforesaid condemned, or to the places where they dwell, any grain, wine, flesh, clothes, wood, victuals, money, merchandize, or any goods whatsoever.

"Further, we command all the faithful to assist any persons who may be engaged in capturing any of the aforesaid condemned persons, or in detaining them when captured, or in transmitting them to us; and *we excommunicate any private person who shall transgress the aforesaid commands, or who shall knowingly call the aforesaid Robert (styling himself Clement), by the name of Pope; or who shall believe or hold him for a Pope; from which excommunication he shall not be freed by any but the Roman Pontiff, except in the article of death.*"

Of the remainder of the Bull we shall only mention, that he offers to all those who shall undertake a crusade for the extermination of the aforesaid schismatics, and who shall persecute them to the utmost of their power, the privileges and indulgences granted to those who proceed to the succour of the Holy Land; and that he releases the subjects of the princes who adhere to his rival from their obedience to their monarchs.

Here, then, was a comfortable position for a private Christian to be placed in. On the one hand, Urban excommunicates him if he calls Clement Pope, or holds or believes him to be so; and he releases him from his obedience to his civil magistrate, if the civil power in question take the part of Clement; while, on the other hand, Clement is not backward in similar threats, if he hold Urban for Pope.

Remember that the main argument for the existence of an infallible guide in the church is, that it is inconceivable that God could have left Christians exposed to the risk of error in any matter concerning their eternal salvation; but here we see that the institution of the office of Pope does not preserve Christians from such risk of error; that, on the contrary, Christians were left for several years together perplexed between the claims of two popes, in favour of each of whom so much might be said, and each of whom uttered the most frightful curses against the other and his adherents.

We have just given a mild specimen of a Pope's curse; we shall now enable our readers to judge what it was worth: for you must remember that one of the two parties must have been the real Pope, and that his curses had all the efficacy which papal dignity can give. If any of our readers, then, have the misfortune to be cursed by the priest for reading the Word of God, or any other similar offence, it may be a comfort to him to find that even a Pope's curse is not a very fatal affair.

The Jesuit Maimbourgh writes as follows (History of the Western Schism):—"The thunderbolts and the anathemas which the two popes launched against each other, and against all those who followed the opposite party, did no harm to any body." P. 57.—"The two popes continued to launch against each other, from time to time, a thousand thunderbolts of curses, which caused furious scandal and terrible disorder throughout Christendom. But as they cared little for the thunderbolts which thus missed fire, they soon had recourse to other arms which did much more mischief, producing bloody and fatal effects." p. 78.

Antoninus, Archbishop of Florence, who was canonized as a saint, in 1523, writes as follows (vol. iii., p. 390):—"There were among the adherents of either party,

all the time that the schism lasted, most learned men, and most religious, and (what is more) even distinguished by their miracles; and the question could never be so decided, but that there remained a doubt with very many. And though it be necessary to salvation to believe that there is but one vicar of Christ, yet, on the occasion of a schism (when several are called popes), it does not appear necessary to salvation to believe that this or that is the true Pope, but only whichever of them was canonically elected. And no one is bound to know who was canonically elected, any more than he is bound to be acquainted with the canon law; but the people may follow their princes and prelates." And again (p. 406)—"Urban and Clement, the pontiffs contending for the Papacy, on solemn days, each excommunicated the other and his adherents, as schismatics. Thence arose great confusion in the Christian religion; and a great opportunity was presented of sinning with impunity. For when any prelate or monk committed any crime, he passed over from the one obedience to the other, as if he were forsaking a schism; and so he not only escaped punishment for his crime, but he obtained even commendation and honour."

It would be easy to multiply quotations from some of the highest names in the annals of the Roman Church, that, notwithstanding the mutual anathemas of the contending pontiffs, the difficulty of ascertaining the true one was a sufficient excuse for the people on either side. In short, provided you believe that there is a Pope somewhere or other, it is quite unnecessary to know who he is; and you may be quite safe though you adhere to a false Pope, and though the true Pope be cursing you as hard as he can all the time.

Having mentioned, however, that there were on both sides saints who worked miracles, it would be a pity to conclude without giving some specimens of the light which those saints throw on the question. Odoricus Raynaldus (p. 48) gives the following "*insigne responsum*," as he calls it, from Peter, of Arragon, who had the reputation of being a saint, and of having had several celestial visions:—

"Your humble son, brother Peter, of Arragon, of the order of Minors, says, that in the revelations made by God to him unworthy, the cardinals (by the second election of the Cardinal of Geneva) are called by the Lord Jesus Christ and by his apostles—Peter, Paul, and John—Nicolaitans, and, by consequence, schismatics, enemies of God, and liars: and, though they be called cardinals, are not, as the Lord says (Apocalypse ii.)—'This thou hast because thou hatest the deeds of the Nicolaitans, which I also hate, and hast found them to be liars who say they are apostles and are not.' And I say, under your correction, that these words refer to the cardinals who made the second election: for it is certain that the heresy of Nicholas was, that he taught that wives were common, whence it follows that he must have taught that a woman may give herself to two men, a husband and an adulterer, contrary to the law of God. Such, then, speaking spiritually, was the error of the cardinals in the second election, who gave to the Church of God two husbands—viz., Urban, whom they had first chosen, and afterwards the Cardinal of Geneva. Therefore, the cardinals are called by the Lord, who foresaw the schism which should come to pass, Nicolaitans, schismatics, and, therefore, not cardinals, since a schismatic cannot be a cardinal. They are, therefore, exactly according to our Lord's description, called cardinals **and are not.**"

We have not space to add to this exposition of the second chapter of the Apocalypse how the anti-Pope was made out to be Herod; nor can we make room for extracts from the letters of St. Catherine, of Sienna, mentioned in our last article, who makes use of rather strong language, calling the French cardinals, when she was mildest, demons in human flesh, and calling Clement himself a demon, an Antichrist, and a limb of the devil.

But the testimony of these saints did not produce effect on the opposite party, because they had their saints, too, who worked as many miracles, and who, they thought, were better saints, because they kept their temper better, and did not abuse their antagonists quite so fiercely. It is sufficient to name St. Peter, Cardinal of Luxemburgh, who, after a life of great austerity, worked at his tomb such a number of dazzling, incontestable miracles, that crowds assembled at his tomb from all parts of Europe. This served the cause of Clement, since people could not believe that one who worked such miracles after his death had not been enlightened by God in his life, or that he could have consented to receive a cardinal's hat from one who was not the true Pope. But people ought to have known, says Maimbourgh, that a saint may be deceived like other men, and particularly in matters of fact; and that the gift of prophecy and of discernment with which God sometimes honours his servants, is not a constant habit, which always infallibly discovers the truth to them, but is one which enlightens them on certain occasions, and leaves them to their natural resources on others.

We have said enough, then, to show that it was, at the time, an exceedingly difficult, if not an impossible task for a man to ascertain the true Pope. Nor can it be said, this was 400 or 500 years ago; for we cannot suppose that God dealt with his church by different rules in the 14th or 15th centuries and in the 19th. If any one tells you, then, that it is inconceivable that God could leave his church without some guide, able to lead them infallibly into truth, you may answer, that it is just as necessary that God should make them know who that infallible guide is; and that it is indelibly written on the page of history that God *did* leave the church for a space of several years in a state in which it was next to impossible to determine who that infallible guide was. This single test, then, will determine whether our suppositions, as to what it is likely God will do, are a good guide for ascertaining what he has actually done.

THE DOCTRINE OF INTENTION.

GREAT is the uncertainty of the law—is a phrase of common use among those who suffer (as, doubtless, some of our worthy readers may have done), from the fallibility of human tribunals; but, alas! great is the uncertainty of the Gospel, too, if the Church of Rome's authorized statements be worthy of credit; for no one can be assured that he has ever received a single sacrament, or ever been admitted into the Church of Christ at all, if the canons of the Council of Trent are true enunciations of Catholic truth.

This may startle many, and will, doubtless, be received with an incredulous smile by all who have not studied the doctrines of the Church of Rome in its approved and authorized documents. Let us, however, fairly inquire into the matter, and see whether the statement be correct or not:—

THE CHURCH OF ROME'S AUTHORIZED STATEMENTS.

"If any one shall say that the INTENTION of doing at least what the church does is not required in ministers, when they make and confer the sacraments, let him be accursed."—*11th Canon of 7th Session of Council of Trent.*

"The penitent ought not so to flatter himself, concerning his own personal faith, as to think that, even though there be no contrition on his part, or no intention in the priest to ACT SERIOUSLY, and to absolve him TRULY, he is nevertheless truly, and in the eyes of God, absolved on account of his faith alone."—*Council of Trent, Session 14, chap. vi., on the Sacrament of Penance.*

"Should any priest NOT INTEND to consecrate, but to act *deceitfully*; also, if any hosts, through forgetfulness, remain on the altar, or if any part of the wine, or any host, is hid, when he only intends to consecrate those which he sees; also, if any one has before him eleven hosts, and intends to consecrate only ten, *not determining which ten he intends*: in these cases he does not consecrate, because INTENTION is required."—*Roman Missal, on Defects of the Mass.*

Pope Innocent III., in his ninth epistle, lays it down that "the smallest mistake, even though made involuntarily, nullifies the whole act." The Council of Florence pronounced the same opinion. Cardinal Bellarmine, on Justification (lib. iii., ch. 8),* lays it down broadly—"Nor can any man be certain, with the certainty of faith, that he receives a true sacrament, since *a sacrament cannot be made without the intention of the minister*, and no one can see another's intention."

Well might Ambrosius Catharinus, Bishop of Minori, argue against the consequences of such doctrines, as frightful, in the Council of Trent. They were, indeed, frightful; for let an Infidel, or a deceitful priest, baptize a child, without having seriously the idea of baptizing it, that child, according to the teaching of the Church of Rome, if it die, is lost. Let a bishop ordain a priest, without having actually and formally, from absence of mind or any other cause, the idea of conferring the priesthood, and behold we have a priest who is not a priest, and those whom he shall baptize, marry, or absolve will not, according to the doctrines of Rome, be baptized, married, or absolved. The Pope himself, without suspecting it, might have been ordained in this manner; and as it is from him that everything flows (according to his teaching), all the bishops of the church might, some day, find themselves to be false bishops, and all the priests false priests, without there being any possibility of restoring the broken link.

Hear, however, Ambrosius Catharinus himself, in arguing against the decreeing this doctrine:—"Let there be a knave priest who feigneth, and hath not an intention to administer the true baptism to a child, who, after grown to a man, is created bishop of a great city, and liveth many years in that charge, so that he hath ordained a great part of the priests. It must be said that he, being not baptized, is not ordained, nor they ordained who are promoted by him. So that to that great city there will be neither eucharist nor confession; because they cannot be without the sacrament of orders, nor orders without a true bishop; neither can he receive orders who is not baptized. Behold millions of nullities of sacraments by the malice of one minister in one act only." The good Bishop of Minori, however, failed in resisting this decree, though he strongly protested against it.

* "Neque potest certus esse, certitudine fidei, se percipere verum sacramentum, cum sacramentum sine intentione ministri non conficiatur, et intentionem alterius nemo videre possit."—4th vol., p. 355, Cologne ed., 1615; also, 3rd vol., p. 48. De Sacramentis in Genere, lib. i., cap. 27. "Requiri intentionem faciendi quod ecclesiam facit."

And we have only now to say a few words upon the CONSEQUENCES OF THIS DOCTRINE.

I.—If the doctrine of intention, as laid down by the Council of Trent, is true, the Church of Rome cannot be a safe guide to follow, because it is impossible to know, either that the Popes and Councils, through whom she is supposed to utter her decisions, are real Popes and Councils, or that the persons by whom those decisions are received are baptized Christians; in short, impossible to know that she is a church at all:

If the doctrine of intention is *not* true, the Church of Rome cannot be a safe guide to follow, because, while pretending to be infallible, she has decreed a falsehood:

But the doctrine of intention must be either true or not true:

THEREFORE—The Church of Rome cannot be a safe guide to follow.

II.—If a Roman Catholic believes the doctrine of intention, he must live and die in utter uncertainty as to whether he has received any one of the sacraments, which his own church declares to be essential to salvation:

If a Roman Catholic does *not* believe the doctrine of intention, his own church pronounces him "accursed."

But every Roman Catholic must either believe the doctrine of intention or not believe it:

THEREFORE—Every Roman Catholic must live and die either under the curse of his own church, or in a state of utter uncertainty as to whether he has ever received any one of the sacraments which his own church declares to be essential to salvation.

III.—If Christ made the doctrine of Intention, as it stands connected with the whole Romish system, part of his religion, he founded a religion which makes obedience to the Bishop of Rome "necessary to salvation for every human creature" (Canon Law, Extrav. Com., Lib. i., Tit. 8, p. 1160, Pars. 2, Leips. 1830), and at the same time makes it impossible for *any* human creature to know who *is* a true Bishop of Rome and who is not; which makes it essential to obey the decrees of Councils, and at the same time makes it impossible to know which *are* true Councils and which are not; which makes the interpretation of Scripture depend upon the opinions of the Fathers, and at the same time makes it impossible to know who *was* a Father and who was not; which makes every man's salvation depend upon his receiving true sacraments, and at the same time makes it impossible for any man to know when he *does* receive them and when he does not; which makes an apostolical succession of priests essential to the existence of a church, and at the same time makes it impossible for any one to know who *is* in the apostolical succession and who is not; which compels every layman to have perpetual recourse to a priest, and at the same time makes it impossible for any layman to know when he has found one; which theoretically makes the church as firm as a rock, but practically makes it as unsubstantial as a shadow:

If Christ did *not* make the doctrine of intention part of his religion—that is, part of Christianity—the Church of Rome, in decreeing it, has decreed anti-christianity, and is therefore so far antichristian.

But Christ must either have made the doctrine of intention part of his religion or not;

THEREFORE—Christ must either have established a religion which is involved in such a hopeless mass of uncertainty, confusion, and absurdity as any mere human philosopher would be ashamed of; *or*, the Church of Rome is so far antichristian.

IMPORTANT QUESTIONS FOR ROMAN CATHOLICS.

Did the priest who baptized you *intend* to baptize you?

Did the bishop who ordained him *intend* to ordain him?

How can Pope Pius IX. be sure that he has been himself ordained or baptized?

If the priest did not *intend* to consecrate the host which he elevated for your adoration, *what did you adore?*

What certainty has any Roman Catholic, *on his own principles*, that he is not unabsolved, unbaptized, an idolater, and the victim of a fatal delusion?

IS NOT THE RELIGION OF ROME THE RELIGION OF DOUBT?

WE KNOW, If our earthly house of this habitation be dissolved, that we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in heaven.'—2 Cor. v. 1 (*Douay version*).

For this WE KNOW, that we abide in him and he in us; because he hath given of his Spirit.'—1 John iv. 13 (*Douay version*).

WE KNOW that we are of God."—1 John v. 12 (*Douay version*).

KNOW YOU NOT that you are the temples of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?"—1 Cor. iii. 16 (*Douay version*).

I know whom I have believed, and I AM CERTAIN that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day."—2 Timothy i. 12 (*Douay version*).

IS NOT THE RELIGION OF THE BIBLE THE RELIGION OF CERTAINTY?

If a man is "justified by faith" (Rom. iii. 28, *Douay*

version), as the Bible teaches, and as Protestants believe, how can any other man's intention confer or withhold JUSTIFICATION?

If the believer is "born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God" (John i. 13, *Douay version*), as the Bible teaches, and as Protestants believe, how can any man's intention confer or withhold REGENERATION?

If the believer's priest is Christ himself (see Heb. iv. 15, 16), as the Bible teaches and as Protestants believe, how can any man's intention confer or withhold ANSOLUTION?

THE EFFECTS OF EXCOMMUNICATION,

ILLUSTRATED IN AN ACTION OF SLANDER, BROUGHT BY PHILIP BOYLE AGAINST THE RIGHT REV. PETER M'LOUGHLIN, TITULAR BISHOP OF RAPHOE; TRIED AT THE LIFFORD SPRING ASSIZES, 1809, BEFORE THE HON. BARON M'CLELLAND AND A SPECIAL JURY.

THE facts were briefly as follow:—A chapel had been built, by voluntary subscription, by the Roman Catholic inhabitants of the parish of Kilbarron, in the county of Donegal; Dr. M'Loughlin, finding it too small, proposed to the parishioners the expediency of erecting two galleries, which were accordingly built by them. Immediately after they were finished, Dr. M'Loughlin and one of his parishioners, calling themselves a committee, allotted the principal pews to such of the wealthy parishioners as *would agree to purchase them at a certain price*. The parishioners conceived themselves ill treated by this partial allotment, and remonstrated against it, telling the defendant that it was not necessary to resort to this measure of disposing of the pews, as they were ready to pay the amount of the arrears due to the builder; and, to effect this purpose, a general meeting of the parishioners took place, when the plaintiff, Philip Boyle, was appointed collector to receive the amount of the balance due. The bishop became enraged with this opposition from the parishioners, when he found he could not dispose of the pews as he had intended, and peremptorily refused time to collect the money. The plaintiff begged for a little longer time; to which the defendant merely replied, "Desist, you set of combinators, or I will punish you with the weapons of the church." On the following Sunday the bishop persisted in his determination of disposing of the pews, and desired the persons he named to take possession of their seats. The plaintiff told the bishop that the parishioners would never consent to the pews being disposed of in that way, and entreated him to wait till the following Sunday. This only served to inflame Dr. M'L.'s passion, and he again called on his friends to take possession of the pews, adding, "I perceive there is a combination formed against me in this parish, and you, Mr. Boyle, are at the head of it." Boyle replied, "I deny the charge, my lord; I assure you it is not so." The defendant then addressed the congregation, and said, "Do you hear this man attempting to make a clergyman a liar at the altar of God!" and then, turning to the plaintiff, he added, "I will denounce you and your family, sir, on next Sunday."

On the following Sunday, Boyle and his family attended the chapel as usual. The defendant then asked him "If he were come to offer satisfaction for the scandal given on the preceding Sunday?" The plaintiff answered that, "If he had offended either against God, or the church, or the bishop, he was sincerely sorry for it." The defendant then required Boyle to sign a paper, on which were these words, "I, Philip Boyle, do withdraw myself from the head of a set of combinators," which the plaintiff declined to do, whereupon the defendant exclaimed, "I will now excommunicate you," and proceeded forthwith to pronounce the sentence in these words—"I, Peter M'Loughlin, titular Bishop of Raphoe, in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; and of the holy apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul; of the blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God, and of all the angels and saints in heaven, do excommunicate you, Philip Boyle, until you sign this paper." The candles were then extinguished, the chapel bells rung, and the plaintiff was rendered an outcast from all civil and religious society, and deprived of the consolations, not only of worshipping God according to his religious belief, but of all social intercourse with those of his own creed, for not pleading guilty to the charge of being a combinator. The foregoing facts having been proved in the usual manner, and learned counsel heard on both sides, the learned judge proceeded to charge the jury as follows:—

"Gentlemen, this is a special action on the case brought by the plaintiff, Philip Boyle, to recover compensation and damages from the Rev. Peter M'Loughlin, for having excommunicated him, and thereby deprived him of the society of persons professing the Roman Catholic religion.

"It has been contended that the excommunication pronounced by the defendant, Dr. M'Loughlin, did not extend to exclude the plaintiff from society, but only from participating in the sacraments; but evidence to the contrary has been given: and I conceive it absurd to contend, at the present day, that the sentence of excommunication by a Roman Catholic bishop has not the effect of banishing the delinquent from the society of Roman Catholics.

"Let me ask any gentleman conversant with ecclesiastical history, what was the power and effect of the sentence of excommunication in those dark times of bigotry and superstition, when Christian popes and prelates exercised an absolute power and dominion over Christendom?

"It is a historic fact, that such dread and apprehension did this odious weapon of the church excite, such terror did it create in the mind, that even the very name of it made princes tremble on their throne. And, gentlemen, unless the tenets and doctrine of the Roman Catholic religion have undergone an entire change, have we any right to infer that the nature and effects of excommunication are not still unaltered? What was its dreadful effects on the mind of an English monarch, Henry II., when he bowed down and humbled himself to the then reigning Pope, begged pardon of him, as if he were his vassal, and prayed his forgiveness? Gentlemen, the difference attempted to be sustained by the defendant has reluctantly drawn from me these historical facts. And from their times down to the present we have not heard that the effects of excommunication have undergone any change in the Roman Catholic Church. I, therefore, consider that the nature and effects of excommunication are very little altered from what they were in those times to which I have alluded; and I do not entertain any doubt that the sentence pronounced by the bishop, in this case, was intended by him to have the effect of excluding the plaintiff from the benefit of Catholic society.

"Gentlemen, in the hearing of the gentlemen of the bar, I do not hesitate to assert that, WHEN A ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOP EXERCISES THE AUTHORITY OF EXCOMMUNICATION IN THIS COUNTRY, HE ASSUMES A POWER INCONSISTENT WITH THE LIBERTY OF THE SUBJECT, AND CONTRARY TO THE LAW OF THE LAND. God forbid that the subject of a free country should be compelled to crouch under such slavish dominion—a dominion repugnant to every principle of your inestimable constitution; for is it not, in point of fact, a judge trying his own cause, and giving judgment where he is himself a party?

"In our ecclesiastical courts the person offending is summoned, not before the bishop of the diocess, but before a judge, who has a temporal jurisdiction to decree as well on the merits as on the law of the case; and if the person be dissatisfied with the judgment of the ecclesiastical court he can remove the cause into a civil court. What is the practice? A petition is made out for a commission of delegates, consisting chiefly of the judges of the land, who are ever anxious to guard the rights and liberties of the subject. Gentlemen, how strongly marked is the contrast between this mode of proceeding in the Establishment, and that adopted by a titular bishop of the Roman Catholic Church, where the same person unites in himself, contrary to the spirit of our constitution, the distinct province of accuser and judge? Gentlemen, I repeat, that it would be a monstrous thing if such an assumption of power were to be sanctioned by law in this free country for a moment; and if, under all the circumstances of the case, you shall be of opinion that, by the sentence of excommunication, the plaintiff was deprived of the benefit of society, you ought to find a verdict for him, and compensate him in damages, not only for the loss of business, but for the trouble and anxiety of mind which this person and his family have, ever since the passing of the sentence of excommunication, suffered."

The jury retired for some time, and returned a verdict for the plaintiff. Damages, £125.

[We have been furnished by a legal friend with a copy of the declaration or pleading filed by Philip Boyle in the above case, and shall be willing to allow any one engaged in a like proceeding, to protect his liberty from similar tyranny, to take a copy of it.—ED.]

INDULGENCES.

THE Right Rev. Dr. Keane having declined to respond to our friendly invitation, "to defend and prove the power of indulgences," we have been obliged, reluctantly, to search for arguments ourselves in eminent Roman Catholic writers upon the subject. We proceed now, as briefly as we can, to lay before our readers the result; and if the received doctrine should, like one of Prince Rupert's glass drops, fly in pieces and vanish into smoke and air the moment it is touched, we entreat our readers not to suppose that we have intentionally handled it roughly, merely because it is of too tender a composition to bear touching. That we have candidly *stated* the received doctrine of indulgences in the Roman Church, without exaggeration or misrepresentation, we believe will be admitted by every fair reader of the article in our October number. Statement and proof, however, are often widely different, and in this matter we think will be found so.

That indulgences have no foundation in Scripture or antiquity will scarcely be denied. Durandus de S. Porciano, successively Bishop of Puy and Meaux, and Master of the sacred palace at Rome, who died about AD. 1318, says, in his Commentaries Super Libros IV., Sententiarum, lib. 4, distinct 20, q. 3, p. 791, Lugdun. Ed., 1595—"But very little can be affirmed, with any certainty, concerning Indulgences; because neither the Scripture speaks expressly of them, and the Fathers—St. Ambrose, St. Hilary, St. Augustine, and St. Jerome—say nothing at all of them." Cardinal Cajetan, Dominus Soto, Bishop Fisher, Polydore Virgil, Alphonsus a Castro, all confess that the use of indulgences came very late into the church, and that there is no controversy on which the Scriptures or Fathers spoke less than this. Thomas Aquinas and St. Bonaventure tell us that there were some in the church who said that the intention of the church in indulgences was only, by a *pious fraud*, to draw men to charitable acts which otherwise they would not have done; as a mother which promises her child an apple, to induce him to run to her, which she never gives him when she has brought him to it." Thomas Aquinas, of course, rejects this opinion, "because this is, in plain terms, to make the church guilty of a notorious cheat; and as (says he, from St. Augustine), if any falsehood be found in Scripture, it takes away from the authority of the whole, so, if the church be guilty of a cheat in one thing, she will be suspected in all the rest."* Bonaventure also, of course, rejects the notion of indulgences being only a pious fraud, for "this would be to make the church to lie and deceive, and indulgences to be vain and childish toys." While, however, St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Bonaventure could not bring themselves to suspect the church of resorting to pious frauds, *to cheat mankind into virtue*, there were not wanting others of learning and piety who, while cordially attached to the Church Catholic, exclaimed boldly against its corruptions, and especially against this new doctrine of indulgences.

Wesselus Groningensis, who flourished in the 15th century, and died A.D. 1489, was incomparably the best scholar of his age, and therefore called, in the quaint phraseology of the times—"Lux Mundi," the "Light of the world." He was not only skilled in school divinity (almost the only learning of that time), but in the Greek, Hebrew, Chaldee, and Arabic languages. He had travelled through Greece and Egypt, and visited most of the universities of Europe; and, on account of his great learning, was much in favour with Pope Sixtus IV., who, on his visiting him at Rome, offered him anything he should ask. Wessel asked only for a Hebrew and a Greek Bible from the Vatican Library. "You shall have them (said the Pontiff), but, simple man, that you are! why did you not ask a bishopric?" "Because," said Wessel, "I do not want one."

Wessel, though thus offered a bishopric by his friend, Sixtus IV., was no friend to indulgences, and boldly asserts, in his epistles,† that no Pope could grant an indulgence for an hour, and that it is a ridiculous thing to imagine that, for the same thing done, sometimes an indulgence should be granted for seven years, sometimes for seven hundred, sometimes for seven thousand, years, sometimes for ever, by a plenary remission; and that there is not the least foundation in Scripture for the distinction of remitting the fault and the punishment, upon which the doctrine of indulgences is founded. that the giving them was a design of covetousness; and although the Pope once swore to the King of France's ambassador that he did not know the corruptions of the sellers of indulgences, yet when he *did* know them, he let them alone, and they spread farther; that God himself doth not give plenary remission to contrition and confession; therefore, the Pope can much less do it. But, if God doth forgive, how comes the Pope to have power to retain? and if there be no punishment retained when God forgives, what hath the Pope to do to retain?

One Jacobus Angularis Hoeck wrote against Wessel, and confessed that "there is nothing in Scripture or antiquity expressly for indulgences;" but he argues, that that is no argument, for there are many other things averred in their church as necessary points, which have as little foundation as this—viz., St. Peter's being at Rome, and sacramental confession; therefore at last he takes sanctuary in the Pope's and church's authority.

Wessel replied, "That indulgences were accounted *pious frauds* before the time of Albertus and Thomas (*i.e.* Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas), about A.D. 1220; that there was a great number of divines who still opposed the canons and practice of the Church of Rome in this matter; that, supposing the church was for them, yet the authority of Scripture is to be preferred to it, and no multitude of men whatsoever is to be believed against Scripture; that he had not taken up this opinion rashly, but had maintained it in Paris 33 years before, and in the Pope's Penitentiary Court at Rome, and was now ready to change it if he could see better reasons for the contrary; that the doctrine of indulgences was

* An anecdote is related of St. Thomas Aquinas when upon a visit to Rome, being in the closet of Pope Innocent IV., when an officer of his chancery brought in a bag of money, procured by the sale of absolutions and indulgences. "You see, young man," said the Pope, "the age of the Church is past, in which she said 'Silver and gold have I none;'" to which Aquinas (the angelic doctor, as he was called) replied, "True, holy Father; but the age is also past in which she could say to the paralytic, 'Rise up and walk.'"

† Wessell. Groning', Epist. ad Engebertum de Indulgentiis.

delivered very confusedly and uncertainly, by which it appeared to be no Catholic doctrine; that the doctrine was so far from being firmly believed, that there was not the strictest person of the Carthusian or other orders, that should receive a plenary indulgence at the hour of death, that yet would not desire his brethren to pray for his soul, which is a plain argument he did not believe the validity of the indulgence: that many in the Court of Rome spoke more freely against them than he did; that the Pope's authority is very far from being infallible, or being averred as such in that church, as appeared by the divines at Paris condemning the Bull of Clement VI., about indulgences, wherein he took upon him to command the angels! and give plenary remission both from the fault and punishment, which authorized Bulls were then to be seen at Vienna, Lemoges, and Poictou."*

In Spain indulgences were condemned by Petrus de Osma, a divine of Salamanca, and his followers, as appears by the Pope's Bull against him in 1478; and in Germany Johannes Burchardus de Vesaliâ, a famous preacher of Mentz, proclaimed that indulgences were only pious frauds and ways to deceive the people, and that they were fools who went to Rome for them.† The celebrated Gerson (John Charlier), one of the most eminent and excellent ecclesiastics of his time (he died in 1429), who was ambassador from the King of France at the Council of Constance, and one of the principal speakers on all matters of doctrine and discipline in that Council, and acknowledged by Cardinal Zabarella as the most excellent doctor of all Christendom, in writing on indulgences, boldly asserts, "that none can give a pardon for so many years as are contained in the Pope's indulgences but Christ alone."‡ And Cardinal Bellarmine himself, in his treatise on indulgences, lib. i., c. 12, confesses "that it were better if the church were very sparing in giving indulgences; and that he would not have the people too confident of the effect of them: for though the church may have power to give indulgences, yet they want their effect in particular persons; and therefore all prudent Christians do so receive indulgences as withal to satisfy God themselves for their sins;" which looks very like a statement that *wise and prudent persons did not and ought not to rely on them.*

Where such eminent Roman Catholic writers are thus opposed to trusting to the efficacy of indulgences, it would, we think, require very clear evidence to establish their validity to any mind not predetermined to adopt and believe in them. Whether any such clear proof is to be found of their validity, we are prevented by our limited space from discussing at present, but hope to proceed to consider it in our next number.

CAUTION.

INFORMATION having been received, and several complaints made, that the CATHOLIC LAYMAN newspaper has been destroyed or wilfully detained in some of the country Post-offices; and complaints having been made at the General Post-office to that effect; our readers are requested to call the attention of country Postmasters to the danger of conniving at such practices, by which they not only incur the forfeiture of their offices, but both they and every person who shall aid or counsel them in so doing incur the penalty of fine and imprisonment, with or without hard labour and solitary confinement, under the Post-office Offences' Act, 1 Vict., c. 36, which enacts as follows:—

1 VICT., C. 36, POST-OFFICE OFFENCES.

"SEC. 32. And for the protection of printed votes and proceedings in parliament, *and printed newspapers*, sent by the post, be it enacted, That every person employed in the Post-office who shall steal, or shall, *for any purpose*, embezzle, secrete, or destroy, or shall wilfully *detain* or *delay*, in course of conveyance or delivery thereof by the post, any printed votes or proceedings in parliament, *or any printed newspaper*, or any other printed paper whatever sent by the post, without covers or in covers, open at the sides, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and, being convicted thereof, shall suffer such punishment, *by fine or imprisonment, or by both*, as to the court shall seem meet."

"SECS. 35 and 36. And be it enacted, That every person who shall aid, abet, counsel, or procure the commission of any misdemeanor, under the Post-office Acts, shall be liable to be indicted and punished as a principal offender; and every person who shall solicit or endeavour to procure any other person to commit a felony or misdemeanor, punishable by the Post-office Acts, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor; and being thereof convicted, shall be liable, at the discretion of the court, to be imprisoned for any term not exceeding two years."

"SEC. 42. And be it enacted, That where a person shall be convicted of an offence punishable under the Post-office Acts, for which imprisonment may be awarded, the court may sentence the offender to be imprisoned, *with or without hard labour, in the common gaol or house of correction*, and may also direct that he shall be kept in *solitary confinement* for the whole or any portion of such imprisonment as to the court shall seem meet."

* Wesel. Epist. contra Jacobum Hoeck de Indulgentiis.
† Serrar. Rerum Moguntium, lib. 1, c. 34, p. 145. Mogunt. Ed., 1604.
‡ Gerson. de Indulg. Consid. 8. Opera, tom. i., lib. iv., p. cxxv. Antwerp, 1706.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st.

No anonymous letter can be attended to. Whatever is sent for insertion must be authenticated by the name and address of the writer, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee for his good faith.

Communications from Mr. Cotton, and several others, have been received, but necessarily postponed for want of room.

We would request our valued correspondents, both Roman Catholics and Protestants, to limit the length of their communications, and not to discuss a variety of distinct topics in one letter.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, JANUARY, 1853.

WE appear before our readers again at the commencement of our second year, having surmounted the difficulties which attach to the commencement of every undertaking, and we pause to look back on our past labours, and to look forward to the work before us.

The success of our exertions so far has only increased the intensity of our desire to proceed with candour and the spirit of love; and we would earnestly entreat all our correspondents, for the year to come, to try and write under the influence not only of kindness, but sincere love for souls, and a desire to promote our salvation in the great day, as we shall strive to do by them.

In this spirit we have already discussed many solemn questions, of the deepest interest—the present state of our departed friends—our own future prospects when we shall have followed them to the grave—our means of arriving at the knowledge of the truth here, and of obtaining the inheritance of the blessed hereafter. And we trust and believe that we have already aided some of our readers in clearing up at least some difficulties, and removing some errors.

We hope we have also led many to think more deeply and more seriously of the necessity of seeking for truth, and detecting error; and in proportion as we may have accomplished this, we feel our *responsibility* increased to *exhibit truth* as well as expose error.

In our laborious search after truth during the past year, we have been compelled to reject much which assumed its name, but none of those who have watched our progress, can suspect that we would leave them, without guide or compass, in the dismal abysses of unbelief. We bless God, that so far have our free inquiries been from leading *us* into the dank and foggy region of infidelity or scepticism, that they have led us to the deep conviction, that Christianity is the *only system of true philosophy* ever yet presented to the world, the true source and sole support of all that is great and good in the human mind. The religion of Christ we unhesitatingly believe to be the religion of God himself, the great source of light and life; and if we devote so much pains and thought to show the uncertainty and inconsistency of doctrines which we believe to be mere human additions to Christ's religion, it is that we may endeavour to restore to our fellow-countrymen the sublime and pure religion of our most Blessed Redeemer in its original simplicity and beauty, and assist in relieving men's consciences from burdens which they are not able to bear. The religion of Christ we firmly and practically believe to be not only the religion of truth and holiness, but the only "service which is perfect freedom." "Come unto me," says the Redeemer, "all ye who travail and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light."

We would, therefore, commence our second year's labours with the language of hope. To a man groping in the dark and dismal caverns of doubt and ignorance, how discouraging the gloom and uncertainty around, how sad the forebodings of dangers and difficulties beyond! How needful that he should have some one at hand to cheer and encourage him in his onward struggle to reach the light; and how exhilarating the first rays of sunshine which burst upon him, and gladden his heart with the hope of freedom and the enjoyment of the pure atmosphere of heaven.

Those who have long held religious opinions in which truth and error were mixed together are in some danger *at first* of rejecting *all*, when they find *some* erroneous. This danger belongs not to religion alone, but to all inquiries after truth upon *any* subject. Shall we, therefore, cease to seek for truth, or cease to expose error? A world of moral and intellectual darkness would be the result; for error increases of itself, truth only by the search for it. No man need *seek* for error or ignorance to find it; but truth must be sought. The indolent and cowardly will increase in error, and lose the little truth they have. Let us only *believe* that God will grant his truth to them that seek it; let us lay hold on every truth we find, and *trust* in him for more.

Our own experience has convinced us that there *is* a clear and marked line between truth and error. It has convinced us, too, that those who cannot yet trace the line between them may still see that there are great and glorious truths on one side, and dark and dreadful errors on the other; and this latter distinction is the most necessary for man. Who can draw the line where daylight fades into the night? But can we not distinguish light from darkness? Can we never say "it is day" or "it is night" till we have fixed the precise boundary between? And yet there *is* a line between truth and error, and we may find it, too, if we proceed diligently and honestly in the serious search for it.

While meditating on this most interesting subject, we were struck with the sound sense and truth of the following impressive passage from an eminent Roman Catholic divine, which we shall give our readers *verbatim*, as expressing our own ideas more effectively than any language we could use ourselves, and we earnestly invite their most serious attention to it:—

"It is obvious to common sense, that, in order to find out any hidden thing, or to do any difficult thing, we must first discover, and then follow, a proper *rule* or *method* for such purpose. If we get hold of a wrong clue, we shall never extricate ourselves from a labyrinth. If we do not take the right road to any distant place, it cannot be expected that we should arrive at it. The importance of adopting a right *rule* or *method* for discovering religious truth, must be admitted by all thinking Christians; as it is evident that a right *rule* alone can conduct them to truth, and that a false *rule* is liable to conduct them into all sorts of errors. Yet, how few are there who follow a rational *rule* or *method* for the discovery of the true religion! In their other affairs, mankind are anxious to find, and careful to follow, a safe and adequate *rule* of acting: but how few are found equally anxious and careful, in the most important of all their affairs!

"Some persons choose their religion as they do

their clothes, by the mere *rule* of their fancy. They are pleased, for example, with the talents of a preacher, and presently adopt his creed. Many others adhere to their religious system merely because they were educated in it, and because it was that of their parents and family, which, if it were a reasonable *rule* of acting, would equally excuse Jews, Turks, and Pagans for persisting in their respective impiety, and would impeach the preaching of Christ and his apostles. Others, again, glory in their religion, because it is the one established in this their country, so renowned for science, literature, and arms: not reflecting that the polished and conquering nations of antiquity—the Egyptians, Assyrians, Persians, Greeks, and Romans—were left, by the inscrutible judgments of God, *in darkness and the shadow of death*, while a poor, oppressed, and despised people, on the banks of the Jordan, were the only depositary of Divine truth, and the sole truly enlightened nation. But the greater part, even of Christians, of every denomination, making the business of eternity subservient to that of time, profess the religion which best accords with the *rule* of their interest, their prejudice, or their convenience. Thus, guided by mere fancy, or bewildered in the mists of prejudice, or blinded by worldly considerations, *they know not whither they go.*—John xii. 35. They may fondly flatter themselves that they are walking in the way of truth and life: *but there is a way that seemeth right to a man, the ends whereof lead to death.*—Prov. xvi. 25. They may persuade themselves that they adopt a sufficiently rational *rule* for discovering religious truth, that they have sufficient and safe *grounds* for the religion they profess: but the *rule* they adopt is but the *rule* of their own self-love; the *grounds* of their religion may be but the *delusions* of their own insincerity. In the meantime, they reflect not, or scarcely reflect, that the matter is of infinite consequence, that, in adopting a *rule of faith*, their immortal souls are at stake; that the religion chosen by this *rule* is connected with their eternal interests."*

It is hard to make those see who have determined to close their eyes, or to see only through the eyes of another; but we have ample means of knowing that it is not so with all. Fellow-countrymen, have you courage to examine and think for yourselves, in a matter where your immortal souls are indeed at stake, and where, if you follow mere fancy, or allow yourselves to be bewildered by the mists of educational prejudice, or blinded by worldly considerations, you may at last find yourselves, when it is too late, in the way that leads to death? Brother laymen, will you aid in the struggle to cast off a yoke which is too heavy for you to bear, or will you tamely bow your necks to the despots of Rome, who would subjugate all mankind to blind obedience to their tyrannical will? We trust the day is approaching when you will take the written Word of the living God as your guide, and disenthral yourselves from an ignominious and servile obedience to an Italian priest; and then may our beloved country be again what once she was—

"Great, glorious, and free—
First flower of the earth—first gem of the sea."

THE TOUCHSTONE.

(Continued from vol. I, page 125.)

OBJECTION 22.—Most Protestants are of opinion that children may be saved without baptism; and that persons grown up may be saved, though they neither are baptized nor desire to be baptized, but even refuse it, as *Quakers*.

Their Bible tells them, in plain terms (John iii. 5)—*Except a man be born of water and of the spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God.*

REPLY.—It is rather bold to say this of "most Protestants," since it is well known that all Protestants (except the Quakers) do baptize; which they certainly would not, if they regarded it as a matter of no consequence.

But, at all events, this objection does not affect the Church of England, which, in her Catechism, pronounces baptism to be "generally necessary to salvation."

OBJECTION 23.—Protestants deny that the grace of the Holy Ghost is given by the imposition of the bishop's hands in *confirmation*.

Their Bible teaches that it is (*Acts* viii. 15. 17), where *Peter* and *John* confirmed the *Samaritans*. *They prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Ghost. Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost.*

REPLY.—If you read the Confirmation Service of the Church of England you will see that that rite *is* there represented as a means of grace. But, as for the "Holy Ghost," in the sense in which it is spoken of in the 8th of Acts (that is, the *miraculous gifts*, such as the gift of tongues, the gift of prophecy, and many others which the apostles conferred by the imposition of *their* hands—Acts xix. 6), this, it is plain, is *not* conferred by the imposition of hands of any bishop—Protestant or Roman Catholic—in these days.

OBJECTION 24.—Protestants deny that the blessed Sacrament, which Christ gave at his last supper, was *the body and blood of Christ*.

Their Bible affirms it in Christ's own express words (*Matt.* xxvi. 26, 28)—*This is my body—This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many, for the remission of sins.* Luke xxii. 16, 20—*This is my body which is given for you—This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you.* See also to the same effect *Mark* xiv. 22, 24, and 1 *Cor.* xi. 24, 25.

REPLY.—Whether the objector has here stated fairly the opinions of the Church of England, he has enabled his readers to judge by what he says in Objection 28—"Their own catechism expressly teaches that *the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.*"

As for the words "This is my body," &c., it must be borne in mind that Protestants do not *deny* the *truth* of anything that Jesus and his apostles said. The only question between them and Roman Catholics is about the *meaning* of it—whether such and such passages are to be understood literally, or figuratively.

The disciples did not *deny* the *truth* of John the Baptist's words when he called our Lord "the Lamb of God," although they did not believe that He was literally a lamb; nor did they deny the truth of our Saviour's own words—"I am the true vine," "I am the door," "I am the good shepherd," &c.—although they did not understand Him to mean that He was a literal tree, bearing real leaves and literal bunches of grapes, or that He was an actual door, or that his occupation was keeping actual sheep, &c.

Protestants, then, do not deny the truth of the words used by our Saviour at the institution of the Eucharist, although they are content to understand them in the same sense in which they must have been understood by the apostles to whom they were addressed. For the apostles, who had not been perplexed when they heard our Lord speak of himself as a *door*, a *shepherd*, a *vine*, &c., would certainly not understand at the time that, by the words, "This is my body," our Saviour meant to convey that He was holding his own body in his own hands, and eating it in their company. And if they subsequently received any further revelation, informing them that they had been before mistaken in the meaning which they had attached to the words of institution, it is strange that they should never have recorded so very wonderful a revelation.

And Roman Catholics themselves must maintain that the words of institution cannot be understood absolutely literally; since, if we understand these words in their most literal sense, we must believe that it is the *cup*, and not the wine in it, which is changed into blood.

OBJECTION 25.—Protestants deny that the *bread which* Christ *gave was his flesh*, the same *which he gave for the life of the world.*

Their Bible affirms it (*John* vi. 51)—*The bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.*

OBJECTION 26.—Protestants deny that *Christ's flesh is meat indeed, and his blood drink indeed.*

Their Bible expressly affirms it (*John* iv. 55)—*My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.*

REPLY.—Before Roman Catholics assert that the Protestant opinions concerning the Eucharist are condemned by the 6th of John, they ought at least to agree among themselves whether this chapter relates to the Eucharist at all. We have already quoted (see vol. i., pp. 34, 46) high Roman Catholic authorities who hold that it did not, as well as the admission of the Council of Trent (session 21, c. i.), that this was a point on which the Fathers differed.

OBJECTION 27.—Protestants are apt to say, with the unbelieving *Jews* (*John* vi. 52)—*How can this man give us his flesh to eat?* and (verse 60), *This is a hard saying, and who can hear it?*

Christ, in their own Bible, assures them (*John* iv. 53, 54, 56)—*Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.*

REPLY.—The eating Christ's flesh and drinking his blood, spoken of in this text, is described as such that he who eateth "hath eternal life," but he who eateth not hath "no life in him." Protestants, therefore, conclude that it does not mean the mere receiving of the Eucharist, since it is acknowledged that many receive the Eucharist who do *not* obtain eternal life, but, on the contrary, thereby increase their condemnation. But if Roman Catholics suppose the verse to refer to the Eucharist, why do they withhold the cup from the laity, since it says, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man *and drink his blood* ye have no life in you?"

OBJECTION 28.—Protestants deny that *the cup of blessing which we bless is the communion of the blood of Christ*; or that *the bread which we break* in the blessed sacrament *is the communion of the body of Christ.*

Their Bible expressly affirms it (1 *Cor.* x. 16)—*The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?* And what makes them more inexcusable in denying it is, that their own catechism expressly teaches them, that *the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.*

REPLY.—The objector has here answered himself by showing that the Church of England does *not* contradict the assertion of St. Paul, but makes a statement in strict accordance with it. And Protestants appeal to this very passage as one of the proofs against transubstantiation, since Paul here expressly calls the consecrated elements BREAD.

OBJECTION 29.—Protestants teach, that to the unworthy *communicant* the sacrament is no more than bare bread and wine, and by no means the body and blood of Christ.

Their Bible assures them of the contrary, when it tells them (1 *Cor.* xi. 27, 29) that the unworthy communicant *is guilty of the body and blood of our Lord*; and that he receives *damnation to himself, not discerning the body of our Lord.* For how should he be *guilty of the body and blood of our Lord* if what he took were no more than *bread and wine?* And how hard a case would it be that he should be damned for not discerning the *body of our Lord*, which, in the opinion of these gentlemen, is not at all there?

REPLY.—The objector here is guilty of practising a remarkable artifice. He leaves out half the text, and says "the unworthy communicant" is guilty of the body and blood of our Lord. He evidently wished to keep out of sight that St. Paul wrote, "Whosoever shall eat this BREAD or drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." If Paul had held Romish views he should have written, "Whosoever shall eat the *body* and drink the *blood* of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty," &c. But then he would have contradicted the verse cited in Objection 28—"Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood *hath eternal life.*"

Every one must perceive that, by "discerning the Lord's body," Paul could not have meant discerning it *by the bodily senses*, since even Roman Catholics admit that a consecrated and an unconsecrated wafer are perfectly undistinguishable by the senses. Protestants do not believe, nor do they suppose Paul to have meant, that a man would be condemned for eating, without any reverence, a piece of consecrated bread which had come in his way by some accident, without his knowing anything of its consecration. But Paul is evidently speaking of those Corinthians who came together to *celebrate the Lord's Supper*, and yet ate and drank irreverently, as at an ordinary meal, without considering the solemnity of the Service and the great event it was intended to commemorate. Persons who do so, Protestants consider as guilty of a great sin, and they do not consider them as in any way partakers of Christ; because they consider this partaking as a benefit and blessing reserved for those who have faith in Christ and true devotion. Augustine, whom the Roman Catholics venerate as a saint, expressly declared this, and denies that the body and blood of Christ are in any sense received by the irreligious.

But they can have better assurance than any Roman Catholic can have, that, if they are truly devout believers, they are partakers of Christ in the sense which He himself meant when they reverently celebrate the Eucharist; for it is expressly declared by the Council of Trent, and in other authoritative documents of the Church of Rome, then the *inward intention* of the *priest* is essential to the true consecration, as well as the pronouncing of the words. If, therefore, a priest should chance to be an infidel in his heart, which is but too possible, (and no human being can be certain of the contrary), the wafer remains mere bread; and no Roman Catholic, therefore, can be at all certain that he is partaking in any way of Christ's body, or that he is not worshipping a piece of mere bread.

OBJECTION 30.—Protestants, to excuse their unbelief of the *real presence* of the body and blood of Christ in the blessed sacrament, pretend that it is impossible his

* Rev. Samuel Jones's Epitome of the Right Rev. Dr. Milner's End of Controversy, pp. 9-10.

body and blood should be in so small a space, or in more places than one at the same time.

Their Bible assures them, that *with God all things are possible* (*Matt.* xix. 26), *even for a camel to go through the eye of a needle.*—Verse 24. *With men this is impossible*, says our Saviour, *but not with God; for with God all things are possible.*—*Mark* x. 27. Nor is it harder with God for one body to be at once in two places, than for two bodies to be in one place, as when our Saviour came in to his disciples, *the doors being shut.*—*John* xx. 19, 26.

Reply.—Any Protestants who should refuse to believe anything that is clearly revealed by the Most High, because they cannot understand *how* it is possible, would certainly be very presumptuous. But it is surely no more than reasonable to require particularly strong *proof* of anything which at least *seems* contradictory, and which is not confirmed either by our own senses or by any one's else.

When Jesus appeared "in the midst of the disciples," the "doors being shut," they could not, of course, tell whether the door had been miraculously opened and shut again without their seeing or observing it, or in what other way their Master had entered; but their *own senses* witnessed that he actually *was* there in his own natural body; and we believe this on their testimony. This is, at least, a very *different* thing—supposing both to be true—from believing the body of our Lord to be, at the same time, in heaven and on a thousand different altars on earth.

Objection 31.—Protestants maintain that there is a necessity of receiving the sacrament *in both kinds* in order to life everlasting.

Their own Bible expressly promises eternal life to them that receive *in one kind only.*—*John* vi. 58. *He that eateth of this bread shall live for ever.* And verse 57—*He that eateth me, even he shall live by me.*

Reply.—Neither Protestants nor Roman Catholics can suppose that a man's salvation can be secured by his merely receiving the sacrament, either in one kind or in both. None of them, therefore, can believe that this was our Lord's meaning. It is plain, therefore, to all—Protestants and Roman Catholics—that He must have meant more than this, when He speaks of "eating of Him." He must have meant to include *faith* in Him, and *love* for Him, shown in "keeping his commandments" (see John xiv. 15)—in short, the whole Christian life.

But most Protestants think it presumptuous to depart from the mode of celebrating the Lord's Supper which was used (as all admit) by the apostles, and by all the early Christians, for many ages. And Roman Catholics would probably think the same, if they were aware not only of this fact, but also that one of the earlier Popes pronounced it sacrilege to administer the bread without the cup to any of the communicants.

Objection 32.—Protestants deny that there is any true and proper *sacrifice* in the church of Christ, to be offered *in all places to the name of God.*

Their Bible affirms it (*Mal.* i. 10, 11), where, rejecting the *Jewish* sacrifices, God declares his acceptance of that sacrifice, or *pure offering*, which should be made to Him *in every place* among the *Gentiles. I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of Hosts, neither will I accept an offering at your hand. For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name and a pure offering.* Which cannot be understood of the sacrifice of the cross, which was offered but once, and in one place, and that among the *Jews*, not among the *Gentiles.*

Reply.—This is a mistake. All Christians, of whatever denomination, hold that sacrifices are to be offered up to God continually. The only question is, *what* the sacrifices should be.

1. The offering of slain beasts, which was an ordinance of the Jewish law, all Christians are agreed to reject, as not belonging to the Gospel dispensation.

2. The offering up of *ourselves*, as a kind of sacrifice to God, we find expressly enjoined in the christian Scriptures—"I beseech you," says the Apostle Paul (Rom. xii.), "that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God."

3. The sacrifice of Christ's body, for the redemption of the world, is very expressly, and strongly, and frequently spoken of in Scripture as having taken place "once for all," and as not being to be *repeated*, but only *commemorated*; and its perfection and sufficiency are inferred in Scripture, from its *not* being repeated, and from there being "no more sacrifice for sin" needed or allowed.

4. The offering of incense, in a literal sense, is nowhere alluded to in the christian Scriptures, and seems to have been quite unknown in the early christian Church.

(To be continued.)

Correspondence.

DID OUR SAVIOUR INSTITUTE SEVEN SACRAMENTS?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Sir—In looking over Dr. J. Butler's Catechism, the other day, my eye caught the following question and answer:—"How many sacraments are there? A. Seven." What! thought I, seven sacraments! How is this? I read in the New Testament of only *two*—Baptism and the Lord's Supper. These I know, and can prove, were instituted by Christ himself, and left obligations on his Church. Being at a loss to know where the Church of Rome got *the other five*, I again looked at Dr. Butler's Catechism.

I thought to myself, since a sacrament must be ordained by Christ himself, surely Dr. B. will give us his very words; nothing else will satisfy me. Well, judge of my surprise, instead of referring me to the Scriptures written by the Apostles, and giving me chapter and verse, Dr. B. refers me to the Council of Trent, SS. 7, can. 1—that is, Dr. Butler says there are seven sacraments, because the Council of Trent says so.

Not being satisfied with this, and being curious to get all the proof the Church of Rome is able to advance on the point, I turned to the decrees of the Council of Trent. Here is the Canon referred to—"Whosoever shall affirm that the Sacraments of the New Law were not all instituted by Christ Jesus our Lord, *or that they are more or fewer than seven, let him be accursed.*"

Now, the inquiry looked more serious. To be eternally cursed is awful even to think of. I then became doubly anxious to find out on what grounds the Council affirmed that "the sacraments were neither more nor fewer than seven." As yet not a particle of Scripture had been quoted in proof.

Thinking that the legates, the patriarchs, the bishops, and the divines (who drew up and sanctioned the canon referred to, as deciding the point) had, when discussing the subject, given Scriptural proof in its support, I took up the history of the Council, and examined the speeches of the Fathers; but still without success. It is true some divines argued that seven is a perfect number—that there are seven days in the week—seven excellent virtues—seven deadly sins—and seven planets—and so *concluded* that there must also be seven sacraments. Such reasoning was irresistible; with me it had the opposite effect.

I now took up the *Catechism* of the Council of Trent—that standard authority—out of which the priests are educated at Maynooth. Thinks I to myself, although Dr. Butler or the Fathers at Trent would not satisfy the laity with the verses in the Scripture which prove that our Saviour instituted seven sacraments, surely the *priests* will be favoured with the Scripture proof. I began to think I was right in my conjecture when I read the following statement in the catechism:—"The Sacraments of the Catholic Church are seven, as is proved from Scripture, from the unbroken traditions of the Fathers, and from the authoritative definitions of Councils."

Now, thought I, we must be near it; Scripture is at last referred to, as proving the point. Let us have the passage; if we have Scripture proof the point is settled: we won't require tradition or the councils, no more than the Almighty Creator required the help of men or angels in creating the world. His word was sufficient to create all things, and so his word written is sufficient to prove that there are seven sacraments.

Well, I looked anxiously through the catechism; I turned over page after page, to find out the particular book, chapter, and verse so confidently referred to, but I searched in vain. No Scripture proof is given; a witness is mentioned, but the witness is not brought forward; his testimony is not given. The natural conclusion is, that he has nothing favourable to say for the parties who keep him back.

Whilst looking for the Scripture proof, I met a note in the catechism, referring me to "C. of Trent 887, Can. 1; and to the Council of Florence."

I stopped and considered the references; I found that I had examined the first already without success; but, on looking at the second, a gleam of hope passed over my mind. Oh, thought I, the Council of Florence was held A.D. 1442, and is earlier authority than any yet examined; perhaps it has given the Scripture proof. I turned to the decree; it simply states—"the Sacraments of the New Law are seven." How provoking! I exclaimed; still no Scripture. All the authorities referred to state, that there are seven sacraments instituted by Christ; but none of them prove the fact by the only witnesses who can prove it—the Apostles or the Evangelists.

But, some Roman Catholic layman will say, why did you not examine Peter Dens on the subject? he is high authority at Maynooth. Well, so I did, but with no better success, as will appear by the following quotation from his work:—"The number seven (says Dens) is *insinuated* in various places in Scripture, thus, in Prov. 9.—'*Wisdom hath built her house* (that is, the Church), *and hath cut out her seven pillars*'—to wit, the seven sacraments, which as so many pillars sustain the Church. Thus (he adds) in like manner, in Exod. xxv., by the seven lights which were in one candlestick, this is *insinuated*, for the seven sacraments are so many lights which illumine the Church."—Den's Theol. Num. Sacr. So, after all, according to Dens, we have nothing but "*insinuations*," taken from the Old Testament, to prove that our Saviour instituted seven sacraments.

Dr. Doyle's Christian Doctrine was now put into my hands, that I might examine what he says, and the proofs which he brings forward. I found that he, like the rest, asserts that "there are seven sacraments, and refers his readers to the C. of Trent, SS. 7, Can. 1." Finding this *authority* referred to so often, and remembering that it pronounces a curse on all who affirm the contrary, it seemed to me that the supporters of the doctrine of seven sacraments relied more on the terror to be excited through fear of a curse, to establish her point, than on Scriptural authority.

But as cursing had no effect on me, I still searched for the Scripture proofs, and the next book I read was Dr. Doyle's, and I was greatly pleased with his answer to the question—"Where did Christ give us a command to baptize? A. In St. Matt. xxviii. 20." I liked that; it was Scripture authority. Thinks I to myself perhaps the doctor gives the Scripture proofs for his statement, that there are seven sacraments. I looked first at the chapter on Confirmation, and read—"Q. When did Christ ordain this sacrament? A. *The time is not certain*; but divines, most probably, hold it was instituted at Christ's last supper, or between his resurrection and ascension." I turned then to the chapter on Extreme Unction, and read—"Q. When did Christ institute it? A. *The time is uncertain*; some think it was instituted at the Last Supper," &c. Further on I read—"Q. When was matrimony made a Sacrament of the New Law? A. *Where and when Christ instituted this sacrament is uncertain*," *&c.*

If I wanted anything to convince me that there was no Scripture authority for the doctrine of seven sacraments Dr. Doyle's admissions, just quoted, would be sufficient. With all his learning he could not find or quote a passage of Scripture on the subject.

Lieberman, a Roman divine, instead of searching for Scripture, is content with saying—"The Church says it;" which, after all, comes only to this—you must believe there are seven sacraments, because the Church of Rome says it is proved by Scripture, whether it is so or not.

I was now convinced *that our Saviour did not institute seven sacraments*; and, on looking into history, I there found that Peter Lombard, a writer of the 12th century, was the first to reckon seven sacraments, and that this invention gained ground in the subsequent centuries until, at last, it took its present form. J. F. G.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Sir—Engaged in the disquisition of truth, and especially with an adversary pledged, as you are, to a full, fair, candid, and impartial investigation of arguments, I shall premise no apologies for offering a few remarks on some of the leading articles of your journal. By the bye, I have a great antipathy to dishonest and disingenuous argumentation, though such sophisticating may give a temporary triumph over an inferior antagonist; but we shall only thus impose on ourselves and others. Truth does not need such subterfuges—"Nec defensoribus istis. Magna est veritas et prevalebit."

In the September number of your periodical you say, respecting the visibility of the Church of Christ, that it was always visible. Let me require of you to point out the locus of its existence in the days of Berengarius. He was bound, of course, to hear the church (Mat. xviii. 17), to obey his prelates and follow their faith.—Heb. xiii. 7, 17. Did he then, and who were these prelates? Will you, Mr. Editor, be able to overleap that obstacle? We find churches, councils, bishops, ecclesiastics and friends exhorting him to obedience, and he would not. Were they or he the Church of Christ? "Utram horum mavis accipe." If he was the church, he recanted, and abjured all his Protestantism towards the close of life. Where was the church then, as well as before he began to broach his new dogmas, about the year 1040? Now, sir, I have you impaled (as they say) on the horns of a dilemma. You have chosen the other alternative; for you say, in reply to objections nine and ten of the "Touchstone," "that the Christian Church" (that is, the churches in communion with Rome, for there were no other, except you make Berenger the church) had never wholly revolted, that God's Spirit never abandoned her, that God had not cast her off, that the fundamentals of Christianity were preserved in that church termed (by modern Protestant controversialists) "the mother of harlots and abominations, the scarlet Lady, drunken with the blood of the saints and martyrs of Jesus, the mystery of iniquity, the man of sin, whom the Lord shall destroy with the spirit of his mouth." In conclusion, the 19th article of your church defines the visible Church of Christ to be "a congregation of faithful men (mind that), in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the sacraments duly administered, according to Christ's ordinance."

For as much as you will signally fail to point out, at the period I have selected, any such congregation, however small, with which you can consistently identify yourself; and inasmuch as this scarlet Lady of ours, this mother of whores, had been sunk in gross and abominable idolatry for 800 years and more, I assert that, according to your principles, the pure Word of God could not have been preached or the sacraments duly

administered, that there was no visible Church of Christ, that the gates of hell must have prevailed against it, that our dear and blessed Redeemer could not, upon your principles, be the true Messiah, and that your system leads to absolute infidelity. There is a climax for you, Mr. Editor. If you affect to despise or attempt to evade these arguments, I will be at liberty to construe such conduct into inability; but if, without turning to the right hand, or to the left, you grapple manfully with them, you shall hear from me again. In the meantime,

I remain, with Christian charity,

PHILALETHES.

P.S.—To the second portion of my letter I would more particularly direct your attention—namely, the visibility of the church.

We have not published the whole of the above letter, for this reason—we have already stated to our correspondents, that it is essential that each letter addressed to us should be confined to some one subject. The limits of our paper render it necessary to adhere to this rule. We, therefore, publish "Philalethes's" account of himself, and that part of his letter which he especially calls on us to answer. The part which we have omitted relates to a quite different subject, the passage in the Book of Maccabees, and contains nothing which we have not answered already. We therefore apply ourselves, as "Philalethes" himself requires, to what he says of the visibility of the church.

Proofs from Scripture are entitled to the greatest attention from us. "Philalethes" quotes Matt. xviii., 17; but, if he will look at the place in his Douay Bible, he will see that it relates merely to offences of one man against another man—"*If thy brother shall offend against thee.*" It is of that case only that our Saviour says—"Hear the Church," for the church should strive to reconcile brethren, and bring them into peace and love with each other.

"Philalethes" quotes also Hebrews xiii. 7 and 17—"Obey your prelates, and follow their faith." Now, here we must insist on coming to an understanding with "Philalethes" on the real meaning of this precept. Does it mean that whatever faith the prelates we happen to be under may choose to adopt, that we are bound to follow his faith? Or, is it to be understood with the limitation which St. Paul elsewhere lays upon our following himself—"Wherefore I beseech you be ye followers of me, as I also am of Christ."—1 Cor. iv. 16. But we are not to follow even Paul, except as he followed Christ, for he says—"Though WE or an angel from heaven preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema."—Galatians, i. 8.

We call upon "Philalethes" to say whether he does or does not admit that a difference must be made between the "faith of the church" and the opinions and doctrines of particular bishops and doctors. To help him to answer this we give him an instance:—

Azorius, one of the greatest doctors of the Church of Rome, says—"The image is to be worshipped with the same honour and worship with which we worship those whose image it is." And this was not merely a singular opinion of his own, for he says further—"This is the constant sense of the divines."—Instit. Moral. par. 1, Lib. 9, c. 6. And we could give a long list of the most celebrated divines in the Church of Rome who have said the same. We could even go farther, for the pontifical published by authority of Pope Clement VIII. contains these words—"The legate's cross must be on the right hand, because latria, or Divine honour, is due to it."—Edit. Roman, p. 672. And Almaine says—"The images of the Trinity and of the cross are to be adored with the worship of latria."

Is "Philalethes" a "worshipper of images?" We trust he is not. But if we should charge him with it, on the ground that a multitude of the greatest doctors and teachers of the Church of Rome have actually taught it, and that he, as a Roman Catholic, is bound *to follow their faith*, how would he answer us? Would he not say that these things were the errors of individuals, and not the doctrines and faith of the church? Would he not say this, even of that worship of the legate's cross which was sanctioned by Pope Clement VIII.?

Well, then, we ask, How are we to distinguish that this doctrine is really an error of individuals, and not the faith of the Roman Catholic Church? What answer will he give to this? Will he say that he knows it, because this doctrine was never decreed by a general council? He CANNOT say this, because this very doctrine was actually decreed by the second Council of Nice, in the year 787, which all Roman Catholics hold to be a general council. These are the words of the council—"These precious and venerable images, as is aforesaid, we honour and salute, and honouring, WE ADORE THEM*—that is to say, the image of the humanity of the great God, and of our Saviour, Jesus Christ, and of our holy and undefiled lady, the Mother of God . . . also the images of the saints and incorporeal angels," &c., &c.—Concilia Generalia, Labbe and Cossart, vol. vii., p. 332.

* "Thou shalt not adore them"—God's commandment in the Douay Bible.—Exodus xx. 5.

Now, how will "Philalethes" show us that "adoring images" is not a doctrine of the Catholic Church, but only an error of particular doctors and bishops, and councils? Can he make any answer now but this, that there never was any such thing in any of the Catholic creeds, in which the church taught and declared her faith?

We think this answer a very good one: only we are puzzled to understand how any one who holds the Creed of Pope Pius IV. can venture to give such an answer; for one of the articles of that creed is as follows—"All other things delivered, defined, and decreed by the general councils, I, without doubt, receive and profess." How can any one who professes this refuse to "adore images?" We submit this to "Philalethes's" consideration.

But now to apply this principle to the visibility of the church in the time of Berengarius—that is, in the eleventh century. We look to the creeds of the Catholic Church in that age, and we do not find in any of them the doctrine which the Pope and some bishops sought to force on Berengarius. We, therefore, conclude that the doctrine in question was not any part of the faith of the church, but only a private opinion of that Pope and those bishops.

We find that "the church" then held precisely the same creeds which the Church of England and Ireland holds now. These creeds were the public authorized testimony of the church, as a church, to what she held as the Catholic faith. Any errors then prevailing among particular bishops were not in the creeds of the church, and, therefore, were not the faith of the church; and, therefore, notwithstanding the errors of individual bishops, we have no difficulty in acknowledging at that time both the faith and the visibility of the church, while condemning and rejecting the errors which were held by individuals.

We have shown that this principle—"that the faith of the church is delivered in the public creeds of the church, and in them alone"—is the only one that can at once enable us to be Catholics, and yet preserve us from being "worshippers of images." On that great principle we, who hold to the ancient Catholic creeds, as the declaration of our faith, have no difficulty in showing the perpetuity and visibility of the Church of Christ.

But can those who hold the Creed of Pope Pius IV. show the perpetuity and visibility of the church on the same principle? It is clear that they cannot; for if the creed of Pope Pius be, as it professes, "the Catholic faith, without which no one can be saved," then, surely, it was necessary that there should have been in every age a visible church professing that creed. Surely "Philalethes" must know that no church on earth even professed that compilation of Pope Pius as its creed until the Roman Church did so in 1563. If that creed be indeed "the Catholic faith," where was the visibility of a church professing it for 1500 years?

We trust "Philalethes" will give a candid consideration to a principle which will enable him to hold the perpetuity and visibility of the church, without being involved in "worshipping images" and other such things; in other words, a principle which will enable him to be a true Catholic, following the apostles, bishops, and martyrs "as they followed Christ," and not otherwise.

We shall be glad to hear from "Philalethes" again, provided he will confine each letter to one subject. And we would suggest to him to write less boastfully: we always try to avoid vain boasting ourselves, and our correspondents would do well to follow our example in this.

We have to thank "Philalethes" for his private letter, in which he gives us his name, and informs us that he was educated for the priesthood, giving us, at the same time, sufficient reference to vouch for his statement. The fact of his education, of course, renders him a desirable correspondent for us.

THE SIN OF JEROBOAM.

MR. EDITOR—Reading in your last number (December) of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN the letters of your correspondents, "Petitor Fontium" and "A Retired East Indian," on the subject of the Roman Catholic view of the second commandment and practice of image worship, it occurred to me it might be useful towards the farther elucidation of the important question, whether the Church of Rome in that view and practice be opposed to the Bible or not, to follow out and add something to the Scriptural evidence adduced by your latter correspondent. He very justly argues, that the golden calves, made by Aaron, were intended to be representations of Jehovah—the God of Israel—from the words addressed by him to the people, in the ceremony of exhibiting the images to their view—"These be thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt," plainly implying it was no new object of worship he was setting up, but only a visible representation of Jehovah, whom they had chosen to be their God, and "who had brought them up out of the land of Egypt;" and also from the still plainer words—"To-morrow is a feast to the Lord," meaning thereby the feast of the dedication of that image to his honour. Yet, we know that Aaron and the people were guilty of a grievous sin in making and bowing before this image, though intended by them to be a representation of the true God; and St. Paul charges them with idolatry—1 Cor. x. 7. (I quote from the Douay Bible)—"Neither become ye idolators, as some of them. As it is written, The people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play." From this passage in that Bible there is a reference to Exod. xxxii. 6, showing that the translators or commentators were fully aware that the Apostle alluded to Aaron's sin.

Again, in Deut. iv. 15, 16 (Douay version), the Israelites are exhorted thus—"Keep, therefore, your souls carefully. You saw not any similitude in the day that the Lord God spoke to you in Horeb from the midst of the fire, lest, perhaps, being deceived, you might make you a graven similitude." Thus it appears, while they were allowed to hear the voice of the true God, they were not permitted to see a *similitude* of him, lest they might be tempted to make a copy, or a graven image of Jehovah, according to the similitude, for religious use and adoration.

The next proof is taken from the sin of Jeroboam, of whom it is said—"He made Israel to sin." In the Douay Bible (3 Kings xii. 28, 30) the following account is given of it:—"And finding out a device"—that is, to prevent any of the ten tribes going up to Jerusalem to worship, according to their previous custom, and of the political effects of which he was much afraid—"he made two golden calves, and said to them, Go ye up no more to Jerusalem; behold thy gods, O Israel, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt. And he set the one in Bethel, and the other in Dan, and this thing became an occasion of sin, for the people went to adore the calf as far as Dan."

There is a note at the bottom of the page, on the first of these verses, in the following words—"'Tis likely, by making his god in this form, he mimicked the Egyptians, among whom he had sojourned, who worshipped their Apis and Osiris under the form of a bullock." But I would venture to suggest, Is it not more "likely" that he imitated Aaron, since not only the material and form were precisely the same, but the words of proclamation also? In the above note, though it is not *expressly* said that Jeroboam set up false gods as objects of adoration, yet the impression left on the mind of the reader is, perhaps, that he did. However this be, it is very material to our argument to determine the precise nature of Jeroboam's sin. Accordingly we turn to 3 Kings xv. 31 (Douay Bible), and find it declared that "it was not enough for him [that is, for Achab] to walk in the sins of Jeroboam, the son of Nabat, but he also took to wife Jezebel, the daughter of Ethbaal, King of the Zidonians, and he went and served Baal." From this passage it appears that Achab's sin was different from, and much worse than Jeroboam's. We are also plainly told what Achab's sin was—that it was serving the false god, Baal. What, then, was Jeroboam's? Was *it*, too, the worship of a false god? If so, where was the difference between them? Could the worship of one false god be so different from, and so much worse than that of another, as to call for the strong reprehension of the sacred writer? The doctrine of Holy Scripture is not so. There the pretended deities are put all upon the same level, and their worshippers are characterized as alike contemptible and wicked—"They that make them are like unto them, and so are all they that put their trust in them."

But if this be disputed, there is further evidence sufficient to settle the question, and determine unanswerably the precise nature of Jeroboam's sin. This proof is taken from the case of Jehu, another of the kings of the ten tribes. From his history we learn that he was specially appointed by Jehovah to punish the house of Achab for their sin in serving Baal—See 4 Kings ix. 6, 7. In the same chapter there is an account of his commencing the execution of the sacred task thus intrusted to him. In the following chapter (15, 16 verses) is related the meeting of Jonadab, the son of Rechab, with Jehu, while engaged in his enterprize, and Jehu's inviting him to come up into his chariot, and saying to him, "Come, see my zeal for the *Lord*." The succeeding verses, which it would occupy too much space to quote in full, tell us that "Jehu slew all that were left of Achab in Samaria," and describe minutely, also, how he destroyed the worshippers of Baal, which is summed up thus in 28th verse—"So Jehu destroyed Baal out of Israel." He is commended for his courage and faithfulness in fulfilling the commission intrusted to him, and promises are given of the continuance of his descendants on the throne of Israel for several generations. Most unquestionably Jehu is described as the champion of the true God—Jehovah, the God of Israel, against the false God, Baal. Nevertheless, what is said of him in the 29th verse? "But yet he (Jehu) departed not from the sins of Jeroboam, the son of Nabat, who made Israel to sin, nor did he forsake the golden calves that were in Bethel and in Dan."

The conclusion, then, is inevitable, that Jehu's and, consequently, Jeroboam's sin consisted not in worshipping false gods, but in making and venerating images of the Lord. It appears to me to be rigidly demonstrated, and it follows as clearly that the Church of Rome, in sanctioning the use and veneration of images

of the true God, is guilty of the sin of Jeroboam; that the strong presumption further is, that what Protestants call the second commandment is directed against and condemns that sin: therefore, that the Romish division of the commandments is erroneous, and the Protestant the right and just one.

A Lover of Truth.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Dear Sir—I live in the west of the county Waterford, near the town of Youghal, where Father Foley kept what the Protestants called a "religious theatre" some time ago, but, like many other undertakings, it did not tell well, times being bad, and the people too fond of cash (small blame to them; 'tisn't gut very easy).

Well, Mr. Editor, I must tell you there was in this neighbourhood, some time ago, a clergyman of the Protestant Church (Mr. Aldworth)—and sure they are calling it a Catholic Church now—and a civil gentleman he was; but, however, like the readers in Kilcommon, he alarmed the priests with what are called "controversy lectures."

Well, as we expected, the priests determined not to let him have "all the game to himself," so they began to lecture in the chapel, and one of them (Father Smiddy) said they made thirty converts, though we never saw them, and he told Mr. Aldworth so in a letter he wrote to him. But what I want, Mr. Editor, is your opinion on a part of his letter to Mr. Aldworth, and to know from you why the people are not allowed to exercise their judgment in the same way, and under the same circumstances, that Father Smiddy says he would exercise his own; and why a priest should be the *first man to prevent us.*

I now give you the part of his letter in question:—

"Let me also inform you"—to Mr. Aldworth—"that, within the last year, at least thirty persons have fled to the rock of Catholicity from the shifting sands of Protestantism. *Can you boast of anything like this?* Thanks again to God, the work of conversion is going on rapidly in Youghal. Without presuming to dictate to any one, I must say that, if I saw the steady and thinking individuals of the crew thus deserting my ship, I should very minutely sound the planks and examine her condition, *no matter by what human authority she was warranted safe.*"

Well, Mr. Editor, I was listening to a lecture delivered in Ardmore school—where St. Declan lived and preached—by a Protestant clergyman, and he said that, in his opinion, 34,000 of the people of Ireland had gone to church; and I'm told that reading the Douay Bible made them do so, and that puzzles me right and left. I don't know what to say to it; 'tis like beating a man with his own stick; and, Mr. Editor, if this is the case, I think the sooner we examine our vessel the better; and, I'm told, the boys in America are doing something like it, and, in my humble judgment, a good many of them are taking the sea-store which your paper says St. Chrysostom recommended so many years ago; and maybe its the ignorance is dying out "of the boys instead of the faith." I'm told they are at liberty to think as they like in America, and, I think, we ought to be allowed to do so here, too; and sure, if a gentleman is kind enough to read the Douay Bible to a person, 'tisnt like liberty to send a bellman after him, as I'm told the priests do in Meath, and in some other parts down, and, I'm thinking, it might serve their cause after—for, as Jem Carty says, it may have the same effect on the readers as it has on a swarm of bees; shouting and bell-ringing will make them pitch and begin to work, instead of driving them away; and, I'm beginning to think (and more of the boys, too) if the church is infallible, it don't want the support of a bellman at any rate. I hope, Mr. Editor, you will pardon me for trespassing on you; but your kindness in printing Pat Murray's letter and T. M'D's made me apply to you for a little information.

I am, Mr. Editor,
Your humble servant,
Jeremiah O'Reily.

Clashmore, county Waterford.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Sir—I have heard say from my neighbour, Pat Murray, and from other honest people too, that ye are a kind man, that will not grudge a bit of advice to a poor man in a nonplush. Sir, it was only last October that my poor Frank was taken from me with the fever. A better boy never lived. From the time that he was the hith of my knee, his mother nor I never had to say a cross word to him; and, sir, it is hard to lose him now, when he was beginnin' to be a support and a comfort to us; but it was the Lord took him, and blessed be his will. Well, sir, we gave him a dacent berrin', and its we weren't stingy to the priest either; for I'd scorn to save money that could be either a credit or a profit to poor Frank. And we were wishin', last month, to have more masses said for him; for though there couldn't be a better Christian nor Frank, nor one that made a happier end, I know it's only saints and holy bishops that can expect to go strait to heaven without passin' through purgatory. So, sir, I went up to the master, Mr. Carter, to borry a pound; for with all we had spent in the berrin' we were hard put to it, and the master is a good and a kind man, and I didn't mind askin' him. And, when I tohld him what made me want the money, ses he to me—"Mike," ses he, "I don't think you're wise in the way you're spendin' your money; for," ses he, "didn't you tell me that your son died trustin' in the Lord Jesus Christ to save him; and don't you think he is able to save us from hell or purgatery?" "He is, sir," said I; "but shure we're all sinners, and sin must be punished." "That it must," says he; "but didn't the Lord Jesus bear the punishment of our sins on the cross, and would God be so unfair as, after he had borne the punishment, to take it agen out of his people, and to be angry with the people he died for?" So, Mr. Editor, though I didn't half like taking it on me to instruct the master, yet as ye couldn't expect a Protestant like him to know the Catholic doctrine as well as one that had been taught by the priest like me, "Sir," ses I, "you're under a great mistake; if God sends souls to purgatery it's not that he hasn't forgiven them, or that he's angry with them, but, sir, the priest tould me that it's in the Bible that nothing defiled can enter into the kingdom of heaven; or if it's not in the Bible, it stands to reason anyhow. Sure if ye were to ask my little Paudheen into yer house, his mother wouldn't let him into yer drawin'-room before he was washed from top to toe, and if she sent him up dirty yer honour would be right to turn him out again; and so it stands to reason, too, that a sowl is not let into heaven until all the sin is burnt out of it, and till there's not as much left as would darken the white of your eye." So, Mr. Editor, I thought the master saw the sense of that, and he stood, for a while, as if he was considering; and at last, "Mike," ses he, "does yer little Paddy ever cry when he's being washed?" "Troth he does, sir," ses I, "whenever his mother tries him that way." "Well," says he, "and if I was to invite him to my drawin'-room, as you say, would you mind his cryin' a little, or would you have him washed till he was quite clean?" "Ah, then, your honour," ses I, "I wish you saw him when his mother gets hould of him; troth he might roar as he liked, but whether he liked it or not, she would not let him out of her clutches till she had made him fit to be seen." "Why, then, Mike," says the master, "here's the money; but I advise ye to consider what ye do with it; for," ses he, "it's no pleasure to God to put Frank to pain, and ye may depend on it he won't send him to purgatery if it's not good for him, and sure he would know better than you. And if all the sin isn't burned out of him yet, it's better for him to bear a little pain till it is, than let him go into heaven with it in him. Sure," says he, "ye might as well let yer little Paddy come into my room with a dirty face, just because he did not like havin' it washed."

So, Mr. Editor, I have been thinking since over what the master sed, and talking it over with my wife, and we were never worse in want of a friend's advice. For though it's the hardest winter we have had this many a long year, and though the money would come handy to us, I'd rather pawn the last stitch of clothes we had, and go without a stick to warm ourselves, sooner nor Frank shuld want anything that nd do him good. But I've been thinking that maybe Frank would not be obliged to us if we got him out of purgatery before the Lord's time to take him out. For sure he would not like it if, when he got into heaven, the other sowls looked down on him, and said—"There's the fellow that his friends got in here before he was half cleaned, and with half his sins not burned out of him." So, sir, a word of advice will much oblige

Your humble servant to command,
Mike Dolan, of Westmeath.

[We tell Mr. Dolan candidly that if a man does not forsake his sins in this world, we don't know of any way for his getting rid of them in the next. However, we are quite sure of this, that if God has provided any such way it would be a very unfriendly thing to prevent a man's having the full benefit of it. And since Mr. Dolan says that his son died trusting in his Saviour, we advise him to leave him in his hands, assured that he will not make him suffer more pain than is for his good.—Ed. C. L.]

FARM OPERATIONS FOR JANUARY.

Any winter ploughing remaining undone should be put out of hands without loss of time, that the land may receive the ameliorating influence of the winter's frosts and thaws as much as possible, taking advantage when the land is dry, but avoid ploughing when the land is saturated with wet. All stubble ploughing ought to be deep, certainly not less than seven inches, and, if possible, ten inches. To turn over the latter-mentioned depth, it will be necessary to yoke three horses in the plough. Shallow ploughing is useless; and good after-crops can never be raised when this practice is followed. Attend closely to the draining and subsoiling of all such portions of the farm as require those primary, vital operations.

Wheat.—The very severe weather, which has continued with little intermission for many weeks, has very much retarded wheat sowing, and in many districts where it has been sown the grain has rotted in the ground. As wheat may be sown with every chance of success during the early part of this month, if the land be found sufficiently dry, we would earnestly urge farmers to make every exertion to get in the usual breadth, taking care, as the season advances, to increase the quantity of seed.

Bere may still be sown in early and dry soils, as a grain crop, and in almost all soils for a soiling crop.

Rye may also be sown, on cold, backward soils, or mountain land, for either a grain crop or soiling.

Spring Vetches may be sown towards the end of the month, if the weather be open and dry.

Peas can be sown from the middle of the month, if the land be light and tolerably dry, with or without manure.

Beans may be sown on strong land, if not too wet, they require a liberal dressing of manure if sown on stubble land.

Plant out Roots for Seed.—This will be a good time to select and plant out the roots of turnips, mangels, parsnips, and carrots for the production of seed. Prepare a deep, rich, friable soil, well manured, in a fully exposed, unsheltered aspect, away from hedges, trees, or walls; select the largest, cleanest, and best formed roots, and plant in trenches—turnips and mangles, three feet trench from trench, and the roots two feet apart in the trench; parsnips, three feet by one-and-a-half feet apart; and carrots, two and-a-half feet by one foot; and then cover the entire of the bulbs. It will be better to choose a stronger soil for those roots to seed in than that they grow in the last season. If more convenient, the roots may be left to seed in the land they grew in, without disturbing them; but in this case, it will be necessary to remove every second row, and every second root in the row; let the intervals be well cleaned afterwards, and the roots to remain be well earthed up. Cultivate but one variety of the same species on the same farm, otherwise the seed will be impure, and not to be relied on.

Grass Lands, whether intended for meadow or grazing stock, should be well top-dressed with rich composts, with as little delay now as possible; and all should be cleared of stock. As soon as the top-dressing is sufficiently dry, bush-harrow and roll.

Water Meadows require constant attention this month, remove every obstruction to the free flow of the water in the various canals and ducts, and keep the water constantly and evenly flowing. Change the water from one field to another once a week or ten days, during mild weather; but in the case of frost keep it still running as the tender grass suddenly exposed to keen winds or frost would be greatly injured.

Stall-fed Cattle should now be putting up flesh rapidly, and as soon as ripe should be disposed of.

Cattle of all sorts should be kept clean and comfortable, for no animal will thrive well, no matter how abundant its keep, wanting these essentials. Attention to these requisites, with moderate rations of good and wholesome food, will keep stores of all kinds, and milch cows, in a healthy and thriving condition, and free from black-leg and other diseases. Feed milch cows so as to keep them in vigorous health—neither too fat nor too lean—by moderate supplies of succulent food—sweet hay and fresh straw. Give no frozen turnips, and let each animal have free access to salt.

Ewes require like treatment; let them have dry lying, shelter, and a moderate supply of wholesome, nutritious food; avoid giving frozen turnips, but let them have free access to good hay and salt.

Fatting Wethers should have a liberal supply of good hay with their turnips and oil-cake or corn. Dry lying, and access to hay and salt, are the best preservatives against rot.

Pigs of all sorts should be well and liberally fed; and all not put up for fatting should have plenty of exercise; those fatting should have a liberal supply of grain, for a month at least before being slaughtered.

Manure.—Let the accumulation of manure be constantly attended to. Leaving the manure strewed about and ungathered, exposed to constant rains, which wash away, and drying winds, to evaporate its most valuable properties, should not be tolerated; let, therefore, no time elapse before it is gathered up and stored, in good-sized middens, or removed to those portions of the farm where it is intended for application to the different root crops, &c., mixed with light, dry, rich earth, banked up, and well covered at both top and sides, to preserve it from the action of the weather. Let the liquid manure be attended to and well husbanded; empty the tanks frequently, and top-dress meadows and grass lands with it, or pour it over the dung-heaps.

Odds and Ends.—Keep the thrashers busy, so as to supply the cattle with straw; attend to the repairs of fences and the formation of new ones. In all open, dry weather keep the plough at work, and in times of frost lead and carry out manure to the land it is intended to be used on; repair roads; quarry and convey limestone to the kiln, with fuel for burning it; scour out ponds and ditches; level old fences, mixing lime with the surplus earth; repair implements.

In a few days will be ready,

Vol. I., Royal, 4to, cloth, Price 5s. 6d.

THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN,

WITH A COPIOUS INDEX.

Cases for the above for Binding, may also be had, Price 1s. 6d.

DUBLIN: WILLIAM CURRY, AND CO.,
9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET.

LONDON: WERTHEIM AND MACINTOSH,
24, PATERNOSTER-ROW.

Selection of New and Useful Works,

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY & CO.,

Booksellers to the Queen,
9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

HENRY AND SCOTT'S COMMENTARY ON THE HOLY SCRIPTURES. New Edition, with 15 Maps and 59 Illustrations on steel. Six Vols. 4to. £3 3s.

THE DIVINE RULE OF FAITH AND PRACTICE. By Rev. William Goode, M.A. New Edition. 3 vols. 8vo. 21s.

*** Subscribers names received till February 28.

THE CHURCH BEFORE THE FLOOD; or, Lectures on the Book of Genesis. By the Rev. John Cumming, D.D. 9s.

D'AUBIGNES' "REFORMATION IN ENGLAND," being Vol. V. of the History of the Reformation. 8vo. 12s. (In the Press.)

A BOOK OF ASPIRATIONS. By Rev. James Lancaster. 3s.

EXPOSITION OF THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS. By Rev. Robert J. M'Ghee. 2 vols. 8vo. 21s.

FOOT-PRINTS OF THE CREATOR; or, the Asterolepis of Stromness. By Hugh Miller. 7s. 6d.

HISTORY OF THE JESUITS; their Origin, Progress, Doctrines, and Designs. By G. B. Nicolini. 12mo. 5s. 6d.

PROGRESS OF THE REFORMATION IN THE WEST OF IRELAND. By the Earl of Roden. 2s. 6d.

THE BOND OF PERFECTNESS, chiefly as explained and illustrated in the 13th chapter of 1st Corinthians. By Rev. Hamilton Verchoyle. 4s. 6d.

SERMON TO CHILDREN, preached in Trinity Church on Thursday, 6th January, 1853. By Rev. John Gregg. (In a few days.)

DISCOURSES ON SOME OF THE MOST DIFFICULT TEXTS OF SCRIPTURE. By the Rev. James Cochrane, A.M. Foolscap 8vo. 5s.

THE HISTORY OF NINEVEH; intended for the Young. By the Author of "The Faithful Promiser," &c. In Square 16mo, with Illustrations. 1s.

BOGATZKY'S GOLDEN TREASURY FOR THE CHILDREN OF GOD; consisting of Devotional and Practical Observations for every Day in the Year. With the addition of several hundred Texts, and a considerable portion of original matter. By the Rev. W. L. Nelson. In foolscap 8vo, cloth. 2s.

THE BATTLES OF THE BIBLE. By the Authoress of "Chapters on the Shorter Catechism." In foolscap 8vo, cloth, 3s. 6d.; cloth, gilt edges, 4s.

STORIES FOR CHRISTIAN CHILDREN. By the Rev. Dr. Barth, Author of "Bible Stories." In 18mo, with Illustrations, gilt edges. 2s. 6d.

MEMOIR OF THE LIVES OF ROBERT AND JAMES A. HALDANE. By Alex. Haldane, Esq. 8vo. 12s.

GAVAZZI'S ORATIONS, delivered in the Rotundo, Dublin, in the months of October and November, 1852. 2s.

HOME TRUTHS. By Rev. J. C. Ryle. 1st and 2nd Series. Each 3s. 6d.

HOW READEST THOU? a Question for 1853. By Rev. J. C. Ryle. 3d.

SHALL YOU BE SAVED? By Rev. J. C. Ryle. 2d.

SKETCHES OF PROTESTANTISM IN ITALY. By the Rev. Dr. Baird. 12mo. 2s.

THE REFORMERS BEFORE THE REFORMATION. Translated from the French of Emile de Bonnechose. 2 vols, 8vo. 9s.

BRIEF VIEW OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY. By the Dean of Cork. 18mo. 1s.

SHEAF OF CORN; or, Mornings with a Sabbath Class. By Rev. Richard S. Brooke. Square, 18mo. 1s.

DISCOURSES AND SAYINGS OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST. By Rev. John Brown, D.D. 3 vols 8vo. 31s. 6d.

THE SUFFERINGS AND GLORIES OF THE MESSIAH; signified beforehand to David and Isaiah. By Rev. John Brown, D.D. 8vo. 8s.

THE RESURRECTION OF LIFE: an Exposition of 1st Corinthians, Chap. XV. By Rev. John Brown, D.D. 8vo. 8s.

DAILY BIBLE ILLUSTRATIONS. Being original readings for a year. By John Kitto, D.D. 6 vols. Fcap., 8vo. 6s. each.

***The Life and Death of Our Lord. Vol. VII. 6s. Just published.

The Apostles and Early Church. Vol. VIII. 6s. (Shortly.)

SACRED PHILOSOPHY OF THE SEASONS; Illustrating the Perfections of God in the Phenomena of the year. By the late Rev. Dr. Duncan. 4 vols. 24s.

MEMOIR OF THE REV. HENRY DUNCAN, D.D. Author of "Sacred Philosophy of the Seasons." Fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

LECTURES ON BUNYAN'S PILGRIM'S PROGRESS. By the Rev. Dr. Cheever. 12mo. 2s.

RELIGION OF GEOLOGY AND ITS CONNECTED SCIENCES. By E. Hitchcock, D.D. 2s.

OBLIGATIONS OF THE WORLD TO THE BIBLE. By Gardiner Spring, D.D. 12mo. 2s.

THE FOLDED LAMB; or, Memorials of an Infant Son. By his Mother. 12mo. 2s. 6d.

THEOPNEUSTIA: The Plenary Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. By L. Gaussen, D.D. 2s. 6d.

BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL DICTIONARY. By Rev. Samuel Green. 12mo. 3s. 6d.

EXPOSITION OF THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS. By Robert Haldane, Esq. 3 vols. 7th Edition. 15s.

EXPOSITION OF EPISTLE TO THE GALATIONS. By James A. Haldane. Foolscap 8vo. 3s. 6d.

EXTENT AND NATURE OF THE ATONEMENT. By James A. Haldane. Folscap 8vo. 3s. 6d.

THE VERBAL INSPIRATION OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES. By Robert Haldane. 3s. 6d.

CONTROVERSIAL LETTERS BETWEEN THE ARCHDEACON OF MEATH AND THE REV. JOHN KELLY. Published by consent and agreement of both the authors. 12mo, sewed, 4d.

GENESIS AND GEOLOGY; or, an Investigation into the Reconciliation of the Modern Doctrines of Geology, with the Declarations of Scripture. By Denis Crofton. B.A. 8vo. 2s.

SCHOOL BOOKS.

HISTORY OF ENGLISH LITERATURE. With an outline of the origin and growth of the English Language. Illustrated by Extracts. By William Spalding. 3s. 6d.

THE DUBLIN LATIN GRAMMAR—Part First, containing an introduction to the eight Parts of Speech, a Vocabulary of Substantives, Adjectives, and Verbs, and an Appendix, consisting of copious Notes.

LATIN SYNTAX AND DELECTUS MINOR.—The rules of Latin Syntax, and a Brief Delectus, with copious Notes and a Dictionary—forming Part II. of the Dublin Latin Grammar. 12mo, 1s. 6d. bound.

ANALYSIS OF THE LATIN TONGUE. By the Rev. Thomas Cooke. 2s.

RUDDIMAN'S RUDIMENTS OF THE LATIN TONGUE. By Dr. Hunter. 12mo. 1s. 6d.

AINSWORTH'S LATIN DICTIONARY. Edited by William Duncan. 8vo. 9s.

MAIR'S INTRODUCTION TO LATIN SYNTAX. By the Rev. Alexander Stewart. 18mo. 3s.

STEWART'S CORNELIUS NEPOS. With Notes and a copious Vocabulary. 3s.

REID'S RUDIMENT OF ENGLISH COMPOSITION. Royal 18mo. 2s.

REID'S RUDIMENTS OF MODERN GEOGRAPHY. 18mo. 1s.

REID'S SCHOOL ATLAS OF MODERN GEOGRAPHY. 4to. Coloured, 5s.

EWING'S SYSTEM OF GEOGRAPHY AND ASTRONOMY. 12mo. 4s. 6d. With nine Maps, 6s. 6d.

EWINGS NEW GENERAL ATLAS. Twenty-eight Maps. Royal 4to, coloured. 10s. 6d.

STEWART'S COMPENDIUM OF MODERN GEOGRAPHY. With Eleven Maps, and a large coloured Physical Chart. 18mo. 3s. 6d.

REIDS ELEMENTS OF ASTRONOMY. With 65 Illustrations on Wood. 12mo. 3s.

HISTORY OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND. With Questions and a Map, by Henry White, B.A., Cambridge. 12mo. 3s. 6d.

ELEMENTS OF GENERAL HISTORY, ANCIENT AND MODERN. By Alexander Fraser Lyster. 24mo. 3s. 6d.

FIVAS FRENCH GRAMMAR. With Numerous Exercises and Examples. 3s. 6d.

BIAGIOLI'S ITALIAN GRAMMAR. Improved by Rampini. 12mo. 3s. 6d.

SURENNE'S NEW FRENCH DIALOGUES. 12mo. 2s.

——— PRONOUNCING FRENCH DICTIONARY. 10s 6d..

——— FRENCH AND ENGLISH DICTIONARY. 18mo. 5s.

——— NEW FRENCH MANUAL AND TRAVELLERS COMPANION. 12mo. 3s. 6d.

CATTY'S VOLTAIRES HISTOIRE DE CHARLES XII. 12mo. 6d.

HOME AND COLONIAL SCHOOL SOCIETY'S PUBLICATIONS.

Graduated Course of Instruction for Infant Schools	0	2	0
Information on Common Objects, fcap, cloth	0	3	6
Helps for Lessons on the Natural History of the Year	0	0	6
Hints on the Establishment of Schools for Early Education, per dozen	0	0	3
Mayo's Remarks on Infant Education, fcap, cloth	0	2	0
Selection of Hymns and Poetry for Infant Schools	0	3	0
Model Lessons for Infant Schools, fc., cl., three parts, each	0	2	6
Lessonson the Miracles, fcap.	0	3	
——— Shells, fcap.	0	5	6

SOCIETY FOR PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF CONSCIENCE IN IRELAND.

President:

HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN.

Hon. Secretary:

REV. CADWALLADER WOLSELEY.

Treasurer:

WILLIAM HOGAN, ESQ.

Office, 133, Stephen's-green, Dublin.

Bankers:

Messrs. BOYLE, PIM & Co., College-green, Dublin.

IT is now well known that the free exercise of liberty of conscience is prevented in Ireland, not only by acts of violence in some places, but by a general and wide-spread persecution, the object of which is to deprive of all means of support, for themselves and their families, those who seek instruction from the clergy, attend the Church, or allow their children to go to the schools connected with it.

The committee of this society have, with the small amount of funds, hitherto intrusted to their care, given assistance, in eighteen different places, to employ those who thus suffer persecution for conscience sake; they now find that their funds are exhausted and that the number of claims on them increases every day. They are, therefore, compelled to seek public assistance, and to call on all the friends of religious freedom to aid them in their struggle against persecution. They stand totally unconnected with other societies, but feel that the importance of their peculiar object cannot be over-estimated.

Any information which may be required respecting the society can be obtained on application to the Rev. Cadwallader Wolseley, the honorary secretary, 133, Stephen's-green, Dublin.

Contributions will be received by

William Hogan, Esq., treasurer, 9, Haddington-street, Kingstown.

At the Office of the Irish Society, Sackville-street, Piccadilly, London.

At the Bank of Messrs. Williams, Deacon & Co., London.
" " Gurney and Co., Norwich.
" " Mortlock and Son, Cambridge,
" " Wakefield, Crewson, and Co., Kendal.

At the Manchester and Salford Bank, Manchester.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON, and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher WILLIAM CURRY, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.
January 15, 1853.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Glóir do Dhia ań ṙna háṙduiḃ, agus ṙíoṁcáin air an dtalaṁ deaġtoil do na dáoiniḃ.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED THE MIDDLE OF EVERY MONTH, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. II.—No. 14. FEBRUARY, 1853. {Annual Subscription, 3s. 6d. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

PAGE.

The Florence Confessors—Rosa Madiai 13
On the Celibacy of the Clergy—A Dialogue between two Italian Gentlemen 13
The Mortmain Committee - Metairie v. Wiseman . . . 15
The Talk of the Road—No. IX. 16
The Baptism of a Bell 16
The Rule of Faith (continued)—Part IV. 17
Civil and Religious Liberty—Pope Pius IX. and the Republic of New Grenada 19
The *Touchstone* (continued) 20
Correspondence:
On Image Worship, by Sidrach 21
On the *Touchstone*, by Catholicus 22
On what is the Church founded, according to the Council of Trent? by Fontium Petitor 22
On Hades, by a Novice 23
Notes and Queries 23
Farming Operations for February 23

THE CONFESSORS OF FLORENCE.

In the nineteenth century of the Christian era, in the year of our Lord 1851, Francesco Madiai and his wife were arrested in Florence, on the charge that they having themselves apostatized from the Catholic religion and professed an heretical confession, called evangelical, were also guilty of impiety in seeking by the distribution of tracts, and by other similar means, to propagate the same opinions amongst others; and it was upon this latter charge of proselytism that the public prosecution relied as bringing them within the criminal code of Tuscany. On this charge they were arrested. Pending the trial both were shut up in prison. After nine months' imprisonment the trial came on. At the trial, the Madiai admitted the truth of some of the charges brought against them. They confessed that they did accord more authority to the Bible than to the Church of Rome; that they had sought to instruct others in those truths of the Gospel which had brought comfort to their own souls; and finally that they had held meetings at their own house, for purposes of prayer and examination of Scripture.

The court, in its sentence of condemnation, resting on the proofs and admission of such meetings having been held, particularly on one stated to have been held on the 17th August, 1851, at which three persons, a child of 15 years, and the Madiai, were surprised in the house of the latter, reading the Bible translated by Diodati, each one having a copy under his eye, and further alleging that tracts had been distributed by the Madiai at various times, then proceeded to condemn the husband to upwards of four years' seclusion in the prison of the Volterra, and the wife to nearly four years' imprisonment in the prison at Lucca. Those punishments they are now undergoing.

In the first century of the Christian era a certain Jew, of the name of Paul, traversed the whole circuit of the Roman Empire, preaching, throughout all its cities, that the gods whom the people worshipped, and whose worship was established by law, were no gods, but wood and stone; endeavouring to persuade all who would listen to him to apostatize from that religion in which they had been brought up, holding, even at Rome, and when under the guard of soldiers, meetings at his own lodgings, at which he "expounded and testified of the kingdom of God, persuading those who came to him concerning Jesus, both out of the law of Moses and the prophets." This course he pursued for a number of years, accused by the Jews "as a pestilent fellow, and a mover of sedition among all the Jews, and a ringleader of the sect of the Christians." He confessed openly "that after the way they called heresy so worshipped he the God of his fathers, believing all things which were written in the law and the prophets." Dragged before the tribunal of the Roman governors upon those charges, even Festus, the corrupt proconsul, could find no fault in all these things, and would have discharged him ultimately, if he had not appealed unto Cæsar.

What crime have the Madiai committed that Paul was not guilty of?

We confess we are unwilling to treat this remarkable case on the narrow grounds of comparison between the tolerant principles professed by the reformed Churches and the intolerant ones sanctioned by the Church of Rome. The issue in question is a wider one. Are the Madiai Christians or not? Are they, according to the evidence afforded to us, believers in those doctrines for the truth of which Stephen, and Paul, and Peter, and James laid down their lives, and suffered all things that they might win Christ? If they are Christians, what, then, are their persecutors, and with whom ought all who profess Christianity to sympathise and unite?

Is an undoubting trust and faith in Christ as a Saviour, a firm reliance on his mediation, a test of Christianity? Listen, then, to Rosa Madiai, writing to her husband—"Courage, dearest. The Holy Spirit has enabled us to bear witness that this Christ, laden with opprobrium and trampled under foot, is our King and our Saviour, and we, through the effect of his light and his power, have taken up the defence of the cross of Christ, bearing his shame, in order that we may one day share in his holiness and glory." Is submission to the will of God in all our trials, meekness and long-suffering under oppression and wrong, evidence of a desire to imitate the example of him who, in his last agony in the garden, prayed—"Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt?" Hear the same Rosa Madiai—"We have been cast down, but not conquered, and I hope that, through the merits of Christ, the Father has accepted our witness, and will enable us to drink, even to the last drop, the portion of that bitter cup which he has prepared for us, and to drink it with thanksgiving." Words not used in the day of prosperity and when troubles are but prospective, but proceeding from one already experiencing the bitterness of the loss of all worldly happiness.

Do we reckon it a proof of the faith of Peter and the other apostles that, when beaten with scourges, they went on their way, rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for the name of Christ? In the same spirit can Rosa Madiai write to her husband—"Be not afraid: God, who made the chains of St. Peter to fall off, and open to him the gates of the prison, will certainly not forget us. Be of good courage, and let us commit ourselves entirely into the hands of God. Bear up, so that I shall behold you joyous, as I hope you will see the effects of the same grace in me." Does Christ himself promise that "every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sister, or fathers, or mothers, or wife, or children, for his name's sake, shall inherit everlasting life?" Who shall exclude from that glorious promise her who, in writing to her husband, says—"Thou knowest if I have loved thee, but how much more now that we have together fought for the great King?" and who, notwithstanding that love, has submitted to separation and imprisonment—to the tedium of prolonged confinement—to the hardship of prison discipline.

Remember that the past lives of these persons have been in conformity with these sentiments. Against them even the unscrupulous malignity of their enemies has raised no charge of moral delinquency; even the public prosecutor in his speech declared—"That the acts of goodness, natural probity, and benevolence that were urged on behalf of Madame Madiai in arrest of judgment might cause one to grieve more over her separation from Catholicism, but could not free her from the present accusation."

We ask, then, our readers, do they believe the Madiai to be Christians or not? Try it by another test. Suppose the trial and imprisonment of the Madiai had taken place in Constantinople, and not in Florence; the Grand Seignior the sovereign, and not the Grand Duke; the Mahometan Muftis the accusers, and not the Romish priests; the charges brought forward the same as those made against the Madiai; the evidence of Christian principle and Christian practice such as we have stated. What view would Christian Europe take of the persecution? Would we stop to inquire whether the victims of the Mahometan persecution acknowledged the supremacy of the Pope or not? Would we ask in what Church baptized? And if the Madiai, on the facts before us, would be martyrs at Constantinople, what are they at Florence? If the charges on which they are found guilty are worthy of punishment, how can Rome herself justify her missions to the heathen nations? If their condemnation be just, then the condemnation of Christ by the Jews is worthy of all commendation. He denounced the consecrated priesthood of Aaron as blind leaders of the blind; he declared that by their traditions they made the Word of God of none effect. They built the tombs of the prophets, and in so doing condemned the conduct of their fathers who persecuted the prophets; yet they imitated the example of their fathers, and slew him of whom the prophets spake. And may not the same be said now of the Church of Rome? She appeals to Peter and Paul, and the other Apostles, as the founders of her spiritual authority, and yet exceeds heathen Rome in the severity of her persecution of those against whom no charge can be brought, save such as was brought against them. Let us not forget that the strength which has enabled this poor Italian courier and his wife to resist the authority of an unjust sentence, and to suffer under the rigour of persecution, is the same which, eighteen centuries ago, founded our Church, and, three centuries ago, reformed it, and in each case changed the face of the world.

Nor is this warning to ourselves without its necessity. There is not a single member of the reformed Churches, here or abroad, who, if he acts up to his profession, would not be bound to do as the Madiai have done. If the Madiai are justly condemned, we, too, are obnoxious to the same condemnation. The power may be wanting at present for its active operation. Are we sure that the will is absent?

An appeal has been made, by an eminent nobleman in England, the Earl of Carlisle, to the Roman Catholic citizens of this empire, "to address the voice of remonstrance to their spiritual superiors, to rescue them from the intolerable reproach this persecution must bring upon them." To that appeal a Roman Catholic gentleman, the late member for Youghal, Mr. Chisholm Anstey, has replied that that appeal is useless. He tells us that nearly every member of the Roman Catholic body is persuaded that it is the bounden duty of the State to coerce heretics by temporal penalties, and, if need be, to extirpate them by the sword.

Again we ask our Roman Catholic readers, is this so or not? Do they sympathize with the Madiai or with their persecutors? If with the latter, what is the nature of that religion which condemns to imprisonment and death those who, in their life and in their trials, exhibit the same Christian patience, the same earnest spirit, the same unwearied trust that, in the first ages of the Christian Church, overturned the idolatrous worship of heathen Rome, and extended the away of Christian doctrine and Christian knowledge to the furthest limits of the world?

We regret that want of space prevents us from reprinting the letters of the Earl of Carlisle and Mr. Anstey, which well deserve to be recorded.

DIALOGUE ON THE CONSTRAINED CELIBACY IN THE CHURCH OF ROME, BETWEEN TWO ITALIAN GENTLEMEN.

Salviano—True, dear friend, I have married a wife, and I have not done so without good reason. Matrimony is the fountain of the human race, the seedplot of the Church, a balm for our cares, a comfort in our afflictions, and the object of Divine blessings. God himself instituted it after the creation of the world: Increase and multiply, said God to our first parents, and replenish the earth. Nay, marriage is, to true Christians, the type of a very great mystery—namely, the intimate union of Christ and his Church.

Eustachio—And I tell you that you have done wrong to enter into this state; nor do I say so without very good reason. Marriage is, in fact, without contradiction, a carnal state; contrary to one who desires to be perfect, and very unsuitable to one who wishes to serve God. Moreover, it is filthiness in clergymen, a crime in priests, impurity in saints. He who is in the married state is in the flesh, and he that is in the flesh cannot please God.

Salviano—Oh, this is fine talk! You, Romanists, are certainly extraordinary people: at one time you say that marriage is a sacrament, at another you call it filthiness. Truly, I know not how you reconcile these opinions—that marriage is a sacrament of the Church, and that it is filthiness for the men of the Church; that it is a sacrament for the laity, and a sacrilege for the priests. You say that all the sacraments of the Church are holy. How, then, can marriage, which is a holy thing, defile those who aspire to holiness? Dear friend, you wish to be a good Catholic, and yet you put forward the arguments of heretics condemned by your own Church. You maintain, in fact, with the heretics of former times, that to be in the flesh means to be married; and we, with St. Clement, of Alexandria, reply to you that S. Paul says also to the married—"Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit." The married, if they are regenerate, are not in the flesh; therefore, being in the flesh does not at all mean living in the married state. The expressions, to walk according to the flesh, to be in the flesh, to do the work of the flesh, do not mean, according to St. Paul, to have a wife and children; but they do mean to have a corrupt nature and to bring forth sin. Did you ever read that the Apostles, when they forbid the works of the flesh, forbid marriage? St. Paul gives us a very long list of the works of the flesh, amongst which you certainly will not find marriage; but you will find adultery, fornication, and uncleanness. Marriage comes from God, and cannot make those that are married displeasing in his sight. According to your opinion, the patriarchs were in the flesh, the priests could not serve God, the prophets were profane, because some of all these were married. Therefore, Enoch, though he had the privilege of being exempted from death, did not please God; nor did Noah, who was a preacher of righteousness; nor Abraham, the father of the faithful; nor Moses, the giver of the law; nor Samuel, a Nazarite of God; nor Ezekiel, a prophet of the Most High. In short, according to your opinion, all married persons go to hell, since you maintain that those who are married live in the flesh, and he who lives in the flesh is condemned. Listen to the words of St. Paul—"If ye live after the flesh ye shall die," and you know well that here the Apostle speaks of eternal death. In the Old Testament marriage was consistent with the sacred office; so that the priests who performed the holy rites took wives; even the high priest, though he alone was permitted to enter the holy of holies, might marry a wife, provided she was not a widow, nor a divorced woman, nor profane, nor an harlot; but he was to take a virgin of his own people to wife.—Levit. xxi, 12. If marriage was permitted to the priests of the synagogue, I know not why it should be forbidden to the ministers of the Church.

Eustachio—Do you, then, think that whatever was permitted to the priests of the Old Testament is suitable to those of the New?

Salviano—Why not? If matrimony were a carnal state, how would God have permitted it to those ministers to whom was prescribed a special purity of body; to those who were defiled by only touching a dead body; to those ministers who were obliged to purify themselves so frequently with water, that they might not be unclean? Let us speak seriously. You say that that is not lawful now to ministers which was formerly lawful to the priests. If so, you are bound undoubtedly, to prove that Jesus Christ has repealed that ancient law, and enacted a new one in its stead. Come, then. How do you prove that marriage is forbidden to the pastors of the Church of God? On the contrary, according to the teaching of St. Paul—"A bishop must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behaviour," &c. "One that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity. For if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the Church of God? Likewise must the deacons be grave, not double-tongued. Not given to much wine. Not greedy of filthy lucre. Even so must their wives be grave, not slanderers; sober, faithful in all things. Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife, ruling their children and their own houses well."—1 Timothy, iii., 2. 4, 5, 8, 11, 12. The rules given by you to the clergy are opposed to these ordinances, given by St. Paul to Timothy and Titus.

Eustachio—That he should be husband of one wife means that he should be clergyman of one parish—bishop of only one bishopric.

Salviano—Truly this is a bold assertion! In this manner you wish to allegorize and get rid of the force of so convincing an argument; but consider that your allegory is opposed to the text, in which, if you look into it closely, you will see that St. Paul distinguishes between the wife of the bishop and the Church. He speaks of the *children* of the bishop, distinguishing them from spiritual children. He speaks of the *household* of the bishop, distinguishing it clearly from the household of God. Do not you see that the Apostle argues from the less to the greater, and that this is his meaning? If the bishop does not know how to rule his own house, how shall he be fit to rule the Church of God? If he has not the qualities fitting him to govern his own wife, his own children, his own household, how shall he be capable of ruling well the Church of Christ and its ministers? It is true that St. Paul does not oblige every priest to marry; but he orders him to do so if he cannot contain, and to have but one wife, and not more at the same time, as the Jews used to do. It is in this way that we understand him; and if you Romanists were candid, you, too, would be obliged to take the same meaning from his words.

Eustachio—When the Apostle says that he should be the husband of one wife he means it of the past, and not of the present. Besides which, the law of St. Paul was only for the rising Church, in which it would have been difficult to find bishops, if married men had not been admitted to the bishopric.

Salviano—Are you joking, or are you in earnest? How can St. Paul mean it of the past, if he says it of the present? He must be the husband of one wife. If to be the husband of one wife mean to *have been* the husband of one wife, then to be blameless will also mean to *have been* blameless—to be sober will mean to have been sober. Do you think it, then, enough for a shepherd of souls to have been blameless—to have been sober—to have been vigilant, although he be none of these at present? Tell me, do you understand of the past also what St. Paul says of the wives of the deacons, that they must be grave, not false accusers, sober, faithful in all things? If you understand this, also, of the past, you must affirm that he was giving instructions for the wives whom the deacons had had, but who were then either divorced or dead. Our sun, my friend, shines brightly, and in vain do you try to cloud it over. And why say that the law of St. Paul was only given for a time? How do you prove that God gave another law afterwards? Every profane person might in this manner cast aside all the precepts of God. No, no—St. Paul does not mean it of the past. I might confound you by bringing up a host of expositors, from among those whom the Church of Rome venerates as saints: for instance, St. John Chrysostom, St Jerome, and others, who have never dreamed that the Apostle, in speaking of the wives of the bishops, meant to speak of the past; but what would be the use of this, when the text of St. Paul is so plain it itself?

Eustachio—Have you anything else to bring forward from your St. Paul?

Salviano—Yes. St. Paul is mine; and if he were among you on the earth he would run the risk of being excommunicated by you for having proclaimed the ordinances of God, and maintained them against those of your Church. Yes, this St. Paul is ours, and it is he who says—"To avoid fornication let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband"—1 Cor. vii. 2. When St. Paul says *every man, every woman*, surely he does not except the bishops, the priests, the monks, or the nuns. No, marriage is honourable *in all*—in bishops, friars, and nuns, as well as in the laity.

Eustachio—Now I have caught you. Here St. Paul is not yours, indeed. These words, *in all*, are not by any means to be understood of all persons; in fact, if they were to be understood so, marriage would be lawful between father and daughter, or between brother and sister. No, sir, the sacred text means marriage is honourable in all *things*, and not in all *persons*; and here St. Paul is not on your side, or, at least, he is not certainly against us.

Salviano—The words, *in all*, are perfectly clear in the Greek text (*εν πασι*), and you deceive yourself when you say that the word all does not indicate persons but things: as if St. Paul had said marriage is honourable in all things; but it is clear as the daylight that the word "all" is put in opposition to fornicators and adulterers; and on account of this contrast it cannot point out any other than persons who marry, that they may not live in such sin. The true sense, then, of this great declaration is, that marriage is honourable in all who, according to nature and the Divine law, may be joined together: whether they be ecclesiastics or secular persons it matters not. The marriage of a father with his daughter, of a brother with his sister, is incestuous, and nature and the law condemn such unions, whence they are not understood by St. Paul in the word all. Nature, therefore, and the Divine law, on the one hand, oblige your clergy who cannot contain to marry. You, on the other hand, forbid them to do so. And do not you perceive that this is the character of those teachers who "In the last times shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils, speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their conscience seared with a hot iron, *forbidding to marry?*" &c.—1 Tim. iv. 1, 2, 3. I know well that there are some among you who apply these prophecies to our reformers; but with what appearance of truth? With what conscience do you do this? Which of them forbid marriage? But your doctrines are so far from being taught by Christian reformers, that they are always condemned by them.

Eustachio—I think that in this case both sides are in error; our people wrong yours if they make this application of the text. Your people, on the other hand, wrong ours by saying that St. Paul spoke in this prophecy of those who forbid the clergy to marry. In fact, we do not forbid marriage; we only say that those who do not wish or cannot remain without wives should not be made priests. St. Paul, in this passage, foretells the heresy of the Tacians, the Marcionites, and the Manicheans, who condemned marriage as a thing evil in itself and proceeding from the devil.

Salviano—So you do not forbid marriage? then why do you speak of it as a carnal state? Why do you call it uncleanness? Why, in defence of this your new law, do you fight with the weapons of the heretics of other times? You do not wish to be either Tacians or Manicheans, yet you bring against us the stale arguments adopted by them against your Church. We shall see from it in what manner your people forbid marriage. I shall now only observe, that you argue badly in saying St. Paul speaks of these heretics, therefore he does not speak of us, as if this special application must hinder a more general one. The Apostle points out not only the above-mentioned heretics who condemned marriage as a thing evil in itself, but also those who considered it contrary to the state of perfection, as you yourselves do. I will tell you two things, to which if you will attend, I think you will change your opinion. The first is, that the apostle, having said, in the foregoing chapter, that the bishop should be the husband of one wife, comes now to speak of the teachers who broach a doctrine contrary to his, and plainly points out those who forbid bishops and other ecclesiastics to marry, tolerating in them base and evil habits rather than grant to them liberty to live in the holy state of matrimony. The second is, that St. Paul speaks of the teachers of the last times—"Now the Spirit speaketh expressly that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith." These last times are not the whole period of the New Testament dispensation. The Apostle distinguishes them clearly and expressly from those in which he lived—in a word, these latter times, according to Anselm, Liranus, and Bellarmine are the times of Antichrist. Now, according to you, Antichrist was not in the time of the Tacians, the Marcionites, and the Manicheans: how, then, can the Apostle speak precisely of these? It is evident, therefore, that these false teachers, foreseen by St. Paul, were to arise afterwards—that is, in after times of the last days.

Eustachio—But you maintain that he who has not the gift of continency is indispensably obliged to marry. Is there, then, no other remedy? May not he who does not possess this gift obtain it from God by tears and prayers? Does not our Father grant us whatever we ask him in the name of his only begotten Son? I think that he that is obliged, by a solemn vow, not to marry, may, by fastings and penances, quench his evil desires.

Salviano—All have not the gift of continency. "I would that all men were even as myself," says St. Paul, "but every man hath his proper gift of God, one after this manner, and another after that."—1 Cor. vii. 7. The Apostle does not command that he who has not the gift of continency should ask it of God, or procure it to himself by fastings or by penances; it does not even come into his mind to give to the incontinent the counsels given by the Roman councillors or lawgivers; on the contrary, he says—"If they cannot contain, let them marry, for it is better to marry than to burn." Our heavenly Father does give us whatsoever we ask him in the name of his blessed Son; but this must be understood of the things necessary to salvation. Now, if it is necessary to salvation not to marry, it follows that all married people are to be damned. We deceive ourselves if we presume to obtain by discipline that which St. Jerome did not obtain; we may read, however, how he grieves about this in an epistle to Eusochius. He therefore who, macerating himself with discipline, still feels the lust of the flesh, is called to the holy state of matrimony; and if he does not obey this call, he rebels against God and against nature. Continency is rare. Read what Gregory the Great says of it—"De Cura Pastorium," third part, 30th chapter. In short, no one can bind himself by vow to a thing which is in the power of another. He who makes a vow to be always continent, with chastity of body and mind, resembles one who should make a vow always to be in his right senses.

Eustachio—I wish to know from you if the Apostles had wives.

Salviano—Certainly, some of them had, and they had them when they were called to the apostleship, and even while they were exercising the apostolic functions. St. Peter had a mother-in-law, and consequently a wife—Matt. viii. 14. St. Ambrose says that all the apostles, except St. John, were married, and, according to St. Clement of Alexandria, St Peter had children. Philip the Evangelist had four daughters that prophesied. It is said that St. Luke lived eighty-four years in the married state; and St. Peter, according to your legend, had a daughter called Petronilla. Were the apostles then in the flesh? were they also displeasing to God?

Eustachio—Some apostles, it is true, had wives when they were called to the apostleship; but then they left their houses, and possessions, and wives to follow Christ. This is a truth which you cannot deny, whilst it is so evident in the Scriptures. James and John left their father to follow Jesus when he called them. "We," said St. Peter, "have forsaken all and followed thee."—Mat. xix. 27. It is true that he had a daughter,

Petronilla; but that happened before he was called to the apostleship.

Salviano—Oh, how you deceive yourself, my friend; you think that the apostles left their wives for ever! If we are to believe the fabulous accounts, either tacitly or expressly approved by your Church, the person married at the marriage of Cana was St. John the Evangelist. Do you think that this man having seen the miracle that Jesus wrought under those circumstances, left his wife entirely, and for ever, to follow the Redeemer? Did Jesus Christ come to separate on earth those whom his Father had joined together in heaven? Did he come to upset the ordinances of God and of nature, to break the closest of all unions, to induce the husband to violate his matrimonial pledge? Oh, no. On the contrary, the divine Redeemer, by his most holy doctrine, abrogated the ancient law, or, rather, the corrupt custom of the Jews, declaring to their face that it was not lawful for them to put away their wives except for adultery. Now, according to your opinion, the practice of Jesus differed from his theory, if he obliged his disciples to forsake their wives; but if he had done so, what would not his inveterate enemies, whow ere the close observers of all his doings, have said of him who denies that, when necessity demands it, we ought to give up everything, even life itself? Justice demands that we should leave the earth for him who, for our sakes, came down from heaven. Parents, wives, possessions are to be forsaken when they stand in the way of our salvation—when these transitory things may prove an obstacle to the pursuit of eternal things; but you consider those to be angels on earth who, having left their wives without necessity, devote themselves to the monastic life. I say, without necessity, because a believer may be saved without being a monk. You say that a young girl gains much merit who, having forsaken her parents, takes refuge in a nunnery. The monastic life is a human invention, nor can you deny it. The Church of Jesus Christ did without these things for more than three centuries, nor is there a trace of such a kind of life to be found in the Holy Scriptures. Marriage, however, is a Divine ordinance. God will not have man to put asunder those whom he hath joined together. God and nature dictate that children should take care of their parents when they are old; nevertheless, in your opinion, they may break the laws of God and nature, to follow the inventions of men. The husband may forsake his wife, or the daughter her mother, to lead a monastic life. The poor, afflicted mother may crave assistance from her daughter; she may show her white hair, her withered and trembling hands, the bosom on which she was nursed, and, in spite of all that, her daughter may behave like one that is blind and deaf, and betake herself to a cloister. Now, don't you see that the very thought of this, in every heart that is under the fear of God, excites horror, and that it is repugnant to nature, and contrary to His law? Ah, undeceive yourself! The daughter may—nay, she ought, to forsake her mother, if she should ask her to do what is ungodly, if she should command her to do things contrary to the commands of God. Yes, then, but only then, is the daughter obliged to leave her mother, and to refuse her obedience. True it is, and all agree about it, that if the mother disobeys God, the daughter ought not to obey her will. But if, on the other hand, the mother permits her daughter to serve Christ in her own house; if she brings her up virtuously; if she exhorts her to the fear of God; if she guides her to salvation, then the mother is as Christian as the abbess, and her house is far more holy than the nunnery. Oh, how many young persons, who are lost in these places, would be saved in their own houses. And although daughters may be saved in the house of a virtuous and pious mother, without going into a cloister, nevertheless, according to your fine rules, they do better to become nuns, in spite of their mothers. Don't you perceive that you transgress the holy law of God by your traditions? You warmly maintain that Peter's daughter, Petronilla, was born before he was called to the apostleship. Pray, how do you know this? Petronilla is a name derived from Peter; and everyone knows that the Apostle received this name at the very time when he was chosen to the apostleship; therefore, he had this daughter after he became an Apostle; and as he received the name of Peter, so he called his daughter Petronilla. In fact, it is not true that the Apostles forsook their wives entirely, and this is clear in St. Paul—"Have not we power," saith he, "to lead about a sister, a wife, as well as other apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord and Cephas?'

Eustachio—You must not suppose that these women were the wives of the Apostles; quite the contrary: they were rich women, who accompanied the Apostles in their journeys, and supplied all their wants.

Salviano—And who can have persuaded you that the holy Apostles, having forsaken their lawful wives, led about with them other women? That would not only have been an inconvenience to them, but a scandal; and the Jews, as well as the Gentiles, would surely have viewed it in a very bad light. Besides which, the Apostles would have little business with such company, in the long journeys that they were obliged to make. Pray, do not deceive yourself. These women could not have been rich, since St. Paul said that he did not bring a woman with him, that he might not burden the Corinthians. Give yourself the trouble to read the entire chapter, and you will be persuaded of this. What burden could it have been to the Corinthians, if Paul had brought with him a rich lady? It would have been beneficial to them rather than hurtful, if this woman had provided the Apostle with all that he required. You are in error, and your error arises from the transposition of the words. In the Greek text, it is not a woman, a sister, but a sister, a woman (or wife), from which we may see plainly, that the word sister points out the sex of the person, and her religious communion. The word woman would then be superfluous, if it did not denote something further. And what can it denote, if not the bond of marriage? The Apostle, by saying sister, speaks of one who was a woman and a Christian; and by using the word woman, he means one who was united in marriage to one of the Apostles. Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and Pope Leo IX. are of this opinion; we may add that which Ecchius relates about St. Peter—"This great hero, seeing his wife led to martyrdom, was much rejoiced, and, calling her by name, said, 'Oh, remember the Lord!'"

(To be continued.)

The foregoing dialogue was sent anonimously, from Italy, to the editor of *L'Echo di Savonarola*, a periodical published in London, in the Italian language. It is now translated and published, in English, with his permission.

THE MORTMAIN QUESTION.

We mentioned in our last number our intention of calling the attention of our readers to the extraordinary influence which many of the Romish doctrines exercise in pouring wealth into the coffers of the Roman Catholic church, and the unscrupulous use which is made of that influence by her clergy. We shall select for our first instance the well-known case of *Metaris* v. *Wiseman*, as one powerfully illustrating, not merely the opportunities which the Romish system opens for undue influence, but as also exhibiting, in a remarkable point of view, the extent to which zeal in the promotion of their objects blinds the eyes of her votaries to the plainest principles of professional honour, and to the most obvious dictates of honesty. The facts of that case, as elicited by the Mortmain Committee of the House of Commons, and published by the order of that House, were as follows.—

"Matharin Carrè, a French teacher, had by his profession, and the exercise of all those penurious arts by which avarice accumulates wealth, put together money to the amount of £10,000. This wealth was vested in the public funds, in two specific sums of £7,000 and £3,000. At the close of February, 1847, this old miser, supposed to be about 77 years of age, was taken suddenly ill. A French Roman Catholic doctor, of the name of Gasquet, was sent for; and finding him very ill, told him it was impossible for him to live, and that he had better send for a priest. The old man answered, "Very well," but took no more notice of it. No priest was sent for by him. A few days afterwards (it would appear on Sunday, the 28th February) Gasquet again saw him, and observed—"He ought to have port wine and arrowroot; but, poor man, it is impossible he can have them." The landlord, in whose house Carrè dwelt, hearing this, said immediately that Carrè was very rich, and was able to have anything he liked. On the same day, after morning mass, Gasquet goes to Mr. Holdstock, the priest in direction of the schools of St. Aloysius, at Somerstown, and tells him that there was a man of large fortune dying in a garret, in a neighbouring street, that he would not recover, and that he had better go and see him. Mr. Holdstock lost no time; went to see him the afternoon of that same day, Sunday, and on that occasion took instructions for his will from this old man, whom he had never seen before, and who had not even sent for him. The paper on which those instructions were taken was *lost or mislaid;* but their alleged purport was in conformity with the will subsequently prepared. That same evening Mr. Holdstock sent for Mr. John Athanasius Cooke, a member of the Chancery bar in England. Mr. Cooke had been a convert, and at the time was an attendant at Mr. Holdstock's chapel; and though he had never seen Carrè, nor had ever received instructions from him, he at once took upon himself to prepare a will, by which the sum of £7,000 was bequeathed to the Somerstown schools, and the sum of £3,000 was distributed among Carrè's relations in France, in the very same proportions in which the statute of distributions would have given it to them, without the intervention of a will at all. And of that will Dr. Griffiths, the Roman Catholic bishop of London district, and Mr. J. A. Cooke, were appointed trustees, and Mr. J. A. Cooke executor.

With this will in his pocket, and accompanied by Mr. Holdstock, Mr. Cooke went to old Carrè on the following day (Monday); and during their visit a call at Carrè's lodgings was made by two women—one of them Mr. Holdstock's housekeeper, the other a neighbouring schoolmistress. These women (evidently intended to act as witnesses, though entirely unacquainted with Carrè) were however, dismissed on this occasion, as Carrè refused to sign the will. It then occurred to Mr. Cooke as the will was not proceeded with, that there might be an improvement in the management of the matter; and accordingly he suggested the execution of a deed, with a power of attorney, to transfer the £7,000 into the names of Carrè, Mr. Cooke, and Dr. Griffiths, the Roman Catholic bishop, and at the same time a will to be made, disposing of the remaining £3,000 amongst the next of kin.

The manifest object of this scheme was not merely to save legacy duty, but to conceal from the relatives altogether the amount of the property, and lead them to suppose that the will was conversant will all that he possessed.

These documents were also prepared by Mr. Cooke; and on the Thursday following Mr. Cooke, accompanied, as before, by Mr. Holdstock, and attended by the schoolmistress and a Mr. Hay, a clerk in the banking-house of the Messrs. Wright, the Roman Catholic bankers, proceeded to old Carrè's lodgings. The description of what passed there is certainly striking. On arriving they were told that Mr. Carrè was too ill to see them—"Very ill, and did not wish to see them." The priest said he was not to be treated in that manner, and rushed up to the bed-room of the dying man, and shortly afterwards called up the rest. All the witnesses agree in stating that the only words used by Carrè were, "You may leave these papers." Mr. Cooke, on hearing this, took his hat, and was about to leave the room. Not so the priest, who desired him to sit still; and then, approaching the old man, spoke something to him in French. Whatever he said, the result was, that the priest, leaning over the "flap of a box" (in which the old miser had for years slept), held him up by the back, put a pen into his hand, and the documents were then executed: by the one conveying away £7,000 of his property to men he had never seen or known before, and by the other making two men, neither of whom he knew, the distributors of the remaining £3,000, among his next of kin. Nor was this all: the deed reserved to old Carrè the usual power of appointment over the fund, by deed, in a certain manner; and of course, under such circumstances, the custody of the deed ought to have remained with the party having such power, for otherwise the exercise of the power would, to a great extent, if not entirely, be at the discretion of the person in whose custody the deed was, and this seems to have been the idea of Carrè; for having signed the documents, he said to Cooke—"Now you may leave them." Not so, thought Mr. Cooke, and he insisted that the possession of the deed should remain with himself. The reasons and excuses assigned by Mr. Cooke for thus proceeding are certainly most contradictory; and though too long for insertion, we venture to say that the perusal of his evidence on this subject affords one of the most striking instances that has ever come before the public of the extent to which zeal in the service of the Church can pervert the human intellect, and blind its votary to the plainest principle of professional honour and integrity.

The possession of the deed thus secured, the next step to be taken was to effect an immediate transfer into the names of the trustees appointed by the deed. The execution of the deed and will was on Thursday; and on the following morning, Friday, the power of attorney was lodged at the bank. On Saturday, although, as Mr. Cooke says, he "did not know Carrè was worse," still, having been at early mass on that morning, "he had a strong feeling on his mind that he ought to transfer the stock that day." Accordingly, he is at the broker's office before the office is open; he pays "an expedition fee" at the bank. The transfer is completed certainly before half-past one o'clock. Returning home in a cab, he calls at poor Carrè's house; the landlord runs down stairs, and says—"He is gone, *sir*." "Gone—do you mean dead?" returns Cooke. "Yes." He then anxiously ascertains that he had died at ten minutes past four. Had his death been sooner, or the transfer been later, the arrangements would have been all defeated. Now, however, Mr. Cooke thought all was right. His duty to the Church was fully discharged, and accordingly he forthwith proceeds to lodge the deed with Dr. Griffiths, his co-trustee, and the Roman Catholic bishop of the London district, who receives it without surprise, and as if already acquainted with its contents.

Such are the leading facts of this extraordinary case, as detailed in the affidavits and examinations in the Court of Chancery, and subsequently given in evidence before the Committee of the House of Commons; and up to the point to which we have now brought our readers it might be said that this was nothing more than the ordinary case of undue influence exercised over a dying man by an officious priest and a meddling lawyer, and their individual misconduct would afford no legitimate ground of charge against clerical influence. We shall now state the subsequent history of this case, in order to enable our readers to judge whether our charge against the system is well founded. The whole of the above facts were indisputably established, both in the Chancery suit and before the Committee; and consequently brought prominently before the notice of Cardinal

Wiseman, and the other leading authorities of the Romish Church. And though neither he nor Dr. Griffiths had originally any concern in the concoction of the instruments, yet undoubtedly it was in their power, when made aware of the mode in which this affair had been conducted, to have renounced, on the part of the church to which they belonged, any benefit from a gift obtained in such a manner. And surely if parties, when made conversant of a fraud, consent to profit by it, they are morally responsible, and must be held to have sanctioned the conduct of those who have been active in its perpetration. The suit in Chancery instituted against Dr. Wiseman, after being opposed in every stage with all the vigour that the ability of able advocates could bring to bear on it, was finally terminated by a compromise, which, in effect, admitted the truth of the allegations, and which, though it left the Roman Catholic Church in possession of a portion of their prey, yet, by the compulsory restitution of the larger part, showed to the world their own conviction of the nature and character of the whole transaction. Nor was this willingness to bargain even for a portion of the money so tainted the only circumstance to connect the Roman Catholic clergy, as a body, with this transaction. It further appears that the plaintiff, Metairie, who had ventured to appeal to the courts of justice in such a case, was forced, in consequence of his doing so, to leave France altogether, and come and reside in England. In his evidence, he states—"That after the hearing of the suit, as all the inhabitants of my country were Roman Catholics, I was ill looked upon, and I found I should have no work. I was so badly treated in my country (Bretagne) that two boys of mine, who were at school, were expelled; the priest spoke to the teacher, and the teacher sent them away. I wished to know why they were sent away? I asked the master; he began to cry, and said it was not in his power."

"Had you any other reason for leaving the country besides the circumstance of your children being obliged to leave the school?"

"I was afraid of the priests; the priests are so powerful in that country. They called me a bad man, and, as I went along the streets, the people pointed at me and my wife, and looked at me, and turned away from me."

"They treated you as a very bad man."

"Yes; not only the priests, but the nobility and rich persons of the country are all on the side of the priests."

With the foregoing facts before us, we confidently ask any impartial reader, have we or have we not a sufficient ground on which to rest our charge, that the Roman Catholic system has a tendency to sanction practices, the aim, end, and object of which are to increase the wealth of their various institutions, at the expense of the fair and legitimate claims of others, and to extract from the weakness or fears of dying sinners the property they themselves can no longer enjoy?

Has Mr. Holdstock, the concoctor of the transaction, by which the coffers of the Church were to be so largely augmented, ever received reproof from his spiritual superiors; or have they, when the facts were brought prominently before them, repudiated or disowned in any way his proceedings? And if so, have we not a right to assume that his conduct was sanctioned and approved by those whom we may with justice regard as the best exponents of Roman Catholic teaching and doctine?

TALK OF THE ROAD—NO. IX.

"Well, Pat, I thought long to see you, to get the news of Kilcommon; how is it at all?"

"Well, it's bad enough, Jem, and it's good enough, too."

"And how's that, Pat?" said Jem; "tell us all about it."

"Well, it's bad enough with Father John, stirring up all the blackguards; you never saw the like; any decent man would be ashamed of it; but Father John is ashamed of nothing. The readers was covered with mud, and half kilt with stones a dozen times; but some of the boys got put up for that, so matters is easier that way now, at least in the town; but if the readers go out into the country parts, there's enough to set on them as if they were mad dogs; but that is not the worst; it's the bad words of a deal of these people that makes me think worse of the teaching the people has been getting than anything. Oh, the shockinist words that you hear them crying out after the readers, and Mr. Owens, and the new clergyman that's come on the mission, through the streets. Now you would be ashamed to think that the worst of the bad women on the street could say such words; and all decent people, women and children, has to listen to them."

"And doesn't Father John stop that, anyway?" said Jem.

"Never a word he said against it yet," said Pat, "nor won't, I know. But I'm not come to the worst yet: it is the songs—oh! them songs—it would make a bad woman ashamed to hear some of them sung in the streets; and there isn't man, woman, or child in Kilcommon that doesn't know that it's Father John gets them songs out. And then to hear them songs about Mrs. Owens; it's the biggest shame that ever came upon Kilcommon; and when I met Mr. Owens the other day I was ashamed to look at him. 'And what's the matter with you to-day, Pat?' says he: and when he worked it out of me, I had to say, 'Deed, I'm ashamed to look at your reverence about Mrs. Owens,' says I. 'Oh, is that it?' says he. 'Well,' says he, 'don't mind about Mrs. Owens, says he, or me, says he; for it doesn't hurt us, says he; and we expected that, says he: because in every place where a clergyman goes to show the Douay Bible to Roman Catholics, says he, the priests always get the blackguards to insult his wife and daughters that way, says he; because they think we can't stand that, says he; but they're wrong, says he; for we know that there's a blessing to them that suffer shame for the name of Christ; and he will help us to bear that, and more, for the sake of souls. We know it's the priests' way of managing religious controversy, says he, and the only way they have any chance at, says he; and so we made up our minds to all that before we begun, says he; so don't mind about us. But it makes me ashamed for my country, says he, and it makes me blush for the name of Irishman, to think they can be taught to insult a modest woman with filthy songs.' So I thought when he had done, that it was better for him that bore it than for them that taught it."*

"Well, now tell us how it's good enough" said Jem.

"Well, I will," said Pat; "sure Mr. Owens and the missioner—that's the Rev. Mr. Burke that's come—has opened what they call a controversial class: it's a meeting where everybody may come and talk, and argue, and question as much as they like, and Mr. Owens and Mr. Burke to answer them all.

"Well, and does any Catholics go?" says Jem.

"A deal of them," says Pat.

"And how do they behave there?" said Jem.

"Oh, quite decent and proper," said Pat; "for no one goes there that Father John can stop; and though there's some that's mighty earnest for their own way, and thinks they can puzzle any clergyman at all, yet they're not under Father John's thumb, or they wouldn't be there; so they argue quite fair and clever; and Mr. Burke and Mr. Owens answers them so fair and so kind, that they're well pleased, even when they're beat; and it's the pleasantest and the hamperedest plan at all."

"And what do they talk about?" says Jem.

"Why, the last night," said Pat, "they were talking about mortal and venial sin. And first Mr. Owens says, says he, 'Is there anything in the Douay Bible, says he, to show that there is any such difference as mortal and venial in the nature of sinful actions?' 'Sure there is,' says Phil Dooley, who is a mighty good scholar, and has bought a Douay Bible to bring with him. 'And where is it?" says Mr. Owens. So Phil Dooley opened his Bible and read—'He that knoweth his brother to sin a sin which is not to death, let him ask, and life shall be given to him who sinneth not to death. There is a sin unto death.'—I John v. 16. So Phil looked quite satisfied, and was going to shut the book."

"Stop a minute," said Mr. Burke; "just read the note on that in the Douay Bible."

So Phil read—"It is hard to determine what St. John here calls a sin which is not to death, and a sin which is unto death. The difference CANNOT be the same as betwixt sins that are called venial and mortal."

"That will do," said Mr. Burke. "I thought the Church of Rome had the true interpretation of Scripture, but it seems they find it hard to interpret this; but they are agreed with us that this verse does not mean the difference between mortal and venial sin, and that is enough for what we are at to-night. But can any one show anything else about it in the Douay Bible?" says he.

And no one had anything to say.

"No wonder," said Mr. Owens, "for there is nothing in the Douay Bible about it; but can any one tell me how they learned anything about it, when it's not in the Bible?"

"Sure I learned it in the catechism," said Peter Foley.

"And what catechism did you learn?" said Mr. Owens.

"Plunket's Catechism," said Peter Foley.

"How many chief kinds are there of mortal sin?" said Mr. Owens.

"Seven, called capital sins," said Peter Foley.

"Which are the seven called capital sins?" said Mr. Owens.

"Pride, covetousness, lust, anger, gluttony, sloth," said Peter Foley.†

"Turn to Apocalypse, ch. xxi., last half of the 8th verse," said Mr. Owens.

So Foley read—"All liars, they shall have their portion in the pool burning with fire and brimstone."

"Is lying a mortal sin?" said Mr. Owens.

"Well, it must be," said Foley, "if liars will go to hell."

"Which of the seven mortal sins is it?" said Mr. Owens.

"Well, it's not among them in the catechism," said Foley.

"Is idolatry a mortal sin?" said Mr. Owens.

"Surely it is," said Foley.

"Which of the seven is it?" said Mr. Owens.

"Well, it's not among them either," said Foley.

"Well," said Mr. Owens, "it seems dangerous to trust in that catechism, for fear we might come under the judgment of God, for mortal sins that are not among the seven. Now," says Mr. Owens, "can you tell me, out of the catechism, what is venial sin?"

"A less offence to God, which does not deprive us of sanctifying grace nor deserve hell,"* said Foley.

"And can you tell me, out of the catechism, what sort of things are venial sins?" said Mr. Owens.

"No," says Foley, "that's not in it," says he.

"Well I think it might," said Mr. Owens, "if it's of such consequence to know the differ."

"I can tell it, your reverence, for it's in mine," said Peter Dooley.

"Oh, you learned Dr. Doyle's Catechism, or the Christian Doctrine," said Mr. Owens.

"I did, your reverence," says Peter, "and here it is—A venial sin, for example, *a vain word*, an officious, jesting lie; the theft of a pin or an apple."

"Does the Douay Bible tell us that vain words are venial sins?" says Mr. Owens.

"It does not, your reverence," says I, "for the Douay Bible tells us, in Matthew xii. 36, that Christ himself said—'I say unto you, that every idle word that man shall speak, they shall render an account for it in the day of judgment.'"

"Very good," says Mr. Owens. "Now take the next. Does the Douay Bible say that any lies are venial sins?"

"Well, we had that already," said Peter Dooley—"'ALL LIARS shall have their portion in the pool burning with fire and brimstone;' that, surely, is hell: so there is no use in saying that any liars are only guilty of venial sin."

"Now, take the third," says Mr. Owens. "Does the Douay Bible say that stealing apples is a venial sin?"

"Well," says Daly, the schoolmaster, "if it wasn't Eve taking an apple, or the likes, that brought sin and death into the world?"

"Quite right," says Mr. Owens, "and now," says he, "look to your catechisms, and look to your own souls, if you trust to catechisms, that tell you these three things are venial sins, that cannot break charity between God and man, when the Douay Bible tells you that these three things bring men under death, judgment, and hell."

And with that Mr. Burke says—"One word, boys, before we stop. What is sin?" Well, now, doesn't it seem a mighty easy question? and yet, no one had an answer! So Mr. Burke opened the Douay Bible, at 1 John, chap. iii., verse 4, and read—"Whosoever committeth sin committeth also iniquity; and *sin is iniquity*." "Now," says he, "can a man commit sin at all without committing iniquity?" So he put it all round to the boys, and all allowed that was plain, for "Whosoever committeth sin committeth also iniquity." "Well," says Mr. Burke, "if a man commits a venial sin, does he commit sin or not? So all the boys allowed that he does. "And does he commit iniquity?" says Mr. Burke. So they allowed that, too. "And will any man tell me that iniquity does not break charity between God and man?" says Mr. Burke. So some one answered him that, for Habaccuc the prophet says to God—"Thy eyes are too pure to behold evil, and thou canst not look on iniquity."—Chap. i. 13. "So," says Mr. Burke, "if venial sin is not iniquity, it is not sin at all; and if it is sin, it is iniquity, and God is too pure to look on it, and it puts us out of the favour of God; and so your catechism is wrong. All sin is iniquity, and is hateful to God, and there is no remedy for any sin but the one: 'The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin.'"

"So the boys went away for that night," said Pat.

"And it's I that will be there some night, I hope," says Jem.

So if we hear of Pat and Jem being there again, we will tell all we hear.

* We know the names of the parties, and the facts; and we, too, blush to say, that every fact that Pat here states about this system of insult to females is strictly true, and has actually happened.—ED. C. L.

† Plunket's Catechism, pp. 22 and 23.

BAPTISM OF A BELL.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH.

THE following account of the baptism of a bell appeared, in the course of last summer, in a number of the *Chretien Belge*, and I take the liberty of sending the enclosed translation for insertion in the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, as I think it is a subject which has been seldom noticed:—

"3rd July, 1852.

"DEAR BROTHER—A few days ago our whole parish was in a state of excitement. We had just heard that a new bell, of which we had long felt the need, had arrived in our village, and that on the next day it was to be baptized; and as few of the people had ever seen a ceremony of the kind, every one seemed resolved to attend; and as I wished to judge by personal observation of the true character of such a proceeding, I determed also to

* Plunket's Catechism, p. 23.

be present; so when I saw the four priests arriving I followed with the crowd.

"The bell was suspended at about the height of a man from the ground, and was modestly robed in white muslin, ornamented with bows of ribbon; it was immediately surrounded by the four officiating priests, and behind these the spectators ranged themselves.

"The dean began at once to chaunt, in a nasal and lazy tone of voice, the 51st psalm—'Miserere me,' the other priests responding to him; they appeared to perambulate the bell, and prayed the 'Lord to have mercy on it'—that he would 'wash it thoroughly from its iniquity'—that he would pardon it 'though shapen in iniquity'—that he would 'create in it a clean heart'—that he would 'restore to it the joy of his salvation.' Such are the expressions of the psalm. Happily none of the persons present (myself excepted) understood one word of all this—(such at least was the conclusion forced upon me by the listless expression of their countenances); and now I seemed in some degree to understand why Rome insists upon speaking Latin to the faithful. She thus induces them to accept, as acts of piety, things which, if spoken in good plain French, would appear no better than words of profane folly.

"As soon as the recitation of the Miserere was over a priest washed the bell, and wiped it very carefully both within and without, whilst the other priests continued to chaunt in Latin, in the same monotonous manner. Then the dean made the sign of the cross, in several places, all round the bell, and pronounced a Latin formula, of which this is a translation—'Be thou consecrated in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and to the honour of the Blessed Mary, always a virgin." After this came the confirmation; and here a little incident occurred which amused the audience. The bit of cotton wool required to wipe up the sacred oil being wanting, one of the spectators hastily took off his hat and tore off as much of the beaver as was required for the completion of the ceremony. The blessed bell had still to inhale the perfume of the incense, which a child, belonging to the choir, waived up and down before it. It must also resound to the nine strokes given to it, at three separate intervals, by its godfather and godmother! and then, finally, it must listen to the litanies of the Virgin, after which the dean declared the ceremony was completed, and pronounced, with an air of satisfaction, and in the vulgar tongue, these words—'May you all hear this bell for many years."

"The spectators, who had scarcely succeeded in remaining serious, whilst the service was going on, now gave full way to their mirth, and retired laughing and ridiculing the whole affair! And this is what Rome calls a religious ceremony.

"For myself, I left the place full of indignation. The priest of our parish is a young man, and but lately entered on his sacerdotal office; and I had observed, that during the service his features expressed deep seriousness and some degree of emotion, whilst the countenances of the others remained unmoved and listless. After having reflected upon this, I decided upon making an appeal to his conscience, and with this view I addressed to him the following letter:—

"'Monsieur Le Cure—Curiosity induced me to be present, the other day, at the baptism of the new bell for this Parish; it was the first time I had ever had an opportunity of witnessing such a ceremony, and I wished to judge, by personal observation, how far it agreed with what I had read on the subject; and now I feel as it were my duty to tell you how much I was shocked at what I then saw and heard. My common sense and my conscience were alike outraged at such a profanation of sacred things. To baptize a piece of metal—what folly! To apply to a bell the magnificent words of the "Miserere"—to ask for it a "clean heart and right spirit"—what a detestable mockery!! Sir, I cannot imagine how a serious-minded man, such as I wish to consider you, could celebrate, without shame and remorse, such a mystery of iniquity. If you could have perceived the irreverent attitudes of your people during this solemn farce—if you could have marked, as I did, their ill-concealed laughter, heard their jocose remarks, you would no longer mistake the tendency of such deplorable ceremonies. It is thus that men are turned into profane mockers. How easily might the defenders of Paganism have retorted the sarcasms of Justin, of Tertullian, of Origen, and of others, if they could have pointed to the practice of such gross absurdities among the Christians. When the ceremony was over your brethren may have laughed at the miserable folly which they had just enacted. And I know enough of the Roman clergy to be aware how many of them view their mysteries in private; but you, sir, are still young, your conscience has not yet been seared by the prolonged practice of such Roman puerilities! I beseech you, therefore, to make use of the Gospel—test and judge of the tree by its fruit—and ask yourself, as in the presence of that God who shall be so soon our judge, whether a Church which commands observances so manifestly impious and absurd, can, in very deed, be the bride and faithful spouse of our Lord Jesus Christ? Do not shut your eyes, under the pretext that others must answer for you; for it is written—*Every man must bear his own burden.* If your Church should be deceiving herself, then you who belong to her, and uphold her errors—you, I say, shall perish with her.

"I beseech you, dear sir, to see nothing in this letter (perhaps severe), but the expression of the affectionate compassion which has dictated it. I feel called upon to warn you, before it be too late, of the danger you are incurring. May God grant that these few lines may find an entrance into your heart. I desire most sincerely that it may be so, but whatever may be the result,

"I am, yours faithfully,

"D. J., Minister of the Gospel."

"I am ignorant of what effect this warning may have produced; but I leave the result to him who has said—"Cast thy bread upon the waters, for thou shalt find it after many days.'—Eccles. xi. 1.

"A few words, and I have done. I remarked, that in consecrating this bell they had asked God to make it a means 'to excite the piety of the faithful;' to 'draw down blessings upon the fields;' to 'break the force of tempests, and to disperse the lightnings.' It is not very easy to imagine what may be the connection between the sound of a bell and the exercise of Christian piety, or the blessing of God upon the fields; but the petition, with regard to the thunder and lightning is in manifest contradiction to the physical laws which regulate this phenomenon.

"Every person of edutation knows that the vibration of a metallic substance would rather tend to hasten than to avert such an explosion—so much so, that in some places magistrates prohibit the ringing of church bells during the prevalence of storms. Unfortunately for the infallible Church, she composed this portion of her liturgy at a period when the universal ignorance of physical science may have accounted for thus consecrating a popular superstition; but now, as she will not acknowledge herself in error on *a single point*, she is compelled to shut her eyes to the light, and to persevere in asking from God, *in Latin!* things which she dare not express to her fellowmen in French!! A priest must occasionally feel sorely perplexed, when he finds himself constrained to offer up prayers which he knows contain a tissue of absurdities. I am somewhat curious to know how intelligent Romanists reconcile such facts with a belief in the infallibility of their Church. It is quite evident that the baptism of bells can have no rational significance in a Christian point of view. It is impossible to give it a place in a religion whose chief characteristic is, that it is "spirit and truth;" and it is equally difficult to assign it a place upon the score of common sense, as it is opposed to the true nature of things.

"Nevertheless, if the antiquity of an error render it acceptable, we may concede to this our own show of respect, and perhaps this is what the Church of Rome feels. In truth, the baptism of bells is more ancient than the Apostles, and may be traced up to their heathen cotemporaries; but as bells were unknown at that period, they made use of trumpets, which they consecrated and purified with the "Lustral water' (the holy water of the Pagans). The day of such a consecration was termed 'Tubilustrium,' as may be seen in the fifth book of Ovid Fastorum, 725. When the Church became lukewarm and worldly, she sought to make converts from among the heathen, by borrowing from them their idolatrous rites, and adapting them as much as possible to her own use. This was done at first in simplicity, and without suspecting how grievously it must undermine true piety.

"Among some others, equally absurd, the baptism of bells formed a place, and it will probably retain it as long as the Church of Rome endures; for she has adopted for her motto the famous saying of the Jesuit—'Let her be *as she is*, or let her *not be* at all!'

"But let us, my brethren, give our God 'no rest' until we have 'destroyed the covering cast over the people'—until he have bestowed upon us the power to bear a faithful testimony to this "corrupt and perverse generation,' so that 'perhaps we may have some.' I should be only too happy if these few remarks might contribute to such an end.

"Believe me to be, &c.,

"D. J., Minister."

THE RULE OF FAITH.

(Continued from Vol. I., p. 138.)

II. The second argument adduced by Roman Catholic divines in support of Tradition is this, that without it the canonicity and inspiration of the books of Scripture cannot be established; in other words the authority of the Church is necessary, in order to determine what is genuine Scripture (22). In order to render this proof as complete as possible, modern theologians of the Romish communion maintain further, that the books of the New Testament were not generally received as inspired by the Christian Church till the *fourth century* after Christ (23); and that the Roman Church then, by its plenary authority, determined which books were canonical Scripture and which were not. So that during the first three centuries immediately subsequent to the Apostolic age there was no distinct knowledge of what was Scripture and what was not; which, of course, could not have been permitted by God if the written Word were intended to be the sole and sufficient Rule of Christian Faith. The inconsistency of Protestants is also triumphantly held up to ridicule, who, whilst they profess to appeal solely to Scripture, are not able to tell what Scripture is without the aid of the very Tradition which they ostentatiously reject. Now, this famous argument, which is styled by Eckius (Enchirid, p. 7) "Achilles pro Catholicis," plausible as it may appear, admits an easy answer. The Church of England admits—nay, appeals to, the testimony, not indeed of the *Roman* Church, but of the Church *universal*, from the first age of Christianity to the present hour, as a proof of the canonicity and inspiration of the Scriptures. "In the name of the Holy Scriptures," she says in her Sixth Article, "we do understand those canonical books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was *never any doubt in the Church*" (24). We have an unbroken chain of incontrovertible evidence, ascending to the very age in which the New Testament Scriptures (with which we are now specially concerned) were penned, that the word contained in them was received by the Catholic Church, "not as the word of men, but (as it is indeed) the word of God" (25). The testimony of the *primitive* Church upon this point is as conclusive evidence of the Divine origin of Scripture as any human testimony can well be conceived to be. The case stands thus: We have a number of writings *professing to be inspired* (26). These writings contain accounts of miracles stated to have been wrought by their authors—that is, their authors are represented as performing the very acts by which Divine inspiration is *proved*—"God also bearing them witness by signs, and wonders, and divers miracles, and distributions of the Holy Ghost;"—Heb. ii. 4. These writings were *received as inspired*, and publicly read as such, by large congregations of persons living at *that very time*, and in *those very places*, in which those proofs of inspiration are affirmed to have been given by the authors (27). The reception and canonization of these writings by the whole or greater part of the Church (28), under such circumstances, is, therefore, justly regarded by the Church of England as one of the most irrefragable proofs of their inspiration. This *historical* testimony is, for the most part, similar to that by which we prove

(22) This is the form into which the argument is generally thrown by the more moderate divines of the Romish communion. The ultramontane writers, however take more decided ground and assert that the canon *of Scripture rests entirely on the authority of the Church of Rome.* "The Church (of Rome) can *give* canonical authority," says Pighius (Hier. lib. 3), "to books which have no such authority from themselves or their authors." Stapleton asserts the same, Rel. Contr. 5. qu 2. art. 4. And the Romish professor Peronne thus writes (Prel. Theol. ii. p. 1051-2, Ed. Paris)—"The Roman Church, being the mother and mistress of Churches, had power to constitute the true canon of Scripture." This notion originated as early as the eleventh century. One of the dictates of Pope Gregory VII. is, that "No book or chapter is to be regarded as canonical without the Pope's authority." See Baron Ann. Eccl ad A. D. 1076.

(23) See, *e. g.*, Milner, End of Controv., Letter xi. Newman, Development, p. 160, descends a century lower. "On what ground do we receive the canon as it comes to us but on the authority of the Church of the *fourth and fifth centuries.* The *Church* of *that era decided*—not merely bore testimony, but passed a judgment on former testimony—decided that certain books were of authority." Mr. Newman's *special* object in maintaining this doctrine is plain; for if the Scriptures were not acknowledged to be the genuine Word of God till the fourth century after Christ, it would be a remarkable instance of a new law of faith and practice emerging long after the Apostolic age. And we should be unable to assign any limit to the process of development, both dogmatical and practical, with so striking an example of it before us as the *divinization* of books more than three centuries after their composition.

(24) The importance of the testimony of the primitive Church, in establishing the genuineness and authenticity of the Books of Scripture, is also fully recognised by the ablest divines of the Church of England. It will be enough to name Hooker, Whitaker, Field, Laud, Chillingworth, Lardner, Paley, Marsh, &c.

(25) The reception of the New Testament Scriptures as the Word of God by the primitive Church is guaranteed by irrefragable proofs. We have not only a continued *succession of writers*, by whom various portions are quoted but we have *catalogues* of the entire, drawn up by individuals (who derived their knowledge from their forefathers), and confirmed by Councils. The constancy of martyrs—the fury of persecutors—the fraud of heretics—all tend to establish the fact, that these Scriptures were regarded as the genuine Word of God.

(26) 1 Cor. ii. 4 13; vii. 40; xiv. 36 37. 1 Th. i. 5; ii. 13. Gal. i. 11. 12 compared with 2 Tim. iii. 16. Eph. iii. 3. 1 Pet. i. 12; iv. 11. 2 Pet. iii. 2. Apoc. iii. 6.

(27) The Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke form no real exception to this, as the primitive Church generally believed the former to have been written under the direction of St. Peter, and the latter under that of St. Paul.

(28) Some books of the New Testament—the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistle of James, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude, and the Apocalypse—though *generally* received, were not *universally* recognised as canonical so late as the time of the historian Eusebius—*i.e.*, the beginning of the fourth century.—Euseb. E. H. iii. 3, 25. He calls them ἀντιλεγόμενα, or "spoken against," in contradistinction to the ὁμολογούμενα or "universally received." The fact of some few persons entertaining doubts respecting the genuineness of the books just mentioned is so far from weakening our belief in the canon, that it rather confirms it, because it proves what extreme caution was exercised in admitting writings into it

the genuineness of *every* ancient book, only far more complete and convincing. But whilst we do not hesitate to confess that we have received the Scriptures from God through the ministry of his one Catholic and Apostolic Church, and that she bears invaluable testimony to their authenticity, we are equally resolute in maintaining that the Scriptures are not the Word of the Church, but the Word of God, and that they owe their authority not to her, but to Him. We acknowledge her to be the "witness and keeper of Holy Writ," but we deny her to be its "judge." Again, however valuable the testimony of the Church may be, it is not the only evidence of the authenticity and genuineness of the New Testament Scriptures. We are not *entirely dependant*, as the Roman Catholic argument assumes, on the Church for our knowledge of what is Scripture. There is a wholly independent head of proof, which, the more it is examined, becomes more copious, complete, and convincing—we mean the *internal* evidence furnished by the writings themselves. The more we study and examine them, the more we are convinced—by the harmony of their parts with each other and with the old Testament, by the majestic simplicity of their composition, by the Divine purity and sublimity of their doctrines, by the loveliness and noble comprehensiveness of their morality, to which we may add the wonderful effects which they have produced on the condition of the world, and the series of providential interferences by which they have been preserved and diffused—that the Scriptures are not the words of man, but of God, and that they are the full and sufficient deposit of that Divine revelation to which the Church owes her existence, and on which she depends for her preservation. Led by the Church, in the first instance, to the Scriptures, we examine them for ourselves, and we say to her as the Samaritans said to the woman—"We now believe, not (no longer, οὐκέτι) for thy saying, for we ourselves have heard him, and know that this is, indeed, the Saviour of the world."—John iv. 42. We believe, in accordance with our Lord's words—"If any man will do the will of him, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God" (John vii. 17)—that to the humble and sober-minded individual Christian no proof of the Divine origin of the Scriptures will be more convincing than the inward testimony of the Holy Spirit whose word they are (29).

III. But it is maintained, in the *third* place, that, even though Scripture were allowed to contain all things necessary for salvation, yet, as it is difficult, obscure, and likely to be misunderstood (30), therefore (unless we are prepared to admit that God designed his Word to be an endless source of doubt and disputation) Tradition is requisite to *determine its meaning*; or, as it has been otherwise expressed, in order that the Scriptures should be a revelation to *us*, there is need of an authorized, visible, living, infallible interpreter and guide, scil. the Catholic Church (31). "Between Scripture and the individual reader of it there yawns," says an eminent Roman Catholic theologian (32), "an immense abyss." In proof of the difficulty and obscurity of Scripture we are reminded of the profoundly mysterious truths which it reveals, and of the numerous sources of error connected with the *mode* in which they are transmitted (33). The authority of Scripture itself is appealed to on the point—*e.g.*, the statement of St Peter respecting the Epistles of St. Paul (1 Peter iii. 16); the fact of our blessed Lord *opening the understanding* of the disciples, that *they might understand those Scriptures* relating to himself, which he had just appealed to (Luke xxiv. 44, 45); and such passages in the Old Testament as Ps. cxviii. (Eng. Ver. cxix.) 34. The Fathers also are cited in support of the same position (34). Thus, passages from Irenæus, Cyprian, and Augustine are brought forward, in which the origin and growth of heresies are ascribed to false interpretations of the Scriptures (35). And, lastly, we are pressed with an *argum. ad hominem*, derived from the admission of Protestants themselves, respecting the great difficulties of the written Word. Now, in reply to all this we answer *in general*, that we do not deny, but freely admit, that Holy Scripture contains many things both difficult and obscure, and that unless it be studied in a spirit of docility and prayerfulness, of sobriety and caution, it may lead, as it unfortunately has too often led, into dangerous and fatal errors. We admit that the exposure of Christians to these dangers, and the necessity for constant watchfulness, in order to escape them, is far from what we would naturally wish, and from what we would, *at first sight*, think probable in a revelation from God. But upon a little reflection we find that God has not, in the most essential matters connected with our *present* life and *temporal* well-being, seen fit to protect us from the risk of falling into dangerous and even fatal mistakes; but that, on the contrary, caution, prudence, and circumspection are, in general, absolutely necessary to ensure our worldly prosperity and comfort. It is not difficult, moreover, to see that the very same line of argument which would prove the necessity of an infallible expositor of all the difficulties of Scripture would equally prove that no such difficulties could exist at all; just as the assumed necessity of a universal and infallible remedy for all diseases would lead to the conclusion that no such thing as disease ought to exist. Nothing can be more hazardous than arguing from our own notions of what *ought* to be, to the necessity of the Most High acting in such or such a manner; because the direct tendency of such speculations is not only to make a man an infidel, as respects the peculiar doctrines of Christianity, but to lead him, if he consistently follows out his principles, to downright Atheism. Our general answer, then, to the presumed necessity of an infallible interpretation of Scripture—whether in the form of Divine unwritten Tradition, or of the inherent infallibility of the existing Catholic Church—is this, that even though the difficulties of Scripture were tenfold what they are, it would be in the highest degree presumptuous and hazardous for us to conclude, that the permission of such difficulties and apparent imperfections in revelation is inconsistent with God's character, or with his purposes in reference to mankind; and that He must, accordingly, have provided some remedy for them, some infallible tribunal by which all perplexing questions might be resolved.

But, in fact, when we examine more closely into the alleged difficulties and obscurities of Scripture, we find that they are of such a nature that they do not concern our *practice*, or the *duties* which we owe either to God or to each other. The side of Christianity which looks towards us, and with which alone we are properly concerned, is plain and easy of comprehension to every honest and humble inquirer after truth. Love to God, faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, as the one perfect and sufficient atonement for the sins of the world, and in the Eternal Spirit, as the sanctifier of all them that believe in Jesus; this, with purity of life, and love to our neighbour, stands inscribed so plainly on the page of Scripture that he who runs may read. The Church of England accordingly invites her children to a sober and humble study of the Scriptures, in order to find in them a full authority for all she teaches in her Catechism and other elementary guides to the knowledge of the truth. The writings of the Fathers, again, are replete with passages in which the plainness and simplicity of Holy Scripture (under this aspect) are declared. Thus Augustine says—"God hath made the Scriptures to stoop to the capacity of babes and sucklings." (36). Chrysostom says—"For what necessity is there of a discourse? All things are plain and simple in the holy Scriptures; all things necessary are evident" (37). And again—"The Apostles and Prophets have acted entirely differently [from the Philosophers]; for they, as the common teachers of the world, have made everything proceeding from them plain and evident to all, in order that each person, even by himself, may be able to learn what is said of it from the mere reading of it (38).

The acknowledged difficulties of Scripture, again, are of various kinds, for none of which, however, is the interposition of an infallible interpreter needed. There are, in the first place, difficulties connected with the triune nature of God; with the incarnation of the Redeemer; with the origin of evil, &c., considered as *speculative* truths. Difficulties of this kind transcend the power of our faculties even to comprehend, so that no interpreter of Scripture, however infallible, could possibly remove them. These, and such like, are "secret things, which belong unto the Lord our God" (Deut. xxix. 29), and, in respect to us, are "occasions of humility, arguments of forbearance and mutual toleration, and an endearment of reverence and adoration" (39). There are, in the second place, difficulties and obscurities in Scripture which only need for their removal a careful study of the Divine Oracles, and a comparison of Scripture with Scripture (40). Every difficulty removed in this way enlarges our conception of, and strengthens our faith in, the wisdom and perfection of the great scheme of providence and grace revealed in the Bible, and is, therefore, at once a delightful and most profitable occupation of the mind. But no infallible interpreter, other than Scripture itself, is here required. To this class of difficulties, likewise, numerous passages in the writings of the Fathers refer. Thus Clemens Alexandrinus, speaking of the true mode of ascertaining the sense of Scripture, says—"The truth is discovered also by confirming each of the points, which are demonstrated in accordance with the Scriptures, by similar Scriptures (41). And Augustine uses the following remarkable words—"Magnificently, therefore, and wholesomely, has the Holy Spirit so fashioned the sacred Scriptures, that by the more open passages provision is made for our hunger, and by the more obscure a feeling of satiety is prevented. For nothing almost is drawn forth from these more obscure places, which may not be found most plainly spoken elsewhere" (42). Exactly to the same effect writes Irenæus, c. Hær. lib. ii., c. 47; as also Basil, Ascet., Quæst. 267. There are, lastly, difficulties and obscurities which depend for their explanation upon various branches of human learning—such as skill in the original languages in which the Sacred Books are written, knowledge of the contemporary history, acquaintance with ecclesiastical archæology, and with the customs, modes of thought, &c., of those by whom the various parts of Scripture were written, and of those to whom they were addressed. All this requires not the interposition of an infallible judge, but the researches of properly qualified scholars. Every advance thus made in the sound criticism and interpretation of the Bible is an addition to our *theological knowledge*, and as such is calculated to exercise, through the teaching of the authorized ministers of the Church, a useful influence upon the general religious education of the community. Accordingly, the Church of England cultivates the use of all such aids for the explanation of Scripture. She takes pains to provide a learned clergy for the instruction of her poorer and more ignorant members. She does not encourage every uneducated person to search out for himself, unaided and unguided, a *system of theology*. In this department of biblical inquiry, the study of the ancient Fathers and Doctors of the Church is particularly valuable: since, living in times so much nearer to the Apostolic age, they had sources of information, upon many points connected with the sense of Scripture, open to them which have since disappeared in the lapse of centuries. It is to this kind of interpretation (Hermeneutical Tradition, as it has been termed), and not to any supposed Divine Tradition, supplemental to Scripture, and handed down in the Church, that such Patristic passages as the following relate:—"There are also many books written by our sainted masters, which, if any one will read over, he shall learn in a certain way the interpretation of the Scriptures, and obtain the knowledge of truth which he desires" (43). "Who that is mode-

(29) Some Protestants have been content to rest the authority of the Scriptures of the New Testament *solely* on the *internal* evidence, especially on the witness which the spirit bears with our own spirits that they are the Word of God. The framers of the *Belgic* and *Gallic* confessions were of this opinion. The Church of England, aware of the danger of making our own private persuasions the sole standard of inspired truth, and bearing in mind that there is scarcely any religion in the world which has not its own sacred books, which its votaries receive as inspired, has wisely insisted on the importance of the *external* evidence.

(30) Chemnitz (Exam. Conc. Trid., p. 13) says, that Eckius, Emser, and the first writers against the Reformation did not refuse to argue from Scripture; but Pighius, finding this detrimental to his cause, invented the mode of arguing from the insufficiency, obscurity, and ambiguity of Scripture for the absolute necessity of unwritten Tradition; in which he was followed by all the Roman theologians.

(31) See the remarks of the Archbishop of Dublin, in our 1st vol., p. 8, col. 1.

(32) Möhler Symbolik.

(33) For example, the *variations of texts and versions* are urged by Roman Catholic divines as an argument to prove the necessity of relying entirely on the existing Church for the meaning of Scripture. The full wing is the reply to these objections, as employed by *infidels*, given by the famous Bossuet—"Will any one say that it is not certain that from all these versions, and from all these texts, there will always result the same laws, the same miracles, the same prophecies, the same history, the *same body of doctrine*, and, in short, the same substance? What more do we want than this immovable basis of the sacred books, and what more could we demand from Divine Providence?—Bossuet, Hist. Univ., t. ii. p. 193. The same answer will serve against the same objections, when urged by Roman Catholics.

(34) See, Especially, Bellarmine, de Verb. Dei., lib. iii. c. 1. Bonfrere, Præloquia, cap. ix., sec. 2.

(35) Irenæus, Cont. Hæres. iii. 12. Cyprian, de Unit. Eccl., p 198., Ed Bened. August. Tract. xviii., in Johan.

(36) Inclinavit ergo Scripturas Deus usque ad infantum et lactentium capacitates.—Aug. Enarr. in Psal. viii. 8.

(37) Διὰ τί γὰρ ὁμιλίας χρεία; πάντα σαφῆ καὶ εὐθέα τὰ παρὰ ταῖς θείαις γραφαῖς· πάντα τὰ ἀναγκαῖα δῆλα'—Hom. iii. in 2 Thess. t. xi. p. 528. Ed. Ben. Peronne (Præl. Theol. ii. p. 1119) tells us that Chrysostom here uses "a certain amplification;" but this mode of getting rid of a troublesome passage is more expeditious than satisfactory.

(38) οἱ δὲ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ προφῆται τοὐναντίον ἅπαν ἐποίησαντο, σαφῆ γὰρ καὶ δῆλα τὰ παρ' ἑαυτων κατέστησαν ἅπασιν, ἅτε κοινοὶ τῆς οἰκουμένης ὄντες διδάσκαλοι, ἵνα ἕκαστος καὶ δι' ἑαυτοῦ μανθάνειν δύνηται ἐκ τῆς ἀναγνώσεως μόνης τὰ λεγόμενα. Hom. iii. de Lazar. t. i. p. 739.

(39) Jer. Taylor, *Dissuasive*. Part II. B. 1. § 3.

(40) The comparing spiritual things with spiritual was the rule of interpretation laid down by St. Paul (1 Cor. ii. 13). This he elsewhere terms the "analogy of faith" (ἀναλογία πίστεως)—Rom. xii. 6.

(41) ἡ ἀλήθεια δὲ εὑρίσκεται καν τῷ βεβαιοῦν ἕκαστον τῶν ἀποδεικνυμένων κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς ἐξ αὐτῶν πάλιν τῶν ὁμοίων γραφῶν.—Clem. Alex. Strom. Lib. vii.

(42) Magnifice igitur et salubriter Spiritus Sanctus ita Scripturas sanctas modificavit, ut locus apertioribus semi occurreret, obscurioribus autem fastidia detergeret. Nihil enim fere de illis eruitur quod non planissime dictum alibi reperiatur.—August. De Doctr. Christ. ii. c. 6. Bellarmine (de V.D. iii. 2) attempts to evade the force of this passage by the remark, that Augustine uses the word *fere*, "almost." But, admitting this qualification, Augustine elsewhere (Contr. Donat. Ep., vel de Unit. Eccles. § 47. t. ix. 371) says that such obscure, ambiguous, or figurative passages are those which any person may interpret according to his own sense (quæ quisque sicut voluerit interpretetur secundum sensum suum). How does this help Bellarmine's cause?

(43) εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν μακαρίων ἡμῶν διδασκάλων εἰς ταῦτα συνταχθέντες λόγοι· οἷς ἐὰν τις ἐντύχοι εἴσεται μὲν τῶς τὴν τῶν γραφῶν ἑρμηνείαν, ἡδέως δὲ ὀρέγεται γνώσεως τυχεῖν δυνήσεται.—Athanas. Cont. Gent. t. i. p. I. Ed. Bened.

rately sane does not easily understand that the exposition of the Scriptures is to be sought for from those who profess to be the teachers of them?"(44) So, in like manner, the ancient Fathers and Doctors are continually appealed to and cited in the writings of the standard divines of the Church of England, as well as in the Book of Homilies which she has authorised; not, indeed, as an authority co-ordinate with Holy Scripture, but as a help to determine the right interpretation thereof in passages which need illustration in any of the points of view above noticed (45).

It is not necessary to consider in detail the proofs alleged by Roman Catholics in reference to the difficulties and obscurities of Scripture. The general answer above given is quite sufficient to obviate any objection to the Protestant Rule of Faith derived from this source. We will, however, conclude this article with a remark on the passage of St. Peter, above referred to—2 Pet., iii., 16. If there was then, or if it were intended that there should subsequently be, an infallible authority, to which the faithful might appeal, in order to clear up those things "hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest to their own destruction," surely here was a most fitting place to mention it; especially as, according to the Roman Catholic theory, the successors of St. Peter himself (the writer of these words) were to be the chief, if not the sole, depositaries of this infallible authority. But the Apostle does not give the remotest hint of any such thing. The only safeguard from error which he points out is one which not only every man *may* obtain without the interposition of any human agency external to himself, but which excludes the very possibility of such interposition—"You, therefore, brethren, knowing these things before, *take heed* lest, being led aside by the error of the unwise, you fall from your own steadfastness. But *grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.*"—Verses 17, 18. The safeguard recommended by St. Peter is cautious vigilance, with growth in grace and in the knowledge of Christ; not an appeal to a visible, living, infallible interpreter. The consideration of the remaining arguments in favour of a double Rule of Faith we must reserve to a future occasion.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Mr. Power's letter, Mr. Collette's, Philalethes's, and several other valuable communications, are necessarily postponed till our next, for want of room.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st.

No anonymous letter can be attended to. Whatever is sent for insertion must be authenticated by the name and address of the writer, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee for his good faith.

We would request our valued correspondents, both Roman Catholics and Protestants, to limit the length of their communications, and not to discuss a variety of distinct topics in one letter.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, FEBRUARY, 1853.

CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

THERE is nothing more deservedly precious to mankind than liberty. We do not understand by *liberty*, as some do, the power of tyrannizing over others. We mean that well-regulated liberty which secures to every man the right of independent action, while respecting the rights of others; the right of every man *to think*, uncontrolled by others; the right of every man to have a free conscience towards God. This is our notion of "civil and religious liberty."

In proportion as this is valuable to men, they ought to stand on their guard against all who claim a right to deprive them of this liberty.

We do not consider it a question whether the Pope possesses power to deprive men of civil and religious liberty. We are sure that all our Roman Catholic readers hold, as we do ourselves, that the Pope has no such power. We think it false and unjust to say that Roman Catholics are slaves, or that they are ready to yield up their civil and religious liberty to the Pope. So far as they submit to the Pope, out of conviction, they are acting freely; and we have no right to suppose that they are ready to submit to him farther than conviction leads them.

But it is often made a question *whether the Pope claims* for himself a power of forcing the actions and the consciences of men, against their own convictions. If he do make such a claim, all who value civil and religious liberty should stand on their guard against it.

Whether the Pope do really make such a claim, is a question that should be calmly and candidly considered; and we propose dispassionately to review what is said on both sides.

One side points to the Bull in which Pope Pius V. excommunicated and deposed Queen Elizabeth of England. We have only room to quote one sentence—"We likewise declare the said Elizabeth deprived of the pretended right to the kingdom above mentioned, and of all dominion, dignity, and privileges whatsoever; and that all the nobility and subjects of the said realm, who have sworn to her in any manner whatsoever, are for ever absolved from any such oath, and from all obligation of fidelity and allegiance. . . . We likewise command all the nobility, subjects, and others above mentioned, that they do not presume to obey her orders, commands, or laws, for the future; and those who act otherwise are involved in the same sentence of excommunication."—Sanders de Schismate Anglicano, p 423. Now, whereas the Pope, in his Bull, claims to do this in virtue of the authority committed to to him by God, these persons consider this a clear claim on his part to overthrow men's civil rights and liberties.

These persons also appeal to the canon law (Decret. Greg. IX., book V., title VII., ch. 13), which gives the Pope power to compel all temporal princes to take an oath to exterminate heretics from their dominions. They appeal to Roman Catholic historians, that this was actually carried into effect by the extermination of a hundred thousand Albigenses and Waldenses in various countries; they appeal to the fact, that this law stands yet unrepealed, in the canon law of Rome, at this day; and they observe, which is certainly of great importance, that this is not only a part of their law, but it is actually a decree of a Pope (Innocent III.), and also a general council (Lateran IV.), acting together with the Pope: and since all Roman Catholics hold a decree of a Pope and a general council together to be infallible, they hold that this decree, being infallible, must also be unchangeable.

Now, these are weighty arguments; for all the facts stated here are certainly true. Yet, we ought candidly to consider what Roman Catholics say on the other side. And we believe their answer is generally this:—"That Roman Catholics, at the present day, do not admit or believe in any such power of the Pope; that if Pope Pius IX. should now attempt to treat Queen Victoria as Pius V. treated Queen Elizabeth, they would think themselves bound to disobey the Pope, and obey the Queen; and in like manner they say, if he should now order them to exterminate heretics, they should think themselves bound to disobey him. They say that their own conscience tells them that these things are wrong, and that they would not believe that such things are right, even on infallible authority.

Now, we are satisfied that this is generally true of Roman Catholics at the present day, though it was not so formerly; and we are quite sure that it is true of all our readers. We only ask those who say this to observe, that since Popes and general councils have claimed to possess spiritual authority from God to do these things, it is clear that their claim to spiritual authority is not to be admitted, unless it can stand the test of truth and reason. And, to be consistent, they should admit no such claim, unless it can stand this test. It is clear that Popes and general councils are not sufficient witnesses themselves for the extent of their own powers. Infallible as they may be, they may claim, and have claimed, powers that were never given to them—powers that it is blasphemous and wicked to claim, as being given to them by God.

But all this, while it is a very sufficient answer as to what Roman Catholics believe, is no answer as to *what the Pope claims*. So, then, Roman Catholics only say that the Pope does not, in fact, now claim any power of interfering with men's civil and religious liberty. We have never heard Roman Catholics offer any *proof* of this—they only *say* it; and, with all respect to them, we think it possible that they may be mistaken. If they could show us that any Pope has ever *disclaimed* the power which his predecessors *claimed and exercised*, this would be conclusive with us; but we do not know of any such disclaimer having been produced, though, certainly, it is called for, while the Pope's canon law stands as it does.

Now, we have met with a document lately which seems to us to settle the question. It is an "allocution" by the present Pope, given in Consistory, dated September 27, 1852, published in the *Tablet* newspaper of November 6. It relates to the affairs of the republic of New Grenada, on the isthmus which connects North and South America. The following extracts will show what kind of laws the Pope complains of. The Pope says that the Holy See had strongly remonstrated against a proposed law, "that emigrants to that country might have the public exercise of their worship, whatever it was; and, disapproving of the above decrees, has again and again insisted, that they should never be ratified." And a little further on he says—"Nor must we pass over in silence that, by the new constitution of that republic, enacted, in these recent times, among other things, the RIGHT ALSO OF FREE EDUCATION *is defended*, and liberty of all kinds is given unto all, *so that each person may even* PRINT AND PUBLISH HIS THOUGHTS, and all kinds of monstrous portents of opinion, AND PROFESS PRIVATELY AND PUBLICLY WHATEVER WORSHIP HE PLEASES." And on this the Pope observes, to the college of Cardinals whom he addressed—"You assuredly see, venerable brothers, how horrible and sacrilegious a war is proclaimed against the Catholic Church, by the rulers of the republic of New Grenada."

So, if the civil government of a country establishes by law the great bulwarks of civil and religious liberty, FREEDOM OF EDUCATION, LIBERTY OF THE PRESS, and the RIGHT OF WORSHIP according to each man's conscience, the Pope considers that "a sacrilegious war" against his authority!

And mark how he fights in such a war. Towards the end of the allocution he says—"We, raising, with Apostolic liberty, *our pastoral voice* in this your most illustrious assembly, do censure, condemn, and DECLARE UTTERLY NULL AND VOID *all* the aforesaid decrees, which have been there enacted by the civil power.

That is, when the civil power in a country passes laws that education and the press shall be free, and every man shall be left to worship God

(44) Quis, enim mediocriter sanus non facile intelliget Scripturarum expositionem iis petendam esse, qui earum doctores esse profitentur?—August. de Morib. Eccles. cap. I.

(45) In the Code of Canons passed by the English Convocation, in 1571, the following rule is prescribed to the clergy, in reference to their sermons, from which it appears how highly our Church estimates the value of Christian antiquity as an auxiliary in the interpretation of Scripture:—"But especially they [preachers] shall take heed that they deliver nothing from the pulpit, to be religiously held and believed by the people, but what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old or New Testament, and which the Catholic Fathers and ancient bishops have collected out of that very doctrine."—Cardwell, Synodal. I 126.

according to his own conscience, the Pope claims a right to repeal those laws by his own pastoral authority.

This is decisive as to what *pastoral* authority the Pope claims. If he do not try to exercise it in this country at present, it is not because he thinks it wrong for him to claim it, but only because it might not be prudent; but, through Dr. Cullen and the Synod of Thurles, he may prepare the way for it; for, of course, the Pope thinks that he ought to have the same "pastoral authority" in Ireland that he exercises in New Grenada.

We submit this to the consideration of Irish Roman Catholics, who are sincerely attached to civil and religious liberty. When the Synod of Thurles, and the Roman Catholic priests and bishops, claim to have to themselves the management of education, under the direction of the Pope, let Roman Catholics remember how the Pope undertakes to abolish, in New Grenada, the constitution of that country, and the law of that land, by which "the right of free education is defended."

THE TOUCHSTONE.

(Continued from page 9.)

OBJECTION 33.—Protestants deny that the pastors of the church have received from Christ the power of *remitting* or *retaining* sins, according to the state and disposition of the penitent.

Their Bible expressly affirms it (*John* xx. 21, 22, 23), where Christ tells his disciples—*As my Father hath sent me, even so I send you—Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained.* Hence their *Common Prayer Book* expressly acknowledges, in the *Form of Absolution*, prescribed in *the Order for the Visitation of the Sick*, that *our Lord Jesus Christ has left power to his church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in him.*

REPLY.—It is generally agreed among Christians, of all denominations, that Christ's ministers are authorised and bound to proclaim that (as is expressed in the Church of England Prayer-Book) "God pardoneth and absolveth all that truly repent, and unfeignedly believe his holy Gospel." And it is also universally admitted that pardon is *not* promised to the ungodly and impenitent, whatever they may profess with their lips. Now, to know with perfect certainty *which* class each particular person belongs to—the sincere or the insincere—is plainly impossible, except to one who should possess the power of reading men's hearts, so as to judge of their most secret thoughts. And this power does not seem to have been bestowed even on the Apostles. For they seem not to have been aware (see Acts viii.) that Simon the sorcerer was "in the bond of iniquity," till he had betrayed his own corruption of heart. And, certainly, Christian pastors of these days possess no such power of reading men's thoughts. They can only, therefore, declare with complete certainty the *general* promise of divine pardon to *all* the penitent. And when any minister pronounces absolution on any particular person, he must be understood to speak not *absolutely*, but *conditionally*—*i. e.*, on the *supposition* of the person's having in his heart that faith and penitence which he professes. To pardon the impenitent is what God has not promised to do, nor authorized any one to do.

All this relates, you will observe, to sins against God. As for any wrong done by one man to another, the person wronged has, of course, a right to forgive it absolutely. And Christians are exhorted to forgive injuries—meaning, of course, so far as regards the injuries done to *themselves*; for no one can have any right to pardon an offence done to another. So, also, a Church can pardon any offence done to that Church, as a society; and so may a State, or any other community, pardon a wrong done to that community. And when any act is done, which is both an offence against the church and also against an individual, and, moreover, a sin against God also, the individual has the power to forgive, as far as he individually is concerned; but he has no power to forgive the offence against the church unless the church authorises him to do so; and the church, again, has power to forgive the wrong done to the church; but sin against God, no man, and no body of men, can have any right to forgive, unless they can show that God has conferred on them that power along with what is *essential to the right exercise* of it—the gift of "discerning spirits," reading men's inward thoughts, and judging with certainty as to their sincerity.

OBJECTION 34.—Protestants deny that a special confession of sins is prescribed in Scripture, or was practised by the primitive Christians in the Apostles' time.

Their Bible confutes both these assertions; the former (*James* v. 16)—*Confess your faults one to another*—that is, to the priests, or *elders of the church*, of whom the Apostle was speaking in the foregoing verses. The latter (*Acts* xix. 18)—*Many that believed came and confessed, and showed their deeds.*

REPLY.—The passage here cited proves the very contrary of the conclusion it is brought to establish. For the very circumstance that the Apostle had just before been speaking of the Elders [the Christian Ministers] shows that he could *not* have been here alluding to a special confession of sins by *the people to the elders*; else he would have said—"confess your sins *to them*;" or "confess your sins *to those elders*;" instead of which he says—"confess your sins *one to another*," which would just as much imply confessing to a layman as to a minister.

So also that passage in the Acts not only says nothing of private confession to any priest, but plainly shows that no such thing was enjoined to Christians; else it would not have been said that "*many*" believers made such a confession, but that *all* of them necessarily did so.

The passage seems to indicate that *some* of the converts had, in their heathen life, committed grievous sins; and that these came forward, on becoming Christians, to proclaim openly, *before the whole congregation*, their repentance and abhorrence of such sins.

As for the Apostle James's exhortation, it is given in general terms, and is left to be applied by each man according to the best of his conscientious judgment. For neither Protestants nor Roman Catholics understand, by confessing sins "one to another," that every one is to make a special *confession of every one of his sins to everybody* he meets.

1. But most Protestants would admit that one who is conscious of having wronged his neighbour ought to *acknowledge* to him that he has done so, and ask his pardon.

2. That it will often be useful to *ask the advice* of a sensible and pious friend, as to the best mode of breaking through some sinful habit, or of repairing some injury we may have done, or the like. And

3. That it may sometimes be advisable to warn a child, or a friend, against some temptation he may be exposed to, by telling him of the sin into which it may have formerly led ourselves.

But as for "*special confession*" *to a priest*, as a duty *regularly* required of *every* Christian, Protestants plainly see that if any such thing had been known in the times of the Apostles, it would have been clearly and expressly laid down, and strongly insisted on in their writings; and in these there is not even the least hint of it to be found.

OBJECTION 35.—Protestants deny that the church has received a power from Christ to grant *indulgences* or *pardons*, for releasing of punishment due to sin.

Their Bible affirms it (*Matt.* xvi. 19)—*I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.* Hence St. *Paul* (2 *Cor.* ii. 10) granted an *indulgence* to the incestuous *Corinthian*, *forgiving* him, as he expresses it, *in the person of Christ.*

REPLY.—Sins against God can be forgiven, it is plain, by God alone. And his pardon of all true penitents who trust in Christ is proclaimed by all Protestant ministers. But they have not the power of so reading men's hearts as to know, with complete certainty, who *are* true penitents and sincere believers. Nor did even the Apostles possess this power; else they would have known the real character of Simon the sorcerer (see Acts viii.) before he betrayed his own wickedness.

But offences *against a Church*, that Church has (as we have said above) power to punish and to pardon. And, accordingly, every Protestant Church claims the right to exclude from the Lord's table, or to expel altogether from the community, those who scandalise the congregation by gross wickedness of life; and again, on their submitting and reforming their life, to re-admit them.

This you may see (among other places) in the Rubric prefixed to the communion service of the Church of England.*

* "So many as intend to be partakers of the Holy Communion shall signify their names to the Curate, at least some time the day before; and if any of them be an open and notorious evil doer, or have done any wrong to his neighbour by word or deed, so that the congregation be thereby offended, the curate having knowledge thereof, shall call and advertise him, that in any wise he presume not to come to the Lord's table, until he hath openly declared himself to have truly repented, and amended his former naughty life, that the congregation may thereby be satisfied, which before were offended; and that he hath recompensed the parties to whom he hath done wrong, or at least declare himself to be in full purpose so to do, as soon as he conveniently may.

"The same order shall the curate use with those betwixt whom he perceiveth malice and hatred to reign, not suffering them to be partakers of the Lord's table, until he know them to be reconciled. And if any of the parties so at variance be content to forgive, from the bottom of his heart, all that the other hath trespassed against him, and to make amends, for that he himself hath offended; and the other party will not be persuaded to a godly unity, but remain still in his forwardness and malice, the minister, in that case, ought to admit the penitent person to the Holy Communion, and not him that is obstinate. Provided that every minister so repelling any, as is specified in this or the next precedent paragraph of this Rubric, shall be obliged to give an account of the same to the ordinary within fourteen days after at the farthest. And the ordinary shall proceed against those offending according to the Canon.—*Book of Common Prayer.*"

But as for punishments or pardons *in the next world*, these must, of course, be left altogether in the hands of the ALL-WISE, who alone can read men's hearts. As for "binding" and "loosing," these were, and, indeed, still are, the words in common use among the Jews to denote the *establishing*, and the *annulling*, of any regulation or ordinance.

And, accordingly, the Church of England exercises the right of making, and of altering, from time to time, regulations for the conducting of divine worship, for the admitting of ministers, &c. But she does not presumptuously take upon her to set forth any *doctrines* not *contained* in Scripture (such as purgatory, or the invocation of departed saints, &c.), nor to introduce any *practices contrary* to Scripture, such as altering the original institution of the Lord's Supper, by administering the bread without the wine, &c.

OBJECTION 36.—Protestants reject *extreme unction*—that is, *the anointing of the sick*; and deny that there is any promise of grace in Scripture to those that receive it.

Their Bible, in plain and express terms, recommends this sacrament, with a promise of grace to such as receive it (*St. James* v., 14, 15)—*Is any sick among you, let him call for the elders of the church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and, if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him.*

REPLY.—Protestants, it is true, do not pretend to the gift of *miraculously healing the sick*, which is evidently what the Apostle is speaking of. No more do the Roman Catholic priests; for they administer their "extreme unction" without any hope of being able to "raise up" the sick man; and, indeed, only when they believe him to be past recovery.

But in the days of the Apostles there were many who had the gift of miraculously curing the sick; and among other sick persons thus cured there were, doubtless, some of those who had been afflicted with sickness as an extraordinary and special chastisement for certain sins.—See 1 Cor., v., 5, and xi., 3.

As for the so-called sacrament of unction, as practised in the Church of Rome, for the supposed benefit *of the dying*, there is no trace in Scripture of any such thing.*

OBJECTION 37.—Protestants deny that there is any grace given by the imposition, or *laying on* of the bishop's hands in *holy orders.*

Their Bible declares that there is, in the words of *St. Paul* to *Timothy* whom he had ordained (2 *Tim.* i. 6)—*Stir up the gift of God which is in thee, by the putting on of my hands.*

REPLY.—It is very strange that any writer should either be so ignorant himself, or should so calculate on the ignorance of his readers, as to put forth such a statement. Any Roman Catholic who may wish to know how much truth there is in it, has only to attend and witness the public ordination of ministers in any Protestant Church; or to read for himself the Ordination Service in the Prayer-book of the Church of England.

OBJECTION 38.—Protestants commonly teach that priests, and other religious persons that have vowed continency, may nevertheless marry, as *Luther* and the first reformers did; and that it is not *damnable* to them to break their *faith* given to God.

Their Bible tells them that to break such a vow, made to God, is sinful and damnable (*Deut.* xxiii., 21, 22, 23)—*When thou shalt vow a vow unto the Lord thy God, thou shalt not be slack to pay it; for the Lord thy God will surely require it of thee, and it would be sin in thee. But, if thou shalt forbear to vow, it shall be no sin in thee. That which is gone out of thy lips, thou shalt keep and perform.* And 1 *Tim.*, v., 11, 12, where *St. Paul*, speaking of widows that are for marrying, after having made such a vow, says they *have damnation, because they have cast off their first faith.*

REPLY.—Whatever may be thought of the lawfulness or propriety of vows under the Christian dispensation, yet, probably, all persons, of whatever persuasion, will admit that a vow, contract, or engagement, of whatever kind, is not binding on a person who has been tricked into it by false representations, as to the very matter relating to that engagement.

If, for instance, some one is induced to promise to vote, or to act in a certain way, by being assured that such is the desire of his father, or some one else whom he highly venerates; and if he afterwards discovers, and can prove, that this assurance is false, and that the reverse is the fact, most people would allow that such a promise is not binding.

So, also, if any one has been brought up in ignorance of what Scripture contains, and in a belief of what is contrary to Scripture, and has been thus seduced into making some rash vow, and afterwards finds that he has been imposed on, and that it will be more conducive to his leading a Christian life to depart from that engagement than to keep to it, in such a case he ought not to

* We beg to refer such of our readers as are desirous of knowing more upon this subject to the article on the novelty of the doctrine of Extreme Unction in our number for August, 1852.—CATHOLIC LAYMAN, 1st vol., p. 85.

be blamed for living such a kind of life as he may judge to be the most acceptable to God.

Suppose, for instance, a man had been brought up in the belief that celibacy is an eminent Christian virtue, and that he had never read Paul's warning against false teachers, "forbidding to marry;" and suppose he had been taught, either that the Apostle Peter was unmarried, or that he lived separate from his wife, and afterwards should have learned that he made her the companion of his travels, and that Paul claimed a right for himself and Barnabas to do the same, if they thought fit (1 Cor. ix. 5, 6); and that so far from prescribing celibacy to the clergy, Paul gives particular directions as to their wives: suppose any one had been deluded into taking a vow of celibacy by such false representations as the above, if, on having his eyes opened to the truth, he threw off that vow, the blame, whatever there might be in the whole transaction, would be entirely with those who had deceived him.

OBJECTION 39.—Protestants reprehend the Catholic Church for receiving none to Holy Orders but those that voluntarily embrace and promise a life of continency, that they may the more wholly devote themselves to the service of God, free from the distraction of a married life.

Their Bible, on the contrary, gives us to understand that this is highly commendable: because, *he that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please the Lord. But he that is married careth for the things that are of the world, how he may please his wife.*—1 *Cor.* vii. 32, 33.

REPLY.—Whatever the Apostle does mean in this passage, it is, at least, quite clear what he does *not* mean. He certainly did not mean to forbid the clergy to marry, or to recommend them to make a vow of celibacy: else he would grossly contradict himself. For when he is writing to Timothy, and giving him very particular directions as to his choice of ministers, he is so far from charging him to select single men, or even to give them a preference, that he gives express directions respecting their *wives and children*.—See 1 Tim. iii. 2, 4, 11.

Much must depend on the kind of woman chosen for a wife. If *every* married man were sure to be drawn off by his wife from "caring for the things of the Lord," this would be a reason, not why the clergy alone, but why *all* Christians should remain single; for the Apostle is not speaking, in the passage before us, of the clergy, but of men in general. And when writing to Timothy he evidently supposes that a clergyman's wife may be, and ought to be, such a one as to prove a help rather than a hindrance in his Christian duties.

Much must depend, also, on the circumstances in which a man is placed. If he has reason to expect very fierce persecutions (as may, perhaps, have been the case with the Corinthians St. Paul was writing to), a wife and children would be likely to add to his "trouble in the flesh," which the Apostle was desirous to "spare them."—See 1 Cor. vii., 28.

And, again, if any one is about to undertake the task—as Paul and Barnabas did—of travelling from place to place to preach the Gospel, with a prospect of being frequently imprisoned, beaten, and stoned (see Acts xiv. 19) he would be wise to remain, as they did, unmarried.

If, for these, or any other good reasons, any man—clergyman or layman—is convinced that he can serve God better in a single life, for him it is plainly *unnecessary* that he should be bound by any prohibition or vow. And he will have this great advantage, that every one will understand his remaining single to be his own constant choice, and that he is not bound by some vow hastily made, and which, *perhaps, he afterwards repents.* Now, no Roman Catholic clergyman can be safe from suspicions of this kind; because it is known that, willingly or unwillingly, he must remain single. It is well known how much scandal has thence arisen.

And Protestants hold that it is "tempting God" to "put a yoke on men's necks," which it is plain the Apostle Paul never contemplated.

(To be continued.)

Correspondence.

ON IMAGE WORSHIP AND MIRACLES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—As you have frequently professed, through the columns of your journal, the utmost willingness to correct any misstatements which you might advance, I need make no further apology for offering a few remarks on two of the most ridiculous and unfounded charges against the Roman Catholic religion, which form prominent topics for your discussion. If your object be to revile and sneer at the religion which I profess, it is an idle task to refute any slander you may think fit to promulgate: but if you wish to appeal to the understanding of sensible men on the principles of truth and reason, it seems to me most strange that any man, possessed with the smallest degree of either, should charge a large body of Christians, as enlightened and well educated as himself, with image worship, or any other species of idolatry, and who persists in the most sanctimonious manner in using arguments from Scripture, tradition, and reason, to dissuade them from practices which they as sanctimoniously disavow, repudiate, and abhor.

In a quotation of the November number of your journal of the conversation of the Tinnevelly gentleman, and in your letter, in the December journal, from a retired East Indian, you attempt to show a similarity between the Catholic respect for images and Brahmin worship. You will, probably, agree with me, that in the worship which the Greeks and Romans gave to the statues consecrated to their deities, they believed that the spirit of God dwelt in them, and that the Bramins have a similar belief. But what Roman Catholic was ever known to believe that any spirit dwelt within the Crucifixion, or the Image of the Blessed Virgin, or that these representations have any power beyond any other figures of wood or stone? So particular are we to prevent the most simple-minded from erring in this particular, that one of the first things which Roman Catholic children learn in their catechism is, that these pictures and images are not to be prayed to, as they have neither life nor sense. But, it may be asked, of what use are those images and pictures, and why keep them in our churches? I have an indistinct recollection of a sentiment addressed by Cicero to Cataline, which is apposite to this subject. He tells him that "he is surprised that whilst gazing on the pictures and statues of his ancestors within his house, he is not inspired with noble thoughts, in being reminded of their virtues." Surely, not less should the representation of our crucified Redeemer inspire us with love of him, and the memorials of our saints excite us to emulate their virtues. These representations preach in a language alike intelligible to all—the learned and unlearned, the simple and wise—they elevate the mind, and stimulate devotion. And how often to the expiring sinner, when the terror of death, and torture of disease, have bewildered his senses and overpowered his faculties, does the sight of the cross recall his recollection to the duties of religion, and bring his departing soul to resignation and trust in the crucified Redeemer? If your interpretation of the first clause of the commandment, "Thou shall not make unto thee any graven image, or likeness," is in itself idolatry, you have presented to us an array of deities outnumbering the Pagan mythology in your statues of the Wellingtons, Nelsons, Williams, Georges, and a host of deified other personages; but if it is not idolatry to bestow upon them this tribute of respect, or that the veneration which you display at the inauguration of their statues, or the obeisance which is made before the empty throne, or the national flag, is not image worship, then do I say, that to place in our churches the crucifixion, the image of the Blessed Virgin, the image of St. Francis Xavier, or of St. Vincent de Paul, is not idolatry, and that it is more rational, and more becoming to a Christian, to respect with this relative respect those who have served God than those who have served the world. Lest you might reject my explanation as not orthodox on Catholic doctrine, I shall quote for you the decision of the Council of Trent—"The images of Christ, of the Virgin Mother of God, and the other saints, are to be kept and retained, particularly in the churches, and due honour and veneration is to be paid to them. *Not that we believe there is any divinity or power in them*, or that anything is to be asked of them, or that trust is to be placed in them, as the heathens of old trusted in their idols.

The other matter is your extreme gullibility respecting miracles, strikingly illustrated by an anecdote from your East Indian correspondent, of his having seen at Tournay an image of the Blessed Virgin, of which the sextoness told him that it had been collecting the balls of the besiegers until it became black in the face. There is an old proverb that travellers hear and see strange things, and I have no doubt in the Griffin's having heard this strange story, and can fancy the laughter which this wag of a sextoness (who was probably a native of Kerry) has enjoyed at the amazement of "the poor ignorant haythen," to whom she related it, and for whose special edification she made it. There are, no doubt, many similar stories extant, some invented for joke, some for roguery, and some originating in the enthusiastic and overheated imagination of religious fanaticism; but these are not to be attributed to any religion or any section of mankind. We find instances of credulity and imposition in all ages, and in spiritual, as well as temporal matters; knaves praying upon fools; but as to the fact of miracles, you will admit, that the Lord has worked such wonders through the medium of his servants; and that whether we regard his mighty power in causing the waters of the Red Sea to arise at the command of Moses, and afterwards to burst with overwhelming force on the host of Pharaoh or making iron swim upon the stream at the well of Eliseus, nothing is mean or insignificant in Him. We have no reason to suppose that he has ceased in giving such proofs of His power or favour; or can we tell in what way, or by whose hands will miracles be wrought according to His will? Who hath known the mind of the Lord?" Whilst I utterly discard such absurd stories as the pretended miracles to which you refer, no matter how great the number of rogues or fools you name as a proof that they were believed in, yet am I willing to acknowledge the manifestation of God's power in all the ways he may think fit to display it; but I would require the proofs of miracles to be beyond all proofs that would satisfy me on natural occurrences; proofs that must remove every doubt as to the possibility of sense or reason being deceived, and that the miracle should be something worthy of Divine wisdom and beneficence.

On this subject of which I have written, I must conclude by admitting, that there are bad practices amongst ignorant and bad Catholics; and there are forged miracles amongst the wicked and the foolish. Such things were in the Church even in the time of the Apostles. But I do most firmly maintain that no such bad practices or forged miracles are countenanced by the Catholic Church, no more than they were countenanced by the Apostles.

SIDRACH.

We readily insert the letter of our correspondent. We could have wished, indeed, for his own sake, that he had abstained from the use of so many angry words; for we may safely appeal to the judgment of our readers, whether we have ever given insertion, since the commencement of our journal, to a single statement, the object of which was to "revile" or "slander" the faith of our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen. But, leaving this charge to refute itself, we must express our regret that our correspondent has overlooked a request which we have frequently made, that in the letters addressed to us, only one subject should be discussed at a time. We often find considerable difficulty in giving insertion to communications which run to an undue length; and the two subjects which "Sidrach" has introduced in his letter are obviously of too great importance to be disposed of in a few cursory remarks. Notwithstanding this difficulty, however, we venture to make one or two observations on the letter of our correspondent.

And, in the first place, "Sidrach" has altogether misrepresented the opinions of the Greeks and Romans on the subject of image worship. The enlightened portion of the heathen world by no means believed that the spirit of the God dwelt in the image. They used the image to recall the idea of the Deity more vividly to their minds; and it is very remarkable that the arguments by which they defended the practice of image worship against the early Fathers and apologists for Christianity are precisely those which Roman Catholic writers now use. For example, in the writings of the Platonic philosopher, Maximus Tyrius, we find the following passage* :—"As spoken language has no need of letters, which were devised as helps for human weakness, that by the aid of these signs the words might be recalled to the memory, thus the nature of the gods in no wise stands in need of statues or images; but poor, weak human nature, being separated from the divinity as far as earth is from heaven, has invented these signs, upon which it bestows the divine names and appellations. Those whose memory is so strong that by a vigorous exertion of mind they can reach up to heaven and approach the divinity, have, perhaps, no need of images. But such men are rare, and you may perchance nowhere meet, even in a crowd, with a person always mindful of the deity, and who can dispense with the aid of images." Is not this, in substance, the very argument made use of by our correspondent?

"Sidrach" quotes, in support of his own views, the decree of the Council of Trent, which disavows any belief of a "divinity or power residing in the image itself." Well, the ancient heathen philosophers would have said the very same thing. "A man must be an arrant fool," said Celsus,† "who believes that the stone or the wood, or the gold, is itself a god, or that it is anything else than a mere statue dedicated to the God." But whatever the Council of Trent may say, we beg leave to doubt whether Roman Catholics do not sometimes believe that a divinity or power resides in some statues more than others. If images and pictures are merely to be used as helps to the memory and imagination, according to our correspondent's theory, one image ought to do as well as another; and there would be no sense in a man's making a pilgrimage to offer up his prayers to the winking image of the Virgin Mary at Rimini, or to the image in the Casa Santa at Loretto, when he could find just as good, and, perhaps, as faithful an image nearer home. It is a notorious fact, however, that the contrary doctrine is inculcated in Italy on the very highest ecclesiastical authority; and we cannot see on what grounds these pilgrimages to favourite shrines can be defended, except on the supposition that the material image or picture possesses some special virtue, which is denied to other similar objects. We would be glad to learn "Sidrach's" explanation of this seeming inconsistency.

Even if it were true, however, that the benefits which Images could bestow, in quickening our zeal and devotion, were a thousandfold greater than our correspondent represents, we consider that the plain prohibition of Scripture against *any* use of images in religious worship ought to be a conclusive argument against their adoption. "Sidrach," indeed, attempts to prove that Protestants act inconsistently in interpreting the commandment—

* Maximi Tyrii Diss. p. 80, Lond. 1740.

† Orig. contra Cels p. 375. Cant. 1668.

"Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image"—strictly, while they violate it by erecting statues to eminent warriors and others; but this objection scarcely deserves a serious reply. The commandment must be taken as a whole; and the making of a graven image or likeness, which is forbidden in the first clause, is obviously limited by the words immediately following—namely, that it must not be done for the purposes of religious worship. Such is the view which the ancient Fathers uniformly take of the meaning of this commandment. In their arguments with the heathen philosophers they continually assert that the Almighty has condemned *all* use of images in religious worship as unlawful, whatever plausible reasons may be adduced in its support; and we cannot but lament the perversity which induces the Church of Rome, notwithstanding the plain declarations of both Scripture and primitive antiquity, to cling so pertinaciously to what we conceive to be a very dangerous error.

We have left ourselves space but for a word or two on the second subject in our correspondent's letter—namely, the miracles ascribed to Roman Catholic saints. "Sidrach" charges us with extreme gullibility, but we cannot see upon what grounds. Our East Indian correspondent stated two facts of which he was personally cognizant—namely, that there is a black image of the Virgin to be seen in a church at Tournay, and that the sextoness gave him a particular explanation of the origin of the phenomenon. We ask, what proof is this of gullibility? Our correspondent, we may confidently affirm, did not himself believe the story, nor did we. But "Sidrach," while declaiming loudly against knavery and credulity, does not explain why the priests of the Church of Rome allowed the black image to be erected in the Church of Tournay, unless they wished the people to believe the supposed miracle. The statue clearly could not have been placed there against their will; and unless they were illiterate, they could scarcely have imagined that the Virgin really had a black face. They either believed the miracle themselves, or they wished the people of Tournay to believe it; and in either case we fear that "Sidrach's" charges of knavery and credulity are but too truly applicable *somewhere*. We gladly concur with him in the very just remarks which he makes on the general character of miraculous interpositions, and the evidence by which they ought to be supported; but we shall hereafter, perhaps, take occasion to examine how far the principles which he so correctly lays down tend to establish or to refute some of the miracles which are sanctioned and acknowledged by the Church of Rome.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—In your January number, in the article on the "Touchstone," reply to objection 24, the following passage appears:—"And Roman Catholics themselves must maintain that the words of institution cannot be understood absolutely literally; since, if we understand these words in their most literal sense, we must believe that it is the *cup*, and not the wine in it, which is changed into blood." As you wish your correspondents to confine themselves to a single question in each letter, I shall in this confine myself to a few remarks upon the above passage, and shall not inquire into the truth or validity of the other arguments in the paper on the "Touchstone." It appears to me that, in your other reasons in reply to this objection, you can have but little confidence yourself, when you are compelled in aid of them to resort to such a reason as that contained in the passage I have quoted. In the first place, when you speak of Roman Catholics understanding "the words of institution" in a particular sense, you depart from the question in dispute. The question has no reference to "the words of institution," but to that part of those words which contains the assertion. Your proposition is that the assertion, "this is my blood" must be taken figuratively, because the word "this" relates to an antecedent which is used in a figurative sense. This is your argument put into plain language; and it is no less illogical than would be the general proposition that wherever the subject is a figurative expression, the predicate, or the thing predicated of it, cannot be taken in a literal, but must be taken in a figurative sense.

I will take, as an illustration, a passage from your Protestant version of the psalms:—"Mark the perfect man and behold the upright, for the end of that man is peace." The word "upright," in its primary and literal sense, signifies "straight;" but, like many other words, it has acquired a figurative sense when applied to other than sensible objects, which sense is as well known and as generally received as its primary sense, or perhaps more so. If you asked me whether I understood the words—"the end of that man is peace"—in a literal or a figurative sense, and I answered in a literal sense, you might or might not agree with me; but if I said, I can only understand them in a figurative sense, because if I took them in a literal sense I should also take the word "upright" in the same sense; and then it would follow that none but straight-backed men could hope for this promise of a peaceful end. If you did not laugh at my folly, you would, in your next number, assure your "respected correspondent" that he had been guilty of very bad logic. The word "cup," however, to express the liquor in the cup, is as well known in that sense as in its literal sense. When we say "the kettle boils," though we use a figurative expression, yet we use an expression as well understood as the expression "the water in the kettle boils;" and so, in the 22nd Psalm (Donay version), the words, "the chalice which inebriateth me," is as familiar in its meaning as if it had been said "the liquor in the chalice." Independent of this, there is nothing in the Gospel to show that the word "this," in the words of institution, relates to the cup at all; but, on the contrary, the context shows that the liquor, and not the cup, is spoken of and referred to. Thus, in St. Matt. xxvi. 27, it is said—"And taking the chalice, he gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, drink ye all *of this*." ἐξ ἁυτου, "out of this." Drink what? Plainly, what was in the cup. And then, v. 27, our Saviour continues—"For this is my blood of the New Testament," &c. What is this? Plainly, what he had spoken of immediately before; what was in the chalice, and what he calls in the next verse—"this fruit of the vine." So, in St. Mark xiv. 23, it is said—"And having taken the chalice, and given thanks, he gave it to them, and they all drank of it;" not of the cup taken literally, which would be nonsense; but of the wine (ἐξ ἁυτου, again), "from," or "out of it." Then follow the words—"And he said to them, This is my blood," &c. So far the word "this" may as well apply to one object as another; it does not, even grammatically, necessarily apply to the cup any more than its contents. There is, however, in Luke xxii. 20, the expression—"This is the chalice, the New Testament in my blood." Here the word "this" plainly relates to "chalice;" but unfortunately for your argument this chalice, taking it literally, is not asserted to be blood, but to be the testament in our Lord's blood. This is all that is to be found in the New Testament on this subject; and I, therefore, assert, that even in its literal sense, the cup or chalice is not asserted to be the blood. I also assert that the use of the name of a vessel to signify the thing contained in the vessel is so familiar in vulgar use, as to have, as it were, lost its figurative form in our minds, and that it cannot, therefore, be spoken of as a figurative expression, in the same manner as Protestants contend that the expression, "this is my blood," must be considered. And, lastly, I assert, that if the word "chalice" were ever so figurative, as here used, and if the word "this" ever so clearly applied to it, it would not follow that the rest of the sentence might not be read in its most literal sense; and that whether our Saviour spoke of the cup or the wine would be a matter of perfect indifference, so far as relates to the question, in what sense the assertion he makes of that object, be it the cup or be it the wine, is to be understood.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
CATHOLICUS.

Our "respected correspondent," if we may venture to call him so without being taunted with the civility, has quite mistaken our meaning, in supposing that while we urge our friends and opponents to limit their communications to one subject at a time, we desire that they should confine themselves to a small part of a subject, or a single argument on one side or the other of any subject; on the contrary, we cordially desire that those who differ with us should come forward freely and manfully, and grapple with our arguments, and the whole of our arguments, upon every subject we discuss in our pages, and show us where we are in error, if we be so. We shall not be at all slow at admitting no error, either in matter of opinion or argument, if clear reasons be given us that it is an error. In the present case, our correspondent, "Catholicus," has not attempted to grapple with the main and important subject in question, whether our Blessed Lord spoke in a literal or in a figurative sense, when he said—"Take, eat; this is my body," and "This is my blood of the New Testament;" but merely criticizes an isolated argument, that "if we are to understand these words in the *most* literal sense, we must believe that it is the *cup*, and not the wine in it, which is changed into blood." "Catholicus" is right in trying *this* by the rules of common sense; and ought, in order to be consistent, to be equally ready to try the meaning of the words—"Take, eat; this is my body," by the rule of common sense.

We may readily admit (what seems to be the whole drift of his argument) that whatever may be the exact form of words used, if we are quite sure what will be *understood* by them by the persons addressed, that it is enough; and that must be the *true* sense, unless the contrary is distinctly stated. When we say "the kettle boils," every one understands us to mean, "the water." When we say, pointing to a map—"This is England, and this is France," no one understands us to mean that England is literally a sheet of paper. And when Jesus, who had a few hours before called himself a shepherd, and a door, and a vine, took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to his disciples; and also took the cup, and gave it to them to drink; they certainly could not understand him to mean that he was holding his own body in his own hands, and asking them to drink out of the cup his own blood, which they knew was still in his living body *unshed* and not in the cup of wine. The *natural* sense of his words was the *figurative;* and if the Disciples were mistaken in so understanding him, of which there is no proof whatever, when and where is the mistake explained?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—A layman often runs the risk of bringing forward as a novelty some combination of facts and arguments that the theologian thinks too familiar to mention. If, however, the information be such as is but little known to the unlearned, then to give it an extended publicity may effect as much practical good as to discover it for the first time. I, therefore, venture to call your attention to a text incessantly paraded as a proof of most various doctrines, and to a commentary on it that is little known, at least among us laymen. I mean the verse, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."—Mat. xvi. 18.

The infallibility of the Church—meaning thereby its ecclesiastics—the infallibility of the Pope, and the necessity for adding the latter to the former, to produce an infallible resultant, are, by turns, proved by this isolated passage. It is quoted by the ignorant, who have no knowledge of Scripture but through such traditional quotations, and with more caution by the skilful controversialist. The Italian, who cannot see the Word of God, and learns his theology from the paintings, sculpture, and decorations of his temples, sees this verse written in gigantic letters of gold, some ten feet long, beneath the majestic dome of the fabric dedicated to the apostle whose successors it is supposed thus to exalt to superhuman power. In short, it meets one so often that it is natural to ask, not only what is its true meaning, but what is the interpretation given by the infallible interpreter, which all Roman Catholics are bound to accept as true. I do not profess to have discovered any such for the entire passage, though at some pains to do so; but I think there is one tolerably distinct upon the most important point—namely, What is the *foundation* on which the Church is built?

You, sir, may point out what has been said by the Fathers; my researches suffice to show that there is, at least, not that "unanimous consent" the Roman Catholic creed demands. The foundation is variously given—as St. Peter—as St. Peter with the Popes claiming as his successors—as our Lord himself—or as the confession of faith in Christ just made by St. Peter, and which called forth the expression. The second alone supplies Roman Catholics with any peculiar argument in their favour, and to the latter Protestants can offer no objection in point of doctrine, even if they do not quite agree in its correctness. Would it not be strange if this were the very interpretation that Roman Catholics are bound to adopt? I must believe it to be so, until some equally authoritative council shall rescind, or explain so as to annul, the following passage in the celebrated Council of Trent.* After noticing the propriety of opening their proceedings with a solemn confession of faith, it thus proceeds—"Wherefore it has thought good that the symbol of faith, which the Holy Roman Church makes use of, as being that principle wherein all who profess the faith of Christ must necessarily agree, and that firm and ONLY FOUNDATION *against which the gates of hell shall never prevail*,† be expressed in the very same words in which it is read in all the churches; which is as follows." Here is given the Creed, known as the Nicene, in the words given in the note,‡ and which every Protestant cordially believes, and will readily accept as the foundation of his faith and hopes, as well as of those believers, throughout all times and places, who form the Church to which he claims to belong. The language of the Council is distinct: the reference identifies its object. Those who assert the infallibility of the Council must yield to its decree. If they say I am mistaken in the meaning I put on it, let them point out how and why; I have as much right and capacity to explain its language as they, for in that they claim no infallible assistance. Who shall interpret the interpreters? But, in truth, there is no ambiguity; it is plainly stated, that the *only* foundation,

---

* Session III.

† "Matt. xvi." The original edition has no marginal references whatsoever to texts of Scripture; but those printed since, under ecclesiastical sanction, have, though it is hardly requisite that so familiar a verse should be thus formally identified.

‡ "I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, of all things, visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God; and born of the Father before all ages; God of God, light of light, very God of very God; begotten, not made, of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made; who for us men, and for our salvation, came down from the heavens, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man; crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate, he suffered and was buried; and he rose again on the third day, according to the Scriptures; and he ascended into heaven, sitteth at the right hand of the Father; and again will come with glory to judge the living and the dead; of whose kingdom there shall be no end; and in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father and Son; who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified; who spake by the prophets; and one Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church. I confess one baptism for the remission of sins; and I look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen."

alluded to in that verse, on which Christ's Church is built, is the profession of faith in Christ, unclogged by any sectarian tenets, and such as every Protestant accepts; and it is, at least, insinuated, that the Church there referred to embraces "ALL who profess the faith of Christ." If so, why do bishops and Popes allow, day after day, a use to be made of this text, to their own exaltation, which they should know, if they would refer to the original archives of their doctrine, is a direct contradiction of their Church's teaching?

FONTIUM PETITOR.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Having observed the kind manner in which you answer all communications like the following, I feel no hesitation in sending you this, hoping to find an answer in the columns of your CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

I remain, sir, your humble servant,

J. C.

Into what place did the soul of our Saviour descend immediately after death? David, speaking of Christ, says, "Thou wilt not leave my *soul* in *hell*;" and St. Peter, referring to this, says, "whom God hath raised up, having loosed the *sorrows* of *hell*, as it was impossible that he should be holden by it." The Creed and the 3rd Article of the Church of England also says, "He *descended* into *hell*." Is this understood as the hell of the damned? if so, where did the thief on the cross go, as Christ promised him he should be with *him* that day in paradise? If there is a third place called Hades, what souls are supposed to be there, or for what purpose? and if Christ went to a place where there were sorrows, what is the meaning of the words, "it is finished?"

A NOVICE.

We are happy to be able to answer our correspondent's question. He has been misled by the Douay translation, in the meaning of the passage which he quotes from St. Peter—"Whom God hath raised up, having loosed the sorrows of hell."—Acts ii. 24. The translation in the authorized version is the correct one—"having loosed the pains *of death*." The Greek is, λυσας τας ωδινας του θανατου. The words of the Psalm, quoted by St. Peter, in verses 27 and 31, are—εις ἁδου. No scholar will pretend to say that the word θανατου, in verse 24, and the word ἁδου in verses 27 and 31, should all be translated "hell," as in the Douay Bible. The Douay translation had some excuse, because they professed only to translate the Latin Bible, which has the word "infernus" in all these places; but it was the Greek, and not the Latin, that was written by the inspired Evangelist St. Luke. The note in the Douay Bible on verse 31 goes far to correct this mistake, for it thus explains—"having loosed the sorrows of hell"- viz., "having overcome the grievous pains of death, and all the power of hell." In former editions of the Douay Bible, the note on verse 27 stood thus—"As his soul suffered no pains in hell, so neither did his body take any corruption in the grave." Therefore it is clear that no question arises out of verse 24, or, as we believe, out of any other passage of Scripture, concerning Christ having gone "to a place where there were sorrows;" and there is no reason to doubt that the words "it is finished," did mean that the whole of what Christ had to *suffer* for the redemption of man was *finished* by his death on the cross.

In reference to the words which David spoke of Christ, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell," our correspondent asks—"*Into what place* did the soul of our Saviour descend immediately after death?" To this we answer, that the Greek word is "Hades;" and we learn from it no more than that word properly expresses. We must always keep in mind, in considering such questions, what St. Augustine observes—"The name of hell is variously put in Scripture, and is in many meanings, according as the sense of the things which are treated of doth require." The proper meaning of the Greek word is "the place which is *unseen*." The fathers often use it in this general sense for the world of spirits; that world which we cannot see. Thus Andreas Cæsariensis—"Death is the separation of the soul and body; but Hades is a place to us invisible or unseen and unknown, which receiveth our souls when they depart from hence."

We have not room for many more proofs, but there is one passage so appropriate that our correspondent may like to see it. St. Gregory Nyssen has recorded a conversation between him and Macrina, the sister of St. Basil, in which Gregory says—"Where is that name of Hades so much spoken of—which is so much treated of in our common conversation—so much in the writings both of the heathen and our own—into which all men think that the souls are translated from hence as into a certain receptacle? To which Macrina replies—"It appeareth that thou hast not given much heed to my speech, for when I spake of the translation of the soul from that which is seen, unto that which is invisible, I thought I had left nothing behind to be required of Hades. Neither doth that name, wherein souls are said to be, seem to signify any other thing, either in profane writers or in the Holy Scriptures, save only a removing into that which is invisible and unseen."—Greg. Nyssen, in Macriniis, oper. Tom. 3, p. 209. We believe this to be a perfectly correct explanation of the word. We are sure it does not necessarily express the hell of the damned. Our Saviour said to the thief on the cross—"This day shalt thou be with me in paradise." That paradise belongs to the unseen world, and is fitly called "Hades."

It may interest our correspondent and our readers to show them a more profitable view of Christ's going to Hades than controversy commonly suggests. There were numerous heretics in old times, who denied that Christ had a human soul. They said that the Son of God took the body of man, but not the soul of a man. If that were so, then Christ could not have experienced himself the temptations or the spiritual trials of man; for neither God nor the human body is capable of feeling those trials. This denial of Christ being *perfect man*, "of a reasonable soul, and human flesh subsisting," as well as perfect God, totally destroyed all foundation for the belief in our Saviour's *fellow-feeling* for us. St. Paul shows us the importance of this doctrine for our comfort and support, when he says—"Wherefore *in all things* it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people, for *in that he himself hath suffered, being tempted*, he is able to succour them that are tempted."—Hebrews ii. 17, 18. What a comfort to be able to say, in all our spiritual trials, as well as all our bodily infirmities, "I know that my Saviour can feel for this, for he felt it all himself!" But the heresy we speak of took away this comfort, for if the man Christ Jesus had not a human soul, he could never have felt the temptations or the trials of the soul. Of course, temptation never led him to sin, but he felt what temptation is; but his soul alone could feel this. Against this heresy the Fathers always argued from this text—"Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell." If Christ went to the place of departed souls, it must have been his soul that went there. Christ is therefore perfect man—"In all things made like unto his brethren." We *know* then that he can *feel* for our spiritual trials and that he knows how to succour them. May we learn practically this lesson from his departure to Hades, and it will be more to our real comfort than all our vain inquiries and guesses about the exact particulars of the place he went to.

Notes and Queries.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I am anxious to learn by whom the celibacy of the clergy was ordained. Was it by Christ, or by his Apostles, or the Church in after times? Is it the law of God or of men? And what does the Church of Rome say in answer to this question?

I have asked several persons likely to know, and some priests of the Church of Rome; and I cannot get a satisfactory answer. And without an answer to this question I cannot make up my mind on the subject. I have thought that you, perhaps, may be able to give me an answer.

Yours, &c.,

AN INQUIRER.

If some of our Roman Catholic correspondents will give us an answer, as to what their Church holds on this subject, we shall be happy to publish it in our next number.

FARM OPERATIONS FOR FEBRUARY.

(From the Irish Farmers' Gazette.)

Wheat Sowing.—From the extreme wetness of the past season wheat sowing will, in all probability, form the principal operation of this month in the wheat growing districts. Such lands as have been prepared for sowing wheat some months since, and have remained unsown from the wetness of the season, will now require the additional preparation of a good harrowing, as soon as it is dry enough, and will be most appropriately sown under the plough, giving about a three inch furrow. If the land be at all inclined to wet, it will be best to plough it in ridges; but if sufficiently dry, may be ploughed into wide sets: or if intended for laying down with grass and clover seeds, may be ribbed up at 18 inch intervals, sown broadcast, and then harrowed down lengthways with a short-tined harrow. In harrowing the land to be sown under the plough, no more should be harrowed than can be sown and ploughed in the same day, lest rain should come on, when the land would not dry so soon after as if it remained rough. The same rule applies to land to be ribbed, as no more should be harrowed than can be ribbed in a day. We lately gave some general hints as to the kinds most suitable for sowing at this season, to which we may add, that the better the land is prepared the less the quantity of seed that will be necessary, as the depth of cover will be more equal and regular: whereas when the land is roughly and slovenly prepared, a greater quantity of seed will be required, from the quantity likely to be covered so deep as to preclude any chance of its vegetating. The weight per acre, also, must be regulated by the size of the grain, as it will take more of a large-sized grain than a small-sized one, the smaller, provided it be well formed, plump, and sound, making the best according to its variety. Wheat, when sown early in the season, may be sown thin in kind, rich soils, as it stools or tillers abundantly and equally: but as the season advances the quantity of seed should be increased, to prevent tillering, which would then, if encouraged, be unequal in time and growth, and ripen unevenly, some heads being ripe, while others from the same stool would be green. Lime from 30 to 40 barrels, with salt from a half to one ton per Irish acre, or two to four cwt. guano, spread evenly and harrowed in along with the seed, if there should be a doubt of the land being sufficiently rich, will materially assist in producing a good crop, and bring it early to maturity.

Beans should be sown as early as possible in the month, provided the land has been previously well prepared and manured. Drilling at from 2½ to 3 feet intervals, the seed being dropped 4 inches apart, is much the best practice, as it gives sufficient room for horse and hand hoeing. If the land has not been manured in the autumn, a speedy mode of getting in the crop may be put in operation by putting out the manure in equidistant heaps and rows; and as the land is ploughed drop the beans in every third furrow, covering them with the dung: or the dung may be put in first, and the beans on top; the next furrow covers all; the rows will then stand at about 27 inches apart. Beans may also be sown broadcast in well-manured and well-prepared land, and harrowed in The produce is generally excellent; but the land should be clean, as there will be no opportunity for cleaning it while occupied by the crop. The Russian bean is hardy and productive; but the following kinds may be relied on for sowing at this season:—The Heligoland, tick, or Egyptian, for cattle; and the early Mazagan, or long pod, for human use. It will take from 3½ to 4 bushels, according to size, to sow an Irish acre broadcast, or 2 bushels sown in drills. A strong, deep loam is best for beans; and if well manured they make an excellent preparatory crop for wheat.

Peas, if required early, may be sown now: but if not, it may be profitably put off till the end of the month. This crop succeeds best on a lighter and drier soil than beans; and unless the land be very poor, there is no manure required, as, if rich, the crop runs too much to haulm, and will be tardy in podding and late in ripening. They may be sown broadcast, or in drills, at 15 to 18 inch intervals, to allow of hoeing in the early part of the season; but they soon cover the ground, which precludes the possibility of going through them. A few beans may be appropriately mixed with the seed; they serve to support the peas, and keep them off the ground, and when thrashed the beans are easily separated from the peas by a suitable riddle.

Oats.—Black oats may be sown about the middle of the month; but the white varieties are best sown about the beginning of next month.

Parsnips may be sown any time during the month, in previously well-prepared, rich, and deep soils. The land intended for this crop should have been deeply tilled, cleaned, and well manured in the autumn; but if the manuring be put off till the spring, the manure to be applied then should be well decomposed, and intimately mixed with the soil. Sow in drills 28 inches apart, the plants to be afterwards thinned out, that they may not stand nearer than nine inches apart. The varieties most generally sown are the common and the Jersey hollow-crowned. We saw a variety shown, a few years back, at the Royal Horticultural Society's show, called the turnip-rooted which seemed very well adapted for shallow soils; but we have lost sight of it for some time. Though parsnips may be sown now with great advantage, we do not recommend the general crop to be sown, but a limited portion. The sowing of the general crop will be best made early next month.

Fatting Pigs should be well and sufficiently supplied with steamed or boiled turnips, mangels, sugar-beet, parsnips, or carrots. They will thrive on all the above roots, either raw or boiled, except the turnips, which should be cooked; but to produce good pork and bacon, they should also get bean, pea, barley, or oaten meal with the roots. Their troughs should be cleaned out as soon as done feeding, and the refuse given the young and store pigs. All should have free access to fresh water.

Fatting Calves and House-fed Lambs require great care and attention, and should have abundance of good cow's milk, with good, dry, and warm lodging and clean beds. To prevent the milk congulating in the stomach, they should have some chalk and common salt beat up and kneaded together, let to dry, and laid in lumps in their troughs.

Odds and Ends.—Proceed with the draining and subsoiling in hands, to completion, as preparation for and getting in the crops will now require undivided attention. Look to the mouths of the drains, and clear away all stoppages, and remedy and repair all defects. Increase your manure and compost heaps by every means within your power; purchase and carry home the quantity of artificial manures necessary for the season, so as to have them in store when required. Turn over, mix, and pulverize compost heaps. Keep the store stock well supplied with fresh-thrashed, sound straw and turnips; and scour drains, ditches, and water-courses.

New and Recent Works

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

Booksellers to the Queen,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

THE RUSSIAN SHORES OF THE BLACK SEA, IN THE AUTUMN of 1852, with a Voyage down the Volga, and a Tour through the Country of the Don Cossacks. By Lawrence Oliphant. 8vo. 14s.

RUSSIA AND THE RUSSIANS; comprising an account of the Czar Nicholas, and the House of Romanoff, with a sketch of the Encroachments of Russia from the reign of the Empress Catherine. By J. H Cole, 21st Fusileers 2s. 6d.

THE RUSSO-TURKISH CAMPAIGN OF 1828-29; with a View of the present State of the Eastern Question. By Colonel Chesney. 12s.

THE HISTORY OF THE FRENCH PROTESTANT REFUGEES, from the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. By Charles Weiss. 8vo. 14s.

HISTORY OF THE PROTESTANT CHURCH IN HUNGARY, FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE REFORMATION TO 1850, with reference also to Transylvania. With an Introduction by Dr. D'Aubigne. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

ALISON'S HISTORY of EUROPE, from the fall of Napoleon, in 1815, to the Establishment of Military Government in France, in 1852; being a continuation of his former celebrated work. Vols. I., II., and III. 8vo. 15s. each.

CHRISTOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, and a Commentary on the Messianic Predictions. By E. W. Hengstenberg, D.D. Vol. I. 10s. 6d.

THE EARLY PROPHECIES OF A REDEEMER; from the first Promise to the Prophecy of Moses. Considered in Six Discourses. By Rev. W. De Burgh, B.D. 8vo. 5s.

EXAMINATION OF MR. MAURICE'S THEOLOGICAL ESSAYS. By Robert S. Candlish, D.D. Crown 8vo. 6s.

OUTLINES OF SACRED PROPHECY. By Rev. T. R. Birks. New Edition. 5s.

THE SCARLET MYSTERY; or, Rome Unmasked. By J. G. MacWalter. 3s. 6d.

THE LIFE OF MRS. SHERWOOD. Edited by her Daughter. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

HOPE DEFERRED, NOT LOST; a Narrative of Missionary effort in South America. With Journals of Captain Gardiner, &c. 5s.

CAUTIONS FOR THE TIMES. Edited by the Archbishop of Dublin. 8vo. 7s.

MEMOIR OF RICHARD WILLIAMS, Catechist to the Patagonian Mission. By the Rev. Dr. James Hamilton. 12mo. 5s.

A MEMOIR OF THE REV. W. B. JOHNSTON, Missionary at Regent's Town, Sierra Leone. 5s.

OF THE PLURALITY OF WORLDS. An Essay. 8vo. 8s.

FRIENDS IN COUNCIL. A Series of Readings and Discourses thereon. 2 vols. Cheaper Edition. 9s.

COMPANIONS OF MY SOLITUDE. Cheaper Edition. 3s. 6d.

THE CHEMISTRY OF COMMON LIFE. By James F. W. Johnston. Vol. I. 5s.

ALISON'S HISTORY OF EUROPE, from the French Revolution in 1789 to 1815. Cheaper Edition. Vols. I. to V. 4s. each.

DISCOURSES ON THE CHRISTIAN REVELATION, viewed in connection with Modern Astronomy. By the late Thomas Chalmers, D.D. Fcp. 2s. 6d.

THE BIBLE IN THE COUNTING HOUSE: a course of Lectures to Merchants. By the Rev. H. A. Broadman, D.D. 8vo. 5s.

STORR'S FAMILY PREACHER. Short practical Sermons for home. 4s. 6d.

CHALMERS'S DAILY SCRIPTURE READINGS. 2 vols. 10s.

CHALMERS'S SABBATH SCRIPTURE READINGS. 2 vols. 10s.

MEMOIRS OF THOMAS CHALMERS, D.D., LL.D. By his Son-in-Law, the Rev. Wm. Hanna, LL.D. 2 vols. 12s.

BRADLEY'S PRACTICAL SERMONS for every Sunday and Principal Holiday in the Year. 8vo. 12s.

BRADLEY'S SERMONS on some of the Trials, Duties, and Encouragements of the Christian Life. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

ROBERTS' PLAIN SERMONS for all the Sundays and Chief Holidays of the year. 2 vols. 10s.

ROBERTS' PLAIN SERMONS for all the Sundays and Chief Holidays of the Year. Second Series. 2 vols. 18s.

THE DOMESTIC COMMENTARY ON THE HOLY SCRIPTURES. By a Clergyman of the Church of England. 4 vols. Imp. 8vo. £2 14s.

MATTHEW HENRY'S EXPOSITION ON THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT; with numerous Maps and Illustrations. 3 vols. 4to. Whole calf. £3 17s. 6d.

WORK: PLENTY TO DO AND HOW TO DO IT. By Margaret Maria Brewster. 4s.

CYCLOPÆDIA OF UNIVERSAL BIOGRAPHY; with numerous Illustrations. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

GRATITUDE: an Exposition of the Hundred and Third Psalm. By the Rev. John Stevenson. 8vo. 6s.

CHRIST IS ALL; a Series of Tracts. By the Venerable Archdeacon Law. No. 1—8. 1d. each.

MY SCHOOLS AND MY SCHOOLMASTERS; or the Story of my Education. By Hugh Miller. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

FIRST IMPRESSIONS OF ENGLAND AND ITS PEOPLE. By Hugh Miller. 7s. 6d.

THE LONDON PULPIT. By James Ewing Ritchie. 4s. 6d.

THE NEW IRISH PULPIT; or Gospel Preacher. New series. 3s. 6d.

The PSALMS Restored to MESSIAH; a brief Commentary. By the Rev. R. H. Ryland. With Preface, by Bishop of Cashel. 6s.

LESSONS and TRIALS OF LIFE. By the Author of "Bertha's Journal." 6s.

MEMOIR OF THE LIVES OF ROBERT AND JAMES A. HALDANE. By Alexander Haldane, Esq. 8vo. 12s.

MEMOIR OF THE REV. W. H. KRAUSE, A.M., Bethesda Chapel, Dublin, with selections from his Correspondence. By Rev. C. S. Stanford. Crown 8vo. 5s. 6d.

MEMOIR OF THE LATE REV. EDWARD BICKERSTETH. By the Rev. T. R. Bicks. Cheaper Edition. 2 vols. Fcap. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

THE BUD OF PROMISE: a Memoir of Eliza H. M. Græme. By the Rev. D. Pitcairn. 3s. 6d.

THE NET IN THE BAY; or Journal of a Visit to Moose and Albany. By the Bishop of Rupert's Land. 4s. 6d.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES; THE MOSLEM AND HIS END; THE CHRISTIAN AND HIS HOPE. By the Rev. John Cumming, D.D. 1s. 6d.

LEILA ADA, THE JEWISH CONVERT: an authentic Memoir. By Osborne W. Trenery Heighway. 3s. 6d.

SELECT EXTRACTS FROM THE DIARY, CORRESPONDENCE, ETC., OF LEILA ADA. By Osborne W. Trenery Heighway. 3s. 6d.

THE BOOK AND ITS STORY: a Narrative for the Young, on occasion of the Jubilee of the British and Foreign Bible Society. By L. N. R. With an introductory preface, by Rev. T. Phillips. Fcap. 4s.

A PORTRAITURE OF THE LATE REV. WILLIAM JAY, of Bath; an outline of his mind, character, and pulpit eloquence, &c. By the Rev. Thomas Wallace. 3s. 6d.

AN APPEAL TO THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF YORK, ON THE UNCONDEMNED HERESIES OF ARCHDEACON WILBERFORCE'S BOOK, entitled, "The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist." By the Rev. J. Taylor, M.A. 2s.

PLAIN SPEAKING. First series. Being forty short, Large-type Tracts. By the Rev. J. C. Ryle, B.A. In packet. 1s.

HOME TRUTHS. First, Second, and Third Series. By the Rev. J. C. Ryle. 3s. 6d. each.

THE BISHOP, the PASTOR, and the PREACHER. Three Biographical Lectures on Latimer, Baxter, and Whitfield; with introductory preface, on some Wants of the present Day. By Rev. J. C. Ryle. *(In the Press.)*

TRACTS FOR CHURCHMEN. Seventeen Numbers. In Packet. 1s.

THE GLORIES OF MARY, from the Italian of Alphonsus Liguori; with the approbation of Cardinal Wiseman. 2s.

THE POLISH LANCER; or 1812. A Tale of Napoleon's Invasion of Russia. By Louis Rellstab. 1s. 6d.

JOHNSTON'S CHART OF THE NORTH SEA, and the BALTIC, with the Countries adjoining; and Enlarged Plans of Cronstadt and Revel. 1s.

JOHNSTON'S MAP OF THE SEAT OF WAR, in the Danubian Principalities. 1s.

JOHNSTON'S NEW MAP OF THE BLACK SEA, CAUCASUS, CRIMEA, ETC., with enlarged plans of Sevastopol and the Bosphorus. 1s.

Lately Published,

WILLET'S "SYNOPSIS PAPISMI." New Edition. Edited by the Rev. J. Cumming, D.D. Ten vols. 8vo. Price £3.

London: JAMES MILLER, 17, Berner's-street, Oxford-street, and all Booksellers.

Just Published, Fcap. 8vo., Price 2s. 6d.

I.

THE FIRST RESURRECTION: Being Comments on First Corinthians, chapter xv. By the Rev. Robert Noble, A.M., Vicar of Athboy.

II.

Fcap. 8vo., cloth, price 1s. 6d.

THE PRINCIPLES OF ELOCUTION; Compiled from "The Elements of Rhetoric, by Archbishop Whately." With considerable additions and alterations.

III.

New Edition, Fcap. 8vo., cloth, price 2s. 6d.

THE COLLECTS OF THE LITURGY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND,

Catechetically Explained, Compared with Scripture, and briefly Commented upon, with the Date and Origin of each Collect annexed. For the use of Families and Sunday Schools.

By the Rev. Charles Miller, A.B.,

With Recommendatory Preface by the Bishop of Meath.

IV.

Fcap. 8vo., Neat Cover, Price 1s.

Cloth, 1s. 6d.; Cloth, Gilt Edges, 2s.

THE TALK OF THE ROAD: Showing how Irish people talk about Irish doings, when they get a quiet place, at the back of a ditch, or under a hedge.

V.

Royal 32mo., Price One Halfpenny each.

Stories about the Mission Work in Ireland.

The Bright Side of a Dark Cloud. II. Biddy Lacey. (The Series to be Continued.)

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Just Published,

Third Edition, Price 1s. 6d.; or in full cloth, Price 2s. 6d.

POOR PADDY'S CABIN; or, SLAVERY IN IRELAND. A true Representation of Facts and Characters. By an Irishman.

London: WERTHEIM and MACKINTOSH. Dublin: WM. CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

New Cheap Edition of the

WAVERLEY NOVELS.

12mo. Fancy Boards, Price 1s. 6d. each.

This Series of the highly popular Works of Sir Walter Scott is in preparation, and will be printed from a new, clear type; each Volume containing a complete Novel. The issue will commence on the First of June, with "WAVERLEY; or 'Tis sixty years since," and be continued in every alternate month.

Subscribers' names for the series received by

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY, 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, Dublin.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher, WILLIAM CURRY, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

FEBRUARY 15, 1853.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Gloir do Dhia añ gna hárdmib, agus síodcáin air an dtalamh deagtoil do na dáoinib.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. II.—No. 15. MARCH, 1853. {Annual Subscription, 3s. 6d. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
What is a Bigot?	25
The Fair of Loughmanagh	26
Rosa Mediat	27
The Power of the Keys	27
Pious Frauds—The Louvain Testament	28
The Talk of the Road—No. X.	29
Latria, Hyperdolia, Dulia	30
Why do the Roman Catholic Priesthood evade Discussion?	31
The *Touchstone* (continued)	31
CORRESPONDENCE—	
On the Baptism of Bells, by a Looker-on	32
On Image Worship and Miracles, by Mr. Collette	32
On Divorce and Marriage, by Mr. E. Power	33
On the Disputed Sacraments	34
On the Rock of the Church	34
Are the Missionaries doing anything in India?	34
Farming Operations for March	35

WHAT IS A BIGOT?

Those of our readers who take much interest in the great religious controversy which is now carried on in almost every part of Ireland, cannot fail to have noticed in how many cases hard words and hard names are made to take the place of fair and candid arguments. It is unfortunate for the cause of truth that controversy in general, and especially religious controversy, should have such a tendency to excite men's passions and to kindle the flames of angry prejudices in their minds. It is not our present business to inquire into the causes which produce this melancholy result; we merely advert to the fact as one which is not peculiar to our own age or country, but which has existed from the very earliest times. The apostles themselves experienced its ill effects, when their adversaries taunted them as persons "who had turned the world upside down" (Acts xvii. 6); and the orator Tertullus, when accusing St. Paul before the Roman governor, in a grave public trial, could find no more gentle or courteous terms by which to describe him, than that "he was a pestilent fellow, and a mover of sedition throughout all the world, and a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes."—Acts xxiv. 5. If the first teachers of the Gospel experienced such contumelious treatment, we need not marvel if those who in our own day attempt to stir up men's minds on the subject of religion meet with the like fate.

Among the harsh terms which are used in the present day, in religious controversy, there is scarcely any epithet which men are more ready to cast against their adversaries than that of *bigotry*. Nothing is more common than to hear it said—"Oh, such a man is an obstinate, narrow-minded bigot; no person of sense will mind what *he* says." It often happens that neither the individual who makes the charge nor they who hear it have any clear notion of the real meaning of the word. It is sufficient that both parties are aware that bigotry is a term of reproach, which is all the more effective for being ambiguous, inasmuch as each person can attach to it whatever unfavourable idea he pleases; and thus hostile prejudices are often excited, without any real or substantial grounds.

It may be useful, therefore, both for those who may be tempted to apply this term of reproach to their opponents, and for those who occasionally hear it used against themselves, to consider what is really meant by the term, and to what class of persons it may justly be applied. We do not wish to engage our readers in any antiquarian discussion as to the first origin of the term.* We are content to take its meaning as we find it laid down by Dr. Johnson, who is the highest authority in this matter. He defines bigotry to be "prejudice; unreasonable warmth in favour of party opinions;" and a bigoted man, according to the same author, is one who is "blindly prepossessed in favour of something; irrationally zealous." Bigotry, it is evident from this, is not warmth and zeal in anything; or rather zeal, and warmth, and prepossession are not bigotry; but *unreasonable* warmth, *blind* prepossession, *irrational* zeal, are bigotry; and those only are bigots to whose conduct such epithets can justly be ascribed.

As far as we ourselves are concerned, we shall not seek to disavow either warmth, or zeal, or prepossession. We confess that our minds were long prepossessed in favour of certain important truths before we entered upon the discussions which we have laid before our readers in the pages of this journal. We were prepossessed by a conviction that the Word of God is true; and that any creed or system of opinions which is not in accordance with this Word, and, much more, any system which is *contrary* to it, is fraught with very great danger to the souls of those who embrace it. This, however, is not bigotry, because it is not *blind* prepossession. The Bible proves itself to be the Word of God, and there can be nothing more reasonable than to believe that whatsoever is not in accordance with that Word cannot have come from God, for He cannot contradict himself. Neither are we anxious to acquit ourselves of the charge of zeal; for we have learned from St. Paul "to be zealous for that which is good in a good thing always."—Galat. iv. 18. We *are* zealous that our fellow-countrymen should be set free from the bondage of error and prejudice, and be brought to the knowledge of the truth; but such zeal is not bigotry, inasmuch as it is not irrational. We must further plead guilty to the charge of occasional warmth; but this is not bigotry, unless it be excessive and unreasonable. It would ill become us to say that we are entirely free from prejudice; but we think it would be unfair to bring such a charge against us, unless it can be shown that we have advanced some opinion for which we cannot give a satisfactory reason. As for party opinions, if the phrase is meant for principles founded on the Word of God, we do not disavow being prepossessed in favour of them. In matters of religion, there are, properly speaking, only two parties in the world; and we hope we shall always be found ready to advocate the opinions, or rather the principles, of that party which is on the side of real Christianity; but this is not bigotry, unless it be done with *unreasonable* warmth and unfair appeals to party prejudices.

Having thus endeavoured to defend ourselves, perhaps needlessly, from the charge of bigotry, it now remains for us to point out the class of persons to whom this term may justly and fairly be applied. That man, then, is a bigot, whose persuasion of the truth of his religion is founded upon prejudice, not upon evidence; who is blindly prepossessed in favour of it, and irrationally zealous in its support and propagation. That man is a bigot, who, without reasoning or inquiry, believes all that his Church teaches, and holds it undoubted that whatever is not taught by his Church must be heresy. Such conduct would be reasonable if it were the result of inquiry and rational conviction; but the man who is prepared to believe anything and everything that he is taught by his religious instructors would be a Mohammedan in Turkey, or a Buddhist in Hindostan, upon exactly the same grounds that he is a Roman Catholic in Italy or Ireland.

We are convinced that the cause of truth will always stand the test of fair and candid inquiry, and that blind prepossessions and prejudices, such as we have described, are no part of true religion. We are far from asserting that such prejudices are to be found only on one side. We believe that there are bigoted Protestants as well as bigoted Roman Catholics. We know that on both sides are to be found men of narrow minds and prejudiced understandings—hasty in forming an unfavourable opinion of their opponents, and prone to condemn without inquiry. We, for our part, are resolved, to the best of our ability, not to imitate such conduct. One of our chief motives in originating this journal was, because we believed that free discussion must lead to more enlarged and liberal views, and would tend to dispel many of the false notions which each party is so ready to take up respecting those of the opposite side. We are deeply persuaded that all Christians, whatever may be the Church to which they belong, ought to bear in mind and to act upon the solemn injunction of the Apostle Peter, "to be ready always to satisfy every one that asketh them a reason of the hope which is in them"—1 Pet. iii. 15. In order that a man may be able to give a reason to others, however, it is evident that his own mind must be first enlightened as to the grounds of his religious belief. He ought to avail himself of every opportunity of becoming acquainted with the arguments in support of the doctrines which he professes to hold; and, on the other hand, he ought to be slow to condemn those who differ from him, unless he is first satisfied of the unsoundness of their views. And if, upon examination and careful inquiry, he becomes persuaded that others entertain erroneous opinions, it is his duty, not to censure them uncharitably, or to join in any acts of persecution against them, but rather to win them over by fair argument and kindly persuasion. The man who thus acts, whatever be his creed, will be sure to gain the respect and esteem even of his opponents: but the narrow-minded partisan, whose judgment is warped by prejudice, and who is opposed to full and free discussion, who forms his own opinions blindly, and condemns others without inquiry, is a bigot, and a foe to the cause of truth.

It may at first sight appear a very strange phenomenon, that many persons who exhibit great credulity themselves, and who take up their religious belief, as it were, upon trust, are sometimes very angry when other persons venture to adopt opinions different from theirs. It seems a curious anomaly, that a man who has bestowed little or no industry upon the business of seeking truth for himself, should suddenly become indignant when he sees his neighbour anxiously inquiring where that precious treasure may be found; and that he should be too often ready either to persecute him for so doing, or else to ascribe his conduct to base and interested motives. Such occurrences are, unfortunately, but too common in our own country; and we believe that, in many cases, the real motive of such conduct is this. A man whose religious belief is founded on rational inquiry, who has himself examined the reasons for his faith, and perceived them to be solid and well-grounded, can afford to stand alone. Not so, however, the individual whose creed is based on prejudice and blind credulity. His mind having no solid foundation on which to repose itself, and being devoid of a rational conviction of the truth of his creed, he naturally looks out for a numerous companionship in the faith which he professes. His belief, and the comfort of his belief, mount with the tens, and hundreds, and thousands, that are seen to be travelling along the same road with himself; and thus it naturally comes to pass, that as his faith depends upon the faith of others, his doubts, too, are in their power. If his friends or neighbours waver in their religious belief, or if they change it altogether, a rude shock is given to his own inward peace of mind. It is not so much that his convictions are assailed, and his pride and self-love irritated by their opposition, but it is because something is withdrawn from the internal warmth and comfort of his soul, so that he can no longer feel as tranquil as before. He is unwilling, perhaps, to acknowledge, even to his own mind, that his neighbour's change of opinion has robbed him of any part of his own assurance of the truth of his creed; but yet, nevertheless, his feelings are the same as if he had been despoiled of that precious possession; and these feelings prompt him to resent the injury, and to visit it upon the unoffending cause.

Credulity, therefore, and bigotry go hand in hand; and when they are combined, as in the case we have just described, they too often break out into bitter persecution and open violence. The true, and, indeed, almost the only remedy for such evils, is to be found in an enlarged spirit of fair and dispassionate inquiry, which, in proportion as it enlightens the mind of him who seeks for the truth, will, at the same time, teach him forbearance and moderation towards others. The doubts and difficulties of the young student in geometry cause no

* It may amuse some of our readers to be told that the name bigot is a very ancient one, and that the person who gave occasion for its use is said to have been Rollo, the first Duke of Normandy. (*Vide Stephan. Paschasium. Disquisit. Francic., lib.* 8., c. 2; *et Chronic. Historiæ Franc. de Rollone, primo Normannorum duce)*—"Ille non est dignatus pedem Caroli osculari, sibi ad os suum levaret. Cumque sui Comites illum admonerent, ut pedem Regis in acceptione tanti muneris (Neustriæ provinciæ) oscularetur, lingua Anglicâ respondit, Ne se bigot, quod interpretatur, Ne per Deum. Rex verò et sui illum deridentes et sermonem ejus corruptè referentes, illum vocaverunt Bigoth unde Normanni adhuc Bigothi vocantur."

uncertainty in the mind of the profound mathematician. His convictions are too deep and solid to be so disturbed: but yet he can sympathize with those who feel such doubts, because they remind him of his own past experience. On the other hand, the man who is blindly credulous, and who believes or disbelieves without inquiry, knows nothing of scruples or difficulties, and has no fellow feeling for others who may be searching for truth. He cannot understand why every one does not exactly coincide in opinion with himself; and the first show of opposition to his views only makes him obstinate and angry. When two narrow-minded disputants of this latter kind come together, instead of discussing their differences in a calm and Christian spirit, they would be ready, perhaps, like the two bishops at the Council of Trent,* to pull one another's beards, were it not that, unfortunately, the daily use of razors now leaves men no beards to pull.

We have seen that bigotry has been described as "a blind prepossession" in favour of some peculiar opinions. One of the most common ways in which it exhibits itself is, when a man is induced, from some cause or other, to attach himself to some one individual, and to adopt all his views without inquiry. It is thus that party leaders acquire an ascendancy over their followers, which enables them to twist and turn them so as to advance their own interests, utterly regardless of the welfare of their misguided adherents. It is, doubtless, a far easier plan to adopt blindly the opinions of others than to be at the trouble of forming them for ourselves; but we need scarcely remark, that it is sometimes a very dangerous plan, especially when we fall into the hands of those who have any pecuniary or other interest in misleading us. Religion is a subject of such deep and momentous importance, that, if we value it aright, we ought to study it for ourselves, and not allow our creed to depend upon the word of any man, or any set of men.

We cannot, even if we would, divest ourselves of the duty of inquiry where religious truth is concerned; and if we really wish to be set free from the bondage of bigotry and prejudice, if we seek to arrive at truth, and to attain some solid resting-place, on which we can safely take our stand, for time and eternity, there is no better or surer path for us to follow than that marked out for us by the Apostle Paul (1 Thess. v. 21)—"*Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.*"

THE FAIR OF LOUGHMANAGH.

I SUPPOSE that everybody knows that the great fair of Loughmanagh, in the county of Westmeath, is held every Valentine's day. There was a capital fair last month; I don't know when there was a better show of beasts, and very good prices they fetched. Pat Murray, that some of you may have heard of, was there selling cattle for his master; and a very good job he made of it, and he had a good bundle of bank notes in his pocket with him when he was going home in the evening. Mike Dolan walked home with him, for he had been at the fair, too, where he had laid out his money on a little slip of a pig that he was driving home before him. The two men were very good friends, and they had a pleasant walk together (Pat in great spirits at the bargain he had made) until they got about half way home, when, just after you cross the bridge, and a little before you come to Cassidy's public house, who should they meet but Brian Shaughnessy, the big beggarman. I don't think either of them were glad to meet him, for there was never a more lazy, good-for-nothing scoundrel than that same Shaughnessy: every penny he could get went for whisky, and it was not his own money that paid for it either, but he had such a tongue that there was not one that liked to provoke him or that would not rather any day give him a trifle than stand the abuse he would give if they refused him. So when he and the boys had saluted each other,

"I'll walk back with you," says he, "to Cassidy's and you'll treat me, and give me some money to take with me, for you must have plenty of it after the fair."

"Indeed, then," says Pat Murray, "I'll not stop at Cassidy's or any where else, for its growing dark, and I don't want to be out late these winter evenings with money in my pocket."

Mike Dolan made some exense, too, for not stopping; but Shaughnessy was not to be put off, and says he, "I don't mind if you can't stop; but at any rate you'll just give me half-a-crown between you, for it's well you can afford it, and I'll leave you my blessing."

"Why, then, Brian," says Mike Dolan, "I am very sorry, and I'd give it to you with all my heart if I had it, but I laid out the last penny I had with me on this little pig here, and I have not got a cross now to bless myself with."

"Well," says Brian, "Pat, you can't put me off that way, for I heard from all the neighbours I met how well you did at the fair; and I know you have your pocket full of money, if you have the heart to give a poor man some."

"Sure, then," says Pat, "you must know very well that what I sold the beasts for is not my money, but my master's. I have not got any money of my own with me, and you would not have me take the master's money and give it to you."

"Troth, then, would I," said Brian, "he is rich enough not to miss it; and how does he know what you sold the beasts for? and it's little sin to take it from the likes of him, and give it to a poor man like me."

So says Pat Murray, "You may say what you like, but you will not make it out to be anything but robbery, if I was to take the master's money and make a present of it to you. I may be as charitable as I like with my own money, but I have no right to be charitable with other people's. But I'll tell you what's more, Brian Shaughnessy," says he, "if the money was my own I would not give you one penny of it. I am a struggling man, with a wife and five small children to support, and I don't think it would be any charity to take the bread out of their mouths and give it to you, that's as well able to work as I am, but that never does a hand's turn, and would spend anything I gave you drinking at Cassidy's."

With that Brian was very angry, as you may suppose, and very bad words he gave. Mike Dolan became terribly frightened—

"For the love of heaven, Pat," whispered he, "give him what he asks, and don't bring his curse on you and the children." But Pat only answered stouter and stouter; and the end of it was, that Brian Shaughnessy went down on his knees in the middle of the road, and put such fearful curses on Pat Murray and all his seed and generation, that it would make your hair stand on end to listen to him.

"O Pat Murray, Pat Murray," said Mike Dolan when they walked on; "the saints between us and harm; but why would not ye take my advice and give him what he asked? I would not for a thousand pound be in your skin this blessed night, after the curses he put on you. It would be better for you to run after him now and make it up with him, and get him to take them off."

"I'll do no such thing, then," said Pat; "what should I be afraid of him for? Is it because I would not rob the master's money, and give it to a good-for-nothing scoundrel like him? Do you think his prayers have such influence with the Almighty, that the Lord would punish me for not breaking one of his own commands because he bids me? If his prayers have so much effect as all that comes to, why does not he pray himself a good coat on his back and plenty of money in his pockets, and then he would have no need to tempt an honest man to do a wrong thing for his benefit?"

"Ah, then, Pat," said Mike Dolan, "that's no way for you to talk. You ought to know as well as I do, that many a one has suffered from the curse of people that were never able to pray much good for themselves or anybody else."

"Why, then," says Pat, "you'll never persuade me to that—you'll never make me believe that the Lord is more willing to do harm than to do good; or that if a man can't pray himself out of poverty, he can pray other people into it."

"Well, but," said Mike, "what do you say to poor Norah Callaghan, that this same Brian Shaughnessy cursed? I know that she was recovering from her confinement when he begged at her house, and I don't know what made her refuse him; but refuse him she did, and give him cross words besides; and he gave her such a curse that she went back to her bed, and never rose up from it again alive."

"Why, I say," says Pat, "that it's no wonder. She is not the first person a fright has killed. I could tell you stranger stories than that, that I heard from Thady Byrne, the pensioner, of things he saw when he was in the West Indies. He told me that the blacks there have got what they call Obeah men; and when one of these puts his curse upon one of them, the poor fellow sickens and pines, and he never will tell who has cursed him; and if nothing is done at last he dies; and sometimes whole scores of them die this way by one of these Obeah men; but if the master can find the fellow out, and give him a sound flogging, all the sick fellows recover at once."

"The Lord only knows," says Mike, "what power wicked spirits have; and I don't doubt but, as you say, *God* can't be more ready to hear prayers for evil than for good; but maybe *the devil* hears the curse and brings it to pass."

"So, then," says Pat, "you want me to be afraid lest the devil should bring Brian Shaughnessy's curses on me. Now, I tell you that I don't doubt that the devil would be well pleased enough if Brian Shaughnessy could tempt me to wrong my master; and I don't doubt, too, but that the devil would be willing enough to hurt me, whether Brian Shaughnessy tells him or no; but while I try to obey God, I am not afraid of man or devil hurting me beyond what he permits them. And I think I might as well say my prayers to the devil at once as let Brian Shaughnessy make interest for me with him not to hurt me; or as well as do a wrong thing, lest he should persuade him to do me a mischief. Believe my words, Mike Dolan, Brian Shaughnessy can't put any one in the devil's power but himself; his wicked words can't harm those that are in God Almighty's keeping; and if a curse puts any one in the devil's power, it is those who speak it. I'll show you," says he, "out of the Psalms who it is that cursing harms;" and he pulls a book out of his pocket, and he reads this verse which describes the punishment of him that took pleasure in cursing his neighbour—"As he loved cursing so let it come to him: as he delighted not in blessing, so let it be far from him. As he clothed himself with cursing like as with his garment, so let it come into his bowels like water, and like oil into his bones."—Psalm cviii. 18.

So when he had read these words, Mike Dolan stopped short, and "Pat," said he, "what book is that you are reading these words out of?"

"What book should it be," said Pat, "but God's own book? sure it's the Bible."

"The Bible!" says Mike, lifting up his hands; "O Pat, Pat, sure it's not Bible reader you are turned. Did not you hear what Father Sheehy threatened from the altar against all those that would read that book? It's well known it makes all those heresies that read it; and, then, Father Sheehy will curse you from the altar with bell, book, and candle, and what will become of you then, here and hereafter?"

"Why," says Pat, "I hope, with God's blessing, I may survive Father Sheehy's curse as well as Brian Shaughnessy's."

"What!" says Mike, "are you going to even the curse of a fellow like Brian Shaughnessy with the curse of a priest of the Church? Though I don't read the Bible, I've heard how the prophets of old could call down fire from heaven on those that would not obey them, and how the apostles, too, could punish those that despised them, and I know God is with his Church still, and that a priest's curse is sure to be heard."

"Well," says Pat, "I *do* read the Bible, and I can tell you that you are very much mistaken if you think that either prophets or apostles cursed out of their own heads; they could do no more than foretell the good or the evil which God was about to bring on those who loved him, or on those who despised him; but they could not *make* any harm happen to any one against God's will. And if you'll attend to me, I'll read for you the story of the Prophet Balaam, which is told in the 22nd of Numbers. You must know that there was one Balak, King of Moab, who was an enemy of the Jews in those days, and he had often heard of the Prophet Balaam, and he knew that good or evil had often followed according as he had blessed or cursed. 'I know,' said he to Balaam, 'that he whom thou blessed is blessed, and he whom thou cursest is cursed.' So you must know, Mike, that Balak thought the prophet put on his curses all out of his own head, and that he could curse any one he liked, and that, if he could get him to curse his enemies, the Jews, it would be all over with them; and he offered to pay Balaam well for doing the job. Balaam, though he was a prophet, was not a good man, and well pleased enough he would be to earn the king's money; but he knew better than to think that he could curse any one if God did not bid him; and he knew very well, too, that if he did curse, it was himself and not the Jews that would suffer by it. So, though he was longing for the money, he did not dare to give the curse. 'How shall I curse,' said he, 'those whom God has not cursed?' and at last, says he—'If Balak would give me his house full of silver and gold, I cannot go beyond the word of the Lord my God, to do less or more.' That's the story, Mike, of the way the prophets had the power of cursing; and as for the apostles, I know that St. Peter was able to strike Ananias and Sapphira dead when they lied unto the Holy Ghost; but I know, too, that the apostles never thought they might curse any one they liked out of their own heads. Many a beating St. Peter and St. Paul got, and many a time they were shut up in prison, and they never once ventured to put their curse on those that ill-used them. But," says Pat, "I'll believe that Father Sheehy has the power of cursing, like the apostles, when I see him work miracles as they did. Let him cure the lame, and make the blind see, and raise the dead, and then, if we see that God hears his prayers for good, we will have cause to be frightened when he prays us harm."

"O Pat, Pat," said Mike, "I am afeard you are in a bad way, hardening yourself that way; there is no knowing what the priest might do to you."

"Well," says Pat, "I often heard say that he could turn a boy into a hare, but I tell you now, and I'd say it to Father Sheehy himself, this minute, here I am now, and you may turn me into a hare, or a rabbit, or a cow, or any other beast you like, if you can. Somehow or other, Mike, I don't think he'd do it when it came to that; and if the priest can make cows as easy as all that, suppose, instead of turning good Christians into cows, he was to turn the rats and mice into them, he might stock his farms then without going to the fair of Loughmanagh, or without troubling us much about dues either."

---

*Lest our readers should suppose that this is a calumny of some bigoted Protestant historian, we here present them with the words of the orthodox Cardinal Pallavicini, who certainly would not needlessly say anything to the discredit of the venerable men who composed the Council—"Tum verò Cæsenis, ut mos est iracundiâ percitis, exarsit in utrumque longè perniciosiorem ultori ipsâ injuriâ quam ultum ibat. *Nam in Chironensis barbam injectâ manu, multos excâ pilos avulsit*, et confestim abscessit."—(*Vide Pallav. Hist., Conc. Trid.* Tom. i. p. 377, Aug. Vin. 1775.) We pity the poor bishop who thus lost a handful of hairs out of his beard; and we could almost fancy that, when Dr. Johnson defined bigotry to mean "*unreasonable warmth* in favour of party opinions," he had these venerable combatants in his eye. It may be deemed, perhaps, some excuse for their quarrel, that the point to dispute related to the abstruse doctrine of original sin! Notwithstanding these bitter internal dissensions, however, the Council of Trent, claiming to act under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, boldly pronounced their usual anathema upon all who presumed to differ from the decree at which they finally arrived!

"You may say what you like, Pat," says Mike, "but I could tell you of people that were cursed by the priest and never throve after it."

"I dare say you could," replied Pat; "and you told me just now of Norah Callaghan dying of Brian Shaughnessy's curse. I dare say a curse is mischievous enough to those that are fools enough to be frightened at it; but I'd like him to try his curse on dumb animals, that have not imagination enough to take fright at it. Sure I'll take Father Sheehy up a cage full of rats, and he may curse them his best, and then, if we see that the rats are the worse of it, we shall know that a priest's curse can do some harm. And I heard the master say that only a couple of hundred years ago the priests used to curse the caterpillars, and all the other troublesome animals in their districts, though they don't do it now, more's the pity; I wish they could curse the fly out of the turnips."*

"Then," says Mike, "Pat, I suppose the whole of it is that you do not believe the Saviour left any commission to the priests to curse his enemies."

"Ay, that's just where it is," says Pat; "if I do not mind Father Sheehy's curse, it's not that I think it could do me no harm. Sure I have heard him tell us to call names after people, and throw stones at them, and not to deal with them; and if he was to do that to me, to be sure I'd be the worse of it; but the more I think of it, the more I am convinced that this was not the commission our Lord left his Apostles. Sure I have searched all the New Testament to find where our Saviour told them to curse their enemies—and there's not a word of it in the whole book; quite the contrary—he tells them to *love* their enemies, and to pray for them that spitefully used them and persecuted them. And St. Peter, that we all ought to mind, told his people never to curse even those that cursed them. Says he, we should follow the example of the Lord, that, when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not. You are not, says he, to render railing for railing, but contrariwise blessing: for he that will love life, and see good days, let him refrain his tongue from evil, and his lips that they speak no guile."—1 Pet. ii. 23; iii. 9.

"Sure," says Mike, "it's a power of Scripture, Pat, ye have got; but I suppose this was only the laity St. Peter told not to curse: but the clergy were to keep this to themselves."

"Not at all, Mike," says Pat. "Here is the instructions St. Paul gives to Timothy, that he ordained himself, about the duties of clergymen—'The servant of the Lord must not strive, but be *gentle* with all men, apt to teach, patient, in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves.'—2 Tim. ii. 24. Now," says Pat, "I see this, that in the Apostles' time all the world was against the Christians, and they beat them, and imprisoned them, and killed as many of them as they could; and sure it would be a fine thing, then, if the Apostles could put curses on their enemies, and make them afraid to do them a mischief; and yet, we know that they never did, and only opposed them with gentleness, and patience, and meekness, and gave reasons and arguments to those that differed with them. And am I to think the men are like the Apostles now that are afraid to argue with those that differ with them, and give them nothing but hard words and curses instead of argument, and strive to do harm, and get people beaten, that I can't but think are as good Christians as themselves? No, Mike, the more they go on in this way the more I misdoubt their having the right doctrine of Christ. Here, Mike, is what our Lord told his disciples, and I am inclined to follow those that I see keep his command best. 'Bless them that persecute you. BLESS AND CURSE NOT.'"

ROSA MADIAI.

THE following is a description of Rosa Madiai, written by a lady who visited her in the month of September last, in the prison in which she is confined in Lucca:—

"28th September, 1852.

"Rosa Madiai is a woman of tall and dignified appearance, with handsome, though strongly-marked features, and dark eyes, sunk deep in their sockets, with a dim, worn look that tells of tears and weary watching. Long imprisonment—for she has been in confinement since May, 1851—and protracted anxiety and suspense, joined to her previous weak state of health, have evidently told upon her; its traces are visible in her thin gray hair, in her emaciated hands, and her drooping head, bowed down with that indescribable expression which acute mental suffering alone can give. But as soon as she began to speak, the unfeigned cheerful resignation, the unquestioning faith, which are her leading characteristics, so lighted up her countenance, that all previous marks of suffering seemed to disappear. There is, however, nothing of the parade of a would-be martyr in Rosa Madiai—no exaggeration, no fanaticism. On the earnest hope being expressed that no arguments, nor promises, nor prospect of speedy deliverance would ever induce her to waver in her profession, she clasped her hands fervently, and looking up to heaven, said—'Oh, no, I trust in God, never! oh, no, I would far sooner die; I do not trust in my own strength, for I know I am a poor, weak woman, and sometimes my heart seems to faint; but I pray to God, and I know, for Christ's sake he will give me strength to glorify him in the end.'

"She has hitherto not been compelled to assume the prison dress, nor to have her hair cut off, the latter in particular being, perhaps, the greatest humiliation to which the feelings of an Italian can be subjected; but it is feared an order from Florence may soon arrive to this effect; she said she expected it from day to day, and hoped for a fitting spirit to enable her cheerfully to submit; her gentle deportment seems to have won the respect of those to whose keeping she is intrusted. On asking one of the nuns, who superintended the female prisoners at Lucca, whether Rosa suffered much, she answered—'Not so much as another would under the circumstances; she is so pious, she has such faith in God.' She expressed much gratitude for the kindness of the nuns, who never taunted or abused her, as had been the case with her former keepers, when she was confined in the Borgello, at Florence.

"Her cell is very small and dark, the lower part of the window being boarded up, and light and air only admitted by a grating at the upper end. At night, when both door and window were closed, the oppression was terrible; she said she could not rest, she felt as if suffocated. The furniture of this room consists of a bed, a bench near the window, and a chair. She is employed in needlework, and at present makes shirts for the galley slaves. Her chief source of annoyance is from the fearful oaths, yells, and shrieks which unceasingly reach her ears, from fifty or sixty of the most abandoned and hardened of her sex, her companions in captivity.

"From the court-yard beneath her window she can also hear the blasphemies and ribald songs of the male prisoners, of whom there are about 300. No tongue can describe all the horrors she is thus compelled to listen to. One night she was repeating the Lord's prayer aloud, and when she came to the words, 'Hallowed be thy name,' she stopped and said—'Ah, no! thy name is not hallowed here; thy name is profaned and outraged all day long. Ah, why do those who build prisons not think of the souls of those they confine in them? Who can ever learn to repent in such a place as this?' She was trying to acquire the custom of speaking aloud to herself; she said it broke the silence of her cell: her voice was like a companion to her. Some days were terrible, when her soul was dark within her, and she was very anxious about her husband—such long, long days, as if they never would come to an end. On others, again, she felt quite cheerful, and scarce conscious of her captivity.

"A person one day asked if her sufferings were not very great. 'Yes, I suffer,' was the reply; 'but I strive always to remember how much more Christ suffered for me, and how thankful I ought to be if I suffer now for his Name's sake.' 'You must be very good, Rosa,' was the rejoinder.' 'No, I am not,' she answered; 'there are none good; but what I am, I am by the grace of God; he will give me strength to glorify him.'

"Controversial books were given her to read; but, unlettered as she is on most topics, she is yet thoroughly well read in that Book which maketh wise unto salvation; and the precision and clearness with which she applies its unerring test to the arguments placed before her, would give a salutary lesson to many in these times.

"She shed no tears during our interview; but the muscles of her mouth often quivered, and her poor, thin hands were often pressed nervously together, particularly when speaking of her husband.

"She said she 'tried not to weep, as she feared her tears might be attributed to regret at the course she had taken, or to faint-heartedness.' Those only who understand the Italian character, its warmth of expression and vehemence in lamentation, can adequately appreciate this heroic woman in her calm, Christian endurance and resignation."

THE POWER OF THE KEYS.

THERE are three remarkable passages in the Holy Scriptures, the right understanding of which we hold to be a matter of great importance to sound views of the priestly office in the Church of Christ; and we proceed to consider them with an anxious desire neither unduly to derogate from nor unduly to exalt that reverend office.

The three passages are Matt. xvi. 19, Matt. xviii. 18, John xx. 23.

In Matt. xvi. 19, our Lord, in his address to St. Peter (who had just acknowledged him to be the Christ, the Son of the living God), says—"And I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."

In Matt. xviii. 18, our Lord, addressing ALL the apostles, and teaching them how they should deal with offending brethren, says—"Verily I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."

In John xx. 23, again addressing *all* the apostles, our Lord says—"Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whosesoever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever sins ye retain they are retained."

We shall not now enter into the question, whether the first of these texts, with its context, gave St. Peter a primacy or superiority over the rest of the Apostles—that will form the subject of a distinct consideration, which we shall not overlook in its proper place: our present object of inquiry is a different one, what is the *nature* and *extent* of the *power* conferred by our Blessed Lord in any or all of these passages, upon the Apostles or any of them, or on the bishops and priests who were to succeed them in their *pastoral* office in future times.

Three things are spoken of by our Lord, which may be either distinct in their nature or several forms of expression for denoting one and the same thing—

1st. The keys of the kingdom of heaven.

2ndly. The power of binding and loosing on earth.

3rdly. The power of remitting or retaining sins.

What "the kingdom of heaven" means in the passage in Matt. xvi. 19, has been the subject of much discussion, and there are strong reasons for holding that it is used in this and other passages as referring to the "kingdom of heaven" in its now existing form of Christ's Church militant here on earth, preparatory to its future development in glory; but we are willing, for the sake of making the discussion as simple as possible, to treat it for the present as if it related directly to the future state of that kingdom only, rather than to its present state as now existing on this earth.

Upon this supposition, the most favourable one to the exaltation of the power of the priesthood, how does the matter in question stand?

On the same night that our Lord was betrayed,* he said to his disciples—"Ye are they which have continued with me in my temptations; and I appoint unto you a *kingdom*, as my Father hath appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table *in my kingdom*, and sit on thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel."

So Matt. xix. 28—"And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, that ye which have followed me, in the regeneration, when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye *also* shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel," which passage closely follows verses 23, 24, in which he says—"A rich man shall hardly enter into the *kingdom of heaven*, and it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the *kingdom of God*."

Assuming that those passages refer to the same kingdom of which St. Peter was to be given the keys, it would follow from them that the kingdom appointed to the apostles was no other than CHRIST'S OWN KINGDOM, which the Father had appointed to him, and which is alike, without distinction, called "the kingdom of HEAVEN" and "the kingdom of GOD." And it is surely manifest, that Christ never intended to *deprive himself* of his kingly power by *conferring on his apostles* twelve thrones, on which they were to judge the twelve tribes of Israel.

What, then, was meant by our Lord when he promised St. Peter (admitting the promise was made to him), "I will give thee the *keys* of the kingdom of heaven?" Could he have meant to relinquish the power of opening and shutting the kingdom of heaven to whomsoever he will, and to bestow on any apostle, however great, that EXCLUSIVE power? Surely it would be equally absurd in reason and inconsistent with the rest of God's revealed Word to think so. We doubt, indeed, if any one, however high his notions of priestly power, would venture to assert a proposition so startling and extravagant.

Hear, however, what our Lord says, in the parable of the ten virgins, who came to the door of the kingdom of heaven, after the door was shut, saying, "*Lord, Lord, open to us.*" Does he answer, Go to Peter, for I have given him the keys? No; but verily I say unto you, "*I know you not.*"

And, again, Rev. i. 17, 18—"Fear not, I am the first and the last, I am he that liveth and was dead, and, behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen; and have the *keys of hell and of death.*" And, Rev. iii. 7—"These things, saith he that is holy, he that is true, he that hath the *key of David, he that openeth and no man shutteth, and shutteth and no man openeth.*"

Can any one doubt that Christ, who is the Alpha and the Omega, the first and the last, has still in his hands the keys of both heaven and hell, and that neither St. Peter nor any other can open or shut the kingdom of heaven, in the same sense that our Lord does, "that hath the key of David, and that openeth and no man shutteth, and shutteth and no man openeth?"

* The following specimen of such a curse is abridged from Ducange, quoted in the Encyclopædia Metropolitana, (article excommunication) —"A complaint having been made to us, by the inhabitants of such a place, that certain cankerworms, caterpillars, and asforth have destroyed the fruits of the vines on several years, and are doing so in this present year, to the great detriment of the inhabitants of the place; and a request having been made to us that we would compel the said animals to depart, by ecclesiastical remedies, we, by the authority which we enjoy in these parts, do admonish the said cankerworms, caterpillars, or by whatever name they may be called, under pain of malediction and anathema, to depart within six days from these regions, and to do no injury either there or in any other place to this diocess. And if, within the above-named six days, the aforesaid animals do not obey this our admonition, then by these writings we curse and anathematize them." This was in the year 1515.

* St. Luke xxii. 28, 29.

In what sense St. Peter and the apostles, or any of their successors, were given the keys of the kingdom of heaven, we shall endeavour presently to elucidate. We shall now only say, that it must be in a different or at least a wholly subordinate sense from that in which our Lord himself holds them.

We shall now consider the power of remitting and retaining sins, given to *all* the apostles, in John xx 23; for the *power of binding and loosing*, if not identical with the *power of the keys*, is evidently annexed to and forms part and parcel of it, as is obvious from the passage in Matt. xvi. 19; and will also incidentally be illustrated by what we have to say on the power of remitting and retaining sins. What, then, does our Lord mean in John xx. 23, when he says—"Whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted, and whosoever sins ye retain they are retained?"

In the life of St. Basil a certain lady is introduced, and represented as coming to that holy Father, for obtaining remission of her sins; but St. Basil, instead of claiming the power of remitting sins, replied to her, by asking this question of her—"Hast thou heard, O woman, that none can forgive sins but God alone?" To which she answered—"I have heard it, Father; and therefore have I moved thee to make intercession unto our most merciful God for me."

St. Basil was too devout and too humble to arrogate to himself that which belonged to God, well knowing that God has never communicated, and never will communicate to any creature, the power that belongs to himself as the Creator, "who will not give his glory unto another."—Isaiah xlviii. 11.

St. Gregory the Great taught the same doctrine in his exposition of the 2nd penitential Psalm, when he thus paraphrases the words of David—"Thou who alone sparest, *who alone forgivest sins: For who can forgive sins but God alone?*"*

So likewise Irenæus tells us that our Lord, in forgiving the sins of the man whom he cured of the palsy (Mark ii. 7, Luke v. 21), did manifestly discover who he was. "For if none," saith he, "can forgive sins but God alone, and our Lord did forgive them, and cured men, it is manifest that he was the Word of God made the Son of Man; and that, as man, he is touched with compassion of us; as God, he hath mercy upon us, and forgiveth us our debts, which we do owe unto God our master."†

It would be easy to multiply from the ancient Fathers authorities on this almost self-evident proposition. Tertullian, St. Hilary, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, St. Chrysostom, St. Cyril, St. Augustine, St. Athanasius, all assert the same thing. We shall be satisfied with St. Cyril, who says—"For, indeed, it belongeth to the *true God alone* to be able to *loose men from their sins*; for who else can free the *transgressors of the law* from sin but he who is the *author of the law* itself?"‡

What, then, must be the meaning of our Lord when he told his apostles, that whatsoever they should bind on earth should be bound in heaven, and whatsoever they should loose on earth should be loosed in heaven?

Many and divers, indeed, have been the explanations given by eminent theologians of the Church of Rome (to say nothing, at present, of the Church of England) upon this important matter. We, for the present, shall content ourselves with a single authority—that of the celebrated Peter Lombard, Bishop of Paris in the 12th century (who died A.D. 1164), known familiarly among scholastics as "*the Master of the Sentences*," from his learned collection of sentences and passages, drawn from the Fathers, illustrating the doctrines of the church, forming such a complete body of divinity, and treated as a work of such high authority, that no less than 244 of the most learned doctors are numbered by the Abbé Fleury among the commentators upon it. After enumerating the opinions of the Fathers upon this point, this master, in his 4th book, thus sums up the matter:—"In this so great variety of opinions (300 years, be it remembered, before the birth of Luther), what is to be held? Surely, this we may say and think, that God alone doth forgive and retain sins, and yet hath given power of binding and loosing to the church; but *he bindeth and looseth one way, and the church another*. For he only himself forgiveth sin, who both cleanseth the soul from inward blot, and looseth it from the debt of everlasting death. But this hath he *not* granted unto priests, to whom, notwithstanding, he hath given the power of binding and loosing—that is to say, of *declaring* men to be bound and loosed. Whereupon the Lord did first by himself restore health to the leper, and then sent him to the priests, by whose judgment he might be declared to be cleansed. So also he offered Lazarus to his disciples, to be loosed, *having first quickened him*".* Cardinal Hugo adds this further explanation—"That the priest cannot bind or loose the sinner with or from the bond of the fault and the punishment due to it; but only declares him to be bound or loosed. As the Levitical priest did not make nor cleanse the leper, but only declared him to be infected or clean."†

We shall probably take occasion, in recurring to this subject again, to show that a vast number of eminent writers, including Pope Hadrian VI. himself, have laid down the same doctrine—that to pardon the fault and eternal punishment due to it is the proper work of God, and that the priest's absolution hath no real operation in so doing, but *presupposes* the party to be *first* justified and absolved by God. Pope Hadrian's words are these—"The most approved divines were of this mind, that the keys of the priesthood do not extend to the remission of the fault."‡

But supposing it were even granted that the power of the church is not merely ministerial or declaratory, but also *judicial*, it surely would not follow that their *judgment* is final and without appeal, irrespective whether the judgment be just or erroneous. Can any one suppose that the Church's judgment, whether pronounced by a priest or a bishop, is not subject to an appeal to the supreme tribunal of the Lord himself? "Shall not the Judge of all the world do right?" And is it possible to believe that God ever deprived himself of the power of doing right, by intrusting to fallible man the judgment of any without an appeal? Whatever the power of the priest may be, it surely is not an arbitrary or unconditional power—of binding those who ought not to be bound, or of loosing those who ought not to be loosed: whatever the power or the limits may be, it is plainly a *conditional* one, and the condition is, that the judgment must be *just*. If the church absolves where she ought not, the sinner can derive no benefit from such absolution—if the church condemns where she ought not, the injured victim cannot be thereby condemned in heaven.

Is this Protestant heresy? Nay, but sound Catholic divinity. The great St. Augustine says—"Thou hast begun to esteem thy brother as a publican; thou bindest him on earth. But look that thou bindest him justly; for *unjust* bonds *justice* shall break." Maldonatus lays it down correctly that when the priest saith, "I absolve thee," he means no more thereby but, "As much as in me lieth, I absolve thee." And the same *Master of the Sentences*, Peter Lombard, pronounces thus:—"God doth not evermore follow the judgment of the church, which sometimes judges by mistake and ignorance; whereas God always judges according to the truth."§ "So the priests sometimes declare men to be loosed or bound, who are not so by God. With the penalty of satisfaction or excommunication they sometimes bind such as are unworthy, or loose them; they admit them that be unworthy to the sacraments, and put back them that are worthy to be admitted. But it must be understood of them whose merits require that they should be loosed or bound; for then is the sentence of the priest approved and confirmed by the judgment of God and the whole court of heaven, when it doth proceed with that discretion that the merits of them who are dealt with do not contradict the same. Whomsoever, therefore, they do loose or bind, using the key of discretion according to the party's merits, they are loosed or bound in heaven—that is, with God; because the sentence of the priest, proceeding in this manner, is approved and confirmed by Divine judgment."‖

To think, therefore, that it lieth in the power of any priest truly to absolve a man from his sins, without implying the condition of his believing and repenting as he ought to do, is both presumption and madness in the highest degree—nearly all theologians agreeing, that the power of binding and loosing committed to the ministers of the church, is not absolute, but limited by the clause, *Clave non errante*, meaning that it is only of force when the matter is judged with right judgment, and no error is committed in the use of the keys.*

We think we have now arrived at the stage of our argument, when it will not be very difficult to give a satisfactory elucidation of what our Saviour means by the keys of the kingdom of heaven, which has been supposed to convey so vast and mysterious a power to the Christian priesthood by those whose aim is to exalt it to an almost superhuman dignity.

We may first remark, that the expression is plainly a figurative one, and therefore much less absolute in its expression than the one of remitting and retaining sins, which we have already shown, upon such high Roman Catholic authority, is not to be construed absolutely, but in a limited and conditional sense, different in kind, as well as subordinate in degree, to the power of God in judging or forgiving the sinner. We have also shown already that Christ did not part with the keys of either heaven or hell, in imparting the keys to St. Peter or his other apostles; and we think it scarcely an assumption to say, that just as the apostles' power of remitting sins was that of *declaring* them to be remitted, conditionally, on the sincere repentance of the sinner, so they had the power of *declaring* men to be true members of Christ's heavenly kingdom, or declaring them excluded from it, on the like condition—viz., that the persons admitted or excluded had or had not the graces of true repentance and true faith.

We can see no reason whatever for conceiving, that the power of admitting or excluding from Christ's kingdom in heaven was at all more absolute or extensive than that of remitting or retaining sin, since sin alone could be the cause of such exclusion; and we think it is almost self-evident, that Christ could never have meant to bestow on St. Peter, or on any other apostle (much less on any of their successors in their *pastoral*, not *apostolical* office), the power of admitting those into heaven whose sins were still unremitted, or of excluding from heaven any whose sins were forgiven. So far, therefore, as concerns that kingdom of heaven of which we have been hitherto speaking—viz., the future state of happiness of the redeemed—we think the power of the keys is identical with, and merely a figurative mode of expressing the same thing as, the power of binding and loosing, and of remitting and retaining sins, all of which were conferred upon the apostles only in a subordinate and conditional sense, and never were, by the early Church, considered as imparting to them that power of forgiving sins which belongs to God alone, who only can discern and judge the inward heart, and spirit of man, or that power which Christ has reserved to himself, of "opening so that no man can shut, and shutting so that no man can open."

There remains much to be said upon the subject in question, on the supposition that "the kingdom of heaven," in the passage referred to, is to be understood of the Church of Christ in its existing state upon earth, rather than of the invisible Church of Christ in heaven; but we must reserve what we have to say on this head to a future number, in which we hope to throw further light upon this important and interesting question, which appears to us to lie at the root of many of the errors of the Church of Rome.

PIOUS FRAUDS.

THE Roman Catholic priesthood in Ireland are constantly denouncing the Protestant version of the Holy Scriptures, as a corrupt and perverted translation, manufactured by impiety to prop up heresy; as, in fact, a gross and audacious fraud, perpetrated to give countenance to Protestant novelties. We doubt whether any of them ever used so mild or equivocal a title as that at the head of this article, in designating the character of what is known in the Church of England by the name of the Authorized Version of the Holy Scriptures. We shall have much to say on the subject of that translation hereafter; but, for the present, what we would call the attention of our readers to is the question, whether the Church of England or the Church of Rome is most justly chargeable with having *manufactured* translations of the Holy Scriptures to prop up the peculiar doctrines of their respective Churches.

To those of our readers who have read the Roman Catholic tract called *The Touchstone*, which, from time to time, we have reprinted, and replied to in our pages, and compared the passages of Scripture relied on by its author (all of which he has quoted from the Protestant authorized version), with the corresponding passages in the Douay and Rhemish versions, it will probably have already abundantly appeared that the Protestant version has not mutilated or perverted to suit a purpose any passage of Scripture bearing on transubstantiation, purgatory, the sacrifice of the mass, or any other of the points

* "Tu qui solus parcis, qui solus peccata dimittis. Quis enim potest peccata dimittere, nisi solus Deus."—Gregor. Expos. in Psalmi penitential, vol. iii, pars. 2, col. 476. Paris, 1705.

† "Peccata igitur remittens, hominem quidem curavit, semetipsum autem manifeste ostendit quis esset. Si enim nemo potest remittere peccata, nisi solus Deus, remittebat autem hæc Dominus, et curabat homines; manifestum est quoniam ipse erat Verbum Dei, filius hominis factus, &c., ut quomodo homo compassus est nobis, tanquam Deus misereatur nostri, et remittat nobis debita nostra, quæ factori nostro debemus Deo."—Iren. Adv. Hæres. lib. 5, cap. 17, pp. 425, 426. Ox., 1702.

‡ "Et certe solius veri Dei est, ut possit a peccatis homines solvere. Cui enim alii præraricatores legis liberare a peccato licet, nisi legis ipsius autori?"—Cyril. Alexand. in. Johan, lib 12, vol. iv., p. 1101. Paris, 1638.

* "In hac tanta varietate quid tenendum? Hæc sane dicere ac sentire possumus; quod solus Deus dimittit peccata et retinet, et tamen ecclesiæ contulit potestatem ligandi et solvendi: sed aliter ipse solvit vel ligat, aliter Ecclesia. Ipse enim per se tantum dimittit peccatum, qui et animam mundat ab interiori macula, et a debito æternæ mortis solvit. Non autem hoc sacerdotibus concessit: quibus tamen tribuit potestatem solvendi et ligandi: id est, ostendendi homines ligatos vel solutos. Unde Dominus leprosum sanitati prius per se restituit; deinde ad sacerdotes misit, quorum judicio ostenderetur mundatus. Ita etiam Lazarum, jam vivificatum obtulit discipulis solvendum."—Petr. Lombard, lib. 4. sentent. distinct. 18., page 121. Lugd., 1618.

† "Vinculo culpæ, et pœnæ debitæ, non potest eum sacerdos ligare vel solvere; sed tantum ligatum vel absolutum ostendere—sicut Sacerdos Leviticus non faciebat vel mundabat leprosum; sed tantum infectum vel mundum ostendebat."—Hugo. Card. in Matt., cap. 16, vol vi., page 58. Ven., 1703.

‡ "Difficultas magna est inter doctores, an claves sacerdotii se extendant ad culpæ remissionem: et certè probatissimi theologi seoserunt quod non."—Hadrian in quodlibet. quæst. 5, art. 3, page 100. Lugd., 1547.

§ "Ita et hic apertè ostenditur, quod non semper sequitur Deus Ecclesiæ judicium: quæ per surreptionem et ignorantiam interdum judicat; Deus autem semper judicat secundum veritatem."—Petr. Lombard, Sentent, lib. 4, distinct. 18, f. p. 122. Lugd. 1618.

‖ "Aliquando enim ostendunt solutos vel ligatos qui ita non sunt apud Deum: et pœna satisfactionis vel excommunicationis interdum indignos ligant vel solvunt; et indignos sacramentis admittunt, et dignos admitti arcent. Sed intelligendum est hoc in illis, quorum merita solvi vel ligari postulant. Tunc enim sententia sacerdotis judicio Dei et totius cœlestis curiæ approbatur et confirmatur: cum ita ex discretione procedit, ut reorum merita non contradicant. Quoscunque ergo solvuot vel ligant, adhibentes clavem discretionis reorum meritis, solvuntur vel ligantur in cœlis—id est, apud Deum: quia divino judicio sacerdotis sententia sic progressa approbatur et confirmatur."—Petr. Lombard, Sentent., lib. 4, distinct. 18, f. p. 124. Lugd. 1618.

* "Quod in terris sacerdos, *clave non errante*, et recto judicio procedens, retinet, nec dimittit, Deus etiam in cœlo retinet nec dimittit."—Card. Tulet. Comment. in Johann. cap. 20, p. 353. Lugd. 1615.

in dispute between the two Churches; and notwithstanding the differences of opinion among the learned as to the meaning of particular passages, we think we may safely say that the authorized Protestant version of the Bible has not been *mistranslated* for the purpose of countenancing Protestantism and confuting Romanism. We shall have occasion hereafter to notice the controversy upon the Greek word *μετανοια* which is sometimes translated by the Roman Catholic translators, *repentance*, and sometimes *penance*, but always by Protestants *repentance*, and give our reasons for believing that the Protestant version is the correct one, but shall be happy to insert anything written with candour, and a competent knowledge of the subject by any Roman Catholic who will assert that the Protestant translators mistranslated these, or any other passages, for the fraudulent purpose we have referred to.

In the meantime we would invite our readers' attention to a remarkable attempt made by some theologians of the Roman Catholic Church to give Scriptural countenance to the leading doctrines of Romanism, and confute Protestantism out of the Bible.

The absence of any passage in the New Testament in which either *purgatory*, the *sacrifice of the mass*, the distinction between *latria* or supreme worship, and *dulia* or inferior worship, or the distinction between *mortal* or *venial* sins, was mentioned, was naturally strongly relied on by the Protestant Reformers in the 16th and 17th centuries. The French people, who were always more inquiring and free than their Italian and Spanish neighbours, could scarcely be successfully prevented from consulting the Scriptures for themselves; and a variety of translations into French had, from time to time, been published, the principal of which were those of Antwerp, in 1530, and reprinted in 1534, and that edited by Amelote, first published with notes in 1666, and afterwards without notes in 1686. All those translations and editions of the French Testament, though very imperfect, were however, felt on the whole, to be anything but favourable to the Roman Catholic party, in opposing the growth of Protestantism; and it, no doubt, was thought advisable to give to the French people a version in their vulgar tongue, which would correct this *defect* in all existing versions, and preserve the people from the taint of heresy. This important and remarkable book was published at Bordeaux, by Jacques Mongiron Millanges (the edition we have seen was printed in 1686), and we shall presently state under what authority.

First, however, let us give a few examples of its mode of translation, as contrasted with the Douay Testament published in Ireland, with the approval of all the Irish Roman Catholic bishops, in 1829, and the more modern translation of the Right Rev. F. P. Kenrick, Roman Catholic Bishop of Philadelphia, New York, 1851.

1 Corinth, iii., 15 (Douay version).—"If any man's work burn, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire."

(Bishop Kenrick's version—) "If any man's work burn, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved: yet as by fire."*

Now for the Bordeaux Testament, p. 52 (1 Cor. iii. 15)—"Si l'œuvre de quelqun brûle, il en portera la perte, mais il sera sauve quant a lui, ainsi toutefois comme par le feu *du Purgatoire*."

"If any one's work burn, he shall bear the loss, but he himself shall be saved, yet as by the fire of PURGATORY."

Acts of the Apostles xiii. 2 (Douay version)—"And as they were ministering to the Lord, and fasting, the Holy Ghost said to them: Separate me Saul and Barnabas for the work whereunto I have taken them."

Bishop Kenrick—"And as they were ministering to the Lord, and fasting, the Holy Ghost said to them: Separate me Saul and Barnabas for the work whereunto I have taken them."

What says the Bourdeaux, p. 36?—Acts xiii. 2.—"Or comme ils offroient au Seigneur le sacrifice de la MESSE, et quils jeunoient le S. Esprit leur dit; Separez moy Saul et Barnabé pour lœuvre anquel je les ay destinez."

"And as they were offering to the Lord *the Sacrifice of the MASS*, and fasting," &c., &c.

How conclusive must such passages have been to the simple-minded readers of the French Testament, who sought in the Word of God a confutation of Protestant heresy, and proof from Holy Scripture of Purgatory and the Sacrifice of the Mass, being among the apostolical doctrines of primitive Christianity.

Not less so the following:—

1 Timothy iv. 1 (Bordeaux Testament, p. 192)—"Or l'esprit dit clairement, ques derniers temps, quelquesuns se separerout de *la foy Romaine* s' adonnans aux esprits d' erreur, and aux doctrines enseignees par des diables. V. 2—Disans des choses fausses par hypocrisie, ayans aussi la conscience cauterisée. V. 3—Condamnans *le sacrament* de mariage, l'abstinence des alimens que Dieu a creés pour les fidelles, &c."

"Now, the Spirit says clearly, that in the last times some shall separate themselves from the Roman Faith, giving themselves up to spirits of error and to doctrines taught by devils, speaking lies in hypocrisy, and having their consciences seared; condemning the sacrament *of marriage*, and abstinence from meats, which God has created," &c.

See now and compare the Douay version—"Now the Spirit manifestly saith, that in the last times some shall depart from the faith, &c. . . . . *forbidding to marry*, to abstain from meats," &c.

Bishop Kenrick follows the Douay version in this passage, but freely admits, in the note (see p. 463), that the passage ought to run *forbidding* to marry, and *commanding* to abstain from meats, as things unlawful; but in neither the Douay nor Bishop Kenrick's version is there a hint either as to the separation being from the *Roman* faith, or marriage being a *sacrament*, or that the apostasy of the latter times was to consist in condemning the *sacrament*, and not the practice of marriage.

Two other examples will suffice:—

1 John v. 17—(Douay Testament)—"All iniquity is sin. And there is a sin unto death."

(Bishop Kenrick)—"Every iniquity is sin: and there is a sin unto death."

Bordeaux Testament, p. 292.—"Tout iniquite est peché, mais il y a quelque peché qui nest pas mortel, *mais veniel*."

"All iniquity is sin; but there is sin which is not mortal, *but venial*."

Luke iv. 8.—(Douay version)—"And Jesus answering said to him, It is written: *Thou shalt adore the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve*."

(Bordeaux Testament)—"Serviras *de latria* a lui seul."

"And him only shalt thou serve *with latria!*"

What a convenient and conclusive mode of settling the controversy with heretics! For if this French Testament was published by sufficient authority, and certified to be a correct translation, what Frenchman could doubt that the alleged reformers had perverted and garbled the Holy Scriptures, by wickedly excluding from their copies and translations all mention of *purgatory*, the sacrifice of the *mass*, the holy *Roman* faith, the *sacrament* of marriage, *venial* sin, or the distinction between supreme and inferior worship,—the *Latria* and Dulia of the Church of Rome—all of which were thus distinctly and expressly mentioned in the authorized French version, though *now* we see them equally omitted from the most authentic of the Roman Catholic versions of the Holy Scriptures.

Let us now inquire by whom was this French translation made, and by what authority published and attested.

Let the volume speak for itself. We give the following translation, with the original French in the note. The title is as follows:—

"The New Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ, translated from Latin into French, by the Theologians of Louvain. Printed at Bordeaux, by James Mongiron Millanges, Printer to the King and the College, 1686, with approbation and permission."

Then follows the *approbation*, which is as follows:—

"We, the undersigned Doctors in Theology, of the *University of Bordeaux*, attest that the present French version of the Latin New Testament, revised and approved of by the Catholic Apostolic Church of Rome, made by the Doctors Theologians of *the University of Louvain*, revised and approved by several Doctors of Theology of the *University of Paris*, and several times printed by the permission of Superiors, is very useful for all those who shall be able to read it with the permission of their Superiors. In faith whereof we have signed this present attestation at Bordeaux, this 11th February, 1661.

"Lopes,
"Theological Canon of the Metropolitan Church
"Germain Carme."

Then is added the following

"permission.

"We, Louis D'Anglure de Bourlemont, by the Grace of God and of the Holy Apostolic See, Archbishop of Bordeaux, Primate of Aquitaine, permit the widow of James Mongiron Millanges to print the New Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ, translated from Latin into French, revised and exactly corrected. Given at Bordeaux, in our Archiepiscopal Palace, this 17th July, 1686.

"Louis, Archbishop of Bordeaux,
"By order of his Grace,
"Cosson, Secretary."*

Here, then, we have the three Roman Catholic universities of Louvain, Paris, and Bordeaux, and the Archbishop of the latter city, and Primate of Aquitaine, attesting and approving of this translation, as carefully revised and exactly correct! What higher authority could any pious Frenchman desire, and who could dream of or suspect the *pious* frauds by which such daring interpolations could alone have been introduced or excused?

Père Simon, in his "Critical History of the Versions of the New Testament," gives us an amusing anecdote of Monsieur Veron, the controversialist, who, being asked why he translated the passage Acts xiii. 2, "*the sacrifice of the Mass*, naively replied by giving the reason—"Que les Calvinistes lui avoint souvent demandé en quel lieu de l'Ecriture il etoit marqué que les Apôtres eussent dit la Messe!"—"That the Calvinists had often asked him in what part of Scripture it was stated that the apostles had ever said Mass!" To get out of which difficulty, we presume, controversy had taught him no readier or simpler means, than that of manufacturing a translation for the purpose, and fortified by no less than the theologians of three great universities, and a Primate Archbishop, we can scarcely be surprised if the expedient was for a time a successful one.

After this, will it be boasted that the Roman Catholic Church have been the only faithful preservers and guardians of the Divine oracles? and do we act uncharitably when we warn our readers against guides so unscrupulous? We do not assert that all Roman Catholic bishops are capable of such barefaced dishonesty; but we do say to our readers, as a man loves his own soul, let him take care how he implicitly, and without inquiry, trusts a Church that will tolerate universities and archbishops who, by way of *pious fraud*, dare to falsify the Word of God at this rate. Any man may honestly make a mistake in translating or transcribing a will; but who would trust one who could deliberately add to or forge testaments or deeds? Surely it is not piety, but wickedness, to corrupt the holy oracles of God, *to serve a turn*. After this, we think no one need be much surprised at the interpolations and forgeries which have been circulated under high authority among the writings of the Fathers, and the epistles of the Popes, much less at the perversions, by modern controversialists, of passages from such writers as Bishop Jeremy Taylor and Sir Edward Sandys—which we have already noticed more than once in our pages—and which we feel assured no Roman Catholic, of education or principle, would willingly countenance, whatever the object aimed at by such fraud, be it pious or otherwise.

THE TALK OF THE ROAD—No. X.

Well, the work began to get a little slack in Kilcommon, so Pat went home for a few days, and, of course, he went over the first evening to Jemmy Brannan, to have a talk with him about what was doing.

"So tell us, Pat," said Jem, "how things is going on."

"Why, then, there's law going on," said Pat.

"And what's that about?" said Jem.

"Why, it's about stoning the readers," said Pat. "I was out one day with the cart, and I saw the greatest work at all; there was the readers first, walking as hard as they could, and you wouldn't see a bit of the colour of their clothes as big as my hand, the way they were covered over with mud and slush from head to foot; and Paddy Brady, and Micky Dooly, and the Finnegans, and a set of the biggest vagabonds in Kilcommon, the fellows that used to be stealing the sheep, and that's up to all kinds of mischief, after them, pelting all the dirt they could get on them; and when the readers crossed over a piece of road that the stones was spread on the day before, and the boys came on it after them, if there wasn't a shower of stones after them fit to wipe the mud off of them! And their hats was knocked off, and their heads cut, and lumps on them as big as eggs. And then the polis comes down, and takes Paddy Brady, and Mick Dooly, and another that was foremost, and marches them off. And sure, says the boys, 'It's only defendin' our religion we are.'"

"And arn't they the pretty fellows to be defendin' their religion?" said Jem.

"Sure enough," said Pat, "I believe it's little they trouble the priest about religion. I hear tell there's not one of them has been at confession these five years; but Father John thinks them the right sort now, as you'll find."

"Well, on the Friday after, the boys were to be tried afore the bench, and it happened to be a holiday, so there was no work doing; and I seen such a crowd going to the chapel that I went there, too, to hear what Father John would say; and, sure enough, after mass, the sermon was all about the firebrands, and the soupers, and the ranters, and the poor, innocent boys

---

* Bishop Kenrick explains this passage in a note, p. 283—"As a man escaping through the fire." See also Catholic Layman, vol. i., p. 45, for St. Chrysostom's opinion on this passage.

* Le Nouveau Testament de notre Seigneur Jesus Christ, traduit de Latin en François par les Theologiens de Louvain. A Bourdeaux chez Jacques Mongiron Millanges Imprimeur du Roy et du College, 1686, avec approbation et permission.

Nous soubs-signes Docteurs en Theologie de l'Universite de Bordeaux attestons que la presente version Françoise du Nouveau Testament Latin reveu et approuué de L'Eglise Catholique Apostolique et Romaine faite par les Docteurs Theologiens de l'Universite de Louvain reveu et approuue par plusieurs Docteurs de Theologie de l'Universite de Paris et par la permission des Superiers plusieurs fois imprimee est treautile a tous ceux qui avec permission des Superieurs, seront capables de la lire. En foy dequoy avons signe la presente attestation. A Bordeaux ce 11 Fevrier, 1661.

Lopes,
Chanoine Theologal de l'Eglise Metropolitaine,
Germain Carma.

permission.

Louis D'Anglure de Bourlemont par la Grace de Dieu et du Saint Siege Apostolique Archeveque de Bordeaux, Primat d'Aquitaine nous permettons a la Veuve de G. de la Court Jacques Mongiron Millanges de faire imprimer le N. T. de N. S. J. C. traduit de Latin en Françoi reveu et exactement corrige. Donné a Bourdeaux dans notre Palais Archiepiscopal, le 17 Juillet, 1686.

Louis, Arch. de Bordeaux,
par commandement, de Monsieur
Cosson, Secretaire.

that was going to be tried, and persecuted, and exterminated, only just for trying to keep their religion from being insulted by the firebrands. So when he was tired, says he, 'Now go down every one of you,' says he, 'man, woman, and child,' says he, 'and stand by the poor fellows that's going to be persecuted and swore against by the firebrands,' says he. So, sure enough, when I got to the courthouse, there was a thousand people there anyway. And there was Mr. Foley, the lawyer, from Dublin, come down to defend the boys."

"And who paid for him coming?" said Jem.

"Why," said Pat, "Father John sent round his servant, and two or three of his head men, to all the Catholic shopkeepers and tradesmen in Kilcommon, and made them all subscribe their pounds, and ten shillings, and five shillings; and I heard tell they liked it little enough, but they were mostly all afraid to bring Father John's tongue on them in the chapel; only Mr. Nulty and one or two more that never cares what Father John can say. Well, the readers told their story mighty fair and clever, and then Mr. Foley got up and examined them, to make them confess they were insulting the people, and he fetched out a tract, and asked them did they give any of that; and they said they did a few; and then he read out a place where it said the priests was harrassing the people for their dues. And then he made a great speech entirely to the magistrates, and said, what wonder what would happen to them, when they were insulting the people and their religion like that?"

"And did he make out they were insulting their religion any other way?" said Jem.

"No then he didn't," said Pat, "but he thought that the greatest insult at all."

"Well, then, I'm thinking," said Jem, "he got his story from Father John, for it's he that *would* think that the greatest insult entirely. But sure the people of Kilcommon is greatly changed this ten years back, if they think the like of that is an insult *to them*. Don't I remember, just ten years ago, when the people was fairly riz for the Priest's Tariff, as they called it, up the country? And wasn't the boys of Kilcommon just going to rise for it too, and had it all settled among them, and the day fixed, and all the boys bound to pay only the dues allowed in the Tariff for christening, and marriages, and everything else? And didn't Father John and the rest get up a great meeting for Repale, to put the boys off it, and promised to get them the country for themselves, and all kinds of things? and hadn't they fifty priests at it? and wasn't that the way the monster meetings for the Repale come about, where all the boys was expecting to get the word at last to take Ireland for themselves? And a mighty cute and clever job it was of Father John and the rest, for it put the people off the Tariff entirely.* But sure the people of Kilcommon is greatly changed if they are so easy hurt at a word agen the dues. But if Father John taught the lawyer his story, sure it's all plain enough."

"Well, that was all the insult they had, any way," said Pat, "and then Mr. Owens got up, and said there was only a dozen of that tract given out, and that he stopped it when he heard Father John took offence, and never gave any more; and if anything else was insulting, he'll stop it too. And when the lawyer was done, the gentlemen said there was no law for stoning people for the like of that, and they would have to find the boys guilty, just as if they stoned anybody else. So then the lawyer asked the gentleman only to put a fine on the boys, and whatever it was it would be paid. And while I was wondering where the like of them would get the money, I turned round, and saw Father John with his roll of bank notes out in his hand."

"Ay," said Jem, "I seen that myself, after the work at the election last summer, when Father John paid down the money in open court for every one of the boys that was fined for the work—and bad work it was.† But did the magistrates let them off with a fine?"

"'Deed, didn't they," said Pat, "this time. Old Mr. Everards says, just as quiet and easy as you please—'It's a month's imprisonment and labour we're going to give them,' says he. And I never seen Father John look so mad, for he was'nt going to stand *that* for the boys. Still it's a pretty good thing they made of it; for all their wives and children got new clothes, and meal, and money, and what not."

"And isn't that the dacent way for Father John to be defending his religion?" said Jem; "didn't the Rev. Mr. Owens write him a letter, asking him to settle who was right, by fair discussion, before the people? But Father John would rather get his religion defended with stones and mud, by the blackguards that never comes to confession at all: and does'nt all that show who knows that he has fair reason on his side?"

"Well, Jem," said Pat, "I am coming to think more and more that the priests hasn't reason on their side, and that they know, that once it comes to fair argument, the people will find out that. But as I was going home I fell in with Mr. Owens, and had a talk with him. And, says he, 'Why wouldn't we be stoned,' says he, 'when the blessed Apostles was stoned in almost every place they went to preach in?' says he, and with that he pulled out his Bible, and showed me two places where the Apostles was stoned for speaking to the people;* and another place where the Jews gathered up all 'the wicked men of the vulgar sort, and made a tumult, and set the city on an uproar,'† just for all the world the way Father John does now, 'and so it's no new thing,' says he, 'but we must follow the way the Blessed Apostles went.'"

"But, your reverence," says I, "what can poor men, like the likes of us, do, when the priest can get up the like of that agin any of us, and maybe put us out of our work too? How can we stand up for the Bible at all? And with that he took out his Bible again (and it was a Douay Bible too), and he read these words, that came harder on me than any words that ever I read in the Bible;" and Pat took out his Douay Bible and read the place (Mark viii. 38)—"'For he that shall be ashamed of me and of my words, in this adulterous and sinful generation, the Son of Man also will be ashamed of him, when he shall come in the glory of the Father, with the Holy Angels.' 'And now,' says he, 'are you ashamed to stand up for the word of the Son of God, and will you make him be ashamed to stand up for you?' So I couldn't tell what to say at all, and I can't get them words out of my mind; and what will I do at all?"

So if ever we hear of what they did, we will tell it to our readers.

* Jem is quite right about this fact. We know it ourselves on good authority. The Priest's Tariff had at that time been proclaimed in many counties in Ireland, when the monster meetings turned the minds of the people in another direction.

† Jem is quite correct about this fact, too.

* Acts xiv. 5 and 19.

† Acts xvii. 5.

LATRIA, HYPERDULIA, DULIA.

A PIOUS clergyman of the Established Church, in the west of Ireland, once showed us a scapular that had been presented to him by one of his parishioners who had seceded from the Church of Rome and joined his congregation, on which were embossed, in rude embroidery, three figures, representing, as he stated, Joseph, Jesus, and Mary, on a small heart of cloth, which, for seven years, the individual in question had worn round his neck as a charm, and worshipped, under the impression that Joseph, Jesus, and Mary were the holy and ever-blessed Trinity. We cannot take upon us to state from what source he obtained this scapular, whether from his parish priest or some itinerant Jesuit, who traded on his simplicity; nor should we think it needful to notice such cases of ignorance and superstition, if we did not believe that thousands of such cases exist in our unfortunate country, and that no exertion is made, on the part of either the Roman Catholic priesthood or hierarchy, to disabuse the minds of the people from such delusions. While examining the subject of indulgences, which we can assure our readers we have not lost sight of, with a view to bringing forward some instances which might practically illustrate that important subject, and enable us hereafter to make the arguments of our opponents and ourselves the better understood by those seriously desirous of arriving at the truth, we were struck by the following specimen, which we conceive to be not wholly unconnected with this subject, and which we take from a volume already referred to in our pages, entitled "Indulgences granted by Sovereign Pontiffs to the Faithful, &c., collected by a Member of the Sacred Congregation of Indulgence in Rome, translated with permission of Superiors," published by Richard Grace and Son, 45, Capel-street, Dublin, p. 136. It is verbatim as follows:—

"*Seventy-fifth Indulgence.*

"In order to increase among Christian people a true devotion towards Jesus and Mary, by frequently invoking their most sacred names, together with that of St. Joseph, and to encourage the faithful to recommend themselves to their protection at the close of life, on which depends eternity, Pius VII., by a Decree of the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences, dated 28th of April, 1807, granted for ever an indulgence of 300 days each time they repeat devoutly, and with contrite heart, the following three aspirations to Jesus, Mary, and Joseph, and whenever they say one of these devout aspirations, he granted them an indulgence of 100 days. In both cases the indulgence is applicable to the souls of the faithful departed. It is recommended to make these short and pious aspirations of the soul in the day, and frequently during life, and to suggest them to sick persons in danger of death, which will afford them much spiritual comfort:—

"Jesus, Mary, and Joseph, I offer you my heart and soul.

"Jesus, Mary, and Joseph, assist me in my last agony.

"Jesus, Mary, and Joseph, may I breathe forth my soul in peace with you."

We are aware that, according to Roman Catholic principles, supreme worship, by them called Latria, is due to our Lord Jesus Christ, as one of the persons of the ever Blessed Trinity. A secondary and inferior worship—Hyperdulia—to the Blessed Virgin Mary, and a tertiary or lower worship—Dulia—to Joseph and other saints canonized by the Church. To keep ever in mind this important distinction is admitted to be necessary to avoid the mortal sin of idolatry; but here we have Pope Pius VII. recommending an act, including *Latria*, *Dulia*, and *Hyperdulia* in the same prayers, and even in the same sentence, solemnly recommending pious persons, in the hour of death, devoutly to offer up their *heart* and *soul*, not to the three persons of the ever Blessed Trinity—God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, each of whom is entitled to the same supreme worship—but to three persons, of whom, according to Roman Catholic doctrine, one only is entitled to supreme, and the others to different degrees of even inferior worship.

Will any of our Roman Catholic readers explain to us how it would be possible to offer up our *heart* and *soul* to Jesus, Mary, and Joseph in three different ways, in the same devout aspiration, or tell us in what respect calling on Jesus, Mary, and Joseph at the hour of death to "assist us in our last agony," differs from the most solemn prayer which the human heart is capable of pouring forth to the Most High God? It would strike an ordinary mind, unclouded by metaphysical and scholastic theology, that it would be mockery to address to the Divine Redeemer of our souls in the solemn hour of death, anything short of the highest adoration—the supremest worship of which the human soul is capable, and that no language addressed to the Supreme Being could surpass in devout solemnity the simple and touching words—"I offer thee my heart and soul—assist me in my last agony—may I breathe forth my soul in peace with thee!" If such be not the prayer of Latria, we would earnestly request some of our friends to show us in what the worship of Latria consists. If it do amount to Latria, or an act of the highest devotion, we would then ask whether it be probable—nay, possible—that a dying man could use these prayers at the same moment, with three different feelings and emotions—Latria towards Jesus, Hyperdulia towards Mary, Dulia towards Joseph? Can one offer up his *heart* and *soul* in three different ways, in the same breath, to three different persons, differing so widely in dignity and nature? In sober sadness, we ask our Roman Catholic friends to tell us whether the blame lies at the door of the ignorant peasant who worships the worsted images of Joseph, Jesus, and Mary, and the itinerants who traffic in such wares, or at the door of Pope Pius VII., who offers, in the nineteenth century, 300 days' indulgence to every one who prays to Jesus, Mary, and Joseph in the way prescribed, and recommends them frequently, every day during their lives, and *especially when dying*, to look for spiritual comfort from such exercises?

We have looked into Cardinal Bellarmine on this subject, who distinctly lays it down (De Sanct. Beatit. Lib. i., c. 17, p. 292—"Quomodo sancti invocandi non sint") that it is proved—1st, by Scripture; 2nd, by the practice of the Church; 3rd, by reason; and 4th, by the Fathers St. Augustine and Theodoret, that we should not expect or seek for anything from saints save that they should, by *their prayers*, obtain from God those things which are useful for us, which he tells us (in chapter xii., p. 287) is the inferior worship of Dulia, as distinguished from Latria or the worship of God, and Hyperdulia, the worship of Christ in his *human* nature, and the Blessed Virgin as the Mother of the Son of God. Now, is there anything in these prescribed prayers (to be rewarded by a 300 days' indulgence) or in the exhortation to use them to guard the suppliant against the danger of confounding the divine and human natures of Christ, and addressing him only in his *human nature* with Hyperdulia, or of falling into idolatry, by addressing the Blessed Virgin and St. Joseph with Latria, at the same moment with Jesus in his *divine nature?*

Did Pope Pius VII. recommend the dying to resort to Jesus in his Divine or in his human nature, to address him with Latria or mere Hyperdulia?

Could any man, however educated in scholastic subtleties, much less any simple-minded rustic, suppose that by the words, "Jesus, Mary, and Joseph, I offer you my heart and soul," it is not meant to convey a *devoting* of the heart and soul to *each* of those three persons, but merely, "Jesus, I devote to *thee* my heart and soul; and, Mary, I beseech thee to intercede for me with thy son Jesus, to accept my heart and soul; and Joseph, I invoke thee to pray for me?"

If we consult the written Word of God, we shall be at no loss to point out to whom we ought to offer our heart and soul, as the highest act of religious homage.

"These are the precepts," says Moses,* "which the Lord your God commanded that I should teach you . . . Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord, and thou shalt love the LORD THY GOD with thy WHOLE HEART, and with thy WHOLE SOUL, and with thy whole strength." And when our blessed Lord himself was asked by a certain lawyer tempting him—"Master, what must I do to possess eternal life?" The answer was, "What is written in the law? How readest

* Deut. vi., Douay Bible.

thou?" He answering said*—"Thou shalt love the Lord THY God with thy WHOLE HEART, and with thy WHOLE SOUL, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind, and thy neighbour as thyself;" and he said to him—"Thou hast answered right; this do, and thou shalt live." Is not this true adoration? Is not this true supreme worship? "God is a spirit, and they that adore him must adore him in spirit and in truth"†

Can any one dare, in the hour of death, to offer the affections of his *heart* and *soul* to any one but him who has thus plainly declared that HE requires the *whole* heart and the *whole* soul of his creatures, and that not from the lips only, but in spirit and in truth?

We ask again, in all sincerity and solicitude for the safety of men's souls, will they peril them (for the promise of a 300 days' Indulgence), and hazard their immortal safety, by offering to any created being that heart and that soul which, if there be any truth in the Douay Bible, belongs to the Supreme God alone? and if not, what must be thought of Pope Pius VII., who thus recommends and tempts them to do so, even in the awful hour of death, by offering them a 300 days' indulgence for each time they do so?

We take this opportunity of stating, that we have not lost sight of the subject of indulgences, nor shall we evade any argument which has been urged by Roman Catholic divines and controversialists in support of it. Possibly the instance above given may serve hereafter to assist us in practically illustrating the doctrine, and the uses to which it has been applied.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Several valuable communications are in type, but are necessarily postponed till our next, for want of room.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st.

No anonymous letter can be attended to. Whatever is sent for insertion must be authenticated by the name and address of the writer, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee for his good faith.

We would request our valued correspondents, both Roman Catholics and Protestants, to limit the length of their communications, and not to discuss a variety of distinct topics in one letter.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, MARCH 1853.

IT has been well said by an old writer, that "there is nothing which truth fears so much as to be prevented from appearing in public, and being exposed to the examination of all men." This must needs be because truth will bear close inquiry, and the more it is tried the more will the pure and solid gold be apparent to those who test and analyze it. As laymen and freemen, we heartily respond to this. We cannot believe that truth can be really promoted by the clergy being allowed to keep up a monopoly of knowledge to themselves, or by the laity being compelled to accept implicitly everything proposed to them relating to religious truth and duty without further inquiry, merely because the Church prescribes it; and we cannot but suspect that priestly advisers have some design not quite unconnected with their own aggrandizement, when they ask men to shut their eyes and ears against everything which does not directly favour their own views, or which tends to encourage freedom of judgment, and enlarged and accurate views of the grounds on which their faith is founded. Any Church or set of men which challenges close inquiry into their pretensions and claims, we think naturally deserves the respectful attention, at least, of every one who has sufficient self-respect and reliance on the reason and intelligence which God has given him, to reflect and judge for himself between truth and falsehood; while any Church which would deter men from inquiry, and invite them to close their eyes and ears against all that is going on around them in the world of intellectual progress, would seem to us naturally to create a suspicion in the mind of any thinking man, that its leaders were conscious they could gain nothing, and might lose everything by too close a scrutiny into the foundation of their pretensions. The champion of truth must, we think, ever be bold and fearless, and anxious for the conflict, because he has proved and assayed his armour and his weapons, and can unhesitatingly confide in them. Distrust and timidity better become him who *doubts* the *soundness* of his cause, as he who anticipates defeat is never very solicitous for the combat. Have our Roman Catholic readers yet satisfied themselves why it is that their priests decline and evade the challenges we have so frequently urged on them to a fair and friendly discussion, and why they prefer maligning our motives and objects to meeting our arguments, and preaching the doctrine of implicit faith and blind obedience, to encouraging all, in the language of their own Bible, to "prove all things, hold fast that which is good?"—1 Thessal. v. 21 (Douay version). We can give but one explanation of it, which we will also do in the language of an old writer rather than our own—"I would have you to wit that the Church of Rome knew what they did when they invented the doctrine of an implicit faith and a blind obedience to all the Church's decrees; for if men should once dare to open their eyes and examine their assertions all their craft would be in danger to be set at nought, and the temple of 'Dominus Deus noster Papa' (as the Canon law calls him) would be despised, and his magnificence would be destroyed, whom so great a part of the world worshippeth."*

We rejoice, however, to think, that the progress of light, knowledge, and education in these free kingdoms has released from the fetters with which priestcraft had so long enchained them, thousands of thoughtful men, of vigorous minds and independent understandings, who know how to distinguish between subservience and respect, and can be inquirers without scepticism, and rational without being irreverent. Ignorant or timid men, of limited capacities and feeble judgment, *may*, and, perhaps, *must* ever be led by others, whether for good or for evil, but that is plainly no rule for those to whom God has given a larger amount of intelligence and capacity, and who feel themselves able to understand and weigh the force of evidence and argument, and who are not disposed to be blindly led, they know not whither, and cannot be happy, or feel themselves secure, without inquiring at least to the extent that will satisfy them that they are not trusting to blind leaders of the blind, which could lead ultimately but to the destruction of both. We would not urge or wish our readers lightly or hastily to make up their minds without the fullest and most careful examination of the important subjects of controversy between the two Churches. All we urge on them is, to persevere in their inquiries, and calmly and deliberately judge for themselves in so momentous a matter, on which no less a stake than that of their eternal happiness may depend. But when they have once made up their minds, on adequate grounds, as to the guides they should follow, let them do so in the spirit of intellectual freedom and enlightened conscientious conviction, and not in the contemptible servility of ignorance and superstitious fear. Priestly curses may be formidable, in a temporal point of view, when backed up by the physical force of the rabble; but to those who would satisfy themselves of their *spiritual* inefficacy, as well as sinfulness, we would recommend the perusal of the article on the *Fair of Loughmanagh*, which they will find in another column of our present number.

* Luke x. 25, 27, Douay Bible.
† John iv. 24, Douay Bible.

* Poole's Nullity of the Romish Faith, p. 18. Oxford, 1667.

THE TOUCHSTONE.

(Continued from page 21.)

OBJECTION 40.—Protestants will not allow that *water*, or other creatures of God, may be *sanctified*, or made *holy*, by the prayers of the church.

Their Bible assures them they may—*For every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving. For it is* SANCTIFIED *by the word of God and* PRAYER.—1 *Tim.* iv. 4, 5.

REPLY.—It is plain that this passage relates altogether to men's *ordinary diet*. The Apostle is warning Timothy against certain false teachers who pretended that there was some special virtue and holiness in celibacy, and in abstaining from certain kinds of food, "forbidding to marry and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believed and knew the truth. For every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused if it be received with thanksgiving."

Protestants accordingly hold, as this Apostle teaches them, that all kinds of food—whether fish, flesh, or vegetables—being all alike "creatures of God," are indifferent in his sight, and are "sanctified"—that is, made pure—by our offering prayers and thanksgiving to Him for his gifts. As for any spiritual efficacy in sprinklings with what is called "holy water," it does not appear that any such thing was ever thought of in the times of the Apostles. And this the writer of the "Touchstone" seems to be aware of, by his bringing forward a passage which so manifestly has nothing to do with the matter.

OBJECTION 41.—Protestants teach, in the eleventh of their thirty-nine articles, that *we are justified by faith alone*.

Their Bible expressly teaches the contrary (St. *James* ii. 24)—*You see, then, how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only.* 1 *Cor.* xiii. 2—*Though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have no charity, I am nothing.*

REPLY.—Protestants do not presume to deny or to keep out of sight what the Apostle Paul says, who most undeniably does speak of justification through faith.—See Rom. v. 1; iv. 1—8, &c. And as it is impossible that he and his brother-Apostle St. James could really have taught contrary doctrines, it is plain that they must be speaking of different kinds of faith. St. Paul certainly did not mean that there is any value in such faith as consists in mere belief, not bringing forth the *fruit* of holiness of life. For that, as St. James observes, is the faith of devils [demons], who "believe and tremble." Nor, again, could St. James be speaking of any good works—however beneficial to mankind, and so far good in themselves—which do not proceed from a right motive. For these would be no less the good works of demons, than the other is the faith of demons. It is a "good thing" in itself to acknowledge Jesus as the Holy One; but those demons, whom He cast out, when they made this acknowledgment, did so because they were overruled by a superior power.

And, indeed, the very instance which St. James brings forward proves that he was speaking of good works springing from faith and love towards God. For Abraham's obedience evidently was the result of a firm faith. And the Apostle accordingly says—"I will show thee my *faith by my works*."

But neither by our own works nor by our own faith are we able to save *ourselves*. Eternal life, we are assured, is the gift of God through Christ; and He has Himself assured us that we can have no claim of *merit* in his sight: for "when ye have done all those things which are commanded you, say, we are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do."

OBJECTION 42.—Many Protestants maintain, that the faith by which we are justified is, to believe, with an infallible assurance, that we are justified, and that we are of the number of the predestinate.

Their Bible expressly teaches the contrary, when it admonishes us (*Philipp.* ii. 12) to *work out our salvation with fear and trembling*. And when *St. Paul* tells us (1 *Cor.* ix. 27) of himself, that *he kept under his body, and brought it into subjection, lest, having preached to others, he himself should be cast away*. Can these people pretend to be more secure than *St. Paul?*

REPLY.—Questions about predestination have nothing to do with the differences between Protestant and Roman Catholic. For as Protestants are much divided among themselves on several of these questions, Roman Catholics are no less so. Augustine, whom they regard as a very eminent saint, was, it is well known, a zealous predestinarian; and so are many eminent Roman Catholic divines; while others of them have taught the contrary. But most advocates of predestination, Protestant or Roman Catholic, would admit that whoever is predestined to final salvation, is also predestined to work out his salvation by walking in God's commandments.

OBJECTION 43.—Many Protestants maintain that the commandments of God are impossible; and that no man ever kept them all.

Their Bible confutes this assertion, by the example of *Zacharias* and *Elizabeth*, of whom we read (*St. Luke* i. 6)—*They were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless.*

REPLY.—No Protestant, or, indeed, any one in his right mind, can conceive that anything can be a *duty*—can be *commanded* by God to be done—which is, strictly speaking, "impossible"—that is, absolutely *out of a man's power* to do. To talk of its being a man's *duty* to go to the field of battle and fight for his country, if he were a bed-ridden cripple; or his duty to relieve the poor, if he were himself in a state of destitution, and had nothing to give; or to talk of *commanding* a man to "add a cubit to his stature," or to fly in the air, would be to talk like a madman.

But though the word "duty" clearly implies "possibility," Protestants may well be allowed to doubt the possibility of actually finding a man who has performed all his duties with unsinning rectitude throughout his whole life, without ever committing even the smallest sin. This at least, however, is perfectly plain, that, supposing any such person *actually to exist*, neither he, nor we, nor any but the all-seeing God, could possibly *know* this with certainty, or could have any right to assert it. For "if we say that we have no sin (says the Apostle John), we deceive ourselves." And this would be no less true, even if we *really were* exempt from all actual sin; we could not be authorized to *say* it, since we could not be infallibly sure of it.

And yet many Protestants, as well as Roman Catholics, are accustomed to speak of such and such a person as a "very worthy man," as a "man of blameless life," a "person of exemplary Christian character," &c.; meaning, and being understood to mean, that such is the *general tenor* of his life; not that he was never guilty of any fault, small or great, in all his life. And this is the sense in which St. Luke's description of Zacharias and Elizabeth is most naturally to be understood.

OBJECTION 44.—Many Protestants maintain, that God has not a sincere will of the salvation of all men, but only of the elect; and that Christ did not die for all.

Their Bible, in express words, confutes this error, when it tells us (1 *Tim.* ii. 3, 4) *that God our Saviour will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth*; and ver. 6, that Christ *gave himself a ransom for all.* And 2 *St. Pet.* iii. 9, that God is *not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance.* And 1 *St. John* ii. 2, that Christ *is the propitiation for our sins; and not for our sins only, but also for the sins of the whole world.*

REPLY.—The same remark is applicable here which was made in objection 42. Questions about predestination and election are nothing to the present purpose, since, on these points, both Protestants and Roman Catholics are divided among themselves.

OBJECTION 45.—Protestants will have it, that there is no middle place, or middle state of souls, after this life: but that all go straight either to heaven or to hell.

Their Bible teaches to the contrary (1 *St. Pet.* iii. 18, 19), 20, where *Christ being put to death in the flesh*, is said, *by the spirit, to have gone and preached to the spirits in prison, which sometime were disobedient*, &c., which *prison* cannot be understood either of heaven or of the hell of the damned; for Christ certainly did not go to preach there; and, therefore, it must be a middle place.

REPLY.—Whatever this obscure text may mean (and Roman Catholics as well as Protestants differ very much among themselves on that point), it cannot refer to purgatory. For purgatory is said to be a place where the *venial* sins of *Christians* are purged away; whereas the spirits in prison are said to have been disobedient in the time of Noah, before the flood, and to have then despised the long-suffering of God; which was plainly a *mortal* sin. But the writer of the "Touchstone," in order to make the text seem to favour purgatory, garbles the passage quoted from St. Peter, in whose Epistle the latter part of it runs thus:—"Which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, when the ark was preparing, wherein few—that is, eight souls were saved by water."

OBJECTION 46.—Protestants will have it, that there is no *forgiveness* of any sins *in the world to come.*

Their Bible declares the contrary (*St. Matt.* xii. 32), where we read, that the sin against the Holy Ghost *shall not be forgiven* a man, *neither in this world, neither in the world to come.* Which words evidently imply that some sins may be forgiven in the world to come; though that particular kind of sin be excepted from this number, hence follows a middle place, which we call *purgatory*, because in hell there is no forgiveness, and in heaven no sin.

REPLY.—The most obvious sense of this passage would seem to be, that the sin in question will not escape divine judgment, either in the present world or in the next.

But if it had been designed to teach us that there is such a place as purgatory, and that persons are sent thither who die with sins unpardoned by God, and that they may afterwards receive pardon there, through the prayers offered up for them by their surviving friends, and masses said for them by priests, paid for that purpose, and indulgences sold by the Pope—supposing all this had been true, we may be sure the apostles and other early Christian teachers would have set forth so important a doctrine very clearly and frequently in their writings.

This, every one knows, is what is done by Roman Catholic priests at this day; and, therefore, we cannot doubt that the apostles would have done the same, if they had known and designed to teach the doctrine. They would have spoken much, and strongly (as the Roman Catholic priests do), of purgatory, and of the efficacy of masses for the departed, and of indulgences: and, in particular, Peter and the other apostles would have dwelt much on the wonderful privilege bestowed on him and his successors, of delivering numberless souls from a place of torment in the next world.

Now of all this we find not one word in the whole of the New Testament—nothing about purgatory, or masses, or the power of the popes, or anything of the kind is at all mentioned by the sacred writers. Hence Protestants infer that all these things were unknown and unthought of in the early days of the Church, and are entirely an invention of man in later ages; and they are convinced, that if any one in Peter's lifetime had supposed him to possess this wonderful power, and had come and offered him MONEY (as is done to the popes, who claim to be his successors), to release the souls of their friends from torment, he would have been likely to answer, "Thy money perish with thee!" "Do you think," he might have added, "that if I had the power to deliver thousands of souls from unspeakable misery, I would wait to be *paid* for it?—to be paid for releasing a *few*, whose friends were able and willing to afford the cost, instead of at once, and without pay, delivering, *by one stroke of a pen*, ALL souls from purgatory?"

Protestants, therefore, feel assured that no such applications were ever made to Peter, nor any such doctrine taught by him.

OBJECTION 47.—Protestants will not allow, that minute sins, in which the servants of God chance to die, will hinder them from going straight to heaven, or make them liable to punishment from the justice of God.

Their Bible on the contrary teaches (*Rev.* xxi. 27), speaking of the heavenly *Jerusalem*, that *there shall in nowise enter thither anything that defileth.* Now, every sin, be it ever so small, certainly *defileth.* Hence, we learn from *St. Matt.* xii. 36, that we shall be *accountable*, and consequently punishable *for every idle word*: and from many other texts we learn, that *God will render to every man according to his works*; and, consequently, will punish all the evil works, though ever so minute, in which a person dies without repentance.

REPLY.—Repentance is (as the original word implies) a change of mind; and if a man be so changed in mind that he is no longer disposed to commit sins great or small in the future state, then he is fit to go straight to heaven. But if he is not so changed, purgatory cannot help him, unless the pains of purgatory produce such a change. Now, if the pains of purgatory are necessary to work such a change, why do the popes and Roman Catholic priests take money to free people from those pains which are necessary to making them fit for heaven? And if those pains are not necessary, why may not such a saving change be wrought by Christ "*without money and without price*," as well as by the Pope for money, and at a heavy price? Or, is there any text which says that God will punish all evil works, *except the sinner or his friends pay for an indulgence?* But the best Roman Catholic divines hold generally that the pains of purgatory produce no inward change of mind at all, but that a man must be fit (in his inward disposition) to go straight to heaven before he enters purgatory, or else can never be fit for heaven. In purgatory, they say, he only pays the *penalty* of his sins. Now, Protestants have learned from Holy Scripture that the penalty of sin has been borne by Christ, and that all that is required on our parts is to quit our sin.

(To be continued.)

Correspondence.

BAPTISM OF BELLS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

MR. EDITOR—In reading, in your last publication, an interesting article on the baptism of bells, I was reminded of conversations I had held, when residing on the Continent, with different persons there, on the subject of that strange ceremony, which, in Roman Catholic countries, is by no means uncommon. I learned from them circumstances connected with it which may readily account for a custom so little in accordance with the intellectual enlightment of the age, being still adhered to by the Roman Catholic clergy. It is customary on those occasions for the *curé* (parish priest) or the bishop, if present, to invite the *richest* lady and gentleman in the parish or neighbourhood to undertake the offices of sponsors. They, in return for this honour, feel themselves bound, by etiquette, if not by duty, to present their interesting god-child with a handsome pecuniary donation on the occasion of her baptism. She, on the other hand, with the most exemplary regard for her spiritual pastors and masters, leaves this money altogether at their disposal; so that this religio-comic ceremony can be traced to the same object as many of the other practices taught by Rome—namely, that of *enriching her clergy.* Often have I felt an earnest and affectionate desire that our dear Roman Catholic brethren would open their eyes to this painful truth, and, with candid impartiality, trace one by one the peculiar tenets of their creed to their real source. Then would they soon learn that the system by which they have been long deceived, deserves but too truly the title which the pious Napoleon Roussell has bestowed upon it, "*La religion d'argent*"—the religion of money.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

A LOOKER-ON.

IMAGE WORSHIP AND MIRACLES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—The crowded state of your pages, and the mass of matter you must have on hand, has, no doubt, compelled you to curtail your remarks on the extraordinary letter of your correspondent "Sidrach" (vol. ii., p. 21). May I be permitted to add a few observations?

I. "Sidrach" quotes the decree of Trent on the subject of "*sacred images*," but he quotes only in part. The decree continues—"But because the honour which is shown unto them (the *sacred* images) is *referred to the prototypes which they represent*, in such wise that by the images which *we kiss, and before which we uncover the head and prostrate ourselves*, we adore Christ, and venerate the saints, whose similitude they bear."—Sess. 25.

This practice, in this very decree, the Council declared to be "according to the usage of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, received from the primitive times of the Christian religion, and according to the *consent of the holy Fathers.*" And this 25th Sess. winds up with the grandiloquent words—"We all thus believe, we all think the very same: we all, consenting and embracing them, subscribe. This is the faith of blessed Peter and of the Apostles; this is the faith of the Fathers; this is the faith of all the orthodox. Thus we believe, thus we think, thus we subscribe. Amen: anathema to all heretics—anathema—anathema.!"

And thus "Sidrach," we presume, believes, excepting, perhaps, the kissing and prostrating part of the decree. But must he not accept the decree in its entirety, or not at all? And here let me remind him, that we (Protestants) do not *kiss, or uncover our heads, or prostrate ourselves* before the "statues of Wellingtons, Nelsons, Williams, Georges, and a host of other *deified* (?) personages." The parallel he would make does not hold good.

"Sidrach" has, doubtless, a sincere reverence for the "Fathers" and primitive writers invoked in the above decrees. Perhaps, however, he does not know that this very relative worship, so boldly advocated by the "Sacred Council of Trent," was the identical species of worship, or honour, which the primitive Christians most emphatically denounced. Let me take as examples Arnobius, Lactantius, Origen, St. Ambrose, and St. Augustine, and see how they opposed the reasoning of the *orthodox heathen* belief with regard to image worship.

Lactantius, about A.D. 300, said—"Beyond all doubt, wherever an image is there is no religion."—Lact. Divin. Instit., lib. ii., c. xix.

Arnobius, who flourished at the beginning of the third century, and had been himself a zealous pagan before his conversion to Christianity, thus remonstrated with the heathen idolaters—"You say, 'We worship the gods *through the images.*' What then? If these images did not exist, would the gods not know they were worshipped, nor be aware of any honour being paid to them by you? What can be done more unjust, more disrespectful, more cruel, than to recognise one as a God, and offer up supplication to another thing; to hope for help from a Divine being, and pray to an image which has no sense?"

Again he proceeds—"But ye say, 'You are mistaken: we do not consider materials of brass, or silver, or gold, or other things of which the statues are made, to be of themselves gods, or sacred divinities; but in these materials we worship and venerate these gods whom the holy dedication brings in, and causes to dwell in the images wrought by the craftsman."—Arnob., lib. v., c. ix. and c. xvii., Leipsic Edit. 1816.

Origen thus strongly condemns, by anticipation, this modern heathenism, in his writings against the heathen Celsus—"What sensible person would not laugh at a man (he says) who . . . . looks to images, and there offers up his prayer to them, or, *beholding them*, REFERS IT TO THE BEING CONTEMPLATED IN HIS MIND, to whom he fancies that he ought to ascend from the visible object, which is the symbol of him (whom the image is supposed to represent)?"—Cont. Cels., lib. vii., cxliv.

Saint Ambrose also thus speaks of this heathen worship—"This gold, if carefully handled, has an outward value; but inwardly it is mere ordinary metal. Examine, I pray you, and sift thoroughly the class of Gentiles. The words they utter are rich and grand; the things they defend are utterly devoid of truth; they talk of God—they worship an image."—Amb. ad Vaten. Epist., cap. i.—xviii. Venice, 1781.

Saint Augustine, arguing against the nice distinctions

made by the heathen idolators of his day, and which your correspondent, "Sidrach," is perhaps prepared to defend, says—"But those persons seem to themselves to belong to a more purified religion, who say—'I worship neither an image nor a demon, but I regard the bodily figure as the *representative of that being whom I ought to worship*. . . . . And when, again, with regard to these, they [the more enlightened heathens] begin to be pressed hard on the point, that they worship bodies . . . . they are bold enough to answer, that they do not worship the bodies themselves, *but the divinities which preside over and rule them*."—Aug., in Psalm xcIII., part 2, vol. iv., p. 1261. Paris, 1679. "But some disputant comes forward, and, very wise in his own conceit, says—'I do not worship that stone, nor that insensible image; your prophet could not know that they have eyes and see not, and I be ignorant that that image neither hath a soul, nor sees with his eyes, nor hears with his ears. *I do not worship that, but I adore what I see, and serve him whom I do not see.*' And who is he?—a certain, invisible divinity, which presides over that image."—Aug., in Psalm xcvi., vol. iv., p. 1047. And, once again, Augustine says—"And lest any one should say, I do not worship the image, *but that which the images signify*, it is immediately added, and they worshipped and served the creature more than the creator. Now, understand well, they either worship the image or a creature; he who worships the image converts the truth of God into a lie."—Aug., Serm. cxcvII., vol. v., p. 905.

I might say much more on this, as also the entire repudiation by the early Church of the use of images in churches or elsewhere for religious purposes; but I think enough has been given to supply matter for grave consideration for any Roman Catholic desirous of learning what the primitive Christians taught with respect to images. Will "Sidrach" pronounce St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, Lactantius, Arnobius, and Origen arch-heretics, for thus writing? and is it possible that any of these great writers would have consented to the decree of the Council of Trent, which exhorted "all bishops, and others sustaining the office and charge of teaching, especially to instruct the faithful, that images of Christ, the Virgin, and other saints are to be had and retained, particularly in temples, . . . that due honour and veneration are to be awarded to them, because the honour which is shown them is referred to the prototypes which they represent; in such wise that the images which we kiss, and before which we uncover the head and prostrate ourselves, we adore Christ and venerate the saints, whose similitude they bear?"

II. "Sidrach" speaks, as the Council of Trent does, of the "*due* honour and veneration" which is to be paid to images; but who is to know what amount of religious worship is sanctioned by the Church of Rome under the word "*due?*" "Sidrach" may repudiate direct idolatry; but hear what Bellarmine says on this subject, and he cannot be accused of misrepresenting the tenets of his church. In his treatise on "Sacred Images," book ii., ch. 20, he thus discusses the subject:—"The question proposed is, with what sort of worship are images to be honoured? *There are three opinions.*" The first he *rejects*—namely, "that the faithful ought to do no more, with regard to images, than to *worship before them:* not to worship the image, but the *prototype, the exemplar, the original, the Being of which the image is the representation.*" The second opinion, and which is the one under consideration, he in no wise objects to, and which is, "that the *same honour is due to the image as to the exemplar;* and thence, that the image of Christ is to be worshipped with the worship of *Latria* (the species of worship rendered by Roman Catholics to the Most High God), the image of the Blessed Virgin with the worship of Hyperdulia, and the images of the other saints with the worship of Dulia." Under this class he ranks the famous Roman Catholic theologians and divines—Alexander, the "blessed saint, St. Thomas Aquinas," Cardinal Cajetan, the "blessed St. Bonaventure, Marsilius, Almayne, Carthusian, *and others.*" With reference to Aquinas it may be as well to remark, that he justifies himself for giving the selfsame worship to the wooden cross as he gives to God himself by the ritual of his church. His words are—"We offer the supreme adoration of *Latria* to that Being in whom we place our hope of salvation; but we place *our hope of salvation in the cross of Christ*; for the Church sings, 'Hail, O cross, our only hope in this time of passion, increase righteousness to the pious, and grant pardon to the guilty.' Therefore, the *cross of Christ is to be adored with the supreme adoration of Latria.*"—Thos. Aquinas, Theo. Sum., part iii., Rome, 1686, quæst. 25, art. 1—4; and see Lib. iii., Dist. ix., Salut. iv., Venice, 1780.

Lest it should be supposed that all this is mere figurative language, the "Pontificale Romanum" directs that the cross of the Pope's Legate be carried in the right hand, giving as a reason, "because *Latria* is due to it" [Quia debetur ei Latria. Romæ 1818, p. 468]. Aquinas belonged to the Order of Dominicans; so does the present Pope, and, if I mistake not, Dr. Wiseman also. Now, "in the Dominican Order, the degree corresponding to that of doctor in the secular clergy, and also this title, conferred on these by the Dominicans, *through special privilege*, is given upon a stipulation, ON OATH, to teach the doctrines of St. Thomas *on every point.*"—Dublin Review for June, 1850, p. 476.

III. With reference to the pretended miracles of his church, "Sidrach" expresses himself with earnest and just indignation. He "utterly discards such absurd stories as the pretended miracles to which you refer, no matter how great the number of *rogues* or *fools* you name as a proof that they believed in them." He is too hasty in his condemnations. Does he not know that the present Pope himself admitted and recognised the truth of the wonderful winking statue of Rimini? Is he aware that as wonderful stories as that told by your correspondent, relative to the "black virgin" catching the enemies' cannon balls, are related in the Roman Catholic priests' "vade mecum," the Breviary? Can he be aware that, in Liguori's "Glories of Mary"—a book in Ireland more common than the Bible—is replete with such "lying wonders?" and yet this very book is not only printed with the sanction of all the Roman Catholic clergy, including Cardinal Wiseman* himself, but is also most unequivocally accepted by the whole Roman Church, which had declared that there is not one word in it worthy of censure.† Let "Sidrach" procure one of the Dublin editions of this work, and he will find that popes, bishops, and priests come within his sweeping condemnation as "rogues and fools." Had a Protestant used such language, he would have been called abusive and uncharitable.

I am willing to believe that your correspondent, "Sidrach," and many other of our Christian brethren, are Roman Catholics only from education, prejudice, and ignorance of the true Gospel of Jesus Christ; did they know the doctrines and teaching of their Church, and what true Protestantism is, they would cease to be members of the Roman Church; and may God grant that your efforts, Mr. Editor, through your excellent journal, may, through his gracious assistance, be the means of enlightening our Roman Catholic brethren to the truth as it is in Jesus.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

C. H. COLLETTE.

* Cardinal Wiseman has just put his seal of authority to the last edition of this work—London, Wallworth, 1852—"We hereby approve of this translation of the Glories of Mary, and cordially recommend it to the faithful. (Signed) N. Card. Wiseman, Archb. of Westminster."

† See Roman Catholic Calendar for 1845, p. 167.

ON DIVORCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—By reference to the leading article of my letter, published in the LAYMAN for December, 1852, it will be seen that I have admitted the connection of the Church of England with the State, and also the readiness of her ministers to re-marry divorced parties; but permit me to say, that I have yet to learn, for you have not explained, by what Scripture authority these marriages are sanctioned.

You say the legislature grants divorces in cases of adultery, and for no other cause. Our Saviour, in the Gospel, permits divorces for the same cause—adultery or fornication (Mat. v. 32); and hence it is plain, if a man put away his wife for any other cause, he cannot be said to have put her away by the authority of a divorce, or by permission either of the legislature or of the Church and ministers of Christ. If I understand you rightly, you assert that "the prohibition to marry applies only to her who is put away in this last-mentioned manner."

Now, this being the case, let me ask you, how can the *prohibition* to marry apply to her who is already married, and to whom neither the Church nor the State can grant a divorce?

The clause, "*saving for the cause of fornication,*" is not an exception to any other principle or condition laid down by our Saviour in the text; neither can it be understood as permissive of a second marriage of the divorced parties; but it is evidently in *antithesis* with the causes of divorce allowed by Moses (Deut. xxiv. 1), and with the many other causes which were subsequently admitted, and which the carnal Jews considered they should be allowed at pleasure, as Josephus bears testimony.

For an additional illustration of this view of what you call a "*special exception,*" allow me to direct your attention to (Mat. xix. 3, 9) where our Lord uses the same exception, "except it be for fornication," evidently as a precise, direct, and definite reply to the Pharisees' question, "Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every crime?" and thereby establish the fact, that for no cause, "*except it be for fornication,*" shall he be allowed to put her away; and he adds, that "whosoever marrieth her that is put away doth commit adultery." Again (Mat. x. 2), the Pharisees "asked him, is it lawful for a man to put away his wife?" Our Lord, anticipating the tempting interrogatories of the Pharisees, declared, in his Sermon on the Mount, as explained above, that it cannot be lawful, "saving for the cause of fornication," and referring the Pharisees to Gen. ii. 24, for an answer; at the request of his disciples, when they were in the house alone, he explains the matter to them, as recorded in Mark x. 11, 12, omitting the exceptionary phrase. The exception is also omitted in Luke xvi. 18; but from the seeming discrepancy of diction between these two texts, I presume no man will maintain that the evangelists established conflicting points of doctrine, or that they did not all understand this subject in the same way. St. Paul (in 1 Cor. vii. 10, 11) inculcates the same doctrine, and he adds, "let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband."

Now, it is plain St. Paul never would have counselled the woman to be reconciled to her husband, without being re-married, if the first marriage had been dissolved by the separation or divorce of the parties.

I find the re-marrying of divorced parties strictly prohibited by the "canons ecclesiastical" of the Irish Church, to which I beg to call your attention.

The 55th canon provides, that "in all sentences pronounced only for divorce and separation, *a Thoro et Mensa*, there shall be a caution and restraint inserted in the act of the said sentence, that the parties so separated shall live chastely and continently; neither shall they, during each other's life, contract matrimony with any other person; and for the better observing of this last clause, the said sentence of divorce shall not be pronounced until the party or parties requiring the same have good and sufficient caution, and security into the court, that they will not any way break or transgress the said restraint or prohibition."

By your own admission, the doctrine of the Church of England at present, as regards divorces and the re-marrying of the parties, is entirely at variance with the dictates of this canon. Does not this look somewhat like a *developing* principle?

If, in the foregoing lines, I have mistaken your views of any point, I am open to conviction, and shall gladly acknowledge my error, if pointed out; and as my object is fair and impartial discussion, and studiously to avoid everything that might give offence, I hope I have used "the sound word that cannot be blamed" (Tit. ii. 8), that truth may be established, until we all meet in the unity of faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God—Ephes. iv. 13.

I am, sir, with sincere regard,

Your obedient servant,

EDMOND POWER.

The subject referred to in the above letter was at first introduced by us incidentally and briefly, merely to illustrate another question. It was never intended by us as a prominent subject of discussion in our pages, to which it is not suited. We should have declined to continue such a discussion; but our correspondent's letter is written in so calm and candid a spirit of discussion that we are most unwilling to refuse insertion to anything that comes from him. We, therefore, insert his letter, with a brief reply to its arguments, which must conclude this subject; and we do so in the hope that our correspondent will then turn his attention to the greater and more important subjects, for the discussion of which our paper was established. In discussing those great subjects we shall be happy to have the assistance of a writer so dispassionate and so intelligent.

The strength of our correspondent's argument appears to us to lie in this—he rightly says that Christ's law does not allow of divorce except for adultery or fornication, and, therefore, if a man put away his wife for any other cause, &c., the marriage between them still exists. And he says—"Now, this being the case, let me ask you, how can the *pro*-hibition to marry apply to her who is already married, and to whom neither the Church nor the State can grant a divorce?" And hence he concludes, that our Saviour's prohibition to a divorced woman to marry cannot be intended of any but of her who is divorced for adultery. We hope Mr. Power will think this a fair statement of his argument; and we answer it thus—In the place in question (Matt. v. 31), our Saviour said—"*It hath been said,* whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a bill of divorce." And from St. Mark x. 3 and 4, we find that it was in the law of Moses that this was said: and if we look for it in the law of Moses, we find it in Deuteronomy xxiv. 1. In verse 2 we find that the woman so put away was permitted to be married to another man; or, at least, that such was the practice. We are satisfied that the former is the right interpretation of the verse, but the latter is quite sufficient for our present practice. So, when our Saviour spoke, it was a prevailing practice among those he spoke to, to marry women who were divorced from their husbands for other causes besides adultery. And could anything be more necessary than for our Saviour, in establishing his law, to forbid this practice for the future? This was the application which we gave of the passage. Mr. Power, in his argument above stated, thinks that there could not have been any room for our Saviour to have spoken the words in that sense; but we have shown that there was an absolute necessity for our Saviour to speak the words in that sense; and, therefore, we conclude that this really was the sense of them.

Mr. Power has mistaken the meaning of the 55th canon of the Church of Ireland, which he quotes. Any one conversant with the law of our courts will tell him that the "divorce" there spoken of is not meant of "divorce" in the sense of dissolving a marriage. It is,

in fact, only a sentence of the court that neither party shall have a right to force the other to live with them; but the marriage still exists, notwithstanding such sentence: and, therefore, in *such* a divorce, security not to marry another is properly taken.

Our practice is this, and with the statement of it we must close the discussion of the subject; if the legislature grant a divorce "a vinculo matrimonii" for a cause for which Christ allows divorce to be granted, we consider that marriage at an end; for divorce puts an end to marriage. But if the legislature should grant a divorce when Christ forbids it, we conceive Church of England clergy would refuse to marry the parties to any others, because Christ says that is adultery; it is a marrying again, while a former marriage is still in force by the laws of Christ. But no such case as this has ever happened in the Church of England. We have already expressed our opinion that such cases have happened in the Church of Rome.

There is another point which Mr. Power would do well to consider; he says—"Our Saviour, in the Gospel, permits divorce for the same cause, adultery or fornication—Matt. v. 32." In this he is quite right. But the Church of Rome refuses to permit divorce for that cause. And why? because, they say, it would be contrary to the nature of marriage, as a sacrament instituted by Christ. Does the Church of Rome know the nature of Christ's sacraments better than Christ himself did? When her doctrines about marriage forces her to deny what Christ himself allows, is it not clear that her doctrine about marriage must be wrong? This is certainly a stronger proof against *her* doctrine than any that can be brought against the Church of Eogland and Ireland.

We trust we shall hear from Mr. Power in future, on some of the great questions which concern every man's faith and practice towards God. It was for the discussion of these that our journal was established.

ON THE FIVE DISPUTED SACRAMENTS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I beg to refer your correspondent, "J. F. G.," to the following portions of Scripture, which (it is argued by individual Roman Catholics) sustain the Divine institution of the five disputed sacraments, viz:—

PENANCE.—John xx. 22, 23—"He (Christ) breathed on them, and he said unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven them: and whose sins you shall retain they are retained."—See also 2 Cor. ii. 10.

MATRIMONY.—Matt. xix. 6—"Therefore now they are not two, but one flesh; what, therefore, God hath joined together, let no man put asunder."—See also Eph. v. 23, 24, 25, and 32.

CONFIRMATION.—Matt. xix. 13 and 15—"Then were little children presented to him, that he should impose hands upon them and pray, and the disciples rebuked them. But Jesus said to them, Suffer the little children, and forbid them not to come to me, for the kingdom of Heaven is for such. And when he imposed hands upon them he departed from thence."—See also Acts viii. 14, 15, 16, 17.

HOLY ORDERS.—Matt. x. 7—"And going, preach, saying, The kingdom of Heaven is at hand."—See also Acts vi. 6. and xiii. 3.

EXTREME UNCTION.—Matt. x. 1—"And having called his twelve disciples together, he gave them power over unclean spirits to cast them out, and to heal all manner of diseases, and all manner of infirmities." And 8th verse—"Heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse the lepers, cast out devils: freely have you received, freely give."—See also James v. 14, 15.

Trusting that you, sir, or some of your correspondents, will analyze the above in such a way as to ascertain, by the assistance of God's Holy Spirit, where the truth is,

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

J. B.

In reply to the above letter, we would observe that, in considering the question of the sacraments of the Church of Rome, and the proof of those sacraments, we must keep in mind what the Church of Rome means by a sacrament.

They hold, first, that a sacrament must have been instituted by Christ himself. This is evident from their pronouncing a curse upon any one who denies that any of their seven sacraments was instituted by Christ himself.—Council of Trent, Sess. vii., Can. 1.

Secondly, they hold that two things are essential to the *existence* of a sacrament—namely, the FORM and the MATTER of the sacrament—"The matter and the form, in which the *essence* of a sacrament is perfected."—Council of Trent, Sess. xiv., Cap. 2.

Now, if a sacrament *cannot exist* without form and matter, it is clear that a sacrament cannot be instituted until the form and matter are instituted.

Take the sacrament of Baptism, for example. The *form* consists of the words—"I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost." The matter is water, with which the person is baptized. *Why* do we say that Christ instituted this sacrament? Is it not because St. Matthew tells us that Christ appointed his Apostles to baptize with water (for so the Greek word expresses), using these words?

But if it did not appear that Christ ever directed these words to be used, or water to be so applied; and if it further appeared that neither these words nor water had been used in the Church for a thousand years after, could any one say that Baptism had been instituted by Christ? Would not every one say, that if the essence of the sacraments consisted in these words and this matter, that the sacrament itself could not have been instituted until this form and matter were introduced and commanded?

We, therefore, think it a self-evident maxim, that a sacrament can be instituted only by instituting and commanding the form and the matter.

If this be so, the question, whether Christ instituted any sacrament, is simply a question whether Christ instituted the *form* and *matter* of the sacrament.

Now, take the "Sacrament of Penance." What is its form? The Council of Trent answers—"The FORM of the Sacrament of Penance, *in which chiefly its force is situated*, is placed in those words of the minister, *Ego te absolvo*," &c. (that is, *I absolve thee*); and this is held of such importance that the great Doctor, Thomas Aquinas, says—"It would not be sufficent to say—Almighty God have mercy on thee, or, God grant unto thee absolution and forgiveness, because by these words the priest doth not signify that the absolution is done, but seeks that it may be done."—Thom., part 3, quæst. 84, art. 3, ad. 1.

Now, the question is, did our Saviour, in the passage which our correspondent quotes, appoint his Apostles to use the words—"I absolve thee"—as the form of a sacrament? If he did not, he did *not* institute the Sacrament of Penance as now held in the Church of Rome, because that sacrament consists chiefly in the use of those words. Now, this *form* of words is not there directed by our Saviour to be used; and we are certain that this form of words was never used by any priest in reconciling penitents for more than a thousand years after Christ. No ancient liturgy contains the form—"I absolve thee." All ancient liturgies contain the form, "God absolve thee," or "God forgive thee," which words, it is acknowledged in the Church of Rome, do not constitute a sacrament.

Here we conclude, that the modern Sacrament of Penance was not instituted by Christ in the above words, and that it never existed, or could exist, until the form, "I absolve thee," was introduced more than a thousand years after Christ.

The same may be said about the *matter* of this sacrament. The Council of Trent declares that "satisfaction" is part of the matter of the Sacrament of Penance. The Catechism of the Council of Trent, explaining this "satisfaction," says—"Satisfaction is *the full payment of a debt*; for when satisfaction is made nothing remains to be supplied . . . . Hence, theologians make use of the word satisfaction to signify the compensation made by man to God, by doing something in atonement for the sins which he has committed." Now, did Christ, in the words in question (John xx. 22, 23), appoint our own satisfaction for our own sins, or the atonement which men make for their own sins, to be the "matter" of a sacrament? There is not one word said there about any such "satisfaction;" and, on the contrary, we are taught, in many places, that Christ came to make atonement and satisfaction for our sins, because it was *not possible* for man to satisfy for sin himself.

Here we conclude again, that if Christ did not institute the "matter" of this sacrament as now held in the Church of Rome, he did not institute the sacrament itself, because a sacrament, according to the Church of Rome, can only consist in the "form" and "matter" of the sacrament.

It may be plainer to some persons to state the thing thus—"Is there one word in the passage under consideration (John xx. 22, 23) about *penance* at all? How, then, can these words be an institution of the Sacrament of Penance?"

We have spoken already of the real force and meaning of that passage, and we shall take an opportunity of doing so again shortly. It is sufficient for our present purpose to show that those words cannot be the institution of the form and matter of the Sacrament of Penance.

The passage which our correspondent refers to, from 2 Cor. ii. 10, plainly relates to excommunication, and restoring again to the communion of the faithful, which no one takes to be a sacrament.

MATRIMONY.

If our correspondent will examine the passage which he quotes (Matthew xix. 6), he will find that our Saviour was simply explaining the nature of God's institution of marriage at the creation of man, and restoring that institution to what God at first had made it. Will any one say that marriage, as it subsisted between Adam and Eve, was a sacrament of the Gospel? And if our Saviour only restored it to that same state in which it was at first instituted, how did that make it a sacrament?

Can any one tell us what are the "form" and "matter" of matrimony, as a sacrament in the Church of Rome? The Council of Trent did not venture to say anything of this. They say a sacrament consists in "form and matter;" but what can be the "form and matter" in matrimony they could not tell. How, then, could they know it to be a sacrament?

There are some curious things about this sacrament. Up to the Council of Trent, 1563, it was not necessary in the Church of Rome that marriage should be celebrated by a priest—any two persons making an agreement together between themselves to be man and wife, constituted a valid marriage. Was matrimony *then* a sacrament? It seems strange that any two persons could make a sacrament without a priest; but if it was not a sacrament *then*, how old is the sacrament *now*?

If sacraments "confer grace," as the Church of Rome says they do, it seems strange that it should be a holier state to be without one of the sacraments of the Gospel than to have it.

Our correspondent also refers to the Epistle of the Ephesians, chap. v., verses 23, 24, 25, 32. The whole force of this argument depends on the word "sacrament," in verse 32. We think the Greek word here should be translated "mystery." It seems to us wholly arbitrary to put in the word sacrament here, and evidently done to serve a purpose. This seems to us very important, because we believe this is the only place in the present Douay Bible in which the word "sacrament" occurs. It is so important that we will give it a separate paper to itself in our next number. We only say here, that St. Paul cannot mean to say that verse 31 is "a great sacrament," as the Douay Bible seems to say; because verse 31 is only the words of the original institution of marriage between Adam and Eve, which the Church of Rome herself confesses was not a sacrament at all. And St. Paul expressly says, in verse 32, that he speaks εις χριστον, και εις την εκκλησιαν, which can only mean "*concerning* Christ and the Church." We have an instance of this use of the preposition εις in Acts ii. 25—"For David speaks εις αυτον" which the Douay Bible translates "concerning Him" (Christ). It is certainly of the union of Christ and his Church that St. Paul says "it is a great mystery," and not of the marriage of a man and his wife.

Our space forbids us to enter on the other sacraments now, but we will consider them in our next number.

We cannot now conclude without expressing the great pleasure which we feel at the calm, and earnest, and dispassionate tone apparent in our correspondent's short letter. We hope to hear from him often in the same style. And we again commend this to his consideration, that if, as the Church of Rome says, sacraments can only consist in their "form and matter," then nothing can be a proof that Christ instituted a sacrament, unless it proves that Christ instituted the "form and matter" of that sacrament.

THE ROCK OF THE CHURCH.

Matt. xvi. 18—*Douay Version*.

SIR—It must be allowed that if St. Peter was to be the rock on which the Church was to be built, it would have been of vast importance that such a fact should be universally known. Is it possible, then, that not only St. Luke and St. John, but St. Mark also, who is supposed to have been with St. Peter when he wrote his Gospel, would have omitted in their narrations the *only* text in the Bible which can be at all supposed to convey such an idea? How do those who look to St. Peter as the rock of the Christian religion explain this?

Yours obediently,

S.

"ARE THE MISSIONARIES DOING ANYTHING IN INDIA?"

THIS question was asked me by a lady not long since. "Why, madam, may I ask," I replied, "do you doubt their doing anything? Do you read the missionary registers and reports? "Sometimes I do; but Colonel C., whom I lately met, and who has just returned from India, after spending thirty years there, assured me he had never seen a missionary, and that I must not believe the reports which are got up in London, simply to rob simple folk of their money." It is hard to say in what part of India "Colonel C." may have served, or in what sort of society he took delight. If he was a gay and worldly man, who frequented balls and billiard tables, it is probable that he knew as little about the operations of missionaries in India as his Excellency's aid-de-camps at the Castle in Dublin are likely to know of those in Kerry or Connemara.

India is a large place, and the occupations of Europeans there are as diverse from each other as they are in Britain; and it is quite possible for an officer in the East India Company's Service to have lived at stations unoccupied by missionaries, or even if at the same station with them, to be unacquainted both with their persons and their operations. To show, however, that missionaries and their labours are not, in every instance, the mere produce of imagination, I will narrate a little incident which occurred to myself one morning in the month of February, A.D. 1851, in the vicinity of Ahmednugur, a large city in the presidency of Bombay.

My tents were pitched outside the town of Yewla, some miles north of Ahmednugur; the hour was early—the sun not long risen—and I had just returned from a ride, when, at the door of my tent, I was accosted, in the Maratha language, by a respectable looking individual, apparently a Bramin. I asked his business: he informed me that he was a Christian, converted by the American missionaries at Ahmednugur, and that he, with three other converts, were travelling through the country, selling books

on account of the missions. After a little conversation on matters connected with the mission, Sukhopunt (for so I will call the Bramin convert) offered to bring me his store of books, in case I should wish to purchase any. I at first declined, and he left me: he had not, however, left me many minutes when I changed my mind, and sent a messenger after him, to invite him and his companions to my tent at ten o'clock, to display their books. My messenger returned after a little delay, and informed me that he had found the converts with some difficulty, as they were not lodging at the "Dhurmsala," (the usual halting-place for travellers), but that they had halted in the open plain outside the village, and that he found them preparing their breakfast under the shadow of their cart. At ten o'clock, a cart drawn by bullocks, drove up to the tent; in it I observed Sukhopunt and his three companions, one of whom was charioteer. *They* evidently were *not* "Bramins;" and observing the friendly terms on which they lived together, I was curious to know whether the latter were Hindoos of the working classes, or whether they belonged to the despised race of *Pariāhs*. They soon entered the tent, carrying in two large boxes full of books, and Sukhopunt introduced his three companions, whom I will call Lakhoram, Rama, and Krishna; the first was an elderly man, the last two were youths. They came up to me with smiling faces, and, in a friendly, though respectful manner, held out their hands (instead of raising them to their heads to "Salaam," as Asiatics usually do). I readily gave them my hand, and then asked them to be seated; and they forthwith, took their places on the ground, on each side of my chair. I found that Lakhoram and his two companions were by birth *Pariāhs*, and I was forcibly struck with the utter annihilation of *caste* prejudices in the mind of Sukhopunt, through which he had consented familiarly to associate with people whom no Bramin of Western India would, for any consideration, touch, and whose *very shadow* is considered a pollution.

But a more striking instance of the triumph of the Word of God, in this respect, remains to be told. I asked Sukhopunt why he and his companions had halted in the plain, instead of entering the village "Dhuem-Sala." "The reason is," he replied, "that these, my brethren, being Purwarees (*i. e.*, Pariāhs) by birth, the villagers would not allow *them* to enter the Dhurmsalas; and as we are all brethren, I refuse to separate from them."

The circumstance of a Bramin thus claiming *brotherhood* with *Pariāhs*, and sharing hardship voluntarily with them, was the most striking instance that I had ever seen of the abolition of caste, through the genial influence of the Gospel.

The countenances of the three Pariāhs struck me forcibly, as evincing the power of religion to "make wise the simple." There was a modest, intelligent propriety in their appearance and manner, that strangely contrasted with the uncouth ignorance usual in men of their class. Lakhoram, the eldest, especially, struck me as superior in intelligence and demeanour. I asked him to tell me the history of his early life and conversion, which he did in nearly the following words:—

History of Lakhoram.—"When the great Wesley (the Duke of Wellington) conquered Holkar, I was 14 years old; I lived at Ahmednugur, of which my father was hereditary gate-keeper; it was about that time that a holy mendicant arrived at our city, and to him my father intrusted me, saying—'Take my son, and make him a holy man like yourself.' The next day I left Ahmednugur with my preceptor, and I commenced a life of travel with him from one shrine to another; we visited every sacred river, mountain, and temple, from one end of India to another, including Rameshwara, at the south, all the holy places in the Carnatic, Jugonath, Gaya, Benares, and various places in the Himalaya Mountains, beyond which mortal man cannot travel. We then travelled down to Dwarca, on the west coast, and, after a lengthened tour of several years, in which we visited hundreds of holy places, of lesser note, I returned to my native city, and sat down in the gate in which I was accustomed to play as a boy. My father was dead, and many other changes had occurred in Ahmednugur; the Peshwa's government had passed away, and the English had come in its stead. I saw in the gate a new gate-keeper, whom I presently recognised as one of my boyish companions. While conversing with him about the many changes which had come over my native city since I left it, another friend came up—the father of this lad (pointing to one of the converts), and, addressing me, he said—'Well, Mr. Pilgrim, you have spent many years visiting shrines, and rivers, and all sacred places, and you know the Holy Book Kubeer almost by heart: tell me, after all, what are you—are you *a saint*, or are you *a sinner?*' The strangeness of this question offended me not a little; however, as I had learned that anger was disgraceful to a holy man, I curbed my temper, and thought over his question—'Am I a saint, or am I a sinner? I have visited every shrine, and washed in every holy river; I have observed every fast, and every religious observance enjoined in Kubeer; *I ought* to be a saint; but then Kubeer says—'Anger, pride, lust, avarice, envy, &c., are sins, and till these are all driven out of the heart man is *a sinner*.' So, after a little reflection, I replied—'*I am a sinner*.' 'Indeed! (he rejoined), *a sinner still*, after so many religious deeds! When, then, do you expect to be *a saint?* and if you are not a saint, how do you expect to see God?' I answered out of Kubeer, of which I was very fluent, showing the various penances and mortifications that a man must perform to subdue sin, and to fit him for heaven. But he rejoined, 'well, but all these you *have performed*, and that for many years: what hope have you of attaining to holiness in future years, having so wholly failed in those that are past?' This question rather provoked me, the more so as it proceeded from an ignorant *Pariāh* who had spent all his life in the lowest menial occupations, while I had read, studied, and travelled, and expected to be regarded by my countrymen as a person of no small sanctity. The unlooked-for questions and objections, therefore, of *Lukma* set my mind at work with new thoughts and ideas. To his last question (above stated) I offered sundry replies, suggested by the book *Kubeer*, which I reverenced much, and on my acquaintance with which, as well as an attendance upon the duties therein prescribed, I fully depended for elevation to the highest station in the world of spirits. My replies, however, not appearing to satisfy *Lukma*, I, in my turn, asked—'How do *you* expect to see God and to attain heaven? have *you* reached sinless perfection?' 'Not I,' he replied; 'I am an unworthy sinner, but I believe that the Almighty became man, under the name of Jesus, the Christ, and that he died to bear the punishment of our sins, and that whoever believeth in Him shall obtain eternal life through his merits.' I now perceived that *Lukma* had forsaken the faith of his fathers, and adopted the religion of the English: looking upon him, therefore, as an apostate, I gave free vent to my anger, and out of this mouth many evil words went forth against him and against Jesus Christ! At length Lukma, finding that he made no impression on me, said—'There's no use in our talking; come to the *Padree Sahib* (the missionary), and hear what he has to say.' I went, and had a long conversation with the missionary. I often went to him after this, and had many arguments with him. For two whole years I fought with him, and at the end of that time the missionary (or rather God's Holy Spirit) conquered; and I have now for *six years* been the servant of Jesus Christ."

Thus ended the history of Lakhoram. And now, reader, what say you? On what do your hopes depend? On your own doings? What are they? Have they purified your heart? Remember what *Kubeer* says—and a greater than Kubeer—"By the works of the law shall *no flesh* be justified."

After hearing Lakhoram's history, I proposed to my four sable brethren that we should read a chapter in the Bible; each immediately produced his Maratha Bible, and we read the 12th chapter of Paul's epistle to the Romans (verse about), and then conversed upon it. I asked my new friends various questions regarding this interesting chapter, and their answers showed, with few exceptions, a clear understanding of its contents. The converts then produced Maratha hymn books, and we all joined in a hymn—Sukhopunt (the Bramin) leading. I then asked him to pray, which he did with much apparent fervour. My friends rose to depart; I parted from them with much regret. "When next we meet," I said, "we shall all speak one language; we shall be of one colour—all of one nation." "Amen," said Lakhoram. "Amen," said they all; and we separated, till we shall meet in that company whom no man can number—who have washed their robes in the blood of the lamb!

Moosaphir.

FARM OPERATIONS FOR MARCH.

(From the Irish Farmers' Gazette.)

Spring Wheat.—From the late fall of snow and continuous frost, the sowing of spring wheat must be much retarded; the early part of the month should, therefore, be devoted to getting in, with as little delay as possible, the usual breadths. In many cases this must be done by the spade and shovel, which will amply repay the farmer for the extra cost, as the land must be, in the greater number of instances, too wet and poachy to get in the crop with horses.

Winter-sown Wheats, if the land be dry enough, should be well harrowed, to break the crust formed by the winter rains, and mould the young plants, after which the application of the roller will be of service; but unless the land be sufficiently dry and firm, this work will be better left undone till early next month. The young wheat in drills may be horse or hand hoed, to destroy weeds and break the winter crust.

Oats may be sown any time during the month; but in medium dry soils, should be got in during the first fortnight. In lea land the oats are generally sown broadcast, on wide sets, and well harrowed in. In some localities the land is ploughed into ridges, from eight to ten feet wide, harrowed before and after sowing; and the furrows either dug with the spade or cut with the furrow-plough, and well pulverized by the drill-harrow, and then shovelled. Although a little more expensive, we prefer the latter mode of sowing lea oats; the seed is more evenly covered, it yields a better head with shorter straw, the crop ripens more evenly and earlier, the soda are better rotted, and the land turns up much cleaner and drier than if left flat. In broken land the same modes are applicable; but if the intention be to sow down with grass and clover seeds, it will be better to sow all corn crops in drills from eighteen to twenty-four inches apart.

Barley, in light, dry, early soils, may be sown by the middle of the month. It is the best crop to sow down grass and clover seeds, from the more ready nature of the straw and the small quantity of foliage it bears in comparison with oats.

Potatoes should now be planted with as little delay as possible. In damp soils they should be planted in lazybeds; in dry soils they may be planted in drills, twenty-eight inches apart.

Parsnips should be sown as early as possible in the month, in suitable, well-tilled soils (see Operations for last month); but when the land cannot be suitably prepared in time, it is a good plan to mix the seed with damp sand and store it in a dark, temperate place, till it shows symptoms of vegetating, when it should be sown. The mass should be turned over every second day for the first week, and every day after to prevent the seed from contracting blue-mould; and if found getting too dry, moistened with a little water, but not to saturation. In this way ample time may be obtained for preparing the land, and the quality of the seed proved, and an even crop insured.

Carrots may be sown between the middle and end of the month. The land should have been deeply ploughed and manured in the autumn. If not done at that time the manure should be well decomposed and deeply buried, or the roots will not be very long. In case the land cannot be prepared in time for this valuable root crop, the seeds may be prepared as directed above for parsnips, the object being to put the seeds in a way to germinate while the land is preparing, and thus time saved and a crop insured.

Cabbages should now be transplanted from the nursery beds for main crops, and make up the blanks in the autumn planted crops.

Cabbage Seeds of the flat Dutch, early York, and nonpareil varieties, should now be sown in well-prepared beds, for successional planting out by the end of May and in June.

Turnips or other root crops that remain undrawn or unstored, should now be drawn, or the land will be considerably deteriorated by the roots now vegetating rapidly, and the spring corn crops suffer proportionably. As soon as the roots are removed split the drills with the double mould-board plough, and harrow the surface well to distribute the manure equally before sowing the succeeding crops.

Ewes having lambed should have a moderate supply of turnips, with good sound hay. Some time previous to lambing, the shepherd should clip away any wool that may be on the udder, or the parts adjacent, least in the lamb's eagerness to suck it swallow some of the wool, which causes more fatality amongst lambs than anything else, the wool mixing with the coagulated milk, forming hard masses that are impossible of digestion. Comfortable quarters and shelter should be provided for the ewe and her new-born lamb, to protect them from the night frosts and piercing blasts which prevail at this time of the year.

Fat and fatting wedders should have abundance of turnips and hay; a little oil-cake or oats will be well bestowed, and salt should be given in their troughs: all parts subject to get foul and dirty should be kept trimmed and clean.

Milch Cows, those newly-calved, and springers will require more than ordinary care and attention. The milkers to have a sufficient supply of artificial food to keep them up to their milk in the harsh piercing weather henceforth to be expected; those newly calved to be kept warm and comfortable, and not exposed to chilling draughts, and have generous food, otherwise milk fever and paralysis are the usual results, which may be prevented by timely precaution; and the springers to have a moderate supply of roots with good hay.

Stall-feeding.—Now that the days are getting longer, and the air sharp and cold, the stall-fed cattle will require their quarters to be kept up to a comfortable temperature, otherwise they will go back, no matter what food is given them. Strict regularity should be observed in their feeding hours, and the food given in such quantities only as they will eat up cleanly, and any that remains after satiating their appetites immediately removed, which should be given to the stores. Keep their houses constantly clean, and the animals well brushed and curried.

Pigs.—Those put up to fatten should have a liberal supply of grain, to harden the flesh; and sows about farrowing should have abundance of succulent, nutritious food, and kept warm and dry.

Fences.—Finish without delay the formation and planting of new fences, and the plashing and laying of old ones; remove root and other weeds, and scour out the dykes.

Odds and Ends.—Turf for peat should now be cut. Repair roads; finish draining and subsoiling where necessary; scour out water-courses, ditches, and ponds; level and turn over old useless fences, mixing lime with them; quarry and burn lime for manure, and get into store all artificial manures wanted for the season.

ILLUSTRATED CATALOGUE

OF

THE GREAT EXHIBITION IN DUBLIN.

IN PREPARATION, FOR MONTHLY ISSUE, IN THE ART-JOURNAL,

A Series of Wood Engravings of the best and most prominent Articles in Art Manufacture to be exhibited in the Dublin Exhibition, which Opens on the 12th of May, 1853.

THIS Catalogue will, in its leading features, resemble that which illustrated the Great Exhibition of 1851; except that to subscribers to the *Art-Journal* no extra price will be charged for it, although extra pages will be given, and a very large extra charge incurred to represent the collection worthily. The first part of this Catalogue will appear with the number to be issued on the 31st of March, and the other parts will appear in May, June, and July, when the whole will be collected into A VOLUME, which volume may be separately purchased.

In the *Art-Journal*, however, the collection will be separately paged, so that those who please may detach it, and bind in into a volume distinct from the *Art-Journal*. Each part will consist of sixteen pages, to contain between eighty and one hundred engravings on wood, and the whole will contain illustrations to the extent of between 400 and 500. The selections will be made, generally, of objects the most suggestive as well as the most beautiful; and the volume will, no doubt, be regarded as an additional text-book for the manufacturer and the Artisan, and an "authority" for those who desire to procure the most graceful and useful of the productions of Art-manufacture.

MESSRS. WILLIAM CURRY AND CO. are now receiving the names of SUBSCRIBERS to the above Work, and would suggest the desirableness of parties securing early copies, thus warranting the possession of good impressions.

EIGHTH EDITION

OF THE

ENCYCLOPÆDIA BRITANNICA.

EDITED BY

THOMAS STEWART TRAILL, M.D. F.R.S.E.,

PROFESSOR OF MEDICAL JURISPRUDENCE IN THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH.

To be published in Parts, Monthly, at 8s., *and in Volumes, Quarterly, at* 24s., *with upwards of* 500 *Engravings on Steel, and several thousands on Wood. The whole to be comprised in Twenty-one Volumes* 4to.

PART I.—THE PROGRESS OF METAPHYSICAL AND ETHICAL PHILOSOPHY. By Sir JAMES MACKINTOSH. 8s. (Already published.)

THE EIGHTH EDITION of this great work will undergo careful revision and extensive correction. Articles, rendered imperfect by the lapse of time, will be submitted for improvement to writers intimately conversant with the respective subjects, whilst other articles will be superseded by entirely new contributions, and subjects not formerly embraced in its pages will be added.

THE FIRST VOLUME will consist of the Dissertations by DUGALD STEWART and SIR JAMES MACKINTOSH, on the Progress of Metaphysical and Ethical Philosophy; and by Professor PLAYFAIR and Sir JOHN LESLIE, on the Progress of Mathematical and Physical Science. In the new edition the Dissertation of Sir JAMES MACKINTOSH will be accompanied with a Preface, by W. WHEWELL, D.D., Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Cambridge.

To these will be added two New Dissertations—the first by the ARCHBISHOP of DUBLIN, on the Rise, Progress, and Corruptions of Christianity; the second by JAMES D. FORBES, F.R.S., Professor of Natural Philosophy in the University of Edinburgh; being a continuation of the Dissertations on the Progress of Physical Science to the present time.

Messrs. WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY will be glad to forward prospectuses, and to receive the Names of Subscribers to the above work.

A New Weekly Periodical, in Imperial 8vo. *Price* 2d.

SUNDAY READING FOR CHRISTIAN FAMILIES.

CONDUCTED BY

JOHN KITTO, D.D., F.S.A.

IN the hours not devoted to public worship and to the reading of the Scriptures there are intervals which must in some manner be filled up, if the Sabbath is not to be regarded as "a weariness," and which cannot properly be filled up by ordinary pursuits or recreations, or even from the resources of general literature.

The object of "*Sunday Reading for Christian Families*" is, therefore, to supply a felt want—to be useful—to afford instruction, and to furnish aid, under the Divine blessing, in building up the intelligent Christian character in knowledge and godliness. To these ends it must be read; to be read it must be readable and interesting; and to insure these essential conditions, the most effectual means will be adopted.

Each Number will contain, so far as can be embraced within its limits, A SHORT COMMENTARY UPON ONE OF THE LESSONS FOR THE DAY, *and continuing in order;* ARTICLES ON SCRIPTURE HISTORY, GEOGRAPHY, MANNERS AND CUSTOMS, NATURAL HISTORY, TRAVELS, &c.—*all designed to form interesting elucidations of various portions of Holy Scripture;* A NARRATIVE OF THE LIFE AND CHARACTER OF SOME REMARKABLE SCRIPTURE PERSONAGE; SHORT BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES AND ANECDOTES OF THOSE WHO HAVE BEEN EMINENTLY DISTINGUISHED IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH FOR THEIR SERVICES, HOLY LIVES, OR DEVOTED DEATHS; A PAPER ON RELATIVE AND SOCIAL DUTIES; SACRED POETRY; *with* A SELECTION OF MISCELLANEOUS ARTICLES, *instructive and edifying*. The writers, while traversing all the fields of knowledge for tribute to the Bible, and for nutriment on the "day of rest," will be deeply conscious of the responsibility they have undertaken, and will anxiously endeavour that "HOLINESS TO THE LORD" shall be plainly inscribed upon all the offerings they present to "Christian Families" for "Sunday Reading."

Each Number will be printed in a clear and beautiful type, cast expressly with a design for this work, and will contain Twenty-four pages of closely arranged matter. Sold also in Monthly Parts.

AGENTS FOR IRELAND,

WILLIAM CURRY & Co., 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET.

In a few Days will be Published, Price 6d., *or by Post,* 8d.

LABOURERS TOGETHER WITH GOD.

A SERMON

Preached in

ST. PETER'S CHURCH, DUBLIN,

On behalf of the

DUBLIN PROVIDENCE HOME,

ON SUNDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1852,

BY THE

REV. ROMNEY ROBINSON, D.D., &c.

(The Proceeds will be given in aid of the above Institution.)

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and COMPANY, 9, Upper Sackville-street.

New Works and New Editions,

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY & CO.,

Booksellers to the Queen,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

FRESH DISCOVERIES AT NINEVEH, AND RESEARCHES AT BABYLON; being the results of the Second Expedition to Assyria. By Austen H. Layard, Esq., M.P., with upwards of 400 Illustrations. 8vo. 21s.

MEMOIRS OF THE COURT AND CABINETS OF GEORGE THE THIRD, from Original Family Documents. By the Duke of Buckingham and Chandos. Two Vols. 8vo. 30s.

REV. THOMAS SCOTT'S COMMENTARY ON THE HOLY SCRIPTURES. New Edition, with 15 Maps and 59 Illustrations on steel. Six Vols. 4to. £3 3s.

D'AUBIGNE'S "REFORMATION IN ENGLAND," being Vnl. V. of the History of the Reformation. 8vo. 12s. (In the Press.)

MEMOIR OF THE LIVES OF ROBERT AND JAMES A. HALDANE. By Alexander Haldane, Esq. 8vo. 12s.

THE SUFFERINGS AND GLORIES OF THE MESSIAH; signified beforehand to David and Isaiah. By Rev. John Brown, D.D. 8vo. 8s.

THE GOSPEL REVEALED TO JOB. Illustrated in Thirty Lectures; with Notes. By Rev. C. A. Hulbert, M.A. 8vo. 12s.

A COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS, with a Translation and Excursus. By Rev. Moses Stuart. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

THE DIFFICULTIES OF ROMANISM IN RESPECT TO EVIDENCE. By G. Stanley Faber, B.D. New Edition; revised. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

THE BOOK OF THE GARDEN. By Charles M'Intosh. In two Vols. (Vol. I. Structural) £2 10s.

THE PRIVATE JOURNAL OF F. S. LARPENT, ESQ., Judge Advocate General to the British Forces in the Peninsula. Three Vols. 31s. 6d.

UNIVERSAL HISTORY ON SCRIPTURAL PRINCIPLES. Chiefly designed for the Young. Six Vols. 31s. 6d.

NOTES ON ENGLISH DIVINES. By Samuel Taylor Coleridge. Two Vols. 12s.

THE CHURCH OF IRELAND. Occasional Sermons preached in Westminster Abbey. By Canon Wordsworth. 8s.

SAINT ALPHONSUS LIGUORI; or, Extracts from the Moral Theology of Liguori. With Remarks by Rev. R. P. Blakeney. 6s.

THE REVIVAL OF THE FRENCH EMPEROR-SHIP ANTICIPATED FROM THE NECESSITY OF PROPHECY. By G. S. FABER. 2s.

THE COMING STRUGGLE AMONG THE NATIONS OF THE EARTH; or, the Political Events of the next Fifteen Years, &c. 6d.

THE MADIAI: A Letter to the Earl of Aberdeen. By Pierce Connolly. 6d.

"LIGHTS IN THE WORLD." A Sermon preached on January 1, 1853. By the Rev. John Gregg. 2d.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON, and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher WILLIAM CURRY, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

March 17, 1853.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Gloir do Dhia aṅ sna háṙdaiḃ, agus síoṁcáin air an dtalaṁ deaġċoil do na dáoiniḃ.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED THE MIDDLE OF EVERY MONTH, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. II.—No. 16. APRIL, 1853. {Annual Subscription, 3s. 6d. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
History of St. Patrick's Purgatory, Lough Dearg	37
Auricular Confession	38
Talk of the Road—No. XI.	39
Are numbers a test of Truth?	40
What Tradition tells us of the Blessed Virgin Mary—No. III	
Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian	41
Mortmain Committee—Cardinal Wiseman	42
On the word "Sacrament" in the Douay Bible	42
Cardinal de Bonald and our Lady of La Salette	43
The *Touchstone* (concluded)	44
CORRESPONDENCE.—	
On the use of Bells in Ireland	45
On Image Worship, by Stirach	45
On Transubstantiation, by Font um Petitor	46
On Auricular Confession, by a Northern Reader	47
On James v. 14, 15, by J. M.	47
On Lady Day and Good Friday, by Peter Brannigan	47
Farming Operations for April	47

BRIEF HISTORY OF ST PATRICK'S PURGATORY, LOUGH DEARG, CO. DONEGAL.

The name of St. Patrick's Purgatory is, no doubt, familiar to our readers, as that of a place resorted to by hundreds of Irishmen, in the hope of obtaining a special cleansing from sin, through penitential exercises performed there, in conjunction with the merits and mediation of the Apostle of Ireland. In cases of compunction for sins of unusual magnitude, a penance of unusual efficacy is conceived to be found in a pilgrimage to the Island. The benediction of the great patron saint of the country is reckoned to have imparted to that spot a character of peculiar sanctity; and to have suffused its atmosphere with a kind of holy influence, which mixes, like sweet incense, with the petitions there presented to the Almighty, and causes the supplication of the sinful and unworthy who there confess their guilt and cry for mercy, to come with acceptance before the throne of the Majesty on high.

The history of this remarkable place is, however, but little known to people, generally; and we shall therefore, we trust, be doing a useful work, and rendering a service to the cause of truth, by putting our readers in possession of some facts, attested by Roman Catholic authorities of the highest character, which will enable them to form a better judgment as to how far the purgatory of Lough Dearg is entitled to any claims on our veneration from any real connection between it and the labours of St. Patrick; or as to whether it be a well-founded hope, or a spirit of delusion, that leads the poor sin-stricken pilgrim to look thither for consolation and relief, to be received in virtue of peculiar privileges bestowed on that island by the prayers and benediction of our Apostle.

The account which Dr. Lanigan gives of the place in his learned *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland* (vol. i., p. 368) is that which follows:—

"It will not be expected that I should waste my time with giving an account of the so-called Patrick's Purgatory of Lough Derg (Donegal), or examining if there could have been any foundation for attributing it to our Apostle. It is never mentioned in any of his Lives; nor was it, I believe, heard of until the eleventh century, the period at which the Canons Regular of St. Augustine first appeared. For it was to persons of that order, as the story goes, that St. Patrick confided the care of that cavern of wonders. Now, there were no such persons in the island in which it is situated, nor in that of St. Davoc in the same lake, until, I dare say, about the beginning of the twelfth century. This purgatory, or purging place, of Lough Derg, was set up against another Patrick's purgatory—viz., that of Croagh Patrick, mentioned by Jocelyn, which, however ill-founded the vulgar opinion concerning it, was less objectionable. Some writers have said that it got the name of Patrick's Purgatory from an Abbot Patrick that lived in the ninth century; but neither were there Canons Regular of St. Augustine at that time, nor were such abridged modes of atoning to the Almighty for the sins of a whole life then thought of. *It was demolished* in the year 1497, *by order of the Pope*, although it has since been in some manner restored."

The original Patrick's Purgatory, then, was at Croagh Patrick, in Mayo, near Westport, speaking of the pilgrimages made to which, the monk Joceline (in his *Life of St. Patrick*, written A.D. 1180, cap. 172) says that "Some of those who spent a night there stated that they had been subjected to most fearful torments, which had the effect, as they supposed, of purging them from their sins, for which reason also certain of them gave to that place the name of St. Patrick's Purgatory."

The account given in the *Annals of Ulster* (which Dr. Lanigan must have seen, though he does not quote it as his authority) of the destruction of the Lough Dearg Purgatory in the fifteenth century, with the reason assigned for the act, is curious enough in its way, and reads thus, as given by the learned Dr. O'Donovan, in his notes to the Annals of the Four Masters, at A.D. 1497:—

"A.D. 1497, - - - - - - The Cave of Patrick's Purgatory, in Lough Derg [*i.e.*, L. Derg], was destroyed about the festival of St. Patrick this year by the Guardian of Donegal, and by the representatives [*properly*, representative] of the Bishop in the Deanery of Lough Erne [i.e. Cathal Maguire], by authority of the Pope, the people in general having understood, from the *History of the Knight*, and other old books, that this was not the Purgatory which St. Patrick obtained from God, though the people in general were visiting it."

We know of one old book, from which the people in general might have gotten that information, and which would have informed them, not only as to the *History of the Knight*, what was *not*, but also what *was*, the true Purgatory which St. Patrick obtained from God. Perhaps some of our readers, too, can tell what that old book is.

But what the *History of the Knight* was, we must confess we know not, and can only guess that it may have been *Joceline's Life of St. Patrick*, above cited, which might be so called, as having been written, as we know that it was, by Joceline, at the request of the famous knight, Sir John de Courcy.

It seems very probable that the destruction of the cave above described, by Papal authority, was brought about by the influence of that very distinguished individual, Cathal Maguire, who is said, in the passage just quoted, to have been one of the agents employed in the execution of the work; for he was a man of great eminence and learning, and "collected together many historical books," from which he compiled that valuable record, the *Annals of Ulster*, or rather the portion of those Annals preceding A.D. 1498, the year of his own death. He was also a Canon of Armagh and of Clogher, and Rural Dean of Lough Erne, as well as "representative of the Bishop," or perhaps his Vicar General, for fifteen years previously to his decease. His assistant in the destruction of the Cave was the Guardian, or head of the Franciscan Friary, of Donegal.

Thus, one might have supposed, there was an end to the concern:—"The people in general," exercising a wise judgment on the contents of what appeared to them trustworthy historical records, were convinced that it was a humbug; that the Purgatory to which Patrick had been directed by wisdom from on High was an altogether different one; and that the wrecking of this place, which they had been visiting under so false an impression, could be no act of profanity, nor occasion them any detriment. The Pope approved of the idea. And by two distinguished Irish ecclesiastical dignitaries the work of demolition was brought to a happy and successful termination.

But, however, the delusion revived—"The people in general" forgot what they had learned out of their old books; and in spite of Papal dooming and all, the idea of the sanctity of the station, as a proper place for salutary pilgrimages, has again taken hold of the popular mind; and so the place, as Dr. Lanigan says, "has been in some measure restored.' Of what vital consequence to the spiritual welfare and edification of Irish Christians the maintaining of the delusion was considered by some in high quarters, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, may be judged from a circumstance which we shall now mention.

By authority of the Lords Justices, who governed Ireland previously to the appointment of Wentworth as Lord Lieutenant in 1633, it appears that the Lough Dearg Purgatory was once more suppressed; a proceeding facilitated by the recent plantation of Ulster, including the parts about the lake, with Scotch and English colonists. But the sort of piety then fostered among the members of the Roman communion in Ireland could ill afford to resign without a struggle what was to them a source of so much consolation, so venerated a means of edification. And high influence was therefore to be called into action, to procure the reversal of the gloomy sentence which had fastened on "the so-called Patrick's Purgatory."

Under the protection of the Roman Catholic Queen of Charles I. of England, ecclesiastics of her communion were able to effect much at court. She herself maintained an agent at Rome, on a salary of £500 *per annum*. "And," adds the Rev. Mr. Gerrard, after communicating this fact to the Lord Deputy of Ireland, in a letter dated April 5, 1536—"We have had one here [*i.e.*, at the English Court] above this twelvemonth, appointed by the Pope, a *Roman* born, and a priest; but what these men shall negotiate either there or here I know not."—*Strafford's Letters*, vol. ii., p. 2. Dublin. 1740.

One business, at all events, which "these men" set themselves to negotiate, was the revival of "St. Patrick's Purgatory," to effect which the Queen was gotten to address to the Lord Deputy of Ireland the following letter*:—

"My Lord Wentworth—I have before now addressed to you letters of recommendation, in regard to which I have observed on your part such a readiness to oblige me, that I am led to write to you myself, to convey to you my acknowledgments of your courtesy; and also to make a request of you, connected with a matter, in which you may further oblige me more than in anything besides; which is, that you will be pleased to allow, that the devotions which the people of that country have ever been wont to pay to a St. Patrick's place there, may not be abolished. They will make use of the permission so modestly that you shall have no reason to repent of having granted it; and you will do me a great pleasure. I have given the Earl of Antrim a commission to urge the matter with you; for which reason I shall add no more, than my assurance, that you shall find in me no ungrateful person, but one that will on all occasions give you proof of the desire she entertains to oblige you; and who will ever be

"*Your very good friend,*

"Henrietta Maria R."

The reply which the Lord Deputy gave to the above communication from her Majesty, was this which follows:—

"May it Please Your Most Excellent Majesty.—The gracious lines I received from your Majesty's own hands, concerning *St. Patrick's* Purgatory, I shall convey over to my posterity, as one of the greatest honours of my past life.

"For the thing itself it was by act of state decreed under the government of the late Lords Justices, before my coming into this kingdom; and since I read your Majesty's letter, I can, in truth, say, I am glad none of my counsel was in the matter.

"Yet, being now absolutely taken away, there will be a greater difficulty to restore it than would be barely to continue and tolerate such a devotion prohibited by a smaller power, or discontinued for a shorter

* The original, in French, reads thus:—"Monsieur *Wentworth*, Je vous ay escrit cy devant pour des recommendations; ou je vous ay recogneu sy prompt a m'obliger, que cela me fait vous escrire moy m me, pour vous en remercier, et aussi pour prier d'une chose en quoy vous pouvez continuer a m'obliger plus qu'en aucune chose, qui est, que vous veuilles souffrir q'une devotion que le Peuple de ce Pais a toujours eu a une place a Saint *Patrick* ne soit point abolie. Ils en useront sy moderement, que vous n'aurez point de raison de vous en repentier; et vous me ferez un grand plaisir. Je donne charge a Monsieur *Antrim* de solliciter l'affaire aupres de vous, c'est pourquoy je finiray en vous assurant, que vous ne trouverez point en moy une personne ingrate, mais une qui vous fera paroistre en toutes occasions le desir qu'elle a de vous obliger, et qui sera toujours

"Votre bien bonne Amie,

"Henrietta Maria R."

time than this hath been.* Besides, the place is in the midst of the great *Scottish* plantation; and I fear, at this time, where some men's zeal hath run them already, not only beyond their wits, but almost forth of their allegiance too, it might furnish them with something to say in prejudice and scandal to his Majesty's government, which, for the present indeed, is by all means to be avoided.

"Yet, considering we often observe, that may be had in due season with ease which, mistimed, may prove unsafe, and very difficult to obtain, my most humble opinion is, your Majesty might do passing wisely to let this devotion rest awhile, till there may be a fitter opportunity apprehended, by which to effect your Majesty's satisfaction therein; which gracious temper and forbearance shall also (in my judgment) dispose and bow all nearer your Majesty's desire, than any other ay that can for the present be taken.

"And I beseech your Majesty to honour me with this belief, that my duties, in fulfilling your commands, are so broad awake, that in all or any, where I may have the happiness or ability to serve to your Majesty's contentment, I shall not need the solicitation of my Lord of *Antrim*, or any other whatsoever, to incite me thereunto, there being nothing abroad which can put me so fast and diligently on, as my own great cheerfulness at home, which, unminded by any, shall, through all your gracious appointments, express me with all faith and attention.

"*Your Majesty's*
"*Most obedient and most humble servant,*
"WENTWORTH.

"*Dublin Castle, 10th October.*"
(See *Strafford's Letters, vol.* 2, *pp.* 221, 222.)

The purgatory, then, had been for some years "absolutely taken away," by authority of the Irish government; and the Lord Deputy, though so anxious to oblige the Queen, was apprehensive that any attempt to revive the devotion there, with the sanction of the executive, would be attended with danger, from the feelings entertained on the matter by the inhabitants of the surrounding country; and yet, after this second suppression, the devotion has a second time been "in some manner restored," and multitudes throng to the place on the faith of a false tradition, so long since exposed and exploded by their own best authorities, in the hope of receiving healing virtues, and balm for their spiritual wounds, from its imaginary privileges. Three hundred and fifty years ago the Pope, the representative of the Bishop of Clogher, and the head of the Franciscans in Donegal, combined their efforts to put down the scandalous fabrication. But yet it remains to this day an object of cherished religious veneration, an object of confidence and faith, on which many a poor soul casts itself to find consolation and repose; and those multitudes of pilgrims, year after year, assemble there, no influence which they look to for guidance forbidding them, to do homage to the vain delusion.

And is there in this no danger to their poor, misguided souls? Or if there be, how is it that those violent efforts which we see so often applied—and so often, too, applied successfully—to prohibit the reading of the Scriptures of Truth, are never directed to the overthrow of what must now be acknowledged to be so manifest an impostnre? Why do none of those high authorities which are so earnest and zealous in the former cause, ever, even for decency's sake, direct their energies to enforce truth and circulate light in the quarter where it is so much wanted? When such pains are taken to watch Scriptural schools, and congregations of converts, in order to warn off from attending them any who may yet be in any measure under the influence of Rome, why is not a teacher appointed to reside on the way to the lake and island, whose duty it should be to tell all pilgrims going that way that they were trusting to an imposture, condemned by a Pope of their own, and having no other connection with St. Patrick than what was invented by the cunning of designing and covetous men, and received by the simple and credulous, in spite of the testimony to the contrary of the learned and respectable? And how excellent a work would it be, in connection with such negative teaching, to tell the poor people what was the real purgatory that God appointed for St. Patrick and for all mankind, to tell them that the Word which cannot lie assures us that the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin; and that by it those that were afar off, in every place, without pilgrimage or visiting of sacred shrines, are brought nigh unto our Heavenly Father, and have secured to them acceptance, remission of sins, and unfailing peace.

* i.e., than 6 years or so at least. Viscount Wentworth having come over as Lord Deputy of Ireland in A.D., 1633, before which time the purgatory had been suppressed.

AURICULAR CONFESSION.

THERE is, perhaps, no point in controversy between the Churches of Rome and England, in which the laity have a deeper or, as it were, a more personal interest than that of the alleged necessity of the practice of confession, as at present enjoined by the Church of Rome. We propose to consider it with the same calm attention, and sincere anxiety to arrive at truth, which we hope has characterised our investigations upon the other points which from time to time have been treated of in our pages, and we invite the assistance of our able and learned correspondents in the discussion, convinced that whichever side truth lies on, cannot fail to reap the benefit of an earnest and searching examination, conducted in a candid and temperate spirit.

The Council of Trent, in its 14th Session, 1551. chap. v., as incidental to the (disputed) Sacrament of Penance, asserts that "the universal Church has always understood that the entire confession of sins was also *instituted by the Lord*, and is of *Divine right necessary* to all who have fallen after baptism;" and by its 6th canon decrees, that "if any one shall deny, either that sacramental confession was instituted, or is necessary unto salvation, of Divine right, or shall say that the manner of confessing secretly to a priest alone, which the Catholic Church *hath ever observed from the beginning*, and doth observe, is alien from the institutions and command of Christ, and is a human invention, let him be Anathema."*

Canon vii.—"If any one shall say, that in the Sacrament of Penance it is not, of Divine right, necessary unto the remission of sins, to confess all and individually the deadly sins, the memory of which, after due and diligent previous meditation, is held, even those which are secret, and those which are opposed to the last two commandments of the Decalogue, as also the circumstances which change the species of a sin; but that such confession is only useful to instruct and console the penitent, and that it was of old only observed in order to impose a canonical satisfaction: or shall say, that they who strive to confess all their sins, wish to leave nothing to the Divine mercy to pardon; and, finally, that it is not lawful to confess venial sins, let him be Anathema."†

Canon viii.—"If any one shall say, that the confession of all sins, such as the Church observes, is impossible, and is a human tradition, to be abolished by the pious; or that all and each of the faithful of Christ, of either sex, are not obliged thereunto once a year, according to the constitution of the great Council of Lateran, and that, on this account, the faithful of Christ must not be persuaded to confess during Lent, let him be Anathema."‡

We propose, in the first instance, to investigate the truth and accuracy of the assertion, that the *universal church* has *always* understood that sacramental, or secret confession to a priest, was instituted by our Blessed Lord, and is, therefore, of Divine right, necessary to salvation; and next whether it be true that the Catholic Church hath observed from the beginning the practice of confessing secretly to a priest alone. The importance of these inquiries we think cannot be estimated too highly, as, if they be once answered, on satisfactory evidence, in the affirmative, no one who believes in Christianity can refuse obedience to it as duty; and we shall begin by admitting in our judgment, the affirmative, if true, may be established, either by the express words of Holy Scripture, or by legitimate inference from what is written, interpreted by such an uniform understanding of the universal Church as is referred to in the foregoing passages.

The "quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus," what has been held "always, and everywhere, by all Christians," *we* at least ever shall deem worthy of the deepest respect, and presume to be true, till the contrary is demonstratively established.

The first question, then, is—Can there be found in the Holy Scriptures any clear or express institution of confession to a priest, by our blessed Lord or any of his Apostles? The second is, Is it capable of proof that the universal Church hath always considered as divinely instituted, and as such always observed, from the times of our Lord and his Apostles, the practice of confessing secretly to a priest alone?

I. As to the first question, we may observe, that the proof of the affirmative does properly lie with those who assert that such a passage is to be found in the Scriptures. The Council of Trent relies alone upon the 20th chapter of John, 22nd verse, which we shall presently consider; but it may perhaps, be satisfactory to our Roman Catholic readers first to know what eminent Roman Catholic writers have said upon the subject, which may assist them in considering both questions with greater freedom, than if we were to rely exclusively on our own reasonings, or merely Protestant authorities on the matter.

Maldonatus,* the Spanish Jesuit, a very learned writer and celebrated divine of the 16th century, who died in 1583, reckons up seven different opinions about confession, among the writers of the (Roman) Catholic Church—1. Of those who denied it to be of divine right, but held it to be useful in the Church, as Rhenanus and Erasmus. 2. Of those who make it to be only of *ecclesiastical* institution, and this, he says, is the opinion of all the canonists. 3. Of those who thought it came in by apostolical tradition, of which he reckons Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury. 4. Of some divines who hold it to be instituted only by St. James. 5. Of others who hold it to be of Divine right, and not instituted by the Apostles, but *insinuated* by Christ, and for this he quotes Alexander Hales and Bonaventure. 6. Of some who thought it instituted in the Old Testament. 7. Of those who hold it instituted by Christ, but not as a precept, but by way of counsel or advice only, and for this he mentions Scotus and his followers

Natalis Alexander, a Roman Catholic theologian of high character (De Sacr. Confess., p. 229), admits that, from the ninth to the thirteenth century, many Catholics did hold that confession to God alone was sufficient to obtain remission of sins.

Peter Lombard,† generally called the Master of the Sentences, Bishop of Paris in the twelfth century, tells us that learned men were of different opinions, because the doctors of the Church seemed to deliver not only divers things, but contrary things—(*i.e.*, they had no certain or constant tradition about them)—St. Ambrose, St. Chrysostom, and Prosper being in favour of confession to God only, while St. Augustine and Leo the First seemed against it; and Gratian, in his Decretum, (which was presented to Pope Eugenius III., who is said to have testified his approbation by conferring on him the Bishopric of Chiusi),‡ de. Pœniten. Dist. 1, states the authorities both ways, as to whether confession to a priest be necessary, or whether confession to God alone be sufficient, and, after summing up all the arguments and authorities, both from the Scriptures and the Fathers, concludes all by leaving the matter to the reader's judgment; for both opinions, he saith, had wise and pious defenders,§ adding in chap. 90, from the Penitential of Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury, A.D. 690, that "some say that we ought to confess only to God, others that we ought to do it to the priest too, for each is not without great fruit in the Church; so that, let us confess our sins to God, who is the forgiver of sins, saying with David, 'I have made known my transgression to thee, and mine iniquities have I not hid. I said, I will confess my sins unto the Lord, and so thou forgavest the wickedness of my sin' (32nd Psalm)—yet, nevertheless, the institution of the Apostle should be followed by us, that we should confess our sins *one to another*, and pray *for one another*, that we may be saved. Therefore, confession which is to God alone purges away sins, but that which is made to the priest teaches how they are purged; for God, who is the author and giver of health and salvation, sometimes gives (this medicine of penitence‖) by an invisible administration of his power, and sometimes by the operation of physicians."

The Council of Cavaillon, in the days of Charles the Great (Charlemagne), A.D 813, held nearly the same words, stating that some confessed their sins to the priests, but not fully, acknowledging that it still remained a question whether men should confess to God only, or to the priests also; we give their words in the note.¶ It is abundantly clear, we think, from the foregoing authorities, that the doctrine of the *divine insti-*

* Conc. Trid. Sess. xiv. Can. vi.—"Si quis negaverit, confessionem sacramentalem vel institutam vel ad salutem necessariam, esse jure divino; aut dixerit modum secrete confitendi soli sacerdoti, quem Ecclesia Catholica ab initio semper observavit et observat, alienum esse ab institutione et mandato Christi, et inventum esse humanum, Anathema sit."

† Can. vii.—"Si quis dixerit, in sacramento Pœnitentiæ ad remissionem peccatorum necessarium non esse jure divino, confiteri omnia et singula peccata mortalia, quorum memoria cum debita et diligenti præmeditatione habeatur, etiam occulta et quæ sunt contra duo ultima Decalogi præcepta, et circumstantias quæ peccata speciem mutant, sed eam confessionem tantum esse utilem ad erudiendum et consulandum pœnitentem et olim observatam fuisse tantum ad satisfactionem canonicam imponendam; aut dixerit, eos qui omnia peccata confiteri studeat, nihil relinquere velle divinæ misericordiæ ignoscendum, aut demum non licere confiteri peccata venalia, Anathema sit."

‡ Can. viii.—"Si quiz dixerit, confessionem omnium peccatorum, qualem Ecclesia servat, esse impossibilem, et traditionem humanam, a piis abolendam; aut ad eam non teneri omnes et singulos utriusque sexus Christi fideles, juxta magni Concilii Lateranensis constitutionem semel in anno, et ob id suadendum esse Christi fidelibus, ut non confiteantur tempore Quadragesimæ, Anathema sit."

* De Sacr. Pœnit. De Confess., c. 2. Tom ii., p. 35. Lugd. 1614.

† *Pet. Lomb.*, Sent. Lib. iv., dist. xvii., pp. 102, 107 Lugd. 1618. "Primo enim quæritur utrum absque satisfactione et oris confessione, per solam cordis contritionem, peccatum alicui dimittatur. Secundo, an alicui sufficiat confiteri Deo sine sacerdote. Tertio, an laico fideli facta valeat confessio. In his enim etiam doctis diversa scitira invenimntur: *quia super his varia ac pene adversa traditisse videntur Doctores.*"

‡ Pancrolus de claris Legum Interpretibus, p. 317. Ed. Hoffmani, Lipsi, 1721.

§ "Quibus auctoritatibus vel quibus rationum firmamentis utraque sententia satisfactionis, et confessionis innitatur, in medium breviter exposuimus. Cui autem harum potius adhœrendum sit, lectoris judicio reservatur. Utraque enim fautores habet sapientes, et religiosos viros.'—Decret, 2 pars. Causa xxxiii. quæs. iii., cap. 89. Note

‖ These words seem to have been interpolated, for it will be observed that no such words as "medicine of penance, or penitence," occur in the Latin decree of the Council of Cavaillon, which is evidently taken from the above, see infra.

¶ Sed et hoc emendatione egere perspeximus; quod quidam, dum confitentur peccata sua sacerdotibus, non plenè id faciunt. Concil Cabilon II., cap. 32. Sacr. Concil., Tom. 17, Lut. Paris, p. 1278. Quidam solummodo Deo confiteri debere dicnnt peccata, quidam verosacerdotibus confitenda esse percensent: quod utrumque non sine magno fructu intra sanctam sit Ecclesiam; ita duntaxat, ut et Deo, qui remissor est peccatorum, confiteamur peccata nostra, et cum David dicamus, Delictum meum cognitum tibi feci, et injustitiam meam non abscondi. Dixi, confitebor adversum me injustitias meas Domino, et tu remisisti impietatem peccati mei, et secundum institutionem apostoli, confitemur alterutrum peccata nostra, et oremus pro invicem ut salvemur. Confessio itaque, quæ Deo fit, purgat peccata: ea vero, quæ sacerdoti fit, docet qualiter ipsa purgentur peccata. Deus namque, salutis et sanitatis auctor et largitor, plerumque hanc præbet suæ potentiæ invisibili administratione, plerumque medicorum operatione.—Concil Cabilon II. cap 33, p. 1279.

tution of auricular confession, whether true or not, was for many centuries disputed in the Church, and was far from being held "always and everywhere, by all Christians." Let us return now, however, to the Council of Trent.

The Council of Trent, we have observed, based the institution of confession, by Divine right, on John xx. 22—"Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained." If they could have found, in the whole body of Scripture, any text more to their purpose, we may fairly conclude, they would have founded the institution on it, and not on John xx. alone.

In our last number, in treating of the Power of the Keys, we gave our readers important extracts from Roman Catholic divines, going some way at least to the explaining of that text; but what we have here to consider is, whether it teaches the duty of Auricular Confession, as insisted on by the Council of Trent. That it does not do so expressly, or with that clearness which our Lord used in the institution of the undisputed sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, is plain, for not a word either of penance or confession is to be found in the passage; and Cardinal Cajetan, in his notes on this text, confesses, "that no precept of sacramental confession is contained in it," which subsequent writers, such as Vasquez, try to explain by saying that Cajetan means no more than that it cannot be proved out of this place. Ambrosius Catharinus*, Bishop of Minori, however (on Cajetan, p. 444), says, "that neither there nor in any other place doth Cajetan allow that Auricular Confession can be proved out of Scripture."

St. Bonaventure†, a learned writer and Cardinal, denies that Christ himself appointed the confession of sins, and, in commenting on this passage of St. John says, "it was not enough to have it *implied* in the priest's power, because it being a harder duty than absolution, it required a more particular command, which even Cardinal Bellarmine himself admits (De Pœnit., l. 3, c. 12, p. 451), when he says, "it is one of the most grievous and burdensome precepts, and, *therefore*, it must have a Divine command to enforce it"—a mode of reasoning in which we cannot agree, deeming St Bonaventure's argument to be much the stronger of the two—viz., that the harder the duty was, the more clearly it ought to have been expressed.

Bellarmine's words are so remarkable, that our readers may think them worth quoting at length.‡

Alexander de Hales§, a celebrated divine, known by the title of the *Irrefragable Doctor*, who died in the Franciscan monastery at Paris, in 1245, observes, in opposition to those who said that Christ instituted confession when he conferred the power of the keys, that if Christ had intended a command of confession, in John xx., it would have been expressed to those who are to confess, and not to those who are to absolve, as he did to those who were to be baptized, in John iii. Except a man be born of water, &c., so Christ would have said "Except a man confess his sins," &c., which we confess we think is an argument not without show of reason.

But if the doctrine in question cannot be found by these eminent writers of the Roman Church itself, in the *express* letter of Scripture, still it may be said that it is to be inferred from thence by what may be called *necessary implication*. We think our readers will be rather disposed to agree with St. Bonaventure, that it is not enough to have auricular confession *implied* in the priest's form of absolution; and *Gabriel Biel*• confesses he cannot find sufficient force to conclude the *necessity* of confession from the power of absolution being granted; to whose authority we might add many others, such as *Nicol de Orbellis*, *Scotus*, *Guido Brianson*, and *Jac. de Almain*, who all debate the matter at large, and give up the point, that Christ's granting a power of absolution makes it by implication a duty to confess to a priest; the last, *De Almain* (in 4 Dist. 17), admitting that "it is a false proposition that, when a form of judging is given, others are bound to submit to it; for all that follows is, that their sentence is valid if they do submit."

Having thus shown what eminent Roman Catholic writers have said, as to this mode of proving, by *inference*, that confession to a priest is a duty of Divine institution, perhaps we may venture to add something of our own on the matter, first premising that it may be fairly asked, when we are urged to rely for proof on a mere *inference*—1, Whether that can properly be said to be of Divine institution, and necessary to salvation, which depends on an inference, and is proved only by an *inuendo*? 2, Whether it be reasonable to assert that our Saviour there institutes a sacrament of penance, including auricular confession, when not only auricular confession, but the whole matter of such a sacrament is left undefined? As to the first, we think it will not be denied that the word "institution" means the expression of a *positive* command, in contradistinction to a mere *moral* or *natural* duty; and as the whole reason of such command lies in the will of the legislator, if that be not plainly discovered, the command cannot be said to be *instituted*. "Where there is no law there is no transgression," and a law is, in effect, no law if it be not sufficiently promulged. Is it not a strange thing then, to tell us of an institution by implication only, and yet at the same time to tell us that the matter so (pretended to be) instituted is no less than absolutely necessary to the salvation of sinners, as the Council of Trent does in the decrees in question?

As to the second question, the Council of Trent itself lays it down that this sacrament of penance consists of matter and form; the form is the priest's absolution, but the matter or materials of this sacrament are contrition, confession to the priest, and satisfaction, in performance of the penance enjoined by him. Now it is evident that not only auricular confession, but also contrition and satisfaction, are wholly omitted and passed over in silence by the Evangelist St. John. And is it not a very strange thing that our Saviour should be supposed to have *instituted a new sacrament* without alluding to the matter or materials of it at all, saying nothing either of the form or of any one of the three matters in which this sacrament of penance was to consist?

We have still, however, to meet the argument, that as our Lord hath made the priest a *judge* of men's consciences and conditions, it is necessary, in order to prevent him from proceeding blindly and indiscriminately, that he should know the merits of the cause, and not only understand the matter of fact, but all circumstances which may aggravate or extenuate it, which can only be attained by the confession of the party. Therefore (it may be argued), auricular confession is as necessarily *implied* in the text as absolution or retention of sin is *expressed* by it.

Those of our readers who have perused, in our last number, the article on the Power of the Keys, will, perhaps, think that the *judicial* character of the priesthood is not a matter to be assumed as proved, even according to ancient Roman Catholic writers, much less that they are *exclusive judges* of the *state of the consciences* of all their fellow-men, and that without appeal to the judgment of God himself. We think we have demonstrated, not only by the Holy Scriptures but the Fathers, that God alone can truly be said to forgive sins, and that the power of the priest is to declare forgiveness *conditional* on true faith and true repentance, and that, even such *declaratory* sentence is not infallible, but subject, like all other things human, to error, and therefore limited by the clause "*clave non errante*," meaning that it is only of force when the matter is judged with right judgment and no error is committed in the use of the keys.

We would, however, wish to go farther, and ask first—Is it certain that, even on such a confession as the Council of Trent requires, the priest will be able to form such a judgment as can be safely depended on, considering especially the intricacy of some cases and the ignorance of some priests? The great St. Augustine, at any rate, did not think so, when he said—"To what purpose do I confess my sins to men who cannot heal my wounds? To a set of men inquisitive in inquiring into the lives of others, but indolent to amending their own. And how shall they (who know nothing of my heart but by my own confession) know whether I say true or no? For no one knows what is in man but the spirit of man that is in him"• We shall presently see what St. Chrysostom and others say on the same subject. But we would ask secondly—What proof is there that the priest is made a judge of secret sins in thought only, as well as of open sins and public scandals, of which the Church took cognizance for the good of society, and the public honour of God? If a certain class of sins is reserved for the bishop why should not sin in thought only be properly reserved for the tribunal of God? Thirdly—We would ask, why, if it be true, as the Council of Trent admits, that sins might be, and were remitted, *before* the times of our Saviour, upon contrition only and confession to God, why might not confession to God *now* be sufficient, without confession to the priest also, since remission does not, in the nature of the thing itself, by their own confession imply confession to a priest? It is scarcely to be believed that pardon under the Gospel is not to be procured upon as easy terms, at least, as it was before, unless, indeed, the contrary be shown very plainly and by something stronger than a mere inference, even if the inference were of a much more stringent and unavoidable character than we have shown it to be.

II. We admit, however, that we have still to inquire historically, whether it be true that the Catholic Church has always observed from the time of our Lord and his Apostles, the practice of confessing all sins secretly to a priest alone?

This we shall not evade, but we are compelled, by the length to which this article has already run, and the importance of the subject, to postpone considering the historical question until our next number.

TALK OF THE ROAD—NO. XI.

Well, on Monday evening, the 4th of April, Pat was walking out to Jem's house, and he fell in with Jem, leading home a pair of Mr. Nulty's horses from the harrow.

"Why, is it working you were to-day, Jem?" said Pat.

"Deed is it," said Jem; "sure there's plenty to do, and the work so backward."

"Well," said Pat, "there was not a turn doing in Kilcommon to day; so I thought I would walk out, and have a bit of talk with you."

"And what are they idling for in Kilcommon," said Jem, "more nor here?"

"Sure it's keeping Lady-day we were," said Pat, "and Father John wouldn't allow plough or harrow to work itself."

"Well, now," said Jem; "I heard the queer talk to-day, between Mr. Nulty, that lives in this parish, and Mr. Smith, that holds the big farm in Kilcommon parish. Mr. Smith was coming up the road, and he stopped to speak to Mr. Nulty; 'and is it working you are to-day, Nulty?' says he. 'Yes,' says Mr. Nulty, 'sure Father Sheridan gave it out in our chapel yesterday that we might all work to-day, for he said the crop was too late.' 'Well, I'll bet you sixpence,' says Mr. Smith, 'that Father Sheridan has farming of his own to do.' 'Indeed he has,' says Mr. Nulty, 'as much as any of us.' 'Ay, that's the reason of it,' says Mr. Smith, 'and that's always the way whatever's their convenience is our duty; and if I'd only known that this morning,' says he, 'I'd have had every plough in Kilcommon at work.'† 'And why shouldn't we work to-day, and the work so backward?' said Mr. Nulty; 'ne'er a priest in Ireland should stop me, to please himself.'"

So then Pat and Jem had some talk about why Lady-day could not be kept on the 25th of March, because it was Good Friday; but we need not tell what they said about that, because we see one Brannigan has written a letter about it.

"And then," says Jem, "I wonder did God Almighty mean that the priests should be laying down laws for us to work, or not to work just as it suits their own convenience and their own crop."

"Well," says Pat, "if he did, wouldn't he put it in the Bible, or wouldn't the blessed Apostles say something about it? And there isn't a word about it in the Bible, that I can find; and sure, if it *was* in the Bible, wouldn't the priests tell us that much out of the Bible anyway? But I know what is in the Bible, and we are not to work on the Sabbath-day, and we are given leave to work on the other six."

"Ay," said Jem, "it's not much the priests seem to

---

* *Catharinus in Cajet.* p. 444, Lugd. 1542. "Circa confessionem primum admiratus sum, quod *ubicunque in Scripturis* legimus peccatorum remissionem, non patitur de confessione auriculari intelligi, et particularium peccatorum."

† *S. Bonaventuræ Cardinalis*, Oper., Tom. V., Ludg. 1668, Lib. IV., Sent. Dist. xvii., Art. 1. Quæs. III., p. 223.

"Item quæro, ubi instituit, si dicas ibi, Agite pœnitentiam; Contra, &c.

Item alii dicunt quod instituerit ibi, ubi misit leprosum ad Sacerdotes. Sed contra, &c., &c.

Item dicunt alii, quod ibi: "Accipite spiritum sanctum."—Joan, 20; quia dum instituit sacerdotes et potestatem absolvendi eis dedit, præcepit per consequens a nis, ut a eis peccata deferrent. *Sed contra. Difficilius est confiteri quam confessionem audere: ergo magis specialiter de hoc debuit mandatum dare.* Quæritur igitur, quare *Christus non instituit confessionem expressæ*, sicut alia sacramenta

Id. p. 224, "ex his quæ dicta sunt, quatuor possunt rationes elici, quare Dominus immediate confessionem, et expresse non instituit. Prima quidem, quia non oportuit. Secunda vero, quia in hoc *voluntariam* esse debere docuit. Tertia, quia est sacramentum reciduantium. Quarta, quia quantum est de se, est *opus humanum*. Unde credo, quod non per se instituit; et si dicatur instituisse, hoc est intelligendum *insinuando* et auctoritatem dando."

‡ "The second reason is taken from the difficulty of confession; for if there be any one matter in the Catholic Church more grave and difficult than another, without any doubt, that thing is confession. For what can be more troublesome, what more burdensome, than that even the most powerful kings and princes should be compelled to unfold to priests (who are men like themselves) all their sins, however secret, however base, however shameful, however dreadful even to him who confesses them, and to abide by the judgments of these same priests, and to undergo the penalties prescribed by them? So great is the difficulty of the whole thing, that it is altogether incredible, either that the prelates of the Church would have dared to impose such a law, or that the people would have been persuaded to receive it, and to observe it for so many centuries, unless it had been of Divine command, of Divine institution, of Divine promise. Therefore, the authority was Divine."

The original is as follows:—

Bellarm. de Pœn. lib. iii. c. xii. tom. iii. p. 451, col. 1615.—"Secunda ratio sumi ur a difficultate confessionis, nam si quæ res est in Ecclesia catholica, quæ gravis ac difficilis videatur, sine dubitatione ulla confessio est. Quid enim molestius, quid onerosius, quam, ut cogantur etiam viri Principes Reæsque potentissimi, sacerdotibus, qui et ipsi homines sunt, peccata sua omnia detegare, quamvis arcana, quamvis turpia, quamvis pudenda, quamvis horrorem etiam ipsi confitenti adferentia, et eorundem sacerdotum judicio stare ac multam ab illis injunctam subire? Tanta profectò hujus rei difficultas est, ut nullo modo credibile sit, aut Ecclesiæ Prælatos ausuros fuisse legem ejusmodi ferre, aut populis persuaderi potuisse, ut ejusmodi legem acciperent, effet jam seculis observarent, nisi Divinum imperium, Divina institutio, Divina promissio accessisset. Igitur Divina fuit auctoritas

§ *Alex. de Ales. Summæ Theol. pars.* 4ta, q. 18, num. 3, art. 2, p. 867, Col. Agrip., 1622. "Alii dicunt, quod instituit confessionem quando contulit potestatem clavium, Matt. xvi. et Joan. xx. Contra in institutione confessionis, debuit, dari præceptum sive inditio confitentibus, non illis qui non debent confiteri, sed audire confessiones, sicut factum est in institutione baptismi baptizandis. Joan iii."

• Biel in 4 Sent. Dist. 17, q. 1, a. 1, Ludg. 1514.

• "Quid mihi ergo est cum hominibus, ut audiant confessiones meas, quasi ipsi sanaturi sint omnes languores meos? curiosum genus ad cognoscendam vitam alienam, desidiosum ad corrigendam suam. Et unde sciunt, cum a meipso se meipso audiant an verum dicam? Quando quidem nemo scit hominum quid agitur in homine, nisi spiritus hominis qui in ipso est."—S. August. Confes. Lib. x., c. 3, Tom. I., p. 171. Paris 1679.

† Such a conversation did take place between two farmers on that day, who lived in different parishes.

think about that; sure there isn't a shop in Ballyboy that isn't open on Sunday, ("and its worse in Kilcommon," said Pat,) and every one doing his business; and the publicans busier nor any other day, selling their whisky; and how can it be right for the publican to be selling his whisky, and doing *his* business any more than for the farmer to be sowing his ground and doing *his*? And who ever heard tell of a priest saying it was against the law of God for a shopkeeper to be doing his business on Sunday? But if any one of *us* goes to earn a shilling on a holyday to keep the children from dying of hunger, they are ready enough to tell us that it's against the law of the Church, and to put their curse upon us, and to take the bread out of the children's months for it; for who will give us a day's work when they do that on us?"

"Well," said Pat, "and isn't it what they would do? Sure it's to think of the Church, and not of the Scriptures, that they want us; and why wouldn't they be harder on us about the laws of the Church, that they make themselves, than about the laws of God, that he wrote in the Bible? But I wonder which will be most thought of in the day of judgment, whether we kept the laws of God himself, or the laws of the priest."

"Well, then," said Jem, "If God's to be the judge, maybe he will think most about his own laws. And if that's to be the way, isn't it better for us to read the Bible now, and find out his laws for ourselves, if the priest is too busy about his own, to tell us what God's laws are?"

"Well, Jem," said Pat, "I'm thinking we'll have to keep to the Bible to know *them;* and sure enough that's just what I came to talk to you about. Do you mind what I said to you the last talk we had, how the Rev. Mr. Owens asked me would I be ashamed of Christ and of his word; and would I make Christ be ashamed of me? and what he showed me in the Bible about it? Well, I couldn't get it out of my head at all; and it was turning up in my mind every minute, that if I met Father John I'd be ashamed of Christ's Word, and that Christ would be ashamed of me, and I couldn't tell what I would do at all. Well, I was walking along the road on Saturday, thinking what would I do at all if Father John taxed me with reading the Bible; and while I was studying it, who should come up but Father John riding along, and when he saw it was ma, he just pult up along side of me, quite sudden. 'Is that you?' says he. 'It is, your reverence,' says I; and indeed, it's I that would be glad to say that same time that it wasn't. 'And what are you doing now?' says he. 'I'm working with Mr. Connor, of Kilcommon,' says I. 'That's not what I mean,' says he; 'you know what I mean,' says he; 'what are you doing now?' says he. Well, I didn't know what to say, and I hadn't a word in me at all, good or bad; and says he, shouting at me, that it would make you afeard to hear him, 'Is it reading the Bible you are?' says he. Well, it just came in my mind that minute—would I be ashamed of Christ's own Word, and would I make him ashamed of me? and my mind was just riz in me that minute, and so I up and told him, 'It is, your reverence,' says I, 'reading the Bible,' says I. Well, with that he got so angry you never saw Father John so like himself in all your life; now, you never seen a man so boisterous. And when his reverence got something easy within himself, with letting it out, he says to me, says he, 'And it's the heretic Bible you're reading, going to turn heretic,' says he. 'No, indeed, your reverence,' says I; "It isn't the heretic Bible, it's only the Douay Bible,' says I. 'And where did the likes of you get a Douay Bible?' says he. 'I got it from the Rev. Mr. Owens,' says I. 'And what business has the likes of him giving you the Douay Bible?' says he; 'why didn't he give the heretic Bible? like a heretic as he is,' says he. "It's ranter your turning,' says he. 'No, please your reverence,' says I, 'I don't rant none; and sure your reverence,' says I, 'the Douay Bible would not make ranters of us,' says I. 'It's a swaddler you are,' says he. 'and a jumper, and it's to the soup-kitchen you're going,' says he, 'and to hell; and it's spiritual prostitution,' says he, 'and it's taking bribes you are, and selling your faith, and your soul, and your God,' says he, 'for base lucre. But I'll be up to you now,' says he; 'I'll just give you your choice,' says he; 'there's the Bible and there's me,' says he, 'and which of us can do you most harm?' says he; 'so now make you choice—will you have me or the Bible,' says he, 'or will you give up the Bible or will you give up me?' says he. Well, now, I felt in myself that I was getting bolder and bolder all the time he was talking, and so, when he left a bit of room for me to put in a word, I just says to him, says I, 'since your reverence is so good as to give me my choice,' says I, 'I think I'll just stick to the Bible,' says I. Well, with that he took on so, that you wouldn't believe; and just then there was a parcel of the Kilcommon boys coming up the road, and he just turns to them, and says he, 'This is a souper,' says he, 'and a ranter, and a swaddler,' says he, 'and a jumper,' says he, 'and Judas that sold his soul for soup,' says he, 'and denied his God here to my face,' says he. 'No, indeed, your reverence,' says I, 'I got no soup at all, nor nothing else, nor I don't mean to look for any, nor take it if it was offered to me, and indeed it was not,' says I. 'Well it's going to be a turncoat you are,' says he, 'that none of your people was before.' 'Indeed I'm not, your reverence,' says I, 'if you don't put me out, and turn me yourself; but sure,' says I, 'your reverence won't put me out and turn me only for reading the Catholic Bible,' says I, 'sure don't the Catholic bishops say, in the first page of it, that it's good for Catholics to read, and sure, your reverence, it can't make anything bad of me; and so your reverence,' says I, 'may as well just let me alone for reading it, and it's not going to turn at all I am,' says I. But he didn't listen to me at all, but just went on to the boys; and with that they set up a shout after me, that you wou'd hear from that to this, and called me all that Father John called me, and more foreby; and it's I that was glad, when I came to a bit of a loneing, to try to get out of their way as far as I could; and ever so far I'd hear them shouting ranter, and souper, and jumper, and Judas, after me, that you never heard the like."

"Well, Pat," said Jem, "you're in for it now, anyway; but it's my opinion, if you can only hold out for a while, you'll have a deal of the boys, and myself too, to keep you company."

So if we hear more of what goes on in Kilcommon, maybe our readers will like to know it.

ARE NUMBERS A TEST OF TRUTH?

We would invite the attention of our readers to a few observations upon an argument often urged in support of the truth of the Roman Catholic religion—the *argument of numbers*—which seems to be considered by some as one of the strongest and most practical tests of religious truth. It is not unnatural to suppose that ordinary minds would willingly lay hold of any mode of reasoning which, by affording a *short cut* to the end sought, would relieve them from the toil and anxiety attendant on more detailed and minute inquiries and conscientious examination; and we believe that there are many persons who actually do feel confident that their religion is true, simply because they believe that the numbers of their religion are more numerous than any other.

The question we would now consider is, are there any real and satisfactory grounds for believing the number of the adherents of any religion to be a test of the truth?

As truth is always the same, so we suppose the proof that a religion is true must be of equal force in all times and all circumstances. Can this be said of the argument of numbers?

The religion which God gave to the Jews was certainly true, yet the professors of it were always a very small minority of the inhabitants of the earth.

For many hundreds of years the Christians were a minority in every nation of the world into which Christianity had spread. Did that make men doubt of the truth of Christianity? or if it had, would Christianity ever have extended over the world? Let this fact be well marked—Christianity grew, and converted so many nations, by *despising, denying, and rejecting* this argument of numbers, as a test of religious truth. How, then, can Christianity ever adopt the argument of numbers as the test of its truth?

If Christians, however, at the present day, should be so senseless as to adopt that test in rejecting which the ancient Christians conquered, they would only be condemned by it, for there are still more heathens in China and India alone, perhaps, than there are Christians in the world. God's Word tells us that this shall not be *always* so, but we know that it *is* so still.

Is the counting up of numbers any better argument among the different divisions which now exist among Christians? There are many who think it is. But what we want to see is, the reason and the truth of it, and how the fact really stands.

How far from home must a man go to count? will it do to count his own parish? and then, by the same rule, have to change his religion if he go into another parish? Will it do to take Ireland, and say, Here are four millions of Roman Catholics and only two millions of Protestants, so the Roman Catholic religion must be true? And, then, what should a man do in England, where the Protestants are twenty to one?

It is clear that if we take this argument at all for our guide, we must take all Christendom, and see who are the most numerous.

Now, is this an easy argument to decide by? How many of those who rely on the proof of numbers could give us even a guess at the numbers of the different divisions of Christians?

For the benefit of those who may fancy this method of deciding the question of religious truth, we give here an estimate of the numbers in almost the whole of Europe, and America besides. We take the population of each nation chiefly from Alison's History of Europe, a work of the highest authority in such matters. We take the proportions of the religious persuasions from various sources, and we think our estimate will be thought fair by those conversant with such subjects:—

France,	...	30 millions,	1-6th Protestants.
Great Britain and Ireland,	...	30 do.	5-6th Protestants.
Austria,	...	35 do.	1-5th Protestants.
Holland,	...	2½ do.	nearly all Protestants.
Sweden,	...	4 do.	do. do.
Norway,	...	1¼ do.	do. do.
Denmark	...	2 do.	do. do.
Switzerland	...	2 do.	2-3rds Protestants.
Prussia	...	15 do.	2-3rds Protestants.
Italy,	...	19 do.	1-9th Protestants in Piedmont &c.
Spain,	...	14 do.	all Roman Catholics.
Russia,	...	64 do.	4 millions Roman Catholics, nearly all the rest Greek Church.
Greece	...	3 do.	nearly all Greek.
Canada,	...	1¼ do.	half and half.
United States	...	21 do.	1-7th Roman Catholics.

South America, Mexico, and Cuba, 6 millions of Europeans and mixed races, nearly all Roman Catholics. As for the slaves in South America, being kept up by continued importations from Africa, we can hardly count them Christians.

We have not counted here the lesser states of Germany, in which the great majority are Protestants, nor the Greek Church in Turkey, Circassia, Georgia, &c., which are very numerous. Yet how stand the numbers now? Total, 250 millions, of whom are Roman Catholics, 103 millions; Church of England and Greek Church, 142 millions.

We do not rely upon this as a test of truth, but we commend it to the consideration of those who do.

We do not overlook the argument by which these numbers may be met. It will be said that the Roman Catholic Church is, at least, the largest body, taken by itself. We doubt the fact very much. The Greek Church is, perhaps, nearly as numerous. It may be said, too, that the Roman Catholic is the most united in itself. That, too, we deny. We shall take an early opportunity of showing that there are differences in it as great as any that exist among Protestants.

But let us take the argument as it is stated by Bishop Milner, the great English Roman Catholic controversial writer. He says that the word Catholic "is derived from the Greek word which means *universal*, and accordingly it has ever been employed to discriminate the great body of Christians, under their legitimate pastors, and subsisting in all nations and all ages, from those *comparatively small bodies* of Christians who at certain places, and in certain times, have been separated from it." Are the 142 millions really *comparatively* small bodies? or can the above be any sound reason for calling the Roman Church Catholic, and refusing to call the Greek Church Catholic, when it is notorious that the Greek Church is as old as the Roman and little less numerous. And when those two Churches parted asunder from each other, the Greek Church was certainly the more numerous of the two.

We place no reliance on this argument of numbers, because we believe it to be false—that is, we think it wholly without proof from reason or Scripture that the division of Christians which can count the greatest number of adherents must needs be right in *everything* which it holds and teaches.

But we are far from despising or undervaluing the testimony of the great body of the Church, and of Christians in all ages and all countries, to the cause of truth. The multitude in any nation, or in any age, may hold many errors; but that which has the testimony of the Church *in all ages*, and all countries, is deserving of respectful attention. This is far different from saying that the majority in any one age must be right in every opinion they hold

Now, is there anything which has had this general and agreeing testimony in all ages? The Catholic creeds, and those alone. The Whole Church, for 1500 years, agreed in testifying that those creeds contained the whole Catholic faith, pure and undefiled. The Church of England, the Greek Church, almost all Protestants agree in this to this day. We might almost claim the Church of Rome herself as still joining in this testimony now, as she did for so many centuries; for the Council of Trent, at their first meeting, recited the Nicene Creed, and testified that it was "That chief thing (*principium*) in which all who profess the faith of Christ do of necessity agree—*that firm and only foundation* against which 'the gates of hell shall never prevail!'"*

Yet it has come to be the great question at this day, between the Church of Rome and those who protest against her, whether that creed do or do not contain the whole Catholic faith. The Church of Rome now says it is not enough to hold that creed, unless we also hold what Pope Pius IV. added to it; and they give in this argument of numbers, that the largest *single* body of Christians at this day do hold that Creed of Pope Pius; and to this we reply, that the whole Church, for 1500 years, and a majority of the Christian Church at this day, and the confession of the Council of Trent itself, do all proclaim that the ancient Catholic creeds do contain the whole Catholic faith, complete and unmixed with error.

Hence it may be judged which of us has the best right to use the argument of numbers, and which of us uses it best.

* See Catholic Layman, Vol. ii., No. 14, p. 22.

And yet we do not receive that faith on the authority of any number of men. We receive it because we know alike from creeds and Scripture that it is the faith which Christ and his Apostles taught, and that it has come down to our times from them.

As for the argument of mere numbers, we again say, we distrust it, because we know it cannot stand at the judgment of Christ hereafter; and no argument can be worth anything *now* which cannot prevail in the judgment *then*. Suppose any poor mortal should then presume to say to the Great Judge, "I always tried to be of the religion of the majority," will not Christ say to him, with truth, "I gave you this warning from the beginning, and if you had searched the Scripture you would have found it—'*Enter ye in at the narrow gate; for wide is the gate and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there are who go in thereat. How narrow is the gate and straight is the way that leadeth to life; and few there are that find it.*'" *

WHAT TRADITION TELLS US OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY—No. III.

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA—TERTULLIAN.

In our last volume we inserted an article, headed, "What Scripture tells us of the Blessed Virgin," in which we printed all the passages of the New Testament in which we found any mention made of her. For the satisfaction of those who might be discontented with the meagreness of the Scripture accounts of her, we determined to publish, in a series of articles, all that we could learn on the same subject from tradition; and we have already given, in two articles, all that we could find concerning her in several Christian Fathers of the first and second centuries. To complete our account of the writers of the second century, it only remains for us to notice the two whose names we have placed at the head of this article—Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian.

We confess that in this examination we have some fear of being tedious. We have brought forward Father after Father only to say—"We can find nothing in this writer about the Blessed Virgin." It must be rather tiresome for a jury when a counsel puts witness after witness on the table, each of whom has nothing to say but—"I know nothing of the matter you have summoned me here to give evidence about." Our readers may ask—"why do you not skip over all the Fathers who say nothing about the Virgin Mary, and come at once to those who have something to tell concerning her?" This is the plan adopted by Roman Catholic collectors of quotations from the Fathers. They know very well that, with the generality of people, one Father is just as good as another, and that if they can produce a strong passage from any one in their favour, few will inquire in what century the writer lived, or whether he invented the doctrine himself or found it in the writings of his predecessors. Accordingly they are quite satisfied if they can produce a sufficient number of Greek or Latin authors in their favour, although, perhaps, they have not brought forward anything to their purpose from any writer who lived within four hundred years after our Savour's birth.

We, however think it very little use to inquire what was said on this, or on any other religious subject, in the sixth century, until we have first examined what was said on it in the first and second: for we are not bound to believe every doctrine that any pious person thinks proper to hold, but only such doctrines as he can show to have been handed down to him from our Saviour. We think it will appear from the present series of articles, that there is still extant enough of works written in the first three centuries to enable us to judge of the views held in their days with regard to the Blessed Virgin. The writers of the works referred to were so eminent that they could not have been ignorant of the doctrines then held by the Church, and the subject is so important that they would not be likely to pass it over in silence, had their views been the same as those now entertained in the Church of Rome. We have more than once remarked before, that we have had many proofs lately, that bishops who believe the Virgin to be the Queen of Heaven—the paramount intercessor with her Son—the most effectual help in all emergencies—do not think it right to abstain from frequently impressing on their people the duty of constantly having recourse to this means of obtaining assistance.

But CLEMENT of ALEXANDRIA certainly did not think it any part of his duty to give instruction to those whom he taught on the duty of seeking the intercession of the Virgin. This eminent Christian philosopher flourished at the close of the second century, at the head of the great Alexandrian cathechetical school, which attained so much celebrity, under the direction successively of Pantænus, Clement, and Origen. The writings of Clement which remain are sufficiently voluminous, and contain much valuable information as to the doctrine of the Church in his time. He speaks in them of our Lord's being born of a virgin, but he does not mention his mother with peculiar titles of honour, nor does he once hint at the addressing of prayers to her. And the following is one of several passages from which we conclude that in his time the Church offered no prayers to any but the Supreme God:—

"It is the extreme of ignorance to ask from those who are not gods as though they were gods. . . . . Whence, since there is one only good God, both we ourselves and the angels supplicate from him alone, that some good things might be given to us, and others might remain with us."—Stromata, book vii., p. 853, Oxford, 1715.

You are not to suppose that the heathen with whom Clement had to argue were so unenlightened as to worship other deities as equal to the Supreme God. They did, indeed, offer prayers to the spirits of deceased virtuous men, or to demons as they called them. We quote Clement's account of the defence which the heathen made for this practice, and we invite our readers to compare it with what is now said by Roman Catholic divines in defence of the worship of the saints—

"But they think that it matters nothing whether we speak of these as gods or as angels, giving to the spirits of such the names of demons, and teaching that they should be worshipped by men as having, by Divine Providence, on account of the purity of their lives, received authority to be conversant about earthly places, in order that they may minister to mortals."—Stromata, Book vi., p. 755.

Having failed to extract anything from Clement more to our purpose than the passages cited, we proceed next to TERTULLIAN, the celebrated Presbyter of Carthage. Of the general estimation in which this light of the African Church was held, we can give no better testimony than the anecdote which St. Jerome records of St. Cyprian—

"I saw one Paulus, who had seen Cyprian's secretary at Rome, who used to tell him that Cyprian never passed a single day without reading Tertullian, and that he often said to him 'Give me my master,' meaning Tertullian."—Jerome; vol. iv., part ii., p. 115.

Tertullian in his later years became a believer in the pretensions to inspiration of a fanatic, named Montanus. His later works must, therefore, be cited with caution. This circumstance, however, does not affect the value of his evidence on the subject we are discussing, since there is no difference in this point between Tertullian's earlier works and his later, and it does not appear that the Montanists had any disagreement with the orthodox relative to the Blessed Virgin.

Well, then, in all Tertullian we do not find a single allusion to the offering of prayers to the Virgin by any sect of Christians in his time; and, on the contrary, we find that he, as well as Clement, was possessed with the prejudice that prayers should be offered to God only. He says—

"These things I cannot ask in prayer from any other except him from whom I know that I shall obtain; because he is the one who alone grants, and I am one whom it behoveth to obtain by prayer."—Apology, p. 27, Paris, 1675.

And, again, he makes the following remarks on our Lord's command to pray *in secret*:—"By this precept he required in a man faith to believe that both the sight and the hearing of the omnipotent God are present under our roofs and in our secret places; and he desired the lowliness of faith, that man should offer his worship to him alone who hears and sees everywhere."—On Lord's Prayer, p. 129.

Our business, however, being more particularly with what this Father thought of the Virgin Mary, we shall quote his commentary on one of the passages of the Scripture in which she is mentioned. Although we printed it already in the first article of this series, yet, to make this Father's comment more intelligible, we print it here again:—

"While he yet talked to the people, behold his mother and his brethren stood without, desiring to speak with him; then one said unto him, Behold thy mother and thy brethren stand without, desiring to speak with thee: but he answered and said unto him that told him, Who is my mother and who are my brethren? And he stretched forth his hand to his disciples, and said, Behold my mother and my brethren. For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother."—Matt. xii. 46-50.

A Roman Catholic cannot deny that the first view of this passage presents him with difficulties. We find Jesus, who is commonly represented by them as ready to grant anything, no matter what, to the slightest wish of his mother, here refusing even to come out to speak to her; we find him, instead of pointing her out to his disciples as an object of their special veneration, and as holding a place in his dispensation which no other mortal was to attain unto, on the contrary, leading them to suppose that their place in his favour was determined, not by the closeness of their earthly relationship to him, but by their readiness to do his Father's will; and we find the Virgin Mary herself, instead of being among the most attentive hearers of her Son's discourses, "standing without," and summoning him away from his preaching. To those, therefore, whose principle it is to interpret Scripture according to the consent of the Fathers, we feel that we shall be doing a service if we lay before them what some of the most eminent of them have thought of the passage we have just referred to. The following is Tertullian's comment on it (De Carne Christi, vii., p. 315):—

"But what reason is there for the answer which denied his mother and his brethren? The brothers of our Lord had not believed on him, as it is contained in the Gospel. His mother, in like manner is not shown to have adhered to him; whereas other Marys and Marthas were often in his company. By this passage, finally, their unbelief is made evident. Whilst he was teaching the way of life, whilst he was preaching the kingdom of God, whilst he was engaged in curing sickness and evils, at a time when strangers were fixedly intent upon him, these persons, so nearly related to him, were absent. At last they come up, and stand outside the door, and do not enter—not thinking, forsooth, of what was going on there; nor do they wait; just as though they were bringing something more urgent than the business in which he was engaged—nay, moreover, they interrupt him, and endeavour to recall him from so great a work.

"Now I pray you, Appelles, and you, Marcion, if perchance, when you were playing at chess, or disputing about players, or charioteers, you were called away by such a message, would you not have said, 'Who is my mother and who are my brethren?' And whilst Christ was preaching and setting forth God, fulfilling the law and the prophets, dispersing the darkness of so many eyes, did he undeservedly employ this saying to strike at the unbelief of those who stood without, or to shake off the importunity of those who were calling him away from his work?"

The same writer says elsewhere on this passage—"Christ with reason felt indignant that whilst strangers were bent intently on his discourse, persons so nearly related to him should stand without, seeking, moreover, to call him away from his solemn work."—Adv. Marcionem, iv. 19, p. 433.

Here, then, we have Tertullian putting on the anecdote recorded in the Gospels the construction the least respectful to the mother of our Lord. He represents her as, at the time, not being a believer in her Son; he speaks of her absence from his preaching as censurable, and her attempt to interrupt him as deservedly calling forth the rebuke which it met with. When we find an eminent writer of the second century adopting views so unlike those now entertained in the Church of Rome, it is proper to ask—Does he fairly represent the sentiments of the Church in his day? Now, as we have pointed out the fact, that Tertullian became a schismatic in his later years, we think it necessary to show that his interpretation of this passage was that adopted by distinguished writers for very many years after; and though it somewhat interrupts our following the chronological order, we shall give the comment of St. Ambrose and St. Chrysostom on the same passage.

St. Ambrose says (vol. i., p. 1392)—"Whereas our Lord was about to instruct others, that one who would not leave his father and mother is not worthy of the Son of God, he first subjects himself to this same rule; not that he might disclaim the kindnesses of maternal piety (for his own rule is, He who honoureth not his father or mother, let him die the death), but because he acknowledges that he owes more to the mysteries of his Father than to the affections of his mother. Nor are parents unjustly discarded here; but the ties of the mind are represented as more obligatory than the ties of the body. They ought not to stand without who seek to see Christ; for if parents themselves, when they stand without, are not acknowledged (and, perhaps, they are not acknowledged for an example to us), how shall we be acknowledged if we stand without?"

But Chrysostom's comment on the same passage uses far stronger language (vol. vii., p. 407, Benedictine edition, 1718):—

"What I lately said, that if virtue be absent all besides is superfluous, this is now proved abundantly. I was saying that age, and nature, and the living in a wilderness, and all such things, were unprofitable unless our principle and our purpose were good; but today we learn something more, that not even the conceiving of Christ in the womb, and bringing forth that wonderful birth, hath any advantage if there be not virtue: and this is especially manifested from this circumstance—'Whilst he was yet speaking,' says the Evangelist, some one says to him—'Thy mother and thy brethren seek thee: and he said, who is my mother and my brethren?' Now, this he said, not because he felt ashamed of his mother, nor with the intention of denying her who brought him forth—for had he been ashamed he would not have passed through her womb—but it was to show that she would derive no advantage from this unless she did her duty in everything. Now, what she was then undertaking was the effect of EXCESSIVE AMBITION; for she wished to show to the people that she commanded and controlled her son, she having as yet formed no high opinion of him; consequently, she comes to him unseasonably. Now, see the foolish arrogance both of herself and of them!* Whereas they ought

* Matthew v.i. 13, 14, Douay Bible.

* Lest our readers should entertain any doubt as to the accuracy of our translation, we give the original text of this sentence, with a Latin version—

Καὶ γὰρ ὅτερ ἐπιχείρησε, φιλοτιμίας ἦν γέμουσα· Nam quod ipsa conata est, ambitione plena erat;

to have entered and heard him with the multitude; or, had they been unwilling to do this, to have waited till he had finished his discourse, and then to have approached him, they call for him out; and this they do before all, exhibiting their excessive ambition, and wishing to show that they commanded him with great authority—a point which the Evangelist marks with disapprobation; for it was to intimate this that he said, 'Whilst he was yet speaking to the multitude;' as much as if he had said—What! was there no other opportunity? What! could they not have conversed with him in private? And what after all did they want to say? If it was on the doctrines of the truth, then it was right he should propound to all in common, and to speak before all that others also might be benefitted. But if it was on other subjects of interest to themselves, they ought not to have been thus urgent. For if he would not suffer a man to bury his father, that his following of him might not be broken off, much more ought his address not to have been interrupted for things which were not of interest to him. Hence it is evident that they did this solely out of vain glory. And John shows this when he says—'Neither did his brethren believe on him!' And he records some words of theirs full of great folly, when he tells us that they took him to Jerusalem, not for any other purpose but that they might themselves derive glory from his miracles. If thou do these things, said they, show thyself to the world; for no one doeth anything in secret and seeketh himself to be conspicuous. At which time he rebuked them for this, reproving their carnal mind. For when the Jews reproached him, saying—'Is not this the carpenter's son, whose father and mother we know? and his brethren, are they not among us?' they, wishing to get rid of the charge, from the meanness of his origin, excited him to a display of miracles. He, therefore, gives them a repulse, wishing to heal their malady, since had he desired to deny his mother, he would surely then have denied her when they cast the reproach. On the contrary, he shows himself to have entertained so great care for her, that on the very cross he intrusts her to the disciple, who was his best beloved of all, and leaves many kind injunctions concerning her. But he does not so now, and that because of his care for her and his brethren; for since they approached him as a mere man, and were puffed up with vain glory, he expels that disease, not by insulting them, but by correcting them. . . . . And why did he chide her? He did not wish to excite doubt in her mind, but to remove the most tyrannical of passions, and, by little and little, to lead to a correct estimate of himself, and to persuade her that he was not only her son, but her sovereign Lord.* You will thus see that the rebuke was eminently becoming in him, and profitable to her, and withal contains much of mildness. So likewise when the woman cried out—'Blessed is the womb that bore thee,' he says not—'She is not my mother;' but, 'if she wishes to be blessed, let her do the will of my Father: for such a one is my brother, and sister, and mother!' Oh, how great an honour! How great a virtue! To what an exalted eminence does it carry one who embraces it? How many women have called that Holy Virgin and her womb blessed, and have longed to be such mothers, and to give up everything besides! What is there to hinder them? For behold he has cut out for us a broad way, and it is in the power not of woman only, but of man also to be placed in such a rank as that—rather in a much higher one; for this far more constitutes one his mother than did these labour pangs. So that, if that is a cause for calling one blessed, much more is this, inasmuch as it is paramount. Do not, then, merely desire, but also with much diligence, walk along the path which leads to the object of your desire."

Here, then, we find St. Chrysostom imputing to the Blessed Virgin "excessive ambition," "vain glory," unbelief in her son. It was no wonder that the Benedictine editors, though they do not ordinarily give marginal annotations, here cannot keep silence, but exclaim "Fair words, Chrysostom," when even Calvin puts a construction on the passage far more honourable to the character of our Lord's mother. But, however we interpret this passage, we have said enough to show that Tertullian's interpretation was not heretical, but was followed by the most eminent doctors of the Church. And we have said enough to show that the views held in that age, with regard to the Virgin's character, were very different from those entertained in the Church of Rome. Now-a-days, men would fain represent her as free from *original* sin. In the fifth century, and those preceding, the saints of the Church were so far from having any tradition to this effect, that they imputed *actual* sin to her without scruple. It seems needless to ask whether any of them addressed prayer to her. However, we hope in a future article to continue this investigation, in the case of the Fathers of the third century.*

ἐβούλετο γὰρ ἐνδείξασθαι τῷ δήμῳ, ὅτι κρατεῖ καὶ αὐθεντῆι τοῦ παιδὸς, οὐδὲν οὐδέπω περὶ ἀυτὸν μέγα φανταζομένη· διὸ καὶ ἀκαίρως προσῆλθεν. Ὅρα γοῦν καὶ αὐτῆς καὶ ἐκείνων τὴν ἀπόνοιαν.

Nam quod illa fecit, ex *nimia ambitione* proficiscebatur; volebat enim populo sese ostentare ac si imperaret illio, de quo nihil adhuc magnum imaginabatur, ideoque importune accesit. Vide ergo et *ejus* (matris ac.) et fratrum *arrogantiam*.

* We also give the original text of this passage.

Ἀλλ' οὐχὶ νῦν τοῦτο ποιεῖ κηδομενος αὐτῆς καὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ὡς ἀνθρώπῳ προσεῖχονψιλῶ, καὶ ἐκενοδόξουν, τὸ νόσημα ἐεβάλλει, οὐχ ὑβρίζων ἀλλὰ διορθούμενος . . . καὶ τί βούλόμενος ἐπετίμα; οὐδὲ γάρ ἐξαπορῆσαι θέλων, ἀλλ' ἀπαλλαξαι τοῦ τυραννικωτάτου πάθους, καὶ κατὰ μικρὸν ἐναγαγεῖν εἰς τῆν προσήκουσαν περι αὐτοῦ ἔννοιαν, καὶ πεῖσαι ὅτι οὐχὶ υἱὸς αὐτῆς μόνον ἐστὶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ Δεσπότης.

At nunc non similiter facit, ut illi (matri sc.) et fratribus suis recte consuleret. Quia enim illum nudum hominem consebant, atque *inani gloria* agebantur, morbum illum depellit, non ad contumeliam, sed ad emendationem. . . . . Et quid volens increpavit? Non enim ut illam (matrem, sc.) in dubium conjiceret, sed ut *a tyrannico morbo* liberaret, eo paulatim induceret ad congruentem de se opinionem, suaderetque ipsi, se non modo filium ipsius esse, *sed etiam Dominum*.

* The reader desirous of further information will find it in Mr. Tyler's work on the worship of the Virgin, in which he has collected with great industry the testimony of the Fathers on this subject. We have been much indebted to his work in these articles; and as far as we have followed his steps, we have not been able to find that he has omitted any important passage in which the Blessed Virgin is spoken of.

THE MORTMAIN COMMITTEE.

In our February number we noticed the well-known case of Metairie *v.* Wiseman, as illustrating the extent to which clerical influence is exercised by Roman Catholic priests in extorting dispositions of property in their favour from persons weakened by disease and old age. And we added the observation, that as the property so obtained was retained by those who, by their position, possessed undoubted control over the agents employed in the transaction itself, we have a right to assume that these means of procuring property are sanctioned by the doctrines and rules of that Church over which they preside. The next case pointing to the same conclusion, is that of Mr. Taylor, Weybridge. That gentleman, who had a family of two sons and three daughters, when in the 77th or 78th year, and in the full possession of health and vigour of mind, made his will, by which he gave the whole of his estate amongst his children, absolutely. About four years afterwards, when in his 81st year, and after a protracted illness of twelve months, and within three months before his death, in 1846, he made a new will, by which, after leaving all his property to his children successively, for their lives merely, the ultimate reversion in all was given to Dr. Griffiths, the Vicar Apostolic of the London district, and to his successors for the time being. And at the time of the discussion of this case before the Mortmain Committee, this ultimate reversion was vested in Dr. Wiseman.

The son of Mr. Taylor, from whose examination the foregoing facts are stated, and who is himself, of course, a Roman Catholic, states that, previous to the making of that last will, his father had stated to himself as well as to many others, that he would not think of leaving anything to the Church—that it was the most foolish thing in the world. He further stated, that at the time when his father first communicated to him his intention of making the will in favour of the Church, he could not think of reasoning with him on the subject, because he found him in that state that he was incapable of holding anything like an argument upon it; and that although naturally a very strong-minded man, from his long illness he had become exceedingly changed. As evidence of the extent to which that change had gone, he says that his father, at the same time that he declared the disposition he proposed to make, was for the benefit of his soul, and for the benefit of all their souls, assured him that he had left to his son personally £100,000, though his whole estate would not, if sold, realize anything like that sum, even including the devise to the Vicar Apostolic, and was, therefore, a mere delusion on the part of the testator.

Such was the evidence as to the circumstances under which this will was made. It did not appear by whom the will was suggested, nor whether there was any direct interference on the part of any spiritual adviser. It appears, also, that the other members of Mr. Taylor's family were so much under the clerical influence, and in so precarious a state of health, that Mr. Taylor, the gentleman examined, had determined to abstain from appealing to the law against the disposition made by his father.

In consequence of this indisposition on the part of the person most deeply interested in disputing the will, this case, at the time it occurred, did not come before the public. And the manner in which ultimately it was brought forward certainly reflects no little discredit on Cardinal Wiseman, and is in our judgment as remarkable an instance of equivocation as ever came before our notice.

It appears that in 1850, during the excitement consequent on what is called by Protestants the Papal aggression, the circumstances of the above case began to be whispered abroad. It was said that four children of an aged father had been disinherited, and that the Cardinal and his Church were to reap the benefit. Upon this an English Dissenter, a Mr. John Dean, who had heard the rumour, took the straightforward course of writing to the Cardinal, mentioning the report, and saying that he would be glad to be put in a position to contradict it. To this application the Cardinal did reply in a letter from which the following are extracts:—

"Dear Sir—I am much obliged for your manly and straightforward application to me. I never in my life saw nor spoke to nor corresponded with the late Mr. Taylor. I am not named in his will. Since coming to London I have had the pleasure of making the acqnaintance of Mr. Taylor's excellent family. I have visited them at Weybridge. I am on terms of perfect good understanding with Mr. James Taylor, the *supposed* disinherited son, who with his sisters, enjoys every farthing of his father's property."

Now, could any one, after reading that letter, have for one moment supposed that Mr. Taylor had in truth made a will disposing of his property substantially in favour of the Church, and that that substantial gift was, at the very time of writing the letter, vested in the Cardinal? and yet the letter is so worded that it is verbally true. The gift was not by name to Cardinal Wiseman, but by description it then belonged to him. The son and his sisters did then enjoy every farthing of the present income of their father's property; but yet, if that property had then been sold and distributed between the tenants for life, and those entitled in remainder, two-thirds of the proceeds would have gone into the pocket of the Cardinal. Now, what meaning did Cardinal Wiseman intend to convey to his correspondent? Mr. Dean, unaccustomed to the casuistical refinements which draw a distinction between a denial "simpliciter" and a denial "secundum quid," forthwith sent the Cardinal's letter to a dissenting journal. "The *British Banner*," who at once published it, with observations denouncing the report in question as a malignant lie. And we believe every honest-minded individual would have drawn a similar conclusion, and, trusting to the written statement of Cardinal Wiseman, have discredited the whole report.

Unfortunately for the Cardinal he trusted too much to the unwillingness of Mr. Taylor's son to bring before the public the wrongs that he had received; for, trusting to that gentleman's submission to his spiritual rulers, he incautiously ventured, in his letter to Mr. Dean, to refer to Mr. James Taylor, the son, as offering to give any contradiction he (Cardinal Wiseman) pleased to the calumny. This was going rather too far, and Mr. Taylor, although unwilling to involve himself and his family in litigation, still could not suppress altogether the feelings of disappointment and annoyance which his father's will had necessarily produced. He, therefore, published a letter, very different indeed in its tenor, from that which the Cardinal calculated on eliciting. He says:—"The bulk of my father's property is left to his children for their lives only; and upon their decease is given to the use of the late Dr. Griffiths, if living, and if not to the then Vicar Apostolic, for the London district, (then Dr. Wiseman) for the time being. The will contains no power enabling me to make any provision whatever in favour of a wife or children; but, on the contrary, my life estate is coupled with very stringent provisions against any attempt at incumbrance or alienation. Such a will appeared to me to create not a *supposed*, but a real and effectual disinheritance; and such I have always felt it to be. I should add, that the will was executed by a most kind and affectionate parent, after he had attained the age of 80 years and upwards, and when his mind was affected by severe illness, and in immediate contemplation of that great change, the approach of which renders the strongest and best prepared *wholly unable to resist any influences which may be brought to assume the sanction of religion.*" Such is the mild unexaggerated statement of a son, who, when asked if there had ever been any interruption of filial confidence between him and his deceased parent, was able to answer—"I never to my knowledge had a word with him in the course of a long life."

And with such facts before us, may we not well urge our Roman Catholic brethren to examine diligently and earnestly the truth of those doctrines of their Church which place in the hands of the priesthood such powerful means of augmenting the wealth of the Church, at the expense and to the injury of those entitled by every tie of affection to the remembrance and consideration of their dying relatives? And ought they not vehemently to suspect the motives of those who, in maintaining these doctrines, thereby retain the power and ability of converting the fears and the weaknesses of their dying penitents into an unfailing fountain of wealth and influence for that great clerical corporation of which they form a part?

THE WORD "SACRAMENT."

The word "sacrament" only occurs *once* in the Douay Bible—viz., Epistle to the Ephesians, v. 32.

St. Paul wrote this epistle in the Greek language, and the word he wrote was *μυστηριον*; written in English letters this word would be "mysterion."

We promised in our last number to examine whether the Douay translators have done right in translating this word "sacrament."

First, we observe, that this Greek word "mysterion," occurs twenty-seven times in the writings of the Apostles and Evangelists—that is, in the New Testament.*

In *twenty-six* of these texts, the present Douay Bible translates the word "mystery;" *in one place only* (that place which we are now considering, Eph. v. 32), do they translate it "sacrament."

Now, if they themselves do thus acknowledge that the word must be translated "mystery" in twenty-six places out of twenty-seven, why do they translate it "sacrament" in the twenty-seventh place? If it was the common use of the sacred writers to use that Greek word to express the meaning of "mystery," as we see that they themselves confess it was, why do not they always translate it so?

It would take some very good reason to justify translating it "sacrament," in *one* place, when they themselves confess that "mystery" is the right translation in twenty-six other places. Have they any good reason to give?

We expect that some learned Roman Catholic will tell us, that it was the Latin translation of the Bible, commonly called *the Vulgate*, which the Douay translators professed to translate. They will tell us that this Latin translation was established by the Council of Trent, as the authorized Bible of the Roman Catholic Church, in these words:—"The Holy Synod determines and declares that this old and Vulgate edition itself, which is approved by the long use of so many ages in the Church itself, shall be held for authentic in public lectures, disputations, preachings, and expositions; and that no one shall dare or presume to reject it on any pretext whatsoever."—Session IV. They will tell us that this Latin translation, being thus the authorized and authentic Bible in their Church, it was the business of the Douay translators simply to translate this Latin Vulgate version into English, and that the proper English translation of this Vulgate edition is the true Bible in English, in the eyes of all Roman Catholics. And they will say that, since the Latin Vulgate version has the Latin word "sacramentum" in the place in question (Eph. v. 32), the proper English translation must be "sacrament."

We think we have here stated their argument as well as they would wish to state it themselves. And we now proceed to examine it, and to inquire whether they themselves think this a good and a certain rule, to translate the Greek word "mysterion," by the word "sacrament," wherever the Latin version has translated it "sacramentum."

We have already said that the Greek word "mysterion" occurs twenty-seven times in the Greek New Testament. Now, we find that the Vulgate, or Latin translation, translates this Greek word by the Latin word "mysterium" in nineteen places out of the twenty-seven; and in the other eight places it translates the same Greek word by the Latin word "sacramentum," and yet, when we come to examine the present Douay Bible, we find "mystery" in twenty-seven places, and "sacrament" only in one! So we find that in *seven* places where the Latin Vulgate puts "sacramentum" for "mysterion," the Douay translation gives "mystery" and not "sacrament;" and how, then, can they tell us that "sacramentum" being in the Latin, is a good reason for putting "sacrament" in English?

Why did they turn the Latin word "sacramentum" into the English word "mystery" in seven places, and translate it sacrament *in only one place?*

We shall tell the reason of this presently; but we must tell a little more of the history of this translation first.

The first Roman Catholic translation of the New Testament into English was published in 1582. It was then called the Rhemish, simply because it was published first at Rhemes; but it is the same translation since called the Douay, as we shall hereafter show.

In that translation they followed the rule of putting the English word "mystery" whenever the Vulgate had the Latin word "mysterium," and the English word "sacrament" whenever the Latin had "sacramentum." They did this in every place but one—viz., Apoc. or Rev. xvii. 7—"I will tell them the *mystery* of the woman and of the beast that carrieth her." In that place the Latin vulgate has "sacramentum," but they thought it too bad to put "the *sacrament* of the woman," because this woman is described, in v. 6, as "drunk with the blood of the saints," and to talk of her "sacrament" would have shown at once that the Latin word "sacramentum" does not mean what we understand by the word "sacrament" now; so they put "mystery." But in the seven other places where the Latin Vulgate had the word "sacramentum" they put "sacrament" for the English. Any one may see this who will examine that English translation published in 1582, in the places following—viz., Eph. i. 9; iii. 3, 9; v. 32; Col. i. 27; 1 Tim. iii. 16; Apoc. i. 20; xvii. 20. In all those places that first edition, and all the Douay Bibles, we believe, for long after, had the word "sacrament" in all those places, because the Latin Vulgate had "sacramentum." Yet, in every one of those places now except *one* (Eph. v. 32), in the present Douay Bible, this word sacrament has been put out, and the word "mystery" has been put in its place; as any one may see by looking at any of the Douay Bibles now published!

With what face, then, can they tell us that the word "sacrament" *must* be the proper translation in this place, *because* the Latin has "sacramentum," when they themselves confess that this rule led them astray in six other places, which they have felt constrained to correct by leaving out this word "sacrament," in spite of this rule? How can they tell us that our translation must be wrong, in having the word "mystery" in this place, when they themselves have felt constrained to alter their translation to "mystery" in *six* other places?

But *why* did they feel constrained to give up this rule, and alter their translation in six places out of seven? We believe it was simply because in those six places, they found it impossible to apply the word "sacramentum" in *any one* place, to *any one* of their seven sacraments! and it seemed, no doubt, dangerous to them to have the word "sacrament" six times standing for *other* things besides their seven sacraments, while in one place only could it be twisted to apply to one of their seven sacraments. So they altered their Bible in six places, so as to make it agree with the Protestant Bible, for fear it should be found out that the Latin word "sacramentum," in six places out of seven, meant other things besides the seven sacraments. For instance, look to Ephesians iii. 3, 4, in both verses the Greek has "mysterion;" the Latin has "sacramentum" in the 3rd verse, and "mysterium" in the 4th. The old Douay Bible had "sacrament" in the 3rd verse, and "mystery" in the 4th: but which of the seven sacraments could that be? Is it not clear that the Latin translators thought it quite indifferent whether they put the word "sacramentum" or "mysterium" for "mysterion" in the Greek? So the correctors of the Douay Bible in modern times put the word "mystery" in both verses. Again, in Ephesians i. 9, the word sacramentum was in the Latin, and sacrament in the old Douay Bible: but which of the seven sacraments could *this* verse mean? So it is now put out, and "mystery" put in its place.

In Colossians i. 26, 27, the Greek has "mysterion" in both verses, the Latin "mysterium" in v. 26, and "sacramentum" in v. 27. The same thing precisely occurs in 1 Timothy iii. 9, 16, and in Apocalypse or Revelation xvii. 5, 7, proving to demonstration, that the Latin translators used the word "sacramentum" merely in the sense of a mystery, and not at all in the sense of what we call a sacrament. As we have said before, the correctors of the Douay Bible have actually acknowledged this in every place but the one, by putting "mystery" in English for the Latin "sacramentum;" and with what reason can they now say that "sacrament" *must* be the right translation in Ephesians v. 32, merely because the Latin is "sacramentum?"*

The reason for believing that mystery is the proper translation in this place, we stated in the end of our reply to "J. B.'s" letter in our last number; we beg now to refer our readers to it again, and we venture to hope they will give it a fair consideration, now that we have shown them that, in twenty-six other places, the present Douay Bible has confessed that "mystery" is the proper translation of the same Greek word, even though "sacramentum" should be the word in the Latin, as it is in seven of those twenty-six places.

* Vis., Matthew xiii. 11, Mark iv. 11, Luke viii. 10, Romans xi 25, also in xvi 25; 1 Cor. ii. 7, and iv. 1, xiii. 2, xiv 2, xv. 51; Eph. i. 9, iii. 3, 4, 9, v. 32, vi. 19; Col. i. 26 and 27, ii. 2, iv 3; 2 Thes. ii. 7; 1 Timothy iii. 9, v. 16; Apocalypse i 20, x. 7, xvii. 5, 7. The reader will do well to examine all these places, and see whether "mystery" be not the right translation, and whether "sacrament" would make sense.

* Dr. Francis Patrick Kenrick, Roman Catholic Bishop of Philadelphia, whose recent translation of the New Testament, published in New York, in 1851, we have frequently noticed, has candidly translated the remaining passage (Ephesians v. 32), mystery, not sacrament; and states in a note, p 395, that he has preferred the literal reading of the Greek, lest he should seem to seek support for the sacramental character of marriage in an ambiguous word.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Several valuable communications, from Mr. Power, Mr. Collette, and others, are necessarily postponed till our next, for want of room.

We have also been obliged to postpone the remainder of our reply to the letter of "J. B.," on the Disputed Sacraments, though in type, for the same reason.

We fear we have mislaid a letter of "Philalethes;" if so, another copy would oblige.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st.

No anonymous letter can be attended to. Whatever is sent for insertion must be authenticated by the name and address of the writer, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee for his good faith.

We would request our valued correspondents, both Roman Catholics and Protestants, to limit the length of their communications, and not to discuss a variety of distinct topics in one letter.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the Journal, which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, APRIL, 1853.

SEVERAL months ago the newspapers contained an account of a very remarkable circumstance, which was said to have taken place in the south of France, near Grenoble. The Blessed Virgin, it was stated, had appeared to two peasant children on the top of a mountain, called La Salette, and had communicated to them some mysterious revelations. The matter was much talked of, and quickly reached the ears of the Bishop of Grenoble, who examined carefully into all the circumstances of the case. The result was, that he professed himself perfectly satisfied of the truth of the miracle, and authorized the erection of a chapel on the spot where the miraculous appearance of the Virgin was said to have taken place. Numbers of pilgrims quickly flocked to this new shrine, attracted by the fame of the miracle, and deposited their gifts and offerings in the chapel of our Lady of Salette. The supernatural vision was, doubtless, often urged by the Bishop and Roman Catholic clergy as a lively and convincing proof of the lawfulness and propriety of offering up prayers to the Virgin, who had afforded such remarkable evidence of her power to hear and assist her worshippers.

But, alas! the brightest prospects will sometimes become dark and clouded; and so it was with the dawning fame of this new miraculous shrine. Cardinal de Bonald, Archbishop of Lyons, and Primate of the Gauls, was not so credulous as the Bishop of Grenoble. Whether it was that the clergy of the diocese of Lyons looked with wistful eyes at the streams of wealth which were fast pouring into the coffers of their brethren at Salette, and urged their diocesan to interfere, or whatever else the cause may have been, certain it is that a coldness sprung up between Cardinal de Bonald and the Bishop of Grenoble, which was followed by a sharp controversy as to the authenticity of the supposed miracle. At length the Cardinal issued a letter to his clergy, cautioning them against false miracles, which was published in a French periodical, called *La Semaine Religieuse*, from which the following is an extract:—

"In times of perplexity, pious, but imprudent, persons are found, who wish to have it thought that God interferes in a visible manner in human affairs. An effect produced by a natural cause, which is to them a mystery, is by them transformed into a prodigy; and without waiting to examine into it, or consult men of knowledge, they allow themselves to be deceived by false appearances, and declare miracles to be true which are very questionable. *Some pecuniary speculations* which intrude themselves into everything, seize upon this imaginary fact, and at the expense of the credulous, turn it into profit. *Men greedy of gain* soon dress out the history of these false miracles, and *accompany them by false indulgences.* What, then, is their grand object, but *to procure dishonest gains, by trafficking in objects of superstition.* We, therefore, forbid the publication of any miracle from the pulpit without previous permission, *should its authenticity be attested even by another bishop.*"

We make no apology for introducing these excellent remarks of CARDINAL DE BONALD to the notice of our readers, some of whom may be disposed to attach far greater weight to his authority than to any comment which we could offer. We have marked one or two passages in italics, as it is possible that some persons may consider them applicable in other instances nearer home. And now, we beg to call the attention of our readers to this significant illustration of the boasted unity

of the Church of Rome. We see here that two eminent Roman Catholic prelates are at open variance with regard to the truth or falsehood of a recent miracle; and the Cardinal goes so far as to assert pretty plainly, that the Bishop was issuing "false indulgences," and that "his grand object was to procure dishonest gains, by trafficking in objects of superstition." When we learn, on such unquestionable evidence, that these questionable things are done in the diocess of Grenoble, we are tempted to ask, is Ireland altogether free from the evils which Cardinal de Bonald so vividly describes? Is there among us any "trafficking in objects of superstition," whether by priests or bishops, "for the sake of procuring dishonest gains?" We sometimes hear that indulgences are issued in various dioceses in Ireland; and it is a serious subject of inquiry, are they, too, false, like those of the Bishop of Grenoble? These questions, we fear, will excite uneasy doubts in the minds of many of our readers; but we entreat of them again to remember, that *we* have not advanced these charges—they rest upon the grave and unimpeachable authority of CARDINAL DE BONALD.

To return, however, to the miraculous vision of the Virgin:—When we behold two Christian bishops flatly contradicting each other with regard to this event of such recent occurrence—the one asserting, the other denying, its truth—is it not a melancholy sight, and one calculated to afford a temporary, though disastrous, triumph to scoffers and unbelievers, and other enemies of our holy faith? Let us suppose that two of the early preachers of the Gospel, St. Peter and St. Paul, for example, differed in the same way about the truth of one of our Lord's miracles, what would the Jews and the heathen have said? "But," perhaps one of our Roman Catholic readers may reply, "St. Peter and St. Paul were inspired, and, therefore, there was no fear of their disagreement. Well! (it may be rejoined) what then? Does not the POPE claim to be infallible, and why does he not decide the point at issue? St. Peter, when he was alive, took special pains to assure *his* hearers that the miracles which he preached to them were not "cunningly devised fables" (Douay Bible, 2 Pet. i. 16); and he forewarns them that, in later times, "lying teachers should arise, who, through covetousness, should make merchandize of them with feigned words." —Ch. ii. 1, 3. When the Cardinal de Bonald testifies that these very evils *now* exist in the Church of Rome, why does not Pius IX., who claims to be the successor of St. Peter, lift up his voice and cry aloud, and tell the people of Grenoble, and the Christian world, whether the vision of the Virgin to the peasant children at La Salette is a miracle or a fabrication? But, alas! for all useful purposes, the chair of St. Peter has long been hopelessly silent.

THE TOUCHSTONE.

(Concluded from page 32.)

OBJECTION 48.—Protestants condemn the honour and veneration of angels.

Their Bible assures them, that God has given his angels a charge over us; and, consequently, expects that we should honour them as his *ministers* and our *guardians*. (*Ps.* xci. 11, 12.)—*He shall give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways; they shall bear thee up in their hands, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone.* (*St. Matt.* xviii. 10.)—*Take heed that you despise not one of these little ones: for I say unto you, that in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father that is in heaven.* (*Exod.* xxiii. 20, 21.)—*Behold, I send an angel before thee, to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared: Beware of him, and obey his voice, provoke him not, for my name is in him.* Hence we read in their Bible, (*Joshua* v. 14, 15) that *Joshua* paid veneration to an angel, by *falling on his face to the earth*, &c.

REPLY.—Protestants do not say that God may not employ his angels to protect and save men; but as for worshipping them, we find it expressly forbidden.—Rev. xxii. 8, 9.

OBJECTION 49.—Protestants deny that it is lawful to *make supplication to an angel*,

Their Bible assures them that *Jacob* did it (*Hosea* xii. 4)—*He had power over the angel, and prevailed; he wept, and made supplication to him.*

OBJECTION 50.—Protestants condemn the invocation of angels as idolatrous and superstitious.

Their Bible recommends it by the example of God's servants, both in the Old and New Testament. *Gen.* xlviii. 15, 16. *God before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk, the God which fed me all my life long until this day, the angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads.* And Rev. i. 4, *Grace be unto you, and peace from him, which is, and which was, and which is to come, and from the seven spirits which are before his throne.*

REPLY 49, 50.—The word angel signifies a messenger. And hence, any *person* or *thing* employed by the Lord to convey any message of his to man, is called in Scripture "the angel of the Lord." Sometimes the Lord manifested himself in a human form; sometimes in a flame of fire; as he did to Moses in the wilderness. And the voice which came there to Moses said, "I am the GOD of Abraham, the God of Isaac," &c., yet this is expressly called by Stephen "*the angel.*"

Acts viii. 30, 38.—And whenever we read, as we do in the Old Testament, of worship offered to an angel, it was always understood to be the *Lord Himself*. But as for those angels who are created persons, we have seen that the worship of them is expressly forbidden.

OBJECTION 51.—Protestants deny, that the saints departed have received any power from God over us which may entitle us to have recourse to their prayers and assistance.

The Bible teaches, that they have received this power. *Revel.* ii. 26, 27. *He that overcometh and keepeth my word unto the end* (as all the saints have done) *to him will I give power over the nations, and he shall rule them, even as I received of my Father.*

REPLY.—Protestants would not scruple to ask one of the Apostles to pray for them, if *present* before them; as Simon the sorcerer did to Peter, and was not censured for it. But to suppose that saints can, after death, hear the addresses of millions of votaries in all parts of the world, is to attribute to them the power of the *all-present* God. And if it had been the practice of the primitive Church to invoke departed saints, we should surely have found mention of invocations of the Apostle James, the brother of John, after his being slain by King Herod (Acts xii. 1, 2.) and of invocations of the Virgin, &c.

OBJECTION 52.—Protestants are not willing to own, that the angels and saints make intercession for us, or offer up our prayers to God.

The Bible declares that they do. *Zech.* i. 12. *The angel of the Lord answered and said, O Lord of Hosts: how long wilt thou not have mercy on Jerusalem, and on the cities of Judah, against which thou hast had indignation these threescore and ten years?* Rev. v. 8 *The four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps and golden vials full of odours, which are the prayers of the saints.* And Revel. viii. 4. *The smoke of the incense with the prayers of the saints ascended up before God, out of the angel's hand.*

OBJECTION 53.—Protestants are not willing to own, that the departed saints *may receive us into everlasting habitations.*

Their Bible expressly affirms it, *St. Luke* xvi. 9. *Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness, that when ye fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations.*

REPLY 52, 53.—Protestants do not undertake to deny that angels and departed saints may make prayers for us; but for us to *invoke* them, implies that they can hear and know all that we say; which is in fact to make them gods. And they may welcome us into the "mansions" of bliss to which not *they* but Jesus Christ has "gone to prepare a place for us.' But as He alone is the *giver* of everlasting life, and as He alone is the one "by whom we have access unto the Father," to whom "no man cometh," says He, "but through me," and it is He who we are assured can hear us, we "come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may find help in time of need."

OBJECTION 54.—Protestants deny, that the angels and saints know what passes amongst us; though they are ready enough to own that the devils know our works, and hear the petitions of their impious invokers.

Their Bible declares *(St. Luke* xv. 10) *that there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth;* which could not be, if they did not know what passes amongst us: and how can any one imagine that they who see God *face to face and know even as they are known* (1 *Cor.* xiii. 12), that they, I say, who enjoy the *Light of Glory*, can be more ignorant of what passes amongst us than the devils who have no more than the *light of nature?*

REPLY.—For aught we can tell, everything that passes on earth may be known to some angel or other, who may be invisibly present, looking on at the occurrence. But we have no example in Scripture of any one paying *adoration* to an angel (except when it was a manifestation of the Lord himself) without being immediately *rebuked and forbidden.* As to saints, there is no reason for believing that they can be present here as well as in heaven.

OBJECTION 55.—Protestants generally are not willing to acknowledge that there is any particular respect due to the blessed Virgin Mary; or that she is any more than any other woman.

Their Bible plainly signifies that there is: in which she is declared by the angel *Gabriel*, and by *Elizabeth*, inspired by the Holy Ghost, *blessed among women* (*St. Luke* i. 28 and 42) and that *all generations shall call her blessed*, ver. 48. *And whence is this to me*, says the same *St. Elizabeth* (ver. 43), *that the mother of my Lord shall come to me?*

REPLY.—Protestants acknowledge that the Virgin Mary was "blessed among women;" but they hold that God only is to be worshipped and prayed to. And they find no mention of adoration paid to her in the New Testament.

OBJECTION 56.—Protestants believe that it is a dishonour to God, and reflecting upon his mercy, to have recourse to the prayers of his saints.

Their Bible demonstrates, that God is pleased that we should have recourse to their prayers, and will more readily hear them, than if we were only to pray for ourselves. *Go to my servant Job*, says God Almighty (*Job* xlii. 8) to *Eliphaz* and his friends; *and my servant Job shall pray for you for him will I accept: lest I deal with you after your folly, in that ye have not spoken of me the thing that is right, &c.*

REPLY.—If God had told any persons, instead of *going* to Job, and asking his prayers, while he was alive, to address him when he was, perhaps, a thousand miles off, or after he was dead, this would give some countenance to the practice of calling on departed saints. And we should thence have inferred that Job must have been a Divine being; but, as it is, the passage is nothing to the purpose. A Protestant would not scruple to ask a friend, whom he *believed* to be a sincere and pious Christian, to pray for him; though, after all, none but the all-seeing God can be *sure* of any one's piety and sincerity, unless he has, as Job's friends had in this case, God's own assurance of it.

OBJECTION 57.—Protestants deny, that God is pleased to work miracles by the bones or other relics of his saints.

The contrary appears from their Bible, where we read, (2 *Kings* xiii. 21), of a dead man raised to life by the bones of the prophet *Elisha*; and (*Acts* xix. 12), that *from the body of Paul were brought unto the sick handkerchiefs or aprons, and the diseases departed from them, and the evil spirits went out of them.*

REPLY.—Protestants never deny that God has, on many occasions, wrought miracles in various ways: but they refuse to believe any accounts of miracles that are not *well attested.*

OBJECTION 58.—Many Protestants deny, that it is lawful to have images in churches.

Their Bible expressly declares, that God commanded *Moses* to make two cherubims, or images of angels, and to place them at the two ends of the mercy-seat, over the ark of the covenant, in the very sanctuary itself, or the holy of holies—(*Exod.* xxv. 18, 19, 20, 21.) *And there*, says he. (ver. 22), *will I meet with thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy-seat, from between the two cherubims, which are upon the ark of the testimony, of all things which I will give thee in commandment unto the children of Israel*

REPLY.—Protestants do not object to images or pictures, in churches or elsewhere, provided they can be sure that no kind of *adoration* is paid to them, whether called Latria, Dulia, or Hyperdulia. The distinctions between these they hold to be not only unwarranted, but also such as the generality *of the unlearned* among the Roman Catholics themselves do not understand. Who will maintain that they do? And yet Roman Catholic divines hold that understanding, and attending to these distinctions, is *essential* for the avoiding of idolatry. Hence, when Protestants perceive any danger of *any* kind of adoration being paid to *any* image, they think it right to deal with it as Hezekiah did with the brazen serpent which Moses himself had made by divine command. He does not appear to have inquired whether they burned incense before it with Latria, or Dulia, or Hyperdulia; but he at once brake it in pieces. As for the cherubim there was no such danger from *them*, because they were kept in the holy of holies, to which none of the people had access.

OBJECTION 59.—Protestants deny the supremacy of *St. Peter*; that is, they deny that he was made by Christ the *rock* or foundation; or the chief *Governor*, and chief *Pastor* of his church.

Their Bible affirms it, (*Matt.* xvi. 18, 19), *Thou art* Peter [that is, *thou art a rock*] *and upon this rock will I build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.* Where our Lord, under the metaphor of the *keys*, declares his making *Peter* the chief *governor* of his church; as when the keys of a city are delivered to a man, he is made ruler or governor of the city. And that *St. Peter* was made chief *pastor* or *shepherd* of the whole flock of

Christ, is evident from *St. John* xxi., 15, &c., where our Lord, after having asked him, *Dost thou love me more than these?* thrice committed to his care all his *lambs* and all his *sheep*—that is, his whole church.

Reply.—The charge given to Peter was afterwards given to all the rest of the Apostles also—Matt. xviii. 18. But supposing (which there is no reason to doubt) that he was the chief of them, answering to the chairman, president, speaker, &c., of any college or assembly, it is plain that he did not rule them as Sovereign, dictating to them their faith and conduct. We find Peter (Acts viii. 14) not *sending* them, but sent *by* them, along with John, to Samaria. And we find St. Paul openly withstanding him when he was to be blamed. By preaching to the Jews on the day of Pentecost, and afterwards to Cornelius, Peter did lay the foundation of the Christian Church among Jews and Gentiles. But if he, or any supposed successor of his, had had authority to decide infallibly all doubts and disputes among Christians throughout the world, St. Paul, when taking leave of the elders at Miletus, and foretelling their dangers (Acts xx., 28) would certainly not have omitted to refer them to Peter, or the Pope, or the Church of Rome.

Objection 60.—Protestants will have it that the Pope or Bishop of *Rome* is *Antichrist*.

The contrary is evident from their Bible (2 *Thess.* ii. 4) where it is said of Antichrist, the man of sin, that he *opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God.* No pope ever did this. *Item* 1 *John* ii. 22, where it is said that Antichrist *denieth that Jesus is the Christ*, which the Pope confesseth and maintaineth, and therefore cannot be *Antichrist*.

Many more articles might be alleged, in which the doctrine or practice of Protestants is condemned by their own Bible; but these sixty points are more than sufficient to convince all sincere lovers and seekers of truth, that the Word of God is on the Catholic side.

Reply.—If any man presumes, without being able to show any warrant for it in Scripture, to call himself Christ's Vicar and Vicegerent upon earth, and pretends to have the power of delivering souls from suffering in the other world (by the indulgences which he either gives or sells), this does look something like exalting himself into the temple of God.

Many passages, besides, might be cited from Scripture, to show that the Church of Rome has greatly departed from God's Written Word. But we have thought it best at present to confine ourselves to those which the Roman Catholics have themselves made choice of in this tract. And they invite all sincere lovers and seekers of truth to judge for themselves on which side the Word of God is; in which invitation we heartily concur.

Correspondence.

THE USE OF BELLS IN IRELAND.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Sir—As probably some of your readers may be ignorant of the importance of bells, in the eyes of no inconsiderable portion of the Roman Catholic population of Ireland, and others may feel a curiosity, at least, to know what pretence there is for *baptizing* them, as, it appears, is still the practice in some places, I beg to call your attention to the fact, which probably you are already aware of, that bells have always been deemed objects of peculiar, and even superstitious reverence by the Irish, and are so to this day, at least in some places.

If Father Colgan be to be credited, which no doubt he is, at least to the extent that the wonders he relates were extensively believed in his day, many notable miracles were, in old times, worked by bells, and bells were oftentimes consecrated by the Pope and sent to saints for men to swear by.

Colgan, in his "Acta Sanctorum," a volume now becoming very scarce and costly, tells us, that the Irish had a great reverence for bells up to his day; and that their most solemn oaths were by them. St. Gildas's bell was consecrated by the Pope, and sent to St. Cadoc for men to swear by. Various miracles were wrought by St. Ultutus's bell, and a King of Dublin was cured by applying St. David's bell to his cheek; to say nothing of the bell of St. Fursæus, that was miraculously sent by him, in token of fraternity, to St. Cuanna, from Peronne, in France, and was seen by him and his disciples, when they were together in the fields, hovering over them like a bird, which, says the good Father, *comforted them very much*;* nor of that of St. Fechinus, by which he brought Tyrechannus from Rome to Cashel, more than 1500 miles.† But I cannot pass over a still more remarkable instance of the importance in which bells were held by Irish saints, related at large by Colgan in his Life of St. Moedoc.

St. Moedoc was one day troubled that he had not asked St. David (whose bell cured the King of Dublin, before mentioned) who was to be his confessor in Ireland. Upon this weighty business, away he walks over the sea, towards Wales; an angel met him upon the sea, and chid him for his boldness, whereupon the saint plainly told the angel he trusted to God's omnipotency and goodness. But the angel (whom some will, doubtless, deem little better than a heretic for so doing), replied, that he went upon a needless errand, for he needed no confessor besides God himself; but if he would have a witness of his conscience, he should choose Molua. Upon this he resumed his journey (or *voyage*) home, but scarcely had returned when straightway he bethinks himself that his bell was in Britain (how he came to leave it behind him is somewhat unaccountable, especially as he had already worked great miracles with it—see Colgan, p. 210, ch. 19—unless it were to give occasion for the joyful and unexpected miracle which restored it!) for, lo! no sooner had he need of it than he beheld the cymbal forthwith coming over the sea to meet him! "which he receiving so miraculously," says Father Colgan, "gave God thanks for it."*

Such miracles or superstitions as these, collected among many others. In so grave a writer as Father Colgan, who obviously believed and intended his readers to credit every one of them,† will make more credible a story told by Bishop Jeremy Taylor, who was Bishop of Down and Connor in the year 1661, and whose name has several times been made honourable mention of, and sometimes by Roman Catholic writers, in your pages. See the 10th volume of his works, preface, p. cxxii. Ed. 1828.

"I was lately," says the good bishop, "within a few months, very much troubled with petitions and earnest requests for the restoring a bell, which a person of quality had in his hands in the time of, and ever since the late rebellion. I could not guess at the reasons of their so great and violent importunity, but told the petitioners, if they could prove that bell to be theirs, the gentleman was willing to pay the full value of it, though he had no obligation to do so, that I know of, but charity; but this was so far from satisfying them, that still the importunity increased, which made me diligently to inquire into the secret of it. The first cause I found was, that a dying person in the parish desired to have it rung before him to church, and pretended he could not die in peace if it were denied him; and that the keeping of that bell did anciently belong to that family, from father to son; but because this seemed nothing but a fond and unreasonable superstition, I inquired further, and at last found, that *they believed this bell came from heaven*, and that it used to be carried from place to place, and to end controversies on oath, which the worst man durst not violate if they swore upon that bell, and the best men amongst them durst not but believe him; that if this bell was rung before the corpse to the grave it would help him out of purgatory; and that, therefore, when any one died, the friends of the deceased, whilst the bell was in their possession, hired it for the behoof of their dead, and that, by this means, that family was in part maintained. I was troubled," adds the Bishop, "to see under what spirit of delusion those poor souls do lie, how infinitely their credulity is abused, how certainly they believe in trifles, and perfectly rely on vanity, and how little they regard the truths of God, and how not at all they drink of the waters of salvation. For the numerous companies of priests and friars amongst them take care they shall know nothing of religion but what they design for them. . . . . I speak that which I know to be true by their own confession, and unconstrained and uninvited narratives. . . . . and if this be religion, it is such a one as ought to be reproved by all the severities of reason and religion, lest the people perish, and their souls be cheaply given away to them that make merchandise of souls who were the purchase and price of Christ's blood."

The following paragraph I think deserves to be added, and does honour to the heart, as well as the discernment of the good prelate—

"Having given this sad account, why I did consent to be engaged in controversy, otherwise than I love to be; and since it is not a love of trouble and contention, but charity to the souls of the poor deluded Irish, there is nothing remaining but that we humbly desire of God to accept and to bless this well-meant labour of love, and that by some admirable ways of his Providence he will be pleased to convey to them the notice of their danger and their sin, and to de-obstruct the passages of necessary truth to them; for we know the arts of their guides, and that it will be very hard that the notice of these things shall ever be suffered to arrive to the common people; but that which hinders will hinder until it be taken away. However, we believe and hope in God for remedy, for, although the emissaries of Rome use all arts to keep the people from the use of the Scriptures, the wells of salvation, and from entertaining notice of such things, which from the Scriptures we teach; yet, as God found out a remedy for the Israelites of old, when the Philistines would stop the Patriarchs' wells, and the wicked shepherds of Midian would drive their neighbours' flocks from the watering troughs, so He will also for the poor, misled people of Ireland, and He will take away the evil minds, or the opportunities of the adversaries hindering the people from instruction, and make way, that the truths we have here taught may approach to their ears, and sink into their hearts, and make them wise unto salvation. Amen."

That your ably and temperately conducted publication may be extensively useful in furthering the prayer of this eloquent and pious man, Bishop Jeremy Taylor, is the sincere wish of your constant reader,

Hibernicus.

ON IMAGE WORSHIP.

25th March, 1853.

Sir,—I did not intend to have made any farther remarks on the subject of my former letter, image worship and miracles, but Mr. Collette's letter in the March number of your journal, has induced me to recur to it again.

My letter was a simple explanation of the relative respect which Catholics pay to images—similar, in fact, to the respect paid to the representations of those dear to us, and greater in proportion as those represented are more venerated, and that we are not called upon to believe in those miracles, which you seem to point out as essential to our faith. Mr. Collette concludes his letter with this charitable remark—"I am willing to believe that your correspondent Sidrach, and many other of our Christian brethren are Roman Catholics only from education, prejudice, and ignorance of the true Gospel of Jesus Christ; did they know the doctrines and teaching of their Church, and what true Protestantism is, they would cease to be members of the Roman Catholic Church." I agree with Mr. Collette, that if the teachings of the Catholic Church are such as you and he describe them to be, the sooner we leave her the better; but, without meaning any disrespect, I cannot take you as exponents of our doctrines, and be assured that if they were so much opposed to Gospel truth and common sense, as you suppose them to be, the many learned men who are daily overcoming education and prejudice would not embrace them. I know as a Catholic what I am bound to believe, but you fall into a grave error in not distinguishing between articles of faith, in which all Catholics must believe, and scholastic opinions or private considerations of which every individual may judge for himself. The respect for images is no article of faith, but a pious practice, recommended by the Church, and we find that it prevailed from the earliest period. We learn from Tertullian that it was usual in his time to represent our Saviour on the chalices as the good Shepherd (*lib de Pudicitia*). Eusebius speaks of an image of our Saviour in brass, which had been erected by the woman who was cured by the touch of his garment, and the historian Sozomen relates that the fragments of this statue were collected by the Christians and placed in their Church. Eusebius and Chrysostom tell us that the figure of the cross was held in great veneration; and even Martin Luther warmly defended our doctrine respecting crosses and images against Carlostadius. Dr. Hawarden teaches with Delphinus that if in any place there is danger of real idolatry or superstition from pictures, they ought to be removed by the pastor, as St. Epiphanius destroyed a pious picture, and as Ezechias destroyed the brazen serpent; and as Dr. Milner says, if you should become a Catholic, as I pray to God you may, I shall never ask you if you have a pious picture or relic, or so much as a crucifix in your possession, neither will you be required to believe in wonder-working pictures and statues. You will ask me on what ground would I defend making pilgrimages to the winking image at Rimini, or to the image in the Casa Santa, at Loretto. I do not believe in any power in those images,

---

Colgan's Acta Sanctorum veteris et Majoris Scotiæ seu Hiberniæ, p. 251.

† Idem, p. 132.

* Idem, p. 210. Vita Maidoci, c. 20—"Quodam die cum esset S. Moedoc juxta mare, dixit fratribus suis, pœnitet me quod non interrogaverim magistrum meum David, ut indicaret mihi, quis in Hibernia esset pater confessarius meus: et nolentes discipuli ejus ire cum eo, vel navem ei præparare, timentes multum mare: vir Dei ambulavit super mare, volens ita pertransire usque ad Britanniam ad magistrum suum David. Tunc Angelus venit ad eum, dicens, magnam audaciam fecisti. Respondit ei S. Moedoc dicens, pro audacia non fecit, sed pro Dei potentia et benignitate. Dixit ei Angelus non est tibi necesse habere patrem alium confessarium præter Deum. Ipse enim scit puritatem tui confessionem tuam, sed tamen si vis habere testem conscientiæ tuæ, habeto Moluam filium Cochæ patrem Confessarium tuum ad Deum. Tunc reversus est S. Moedoc de mari ad Hiberniam et intravit portum in regione Hua Kinselach in oppido, quod dicitur Ardlethium; et cum ibi sedisset in loco, qui dicitur Achell, contigit quod oblitus esset cymbalum suum in Britannia—Cumque necesse illi esset, ut perveniret, cymbalum ipsum trans mare veniens juxta se vidit prope in littore—tunc vir Dei accipiens cymbalum suum gratias Deo egit."

† As Colgan's work is so scarce, and some of our educated readers may feel curious to see in his own words the various uses to which bells were applied in his day, we think it may be acceptable to them to give the following passage in the original Latin. [Ed. C. L.]

"*Tintinnabulum quo in variis usibus, more sanctorum totius patriæ et sæculi utebatur*, c. 12.

"Frequentissima mentio tintinnabulorum, cymbalorum, et campanarum in vitis Sanctorum gentis nostræ et Britannicæ: utebantur istis in primis pro signo officii divini, tempore vicenti pro discipulis aliisve vocandis; item inter invocandum nominis auxilium contra ecclesiæ vel servorum Dei oppressores contemptores, vel aliter aliquid contra immunitatem ecclesiasticam attentantes. Et quis tunc, dum pulsabantur *plurima fiebant miracula*, in similium pœnitione experunt postea esse to *magna veneratione apud populum*, et plurima non solum contra ecclesiasticæ immunitatis violatores sed et in *infirmitatibus curandis, in furtis et perjuriis detegendis aliisque omnis generis* per ea fiebant *miracula*. Diebus nostris extiterunt plurima alia in Hibernia auro, argento et gemmis tecta, quæ magna experte ab hæreticis, luti auro et argento labentibus, sunt destructa; partim tempore persecutionis custodientium timore in puteos et cavas conjecta, vel alia negligentia deperdita, ex aliqua etiam parte pia Catholicorum devotione preservata, *in magna habentur devotione*."—p. 142.

but I consider that it is quite consonant with the religious feelings of those who believe that God has displayed extraordinary manifestations of his power in particular places, to visit such places, and pay to God there the tribute of their devotion; but not to pay it to images on any account, even though they stepped down from their pedestals and walked.

SIDRACH.

The remarks which we made in the November number of our journal (page 122). as well as our observations on the former letter of "Sidrach," have already put our readers in possession of our views on the important subjects which he discusses; and we do not deem it necessary to repeat them now. We have only space to make one or two brief observations on the new topics which "Sidrach" has introduced in his present communication.

He says that we have "fallen into a grave error in not distinguishing between articles of faith, in which all [Roman] Catholics must believe, and scholastic opinions or private considerations." This charge must have been advanced through inadvertence; inasmuch as, in all our discussions of the points of difference between the two churches, we have studiously endeavoured to guard ourselves against the very error which "Sidrach" condemns. Let him turn, for example, to the article on "Auricular Confession" in our present number, and he will find that in this, as in all other instances, we have been careful, not only to assign a prominent place to the decrees of the Council of Trent, but even to quote their exact words. If "Sidrach" will refer us to any other more authoritative exposition of the creed of the Church of Rome, we shall readily bring it forward. In the course of our arguments, indeed, it is sometimes difficult for us to avoid noticing "private" or "scholastic" opinions. Roman Catholic controversialists are so fond of insisting on the unity of their own Church, and the divisions of Protestants, that we have occasionally felt it necessary to prove that the Church of Rome has, from time to time, been rent asunder by as deep dissensions as any which can be alleged against other branches of the Catholic Church; but we have ever been careful to avoid the error of imputing the extreme opinions of individuals to the whole Roman Catholic body.

"Sidrach" goes on to state. that "the respect for images is no article of faith, but a pious practice recommended by the Church." This assertion of our correspondent surprised us not a little. We opened the decree of the Council of Trent (Sess. xxv.), which, after reciting that "due honour and veneration is to be paid to the images of Christ, the Virgin, and other saints," in the next paragraph adds the significant words—"If any person shall teach or *think* contrary to these decrees, let him be accursed." (Si quis autem his decretis contraria docuerit aut senserit, anathema sit.) Is the Church o Rome wont to *recommend* her pious practices to her people under the dread alternative of an anathema? We always believed that this terrible sentence was reserved for those obstinate heretics who rejected articles of *faith*. Yet here we see, that it is denounced against all who even *think* that "due honour and veneration" (whatever that may mean) is not to be paid to the images of the saints. Either. therefore, image worship is an article of faith, or else the Church of Rome is more uncharitable than our correspondent would willingly have her thought.

The next plea urged by "Sidrach" on behalf of this practice is. that it prevailed from the earliest period; and in proof of this he adduces some passages from Tertullian, Eusebius, and other writers. It is a dangerous thing to quote isolated allusions from ancient authors in support of opinions which they would be the first to condemn. We are sure that if our correspondent had ever read the following extract from Tertullian, he would scarcely have relied upon *his* authority in support of image worship. "When the devil," says Tertullian (de Idol. p. 86, Par. 1675,) introduced into the world manufacturers of statues, and images, and representations of every description, that rude trafficking of human calamity derived both its name and its profit from idols Hence every act which produces an idol, in whatsoever manner, becomes the head of idolatry. . . . . Consequently, every form or diminutive image must be called an idol. . . . . Wherefore, to eradicate the very basis of idolatry, the divine law proclaims: 'ye shall not make an idol;' and it forthwith subjoins; 'nor the likeness of the things which are in heaven, and which are in earth, and which are in the sea.'"

We invite the attention of our readers to this remarkable passage. Not only does Tertullian interpret the second commandment literally, as we have done—in accordance with the great body of English Divines, and *against* the decrees of the Council of Trent—but he goes much further, and does not hesitate to assert, that the *devil* was the author of the arts of statuary and painting. This very exaggeration adds to the value of his testimony against the prevalence of image worship in his day; for he never would have used such strong language in condemnation of these arts, if the Christians, in his time, notoriously venerated images. If "Sidrach," instead of relying on the authority of Bishop Milner, had taken the trouble to refer to the passage of Tertullian which he cites, he would have seen what little support it lends him. (The words are these (p. 563.), "cui si ille forté patrocinabitur pastor, quem in calice depingis . . . de quo nihil libentius bibas, quam ovem pœnitentiæ secundæ.") The allusion to the sheep renders it probable, that the cup referred to by Tertullian represented a scene from our Lord's well-known parable, not a personal likeness of the Saviour. but even granting that the latter is his meaning in this passage, which must be admitted to be very obscure, Tertullian does not assert that this was a prevalent custom in the Church; nor does he give the least hint that any special reverence or veneration was paid to this figure; on the contrary, he plainly intimates his disapproval of such representations, by adding the words, "Ast ago ejus pastoris Scripturas haurio, qui non potest frangi." "I," saith he, "imbibe the Scriptural representations of that Shepherd, who cannot be broken"—*i.e.*, the history of Christ in his holy Word, the superiority of which Tertullian contrasts with frail, perishable memorials of wood or metal. To *this* picture of our Lord—a picture drawn by the pencil of the inspired Evangelists—we would earnestly invite the attention of "Sidrach," and of our other Roman Catholic readers. It is one which they cannot study too often, or prize too highly.

Eusebius is "Sidrach's" next authority, which he borrows, like the former, from Bishop Milner, who, as usual, overstates, or rather misrepresents the meaning of the original Eusebius does *not* assert that a brazen image of our Saviour was erected hy the woman whom he cured. He saw a brazen statue, indeed: but he takes care not to pledge himself to the truth of the story, for he twice uses the cautious phrase "*they say*," (ἔλεγον). Eusebius. as is well known, lived about three hundred years after our Lord, in which period many false stories and legends would naturally arise. He further adds, at the end of the chapter, a pretty severe condemnation of this practice of erecting statues, which he traces back to the times of heathen superstition. "It is probable enough," he says, "that those ancients, according to the custom of the heathens, were wont, *unadvisedly*, to honour all those after this manner as saviours, by whom they have been any ways benefitted." The Greek word is ἀπαραφυλάκτως, which Valesius (the eminent Roman Catholic editor of Eusebius) translates, "inconsiderate et imprudenter, contrá vetcrem disciplinam,"—*i.e.*, inconsiderately, unadvisedly, contrary to the doctrine of the ancients. So much for the testimony of Eusebius.

We cannot now discuss the other passages cited by "Sidrach." from Bishop Milner. but we hope, on some future opportunity, to return to this subject. Meanwhile, we would request our correspondent (whose good temper and moderation we gladly acknowledge) to read the original authorities himself; and, unless we are greatly mistaken, he will see much reason to distrust his clever and plausible, but very unsafe guide.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—You will excuse the presumption of a layman if I protest against your tacit acquiescence in the view incidentally put by "Catholicus," of the question of Transubstantiation. I cannot believe it to be a question of *figurative* or *literal* interpretation of our Lord's words on the institution of the Eucharist. I deny that Roman Catholics interpret them as literally as Protestants, or that Protestants resort to as many figurative interpretations as Roman Catholics. To rest so momentous a question on any delusion of words is most dangerous. Misplaced epithets generate false ideas.

Both sides are too apt to think that the whole question in dispute turns on the "material" instead of the "spiritual" presence of our Lord's body and blood. The Roman Catholic controversialist thinks he has proved all when he advances his arguments in favour of the material presence. To me it appears that all that is worth disputing in his faith yet remains unproved. I am firmly convinced that the material presence is a mistaken view; but yet it appears to me a mere matter of abstract theory, not directly influencing practice or involving religious guilt.

The dead body of our Saviour, deprived of his "soul and Divinity" (the mere flesh), was not worshipped when laid in the tomb (1), nor the blood that flowed from his wounds on Calvary. Were a portion of one substituted miraculously for the consecrated wafer, and of the other to fill the chalice in place of the wine, it would, indeed, literally and exactly fulfil the words of the text, but it would form no grounds for believing that either or both of them were the actual Deity incarnate. We may believe the bread to be His body without perilling our souls upon our judgment; but we cannot offer the *adoration* that is due to God alone to the consecrated bread, without a tremendous risk.

This is the important point that controversialists usually omit. What exact name should be given to such an act of adoration, assuming it to be founded in error, I do not pretend to say. It may not, perhaps, be actual idolatry, for it is offered under the conception that the Deity himself is its object; but it certainly very nearly approaches it, and must, at least, involve an awful responsibility. The commands to worship none but God himself, "in spirit and in truth'—no material emblem of him—are plain and peremptory. We need commands as express to justify our adoration of aught in apparent violation of these. The onus is thrown on those who make an exception to a plain precept, to show that they do not bow down before senseless matter.

Bearing this in mind as the most momentous point in the doctrine of Transubstantiation, let us see whether the "literal" meaning of the words will justify such a dogma of the Divine and adorable presence, or whether the Roman Catholic doctrine be not only figurative, but even imaginative.

Let us take the words of institution in St. Matthew (2), as well as the explanatory version in the Corinthians, and then place after the text the authoritative definitions condensed from the Council of Trent (3).

St. Matthew says—"*As they were eating*," &c.

Council of Trent—"It must not be after eating, but after fasting."

St. Matthew—"*Take eat*," &c.

Council of Trent—"Not only eat this, but ADORE it as the Deity, and offer it as the same SACRIFICE that was offered by our Saviour on the cross."

St. Matthew—"*Drink ye all of it*," &c.

Council of Trent—"Do not ALL drink of it; let only the few who are ecclesiastics drink of it."

St. Matthew—"*This is my body*," &c.

Council of Trent "This is not my body, but my body AND blood, my soul and Divinity—the Deity."

St. Matthew—"*This is my blood of the New Testament*, &c.. and St. Paul and St. Luke—"*This is the New Testament in my blood*," &c. (4).

Council of Trent—"This is not my blood, nor is it the New Testament; but it is my blood AND body, my soul and Divinity—the Deity."

St. Matthew says—"*I will not drink of this fruit of the vine*," &c.

Council of Trent—"The fruit of the vine of which I speak is NOT the fruit of the vine: but is this Jesus Christ, who hold it in my hand, and say, *I will not drink of it till*," &c.

St. Paul says—"*Is it not the communion of the body of Christ?*" (5).

Council of Trent—"Is it not the body itself, and NOT our communion of (κοινωνια)—participation in—the body?"

N.B.—The sacrifice, or victim, and our participation in it, or its benefits, are two very distinct matters.

St. Paul says—"*My body which is broken*," &c. (6).

The Council of Trent says—"This is not that which Christ 'brake'—it is not το κλωμενον—not that which *is*, but that which *shall* be broken" (7).

St. Paul and St. Luke say—"*Do this in remembrance of me*."

Council of Trent—"Do not do this in remembrance of him who 'sits for ever at God's right hand,' but in his actual presence, with human body and incorporated Divinity."

St. Paul says—"*For we being many are one bread and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread*" (8).

Council of Trent—"Neither of the breads here spoken of are literal, neither of them means bread, and both figurative meanings are different."

St. Paul says—"*This bread*," &c.; (9) but the Council of Trent says—"This bread, referred to thrice by the Apostle, after its consecration, does not, any one of the three times, mean LITERAL bread."

St. Paul says—"*Not discerning the Lord's body*."

The Council of Trent says—This is spoken of the unworthy; but it is only figurative, as neither worthy nor unworthy do literally *discern* (10) the Lord's body, which, though there. can never be discerned."

I trust, sir, that till "Catholicus" can explain these vital discrepancies we shall hear no more of the Roman Catholic being the *literal* interpretation! Whether it be the *natural* one is another matter—that we can argue separately; but the vulgar are apt to assume, that however that part of the argument might lean to the Protestant views, the letter of the text is with Roman Catholics. I cannot see any foundation for such a prejudice.

But for the space I have already occupied I should proceed to show that the Protestant interpretation flows

(1) We find Mary Magdalene *sitting* at the sepulchre (Mat. xxvii. 61). but *worshipping* him on his appearance after the resurrection (xxviii. 9).

( ) xxvi 26.

( ) I need hardly say, that the words themselves are not here copied, but what appears to be their short effect, as given in the Council, and as developed in the Catechism.

(4) 1 Cor. xi. 25. Luke xxii. 20.

(5) 1 Cor x. 16.

(6) 1 Cor. xi. 24.

7) This change of tense is made because it is supposed to identify the Eucharist with Christ's actual body that should be broken on the cross It is curious that it was not observed that it would have just the opposite effect. Christ's body was *not broken* on the cross; and some stress is laid on the fact by St. John, xix. 33—'They brake not his legs," and v 36—"That the Scripture might be fulfilled, a bone of him shall not be broken"

(8) Cor. x. 16.

(9) 1 Cor. xi. 26, 27. 28

(10) Whatever different translations may be given to this word, it cannot be literally understood by Roman Catholics

from the words—*ex vi terminorum*: so that it is not fair to represent it as figurative. The word "is" has not been used simply for "represent;" the latter would not convey the whole meaning, nor could our views have been expressed consistently with the Jewish notions of the times—in any other words but those which inspiration has here employed.

In the sacrifice of the Passover the one victim was slain for the entire household: none participated in its benefits who did not partake of the flesh; to eat it was the mark of those who joined in it. The passage in the sixth chapter of St. John, does not refer to the Eucharist; but as both passages relate to the offering up of our Lord's body and blood upon the cross, both have parallel expressions of harmonious import. Except we eat of the great victim, except we participate in the great atoning sacrifice, we have no life. In this sense the Eucharist *is*—not *represents*—what St. Paul declares it to be, our "participation in the body and blood of Christ" (11). But this branch of my argument cannot be more than suggested, without trenching unreasonably on your space.

FONTICM PETITOR.

ON AURICULAR CONFESSION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Having read, in your February number of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, what you have quoted from the "Touchstone," and your reply concerning private confession, you appear to me to think that no such practice existed in the Apostolic age; and I believe, from what I have seen of your research, that you are a competent person to tell when and where the practice began, &c.

I, though a member of the Roman Catholic Church, would be anxious to ascertain the truth, and would, therefore, feel greatly pleased and truly thankful if you would give your readers a historical specimen of the whole matter.

I have seen a statement made in a catechism, written by the Rev. E. Norman, Rector of Brosna, relative to Auricular Confession, which is as follows:—

"Q. When was auricular or whispering confession introduced?

"A. In the year 1215, at the fourth Lateran Council it was commanded as an ecclesiastical constitution, but not made necessary to salvation till the Council of Trent, about 1546."

But I am of the opinion that it was in existence long before that; for I remember to have read in a Protestant author—Bishop Burnet's "Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles," p. 363—as follows:—"Penitents were enjoined to publish such of their secret sins as the penitentiary priest did prescribe. This happened to give great scandal at Constantinople, when Nectarius was bishop there, in the fourth century."

Again, I have read, from Bishop Chaloner's "Catholic Christian Instructed," p. 99, edition 13, Dublin. Speaking of Confession, he says—"We conclude with St. Augustine, that to pretend it is enough to confess to God alone, is making void the power of the keys given to the Church," &c. In proof of this, a reference is made to Homil. 49, inter alios. 50.

From these testimonies I have some reason to believe that private confession is of very early standing, &c.

I sincerely hope you will do me the kindness of inserting these few lines, &c.

I am, &c., yours truly,

A NORTHERN READER.

[Our correspondent will perceive that we have commenced the subject of confession in our present number, but have been obliged to postpone the *historical* part of it till our next, in which we hope to give him the information he very reasonably requires.—ED.]

ON JAMES V. 14, 15.

SIR—Permit me to express a different opinion from you on the interpretation of the text—James v. 14, 15—given in a paper headed the "Touchstone," in the February No. of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, page 20, objection 36.

I shall first quote the text in full, then quote the interpretation you have given, next advance reasons which compel me to dissent from this, and afterwards propose a paraphrase expressing my own view.

"Is any sick among you, let him call for the elders of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord, and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him."

The interpretation given is—"The gift of *miraculously healing the sick*, which is *evidently* what the Apostle is speaking of."

The following are some of my objections to this interpretation:—

1. It does not appear to me that gifts of healing were ever possessed generally by the Church to the extent which this interpretation supposes. It would imply that in *every* congregation, in *every* possible illness, of *every* individual, a miracle *might be* expected. The Apostles themselves do not appear to have possessed this power (2 Tim. iv. 20), where the Apostle Paul says he left Trophimus sick at Miletus.

2. It appears strange that if such a power existed in any individuals of each congregation that it should be necessary to tell them to apply for the exercise of such a gift. The people themselves must know it, and would be ready enough to use it.

3. It would appear from 1 Cor. xii. 9, 28, 30 and from ecclesiastical history (if dependence can be placed on it in this respect), that the gift of healing did not always reside in the ministers of the Church; but that laymen, and even women, possessed this power. It seems strange that these should not be alluded to.

4. The *constant* use of prayer, as the means of working the miracles spoken of, seems contrary to the general manner of God's dealing in this matter. The majority of miracles appear to have been suggested by Divine impulse. See among other places Acts xiv. 8; the use of prayer seems the exception.

5. The same argument may be applied to the use of oil. There is no instance after the ascension where oil was used.

6. The precept under consideration comes in among a number of precepts obligatory on the Church to the present day. It seems strange that one precept, the use of which was very shortly to cease, should be introduced among them.

These reasons render it impossible for me to receive the interpretation proposed in the LAYMAN, though it corresponds with that proposed by all the interpreters I can recollect, including Poole, who, however, hints another.

I, therefore, venture to suggest another—premising that though the style of St. James is very abrupt, and the transitions from one subject to another very rapid; yet that frequently we are able to discover a connection, or at least imagine a connection, in the mind of the Apostle. In *this respect* the Epistle is similar to the Book of Ecclesiastes. The connecting link in the mind of the Apostle in this case appears to be.—"Let a spirit of true religion, or a recollection of God as the providential ruler of the world, influence you under all dispensations." (I commence the paraphrase at verse 13.) "(Therefore) is any afflicted (in mind or estate) let him pray (to the author of the affliction). Is any (prosperous, and therefore inclined to be) merry? let him sing psalms (and thus acknowledge God as the Author of his prosperity). Is any sick among you (and therefore more especially under the hand of God, let him acknowledge God more especially, and to do this) let him call for the elders of the Church, and let them pray over (for*) him, (making use of the best means of cure, such as) anointing him with oil, (not with Jewish incantations, but) in the name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith shall (frequently) save the sick, and the Lord (by his blessing on the means used, or providential circumstance) shall raise him up: and if (the sickness has been sent, not merely as a trial of his faith, but because) he has committed (some particular) sins (1 Cor. xi. 30), they shall be forgiven him, (and his being raised up when this event does take place may be accepted as an evidence of God's forgiveness)."

The above paraphrase is somewhat long, but I have made it so in order to leave no doubt as to the meaning I endeavour to convey. I was anxious also, to use every word of the Authorized Version, and I have only in this respect made the alteration of the subjunctive into the indicative mood. I don't think it at all necessary to suppose that the elders were the persons who anointed, though the construction might seem to imply that. That might be the act of any individual connected with the sick man. Prayer was the especial duty of the elders.

If you cannot adopt this interpretation I hope you will at least excuse my sending it to you. This is the explanation I always give my own congregation, and I generally follow it up by some observations on the propriety of sending for a clergyman in case of illness, and not waiting till the last moment.

Yours, &c.,

J. M.

We freely lay the foregoing before our readers, and think it well deserving of attention. The passage cannot be deemed free from difficulty, and the most clear thing in it is, that it does *not* refer to *Extreme Unction*, as contended for by the author of the Touchstone, for the simple reason we have already given, p. 20 Roman Catholic priests administer *Extreme Unction* without any hope of being able to "raise up" the sick man; and, indeed, only when they believe him to be past recovery.—ED.

ON LADY DAY AND GOOD FRIDAY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—I'm entirely astray about Lady-day. I'm a poor man that doesn't know much, but I gets your newspaper (thanks be to them that sends it to me), and maybe you would ease my mind, for sure you know more about our religion than I do. Your honour knows that Lady-day always comes on the 25th of March, and it's the greatest holiday we have at all; there's nothing a man can do worse nor to work upon it. Stealing is nothing to it; why, it's worse even than eating meat on a Friday.

Well, your honour, Good Friday is no day with us at all; we never were asked to go to mass and we may work, or amuse ourselves, or do any idling the boys please.

Well, they say it's the day that our Blessed Saviour was crucified for us; and, indeed, many's the time it seemed strange to me, that we wouldn't be asked to say our prayers *that* day. But now it seems worse entirely; for this year Lady-day and Good Friday come on us altogether, just on the one day; and it's the great day for religion and mass, is Lady-day; and it comes about, that just because it's the day that our Saviour died for us there's no mass nor prayers at all, not on Lady-day itself. For sure we had no mass, and everybody was labouring or diverting themselves this Lady-day, just as if it was a common day; and a farmer beside me, that's cousin to the priest, had all the men in this side of the country setting his praties, just as if it wasn't Lady-day at all; and that's just what he would be read out in chapel for doing any other Lady-day that ever come. And all because it's the same day, too, that our Saviour died for our sins! Well, now, I want to know, when the Blessed Virgin was standing by the cross and watching him at his death, didn't she pray at all? And would she tell us that we musn't pray on that day? And the blessed Apostles, and the holy women that was looking on, didn't they pray? And why wouldn't we pray on that day now? Why, if Lady-day was ever so good a day for religion, how could it be spoiled entirely by being the same day that Jesus Christ died for our sins? and why would we have no religion at all on that day more nor any other day?

Your honour's obedient servant,

PETER BRANNIGAN, *of Meath*.

We have heard of this strange fact already, but we are rather at a loss to explain it or account for it. We do not suppose that the priests wish to prevent people from praying on Good Friday; but why do they refuse them public service just *because* it is Good Friday? We have just heard that there is a rule that they may not celebrate mass on Good Friday—a very strange rule, if true. We would be glad if any of our readers could tell us if there be such a rule, and, if so, if they could give us any authorities to show how old this rule is.

But even if there can be no mass, why should there not be public prayers on such a day? But we forgot—the prayers are *in Latin*, and the priests may think that when there is no mass, it can hardly be worth while to bring the people to the prayers that they cannot understand. Alas! for the ancient Church!

FARMING OPERATIONS FOR APRIL.

(From the Irish Farmers' Gazette.)

FROM the unusually great inclemency of the weather, farming operations of every description have been so much retarded as to increase the labour and render the next few months a time of anxious care and thought to the farmer, and require considerable exertions in pushing on the general routine work to make up for lost time; at the same time, we would recommend the exercise of the utmost care and caution, and rather do the work well and carefully than do it ill and hurriedly; for though early sowing is much to be encouraged, still it will be better to wait a few days (which may be confidently done) for weather to dry the land sufficiently to enable the harrows to work freely to get in and cover the spring corn, than to do so while the land is wet and poachy; and the same remarks are applicable in the preparation of the land for green crops, which cannot be pulverised as it should be if the land be not sufficiently dry to permit the harrows and grubbers to work freely.

Oats sowing should be proceeded with as the state of the weather and land will be found dry enough. In the poorer class of soils it will be necessary to increase the quantity of seed as the season advances.

Barley.—During this and the beginning of next month is the proper time for sowing spring barley. This species of grain delights in a well-pulverized and sharp, yet rich, soil. Its place in the rotation, like all other grain crops, is after green crops (turnips, &c.). Very often, however, we find the wheat or oat stubble set apart for barley, particularly the former, which in all likelihood had also followed a grain crop, but manured on the stubble. This is very bad farming, and no one who wishes to keep his farm in good order, or to reap the greatest amount of produce which it is capable of producing, will pursue such a practice. When barley is to be sown after potatoes, or such green crops as are raised at the end of the year, the land must receive a winter ploughing, clearing out all the furrows to prevent water from lodging, and in spring let it be cross-ploughed: after this, harrow and then plough the seed furrow. This treatment, if the ploughing has been sufficiently deep, will bring the land into a finely-pulverised state, and the crop will be stronger and more equal than if ploughed with only one furrow.

Top-dress wheat and other grain crops and meadow lands with guano, soot, superphosphate of lime, &c., in wet weather, or on the approach of rain.

(11) 2 Cor. x. 16.—κοινωνια του αιματος.

* επι With an accusative admits this meaning.—Luke xxiii. 24.

Selection of Books

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

Booksellers to the Queen,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

☞ Messrs. CURRY and CO. have always in Stock a large and varied assortment of Bibles, Church Services, &c., in plain and elegant Bindings, together with an extensive Selection of Works in Divinity and General Literature. Catalogues to be had on application.

LAYARD'S FURTHER DISCOVERIES in the Ruins of Nineveh and Babylon. 400 Illustrations, 21s.

KEY TO UNCLE TOM'S CABIN. By Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe. 10s. 6d., and 3s. 6d. (In a few days.)

THE CHURCH HISTORIANS of ENGLAND, from Bede to Foxe.

*** Each of these two portions—the Pre-Reformation Period and the Period of the Reformation—will occupy eight large volumes octavo; the size will be larger than the ordinary demy; and the volumes will extend to about 800 pages each. For convenience, it will probably be expedient to issue them in half volumes of 400 pages. The whole work is intended to be completed in five or six years.

The terms of publication will resemble that of the Parker Society—Subscriptions being 20s. per annum.

D'AUBIGNE'S HISTORY of the REFORMATION. Vol. V. Subject—The Reformation in England. 8vo., 12s.

ALISON'S HISTORY of EUROPE, from the Downfall of Napoleon, in 1815, to the accession of Louis Napoleon, in 1852. In five vols. Vol. I., 15s.

UNIVERSAL HISTORY, on Scriptural Principles. 6 vols. 31s. 6d.

GOODE'S (Rev. Wm.) AID to DISPUTED POINTS in the Ceremonial of the Church. 4s.

THE ISRAEL of the ALPS: Persecutions of the Waldenses in Piedmont. By Alexis Muston, D.D. 2s. 6d.

THE JEW. By the Author of "Both One in Christ." New Edition, 4s. 6d.

BRIEF VIEW OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, from the Earliest Periods to the Nineteenth Century. By the Dean of Cork. 1s.

GAUSSEN'S THEOPNEUSTIA. 2s. 6d.

CLERGYMAN'S PAROCHIAL REGISTRY and Vade Mecum. 2s. 6d. (Pocket size.)

ALISON'S HISTORY OF EUROPE. Cheap edition, in 44 monthly parts, each 1s.; in quarterly volumes, 4s. To commence on 30th April.

*** Specimen pages on application.

THE CHURCH OF IRELAND: Occasional Sermons. By Canon Wordsworth. 8s.

GENESIS and GEOLOGY. By Denis Crofton, B.A. 2s.

ST. HIPPOLYTUS and the CHURCH OF ROME. By Canon Wordsworth. 8s. 6d.

FABER'S (G. S.) MANY MANSIONS. 12s.

THE DIVINE RULE OF FAITH and PRACTICE. By the Rev. William Goode. 3 vols. New edition. 8vo., 21s.

*** A few copies still remain unsubscribed for. 21s.

Works on the Romanist Controversy.

DELINEATION OF ROMAN CATHOLICISM. By the Rev. Charles Elliott, D.D. Imp. 8vo. 10s.

THE PAPACY; its History, Dogmas, Genius, and Prospects. By the Rev. C. A. Wylie. 8vo. 8s. 6d.

ROMISH RITES, OFFICES, and Legends of the Church of Rome, from the Roman Pontificial. By the Rev. M. W. Foye. 6s.

THE CHURCH OF ROME: her present Moral Theology, Scriptural Instruction, and Canon Law. By the Rev. R. J. M'Ghee. 8vo. 5s.

BARROW ON SUPREMACY OF THE POPE. 7s. 6d.

WILLETT'S SYNOPSIS PAPISMI. Edited by the Rev. Dr. Cumming. 10 vols., £3.

DIFFICULTIES OF ROMANISM, with respect to Evidence. By Rev. G. S. Faber. New Edition. 10s. 6d.

CANONS AND DECREES OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT (Latin). 12mo. 2s 6d.

CANONS AND DECREES OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT (English). 12mo. 4s.

CATECHISM OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT (Latin). 3s.

CATECHISM OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT (English) 6s.

HAMMERSMITH DISCUSSION between the Rev. Doctor Cumming and J. French, Esq. 12mo. 6s.

THE LAWS OF THE PAPACY, with Index of Latin Bulls. By the Rev. R. J. M'Ghee. 12mo. 8s.

PRIMER OF THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH IN IRELAND. By the Rev. Robert King. 3 Vols. 10s. 6d.

THE MASS AND RUBRICS OF THE ROMAN CHURCH. By the Rev. John R. Cotter. Fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

PILGRIMAGE TO ROME. By the Rev. Hobart Seymour. Post 8vo. 8s. 6d.

MORNINGS AMONG THE JESUITS AT ROME. By the Rev. Hobart Seymour. 7s.

ANALYSIS OF THE HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION. By the Rev. W. H. Pinnock. 4s. 6d.

NORMAN'S PROTESTANT CATECHISM. 1d.; or 7s. 6d. per hundred.

PASCAL'S PROVINCIAL LETTERS. 12mo. Cloth. 2s.

TAYLOR'S (Isaac) LOYOLA AND JESUITISM. 10s. 6d.

HISTORY OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT. From the French of L. F. Bungener. 7s. 6d.

CASES OF CONSCIENCE. By Pascal the Younger. 3s. 6d.

MORAL THEOLOGY OF ALPHONSO LIGUORI. By the Rev. R. P. Blakeney. 6s.

HISTORY OF COUNCIL OF TRENT. By T. A. Buckley. 6s.

BRIEF VIEW of the English and Roman Versions of the Bible. 1s. 6d.

Commentaries, Expositions, &c.

REV. THOMAS SCOTT'S COMMENTARY on the Bible. 6 Vols., 4to., with maps and illustrations. £3 3s.

DAVIDSON'S BIBLICAL CRITICISM on the Old and New Testaments. 2 vols., 28s.

FAIRBAIRN'S (Rev. Patrick) EXPOSITION OF EZEKIEL. 10s. 6d.

FAIRBAIRN'S (Rev. Patrick) TYPOLOGY OF SCRIPTURE. 2 vols., 7s. each.

FAIRBAIRN'S (Rev. Patrick) LIFE, CHARACTER, and MISSION OF JONAH. 3s. 6d.

TRENCH'S Rev. Fred.) NOTES on the PARABLES. Fifth edition. 12s.

TRENCH'S NOTES on the MIRACLES. 12s.

RESURRECTION of LIFE: Exposition of 1 Cor. xv. By the Rev. Dr. Brown. 8s.

SUFFERINGS and GLORIES of the MESSIAH. By the Rev. Dr. Brown. 8s.

CANDLISH'S CONTRIBUTIONS to the BOOK of GENESIS. 2 vols., 12s.

CUMMING'S CHURCH before the FLOOD. 9s.

STUART (Moses) on the ROMANS. 7s. 6d.

Sermons.

SIMPLE SERMONS, after the Fashion of the Reformers. 5s.

BLUNT'S (Rev. Henry) LECTURES on Abraham, Elisha, Our Saviour. 3 vols.; St. Paul, 2 vols.; Seven Churches, Thirty-nine Articles, 5s. 6d. each.

BLUNT'S (Rev. Henry) LECTURES on Jacob and St. Peter, 4s. 6d. each.

THE ROYAL PREACHER: Lectures on Ecclesiastes. By Rev. Dr. Hamilton. 5s.

BUTLER'S (Rev. W. A.) SERMONS, Doctrinal and Practical. With Memoir, 12s.

VERSCHOYLE'S (Rev. H.) LECTURES ON THE LORD'S PRAYER. 5s 6d.

VERSCHOYLE'S (Rev. H.) BOND OF PERFECTNESS. 4s. 6d.

THE EXPOSITORY PREACHER; or, St. Matthew's Gospel Practically Expounded. By the Rev. Charles Overton. 2 vols., crown 8vo, 15s.

ROBERT'S PLAIN SERMONS for all the Sundays and Chief Holidays in the year. 2 vols., 10s.

BRADLEY'S PRACTICAL SERMONS for every Sunday and Principal Holiday in the Year. 12s.

SUMNER'S PRACTICAL EXPOSITION of the New Testament, in the form of Lectures. 9 vols. 8vo. 9s. each.

Works in Biography.

LIFE AND LETTERS OF REV. HENRY VENN. 7s.

MEMOIR OF ROBERT AND JAMES A. HALDANE. By Alexander Haldane, Esq. 12s.

LEILA ADA, the Jewish Convert. 3s. 6d.

MEMOIR OF THE REV. EDWARD BICKERSTETH. By the Rev. T. R. Birks. Third Edition. 2 vols. 16s.

MEMOIR OF THE REV. DR. CHALMERS. 4 vols., crown 8vo., 10s. 6d. each.

MEMOIR AND REMAINS OF REV. J. H. EVANS. 8vo., 12s.

MEMOIR OF THE REV. W. H. HEWITSON. By the Rev. John Baillie. 5s.

MEMOIRS AND REMAINS OF REV. R. M. M'CHEYNE. 12mo., 5s.

MEMOIR OF REV. W. B. JOHNSON. 5s.

Works on Prophecy.

HORÆ APOCALYPTICÆ: Commentary on the Apocalypse. By the Rev. E. B. Elliott. 4 vols., 8vo. £2 14s.

FABER'S REVIVAL OF THE FRENCH EMPERORSHIP Anticipated, &c. 2s.

PROPHETICAL LANDMARKS. By the Rev. Horatius Bonar, 5s.

CHRIST'S SECOND COMING. By the Rev. David Brown, D.D. Third Edition, 7s. 6d.

EVIDENCE OF FULFILLED PROPHECY. By the Rev. Dr. Keith. 7s. 6d.

THE LAST THINGS. By Rev. Walter Wood. 7s. 6d.

PROPHETIC STUDIES: LECTURES ON DANIEL. By the Rev. Dr. Cumming. 9s.

APOCALYPTIC SKETCHES. By the Rev. Dr. Cumming. 2 vols., each 9s.

Works on Missions.

THE NEW REFORMATION IN IRELAND. By the Rev. Llewelyn W. Jones. 1s. 6d.

THE REFORMATION MOVEMENT IN IRELAND. By J. G. MacWalter. 3s. 6d.

WEITBRECHT'S PROTESTANT MISSIONS IN BENGAL, &c. Illustrated, 5s.

MOTIVES FOR MISSIONS: Six Lectures, delivered before the Church of England Young Men's Society, in 1852. 3s.

BISHOP OF VICTORIA'S VISIT TO LEWCHEW. 2s. 6d.

THE RAINBOW IN THE NORTH; a Short Account of the First Establishment of Christianity in Rupert's Land, by the Church Missionary Society. By Miss Tucker. Third Thousand, fcap., 3s. 6d.

PROGRESS OF THE REFORMATION IN THE WEST OF IRELAND. By the Earl of Roden. 2s. 6d.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON, and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher WILLIAM CURRY, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

April 14, 1853.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Gloir do Dhia an fna hárduibh, agus fíoghdáin air an dtalamh deaghdoil do na dáoinibh.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED THE MIDDLE OF EVERY MONTH, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. II.—No. 17. MAY, 1853. {Annual Subscription, 3s. 6d. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

Page.

Bishop Jewell's Challenge, A.D., 1560 49
Is the Protestant Bible a corrupt and mutilated version of the Holy Scriptures? 49
The Story of St. Epiphanius and the Veil 50
On the constrained Celibacy of the Clergy—Dialogue II. . . 50
On the Old Irish Clergy—No. I. 51
Talk of the Road—No. XII. 53
Auricular Confession—Part II. 53
The Success of our Paper.—Controversy in a Christian spirit . 55
CORRESPONDENCE—
On Purgatory, by Mr. E. Power 56
On the Disputed Sacraments, in reply to J. B. 56
On the Sacrifice of the Mass, by A. C. T. 57
Authorized Statements on the Nature and Kind of Punishments in Purgatory 58
Letter on Lady Day and Good Friday, by A. C. 58
Letter from Catholicus, in reply to Fontium Petitor . . . 58
Farming Operations for May 60

BISHOP JEWELL'S CHALLENGE.

THERE has been proclaimed to the world, now nearly for 300 years, and *never yet taken up*, and responded to, by the party whom it concerns, this challenge, to which we solicit the serious attention of our Roman Catholic correspondents—

"If any learned man of our adversaries, or if all learned men that be alive, be able to bring any one sufficient sentence, out of any old Catholic Doctor, or Father, or General Council, or Holy Scriptures, or any one example in the Primitive Church, whereby it may clearly and plainly be proved, *during the first six hundred years*,

"1st, That there was at any time any private masses in the world: or,

"2ndly, That there was any communion then administered unto the people under one kind: or,

"3rdly, That the people had their common prayer in a strange tongue that the people understood not: or,

"4thly, That the Bishop of Rome was then called an Universal Bishop, or Head of the Universal Church: or,

"5thly, That the people were then taught to believe that Christ's body is really, substantially, corporally, carnally, or naturally in the sacrament: or,

"6thly, That his body is, or may be, in a thousand places at one time: or,

"7thly, That the priest did then hold up the sacrament over his head: or,

"8thly, That the people did then fall down and worship it with godly honour: or,

"9thly, That the sacrament was then, or ought now to be, hanged up under a canopy: or,

"10thly, That in the sacrament, after the words of consecration, there remaineth only the accidents and shows, without the substance, of bread and wine: or,

"11thly, That then the priest divided the sacrament into three parts, and afterwards himself received alone: or,

"12thly, That whosoever had said that the sacrament was a figure, a pledge, a token, or a remembrance of Christ's body, had therefore been adjudged for an heretic: or,

"13thly, That it was lawful then to have thirty, twenty, fifteen, ten, or five masses said in the same Church in one day: or,

"14thly, That images were then set up in the Churches, to the intent the people might worship them: or,

"15thly, That the lay people were then forbidden to read the Word of God in their own tongue: or,

"16thly, That it was lawful then for the priest to pronounce the words of consecration closely, or in private to himself: or,

"17thly, That the priest had then authority to offer Christ unto his Father: or,

"18thly, To receive the sacrament and to communicate for another: or,

"19thly, To apply the virtue of Christ's death and passion to any man by the means of the mass: or,

"20thly, That it was then thought a sound doctrine to teach the people, that mass 'ex opere operato' (that is, for even that it is said and done) is able to remove any part of our sins: or,

"21stly, That any Christian man then called the sacrament his God: or,

"22ndly, That the people were then taught to believe that the body of Christ remaineth in the sacrament as long as the accidents of bread and wine remain there without corruption: or,

"23rdly, That a mouse, or any other worm or beast, may eat the body of Christ (for so some of our adversaries have said and taught): or,

"24thly, That when Christ said, 'Hoc est corpus meum,' the word '*hoc*' pointed not to the bread, but to an 'individuum vagum,' as some of them say: or

"25thly, That the accidents, or forms, or shows of bread and wine be the sacraments of Christ's body and blood, and not rather the very bread and wine itself: or,

"26thly, That the sacrament is a sign or token of the body of Christ, that lieth hidden underneath it: or,

"27thly, That ignorance is the mother and cause of true devotion:—Then, the conclusion is, I shall be content to yield and subscribe."—*Sermon preached by Bishop Jewell, on March* 31, 1560 (*being the second Sunday before Easter*). *Vide Jewell's Works, Parker Society Edition, vol. i., pp.* 20-21.

IS THE PROTESTANT BIBLE A CORRUPT AND MUTILATED VERSION OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES?

THE authorised or Protestant translation of the Holy Bible into the English language, is often accused by Roman Catholics as being corrupt and false. We need hardly give many proofs of such a charge; and most of our readers will probably recollect the case of the monk who, about a year ago, was convicted at the Mayo Assizes, for having publicly burnt a Protestant Bible in that county.* He said it was not God's Book, but the devil's book that he was burning. We should not have mentioned this case, but have treated it as the act of a fanatic, which all sober men would join in reprobating; but that, after the monk was tried and convicted for the offence, the act was loudly applauded in the *Tablet* newspaper, which is the favoured organ of Dr. Cullen, Dr. M'Hale, Dr. Cantwell, and most of the Roman Catholic bishops. We shall not here repeat what we have already given at length in a former number, but shall merely say, that the *Tablet* praises the monk for what he did, saying, that it was indeed the book of the devil which Father John burned, and not God's book.

Now, this does not very greatly concern the discussions carried on in the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, because, as our readers must have observed, the writers in this journal do generally quote Scripture from the Douay Bible. Still the question is one full of interest, and is deserving of careful examination, whether the Protestant Bible be indeed a mutilated and corrupt translation.

We propose to give this question a full and candid examination. The charge of "mutilation" is commonly founded on the authorized Bible not giving the *Apocryphal* books as Scripture given by inspiration of God. We shall consider that question at an early period. We propose now to inquire whether the authorized translation of those books which both Churches admit to be inspired Scripture, be indeed a corrupt or a fair and honest translation.

We must consider briefly the history of the Bible in English.

When Saxon was the language spoken in England, there were translations of the Bible in the Saxon tongue, which were freely permitted to be read by the people. That was before the Church of Rome had taken up some of the doctrines she now holds, and before she claimed all the power she now claims.

There were several English translations made before the year 1407, one of which was by Wickliffe, a priest of the English Church. A council, held at Oxford in that year, forbad Wickliffe's translations to be read, but allowed of others sanctioned by the provincial councils.

At the time of the Reformation all these translations had disappeared from public use. The clergy had taken no pains to keep up a supply of English Bibles, and no man could read a word of the Bible for himself, unless he knew Latin, except a very few, who still preserved some of the old copies in their families.

It was then the great object of all who wished to restore the purity of doctrine, and to weed out errors that had crept in, to produce an English translation of the Bible.

There were several editions of the Bible in English published by the Reformers, from the beginning of the Reformation to the year 1580—that is, in about 50 years.

The Roman Catholic translation of the New Testament only, was first published in the year 1582. The translators were Cardinal Allen, Dr. Gregory Martin, and others.

They say, in the preface, that they have the Old Testament lying by them for lack of means to publish the whole, so they publish only the New. This they did at the town of Rhemes, in Flanders, in the year above mentioned, 1582. The Old Testament, though then prepared, was not published until twenty years after. It was then published at Douay, from whence came the name of the Douay Bible. The New Testament was at first called the Rhemish Testament, from the town of Rhemes; but the translation was in fact all one, and when both Old and New were published together, the whole was called the Douay Bible.

The translators have told us, in the preface of that first Rhemish Testament, the reason of their making this translation—"Which translation we do not, for all that publish upon erroneous opinion of necessity, that the Holy Scripture should always be in our mother tongue . . or that we generally and absolutely deemed it more convenient in itself, and more agreeable to God's Word and honour, or edification of the faithful, to have them turned into vulgar tongues, than to be kept and studied only in the ecclesiastical or learned languages. *Not for these, nor any such like causes*, do we translate this Sacred Book; but upon special consideration of the present time, state, and condition of our country, unto which divers things are either necessary or profitable, or medicinable now, that *otherwise, in the peace of the Church*, were neither much requisite nor, perchance, *wholly tolerable*."

So it seems they thought it would have been better if they could have gone on without any English translation at all. If the Church could have been kept *in peace* (that is, without any searching of the Scriptures at all), then it would *not* have been "wholly tolerable" to have published even the Douay translation of the Bible.

But they go on to say that there is no way of meeting false translations of the Scriptures but by giving true ones, "which causeth the Holy Church *not to forbid utterly* any Catholic translation." So it seems that, only for the necessity of giving a true translation, in order to meet false ones, the Church of Rome might, perhaps, have "forbid utterly" a Catholic translation. They go on to speak with great approbation of "the order which was taken by the deputies of the late famous Council of Trent, and *confirmed by supreme authority*, that the Holy Scriptures, though truly and Catholicly translated into vulgar tongues, yet may not be indifferently read of all men, *nor of any other* than such as have express licence thereunto of their lawful ordinaries or bishops." Although they lament that this rule, "in these days of ours, cannot be so precisely observed as in other times and places *where there is more due respect* of the Church's authority, rule, and discipline," they go on to praise the good old times, when Bibles were only "in libraries, monasteries, colleges, churches, in bishops, priests, and some other devout and *principal* laymen's houses and hands;" and, to show the great advantage of that state of things, they say—"The poor ploughman could then, in labouring the ground, sing the hyms and psalms, either in known or unknown languages, as they heard them in the Holy Church, though they could *neither read*, NOR KNOW THE SENSE, MEANING, AND MYSTERIES OF THE SAME."

They evidently thought it would have been a fine thing if the poor ploughmen could have gone on this way for ever, repeating holy words like parrots, without knowing what they meant; for they go on to say—"The wise will not here regard what some wilful

* See 1st Vol. CATHOLIC LAYMAN, p. 41.

People do mutter, that the Scriptures are made for all men, and that it is of envy that the priests do keep the holy book from them. . . . . No, no; *the Church* DOTH IT to keep them from blind, ignorant presumption, and from that which the Apostle calleth knowledge, falsely so called; and not to debar them from the true knowledge of Christ."

It was not, therefore, from any desire that the people should be able to read God's Word that the Douay translation was made. It was simply because that was the only way to keep the people from reading the Protestant translations.

Of those translations, the Douay translators say, in this preface—"The Protestants . . . . have so abused the people, and many other in the world not unwise, that by their false translations they have, instead of God's law and testament, and for Christ's written will and word, given their own wicked writing and phantasies;" and they also charge them with "adding whole sentences, proper to their sect, into their psalms in metre, even into the very creed in rhyme, all which the poor deceived people say and sing, as though they were God's own Word, being, indeed, through such sacrilegious treachery, made the devil's word." So the poor monk, who was found guilty a few months ago of burning the Authorized Version, as being "the devil's word," was not guilty of an invention of his own, but was only following the Douay translators.

It is true, the Douay translators did not speak in that preface of the present Authorised Version, which was not published, as it now is, until the year 1610. They spoke of the former Protestant translations made before the year 1580.

We shall state in our next number how far the present authorized translation agrees with, and differs from, those former Protestant translations; and we shall continue the history of the Douay translation, and the changes that have since been made in it.

In the meantime, we ask our Roman Catholic readers, who are in the habit of referring to the Douay Bible, when reading our discussions, to observe this fact, that if it had not been for the Protestant translations, they would never have had the Douay translation of the Bible into English—they would never have been able to read a word of the Bible at all. It is clear that only for what is thus indecently called "the Devil's book," their Church would have been well content to leave them for ever without "God's Book." Thus the Protestant translations have done at least this much good, that they have been the means of getting for Roman Catholics the Douay translation of the Scriptures into their own tongue. This, at least, is a merit that should not be denied or forgotten, unless we will say, what we hope none of our readers will say, that it would have been better if the Douay translation itself had never been made, but that all who can speak English only should have been for ever debarred from reading the word of God.

THE STORY OF ST. EPIPHANIUS AND THE VEIL.

Having had occasion, in another column, page 56, to quote the letter of St. Epiphanius to John of Jerusalem, we give here, according to our promise, an extract, which will explain some of the circumstances which gave rise to the letter. "I heard that some are murmuring against me, for the following reason:—When we were going together, to the holy place, which is called Bethel, that I might there hold a service with you, according to the ecclesiastical custom, and when I had come to the village called Anablatha, I saw, as I was passing by, a light burning there; so I asked what place it was, and, being told that it was a church, I entered in, to pray there; and I found there a veil, hanging on the doors of the same church, dyed and painted, and having the likeness of Christ, I believe, or of some saint or other, for I don't exactly remember whose likeness it was. So, when I saw this—the likeness of a man hanging in the church of Christ, contrary to the authority of the Scriptures—I tore it, and I gave directions to the keepers of the place, to roll up some poor dead person in it, and bury him in it. But they murmured against me, and said, 'If you wished to tear our veil, it would be only right that you should give us another in exchange for it. So, when I heard this, I acknowledged that it was reasonable, and promised that I would give it, and would send one forthwith. Some delay, however, has taken place, because I was anxious to send a very good veil, instead of it, for I thought I ought to send one from Cyprus [his own diocese]; but now I send the best veil I could find, and I beg you will give directions, to the priests of that place, to take it from bearer, and will give orders that no veils of that kind, which are contrary to our religion, should henceforth be hung up in the church of Christ, for it becomes you to be more careful to take away this cause of offence, which is unworthy of the church of Christ, and of the people who have been committed to you."

We have thought this story worth translating because of the important light which it throws on the practice of the Church towards the end of the fourth century. We have here St. Epiphanius, one of the leading Bishops of the time, going into a church, and seeing there an innocent picture of Christ, or of a saint hanging up. It does not appear that any adoration was being offered to the picture, or that any other abuse was connected with it—the picture was there, that was all. St. Epiphanius does not examine whose picture it was; he considers it contrary to the authority of Scripture to have a picture there at all; he tears it, and orders a dead person to be buried in it. Well, then, the attendants of the church murmur at him. No doubt they do, one might say. No doubt, they say—"You sacrilegious wretch, who have dared to tear this holy picture, do you think we will be partakers in your vile impiety, or that we will employ the likeness of this blessed saint in the mean use you tell us to apply it to." Not so; the attendants of the church say no such thing. They merely say—"Will not your reverence pay us the price of the canvas you have spoiled."

Further, St. Epiphanius has so little notion that he has done anything wrong, that he sends a full account of his performances to a bishop who was not on the best possible terms with him, whom he was himself, in the very same letter, rating sharply for his too great leaning to the Origenist heretics, and who, one would think, would be glad of the opportunity of a countercharge against Epiphanius. And yet no such charge is made, and St. Epiphanius is not accused of the least irreverence in his conduct, which a present of a new veil amply atones for.

Finally, St. Jerome gets a copy of St. Epiphanius's letter, and in place of discreetly concealing the impiety of his friend, he makes a Latin translation of the letter, and hands down this anecdote of St. Epiphanius to perpetual memory.

Verily, the Catholic Church, at the end of the fourth century, had very different usages from the Church calling itself exclusively Catholic in our day. If St. Epiphanius could now be introduced into a Protestant church and a Roman Catholic chapel, the latter ornamented with handsome paintings of Christ and the Virgin, and perhaps, other saints—and that not merely for historical use, but bowed down to by the people—which do you think St. Epiphanius would take for the *old* Church?

DIALOGUE ON THE CONSTRAINED CELIBACY IN THE CHURCH OF ROME.

NO. II.

Eustachio—The saints of the ancient Church praised virginity and continency to the skies, and were not satisfied with words only. How many holy bishops were there, in fact, who, abstaining from marriage, lived holily in celibacy?

Salviano—Let all due praise be given, then, to virginity. Continency is a great virtue. Tertullian calls it the flower of customs, an honour to the body, the ornament of the sexes, the foundation of holiness, &c. And Cyprian calls chastity the ornament of the noble, the exaltation of the humble, the comfort of the sad, the embellishment of the deformed. Be it so then; it is true that these holy bishops did not marry, but it is no less true that they did not speak ill of marriage, nor condemn those who were married. On the contrary, the great Bishop of Hippo (St. Augustine) confutes the error of St. Jerome, who had allowed reproachful words to escape him concerning a state ordained by God. And Augustine selects this opportunity to show, in various ways, the utility of marriage. You say that there were many bishops who lived holily in celibacy, and we answer you that we can count up many who lived laudably in matrimony. Spiridion was father of St. Basil, and father-in-law of St. Gregory Nazianzen. In the family of Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, the bishopric was preserved, and had descended from father to son for eight turns, as Polycrates himself says, in writing to Victor, Bishop of Rome—"Seven of my ancestors were bishops in succession; I am the eighth." What shall we say, too, of Cheremon, Bishop of Egypt, who, with his aged wife and with many others of the faithful, was driven into exile and died in a mountain of Arabia? Clement, of Alexandria, exclaims concerning this—"Such was the marriage of the blessed." Hilary, a bishop, most celebrated for learning and for holiness, had a wife and children, of whom it is written that his family was no damage to him, nor was his wife, who was united to him in lawful marriage any hindrance to his ministry. Notwithstanding these examples, if a priest or a friar takes a wife, you look upon him as profane, you load him with abuse as the vilest man in the world. It was not so, however, my friend, in the primitive times of the Church of Jesus Christ. I have named to you many persons distinguished for holiness and for doctrine, who lived in lawful marriage. Now, we cannot find anywhere that those who lived in celibacy condemned or defamed those holy persons as you do in these days. But not only were the saints whom I have named hitherto married, but many of your popes themselves were sons of priests and begotten in lawful matrimony. We may instance, amongst many others—Boniface the First, Felix the Third, Agapetus the First, Adrian the Second, Agapetus the Second. Gratian, Platina and others bear witness to this. In fine, are there not many councils who make mention of the wives and children of bishops?

Eustachie—True, indeed; but there are, on the other hand, many other councils in which the contrary was ordained.

Salviano—You cannot bring forward even one, especially of the four universal and truly catholic councils. The devil, as the enemy of the Divine ordinances, did not fail, it is true, to suggest to many the prohibition of holy matrimony, in order that he might introduce into the Church of Jesus Christ fornications and adulteries. There rose up some in the first Council of Nice who were of opinion that marriage should be forbidden to the clergy; but St. Paphnutius advised the very opposite. Hear what Socrates says on this subject—"Some bishops wished to introduce a new law into the Church, by imposing it upon bishops, priests, and deacons not to live with the wives whom they had taken when they were laymen. Paphnutius, rising up among them, cried out, that "such a heavy yoke should not be put upon the most holy men, since marriage was honourable in all," &c. Socrates says that Paphnutius considered chastity to be living with a lawful wife. All the assembly consented to his opinion, and silence was imposed about the controversy, each man being left at liberty to abstain or not from living with his own wife. You may read to this effect Sozomen, Gelasius, Cyzicenus, Nicephorus, Cassiodorus, and others. In the fifth of the Apostolic Canons, these remarkable words are to be found—"A bishop, priest, or deacon shall not put away his wife *under pretence of religion*. If he sends her away, let him be separated from the communion; and if he perseveres, let him be deposed." Whether these canons be those of the Apostles or not, let those declare who boast of them. The Council of Gangra excommunicates those who condemn married priests, and in the fourth canon expresses itself as follows—"If any one thinks that a married priest cannot, *because of his marriage*, exercise his ministry, and abstains *on this account* from communion with him, let him be anathema." Moreover, the Trullan Council, A.D. 692, ordained (contrary to the Church of Rome) that whoever, in spite of the Apostolic Canons, should dare to prohibit commerce or living with a lawful wife, should be excommunicated; and this canon is expressed as well with regard to the clergy as to secular persons.

Eustachio—If the councils just now named by you grant marriage to ecclesiastics, there are, however, many others which are of our opinion, and forbid the clergy to marry and to have children. We may say, then, as it is commonly said—here is altar against altar, council against council; on which are we to pin our faith?

Salviano—You cannot err if you follow the Word of God and the practice of the saints of the Old and New Testaments. Who can ever take away from you that which God granted to the patriarchs, the prophets, the apostles, and the disciples? Follow the rule of those councils which follow the Word of God. St. Jerome, in his commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, says—"The doctrine of the Holy Spirit is that which is declared in the canonical books, against which, if councils ordain anything, it is altogether wicked." But let us have recourse to your own practice. Since there is to be found in some acts of the councils a discordant opinion, we should hold to the sentence of that council the authority of which is the best founded and the most ancient. Do you wish to know, for instance, if images ought to be venerated? If you look to the councils you will find yourself somewhat puzzled—in fact, the Council of Elvira ordains that there should not be pictures in the Church. The Councils of Constantinople ordain the same thing, and the Council of Frankfort desires that images should not be venerated. But then, on the other hand, the second Council of Nice, the Roman and the Trent Councils, desire that images should be venerated. Well, then, it is very easy to know which of these councils have ordained the truth. He who is sincere will follow the first, since they follow in their decrees the Word of God and the practice of the ancient Church. He will do this the rather since, with regard to the matter about which we are in controversy, the councils adopted by your party, in favour of the celibacy of the clergy, are not in general opposed to those adopted by us nor are they in your favour.

Eustachio—What then? Is not the Council of Elvira on our side, which forbids, in one of its canons, the very same thing which our popes now prohibit? Here it is, word for word—"It pleases us altogether to command bishops, priests, deacons, and subdeacons to abstain from their wives and not to beget children." Can anything be clearer?

Salviano—No, dear friend; this canon is not at all in your favour, if you only quote the whole of it, as it stands in the volumes of the councils—"to bishops, priests, deacons, and subdeacons, *positis in ministerio*, while they are exercising their ministry." Thence it is clear that it was enjoined by the fathers on the clergy to abstain from their wives only while they were ministering or preparing for sacred duties. This is the true sense of many canons which you think favourable to celibacy. But how, I pray you, can canons of this sort be in your favour? How in the world do these canons forbid marriage to the clergy whilst they actually suppose that they are married already, and only command them to abstain from all commerce with their wives whilst they are preparing for sacred offices? To command the clergy to abstain from their wives when

they were to officiate, is that the same thing as forbidding them to marry? To reason in such a manner is the same as to say—The priests of the Old Testament, when they were to sacrifice or perform any other function in the Temple, were not to come near their wives, therefore they were forbidden to marry. Be candid, my friend. Does not such a mode of reasoning appear to you ridiculous?

Eustachio.—This remark of yours is curious. Many obscure things may thus be made clear, by showing the agreement of those canons which seem to disagree. Prove to me now, however, that the councils really had this meaning when they ordered the clergy to abstain from their wives, &c.

Salviano.—Yes, such was the meaning of various councils, and they cannot be understood otherwise. We must thus understand the second canon of the second Council of Carthage, which is expressed in this manner—"It is pleasing to all that the bishops, priests, and deacons—those, in fine, who administer the sacraments—that they should observe chastity, and abstain, also, from their wives." To the same effect is the 8th canon of Gratian, which says—"Having heard of the incontinency of some of the clergy, though it be with their own wives, it is decreed that the bishops, priests, and deacons, *according to their own statutes*, should abstain from their wives." Therefore, according to these canons the clergy might have wives, provided they abstained from them according to their own statutes. What is the meaning of this? To say the truth, in reading these words—"*Secundum propria statuta*"—I myself did not know well, at first sight, what they meant. I observed, however, that in some canons, instead of the words above quoted, it was written, *in propriis terminis.*" These canons mean, therefore, that the clergy should abstain from their wives whenever it came to their turn to perform ecclesiastical duties. Balsamo explains the fact so clearly as to take away every difficulty. In the fourth canon of the same council he says—"The synod does not forbid commerce with them except in their own terms—that is, on the days appointed for the turn of each of them." "*Nisi in propriis terminis—id est, in præstitutis unius cujusque vicis diebus.*" We may add, also, the Trullan Council, 13th canon, which orders "the sub-deacons, deacons, and priests who administer the sacraments to abstain also from their wives *in their own terms*, knowing that there is a time for everything, especially for fasting and prayer; therefore, it is suitable for those who assist at the altars when they begin the sacred functions to be continent in all things."

Eustachio—But does the Greek Church also understand it thus?

Salviano—The Greek Church has better views than the Latin upon this point. To command priests to abstain from their wives when they were to preach the Holy Gospel, or to administer the sacraments, is quite a different thing from taking away their wives by forbidding them to marry according to an express law. The decrees of the above named councils are Catholic and praiseworthy. If, according to the doctrine of St. Paul, the husband should separate from his wife for a time, to give himself to fasting and prayer, why should not the minister leave his wife at the time when he is to fulfil the duties of his ministry? But your ordinances, on the contrary, are opposed to the Word of God, and to the practice of the Church of both testaments, and very far from being truly catholic, they may be considered quite heretical. As they derive their origin, moreover, from the impure sources of the Tatians, Siricians, and other heretics, so they cover all Christendom with impurity. Ah, if your Church had followed the doctrine of Jesus Christ as their pole-star, they would not have struck upon such rocks; they would not have been enchanted by the Siricians and the Callistians, as by so many Syrens; they would not have given up the valuable liberty granted to them by God himself, nor would they in fine, have cast up so many snares upon the necks of men to drag them into the most filthy lusts, and thence into eternal perdition.

Eustachio—In saying that our Church has not followed the doctrine of Jesus Christ, nor the practice of the Churches of the Old and New Testaments, you mean to insinuate that the law enacted against the marriage of ecclesiastics is quite a new thing; and you do this, perhaps, to make it odious to our young priests; but you ought to know that it dates many centuries back, and that for many ages it has been received by our Church and practised by her ministers.

Salviano—Your law is not only a new thing, but I must tell you, moreover, that it is not a law at all, since a rule is no rule if it be not according to the Holy Gospel. Admitting that your law has been introduced into your Church as long ago as you please, by artifice and trickery, still it is new for all that. We have marriage granted by God to the patriarchs, the prophets, the apostles, and the pastors, during the course of many ages, and this marriage was taken away by you in the ages that came after. This alone would be sufficient to prove that the celibacy of priests is quite a new thing; but I am not satisfied with this, and will prove it to you more fully at our next meeting. At present farewell.

(To be continued)

THE OLD IRISH CLERGY.—No. I.

The following is one of the odd stories contained in that ancient and sufficiently curious compilation, the *Tripartite Life of St. Patrick*. That we do not err in styling it *ancient*, appears from the fact, noticed by Mr. Petrie, in his learned essay on the Round Towers, &c., of Ireland, p. 158, that "no writer, however sceptical, has ever ventured to assign it to a later period than the tenth century." Of the nature of its contents this story furnishes a not altogether uninteresting specimen:—

"Another time this holy man took his journey from Tarah to Usney Hill, with a view to building a Church there. But in this he met with opposition from the two sons of Niall, and brothers of King Laogaire, Fiach and Enda: to whom the man of God at first spake civilly, promising them that if they would allow the Church to be erected in honour of God, in that lovely spot, the moderators and rectors of that Church should be chosen from among their descendants. But when they not only refused to give heed to his preaching, and the benevolent proposal he made them, but were even taking steps to have him laid hands on, and removed by force from the place; then began the man of God, in righteous vengeance for such ill-usage, to let fly the dart of malediction against them and their posterity. And when, opening his mouth for this end, he had given utterance to the word *Cursed*, thereupon his disciple, S. Seachlin, taking out of his mouth the sentence he had commenced, completed it by adding the words, *be the stones of Usney Hill*. Well pleased was the man of God with the dutiful sympathy of his disciple, and the prayer that he expressed: and to the sentence thus pronounced he gave accordingly his ratification. Wonderful to tell, from that day to this, those stones, as though still subject to the influence of that curse, are found utterly unserviceable for building, or any other human purpose. So that it has become a proverbial expression, whenever stone, or other material, answers not the purpose for which it may be designed, to say—'*'Tis a stone from Usney Hill.*'"

What a ready-witted and good-natured Irishman was S. Seachlin, who seeing his master tempted to indulge in the naughty habit of cursing his enemies, and bethinking himself, perhaps, that such was not the kind of prayers that St. Paul would have made for kings, and for all that are in authority (1 Tim. ii. 1, 4), at once administered such a respectful rebuke as came gracefully from a disciple, and, at the same time, interrupted the unholy prayer, and caused the malediction to turn aside from Fiach and Enda, and their unoffending posterity, to spend its poison on the senseless stones, just as the conductor, which diverts the lightning flash from doing injury to human life, and sends its fury away to consume itself in the bowels of the earth.

But no more about this at present. It is for a different purpose that we have quoted the story above told, our object being rather to direct the reader's attention to the terms of the agreement which Patrick proposed making with Fiach and Enda, in case they would allow him to build the Church at Usney Hill, as he desired to do. *The Church was to become the property of their family*, so as that none but their descendants should be its *rectors* or *moderators*. This kind of ecclesiastical arrangement, by which particular churches became the property of particular families, came afterwards into very general use in Ireland; and ecclesiastical benefices and offices descended from one member of a family to another, much in the same way as did secular landed property, according to the old Irish law or custom, known by the name of *Tanistry*.

To explain the custom intended by this term for such readers as may not already be acquainted with it, we may remark, that according to it, on the death of any chief Lord or Captain among the Irish, there was usually elected in his stead, not the eldest son, nor any of the children of the lord deceased, but the next to him of blood that was eldest and worthiest of the office, in the estimation of the tribe; as commonly the next brother, or the next cousin, and so forth: and then, next to the one so chosen for chief, another similarly related to him was chosen to be *Tanist*, to succeed to the chieftainry, in case he should survive the one appointed to it. This mode of succession was considered to have an advantage over that of strict lineal descent from father to son, as affording a better protection to the lands and other rights of the tribe, which might be more easily encroached on if the father were to die leaving a minor to succeed to his office, during whose minority the neighbouring lords, and more especially the English, might seize their opportunity for invading the defenceless inheritance; whereas, by the Irish custom, if the chieftain fell in battle, his Tanist, already known, and one of years and ability, was ready to step immediately into his place. That the son should, however, in many instances, become the successor, though not as a matter of course, nor according to general rule, was natural enough.—*See Spenser's View of the State of Ireland*, Dublin Edn. of 1809, pp. 10, 12.

Accordingly we find mention, in the Irish Annals, of *Tanist Abbots*, as well as of the Secular Tanists, as of "Cormac, Tanist Abbot of Clonmacnoise," at A.D. 887 of the *Four Masters*; "Dungal, son of Gorman, Tanist Abbot of Clonmacnoise," at A.D. 1070, *ib.*; "Casey, son of Fergus, Tanist Abbot of Armagh," at A.D. 892, of the same annals; and similar entries recur in various other places.

And that the *Tanist* of an ecclesiastical benefice was not merely a name given to the next successor expectant, canonically appointed, by election or otherwise, according to regular Church law, as upheld in other countries, might be evident even from this, that according to such law the successor to a benefice could not generally be appointed until the holder of it were deceased; so that the holder, while alive, could have no Tanist. But the same thing is still more apparent from examining, as we shall do presently, into the successions of officers connected with particular ecclesiastical establishments, and observing how the offices which they held were handed successively from one relative to another in the same tribe, through a course of many generations.

The offices which we have here particularly in view were those of *abbot*, or coarb, and *erenach*, or (according to the Irish spelling of the word) *archinneach*; the former implying the chief place of command and influence in the old ecclesiastical corporations of Ireland; the latter, the holding of the temporalities belonging to the establishment. The *bishop's* office, among the ancient Irish, was attended with less of authority and emolument, although otherwise held in much veneration, and regarded as proper to be occupied only by men of eminent spiritual attainments.

In illustration of the remarks above advanced, we shall exhibit, from the Ancient Irish Annals, various instances in which the same ecclesiastical office, that had been held by a father, descended in course of time to his son (the son not always or naturally being the next successor, but coming in after, perhaps, an uncle, a cousin, &c.), or in which different ecclesiastical offices, about the same place (or in places having some particular connection with one another), came to be filled, from generation to generation, by members in lineal descent of the same family.

The most remarkable case of this kind which occurs in our ancient Annals appears to be that of the Mac Connemoghts (or more properly Mac Chuinn-na-mochts), of Clonmacnoise, whose history, so far as we are particularly acquainted or concerned with it, commences in the middle of the eight century, and, from that period onwards, occupies for three centuries and a half a distinguished and interesting place in the ecclesiastical records of Ireland. In tracing the history in question we shall, for the satisfaction of our readers (many of whom, it is to be hoped, can read Irish well), give the passages quoted from the Irish Annals in the original language, with a correct translation into English, in parallel columns. The extracts underneath are all from the "Four Masters," in whose work, by a reference to the proper year, each of them may easily be found:—

A. C. 753. Gorman, coarb of Mochta of Louth, died at Clonmacnoise, on his pilgrimage; and it was he that was father of *Torbach*, coarb of Patrick [*i.e.*, Prelate of Armagh].

A. C. 807 [*recte* 812]. Torbach, mac Gormain, scribhnidh, leighinn, 7 abb Aenda Macha dirighe [decc]. Do Cheneil Torbaigh, i. O Ceallaigh Breagh, 7 no ba dibhrighe Conn na mbocht no bai hi cCluain mic Nois, 7 ar aire atbeirtei Conn na mbocht frit, ar a nidh do bochtaibh no biatadh do gner

A.C. 807 [properly 812]. Torbach, son of *Gorman*, scribe, lector, and Abbot of Armagh was he, died. Of the kindred of Torbach, *i.e.*—The O'Kelly Breagh [tribe] and of these was [also] Conn-na-mbocht, who was at Clonmacnoise, and received the name of Conn-na-mbocht [*Conn of the paupers*], from the number of paupers he constantl supported.

A. C. 834. Aodagan, mac Torbaig, abb Lucċmaiġ, dēcc ina aiłechṫiġ hi cCluain mic Nōis. Egan, mac Aedagain, do ainṫiġe hi cCluain mic Nōis, conad uada do ċinṫi Mhelc Cuinn na mbocht innte.

A. C. 845. Egan i. anġcoiṁe, mac Aedagain, mic Torbaig, ō Cluain mic Nōis, dēcc.

A. C. 863. Luchairḃēn, i. athair Egeartaig, mac Egain, mic Aedagain, mic Torbaig, scribhnid, 7 anġcoiṁe, hi cCluain mic Nōis, dēcc.

A. C. 893. Egṡtach, airchinnech ecc, airiṙi bicce, athair Aenacain 7 Dúnadaig-dēg.

A. C. 898. Caenċomṁac Inṙi Endoiṁ, epscop, 7 abb Luġmaiḋ, aitti Aenacain, mic Ecclṡtaig, 7 Dúnadaig, mic Eccertaig ō ttat Uí Chuinn na mbocht, dēg an tṁeaṙ la ṙēṫ Iuil.

A. C. 947. Oenacan, mac Ecclṡtaig, airchinnech Eccailṙi bicce hi cCluain mic Nōis, epscop 7 ōg Isdan, bṙāṫaiṙṙḋe Dúnadhaig, mic Eccartaigh, do Mhaġdonnaib Mhuiġen a ċenēl, 7 a ēcc.

A. C. 953. Dunadac, mac Ecclṡtaig, epscop Cluana mic Nōis, [dēcc.]

A. C. 1005. Dunchad, mac Dunadaiġ, ṙuileiġind Cluana mic Nōis, 7 a hanġcoiṁe iaṙṙin, cinnd a ṙiaġla, 7 a seanċaiṙ, dēcc. Sin ṙil Cuinn na mbocht eiṙḋe.

A. C. 1022. Joseph, mac Dunchada, anmċaṙa Cluana mic Nōis, dēcc. Athair Coinn na mbocht eiṙḋe.

A. C. 1031. Conn na mBocht, cinn Celeḃ ḋē, 7 ancoiṙi, Cluana mic Nōis, do ċēd tionōl aiṙġe do bocṫaiḃ Cluana i nIṙeal Chiaṙain, 7 ro ebhaiṙ ṙiche bō uaiḋ ṙēin innti.

A. C. 1056. Mhaelṙinnēn, mac Cuinn na mbocht, athair Chormaic, comarba Chiaran, dēg, i. Mhaelṙinnen, mac Cuinn, mic Joseph, mic Donnchada, mic Dunadaig, mic Eicceartaig, mic Luachain, mic Egain, mic Aedagain, mic Torbaig, mic Gormain, do Ui Ceallaig Bṙeag.

A. C. 1059. Conn na mBocht, ollam 7 airdeachar Cluana mic Nōis, dēcc ian sin dataig.

A. C. 1067. Celechair Mhaġdonnach epscop Cluana mic Nois, do ēcc. Do Ui Ceallaiġ Bṙiġ a ċenēl.

A. C. 1079. Mhaelċiaran, mac Cuinn na mBocht, comarba Ciaran, do ēcc. Ba eiṙḋe olldam 7 airmitiu Cluana ina ṙēimṙ.

A.C. 1089. Iṙeall Ciaran do ċeandach ar ḋiṙi do Corbmac mac Cuinn na mBocht ō Ua Flaiṫēin, 7 ō Dhomnall mac Flainn Ui Mhaelṙechlainn ō ṙiġ Mhide.

A. C. 1103. Corbmac mac Cuinn na mBocht, tanaiṙṙi abbaiḋ Cluana mic Nōis, 7 ṙin ṙoṁa raiḃḃi, dēcc.

A. C. 1104. Leṫṙann damliacc Cluana mic Nōis do ṙorbaḋ la Flaiṫḃertaċ Ua Loingsiġ ian na tinnṙcetal la Corbmac mac Cuinn na mBocht.

A. C. 1134. Celeaċair, mac Corbmaic Ui Chuinn na mBocht, ṙnuiṁ ṙḟinṙin cinn comainle, 7 tobar eccna, ṙḟiṫaṙa, cinn eniġ 7 comeda ṙiaġla Cluana mic Nois, dēcc, &c.

A.C. 834. Egan, son of *Torbach*, Abbot of Louth, died on his pilgrimage at Clonmacnoise. Owen, son to Egan, remained at Clonmacnoise; and from him descended the MacConnemoghts there.

A.C. 845. Owen—*i.e.*, the anchorite—son of *Egan*, son of Torbach of Clonmacnoise, died.

A.C. 863. Luchairen, *i.e.*, the father of *Egertach*, son of *Owen*, son of Egan, son of Torbach, scribe, and anchorite at Clonmacnoise, died.

A.C. 893. Egertach, erenach of the Little Church [at Clonmacnoise], and father to Enacan and *Donoghue*, died.

A.C. 898. Kenecorach of Inisenagh [in Lough Ree, near Lanesborough], bishop, and Abbot of Louth, tutor to Enacan, son of Egertach, and to Donoghue, son of Egertach, from whom are descended the Connemoght family, died on the 23rd day of July.

A.C. 947. Enacan, son of Egertach, Erenach of the Little Church at Clonmacnoise, bishop, and pure virgin (he was brother to Donoghue, son of Egertach), of the tribe of Morna-Moyne, died.

A.C. 953. Donoghue, son of *Egertach*, Bishop of Clonmacnoise [died].

A.C. 1005. Donogh, son of *Donoghue*, lector of Clonmacnoise, and its anchorite afterwards, head of its rule [or, *discipline*], and of its historical department, died. He was an ancestor of the Connemoghts.

A.C. 1022. Joseph, son of Donogh, anmchara [*i.e.*, *spiritual adviser*, or *confessor*] of Clonmacnoise, died. He was the father of Conn-na-mbocht.

A.C. 1031. Conn-na-mbocht, head of the Culdees, and anchorite of Clonmacnoise, first invited a party of the poor of Clon [*i.e.*, Clonmacnoise] at Iseal Kiaran, [*i.e.*, *St. Kiaran's low* establishment, or hospital, at Clonmacnoise,] and presented them with twenty of his own cows.

A.C. 1056. Maelfinnen *Mac* [or, *Son* of] *Connemoght*, (father of *Cormac*,) coarb of Kiaran, [*i.e.*, Abbot of Clonmacnoise,] died—*i.e.*, Maelfinnen, son of Conn, son of Joseph, son of Donogh, son of Donoghue, son of Egertach, son of Luachan, son of Owen, son of Egan, son of Torbach, son of Gorman, of the O'Kelly Breagh [tribe.]

A.C. 1059. *Conn-na-mbocht*, the glory and honour of Clonmacnoise, died, after having attained to a great age.

A.C. 1067. Kelcher of Morna, bishop of Clonmacnoise, died. He was of the O'Kelly Breagh [tribe].

A.C. 1079. *Maelkiaran Mac Connemoght*, coarb of Kiaran [*i.e.*, Abbot of Clonmacnoise,] died. He was the glory and veneration of Clon [macnoise] in his time.

A.C. 1089. Iseal-Kiarain, [*i.e.*, St. Kiaran's Hospital, at Clonmacnoise] was purchased for ever by *Cormac mac Connemocht*, from Ua Flaihen, [Abbot of Clonmacnoise. *See* 4 *M.* A.D. 1100] and from Donnell (son of Flann) O'Melaghlin, king of Meath.

A.C. 1103. Cormac Mac Connemocht, Tanist, Abbot of Clonmacnoise, and a prosperous and affluent man, died.

A.C. 1104. The shingles of one-half of the stone Church of Clonmacnoise, were finished by Flaherty O'Linsby, [Abbot of Clonmacnoise. *See* 4 *M.* A.D. 1108,] the work having been begun by *Cormac* Mac Connemoght.

A.C. 1134. Kelcher, son of *Cormac* Ua Cuinn-na-mbocht, learned senior, head of the counsel, fountain of the wisdom and historic lore, and head [also] of the hospitality and observance of the rule, of Clonmacnoise, died, &c.

The circumstances brought before our notice in the passages now cited are sufficiently curious and worthy of our attention. The members of *the O'Kelly Breagh tribe of Morna-Moyne*, managed, it must be admitted, to secure for themselves a pretty good share of the ecclesiastical honours and emoluments which were going at Clonmacnoise; and it is worth while to observe what a number of generations of them attained, in direct lineal succession, to those high promotions in the Church which they enjoyed there and elsewhere. With this object in view, let us retrace our steps a little. We are informed, then, in what precedes, of the following facts:—

1—That *Gorman*, *Abbot* of Louth, died in A.D. 753, at Clonmacnoise.

2—*Torbach*, son of this Gorman, became *abbot* of Armagh, and is also entered as *Archbishop* or primate, in the list of successors of St. Patrick, as usually received, on the authority of the Psalter of Cashel. Torbach died, it seems, in 812.

3—*Egan*, son of Torbach, became *Abbot* of Louth; and died at Clonmacnoise in A.D. 834.

4—*Owen*, son of Egan, *anchorite* of Clonmacnoise, died A.D. 845.

5—*Luchairen*, or Luachan, son of Owen, *anchorite*, &c., of Clonmacnoise, died A.D. 863.

6—*Egertach*, son of Luchairen, *Erenach* of the Little Church, Clonmacnoise, died A.D. 893. He was the father of Enacan and Donoghue, the former of whom succeeded him as Erenach, but left no children, as he died unmarried, for which reason the Four Masters give him the title of "pure virgin." The family succession was, however, continued in the line of descendants of his brother Donoghue.

7—*Donoghue*, son of Egertach, *Bishop* of Clonmacnoise, died A.D. 953.

8—*Donogh*, son to Bishop Donoghue, became *lector* or tutor, and subsequently *anchorite* of Clonmacnoise. He is also styled "*head of its rule and history*," implying that he was zealous in attending to the charge of maintaining the discipline of the institution, and that he was the most learned of its professors in the department of history and antiquities. He died A.D. 1005.

9—*Joseph*, son of Donogh, was *anmchara* (*i. e.*, literally, "soul-friend"), of Clonmacnoise, and died A.D. 1022. The word *anmchara* Dr. O'Donovan translates in some places "*confessor*," and elsewhere "*spiritual adviser*." Whichever be the most proper term, or if the meaning be anything at all like that implied by either, the holder of the office must, of course, have been a clergyman.

10—*Conn-na-mbocht*, son of Joseph, was *Head of the Culdees* of Clonmacnoise (*i. e.*, *prior*, probably of the place) and an *anchorite*. He was a most eminent and famous ecclesiastic, regarded as "*the glory and dignity*" of Clonmacnoise, and his descendants the Mac Chuinn-na-mbocht added by their personal qualifications to the dignity derived from their illustrious progenitor. The family name borrowed from him is, according to the most correct Irish orthography, that just given above; but they are also called Mac-Cuinn-na-mbochts, Mac Connembochts, or MacConnemoghts. The English reader may, for facility of reading, adopt, if he think fit, the form Mac Connemot, which will be sufficiently near the original for general use. Conn himself, or Conn-na-mbocht, died in A.D. 1059.

11—*Maelfinnen*, son of Conn-na-mBocht, and *Abbot* of Clonmacnoise, died in 1056. The statement of the Annals about this is, however, a little ambiguous. The same Mac Cuin-na-mBocht, becoming now a general surname of the family, might be applied to Maelfinnen, even though he were *grandson*, instead of *son*, of Conn-na-mbocht. That he was, however, *son*, seems from the dates most probable. Further when the annals say —"Maelfinnen, Mac Cuinn-na-mbocht, the father of Cormac, successor of Kiaran, died;" it is left uncertain whether the epithet, *successor of Kiaran* (*i.e.*—Abbot of Clonmacnoise), belongs to Maelfinnen or to Cormac.

Maelkiaran Mac Cuinn-na-mbocht, *Abbot* of Clonmacnoise, died in 1079. He was brother, probably, to Maelfinnen above; or else otherwise very nearly related; their common progenitor, Conn-na-mbocht himself, having died but twenty years before.

12—*Cormac* Mac Connemoght, called by the *Four Masters*, *Tanist Abbot* of Clonmacnoise, died in 1103. In the more ancient *Annals of Clonmacnoise*, however, he is called, at A.D. 1100 [*properly*, 1104] "Cowarb [*i. e.*, *successor*] of St. Keyran;" or, in other words, *Abbot* of Clonmacnoise. He was son to Maelfinnen above named, and is called by the Four Masters *Ua* Chuinn-na-mbocht, or *grandson* of Conn-na-mbocht, at A.D. 1134.

13—*Kelcher*, son of Cormac, was another distinguished member of the family, a "learned senior" of Clonmacnoise, and died in A.D. 1134.

There are also different other notices of members of the family in the same records, which we need not quote here, but which further illustrate the degree of influence and importance of which they were possessed.

The last mentioned of any of them by the family name in the Four Masters occurs at A.D. 1187, where is recorded the death of Mulmurry McConnomoght, "*chief senior of Ireland.*"

We have, then, in the history of this family, as brought before us in the above extracts, the following facts:—First, an Abbot of Louth, father to a Primate of Armagh. Then this Primate, father to another Abbot of Louth, who was, in his turn, father to the Anchorite Oweu. And Owen the Anchorite was father to Luchairen, or Luachan, another Anchorite; who was again father to Egertach, *Erenach* of the Little Church, Clonmacnoise. And Egertach was father to Donoghue, Bishop of Clonmacnoise. And Bishop Donoghue begat Donogh, Lector, (*i.e., Professor of Divinity*, according to Colgan, *Trias Thaum*, p. 293,) of Clonmacnoise; who was father to Joseph, spiritual adviser to Clonmacnoise; who was father of Conn-na-mbocht, head of the Culdees, and Anchorite of Clonmacnoise; who was father to Maelfinnen, abbot [?] of the same place; who was father to Cormac, another abbot of the same place; who was father to Keleher, learned senior of Clonmacnoise, &c., &c.

In other words, in the *twelve* generations, according to lineal descent, preceding Keleher, we have, 1 Abbot of Armagh and Primate of all Ireland; 2 Abbots of Louth, and 2 of Clonmacnoise, 1 Head of Culdees, or Prior, at Clonmacnoise, 1 Bishop there, 1 Divinity Professor and Anchorite, 2 other Anchorites, 1 *Anmchara*, spiritual adviser, or confessor, and 1 Erenach. The office of Erenach, at the time of the plantation of Ulster, was held by laymen, at least persons who received only the "*prima tonsura*;" but in earlier times it would seem to have been a spiritual or clerical one, as much as that of the abbot. Sometimes indeed the two were identified. Thus, at A.D. 834, the Four Masters make mention of Brasal. "*Erenach*—i.e. *Abbot* of Kildua [Kilglin, Co. Meath]—and other churches."

Our illustrations of the state of those matters at Clonmacnoise, to which the reader's attention has now been directed, might easily be extended further; but on what relates to that one place we have, perhaps, dwelt sufficiently for the present. In a future paper we hope to throw some additional light on the subject, from the notices connected with other ancient Irish religious foundations which occur in our old annals; and we think that we shall be able to exhibit sufficient indications that in them also a similar system of family succession to ecclesiastical offices, or application to them of the principle of Tanistry, more or less prevailed. This is indeed what might be expected, as a natural conclusion from the evidence already adduced. For Clonmacnoise was one of the most famous of all those old Irish establishments; Armagh itself scarcely occupying a position of more prominence or importance in the Irish annals; and it was therefore but natural, that a system so cherished as we have seen at Clonmacnoise, or in the family above described, for at least 350 years, from the time of Abbot Gorman, who died in A.D. 753, to that of Abbot Cormac, who died in 1103, should be approved of and adopted into use in places of lesser note also.

R. K.

TALK OF THE ROAD—NO. XII.

"Well, Pat, did yon get leave to stay in Kilcommon?" said Jem, when they went on the road.

"'Deed I did, then," said Pat, "and it's peace we are getting in Kilcommon now."

"And how is that come about?" said Jem.

"Why, I hear tell," said Pat, "that Father John got a letter from the Bishop, telling him he was bringing scandal on the Church, and that everything is to be kept quiet till it's forgot."

"And you're not going to turn, Pat?" said Jem.

"'Deed no, Jem," said Pat, "sure I was never thinking of turning; what do I know about it? Sure I only want to read the Catholic Bible, and try to learn something out of it. But where were you, Jem, since I saw you?"

"Why, then, I was at the wake," said Jem.

"And whose wake was it?" said Pat.

"Well, then, it was old Molly Kearney's," said Jem.

"Is it her, the creature?" said Pat, "and where would the likes of her get a wake? Sure, don't I know that she had nothing to live on these ten years only the fifteen pence a week that Mr. Owens allowed her out of the Church money, and she gives three pence a week of that for her lodging, and who would be bothered waking her? 'Deed, Mrs. Owens was mighty good to her, and gave her her bit often; but sure Mr. Owens wouldn't be going to pay for the pipes and whiskey?"

"Well, you may say that," said Jem; "but I'll tell you how it was. I was going past old Ned Flanagan's, where she lodged, one evening, and he called me in, and told me she was dead, the creature, and he said he wasn't going to have any nonsense of waking, only just what was wanting; and so he asked me to go down to the shop, at the cross roads, for two halfpenny candles, and a pen'orth of snuff, and he said that would do. So I went, and got the candles, and the snuff; and when the candles was lighted, who should come in, but old Judy Brannigan, that has the scapular, and sells the books; well, down she goes on her knees, you know, and begins with the Latin; and 'deed she seemed to handle it mighty clever; and when she was done, 'Judy, dear,' says I, 'what is it at all?' 'Well, I b'lieve it's a psalm,' says she, 'but I'm sure it's the right thing,' says she. 'And, Judy, dear,' says I, 'do you know what it means at all?' says I. 'How would I,' says she, 'when it's in the Latin it is?' 'And what is it good for?' says I. 'Why, it's good for old Molly Kearney's soul,' says she. 'And wouldn't it be good for our souls, too?' says I. 'Well, in course it would,' says she. 'And would the meaning of it do any harm to them that understood it?' says I. 'No, sure, it wouldn't,' says she. 'Well,' says I, 'and wouldn't it be better for us to have it in English, the way we could understand it?' 'And is it jumper you're going to turn?' says she, 'to be talking that way of the blessed Latin; sure where would be the use of larnin', at all, if English was as good for the soul as Latin?' 'Well, I'm thinking, Judy,' says I, 'our souls wouldn't be the worse for understanding good words.' So, with that old Ned Flanagan comes over, and he says, ''Deed, I'm thinking this long time, there's sense in that,' says he; 'and I can't help thinking betimes, where's the great use in my going to Mass, when I can't understand one word, good nor bad, till the scoulding begins.'"

"Aye," says Pat, "that's the sermon he meant, sure enough; and, I wonder what's the reason they don't scould in Latin, too. Sure, if we listen to the prayers in Latin, why wouldn't it do to listen to the scoulding in Latin, too? It's a poor way with us to understand nothing but the scoulding; it ought to make us read the Bible anyway to try and know something—but go on with the story, Jem."

"Well," said Jem, "when old Judy saw that we were both again' her, she began taking a pinch of the snuff; and, I says, 'Isn't it you that has the blessed scapular, Judy,' says I. ''Deed, it's myself,' says she, 'that has.' 'And what is it good for,' says I. 'Why, it's good to die in to be sure,' says she, 'and it's I that hopes to get it on in time,' says she, 'if my senses is spared to me,' says she. 'And what's the good of dying in it,' says I. 'Why, to be sure,' says she, 'don't you know? Didn't the Blessed Virgin say herself, when she gave it, that them that dies in it shall never go to hell, and if they go to purgatory at all, that she'll go down there herself the very next Saturday after they die, and let them out herself.' 'And where did you hear that at all,' says I; 'is it in the Bible it is?' 'Sure, how would I know if it's there,' says she, 'but isn't it in the treatise on the scapular that I have at home,' says she. 'And you won't put it on till you are dying,' says I. 'No,' says she, 'sure I won't.' 'And how will it be,' says I, 'if you wouldn't have the sense to put it on then,' says I; 'sure here's old Molly Kearney lying here,' says I, 'and she wasn't as old as you, and she was took quite sudden, and if she had a dozen scapulars in her box, would it be any good to her soul, when she wouldn't have time or senses to put one of them on her?' Well, now, the creature, I was a'most sorry for saying it, when I saw how troubl'd she got in her mind at thinking of that. 'Oh, wirra,' says she, 'won't there be any good Christian near me at all to put it on me? Ochone,' says she, 'will I die with the scapular in the chest, at the foot of the bed there?' Well, when I saw the old creature take on so, I just says to her, 'Did you never hear, Judy, dear,' says I, 'that it's in the Bible, that the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin? and sure,' says I, 'if he will put that on you his own-self, there will be no mistake about that, and won't that do?' says I. 'Och,' says she, 'what do I know about that, but, don't I know about the blessed scapular? but, ochone,' says she, 'who will put it on me at all? sure, I'm a poor, lone creature, that lives by myself, without kith or kin, and who will put it on me at all?' Well, I couldn't help thinking that time, that it was the poor case for an old creature to be taking such trouble about her soul, and knowing nothing of the blood of Jesus Christ to put away her sins; and isn't it the poor thing for the priests to be leaving an old creature that way, that will be dying like old Molly some of these days? And don't they all hold up poor Judy for the most religious woman in the country, and the surest of heaven? Well, it makes me think more nor ever that reading the Bible is what the people want.

"Well, but while I was talking to old Judy, there came a noise at the door, and when it opens, there was all the wildest boys in the country coming in; and old Ned Flanagan goes for'ed to meet them, and—'What do you want here?' says he. 'We're come to the wake,' says they. 'Well, you'll get no waking here,' says he; 'so you may be off with yourselves.' Well, they swore they'd have some of the fun over old Molly: 'And what did you or the likes of you care for old Molly when she was living,' says he; 'and what right have you to fun over her now?' says he; 'so be off with yourselves out of that,' says he. Well, with that they gave him a deal of bad language, and they pushed by him, and drove into the house, and began screeching for the pipes and the whiskey, for they said they had a right to have some diversion when there was a corp in the house. Well, with that old Ned went up into the inner room, and he fetched out his scythe with him (for he's a mower by trade), and he swore—'By this and by that,' says he, 'if they didn't be off with themselves out of that,' says he, 'he'd shear the heads off them, like mice,' says he. Well, 'deed if I hadn't caught hold of his arm, I think he'd have had the arm of one of them anyway; and when the boys saw that, they weren't long in being off with themselves.

"Well, when they were gone, says I to Ned, 'Would you let me read a bit out of it to you,'" says I. So he said he'd like that well; so I just took out my Bible, for I had it in my pocket, and I just read to them about Jesus Christ coming to Mary and Martha when their brother was dead, and how kind he was to them, and how he even cried like themselves at the grave; how he told them he was the Resurrection and the life, and that if they would believe in Him, he would raise them up to life again when they were dead, and how he called Lazarus out of the grave before their eyes, to show that he could do it, and that He would do it if they believed in Him; and old Judy, the creature, she come and listened to it all, and said, 'of all the reading ever she heard, it was the purtiest,' and, indeed, Ned was mighty well pleased too, and his wife, and they said 'they'd often be glad to hear the like, and that it was a deal decenter than pipes and whiskey when there was a corp in the house;' and, indeed I could not help thinking then that if the priests would try and stop the waking, and advise the people to have a little reading like Christians, it would be doing more good to the people than setting them to stone the Scripture reader."

"Well," said Pat, "it surely would; but I'm afraid they won't try that. But how would we know anything more about that scapular, or how it did come out at all, when there's nothing about it in the Bible?"

"Well," said Jem, "I think I know a man that has the treatise on the scapular that old Judy spoke about, and I'll try and borrow it."

"Well," said Pat, "it would be a good thing to get it and read it, and see if it's like the Bible at all."

So if they find out anything more about the scapular, we will try and have it for our readers.

AURICULAR CONFESSION, PART II.

In our last number we laid before our readers some of our reasons, taken from the very eminent Roman Catholic writers, Maldonatus, Natalis Alexander, Peter Lombard, Gratian, Cardinal Cajetan, St. Bonaventure, Alexander de Hales, Gabriel Biel, and others, proving, as we conceive, very clearly, that the *Universal Church* has not *always* understood that sacramental or secret confession to a priest was *instituted by our Blessed Lord*, and, therefore, of Divine right necessary to salvation; but, on the contrary, that there is no point which was more freely discussed for many centuries, or upon which a greater difference of opinion existed for more than 1000 years after the times of our Lord and his Apostles. We now proceed to examine whether it be historically true that the Catholic *Church* hath always observed, from the beginning, the *practice* of confessing all sins secretly to a priest alone, as decreed by the Council of Trent; admitting that such a practice would be entitled to great weight, even though its *institution* by our Blessed Lord be incapable of proof, as we think we have proved it to be, by the admission of no small number of the most eminent divines of the Roman Catholic Church.

We would first observe, that the proof of the affirmative lies on those who assert the fact to be as stated—viz., that such a practice has existed in the Church since the times of primitive Christianity; and we would next ask our readers to bear in mind what the exact thing called in question by the Church of England is. The Church of England does not deny that the *public* confession of sins in the Church was in very early use, nor does she deny the lawfulness or usefulness of *voluntary private* confession, either to a pious friend or discreet minister. There is, doubtless, the highest authority—viz., that of the Holy Scriptures—for the practice of confession of sins* to one another, which no one contends excludes confession to a priest, any more than does the concurrent injunction—"Pray for one another;" and so far is the Church of England from disapproving of *voluntary* private confession, that the form of *exhortation* in the Book of Common Prayer, prescribed by the Rubric, to be read when the minister gives warning for the celebration of the Holy Communion, contains an express encouragement for the use of it.†

The only matter in dispute therefore is, whether the practice of private confession to a priest was *enjoined* by the Church from the earliest times, as a matter of necessary discipline, on all its members; or to state the matter a little

* St. James c. v. 16.

† "And because it is requisite that no man should come to the Holy Communion but with a full trust in God's mercy, and with a quiet conscience; therefore, if there be any of you who, by this means—(viz., self-examination previously mentioned) cannot quiet his own conscience herein, but requireth further comfort or counsel, let him come to me, or to some other discreet and learned minister of God's Word and open his grief; that by the ministry of God's Holy Word he may receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly (spiritual) counsel and advice, to the quieting of his conscience, and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness"—Book of Common Prayer

more fully, the matter to be proved by Roman Catholics is this—not merely the primitive *existence* of sacerdotal confession (such as may now be lawfully practised in the Church of England), but also the primitive *enforcement* of a periodical auricular confession, through the medium of which every mortal sin, even though, by reason of its having been secretly committed, occasioning no public scandal, and even though committed against what Protestants call the 10th Commandment of the Decalogue, is required to be fully stated to a priest, under the penalties of imperative religious obligation, and with the associated doctrine, that any voluntary concealment is absolute sin.

We may hereafter point out and illustrate more fully the broad difference between auricular confession, as practised and enjoined by the Church of Rome, and what the Church of England allows and recommends, which is not auricular confession, in the conventional sense of that phrase, but merely the friendly and spontaneous consulting of a pious and judicious divine—by those labouring under some particular distress of conscience. Our present object, however, is the historical, not the theological view of the subject, and to that we must now confine ourselves.

We must begin by observing what, no doubt, has struck every careful reader of the Holy Scriptures, that in the history therein recorded of the life and ministry of our Blessed Lord, there is no trace of his enjoining his followers to confession by a particular enumeration of their sins and their circumstances—though we find him there daily conversing with sinners, reproving, instructing, healing and forgiving them. He told the woman of Samaria all that ever she did, but he never exhorted her to auricular confession; he pardoned the woman taken in adultery, when he had made her accusers shrink away; but he demanded no confession of her guilt. He pardoned the sins of the man sick of the palsy on seeing his faith, without requiring any confession; and in the historical records of the ministry of the Apostles, we find them going about preaching the gospel, calling men to repentance, erecting and governing churches; but we find no instance of their sitting down in a confessor's chair, for penitents to tell them in their ear, the story of their vicious lives, as a matter of sacramental and necessary obligation; while, as we have shown, one of the Apostles themselves—Saint James—expressly inculcates the duty of confessing their faults one to another, and praying for one another, that they might be healed. Leaving the supporters of auricular confession to provide proof, if they can (which we shall gladly insert in our pages), that ecclesiastical history provides proof which sacred history does not, of the truth of the proposition which it lies on them affirmatively to establish, we shall proceed to give some account of by what steps and degrees we conceive auricular confession to have crept into the Church, at a much later period than the primitive ages of Christianity.

In the first ages, when Christian churches were founded in the midst of heathen nations, public scandalous offenders after baptism, and especially those who, through timidity or want of faith, relapsed into the practices of heathen idolatry, were, by the discipline of the Church, brought to public penance, which was generally called *Exomologesis*.

This word Exomologesis, in the original Greek, properly, no doubt, signifies confession, but in no way includes the idea of *secret* confession; and, on the contrary, is commonly used by the fathers as including the whole matter of repentance in all its parts, and especially of public penitential confession of gross and scandalous sin, made to God in the Church, in the presence of the assembled congregation. We shall presently exemplify and prove this more fully.

The necessity of this penitential rigour in the early Church arose out of the public dishonour which was brought on Christianity by the inconstancy and misconduct of some who professed it, at a time when large numbers of converts from heathenism were admitted into the Church, and the Church suffered extremely from the reproaches brought upon it by such inconsistency. Though the Apostles gave no rules about such matters, but avoiding or excommunicating the guilty persons, yet it was natural and fitting that the Church should resolve, as far as it was possible, to prevent such scandalous offences among them; with that view the actions of professing Christians were narrowly watched; their faults, especially such as led to scandal on the church, complained of, and then if they confessed them, or were convicted of them, a severe and rigorous discipline was enforced before they were restored to communion, that their enemies might see how far Christians were from encouraging either immoral lives, or any compliance with Gentile idolatry; any tendency to which was looked upon as a degree of apostacy, and punished accordingly. This led to the framing of the Penitential Canons, which never extended, in the primitive Church, to all those sins which the Church of Rome now accounts *mortal*, and, therefore, necessary to be confessed; and required that the declaration of penitential sorrow should be made in the most public manner, the last and most solemn act of which was, when the bishop led the penitents from the entrance of the church up to the body of the congregation, where they prostrated themselves, and expressed their abhorrence of their faults in the most humiliating manner, by actions as well as words. The publicity, however, of such penances, *in facie Ecclesiæ*, in progress of time led to inconvenience, for the Church being now very numerous, a great many offences were brought publicly forward, which not only gave rise to sport and ridicule for light and ill-disposed persons, and possibly, also, subjected the penitents to the severity of the Pagan criminal judge, but as some sins are of such a nature that they can scarcely be published without the risk of spreading a contagion, the good of the Church itself prohibited their publication before the face of the congregation.

This, in the time of the Emperor Decius, when persecution cruelly shook the Church, and numbers of her weaker members fell off in the storm, gave rise to a remarkable controversy, which, for some time, sadly distracted the Church, about the restoration or final rejection of those who had lapsed either in faith or public morals. We allude to the Novatian schism. The best and wisest of the Church, more merciful and considerate of human infirmity, were willing to receive those again, upon public repentance, over whom the temptation of fear had too much prevailed; but the Novatians, a great and zealous part of the Church in that age, looked with sterner eyes on them as desperate, who had once broken their baptismal vow, and would rather separate from the Church themselves than suffer such persons to be restored to it.

This Decian persecution was at its height about 250 years after our Saviour, and appears to have given rise to a new office in the Church, probably intended, if possible, to accommodate matters with the Novatian dissenters (who complained of the too compassionate facility of the Church in restoring offenders), by taking a middle course between an indiscriminate enforcement of that public penitential confession and humiliation which was called exomologesis, and the too lax mercy of restoring all who professed penitence, without insisting on confession and penitential discipline, as laid down in the canons.

This was the appointment of the office of public penitentiary, which appears to have originated about this period, and to have continued until the time of Nectarius, Bishop of Constantinople, who (we shall presently state for what reason) abolished it about 400 years after the time of our Saviour. The Novatians, so far from being satisfied, resisted this expedient as a new invention, an addition or supplement to the ancient rites of the Church; though the great majority of the orthodox appear to have acceded to it, as a wise and moderate mode of avoiding the scandals of too great lenity on the one hand, and indiscriminate publicity upon the other.

The Penitentiary was a public functionary, selected by the Church for his prudence, learning, and piety, to receive the confessions of all penitents (not, however, it would appear, under the seal of secrecy, as at present in the Church of Rome), but with power, after hearing privately the several cases of the penitents, to bring forward into public such of them as, in his judgment, might be made exemplary without incurring the dangers before referred to. There seems to have been no necessity imposed upon any one to disclose his secret sins even to the Penitentiary, much less to choose as his confidant any other priest, whom he might expect to be more complaisant than this selected public officer; but the office seems to have been no more than a prudent provision, in the existing state of the Church, to provide a safe help to men really penitent, and relieve perplexed and weak consciences, and especially to assist them in their preparation for the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, of which we shall give some proofs hereafter.

With this brief review of the result of our own researches into early ecclesiastical history, let us now see whether there be any semblance of authority, during the first three or four centuries, for holding that the practice of Auricular Confession was *enjoined* as a *necessary* duty by the Church in those times.

Our readers have, perhaps, become sufficiently familiar with the names of the early Fathers, to know that Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Clemens Alexandrinus, and Tertullian, are the most ancient of them, and nearly all, who lived during the first two centuries, whose works are extant.

Now, if secret confession of sins to a priest were the universal practice of the primitive Church, we should naturally look for some proof from their writings that such practice existed in those times.

Ignatius dates A.D. 106. Justin Martyr, A.D. 150. Irenæus A.D. 180. Clemens Alexandrinus and Tertullian, A.D. 200. In the works of St. Ignatius, Justin Martyr, and Clement of Alexandria, there is absolutely no mention of confession at all; on the contrary, Clement in speaking of the Eucharist, and the duty of self-examination before receiving it, expressly says, that a man's own conscience is his best director in that case.*

Cardinal Bellarmine (De Pœnit., Lib. iii., c. 6, vol. iii., p. 443) cites two passages from Irenæus (Adv. Hær., Lib. i., c. 9. and Lib. iii., c. 4) in the former of which, speaking of a worthless gnosticizing impostor, named Marcion, who induced many silly women to join his party, and then most infamously abused his influence over them, he goes on to state, that some of those women, on their repentance, made a full confession to the Church of the impurities into which they had been seduced, and spent *their whole time* in "Exomologesis," weeping and lamenting on account of their defilement.†

What "*Exomologesis*" means, we shall presently see.

In the second passage referred to, Irenæus (Adv. Hær., lib. iii., c. 4) says, that the *heretic* Cerdon often came into the Church, and made or performed Exomologesis,* but we can find nothing in Irenæus which has relation to auricular (or, as it is called by some, clancular) confession in secret to a priest. Tertullian has also some passages speaking of penitential confession, but they so clearly relate to public confession in the face of the Church, that Rhenanus, in his preface to Tertullian, says distinctly that there was no such thing as secret or clancular confession in use in Tertullian's time, which was a thing not so much as known in those days.†

Tertullian gives us, however, probably the best explanation of EXOMOLOGESIS which is to be found in any ancient Father, and which may assist in clearing up doubts which otherwise might be occasioned by its Greek etymology.

"This act, which is better and more commonly expressed by a Greek word (ἐξομολόγησις), is confession, whereby we acknowledge our sin *unto the Lord*, not because He knoweth it not, but inasmuch as by confession satisfaction is ordered, from confession repentance springeth, by repentance God is appeased; wherefore Exomologesis is a discipline for the abasement and humiliation of man, enjoining such conversation as inviteth mercy; it directeth also, even in the matter of dress and food, to lie in sackcloth and ashes, to hide his body in filthy garments, to cast down his spirit with mourning, to exchange for severe treatment the sins which he hath committed: for the most part, also, to cherish prayer by fasts, to groan, to weep, and to moan night and day unto the Lord his God; to throw himself upon the ground before the presbyters, and to fall on his knees before the beloved of God; to enjoin all the brethren to bear the message of his prayer for mercy."‡

This brings us down to the time of Origen and St. Cyprian, who lived some 50 years later, and who tell us that the confession of the penitent was, in their time also, made before the whole congregation, prostrating themselves on the ground, with weeping and humiliation, in the Church, and desiring the prayers of all the congregation, whereupon the bishop and clergy laid their hands on them, and reconciled them. In which description the Ecclesiastical Historian, Sozomen, concurs.§

This, no doubt, was generally only for such public and mortal sins as were dealt with by the old penitential canons, and especially the offences either of openly apostatizing from Christianity during times of persecution, or at least in secret committing or conniving at some act of Gentile idolatry, which amounted in thought, at least, to denying Christ, and sinning against the Holy Ghost; and it appears not to have extended, even in the way of *voluntary confession*, to what St. Cyprian calls *minora delicta*, as to which there is no intimation in St. Cyprian, that any persons were under an obligation, by the rules of the Church, to discover or confess them. We think, however, it does appear, both from St. Cyprian and Origen, that, though at first public confession was enjoined only for public offences, yet afterwards some men did voluntarily submit themselves to the Church's discipline, and undergo public confession and penance, to ease their consciences, and procure quiet of mind from the burden of sins, which, being done in secret, were not subject to the censures of the Church until they confessed them. And there is one place in St. Cyprian where he says, "That some confessed their very thoughts, though they had not proceeded to actual sin."‖

We think it also appears that great sinners were strongly exhorted by St. Cyprian, Origen, and St. Ambrose to a voluntary public confession, as a wholesome and safe practice, though not as a matter of necessity, for St. Ambrose distinctly says—"Tears do wash the sin which the voice is ashamed to confess: weeping doth provide both for pardon and for shamefacedness: tears do speak our faults without horror, tears do confess our crime without offence to our shamefacedness."¶ In commenting on which the gloss in Gratian, who has inserted these words of St. Ambrose in his Decretum, says, "If for shame a man will not confess, tears alone do blot out his sins."**

---

* Ἀρίστη γὰρ προς τὴν ακριβῆ αἵρεσιν τὲ και φυγὴν, ἡ συνειδησις.—Clem. Alex. lib. I. Strom., p. 318. Oxon. 1715.

† "Hæ sæpissime conversæ ad Ecclesiam Dei confessæ sunt, et secundum corpus exterminatas se ab eo velut cupidinè, etiinflammatæ, valde se illum delexisse. Cum magno labore fratres eam convertis-sent, omne tempus in Exomologesi consummavit, plangens, et lamentans ob hanc, quam passa est ab hoc Mago, corruptelam."—Lib. i. c. 9, p. 60, Oxon. 1702.

* "Cerdon sæpe in Ecclesiam veniens, et Exomologesim faciens, sic consummavit, modo quidem latenter docens, modò verò Exomologesim faciens."—Lib. 3, c 4, p. 206, Oxon. 1702.

† "Nihil illum de clancularia illa pœnitentia loqui, quæ id temporis, penitus ignorabatur."—Beatus Rhenanus in præf. ad Tertull. de pœnitentia.

‡ "Exomologesis est, qua delictum DOMINO nostrum confitemur: non, quidem, ut ignaro; sed quatenus satisfactio confessione disponitur, confessione pœnitentia nascitur, pœnitentia Deus mitigatur. Itaque Exomologesis prosternendi et humilificandi hominis disciplina est, conversationem injungens misericordiæ illicem. De ipso quoque habitu atque victu mandat, sacco et cineri incubare, corpus sordibus obscurare, animum mœroribus dejicere—jejunii preces alere, ingemiscere, lachrimari et mugire dies noctesque ad Dominum Deum tuum, Presbyteris advolvi et caris Dei adgeniculari, omnibus fratribus legationes deprecationis suæ injungere."—Tertull. de Pœnit., § ix., Opera, p. 127, Par. 1675.

§ St. Cyprian, Ep. 15, Oxon., p 34, Origen, tom. 2, in 37 Psalm, and Sozomen, lib. 7, c. 16.

‖ St. Cyprian de lapsis, n. 23.

¶ Ambrose, lib. 10, comment in Luc. sec. 88, tom. 1, p. 1523—"Lavant lachrymæ delictum, quod voce pudor est confiteri, et veniæ fletus consulunt et verecundiæ; lachrymæ sine horrore culpam loquuntur; lachrymæ crimen sine offensione verecundiæ confitentur."

** "Unde, etsi propter pudorem nolit quis confiteri, solæ lachrymæ delent peccata."—Gloss, de pœnit Grat. Decret dis. 1, c. 2.

To these we might add many similar testimonies. But to come a little further down, to the time of St. Chrysostom, we find him speaking slightly of confession to men, and urging continual confession to God only. Out of many passages our space allows us to give only the following:—"It is not necessary," says he, "that thou shouldest confess in the presence of witnesses; let the inquiry of thy offences be made in thy thought: let this judgment be without a witness; let God only see thee confessing. Therefore, I entreat you, and beseech and pray you, that you would continually make your confession to God. . . Unclasp thy conscience before God, and show thy wards unto him, and of him ask a medicine; for although thou hold thy peace, he knoweth all. I do not say to thee bring thyself on the stage, nor accuse thyself to others; but I command thee to obey the prophet, saying—reveal thy ways unto the Lord—confess them before God, confess thy sins before the judge, praying, if not with the tongue, at least with thy memory, and so look to obtain mercy. But thou art ashamed to say that thou hast sinned. Confess thy faults, then, daily in thy prayers. For, do I say, confess them to thy fellow-servant, who may reproach thee therewith? Confess them to God, who healeth them.'* In our last number, page 39, we cited St. Augustine to the same effect; and need we go further to show that whatever differences may exist in the writings of the early Fathers as to the advantages of seeking the aid of the discreet spiritual physician for advice and consolation (and St. Augustine himself, doubtless, in another passage,† urges on notorious offenders, whose crimes had bred open scandal, that private confession to God was not sufficient, but that they should also make public acknowledgment, and apply to the power of the Church, publicly, for reconciliation); yet none of them ever conceived that secret confession of every sin to a priest was an indispensable condition of salvation, or that it was invariably understood so to be by the whole Church from the days of our Lord and his Apostles, as asserted by the Council of Trent.

We have much more to say illustrative of the historical view of this important subject; but we fear we have already run the risk of wearying such of our readers as may not feel as intense interest in this matter as we do ourselves. We must, for the present, therefore, conclude this short historical sketch by giving a brief account of the abolition of the office of public Penitentiary, in the latter end of the fourth century, by Nectarius, Bishop of Constantinople, the immediate predecessor of St. Chrysostom, referred to in the letter of a "Northern Reader," inserted in our last number.

If there be any passage in ancient ecclesiastical history which seems to promise a satisfactory elucidation of the antiquity of the confessional, and a test by which to try whether it existed, in its present form, in the primitive Church, in a constant and uninterrupted succession, as alleged by the Council of Trent, it is this. And the story, on the joint testimony of the two ecclesiastical historians, Socrates and Sozomen, is as follows:—

"In the time of Nectarius, Bishop of Constantinople, there was, it seems, a custom in that Church (as also in most others), that one of the Presbyters, of greatest piety, wisdom, and gravity, should be chosen Penitentiary—that is, be appointed to the peculiar office of receiving confession, and assisting and directing penitents in the management of their repentance. Now, it happened that a certain woman of quality, stricken with remorse of conscience, comes to the penitentiary (that then was), and, according to custom, makes a particular confession of all such sins as she was conscious to herself to have committed since her baptism; for which he, according to his office, appointed her the penance of fasting and continual prayers, to expiate her guilt, and give proof of the truth of her repentance. But she, proceeding on very particularly in her confessions, at last, amongst other things, comes to declare that a certain deacon of that Church had defiled her; upon notice of which horrid fact (secrecy not being, we conclude, then enjoined in confessions), the deacon was (very properly) cashiered, and cast out of the Church; and the matter coming to the ears of the people, they presently fell into a mighty commotion and rage about it, partly in detestation of so foul an action of the deacon, but principally on account of the dishonour and scandal that reflected on the whole Church. The Bishop, Nectarius, finding the honour of the whole body of his clergy extremely concerned in this accident, and being very anxious both to extinguish the present flame and to prevent like occasions in future, resolved, by the advice of one Eudæmon, a presbyter of that Church, to abolish the office of penitentiary altogether; and now, says the historian, by this means every man is left to the conduct of his own conscience, and permitted to partake of the holy mysteries at his own peril."‡

This, we think, plainly shows that the office was not then considered a divine or apostolic constitution, but one created, as well as thus abolished, upon merely prudential considerations, as a matter of ecclesiastical discipline, and involving no sacramental considerations whatever. Sozomen adds, that the example of Nectarius was followed by almost all the bishops and Churches in the world; and Socrates, who was the first and principal relator of the whole story, states that he was personally acquainted with this presbyter, Eudæmon, on whose advice Nectarius acted, in making this change in the discipline of the Church; and that he had the said relation of it from his own mouth, and expostulated with him about it, thinking that the state of piety would be much endangered by this change, and, in plain words, tells him that he had thereby bereft men of assistance in the conduct of their consciences, and hindered the great benefit men have, or might have, one of another, by private advice and correction.

We think this matter throws great light on the history of auricular confession, and disproves any such *suggestion* as has been sometimes made, without any good reason, that it was only *public* confession, and not *private*, which was, on this occasion, so generally laid aside; for (not to go at present into many other coercive reasons to the same effect), we would ask, how could the abolition of one public functionary have bereft men of assistance in the conduct of their consciences, or left each of them to partake of the holy mysteries—*i.e.*, the Holy Eucharist—at his own peril, if each was still bound, at that very time, sacramentally to confess and be absolved by a priest, as laid down by Pope Innocent III., in the Council of Lateran, A.D. 1215, and afterwards by the Council of Trent, A.D. 1551, in the canons, printed in full in our last number? see page 38.

We conclude that it is *not* true that the Catholic Church has always observed, from the time of our Lord and his apostles, the practice of confessing all sins secretly to a priest alone.

Whether the practice can be maintained by the authority of those texts of scripture which are sometimes cited by Roman Catholic writers in favour of it, or whether the practice of auricular confession, as now used in the Church of Rome, be favourable or mischievous to practical piety, will form the subject of our future consideration.

* Chrys. st. Hom. de pœnitent. et Confession. tom. 5, Edit. Lat. Col. 971. Edit. Basil. 1558. Opera, tom. 12, p. 289.
† Augustin. Serm. 392, tom. 5, p. 1501.
‡ Socrates' lib. 5, c. 19. Sozomen lib. 7, c. 16.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st.

No anonymous letter can be attended to. Whatever is sent for insertion must be authenticated by the name and address of the writer, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee for his good faith.

We would request our valued correspondents, both Roman Catholics and Protestants, to limit the length of their communications, and not to discuss a variety of distinct topics in one letter.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal, which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, MAY, 1853.

The continuance and success of our paper, for nearly a year and a half, and the acceptance it has met with, both from Protestants and Roman Catholics, has proved some things that are worthy to be proved.

We conceived that it was possible, and that it was a Christian duty, too, that they who differ about religious truth should try whether a calm and Christian consideration of each other's arguments and opinions might not bring them nearer to an agreement in the truth. We were persuaded that a careful avoidance of all angry expressions, and a steady perseverance in kindly feelings, would change the common character of religious controversy. We did not expect that it would bring all to agree in the same opinion at once; but we did hope that, in a very brief time, it would prove that it is possible for those who sincerely differ, to discuss and examine those differences in a spirit of Christian love, and with a real desire to ascertain what the truth is, for themselves and others.

We were well aware that, in a time of great excitement about religion, when so many on each side are earnestly endeavouring to win over others to their side, such an attempt was peculiarly difficult; but then we saw, that for that very reason it was peculiarly necessary. All experience shows that man's passions are never so violent as when they are inflamed about religion. The greatest cruelties, the most terrible persecutions, and the most bitter hatreds that the world has ever seen, have arisen from this cause.

Seeing, then, that extensive discussion and controversy was inevitable—that it was impossible to stop it, even if it were right to do so—we resolved to try if it were possible that discussion among Christians could be conducted in a Christian manner.

And though the task be difficult, we never doubted that it was possible; for this reason—*it is a duty*, and duties are always possible.

Neither were we without encouragement. Are we not all fellow-countrymen? Have we not a common country, suffering under heavy visitations, and needing our united efforts for her welfare? Can we unite for her good with hatred between us? Is it not our common interest to love each other? and should not even our differences be governed by love and not by hatred? Have not all the same heaven and the same hell set before us? Can we be indifferent to which of them ourselves and our neighbours are going? and will not a loving and a gentle treatment of each other's errors be the most hopeful method of advancing the progress, both of ourselves and others, towards the God of love?

These reflections had led us to a settled resolution, that in this journal which we proposed to establish for religious discussion, we would labour to exclude every angry word, every thought of hatred, every approach of passion; that we would allow those only to write in our pages who love their neighbours' souls, and who treat them in a spirit of love.

We trust it is in no spirit of idle boasting, but in a spirit of thankfulness, that we now ask our readers to consider how we have carried out our design. If any one of our readers can show us where we have offended them, or where our spirit needs to be corrected, we shall thankfully accept it at their hands.

We have ourselves, of course, more opportunity of learning the general effect already produced, than individual readers can often have. We receive numerous communications from Protestants, expressing their approbation of the spirit in which we write, and of our care to avoid offending their opponents. This seems to be our chief merit in the eyes of our Protestant friends. We also receive numerous communications from Roman Catholics, in various ways, expressing their satisfaction at the kindness and the fairness of our conduct. On both sides we find that our readers approve of the manner of religious discussion which it has been our object to promote. The existence of our paper for so long a time, and its present prosperous position, affords proof of this; for we could not continue to publish if we did not get extensive support, and acceptance and encouragement from *both* sides. And we find that we are daily advancing in public favour, which is conclusive that the public are pleased with discussion free from anger and strife.

Now, we ask our readers on both sides to consider the importance of this. If, through our means, the two great parties should come to regard each other rather as persons to be convinced with patience and meekness, than provoked by abuse and insult; if, by our means, they should come to understand that these feelings are mutual; if, by our means, they should come to understand and to view each other in this light, shall we not have done much for the peace and happiness of our common country, as well as for the promotion of Christian charity and Christian truth?

We invite the attention of all our contributors, and all our correspondents, and of all readers, too, to the importance of this object; and we ask the assistance of each of them in their several stations, in promoting it.

We are aware that this happy result is in pro-

gress in a multitude of instances, and it is our most earnest desire to labour diligently to promote it, and to obtain the co-operation of all who have it at heart like ourselves.

OUR attention has been called to a letter in the *Freeman's Journal*, from the Rev. R. C. Kelsh, who appears to be a Roman Catholic clergyman, in the diocese of Meath. Part of the letter is as follows:—

"DEAR SIR,—Will you allow me the favour of complaining through your paper of *a gross outrage* practised of late on my Catholic friends in this neighbourhood, in the repeated transmission to them through the Post-office, of publications highly offensive to their religious feelings. .....I need scarcely say, that I allude particularly to the CATHOLIC LAYMAN..... It is idle for these mistaken men to imagine that they will gain converts to their cause, from our intellectual, upright, and religious people, by their *foul, filthy effusions.*"

Mr. Kelsh also accuses us of "*unnecessary insult!!*" We think our readers will scarcely sympathize either with Mr. Kelsh's epithets or irritation.

If Mr. Kelsh would write to ourselves, and explain to us what "outrage" we have committed, or what "insult" we have offered, or wherein we have been "filthy," he would do us a kindness.

If we have, in any point, mistaken the doctrine of the Church of Rome, our pages are at Mr. Kelsh's service to correct our mistake. If we have advanced arguments that can be shown to be unsound, our pages are at his service to show it. We tell him that our paper is read by a vast number of Roman Catholics. If he thinks they have been set wrong by what they read in our pages, we offer him the same opportunity of setting them right; would not this be the most likely way of accomplishing the object?

Correspondence.

ON PURGATORY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—Before I undertake the discussion of any other subject, permit me to offer a few words in reply to your remarks on the second part of my letter, published in the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, of December, 1852. The only point to which I wish to direct attention, is the extract from Origen, which I quoted in support of the doctrine of purgatory, and which, in my opinion, has not been, in the slightest degree, rendered nugatory by the fact, that some of the writings of this great man have been justly condemned by the Church. I am not aware that the homily from which I quoted has ever been condemned by any *Council*, *Pope*, or other legitimate authority, and when I shall have been informed that such has been the case, I will most willingly give up *Origen;* but till I shall be furnished with this information, I will hold the doctrine set forth in the extract, as the doctrine of the Catholic Church in the third century; particularly, as I find this same doctrine unequivocally set forth and supported by the concurrent testimony of other distinguished Fathers, who, if not co-temporary, were immediately subsequent to Origen.

St. Epiphanius, who wrote about the year 368, expresses his admiration of the rite which directs the names of the dead to be mentioned in our prayers, and says—"the prayers which are offered for the dead, are profitable to them, though they may not blot out all their sins." Again, he says—"We make mention, both of the saints and of sinners; of sinners that we may supplicate God for mercy on them, but of the saints, both Fathers, Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Evangelists, &c., that we may honour the Lord Jesus Christ in a particular manner."—Epiphan., Hær. 75, sec. 7, T. i., page 911.

He further maintains, in sec. 8, page 912, "that the Church has this doctrine traditionally from Christ."

St. Augustine, who was ordained priest in 390, inculcates the same doctrine. He first proves from (Matt. xii. 32), that some sins may be forgiven in the world to come, for, "otherwise," says he, "it would not have been truly said of some, that their sins would neither be forgiven in this world, nor in the world to come, unless some sins, though not remitted in this world, were remitted in the world to come"—Ang. Lib. 21, de Civit Dei, cap. 24.

He next says—"When sacrifices of the altar, or alms, are offered for all the faithful departed, for the truly good they are *acts of thanksgiving;* for those not very bad, they are *propitiations;* for those very bad, although they afford no helps to the dead, they are, in some sort, a consolation to the living. But to those to whom they are profitable, they are either a full remission, or by them their punishment is rendered more tolerable"—*Enchiridion*, cap. 109, 110.

I might produce many other respectable witnesses from the fourth century, but the two I have produced are, I think, beyond exception; and from the quotations I have given, it is manifest, first, that the ancients did mention the saints, the Virgin Mary, the apostles, martyrs, &c., not to pray for them, as if they thought they needed their prayers, but to give honour to Christ, whose saints, &c., they are. Secondly, That they mentioned all those departed in the Christian and Catholic faith, entreating God to have mercy on them, through the *saints*, &c., whom they named along with them: and hence it is plain they offered these prayers, believing in a middle state of purgation or suffering of the souls of penitent Christians. "This Tradition of the Fathers the universal church observes," says St. Augustine, Serm. 172, de Verb. apos. sec. 2.

In these discussions I cannot be persuaded that any party can claim an exclusive privilege, excepting so far as he may be entitled to such, either by the validity of his arguments, or the character of his testimonies; nor do I imagine, from my connection with your paper, that such would be attempted. Upon this principle, then, I claim the right of quoting, in support of my views, from Origen's comment on Jeremiah, a right too which I consider I am as fully entitled, as you could be, when you quoted from the same comment, in page 110, col. 3, October, 1852.

I remain, Sir, yours sincerely,
EDMOND POWER.

Mullinavat, April 4th, 1853.

The first thing we have here to do is to defend ourselves from the charge of inconsistency in quoting Origen ourselves, and yet rejecting his authority when he was brought forward as a witness by Mr. Power; and our defence consists in a simple explanation of the principles on which we appeal to the testimony of the Fathers. We do not believe that we are bound to assent to everything that is contained in any work of an ancient Father, even though that work be not condemned by any Pope or Council. When we quote Origen we do so merely to ascertain what were the sentiments of Origen on such a subject; but, then, there is a further question—Were the sentiments of Origen approved of by the Catholic Church of his day—that is to say, by the majority of Christians of his time? And, again, there is an appeal from *their* doctrine to that of their predecessors, and, above all, to the statements of our Lord himself and of his apostles. We did quote Origen's testimony to the sufficiency of Scripture; but, then, we gave quotations enough from other Fathers to show that this, at least, was not one of Origen's heresies; and we do not think Mr. Power will say that this is a subject on which Origen's views were ever held heretical. We objected to Origen's testimony in favour of Purgatory—not on account of erroneous views of his *on irrelevant subjects*, but because it was on this very subject of the state of the soul after death that Origen was decidedly and particularly heretical, and because *the passage quoted by Mr. Power* is acknowledged, by learned Roman Catholics, to be one embodying Origen's heretical views. In fact, Origen believed that *all* future torments were only purgatorial and temporary; and, in the excess of his charity, he supposed that even the devil himself, after a sufficient amount of suffering, would be purified enough to resume his place among the angels of God. It is easy, then, to produce passages, in which Origen speaks of the sufferings to be endured by sinners after death as temporary; but it will be seen that this is very different from the Roman Catholic doctrine of a Purgatory where torments are endured by the souls *of the justified* after their departure from this world.

In proof of our assertion, that the passage quoted by Mr. Power from Origen is heretical, we need only refer to the note of the Benedictine editors on the passage—viz., "Not only in this place, but in a multitude of others, Origen establishes a Purgatory; but *in his own way*—that is to say, that *no other fire* or punishments torture souls but those that are *Purgatorial* or *temporary*."—Vol. iii., p. 232. We suppose we shall not be asked for formal proof that this doctrine is heretical, but the reader who requires the authority of Popes and Councils will bear in mind that Origen was condemned by the Synods of Alexandria and of Cyprus, by Pope Anastasius, and by the fifth General Council held at Constantinople in the Pontificate of Pope Vigilius.

And as to what the Fathers taught, as to this particular doctrine of the purifying influence of the torments of another world, will best appear from the evidence of Epiphanius and Augustine, which we select from that of other Fathers, that it may be seen how Mr. Power's three witnesses agree with each other.

St. Augustine says (Lib. de Hæres, c. xliii.—Ed. Bened. t. viii., p. 10]—"What Catholic Christian, learned or unlearned, does not vehemently abhor that Purgatory of sins which Origen speaks of—namely, the doctrine that those who have finished this life in scandalous crimes, and sacrileges, and impieties, the greatest possible—nay, that the devil himself and his angels shall, after a very long time indeed, be purged and liberated, and restored to the kingdom of God and to light. . . . . Concerning which vain impiety I have disputed diligently in the books on the city of God, against the philosophers from whom Origen learned these notions."

What Epiphanius thought of Origen may be learned from his second book on heresies, where the 64th section (a very long one) is devoted to an examination of some of the errors of Origen, and where such epithets are applied to him and his doctrines that we can guess how the good father would have shuddered could he have known in what company he would be placed by Mr. Power. At present we refer to Epiphanius's letter to John, bishop of Jerusalem* (works, vol. ii. p. 314, Paris, 1622) in which, after calling Origen the father of Arius, and the root of other heresies, he goes on—"And this, too, which he maintains, I know not whether to grieve or laugh at; for this excellent teacher, Origen, dares to teach that the Devil will again be what he was once, and will return to the same dignity, and will ascend the kingdom of heaven. O shocking! Who can be so senseless and so foolish as to believe that John the Baptist, and Peter, and John the Apostle, and Isaiah, and Jeremiah, and the rest of the prophets shall be co-heirs with the Devil in the kingdom of God?"

We think we have said enough to show that Origen's notions on the subject of Purgatorial torment cannot be safely followed. And we might now reasonably refuse to go further; for it will be remembered that our controversy with W. C. Search and Mr. Power, arose out of a discussion of the question, Did the Fathers of the first *three* centuries know anything about Purgatory? When every attempt has failed to produce a mention of Purgatory from any orthodox writer of the first three centuries, we may be satisfied that the doctrine of Purgatory was not received by tradition from the Apostles. It becomes, then, a matter of mere *historical curiosity* whether the belief in it arose in the Church in the fourth or in some succeeding century. We are content, however, to enter into this discussion as far as it relates to the fourth century, and shall prove that Purgatory was no part of the doctrine of the Church in that age. In particular we shall prove that St. Epiphanius and St. Augustine counted no such belief among their articles of faith, and we shall prove it from the very passages to which Mr. Power has referred. We have so much to say on this subject that we shall make the sentiments of St. Epiphanius and St. Augustine, about Purgatory, the subject of a separate article in our next number.

THE SEVEN SACRAMENTS.

WE resume our examination of the seven sacraments of the Church of Rome, in reply to the letter of "J. B.," in our March number.

We beg to remind our readers that a sacrament can only be instituted by appointing and commanding the form and matter of the sacrament. The question whether Christ instituted a sacrament is, therefore, in fact only a question whether Christ appointed the form and matter of it—that is, the words to be said and the thing to be used.

CONFIRMATION.

Our correspondent mentions Matt. xix. 13-15, as being applied by individual Roman Catholics to prove that the sacrament of confirmation, as now held by the Church of Rome, was instituted by Christ. Those words are—"Then were little children presented to him, that he should impose hands on them and pray, and the disciples rebuked them. But Jesus said, Suffer little children, and forbid them not to come to me, for the kingdom of heaven is for such. And when he imposed hands on them, he departed from them." Our correspondent adds, "see also Acts viii. 14, 15, 16, and 17."

What, then, is the "form and matter" of the sacrament of confirmation, as now held in the Church of Rome? And do these passages of Scripture prove that Christ instituted that form and matter?

What, then, is the "matter" of the modern Roman sacrament of confirmation? The Catechism of the Council of Trent answers, "The matter of confirmation is chrism" (that is, a kind of ointment, made of olive oil and balsam). Without this "matter" the Roman sacrament cannot exist at all. Now, is there any proof, in the passages above referred to, that Christ or his apostles ever used chrism? Clearly not; and, therefore, there is no proof that Christ or his apostles ever made the sacrament at all. Protestants believe that the laying on of hands is an apostolic institution; but the Church of Rome says that it is no sacrament without the use of chrism. Is not the question about *the sacrament* of confirmation a question whether Christ appointed chrism? and where is the proof that he did?

This "form" of the sacrament of confirmation is stated, by the same Catechism of the Council of Trent, to consist in these words—"I sign thee with the sign of the cross, and I confirm thee with the chrism of sal-

* As we have had occasion to quote this letter, it may interest our readers to know some of the circumstances which gave occasion to it. We add them in a separate article (see page 59), not wishing to mix up two subjects in the same article.

vation, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Did Christ or his apostles use these words? If not, they made no sacrament of confirmation, according to the Church of Rome. Do the passages prove that Christ instituted these words? if not, they prove no sacrament. Many most learned Roman Catholics have confessed that Christ never appointed either the matter or form of this sacrament, as now held in their Church.

HOLY ORDERS.

Matt. x. 7—"And going, preach, saying, the kingdom of heaven is at hand." See also Acts vi. 6, and xiii. 3.

These words of our Saviour express only a commission to preach the Gospel; they do not institute a sacrament.

All Roman Catholics say that our Saviour did not institute a sacrament of orders until his last supper; the above words were spoken by Him nearly two years before. These words, therefore, prove that a Divine commission to preach may be given without instituting a sacrament of orders.

The "matter" of the sacrament, according to the Council of Trent, is handing to the person ordained a chalice with consecrated wine, and a paten with consecrated bread. Is there any proof from Scripture that our Saviour appointed the paten to be so handed, as the "matter" of ordaining? We have certain proof that the clergy of the early Church were not ordained by any such form; and how, then, can we say that "matter" was instituted by Christ? If that "matter" was not used, there was no sacrament in orders, according to the Church of Rome.

The "form" of this sacrament is declared, by the Catechism of the Council of Trent, to consist in these words—"Receive the power of offering sacrifice," &c. Without these words the Church of Rome holds that the sacrament of orders cannot be made. If any one will show us proof that Christ appointed these words, to be used in conferring orders, we may then believe that he instituted the Roman sacrament of orders.

We acknowledge that Christ instituted a ministry, and gave a Divine commission, which still continues in the Church; but the Church of Rome says that this institution is no sacrament without the use of the words—"Receive the form of offering sacrifice." Without those words the sacrament cannot be. Now, it is notorious that no such words were used in ordaining for ages after Christ; we, therefore, acknowledge Holy Orders as an institution of Christ, but not as a sacrament instituted by him.

EXTREME UNCTION.

Of this we have spoken before; there is less reason to dwell on it here, which our space does not permit. The only passages even referred to for it (Matt. x. 6, and James v. 14, 15), so evidently refer to the healing of the body, and so expressly promise that healing, that we are at a loss to understand how any one can suppose that these passages could be intended to institute a sacrament which was to be understood only in case "of approaching dissolution."

ON THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—As it is possible that many members of the Church of Rome may never have read or considered the original documents in which the doctrine of their church, regarding "the sacrifice of the mass," is set forth, I have thought it desirable to put together some extracts relating to it, taken from the most authentic Roman Catholic formularies, and to subjoin some observations upon them, in order that Roman Catholics may be fully aware of the teaching of their church on this head, and of the consequences to which it leads.

1. The doctrine of the Church of Rome on the "Sacrifice of the mass," as set forth by the Council of Trent, is this:—(Vid. Catechism, by decree of the Holy Council of Trent, *published by command of Pope Pius V.* Rome, printed *at the Propaganda Press.* SUPERIORUM PERMISSU, 1839)—

"We, therefore, confess that the Sacrifice of the Mass is, and ought to be, considered, *one and the same sacrifice with that of the cross*, FOR THE VICTIM IS ONE AND THE SAME, *Christ our Lord*, who offered himself once only a bloody sacrifice on the altar of the cross. This being the case the pastor will teach with *absolute certainty* that the holy sacrifice of the mass is a TRULY PROPITIATORY SACRIFICE, by which God is appeased and rendered propitious to us. If, therefore, with pure hearts, a lively faith, and an inward sorrow for our transgressions, we IMMOLATE and offer this most holy victim, we shall, no doubt, obtain mercy," &c., &c. (pp. 246-7).

Again (Council of Trent, Session xxii., ch. 1, 2, and canon 3, also Creed of Pius IV.), the doctrine is thus authoritatively set forth—"Christ having celebrated the ancient passover, which the multitude of the children of Israel immolated in memory of their departure out of Egypt. He instituted the new passover—to wit, namely, THAT HIMSELF SHOULD BE IMMOLATED, under visible signs, by the Church *through the priests*, in memory, &c. And inasmuch as in this Divine sacrifice which is performed in the mass, that *same Christ is contained and immolated* in a bloodless manner, who once offered himself in a bloody manner on the cross, the holy synod teaches that this sacrifice is *truly propitiatory; for the* VICTIM IS ONE AND THE SAME, the same now offering, by the ministry of priests, who then offered himself on the cross, *the manner alone of offering being different.*" Therefore, saith the canon, "If any one shall say that the sacrifice of the mass is only a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, but not a propitiatory sacrifice; or that it avails him only that receiveth; and that it ought not to be offered for the living *and the dead for sins, satisfactions*, and other necessities; let him be anathema"—accursed!

2. This is the doctrine of the Church of Rome, based (as we have seen) upon a special, and formal, and authoritative decree of that church, in synod assembled, regarding this awful subject. It follows, of course, unavoidably, upon a doctrine previously propounded, the doctrine of transubstantiation. The Church had there taught by decree (Vid. Cat. of Pius V., ib. pp. 208, 214, 219, 225, 243-4: and Council Trident, Sess. xiii. ch. 4, and Can. 1, 2: and the Creed of Pius IV.), that "In the Eucharist, that which before consecration was bread and wine, is, *after consecration, really and* SUBSTANTIALLY, *the body and blood of* our Lord:" that "it is the CONVERSION *of the bread into the* TRUE BODY *of our Lord*;" "that the *real body of Christ*, THE SAME THAT WAS BORN OF THE VIRGIN, and sits at the right hand of the Father in heaven, is *contained in this sacrament*; and that, however remote from, and alien to, the senses it may seem, NO SUBSTANCE OF THE ELEMENTS REMAINS IN THE SACRAMENT; *the substance of bread and wine is so changed into the body and blood of our Lord*, THAT THE SUBSTANCE OF BREAD AND WINE ALTOGETHER CEASES TO EXIST:" "*after consecration the substance of bread and wine* DOES NOT REMAIN IN THE SACRAMENT:" and that, therefore, "the WORSHIP *of Latria* (worship of highest order), *which is* DUE TO THE TRUE GOD, *is to be offered* TO *this most holy sacrament*;" and that "if any one shall deny the same, let him be anathema," or accursed!

Having decreed this as its doctrine regarding the *nature* of the sacrament, the *offering* of such a sacrament must, unavoidably, become a "*sacrifice*"—a sacrifice of the host ("hostia") or victim—that victim being Christ Himself.

There cannot be two opinions, then, regarding *what* the authoritative teaching of the Roman Church, since the Tridentine council, upon this subject is. That Church teaches, that the sacrament of the Eucharist is *the sacrificing of a propitiatory victim for the sins of the living and of the dead*, every time it is celebrated; *that the very body and blood* CREATED BY CONSECRATION OF THE ELEMENTS—*the same that was born into the world of the Virgin Mary*—ARE THEN "IMMOLATED;" and that *the sacrificer is the officiating Priest.*

3. Now, my object in publishing this statement from the Catechism, Creed, Councils, and Canons of the Tridentine Church at Rome is, that those who are designedly *kept in ignorance* regarding what the *very* doctrines of that Church are, may accurately *know the truth*, and thereby be in a position to follow my arguments and observations upon them, and judge for themselves as to the unavoidable consequences to which those doctrines lead.

First, let us simply regard the terms in which this doctrine is embodied.

It is stated that the sacrament of the Eucharist is *the sacrificial offering of the human body of Christ*—"the same that was born of the Virgin"—"the same that was offered on the cross."—Vid. *Catec., ibid.* p. 205, 246.

Now, if this defines this holy sacrament it must also define what it was at *the time of its institution* by our Blessed Lord himself. And then, speaking of what took place on that occasion, we ought to say and believe that Christ offered up himself *before* he offered himself; that he sacrificed (*immolated*) himself, *all the while being alive*; and, moreover, while alive, in that sacrifice, *ate himself!* For Cardinal Bellarmine (De Missa. lib. i. c. 2,) plainly states—"In a true sacrifice it is requisite that which is offered unto God be *destroyed.*"—(Vid. Bp. Beveridge, Art. xxxi.)

And next, from the wording of the doctrine thus defined by the Church of Rome, let us proceed to compare the doctrine as thus intended to be set forth, with the unequivocal teaching of the word of God upon the subject which is thus daringly handled:—

The Tridentine doctrine is—"that having celebrated the ancient Passover, which the multitude of the children of Israel immolated in memory of their departure out of Egypt, He (Christ) instituted the new passover, to wit, namely, that Himself should be immolated through the priests." (*Vide* Trident. Counc. supra.) By which one thing only can be intended to be stated, namely, that as the children of Israel "slew, immolated, destroyed" the lamb in the Passover, *so, in like manner, is Christ* (the host, or victim) *slain, immolated, and destroyed, by the officiating priest, every time the sacrifice of the mass is offered!* The doctrine, as stated in the words of the Trent Catechism, Creed, and Canons of the Council, cannot, I think, bear any other construction; and, if that construction be not nonsense, it appears to me to be very like *blasphemy.*

This same decree of the Tridentine Council on "the sacrifice of the mass," asserts, that in the host "Christ himself is immolated, under visible signs, *by the priest*," which, if it does not *deny* that our Blessed Lord was "the priest" as well as the victim, when he shed his precious blood, once for all, on Calvary, asserts that the *officiating priest is Christ*; for it states (Catech. p. 246—7), that "*the priest is one and the same* (who offers up the host) as Christ our Lord," (who offered up himself). If this be not nonsense, I fear it is blasphemy; and yet the priest who says that in the eucharist he has *made Christ* his God by transubstantiation, *must* also affirm, as his Church teaches him, that when he offers the mass he (*the priest*) *sacrifices* him again! But Christ is not only our only victim for the forgiveness of sins, but he is also *our only High Priest* "for ever according to the order of Melchisedech," *capable of offering that victim.* Will any one dare to say that *in any sense* he offers Him in sacrifice? Do the Romish priests, indeed, desire to "crucify the Son of man afresh?"

But even this, shocking as it appears, is not the most fearful of the consequences to which the Tridentine Church is committed by its canons, creed, and catechism, already rehearsed, on the doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass.

That doctrine is, that *every time* the mass is celebrated, a *fresh* propitiatory sacrifice "for the remission of sins" is offered; that "it is a perpetual sacrifice, *by which* our sins may be expiated" (Catec. Pius V., p. 244), "by which the bloody sacrifice *once* offered on the cross may be *renewed.*"—Ibid. In short, that *every time* the mass is offered, Christ is offered also "for the remission of sins!"

How thoroughly subversive this is of the doctrine of the Cross, and how totally it is contradicted, in consequence, by the plain and repeated statements of the Word of God, we need scarcely point out to those who have free access to that standard of truth.

The Word of God teaches that CHRIST suffered "once," "*only once.*"—(Heb. ix. 12), "Christ being come a High Priest of good things, not by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood, He entered in once (ἅπαξ, *once for all and for ever*) into the holy place, having obtained *eternal redemption* for us (*αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν*) *a propitiatory offering for ever and ever!*"

Again, the Word of God states (Ibid v. 25, 26), "*nor yet that He should* OFFER HIMSELF OFTEN (*ἵνα πολλάκις*) *not more than once*; not again and again, as in the mass, *for then* must He often have suffered: but now once (*ἅπαξ, once for all*) in the end of the world hath He appeared, to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself!'

Again, it is clearly stated, by the same unerring authority, as if the prophetic mind foresaw the future heresy of Rome (Ibid ch. x. 11, 12, 14)—"Every high priest standeth *daily* ministering, and offering *oftentimes* the same sacrifice, which can *never take away sins*; BUT this Man, *after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever*, sat down on the right hand of God!"

Every one must perceive the *direct denial* which these declarations of God's Word receive from the Tridentine dogmas. The Tridentine dogma is, that "the sacrifice of Christ on the Cross is *daily renewed* in the mass *for the remission of sins* of the living and the dead." The Word of God says—"Now, where remission of sin is, there is no more offering for sin." Now, in the mass *there* is "an offering for sin" made again and again continually; *therefore* the offering for sin upon the cross was *imperfect* and *insufficient!*[*]

I challenge the Church of Rome to prove, first, that the doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass, as stated above, is not the authoritative teaching of that community; and, secondly, as compared with the Word of God, that it is not what it was asserted 300 years ago to be, a "blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit."—Art. of Ch. of Eng. xxxi.

4. And now, before I dismiss this subject, it will be a relief and satisfaction every way to the reader, to know what the teaching of the true Catholic Church, regarding the great mystery of the Eucharist, is. It is thus stated by one of her confessors and martyrs, Bishop Ridley, who was burned alive at Oxford, on the 16th October, 1555, in these words—"The controversie, no doubt, which at this day troubleth the Church, is not whether the holy sacrament of the body and blood of Christ is no better than a peece of common bread or no; or whether the Lord's table is no more to be regarded than the table of any earthly man, or no; or whether it be a bare sign or figure of Christ and nothing else, or no; for all do graunt that St. Paule's words do require

[*] "Whosoever shall seeke any other sacrifice propitiatory for sinne maketh the sacrifice of Christ of no vaildities, force, or efficacie. For if it bee sufficient to remit sinnes, what need is there of any other? For the necessitie of another argueth and declareth this to be insufficient. Almightie God, grant that we may truly leane on this one sacrifice of Christe; and that wee to him may again repay our sacrifice of thanksgiving, or praise, of confessing of His name, of true amendment, or repentance, of mercifulness towards our neighbours, and of all other good words of charitie! For by such sacrifices wee shall declare ourselves neither ungrateful to God, nor altogether unworthy of this holy sacrifice of Christ."—Archbishop Cranmer's Explication, given at Oxford before he suffered.

that the bread which we break is the partaking of the body of Christ; and also do graunt, hym that eateth of that bread, and drinketh of that cup unworthelye, to be guiltie of the Lorde's death, and to eat and drink his own damnation, because he esteemeth not the Lorde's body, &c.

"Thus, then, hetherto yet, we all agree. But now let see wherein the dissention doth stande.

"It is neither to be denied nor dissembled, that in the matter of this sacrament there be divers pointes, wherein men counted to be learned cannot agree—as, Whether there be any transubstantiacion of the bread, or no? Any corporall and carnal presence of Christe's substance, or no? Whether adoration, only due unto God, is to be done to the sacrament, or no? And whether Christe's body be there offered indeed unto the Heavenly Father by the priest, or no? Or whether the evyll man receyveth the natural body of Christ, or no? Yet, nevertheless, as in a man discased in divers partes, commonly the original cause of such divers diseases, which is spread abroad in the body do come from one chief member, as from the stomacke, or from the head: even so all these five aforesaid poyntes do chiefly hang upon this one question, which is, What is the *matter* of the sacrament? whether it is the natural substance of bread, or the natural substance of Christe's owne bodye? The truth of this question, truly tried out and agreed upon, no doubt shall cause the controversie in all to rest. For if it be Christe's owne natural body, born of the Virgin, then assuredly (seeing all learned men in England, so far as I know, both new and old, graunt there is but one substance), then, I say, they must need graunt Transubstantiation—that is, a chaunge of the substaunce of bread into the substaunce of Christe's body; then, also, they must graunt the carnal and corporal presence of Christe's body; then must the sacrament be adored with the honour due unto Christe himself, for the unitie of the two natures in one person; then if the priest do offer the sacrament, he doth offer indeede Christe himself; and, finally, the murtherer, the adulterer, or wicked man, receyvyng the sacrament, must needes there receive also the natural substaunce of Christe's owne blessed body, flesh and blood.

"Now, on the other side, if, after the truth shall be truly tried out, it be found that the substaunce of bread is the natural substaunce of the sacrament, although, for the chaunge of the use, office and dignity of the bread, the bread, indeed, is sacramentally chaunged into the bodye of Christe, as the water in baptism is sacramentally chaunged into the fountaine of regeneration, and yet, the natural substaunce thereof remayneth all one, as it was before; if, I say, the true solution of that former question, whereupon all these controversies do hang, be, that the natural substaunce of bread is the *material* substaunce of the sacrament of Christe's blessed body, then must it needes follow of the former proposition (confessed of all that be named to be learned, so farre as I do know, in England), which is, that there is but *one* material substaunce in the sacrament of the body, and one only likewise in the sacrament of the blood—that there is no such thing, in deede, and in truth, as they call transubstantiacion; for the *substance of the bread remayneth* still in the sacrament of the body; then, also, the natural substance of Christe's human nature, which he took of the Virgin Mary, is in heaven, where it reigneth now in glory, and not there enclosed under the form of bread; then that godly honour, which is onely due unto God the Creator, and may not be done unto the creature, without idolatrye and sacrilege, is not to be done unto the sacrament; then, also, the wicked, I meane the impenitent murtherer, adulterer, or such lyke, do not receive the natural substance of the blessed bodye and blood of Christe: finally, then doth it follow, that Christe's blessed bodye and bloud, which was once onely offered, and shed upon the cross, beyng available for the synnes of all the whole world, is offered up no more in the natural substaunce thereof, neither by the priest nor any other thing.

"Now, then, you wy llsay, What kind of Presence do they graunt? and what do they deny? Briefly, they deny the presence of Christe's body in the natural substaunce of his human and assumpt nature, and graunt the presence of the same by grace—that is, they affirme and saye, that the substance of the natural body and bloud of Christe, is only remaining in heaven, and so shall be unto the later day, when he shall come agayne in glory, accompanied with the angels of heaven, to judge both the quicke and the dead. And the same natural substaunce of the very body and bloud of Christe because it is united unto the divine nature, in Christ, the second person in the Trinitie; therefore, it hath not only life in itself, but is also able to give, and doth give, life unto so many as be, or shall be partakers thereof; even, as for example, we saye, the same sunne, which in *substance* never removeth his place out of the heavens, is yet *present* here by his beames, light, and natural influence, where it shineth upon the earth; for God's Word and his sacraments be, as it were, the beames of Christ, which is 'sol justitiæ'—the sun of Righteousness."—*Vide Bp. Ridley's Treatise on the Lord's Supper*

"As for us," saith Bishop Cosin, "we al lopenly profess, with St. Bernard, that the presence of the body of Christ, in the sacrament, is spiritual, and, therefore, *true* and *real*; and with the same Bernard, and all the ancients, we deny that the body of Christ is either carnally present or given. The thing we willingly admit, but humbly and religiously forbear to inquire into the manner."

Had the Romish maintainers of transubstantiation done the same, they would not have determined and decreed, and then have imposed, as an article of faith, absolutely necessary to salvation, *a manner of presence*, newly by them invented, under pain of the most direful curse, and there would have been, in the Church, less wrangling, and more peace and unity.

A. C. T.

AUTHORIZED STATEMENTS ON THE NATURE AND KIND OF PUNISHMENTS IN PURGATORY.

SIR—I want to know if the following passage fairly represents the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church about Purgatory; and I hope you will give me an answer, or get it for me, in your paper, as I want particularly to know if it is correct:—

"When life is fled with the last light, still neither every evil nor all corporeal suffering departs from the wretched beings. It is inevitable, that many things that have, for a long time, cleaved to them, should have grown into them in a wonderful manner; therefore, they are grieved with torture, and suffer the punishment of their former sins. Some are spread out, hung up to the winds: the stain of guilt is washed out of others in a deep whirlpool, or burned out with fire. Each suffers his proper expiation. At length we are conveyed into the spacious paradise, and a few of us possess the habitations of joy, when a long time has taken out the stain that was contracted."

I hope, sir, that you will be able to tell me whether this statement of Purgatory be correct, and authorized.

Yours, &c.,

A CONSTANT READER.

We think the above passage gives *a fair statement* of the doctrine of Purgatory, as now commonly held by Roman Catholics. At the same time, we are bound to say, that the passage is *not* an *authorized* statement of the doctrine of the Church of Rome.

We give here such statements as are authorized, in order that our readers may compare the two. The only really authorized statement we know of, as to the *nature* of the sufferings in Purgatory, is in the Catechism of the Council of Trent:—"The *fire* of Purgatory, in which the souls of just men are cleansed by a temporary punishment, in order to be admitted into their eternal country, into which nothing defiled entereth"—p. 59. Again—"Those who require to be freed from the stains of sin, or die indebted to the Divine justice, are purified in the fire of Purgatory"—p. 61.

These are authorized statements of what the Church of Rome believes about Purgatory.

Now, on comparing the passage which "A Constant Reader" has brought forward, it will be seen at once that it agrees exactly with these authorized statements—1st, as to the purpose for which souls are sent to Purgatory—viz., to have the stains of sin purged out; 2nd, as to the efficiency of torture in effecting that cleansing; and 3rd, that fire is employed to accomplish this object. They differ in this: that the passage produced by the reader speaks of *other* tortures being also employed for the same purpose, such as bleaching the souls in the winds, and steeping them in a whirlpool. The Council of Trent says nothing of these punishments; but the difference is not irreconcileable, because the Catechism does not say that fire *only* is employed. We do not know of any *authorized* statement of the Church of Rome that other punishments *are* employed; but we believe it is left at liberty for persons to believe that other punishments are used. Thus, when some of the Greek Church, at the Council of Florence, A.D., 1439, agreed for the first time to believe in Purgatory (which confession the Greek Church disavowed), they did it in these words—"The middle sort of souls were in a place of punishment; but whether that were fire, or darkness and tempest, or something else, they would not contend."—Sess. 25. This was accepted, and so the formal instrument of agreement was drawn up—"their souls are purged after death, with purgatorial punishments"—without saying exactly *what* punishments. There are also many books, published by Roman Catholic authors of credit in their own church, which affirm that bleaching and steeping are used in Purgatory. These may be found in the Speculum Exemplorum, printed at Douay, A.D., 1603.

The passage which our Reader brings forward is, therefore, quite agreeable, in the main, to the authorized statements of the Church of Rome; and when it goes beyond those authorized statements, in some lesser details, it is only what Roman Catholics are allowed by their church, and what we believe they commonly do hold.

But while we say this we are bound also to say, that that passage which the Reader quotes is *not* an *authorized* statement of the doctrine of the Church of Rome: for this reason, it is actually a statement of the doctrine of the heathen religion. In fact, that passage was written by a heathen poet, Virgilius Maro, (Æn. vi. 735), before the birth of Christ, and of course before the Catholic Church or the Catholic religion were in existence. It is, therefore, a statement of the doctrines of the heathen religion, and not of the Christian religion.

It does certainly seem very strange that a statement made by a heathen, of the doctrines of the heathen religion, the religion of false gods, should serve so exactly to express the doctrines of the Church of Rome now. How can this be accounted for? Cardinal Bellarmine tries to account for it by saying that Virgil learned this much truth from the light of reason itself.—De Purgat. lib. i., cap. 11, p. 612, Colon. But, then, it seems strange that the light of reason should have taught this heathen nothing of the true God, not even that God is one. And, besides this, though the Church of Rome considers it quite true to believe *now* what Virgil wrote then, yet that Church considers it quite false for him to have believed a great part of it *then!* For Virgil believed not only that Purgatory was then in existence, but that the actual deliverance of souls from Purgatory was then actually taking place. The Church of Rome believes that Purgatory was then in existence, but holds, also, that there was no deliverance out of Purgatory until Christ descended there "to liberate from suffering the holy and the just who were held in painful captivity."—Catechism of Trent, p. 60. It is clear, therefore, that Virgil was wrong in holding what he did at that time, though the Church of Rome thinks herself right in holding the same doctrine now.

We, therefore, do not see how the exact resemblance of the heathen religion and the religion of the Church of Rome, in this doctrine, can be accounted for. Protestants say that this is a heathen doctrine, that the early Church rejected it as such, and that the Church of Rome, in later times, copied it (like other things, such as the use of incense in sacrifices, images in worship, &c.), from the heathens.

This would certainly account for the exact resemblance between the two. If any other way of accounting for it can be suggested, we will be ready to publish it.

ON LADY DAY AND GOOD FRIDAY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I have read, in the last number of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, the letter of Peter Brannigan, of Meath, on the observance of Good Friday and Lady Day, together with your remarks upon it.

I have myself been very much surprised at finding that the 25th of March this year was, as your correspondent expresses it, "*no day at all*" among the Roman Catholics, as, although long since aware that it was contrary to the practice of the priests of the Church of Rome to celebrate Mass on Good Friday, I could scarcely believe it possible that it would be thought right to disregard so high a festival as Lady Day, merely because it fell on the anniversary of the crucifixion. I thought it was most likely that the same relaxation of discipline would be allowed, as in the case of *Christmas day* falling on a Friday, in which case you are aware that *no fast* is required.

I find, however, that in the case under consideration a different expedient was had recourse to (at least in this county—Limerick)—viz., to celebrate Lady Day on the *Monday week following*, while the *real festival* was rigidly observed as a black fast.

I am not able to give you any authority for the "strange rule" which forbids the priest to celebrate Mass on Good Friday, but I have long been aware that such a rule was in existence. I have, however, lately heard a *very strange reason* given for this rule. I have been told that it is because *no priest is allowed to drink wine on that day.* Now, sir, if this really be the reason of the rule, I would ask some of your Roman Catholic correspondents to inform me whether in the celebration of Mass the priest *drinks wine at all*, as I have always understood it to be the faith of the Church of Rome that, after the words of consecration (and it is then that the priest drinks of the chalice) *there is a total change* of the *whole substance* of the wine into the *substance* of the *blood of the Lord Jesus Christ*, which change is called *Transubstantiation.*

If there be any truth in the doctrine of Transubstantiation I should think that the priest may, *without any breach of his abstinence*, partake of the contents of the chalice, and if it contain the *very blood of Christ*, I know of *no day* during the whole ecclesiastical year which seems so appropriate for a participation of *it* as the anniversary of that day on which it flowed from the bleeding wounds of our crucified Redeemer.

I am, sir, faithfully yours,

A. C.

ON I. CORINTHIANS XI. 24.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Permit me to correct one or two inaccuracies into which your correspondent "Fontium Petitor" has fallen. The view of Transubstantiation against which he contends, was not "put by Catholicus," but by you in the article on the Touchstone in your January number. Your words are—"If we understand these words in their literal sense, it is the *cup* and not the wine in it which is changed into blood." The sole object of my

letter, which appears to have been misunderstood, was to impeach the logical correctness of an argument that if the predicate of a proposition is taken in a literal sense, the subject must be used in a similar and cannot be used in a figurative sense, as the word cup plainly is.

I do not pretend to be able to cope with the learning and research often displayed in your columns. I often wished that some learned Catholic divines would enter the lists with you on such matters; but it is not because I am unable to reply to the whole of a subject, that I should refrain from noticing any errors I perceive. I cannot, for example, explain why the words "το κλωμενον," alluded to by your correspondent are, as I candidly confess I think, erroneously translated in the Rhemish Testament, "which *shall be* broken," instead of "which *is* broken;' and yet I cannot admit the argument of "Fontium Petitor," in the note (7) to his letter, founded on such a statement as that our Lord's body was not broken on the cross. It is true that neither his *legs* nor his *bones*, which Fontium Petitor seems to confound with his body, were broken; but if Fontium Petitor contends that our Lord's body, which our Lord himself speaks of as broken was not broken on the cross, I would ask him where, and when else was it broken?

I regret that your correspondent had not space to be more explicit in the latter part of his letter; I fear I do not comprehend the exact nature of his argument contained in the last two paragraphs of it; and I greatly desire to understand his exact views on the subject of those paragraphs.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

CATHOLICUS.

We are inclined to concede to "Catholicus" that "Fontium Petitor" has fallen into an inaccuracy in the note in question; and if our view be correct, the argument founded on the mistake (which, however, is of very minor importance), must fall to the ground. It strikes us, however, that the mistranslation of the words το κλωμενον in the Rhemish Testament, if made with the intention supposed by "Fontium Petitor," remains open to the same objection, but on different grounds from those put by him in the note to his letter. The change of tense, from the present to the future, gives the passage a sense that does not amount to proof; the utmost it can establish is an inference, and it appears to us that the inference afforded is rather the opposite to the one intended to be drawn. Roman Catholics are driven to argue that at the very time of the institution of the Eucharist the bread was actually, miraculously, though not visibly, changed into the body of our Lord. If such a change did not then occur, it could not be contended that in future ages, down to the present time, a change has been, and is, wrought by force of the words which failed to effect it at the time. But if that change was, as they contend, effected at the time that our Lord was breaking the bread, it follows, that the breaking of his body, which he then spoke of, was the act of breaking which he, *or what then appeared to be him*, was then performing upon what, though it looked like bread, was really his body.

If the words *το κλωμενον* however, are translated "shall be broken," the expression naturally excludes the present breaking, and the substance then broken, from our Lord's description of his body which should be broken thereafter. So far as relates to the breaking, referred to as only a future act, the bread could not then have been converted, otherwise our Lord would have spoken of his body as then broken, not as afterwards to be broken. The inference, therefore, from this language, "shall be broken," negatives the identity of the bread with the body, instead of establishing that proposition. With the wish of "Catholicus" that some learned divine of his Church should enter into discussion with us, we most cordially concur. We have again and again invited them to do so, and have offered to open our columns to any Roman Catholic in the kingdom, lay or clerical, who pleases to write in a calm and temperate tone. We cannot help asking ourselves why this repeated challenge has not been accepted by any of the clergy of that Church? And but one answer suggests itself—namely, that their side of the question does not bear free discussion, and they fear its effect upon the minds of their flocks. We are unwilling to suppose that there are not in the kingdom many Roman Catholic clergymen who have sufficient learning and ability to put forward whatever can be said in favour of the doctrines of their Church, and we can, therefore, only attribute this silence to consciousness of the weakness of their cause. They no doubt, have much to say, which, to minds predisposed in their favour, is plausible enough; but there are many plausible arguments, all wise men know, which will not bear the scrutiny of a thorough examination, and it is not, perhaps, thought altogether prudent to sift to the bottom the matters we have discussed in our pages. Be this as it may, we now repeat our invitation, and our offer to insert any argument that can be produced to controvert our reasoning, or to answer those authorities, frequently taken from the works of Roman Catholics, upon which our reasoning is founded.

FARMING OPERATIONS FOR MAY.

This being the best season for general green-cropping, all routine business likely to impede the preparation of the land for these crops should be got out of hands with all the despatch possible. This will more generally apply to the sowing of the barley crop, which, from the severity of the previous weather, is now, without doubt, greatly behind the usual time of sowing that crop.

Winter sown wheat, if too luxuriant, should be eaten down with sheep, or mown; and when sown in drills should now be hoed, or harrowed and rolled.

Beans, if well up, will require hand or horse-hoeing, and the spaces between well grubbed.

Carrots and parsnips, when well up, will require careful weeding, and when sufficiently advanced hand-hoeing, thinning, horse-hoeing, and grubbing.

Mangel-wurzel, sugar beet, and Swede turnips should be got in as early in the month as possible, if not already sown. It will greatly assist their brairding to steep those seeds in soft, or manure water, for 48 hours, and after draining well to dry them with wood or other ashes. The mangels may be germinated in the same way as recommended for carrots and parsnips the two preceding months.

Dale's hybrid and purple-topped Aberdeen turnips may be sown between the middle of this and the beginning of next month.

Cabbages.—Successional sowing of early York, Fulham, M'Ewan, Vanack, or drumhead cabbages may be made early in the month; should those already made be cut off, or insufficient; and continue putting out successional crops from the nursery beds.

Sowing Clover and grass seeds.—Lose no time in sowing the clover and grass seeds, so that they may be got in before the various corn crops, with which they are to be sown, begins to cover the ground.

Flax, if not already sown, should now receive no further delay, but be committed to the ground with all the dispatch possible.

Vetches.—Sow successional breadths, according to requirements. The best guide now will be to sow another breadth as soon as the last one is up.

New Pastures.—It is highly desirable to eat down the new pastures as closely as possible with sheep. Let no culms or seed stems arise; the sure mode of having a close sward and abundant supply of succulent leaves will be, to prevent the young grasses from flowering.

Sheep.—The flocks will require close tending this month; in case of being fly stricken, let the larvæ be immediately picked out with a blunt-pointed stick, and shake in through the wool a little finely-powdered dry white-lead, which will quickly dry up and heal the part. Let the ewes having lambs be closely clipped and cleaned of all hair or wool that may grow on or about the udder, likely to be in the way of the lambs when about sucking, as swallowing particles of wool by the lambs forms, with the coagulated milk, hard balls, impossible of digestion, and destroys numerous lambs every season. Towards the end of the month, the entire flock will require washing preparatory to shearing. For this purpose a stream of pure soft water, with a clean, gravelly bottom should be chosen. Much care, supervision, and attention is required in this operation, as the value of the wool will be greatly enhanced or deteriorated, as it is well or ill handled.

The dairy should now be coming into full and profitable operation. Clean milking must be closely attended to and insisted on, and every utensil or thing connected with the stock or dairy must be kept scrupulously clean. Constant scouring and rinsing are necessary; but to keep the tubs, keelers, milking vessels, &c., thoroughly clean and sweet, nothing will be found so effective as having a boiler large enough to receive them, and give them a good boil, being previously well cleansed, which will extract the oily particles from the pores of the timber.

Calves will now require particular attention—feed regularly, and be particular in seeing that the milk be strained, so as to free it of hairs; and as they are particularly liable to suck and lick each other, each should have a small wicker work muzzle put on and shaped to prevent it; many calves being lost every season from the hair and other substances swallowed, mixing with the coagulated milk, and forming hard and large balls in the stomach, impossible of digestion. A little chalk or soda given occasionally will prevent coagulation, and even when it has taken place will dissolve it, when a dose of castor oil or Epsom salts should be given to carry off the crude matter. We extract the following from the transactions of the Highland Society, and which will be found at length in the GAZETTE, vol. x. page 219:—

"*Indigestion.*—The only ailment under this head, to which calves are specially subject is a peculiar sort of indigestion, generally attacking them about the first or second week after birth, but liable to occur at any time while being fed on milk, and almost exclusively confined to those reared by the hand.

"*Symptoms.*—It is no uncommon thing for strong, healthy calves, fed from the pail, after being three, four, or five days plentifully supplied, to fall sick. They refuse their milk, the countenance is dejected, the belly hard, the extremities cold, and the whole animal seems overcome with sickness; and after an illness, varying from a day to three or four days, they die.

"The *remedial*, or, at least, *preventive treatment*, is simple. Nature herself points it out. She never designed the calf to swallow its milk a gallon at a time, but to suck it jet by jet from the teats of its mother. By this sucking process, an abundant secretion of saliva is carried on, so that a froth-like soap-lather is seen around its mouth; and in this the air is entangled and carried down into the stomach, to perform the functions we have been speaking of. It is well-known to those who have to do with the feeding of calves, that they have an insatiable desire to suck everything within their reach. This inclination is one of nature's own provisions, and ought not, without cause, to be thwarted. If the calf cannot be allowed to suck its mother, it should have its milk given it in smaller quantities, and more frequently than is commonly done—say four or five times a-day for the first fortnight of its life. It should also be induced, by the finger or some other object in its mouth, to suck its milk, and not to drink it; and should, in addition, have some loose article within its reach at which it can draw till it is tired. Means of this kind, coupled with a judicious restriction as to the entire quantity of milk given, would prevent a large amount of disease, and the death of many calves annually would be avoided.

"*White Scour.*—Under the present head may be mentioned also a form of disease occurring at a subsequent period of the life of the calf, when a similar set of conditions in the stomach produces a very dissimilar set of symptoms and terminations. It is commonly from the fourth to the eighth week of age that calves are affected by what is provincially termed the 'white scour'—a disease I do not recollect to have seen anywhere described, yet in some seasons and districts occurring almost with the frequency of an epidemic.

"*Symptoms.*—An increased hardness of the belly, without apparent enlargement. The animal is partially off its feeding, has dry and staring hair, and loses condition.

"From the bowels there is a copious chalky discharge of a white colour, generally semifluid, and always of an intolerably fetid odour. There are also commonly discharges of blood and mucus along with the fæces, occurring now and then during the course of the disease.

"The *treatment*, so far as prevention is concerned, I have already indicated, when speaking of the disease as it affects the younger animal; but in the case of the 'white scour,' we are able to do more in the way of remedy than in the other. Physic is here indicated. But will physic act upon the mass of cheese-like curd that has been accumulating for weeks? Along with purging, something has to be done to promote the secretion of a healthy, digesting fluid. This points out tonics. But there is also a tendency to extra acidity, and an antidote to this is to be found in some of the alkalies. We are now led to ask if anything could be given likely to have a dissolving action in the curdy matter already past the stage of healthy digestion, and here chemistry gives us efficient aid. Milk contains a portion of free soda, by means of which the caseine or curd is held in solution. It is the neutralization of this soda by an acid either added to or produced in the milk itself that causes coagulation, and the coagulated caseine may be again re-dissolved by the action of the caustic soda. This is exactly the action desiderated, but, unfortunately, caustic soda, from the difficulty of preparing and preserving it, is not yet admitted into the veterinary pharmacopœa. As a valuable substitute, however, and antacid also, which experience has convinced me has a slow but certain solving action on the curdy accumulations under notice, I can recommend the soda carbonates or bicarbonates; the former contains a larger amount of soda in proportion to acid than the latter, but the latter has more soda in a given weight. The formula I have found most useful in the treatment of the 'white scour,' is to give first a dose of physic—oleum ricini, if it can be conveniently procured, strengthened by a few drops of oleum crotonis, and beaten up with an egg. The dose may be from two and a half to four ounces of the first named, and from four to seven drops of the last. If the above is not at hand, from four to six ounces of Epsom salts, and a tablespoonful of common salts, will have nearly the same effect. For three days after the physic, should the chalky-like fæces continue, I give the following powder, in a little milk and water, once a day:—

Bicarbonate of soda ..	....	½ oz. to 1 oz.
Powdered gentian or ginger ..	..	½ „ to ¾ „
„ croton seeds ..	..	½ gr. to 10 grains.

Mix.

"The variations in the quantities of medicine above stated are, of course, applicable to animals of different size and age. Should the disease still continue, and the animal be getting weak and reduced in flesh, after another dose of physic similar to the first, continue the antacid and tonic medicine, omitting the purgative, and giving instead, if severe purging and tenesmus supervene (as is sometimes the case) from gr. x. to gr. xxx. of pulv. opii. in each powder. By following out the above indications, a cure will seldom be missed. But as prevention is the better remedy, let the feeding of calves be judiciously attended to, and let it be recollected that it is not the quantity of milk swallowed, but the quantity digested and assimilated, that is useful to the animal, and then the disease which I have in this section endeavoured to describe, and to which calves are so liable, will disappear of themselves."

Waste or Mountain land in process of reclamation should be scrawed and burned to grow rape or turnips.

New and Recent Works

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

Booksellers to the Queen,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

THE FIRST RESURRECTION: Being Comments on 1 Cor. chap. xv. By the Rev. Robert Noble. (Immediately.)

THE DOMESTIC COMMENTARY ON THE HOLY SCRIPTURES. By a Clergyman of the Church of England. 4 vols. Imp. 8vo. £2 15s. 6d.

CHRISTOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, and a Commentary on the Messianic Predictions. By E. W. Hengstenberg. vol. 1. 10s. 6d.

INCIDENTS OF TRAVEL IN CENTRAL AMERICA, CHIAPAS AND YUCATAN. By the late John Lloyd Stephens. With numerous Engravings. 8vo. 12s.

GRATITUDE: an Exposition of the Hundred and Third Psalm. By the Rev. John Stevenson. 8vo. 6s.

THE BIBLE IN THE COUNTING HOUSE: a course of Lectures to Merchants. By the Rev. H. A. Broadman, D.D. 8vo. 5s.

LEILA ADA, THE JEWISH CONVERT: an authentic Memoir. By Osborne W. Trenery, Heighway. 3s. 6d.

SELECT EXTRACTS FROM THE DIARY, CORRESPONDENCE, ETC., OF LEILA ADA. By Osborne W. Trenery, Heighway. 3s. 6d.

THE BUD OF PROMISE: a Memoir of Eliza H. M. Græme. By the Rev. D. Pitcairn. 3s. 6d.

THE RUSSO-TURKISH CAMPAIGN OF 1828-29; with a View of the present State of the Eastern Question. By Colonel Chesney. 12s.

THE RUSSIAN SHORES OF THE BLACK SEA, IN THE AUTUMN of 1852, with a Voyage down the Volga, and a Tour through the Country of the Don Cossacks. By Laurence Oliphant. 8vo. 14s.

PROGRESS OF RUSSIA IN THE WEST, NORTH, AND SOUTH. By David Urquhart. 1s. 6d.

THE RUSSIANS OF THE SOUTH. By Shirley Brooke. 1s.

TURKEY AND CHRISTENDOM: An Historical Sketch of the Relations between the Ottoman Empire and the States of Europe. 1s.

RUSSIA AND THE RUSSIANS: comprising an account of the Czar Nicholas, and the House of Romanoff, with a sketch of the Encroachments of Russia from the reign of the Empress Catherine. By J. H. Cole, 21st Fusileers. 2s. 6d.

THE BOOK AND ITS STORY; a Narrative for the Young, on occasion of the Jubilee of the British and Foreign Bible Society. By L. N. R. With an Introductory preface, by Rev. T. Phillips. Fcap. 4s.

WORK; or Plenty to Do, and How to Do it. By Margaret Maria Brewster. 12mo. 4s.

MY SCHOOLS AND MY SCHOOLMASTERS; or, the Story of my Education. By Hugh Miller. post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

THE HISTORY OF THE FRENCH PROTESTANT REFUGEES, from the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. By Charles Weiss. 8vo. 14s.

HISTORY OF THE PROTESTANT CHURCH IN HUNGARY, FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE REFORMATION TO 1850, with reference also to Transylvania. With an Introduction by Dr. D'Aubigne. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

THE CROSS AND THE DRAGON; or, the Fortunes of Christianity in China, with Notices of the Secret Societies of the Chinese. By J. Kesson. Post 8vo. 6s.

D'AUBIGNE'S HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION. Vol. V.—Subject:—"The Reformation in England." 8vo. 12s.

D'AUBIGNE'S HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY. Five vols. in One. 8vo. Cloth, 8s., Gilt Edges, 9s.

THE NET IN THE BAY; or Journal of a visit to Moose and Albany. By the Bishop of Rupert's Land. 4s. 6d.

INCIDENTS IN THE LIFE OF OUR SAVIOUR, ILLUSTRATIVE OF HIS DIVINE CHARACTER AND MISSION. By Rev. A. L. R. Foote. 6s.

THE WORDS OF JESUS. By the Author of the "Faithful Promiser." In Cover, 8d.; Cloth, 1s.

THE PSALMS RESTORED TO THE MESSIAH: A Commentary on the Book of Psalms. By Rev. R. H. Ryland. With a commendatory notice, by the Bishop of Cashel. 6s.

THE GREAT SACRIFICE. By Rev. John Cumming, D.D. 2s. 6d.

THE COMFORTER. By Rev. J. Cumming, D.D. 2s. 6d.

CHRIST OUR PASSOVER; or, Thoughts on the Atonement. By the Rev. John Cumming, D.D. 2s. 6d.

THE TENT AND ALTAR: Sketches of Patriarchal Days. By Rev. Dr. Cumming. 9s.

MEMOIRS OF THOMAS CHALMERS, D.D., LL.D. By his Son-in-Law, the Rev. Wm. Hanna, LL.D. 2 Vols., 12s.

MEMOIR OF THE LATE REV. EDWARD BICKERSTETH. By the Rev. T. R. Birks. Cheaper Edition. 2 vols., fcap. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

MEMOIR OF THE LIVES OF ROBERT AND JAMES A. HALDANE. By Alexander Haldane, Esq. 8vo. 12s.

MEMOIR OF THE REV. W. H. KRAUSE, A.M., Bethesda Chapel, Dublin, with selections from his Correspondence. By Rev. C. S. Stanford. Crown 8vo. 5s. 6d.

THE SUCCESSFUL MERCHANT: Sketches of the Life of Mr. Samuel Budgett. By William Arthur, A.M. 2s. 6d.

LIVES OF THE QUEENS OF ENGLAND. By Miss Strickland. New and Revised Edition. With numerous Portraits. Vols. I., II., III., IV., post 8vo, 7s. 6d. each. (To be completed in 8 monthly volumes.)

MEMOIR OF THE REV. JOHN PYE SMITH, D.D., LL.D. By John Medway. 12s. 6d.

DAILY BIBLE ILLUSTRATIONS: The Apostles and Early Christian Church. By Dr. Kitto. 6s.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES: THE MOSLEM, AND HIS END; THE CHRISTIAN AND HIS HOPE. By the Rev. John Cumming, D.D. 1s. 6d.

NUNS AND NUNNERIES. Two Lectures. By the Rev. Hobart Seymour. 1s. 4d.

THE MYSTERY SOLVED; or, Ireland's Miseries; the Grand Cause and Cure. By the Rev. Marcus Dill, D.D. 2s. 6d.

THE HISTORY OF ENGLAND, from the Invasion of Julius Cæsar to the end of the Reign of George II. By Hume and Smollett. With Continuation to the Accession of Queen Victoria. By the Rev. T. S. Hughes. Vol. i. 4s. (To be completed in 18 monthly vols.)

ST. PATRICK AND THE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH IN IRELAND. By the Rev. W. P. Walsh. Third Edition. 6d.

THE NECESSITY FOR AN INTERMEDIATE SYSTEM OF EDUCATION BETWEEN THE NATIONAL SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES OF IRELAND. By the Rev. Professor M'Cosh, D.D., Queen's College, Belfast. 6d.

THE ART OF QUESTIONING; or, a Short Analysis of the Interrogatory Methods of Instruction, designed for the use of Teachers, Pupil Teachers, and Monitors, By W. T. Young, T.C.D. 1s. By post, 1s. 4d.

PHILIPS' MAP OF THE FRONTIER PROVINCES OF TURKEY, RUSSIA, AND AUSTRIA, THE BLACK SEA, &c., with a detailed Map of the River Danube, showing the Fortified Towns, &c., along its course. In case. 1s.

PHILIPS' CHART OF THE MEDITERRANEAN, with detailed Plans of the Bays of Gibraltar, Genoa. Marseilles, &c. 1s.

PHILIPS' CHART OF THE NORTH SEA AND THE BALTIC, with detailed Plans of Cronstadt, Revel, &c. 1s.

JOHNSTONE'S MAP OF THE SEAT OF WAR in the Danubian Principalities, the Black Sea, &c. 1s.

JOHNSTONE'S CHART OF THE BALTIC, with enlarged plans of Kronstadt and St. Petersburgh. 1s.

WYLD'S MAP OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE, THE BLACK SEA, AND THE FRONTIERS OF RUSSIA AND PERSIA. Coloured, 2s. 6d.; mounted and in case, 4s. 6d.

WYLD'S CHART OF THE NORTH SEA AND THE BALTIC. 4s.

WYLD'S CHART OF THE THEATRE OF WAR, on an enlarged scale. 3s. In case, 5s.

WYLD'S PLAN OF CRONSTADT, with its Fortifications and Batteries. 1s.

Lately Published,

WILLET'S "SYNOPSIS PAPISMI." New Edition. Edited by the Rev. J. Cumming, D.D. Ten vols., 8vo. Price £3.

London: JAMES MILLER, 17, Berner's-street, Oxford-street, and all Booksellers.

Just Published, No. II., Price 6s.,

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND QUARTERLY REVIEW.

CONTENTS:

I. Convocation.
II. American Painters.
III. Prophet and Seer.
IV. Life Assurance.
V. Cholera and its Causes.
VI. Cathedral Reform.
VII. Tractarianism in London.
VIII. Russia, its Power and Prospects.
IX. Quarterly Journal of Facts and Progress.
X. Literature of the Quarter Classified and Reviewed.

London: Sampson Low and Son. Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY AND CO., 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET.

Just Published, New Edition, Price 2s. 6d.,

THE COLLECTS OF THE LITURGY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND,

Catechetically Explained, Compared with Scripture, and Briefly Commented upon, with the Date and Origin of each Collect annexed. For the use of Families and Sunday Schools.

By the Rev. Charles Miller, A.B.,

With Recommendary Preface by the Bishop of Meath.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY, 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET. London: Wertheim and Mackintosh.

Just Published,

Second Edition, with additional Facts and Anecdotes, in limp cloth, 1s. 6d., or in cloth, 2s. 6d.,

POOR PADDY'S CABIN; or, SLAVERY IN IRELAND. A true Representation of Facts and Characters. By an Irishman.

"We could desire nothing better for the British Empire, and indeed for the interests of mankind everywhere, than that 'Poor Paddy's Cabin' may have a circulation as extensive as Mrs. Stowe's beautiful narrative. The story on which the incidents are engrafted is in the highest degree interesting and gratifying, and it would do more good within the British Islands, if found in every hand, than even 'Uncle Tom's Cabin' has done for the cause of Negro Emancipation in the New World!"—*Standard.*

London: WERTHEIM and MACKINTOSH. Dublin: WM. CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Just Published, Price 3d.,

CHILDREN IN HEAVEN: A Sermon to Children, preached in Trinity Church, on Thursday, January 5, 1854. By the Rev. John Gregg, A.B.

II.

Price Twopence.

GOOD TO BE DONE, AND WHO SHOULD DO IT: A Sermon preached in Trinity Church, on Sunday, January 1, 1854. By the Rev. John Gregg, A.B.

III.

Price Twopence.

A CURE FOR CARE: A Sermon preached in Trinity Church. By the Rev. John Gregg, A.B.

IV.

Price Twopence.

THE WAY OF ESCAPE: A Sermon preached in Trinity Church, on Sunday evening, January 1, 1845. By the Rev. John Gregg, A.B.

V.

GOOD NEWS FOR THE POOR: A Sermon preached in Trinity Church, on the 11th December, 1853. By the Rev. John Gregg, A.B.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher, WILLIAM CURRY, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

May, 1853.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Glóir do Dhia aṅ gna háṁuiḃ, agus síoḋáin air an ṫalaṁ ḋeaġṫoil do na ḋáoiniḃ.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED THE MIDDLE OF EVERY MONTH, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. II.—No. 18. JUNE, 1853. { Annual Subscription, 3s. 6d. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
Is the Protestant Bible a corrupt and mutilated translation of the Holy Scriptures? No. 2.	61
The Catholic Doctrine on the Use of the Bible, by Cardinal Wiseman	62
Festival of the translation of the Relics of SS. Patrick, Brigid, and Columbkille—June 9	63
The two Pictures. A Dispute	64
On the Worship of Reliques	64
Talk of the Road—No. XIII.	65
Christianity the Religion of the Heart	66
The Rev. Mr Kelly, R.C.C., and the Catholic Layman	67
Correspondence—	
Mr. E. Power on Origen and Purgatory	67
Mr. Dermot Mac Manus on the Internal Evidences of the Catholic Religion.	69
The Catholic Layman in Kilpatrick, by Denis Gasteen	70
Farming operations for June	71

IS THE PROTESTANT BIBLE A CORRUPT AND MUTILATED TRANSLATION OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES?

NO. II.

After the English Reformation several persons undertook to translate and publish the Holy Scriptures in English. Thus there came to be several translations, differing from each other in words and phrases, though generally agreeing in substance. Some of these were the work of individuals, and never had any sanction from the Church of England.

This was felt to be unsatisfactory, and the more so, as it gave a handle to those who wished to have no Bible in English, to charge the English Church with faults which were found only in translations made by private persons, and for which the Church was not responsible. Thus, the great Roman Catholic book on this subject, "Ward's Errata," complains loudly of the heresy of the Protestant Bible, in translating the Greek word εκκλησια, "congregation," instead of "church." It is true, it was translated "congregation," in Tyndal's translation, which never was authorized; but in the "Bishop's Bible," which was then read in the churches, it was translated "church."

To take away such handles for misrepresentation, as well as to make the translation as perfect as possible, in the beginning of the reign of King James I., about 50 of the most learned men in England were appointed to revise the translation; which work they performed with great care during several years, and it was at length published in the year 1611. Since that time no other translation has been used by Protestants; and it has often been spoken of with admiration by learned Roman Catholics, as by Bishop Doyle in Ireland, and, lately, by Bishop Kenrick in America.

Seeing that none of the old translations have been used by Protestants for two hundred and forty years, it seems needless to discuss their merits now, and we should, perhaps, not have mentioned them, but that some Roman Catholic writers still bring them forward as proofs of the variations of Protestants. They might be satisfied with the fact that, for 240 years, Protestants have not found reason to make any variations in their translation.

But how stands the fact with the Douay Bible, as to "variations?" Roman Catholics will, perhaps, be surprised to hear us talk of such a thing; they will suppose that their translation must be perfect, and can have no "variation." We ask them to attend to us now.

If any one was to get a Douay Bible, published about 50 or 60 years ago, or even the Douay Bible published in Dublin, by Dr. Troy, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, in the year 1816 (only 37 years ago), and were to compare this with the Douay Bible now published, he would find much more difference between these two Douay Bibles, than he would find between the present Douay Bible and the Protestant Bible!

The writer of this has diligently compared the three Books—that is, the old Douay Bible, the new Douay Bible, and the Protestant Bible—through many of the Books of the New Testament; and he can answer for the truth of this strange fact. He found about *fifteen hundred* variations in the Gospel of St. Matthew alone, between the old Douay Bible and the new Douay Bible! Many of these variations are of no importance in themselves; they are merely alterations of words without altering the sense; but many of them are of great importance. In many places, the very things in the Protestant translation which used to be cried out against by Roman Catholics, as proofs of the heresy of Protestants, are now found standing in the new Douay Bible, in the very words of the Protestant Bible! Proofs and instances of this strange fact will be given presently.

There is another fact not less strange; most of the corrections that have been made in the Douay Bible have been taken out of the Protestant Bible.

Of the 1500 alterations made in the Gospel of St. Matthew in the Douay Bible, about 1200 are taken from the Protestant Bible; the other 300 that are not taken from the Protestant Bible are generally of least consequence; all the most important corrections are taken from the Protestant Bible. We will give proofs and instances of this fact too. And then we think it will be fair to ask those Roman Catholics, who say, like the Mayo Monk and the editor of the *Tablet*, that the Douay Bible is God's Book, and the Protestant Bible the Devil's Book, how it came to pass that God's Book was corrected out of the Devil's Book? For the fact is certain that the persons who were entrusted with the correction of the Douay Bible, did take the Protestant Bible, as their best and surest guide in making their corrections.

We proceed now to give some instances of the importance of the changes that have been made in the Douay Bible.

Matthew, chap. i., v. 25. The old Douay Bible read, "And he knew her not, till she brought forth her first-born son, and called his name Jesus." The Protestant Bible reads, "and HE called his name Jesus." On this Dr. Ward in his "errata" says (p. 59), "*to take from the Holy Mother of God what honour they can*, they translate that 'HE (viz. Joseph) called his name Jesus,' and why not *She* as well as *He*? &c." Yet, in the Douay Bibles now published we read, "and *He* called his name Jesus." So they have found out that what Dr. Ward railed at in the Protestant Bible as dishonouring the Blessed Virgin, is right after all, and they have corrected the Douay Bible accordingly.

Here is another instance from 1 Cor., chap. xv., v. 55. The Douay Bibles, in Dr. Ward's times had the verse thus, "Where is, O Death, thy Sting? where is, O Hell, thy victory?" The Protestant Bible has, "O Death, where is thy sting? O Grave, where is thy victory?" On this Dr. Ward says, "Thus all along, whenever they find the word Hell—that is, when it signifies the place where the Holy Fathers of the Old Testament rested, called by the Church Limbus patrum, they are sure to translate it grave. . . With what face, then, can they look upon these wilful corruptions of theirs?"

Yet, when we turn to the Douay Bible now, we find this word Hell left out, and the verse runs thus—"Oh, Death, where is thy victory? Oh, Death, where is thy sting?"

Again, Hebrews, chap. ii., v. 9, was thus translated in the old Douay Bibles—"But him that was a little lessened under the angels, we see Jesus, because of the passion of death, crowned with glory and honour." The Protestant Bible has: "But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels; for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour."

On this Dr. Ward complains that Beza had translated it different from either; and, of the Protestant version, he says—"But in their last translation they so place the words that they will have it left so ambiguous, as you may follow which sense you will; *intolerable is their deceit!*" But if any one will look at the Douay Bible *now*, he will find the passage, *word for word*, as it is in the Protestant Bible, which Dr. Ward cried out against as being intolerably deceitful!

Again, in 2 Peter, chap. i., v. 15, the old Douay Bible had, "And I will do my endeavour, you to have often after my decease also, that you may keep a memory of these things." The Protestant Bible has, "Moreover, I will endeavour that ye may be able, after my decease, to have these things always in remembrance." A plain reader might be apt to think that the only difference here was that the Douay Bible made the apostle speak nonsense, and the Protestant Bible makes him speak sense. But Dr. Ward saw a greater difference: he says (p. 59)—"St. Peter speaks so ambiguously, either *that he will remember them after his death*, or that they shall remember him; but the Calvinists restrain the sense of this place, without any necessity, and that against the prayers and intercession of saints for us." But if we look to the Douay Bible now, we read it thus—"And I will do my endeavour, that after my decease also, you may often have, whereby you may keep a memory of these things." This translation "restrains the sense" to the very meaning of the Protestant Bible; and that, too, as Dr. Ward says, "against the prayer and intercession of saints for us."

Our readers will observe that in two of the passages above, the correctors of the Douay have adopted the very words of the Protestant Bible. We could fill our whole paper with examples, but we must be brief.

The old Douay Bibles were full of Latin words, not translated. The preface gave the reasons thus—"These words we thought it far better to keep in the text, and to tell their signification in the margin, or in a table for that purpose, *than to disgrace both the text and them with* translating them." They give a long list of such words, most of which are now translated in the Douay Bible just as they are in the Protestant Bible. As, for instance, Matthew, chap. xxvii., v. 62, the old Douay Bible had "Parasceue;" the Protestant Bible had "the day of the preparation," which the Douay translator said was "a cold translation, and short of the sense:" yet the Douay Bible now has "the day of preparation."

Again: the preface to the old Douay Bibles said, "how is it possible to express evangelizo but as we do, *Evangelize?* For *evangelium* being the Gospel, what is *evangelizo* or *to evangelize*, but to show the glad tidings of the Gospel, of the time of grace, of all Christ's benefits? All which signification is lost, by translating as the English Bibles do, *I bring you good tidings.*—Luke, chap. ii., v. 10. Yet, if we look to that verse now in the Douay Bible, we find it translated, "I bring you good tidings."

The preface of the old Douay Bible took great credit to itself for translating in Eph. vi., 12, "The spirituals of wickedness in the celestials," of which it is not easy to see the sense. But the Douay Bible now has "Against the spirits of wickedness in the high places;" which is taken from the Protestant Bible, and the note in its margin.

We could fill a book with instances of places in which the Douay Bible has been corrected, to make it agree with the Protestant Bible; but we must stop after one instance more. The old Douay Bibles always translated "*our* Lord," instead of "*the* Lord," though any one who knows either Greek or Latin knows that the latter is beyond all question the true translation. They give the reason for this in a note to 1 Tim., chap. vi., v. 20. Speaking of the words used by Protestants they say, "and though some of the said terms have been by some occasion without ill meaning, spoken by Catholics, *before these heretics arose*, yet now, knowing them to be the proper speeches of heretics, Christian men are bound to avoid them . . . As now we Catholics must not say "*The Lord*," but "our Lord;" as we say *our Lady* for his mother, not *the Lady*." So, in some hundreds of places, they translated wrong, *because* the Protestant Bible translated right. But in the new Douay Bibles all these places are changed to agree with the Protestant Bible.

Roman Catholics may wish to know *when* all these changes in the Douay Bible were made. The oldest edition, in which we happen to have seen these new improvements, is a Douay New Testament, published by Dr. Troy, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, in 1803. There may have been earlier editions with the corrections, and we should be obliged to any one who could give us information about this.

It is a curious fact, that this same Dr. Troy, 13 years after, should have published a large Douay Bible (quarto. Coyne, 1816) *without* the alterations, and exactly the same as the old Douay Bibles. It would seem that there must have been great uncertainty then as to what the Roman Catholic translation ought to be: and, perhaps, a great struggle about it. But the corrected version conquered in the end. We do not complain of this; we approve of all those corrections. But we think it unreasonable of Roman Catholics now to complain that corrections were made in the Protestant translation 250 years ago, when they

themselves have made so many thousand corrections in theirs within 50 years past. And we think it very unreasonable that any Roman Catholic should say, as the poor monk in Mayo, and Mr. Lucas, the editor of the *Tablet*, have said, that the Protestant Bible is "the Devil's Book," when, in fact, it is the Book by which their own translation has been corrected. We ask Roman Catholics to remember that the Roman Catholic Bibles now circulated, with the approbation of all the Roman Catholic bishops, *have been corrected by the Protestant* Bible. Surely, then, they cannot think that the Protestant Bible is "the Devil's Book."

We showed in our last paper, that only for the Protestant Bible, Roman Catholics would never have had the Douay Bible at all. We have now showed them that the Douay Bible has been corrected in a vast number of places, and many of them very important places, by the Protestant Bible. This may well lead them to give a candid consideration to the things in which the two translations still differ. We shall return to this part of the subject again.

THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE ON THE USE OF THE BIBLE.

BY HIS EMINENCE, CARDINAL WISEMAN.

IT was with feelings and expectations of a mixed kind that we began the perusal of this tract. We are glad, at any time, to meet with an argument written by a modern Roman Catholic divine, addressed to the members of his own communion; for, in quoting his words, or in stating their substance, with references to his text, we are safe from the suspicion of intentional mis-statement. When we took up a paper, not only re-published, but given to the world under the high sounding name of Cardinal Wiseman, we looked for that which, indeed, we found—ability, eloquence, a certain plausibility of reasoning and still more of manner. But we also expected an appearance of candour, and a line of argument more weighty, more difficult to meet in reply, than we think this tract presents: we did not anticipate that the manly intellect and well-known talent and learning of Cardinal Wiseman could stoop to such weapons as shallow misrepresentation; or rely upon those hacknied sophistries which we so often find palmed in place of argument upon Roman Catholics to justify the restricted use of the Holy Scriptures. Whether these remarks are just we shall presently leave to the candour of our readers.

This paper first appeared in *The Dublin Review*, under the title of "The Bible in Maynooth." It purports to be a review of an introductory work on Scripture, by the Most Rev. Dr. Dixon, then professor of the Holy Scriptures at the College of Maynooth. In its present form, however, a very small portion of it is devoted to the notice of that work; and of that portion, none but the few opening sentences call for any observation from us. The tract opens in a tone of triumphant exultation at the "consternation" which Dr. Dixon's work will cause in the "enemy's camp;" not by its arguments, its learning, &c., all of which are duly praised, but by the discovery it will impart of the actual existence of a chair of Holy Scripture at Maynooth—a professorship not existing (*de nomine*) in the universities of "the enemy." Cardinal Wiseman is mistaken if he supposes that the "enemy" will, on this discovery, jump to the simple conclusion that because Maynooth pays a professor, it must follow that, in a *bona fide* sense, "Scripture is there read, Scripture is studied, Scripture is expounded" The tree planted at Maynooth, like every tree in the garden of Christianity, must be submitted to the test appointed by our Lord Himself, and be known by its fruits. Now, we are not disposed to inquire how far the alumnus of Maynooth comes up to the character which St. Paul describes as befitting a servant of God, who, he says, "must not wrangle, but be mild towards all men, apt to teach, patient, with modesty admonishing them that resist the truth."—2 Tim. ii. 24. Such an inquiry would afford no certain test of the nature and quality of the Scripture instruction at Maynooth; for, unhappily, there is too little mildness elsewhere also. We doubt not, too, that there are some excellent and pious priests who do read the Bible for themselves, though they may not feel at liberty to urge its study on the laity, but we are obliged, by the experience of others as well as our own, to say we seldom meet in Ireland a priest of Maynooth who even pretends to an intimate acquaintance of the Holy Scripture—to that head knowledge of it which is the peculiar fruit of the professor's labours. You may meet and converse with the Maynooth-educated priest in every steam boat, railway carriage, public place; you may see the rapid movement of his lips when engaged in the recital of his devotional exercises; you may observe in his hand the open Missal or the Breviary; but you seldom see with him a copy of the Douay or any other Bible; you can seldom trace, by his conversation or otherwise that he is a well-instructed or a habitual reader of Scripture. Until we see the fruits, therefore, we are unable to believe that the tree of Scripture instruction, though it may be planted at Maynooth, has been properly nurtured and trained, so as to take deep root and flourish in the soil.

Cardinal Wiseman rejoices, that Dr. Dixon has taken possession of a ground, which, he says belongs of right exclusively to the "Catholic." Every Protestant, says he, who, if he reads the Bible at all, does not understand three words of what he reads, who does not practice one of its precepts, considers himself entitled to ask any Catholic, "why do you not do as I do, make the Bible your rule of faith, and use the privilege of reading it and judging for yourself?" The Catholic, so interrogated, "knows that it is a foregone conclusion that all religion consists in reading, or pretending to read the Bible; that he who does not at least claim the privilege of reading it as he likes, though he may never use it, is something horrible, while he who boasts of it, and talks about it, secures some sort of religious pre-eminence here, and has a passport for the sort of fools paradise, which he considers Heaven to be."

The "Catholic," therefore, for want of courage, instead of saying, "and pray sir," (or "madam") what do you know about the Bible, or where did you get the book you call by that name, or how do you know that it is the Bible at all?" will assert that his Church *does* permit him and some others to read the Bible, thus admitting the principle of his adversary, instead of taking the "higher ground" of *denying the right* of Protestants to use, much more their right to interpret the Bible, to which, he says, they have no claim, and asserts that they "can prove neither its canon, its inspiration, nor its primary doctrines, except through that very authority which they are questioning."

Cardinal Wiseman writes exclusively for the "Catholic" reader, and draws freely enough upon his credulity and ignorance of Scripture, and consequently of true Protestantism. When he speaks of it as "decided by the newspapers and by Exeter Hall," that all religion consists in reading or pretending to read the Bible, or that the dry and barren reading of it, even without the "boasting and talking" he speaks of, gives any pre-eminence, or any privilege but that of better means of knowledge with the attendant increased responsibility, he greatly mistakes, or, at all events, mis-states the principles of Protestantism. He may be challenged to produce any evidence of the truth of his account of the Protestant notion of Scripture reading. No Protestant would insult the understanding of an assembly at Exeter Hall, or anywhere else, by asserting that the bare reading of the Bible gives one sinner a superiority over his fellow sinner. Protestants profess to take the Scripture as their guide, and it is not the hearing or the reading, but the doing of the word, the conformity of men's lives to its precepts, that they find inculcated in Scripture, and that they therefore profess to consider as the profitable fruit of its study.

Another misrepresentation of a different kind is the statement that Protestants cannot prove the canon, inspiration, &c., of the Bible, "save through the very authority they are questioning." The argument of Cardinal Wiseman would be lame, indeed, if he once admitted what Protestants insist upon, the internal evidence of inspiration afforded by the Scriptures. And as to the canon, it is a mistake to suppose that Protestants do not attach weight to the authority and practice of the Christian Church from the Apostolic age downwards. Not only was the canon of Scripture, as recognised by the early Church, adopted by Protestants of the Church of England in her Articles, but they made use of this evidence in support of the practice of infant baptism, the observance of the Sabbath, and other matters. What they deny is the infallibility of any Church; and they totally deny what Dr. Wiseman, of course, asserts, that the primitive Christian Church and the Roman Catholic Church are one and the same. The infallible authority of the latter they reject; the legitimate power of the former they admit.

The Cardinal proceeds to compare the alleged cry of "the Bible! the Bible! nothing but the Bible;" with the Jews senseless cry of the "Temple of the Lord," and describes the one to be as "perilous to salvation," as "vain, formal, and superstitious" as the other. As the temple became an idol and was destroyed, so he prophesies will the Bible be also removed—nay, the process he says, is actually going on; for, on the one hand the learned Protestantism of the continent is hastening into the abyss of infidelity, and dragging the Bible with it down to the level of an ordinary book, an uninspired old record; on the other hand the handling of it by the unlearned is destroying its vitality. The description of this process affords probably the best specimen of the Cardinal's style, and in our usual spirit of fair dealing, we transcribe his very words:—

"The holy, the sublime, the awful word of God, over which saints have meditated in cells for years of ineffable sweetness, yet of solemn reverence, round which scholars, pale with watching, have wreathed the flowers they have woven, or culled, in variegated commentaries; which the silver voice of virgins, or the deep tones of monks, have chaunted in breathless midnight, that no earthly sound might disturb the depth of their meditation; this compilation of the one spirit of God from the providence of centuries, through which alone He has lived; this treasure of spiritual honey, drawn from a thousand flowers of various delicacy of perfume and flavour, not mixing, but each preserved; this gem of matchless price, reflecting in an infinite number of faces, the ever varying, yet constant image of God, in his might, in his sweetness, in his anger, in his love, in his unity, in his Trinity, in his heavens, on his earth, on Sinai and on Calvary; this noblest, greatest, divinest of things unsacramental, is put, indiscriminately, unceremoniously, into the hands of every one. It is the school-boy's task book, it is the jailor's present, it is the drunkard's pawned pledge, it is the dotard's text book, it is the irreverent jester's butt, it is the fanatic's justification for every vice, blasphemy, and profaneness which he commits. For into every one's hand it must needs be thrust, from the Chinese to the Ojibbewa, from the Laplander to the Bosjesman; from the child to the dotard, from the stuttering peasant to the glib self righteous old dame."

The argument proceeds to the effect, that there is no evidence but the word of the giver, that this book, so put into every hand, clean or unclean, is what it is called—the Word of God. There is no previous study, no demonstration of genuineness or information about the writers, &c. Full power is given to uninstructed minds to interpret it as they please, and to put any construction they please upon it, and it is asked what code of laws, moral or social, could, with safety, be thus treated? The Bible, it is alleged, is the most abstruse book extant, and allusion is made in proof of this to the genealogies of Genesis and Esdras, the architectural details of Exodus, Kings, and Ezekiel, the minutiæ of the Levitical code, &c. To the objection supposed to be made to this argument—namely, that the "Bible-alone theory" does not exclude guidance in the use of Scripture, and that commentaries and expositions have been written by Protestants, and that reformed clergymen expound the Scriptures to their flocks—it is answered to the effect, first, that there is not one copy of any commentary sold for a hundred copies of the Bible given away—and, secondly, the great variety of opinions to which the indiscriminate use of the Scripture gives rise is relied upon. Every man goes to his own Church and preacher, and learns a different doctrine from that professed by others; so that the Scriptures, so given and thus variously interpreted, are "wrested by the unlearned and unstable to their own destruction." The dominions of Queen Pomare are pointed to in triumph, where it is alleged that, "under the judicious management of evangelical missionaries, a mild and promising people were transformed into a pack of lazy, immoral infidels." The slowness of the destructive effect in England of the word of God is attributed to a "strong underground of old tradition" which the Reformation could not dig up, the "civilization interwoven with old truths," "a deference to rank and wealth," and attention is invited to the agencies at work to destroy "these preservative and conservative influences?' The poisonings, infanticides, disregard of connubial ties, and increase of illegitimacy in the rural districts in England, and the infidel publications in towns, are pressed into service for this purpose, and, it is asserted, that the Bible is "unable to contend" with these evils. Modern science, electricity, and even mesmerism, are brought in aid, as furnishing new implements for the attempt to uproot the inspiration of Scripture miracles and prophecy. The two ways, therefore, in which the unlimited use of Scripture is leading to the destruction of this "ill-used blessing," and to the "spread of infidelity less intellectual and more sensual than German rationalism" consist—first, in the want of evidence that accompanies the Scriptures beyond the word of man; and, secondly, in the innumerable varieties of opinion into which unlearned men, judging for themselves, must fall. An argument of Dr. Dixon is then touched upon, founded upon the following extract from a charge of the Bishop of London—"To deny the inspiration of Scripture is one step towards the rejection of the Gospel as a revelation from God. Against this fatal heresy I would earnestly caution my younger brethren," &c. And the following is quoted as Dr. Dixon's "pithy comment":—"We are here told, and truly, that to deny inspiration is to embrace a fatal heresy. On the other hand, the Church of England, in her 6th Article, declares that 'Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, so that whatever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.' We shall see, just now, how, by adhering to the doctrine of *this article*, any one can be convicted of fatal heresy, for denying the inspiration of Scripture." Dr. Wiseman proceeds to assure us that Dr. Dixon has established this point satisfactorily. He prefers, however, giving us his own logic on the subject, as follows:—

"A fatal heresy can only be the denial of an article of faith necessary to salvation. But according to the Articles nothing can be of faith which cannot be proved by Scripture; it follows, therefore, that the inspiration of Scripture is proved by Scripture: hence, we have this process of logical demonstration established. You are bound, under pain of heresy to believe in the inspiration of the Bible. But as no heresy can exist unless the doctrine which it contradicts be read in the Bible, it follows that you are obliged to believe in the inspiration of the Bible, because that inspiration is there declared. But belief in what is there taught, as an essential truth, to deny which is heresy, pre-supposes the recognition of the Bible as an inspired book; and, therefore, you are thrown back and forward, from one horn to the other; you believe in the Bible because it is inspired, and you believe it is inspired because you find it in the Bible."

The whole argument concludes with the following proposition:—

"The truth is comprised in a few words—'No infallible Church, no Bible.' On no less, on no other authority could such a tremendous fact be received; no weaker foundation will uphold it."

We have endeavoured to give a connected sketch of the substance of this argument; and, in order to do so, have resisted the frequent temptation to interrupt the thread of it with observations of our own. The first thing that strikes the mind of the Bible-reader on perusal of it is, the total rejection of the internal evidence (to which we have before

adverted) as affording proof of the Divine origin of Scripture. It is a question too long for discussion here; and we must pass it by with the remark that Dr. Wiseman himself, if he has read, as no doubt he has, the works of Paley,* cannot but admire the lucid and satisfactory manner in which the truth of the historical parts of the New Testament is proved by the mere collation and comparison of different passages, independent of external evidence. Such proof of the historical parts opens the door at once to all that noble train of reasoning founded upon them, written by the same author, in his work on the Evidences of Christianity. The truth of the Gospels follows, of course; and, in short, when once we can find a spot of Divine revelation large enough for the foot to rest upon, proved satisfactorily, without external aid, the proof of the whole must be easily established. But the next thing that strikes us is the total rejection of Divine aid in the understanding and interpretation of Scripture. Cardinal Wiseman may be himself a great Biblical scholar, as, no doubt, he is; but in his pamphlet were written by an infidel it could not more completely set at nought the teaching and guidance of the Holy Spirit, *which is promised* to all that ask it in sincerity. It is not to prelates or priests, but to *every one* that asketh, it shall be given; *every one* that seeketh findeth, and to *every one* that knocketh it shall be opened.

This belief, professed by Protestants, founded on the express promises of God, that all who ask it shall receive the Spirit to guide them to all truth, by which they, of course, understand all vital and essential truth—all truth necessary to salvation—is not even honoured with a sneer. And yet upon this promise of the teaching of the spirit rests the true answer to that part of Cardinal Wiseman's argument, which is founded upon the variety of opinion to which the free use of Scripture leads. He argues from the abuse against the use; we say, that the humble student of Scripture, who prays earnestly for Divine assistance *cannot*, if the promises of God are true, fall into error in anything essential to salvation. If a variety of opinions be formed by the Infidel, the Rationalist, those who set their own reason above, instead of using it with the aid of Heavenly revelation, the true use of the Bible is not, on this account, to be denied to the Christian. We must observe that Dr. Wiseman perverts what he calls the "Bible-alone axiom" of Protestants; and he is also guilty of gross misrepresentation when he asserts, or insinuates, that Protestants hold that every man is at liberty to interpret Scripture according to his will and fancy, without any other guidance than his own reason. The "Bible alone" axiom is solely applied to the question of the rule of faith of Protestants; Cardinal Wiseman treats it as if the Bible alone, and not the keeping of its precepts, constituted their religion. Again, the Church of England, and almost every Protestant sect, professes to have its oral teaching by its ministers, both in and out of the pulpit. What it maintains is not the right of capricious interpretation, but the right of exercising the reason, with humility and prayer, and thus of judging whether the doctrine taught by its clergy is in accordance with the Word of God. That the Scriptures are, as it must be confessed, with regret, they are, often turned to a bad use, perhaps made the "jester's butt" or the "drunkard's pledge," is no more a just argument against the free use of them than a similar profane use, by the same class of persons, of those relics, and rosaries, and crucifixes, which the Church of Rome holds sacred, would be against delivering these venerated things to the good "Catholic;" and yet that Church never scruples, and we suppose Cardinal Wiseman himself would not scruple, to place them in the hands of every one that professes a willingness to receive them, even the untutored African or American savage. The difficulties of some parts of Scripture present an argument equally devoid of force against the general reading of it. Scripture, we are told, is "profitable to teach, to correct, to instruct in justice"—2 Timothy, iii. 16—notwithstanding the abstruseness of parts of it which do not relate to matters essential to Christian doctrine. St. Peter, when he speaks of the "things hard to be understood"—2 Peter, iii. 16, 17—cautions the brethren not to abstain from the reading of the Scriptures, but to "take heed lest, being led aside *by the error of the unwise*, they should fall from their own steadfastness." We cannot but regret the eagerness which is apparent in that part of Cardinal Wiseman's argument—where he brings forward every piece of hypocrisy, immorality, infidelity, and vice he can find, as if he gloated over it with triumph, and lays it all at the door of the sacred Word of God. Now, we deny *in toto* that these things are attributable to any such cause. The infidelity of the continent, by no means confined to Protestants, we could easily trace to far different sources. If vice in some parts of England be on the increase, it will be found owing more to the neglect than the use of Scripture and of religious teaching; owing also to other causes in conjunction with that neglect, yet totally unconnected with religion. While we refuse to admit the unproved assertions of Cardinal Wiseman respecting the subjects of Queen Pumaru to be true, we reply to them on the one hand by saying, that we are not without materials, if we had but space, to show the blessed effects of the preaching of the Gospel upon many individuals in the island of Tahiti; effects most satisfactory to those who know both by experience and from the express words of our Lord, how small a proportion the "chosen" must bear to the "called," wherever the Gospel is preached; and, on the other hand, by pointing, by way of set off, to those other parts of the world to which the cardinal would have referred if he found anything there to aid his argument. The wonderful changes wrought by missionary labour and Gospel teaching amongst the red men of America, the sons of Ham in Africa, and the cannibals of New Zealand, may be adduced as examples on the other side. We may also refer to the United States, where there is but little of that "underground of old tradition," where the civilization is not much "interwoven with old truths," where there is not to be found that "deference to rank and wealth, their opinions and doctrines," which Cardinal Wiseman would represent as checking the evil effects of God's word at home. There, at least, all religious creeds meet on equal terms. There the word can "run" and "have free course," and yet we do not find that immorality and infidelity prevail, though doubtless that free soil is unfavourable to the Church of Rome, as has been abundantly proved by Roman Catholic authorities within the last few years.* But if we descend to lower ground and point to the temporal fruits of the spread of Christian truth; if, without excluding other causes of social progress, we give, as truth obliges us to do, to the influence of the Gospel by far the foremost place amongst the causes of the advancement of civilization in the greater part of the world—an influence pervading the whole of society, and operating indirectly upon those supposed to be furthest removed from its direct control; if we point to the almost unlimited freedom tempered with order, the willing obedience to law, respect for Sabbaths, regard for religious observances, universal toleration, humane laws, munificent contributions, splendid charities, and the general energy and spirit, all combining to place the English nation in a position unparalleled by anything to be seen on the face of the earth, or to be read of in the page of history; if we pursue this investigation and see the extension of all or most of these blessings from England their parent over all her scattered dependencies, as well as throughout the American Continent; we may well smile at the beggarly regiment of infidels, scuffers, and profligates, which Cardinal Wiseman is able to muster from the "slums of Westminster," and with which he vainly expects to exclude the Bible and, with the Bible, we contend, the progress of eternal truth from the people.

When we come, however, to the conclusion of all this argument—"No infallible Church, no Bible," we cannot but feel amazed at the coolness with which a Roman Catholic divine calculates the exact length to which he will permit his flock to use their reason and intellect. His whole train of argument, including that upon the Bishop of London's charge (which we pass by for the present, as founded on the exclusion of internal evidence of the inspiration of Scripture), is addressed, to the credulity of his readers, indeed, as to facts, but to their reasoning faculties as to argument. Does he flatter himself that any rational person can bring his mind to a stand still, at "no infallible Church, no Bible," and not ask the next question that forces itself upon his reason, and say—"If the Bible rests upon the infallible Church, *what does the infallible Church rest upon?* How do you *prove* your infallibility? If you say, I rest it upon the Divine commission given to Saint Peter and his successors, when our Lord said—'Upon this rock will I build my Church,' or upon the promise of our Lord to be with his Church 'all days, unto the end of the world,' I answer, are not these sayings and promises to be found only in the Bible? If you attempt to prove your authority from Scripture, I immediately retort upon you your own argument against the Bishop of London; you argue in a circle; you are "thrown back and forward from one horn to the other;" you believe the Bible to be inspired because the Church has authority to declare it to be so; you believe the Church has that authority because you find it (or what you represent as it) in the Bible. But if, on the other hand, you declare that the Church has, independent of Scripture, an inherent authority, founded on tradition, or on something, by which it first declares itself infallible, and then declares the Bible inspired, I again retort upon you, and say, that if driven to an assertion, a mere "*ipse dixit*," instead of proof, I shall prefer the authority of the Word of God for its own inspiration to that of the Church of Rome for its own infallibility. If the Church claims at all to be infallible, I should be more ready to give credence to that claim, if provable by Scripture, than to believe the inspiration of the latter on the bare authority of the former, that authority resting on *its own assertion*." The Cardinal must either stop the play of his readers' intellect at the particular point, and say—"Hitherto shalt thou come, and no further," or, having led the mind by a train of reasoning, such as it is, to that point, he must go a step further, and remove, from before his Church's claim, the very difficulty he has himself thrown as a stumbling-block before that of the Bible.

(*To be continued.*)

FESTIVAL OF THE TRANSLATION OF THE RELICS OF SS. PATRICK, BRIGID, AND COLUMKILLE—JUNE 9.

In days of old, when Translations of the Bible were much less common, and less thought of, than they are now, the minds of religious people were often very much occupied with Translations of books and relics of the Saints, connected with which, from time to time, very wonderful circumstances were not unfrequently narrated. What is implied by a *Translation*, used in this latter sense, a good many of our readers are probably more or less aware. Those who are wholly unacquainted with the nature of the ceremony may now have an opportunity of learning somewhat of its character, from the account which is to follow; while all, we doubt not, who give this paper an attentive perusal, will feel not a little interested at the sufficiently curious particulars which we propose here to submit to their consideration.

There is published by Messrs. Richardson and Son, of Capel-street, in Dublin, for the edification of Roman Catholics in these countries, a very neat little book of the lives of SS. Patrick, Brigid, and Columkille: it is bound in green cloth, with gilt edges, has for frontispiece a handsome copperplate of St. Patrick *spiflicating*" the serpents, and an ornamental title page with rubricated letters, wherein the book is called a "*a Triple Leaf, just collected from the purest sources;*" which prepares one for finding some rather poetical matter in the narratives to follow, and may suggest also, to a cautious reader, the propriety of examining the purity of the sources concerned; though the black letter inscription at the commencement "*For God, Our Lady, and St. Patrick,*" might, perhaps, appear to some a sufficient guarantee, that, under such auspices, nothing but what was very carefully ascertained to be truthful and orthodox would be presented for perusal in the volume.

From this little book, as appearing to be the latest and most respectable thing of the kind provided for popular use, we take the following account of the Translation of the relics of the patron Saints of Ireland, occupying the last three pages of the work—(pp. 146-148):—

"During the incursion of the pirate Danes in the ninth century, the holy remains of St. Bridget were, for security, transferred from Kildare to Down, and deposited with those of St. Patrick; and soon after St. Columba's sacred relics were removed from Hy, and laid in the same resting-place. The memory of this event was indeed long and faithfully preserved, but gradually the remembrance of the precise spot in which the holy remains lay became obliterated both from the minds of clergy and people, perhaps because that, originally, the knowledge of the circumstance was, for greater security, confined to a few. The extraordinary veneration entertained for this *saintly trio* by the glorious St. Malachy, who, in the year 1136, occupied the primatial see of Armagh, made him desirous to discover their hallowed tomb; and as every means devised by his ingenuity for procuring such information had proved unavailing, and that human exertion had failed, he had recourse to *omnipotent prayer*, and, with a holy importunity, besought our Lord to reveal to him what he was so anxious to know. He was heard: for lo! after having persevered for some time in urging this pious request, on a certain night, while still communing upon it with God in the Church, a ray of light resembling a sunbeam was seen by him to pass along the sacred edifice until it reached a particular spot, when it ceased to advance. Convinced that the Divine Majesty had appointed this means of enlightening him on what he was so much interested in, the holy primate had the place dug up, and when the earth was removed, behold! the bodies of the three blessed saints were discovered in the same grave. When exhumed, Malachy had them deposited in new coffins, and once more enclosed in their sepulchre.

"On learning the circumstance from the holy prelate, De Courcy, Lord of Down, concurred with him in sending deputies to the holy see to solicit permission from the pope to deposit the sacred relics more honourably, and to remove them to another part of the church. Urban III. then filled St. Peter's chair, and, having personal knowledge both of St. Malachy and De Courcy, he instantly ordered Vivian, Cardinal priest of St. Stephen, to proceed to Ireland to assist at the celebration of the intended ceremony. He did so; and, on the appointed day, the 9th of June, feast of St. Columba, the *translation*† took place with the usual solemnities: the venerable remains being interred in the place prepared in presence of fifteen bishops, and a numerous assemblage of priests.

"To preserve the memory of this consoling event, it was immediately decreed that the anniversary of '*the translation*' should be thenceforward kept as a solemn festival throughout Ireland, which decree has long since, for just reasons we presume, ceased to be in force."

'Twere a pity, surely, that there should be any just reasons for risking the memory of *so consoling an event*. That there do exist sufficiently weighty considerations, which might exercise an influence in that way is, however, only too certain, as we shall easily make apparent.

It is very odd that the author of the "Triple Leaf from the purest sources" has not communicated to his reader the *year* in which the above marvellous transaction is supposed to have taken place, as he might have found it, as well as the rest of the story, in any of the authorities which contain the same recital. According to *Giraldus Cambrensis*, in his *Topographia Hiberniæ*, Dist. iii., c. 18, the

* See the Horæ Paulinæ.

* See Catholic Layman, vol. i., page 113.

* We hope our English readers will not deem an expressive *Irishism* inadmissable on such an occasion—we maintain the word, if not altogether classical, ought to be made so forthwith!—Ed.

† N.B.—The few Italics used in this extract are from the original.

relics were found in the year in which John Earl of Morton (afterwards King John) first visited Ireland, *i. e.* 1185. In the *Office for the Translation of the Relics of SS. Patrick, Columba, and Brigid*, printed at Paris, in 1620, and reprinted by Colgan, Messingham, and Ussher, a full account is given of the discovery in that year, 1185; which has been abstracted by Dr. Lanigan, in his Ecclesiastical History of Ireland, vol. iv., p. 274, &c., and the substance of which is also given to the readers of the *Triple Leaf* (as well as now to those of the *Layman*), in the passage above.

But the whole account of this marvellous transaction, patronised by the Anglo-Norman invader of Down, and by the highest authorities of the Church of Rome, was altogether ignored by the people of Ireland, who had another "Translation" of their own, and either knew nothing about the one in Down, or else gave no heed to the attempts made to elicit their veneration towards it. Of the native Irish "Translation," rather more than 100 years later than the Anglo-Roman one, the following notice (copied afterwards, almost *verbatim*, by the Four Masters into their Annals), occurs in the Annals of Ulster, at A.D. 1289. [*Al.* 1293.]

"A.D. 1289—It was revealed to Nicholas Mac Molissa, coarb of Patrick [*i. e.*, Primate of Armagh], that the relics of Patrick, and Columkille, and Bridget, were in Saul of St. Patrick† [*i. e.*, Saul, Co. Down], and they were taken up by him, whereupon followed great wonders and miracles; and he placed them honourably in a shrine again."

In the Irish Annals of the Four Masters, the passage in question reads thus:—

"A.D. 1293. Taifi Patraic, Colum cille, 7 Brigde, do foillriuccad do Nicol mac Maoilisa (comarba Patraicc) do beit i Saball, a tdoccbail laif, Feairta mora azur mionbaile do denam doib iarain, azur a ccuri i Sceirin iar na cumdac go honorach ar a haicle."

Dr. O'Donovan's note on this passage is well worthy of our attention. It runs thus:—

"It is a very strange fact that the body of St. Patrick, the Apostle of Ireland, was said to have been pointed out by an angel, at Glastonbury, the year before.—See Ussher's *Primordia*, p. 892. But the most extraordinary circumstances connected with the history of the relics of the Trias Thaumaturga is, that the Irish annalists—that is, such as wrote in the Irish language [such, in fact, as were of the 'mere Irish,' and not of the Anglican 'pale'], do not appear to have ever heard of the discovery of them by Malachy in 1185, and hence it is but fair to conclude that Malachy's dream at Down was got up by the English party, in order to add dignity to Down, then in the possession of Sir John de Courcy. It is quite evident that the mere Irish never heard, or, at least, never believed this story of their discovery at Down, in 1185; for, if they had been deposited in a costly shrine at Down in 1185, as stated by Giraldus, it is hard to believe that they would have been lost in the course of the next century, so as to make another revelation necessary for their discovery in 1293, when it would appear they were under the earth at Saul, in a spot unknown to all except Nicholas Mac Maelisa, the Archbishop of Armagh, to whom it was pointed out in a vision. It seems, therefore, quite clear that the discovery of them at Down, in 1185, was, like the propheey of Merlin, already alluded to under the year 1177, a scheme of Sir John de Courcy and his writers, and that their discovery at Saul, in 1293, was a counter scheme of Nicholas Mac Maelisa, who was one of the greatest opposers of the English that ever governed the See of Armagh. It may, however, have happened that both bishops had dreamed of bones, and that bones were found in both places."—(*Annals of the Four Masters. Note* at A.D. 1293, p.p. 457, 458.)

D'feidir sin, mairead, go cinnte.

There is certainly a very curious discrepancy between this note of Dr. O'Donovan's and the specimen of the *Triple Leaf* above given. Both are, alike, from writers belonging to the Communion of the Church of Rome. The one, however, contains the reflections of a careful and learned inquirer into history, while the other, although professing to derive its matter "from the purest sources," exhibits such extravagant blundering in reference to plain facts of well ascertained history, as may cause us to feel no surprise at finding him swallow for genuine, and circulate for reception among others, the fictions contrived among the Anglo-Romish Churchmen of Down, in the 12th century. For what could well be more absurd, than to bring in "*the glorious St. Malachy*," to have anything to say to a transaction that occurred 37 years after his death. For, anybody who has paid the least attention to the history of that period (especially one having access to the "purest sources."), should have been aware that the individual known by the name of "St. Malachy," (who had been primate of Ireland, and afterwards Bishop of Down), died at Clairvaux, in France, on Nov. 2, 1148; and that the Malachy, Bishop of Down, and friend of John de Courcy, who assisted at the Translation celebrated on June 9, 1185, was a wholly different person.

† *Sabl* is now a small village, about two miles east of Downpatrick. The word means a *barn*; and, probably, it implied originally (as Dr. Lanigan thinks), the barn of Dichu, St. Patrick's first convert, afterwards made use of as a Church.

The case now presented to the reader furnishes a very instructive illustration of the purity of the sources, from which highly respectable parties in the Church of Rome are content to draw materials for feeding and cherishing the devotional feelings of members of her communion. The "*consoling event*" of the Triple Leaf, the wonderful miracle which furnished occasion for a special *office* of its own in the Ritual of that Church, turns out to be, when examined into, "*a scheme of Sir John de Courcy and his writers*;" a scheme which never *took* with the Irish people, which none of *their* writers ever cared to notice in the religious Annals of their country (well enough disposed as they certainly were, to make mention of all such marvellous occurrences generally, when not in some special way distasteful to their prejudices), and which, finally, "for just reasons," we may now safely say, the Church which fostered it at the outset has seen it more desirable to efface, if possible, from a place in her memorials, than to submit any longer to the light of public attention.

R. K.

THE TWO PICTURES—A DISPUTE.

R. Catholic.—"Where was your religion before Luther?"
Protestant.—"Where was your face before it was washed?"
OLD SAW.

As the delays of the courts of justice have latterly become a favourite subject of discussion, we propose to give a short account of one of the most protracted suits that have ever arisen. It is now upwards of 300 years since the litigation in question commenced, and, at the present moment, it appears as far from a decision as on the day when the first proceedings were taken.

In the sixteenth century, there lived, in an ancient manor-house, two sisters, co-heiresses.

Amongst other property that had descended to them from a long line of ancestry, were two pictures. One of which had long hung up in the room appropriated specially to the use of one of the sisters, the other in the room similarly appropriated to the other. These pictures, which were duplicates, were known to be the likenesses of a distinguished ancestor who had been remarkable for his eminent virtues. Tradition had also assigned to him all the personal advantages of beauty and strength. Of these, however, the pictures gave no adequate representation; to such an extent had the dust of ages accumulated on the canvas, that it was almost impossible to discern any trace of the original features or appearance. In the same mansion-house there was also a library, which contained many ancient and curious manuscripts, and the younger sister being of an inquisitive turn of mind, spent much of her time in deciphering these ancient records. In this pursuit, she at length came upon a very old manuscript, which, to her great joy, she found had been written in the age when her distinguished ancestor lived, and in it was contained a very full and particular description of his person and appearance. The writer dwelt much on his great virtues, and on how eminently their existence was indicated by his external features, and he referred to the pictures of him as most accurate delineations, describing also their original brilliancy of colouring and well defined outlines.

Greatly delighted with this discovery, the younger sister at once carried the manuscript to her sister, and proposed that steps should be immediately taken to restore these pictures to their original state by the removal of the dust, which ages of neglect had encrusted upon them. At first the elder sister seemed well pleased with the proposal, and immediately sent for the old butler to whose care these pictures had been, for a long time, entrusted.

Now this old butler was very obstinate, and having no great taste for exertion or change, immediately raised many objections to the order of his mistress. He said that, for his part, he remembered the pictures to have been exactly in their present state in the time of the father and grandfather of the present owners, and as they had been quite content with the pictures in their present condition, he did not see why the daughters should not be so also. Besides, he said, to meddle with them would be dangerous, and in the attempt the pictures themselves would probably be destroyed. These arguments of the old butler prevailed with the elder sister, and as her own disposition inclined her to agree with the old man, she declined, though often pressed, to take any step in the business. The younger sister thus disappointed, and believing it useless to reason further with her sister or the old butler, at length determined to take in hand the cleaning of that picture which, hanging in her own apartment, had been particularly appropriated to her, and proceeding cautiously to work, she tried first the effect on one corner of the picture where nothing but the drapery could be injured.

The experiment was completely successful, and in her triumph, she called her sister and the old butler to witness her success, but instead of convincing them by the evidence of their own senses, her proceedings only roused their indignation, and, at the suggestion of the old butler, the elder sister declared that she would separate for ever from the other if she persisted in her attempt. Indeed the old butler, forgetting altogether his position, threatened to turn her out of the house. Notwithstanding these threats, the younger sister proceeded with her task, and, after much labour and anxiety, succeeded in removing almost all the dirt and dust that had hitherto obscured the picture, and great indeed was her delight when she found that the picture, as restored, corresponded accurately with the description contained in the old manuscript. Again were seen in all their original brilliancy of colouring, the noble features of their great ancestor. In them now could be traced the high resolve, the devoted courage, which had won him so high a name amongst his contemporaries, and even the armour in which he was clothed was found to correspond accurately with the description in the manuscript. Now, at length, she said, my sister will be convinced of the propriety of the course I have adopted, and, surely, she will now no longer listen to the suggestions of the old man, but will restore her own picture also to the same condition that I have brought mine to. With these thoughts in her mind, she at once sent for her sister, and showed her the picture as restored. She pointed to the description in the manuscript, as proving conclusively that this was indeed the picture as it proceeded out of the artist's hands. She was however doomed to great disappointment. The elder sister had become, gradually, still more under the influence of the old butler, and was now filled with indignation that her sister should have dared to proceed without her consent, and, assisted by the old butler, went to such extremities against her, that the latter, to save her life, fled from the mansion-house, taking with her the picture she had so carefully restored, and which, of course, she hung up in the house she now occupies.

Then commenced the litigation to which we have referred. As the two sisters were co-heiresses, and, therefore, each entitled in common to the whole property of their ancestors, the elder sister instituted proceedings against the younger, to compel her to bring back the picture, in order that it may be restored to its former state of dust and obscurity, and may again be entrusted to the care of the old butler. The following are the leading arguments urged on behalf of the elder sister by her advocates:—They say, that the picture, which descended to the two sisters as co-heiresses, was the picture in its condition before the younger sister began her operations; that the interest of the younger was an interest in it such as it was at that time; that the dust which had accumulated on, and adhered to it, had, by the lapse of time, been incorporated in, and become part of the picture. They even went still further, and insisted that the care and superintendence of the old butler had also attached to the picture when it descended to the sisters, and that his superintendence had, in fact, become a constituent part of its identity. When urged by the evidence of the manuscript (which they were obliged to admit was contemporaneous with the painting of the pictures), and by the fact that neither the will of the ancestor nor the manuscript said anything of the pictures having been entrusted specially to the care of the old butler or of his predecessors in that office, they replied that these things were *developments* arising necessarily out of its very nature as a picture, and which, therefore, when once attached to it became inseparable from it. And they prayed that the younger sister might bring back the picture to be again entrusted to the care of the old butler, who would carefully restore all the dust which had been so improperly removed.

To these arguments the counsel for the younger sister replied, that as the sisters were co-heiresses, the younger sister had equal rights with the elder over the pictures, and as this particular picture had been alloted as her share, she had clearly a right to deal with it as she pleased—that even if the court were of opinion that she had not such an exclusive power over the picture, still, before granting any such order as was prayed, it must be determined whether the picture, in its present state of cleanliness and restoration, be the original picture or not. For as the other side had avowed their intention of restoring the dust, she, as equally interested with her sister, had clearly a right to have the identity of the picture ascertained; and, as the manuscript showed clearly, that, in its present state, it corresponded with the description of it as it was when originally painted, it would be manifestly unjust to compel a restoration of it to that state which rendered it impossible to discover its identity with the description in the manuscript. They also argued, that all the arguments urged on behalf of the elder sister were equally strong in favour of the right of the younger to demand the production of the picture, still in the possession of the elder, in order to have the same cleaning process applied to it, as had already proved so successful in the case of the other picture. And they concluded by praying that this should be done.

Such were the principal arguments urged by the opposite counsel in this protracted litigation; and as each succeeding discussion only leads to the repetition of the same arguments, it is hardly possible to expect that the court will be able to arrive at a speedy conclusion of a cause so protracted in its course. We, therefore, submit the facts and the arguments of counsel to the consideration of our readers, and as they have the power of obtaining access to the manuscript, and of comparing its description with the pictures themselves, we trust that they will be able to arrive at a decision without waiting for the adjudication of the court.

ON THE WORSHIP OF RELIQUES.

PILGRIMAGES to the shrines in which the bones and other reliques of saints are said to be preserved, and processions and other ceremonies in which they are carried about for the edification of the faithful in the Church of Rome, are asserted by that Church to be of great efficacy in promoting

devotion, and held by Protestants generally to be a groundless and dangerous superstition.

The Church of Rome understands by reliques not only the bodies or parts of the bodies of the saints, but any of those things which belonged to them, such as St. Francis's girdle and the like, which are considered blessed, as having touched their sanctified bodies, and worthy of religious veneration and honour. The Council of Trent, not only defends the Church's former practices towards reliques and confirms the worship of them, but curses those who shall dare to say that such worship is unlawful. The decree, so far as it relates to this subject, is as follows:—

"The Holy Synod enjoining on all bishops and others sustaining the office and charge of teaching, that they especially instruct the faithful diligently touching . . . . . the honour paid to reliques. . . . . Also, that the holy bodies of holy martyrs, and of others now living with Christ, are to be venerated by the faithful; through which bodies many benefits are bestowed by God on man; so that they who affirm that veneration and honour are not due to the reliques of saints; or that those and other sacred monuments are uselessly honoured by the faithful; and that the places dedicated to the memories of the saints are vainly visited for the purpose of obtaining their wish, are wholly to be condemned, as the Church has already long since condemned, and doth now also condemn them." (Sess. 25, 3 Dec., 1563.)

What we propose at present to enquire is whether this worship of reliques has any foundation in Holy Scripture, which our readers will observe is always the first question in our consideration, though we do not avoid referring afterwards to the testimony of the early Fathers, as the best witnesses of what was handed down by tradition from the time of our Lord and his Apostles.

Cardinal Bellarmine relies upon several texts of Scripture in favour of such worship.* We shall examine them one by one.

The first is Exodus xiii. 19.—"And Moses took the bones of Joseph with him, for he had strictly sworn the Children of Israel, saying, God will surely visit you: and ye shall carry up my bones away hence with you." If this text had proceeded to tell us that Joseph's bones were carried with them, in order to the Children of Israel receiving benefits or blessings from them, or making them the objects of religious honour, or with a view to having recourse to them for obtaining aid in cases of difficulty or distress, we would, of course, admit that it would afford a striking support of the present practice of the Church of Rome, but not one of these things is intimated or hinted at in the text, which contains merely a simple narrative of a matter of fact—viz., that when the Children of Israel left the land of Egypt, to seek the Land of Promise, according to God's command, Moses obeyed the express injunction of Joseph, that his bones should be removed also. What the object of Joseph was in this matter is not stated by the sacred historian; but we think it quite obvious there is no similarity at all between a man's body, *at his own request*, being carried into another country to be buried with his kindred, in the country his brethren should possess, and the present practice of the Church of Rome of separating the remains of their saints, and carrying one part of a saint's body to this church and another part to another church †—putting them up in glass-cases and shrines—making solemn processions with them on occasions of solemnities, and never burying them at all. Joseph's bones were put together into a coffin, in Egypt, and, on the departure of the Israelites thence, were carried to the Land of Canaan, to be buried there with his father, in accordance with a solemn oath made to him, at his own desire, while alive; and that is all that can be drawn from this passage of Exodus, which affords no countenance to the practices it is cited to defend.

The next passage is from Deuteronomy xxxiv. 6, where it is said of God that "he buried him (Moses) in a valley in the land of Moab, over against Beth-peor; but *no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day.*"

How Cardinal Bellarmine or any man of common reason could consider this text favourable to religious worship of reliques, we are at a loss to conceive; for, so far as any inference can be drawn from it, it appears clearly against it; and the common interpretation of the passage, even among the Jewish doctors, as well as others, is the very natural one, that God purposely hid the body of Moses, so that "no man knoweth of his sepulchre to this day," lest the people of Israel should, out of their great love and veneration to their great deliverer from Egyptian bondage, have been led away, at some time or other, to worship his remains with superstitious veneration. So palpable indeed is this, that Bellarmine himself, in chap. iv., p. 308, admits, that it is probable (as stated by St. Chrysostom in Hom. 5, in Matthew) that the sepulchre of Moses was concealed, lest he should be worshipped by the Jews as God, and refers to the case of the brazen serpent which Hezekiah afterwards destroyed, because the people sacrificed or burned incense to it.—2 Kings ch. 18, as a proof that the danger was a real one, though *while Moses was living*, there was no fear of the people either worshipping him or the serpent, he being always at hand daily to tell them that there was but one true God, and that he (Moses) was only his servant, and the brazen serpent, by looking on which they were cured, was not that God, but a symbol only.

Bellarmine's next Scripture proof is taken from 2 Kings xiii. 21, which contains no account (and the only one in the whole Bible) of an extraordinary miracle done by the Almighty in honour of the bones of a prophet—the prophet Elisha. "And it came to pass as they were burying a man, that, behold they spied a band of men, and they cast the man into the sepulchre of Elisha; and when the man was cast down, and touched the bones of Elisha, he revived and stood upon his feet." Of course we neither doubt the miracle, nor that God honoured the bones of his prophet Elisha by it, but we neither meet with one word of any honour done or commanded to Elisha's bones in consequence of this miracle, nor do we find that they were taken up and enshrined by the Israelites, nor any processions made to them in order to receive any benefits from them, notwithstanding so great a miracle as that of restoring a dead man to life, which surely could not have failed to be recorded, if any such things had taken place.

The next text cited is 2 Kings xxiii., 16, 17, 18, where Josiah is described as breaking up the sepulchres, and burning the bones of false prophets upon an idolatrous altar, yet commanding the bones of the true prophet not to be moved, but preserved entire, when the men of the city told him it was the sepulchre of the "man of God which came from Judah, and proclaimed these things that thou hast done against the altar of Bethel." And he said, "let him alone, let no man move his bones." What does this prove but that the good king Josiah so respected the remains of the prophet, that he would not let him be disturbed, but left quietly in his grave: which seems to be a curious passage to be adduced by them, who, instead of letting the bodies of good men rest in peace in their graves, have, in honour of them, been in the habit of digging them up, and then, instead of burying them together again to rest, turn them to pecuniary profit, placing an arm here, and a leg there, and in another place a piece of the skull, and carrying them in procession on occasions from one place to another, pretending that they have some signal virtue in them to confer benefits or arrest misfortunes, which, if King Josiah had thought, he would probably have acted similarly, Instead of merely ordering that the prophet's bones should be left undisturbed; which command was obeyed, for the same historian adds—"So they let his bones alone with the bones of the prophet that came out of Samaria."

The only remaining text cited by Bellarmine from the old Testament is Isaiah xi. 10. Speaking of the Messiah Isaiah says, "In that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people, to it shall the Gentiles seek, and his rest shall be glorious." Bellarmine here translates the word (rest) מנוחה "*sepulchre*," as does the Douay version, and supposing that *sepulchre* were the correct translation, which we think it clearly is not,* it never could mean that *the sepulchre of stone* in which Christ lay should be worshipped, but merely by a figurative expression was obviously meant to convey that Christ's victory over the grave would be glorious, and the cause of salvation and deliverance from the power of death and the grave to the Gentiles who should believe in Him.

That none of these texts from the Old Testament prove that the worshipping of reliques is proper or justifiable we think the candid reader will allow. Whether the learned Cardinal is more successful in the authorities he has cited from the New Testament we hope to be able to consider in our next number.

THE TALK OF THE ROAD.—No. XIII.

"Well, Jem, did you get the book about the Scapular?"

"Deed then I did, Pat, and here it is," said Jem, taking the book out of his pocket, as they met on the road.

"Well, and is it like the Bible at all?" said Pat.

"Why then," said Jem, "if there's two books in the world that isn't like each other one bit, it's this book and the Bible; and more foreby, if this book is true, I don't see what call there is for the Bible at all; for sure enough, it's a deal easier to be saved by this book and the Blessed Virgin, than it is to be saved by Jesus Christ and the Bible—that is, barring it isn't all a lie about the Scapular. But I'm thinking, if the Bible is true, it will go hard with poor Judy and them that trusts in this book."

"Well, what is it all about?" said Pat.

"Why, first and foremost," said Jem, "it tells us how the order of Carmelites was founded by Elijah the prophet on Mount Carmel; and it tells us how he was upon the mountain nine hundred years and more before our Saviour was born, and he seen a little cloud as big as his hand coming up out of the sea, and that was the Blessed Virgin herself! no less, and so then he set up the Carmelites in honour of her, and it tells the place in the Bible where to find it, (3rd Book of Kings, ch. xviii., v. 42, &c., Douay Bible; 1st Book, authorized version), and sure enough, when I went to look for it, Elijah was there, and saw the little cloud, but not one word good or bad about the Blessed Virgin, nor the order of Carmelites neither."

"Well, well," said Pat, "was these Carmelites nine hundred years before our Saviour was born, and were they Christians then?"

"Why the book makes it out they're that old," said Jem; "and that they took up with the Blessed Virgin as soon as she was born, and that she was mighty fond of them, and gave them the Scapular herself. But 'deed she was in no hurry to give it to them, for she didn't give it to them for more nor *twelve hundred years* after that again!"

"And how could that be at all, at all," said Pat; "sure she must have been dead before that, anyway."

"Why here's the story," said Jem (page 31). "There was one Simon Stock, that lived in England, and a quare way he got his name, for he ran away into the woods when he was twelve years old, and lived in a hollow tree for twenty years, and he lived on the roots he scraped up, only when a dog brought him bread in his mouth on the festival days; and the Blessed Virgin would be coming to him often; and it so fell out that was the time that the Carmelites was turned out of Mount Carmel. So the Blessed Virgin told one day they were coming that way and that he'd be a Carmelite; and so when they come, he joined them, and was the greatest man that ever they had."

"Well, and did she give him the Scapular then," said Pat.

"Not that time," said Jem; "but when he was near dying, and thinking what would the Carmelites do without him, he went to the Blessed Virgin and told her all about it, and how all the Popes had confirmed the order, and all they had done for it. And so one day she come to him, just dressed the way she would be in heaven, and thousands of angels with her, and the Scapular ready in her hand; and she says to him, see, here's the very words in the book, (p. 31), '*Receive, most beloved son* (says she) *the Scapular of thy order, a sign of my confraternity, a privilege both to them and to all Carmelites, in which he that dieth shall not suffer eternal fire; behold the sign of salvation, a safeguard in danger, the covenant of peace and everlasting alliance.*' And then she just gives it into his hand, and was gone in a minute; and see, here's the very day, and it marked the 16th of July, 1251."

"Well, I wonder did all that happen," says Pat.

"Well, I'm thinking," said Jem, "if the Blessed Virgin was so fond of the Carmelites for 1250 years before, and if the scapular was so good for them, would she never give it to them before? Why wouldn't she give it to them when she was visiting them so often on Mount Carmel, at the time when our Blessed Saviour was born? Why would she leave them without it so long, and they so fond of her, and she so fond of them?"

"There's reason in that any way," said Pat; "and howsomever it isn't the ould religion. Why sure the scapular isn't more nor six hundred years old yet, even by the book's story; and don't the Catholics cry out on the Protestants, because everything in their religion isn't as old as the apostles?"

"Well," says Jem, "I think there's a better way still to see if the story is true."

"And how's that?" said Pat.

"Why," said Jem, "just to see how we are to be saved by the scapular, and how that fits with our being saved by Jesus Christ the way the Bible tells us; for if the two doesn't fit, it's reason that only one of them can be true."

"Well, I'll stand to that," said Pat, "and how does the book say the scapular saves us?"

"Why, first of all," said Jem, "the book says it is a grand thing for people to be joined in societies, because then every one in the society gets a share in all the prayers, and sacrifices, fastings, alms, and mortifications, and of all the good works of all the rest." (Preface, p. 1.)

And then Pat scratched his head for a minute, and said he, "and whose the gainer by that I wonder or whose the loser? why there won't be more good works among them after all; and how will they divide? If every man gets his own (and that's the fairest) I don't see the gain at all. And if they get share and share alike, why them that does the most is the losers; and them that does nothing is the gainers. Sure enough there was short commons here in the famine; but if every one, big and little in the parish, had brought all they had together to eat it at worst, sure it wouldn't go farther? And if all the boys in the parish was working at task work, and all in under one, to divide all the earnings among them, I'm thinking maybe its less work would be done, for all the lazy fellows would be saving themselves, to get their share of the work and they doing nothing. So I don't see the good of clubbing all together no ways."

"Well that's likeenough, Pat," said Jem, "I don't see no great good in it so far; but, then, there's more in it still: sure the book says that Pope Clement VII. has given the

---

* Card. Bellarmine, de Reliq. Sanct. l. 2. c. 3. tom. ii. p. 304, Colon Agripp 1618.

† Bellarmine himself well knew this, for being pressed with the difficulty that many of the pretended reliques of saints were and must be suppositious, because so many reliques of the same kind are found, that either the same saint must have had many bodies, or many of the reliques must be false (p. 308) he replies, that parts of the same bodies were in various places, but the whole was owned from the part—as St. Basil writes in his oration on the Forty Martyrs, who were then spoken of as whole (*toti*) in various cities, because *each city had a part of them*; and as Theodoret also, in his Eighth Book *de Martyribus*, says, "the bodies of martyrs were rarely found whole in any one monument, but are divided, and distributed in various places." (p. 309.)

* The Hebrew word, which Bellarmine, following the vulgate, translates "sepulchre" is מנוחה. This word occurs 21 times in the Old Testament. In 10 of these passages it is translated by the vulgate "requies," or rest; and *in no one other passage*, except this one of Isaiah xi. 10, do they render it "sepulchre." Such a translation, indeed, would make sheer nonsense of some of the texts to which the word occurs. Take, for example, Psalm cxxxii (cxxxi. Douay) in the 8th verse, "Arise, O Lord, into thy '*sepulchre*,' thou and the ark which thou hast sanctified;" or, again, the 14th verse of the same Psalm, "This is my *sepulchre* for ever and ever; here will I dwell, for I have chosen it." We conclude, therefore, that the proper translation of Isaiah xi. 10 is that of the authorized version—"His rest shall be glorious."

Scapularians a share of all the pious actions which are done throughout the whole church of God (page 46), and wouldn't that be making more for the Scapularians anyway?'

"And mercy on us," says Pat, "what right has the Pope to take their good works off them that does them, to give them all to the Scapularians? Why, if I'd stint the childer to give the bit to a poor creature on the road, for the love of God, what right has the Pope to take that off me to give it to them that never done it? Sure I'm not the fool to think the Pope can do that, or that God Almighty will let him handle us that sort."

"Nor I, neither, Pat," said Jem, "for doesn't the Bible say that every man 'must appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every man may receive the things done in his body, according to that HE *hath done*, whether it be good or bad' (2 Cor. v. 5-10); and sure how can the Pope go again that?"

"Well now," said Pat, "I mind a story I was reading, in St. Matthew's Gospel, a Sunday, and there was ten virgins that was going out to meet the Bridegroom (and that was the Lord himself), and they had to fetch lamps with them, for belike it was night, and there was five of them had no oil for their lamps, and, the creatures, they just wanted to have all in common, but the wise ones wouldn't agree to that at all, for they said they hadn't enough to be doing that with; so them that had no oil didn't get in at all, and Jesus Christ said that's just the way it would be when he'd be coming in glory; so it's plain that what's borrowed won't stand then, and isn't that enough for that?"

"Well I think it is, Pat," said Jem, "and so we'll go on a bit, for there's more in it yet. Sure here's a chapter to say that them that dies in the scapular will never suffer hell fire; and the quare proof the book gives of it, too, for see what it says here (p 48)—'In the city of Quarena, during the procession of the holy scapular, which is made on the third Sunday of every month, the devils were heard to execrate the holy scapular with many howlings and outcries, lamenting themselves that by means of this sacred habit of the Blessed Virgin, the gates of hell were shut to many persons."

"And does it mean that them that dies with the scapular on will never go to hell, if they were ever so bad?" said Pat.

"Well them's the words that the Book says the Blessed Virgin spoke to Simon Stock, "in which he that dieth shall not suffer eternal fire," p. 34, said Jem; but still the book won't stand to it all out; for it says, "it only means that if any one that dies with the Scapular on does go to hell, it will be his own fault, because God did enough for him." (p. 48 and 49.)

"Well, and wasn't that true for 1250 years before there was a Scapular at all," said Pat, "and isn't it true now to them that never saw a Scapular? but I doubt poor Judy doesn't take it that way."

"Well," said Jem, "here's a whole chapter about what Judy said, 'that the Blessed Virgin would go down to Purgatory to take out the Scapularians the very Saturday after they die. And, well, it turns out that that isn't in what the Blessed Virgin said to Simon Stock at all; but it was the Popes done that; and here the book gives us a list of five Popes no less, that all laid it on the Blessed Virgin to do that same, (p. 50), and what do you think of that Pat?"

"Why then, Jem," said Pat, "I'd think it a great pity that ever they'd die at all, barring of a Friday night."

"Well, Pat," said Jem, "here's more; here's a whole chapter of all the indulgences that ever the Popes gave to the Carmelites, for the foolishest things that ever you read. Sure here's an indulgence of three years to all Christians, let alone Carmelites, for every time they call the Carmelites 'the order of the Blessed Virgin Mary;' now isn't that easy got?"

"Well, salvation's chesp by the Scapular anyway," said Pat.

"I'm thinking it's not, Pat," said Jem, "for if the Bible's true, the Scapular will, may be, cost their souls to them that trusts in it."

"And is there any more in it?" said Pat.

"Deed is there," said Jem, "sure here's a whole chapter, to show that the Scapular is good against 'devils, and fire, and water, and wild beasts, and sickness, and witchcrafts, and danger in child-bed, and pistol shots and many other ill accidents (p. 71); and here's stories for them all: first and foremost, here's a story of a man that was shot with a pistol and two bullets in it, and the minute he was shot he just felt the two bullets fall down into his breeches; and when he got home, he found they just hit on the Scapular."

"Stop a bit, Jem," said Pat, "wouldn't that be the fine thing for Mr. Collins, the agent, that's shot at so often; I'm thinking if that was true, he'd be a Scapularian himself."

"That would be the thing for the agents, Pat," said Jem, "but here's more stories for you; here's a poor fellow that was kept alive by the Scapular for four hours after the whole heart was shot out of him by a cannon ball; and sure it was the pity that he died at all; and here's a man got out of the sea by it, and here's a great fire put out by it."

"Well, that won't do anyway," said Pat, "didn't I know Peter Brady that took his family off to America, and weren't they all Scapularians, and didn't the ship take fire before they got out of Liverpool, and wasn't there both fire and water there to try the Scapular on, and weren't they all drowned."

"I mind that well, too, Pat," said Jem, "and, sure enough, it did them little good, the creatures."

"But what have the Scapularians to do for all this?" said Pat.

"Why, just not one haporth, but only to wear the Scapular on their backs, for it won't do no good at all if it's wore on the breast; (p. 50), sure here it is, 'it sufficeth that the Scapular be received lawfully, and worn devoutly, without any other obligation' (p. 60); only if they want to get out of Purgatory on the first Saturday, they must fast on Wednesdays, or else say the office of the Blessed Virgin, which they please; but they must do neither the one nor the other to be kept out of hell."

"Well, isn't it the poor thing that creatures like Judy should be striving to get salvation by the Scapular, and not knowing nor thinking about the blood of Jesus Christ," said Pat; "and isn't it the poor thing that the clergy has never one word to say agin' books like that, and if a Bible turns up afore them, they're ready to hunt it like a mad dog; surely there's something wanting to set it right."

"And with all, Pat," said Jem, "there's something in the Scapular itself that won't fit father John."

"And what's that, Jem?" said Pat.

"Here it is, Pat," said Jem, "'those that visit our churches (that's the Carmelite churches), and pray for the ordinary necessities, may free a soul out of Purgatory every Wednesday throughout the whole year,' and where's the call for buying masses if that's true?"

"Well," said Pat, "if the people once come to take to that plan, isn't it father John that will hunt the Scapular out of the parish."

"It might be better nor hunting the readers," said Jem. So Pat and Jem parted for that night.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We have to apologise to PHILALETHES *and several other correspondents for postponing the insertion of their communications, some of which are already in type, but omitted necessarily for want of space.*

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st.

No anonymous letter can be attended to. Whatever is sent for insertion must be authenticated by the name and address of the writer, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee for his good faith.

We would request our valued correspondents, both Roman Catholics and Protestants, to limit the length of their communications, and not to discuss a variety of distinct topics in one letter.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, JUNE, 1853.

WE have been so much occupied hitherto in our efforts to induce our fellow-countrymen to discuss, in a more calm and amicable spirit, the differences existing between them in religious matters, that, perhaps, we may have appeared to some of our readers as applying ourselves too much to the mere *intellect*, and too little to the *heart*, and to be more anxious to disprove error, than directly to advocate truth. We can assure our readers, however, that the notion of the affections being out of place in religion is not one that we recognize as a sound one. We are fully persuaded that those who would exclude from the service of religion so important a part of the composition of man as his feelings and affections, have wholly mistaken the character of Christianity, undervalue her strength, and are ignorant of her true power. It is, we strongly feel, the peculiar glory and the special office of Christianity to bring all the faculties of our nature into their just subordination and dependance, and restore the whole man, complete in all his functions and faculties, of heart as well as understanding, to the service and glory of God.

It was, therefore, with a feeling rather of pleasure than surprise, that we received a letter, which our readers will find in another column, signed DERMOT M'MANUS, in which he accuses us of prudently keeping clear of the arguments derivable from the *feelings*, or, as he calls them, the *internal convictions* of Roman Catholics that their religion is true. The importance of the subject may justify us in calling especial attention to this letter as well as to what we shall say in reply to it, though, we confess, we are surprised that a gentleman so candid and fair-minded, as we take Mr. M'MANUS to be, should have hazarded a representation of our religious opinions so utterly erroneous, so wholly unlike the real state of the case as that contained in his letter. We are still more surprised at his strange assumption, that *we ourselves must allow* that the character of the system which we have always supported is one unable to make any solid impression on the heart and affections. So far from allowing this, we earnestly maintain that those grand truths of the Gospel of the grace of God, which we seek and have always sought, to preserve in their simplicity and integrity, free from all human additions and corruptions, are exactly those most calculated in their own nature, and most effectual, as proved by experience, to stir up the heart of the believer to its inmost depths, and influence, and purify while they influence, his noblest affections and highest energies.

Without anticipating the argument of our correspondent, we would avail ourselves of this opportunity of stating distinctly the class of truths we refer to. They are happily those on which all pious and real Christians, of whatever creed, may, we hope, agree, and which centre on the person of God our Saviour. The Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ—his true humanity—his love for men prompting him to lay down his life for their sakes—the offering of his atoning blood reconciling sinners to God—the free pardon offered to all who have faith in that precious blood, and are obedient to the truth—the sanctifying and consoling influences of God the Spirit—together with the sacramental and other means of grace which the Christian has provided for him in what we hold to be the church of Christ, and to the right and faithful use of which He has promised his blessing—these are some of the glorious truths of God which we believe and cling to—which the Apostles believed—which the ancient Fathers believed—which the noble army of martyrs believed—which were not only assented to by their understanding, but which were received into their heart, and which were found mighty, as principles of action, in moulding them to habits of piety and virtue. Must these truths have lost their power and become inoperative, when believed by us, because we are unable to hold, along with these doctrines, others which we are persuaded we can prove to be of human invention? Can we have no love to our adorable Saviour and Redeemer, our merciful High Priest and Mediator, because we refuse to share his work and merits with any creature, however exalted, or to lavish on such a created being that tribute of devout affection which we believe to be due to God alone? We think our readers will see that our correspondent has done us an injustice in this matter—that there is nothing in the doctrines which we hold (and the greater part of which, he it observed, we hold in common with Roman Catholics themselves), which can justify the charge of ours being a cold, lifeless creed. It is possible that many Roman Catholics do not know that we have in the Church of England a ritual also, sublime in its devout simplicity, and breathing the very spirit, and often the very language, of primitive piety? Were they also to become intimately acquainted with the sacred treasure of the written Word of

God, the study of which we have so earnestly and repeatedly advocated, they would find it to be impossible that any true Protestant, who loves the Bible, could be satisfied with a religious system which did not commend itself to his heart. We deem it impossible to look into any part of the sacred volume without meeting abundant proofs that it is the religion of the *affections* which God particularly requires. "My son, give me thine heart." "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart." Such are the direct and comprehensive claims made on us in the Holy Scriptures; love, zeal, gratitude, joy, hope, trust, are each of them specified, not as weaknesses to be tolerated, but as bounden duties enjoined on us, and commended to us as our acceptable worship. The lively exercise of the feelings towards their legitimate object is always spoken of in the Holy Scripture with praise, while a cold, unfeeling heart is represented as highly criminal; and lukewarmness is spoken of as the object of God's disgust and aversion; zeal and love, of his favour and delight; and the taking away the heart of stone, and the implanting of a warmer and more tender nature in its stead, are specially promised as the effects of his returning favour, and the work of his renewing grace.

If we look to the most eminent of the Scripture characters we shall find them warm, zealous, and affectionate. When engaged in their favourite work of celebrating the goodness of their Supreme Benefactor, their souls appear to burn within them, and their hearts kindle into rapture; the forms of language are inadequate to the expression of their transports, and they call on all nature to swell the chorus, and to unite with them in hallelujahs of gratitude, and joy, and praise. And will it be believed that the system whose chief feature it is to encourage and urge every human being, prayerfully and constantly, to study and imbibe the spirit of this glorious volume, can set at nought or undervalue the religion of the heart. It is just because the study of God's Holy Word is, in our deliberate judgment, the best fitted instrumentality to warm, and purify, and influence man's *heart*, that we are so earnest for its universal use, and not because it favours one set of doctrinal tenets more than another. We regret that we cannot dwell longer on these topics at present, but we hope to return to them again, for the present contenting ourselves with assuring our correspondent, that hundreds of thousands of Protestants have found the evangelical doctrines of the Bible to confer comfort in sickness and sorrow, strength in temptation, joy and peace in believing, growth in grace, support in death, and hope for eternity.

We need scarcely state, though we sent a copy of our last number to the Rev. Mr. Kelsh, challenging him to prove any of his charges against us, that gentleman has not ventured to reply to it, well knowing that it was out of his power to point out one sentence in our paper from its commencement to justify any of the expressions he has ventured to use in his published letter respecting us. We only hope those opposed to the circulation of the Catholic Layman, feeling that they are unable to cope with it in a manly manner by argument, will continue to use the same abusive language towards us, which we assure them we are able to bear in the calmest spirit, without the slightest exertion of either philosophy or Christian resignation. We should not have noticed such a letter at all, but that we believe that it is a fair sample of the language of those who would prevent the people from hearing both sides, throughout the country. We rejoice to know that there are many of those who differ from us, yet who do wish to hear both sides, and it is for them we write.

Correspondence.

ON ORIGEN AND PURGATORY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Sir—I freely grant that the heretical opinions of Origen, founded on a fallacious principle, by which he maintains, that, after a fixed revolution of ages, the offences of Satan, and of his damned associates, will be purged away, and that they will then be restored to the friendship of God, were condemned by the fifth general council, under Pope Vigilius; but that Origen's commentaries on the Scriptures, and his books against Celsus, shared in this condemnation, I deny. The passages, which you adduce from Epiphanius and Augustine, afford *prima facie* evidence, that they are directed against these heretical principles solely, and not against the Catholic doctrine of Purgatory. The necessity of Purgatory to those who die free from all stains of sin, forms no part of Catholic doctrine; the Church offers prayers and sacrifices for those only who die repentant in the Catholic and Christian communion, not for those "who," to use the words of St. Augustine, "have finished this life in scandalous crimes, and sacrileges, and impieties, the greatest possible." Neither can you show that a belief in the purifying quality of hell's fire can have any place in Roman Catholic doctrine. Epiphanius does not, in the slightest degree, impugn the doctrine of Purgatory, when he says, that "Origen dares to teach that the devil will again be what he once was, and will return to the same dignity;" on the contrary (in Hær. 75, sec. 3, Tom. 1, page 908) he says—"that a part of the heresy of Arius consisted in his maintaining that the prayers, alms, &c., of the living afforded no relief to the dead." And it is not a little remarkable, that the objection started by this heretic against prayers for the dead in his time, is very nearly related to, if not the same with that urged against it by the anti-purgatorians of the present day:—"No one, then," says he, "will live piously here, nor do any good action; but he will engage some friends, either by entreaties or by bestowing large sums of money on them, who may pray for him after death, that his wicked deeds might not be punished in the next world." To the orthodoxy of the quotation from Origen, you next object the opinion of some learned Roman Catholics; but we are here discussing the doctrine of the Catholic Church, not the doctrine of individual opinion.

In Hom. 6, Exod. Tom. ii., page 148, Origen is peculiarly explicit, with regard to the doctrine of Purgatory, where he also, by a distinctive clause, points out the eternal condemnation of the wicked, typified by the overthrow of the Egyptians in the Red Sea—"But," says he, "when we arrive at that place, he that shall bring many good works, and little that is evil, this evil the fire shall purify as it does lead, and the whole shall become pure gold. He that takes with him more of lead suffers the more, that he may be refined, and what little of gold there is after the purification remains. But should the whole mass be lead, that man must experience what is written—"*The sea covered them; they sank as lead in the mighty waters*"—Exod. xv. 10.

St. Cyprian, in Epist. 52, page 72, says—"It is one thing in punishment of sin to be purified by long suffering and purged by long fire, and another to have expiated all sins by previous suffering," and thus bears testimony to the belief of a future purgation of souls, and the consequent doctrine of Purgatory. The passage quoted by you, in page 82, Vol. I. Catholic Layman, from Cyprian's Ep. to Demetrius, affords no contradiction to this doctrine—namely, "once gone hence, there is no more place for repentance; no satisfaction can be accomplished; it is here life is either lost or saved." St. Augustine teaches the same doctrine in many parts of his writings. In sermon 172, De Verbis Apost., sect. 2;—Enchiridion, cap. 109, 110; Lib. 21, De Civit Dei. cap. 13, 24, &c., he proves the practice of the Universal Church, in offering up prayers and sacrifices for the dead, affirming it to be a custom derived from the Fathers, and that they are offered for those who have not lived so well as not to need such *propitiations*, nor so bad as to be incapable of such reliefs after death; and yet he tells us "*no new merits are acquired by the dead;*" "but," says he, "these reliefs are afforded them on account of their former good actions." And he says again, "all that merit is provided in this life, by which each person, who may be in need of prayers after death, can be relieved." These passages show that "it is here life is either lost or saved," and fully explain the words of St. Cyprian, and establish the orthodoxy of the extract from Origen; so that my three witnesses are not only united most cordially in opinion, but I have, moreover, the accession of a fourth, whose testimony is invincible.

I shall further add, although Augustine affirms that all that merit is provided in this life, and that no new merits are acquired by the dead; yet, as an additional proof of the doctrine of Purgatory, he says—"Cleanse me so in this life, make me such, that I may not stand in need of that purifying fire, designed for those who shall be saved, yet so as by fire." *Enarr* in Psalm xxxvii. Tom. 4, page 295.

In page 50, Vol. I. Catholic Layman, after many vague opinions concerning the origin and object of these prayers, you allege that "they appear to have amounted, at most, to prayers that God would forgive them their sins, accompanied by the hope that they might impart some consolation and comfort to them," and with this admission you connect the opinion of Pope Gregory the Great, that "*this is to be believed possible only so far as little sins.*" Hence, we may justly conclude, that the primitive Christians believed that some sins were forgiven in the world to come, which could not be in heaven (Rev. xxi. 27), neither in hell, and, therefore, in a third place. The Purgatory of Roman Catholics means a middle state of souls, who have neither lived so innocently as to go straight to heaven, nor so ill as to be condemned to hell—that is, of those who have been guilty of "*little sins*," and they hold, as an article of faith, that these souls are helped by the prayers of the faithful, and by the sacrifice of the altar: but the nature of the purifying fire and the term of its duration, form no points of doctrine. This doctrine, I find, has been taught by the Roman Church, *ab antiquo*, attested by the evidence of the most learned Fathers of the Primitive Church, and confessed even by her enemies, whilst all objections to it are confined to mere conjecture, speculation, theories, negative arguments, and the opinions of modern reformers or disguised heretics. In the article which you have promised on this head, I expect you will deal in clear, positive, and direct proofs; and if you have any one stronger and more pointed than another, or than any of those heretofore used, by which you may be able to convince the Church of the folly and *impiety* of this doctrine, let it now be brought forth.

With many apologies for having exceeded so far, in these observations, that brevity which is so desirable to you and to me.

I remain, Sir, yours truly, &c., &c.

Edmond Power.

May 30th, 1853.

It will be remembered that the question we are discussing is, "What testimony in support of the dogma of Purgatory can be adduced from any orthodox writer of the first three centuries?" Mr. Power makes a hard battle not to give up passages which he has cited from Origen, a condemned heretic, and which are owned, by learned Roman Catholic commentators on the places he quotes, to embody the very heresy in question. And we cannot blame him, for if he parts with Origen, he will have very little left in the first three centuries to fall back upon. It is remarkable that men are often proud if they can trace their ancestry in some remote degree to a person whom they would be ashamed to have for a father. We have heard of a gentleman who is very proud of being able to trace his descent to a man who attempted to steal the crown jewels in the reign of Charles the Second. And though it is not considered very creditable to have one's own father hanged, yet many would be rather proud than otherwise if they could prove distinctly that one of their ancestors was hanged in the reign of Henry VIII. For as there are not many who can name their great-great-great-great-great grandfather, the few who can do so cannot afford to be too particular as to what kind of character this gentleman bore. It is on the same principle that though, had Mr. Power lived within a couple of hundred years after Origen, he would have been much ashamed of seeming to adopt his views on the state of the soul after death, yet at this distance of time he thinks it better to be able to trace his doctrines to a heretic in the second century, than to have no trace of them there at all. The following, then, is a summary of the argument which has taken place between us and Mr. Power on the subject of Origen.

Catholic Layman. Did the Church of the first three centuries believe in Purgatory?

Mr. Power. Yes; for Origen in the passages here produced, speaks of certain temporary tortures to be endured by sinners after death.

C. L. But Origen's doctrine on this subject was not the doctrine of the Church; for he believed that *all* future punishments were temporary; and his doctrines on this subject were condemned by (amongst others) Epiphanius and Augustine.

Mr. P. The passages you cite from Epiphanius and Augustine do not disprove Purgatory; they only prove that it is heretical to believe that those who die in *mortal* sins, shall be restored to happiness after certain temporary torments; but it does not follow that they who die repentant in the Catholic communion may not have certain temporary torments to endure.

C. L. We did not cite these passages as an argument against *Purgatory*, but as an argument against *Origen*. They show that on the subject of future punishment the views of Origen differed widely from those of the Church. All your citations from Origen therefore go for nothing, and until you have proved from *orthodox* writers of the first three centuries the existence of those temporary torments after death, our question as to the sentiments of the primitive church on this subject remains unanswered.

Mr. P. But Origen *was* orthodox, in believing that the righteous shall endure certain temporary torments hereafter; although I own he was heretical in maintaining that the wicked, and that the devil himself, should have the benefit of the same Purgatory.

C. L. You are pleased to say so, but this is precisely what we want to have *proved*. Origen himself provides a Purgatory, as well for those who died in mortal sin as those who did not: and certainly it would seem that if purgatorial fires could cleanse away small sins, the same fires, a little hotter and a little longer endured, might cleanse away

large sins. At any rate, as we agree as to part of Origen's views being heretical, it is your business to prove, by citations from the fathers of the first three centuries, that the remaining part of his views is orthodox.

Mr. P.—I have already given you citations which show that Purgatory was the doctrine of the Church in the time of Epiphanius and Augustine.

C. L.—But Epiphanius belonged to the fourth century, and Augustine to the beginning of the fifth; over two hundred years after Origen. We shall discuss the views of these writers presently; but even if you could prove that they believed in Purgatory, it would not follow that this was the faith of the Church two hundred years before—nay, rather, if in the first three centuries it is only in heretical writers that you find a doctrine resembling that of Purgatory, is not the presumption that the doctrine of Purgatory was not a tradition of the primitive Church, but only a revival of the heresy of Origen (which he again had borrowed from the heathen Platonists) stripped of some of the most offensive of its extravagancies. In short Mr. Newman and other learned Roman Catholics confess, that the doctrine of Purgatory was not, in its present form, distinctly taught by the Church in the first three centuries, but that it was a development of a subsequent age. Now, the citations from Origen enable us to judge by what hands this doctrine was developed.

Mr. P.—Well, if you insist on quotations from writers of the first three centuries, you shall have one. Listen to St. Cyprian—"It is one thing in punishment of sin to be purified by long-suffering, and purged by long fire; and another to have expiated all sin by previous suffering." What can be a clearer testimony to his belief in Purgatorial fire?

C. L.—We are tolerably familiar with this passage, and when separated from its context, it will, indeed, teach Purgatory very distinctly to *those who have heard of the doctrine before;* but if you will take the trouble not to be satisfied with copying from a Roman Catholic list of citations, but to look out the passage in St. Cyprian himself, you will find that he is speaking, not of any torments in the next world, but of the allegorical fire of penitential austerities in this life, a fire in which, by the early discipline of the Church, it was required that the lapsed should, for an appointed season, discipline themselves.

The question St. Cyprian was discussing was, whether those who had offered sacrifice to idols should be re-admitted to the communion of the Church: St. Cyprian maintained that, after a proper course of penitential discipline, they might. His opponents urged—"If you thus relax our discipline, according to which the lapsed should never be re-admitted, the greatest injury will follow. In time of persecution nobody will have courage to confess Christ; all will be glad to save their lives by offering sacrifice, if they know that they may hope notwithstanding to be ultimately received into the Church. St. Cyprian argued in reply, we need not by any means fear this; for the condition of the lapsed will still be far different from that of confessors and martyrs. The one are immediately received into paradise, sure of their reward; the others have to wait for pardon, anxious as to what the Bishop may decree concerning them; doubtful whether he may not order them a time of penance so long that they shall be as weary as the debtor confined in prison, who cannot get out until he have paid the last farthing; doubtful whether the form of penance may not be severe in proportion to their guilt, as for example, to roll in dust and ashes, to be macerated by fastings, by sackcloth, by groans and sighs, as metal is purified in vehement fire; doubtful whether after all this they shall be received back with difficulty, or reserved to await the judgment of the Lord. Since, therefore, the martyr has the prize of certain and immediate glory held out to him, while he who lapses has to look forward to the uncertain event of long and weary probation before he can be admitted to the church, there is no danger that the practice of re-admitting the lapsed after sufficient penance should tempt men to shrink from martyrdom.

Such is Saint Cyprian's argument, and you see that in the whole there is not the slightest allusion to Purgatory.

Mr. P.—I cannot believe that this is St. Cyprian's meaning. No doubt you are giving me a forced Protestant explanation of the passage, got up to evade the pressure of the argument I was urging against you.

C. L.—By no means: the explanation I have given you I have translated nearly verbatim from Rigaltius, the learned Roman Catholic commentator on St. Cyprian. (Rigalt. in Cyprian. Epist. lii., Paris 1648, p. 68). And you will find an acknowledgment that this explanation of the passage harmonizes perfectly with the context in Mr. Newman's Essay on Development (p. 416). And we cannot think it very fair that while when Roman Catholic writers are commenting on a passage of an ancient writer, and considering it in connection with its context, they are constrained to give one explanation, they should, in controversy with Protestants, pick the passage away from its context, and present us with another explanation.

Mr. P.—What you say appears strange, but I shall examine into it; meanwhile I should be glad to know how you can possibly reply to the arguments of Epiphanius against the heresy of Arius, part of which consisted in maintaining that the prayers of the living afforded no relief to the dead.

C. L.—This is coming to the fourth century; and unless you prove that the doctrine existed in the Church in the previous century, proving that it existed in the fourth century will not answer your purpose. For we all know that Purgatory was believed in by the majority of Christians in the fourteenth century, and if it was not so taught in the third century, it is a matter of mere historical curiosity at what precise century between, the belief was introduced. However, we have no reason to shrink from discussing the question—"Was Purgatory part of the faith of the Church in the fourth century?" For victory on this ground will not answer *your* purpose; but if we show, as we expect to do, that it was not a part of the faith of the Church at that time, of course, all pretence to earlier antiquity for the doctrine, as an article of faith, falls to the ground at once. There is one small point, however, at which we wish to take exception. You speak of the heresy of *Arius*, who disputed the utility of prayers for the dead; and we wish to explain that the *Aerius* who held these views, and against whom Epiphanius argues, in his 75th heresy, is a very different person from the arch-heretic, Arius, who denied the Divinity of our Lord.

Mr. P.—Doubtless he was: I never intended to confound the two, although I was careless in spelling the name.

C. L.—The only reason we mentioned the point is, that the views of Aerius may be discussed on their own merits, and that a needless prejudice against them may not be excited in the minds of our unlearned readers, who might imagine that it was the Arch-heretic, Arius, with whom the opposition to these prayers had originated.

Mr. P.—Take the benefit of the distinction, whatever that may be; but let us see your answer to the plain statement of Epiphanius, that prayers for the dead were a custom handed down to him from the primitive Church.

C. L.—Remember that we are now discussing Purgatory, and not prayers for the dead. We freely acknowledge that prayers for the dead were used in the fourth century; and that the section of Epiphanius, to which you have referred, contains his answer to the question of Aerius—what was the use of these prayers? Now, surely, if Purgatory was part of the doctrine of his Church in his day, we should find some mention of it in his answer to this question. If you were to ask any Roman Catholic child now, "why do you pray for the dead?" He would be able to answer, clearly and distinctly, "To get their souls out of Purgatory." If the good bishop had known as much of the late theories of temporary punishments after death as every Roman Catholic child knows now, he would have been at no loss for an answer to Aerius. But, on the contrary, he does not take this simple ground, but is exceedingly vague and unsatisfactory. You blamed us because, in a former number, we only gave vague accounts of the reasons why the Primitive Church used prayers for the dead. The fact is, we cannot tell you more than the early fathers knew themselves; and all those fine theories, so harmonious, and so logical (only so baseless), which delight you now, were not known in these days. In this essay of Epiphanius, you will find the main ground he takes up is, that the Church had handed down the practice of such prayers, and that it is presumptuous in Aerius to find fault with it. Just read over this essay of Epiphanius again: tell us plainly whether in this controversy with Aerius he could possibly have omitted to have brought forward all he knew about Purgatory; and own that the result is, that the Church of his day had defined nothing on the subject.

Mr. P.—I ask no more than your acknowledgment that prayers for the dead were used in the Primitive Church, and if such prayers were not to get their souls out of Purgatory, what else were they for?

C. L. That these prayers for the dead do not necessarily presuppose a Purgatory is proved by the fact that the primitive prayers included the Blessed Virgin, the Apostles, the Martyrs, &c., and surely you do not maintain that these were in Purgatory.

Mr. P. I have already answered this objection. The Saints were named in these prayers, as Epiphanius says, to do particular honour to Christ, whose saints they are: and this honour was done by entreating God to have mercy on the departed *through* the saints, whom they named along with them.

C. L. You much mistake if you suppose that in the ancient prayers the saints were named to offer the prayers *through* them; the prayers were most decidedly and unmistakeably *for* them. So (Apostolic Constitutions), "we offer unto thee for all thy saints that have lived well-pleasing in thy sight from the foundation of the world, for patriarchs, prophets, holy men, apostles, martyrs, confessors, bishops, presbyters, deacons, sub-deacons, readers, singers, virgins, widows, laymen, and all whose names thou knowest." Or again, St. Chrysostom's Greek Liturgy (Bened. vol. xii. p. 792), "We offer unto thee this reasonable service for the faithful deceased, our forefathers, fathers, patriarchs, prophets, and apostles, evangelists martyrs, confessors, eneratites, and every spirit perfected in the faith, especially for the holy undefiled most blessed lady, the *Theotokos* and ever Virgin Mary." Here you see so late as the fifth century, the saints, apostles, and Virgin Mary prayed *for* with other Christians indiscriminately. The praying *through* them was an improvement of a later age. We have already given in this paper a notable instance of this alteration. In the ninth century Hincmar informs us that the following prayer for the soul of St. Leo, stood in the old Roman Missal:—"Grant O Lord that this oblation which thou hast appointed to be for the relaxation of the sins of the whole world, may be of advantage to the soul of thy servant Leo." But, in the time of Pope Innocent III, we learn that the prayer had been altered to the following—"Grant, O Lord, that this oblation may be of advantage to *us* by the intercession of St. Leo!"

When Epiphanius says that we pray for the saints to do especial honour to Christ; he does not mean 'by using their intercession,' but, as the context plainly shows, to do our Lord this especial honour, that he alone is to be considered above our prayers, but that all others, however eminent in Christian virtue, must be placed on a different level, and must be considered as fitting subjects for our prayers.

Mr. P. I grant that there are prayers *for* the saints in the early liturgies, but I have St. Augustine's authority for saying, that in their case these prayers must be understood as *thanksgivings* and not as *propitiations.*

C. L. It is true that St. Augustine, in whose time the veneration for the martyred saints had begun to reach a high pitch did put forth this then novel doctrine. But nothing can be more forced than to contend that the very same words are to be understood in the case of some as a *petition* and in the case of others as a *thanksgiving.* The fact is, that the ancient liturgies in recording the prayers then made for the Virgin and the saints, not only prove that prayers for the dead do not necessarily imply a belief in Purgatory; but also contain important testimony against the *cultus* of the saints. In the earliest ages, they prayed *for* them without scruple, and considered Christ as alone above our prayers. As the veneration for the saints increased, St. Augustine had recourse to forced explanations of the forms which still existed in his liturgy; but, as time went on, it was found intolerably inconsistent to pray for those who were supposed to be in heaven interceding for us, and the forms of the liturgies were themselves changed.

Mr. P. I cannot admit St. Augustine's explanation to be forced in the least degree.

C. L. Then why does not your church still continue to pray by name for the Virgin, St. Peter, and St. Paul, &c.? Confess that you would be shocked at being asked to join in such a prayer. But, at any rate, you grant all we require, when you own that prayers were offered by the Church for the saints and martyrs, and that these saints were not supposed to be in Purgatory. It follows, then, that the mere fact that the deceased were prayed for, is not sufficient to prove that the persons prayed for were supposed to be in Purgatory. We have as good a right to say that the mention of the names of *all* the deceased were only thanksgivings, as you have to say that the mention of the names of the martyrs were so.

Mr. P. But how did prayers for the dead arise in the Church, if Purgatory were not part of her creed?

C. L. Very simply—in prayers for the living. The church liturgy, for instance, contains—"We offer unto thee for all thy faithful servants, and especially Philip, our Bishop." Well, Philip dies, and they say—"shall we leave out his name now? Not so; let us testify our belief that he is, though unseen by us, still in being and with the Lord. The case is only the same as if he had journeyed from us to a distant place. We shall, by our mention of him in our prayers, show our love to him, our pious belief concerning him, and, at the same time, our conviction, that of all who are in being, it is Christ alone whom we cannot, without insult, pray for."

It was in feelings such as these that prayers for the dead originated. We would gladly say something more as to the different theories that were invented to explain the benefit which the dead might be supposed to derive for such prayers. We should wish also to produce some passages from St. Augustine which decisively prove that in his time Purgatory was no part of the faith of the Church. The length to which our remarks have already run warns us that we must put off any further observations to next month. We will only conclude by remarking, that when Mr. Power undertakes to establish Purgatory by the *tradition* of the Church, he undertakes a task which the best Divines of his own communion have long since acknowledged to be hopeless. The only principle on which Purgatory can be defended is, that the later church possesses light which was unknown to the earliest. It was on this principle that Purgatory was boldly defended by one of their most famous English divines, Cardinal Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, who was martyred by Henry VIII., and who wrote against Luther in the following terms—

"Whoever reads the commentaries of the ancient Greeks, will find no mention, as far as I can see, or the slightest possible, concerning Purgatory. Nay, even the Latins did not all at once, but gradually enter into the truth of this matter. . . For a while it was unknown; at a later date it was known to the Church universal. Then it was believed by some, by little and little, partly from Scripture, partly from Revelations" [that is to say, from ghost stories—Ed. *C. L.*].—Assert. Luther. Confut. 18.

We conclude then for the present by saying that those who would prove Purgatory from the Fathers, must be more learned than Cardinal Fisher. One question, however, we wish to ask for our information, before we part. You say that the "nature of the purifying fire of Purgatory, and the term of its duration, form no part of the Church's doctrine." We want to know whether it is any part of your Church's doctrine that there is any purifying fire in Purgatory at all?

ON THE INTERNAL EVIDENCES OF THE CATHOLIC RELIGION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—A feeling of deep interest in the religious controversy between Catholics and Protestants, has led me to be an attentive reader of your journal from its commencement. I feel bound to acknowledge the learning, candour, and impartiality with which your discussions, for the most part, have been conducted; and I think it must be confessed that you have proved how little evidence is to be derived from the ancient fathers, in support of the reverence which the Catholic Church has always paid to the Blessed Virgin, and other important doctrines which we are taught to believe.

But, sir, even granting that you have proved all this (and that is a very great concession), you must yourself be quite conscious how little you have done to shake the hold which the Catholic faith possesses over the affections of the people of Ireland. The testimony of ancient authors is the least part of the evidence on which we rely. You have prudently abstained from touching on the *internal* convictions which in all ages, have vouched for the truth of our faith to multitudes of sincere and pious men, to a Fenelon, a Bossuet, a Pascal. It is the boast of Catholicism that it comes home to the wants and wishes of the mass of mankind in a way in which no other religion ever yet has done, and it thereby proves itself to be the religion of the *heart*. The whole system of the Catholic religion—its sublime ritual—its fasts and penances—its intercessory offerings for departed souls—its saints and confessors interceding in the presence of God—its devotions to the Virgin Mother of God, all are but so many links of the chain, whereby the faith which we profess (in common with the majority of the Christian world) is entwined around the deepest principles of our nature. When Protestant divines are contending with Deists and Infidels, they rightly dwell on the beautiful adaptation of Christianity to the wants of fallen man, as one of the proofs of its being a divine revelation. I admit the validity of the argument; but I want to know why Catholics may not advance a similar argument in their controversy with Protestants, in order to prove that theirs is the only true and genuine form of Christianity? Protestantism, in the aspect under which it daily presents itself to Catholic eyes—namely, as it is exemplified in the lives of the great mass of professing Protestants—is (as you yourself must allow) a cold, lifeless system, unable to make any solid impression on the heart or affections. There is nothing in it to call forth those deep and hidden emotions of love and devotion, which find such scope and exercise in the beautiful and impressive ritual of the Catholic Church. In proof of this, I confidently appeal to the experience of all those persons who have made any inquiries into the religious condition of the mass of the population, in almost all Protestant countries, not even excepting enlightened and intelligent England. There is, indeed, plenty of wrangling upon religious doctrines, among certain classes, but how little hold has religion itself upon the daily life, the hopes and fears, the joys and sorrows of the multitude; how rarely do they turn to it for comfort and consolation under the trials and calamities of life! When the heart of some poor penitent, gushing with feelings of sorrow and contrition, and groaning under the burden of sin, seeks for some sympathising bosom whereon to repose the burden of its griefs, how does your church endeavour to satisfy the intense craving of his soul? You tell him that penances are unavailing, that priestly absolution is but an empty sound. You forbid him to turn his thoughts to the sainted martyrs and confessors; you tell him that it is rank idolatry to fly for refuge to the blessed mother of God; and what do you offer him instead? You give him the thirty-nine articles! You set before his mind a dry and barren abstraction of a Deity, enveloped in a cloudy maze of dogmatic theology! As well might you hold forth an empty vessel to the parched and thirsty wanderer in the desert, as tell the sorrowing and heavy-laden soul to be content with such as a religion as this.

My argument, therefore, is briefly as follows:—If adaptation to the wants and infirmities, not of a select few, but of the whole mass of mankind, be among the proofs of the Divine origin of a religious system, I must conclude that the Catholic faith has greater claims upon our reverence and regard than any religion such as I have described, which strips Christianity of all that can make it lovely and attractive, and leaves nothing behind save the lifeless skeleton, a fit subject for logical disputants and intellectual anatomists.

DERMOT MACMANUS.

Grange, May 20, 1853.

We have already invited the earnest attention of our readers to the foregoing letter, and to what we are about to say in reply to it. No more important topic has, we think, appeared in the CATHOLIC LAYMAN than that suggested by this letter. A religion to be true must be adapted to the wants and infirmities, not of a select few, but of the mass of mankind. It must not be a system cold and lifeless, unable to make any solid impression on the hearts and affections. It must be capable of being entwined around the deepest principles of our better nature—and have something in it to call forth the deep and hidden emotions of love and devotion which we in a spirit of grief, admit to be but little exemplified in the lives of the great mass of mankind, Protestants or Roman Catholics. It must have something better to set before the poor penitent, groaning under the burden of sin, than a dry and barren abstraction of a Deity, enveloped in a cloudy maze of dogmatic theology; and if the religion of any Church, Catholic or Protestant, be indeed one which strips Christianity of all that can make it lovely and attractive, and leaves nothing behind save the lifeless skeleton, a fit subject for logical disputants and intellectual anatomists, away with such a religion from the earth!

If we did not feel from the bottom of our souls that *our* religion is not such, we should never have written a line in this paper, nor indeed would the CATHOLIC LAYMAN ever have had existence.

We must take leave to begin by correcting Mr. M'Manus as to a matter of fact. It is not true, when a penitent groaning under a sense of sin seeks in the Church of England for something to satisfy the intense cravings of his soul, that she offers him nothing but her thirty-nine articles, and a dry and barren abstraction of a Deity. It is true, indeed, that she forbids him to trust in the merits of saints or martyrs, or to look to them as mediators and intercessors. It is true that she warns men, as they regard the safety of their souls, not to peril them by "flying for refuge" to any created being, or offering religious worship to any but the Supreme God. But why does she do this? Is it not because she would have them trust to the *one great intercessor* between God and man, not a dry and barren abstraction, but the ever-blessed Son of God, the Lord Jesus Christ, who, though co-eternal and co-equal with God the Father, condescended to take on him man's nature, that being touched with the sense of our infirmities[a] after laying down his precious life for the sins of the world, he might be for ever at the right hand of his Father making intercession for us? Is this system—of which *the all-merciful Jesus* (who wept at the tomb of Lazarus before he restored him to life) is *the centre and the life*—a lifeless system, unable to make any solid impression on the heart and affection? And is there, indeed, nothing left to make the religion of the Bible lovely and attractive, while that Bible remains the only authentic record of the life and sufferings of our Blessed Lord. If the Church of England determines to know nothing but *Jesus Christ and Him crucified*, it is because the great Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul did the same, and whether the system they taught or that now taught by the Church of Rome be most "enveloped in a cloudy maze of dogmatic theology," or whether the religion of the Bible be not that of the heart and affections, rather than that of logical disputation, we shall not shrink from examining, with all the earnestness which such a topic demands from every rational being anxious to save his soul.

The feelings which Mr. M'Manus's letter has evoked are indeed of no ordinary kind, but we must restrain the emotions which such charges have naturally excited, and endeavour calmly to consider the argument conveyed by it, though we find it would be impossible to make more than a few preliminary observations on so extensive and important a subject in our present number.

We think our correspondent has begun by confounding two things essentially distinct. Internal *evidence* and internal *convictions*. We do not think that the *external* and *internal* evidences of religion should ever be dissociated, or that either should be represented as able to stand alone; but were we obliged to admit one to the exclusion of the other, the *evidence* which any religion contains within itself—that is, the *internal evidence* of its truth, we have always considered the most satisfactory and conclusive kind of evidence, as being the most independent of fallible human testimony; but *internal convictions*, as distinct from *internal evidence*, are too often in favour of what is false, to make them safe guides without further examination.

Nothing is true merely because any man or any number of men are *convinced* that it is true; but that which has *proof within itself must* be true.

When our correspondent asks why Roman Catholics may not advance against Protestants in order to prove that theirs is the only true and genuine form of Christianity, the same argument that Protestant divines use against infidels and Deists, drawn from the beautiful adaptation of Christianity to the wants of fallen man, we understand him, therefore, as referring to the *internal evidence* which that beautiful adaptation affords, and not merely to the persuasion of any man or set of men, that it is a true religion because it suits the wishes of unregenerate human nature.

In discussing this subject, however, we would distinguish between the *wants* and the *wishes* of fallen man. The mere fact that we *want* a thing, is not in itself a proof that we have got it; for we live in a world which sin has blighted, and where we have to *bear* the want of many things which we believe we should have enjoyed had man not fallen. Still when direct evidence has been produced of the divine origin of a revelation, it is a strong *confirmatory* argument, if that revelation be found to supply some at least of those real wants of which mankind have always been conscious, that it comes from Him who alone is able to supply these wants. But a system which is adapted only to the *wishes* of fallen man may, for all we know, come from the enemy who first brought man into the fall, and awakened in his breast the wishes of a fallen nature.

The nature of the argument used by Protestants against Infidels and Deists is as follows:—

All nations of the world, in every age, have felt that they were liable to the wrath of God, and hence dreaded that wrath. All religions have ever consisted in sacrifices and explations for the purpose of turning away the wrath of God, and procuring his favour. There is no record of any nation who have not felt this great necessity. This universal sense of guilt and helplessness so deeply felt, is proof enough that man does need some means of being reconciled to God; and this is confirmed by a fact as universal, that all mankind were ever doing those things which their own reason and conscience testified were wrong. Here, then, comes in the argument which Protestant Divines urge as a strong confirmation of their faith, against infidels and Deists. Our revelation not only explains the causes of this universal sense of the need of being reconciled to God, and of this universal doing of what man knows to be wrong, but it provides the only remedy that has ever proved effectual to cleanse the conscience from the sense of sin and guilt—the only one that has ever given a real feeling of peace with God; the only means that have ever proved effectual to enable man to act up to the light of his own conscience and reason. This, when once we come to know it, strikes every man at once, as internal proof that the religion of the Gospel is, indeed, from God, who alone can give us peace with God.

This evidence of "adaptation or suitability to the universal *wants* of fallen man—that is, in fact, supplies him with that which he cannot do without—is one of the strongest that any religion can possess; and we heartily agree with Mr. M'Manus that a religion which does not possess it can have little claim on our hearts.

But have we equal reason to believe that the things which "fallen man" have ever *wished for* the most earnestly, as the remedy against this fear of the wrath of God, was, therefore, the thing most adapted to his real wants? We appeal to the history of mankind, and to the experience of every individual, whether the most universal *desire* of fallen man has not always been to find some way of escaping from the wrath of God, without forsaking the pleasures of sin. Is it not the natural desire of every man to spend his life here in the enjoyment of sinful things, and yet be saved from the wrath of God hereafter? And must we therefore conclude, that a religion which should profess to do this, must, therefore, be true; because it was so admirably adapted to the universal wishes of man. We see here, then, the difference between adaptation to "the wants" and to "the wishes" of "fallen man." The one is internal evidence, in some degree, that the religion comes from God; the other may even afford presumption that it comes from Satan.

The argument used by Protestant divines against Deists and infidels has ever been of the first kind, never of the last. Those divines have always argued that Christianity was perfectly adapted to meet the *real* wants which mankind universally felt—not that it satisfied all their fancied wants—and they have never argued that it must be true, because it was just the way that all mankind *wished* to have their wants provided.*

---

[a] "It behoved him in all things to be made like unto his brethren, that he might become a merciful and faithful high priest before God, that he might be a propitiation for the sins of the people. For in that wherein he himself hath suffered and been tempted, he is able to succour them also that are tempted." "Having, therefore, a great high priest that hath passed into the heavens—Jesus the Son of God; let us hold fast our confession. For we have not a high priest who cannot have compassion on our infirmities; but one tempted in all things like as we are, without sin. Let us go, therefore, with confidence to the throne of grace: that we may obtain mercy and find grace in seasonable aid."—2 Hebrews, 17, 18. 4 Heb., 14, 16. (Douay Bible)

* NOTE—Some able Protestant writers have judiciously and strongly cautioned their readers against pressing the argument in question too far. We may give, as an illustration, a passage from the able work entitled "Lessons on Christian Evidences; or Lessons on the Truth of Christianity," used by permission of the Board, in the National Schools in Ireland; 18th Edition, 1852, p. 74:—

"Sec. 6. Great care should be taken not to misunderstand what has just been said; because you may hear from some persons what appears, at the first glance, very like it, though, in reality, quite different. I mean, that you may meet with persons who profess to despise and dislike all that is commonly called 'evidences for the truth of Christianity;' and who say, 'Let a man but feel the *want* of it; let him feel how suitable Christianity is to the needs of such a being as man, how it supplies such motives, and such guidance, and hopes and consolations, as human nature requires; and then he will want no evidence to convince him of its truth;' with a great deal more to the same purpose.

"Now, all this may seem, at the first glance, very plausible, but on reflection, you will perceive that it is setting up man—each man for himself—to be the standard of divine truth. On this principle each one is to receive, as a revelation, whatever religion suits his own judgment of what is good, and his own wants, and wishes, and tastes. Now, we know how widely men differ from one another on these points and what various and erroneous systems they are, accordingly, disposed to embrace. For instance, the Jews, at the time when Jesus appeared, felt a *want* of a victorious and mighty earthly deliverer, who should exalt their nation, and reign in great worldly splendour. The kingdom of Jesus, which was a 'kingdom not of this world,' and which admitted 'Gentiles to be fellow-heirs,' was precisely what they did *not* want. It did not at all suit their hopes, and wishes, and habits of thought. And, accordingly, the greater part of them rejected Jesus, and followed those false Christs who promised to lead them to victory over the Romans. Jesus indeed, appealed to the evidence of his mighty works, which those false Christs produced no evidence at all, except the suitableness of what they taught to the judgment, and to the feelings and wants of the Jews. But most of the Jews, acting on the very principle I have been speaking of, disregarded evidence altogether, and gave themselves up to their own feelings, resolving to believe what suited them best.

"In like manner, when Mohammed proclaimed himself a prophet,

Rather they have argued, and rightly too, that we must expect that what is really suited to the wants of fallen man, will be just what man in that state does not like nor wish for. For consider what is meant by "fallen man." It means that man's nature is corrupt—that his affections are turned away from God, and set upon things that God hates—that his desires are fixed on the very things that cause his ruin and his misery. How, then, can the remedy for his fall be agreeable to the desires and inclinations that spring out of that very fallen nature itself. We think that those who believe in the divine origin of Romanism, on account of its admirable suitableness to *human nature*, forget that the great aim of Christianity is professedly to *regenerate* man's nature. Christianity does not profess to accommodate itself to the tastes and reasons of man, or (as the law of Moses did) *permit* things on account of the hardness of man's heart, but gives man the promise of God's Spirit to *change* their hearts, and render them "new *creatures*." Accordingly, though the Pagans of Italy, in St. Paul's time, were just as fond of altars and sacrifices, images, shows, and spectacles, as the Christians of Italy are now, St. Paul never thought of accommodating the simple worship of the Church to their tastes; and though the Greeks at Corinth were quite as fond as St. Thomas Aquinas or any of the modern schoolmen of subtle and abstruse inquiries, St. Paul was so far from indulging them therein, that, for that very reason, he was determined to know nothing among them but Jesus Christ, and him crucified.—1 Cor. 11, 1, 2.

We may go farther still, and deny that the promptings and cravings of man's fallen nature have ever pointed to the true remedy. We may affirm that they have always tended either to oppose and reject, or at least to corrupt and distort the remedies which God had provided.

Is there any instance, in any nation of the world, of men's cravings after something that would set them at peace with God, having led them to a true remedy? Did not their own judgment and devices ever lead them to what was ineffectual, degrading, and wicked? These promptings and cravings of fallen nature are well stated in a conversation between Balak, the heathen king, and Balaam, the prophet, recorded by the prophet Micah (ch. vi. v. 7), "May the Lord be appeased with thousands of rams," said the heathen king, "or with many thousands of fat he-goats? *Shall I give my first-born for my wickedness, the first fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?*" We may accept this as proof that even heathens *felt* that something more precious than man could give was needed to make our peace with God. But the greatest effort ever made by the cravings of fallen man, was to lead men to sacrifice their own children to atone for their sins! Here we learn how far that nature is from guiding us aright to the remedy. Fallen nature never attained to the answer which the prophet gave, short as that answer comes of what the Gospel reveals—"I will show thee, O man, what is good, and what the Lord requireth of thee: verily to do judgment, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God."

So far we trust Mr. M'Manus will agree with us, and think we have given, at least, a fair statement of the argument. The feelings and experience of all mankind, especially when that experience leads to what no man wishes for—a sense of guilt, and terror of judgment to come—is proof of the real *wants* of man, that he needs something to make his peace with God. But fallen man's *desires and wishes* to have his wants supplied in a particular way, is no proof whatever that the way he wishes for is the right way.

And when we once know that God has spoken, and revealed his way of providing for the wants of fallen man, it is surely no longer open to man to argue that some other way of his own devising must be better. Man cannot then say—"I see, indeed, that such is the way that God has provided and revealed, but my own *feelings and convictions* teach me that such and such other things which God has not mentioned are more suited to my nature and my wants. I see and feel that these things are more adapted to the wants and infirmities of the mass of mankind than the things which God has provided and revealed to me; and therefore I conclude that these things have a greater claim upon my reverence and regard."

We think this would be the greatest abuse of private judgment that man can commit.

We are no enemies to private judgment—that is, we think that men ought to use the faculties of reason which God has given them, to learn that will of God which He has revealed to them. But our own reason must be kept in subjection to the wisdom of God. Having once ascertained what things he has provided for our salvation, then it is *reason* as well as *faith* to believe that the things chosen by God must be the fittest for their purpose. And though we cannot see the fitness of these things—nay, even though we should think that the things have not fitness in themselves—yet it is reason, as well as faith, to believe that as instruments in His hand they have a power that cannot fail. It is reason as well as faith, to believe that "The foolishness of God is wiser than men: and that the weakness of God is stronger than men."—1 Cor. ch. i., v. 28.

We do not say this with any desire of weakening men's expectations that the things which God has provided for supplying our wants will be found to be the most fit for their purpose. We only say it to guard men from drawing a hasty conclusion against those things, if, at first sight, they should *seem* less fit than other things for the purpose.

We have thought it well to state exactly what the nature of the argument is before we proceed to examine how it applies. We trust our valued correspondent, however predisposed, in point of feeling and taste, to differ from our views as to what form of religion is best calculated to call forth the deepest emotions of love and devotion, to afford solid comfort and consolation under the trials and calamities of life, will, at least, admit that we have stated the nature of the argument fairly. We shall proceed to consider it further in our next.

THE *CATHOLIC LAYMAN* IN KILPATRICK.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

MR. EDITOR—I intended some months ago to write you word what was thought and said of your paper in our little town of Kilpatrick, but I never could find courage in my mind to think that I could write such a letter as you would be at the trouble of reading. For all that, I think if I could have written down properly many of the things I knew of, at the time when they were fresh in my mind, that they would have amused you; but they are old stories now, and I cannot make a long history about them. I mind well, though, the time the paper first came down, and how puzzled the boys were to know who sent it to them. Only it was guessed that 'twas the same people sent it as sent down the *Telegraph*; for there used to come down at that time as many of the *Telegraph* every week as would have filled a canal boat, and nobody had anything to pay for them. There didn't none of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN come to me at first, and the first I heard of it was from Brian Kennedy, who works for me on my little farm, and who lent me a number or two, telling me there was very fine reading in it. So, though I am a Protestant, I never grudge to hear what the Catholics have to say for themselves, and I liked your paper mightily, and many a talk I had with Brian and other of the boys about the things that were in it. What we liked most to read about was about Pat and Jim, that talked by the road; only we often wondered how you, that was so learned, would demean yourself by printing what's said by them that only talk just the same as we do ourselves. And, indeed, 'twas that put it into my head that you would print my letter if I was to write to you, for I have got a good education, and sure 'twill be easy to write as good as that, anyhow. Well, the paper had been coming about three months when I was told that Father Sheehy had spoken against it from the altar, and threatened those that would be reading it. Poor Father Sheehy is a quiet, fat slob of a man himself; but they say that he is in dread of his superiors, who say that he is not active enough, and that he is to be sent away to Killenagory district, if he lets the Jumpers get a footing in the parish. So this time he stirred himself in earnest. It was not only in the chapel he spoke, but he went and told the postmaster to send back all the papers to Dublin, and not to deliver one to any member of his flock; but Mr. Jackson answered him, that it would be as much as his place was worth if he was to do such a thing, and that he might be sent to gaol if he did not deliver the papers as they were directed. So then Father Pat went round the parish and got up all the papers he could find, and wrote "refused" on them, and sent them back to Dublin—all, except Brian Kennedy's; for he got into such a passion when Brian would not give him his paper at once, when he asked it, that he snatched it from his hand, and tore it in pieces, and flung the bits on the road. Poor Biddy Kennedy had a troublesome job sewing them together afterwards. Well, next month there was the same work; but still the papers kept coming. I suppose the people of Dublin saw that many of the papers that were marked "refused" had the marks of being well read before they were sent back; and some of the boys never gave Father Pat their papers after the first, and let on to him that they had not come. At last Father Pat was fairly tired out—that same was not hard—and now plenty of papers come down every month, and nobody says a word again them, and there only come three *Telegraphs* now to all the parish. I get a copy of the LAYMAN myself now, for, as I can well afford it, thank God, I would not be beholden to the boys, the time the priest was giving them such trouble about their own papers; and I sent up my 3s. 6d. to Mr. Curry and it has come regularly ever since. But I wish, sir, you would tell Mr. Curry that Tim Donovan, of this town, has got no paper the last three months; and though at first, he used to abuse the paper, and to say that lighting his pipe was too good a use to put it to, he was very angry it did not come to him, and says he does not know why he should be left out, when it is sent to his neighbours.

But, sir, what I wanted to tell you, when I began my letter, was about a talk I had with Mr. Townsend, our clergyman, about your paper. It was on last Tuesday evening three weeks that some of the neighbours were over at my house, and I was reading the CATHOLIC LAYMAN for them, and it came on to rain cats and dogs. I suppose you remember what a power of rain we had then; I thought that the weather would never get fine; but, I am sure, that if we had some of that same rain now, the crops would be a deal the better of it. Well, Mr. Townsend, who was going by, came in, and asked for shelter; so we gave him a chair and he sat down, and I was shutting up the paper, but says he—"Don't let me stop the reading;" and so, though I did not want it, he made me go on and finish the article I was reading. And indeed, I was ashamed enough, for the article was all about the Fathers, and it wasn't only that I was afeared I might be miscalling some of their long names, but I knew of old that Mr. Townsend hadn't much liking to those same Fathers; for I have been hearing him preach once a week, and oftener, now for a long time, and never a word out of the Fathers does he put into his sermons, from one year's end to another. And once that I was telling him of a book that Father Sheehy had lent Tim Donovan, that was all sayings taken out of the Fathers, says he to me—"Do *you* read your Bible well, and if you know well what Peter and Paul taught, you need not care much what Chrysostom or Augustine thought? They may have the fathers, says he, but you have got the *grandfathers*; for, sure, it's not alone from us that the blessed Apostles are entitled to respect, but the Fathers themselves were as much bound as we to listen to what they say." So, when I thought of this in my mind, I felt ashamed as I was stumbling over the names of the Fathers, thinking what Mr. Townsend would say to it; and when I had done, I said—"I hope, sir, you don't disapprove of what I was reading; but myself, and other of the neighbours, take great pleasure in reading this paper every month." "Quite contrary," says he, "I read the paper myself, and think very well of it; but, even if I did not approve of every word of it, I would be glad to see you all taking an interest in inquiring about religion, and trying to find out where the truth lies. And I like the paper, because it's called the LAYMAN, if it was for nothing else, because there are too many in this country who seem to think that it's no one's business but the clergy to learn anything of what God has revealed to us. They seem to think that they are to get their clergy to save their souls for them, without their having anything to say to it; just as you would get Dick Conry to make your brogues for you, and not care to see how he did it if he did it well. That's why I am glad that the *laymen* are now beginning to see that it's some business of their own to find out whether they are on the right road or not. If they go wrong it will be no excuse for them that they followed bad guidance, when it was their business to look out better who they trusted to. When our Lord came into the world, many of the Jews did not believe him, because they trusted their priests, who said that he was a deceiver; but Jesus never said that those who rejected him would escape because it was their priests who led them wrong. He only told them that when 'the blind led the blind *both* would fall into the ditch.' And Dennis," says Mr. Townsend to me, "you know very well that though it is my duty to teach you, and I try to fulfil my duty in that respect, yet I never ask you to believe anything on my word. I give you chapter and verse for all I say to you; and I am as glad as St. Paul was himself when those he preached to searched the Scriptures to examine whether what he said was true." So I should have told you, sir, that, amongst others that was there, was Tim Donovan, that came up to have an argument with me—he's fond enough of one, and he finds plenty to say about all that's in the paper—and when Mr. Townsend came in I saw he didn't much like it, and I think he would have gone away only for the rain that came down like as if it was out of a sieve; and, besides, there's not one in the parish that would wish to do an uncivil thing to Mr. Townsend

---

though he produced no miraculous evidence, he was joined by a multitude of followers. His religion suited a sensual, and gross-minded, and warlike, and ambitious people. He promised them victory and plunder in this world, and, after death, a paradise of sensual enjoyments. And, finding that such a religion suited their tastes and wants, they embraced it without seeking for any further evidence of its truth. The Hindoos, again, and other Pagans, adhere to their own religion without any evidence, and find it suitable to their own wants and tastes.

"And the same must be the case with all the most extravagant corruptions of Christianity that have arisen from time to time: such as that of the ancient Gnostics, who thought to obtain immortal life without practising moral virtue, and who had a taste for idle speculations concerning the nature of God. No one of these corrupt religions could ever have arisen at all, or have been received, if those who introduced it, and their followers, had not felt a 'want' of some such system.

"It is plain, therefore, that the principle I have been speaking of tends to lead men into an endless variety of errors.

"Sec. 7. But the course I have been recommending is, in reality, exactly the reverse of all this. Jesus tells us that if any man is willing and desirous to do the will of his Heavenly Father, he shall know the truth of the doctrine. You must begin, therefore, by a readiness to follow, not *your own* will, but the will of God; and to receive whatever shall appear to come from him, however contrary to your own expectations or wishes. And if in this temper of mind you proceed to examine those evidences which Jesus and his Apostles appeal to, you will see good reason for believing in the Gospel. And then, if you embrace the Gospel and labour to conform your heart and your life to it, you will perceive that it does suit the nature and the *real wants* of man. For you will perceive that it tends to enlighten his judgment, and to improve his moral taste, and to lead him to live according to the best principles of his nature, and to secure him the truest peace and comfort. And in proportion as you come to perceive all this, you will thus obtain a strong additional *confirmation* of the truth of Christianity.

"But you will have obtained this, not by rejecting evidence, and resolving to conform your religious belief to your own tastes and inclinations; but, on the contrary, by striving to conform your own tastes and inclinations to your religious belief."

since the year of the famine, when he didn't spare himself; and many a one in Kilpatrick owes their life to him that year, and indeed he was near dying himself of the fever he took before it was quite over. But when Tim Donovan stayed, he was not the boy to let any one have the talk all to himself; and bedad, says he, "I hope your reverence will not take offence; but I think, if you knew you had a right commission you would talk in a very different style, and that you would not encourage your flock to call in question what you tell them. Why, when I asked Father Pat last month to give me some proofs from the Bible that we might offer prayers to the Blessed Virgin (for Dennis here had been trying to make out that there were not any), Father Pat turned round on me sharp, and said, 'What nonsense it is for you, man, to be bothering your head about Bible proofs. Can't you be satisfied to attend to your duties as you always did and leave those matters to your clergy?' And he went on to explain to me that what he taught me was on the authority of the Church, which was infallibly true, and that I was committing a great sin if I asked for any other proof. So there, sir, is the way our clergy talk, because they are *sure* that they are in the right; but it's no wonder that you, Protestant clergymen, that have got no certainty among you, should not object to your flocks calling in question what you tell them."

"I see," says Mr. Townsend, "you think that, because I wish Dennis to take the Bible himself and see the proofs of everything I tell him, I can't be as sure of my doctrines as Mr. Sheehy is of his."

"Just so," says Tim.

"Well," says Mr. Townsend, "suppose you went to Loughmanagh fair to buy a horse, and suppose there were two men that had each a horse to sell, and both said that he was sound, but that one of them would let you give his horse every fair trial, and get a veterinary opinion if you liked, and that the other man did not wish to let you look in his horse's mouth or examine him in any way at all, which do you think would be the man that really believed his horse was sound? Or suppose that you were selling beasts there, and that you were offered gold in payment for them, which would you think best of, a man who said his sovereigns were good, and you should take them on his word, or of a man who wou'd let you ring them and weigh them, and make sure for yourself whether they were good or not? I suppose you would say, that if he was sure himself his gold was good, he would never let you examine it: but *I* would say, that the man that is really sure is the man that does not object to having all he says well tried and looked into. Take my advice, Mr. Donovan, read your Douay Bible well, and try to get your priest to give you his proofs out of it for what he teaches you; and if he objects to this I would not trust much to any man who would give you no better satisfaction than that he was so sure that he was right, that he scorned to give any proof of it.'

"I am no Biblical," says Tim Donovan. "The Bible may be your rule of faith, but it isn't mine. It's out of the Fathers that the church learns many things that you Protestants haven't got in your Bible."

So when he talked of the Fathers, I said—"There's plenty of the Fathers in this paper at any rate; and that's, sir, why I thought you might not approve of it, because I know you are not much given to quoting them."

"I believe," says Mr. Townsend, "one reason why I don't quote them much is precisely the reason why the priests do, and that is, that I wish you to be able to judge yourself of the proofs of what I teach you, while there is nothing they dislike so much as that their people should ask them for proofs of what they tell them. When I prove a doctrine to you out of the Bible, I know that you can get a Bible for a shilling, and that you can find out for yourself, in five minutes, whether I am telling you right what's in the Scripture or not. But where would be the good of my quoting the Fathers to you, except I wanted, as some do, to stop your mouth with them? Why 'twould take you more than £100 to buy a set of the Fathers; and you should build a new wing to your house to put them in when you had bought them, and I doubt if your Tramp, though he is a good plough horse, could draw them home for you in one journey; and 'twould be twenty years before you had read them all, if you worked hard at them, and supposing you had learning enough. And might I not as well ask you to believe upon my own word at once, as send you away from the Bible to the Fathers, that I know you can't get at? I remember a story I read of a woman that was not very fond of telling the truth; but whenever she wanted to say anything that she did not think would be believed on her own word, she used to say Mrs. Harris told me that, or Mrs. Harris will swear to that; and the joke was, that nobody but herself knew who Mrs. Harris was; so nobody could get at her to find out whether it was true or not. Now, I think, when the priests send you to the Fathers, they have no more idea of your really going to consult them, than this woman had of her friends going to consult Mrs. Harris, but it sounds better than giving one's own word for what one says."

"Well, sir," says I "The CATHOLIC LAYMAN does not agree with you, or they would not quote so much of them."

"I don't object to quoting the Fathers," says he; "for many that read that paper have a good deal of learning. But I will explain to you how that is. When I ask you to show me from Scripture that it is right to pray to the Blessed Virgin, the priests will say, 'We own there is not much about it in Scripture, but we'll prove it to you from the Fathers.' Well, then, I confess *I* would not be for going any further. I would say, if God meant us to do it, he would have told us in his own Word; and when you can find no warrant in that for your doctrines, I don't care where else you get proofs for them. However, the CATHOLIC LAYMAN meets the priests on their own ground, and I think he shows that they have not their own way there as much as they would like you to suppose; and that, though the priests make use of the Fathers, to throw dust in the eyes of people who ask them troublesome questions out of the Bible, yet the early Fathers say nearly as little as the Bible itself about the doctrines peculiar to Roman Catholics, and they would be nearly as much puzzled to prove them out of the Fathers of the first three centuries as out of Scripture."

"But why do you say the first three centuries?" says Tim Donovan, "why might not any of the Fathers do?"

"Because," says Mr. Townsend, "it is not enough for us to know that St. Bernard, suppose, held such and such a doctrine; what we want to know is, whether he got it by *tradition* from the apostles. Now, the farther we go from the apostles the harder it is to make out a proof of tradition; and if there be any doctrine which neither the apostles themselves mention in their writings, nor any other Christian writer for three hundred years, I think it is hard to believe any one afterwards who tells us that the belief of such doctrine is necessary to our salvation."

"Well, sir," says Tim Donovan, "I think that those who lived so long ago as the fifth and sixth century ought to have known exactly what the apostles believed."

"The fifth century may be a long way from us," said Mr. Townsend, "but it does not follow that it was near the apostles. I dare say Brian Kennedy remembers that, some years ago, when my sister was going out to New York, he wanted her to take money and messages to his brother that lives in New Orleans."

"You ought not to bring up that old story against me, sir," says Brian. "We know more about America now than we did then. I remember we thought then that two people that went to America would be as sure of meeting each other as if they went to Loughmanagh fair; but now I know that it's a big place, and that New York and New Orleans are hundreds of miles from each other."

"Well," says Mr. Townsend, "it's much the same with the Fathers. People are apt to think, because Pope Gregory the Great and St. Paul both lived more than a thousand years ago, that their being both a long way from us makes them near each other. They forget the five or six hundred years that lie between them; or, perhaps, they don't think what a length of time three or four hundred years is, and how little we know ourselves, by tradition, what happened three or four hundred years ago."

"So now, Dennis," says he, "I have no objection to your reading, if you like, what the CATHOLIC LAYMAN tells you of the fathers, if you'll only remember this, that on that ground Protestants have every thing to gain and nothing to lose. If there was *one* orthodox father in the fourth century who did *not* believe in Purgatory, this would be conclusive proof, that it was not the doctrine of the Church in his time, and that, therefore, it had not been handed down by tradition from the Apostles. But if Roman Catholic writers could produce one such writer who did believe in Purgatory, they would have no cause to triumph, as they would be apt to do. They must first show that this was not merely that writer's private opinion, but that it was the belief of the generality of Christians of his day. And then they must show that it was the same in the century before that; and then, again, in the century before that, and so on; and if they break down in any of these proofs their whole doctrine falls to the ground. No tradition could get to the fourth century without passing through the three before it; that's why, if the CATHOLIC LAYMAN could show that the priests had not the fathers of the first three centuries on their side, we might be saved the trouble of looking into those that were after."

"One story is good till another is told," says Tim Donovan, "and I only wish that one of the priests that has learning would think it worth his while to answer some of these articles you are speaking of, for, I am sure, if one of them liked, he could prove that you are all wrong, as easy as anything."

"I am very sure," says Mr. Townsend, "the conductors of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN would be willing to print anything the priests have to say for themselves; but if you wish to know what that is, you can very soon find out, for there's Mr. Sheehy turned round the corner at the foot of the hill, and when he comes up we can ask him."

"Is it Father Pat coming," says Brian Kennedy, "I would not for five pounds he caught me talking about the Fathers with the parson." So out he flies through the back door and Tim Donovan after him, and so down through the oat field, and they were gone before you could say peas; and, sir, I am afraid I have made too long a letter about nothing, but if you think this worth printing, may be I'd write to you another time.—And so no more at present from your humble servant to command,

DENNIS GASTERN.

FARM OPERATIONS FOR JUNE.

(From the Irish Farmers' Gazette.)

The Turnip Crops.—Finish the sowing of Swedes as early as possible in the month; if this cannot be accomplished by the 15th at farthest, it will be much better to substitute Dale's hybrid, to be followed by the purple-topped Aberdeen, the sowing of which may be continued till the end of the month; but the earlier in the month these valuable varieties are sown the better. The white globe or red Norfolk may be sown from about the 20th of this month till the middle of the next; but as it is hazardous to put off sowing till the last moment, the earlier these important operations are concluded the better.

Swede Turnips and Mangel-wurzel, if sown early, should now be so far advanced as to require hoeing out and singling to the proper distance. This is an operation that requires much judgment in regulating. In good, deep, loamy soil, and warm, well-sheltered aspects, they should be hoed and singled out to stand from 15 to 18 inches apart in the drills; if left closer, the plants stand a chance of being drawn up too much to foliage, at the expense of the bulbs; but in good soils which are much exposed, or lie at greater elevations, or medium soils, from 12 to 15 inches apart will be the proper distances, where blanks occur they should be filled up by transplanting, to which both Swedes and mangels are admirably suited, and, when properly executed, produce as good crops as those from sowing. The best size or age at which to transplant is when the root is about as thick as a man's thumb, though we have seen fine crops raised from plants with roots as large as a hen's egg, and of orange globe of the size of a goose egg. The plants for this purpose should be taken carefully up, trimmed of all leaves, but a few in the centre, and the roots dipped in a puddle, composed of fine, rich earth and soft water. The place to be planted should be freshly turned up with a fork or spade, and the plants carefully dibbled in, so as that the roots be not doubled up. Cloudy, dropping weather is best for this purpose, but it will succeed well, even though the weather be dry, when carefully conducted.

Carrots and Parsnips will now require hoeing and thinning: eight to nine inches apart will be about the proper distance to leave them, and the hand-hoe should be kept busy amongst them, to keep down weeds, till the plants are strong enough to admit the horse-hoe and grubbers, which are necessary to pulverise and keep the soil loose and friable between the rows.

Beans and Peas should be hoed between, and earthed up, when cultivated in rows or drills; in broadcast cultivation careful hand-weeding must be resorted to when necessary.

Clover and Grass Seeds, if not sown immediately after the corn crops, no time should now be lost in doing so, as when the corn is shooting up into the culm, or seed stem, it will be destructive to use the harrow or roller, to cover the small seeds.

Flat Dutch Cabbages, for main crops should now be planted in rows 2½ to 3 feet apart, and from 18 inches to two feet, plant from plant.

Rape, intended for transplanting after early potatoes, spring vetches or after the corn is removed, should be sown not later than the 20th; or, rather, there should be two sowings made, the first about the beginning of the month, and the second by the 20th; the land should be clean, well cultivated, and manured, and the surface fine. Mark it out in four-feet beds, with narrow paths between, sow the seed thinly, cover with an inch of fine mould; they will be fine strong plants to put out from August till the middle of October, according to requirements. The hundred-headed cabbage, a very valuable variety, may be treated in the same way.

Winter Vetches, &c., will now be nearly consumed, and as the breadths get cleared off, prepare for and sow such varieties of turnips as are most suitable to the time and season.

Potatoes will now require careful hoeing and weeding: if in drills, a little earth should be drawn up to the stems as they advance; if in beds, they should have a little fresh earth raised from the furrows, and spread over the beds just as or before they shoot above the surface.

Buck Wheat may now be sown on exhausted light uplands, to be ploughed in as a manuring crop, after the land has been well and deeply ploughed, or digged, and cleaned. When in flower, the crop should be rolled with a heavy roller, and then ploughed in, as a preparation for autumn sown wheat, or laying down land to grass is an excellent mode when manure is scarce. Buck wheat may now also be sown for the production of seed.

Soiling Crops—such as vetches, rye-grass, and clover, &c.—should henceforth be abundant and in their prime, for house-feeding.

FOUR MONTHS IN ALGERIA, with a Visit to Carthage. By J. W. Blakesley, B.D., Vicar of Ware, Herts; sometime Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College. With Maps and Illustrations by W. G. Linton, after Photographs. 8vo., cloth, 14s.

TOM BROWNE'S SCHOOL DAYS. By An Old Boy. Sixth Edition. Crown 8vo., cloth, 10s. 6d.

"These manly, honest thoughts, expressed in plain words, will, we trust, long find an echo in thousands of English hearts. —*Quarterly Review.*

RUTH AND HER FRIENDS. A Story for Girls. Second Edition. With a Frontispiece. Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 5s.

WILLIAM CURRY AND CO.,
9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

WANTED, A CURATE FOR A COUNTRY PARISH, in the Diocese of Leighlin, about four hours journey from Dublin. The Rector is resident. Salary, £90 a-year to a Clergyman in Full Orders, or £80 to a Deacon.

Application to Rev. FREDERICK OWEN, COOLKENNO, CARLOW.

Just Published.

The Churchman's Almanack

FOR THE YEAR OF OUR LORD 1859.

Containing a View and Historical Notice of BANGOR CATHEDRAL—References to the Lessons for Each Day in the Year—Universities—Theological Colleges—Royal Birthdays—Sovereigns of Europe—List of Archbishops and Bishops—Her Majesty's Ministers—Houses of Lords and Commons—Courts of Law—Societies in connection with the Church—List of Members of Convocation—Rates of Postage—Stamp and Legacy Duties—Assessed Taxes—London Bankers.

On a Large Sheet, Price 2d. Small 8vo., Price 2d. Royal 8vo., 1d.

Sold by
WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,
9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

CHURCH MUSIC.

PRICE EIGHTEEN PENCE.
A Selection of Standard

Psalm and Hymn Tunes,

Of a sound and devotional character, adapted for the use of Parish Choirs and Churches. Edited and arranged by
E. H. THORNE,
Organist and Choir Master, Henley-on-Thames.

PRICE EIGHTEEN PENCE.
A Selection of

Single and Double Chants.

Edited and arranged by
E. H. THORNE.

Also, PRICE THREE PENCE,

Canticles, Divided for Chanting.

London: W. WELLS GARDNER, 7, Paternoster-row.

NEW WORK BY THE AUTHOR OF "PEEP OF DAY."

Just ready, 18mo., with Illustrations by Harvey, price, 2s. 6d.

More Words about Jesus:
A SEQUEL TO "PEEP OF DAY."
By the Same Author.
Sold by
WILLIAM CURRY AND CO.,
9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Third Edition, revised and enlarged, cloth, 1s. 6d.

A GLOSSARY OF THE OBSOLETE WORDS AND PHRASES IN THE ENGLISH BIBLE AND PRAYER BOOK,
By Rev. JOHN BOOKER,
Vicar of Killurin.

"Every person with a Bible or Prayer-book should have a copy of this work."—Archbishop Whately.

London: HAMILTON AND ADAMS.
Dublin: HODGES AND SMITH.

Mrs. Alfred Gatty's Popular Works.

I.
PARABLES FROM NATURE. First Series. Sixth Edition. 16mo. With Four Illustrations, 1s. 6d. Second Series. Second Edition. 2s.

II.
WORLDS NOT REALISED. Second Edition. 16mo. With Frontispiece. 2s.

III.
PROVERBS ILLUSTRATED. Second Edition. 16mo. With Four Illustrations. 2s.

IV.
THE FAIRY GODMOTHERS AND OTHER TALES. Second and cheaper Edition. Fcp. 8vo. With Frontispiece. 2s. 6d.

V.
LEGENDARY TALES. Fcp. 8vo. With Illustrations by Phiz. 5s.

VI.
THE POOR INCUMBENT. Fcp. 1s.

VII.
AUNT JUDY'S TALES. With Illustrations by Miss LANE. Fcp. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Sold by
WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,
9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Illustrated and Attractive Juvenile Works.

Price 3s. 6d. each. Illustrated.

Romance of Adventure.
Robinson Crusoe. New Edition.
Peter Parley's Tales about Greece.
———— Tales about Rome and Italy.
———— Tales about the Sun, Moon, &c.
———— Balloon Travels.
Picture Story Book. 400 Illustrations.
Grimm's Home Stories for the Young.
Old Tales for the Young.
Edgeworth's Popular Tales.
———— Moral Tales.
———— Early Lessons.
———— Parents' Assistant.
Hans C. Andersen's Fairy Tales and Legends.
The Little Boy's Own Book.
Edgar's Boyhood of Great Men.
———— Footprints of Famous Men.
The Whaleman's Adventures.
The Wonders of Travel.
The Child's First Lesson Book.
Hildred the Daughter.
Influence.
Heroines of History.
Matilda Lonsdale.
Stray Leaves.
The Book of the Months.
Mary Elliott. By Cousin Kate.
Louisa Morton; or, Children, Obey your Parents in all Things.

Price 3s.

Old Gingerbread and the Schoolboys. Coloured Illustrations.

Price 2s. 6d. each.

Arbell A Tale for Young People.
The Orbs of Heaven.
The Lucky Penny. By Mrs. Hall.
Eda Morton, and her Cousins.
Bible History for Young People.
Adventures of a Cat.
Gilbert the Adventurer.
Minna Raymond. A Book for Girls.
Life of Marlborough.
Extraordinary Men.
Extraordinary Women.
Macfarlane's Life of Wellington.
Allen's Life of Nelson.
Adventures of a Dog.
Adventures of a Bear.
Life of Lord Exmouth.

Price 2s. each. Illustrated.

The Great Wonders of the World.
Visits to the Zoological Gardens.
The Richmonds' Tour in Europe.
Memoirs of a Doll.
The Donkey's Shadow.
The Broken Pitcher, and other Tales.
Violet; or, Lost and Found.
Historical Tales.
The Cabin by the Wayside.
Evenings at Donaldson Manor.
The Black Princess.
Amy Carlton.
The Spirit of the Holly. By Mrs. Owen.
Amusing Tales for Young People.
The Lofty and the Lowly.
Story of an Apple.
Our Native Land.
Conquest and Self-Conquest.
Juvenile Tales for all Seasons.
The Little Lysters.
Gertrude and Eulalie.
Robert and Harold.
Robinson Crusoe. Unabridged Edition.
Laura Temple.

Price 1s. 6d. each.

Rosamond. By Miss Edgeworth.
The Crofton Boys.
Prevarication.
Frank. By Miss Edgeworth.
Peasant and the Prince.
A Hero: Philip's Book.
Holiday Rambles.
Harry and Lucy. By Miss Edgeworth.
The Little Drummer.
Settlers at Home.
Feats on the Fiord.
The New Shilling.
The Young Marquis.

Price 1s. each. 18mo. Illustrated.

Home Stories in Pleasant Tales. By Miss Sedgwick.
Ben Howard; or, Truth and Honesty. Illustrated by C. Adams.
Bessie and Tom. A Book for Boys and Girls.
The Story of Topsy and Eva. By Mrs. Crowe.
Madeline. A Franconia Story. By Jacob Abbott.
Wallace. By Jacob Abbott.
Helen's Fault. By Author of "Adelaide Lindsay."
The Cousins. By Miss M'Intosh.
Casper. By the Author of "Rutherford's Children."
Brave Boy; or, Christian Heroism.
Grace Greenwood's Stories.
Mr. Rutherford's Children. Second Series. By the Author of "The Wide, Wide World."
Beechnut. By Jacob Abbott.
Mary Bell. By Jacob Abbott.
Mary Erskine. By Jacob Abbott.
Visit to my Birthplace. By Miss Bunbury.
Carl Krinken. By the Author of "The Wide, Wide World."
Mr. Rutherford's Children. By Miss Wetherell.
Emily Herbert. By Miss M'Intosh.
Rose and Lillie Stanhope. By Miss M'Intosh.
Uncle Frank's Home Stories.

Price 6d. each.

Prince Pharamond and His Cat.
The Herd-boy.
Edgeworth's Stories. 12 varieties.
Aunt Mayer's Toy Books. 39 varieties.
Mamma Lovechild's Series. 13 varieties.
Papa Please-you-well's Series. 13 varieties.
Cousin Honeycomb's Series. 13 varieties.
Scripture Toy Books. 13 varieties.

ROUTLEDGE'S EDITIONS OF THE BRITISH POETS.

Profusely Illustrated by Gilbert, Corbould, &c. Fcap. 8vo. Cloth, gilt, 5s. each; morocco, elegant, 9s.; antique, 10s. 6d.

Jerusalem Delivered. Translated by Fairfax.
Percy's Reliques of Ancient Poetry.
Charles Mackay's Poetical Works.
———— Songs and Ballads.
Pope's Poetical Works.
Milton's Poetical Works.
Thomson and Beattie's Poetical Works.
Poetical Works of Gray, Collins, Parnell, &c.
Spencer's Faerie Queene.
Chaucer's Canterbury Tales.
Kirke White's Poetical Works and Remains.
Southey's Joan of Arc, Ballads, &c.
Burns' Poems and Ballads.
Dryden's Poetical Works.
Akenside and Dyer's Poems.
Herbert's Poetical and Prose Works.
Poetical Works of Goldsmith, Johnson, &c.
Sir Walter Scott's Poems.

In Two Volumes, 8vo. Price 15s. Cloth.

The Bible, The Missal, and the Breviary,

Or Ritualism Self Illustrated in the

Liturgical Books of Rome.

Containing the text of the entire Roman Missal, Rubrics and Prefaces, translated from the Latin. With preliminary Dissertations, and Notes from the Breviary, Pontifical, &c. By the REV. GEORGE LEWIS.

EDINBURGH: T. & J. CLARK, and all Booksellers.

ALMANACS, ETC., FOR 1859.

THOM'S ALMANAC AND OFFICIAL DIRECTORY. 1 vol. 8vo., 8s. 6d., cloth.

POST-OFFICE DUBLIN DIRECTORY. 1 vol., 8vo. 7s.

THOM'S ALMANAC AND THE DUBLIN POST-OFFICE DIRECTORY, bound together, 13s. 6d., cloth.

Orders received and sent Post-free by
WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,
9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

LADIES' POCKET-BOOKS FOR THE YEAR 1859.

CARNAN'S LADIES' COMPLETE POCKET-BOOK.
POOLE'S LADIES' SELECT POCKET-BOOK.
THE CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.
FULCHER'S LADIES' POCKET-BOOK AND POETICAL MISCELLANY.
PAWSEY'S LADIES' FASHIONABLE REPOSITORY
MARSHALL'S LADIES' ELEGANT POCKET SOUVENIR.
MARSHALL'S LADIES' DAILY REMEMBRANCER.
MARSHALL'S LADIES' FASHIONABLE REPOSITORY.

SOLD BY
WILLIAM CURRY AND CO.,
9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, Parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher WM. CURRY 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.
JUNE, 1853.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Glóir do Dhia añ ṗna háṗduiḃ, agus ṡíoḋċáin air an dtalaṁ deagḋóil do na dáoiniḃ.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. II.—No. 19. JULY, 1853. Annual Subscription, 3s. 6d. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
Nunneries	73
Is the Protestant Bible a corrupt and mutilated translation of the Holy Scriptures?	73
The Passover and the Eucharist	74
On the Constrained Celibacy of the Clergy—Dialogue III.,	75
The Catholic Doctrine on the Use of the Bible, by Cardinal Wiseman	78
The Marleys—A Story of Real Life	77
Talk of the Road—No. XIV.	78
The Discussion at Carthage	79
On the Internal Evidences of the Catholic Religion	80
CORRESPONDENCE—	
On the Visibility of the Church —by Philalethes	81
On Purgatory.—By Mr. E. Power	82
On a Sacrificing Priesthood —By D.	82
On the Sacrifice of the Mass.—By J. B.	83
On Christianity in India.—By Peregrinus	83
Farming Operations for July	83

NUNNERIES.

The great increase in the number of nunneries in these countries, during the last few years, has brought the questions connected with those institutions more prominently before the public. In these countries, where employment in general for the male part of the population is abundant, and where emigration generally allures the unemployed away from our shores, the increase of monasteries is not likely to occur. Not so with regard to nunneries; for, as to them, the very same causes lead to their increase, and of this the Roman Catholic Church has eagerly availed itself.

During the middle ages, when violence was rife, and protection for female virtue from lawless force was often to be found only within the walls of the convent, reasons did exist for these institutions which certainly have no place at the present day. And now, undoubtedly, the only reasonable inquiry can be, whether religion, rightly understood, does, in any case, require persons to separate from the natural ties of relationship, renounce intercourse with the world, and enter into vows, to adopt a course of life which can, if necessary or desirable, be followed without them.

Now, we do not purpose to enter into the theological question, but we are anxious to call the attention of Roman Catholics to the evils necessarily arising out of such institutions, and to their obvious tendency to accumulate wealth in the hands of those who have the control or management of them; for, if they have such tendency, it surely is not unreasonable to infer that the motives of those who maintain their existence are, at least, open to grave suspicion, and are well calculated to excite the attention of those members of their own persuasion, who are not satisfied to encourage the grasping disposition of an ambitious priesthood. To enable such persons, therefore, to form a correct opinion on this subject, we will lay before our readers the facts of some cases which have, of late years, come before the public notice.

The first case to which we would refer is that of Fulham v. M'Carthy; for, as the facts proved in it were made the foundation of a decree of the Court of Chancery, and were, consequently, the subject of protracted discussions, their accuracy can hardly be doubted, particularly, as the parties against whom the allegations were made, declined to go before a jury, to contest their truth. It appeared that two daughters of a wealthy Roman Catholic gentleman, at Cork, had entered as nuns into the Ursuline Convent there. With each of them, on their entrance, the father had given a portion of £1,000, on the understanding (as his son expressly stated before the Mortmain Committee) that they were not to participate further in his property. Some years afterwards, he died intestate, and his property, which amounted to about £90,000, became divisible amongst all his children, and the distributive share of each of the sisters, who had become nuns, would have amounted to nearly £10,000. It appeared that each of these sisters declared to several members of their own family, that they considered themselves as having no claim to any share, and their wish was to remove the legal claim, by an assignment to their brothers and sisters; indeed, one of them, in a conversation with her brothers, stated she had applied to the superioress for permission to do so. To this application the superioress said that she had no power, but told her to apply to the bishop. The bishop, however, declared he had no power, and, when urged to say who had the power, he replied, "Nobody," and referred her back to the superioress.

The bishop's own statement as given in the cause confirms the fact of this application, for he admits that he told her that he had no power to grant her permission, or to dispense with her vows of poverty, and that she could not, consistently with such vow, alienate from the convent the property, and that, according to the rules and regulations of the institution, any property devolving upon her or upon any other professed nun, became the property of the community. The poor nun then said that the superioress had already referred her to him; upon which the bishop said—"You must observe your vow of obedience." The sisters, it would appear, notwithstanding these plain intimations of the will of their superiors, still resisted; but, at length, were coerced into signing the necessary deeds, assigning their property to the convent; and it was upon foot of these assignments that legal proceedings were instituted.

Of the means by which these assignments were obtained we have no obscure intimation in the evidence given in the cause. Mrs. Murrogh, another of the sisters, and whose evidence the Chancellor stated to have been wholly unimpeached, says—"My sister Maria stated that she had signed a certain deed, in conformity with her vows of obedience. The other sister said she hoped the convent would never get a farthing of the money; and, previous to her signing the deed, she declared in the presence of the witness and of her brothers—that if she was obliged to sign a deed it would be like the act of *a dead person*, and that she would have no more power over her will or act than a dead person would have; that it was out of her power to avoid signing the deed, in consequence of the strictness of her vow, the operation of which she compared to the effect of the presentation of a pistol by a highwayman about to rob another."

This evidence of the sister confirms the evidence of the brother, who, in his examination, stated, that the same sister declared—"That she feared she would be obliged to sign the deed in compliance with her vows, and would be obliged to state that her acts were *free and voluntary*." After the deed was signed, the same sister said—"That she knew she did an act contrary to her conscience, but let the sin be on those who caused her to do so." The same witness said—"That having called the attention of her sister Maria to the statements of an affidavit made by her, and which were at variance with her sentiments as expressed to himself, she replied—"I refused to make that affidavit in my own person as coming from Maria M'Carthy, but I told the solicitor if he put the word "religious" into the affidavit I would then take it. He then asked her this question—If one of the young ladies of the convent was obnoxious to the superioress, and you were desired to give her arsenic, would you do so under your vow of obedience. She said she would not be asked to do so. To which the witness very naturally replied—'Maria, do not say so—as they have asked you to make an affidavit which you refused to make in your own name, and to assist in proceedings taken contrary to your wish and without your consent.'" The same witness also stated that the other sister told him, "that if all the sufferings during her whole life were contracted within the space of half an hour, it would not equal what she suffered since her father's death in reference to this matter; and that she had seen a book in the convent, in which it was stated that the punishment for serious crime was to be immured, and fed on bread and water, and that, in some cases, persons had died of it; and that it had been decided that any member of the convent speaking or acting against their claims to this property would be guilty of mortal sin."

Now, this evidence was believed, and was the foundation on which the decree of the court rested; and, we would ask our readers, to consider well the workings of the system thus disclosed. It is obvious that, for one case thus brought before the public notice, fifty would occur of which no intimation would escape beyond the walls of the convent. The influence that the priesthood exercise over the members of their own flocks—the unwillingness to bring discredit on their spiritual superiors—the effect which the teaching of implicit obedience must produce in the minds of the unhappy inmates, and the dread of incurring those penalties which, it appears, are denounced, even against the apparent hesitation to comply with the commands of their superiors, all combine to make it difficult, if not impossible, to bring such cases before our legal tribunals, or submit them to the ordeal of public opinion. But the very possibility that such things can occur, is surely sufficient to justify the Protestant objections to such institutions. And when Roman Catholics remember the class of persons from whom votaries are always sought—that it is invariably the wealthy and well-endowed who are urged to enter these communities—that the vows of poverty thus taken by the wealthy have a direct and manifest tendency to augment the general wealth of the great spiritual corporation to which they are attached—these things, surely, should excite their suspicions, and lead them to investigate narrowly the reasons on which such institutions are maintained.

To us, we confess, they appear wholly inconsistent with the spirit and tenor of the Gospel, which, in all its teachings, deals with mankind as social beings, bound to perform social duties, and in its precepts enjoins what our conduct should be in the various relations of life. It is in the daily duties of life—in our intercourse with our fellow man, that the best exercise of Christian feeling and Christian principles is to be found. And to reject the means thus appointed by Providence for our probation and trial appears to us to set at nought the ordinance of God, and to dethrone the God of nature from his throne; because, in his mercy he has also revealed himself as a God of grace.

IS THE PROTESTANT BIBLE A CORRUPT AND MUTILATED TRANSLATION OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES?

We suspend our papers on the Douay Bible, for this month, for the purpose of giving insertion to the following valuable letter, which comes in very well into our series, as it applies to the notes of the present Douay Bible, the same examination which in our last number we applied to the text, and which thereby very much strengthens our argument.

Those who compare this letter with their Douay Bibles will probably observe that, in two or three places (such as Phil. ii. 7, and Hebrews i. 3), the Douay Bible, published at Derby, which the writer of this letter used, differs from the Douay Bibles now in use in Ireland. The notes which the writer gives from the Bible printed at Derby, are the same as those in the Irish Bibles. With very few exceptions these notes have been introduced into the Douay Bible in modern times. Very few of them were in the old Douay Bibles. We have not been able to trace back the new notes, farther than the Testament printed with Dr. Troy's sanction in 1803.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Sir—I trust that your Roman Catholic readers will duly appreciate your remarks under this title, and will profit by the service rendered to them by our translators of the sacred Scriptures.

You have satisfactorily shown that, if our version be the "Devil's Book," Romanists are much indebted to that book for the translation which they now possess.

In your examination you have shown the emendations made in successive Romish editions, up to the one now in circulation. If I am not anticipating the course of your arguments, I would beg to offer a few remarks on this last edition.

I have before me the edition published by Messrs. Richardson of Derby, with annotations by Dr. Challoner, which bears on the title page Dr. Wiseman's approval, dated from Birmingham, January, 1847, and "published with approbation."

The persons in authority, feeling how imperfect is the present Roman Catholic edition, and admiring the fullness and completeness of our authorised translation, in addition to the several emendations and corrections in the text embodied in the present Romish edition, as shown by your articles, have, in the notes, suggested still farther emendations and corrections. They have placed their corrections in foot-notes, and, doubtless, in a very short time, we shall

see these, also, incorporated in the text, when they are held enough to publish another new edition.

The following are a few of the proposed emendations set out in the foot-notes of the Roman Catholic Bible now in use; and, to limit my remarks, I will take the New Testament alone.

It will be observed that, in most instances, the Romish version conveys no meaning, which is to be explained by the foot-notes which foot-notes, actually borrow, in most instances, the exact words, and always the sense conveyed, by our authorized version.

In the following arrangement I place the Roman Catholic version first, then the foot-note, and, lastly, the Authorized version.

R. C. standing for the first, N. for the *note* to the Romish version, and P. for the Protestant or Authorized version.

R.C.—Matt. vi. 11—Give us this day our *supersubstantial bread.*
N.—In St. Luke the same word is rendered *daily bread.*
P.—Give us this day our *daily bread.*

R.C.—Matt. x. 16—Be ye, therefore, wise as serpents and *simple* as doves.
N.—That is, *harmless*, plain, &c.
P.—Be ye, therefore, wise as serpents, and *harmless* as doves.

R.C.—Matt. xi. 6—And blessed is he that shall not be *scandalized* in me.
N.—That is, who shall not take occasion of scandal or *offence*, &c.
P.—And blessed is he whosoever shall not be *offended* in me.

R.C.—Matt. xx. 15—Or is it not lawful for me to do what I will.
N.—Viz., *with my own.*
P.—Is it not lawful for me to do what I will *with mine own?*

R.C.—Matt. xxvi. 17—And on the first day of the Azymes; and, also, Mark xiv. 1, and Acts xii. 3.
N.—*Feast of the unleavened bread.*
P.—Now, the first day of the *feast of unleavened bread.*

R.C.—Luke xxiii. 54—And it was the day of the *parasceve*, and the Sabbath drew near; and see John xix. 14.
N.—That is, the eve, or day of *preparation* for the Sabbath.
P.—And that day was the *preparation*, and the Sabbath drew near.

R.C—John iii. 18—He that believeth in him *is not judged.*
N.—That is, is not *condemned.*
P.—He that believeth in him is not *condemned.*

R.C.—John iii. 19—And this is the judgment.
N.—That is, the cause of *condemnation.*
P.—And this is the *condemnation.*

R.C.—John xiv. 16—And he shall give you another *Paraclete.*
N.—That is, a *comforter.*
P.—He shall give you another *comforter.*

R.C.—Acts ii. 24—Whom God hath raised up, having loosed the *sorrows of hell.*
N.—Having overcome the grievous *pains of death.*
P.—Whom God hath raised up, having loosed the *pains of death.*

R.C.—Acts xvi. 16—A certain girl possessed with a *pythonical* spirit.
N.—That is, a spirit pretending *to divine* and tell fortunes.
P.—A certain damsel possessed with a spirit of *divination.*

R.C.—Romans vii. 1—As long as *it* liveth.
N.—As long as *he* liveth.
P.—As long as *he* liveth.

R.C.—Rom. viii. 38—For I am *sure.*
N.—That is, I am *persuaded.*
P.—For I am *persuaded.*

R.C.—1 Cor. ix. 16—For if I preach the Gospel it is no glory.
N.—That is, *I have nothing to glory of.*
P.—For though I preach the Gospel, *I have nothing to glory of.*

R.C.—1 Cor. x. 13—Let no temptation take hold on you but such as is human.
N.—Or, no temptation hath taken hold of you, or come upon us yet, but what is human, or incident to man.
P.—There hath no temptation taken you but such as is common to man.

R.C.—1 Cor. xiv. 12—So you also, for as much as you are zealous of *spirits.*
N.—Of *spiritual gifts.*
P.—Even so ye, forasmuch as ye are zealous of *spiritual gifts.*

R.C.—11 Cor. viii. 2—And their very deep poverty hath abounded unto the riches of their *simplicity.*
N.—That is, sincere bounty and charity.
P.—Unto the riches of their liberality.

R.C.—Gal. iii. 24—The Law was our *pedagogue.*
N.—i.e., *schoolmaster.*
P.—The Law was our *schoolmaster.*

R.C.—Ephe. i. 14—For the redemption of *acquisition.*
N.—i.e., *a purchased possession.*
P.—Until the redemption of the *purchased possession.*

R.C.—Ephe. iii. 15—Of whom *all paternity* in heaven and earth is named.
N.—Or *the whole family.*
P.—Of whom *the whole family*, &c.

R.C.—Phil. ii. 7—But debased himself.
N.—Made himself as of no account.
P.—But made himself of no reputation.

R.C.—2 Thess. ii. 3—For unless there came *a revolt.*
N.—A revolt or *falling off.*
P.—Except there come a *falling away.*

R.C.—2 Thess. iii. 1—That the Word of God *may run.*
N.—That is, *have free course.*
P.—That the Word of the Lord *may have free course.*

R.C.—2 Tim. i. 10—But now is made manifest by the illumination of our Saviour Jesus Christ.
N.—That is, by the bright coming and appearing of our Saviour.
P.—By the appearing, &c.

R.C.—Heb. i. 3—Who being the splendour of his glory and the *figure* of his substance.
N.—That is, the *express image.*
P.—And the *express image* of his person.

R.C.—Heb. ii. 16—For nowhere doth he take hold of the angels.
N.—That is, *he never took upon him the nature of angels.*
P.—He *took not on him the nature of angels.*

R.C.—Heb. vi. 1—Wherefore learning the Word of the beginning of Christ.
N.—The first rudiments of the Christian doctrine.
P.—Therefore, learning the principles of the doctrine of Christ.

R.C.—Heb. viii. 2—A Minister of the *Holies.*
N.—That is, the *sanctuary.*
P.—A Minister of the *sanctuary.*

R.C.—Heb. viii. 13—Now, in saying a new, he hath made the former old.
N.—*A new*, supply, *covenant.*
P.—A new *covenant* he hath made the first old.

R.C.—Heb. xi. 8—By faith, *he that is called Abraham.*
N.—He that is called Abraham, or Abraham *being called.*
P.—By faith, Abraham, *when he was called.*

R.C.—Heb. xi. 19—From whence also he received him for *a parable.*
N.—That is, as a *figure* of Christ.
P.—From whence also he received him *in a figure.*

R.C.—James i. 18—For of his own will hath he begotten us by the word of truth, that we might be *some beginning* of his creatures.
N.—*Some beginning*—that is, a kind of first fruits of his creatures.
P.—That we should be a kind of first fruits of his creatures.

R.C.—2 Peter ii. 1. Who shall bring in sects of perdition.
N.—*Sects of perdition*—that is heresies destructive of salvation.
P.—Who privily shall bring in damnable heresies.

R.C.—2 Peter ii. 11—Whereas angels, though they are greater in strength and power, *bear not an execrable judgment* against them.
N.—That is, they use no railing, nor cursing sentence.
P.—Bear not railing accusation against them.

R.C.—1 John iii., 4—Whosoever committeth sin, committeth also iniquity.
N.—*Iniquity*, transgression of the law.
P.—Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth the law.

R.C.—3 John 4—I have no greater grace than this.
N.—That is, nothing that gives me greater joy.
P.—I have no greater joy, &c.

R.C.—Jude vi.—And the angels who kept not their principality.
N.—*Principality*; that is, the state in which they were first created.
P.—And the angels which kept not their first estate.

R.C.—Jude viii.—And blaspheme majesty.
N.—Speak evil of them that are in dignity.
P.—And speak evil of dignities.

R.C.—Jude ix.—The Lord *command thee.*
N.—Or *rebuke thee.*
P.—The Lord *rebuke thee.*

Such, then, are some of the proposed emendations borrowed from our Authorised version, the so-called "Devil's Book"!

Allow me to add one more remark.

Mr. Ward, in his "Errata," you inform us, "complains loudly of the heresy of the Protestant Bible, in translating the Greek word εκκλησια, *congregation* instead of *Church*," you might have added to your well directed arguments that the same word is rendered "society" in their own translation in Acts ii., 47. Roman Catholics can know a very little of their own Bible, otherwise they would not make such blunders, when they undertake to censure Protestants.

I am, Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
C. H. COLLETTE.

THE PASSOVER AND THE EUCHARIST.

THE doctrine of the Eucharist forms such a prominent subject of controversy between the Churches of Rome and England, that, although it has been frequently discussed in our pages, yet we deem it needless to make any apology for bringing it again under the notice of our readers. The point which we are now about to discuss is one which is not generally adverted to, and Roman Catholic divines especially have, for the most part, omitted all mention of it. We hope, nevertheless, to show that it is not undeserving the careful consideration of all who value Scripture truth, and are anxious to learn all that the Bible makes known to us upon this important subject.

The Council of Trent, as most of our readers are aware, delivered the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, respecting the Eucharist, in eleven canons, which were passed in the thirteenth session of the Council. The first of these canons is as follows:—

"Whosoever shall deny that in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist, there are truly, really, and substantially contained the body and *the blood* of our Lord Jesus Christ, together with his soul and divinity, and, consequently, Christ entire; but shall affirm that he is present therein only in a sign or figure, let him be accursed."

Again, the third canon of the 22nd session of the same council, respecting the sacrifice of the mass, runs as follows:—

"If any one shall say that the mass is only a service of praise and thanksgiving, or a bare commemoration of the sacrifice made on the cross, and not a *true propitiatory offering*; or that it only benefits him who receives it, and ought not to be offered *for the living and the dead, for sins*, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities, let him be accursed."

From these canons, it is abundantly clear that the Church of Rome holds that the wine in the Eucharist is changed into the *real, actual blood* of our Blessed Lord; and that, in the sacrament, this blood is offered up to God as a real propitiatory sacrifice, to make atonement for the sins of the living and the dead.

The Church of Rome declares further, in the second canon of the 22nd session of the same council, that our Lord, by the words—"Do this for a commemoration of me," appointed his apostles *priests*, to offer his body and blood. And we learn from the Acts of the Apostles that, shortly after our Lord's ascension, it was the custom of the Apostles, with the other converted Jews, to "break bread from house to house" daily—that is, to observe a daily celebration of this sacrament.

The question, then, naturally arises, did the Apostles and the Jewish converts really believe that the wine of which they partook in the Eucharist was really and actually the blood of our Blessed Lord? If they did, the controversy is, of course, settled; for, in a doctrine of such importance, all true Christians are bound to follow the inspired teachers whom Christ appointed to establish his Church in the world.

But *did* the apostles believe this? The Council of Trent must have supposed that they did; for if St. Peter and the other apostles believed that, in the Eucharist, they partook of wine and *not* of blood, the venerable Fathers who composed the council would scarcely have been so uncharitable as to utter a sweeping anathema against *them*. This is the point, however, on which we beg leave to entertain very serious doubts, and our reasons for doing so are as follows:—

One of the laws given by God to the Israelites in the wilderness, is contained in the following passage of Leviticus (Lev. xvii. 10, 11, 12, Douay version):—

"If any man whosoever of the house of Israel, and of the strangers that sojourn among them, *eat blood*, I will set my face against his soul, and *will cut him off from among his people*. Because the life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you, that *you may make atonement with it* upon the altar for your souls, and the blood may be for an expiation of the soul. Therefore, I have said to the children of Israel, no soul of you, nor of the strangers that sojourn among you, shall eat blood."

This injunction is given in such solemn words, and fenced in by such appalling sanctions, that it is scarcely possible to conceive a religious Israelite wilfully violating it. Not only were the whole people, Jews as well as Gentile proselytes, forbidden to eat blood, but the reason is expressly added by the Divine lawgiver—"Because it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul." It was the very fact of the mysterious but necessary connection between the shedding of blood and the remission of sins, which is assigned as the reason for this law. All use of blood was forbidden, but more especially were the Jews prohibited from eating blood which was offered up upon

the altar, to make an atonement for the souls of the people. The blood of atonement was consecrated by the special command of God, to the one solemn office of making reconciliation between God and man, and the Almighty saw fit, in consequence, to prohibit the Israelites, under the most solemn sanctions, from eating *any manner of blood* (כלרם).

It is scarcely possible to conceive that the Apostles, who must have frequently heard this law read to them in the ordinary services of the Synagogue, must not have been struck by the contradiction between it and the words used by our Lord in the institution of the Eucharist, when taken in their bare, literal imports. We read in St. Matthew's Gospel (xxvi. 27) that, "taking the chalice, he gave thanks and gave to them saying, drink ye *all* of this, for this is my blood of the New Testament which is shed (ἐκχυνόμενον) for many, unto remission of sins." Let us suppose that the doctrine of transubstantiation is true, and that the apostles actually believed that the wine in the cup which was given to them by their Divine Master was really and truly his blood, identical in substance with the blood which then ran in his veins, must not Christ's command to them to drink this blood have appeared absolutely contradictory to the Mosaic law—a law, be it remembered, which, as our Lord himself informs the Jews, he came "not to destroy but to fulfil"—Matt. v. 17. That law, as we have seen declared—"I will set my face against the man that eateth blood, and will cut him off from among his people, *for* it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul." Our Blessed Lord said to his apostles, when giving them the cup—"Drink ye all of this; *for* this is my blood which is shed for many for the remission of sins." The very same reason is assigned for the prohibition of blood in the Old Testament, and for the use of the Eucharistic cup in the New—namely, the connection between blood and the remission of sins. If the doctrine of transubstantiation be true—if the actual, corporeal blood of Christ is drank in the Lord's Supper—it seems plain that the very same action—namely, the use of blood—is, at one time, *forbidden* by God, and at another time *commanded*, and that the same identical reason is stated both for the prohibition and the commandment. This would be thought strange conduct in any human legislator—how much more so in him "with whom there is no variableness, neither shadow of turning"—Jam. i. 17. Who is "the same yesterday, to-day and for ever"—Heb. xiii. 8. And further, is it reasonable to suppose that if the Eucharistic cup really and actually contained blood, and if the apostles believed that it contained it, they would have all drank it, in express defiance of one of the plainest and most solemn prohibitions of the Mosaic law?

The evangelists, however, do not seem to have been at all aware that there was any difficulty in the case. When our Lord, after using the words we have cited above, gave the cup to them, we do not find that they made the slightest objection or remonstrance. St. Mark simply states, "they all drank of it," and adds no further comment. Now this unhesitating compliance of the apostles with a command which *sounded* like a plain violation of the Mosaic law, seems explicable only in one or other of two ways, either the apostles did *not* believe that the cup really contained the actual, corporeal blood of Christ—in which case, of course, they might freely partake of it without any violation of the law—or, if they believed that the miracle of transubstantiation had really taken place, and that the wine was physically converted into the blood of Christ, they may have conceived, nevertheless, that they might drink of it without sin, because they had our Lord's express authority and command. Let us inquire into the probability of this latter view of the case.

We have before cited the remarkable words in which our Lord expressly disclaimed the intention of annulling or setting aside the Mosaic law. "Do not think," said he, "that I am come to *destroy* the law or the prophets. I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, *one jot or one tittle* shall not pass of the law till all be fulfilled"—Matt. v., 17, 18. From these words we may judge how very improbable it was that Christ would dispense with one of the weightiest commands of that law, by enjoining his apostles to partake of blood—blood shed for the remission of sins—and, *therefore*, expressly prohibited for that very reason by God himself. But granting, for the sake of argument, that our Lord did give this command, the difficulty still remains, that all the Apostles, who had such intense reverence for the Mosaic law, seem to have complied with this open violation of the law, without the least word of remark or inquiry. St. Peter, who was forward enough with his remonstrances on other occasions, is now as silent as his companions. Did he believe that the law might be safely disregarded in virtue of Christ's command? No; for his conduct, on a later occasion, remarkably proves his deep unwillingness to break through one of the common precepts of the ceremonial law, even when ordered to do so by the voice of God himself. The occurrence to which we refer is related, at length, in the 10th chapter of the Acts. St. Peter, we are told, saw, in a vision, a sheet let down from heaven, wherein were beasts of various kinds; and there came a voice to him—"Rise, Peter, kill and eat." But Peter said—"*Not so, Lord*, for I have never eaten anything that is common or unclean." Thrice, we are told, the vision was repeated—thrice the Divine command came to him, and thrice he refused to comply with what seemed to him a violation of the law—a law, which, he asserts that he had *never broken*, by eating anything that was common or unclean.

Our readers may now judge for themselves in what light St. Peter and the other Apostles must have viewed our Lord's words, used at the institution of the eucharist. If they believed him to assert that the cup actually contained his own real, corporeal, physical blood, and that this was what he drank himself, and commanded them to drink likewise, then we do not hesitate to assert that their silent and unresisting compliance appears not only unaccountable in itself, but is contradicted by the recorded behaviour of one of the chief of the Apostles, under circumstances of a much simpler kind—where the command came directly from God, and involved a much more trifling infringement of the Mosaic law.

If, on the other hand, the disciples interpreted our Lord's words in accordance with the well-known custom of the paschal feast, which they had just celebrated, then the whole narrative becomes plain and easy. In that feast, we are told, the Jews, while partaking of the unleavened bread, which they were commanded to eat, used to say the following words—"This is the bread of affliction (לחמא דעניא) which our fathers ate in the land of Egypt."* Of course they did not think it was the *self-same* bread which their fathers ate in Egypt, but it *resembled* it, and was a representation of it. So, in like manner, when our Lord used the words, "this is my blood of the New Testament," the Apostles might naturally conclude him to mean, that the wine in the cup was a symbol or representation of his blood—an interpretation which would be confirmed by the fact that, in the very same sentence, *after consecration*, he called it "the fruit of the vine." Compare Matt. xxvi., 26, 28, 29.) If so, his command to them to drink it would plainly involve no violation of the Mosaic law and would naturally call forth no remark or remonstrance from them. The whole narrative becomes plain and consistent; no fundamental precept of the law is violated, and the Old and New Testaments are in perfect harmony. If, however, the dogma of transubstantiation be true, then the whole becomes nearly inexplicable. Our, Lord, without one word of explanation, gives a command to his Apostles to violate the law forbidding the use of blood, a law which was first given to Noah (Gen. ix. 4), which was re-enacted by Moses (Lev. xvii. 10), and, what is stranger still, was afterwards prescribed by these same Apostles to all the Gentile converts (Acts xv. 29)! The Apostles immediately, without one word of remonstrance, comply with this command, and perform an action which was forbidden under the most awful penalty in the law of Moses; and yet, at a later period, one of these very Apostles refuses to break this law in a much smaller matter, even in obedience to God's express desire. We do not say that it is impossible that all this can be true: but we certainly do affirm that the above considerations appear to us to add greatly to the other difficulties which are involved in the belief of transubstantiation.

* *Vide* Haggadah Shel Pesach, p. 4. Ed. Kitlar gel, fol. 242, 2. Ed. Basil.

DIALOGUE ON THE CONSTRAINED CELIBACY OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

NO. III.

Eustachio.—You have asserted very freely that the law of celibacy, imposed upon our clergy by the Church, is a new law: you have said, moreover, that it was your intention to bring forth more ample proofs of this than those which you have already adduced. I release you from this trouble, however, since, if you will listen to what I am about to say, you will be convinced that it is impossible to introduce into the Church of Rome new doctrines or new laws. If any one should attempt to introduce any novelty into a church, which sets up to be the chief, as well as the most ancient, and to have descended by a lawful chain of successors from Jesus Christ himself, all Christendom would be grieved at it; all her doctors would strongly oppose it (at least all those who were not the inventors of the novelty); it would be resisted by councils, and the learned would immediately take pen in hand, to write against the innovator. Now, if the law against the marriage of the clergy is new, as you maintain, in what manner was it established in the Church? Why have the priests, the friars, the nuns, and, and, in fact, all the ecclesiastical orders accepted it? Why have not the councils maintained the primitive practice, supporting it, as they ought to have done, by strong arguments?

Salviano.—There are many things, my dear friend, which, in spite of bishops, princes, councils, and all who have opposed them, have been, nevertheless, established in the Church of Rome. Truly many learned persons have opposed the new law of celibacy, as well as various councils, some sovereigns, and many subjects of the first rank, both ecclesiastics and secular persons. I might present you with a host of writers who, from age to age, have loudly exclaimed against the new law, and have stoutly contended for the liberty granted them by Christ. In fact, Isidore, William Durandus, Alderigo Bishop of Agusta, bearing the title of saint, as well as the whole of the Greek Church, manfully opposed all who tried to deprive them of it. This latter Church would never consent to be subject to the Roman Church. Thence it is that the Greek ecclesiastics contract marriage, according to the law of Justinian, of the year 530—(In autent. de sanctiss. coll. 9). Cardinal Bellarmine writes to this effect—"The Roman Church does not approve of it, believing it to be an abuse. She grants it, however, to the Greeks, with whom peace would easily be made if they held no other error." We are fully convinced of this. It is a small thing, in fact, whether the Greek clergy marry or not; Rome would easily make peace with them, provided they did not impugn the authority and the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff. The Greek Church directs this question to the Latin Church—"Who gave you authority to forbid the marriage of the clergy?" Why does not Rome answer her? Why does she not justify herself? Let the Latin Church answer for once, but let her bring forth convincing arguments in reply. Who gave her authority to forbid things granted by God—to forbid marriage to ecclesiastics, whilst it has been granted to them from heaven?

Eustachio—I cannot deny that your arguments are very weighty, nor do I know how the Church of Rome can answer them. He who does not see the truth of these reasons is blind; he who does not yield to their force is obstinate indeed. We must either admit that men are wiser than God, or we must pronounce them rash, when they enact laws in opposition to his. To say that a man can make ordinances contrary to the ordinances of God—to say that the Pope, who is but a man, can make and unmake the Divine law—to call vice virtue, and virtue vice—these are abominable axioms, but such wares are not worth much in our days.

Salviano.—The law of celibacy, impugned by us, was promulgated and observed in the diocese of Rome many ages before it was enforced in many other dioceses. Mention is made of a letter of Pope Siricius to Imerius, by which he forbids marriage to the clergy, saying—"They who live in the flesh cannot please God" (In Tomo 1 Concil., p. 74); as if living in the state of matrimony was the same thing as living in the flesh; as if the most glorious saints of the Old and New Testament had been displeasing to God. It is true, however, that many learned men consider this letter to be a forgery. Another Pope—viz., Innocent the Second—puts marriage in the list of uncleannesses—Canone decernimus, distinct 28. And St. Gregory, the first Pope of this name, desired that he who suffered from the stings of the flesh, to the danger of his eternal salvation, should have recourse to marriage.—(Conjugii portum petant., De Cura Past., part 3., cap. 30). Six thousand heads of young infants, that were taken out of a fish-pond, having been brought to this saint, he was horrified at the sight, and acknowledged that the forbidding of marriage to the clergy was the cause of such barbarous butchery. Then sighing, he exclamed—"Oh, it is better to marry than to burn." "It is better to marry than to give occasion to such black crimes."—(Vide Balœi. Act. Pont. Rom., p. 46. Francof, 1567). This fact, so lamentable, was also related, by St. Ulrick, to Pope Nicholas.—(In Catol. Test. Ver., lib. 9). These things happened exactly at that time in which the Popes were trying to bind the prohibition of marriage upon other Churches; and those who were of this party pretended that they had St. Gregory on their side, but St. Ulrick proves the contrary, asserting plainly that St. Gregory did not belong to their sect—"I smile," said he, "at their rashness, and I weep for their ignorance."

Eustachio.—In truth I do not know how they were able, in process of time, to enforce that law. Pray tell me by what means they obliged Christendom to yield to it. I know that the Bishop of Tarragona, in writing from Spain to Siricius, Bishop of Rome, acquainted him with the resistance of the bishops there against the law of celibacy.

Salviano.—That resistance was still stronger in England and in Germany. I would never come to an end if I were to tell you of all the tricks by which the Bishops of Rome tried to force celibacy upon the clergy on the other side of the Alps, and of all the difficulties which they met with in the attempt; what, in fact, was left undone in the eighth century to induce the English clergy to abstain from marriage, and to oblige those who had already married to separate from their wives. How many miracles were invented; how many deceptions were used to make this holy state odious, and to render the married clergy hateful to the people. Amongst other things a paper was produced, upon which were drawn out twelve articles against the marriage of the clergy; and in order that these articles should have greater authority, it was declared that this paper had been brought there by the Angel Gabriel. Images were even made to speak. In the year 975 those ministers who would not separate from their wives being deposed, and some time after being about to be re-established in their parishes by a majority of votes, a voice was heard to cry out—"The opinion of those who are in favour of the priests is not sound." As the people were given to understand that this voice had proceeded from an image which was set up there, the poor priests lost their cause, and were driven out of the Church in consequence, by King Canute, and were afterwards expelled from the College of Oxford, by King Edward. These things happened, as Polydore Virgil relates, about the year 1020—Lib. 6, Hist. Angl. In the year 1097, William gave leave anew to the clergy to marry, which King Henry also did about the year 1120. The Archbishop of Canterbury, however, opposed King William, and in a synod, held at London, in the year 1102, forced celibacy on the clergy. But a short time afterwards an abominable vice, which we dare not

name, having been introduced amongst the clergy, strong complaints were made about it to the Archbishop himself; and he not being able to find any remedy for it, since he neglected that prescribed by God, could do nothing further than to make it known to the Roman Pontiff. The Pope sent John, a cardinal, into England, who, in another synod, held in London, in the year 1125, forbade marriage again to the clergy. This did not occur, however, without an evident scourge from God, for the said prelate was, on the following night, caught in bed with a harlot, and taken. King Henry having then, as we have already stated, granted marriage anew to the clergy, the Roman Pontiff sent there Albert of Ostia, who put the finishing stroke to the work, by forbidding marriage altogether to the English clergy, as it came to pass, in fact, in the year 1138. Balacus cent. 3, cap 10. There were, notwithstanding, in England, after that, many clergy, most celebrated for piety and learning, who lived in the holy state of matrimony, and begot children for their country and for the Lord. In Ireland also, up to the year 1130, many married bishops were to be found, as St. Bernard attests, in his life of Malachy.

Eust.—Truly, all that is very surprising. Tell me now how things went on in Germany. The Germans would not easily have parted with that liberty which they had already possessed for so many years, but, doubtless, the French may have less stoutly resisted the new law.

Salv.—The practice of this new tradition did not succeed more easily either in Germany or in France. Geolibo, Bishop of Magonza, was son of Gerald, who had been bishop of the same diocese—Avent. lib. 3, p. 294. That took place in the eighth century. Paschal, Bishop of Coira, about the year 760, had his lawful wife called—"Antistites et episcopa Curiensis." And traces of this are still to be seen upon her tomb. In the year 1075, the priests of Germany had their wives, as Aventinus asserts. Lib. 5, p. 579. Whilst the priests of Italy had, for a long series of years, been deprived of wives, the clergy of Germany and of France were married; and about the year 1090, there might be reckoned up as many as twenty-four bishopricks, in which all the clergy, from the highest to the lowest grade, were married.

Eust.—Who succeeded finally in bringing them to obey so severe a law? And how did it happen that all these vast countries were not thrown into confusion by the execution of such a law, since, indeed, it is a hard thing to allow one's self to be deprived by men of that which was granted by God?

Salviano—The Nicolaitans, the Callistians, and others had already desired that the clergy should live in celibacy; but the man who laboured indefatigably in this work was Gregory VII., who, having acted as Pope before he was so actually, succeeded thus in causing to be promulgated some vigorous laws against the marriage of the clergy. But, as soon as he had mounted the Papal throne, he left no means untried to carry out his object, launching from the Vatican the thunders of excommunications, interdicts, and a thousand other jugglerics of the Papal forge. After him Pope Paschal II. did the same thing. "It was then," as Aventinus relates (lib. 5, p. 452), "that a most fierce sedition broke out. The parish priests were against the Pope; the people against the priests; and the profane were cruelly exasperated against the clergy. . . . The married priests were despised to such a degree that they burned their tithes, threw into the dirt the Host consecrated by them, and trampled it under foot (a wondrous monument of Catholic respect for their beloved transubstantiation), as they said that those priests who had wives could not consecrate. . . . There were some, however, who cursed Hildebrand, saying from the pulpits, that whilst he dared to bear the titles of Vicar of Christ and God upon earth, he made a Babylon of the church, and carried on the work of Antichrist in the temple of God. They went on to say, this man by asserting that he is infallible covers his ambition, forges fables, corrupts annals, falsifies oracles, adulterates the Divine Scriptures, making them favourable to his lust. Others also said, the law of Hildebrand can only be agreeable to fornicators, since they, instead of one lawful wife, may take to themselves 600 concubines. Isfeldese subjoined—"The clergy of Germany exclaimed that the Pope was a heretic and of unsound doctrine, for that having forgotten the words of Jesus Christ—"*All cannot receive this saying;*" and those of the apostle, "*It is better to marry than to burn*"—he strove to oblige men by force to live, as if they were angels; and, whilst he forbade them to follow the course of nature, he opened wide the road to fornication and uncleanness. Firm in their opinion, they chose rather to give up the priesthood than to put away their dear wives, and said that they would watch to see if the Pope (in whose sight the married were unclean) would find angels to govern the Church of God.

In the year 1075, Gregory VII. sent the Bishop of Coira to Magonza, with an express order to force all the priests of that diocese either to renounce their wives or the priesthood. The Bishop of Magonza assembled a synod in the month of October, in which, when he wished to promulgate the prohibition of marriage which he had received, he found such a resistance among the clergy that he was obliged to give it up. Nay, these priests were so exasperated that they threatened to take away his life. All that I have said, and even more, is certified by Isfeldese and Nauclerus. In the year 1076, at the time of Pentecost, a council was held in Vormezia, at which the Bishops of France and Germany assembled; and as Gregory VII. had excommunicated the Emperor, so the council deposed the Pope, who was accused and convicted of various crimes. Amongst the other wickednesses for which he was condemned were these, that he separated husbands from their wives; that he preferred harlots and concubines to chaste spouses, and adulteries and incests to holy matrimony—(Avent. lib. 5, p. 570). Even the Bishops of Italy, to the number of eight, having assembled in the Canton of Ticino, subscribed to the decree of this council, though, to say the truth, these, and many others were not stedfast, as they were too much in dread of the wrath of Hildebrand.

(To be continued.)

THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE ON THE USE OF THE BIBLE.

BY HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL WISEMAN.

(*Continued from page 63.*)

Cardinal Wiseman having, in the manner stated in our last number, endeavoured to establish the complete dependence of the Holy Scriptures for vitality, authenticity, and inspiration upon the authority of his Church, proceeds to explain the threefold grounds upon which she refuses to give the Bible indifferently to all.

First, he says, the Church will not give the Word of God indiscriminately to all, because God himself has not done so. He has not made *reading an essential part of man's constitution, nor a congenital faculty, nor a term of salvation, nor a condition of Christianity*, but he *has made hearing so*; for he tells us that, "faith cometh from hearing, and hearing from the Word of God." He did not give the world the means of multiplying books, by machinery, till after his Church had flourished for fourteen hundred years, and had bred thousands of martyrs, educated hundreds of doctors and learned men, trained myriads of holy religious to perfection, sent millions of believers to the heavenly Jerusalem, converted nations, planted churches, &c., &c.; and it is asked, if no Providence watched over the Church while she achieved all this? God did not give his Apostles a precept to write, a code to be written, a liturgy or a prayer to be recorded: and this branch of the subject concludes by saying that, if the first persecutors, who hunted inexorably after the Scriptures, had succeeded in destroying them, or if any portion of them had been lost, still the Church, and the faith once delivered to the saints, must have remained complete; because the Holy Spirit, who indited the precious page, would still continue to preserve its substance unimpaired—"For independent of, and anterior to, all written word, was the promise that he should teach the Church *all* truth."

How many curious reflections are suggested by this argument! That "reading is not an essential part of man's constitution" is a curious reason to offer to the "Catholics" of the nineteenth century for restricting the use of the Bible! and in placing in opposition to this, the text that "faith cometh from hearing, and hearing from the Word of God," Cardinal Wiseman forgets, for a moment, that there was then a "written Word of God." He puts the narrowest construction upon the word "hearing," which frequently, in Scripture, bears a much wider sense than merely listening with the ear. Thus God is spoken of as "hearing" in the sense of attending to prayer. Abraham, in the parable, says, "they have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them;" and, "if they hear not Moses and the prophets neither will they *believe* if one rise again from the dead" (Luke xvi. 29, 31), showing, plainly that it was the belief of Moses and the prophets (who, by the way, being then dead, *could* only be learned through their *writings*), and not merely hearing them with the ear that was meant by the word "hearing." We might ask, why the Apostles wrote at all if they were not inspired to do so, and if it was not in obedience to the Divine command to "Preach (the word implies to proclaim or publish, not merely to preach *orally*) the Gospel to every creature?" We might, also, refer to the express command to St. John to write his vision in the Apocalypse, and point to the injunction to abstain from writing a particular part of it, showing the Divine superintendence over the work in which he was engaged. Again, we might bring forward what Cardinal Wiseman himself loves to dwell upon, the analogy between the Old and New Testament dispensations, where the people were first brought out by signs and wonders, the law was then delivered orally, and, afterwards, the Scriptures were written, the use or the interpretation of which would appear to have been by no means confined to the Priests. But, supposing there were any weight in this argument, founded upon the difference between the reading and the hearing of the word, or upon the time that elapsed before it was written, or before printing was invented, it would appear to tell much better if the Church had not adopted the Scriptures as inspired, and if the argument had been directed against such adoption. We could understand the argument, however untenable it might be, "These Scriptures have been written without authority; 'faith cometh only by hearing,' and as the Spirit promised to lead us into all truth before they were written, we will reject them as part of the means of fulfilment of that promise." But we confess that it still appears quite unexplained to our minds how the mere time at which the writing or the printing of the Word was vouchsafed by God to the world can affect the question, not of its reception into the canon of the Church, but of the *number of persons who shall be permitted to read it*. We cannot help suspecting that if it had been delivered in writing, in the first instance, the Church of Rome, finding the free use of it injurious to her claim to universal authority, would find some other excuse for restricting its circulation.

But the Cardinal proceeds to his second reason.

Secondly, the Church does not permit the indiscriminate use of the Bible, *because God has not given her the "instinct to do so."* As he has neither furnished her with the means, nor with the command, "so he has not instilled into her that spontaneous impulse that guides her to new duties, in favour of this mode of propagating the faith." He gave her, the Cardinal says, "first, apostles; secondly, prophets; thirdly, doctors;" and the questions, "Are all apostles?" "prophets?" "doctors?" could have been answered negatively till now. It was not communicated to the Church that every one was a doctor, and might become an apostle, which, he asserts, is the result of universal Bible reading, &c. "Men are now deemed fully qualified to teach the heathen, if they have a sufficient supply of Bibles to distribute, in some *ludicrous translation*, and have themselves learnt *sufficient of Bible phraseology to perfect them in cant.*" God has fixed in the heart of his Church the instinct of unity, &c.; and the argument is wound up thus:—"If, then, we still prize unity, should we not be mad, putting all questions of principle and duty to a revealed system and law aside, to reject what has been its safeguard till now, and try what has been its destruction? For, be it remembered, the Catholic Church is no experimentalist."

The above argument is incapable of being controverted in point of fact. We cannot deny that, so far from the Roman Catholic Church having been endowed with an "instinct" to circulate the Scriptures, she has the common instinct of self-preservation to induce her to shut them up; nor can we doubt what the Cardinal candidly avows, that no sacrifice is too great, even to the withholding of God's word, in order to preserve and maintain that external, formal, nominal unity, on which the safety of his Church depends, and whose aim is the universal domination of the priesthood, and the universal subjection of the laity. We by no means wish to dispute that the "indiscriminate reading of the Bible" has been the "destruction" of that kind of unity; that to permit such reading would be "to reject what has been its safeguard;" and that upon this question the "Catholic Church" is not likely ever to become an experimentalist. While we admit these facts for the Cardinal, we must leave it to the judgment of our Roman Catholic readers to estimate their weight as an argument against the free circulation of the Scriptures, and to judge if the surrender of their liberty and their reason to others (to say nothing of the peril of Divine wrath which they must incur if they are in error in rejecting the means of grace within their reach), is not too large a price to pay for the maintenance of that kind of unity, unknown to the early history of Christianity, which implies nothing more than spiritual despotism on the one side, and slavish submission to assumed authority on the other.

The insinuation that "colonies of artizans, with wives and children, all pensioned for the work, under the title of missionaries," are shipped off to convert the heathen, we cannot pass by in silence. This statement must be placed in the same category with other statements of Cardinal Wiseman's on matters of fact. He well knows that at least the Church of England sends forth no missionaries but her own ordained and educated ministers; and if we consider the studious and laborious lives of those men, their devoted piety and zeal, their indomitable courage and perseverance in facing and surmounting apparently unconquerable difficulties—their patient plodding in the learning of languages—their untiring toil in turning that knowledge to the sole purpose of its acquisition—the translation of the Scriptures—the ingenious devices—the application of a syllabic alphabet to the language of the Cree Indians, unmanageable with our orthography—the invention for the Chinese of a simple written language, in lieu of one so difficult as to be beyond the reach of foreigners, and hardly capable of being acquired by natives—and then, when we reflect upon the self-sacrifices, the disinterestedness of those men, and the wonderful success of their labours, we have no fear that any but the wilfully blind and ignorant can be misled into the belief that this "noble army" is composed of men "uneducated, unspiritual, unqualified for the work."

But the Cardinal says—

Thirdly, that the Roman Catholic Church "cannot, and must not, adopt the Protestant course, because we have no reason to admire its fruits or its expectations. We see no motive to be satisfied with the reckless experiment which others are trying, we do not see morals improving or crime diminishing, but the contrary. We see dogma after dogma disappearing; baptismal regeneration is gone; the Eucharist is scarcely believed in; even the Divinity of our Lord is faintly held to, and that generally obscured by Nestorianism or some other ancient heresy. No one can dream that faith in these great truths will revive through the diffusion of Bible reading," &c.

We have before observed, that to attribute an increase of immorality or crime to the reading of Scripture is mere assumption, unsupported by proof. When a portion of Christendom shook off the yoke of the Roman Church, and

freed itself from the inquisition, and all those severe temporal punishments by which that Church maintained her authority, we know of no substitute that could have withheld the seceders from the depths of vice and sin, but the gentle, yet all-powerful, sway of the Gospel. Experience proves, in direct opposition to Cardinal Wiseman's assertions, that in Germany, Switzerland, and elsewhere, civilization, in the Protestant districts, is in advance of that in the Roman Catholic. We may add our own observation, that among Protestants of the Church of England, the parish or district where the Gospel is most diligently read and most faithfully preached is the most distinguished for morality and propriety of conduct, and where it is neglected the opposite effects appear. The alleged rapid disappearance of dogma after dogma is mere exaggeration and assertion, in support of which no facts are cited. That a difference of opinion has occasionally arisen respecting the sense in which the Church of England uses the term "regenerate," in her baptismal service is true; but the assertion that "baptismal regeneration is gone" is a misrepresentation founded on a perverted view, both of the point in dispute and of the precise decision in the Gorham case. The doctrine of the Eucharist, as professed by the Church of Rome, is, doubtless, not believed by Protestants, but, so far as the Church of England is concerned, we may venture to say that her doctrine is, and always has been maintained in its integrity, and that, at least upon that subject, there is no schism amongst her members. The Divinity of our Lord is denied by a sect, who may, in one sense, be called Protestants, but who can scarcely be denominated Christians. We can answer for the Church of England, by challenging Cardinal Wiseman to prove the existence, in that church, of any doubt or question upon the subject. We know not to what other "ancient heresies" the Cardinal alludes, but we boldly assert that the doctrine of our Lord's Divinity is as essential a tenet of the Church of England as it is of the Church of Rome, unobscured by Nestorianism or any other heresy, which no one, who has ever read the Articles of the Church of England, could for a moment venture to controvert. Indeed, we only advert to this matter at all to prevent the misapprehension that might arise if we left this undiscriminating assertion of Cardinal Wiseman altogether unnoticed.

(To be continued.)

THE MARLEYS.

A STORY OF REAL LIFE.

Such of our readers as have been educated in the Roman Catholic religion, and have ventured to read and inquire for themselves into the ground of their faith, and have seen reason to think that the system in which they have been brought up is one not unmixed with error—but yet are deterred by timidity, or prudence, from avowing the real state of their minds on the subject—may, perhaps, take an interest in the narrative that follows.

Many persons, we believe, are disposed to think, that because they are not placed in what are called "independent circumstances in life," it is not to be expected that they should act in an independent manner in matters respecting the concerns of the life that is to come. "It is all very well," say they, "for those who are not engaged in trade or business, and not dependant on others for daily employment; it is all very well for persons in the upper and middle ranks of life, who are born in comparative freedom from the coercion and tyranny that can be brought to bear on *us*; *they* may give honest expression to their sentiments, but *we*, however serious or sincere, dare not do so." Now, we do not think lightly, nor do we mean to make light of the dangers and difficulties of an honest renunciation of error, and we appreciate to the fullest extent the moral fortitude of the individual who boldly and valiantly takes up the cause which he believes to be true, whatever his position in life may be. But we deny, that the trials to which such persons refer as peculiar, are confined to the humbler walks of life, and we would illustrate, by a brief narrative of incidents which are not fictitious, that the difficulties and dangers of free and honest inquiry after truth are not confined to any rank or degree, nor to any age or sex, and that, nevertheless, the path of duty, if boldly and honestly pursued, leads uniformly to a successful and happy result. With this view we introduce to our readers the history of a Roman Catholic family into which truths hitherto unknown made their entrance, and forced their way under circumstances of considerable disadvantage and chequered with difficulties of a nature quite as formidable as any that the terrors of mere physical force, or the tyranny of exclusive dealing, or social separation, can impose on freedom of thought in another sphere of life.

Major Marley was a member of an ancient Roman Catholic family, which had resided for a couple of centuries in the County of W——. He was a man of strong impulses, warm affections, but of a violent and uncontrolled temper. This latter characteristic was, perhaps, to be attributed to the defect of his early education, and from his having started in life, to seek his fortunes at the age of fifteen, with the slender provision of an eighth son, whereby he became the master of his own movements, at a time when judicious training and moral control are most needed. Being an intelligent and spirited youth, he worked his way vigorously through the world, and secured to himself in his latter years a respectable independance, upon which he had retired at the time to which our little narrative relates.

Major Marley was a man of acute observation and strong common sense, and we believe in his inmost heart despised the puerilities and superstitions which he saw practised around him by his humbler fellow-religionists. He was one of that class of which, in our intercourse with respectable Roman Catholics, we have met several instances, who take for granted that their religion comprehends or admits of two different standards of belief—the one intended for the educated and intelligent, the other for the vulgar and credulous. He certainly did, in common with many steadfast Roman Catholic gentlemen whom we could name, laugh at the absurdity of beads and reliques, and ridicule the idea that the prayers of the plump, plethoric parish priest could keep his soul out of Purgatory; and he repudiated the invocation of saints and angels as more than unnecessary. When, with military frankness and freedom, he would canvass such topics with Father Paul O'Reilly, the parish priest, his reverence would comfortably assure him, that such as he were not called on to do or to believe all these things; that many of them were the vulgar notions of the lower orders of Roman Catholics, and for which the Church was in no way responsible.

Major Marley having, as we have said, very little confidence in the remission of sins at the hands of Father O'Reilly, was, for this reason, perhaps, somewhat negligent in his attendance at confession; and, though most strict in enforcing the discipline of his Church upon every other member of his family, the old gentleman himself was rather regardless of fasts and penances, and such like observances: indeed, his Bishop had provided him with the convenient dispensation so readily given to a weak stomach, when accompanied by a strong will; and the discipline of fishes and slops on Fridays was considerately spared to a delicate gentleman, who never had a pain or an ache till a week before his death, which overtook him in the eightieth year of a life spent, nearly to the last, in the full vigour of health and strength.

But, perhaps, the most decided of the Major's irregularities was in respect of the Sacrament of the Eucharist. He used, rather freely—and perhaps irreverently—to tell his pastor that he felt it to be impossible to believe that the wafer which Father Paul gave him to eat was the *flesh and blood* of the Saviour.

The good father would debate the subject with his presumptuous and independent parishioner to the best of his ability: he would bring forward every argument and text which he had been taught at Maynooth; but finding his disciple invincible, instead of excommunicating him with bell, book, and candle-light, and pouring upon him the vials of his wrath and the anathema of heresy and schism, he gently sought to conciliate his friendship and satisfy his reason by assuring him, that surely, at all events, *he spiritually* eat and drank the body and blood of Christ in the worthy reception of the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist. Good Protestant doctrine was thus conceded to the contentious Major, so long as he outwardly conformed to the communion of the Holy Roman Catholic Church. Major Marley was a man too shrewd to be put off with shallow sophistries, and he was too wealthy and influential in the parish to be lightly offended and driven into Protestantism. If a new chapel was to be built, or the priest's house to be enlarged, or the orphans' school to be maintained, the foremost and most liberal man in the parish to contribute was Major Marley. So that his assistance was too large, his example too influential, and his character too much respected to be sacrificed for such small irregularities as his notions about the Eucharist, or penance, or Purgatory, fasting or fish; and, accordingly, the wide indulgences of this most accommodating church were enlarged just to the letter of his requirements. Any indulgence that he demanded was freely conceded—any omission of which he was guilty was gently passed over, so long as the scandal of public disaffection was avoided. Had he indecently gone to church, or publicly taken to reading the Bible for his family, the thunders of Rome would soon have been rattling around his ears in a terrible clatter; but as he only expressed his doubts and indulged his cavillings in the presence of the orthodox Roman Catholic father, it was more conducive to the interests of the Holy Mother, the Church, to permit him to have his little sneer at Purgatory, and to disregard the fasts, and absent himself from confession and the Sacrament of the Eucharist, than to incur the risk of estranging a useful member from the communion of the faithful. And here we cannot but admire the wonderful flexibility of a system which is, in a certain sense, "all things to all men," which adapts itself to every phase of human life and character, and accommodates itself to every eccentricity and perversity of human nature—which has a scale of faith suitable to every natural intellect, from the most sceptical and fine-drawn to the most credulous and superstitious.

Father O'Reilly knew his man. Major Marley, though he took leave to think for himself, and to doubt and to cavil at anything that did not commend itself to his own plain, downright, common sense, was, nevertheless, one of the strictest disciplinarians in the world, as to the religious conduct of the members of his household. His pride of family and early associations would have revolted at the least semblance of apostasy with horror. To turn his back upon the religion of his ancestors was, in his mind, as disgraceful as to desert his colours on the field of battle, and go over to the enemy of his king and country. Protestantism was nothing short of open rebellion against the good old Church, which, whatever might be its faults and failings, still he considered to be the *old* Church. At all events it was the Church in which he and his great grandfathers had been born and bred, and, therefore, to it he was a staunch, unswerving adherent, and however he might argue with Father O'Reilly, or with Archbishop M—— himself, no other person dared to impugn its doctrines or its discipline in his presence.

At the time we speak of, Major Marley's family consisted of his wife—a mild, amiable lady—and three unmarried daughters, and from them he exacted a rigid observance of every fast and feast, and a strict attendance upon every ordinance and ceremony of the Church.

The major was himself declining in years, though not in strength. Mrs. Marley was still in the prime of life, being many years younger than her husband. Marcella, their eldest daughter, was a strict and devoted Roman Catholic, and had most conscientiously endeavoured to instil the principles in which she believed into the minds of her younger sisters, Edith and Adeline. They were her juniors by many years, and were then just entering into life in the happy, buoyant period of early womanhood. Edith had just attained her seventeenth year, and was in the full possession of a light heart and gay spirits, upon which care sat lightly, and to which everything furnished a source of enjoyment. Adeline, though younger in years, was more sedate and serious in manner, and grave and reflective in disposition. Indeed, the gay and mirthful Edith formed a striking contrast to the sober and demure Adeline; but this diversity of disposition formed no hindrance to the entire union of heart and devotedness of mutual affection between sisters who had played together in happy childhood, wandered over the same meadows in innocent pursuit of gaudy butterflies and wild flowers, which they seemed loth to disturb.

Hollywood, where their childhood and early years had been spent, was a sweet, romantic spot, to which nature and art had contributed every possible adornment. The gardens and plantations, which surrounded the old house, were of singular beauty, and formed a paradise of flowers and shrubs, where everything luxuriated, and opened out its choicest colours and fragrance. Such a place was suited to develop a sentiment of romance in the youthful mind; but, truth to say, neither Edith nor Adeline possessed a superfluity of sentimentality, in the modern sense of the term. Deep in feeling to an intensity, and warm and affectionate in disposition, either might be said to be deficient in the romance of the novel-reading school. Edith was a great admirer of poetry, and could recite the finest passages from the best authors, and her disposition was light and gay, and exuberantly joyous; still her mind was eminently of a practical turn. Adeline, on the other hand, was more disposed to explore the recondite secrets of philosophy and art, and rarely ventured into the regions of poetry or fiction. Although both sisters were deeply imbued with a religious feeling, all the sentimentality of the family had devolved upon Marcella. She could poetize for an hour upon a moonbeam, and people the deserted Abbey of Hollywood, which adjoined the grounds of the old house, with cowled monks and mitred abbots, receiving homage from proud and lordly barons, and spreading their abundant hospitality before their retainers. Wandering through its desolate aisles, she could recall to fancy the times of the supremacy of the Roman Catholic Church, and sigh for its restoration to its pristine pomp and power. The solid columns and graceful arches of the old abbey suggested to her imagination a hierarchy of scholars and gentlemen, and a respected and venerable priesthood, which once trod its sacred pavements, and chaunted their matin and vesper hymns within its consecrated walls, and her mind would become sad at the recollection of the vulgar dialect and clownish mien of Father Paul O'Reilly and his two curates—Father Walsh, who was suspected of being no votary of temperance, and Father Daveren, who was said to have been surprised in reading along the roads, under cover of his Breviary, love songs, more suited to a gay cavalier than a Christian priest. She could not help sometimes exclaiming, "Ichabod, Ichabod; how is the glory departed from Israel?"

To Edith and Adeline the ruins of the old abbey furnished very different topics for reflection, which, if they were less poetical, were more practical. They in their secret hearts had long since begun to doubt many of the legendary doctrines of the Church, of which it is said, to doubt is to disbelieve. The conviction of error had taken possession of the mind of each, and without direct communication or suggestion from the other. It was a secret hid in the innermost recesses of their minds, of

so terrible a nature, that it seemed fraught with tremendous consequences. The bare idea of apostasy was invested with such apprehensions, that the first doubt was distrusted as a temptation from the evil one. When the doubt became fixed and immoveable, it was regarded as an awful secret, a dread and terrible mystery, to disclose which might conjure up the foul fiend himself from hell.

It was upon an evening in June, as the summer sun was setting in a flood of light behind the hills, and Edith and Adeline were returning homewards after a protracted walk in the adjoining demesne of Admiral Taylor, they sat down to rest on a portion of the old abbey walls. The sisters were repeating some particulars of their conversation with Emily Taylor, their companion in their walk—a wild, giddy girl—who had, perhaps inadvertently, asked them "Had they ever read the Bible?"

"I wonder (said Adeline) what put it into Emily's head to ask such a question?"

"I am sure I cannot tell (replied Edith), but I observed that you, Adeline, avoided the question, and gave her no answer."

"Then, Edith, I think you were equally slow in giving an answer yourself."

Edith and Adeline were mutually silent for some minutes, until Edith said, in a half confidential but decided manner—"The fact, Adeline, is, I have been for some time reading a Bible, and the more I read it the more inclined and resolved I am to read it through, and examine whether what I hear be in accordance with the Bible or not. St. Paul himself praised the Bereans because they searched the Scriptures from day to day, to see whether what he taught was according to them or not; and if an apostle was not offended at his teaching being examined in that way, I fancy that nobody else has a right to complain if theirs be examined."

"I confess," said Adeline, "I have been looking into a Bible myself. It was given to me by Jane Stewart. I met with such a passage in the Acts of the Apostles, and the text so struck me, that I wondered could it be in any Bible but the Protestant Bible; I scarcely believed that it could: so I asked mamma to lend me the large pictorial Bible out of the book-case, and I compared the passages, and, do you know, they are word for word—the same in both—and I can never get it out of my mind why the priests dislike our reading the Bible so much."

"Well, then, Adeline, as you have been reading the Bible as well as I, I will tell you why, I think, the priests make so much work about letting us see the Bible, and why they say so little about the Bible themselves. I suspect, indeed I am quite sure, there are many things which they tell us that cannot be reconciled with the Bible, and that is just the reason why they forbid it to be read without their authority. For my part, let them say what they please, I will read this Bible, and see how these matters stand; and more than that, I will ask Mr. O'Reilly, the first time I see him, in what part of the Bible we are told to pray to the Virgin Mary, or to saints or angels, for it appears to me to be most expressly forbidden to worship any being but God himself, and prayer is an act of worship the most decided we can well offer."

"But, dearest Edith, take care that he does not find out that we have been reading the Protestant Bible, and bring papa's anger down upon us."

"Oh, as to that, as you and I have kept our secret so long and so well from each other, there is no fear but we can keep it from Mr. O'Reilly."

The sisters returned home more thoughtful than usual, but each relieved of a great load, that oppressed her mind, while charged with a secret which she dared not communicate to the other. The tie of mutual confidence was once more restored, and more strongly confirmed than ever, cemented by a new bond of sympathy. Thenceforth they communicated to each other, from day to day, the subject of their thoughts and the result of their inquiries, and found more and more to be dissatisfied with in their earlier instruction. They soon discovered that the grand fundamental doctrine of the New Testament was justification by faith, in the finished work of Jesus Christ, and that the seeking the assistance of saints and angels, and of the Blessed Virgin Mary, was both unscriptural and dishonouring to God himself.

Some weeks after this, Father Paul O'Reilly was a guest at Hollywood, upon a Sunday, as usual, and Edith determined to get near him at the dinner table; and when she found him in the height of good humour, after partaking plentifully of the good things provided, and her father deep in argument with his son-in-law, Mr. Waring, she said—"Sure, sir, we are not required by our Church to pray to saints or angels; are we?"

Now, Father O'Reilly would rather talk of anything in the world than divinity, especially controversial divinity, and most particularly after dinner. It spoiled his digestion, and disturbed that peaceful serenity which he said Providence had provided as a concomitant on a comfortable dinner. He would talk for ever on the quality and body of the Major's port, and the flavour of his grapes and melons, or the chit-chat of the neighbourhood; but anything bordering upon controversy he detested, and considered a most decided bore. But, constrained, in courtesy, to answer Edith's point-blank question, he said—"What makes you ask such a question as that, my dear?"

"Why, sir," said Edith, "it has occurred to me very often that it is a very questionable thing to do, and I wish to know exactly whether it is commanded by the Church or not."

"Well, my dear, it is not exactly commanded by the Church, but it is commended. The Church is a kind and gentle mother, and does not constrain the faithful on such matters. But you know the blessed saints in glory, around the throne of God, and especially the Blessed Virgin, the Mother of God, must have more influence with him, and are purer and more bold to approach him than any sinful creature like you or me can be; and, therefore, it is well to have their intercession with Jesus to make him favourable to us, and it is only for this that we are to pray to them."

"But surely, sir, Jesus himself has told us whosoever cometh unto *me I* will in no wise cast out; and if that be so, why need we go to the saints, instead of to the Saviour direct?"

Father Paul replied, rather impatiently, "That it was quite unnecessary to argue the question, as the Church did not command it, but only recommended it."

And after giving this very unsatisfactory solution of the difficulty, he seized upon a passing observation of the Major to escape from divinity to the more congenial topic of boat racing, then on the *tapis;* the gentlemen discussing a match gotten up under the auspices of Admiral Taylor, Major Marley, and some neighbouring gentlemen, to come off early in the ensuing month.

However, Edith and Adeline were not so easily satisfied as to rest content with Father O'Reilly's explanation. It struck them that it amounted to an admission of connivance and express recommendation of idolatry and creature-worship by those who are so ignorant or superstitious as to practice it, leaving the Church a convenient loop-hole of escape from the charge of error, when confronted with the light of common sense and the plain texts of Scripture.

This set them more and more upon inquiry and diligent examination of the Word of God: with what results we shall state on a future opportunity.

THE TALK OF THE ROAD.—NO. XIV.

"Well, Pat, how is it with you now?" said Jem, when they met next on the road.

"I do'nt know, Jem," said Pat, "I'm down entirely."

"And what are you down for at all," said Jem, "has Father John been at you again?"

"No, Jem, it's not that," said Pat, "it's worse entirely."

"And what's the matter at all?" said Jem.

"Why it's afeard I am that the Bible's setting me astray after all," said Pat.

"And what's the matter at all with the Bible?" said Jem.

"Why it's troubling my mind in me," says Pat. "Sure before I read the Bible, my mind was uneasy enough, not knowing nothing at all; and didn't I think when I'd know the Bible, I'd have no trouble at all; and now my mind is more troubled in me nor ever, and I can't get it quiet at all."

"And what is it that's troubling it at all?" said Jem.

"Why, then, its showing me how wicked I am," said Pat;" and it's showing me how good I ought to be, and how I ought to love God entirely, and do everything in life for the love of God; and, then, it's so hard to love God entirely, and it seems as if my heart couldn't love him at all; and it's telling me to love my enemies, and Father John itself, and it's so hard to do that any way. But it's the badness of my heart entirely that the Bible's showing me, and what will become of me at all if it's so bad? And, then, evermore it's coming into my mind that the Bible is setting me astray."

"Well, Pat," says Jem, "sure you're not that bad; sure you're not worse nor another; sure all the neighbours calls you a decent, quiet, civil boy, and sure you're taken to reading the Bible."

"Well, but it isn't what the neighbours says of me," said Pat; "what does that signify? Isn't it what God says of me, when he looks just straight into my heart? It's that that signifies; and don't I feel entirely that I'm a sinner, and nothing but a sinner? And doesn't the Bible itself say—'The soul that sinneth, the same shall die'—Ezekiel xviii. 4. And isn't that me? And doesn't it say—'The wicked shall be turned into hell;' and don't the Bible show me that I'm wicked, and what will I do at all, at all?"

"Well, Pat," said Jem, "if the Bible isn't agreeing with you, maybe if you just put it away for awhile, you could come back on it again where it wouldn't trouble you so much."

"No, Jem," said Pat, "I can't do that at all. It's taken hold of me, and I can't get shut of it at all; and I wouldn't neither, Jem, for all it's done to me: what would I take to at all? Is it the scapular, or the like of that I'd take to? Or would I take to Father John and his cursing? And sure I can't do without something now. And what can I take to only the Bible? And I'll stick to that, if it kills me; sure *I know* nothing else can do me any good."

"Well, Pat," said Jem, I'm sure the Bible's good too; but why would it trouble you that way, when it does'nt set me astray?"

"And isn't it as bad for you as for me, Jem," said Pat, "does'nt it make us all out to be as bad as other? Doesn't it say, that '*They are all under sin*,' and that every mouth is stopped (Rom. iii. 2, 19), and what *will* we do if not one of us at all can have one word to say at the great judgment of God?"

"Well, Pat" said Jem, "I did'nt think of it rightly before, and I do'nt know what we'll say at all; only this, if we're all that bad, and all sinners entirely, does'nt God mean to save some of us anyway, by Jesus Christ? Sure your not going to say, that there won't be none at all saved by Jesus Christ? and if we're all sinners, sure some of us sinners will be saved by Christ."

"Well, Jem," said Pat, "that's the only thing that stands to me at all; but, somehow, I don't see how that can be, and that's just what I want to come at."

"I'll tell you how we'll get it," said Jem, "won't we just go down to Mr. Owens, and ask him?"

"Well, I'll try that any way," said Pat, "for if any one can show it to us, he will."

So off they went to Mr. Owens. And when they got into his study, he asked them was there anything they wanted to talk about. So Pat let it all out then, and, said he, "your reverence, the Bible's setting me astray entirely."

And how is that," said Mr. Owens.

"Why, your reverence," said Pat, "It's telling me that I'm a sinner entirely, and that all sinners will be turned into hell, and what will I do at all?"

"Well, that's all right so far," said Mr. Owens, "if the Bible didn't tell you that, it would do you no good at all."

"And how's that, your reverence?" said Pat, for he thought it mighty odd.

"Did you know Jemmy Gougerty?" said Mr. Owens.

"Aye, did I," said Pat, "didn't he die in the fever that came after the praties failed?"

"And what about him?" said Mr. Owens.

"Why, he just went raging mad with the fever," said Pat, "and he said he was quite well, better nor ever he was in his life, and that he didn't want a doctor at all."

"And didn't they send for the doctor?" said Mr. Owens.

"No, indeed," said Pat; "for his wife was dead, the creature, and there was none but the childer with him, and when he said he was quite well, they never thought the doctor was wanting at all."

"And the doctor told me, two days after," said Mr. Owens, "that that was just the case, he could have cured, only he never was sent for at all."

"And what has that to do with me and the Bible, your reverence," said Pat.

"Why just this," said Mr. Owens, "that a man ought to know when he is sick and wants the doctor. Are there not many people that are mad about their souls, and don't know that they want Jesus Christ, the great physician of souls, at all?"

"Well, that's me, sure enough, your reverence," said Pat. "I was mad that way long, long enough; and the more I wanted Jesus Christ, the more I didn't know that I wanted him."

"Well, that's just what I mean," said Mr. Owens. "If the Bible didn't make you feel that you are a sinner, and that you want a Saviour, it would just be doing you no good at all."

"Well, it's done that for me, anyway," said Pat. "But how will I be saved, if I'm a sinner? that's just what I want to know."

"Do you know Mr. Nulty?" said Mr. Owens.

"Well, I do," said Pat, "and many's the day I worked for him, and a good man he is."

"Is he good to the beggars?" said Mr. Owens.

"Well, he's mighty hard to them that chooses to live by begging, and won't work at all," said Pat, "but he's the best man at all to them that works hard, and can't do it. Don't I know Pat Flaherty, that works harder than any man in the parish, and didn't his cow die on him, and he hadn't the rent, and wasn't he processed and decreed for it, and hadn't the gripper a hold of him, to take him off to jail; and didn't Mr. Nulty come for'ad in the court, and just lay down the money for him."

"And did the gripper take him to jail then?" said Mr. Owens.

"How could he," said Pat, "when the debt was paid for him?"

"Well, and if Jesus Christ should pay for your sins," said Mr. Owens, "what have you to fear the gripper of souls?"

"Aye, and is that the way, your reverence," said Pat; "well, I'm seeing it now, sure enough."

"Don't read *half* the Bible, Pat," said Mr. Owens, "that's a bad way, read it all; and if it makes you see that you are a sinner, and that you want a Saviour, it will make you see, too, that you have a Saviour, that is able and willing to save you. Just listen to this," said Mr. Owens (and he turned to 1 Tim. i. 15, Douay Bible, and he read), "a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief."

"And who was that, that was chief of sinners?" said Pat.

"It was the great Apostle St. Paul himself, that said that of himself," said Mr. Owens.

"And was he a great sinner?" said Pat.

"He calls himself 'chief of sinners,'" said Mr. Owens; "and look what he says here," said Mr. Owens, and he turned to Acts xxvi. 10, 11—'Many of the saints did I shut up in prison . . . . . and I punished them often in every synagogue, *and compelled them to blaspheme.*'"

"And why did Jesus Christ take him for an apostle if he was that wicked?" said Jem.

"Read the next verse to what we read in the Epistle to Timothy," said Mr. Owens; and he handed the book to Jem (and a Douay Bible it was). So Jem read—"And for this cause have I obtained mercy; that in me first Christ Jesus might show forth all patience, for the information of them that shall believe in him until life everlasting."

"Well," said Pat, "that's good, for there's a pattern that he will save sinners."

"Listen to this," said Mr. Owens, and he read from the Gospel of St. John iii. 16, the words of Christ himself—"'God so loved the world, as to give his only begotten son; that *whosoever* believeth in him, may not perish, but may have life everlasting.'" And then Mr. Owens went on—"Does not this show you that whatever is wanting to bring you to life everlasting, Jesus Christ is willing to do for you?"

"It does, your reverence, and I'd like to know, what he *will* do," said Pat.

"If you believe and trust in him," said Mr. Owens, "he will stand up for you at *the great day*, and say—'I have taken this man's sins upon myself, I have paid for all his sins; and his soul is mine, that I may save it for ever, and won't that do?" said Mr. Owens.

"That's just what I want, your reverence, to make me happy," said Pat.

"Well," said Mr. Owens, "you have read your Bible to some purpose, to see that you want a Saviour; now read your Bible again, to see what that Saviour did for you, and you will find comfort for your soul."

So Pat went home with a hopeful mind that night, and we hope to hear more of his reading yet.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st. No anonymous letter can be attended to. Whatever is sent for insertion must be authenticated by the name and address of the writer, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee for his good faith.

We would request our valued correspondents, both Roman Catholics and Protestants, to limit the length of their communications, and not to discuss a variety of distinct topics in one letter.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, JULY, 1853.

We feel it to be our bounden duty, from time to time, to give our readers satisfactory proof that they do right in reading our paper.

Our paper is an appeal to our fellow countrymen to consider, calmly and seriously, the questions which concern their souls and ours. Thousands have responded to our call, and do read our paper; and many Roman Catholics, as well as Protestants, do promote our object, by their contributions to our pages.

We do not wish that they should read our discussions with an uneasy mind, uncertain whether they are doing right or not. We know that many are warned against reading the Catholic Layman, as if the very act of doing so were a sin. The warning rests upon such arguments as this—that they who have the truth, should never condescend to argue or discuss with those that have not; that it is like putting truth and falsehood on a a level; that discussion always leads to error and not to truth, and therefore that Catholics should never argue or discuss religious matters with heretics.

There is another argument sometimes urged against discussion—that it excites angry and uncharitable feelings and passions. We are no way afraid of this charge been made against us; we leave it to our readers to say whether we are liable to it. But the arguments above mentioned may cause some to read us with an uneasy conscience, and it is for them we now write.

They are not only told that Catholics should avoid all discussion with heretics, but they see this example now everywhere set by Roman Catholic priests. This was not always so; in our own day there have been "discussions," "Pope and Maguire," "the Downpatrick discussion," "Gregg and Maguire," and many others besides. But latterly the priests have shrunk from all discussion. It is not for want of being invited; their ablest men are now everywhere invited to discussion by the clergy of the Church of England and Ireland. Their travelling missionaries, Lockhart and Rinolfi, Dr. Cahill, Dr. Marshall, and various others, have been repeatedly invited to discussion of late, and everywhere they decline. It is clear that they are resolved not to venture into discussion again; and there seems to be much reason to think that the Pope and the Bishops have forbidden them to do so; and it is since they have adopted this new plan that we hear all the arguments to prove that it is wrong for "Catholics" to enter into any discussion with those whom they think in error.

Now, we think, two things are plain from this—1st, That they feel that discussion of their reasons and ours, will injure their cause, and advance ours; for, if they thought that discussion would serve their cause and injure ours, they would, no doubt, come forward to discuss with us. 2nd, Their reasons are only invented to serve a purpose, since, up to a few years ago, they never thought it wrong to enter into discussion.

Our object now is to show our readers that discussion and examination of the reasons on both sides, was never thought wrong by Catholics in ancient times, while the Church held fast to the faith contained in the Scriptures; but that, on the contrary, it was always the true Catholics who invited discussion and sought for it, and it was always those who were engaged in upholding error that cried out against discussion, and that said that they who had the truth should not discuss with those who had it not.

We have a striking instance in the conduct of one of the greatest, and best, and wisest of the Fathers (perhaps the greatest of them all), St. Augustine, in which he was joined by no less than 266 bishops of the Church of Africa.

No case could better serve to illustrate our discussions now; for the question in Africa then was, as it now is with us—"Which is the true Church?" Is it not interesting to us now to see how the Catholic Church in Africa, under the guidance of St. Augustine, dealt with such a question nearly 1,500 years ago? Is it not interesting to see whether Catholics then thought it right to discuss such a question with those who differed from them, and to see how they discussed it?

The facts were these: Donatus had got himself ordained Bishop of Carthage, where Cecilian was Bishop already, under pretence that Cecilian had fallen off from the Catholic Church. Hence arose two rival communions, which soon spread over all Africa. In the province of Numidia the Donatists became more numerous than the Catholics.

The Donatists boasted that they only were the Church; they only had Bishops; they only had the truth. The Catholics made no such claim. They acknowledged the Donatists as brethren, though erring.

The Donatists scorned to discuss the question, "which was the true Church," with those whom they did not acknowledge to be a Church at all, just as the Roman Catholic priests in Ireland do now. The true Catholics continually invited the Donatists to discussion, and at last succeeded in forcing them to it.

We possess a report of the proceedings at this discussion. We quote it from the valuable collection of councils made by two French Jesuits, Labbé and Cossart, vol. ii., p. 1336, &c. Ed. Paris, 1672.

About 266 Catholic Bishops were engaged in it, and perhaps nearly as many Donatist Bishops. Fourteen managers were appointed on each side, St. Augustine being one of the fourteen for the Catholics.

The Donatists, when at last compelled, by the Emperor's order, to attend, did everything to make delay and difficulty, and to evade discussion. They said (cap. 4, p. 1419), that "they were forbidden by the divine law to sit down in the same place with their opponents;" while the Catholics were willing to sit down with them.

Marcellinus, the tribune and notary, who conducted the proceedings, proposed that each party should sign their name to a report of what they said, so that they might not be able to deny it afterwards (c. 13). St. Augustine answered that his party had already bound themselves in writing to do so (c. 14). The Donatists refused to do so (c. 16). We have seen such things at discussions in Ireland.

When the Donatists were driven to say something for themselves, it consisted wholly of bold and confident assertions, for which they gave no proof; such as this—, *We say* that we are Bishops of the truth of our Lord Christ (c. 10)." To which the Catholics replied, "there is need *to prove* that they are Bishops of the truth, and not *to boast* of it" (c. 11).

The Catholics were equally anxious to avoid all excuses for delay. Thus, when the Donatists objected to their opponents assuming to themselves the name of Catholic, saying that the right to that name was in dispute between them, St. Augustine avoids using that word in the discussion, saying—"they object to the Catholic Church, or—that I may speak without controversy—the Church which we hold" (c. 226). Would any Roman Catholic priest go this far now to promote discussion?

We might illustrate our Irish controversies, in a variety of particulars, from this most interesting discussion at Carthage, but we must be brief. The following speech of St. Augustine shows the whole state of the case, and allows us to proceed to the great question, and how he dealt with it:—

"It was to the Catholic Bishops (*i. e.*, at their request) that the holding of this discussion was granted. The Emperor's decree proves this. We have both come; here we are; and *God has commanded us to be disputers and discussers* rather than goers to law; and the Emperor, who fears and serves God, wishes for nothing else. Let nothing be introduced which is not necessary to the business. . . . . How long shall this so great expectation of the people be kept in suspense? All are thinking about their souls; and we are hitherto creating delays, that we should never come to the end of knowing the truth!"—c. 21.

But the manner in which St. Augustine and the Catholics dealt with the question itself is worthy of notice above all. From first to last they maintained and asserted, over and over again, that the question—"Which is the true Church?"—was to be settled *by the Scriptures alone.*

Thus Fortunatianus, one of the Catholic managers, says to the Donatists:—"We show the Catholic Church from the law (Moses), the prophets, the evangelists, the Psalms, and all the divine writings. . . . . We bring forward the Gospel to show the Church with you."

And St. Augustine himself (c. 101)—"We hold that Church which we find in those Scriptures, in which we also have learned Christ. Forasmuch as our Scriptures, to the authority of

which both parties are subject, commend to us CHRIST and his Church as a holy marriage—CHRIST the bridegroom, she the bride; where we learn of Him, there also we should find her. If, therefore, we have now arisen, and consider to what communion of Christians in Africa we should be joined, beyond all doubt, we should hold to that which we find in the Scriptures." And again (c. 187)—"If, therefore, it be inquired concerning the Church—What it is? How great it is? What sort it is? the Divine Scriptures alone are sufficient to point her out."

It is equally remarkable that St. AUGUSTINE nowhere appeals to Rome or to the Bishop of Rome, to decide which was the true Church. No such notion appears in this discussion. But when the Donatists wanted to make out that CECILIAN was the father and head of the Catholics in Africa, St. AUGUSTINE, instead of saying (as some would now say) that the Pope was the head of their Church, answers thus: "We call those fathers, for the sake of honour, who have gone before us either in time or merit. It is otherwise when we come to inquire whom we have as father, in respect of the faith; whom we have as father in respect of life everlasting; whom we have as father in respect of *holding to the Church, and possessing the promises of God.*" To all this he answers, "I have a Head, but He is CHRIST."

It seems St. AUGUSTINE knew nothing of "CHRIST's Vicar upon earth."

What St. AUGUSTINE thought of the necessity of obedience to the Pope, we will show some other time. We conclude here with the testimony of another great Catholic Bishop, OPTATUS, of Milevis, who worked with St. AUGUSTINE against these same Donatists:—"No tribunal can be found on earth concerning this question; a judge must be sought from heaven. But why need we reach to heaven, when we have his testament here in the Gospel?—(De Schis. Don., l. v., c. 3.)

Our readers may wish to know, what was the result of this famous discussion. Orders were given that this discussion should be read in all the Churches every year; and, in a short time, it came to pass, that the Donatist Church dwindled away to nothing, and there was again but one Church in Africa.

If Roman Catholic priests dare not now follow St. AUGUSTINE's example in discussion, if they cannot hope to produce the same results, it is principally because they cannot use the same means—they cannot prove their Church out of the Scriptures alone.

We trust we have now done something to satisfy our readers that discussion is right, and to show them also on what principles it should proceed; and we simply ask, can they wish for a greater authority than St. AUGUSTINE?

ON THE INTERNAL EVIDENCES OF THE CATHOLIC RELIGION.

IN returning to the consideration of Mr. M'Manus's letter, we desire to repeat, in the first instance, our deep conviction that any religion which does not claim to be the religion of the heart—which does not apply the strongest and highest motives to move the affections of the heart—can have little claim to be from God (for "God is love"—1 John iv. 8), and little deserves to find acceptance among men.

We also desire to repeat our conviction that a religion can possess no stronger internal evidence than its suitability to the wants of fallen man; while, each day, reflection makes us feel more strongly that the fact of a religion meeting all the *wishes* of our fallen nature should make us very suspicious of the snares of Satan, who first planted those wishes in our breasts, and whose best weapon against us is still to make false promises of supplying them all.

Our business now, in reference to Mr. M'Manus's letter, is to enquire, 1st, which the Church of England or of Rome sets before men the highest motives to move the deepest affections of the heart of man; 2nd, which proposes the religion most suited to supply his real wants; 3rd, which is clearest of the charge of conciliating the *wishes* of a fallen nature, by making offers and provisions which God has not made.

Mr. M'Manus has compared the two churches, in reference to the first and second of these points; and it is necessary that we should follow him in this: we trust that he will think that we only complete the subject of his letter in adding the third.

With respect to the first question: "which religion sets before men the highest motives to move the deepest affection of the heart?" we ask Mr. M'Manus to consider, in the first place, that the two churches agree in some things, and differ in others. Now, if the things in which the two churches do agree, be, indeed, the highest motives to work upon the deepest affections of man's heart, then, the only question is, which church puts these things forward most prominently—which church gives them the chiefest place—which is most careful that all should know them—which is most careful that nothing else should supplant those things in the hearts and affections of men? But, if the things which the Church of Rome holds, and which the Church of England rejects, be, indeed, the things which Mr. M'Manus thinks are those which apply the highest motives to move men's love to God, then we must enquire, whether these things be, indeed, from God? for, if not, Mr. M'Manus must be mistaken; for we expect he will admit, frankly, that those things which are revealed by God to lead our hearts and draw our love to him, must be fitter for that purpose (whether we at present see it or not) than any inventions which men have made for moving our affections. The waters of Jordan *were* really better than the rivers of Abana and Pharphar for cleansing the leprosy of Naaman, whether he saw the reason or not; and though he saw not this reason at first, yet, doubtless, he saw it afterwards; and we see now that the choice of Jordan was really suited to direct his heart aright to God, for it pointed to the God of Israel. (See 2 Kings v.—4th Kings, Douay Bible.)

How, then, stands the case between the churches—in what do they agree—in what do they differ?

In what do they agree? We must be very brief—but the greatest and noblest things bear brevity best—it is enough to say what they are.

Hear the words of our Blessed Saviour's own appeal to men to draw their hearts by love to God, through him:—"For God so loved the world as to give his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him may not perish, but may have life everlasting."—(1 John iii. 16.)

Is this no appeal to "the heart of a poor penitent, gushing with feelings of sorrow and contrition, and groaning under the burden of sin?" Can it do nothing to move our hearts with love towards God? Let St. John, "that disciple whom Jesus loved" (John xxi. 20), and who was himself in consequence, in an especial manner, "the Apostle of love," answer this question—"Let us, therefore, love God, because God first hath loved us."—(1 John iv. 19.)

Does Mr. M'Manus see no force in this appeal to the best affections of a soul groaning under the burden of sin? or will he say that this is a mere "dry and barren abstraction of a deity." We ask him to consider who brings this message of love and grace from God to man: it is the man Jesus Christ; himself perfect man, as well as perfect God. "*In all things* made like unto *his brethren*, that he might become a *merciful* and faithful high priest before God, that he might be a propitiation for the sins of the people; for in that wherein he himself hath suffered and been tempted, he is able to succour them also that are tempted."

It is not easy nor possible to express the comfort that God's children feel in every trial, in looking to a Saviour who has felt every trial, bodily and spiritual, that they can feel (though always without sin), and for this reason, that they might look to him as one *who can feel for them.* Such a Saviour is to them no "dry and barren abstraction of a deity;" he brings the very essence of the Godhead himself within the reach and comprehension of their love.

In this great object, and these effectual motives of love towards God, both churches professedly agree. We have quoted from the Roman Catholic Bible, which suits our purposes here as well as the authorized version of the Church of Rome.

Our heaviest complaint against Rome is this: that professing to believe such things as these, she does not rely simply on them to move men's love to God; but, treating them with cold neglect, she multiplies all other means, of human invention, of moving the affections of men.

How does Mr. M'Manus judge of these things? The two churches agree in these things: yet Mr. M'Manus condemns the one, notwithstanding that her great and chief object is to hold up Christ the Saviour as the true object of the love and adoration of men. He extols the other, *not* because she proposes such objects and motives of love, but because she has "a sublime ritual—fasts and penances—intercessory offerings for departed souls—saints and intercessors interceding in the presence of God—devotions to the Virgin Mother of God," all of which, he says, are but so many links of the chain whereby the faith which he professes is entwined around the deepest principles of our nature."

Did the blessed Apostles know how to preach that faith; or how to move men's hearts with love to God? And was it upon these things that they relied? In all the accounts that Scripture gives of their earnest preaching (that preaching which converted the world)—in all their earnest and affectionate letters to their converts, we find *no mention of these things.* Mr. M'Manus, himself, admits in his letter—"it must be confessed that you have proved how little evidence is to be derived from the ancient fathers in support of the reverence which the Catholic Church has always paid to the Blessed Virgin, and other important doctrines which we are taught to believe." And yet he makes these things (which must be, by this admission, mere inventions of men in later times) the test of the religion of the heart, to the utter forgetting of the grace and mercy which God has revealed to us through Jesus Christ our Saviour! He still suffers from the practical teaching of the Church of Rome. She has laboured to keep these human inventions ever before his eyes—she has coldly neglected to set Christ, his nature, his office, his character, and his grace and mercy before him; and he does not yet see how wonderfully suited the Saviour is, as shewn to us in Scripture, to draw to himself every affection of the hearts of sinners oppressed with the sense of sin.

But, why did he not bring forward *more* "links of the chain" by which his faith is "entwined around the deepest principles of our nature." Why did he not bring forward the scapular and all the lying stories connected with it, so sedulously used to touch the hearts of the Irish peasantry—why did he not bring forward the holy coat of Treves, the winking picture of Rimini, the fanatical delusions of the "Adolorata" and Estatica," by which the Church of Rome imposed on the heart of the late Earl of Shrewsbury? Why not mention the countless succession of lying wonders which the Church of Rome, in all latter ages, has produced or countenanced—why not all the legends of the Breviary, which the Roman priests are bound to study? Why, in fine, has he not said that the Church of Rome, in our own day, is continually producing a succession of such lying wonders, to touch the hearts of her children, whenever she sees their zeal to flag (as in the Rimini pictures, and other cases above mentioned)?

Are not these things the strongest evidence that she has not the religion of the heart to rely on—that she feels the necessity of a constant production of the inventions of men, to keep up anything like popular devotion? Seriously, we ask Mr. M'Manus if all this be preferable to fixing all our hearts and hopes upon the life and death of Christ for us?

Mr. M'Manus speaks of the sincere and pious men in his communion who have felt the internal conviction of its truth. What we have said of the great things in which the Church of Rome professes to agree with us, may leave us room to hope that some in that Church do find what satisfies their hearts, in spite of the coldness of their Church about it. But the question is, do they find this in what the Churches agree in, or in the things which Mr. M'Manus thinks so important and which we reject? We thank Mr. M'Manus for his instances: he produces Fenelon and Pascal—the latter is, perhaps, the recluse of Port Royal, the disciple of St. Cyran; a member of a community which all zealous Roman Catholics at this day are agreed in calling heretics, because they rejected the decrees of Popes, and neglected the inventions of their Church, to fix all their thoughts upon Christ and his grace as they found them in the Bible; and sore and long their persecutions were at the hands of Rome for this their choice. Fenelon, also, was a man of like spirit, and suffered for it too. Why does Mr. M'Manus take his instances of genuine love to God in members of his Church, from among those who came nearest to us—who thought the least of the things he boasts of, and who dwelt the most on the great things we hold? Is it not a plain confession that these are, indeed, the things that can fill our hearts with love, and make our profiting appear to all?

Mr. M'Manus has much to learn, if he really believes what he says, of what the Church of England and Ireland offers to meet the intense cravings of a soul burdened with a sense of sin—"You tell him that penances are unavailing" (and so they are, indeed, *to atone for sin*)—"that priestly absolution is but an empty sound" (we tell him that the ministers of the Church are God's ambassadors, and that to them the ministry of reconciliation is committed. 2 Cor. v. 18, 19, 20.) "You forbid him to turn his thoughts to the sainted martys and confessors" (nay, rather we point to that "so great a cloud of witnesses" to make him "look to Jesus" as they also looked. Hebrews xii. 12.) "You think it rank idolatry to fly for refuge to the Blessed Mother of God (we do; for Christ himself is the refuge set before us). "And what do you offer him instead? You give him the Thirty-nine Articles! You set before his mind a dry and barren abstraction of a deity, enveloped in a cloudy maze of dogmatic theology." So Mr. M'Manus asks and answers. Nay, nay, it is not so; we call God to witness. The Church of Rome, indeed, propounds Pope Pius's Creed to any restless soul that seeks for peace in her communion; and refuses any hope of comfort till the poor wanderer swallows every article, with all that is in it, and all that is *not in it.* But not so we. We highly prize the Thirty-nine Articles for their own purpose; but we do not offer that formulary to a convert, much less to one seeking the cleansing of his soul from sin. We show him Christ, as Christ showed himself on earth: we show him the man Christ Jesus, meek and lowly, dwelling among men; sharing all their sorrows, healing all their infirmities, bearing with all their contradictions, and giving himself to die for their sins. We show his gracious words, "come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden and I will give you rest."—Matt. xi. 28. We shew his sacred promise, "Him that cometh to me *I will not cast out.*"—John vi. 37. We point to Christ as still the same, yesterday, and to-day, and for ever.—Hebrews xiii.

8. We point to him still, as one who, in his human nature, feels for our infirmities; as interceding for us *now* in Heaven before God, and, therefore, able "to save for ever them that come to God by him."—Hebrews vii. 25. We think him the great end and object of all love; and the great object of all our labours is, that nothing else shall stand between, to prevent the groaning sinner looking straight to this great high priest.

Is it of this that Mr. M'Manus means to say; "as well might you hold forth an empty vessel to the parched and thirsty wanderer in the desert, as tell the sorrowing and heavy laden soul to be content with such a religion as this!" Is Christ the Saviour, "in whom all fullness dwells," this empty vessel! or shall we turn from Him who is the Well of Life, to the broken cisterns which men have made, which hold no water?

We might well meet Mr. M'Manus on the practical results of the two systems. He asks—"How rarely do they (in the Church of England) turn to religion for comfort and consolation, under the trials and calamities of life." We thank God we could show him multitudes who draw comfort and support in every trial from the Word and the ministry of reconciliation. But the religion of the heart is not paraded. All outward parade and show is but evidence of heartfelt want within.

But we must ever protest against religion being judged of by the conduct of those who are indifferent to religion; a class too sadly large in every Church and creed. The increasing multitude of Roman Catholics who never go to confession is an instance in point; a stronger instance still we noticed in our number for September last: It is a fact that of Irish Roman Catholics who go to America, not one-fourth continue Roman Catholics there. We gave the testimony of an Irish priest, from his own observation on the spot, that *two millions* have been lost in this way! What a commentary on Irish Romanism as the religion of the heart!

We shall consider in our next number which religion best meets the wants and wishes of our fallen nature. In the mean time we ask Mr. M'Manus to study the character of the man Christ Jesus, as given to us in the Bible, and consider whether that be not an object capable of moving and supplying every feeling of love of which his heart is capable; and whether it be not true that the more perfectly a religion relies on this best and greatest object, the more truly it becomes "the religion of the heart."

Correspondence.

ON THE VISIBILITY OF THE CHURCH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Instead of sending a copy of my mislaid letter, I beg most respectfully to draw your attention to a synopsis of my arguments and objections compressed within the narrow compass of a sheet of letter paper. My sole object being the investigation of truth, and feeling an earnest desire (one, I think, which ought to be very generally participated in) of knowing the best that can be said on the opposite side, in this enlightened age, respecting the visibility of the Church, I also beg you will address yourself to the real difficulty, in a manner befitting the importance of the subject, without diverging into extraneous topics. I have particularly to request that you will not attempt to hide the real state of the question; truth loses nothing by being seen in its own native colours. If you have God's truth, why not support it powerfully? and if you are in error, why should you impose on your own soul if you would not be classed with those persons of whom our Saviour says, that they had closed their eyes, and that their ears were dull of hearing.—See Matt. xiii. 14, 15.

In the LAYMAN for January, 1853, page 10, column 2, you say you have no difficulty in showing the perpetuity and visibility of the Church; this, then, being an admitted principle between us, I call upon you to show where your Church existed in the days of Berengarius (circiter, A. D., 1040). 2adly—I call upon you to say whether Berenger, or the various councils, churches, bishops, and ecclesiastics that condemned him, constituted the true Church of Christ? 3rdly—If Berenger were the true Church, where was the true Church before he began to broach his errors (A.D., 1016)? and also when he recanted and abjured his errors, and died a penitent Roman Catholic? 4thly—In the LAYMAN for September 1852, page 104, column 2, you say—"The Christian Church had never wholly revolted from God; God had never abandoned her; the fundamentals of Christianity—the means of salvation were preserved in her." You mean, of course, the Roman Church, and the other churches in communion with her, which you here seemingly admit to be the true Church of Christ—"Fair as the moon, bright as the sun, terrible as an army with banners."—See Canticles vi. 9. I call upon you to reconcile these expressions with her being "The Scarlet Lady, 'fallen into grievous and damnable errors,' and drunk with the blood of the saints and martyrs of Jesus." 5thly—Berenger was bound to hear the Church, according to Mat. xviii. 17; to obey his prelates, according to Heb. xiii. 7, 17. Where were these prelates and that Church? 6thly—I call upon you to point out the congregation of faithful men among whom the pure Word of God was preached, and the sacraments duly administered, in the days of Berengarius, according to the 19th Article of the Church of England.

These are the points I urged in my first letter, and I beg most respectfully to say, that in your answer you have evaded them by attacking the doctrine of Images, the Creed of Pope Pius, &c. It seems your correspondents must confine themselves to one topic, whilst you are at liberty to ramble; this plan, if not very honourable, is, at least, very convenient no doubt.

You say Mat. xviii. 17 refers to the offences of one man against another, which the Church was bound to reconcile (See No. for January, 1853, page 10, column 1). Much more, I argue, should she strive to reconcile those individuals to God, who may have offended him by errors in faith or doctrine, and, on the same principle, they were bound to hear; but your exposition of the passage is—"Hear the Church in petty disputes, and matters of minor importance; but if matters of faith or doctrine happen to be agitated, follow your own peculiar whims and fancies." I shall, at present, make no farther comment upon this very popular explanation, which aims at the subversion of all Church authority.

Respecting Heb. xiii. 7, 17, you cannot deny that the prelates here alluded to had the true faith, and that the people were bound to follow them. In like manner, in the time of Berengarius some prelates must have had the true faith, and he was bound to follow them; or there was no visible Church of Christ. I call upon you, again, to point out these prelates, as I have frustrated your attempts at explaining away the above passages of Scripture.

You argue thus:—"The doctrine for which Berengarius was condemned was not in such or such a Creed, *ergo*, it formed no portion of the faith of the Church; it was but the private opinion of particular doctors and individual bishops." I argue *contra*. Your Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is not contained in the Nicene, the Athanasian, or the Apostles' Creed, hence, upon your own principles, you should have only one sacrament of the New Law, or else your arguments from the Creeds goes for nothing at all.

Lastly—I call upon you, most emphatically, as the onus lies upon you, to prove that the councils, churches, bishops, and ecclesiastics, that condemned Berengarius, were merely particular doctors and individual bishops, as you assert in the No. for January, 1853, of your periodical, page 10, column 2; and that the great majority of the visible Church supported the opinions of Berengarius.

I now proceed to anticipate some arguments which you may be expected to adduce; just merely to prevent you from wasting time at them, and to compel you to bring forward better, if you have any such in your theological armoury.

First Kings xix. 14, 18 is quoted to show, by analogy, that, as 7,000 faithful existed unknown to even Elijah the prophet: even so the Christian Church may be hidden in the days of Berengarius. I deny the analogy, for three reasons: first, Ahab, king of Israel, and Asa, king of Judah, were cotemporaries (see 1 Kings xvi. 29); and, though Ahab persecuted and exterminated the prophets, still the Church flourished at the same time under good King Asa, in Judah (see 1 Kings xv. 11, 14), the Jewish Church then was not invisible. Secondly, Elijah must have known that Obadiah, the governor, had concealed the prophets by fifties in caves (1 Kings, xviii. 13). And lastly, and principally, we have the infallible Word of the living God, that 7,000 faithful existed at that time in Israel (see 1 Kings xix. 18). Now, as we have no such assurance respecting your Church in the days of Berengarius, I maintain that I have smashed for ever, this argument from analogy.

Next, Protestants have recourse to the expedient of a church within a church, saying that the true believers were mixed up with those of the Romish communion, like the tares and the wheat (see Mat. xiii. 24, 30); but it cannot be alleged that either the wheat or the tares were invisible, so here again the analogy ceases, and this theory is liable to all my former objections from the invisibility; and if Protestants cannot point out any distinct party, it is evident, their church if any previously existed, had become invisible and contradicted our first principle and postulate: "that the Church of Christ is perpetual and always visible."

Mat. xxiii. 2, 3, is quoted to prove that a church may be still the Church of Christ, though "fallen into grievous and damnable errors." Now the errors of the Scribes and Pharisees consisted in their pride, ambition, covetousness, and hypocrisy, against which the eight woes are denounced in the Gospel (see Mat. xiii. 13, 36, and Luke xi. 37, 52). Had they erred in doctrine our Saviour would not have commanded the people to hear them, as he did in the passage so infelicitously quoted by our adversaries; and though the Jewish rulers were, generally speaking, very wicked, there were bright exceptions: Zacharias and Elizabeth—see Luke i. 6, 67; Mary and Joseph—Mat. i. 19, 20; holy Simeon—Luke ii. 25, 26; the prophetess Anna—Luke ii. 36, 37—*cum multis aliis*, and not to speak of John the Baptist or of the light of the world, Jesus Christ; but who was there to protest against the pretended innovations of Rome, at the period I have selected, except that weathercock, Berengarius, who abjured and relapsed so often.

It is vain, Mr. Editor, to try to embarrass me with the creed of Pope Pius. I beg to remind you of the old adage: "*Nihil agit qui item lite resolvit.*" You are bound not only to prove your own position but to answer the objections stated against it. If you show a disposition to do so by clear and logical deductions, and by Scripture references, as I am, in my humble sphere, a friend to free discussion, I will, from time to time, submit to you my crude arguments and objections, upon several other controverted points; but if you continue to evade, or to hide the real state of the question, as I said before, I shall feel myself at liberty to conclude that the defeat is in the cause and not in the advocate.

With unfeigned thanks for your attention to my communications, I beg to subscribe myself

Φιλαληθης.

The subject of the visibility of the Church is one which we willingly admit to be discussed in our pages. It is, however, an inconvenience that our correspondent should insist on discussing it upon a case (that of Berengarius) out of which no question arises about the visibility of the Church. It is rather hard to ask us to say which, Berengarius or his opponents, were the true Church, when they both professed to belong to the same Church. The Pope and Council drew up a recantation for Berengarius, and they began it thus—"I, Berengarius, an unworthy deacon of the Church of St. Mauritius of Andegave, &c.;" in which it is clear that they looked on Berengarius as a deacon of the same Church as themselves. If Berengarius had been asked—"Which are you or your opponents the true Church?" he would, no doubt, have answered—"We are both members of the same Church, and the only question between us is, which states the doctrine of that Church most correctly." We really can give no other answer to the same question. We do not see how any question arises out of this, as to the *visibility* of the Church; though we do see a great question as to *how far* individuals are bound to believe and profess in the words which any bishop or any number of bishops choose to dictate to them.

The only way we can deal with our correspondent's letter is, first, to state plainly what we believe as to the visibility of the Church of Christ; and then to show whether Berengarius was bound, or not, to adopt the recantation dictated to him.

We believe, then, that the visibility of the church consists in a lawful succession of bishops, clergy, and people, professing the articles of the Christian faith, as contained in the Catholic creeds. We believe that in all ages, throughout the world, there has been such a succession of bishops, clergy, and people professing those creeds. The whole of these, as existing at any one time, we take to be "the visible Church of Christ on earth." We believe that Christ always has had, and always will have, such a Church.

So our correspondent has given himself a very needless trouble in finding arguments for us to prove that Christ might have no visible Church on earth.

We do not hold that every error held by individual bishops, or number of bishops, or even by particular churches (as the Churches of Jerusalem, Rome, Antioch, &c.), destroys the visibility of Christ's Church on earth; although such errors do deface the purity of those particular churches, and make them less worthy of Christ. The visible Church of Christ, *as a whole*, has never professed anything but the Catholic creeds.

Our correspondent has mistaken the meaning of the 19th Article of the Church of England and Ireland, which describes "*the* visible Church of Christ" as "a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached," &c. This is the highest notion we can form of the visible church, one which should be ever in our minds. So far as particular churches come up to this, they have a good claim to be parts of the visible Church of Christ; so far as they come short of this, their claim is weakened and obscured. But this article does *not* mean that *every* departure *in any degree*, from that "pure Word of God," does wholly separate from the visible Church of God: and this is perfectly clear from the latter part of that same article itself, "as the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred; so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of communion, but also in matters of faith;" so it is clear from the article itself, that a church may entertain some errors, even in matters of faith, and yet not wholly cease to be a visible church.

On these principles, we have no difficulty in answering our correspondent's question, "where the visible Church of Christ was in the days of Berengarius?" It was all over the world, wherever there were bishops, clergy, and people, professing the Catholic creed as their faith.

And even though the Church of Rome, and all churches then in communion with her, should have perished, or utterly fallen from the faith, Christ would still have had a visible church on earth; for there were then, as there are now, churches at Alexandria, Jerusalem, Antioch, Constantinople, and all over the east, churches not in communion with Rome, yet, perhaps, greater in extent and numbers, and some of them older than she. So little difficulty have we in answering this question.

And here we must protest against the construction which our correspondent puts upon the words he quotes from the LAYMAN of September, 1852, p. 104—"The Christian Church had never wholly revolted from God; God had never abandoned her; the fundamentals of Christianity—the means of salvation, were preserved in her." On this our correspondent observes, "you mean, of course,

the Roman Church, and the other churches in communion with her, which you here seemingly admit to be the true Church of Christ." We spoke plainly, and evidently of *the whole church*, and our correspondent says, "of course, you mean a part only!"

Now, this is really very unfair, and it is hard to argue on such terms. But we are quite sure our correspondent meant no unfairness. The fact is, Roman Catholics are so drilled into the habit of taking a part for the whole themselves, that they think every one else must do so too. But it really is time for them to look at this great fact, that the Greek and Eastern Churches are really existing, though not in communion with Rome, that they are, perhaps, equal to her in numbers, some of them superior in antiquity, and all of them superior to her in having preserved the Catholic creed without mixture or addition. It is time for them to learn that a part is *not* the whole.

We trust, we have clearly answered the question as to the visibility of the Church. We have nothing to add, except that we do not think that perseverance in error, when it has once crept in, is necessary to the succession or continuance of a church. On this ground we hold that the present Church of England and Ireland is the same church that existed in these countries before the Reformation; the succession of bishops, clergy, and people professing the same creed, having been then continued, and nothing done but the removal of errors which had crept in.

Now for the only question that really arises out of the case of Berengarius. Are individuals, clergy or laymen, bound to profess anything or everything that any bishop, or any number of bishops may choose to dictate to them? This is really the question that arises out of the case of Berengarius; it is a question of the *infallibility*, not of the *visibility* of the Church. To this we auswer, that persons are not so bound to receive everything that bishops may propose to them. But, we do not, on the other hand, adopt the alternative offered to us by Philalethes, that every one is to follow "his own peculiar whims and fancies." A line must he drawn somewhere; this is the way we draw the line; all Christian people are bound to follow the prelates and clergy of the Church, in that faith which Christ and his Apostles delivered to the Church; but if prelates and clergy require people to believe other articles of faith besides what Christ and his Apostles delivered to the Church, then we are bound to refuse to adopt such things as our faith. Does Philalethes deny or adopt this rule? Does he believe everything that every pope or bishop, or council has said? If we do, we promise him a nice collection. If he do not, can he draw the line better than we have drawn it?

We said, and say again, that, Matthew xviii. 17, "to hear the Church," applies only to offences of one man against another; we say so, because our Saviour said so; for he expressly gives that direction to meet this case, and this only—"If thy brother shall offend against thee"—(v. 15, Douay Bible). But Philalethes says of it "much more *I argue*," should the Church govern men's faith; but *his arguments* are not Christ's words; and we must beg leave to take that passage simply as Christ spoke and applied it. The other passage he quotes—"Obey your prelates" (Hebrews xiii. 17.) is more to the purpose. We accept that passage as binding us to obey prelates, declaring to us the faith which Christ and his Apostles gave. The same Apostle who gave us that precept has told us also—"Be ye followers of me *as I also am of Christ*"—1 Cor. xi. 1. But he has told us also—"Though we, or an angel from heaven, were to preach a Gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema"—Gal. i. 8. We do not understand St. Paul's precept—"Obey your prelates," as giving those prelates a higher power over our faith, than St. Paul claimed for himself; we, therefore, think that we are to follow prelates "as they follow Christ"—that is, in all things in which they follow him; but if any prelates should preach other doctrine to us, than Christ delivered to his Church, we are to connt those prelates anathema.

But one clear case in which Philalethes himself must say that a pope and a council required a man to profess what no Catholic can or ought to believe, will, perhaps, have as much weight as many arguments. Such a case we have at hand; it is the case of Berengarius, which he brings up to us. We have before us the recantation which Pope Nicholas and his council compelled Berengarius to sign. That recantation was put into the canon law, and we quote it from the canon law, so there is no mistake—Decret. de consecrat. Dist. ii c. 42. It runs thus:—The true Body and Blood of Christ is said to be "*in a sensible manner* (sensualiter) handled by the hands of the priest, broken, and ground by the teeth of the faithful." Now the only possible meaning that can be given to the word "sensualiter" is this: that the Body of Christ is handled, broken, and eaten, in a way that our senses can judge of and perceive; that it becomes the object of the senses; in other words, that the priest *knows by the feel*, and those who eat *know by the taste*, that it is the true Body of Christ! Yet, if Philalethes ask any Roman Catholic priest or bishop now whether this doctrine be true, that our senses can discern the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament, he will be told that this is downright heresy, and not the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church; for that our senses can perceive nothing but the accidents of bread and wine; and cannot perceive the body and blood of Christ at all; and that it is heresy to say that the body and blood are in the bread and wine "sensualiter," or in a way that our senses can perceive.

Yet this is the doctrine that Pope Nicholas and the Council compelled Berengarius to subscribe!

We are not the first to discover that the plain sense of this recantation is not only contrary to our senses, but is heretical according to the Church of Rome itself. We have said that this recantation stands in the Canon Law, into which Gratian put it. The authorised editions of that law have generally printed with them a commentary called "the gloss," and the gloss says of these words of the recantation—"Nisi sane intelligas verba Berengarii, in majorem incides hæresin quam ipse habuit;" that is, "unless you understand the words of Berengarius in *a sound sense*, you will fall into a greater heresy than his"! Admitting that the natural and obvious meaning of these words is heresy; and showing that these words must be twisted some way to get rid of the heresy. But there is no way of doing it; the words have one meaning only, and can have no other; that meaning is heresy in the Church of Rome itself!

The fact is, that Pope Nicholas and his council were mere bunglers; they did not rightly understand the Popish doctrine; and it was hard for them, for that doctrine was not settled until afterwards; and hence the difficulty that later authorities found in taking their words "in a sound sense."

Poor "Weathercock Berengarius, who abjured and relapsed so often!" They made him a weathercock indeed; it would have needed the true spirit of a martyr, of a Jerome or a Huss, a Ridley or a Latimer, to have come through that trial; and he had it not. Yet we feel great compassion for those whom the Church of Rome in her palmy days made "weathercocks"; for we know that in her mercy she gave them their choice, either to be "weathercocks" or martyrs.

ON PURGATORY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Permit me to say, that you should first have shown, from unexceptionable authority, the Catholic Church of the third, fourth, fifth, sixth, or even of succeeding centuries, that my citations from Origen are heretical, and have been formally condemned; and when you give this proof you may then call upon me to prove, from orthodox writers of the first three centuries, the doctrine of purgatory. This proof I have, more than once before, called for, yet you have not attempted to give anything of more weight than your own opinion. Mere assertion is the only authority you oppose to these citations; and this, however respectable the party, falls far short of a definitive proof. The doctrine of purgatory remains untouched and unsealed; you have not yet disproved it: these are the real features of the case at present. Do not be tardy in bringing forth the requisite proofs, and the Catholics of the world will bless you for the enlightenment. You tell me to own that the Church, in the days of St. Epiphanius, had defined nothing on the subject of purgatory. I confess; and when you show the heterodoxy of my citations from Origen, I will prove that the Church long before that time taught the efficacy of prayers for the dead, and the remission of sins in the world to come. This you do not deny to be the belief in the time of Pope Gregory the Great. Let me now ask you, can a definition confer being or vitality? Or does nothing really exist but what has already been defined? Your charge, whereby you impute heresy to St. Augustine, is novel and startling. This is a light which the ancient Church had not, and which could not be found in any save in a very modern Church. This is truly a summary mode of disposing of an adversary, whose evidence is otherwise incontrovertible. You must also charge St. Epiphanius with *innovation*, or admit the distinction he makes between prayers for the *saints* and prayers for sinners: the former were decidedly and unmistakably *thanksgivings*, and the latter *propitiations*; and this fact, together with the *cultus* of the saints, is unequivocally set forth in the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom, from which you attempt to prove the contrary. First—"By the intercession of the most holy, immaculate, blessed above all, our glorious lady, Mother of God, and ever Virgin Mary, by the virtue of the glorious and vivifying cross, and of all the saints, may Christ, our true God, have mercy on us."—*Goar, page* 63. This extract contains very important evidence in favour of the *cultus* of saints (but this apart), with a verification of the distinction recognised by St. Epiphanius.

Again—"It is truly meet to praise thee, Mother of God, who art always to be blest, to be venerated above the cherubim, and incomparably more glorious than the seraphim, who, in all purity, didst bring forth God, the Word; we magnify thee, who art truly the Mother of God. Perfect us, O God, by the prayers of St. John the prophet, precursor, and Baptist, of the saint whose memory we celebrate, and of all the saints; and be mindful of all who have slept before us in the hope of the resurrection to eternal life."—*Ibid.*

Here we see whether praying to saints was an improvement of an age later than the fifth century, or not; and we also find, that God was supplicated, through them, for mercy on the souls of those who were already departed.

These passages afford palpable evidence that the Apostles, the Virgin Mary, the saints, &c., were not prayed for indiscriminately with the other dead, and that the prayers and offerings made for them were only those of thanksgiving; for it could not be consistent with reason that the Apostles, Blessed Virgin, &c., should be prayed *for* in common with the other dead, in one part of the Liturgy, and be prayed *to*, as intercessors, in another part of it. I am most anxious to have the question of purgatory dispassionately and amicably discussed, with Christian and charitable feelings, free from all levity, and from that acrimony which so generally marks the temper of polemical disputants.

I remain, sir, yours sincerely,

EDMOND POWER.

We print the foregoing letter in courtesy to our correspondent, but we do not know that it requires any answer, since he has brought forward no new evidence or argument in support of purgatory. He tells us that we have not disproved it; but our business in this argument was not to *disprove* it—we were examining what evidence there was *for* it. We were content to waive for the present the argument that weighs most with Protestants, namely, the silence of Scripture about Purgatory; for Protestants cannot believe that if the Apostles knew that their converts had a prospect of undergoing torments after death, they would be justified, in common honesty, in concealing this from them, and in speaking as if their death was to be succeeded by an immediate entrance into happiness. But, omitting this point, we asked—Could the silence of Scripture be supplied by tradition, and can it be proved that purgatory was the doctrine of the primitive Church by the testimony of any orthodox writer for the first three hundred years? In answer to this question our correspondent has been able to produce nothing better than passages from Origen, which are branded as heretical by the Benedictine editors themselves, and which it is, therefore, not very unreasonable of us to decline to receive as orthodox sentiments. We pronounce, then, the doctrine of purgatory as still "Not Proven," and we think it is plain that if the Apostles and the early fathers had believed in it, it would have been easy to prove it from their writings.

We need not enter into a new subject—the worship of the saints—nor discuss the passages which Mr. Power has cited from the Liturgy which goes by the name of St Chrysostom, out which learned men are agreed did not, in its present shape, proceed from that Father. We quoted this liturgy merely in correction of the evasive expression that the saints "were named" in the prayers of the ancient Church, and to show that prayers were offered in plain words (explain it as you may) *for* them. Such prayer, we know to have been offered for the saints, from much earlier testimony. And it matters not that, in after times, prayers were offered through them and *to* them, unless it can be proved that these latter prayers were as ancient as the former. The fact, we believe, was, that in the times when men prayed *for* the saints they did not pray *to* them; and when they began to pray to them they left off praying *for* them.

ON A SACRIFICING PRIESTHOOD.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—It is evident that "Milner's End of Religions Controversy" has not put an end to controversy between the two contending Churches of Rome and of the Reformation. That astute theologian has charged the Church of England with inconsistency in having her ministers still called priests, while she has put away her altars, and pronounced the Sacrifice of the Mass to be a "Blasphemous fable and a dangerous deceit." And this charge would indeed fall with a crushing force upon the Church of England, if by "Priests" they meant sacrificers for sins, and not presbyters.

But the question is, which of the antagonist Churches, of Rome or England, is right in this matter? The ministers of the former are held to be a sacerdotal college, or caste, ordained to offer for sins; there is no doubt of that. And it is as clear, that the reformers of the latter protested against the idea of such an offering, offered oftentimes (for which cause they suffered death at the stake), and retained the word "Priest," as it had been handed down to them from the earliest ages, as the proper name of a "Minister of the New Covenant," which is rendered, in the authorized version of the Bible, uniformly, by the word "Elder." The controversy between the two Churches may now be brought to an issue at once, by the discussion of this one simple question, which I write this article to propose—namely, are the ministers of the New Testament (or Covenant) priests (ιερεις) apart from the people, to offer for sins? or to offer Christ again and again, for the sins of the quick and the dead? or are they not? Does the eternal and unchangeable high priesthood of the Son of God, who, having finished the work upon earth, which his Father gave him to do, ascended upon high, carrying with him the blood of the eternal Covenant, admit of such an idea, or leave any place in the Church upon earth for a successional atoning priesthood? To whom can they be successional? Not to Aaron, for his priesthood is defunct; and while it lasted, it made nothing perfect. Not, again, to Melchisedec, or to Christ, as his antitype; for that priesthood is absolutely απαραβατος; and since he "*sat down*" on the right hand of God, no priest coming after him, until he comes again, has, or can have, any authority from God, or from his word, to *stand* at an altar upon earth, daily ministering. The vail is rent, and under a new and spiritual dispensation every Christian is a priest—

not, indeed, to offer for sins (for which there is no place nor occasion) but to "offer unto God spiritual sacrifices, acceptable (their persons being acceptable first) through Jesus Christ."

It follows, that if there be no priest upon earth to offer for sins, then there is no Sacrifice of the Mass; no transubstantiation; no *judicial* absolution; no lordship over God's heritage; no endless genealogical succession of priests from the apostles, who, *in this sense*, were not priests themselves; no SUMMUS SACERDOS taking the place of Christ upon earth, who, when he went away, promised to send, in his stead, another comforter, who should be no mortal man, but the Holy Ghost, the personal Spirit Jehovah. In a word—"The priesthood being changed, there is a change also in the law." Under the Old Testament there was a priesthood confined to one family, into which no stranger might intrude, under pain of death. This was the sin of the "tonsured" CORAH, in which he perished, with all that appertained to him. Under the New Testament there is an ever-living priest, Christ himself, whom Aaron and his sons prefigured. And as God has sworn with an oath, that his is the priesthood for ever, whom he has raised from the dead, as the antitype to Aaron's rod that budded, I ask, who, then, are they, or can they be, who shall perish in the gainsaying of the man who "sought the priesthood" in the last day, except the party whom Milner undertook to defend in his "End of Religious Controversy"? D.

SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—In a work, called "The Sincere Christian instructed in the Faith of Christ from the Written Word." By Bishop Hay, published in 1845, by the printer and bookseller to St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, at pages 368 and 371, the following questions and answers occur:—

Q. 30. What then, properly speaking, is the sacrifice of the mass?

A. It is an offering made to God, of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, &c.

Q. 37. By whom is the mass offered?

A. (2) By the Bishops and Priests of his (Jesus Christ's) church, who are his ministers and deputies, whom he makes use of, for performing the outward and visible celebration of this sacrifice here upon earth in his stead, &c.

Q. 38. For whom is the mass offered?

A. . . . . For those (the Church) in heaven, in thanksgiving to God for all their happiness, for the Church on earth, according to the four great ends of sacrifice, and for the souls in purgatory, &c.

No Roman Catholic can deny that the teaching in this work ("the Sincere Christian") is in strict accordance with that of the Roman Catholic Church of the present day; notwithstanding which, the Roman Catholic version of the "written Word," from which the above teaching purports to have been taken, promulgates directly opposite doctrines, which can be seen by referring, amongst other passages, to the Roman Catholic authentic interpretation of the words "ETERNAL REDEMPTION," spoken of in Heb. ix. 12, which is given at foot of the page in the explanatory note, Douay Bible, published by Simms and M'Intyre, Belfast, 1840, with the sanction of ✠ Cornelius Denvir, D.D., Roman Catholic Bishop, Down and Connor, given at Belfast, 24th July, 1839—viz.,

Verse 12. Eternal redemption. By that one sacrifice of His blood, ONCE OFFERED on the cross, Christ our Lord paid and exhibited, ONCE FOR ALL, the general price and ransom of all mankind, which no other priest could do.

See also Hebrews x. 14. For by one oblation he hath *perfected for ever* them that are sanctified.—*Douay Bible.*

The greatest treasure of which the Church is possessed, is the written Word of God, and yet it is kept locked from the people whose property it is. 1 Thess. v. 27—I charge you by the Lord, that this epistle be read to ALL the holy brethren. See also Phil. i. 1, Eph. i. 1, 1 Cor. i. 2, Rom. i. 7, Colossians i. 2, James i. 1, 1 Peter i. 1, 2 Peter i. 1, Jude i. 1, showing that these epistles were addressed, not to priests only, but to all the faithful.

If you, sir, can find space for the above, it may be instrumental in convincing some one of our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen of his right, and inducing him to assert his title to an open Bible.

Your obedient servant,

J. B.

CHRISTIANITY IN INDIA.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—The following short narrative is wholly matter of fact. Perhaps you may give it a place in your paper. The names of persons and of places have been altered, as some of the former are still living; I knew them all; and when I think of these circumstances I am constrained to say—"May I die the death of the righteous,—May my last end be like his":—

God's ways are not our ways, nor his thoughts like our thoughts. Those things or persons to which man attaches great importance are shown by him to be of small value; and, on the other hand, he chooses foolish things of this world to confound the wise, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are: *that* no flesh should glory in his presence!

The above reflections were first powerfully brought to my mind when I heard of the conversion of G—— L'Estrange, a young officer in the East India Company's army, of genteel appearance and prepossessing manners, a favourite with the world, and an acquisition in every gay party; but a libertine in principles, and one who truly lived without God in the world. Once, and once only, I was in the same company with him: the occasion was peculiarly painful, owing to L'Estrange's part in the affair, and one which I could never forget. I never was more strongly tempted to adopt the Pharisee's prayer and say—"God, I thank thee that I am not like" ———. But if any such sinful thought did find place in my heart, I was taught by after events to perceive its sinfulness and folly.

One of the peculiarities of European society in India is, the great familiarity and close intimacy which springs up between individuals unconnected with, and previously unknown to each other, who, by circumstances, are thrown together—either at the same European station, or in places remote from all European society, and which, though often in the midst of a dense native population, it is usual to denominate "the jungle."

L'Estrange was, under peculiar circumstances, directed to proceed to the military cantonment of "*Belapoor*," apart from his regiment On his arrival he had at first some difficulty in procuring a house. A share in one was, however, offered to him by Mr. William Brown, a civilian, a man with whom previously he was slightly acquainted; and this circumstance changed their acquaintance into intimacy, if not friendship. In some respects their characters were dissimilar; L'Estrange was professedly a "man of pleasure"—*pleasure* (mistaken for happiness) was his idol; indulgence of every sense was his notion of "knowing *how to live.*" He was thoughtless, and, (externally at least,) *gay:* religion and religious people excited his merriment; he pitied and despised them from his heart. He believed that among them there were many sincere but foolish people, who lost the pleasures of this life in the vain hope of procuring thereby some undefinable happiness hereafter—called "heaven;" a place and a condition the existence of which he *doubted;* and he held himself at liberty, while he *doubted*, to act as if he *was certain* that no such place existed. Brown was as worldly as L'Estrange, but he was a less amiable character. He followed pleasure as earnestly, yet he never seemed to obtain even a momentary happiness from it; he loved reading, but it was of a licentious or infidel kind. He loved poetry, but chiefly that of an infidel or irreligious stamp. He was, to some extent, a *thinking* man; but he rejected religion as a fable, and religious people as consisting of fools and hypocrites; which predominated, he neither knew nor cared.

Brown had a brother, who, at the time of our narrative, was also at Belapoor. Charles Brown was as unlike his brother in natural as in religious character. Naturally of a cheerful and cordial disposition—his heart had been led to consider the great truths of Christianity, as set forth by Mr. Turpin, a missionary at Belapoor, and heartily to embrace them. He consequently belonged to a comparative small band, who were in derision called "New-lights." Being a married man, his brother's house would not have been a fit residence for him; when, therefore, he visited Belapoor he lodged at Mr. Turpin's.

Thither William Brown was frequently invited during his brother's stay, and, out of regard to him, William endured the "cant and humbug" of the missionary's house. But if he listened with outward decorum to hymns, and Holy Scripture and to religious discourse, his *heart* had no share in these things. All that he heard seemed but to increase his scorn for, and bitter antipathy to "Methodism," as he called it; and when he returned to his own house, his great delight was to entertain L'Estrange with a full recital of all that he had heard—all, however, grossly burlesqued, and this by the aid of a remarkably accurate memory, added to a ready wit, he was enabled to do, to the no small amusement of his friend.

Things thus proceeded for some weeks. William B.'s visits to the missionary's always furnished him with material for a recitation on his return to his own house; but the bold blasphemies which he uttered on those occasions gradually more and more horrified L'Estrange, while some of the solemn truths (ironically repeated by Brown) uttered by Mr. Turpin, rung in his ears. The words—"What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" excited a momentary laugh when uttered by Brown with mock solemnity; but these and similar texts occurred to L'Estrange, in after moments; and then followed the question—"*What, if these things should be true?*" The effect of these thoughts was to make Brown's recitations more and more distasteful to L'Estrange, till, at length, he expressed his weariness of them, and his wonder that Brown could make so bad a return for Mr. Turpin's hospitality, as to turn him into constant ridicule. Brown was surprised at these remarks; but his surprise was greatly increased when, shortly after this, L'Estrange said—"I think that I should like to know Mr. Turpin. Will you introduce me to him?" "Certainly," said Brown, with a sneer, "and I hope that your soul may benefit by his godly admonitions!"

The "hope," thus sarcastically expressed, was realized. L'Estrange was struck with the unaffected cheerfulness which pervaded Mr. Turpin's family. The truths of Christianity seemed there to be felt as a reality; and when Mr. T. read and expounded Scripture, L'Estrange thought, "How solemn and important are these words! How is it possible that I have hitherto lived regardless of them?" L'Estrange's character underwent a total revolution, and as he had been earnest in the pursuit of what he then believed to be happiness, so was he now decided in embracing the life of a Christian. To one whom he had known and ridiculed as a religious man, he thus wrote—"*How* delighted should I be to meet you *now*. When we last met I despised you as a '*saint*;' now I despise myself, and marvel at the grace of God, who has had mercy on such a sinner as I am." From this time till his death, which occurred a few years after this, at a remote station, L'Estrange never faltered in his Christian course. His end was *peace*. A brother officer, who attended on his dying hours, writing of him said—"May my last end be like his!"

William Brown outlived L'Estrange by some years; but his dislike of religion, and its professors, in no degree abated—he became morose in character, and addicted to intemperance, from the effects of which he died suddenly, without a friend or countryman near. We cannot follow him to the presence of his God.

PEREGRINUS.

FARMING OPERATIONS FOR JULY.

(*From the Irish Farmers' Gazette.*)

HAYMAKING will generally form the chief operation for the month—particularly that of the artificial grasses, which should be cut and saved early in the month; avoid cutting in wet weather, or, at least, while the grass is saturated with wet, and have the spread-ground well raked up before the dew falls, to enjoy the earliest sunshine and air to dry it before spreading out; for details see the GAZETTE of last week.

Turnips.—Finish turnip sowing as early as possible, and proceed with the hoeing and singling of those already sown and advanced into rough leaf. The horse-hoe should commence these operations, which should be adjusted so as to hoe within two or three inches of the plants, reducing the ridge to about four inches in width, leaving the plants standing about two inches above the general level; the hand-hoes then proceed, and by alternately pushing and pulling, leaving small tufts of plants at the required distance, and destroying all between. Dry weather should be chosen for these operations, as the tools work clean, and the sun quickly dries up and destroys the young plants, and weeds eat up. In a few days the drill-grubbers should be put on to loosen up and expose fresh surfaces of soil to the disintegrating influence of the atmosphere, and bring to the surface any root weeds which may be buried. This grubbing or hoeing should be repeated at intervals, till the crop is so far advanced as to be injured by trespassing on it.

Carrots and parsnips require like treatment with the more advanced turnips, and the singling completed, if not already done, and the young plants appearing since the last hoeing, pulled or hoed out.

Mangel-wurzel and sugar beet must also be frequently horse-hoed and grubbed during the month.

Rape, if sown broadcast, should be hoed as soon as sufficiently high, to eight or ten inches apart; if sown in drills, it should be hoed and singled out as turnips are. Rape sown for transplanting in the stubble land should be thinned out to six inches apart to insure good plants for that purpose, otherwise they will be drawn up weakly, with slender, crooked stems; the thinnings may be planted in nursery beds, well dug and manured, and will make fine plants to range out in August and September. Continue sowing rape during the month as the land gets ready.

Flax should be pulled as soon as ready, which is known by the seed vessels turning a brownish colour, which is generally from the middle to the end of the month. The bolls may be separated by rippling in the field at once, or after the flax is dried in stook before ricking, or it may be ricked with the seed on, on the Courtrai system, and the seed removed in the spring before steeping. The details will be found in another part of our columns of this week. Rape or stone turnips is frequently sown with much profit on the flax stubble.

Corn crops.—This will be the best time to clean the crops of wheat, oats, or barley, of smut. A couple of careful men or boys will go over a large breadth in the day, cutting off the smutted ears with a knife or scissors, letting the severed ear drop to the ground; thus no smut can be bound up with the sheaves, or injure the sample in thrashing.

Peas.—In early localities, early sown peas may be fit for harvesting by the end of the month; when fit they may be mown, or reaped, rolled into bundles, and left to dry, and turned over daily till fit for stacking.

Beans.—The Russian bean, if sown in October last, may be fit for harvesting by the end of the month; they may be reaped, tied in small sheaves with straw bands, and stooked; in dry weather they may be laid on the bands, but not tied, for a few days, which cures the crop more speedily.

Bere and Rye will be ready for the sickle before the end of the month in early localities. Cut before the grain is dead ripe, and bind and stook immediately. Rape may be either sown or planted, or stone turnips be sown as a stolen crop, on the stubbles.

Cabbages should now be planted out with as little delay as possible.

New and Recent Works

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

Booksellers to the Queen,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

THE SCENERY and ANTIQUITIES of IRELAND. Illustrated from Drawings by W. H. Bartlett, 2 vols., 4to., cloth, gilt. £2 2s.

HISTORY of the ADMINISTRATION of the EAST INDIA COMPANY, by John William Kaye. 8vo. 21s.

MODERN INDIA: a sketch of the system of Civil Government, with some account of the Natives and Native Institutions. By George Campbell, Esq. 8vo., 16s.

BURKE'S DICTIONARY of the PEERAGE and BARONETAGE of the BRITISH EMPIRE, for 1853. Royal 8vo. 38s.

NARRATIVE of A JOURNEY round the DEAD SEA, and in the Bible Lands, in 1850 and 1851. By F. De Saulcy. 2 Vols. 30s.

LORD JEFFREYS' CONTRIBUTIONS to the EDINBURGH REVIEW. (Uniform with Macaulay's Essays.) I vol. Crown 8vo. 21s.

HEBREW POLITICS in the time of SARGON and SENNACHERIB; an Inquiry into the Historical Meaning and Purpose of the Prophecies of Isaiah, with some notice of their bearing on the Social and Political Life of England. By Edward Strachey. 8vo. 14s.

THE APOCALYPSE ITS OWN INTERPRETER, by the application of a sound and ancient rule for the Interpreting of Holy Scripture. By the Venerable James W. Forster. 8vo. 14s.

MESSIAS and ANTI-MESSIAS; a Prophetical Exposition; to which are added Two Homilies on the Body of Christ. By Charles Ingham Black. 5s.

THE CHURCH OF CHRIST, in its Idea, Attributes, and Ministry, with a particular reference to the Controversy on the subject between Romanists and Protestants. By Edward Arthur Litton, M.A. 8vo. 16s.

POOLE'S ANNOTATIONS on the HOLY BIBLE. 3 vols. 8vo. New Edition. 31s. 6d.

BRITISH and FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW. No. V. 3s. 6d.

PHILOSOPHIE PROVERBIALE [La Philosophie en Proverbes]. Par Martin F. Tupper. With Portrait. 3s. 6d.

THE ART OF QUESTIONING; or, a short Analysis of the Interrogatory Methods of Instruction, designed for the use of Teachers, Pupil-Teachers, and Monitors. By W. T. Young, T.C.D. 1s.

THE LUNAR WORLD; its Scenery, Motions, &c., Considered with a view to Design. By Josiah Crampton, A.M. 1s. 6d.

GENESIS AND GEOLOGY; or an Investigation into the Reconciliation of the Modern Doctrines of Geology; with the Declarations of Scripture. By Denis Crofton, B.A. 2s.

"This very able and interesting dissertation was originally inserted in Kitto's Quarterly Journal of Sacred Literature, and it is now re-published with certain additions. We will say for Mr. Crofton, that his Dissertation appears to be most complete in its way, and to grapple with scientific difficulties in a way which brings out most unmistakeably his scientific and theological attainments, and his powers of able and vigorous argument."—*English Review.*

A TREATISE ON BIBLICAL CRITICISM; exhibiting a systematic view of that Science. By Samuel Davidson, D.D. 2 vols. 28s.

SERMONS PREACHED IN BETHESDA CHAPEL, DUBLIN. By the late Rev. W. H. Krause, A.M. Vols. I. II. 5s. each.

JOB'S TESTIMONY TO JESUS, and the Resurrection of the Body. By Rev. Francis Trench. 1s. 6d.

A TREATISE ON THE ASSURANCE OF SALVATION. By Rev. Paton J. Gloag. 1s. 6d.

THE HOLY, CATHOLIC, AND APOSTOLIC CHURCH OF IRELAND Truly Represented. By Rev. William Agar. 1s.

THE LAMP AND THE LANTERN; or Light for the Tent and the Traveller. By James Hamilton, D.D. 1s. 6d.

LETTTERS IN CONTROVERSY WITH CARDINAL WISEMAN. By William Palmer, M.A. 4s.

A REVIEW OF THE "SPIRITUAL MANIFESTATIONS." By Rev. Charles Beecher. 2s.

POPULAR ERRORS on the Subject of Insanity Examined and Exposed. By James F. Duncan, M.D. 4s. 6d.

THE SEAWEED COLLECTOR'S GUIDE; Containing plain Instructions for Collecting and Preserving, and a list of all the known Species and Localities in Great Britain. By J. Cooke, M.D. 2s. 6d.

HAND-BOOK OF ANGLING; Teaching Fly-fishing, Trolling, &c. &c. By Ephemera. 5s.

D'AUBIGNE'S HISTORY of the REFORMATION. Vol 5. Subject—"The Reformation in ENGLAND.' 12s.

POPULAR HISTORY OF BRITISH FERNS, AND THE ALLIED PLANTS, comprising the Club-Mosses, Pepper Worts, and Horse-tails. By Thomas Moore. With Coloured Illustrations. 10s. 6d.

A SELECTION from the Correspondence of the late THOMAS CHALMERS, D.D. Edited by Rev. Wm. Hanna, L.L.D. 10s. 6d.

MEMORANDUMS made in Ireland in the Autumn of 1852. By John Forbes, M.D. With a Map and Illustrations. 2 Vols. 21s.

LAYARD'S FURTHER DISCOVERIES IN THE RUINS OF NINEVEH AND BABYLON, being the results of a second expedition. With 400 illustrations. 21s.

AUTOBIOGRAPHIC SKETCHES. By Thomas De Quincy, Esq. 7s. 6d.

ALISON'S HISTORY OF EUROPE. Cheaper Edition. (To be completed in 44 Monthly Parts, 1s. each, or in 12 Quarterly Vols. at 4s.) Vol. I. just published.

THE DIVINE RULE OF FAITH AND PRACTICE. By Rev. William Goode. 3 vols. 8vo. New Edition. With index. 21s.

SIX-PREACHER SERMONS; Including the Subjects of National Education; the Church of England View of Lent Duties, and Services, &c. By Rev. Charles Foster. 10s. 6d.

HISTORY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN IRELAND. By Rev. James Seaton Reid, D.D. Continued to the present time, by Rev. W. Killen, D.D. 3 vols., 28s. 6d.

CHRIST OUR LIFE: In its Origin, Law, and End. By Rev. Joseph Angus, D.D. 5s.

ABBEOKUTA; or, Sunrise within the Tropics: An Outline of the Origin and Progress of the Yoruba Mission. By Miss Tucker. 3s. 6d.

THE FINGER OF GOD. By Rev. John Cumming, D.D. 2s. 6d.

MEMOIR OF ROBERT AND JAMES A. HALDANE. By Alex. Haldane, Esq. 12s.

MEMOIR of the REV. W. H. HEWITSON. By the Rev. John Baillie. 5s.

SELECT LETTERS AND REMAINS of the Late Rev. W. H. Hewitson. Edited by the Rev. John Baillie. 2 Vols. 10s.

THE MILLION-PEOPLED CITY; or, One-half of the People of London Made Known to the other Half. By John Garwood, M.A. 4s. 6d.

THE NEW REFORMATION IN IRELAND, with striking facts and anecdotes illustrating the Extent and Reality of the Movement. By the Rev. L. W. Jones. With a Missionary Map. 1s. 6d.

PROGRESS OF THE REFORMATION IN THE WEST OF IRELAND. By the Earl of Roden. 2s. 6d.

THE ENGLISH HUMOURISTS of the EIGHTEENTH CENTURY. By W. M. Thackerary, Esq. 10s. 6d.

HOME LIFE IN GERMANY. By Charles Loring Brace. 10s. 6d.

THE DOWNFALL OF DESPOTISM; or, the Last Act of the European Tragedy; showing the overthrow of Political and Ecclesiastical Despotism in Europe—the Mission of the Russians—the fall of the Turkish Empire—the invasion of Britain, and the Reign of Liberty in the New World. 6d.

CONNEMARA: Past and Present. By Rev. J. D. Smith. 2s.

THE COMPLETE ANGLER. By Izaak Walton. With numerous Illustrations. 2s. 6d.

GUIDE TO BELFAST AND ITS ENVIRONS, WITH A TOUR TO THE GIANTS' CAUSEWAY. By J. Huband Smith, M.R.I.A. 2s. 6d.

THE TOURISTS' ILLUSTRATED HAND-BOOK FOR IRELAND. 3s. 6d.

PLAN OF DUBLIN. In a Case. 1s.

A RUN THROUGH THE SOUTH OF IRELAND. With Maps and Illustrations on Steel. 1s. 6d.

A WEEK IN THE WEST OF IRELAND, GALWAY, CONNAUGHT, CONNEMARA, &c. 1s.

BETTS' ROAD AND RAILROAD MAP OF IRELAND. In a Case. 5s.

FRASER'S TOURIST'S TRAVELLING MAP OF IRELAND. 5s.

IRWIN'S HISTORICAL AND DESCRIPTIVE GUIDE TO DUBLIN. 2s.

ENVIRON'S OF DUBLIN. Coloured. In a Case. 1s. 6d.

FRASER'S GUIDE TO THE COUNTY WICKLOW. With a Map and Illustrations. 2s. 6d.

THE SCOTTISH TOURIST. With Seventy-one Engravings on Steel, and Seventeen Travelling Maps and Charts. 8s. 6d.

BLACK'S PICTURESQUE TOURIST, and Road Book for England and Wales. With Maps and Illustrations. 10s. 6d.

BLACK'S GUIDE TO THE ENGLISH LAKES. With a Map, and Illustrations on Steel. 5s.

SYNOPSIS OF THE CONTENTS OF THE GREAT INDUSTRIAL EXHIBITION OF 1853. By Charles C. Adley. 6d.

*** A variety of Guide Books, Charts, Maps, &c., for Tourists in England, Scotland, Ireland, and the Continent.

POPULAR FIELD BOTANY. A description of British Plants. By Agnes Catlow. With Coloured Illustrations. 10s. 6d.

POPULAR BRITISH ENTOMOLGY. A descriptions of the Insects common to the British Isles. By Maria E. Catlow. With Coloured Illustrations. 10s. 6d.

SOLITARY RAMBLES and ADVENTURES of a HUNTER in the PRARIES. By John Palliser, Esq. With Illustrations. 10s. 6d.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON, and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher WILLIAM CURRY, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

July, 1853.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Glóir do Dhia an fna háirdib, agus fíoċċáin air an talamh deaġċoil do na daoinib.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED THE MIDDLE OF EVERY MONTH, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. II.—No. 20. AUGUST, 1853. Annual Subscription, 3s. 6d. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
Is the Protestant Bible a corrupt and mutilated translation of the Holy Scriptures?	85
Can the Infallibility of the Church of Rome be proved from Ecclesiastical History and the Writings of the earlier Fathers	85
The Catholic Doctrine on the Use of the Bible, by Cardinal Wiseman—continued from page 77	86
The Old Irish Clergy—No. II.	87
The Marleys—A Story of Real Life—Chap. II.	89
Talk of the Road—No. XV.	90
Blaise Pascal—The Jesuits and the Jansenists	91
Mr. Lockhart and the Rev James Fowler, on Scripture Proofs	92
On the Internal Evidences of the Catholic Religion—Peace at the last	92
Correspondence—	
Mr. E. Power on Saints' Days, Purgatory, &c.	93
Mr. Blood, on the title "Mother of God"	93
The Catholic Layman and the Index Expurgatorius—by T. Brian, of Kerry	94
On Nunneries—St. Alphonso Liguori—by M.	94
The Catholic Layman in Kilpatrick, No. II.	94
Farming Operations for August	95

IS THE PROTESTANT BIBLE A CORRUPT AND MUTILATED TRANSLATION OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES?

We have shown in late numbers the high testimony borne to the Protestant translation of the Bible, in the fact that those who have had to correct and amend the Douay Bible have relied so largely on the Protestant Bible for their corrections. This striking fact may naturally lead candid Roman Catholics to consider whether the Protestant translation may not, perhaps, be right in the things in which the Douay Bible yet differs from it. It must be remembered that many of the things which the Douay Bible has now, at last, adopted from the Protestant Bible, as being right, were long cried out against, even by very learned Roman Catholics, as being gross faults and heresies in the Protestant Bible. It seems now that these outcries and heavy charges, made by learned Roman Catholics against the Protestant Bible, were not sufficient proof that the Protestant Bible was wrong, since in those very things the Douay Bible has now been corrected to agree with it. The Protestant Bible is, therefore, confessed to have been right in those things, notwithstanding the accusations of such learned men as Dr. Wurd. And, therefore, candid men will think that it is, at least, possible that the Protestant Bible may still be right in the things in which it is still cried out against. This probability derives great confirmation from the fact noticed by Mr. Collette, in our last number, that where the Douay Bible still differs from the Protestant Bible, explanations taken from the Protestant Bible are put in the notes of the Douay Bible. It is further confirmed by the fact, that one edition of the Douay Bible, still further corrected by the Protestant Bible, has been lately published by a learned Roman Catholic bishop in America, Dr. Kenrick. We have, therefore, every reason to expect that the Douay Bible, in some time to come, will be still further corrected by the Protestant Bible; and, therefore, we may fairly invite a calm and candid consideration of the points in which they still differ.

There are two points of principal importance in which the two translations still differ—First, where the Protestant Bible has the word "repent," the Douay Bible, generally, has the words "do penance;" and, secondly, where the Douay Bible has the word "priest," the Protestant Bible, generally, has the word "elder." Our present business is to inquire which of these translations is the most correct—which most faithfully expresses the sense and meaning of the Scripture, as the Apostles wrote it in Greek.

With respect to the first of these points, the Greek word is *μετανοειτε*: and the question is, ought we to translate this "repent," or "do penance?"

Consider first the difference of these two translations:—"Repent" expresses a change of mind; it signifies sorrow of mind for what we have done, and a change of mind, by which we resolve to act otherwise in future. "Do penance" is taken, by all Roman Catholics, for performing, as a punishment on ourselves, works and actions which are painful to ourselves in the performance. The question comes simply to this—Does the Greek word mean to express the change which takes place in the mind within? or does it mean to express outward actions and works done?

Now, the Greek language, above any other language in the world, has a power of making the meaning of its words plain, by the derivation of the words. Young scholars in the Greek language are always taught to fix the meaning of Greek words in this way, by attending to the derivation of the words. We could have no better instance in this very word, *μετανοειτε*. It is derived from two other Greek words, joined together—the first is *μετα*, which signifies "afterwards," and *νοος*, which signifies the mind. We have a saying in English, that "*second thoughts* are best"—that means that we very often have need to change our thoughts and opinions. We are very apt to go wrong at first; and, on reflection and consideration, we find where we were wrong, and how we ought to change our minds. These second thoughts, or "after thoughts," are generally best; and this is evidently what is implied and expressed in joining together the Greek words, *μετα* (afterwards), and *νοος* (the mind). It can have no other meaning than a change of mind, following after reflection and consideration; and this is properly called "repentance." But those two Greek words have no fitness whatever in them to express the performance of outward actions that are painful in themselves.

This is so plain in the Greek words, that if both the Protestant and the Douay translations had been made by translating the Greek into English, there would, most probably, have been no difference between them in this.

And now some of our readers may ask, in astonishment, "And were not both these translations made by translating what the Apostles and Evangelists wrote in Greek?"

To this we answer, that indeed they were not. The Protestant translation was made by translating the Greek; but the Douay translation was not. In former times some one, we do not know who, translated the Greek into Latin, and then the Douay translators translated that Latin translation into English. They say this themselves in the preface of the first Douay Bible:—"We translate the old Vulgar Latin text, not the common Greek text." Now this is a round-about way, and evidently more liable to error; and this may explain why the correctors of the Douay translation should have found the Protestant translation so much more correct than their own.

This fact explains how the two translations come to differ about the words "repent" and "do penance." As we said before, if both had been translated from the original Greek, there would, probably, have been no difference between them; but the Douay translators translated from the Latin, in which they found the Latin words, "agite pœnitentiam." Now, "agite," *taken by itself*, is certainly Latin for "do;" but all Latin scholars know, that when joined thus with a substantive, it is *not* to be translated "do." For instance, if a schoolboy should meet in his lesson, "agite vitam," and should translate it "do your life," he would be whipped. He ought to translate it as if it were "vivite," "live." Let any one look at Ainsworth's Latin Dictionary, under the word "Ago," and he will read, "it is often rendered by the verb of its noun, as *agere vitam*, 'to live;'" there follows then about fifty instances of the same kind, taken from the best Latin authors, and among them "agere pœnitentiam, to repent," taken from Pliny the younger.

Therefore, it is likely that the Latin translator, whoever he was, when he wrote "agite pœnitentiam," meant simply to repent. But it is not only *likely*, but it is *certain*, and we have proof of it; for in St. Matthew's Gospel, ch. iv., v. 17, we have an account of the first beginning of our Saviour's preaching; and in St. Mark's Gospel, ch. i., v. 15, we have another account of the very same thing. St. Matthew and St. Mark both agree in reporting that our Saviour said *μετανοειτε*; yet in St. Matthew, the Douay translators put "do penance" for *μετανοειτε*; and in St. Mark, for the very same Greek word, they put "repent." So we have here their own confession, that "repent" is a good and proper translation of the word that our Saviour spoke. Why, then, should they insist on translating the very same words in St. Matthew's account of the very same discourse of the Saviour, "do penance?" When the two Evangelists put the same words in their two accounts as that which our Saviour spoke, why should the Douay translators insist on putting two different words, which *they say* mean different things? The reason of this is to be found in the Latin translation; in St. Matthew's account, the Latin translator wrote "pœnitentiam agite," for *μετανοειτε*; and in St. Mark's account he wrote, "pœnitemini" for the same Greek word. Is it not clear from this, that the Latin translator thought both forms of expression, in Latin, meant exactly the same thing, since he thought he might put either of them for the same Greek word? And we have seen from the dictionary that he was quite right. But then the Douay translators take hold of this difference, and they insist on putting two English words, which mean quite different things. Both the Evangelists, in reporting that same discourse of our Lord, relate that he used one and the same Greek word. Are we not bound, in translating those two accounts of the same discourse, to give that Greek word the same meaning in both accounts? Yet, because the Latin translator gave two different expressions for it in the two accounts—which two expressions *mean* the same in Latin—the Douay translators insist on putting two *different* meanings in the English translations.

Clearly, they must be wrong, either in the one place or the other, for both accounts report the same speech of our Lord, and in the same Greek word; therefore, whichever translation be right, that same translation should be given in both places.

We trust, therefore, that a time will come when some future correctors of the Douay Bible will see that it is their duty to consider which word ought to be put in *both* places. And we are satisfied that, if they consider it fairly, they will see from the reasons we have given above, that "repent" is the proper translation of *μετανοειτε*. And thus we may hope that this difference, also, between the two versions will, in time, disappear.

The more it is considered, the more ground there is to hope for this. For why is the word "do penance" kept in the Douay Bible? Is it not to give countenance and support to the Roman Catholic sacrament of penance? We all know that every passage where the words "do penance" occur in the Douay Bible, is constantly quoted to prove that penance is a sacrament of the Gospel: but the more this is examined, the more unsound it will plainly appear to be, for it is quite contrary to the Council of Trent itself. For the Council of Trent says (Sess. xiv., c. 1), that "penance is a sacrament, by which the benefit of the death of Christ is applied to those who have fallen *after baptism*." According to the Council of Trent, it would be profanation to give the sacrament of penance to those who were not yet baptized. No Roman Catholic priest will deny this. Now, it is clear, that in the discourse of our Saviour, of which we are speaking, he was telling men what they ought to do *before* they were baptized: and, therefore, it does not serve the Roman Catholic doctrine at all to translate it "do penance," as referring to the sacrament of penance. We have, therefore, every ground for hoping that, at the next correction of the Douay Bible, we will find this also changed to agree with the Protestant Bible, as so many things have been changed already.

We have not space here to consider the other important difference yet existing between the two translations, as to which "Priests" or "Elders" is best, but we will consider this in our next number.

CAN THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH OF ROME BE PROVED FROM ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY AND THE WRITINGS OF THE EARLIER FATHERS?

The theologians of the Church of Rome, when arguing against Protestants, usually endeavour, in the first instance, to establish their peculiar doctrines by the evidence of the written Word of God. A professed recognition of the authority of Scripture looks well, and removes the awkwardness that might result if Protestants alone appealed to the authentic records of inspiration. When the alleged Scripture proof of the characteristic doctrines of the Church of Rome is shown to be, at the very best, most precarious, her champions next fall back upon the stronghold of tradition, maintaining that she inculcates nothing but what has been

transmitted by the teachers and preachers of the Church from age to age, beginning with the Apostolic times. And, when they are driven from this position also, they finally intrench themselves in what they deem the impregnable fortress of the authority of the living Church, which is invested with an infallible judicial power in articles of faith. This is a very summary and convenient mode of terminating a troublesome discussion, and accordingly, as might be expected, Roman Catholic controversialists avail themselves largely of it. It becomes, then, an inevitable and a most important question—Does such an infallible authority exist? and what are the proofs upon which its supposed existence rests?

Three classes of argument may be, and generally are, adduced to prove the infallibility of the Church of Rome—First, *a priori* arguments, derived from the *nature of the case*, and from the necessity which exists for an infallible interpreter of Scripture, and judge of controversy.

Secondly—Arguments drawn from *Scripture*, such as our Lord's commission to his Apostles, and His promises to Peter in particular.

Thirdly—Arguments derived from the *history* of the Church, and the recorded testimony of the earlier *Fathers*.

It is to the last of these heads that we propose to direct our immediate attention. The others have already been partially discussed in this Journal, and shall be more fully handled in succeeding Numbers.

Before we enter on our proposed subject, it may be well to premise a few observations relative to the defects under which, regarded even *as a theory*, the dogma of Infallibility still labours, and the consequent obscurity and uncertainty which we have to encounter in discussing it.

First, then, we are not told how we may be infallibly certain that such an attribute as Infallibility has been bestowed upon the Church at all: and, secondly, supposing it to have been conferred, we are not informed where it resides, what is its visible centre and organ. In other words, we are not told *who* or *what* is infallible, or *why*. The Council of Trent, which decided so many points, determined nothing on the great subject of Infallibility. Nor was the omission undesigned. The Papal Legates were strictly enjoined, on no account whatever, to allow any discussion concerning the authority of the Pope. The cause of this reserve it is not difficult to assign, when we bear in mind that the opinions of some of the greatest authorities of the Church of Rome have been, and still are, divided as to the seat of Infallibility. There are, at least, six different opinions upon the subject: some lodging the gift with the Pope speaking *ex cathedra*; others, with the Pope in the council of Cardinals; others, with the Pope in a general or provincial council; others, in a general council without the Pope; and others, lastly, in the Church diffusive—that is to say, in the whole body of believers throughout the world. Under these six general heads may be found grouped a great number of minor differences. Nor is this all. Even though we should grant (what Bellarmine maintains is agreed upon by all the members of his church) that infallibility is lodged with the Pope in general council, yet it has never been formally determined what Popes have been *true* Popes; which of the many *de facto*, or rival Popes, are to be acknowledged *de jure*. Nor, again, which of the many professed General Councils are really so. A Roman Catholic might, at this moment, deny the existing Pope to be the successor of St. Peter, without offending against any article his creed. And, as to General Councils, while the Gallican Church receives the Councils of Basil and Constance wholly, the Roman Church rejects them both in part. The acts of other Councils are admitted to be adulterated, without any attempt being made to correct them. "This inconsistency in the Romish system," to use the language of the celebrated Dr. Newman,* "one might almost call providential. Nothing could be better adapted than it is to defeat the devices of human wisdom, and to show to thoughtful inquirers the hollowness of even the most specious counterfeit of Divine truth. The theologians of Rome have been able dexterously to smoothen over a thousand inconsistencies, and to array the heterogeneous precedents of centuries, in the semblance of design and harmony. But they cannot complete their system in its most important and essential point. They *can* determine, in theory, the nature, degree, extent, and object of the infallibility which they claim; they *cannot* agree among themselves *where* it resides. As in the building of Babel, the Lord has confounded their language, and the structure stands half finished, a monument at once of human daring and its failure."

No wonder, then, that the Council of Trent did not see fit to lay down any positive statement respecting a point so much contested as this, especially as the claim to *Papal* infallibility was not distinctly asserted until the dawn of the Reformation. This we shall hereafter prove by the conclusive evidence of facts; for the present we shall content ourselves with merely stating it in general terms. Nor, be it remembered, is this assertion, however startling it may appear, made only by Protestants. The main object of the famous Bossuet's Vindication of the Gallican Synod of 1682, was to prove that the doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope was altogether of modern origin; that for many centuries it had never been held under any form; and that, even down to the 16th century, there were ample proofs of its not having been regarded as an article of faith. He proves this by the decrees of Councils, by the testimony of Fathers, Doctors, and Schoolmen, and by the declarations of Popes themselves, amongst others by the following words of Pope Hadrian VI., when he was professor at Louvain—"If by the Roman Church he meant its Head, the Pontiff, it is certain that he may err, even in things pertaining to faith, in asserting heresy either by his decision or decretal; for many Roman pontiffs have been heretics."* Such was the opinion of the famous Bishop of Meaux, of whom Roman Catholics are so justly proud. This opinion was also maintained by the great Church historians Fleury and Dupin. These profound scholars knew full well, and were honest enough to confess it, that the evidence of ecclesiastical history was utterly opposed to the modern doctrine of the infallibility of the Church of Rome. They knew full well that Pope Liberius had fallen into Arianism, and Pope Vigilius into Eutychianism. They knew that Pope Honorius espoused the heresy of the Monothelites, and was condemned as a heresiarch by Pope Leo II. and his successors.† They knew that the profession of faith of the Popes in the 9th century contained the following clause, in which the possession of infallibility is expressly disclaimed—"We strictly anathematize those, whether *ourselves* or any others, who shall presume to put forward anything novel, contrary to the evangelical tradition, and the integrity of the orthodox faith and the Christian religion; or shall attempt to *change* anything, or *subtract* from the integrity of our faith, or consent to those who, with sacrilegious daring, presume to do so."‡

It is, we repeat, no wonder that the Council of Trent, with such irresistible evidence before it as to the comparative novelty of the doctrine of the infallibility of the Church of Rome, carefully abstained from publishing any decree upon the subject. In our next number we shall proceed to show more in detail that the existing records of Christian antiquity utterly refute the notion of an infallible authority being lodged in any manner in the Church, and specially that the Church of Rome was at any time regarded as its depositary.

* Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church, p. 149.

* Si per Ecclesiam Romanam intelligatur caput ejus, puta Pontifex, certum est quod possit errare, etiam in iis quæ tangunt fidem, hæresiam per suam determinationem aut decretalem asserendo; plures enim fuere Pontifices Romani hæretici.

† In the "Liber Diurnus Romanorum Pontificum" (ed. Paris, 1680), which was used to the 8th century at the consecration of the Popes, we find the following solemn public declaration made by them:—"Auctores novi hæretici dogmatis Sergium, &c., una cum *Honorio qui pravis eorum assertionibus fomentum impendit*, cum suprà satis hæreticis, Sabellium, &c., *exercumur ac condemnamus.*"

‡ "Unde et districti anathematis interdictioni subjicimus, si quis unquam, seu *nos*, sive est alius, qui *eorum* aliquid præsumat contra hujusmodi evangelicam traditionem, et orthodoxæ fidei Christianæque religionis integritatem; vel quidquam contrarium annitendo *immutare*, sive *subtrahere* de integritate fidei nostræ tentaverit, vel ausu sacriego hoc præsumantibus consentire."

THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE ON THE USE OF THE BIBLE.

BY HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL WISEMAN.

(Continued from page 77.)

In our last number we gave our readers the threefold grounds on which Cardinal Wiseman states that his Church refuses to give the Bible indifferently to all.

The Cardinal proceeds thus:—

"Immediately we hear the words, 'Ha! You own you are afraid of the Bible—you dare not trust your people with it. You acknowledge that if they read it, they would abandon the unity of the Church, and seek relief in the liberty of the Gospel." To this we reply, that *we fear anything which we see in others baneful.*"

He then goes on to argue that in early times the indiscriminate reading of Scripture was an impossibility, because few could read; the faithful heard the word read in the Church, and heard the sermons of Augustine, Chrysostom, or Ambrose. "The instances were few in which any one dreamt of judging for himself, and when he did, he became a schismatic or a heretic. The Church continued through centuries, and as the deepening darkness of the ages into which she descended clouded literature, the more difficult became self-willed interpretation. But, when a revived civilization infused a bold spirit into the world, with the learning of the Pagans came back their haughty spirit. Sensualism incarnated in Luther, fatalism embodied in Calvin, the luxury and the philosophy of ancient Rome, its epicureanism and its stoicism, came to battle with the Church. Luther, by teaching that every man may sin as he likes, if he only have faith—Calvin, by proclaiming that a predestined fatalism imperiously domineers over his actions, opened each his door to vice and crime, unchecked and unbounded. Both agreed in one means of gaining partisans, by setting up the private judgment—that is, the pride of each one, against what had held *undisputed* sway over the minds of all. Whoever read the Bible was to get rid of all the restraints and holy ordinances of confession, fasting, mortification, monachism, celibacy, penances, &c., and was to live by a rule of his own making, in the liberty which his passions could wring from conscience." The Church, to meet this evil, struck at the root of it, encountered its principle. This was, had the individual the right—not merely to read, but to interpret Scripture according to his private judgment, and follow this in preference to the Church's teaching? To this she answered—"No." But the evil was practical; she met it by separating the two—the reading and the interpretation. She allows the first—"*where there is no danger of the second.*" Three things were necessary for this division: First—an accurate version; secondly—such annotations as keep before the reader the Church's teaching; and, thirdly—such good sense, knowledge, and piety, as would give security that the reader did not belong to the class of "the unlearned and unstable," and would not pervert his own fancies to the authorized interpretations of the Church. To all who came within these conditions, the reading of the Bible in the vulgar tongue was, and is, permitted. *The pastors of the church could alone be the judges of their existence.* "In countries like *this*,* in which the very antagonism of Catholics with Protestants keeps alive, and before their minds constantly, the two opposing principles of Church authority and free judgment, restriction is less necessary and scarcely exists; and, on the other hand, in Catholic countries, such as can read, or do read, have access *to the Latin version without restraint.*"

An historical glance at the Reformation, by a Roman Catholic prelate, would be incomplete indeed if it did not include the usual misrepresentations respecting Luther and Calvin. They persuade themselves, by what process of reasoning we know not, that the merits of the controversy are affected by the personal character of the former, and by charges of sensuality against him. The Church of England does not pledge herself to follow the views of either Luther or Calvin, and we advert to this part of the subject not to refute any charge against either of those eminent men, but merely to say in passing, that nothing can be more untrue or inaccurate than the representation given here by Cardinal Wiseman of their doctrines. Nowhere has Luther maintained that "A man may sin as he likes, if he only have faith," and we do not believe that Calvin ever proclaimed "that a predetermined fatalism imperiously domineers over men's actions." Predestination and election are not doctrines confined exclusively to the followers of Calvin, and have been as much maintained and controverted among divines of the Church of Rome themselves as they are among Protestants.

The Cardinal then proceeds to say, that though the Scriptures may be permitted, without restraint, to those who can *read Latin*, yet the church does not *urge* them on the people, *does not encourage them to read them*, does not spread them to the utmost; and for the following reasons:—Whatever is God's work is made at once complete; he "rests from it" when he has accomplished it. Modifications and variations may appear in its secondary parts, but as to organization all is perfect. Thus it was with the creation—so with man. What God does in the physical world, created that man might live, he has done in the spiritual order, established that man might live for ever. When God bestows a system for the spiritual and eternal life it is by revelation. The first revelation completely developed was the old law. This system was delivered in a few days; the brief code of ten moral precepts, the full system of ecclesiastical law, the doctrine of clean and unclean, a priesthood, a worship, a ritual, a calendar—all was given at once; and, to this (saving additional commemorative festivals) nothing was ever added. Yet, at this time, the Book of Genesis (and perhaps that of Job) was the most that was written; the Pentateuch was finished in forty years; then some historical books were added—Joshua, Judges, Ruth, and Kings. How were men saved in the meantime? How could worship be carried on without the chaunts of David? Four hundred years passed before this, to us *apparently necessary*, portion of the Old Testament was composed, &c. The giving of the Jewish law was the work then of a few hours; the formation of its Scriptures was the work of a thousand years. The first resembled the creation of man; the second, the record of his civilization, The first was life, the second culture. Whatever was necessary to life, that is, salvation, was complete at once. Comparing this course of the first revelation with that of the second, Cardinal Wiseman commences with the descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, which he likens to that of the same spirit on the chaotic elements of the material world. In the apostles there were laid up, unconsciously, the rudiments of the future church—its primacy, episcopate, priesthood, sacraments, powers. There lay locked up commissions of boundless magnitude, to be teachers of the learned, conquerors of the strong, confounders of the proud, salt of the earth, light of the world. When the Spirit descended on them, their latent powers burst into life; the Church in all its perfection and beauty is born to all the world, to all ages. Not to mention Mary, who, the Cardinal asserts, was present, with others, when three thousand *laymen* were joined to the *clergy* in a few hours. As completely as the child is the same as the man, so is the Church of Whitsunday that of the third or the nineteenth century. The hierarchy, which is to spread its harmonious rule over the world is there, and Peter already leads its force, and centres in himself its union. The faithful are gathered round them, not to dispute but to learn; they persevered in the breaking of bread, which the Cardinal calls the eucharistic *sacrifice* and sacrament. Many came to the Apostles *confessing* their sins, who placed their hands on the baptized, gave them the Holy Ghost—ordained new ministers; and soon the sick were *anointed with oil*, and

* We think if Cardinal Wiseman had been as familiar as we are with the state of Ireland, he would scarcely have ventured on such an assertion. We should like to know the name of the parish in Ireland where such restriction scarcely exists!

were *healed* in *soul* and body. There was no room for further revelation. Whatever might be written by an inspired apostle could only be a record of what was already known and believed, a truly important, sacred, invaluable record—a treasure of wisdom—a gift of God, but still incapable of adding to the deposit of faith *safely lodged* in the Church's keeping. The first Gospel does not appear for twelve years after; and the Gospel of St. John was not written for sixty years after the death of our Lord. If this Gospel had formed a part of a plan of essential salvation, *St. John would not have risked such a lengthened space, till he was an aged man, &c.* It was, in fact, a new heresy that tempted him to write: had it come a few years later we might have been deprived of his heavenly Gospel. We cannot imagine how a spiritual Jew lived, before a psalm, or a proverb, or prophecy enlightened him, or how Christians grew to perfection, and died for the faith, before a line of the New Testament was penned. They heard, no doubt, the words and actions of our Lord, but only from faithful witnesses—not under the safe-guard of inspiration. Might not the reminiscences written down fresh have satisfied future ages as well, and yet inspiration have been withheld? And as to faith, Jesus Christ had not promised inspiration to his *Apostles' writing*, but *infallibility in teaching*. Still the Church, with gratitude and reverence, accepts, cherishes, and prizes the gift of his words to man. When she unfolds it, and reads to her children the smallest passage of her spouse's life, she orders the *tapers* of the sanctuary to burn round it, and the incense to perfume the atmosphere, and when the priest kisses the blessed text, and whispers his prayer—"Per evangelica dicta deleantur nostra delicta," he expresses more confidence in the Gospel than all the speeches in Exeter Hall can match. Nothing can exceed the value the Church sets on this inheritance, *which is exclusively hers, and of which she alone holds the record and the key*. But she would be departing from her duty, and from truth, if she held out the Scriptures *as the appointed channels of salvation*. These existed in their fulness before they were written; in the old law before the Bible; in the new, before the Testament. The means of eternal life contained by the Church are what she urges on the people; she desires them to employ the means of grace confided to her alone—the ministry of her priesthood, in exhortation, reproof, advice, direction—the devout use of the sacraments, especially penance and the eucharist—the employment of prayer, meditation, and watchfulness over the conscience. Such are the means by which saving grace was given. To Bible reading no such gift has been attached. The Cardinal professes to answer the difficulty which he anticipates—that as each book was added to the canon of the Old Testament, a new obligation was imposed of receiving and believing that book; and so a new condition of salvation was added to the law; and so the compilation of the new brought with it a new belief in its inspiration and truth, and thus modified the terms of salvation originally granted. He gives what he terms a brief and simple answer. In each case provision is made for the future contingency. In the old law Moses teaches that prophets will arise which they must hear (quoting Deut. xviii., 18), and the new law had its provision for future inspiration. And where? In *the belief of that authority which* could alone attest inspiration and sanction a canon. What the line of prophets was in the old law, the unbroken continuance of Divine authority is in the new. It was the church which gave to Christendom a uniform canon, a work not completed *till the age of councils*. The principle of believing whatever the Church should define, is the very first and fundamental one laid down in the organization of the Church from the beginning. It is not a new condition of salvation, but only an application of one laid down at the very births of Judaism and of Christianity.

We have abstracted this argument at some length, and in Cardinal Wiseman's own words, in order to give the fairest view of its substance; and we would ask, is there from beginning to end of it an argument against at least the free *reading* of the Scriptures, or a reason why the Roman Catholic Church, even while she denies the right to *interpret* Scripture, should not *urge the reading of it*, in her own authorized translation, on every one of her members who is able to read? We regret that want of space prevents us from examining every part of this argument in detail. We must content ourselves with a few words by way of caution to such of our readers as might be misled by specious language, addressed to minds predisposed to that side of the question. First, Cardinal Wiseman professes to give reasons for not urging and encouraging the reading of the Scriptures; what he does defend, however, is a very different thing—namely, that his church does not hold out the Scriptures to man "as the appointed channels of salvation," which, he says, "existed in their fulness before they were written," &c. A good deal may turn upon the meaning of terms; if these words were understood in their ordinary sense we should say, "neither do Protestants so hold them out." Our present purpose, however, is merely to point out that the Cardinal shifts his ground, and writes in defence of one thing while professing to excuse another. It is clear, that though his church considers her own authority and the means she says she possesses as the appointed channels of salvation, and holds them and not the Scriptures out as such, this does not afford a reason for not encouraging the reading of Scripture, and inviting her children to view and examine this "charter of her authority," this "storehouse of her evidences," this "armoury of her defence."

Secondly, There is nothing in this argument which might not have been, with equal force, replied to our Saviour, when he referred the Jews to the Scriptures, as bearing testimony of him, and when he told them that they erred, "not knowing the Scriptures." They might have answered—"We set an inestimable value on those invaluable records, those treasures of wisdom, but we will not encourage the reading of them, because the law was delivered to Moses in a few hours, and the Scriptures were not completed for centuries after; they were incapable of adding to the deposit of faith safely lodged in the church's keeping." Our Saviour would have replied to them, as he did at times reprove them—"In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." "Why do you transgress the commandment of God by your traditions?" "Ye have made the commandment of God of none effect by your traditions," &c.

Thirdly, Great care and caution is necessary in reading this argument, and, indeed, the whole tract, to distinguish between what is true and what is false—what is supported by reference to Divine authority, and what rests upon bare assertion, sometimes on bare insinuation. The fanciful deposit of the rudiments, the primacy, the episcopate, the priesthood, the sacraments, the powers of the church, with the boundless commissions, and the titles of highest dignity in the persons of the Apostles while yet rude and uninspired, is a tasteful and poetical idea, but it has no other foundation than the brilliant imagination of Cardinal Wiseman. The division of the persons present at the feast of Pentecost into clergy and laity, and the representation of the hierarchy as led by Peter, rest upon no better basis. The interpretation of the words "breaking of bread" into the Eucharistic *sacrifice*, the application of the anointing with oil, &c., are matters of controversy; and our objection to the use of them in this argument is, that though Cardinal Wiseman's arguments are written for Roman Catholics, yet, when one undertakes to answer objections, he should not do so on grounds which the objectors themselves deny to be true. If he does not undertake to give an answer resting on undisputed facts or doctrines, but upon grounds established by the authority of his Church alone, there is no use in this elaborate reasoning at all. The short proposition—"the Church wills it"—is sufficient in the eyes of his Roman Catholic readers; at least it is as convincing as a long train of argument referable in the end to the same ground. The same may be said of the argument founded on the text—"If he will not hear the Church," &c. It is founded upon what Protestants assert is a perversion of the text, and also upon the assumption that the Church of Rome is identical with the primitive Church; that the "Church of Whitsunday" is the Roman Catholic Church of "the nineteenth century."

Cardinal Wiseman concludes with an eloquent protestation of the great love and reverence in which he holds the written Word, the "book of his predilection from earliest youth." What a pity that his love should resemble that of the miser, who hoards his treasure and hides it from the public view, instead of putting it in circulation, for the benefit of himself and the community! What boots it that the kiss, unmatched by the speeches of Exeter Hall, is imprinted on its page, that tapers are lighted about it, that the air is perfumed around it with incense, while it lies *closed* before the priest? The primary object apparent throughout this tract, that which suggests every disparaging expression, which dictates each irreverent jest at the Bible, its readers, and its "ludicrous translations," is the exaltation of the priesthood, and the complete subjection of the laity—body, soul, and mind—beneath the yoke of their authority. If, in his zeal for this object, Cardinal Wiseman has used arguments unworthy of his high reputation and acknowledged ability, we will do him the justice to express our opinion that he was forced to resort to them for lack of better.

We now take leave of him, wishing him, notwithstanding all his professions, more love, more reverence for the Word of God, and a more constant perusal and study of its pages, commending to his attention especially those parts where our Lord directs that His Gospel shall be preached, (not necessarily by word of month only,) proclaimed and published, not only to every nation, but *to every creature*: and we venture to assure him that no impediment he can raise, no frantic efforts of his Church and her priesthood, can impede the working of the wonderful and glorious Word of God; that it will still have "free course;" it will never return void to its Giver, but will prosper in the thing whereunto He hath sent it, and by its blessed influence, diffused throughout the whole earth, there will, spite of Priest, Pope, or Cardinal, be daily added to THE TRUE CHURCH OF CHRIST such as shall be saved.

THE OLD IRISH CLERGY.

NO. II.

In illustrating the mode of hereditary succession to ecclesiastical offices and benefices, which prevailed among the ancient Irish, we commenced with a case connected with Clonmacnoise, because the accidental circumstance of the great eminence and repute in their native Church to which the family brought under our notice in that instance attained, has been the means of preserving to us a much more detailed and accurate account of such a succession in their case, than we are able to cite in any other. Next, it might seem a natural course for us to direct our inquiries to the principal religious establishments founded by *the three Patron Saints* of Ireland, and examine how far anything similar to what we have noticed at Clonmacnoise, may be observable in connection with them—*i. e.* with Armagh, St. Patrick's principal foundation; Derry and Iona, similarly connected with the name of St. Columbkille; and Kildare, no less famously associated with the memory of St. Brigid. It will be more convenient, however, to pursue a somewhat different order, and, before coming to speak of these last-named foundations, to refer to some other cases which furnish very striking illustrations of the topic now under examination.

1. The interesting ruins of the old church of *Killeshin*, situated about two Irish miles west of the town of Carlow, mark a spot which was distinguished, in very early times of Irish Church history, as the site of an ecclesiastical establishment of no small celebrity—it having been presided over in the beginning of the tenth century by one who bore the dignity of *Archbishop of Leinster*. The first mention of the place (by its ancient name, *Gleann Uiscan*) in the Annals of the Four Masters, is at A.D. 843, where we read that "Aedhan, of Gleann Uiscan, died" in that year. From this period on to A.D. 1082, the place is repeatedly mentioned in the same Annals; and in the interval between occur the *obits* [*i. e. entries of the deaths*] of nine Abbots and one *Erenach*. Among these are the following:—

A.D. 874. DERMOT, son of Corprey, Abbot of Gleann Uiscan, died.

A.D. 915. [At the great battle of Confey, near Leixlip, fell, among others of the nobility] the archbishop MAELMOGUE, son of *Dermot*, who was of the Ui-Conaonla [tribe], a distinguished scribe, anchorite, &c.

A.D. 917. DONNELL, son of *Dermot*, Abbot of Gleann Uiscan, died.

A.D. 938. ANVEY, son of *Donnell*, Abbot of Gleann Uiscan, died.

A.D. 946. CASEY, son of *Donnell*, Abbot of Gleann Uiscan, died.

A.D. 951. FELIMY, foster son of *Maelmogue*, Abbot of Gleann Uiscan, sage of Leinster, died,

A.D. 977. FLAN, son of *Maelmogue*, *Erenach* of Gleann Uiscan, died.

A.D. 986. KENCORACH, son of *Anvey*, Abbot of Gleann Uiscan, died.

A.D. 1016. DERMOT *Ua Maelmogue* [*i. e.* grandson, or descendant, of Maelmogue], Abbot of Gleann Uiscan, died.

The first abbot here named [*i.e.* Dermot] was accordingly, as it seems, father to the two next abbots, Maelmogue and Donnell. His son, Maelmogue, who succeeded him, was archbishop as well as abbot, and was father to the *Erenach* FLAN, mentioned in the seventh entry above. Donnell, brother and successor to Maelmogue, was father to Abbot Casey, named in the fifth entry. Abbot Anvey, successor to Donnell, was father to abbot Kencorach, named in the eighth entry. Abbot Felimy succeeded as foster son (a relationship valued among the Irish as much as that of natural sonship), to Archbishop Maelmogue. Perhaps Maelmogue adopted him before the birth of his own son, Flan, who was erenach of the place more than twenty-five years afterwards.

As it would be tedious to repeat similar observations on all the cases of successions of this kind which remain to be submitted to the reader's notice, we shall, in those which next follow, merely give the lists of names and dates from the Annals of the Four Masters, and trust to the reader's sagacity to observe the interesting connection that seems to subsist between the several parties concerned.

2. In connection with the church of *Killtoom*, near Castlepollard, in the County Westmeath, five obits of ecclesiastics occur in the Annals. Four of which are these following:—

A.D. 746. Eochy, of Killtoom, died.

A.D. 808. Kellach, son of Eochy, Abbot of Killtoom, died.

A.D. 849. Colga, son of Kellach, Abbot of Killtoom, died.

A.D. 883. Rovertach, son of Colga,* Abbot of Killtoom, died.

3. *Lusk* is a very well-known place in the County Dublin, midway between the Irish metropolis and the town of Drogheda. Its church was also a very distinguished one in ancient times, as appears by the frequent mention made of it in the Irish Annals. The following interesting list of abbots and other official persons belonging to it, is constructed from the notices of the place, occurring in the *Four Masters*:—

A.D. 731, CRUNNMAEL, son of *Colga*, Abbot of Lusk, [died].

A.D. 779 [*properly*, 784], CONALL, son of *Crunnael*, Abbot of Lusk, [died].

* In this entry, Dr. O'Donovan's translation has *Colgan*, by mistake, for *Colga*: Colgan, in the original, being the genitive case of the name Colga, or Colgu. If Colgan were the right English, the original should have been Colgain, the genitive of Colgan. We omit giving the Irish in full, to save space for more copious extracts.

A.D. 782 [*properly*, 787], COLGA, son of *Crunmael*, Abbot of Lusk, died.

A.D. 786 [*properly*, 791], MURRAY, son of *Ængus*, Abbot of Lusk, died.

A.D. 791 [*properly*, 796], MOYNAGH, son of *Ængus*, Prior of Lusk, died.

A.D. 799 [*properly*, 804], CORMAC, son of *Conall, œconomus* [bursar, treasurer, or 'spenser,'] of Lusk, died.

A.D. 800 [*properly*, 805], MOYNAGH, son of *Colga*, Abbot of Lusk, died.

A.D. 838, MULRONEY, son of *Cahal*, Vice-Abbot of Lusk, died.

A.D. 848, RURY [*i.e.* Roderic], Abbot of Lusk, died.

A.D. 878, ENACAN, son of *Rury*, Abbot of Lusk, died.

A.D. 891, MURRAY, son of *Mulroney*, Prior of Lusk, died.

A.D. 902, FLANN, son of *Enacan*, Abbot of Lusk, died.

A.D. 927, TOOLE, son of *Enacan*, Bishop of Dulcek and Lusk, and steward of the family of Patrick [died. The office he held as 'steward,' &c., Dr. O'Donevan explains to be that of Proctor of Armagh.]

A.D. 1055, OWAR O'Murray. Erenach of Lusk, and Chief of Ui-Colgain, died.

A.D. 1059, ANNESLEY, son of *Owar*, Erenach of Lusk [died].

4. By tracing through the Annals the different places in which mention is made of the religious establishment at *Slane*, in the Co. Meath, we are able to exhibit for it also a succession very closely similar in character to the preceding, as follows:—

A.D. 746, COLMAN of the Britons, son of Faelan, Abbot of Slane, died.

A.D. 768, MOYNAGH, son of *Colman*, Abbot of Slane and Kilbrew, died.

A.D. 782 [*properly*, 787], ROVARTACH, son of *Moynagh*, Œconomus [*i.e., House-steward*, or *Bursar*] of Slane, and Abbot of Kilbrew, died.

A.D. 784 [*properly*, 789], FEADHACH, son of *Cormac*, Abbot of Louth, Slane, and Duleek, died.

A.D. 797 [*properly*, 802], AILILL, son of *Cormac*, Abbot of Slane, a wise man and a learned judge, died.

A.D. 801 [*properly*, 806], Congal, son of *Moynagh*, Abbot of Slane, a learned sage and pure virgin, died.

A.D. 809 [*properly*, 814], Sweeny, son of *Moynagh*, Œconomus of Slane, died.

A.D. 823, COLMAN, son of *Ailill*, Abbot of Slane, and also of other churches in France and Ireland, died.

A.D. 838, COLMAN, son of *Rovartach*, Abbot of Slane, died.

A.D. 843, Lowry, son of *Ailill*. Abbot of Slane, died.

A.D. 847, Rovartach, son of Colga, Abbot of Slane, died.

A.D. 886, MAELPATRICK, son of Niall, Abbot of Slane, died.

A.D. 920, COLGA, son of *Feadhach*, Abbot of Slane, died.

A.D. 935, Feadhach, Abbot of Slane, died.

A.D. 938, Sweeny, son of *Cu-Breatan*, Abbot of Slane, killed by the foreigners [*i.e.*, the Danes].

A.D 946, COLMAN, son of *Maelpatrick*, Erenach of Slane, killed by the foreigners.

A.D. 954, Maelpatrick, son of *Cu-Breatan*, Erenach of Slane, died.

A.D. 956, LOOEY, son of *Colga*, Erenach of Slane, died.

A.D. 1001, KAYLEY, son of *Sweeny*, Abbot of Slane, died.

A.D. 1053, DONNELL UA KAYLEY [*i.e.*, grandson, or descendant, of Kayley], Erenach of Slane, died.

The series now given, it will be seen, runs through a period of 300 years, commencing just at the same part of our history as that where the MacConnemoght family, mentioned in the preceding paper, is first discernible in the Annals. How decidedly the succession to those ecclesiastical offices at Slane, which are above mentioned, was *a family matter*, is sufficiently evident from inspection of the names given in connection with those offices, together with the dates accompanying the different entries, and observing the relationships which thus appear to exist between the several persons named in them. If we are unable to trace the family character of the succession in question to an earlier date, it is merely for want of evidence, as far as we may judge from what remains on record concerning the matter; for that feature begins to appear from the very first mention of the Abbots of Slane in the Annals; the earliest name of any of them there given being that of Abbot Colman, A.D. 746, whose name stands at the head of the series above set forth. A like remark applies to the case of Lusk, which precedes; the first of its Abbots mentioned in the Annals being Crunmael, son of Colga, A.D. 731, who stands first in our list of entries connected with Lusk, as quoted from the same Annals, above. Seeing, then, that this principle of hereditary or family succession prevailed as far back in these instances as any remaining record enable us to trace the history of the places concerned, it is reasonable to conclude, that the same principle would be found to have been acted on from a still earlier date, in fact, from the first origin, probably, of the different religious foundations established in these places, had we the additional documentary evidence which would be needed to enable us to form a fuller and more comprehensive judgment concerning this matter. St. Patrick, at least, we know, from what was stated at the opening of No. 1, was considered by the ancient Irish to have had no scruples against giving to such a system the sanction of his own high authority.

5. But to proceed with our illustrations from the Annals. Of *Lann Leire*, now the old church of Lyn (on the east side of Lough Ennell, barony of Fartullagh, Co. Westmeath), we have occasional notices in them, from the middle of the eighth century to the middle of the twelfth, consisting chiefly of the obits of some six or eight successive abbots, and a few other persons connected with the place. The principal of these are comprised in the following series, commencing with the first Abbot of Lyn mentioned in the Annals:—

A.D. 740, Cuimmene *Ua Moynagh*, Abbot of Lann Leire, died.

A.D. 776 [*properly* 781], Moynagh *Ua Moynagh*, Abbot of Lann Leire, died.

A.D. 843, Gormal, son of *Murray*, Bishop and Anchorite of Lann Leire, died.

A.D. 848. FEARCHAIR, son of *Murroy*, Abbot of Lann Leire, died

A.D. 867, FLANN, son of *Feorchair*, Abbot of Lann Leire, and œconomus (*i. e.* house steward,) of Armagh, died.

A.D. 893. Carbery, son of Sweeny, Abbot of Lann Leire, died.

A.D. 919. KEANNEY, son of *Flann*, Abbot of Lann Leire, died.

A.D. 930. Sweeny, Abbot of Lann Leire, died.

A.D. 965. FLANN, son of Œngus, Abbot of Lann Leire, died.

A.D. 1016. Œngus, son of *Flann*, Erenach of Lann Leire, died.

A.D. 1021. Moynagh, priest and Erenach of Lann Leire, died.

6. The system of hereditary succession shows itself to have been in operation at the great religious foundation at St. Edan, at *Ferns*, also, although we have not the means of tracing it among the earlier officials of the place, whose names occur in the Four Masters, from A.D. 624 onwards. At A.D. 900, however, and subsequently, we meet with the illustrations contained in the following entries.

A.D. 900. LACHNAN, Abbot of Ferns, died.

A.D. 937. LYNAM, coarb [or Abbot] of Ferns and Tallaght, died.

A.D. 956. FINNACHTA, son of *Lachnan*, erenach of Ferns, died.

A.D. 965. CARBERY, son of *Lynam*, Abbot of Ferns and Timolin, died.

A.D. 996. Conn Ua [*i.e. grandson*, or *descendant of*,] *Lynam*, Abbot of Ferns, died.

A.D. 1043. Conor Ua Lynam, Erenach of Ferns and Timolin, died.

A.D. 1062. Murrogh Ua Lynam, Erenach of Ferns, died.

A.D. 1085. Ugaire Ua Lynam, Erenach of Ferns, died.

7. Between some of the entries in the annals connected with the Church of *Monasterboice*, county Louth, a like sort of relationship may be observed, in these, for instance:—

A.D. 759. CORMAC, son of Ailill, Abbot of Monasterboice, died.

A.D. 762. Dudinver, son of *Cormoc*, Abbot of Monasterboice, drowned in the Boyne.

A.D. 1056. FLANN MAINISTREACH, lector of Monasterboice, a sage distinguished among the Gaeil for acquirements literary, historical, poetic, and scientific, died December the 18th, as is said,

"Flann of sweet Boice's fav'rite Church," &c.

A.D. 1067. AHERN, son of, *Flann Mainistreach*, Erenach of Monasterboice, died.

A.D. 1118. Owen, son of *Ahiern*, Coarb of Boice, [*i.e.* Abbot of Monasterboice,] died.

A.D. 1122. Fergna, son of *Ahiern*, [or Mac Ahiern] a wise priest, died.

8. Of the Abbots of the Church of Kilglinn (parish of Balfeaghan, barony of Upper Deece, county Meath), called in the *Annals* Kildua, these two only are mentioned by the *Four Masters*.

A.D. 834. Brasal, son of Cormac, erenach, or Abbot, of Kildua and other churches, died.

A.D. 841. Finnacta, son of Brasal, Abbot of Kildua, died.

9. Connected with the distinguished Church of Emly, we have, among others, these obits:—

A.D. 817. Rehawry Ua Mohiern, sage and Abbot of Emly, died.

A.D 870. Kenfela Ua Mohiern, lord of Cashel died, after a long and protracted illness. He was Abbot of Emly.

A.D. 886. Owen, son of Kenfela, Abbot of Emly, died.

10. Among the Abbots of St. Brendan's famous foundation, at Clonfert, county Longford, are mentioned the two following:—

A.D. 776 [*properly* 781]. Floinia, son of Congal, Abbot of Clonfert Brendain, died.

A.D. 778. Floinia's son, Abbot of Clonfert, died.

11. The entries connected with the Church of Trevet, county Meath, in the *Four Masters*, contain these following;—

A.D. 788. Dovach, Erenach of Trevet, died.

A.D. 808. Conall, son of Dovach, Abbot of Trevet, died.

A.D. 833. Cormac, son of Conall, Abbot of Trevet, died.

12. The abbacy of the Church of Terryglass, (near Borrisokane, county Tipperary,) was, in the eleventh century, a part of the hereditary property of Brian Boru's family, as appears from the entries in the Four Masters, which we next cite, the Kennedy mentioned in them being Brian's father.

A.D. 1007. Kelcher, son of Donncuan, son of Kennedy, Abbot of Terryglass, died.

A.D. 1009. Marcan, son of Kennedy, head of the clergy of Munster, coarb of Colum, son of Crivhan, [*i.e.* Abbot of Terryglass,] &c., died. [He was brother to Brian Boru, and uncle of the preceding abbot. This entry is given in a corrupt form by the Four Masters, but easily corrected from the Annals of Ulster, their authority in the matter.]

A.D. 1081. Keleher Ua Kennedy, coarb of Colum, son of Crivhan, died.

A.D. 1152. Finn, grandson of Kelcher Ua Kennedy, coarb of Colum, son of Crivhan, died.

N.B.—The Church of Terryglass having been founded by St. Colum, son of Crivhan, its abbots were styled his *coarbs*, or successors there.

13. The two entries next cited from the Four Masters, refer to St. Finnian's famous foundation, at Moville, county Down.

A.D. 1061. Tiernach Borkagh, chief spiritual adviser of Ireland, anchorite and coarb of Finnian, died of the plague.

A.D. 1098. Flaherty, son of Tiernach Borkagh, coarb of Finnian of Moville, died on his pilgrimage.

A.D. 1170, [mention is made of] the monk Awlave, son to the coarb of Finnian [*i.e.* to the *Abbot*] of Moville; [but no other office beyond that of a monk is assigned to him. The passage referred to seems, however, to imply that he had been an abbot, but was deposed from that office for some offence committed by him.]

It remains for us to consider, as proposed at the outset of this paper, how far any symptoms of the operation of the principle of hereditary succession are traceable in the principal ecclesiastical foundations of the three patron saints of Ireland; and we shall, accordingly, now direct our attention briefly to the cases of Iona, Derry, and Kildare, leaving that of Armagh for more special examination in a future paper. Durrow, another famous establishment of St. Columbkille's, in the north of the King's County, may also receive here a passing notice, in connection with his foundations in Derry and Iona.

14. St. Columbkille was of the royal family of Tirconnell or Donegal. Tirconnell (*i.e.* Conall's country) was so named from its being the seat of the descendants of Conall Gulban, son to Niall of the Nine Hostages, which Niall was one of the most famous of ancient Irish monarchs. Fergus, a son of the said Conall, was father to Felimy, the father of Columbkille; and the saint was, accordingly, great grandson to Conall, after whose family Tirconnell was named. The lineal descendants of the same Conall became afterwards possessed of the chief power in the Abbey of Derry, and it would seem in that of Iona also, as may be inferred from the following entries:—

A.D. 595. S. Baethan, son of Brennan, Abbot of I-colum-kille [or Iona], died on the 9th of June.

A.D. 601. S. Laisren, Abbot of I-colum-kille, died September 16.

A.D. 677. FALVEY, Abbot of I-colum-kille, died March 22.

A.D. 702. Adamnan, son of Ronan, Abbot of I-colum-kille, died September 23.

A.D. 708. Conawil [or Conan.—*Annals of Ulster*], son of *Falvey*, Abbot of I. [columkille] died.

A.D. 713. ST. DORBENY Foda [*i.e.*, Dorbeny the Tall], Abbot of I. [columbkille] died October 28th.

A.D. 714. Faelhu, son of *Dorbeny*, was appointed to the Abbacy of I [columkille] on Saturday, August 29, in the 74th year of his age.

A.D. 762. Sleveny, son of Conghal, of the race of Conall Gulban, Abbot of I. [columkille] died.

A.D. 810. Kellach, son of Conghal, Abbot of I-colum-kille, died.

Baethan, the *second* Abbot of Iona (named in the first entry above) and Columbkille, were first and second cousins, Baethan being son to Brennan, son of Murray, Columkille's uncle. Lasrean, the *third* Abbot, was also a descendant of Conall Gulban, and stood to Columkille in the same relationship as Baethan did, he being son to Feradach, the son of Ninnedh, another uncle of the saint's. Adamnan, again, Dr. O'Donovan remarks, was seventh in descent from Conall Gulban. Sleveney, A.D. 762, is said by the *Four Masters* to have been of the same race. Two other Abbots above-named were the fathers, respectively, it will be seen, of

abbots coming after in the list. Several others belonging to the same period are unnoticed here, the *Four Masters* affording us no means of tracing any relationship between them. But the evidence which is available from their Annals, for our present purpose, although less full in some respects than could have been wished, abundantly suffices to show this much, at least, that the method of family succession was in use at Iona, not only at a very early period, but even from the very first institution of the place, and with the sanction of its founder, by whose appointment his cousin, Baethan, became his own immediate successor.

15. Of the abbots who successively governed the institution founded at Derry by St. Columkille, for more than 250 years from its first origin, we know nothing; not even a name of any one of them previously to the latter half of the ninth century being found on record in our ancient annals. Of the notices to be met with of those who came after, the following are a few. (See the learned *Ordnance Memoir of Derry*, which is our authority for a few additions in the following entries to the information supplied by the annals of the Four Masters; pp. 26, &c.)

A.D. 844. Niall Caille, son of Hugh Ornee, having been sovereign of Ireland for 13 years, was drowned in the Callan [co. Kilkenny, probably].

A.D. 879. Murtogh, son of Niall, Abbot of Derry and other churches, died.

A.D. 906. Donnell, son of Hugh Finlia, Lord of Ailleach, took the [pilgrim's] staff. [N.B. Aileach was a royal residence, about five miles N.W. of Derry.]

A.D. 911. Donnell, son of Hugh Finlia, Lord of Aileach, died in religion, after a good life.

A.D. 919. Kinaedh, son of Donnell, Abbot of Derry and Drumhome [co. Donegal], head of the council of the descendants of Conall, died.

A.D. 925. St. Maelbride, son of Tornan, coarb [*or*, successor] of Patrick, Columkille, and Adamnan [*i. e.*, Abbot of Armagh, Derry, and Raphoe], head of the piety of all Ireland, &c., died at a good old age. From Colgan's notice of this eminent man [in his *Acta Sanctorum*], it appears that he was of the same royal stock as Columkille himself, being the twelfth in descent from Conall Gulban, son of Niall of the Nine Hostages.

A.D. 927. Kencorach, son of Maelweer, Abbot and Bishop of Derry, &c., died. This abbot also was descended in the twelfth degree from Conall Gulban, as appears from the Genealogies of the Irish Saints.

A.D. 936. Dubhthach [or Duffy, son of Duan], coarb of Columkille and Adamnan in Ireland and Scotland [*i. e.*, Abbot of Derry, Raphoe, and Iona], died. He was nephew to his predecessor, and thirteenth in descent from Conal Gulban.

A.D. 950. Aylan, son of Egneach, son of Dalach, coarb of Columkille [*i. e.* Abbot of Derry, &c.], died. He was of the royal family of Tireonnell, and thirteenth in descent from Conall Gulban. The Four M. give the death of Egneach, son of Dalach, Lord of Tyreonnell, at A.D. 901.

A.D. 952. Rovartach, coarb of Columkille and Adamnan, died.

A.D. 962. Duskila, son of Kinaedh, coarb of Columkille, died.

A.D. 967. Aenghus, grandson of Rovartach, anchorite of Derry, Columkille, died.

The first abbot brought under our notice in this list (before whom only one other is mentioned in the *Annals*)—viz., Murtogh, A.D. 879, appears plainly to have been the son of the Monarch Niall Caille mentioned in the previous entry. That monarch had come of a devout family, his paternal grandfather, Niall Frosach, having resigned his regal sceptre to spend the last years of his life in religious retirement at Iona (as mentioned by the Four Masters), at A.D. 765. Kinaedh, the next abbot named in the extracts above, was in like manner evidently the son of Prince Donnell, of the same family; Donnell being grandson to Niall Caille, by his son Hugh Finlia, father of the said Donnell. And this Donnell, after the example of his progenitor, Niall Frosach, had spent his latter days "in religion," most probably in the establishment of Derry, in which his son became abbot. The continued influence of the same royal race in other later entries above will be sufficiently observable on inspection.

16. The few entries connected with *Durrow*, in the Annals, are not wholly barren of matter illustrative of our present subject. Among them occur these:—

A.D. 788. Kinaedh, son of Cumusgach, Abbot of Durrow, died.

A.D. 835. Saerghus*, grandson of Kinaedh, Abbot of Durrow, died.

A.D. 848. Toole, son of Fearadhach, Abbot of Reachrainn and Durrow, died.

17. The *Reachrainn* here named is not the well-known island of that name off the coast of Antrim (called also Rathlin, and Raghery,) but the island near Howth (Co. Dublin), now called Lambay, on which Columkille erected a monastery. Fearadhach, father of Toole, named in the last entry, had been himself also abbot of Reachrainn, as appears from this notice of him in the same *Annals*:—

A.D. 791. Fearadhach, son of Seighenl, Abbot of Reachrainn, died.

18. As for *Kildare*, the Annals, although registering the obits of many of the *abbesses* who succeeded St. Brigid in that place, yet supply us with no materials enabling us to ascertain what relationships may have existed between the several successive occupants of the office. But with the *abbots* who held office in the same place, and the origin of whose succession dates from the same period, the case is different. The operation of the system of hereditary succession is observable plainly enough among them, as well as the fact, that the particular family in which the right of succession to this abbacy became vested, was the royal one of Leinster. A sufficient foundation for these remarks will be found in the extracts which follow:—

A.D. 638. Hugh Duv, Abbot and Bishop of Kildare, died. He had been at first King of Leinster.

A.D. 697. Forannan, Abbot of Kildare, died.

A.D. 747. Cahal, son of *Forannan*, Abbot of Kildare, died.

A.D. 771. Kellach, son of Donogh, King of Leinster, died.

A.D. 782. Murray, son of *Cuhal*, Abbot of Kildare, died.

A.D. 799. Faelan, son of *Kellach*, Abbot of Kildare, died.

A.D. 803. Finnachta, son of *Kellach*, King of Leinster, died at Kildare.

A.D. 821. Murray, son of *Kellach*, Abbot of Kildare, died.

A.D. 826. Hugh, son of *Kellach*, Abbot of Kildare, died.

A.D. 836. Regan, son of *Finnachta*, joint King of Leinster, died.

A.D. 850. Artry, son of *Faelan*, Erenach of Kildare, died.

A.D. 868. Coffey, son of *Murray*, Abbot of Kildare, a wise and well-learned doctor died. Of him was said, &c. [Then follows a quotation from an ode in his praise, in which he is styled a *descendant of Kellach*, &c.]

A.D. 878. Sweeny, grandson to Finnachta, Bishop of Kildare, died.

A.D. 882. Murray, son of Bran, Lord of Leinster, and Abbot of Kildare, [died]. Of him it was said, &c. [Then follows an elegy.]

A.D. 892. Bran, son of Murray, *tanist* of Leinster, was slain.

A.D. 920. Flannagan, grandson of *Regan*, Abbot of Kildare, and Royal Heir of Leinster, died.

A.D. 930. Flann, son of Murray, royal heir of Leinster, died.

A.D. 942. Flann, son of Finn, and Maelmora, two Royal Heirs of Leinster, died.

A.D. 965. Murray, son of Faelan, Abbot of Kildare, and Royal Heir of Leinster, was slain by Aulave, Lord of the Foreigners, &c.

A.D. 985. Murray, son of Flann, successor (*coarb*) of Conlath [*i. e.*, Abbot of Kildare], died.

This Murray, son of Flann, is the last Abbot of Kildare whose name occurs in the Annals. The entries thus given in connection with Kildare, run, it will be seen, through a period of about three hundred and fifty years, commencing before the middle of the seventh century. And they serve to illustrate well, both the working of the principle to which this paper has been referring throughout, and also the close union existing between Church and State in those old times. It should be observed, moreover, that all the evidence thus far adduced concerning the mode of succession under consideration has been wholly of an incidental nature; the compilers of the *Annals* having had it in view, not to enlighten posterity concerning the genealogies of the Irish ecclesiastics, but only to identify them, so far as might seem necessary, for preserving the proper obits of some of them on record. What was thought of these Irish successions in other parts of the Church Catholic, when attention was drawn to them abroad, we shall see presently, if permitted, as we hope to be, to resume the subject, and examine the case of Armagh in particular, in a future paper.

THE MARLEYS.

CHAPTER II.

Since the discussion with Father Paul O'Reilly, on prayers to the saints, detailed in our last number, Edith and Adeline Marley had applied themselves more carefully to a diligent reading of the sacred Scriptures. They were still somewhat frightened at the denunciations which they had heard against the exercise of the right of private judgment, and the danger of anybody, but the Church or the priest, interpreting the Word of God; so they thought the best way to arrive at a correct knowledge of the real state of the case would be to listen to both sides of the argument, and, accordingly, they made up their minds to attend a course of controversial sermons on the subject, both at church and chapel, and thus, having heard both authorities giving their respective versions of the matter, to judge for themselves which had the warrant of God in their favour. They waited with some impatience the approach of Lent, which, by some strange arrangement of things, is made a season of religious controversy. In pursuance of their former purpose they attended a course of sermons, preached at the chapel of ——— street, in Dublin, and, at the same time, as we have hinted, thought it would be no harm to listen to another set of sermons on the Protestant side of the question, by the Rev. Mr. G———, an extremely faithful and zealous clergyman, who preached not very far from the aforesaid chapel.

It so happened that the priest appointed to preach at ———street chapel was a gentleman whom we shall call the Rev. Mr. Lawrenson, an intimate acquaintance of their father. Mr. Lawrenson was a man of distinguished literary and scientific attainments, of polished address, and gay and engaging manners, and, being still comparatively a young man, was, perhaps, as fitted to be a courtier as a priest. He had been, during the previous winter, a frequent guest at Hollywood, and had been subjected to many an inquiry on matters of religion, by our young friends, which he answered, or confessed himself unable to answer, with an extraordinary degree of frankness and *nonchalance*. He rather endeavoured to divert their attention from such topics, and lead them to subjects of literature and science, in which he was a proficient. His conversation was fascinating; his manner kind, courteous, and playful; and he laid himself out to win the confidence and friendship of the two sisters. In this he succeeded in no small degree, and Father Lawrenson was the universal favourite of everybody at Hollywood, and had become, as it were, the confessor of the family. With Edith and Adeline he was still more intimately associated. He became the preceptor of their studies, their counsellor in their little plans and arrangements, and their companion in many a walk. In these they took advantage of their intimacy and opportunity, to discuss the most prominent points of controversy between the Protestant and Roman Catholic Churches, and brought forward such passages of Scripture as they had found bearing upon the subject, and had become, from practice, and earnest and prayerful reading, expert reasoners on the matter, and thoroughly conversant with every text and argument that is habitually brought forward on either side, and with these they pressed Father Lawrenson, without mercy or reserve, really anxious to arrive at the truth, and to have the benefit of his learning and acknowledged great intellectual powers. Father Lawrenson entered into such discussions but feebly, and resisted the arguments brought to bear upon him more weakly every day; and indeed, before very long, he gave the sisters to perceive, though he never openly ventured to make the confession, that neither his heart nor his understanding were on the side of the Church of which he was an ordained and officiating priest, and a distinguished ornament. He so faintly deprecated their inquiries and doubts that he rather seemed to sanction them. Fancy then, reader, the astonishment of Edith and Adeline on going, on a Thursday to ——— street chapel, to find Father Lawrenson mount the pulpit to deliver a controversial sermon, on the subject of the Eucharist. They waited with breathless anxiety to hear what texts and arguments he would adduce before a large and attentive congregation, assembled to be instructed and confirmed in their faith by the reverend and learned preacher. They, on this vital point of Catholic doctrine, listened with amazement at the solemn mockery of passages of Scripture cited by the priest (unconscious, no doubt, of the presence of two individual members of his auditory), which he had an hundred times admitted to have no earthly application to the controversy, and some of them to prove directly the reverse of what he had admitted to be their obvious meaning. As soon as the sermon was over, they hurried out, so as to extricate themselves from the general congregation, with a sense of awe and terror, and almost with an inclination to address them in the language of the Prophet—"Come out from among them, O my people." Very soon afterwards they contrived to attend a controversial sermon preached by the Rev. Mr. G———, and could not fail to contrast the earnest and affectionate manner, the pure and plain Gospel truth, enforced in a spirit of charity and sound common sense, with the cold logic and laboured metaphysics of the sermon they had heard so recently. It is not our present purpose to enter into a detail of either discourse, or to enforce the relative merits or defects of either. The main object of our pages has been to assist our Roman Catholic readers to find the truth for themselves; and we trust we have not been found unfaithful, and that many of them have derived assistance in their inquiries from our paper. Mrs. Marley, some few years before the time of our narrative, had accidentally (or rather, should we not say, in the wise providence of God) met with a weekly newspaper, containing a report of the proceedings at a meeting of the Irish Society at the Rotundo. She read in this the speech of some good and faithful man, and it opened to her mind truths which she had never known before, and which made a deep impression on her mind, and set her on diligent examination of the subject. Being of a timid disposition and undecided character, she never ventured to speak of these matters, but treasured them up in her mind. Thus, strange it was that, in the same family, an attached mother and two sisters, who had in general every thought and feeling in common, for some time were each under the influence of a powerful change of mind without the knowledge of the other, and without venturing to disclose what was passing in her own mind. Such an instance as this cheers us with the hope that in many a quarter, where fear or persecution, or the many influences of the world, may

---

* The extremely rare occurrence of this name in the Annals makes it highly probable that the person here intended was father to the Bishop of Armagh, thus noticed at A.D. 858:—

Kellach, son of Saerghus, anchorite, and Bishop of Armagh, died.

prevent the open declaration of the truth, it may have taken root, and in due time bear its fruit.

As time wore on, many at least of our readers will scarcely be surprised to learn that Edith and Adeline became more fixed in their convictions as to the errors of the Roman Catholic faith. Still they could not muster courage to avow their change of mind, not having the direct countenance of their mother, and dreading the fiery wrath and displeasure of their father, whose advanced age added a peculiar sanction to his parental displeasure. Indeed, to incur their father's displeasure was an event which they dared not contemplate for a moment; yet they had become satisfied that the wrath of God, their Almighty and Heavenly Father, was infinitely a more serious matter, and that it was involved in their attendance at the celebration of the mass, in which the one offering, by which God had perfected for ever them that were sanctified, was set at nought, and the perishable elements of bread and wine held forth for adoration and worship, in plain and palpable defiance of the denunciations against idolatry, or the worship of anything but the true and invisible God. They accordingly resolved that, come what might, they would never again be present at the offering up of the sacrifice of the mass; but in order to preserve appearances, and to avoid an open rupture, they regularly entered the chapel doors on the right hand side, and walked out at the left side, and passed over to hear the Gospel preached in all its glorious fulness and freedom by their friend, the Rev. Mr. G——. It would require a greater degree of casuistry than we desire to possess to determine whether, in this compromise to appearances there was involved a reprehensible compromise of principle, and we do not pretend to say whether the example of Naaman, the Syrian, who asked and obtained permission from the prophet Elisha to enter the temple of Rimmon and bow the knee to the false god, can be adduced to justify the entering a house in which a false worship is carried on, although it is not partaken in. However, the timidity of Edith and Adeline induced them to adopt a course that might save appearances, and save them from open disclosure of their change of feeling before the eyes of the Major. Circumstances seemed to favour this course. The Major, though formerly a regular attendant at chapel every Sunday, had latterly, from advanced age, been unable to go out as usual. Mrs. Marley, it may be guessed from what we have said, though she gave no express sanction to her daughters deserting their religious attendance at the mass, did not interfere with them, while Marcella regarded with unutterable anguish the defection of her sisters, whose early education had been chiefly intrusted to herself, and, with many a bitter pang of remorse, she reproached herself with not having been more diligent in imbuing their young minds with Catholic truth; yet she dreaded her father's violent temper too much, and loved her sisters too tenderly, to expose them to his displeasure by revealing their conduct to him. But many a time the sisters found themselves on the brink of a volcano. The Major would, Sunday after Sunday, at 11 o'clock, announce his intention of going to mass, and would make every preparation to be ready. Then impended a crisis, when they should either have abjured the truth of God or come to an open rupture with their father. On such an occasion, as argument or expostulation would have had a precisely opposite effect, and only determined him to go, Edith and Adeline having no resource in themselves, would betake themselves to their knees, and ask the great Disposer of all events, who taketh cognizance of the falling of a sparrow, and counteth the hairs of the heads of his people, to spare them such a trial, and keep their dear father from attending what they conceived to be the idolatry of the mass: and certain it was, that some passing cloud, some fancied ailment, some whim, as light as air, would turn the purpose of the Major, and, when the carriage had driven up to the door, he would unexpectedly say, "I don't think, my dear, I will go out to-day."

In this way Edith and Adeline were left, comparatively free to follow the dictates of their own consciences, and to pursue the path of truth, as they considered it to be, free and unmolested. But it was not long before their kind and gossipping friends perceived their mysterious disappearance from mass, and noticed that Mrs. Marley and Marcella, though always accompanied by the two younger girls when entering the chapel, were, some way or other, without them when leaving it. Others of their inquiring friends found out that, about two o'clock, the two young ladies were to be met in the direction of —— street church, and, as there is no philosopher so diligent in the pursuit of knowledge as the gossip in the pursuit of scandal, the sisters were watched, and traced, and actually discovered entering the precincts of the church. The parish priest and the bishop were very soon apprized of the scandalous proceeding; the alarm was sounded and spread, and the neighbourhood duly informed, and, though nobody ventured to be the direct medium of communicating such bad news to the Major, it was not long before he received a bundle of anonymous letters, written by *sincere* friends and devoted Roman Catholics, warning him "that he was nurturing a pair of vipers in his bosom, and they of his own household were about to disgrace and dishonour him." To do the old Major justice, whatever might have been his feelings of alarm or indignation at such intelligence as this, he had a manly and thorough contempt for all anonymous letter writers, he regarded them as cowards, and suspected them as being slanderers, and he would have considered himself demeaned if he were betrayed into any participation of their base purpose by acting upon their information. Accordingly he put a restraint upon himself, and never mentioned the intelligence he had received to anybody. Another circumstance happened shortly after this, which added something more to the Major's disquietude. The housemaid, Ellen, had brought him a Protestant Bible, which, she said, she had seen Miss Adeline continually reading; but, at the same time, she extracted from him a solemn promise not to mention her name in the matter, as (though she had been ordered at confession to give the Bible to the Major) "she would not, for all the world, bring dear Miss Adeline into any trouble." This further piece of intelligence, communicated under the seal of confidence, added fuel to the internal fire which was consuming the soul of the Major and had no vent.

Edith and Adeline had remarked for some time that their father, though still affectionate in manner as usual, was more reserved, and less familiar and playful with them than was his wont. Mrs. Marley, also, found his temper more excitable, and it was not long before the Major found occasion to speak. On a Monday morning, Father O'Reilly, the parish priest, and the Very Reverend Dr. ——, the Vicar-General of the diocess, drove up to Hollywood. Their arrival struck the young converts as being portentous of no good. After about half an hour's private conference with their father, the parlour bell was rung peremptorily, if not violently, and a summons forwarded, requesting the attendance of Miss Edith and Miss Adeline in the parlour. They entered the room with a slow and faltering step, in fear and trembling, and not without a prayer first offered up for strength and wisdom. The old Major was sitting at the table, with his writing desk open before him, excited and inflamed to a degree that alarmed the timid girls. Father O'Reilly sat at the window, looking as perplexed and uncomfortable as possible, while the Reverend Vicar-General had a cold, impassive, inquisitorial expression of countenance, that would have struck terror into the heart of an ordinary heretic, and might have caused the Maid of Orleans herself to quail. He received the girls with a smile, like the glare of a winter's sun upon the dark waters of a gloomy lake. His object seemed to be to reduce them to immediate submission, by a resolute attack upon their fears, and the scene was eminently calculated to produce such an effect. Their father motioned them to be seated, and said to Edith, in a tone of affected calmness and placidity—"Edith, may I take the liberty of asking you when were you last at confession?"

"Not for some time, papa," replied Edith, rather boldly.

"Then, may I expect that you will attend Mr. —— to confession, on Friday next?"

"Indeed, papa, I will do anything in the world to please you, consistently with my sense of what is due to God, and what he commands me to do."

The Major said—"Edith, I desire to have no equivocation or reservation; I wish to have a distinct answer to my request; will you go to confession on Friday next, according to my wish and desire, or will you not?"

To this Edith, after a moment's pause and reflection, replied—"Do not, dearest papa, press me on this subject, until I can explain to you what my reasons are, and, I am persuaded, I will satisfy you that I am acting rightly in pursuing the course dictated to me by my conscience."

"Am I, then, to understand you, Edith, to mean that you will not go?"

"Indeed, papa, it is not fair to press me now on the subject."

Upon this the Major turned round to Adeline, pale as death, and trembling with terror, and fiercely demanded of her—

"Well, madam, what is your answer to my most unreasonable request, that you shall attend confession on Friday next?"

Adeline, more dead than alive, appeared to be on the point of fainting; she looked up, slowly and fearfully, and met the scowling glance of the Vicar-General lowering upon her triumphantly, as if he beheld her conquered and at his feet. She aroused herself, and with an energy which, a moment before, appeared impossible, she advanced toward her father, and said—"Dearest papa, anything on the earth you desire me or wish me to do, however hard or disagreeable, I will cheerfully do; but to go to confession, or to make any such compliance with a system, which I believe to be one of rank error, I cannot, and most decidedly will not do."

At this unexpected announcement the Major was perfectly astounded. From their earliest childhood he had not only exacted but received the most implicit obedience, and never had heard before his slightest wish questioned, much less denied. When he recovered himself sufficiently his wrath knew no bounds, he stamped and strode about the room, and expressed himself in language neither measured nor orthodox. He imprecated in terrible words all heretics in general, and especially his disobedient and recreant daughters. He vowed all sorts of vengeance, and declared, in the most solemn and awful manner, that his roof should never for a night harbour any heretic who disgraced his family and his name, and that they should begone immediately from his presence for ever, and the old man in a paroxysm of uncontrollable passion and grief knelt down for the wicked purpose of pouring upon the children of his old age and affection, whom he most tenderly and devotedly loved, the direst, most terrific words that human tongue can utter—a father's curse.

Edith and Adeline sprang like the lightning to their father's side and literally closed his lips with their hands, and with wild and bitter tears they cried out almost in one voice—"Oh, papa! cast us out on the world if you please—kill us, but do not curse us."

This was no sudden impulse that had moved them. It had been for months their daily, almost hourly prayer, that their dear father, whose temper knew no restraints, might never be permitted to curse them. They felt they could encounter every trial and every persecution—fire—sword—the loss of friends—misconstruction—anything but a father's curse, and yet they foresaw that no danger was more imminent, and accordingly they made it the subject of their constant prayer that that calamity at least should be averted from them.

In this instance the Major was, for the time, absolutely silenced, and drawn with gentle violence to his chair, while his daughters hung upon his neck in tears. The Vicar-General, seeing that he was over-doing the business, and that, by driving matters to extremities, he might lose his game altogether, advanced to the Major, and, in the most conciliatory and soothing tones, reproached him for his violence, and said that "he had no doubt his daughters were very good girls, and if left to their own good sense, and if they would but explain to their spiritual preceptors what their difficulties were, they would soon find them removed, and the Major would have the satisfaction of seeing them act as he wished." The Vicar-General then blandly asked Edith and Adeline would they not consent to see the Bishop, and explain to him what their doubts and difficulties were, and see whether he could not remove them. They readily assented, and said "they had no objection whatever to hear from the Bishop anything he had to say on the subject which had influenced their conduct, as their only desire was to arrive at the truth."

The Major, whose fits of passion were as transient as they were violent, was half ashamed of himself by this time, and, affectionately kissing his daughters, said he had always found them good and dutiful children, and was happy to hear that they would act as Dr. —— had advised, and hoped he would hear no more of their new-fangled notions; and then he gave them permission to leave the room, of which they availed themselves with alacrity, and were soon found at the throne of grace, thanking their Almighty Father for his deliverance of them from this terrible ordeal, and, above all, from their Father's curse.

Their visit to the Bishop we must postpone to our next number.

THE TALK OF THE ROAD.—No. XV.

"Well, Pat, what were you doing since I saw you?" said Jem, when they met next.

"Well, then, I was hearing a sermon in Kilcommon," said Pat.

"And was it Father John that was in it?" said Jem.

"No, then," said Pat, "it was Doctor Martin, from England, that was a Protestant clergyman and that turned; and I saw it up in letters as big as my hand, so I thought I'd go and see if he came up to Father John."

"Well, and how did he do it?" said Jem.

"Well, he's a great preacher entirely," said Pat, "and no mistake, for you would hear him a mile off. But for what he said, it beat all that ever I heard from ourselves itself. Why, sure he spoke it out plain, that the Blessed Virgin was the wife of the Holy Ghost!* Now, is that in the Bible, I want to know?"

"Why, Pat," said Jem, "sure that beats ourselves all out; sure that's worse nor ever we were. Doesn't the Blessed Virgin call herself the handmaid of the Lord? and to go to make a woman the wife of God! sure that beats all. And didn't God say, that man and wife are one flesh? and how can she be one flesh with Him? Sure it's too bad entirely."

"And how comes it at all," said Pat, "that the great English clergy, that has learning and knowledge, should be turning to worse than the likes of us can stand?"

"Well, I heard Mr. Owens preach a sermon on that," said Jem, "and he made it plain enough, for he said our hearts was all turned away from the truth, by nature, and that the wise and learned was as bad this way as the poorest creatures; and he showed that it wasn't the wise and learned that was mostly called,† but that the Gospel was preached to the poor,‡ and that God had chosen the foolish to confound the wise;§ and if that was the way in St. Paul's own time, why wouldn't it be that way now? And he said, forehy that, the most learned of those clergy that turned in England didn't give any learned reason for it at all; but just no better nor ourselves would give, when the priest told us that his way was right;‖ and sure that's the poor proof, when it isn't in the Bible? And isn't it enough to make out Mr. Owens right, when Dr. Martin says the like of that? But what more did he say?"

"Well, of all that ever you heard, he said of the Protestant clergy. He said he knew them well, for he was one himself, and that they didn't believe in God, or in Jesus Christ, or in the Holy Ghost itself; but that they was all infidels and heathens."

* Pat is, probably, correct in this, shocking as it may appear, for we find a similar statement in a report of a sermon, preached at Navan, by Dr. Marshall, in 1852; published by T. Henderson, Kells.
† 1 Cor. i., 26. ‡ Matt. xi., 5; Luke iv., 18. § 1 Cor. i., 27.
‖ This was shown in our number for March, 1852, vol. i., p. 23.

"Well, it'll go hard with me before I take his word that Mr. Owens does not believe in God or in Jesus Christ," said Jem; "but what more, Pat?"

"Well, he said that they didn't care about the souls of the people at all, and that, with all the talk they made, they didn't want the people to turn Protestants at all, but only to pretend to do it; and that they give the people five pounds a piece only just to pretend it, and him getting five pounds for preaching that same sermon, as I heard tell."

"Well, stop there a bit, Pat," said Jem; "if the priest thought that the five pounds a piece was really going, would he give it out in the chapel that way? Doesn't he know there would be plenty to look for it, if it was to be got? and, if it was true, wouldn't he be more like to tell the people they wouldn't get the money at all, and they needn't go to look for it?"

"Well, signs by," said Pat, "I was up with Mr. Owens next day, and who should I see at the door but Molly Brady; and Mr. Owens comes out and asks her what she wants: 'your reverence,' says she, 'I'm a girl that wants to turn;' and so Mr. Owens began to talk to her about the reasons for turning; and Molly kept looking at him mighty hard; and at last, says she, 'but what are yees going to give me?' says she. 'So,' says Mr. Owens, 'we're going to give you the Word of God,' says he, 'that's able to save your soul.' 'And won't yees give me the five pounds?' says she: so when he told her that was all a lie, she went off in a huff; so I overtook her going back, 'and who told you that, Molly?' says I. 'Father John did,' says she. 'And will you believe Father John again?' says I. 'Why would I," says she, 'when he made that fool of me? and wasn't I the fool to believe him at all;' says she, 'sure I might have knowed,' says she, 'that he never told one word of truth in his life, barring he mistook it for a lie,' says she.

"Aye," said Jem, "and didn't I hear of old Judy Callaghan, a while back, when Father John gave it out in the chapel that Mr. Owens would give a leg of mutton and a blanket to every woman in the parish that would turn? And up goes Judy to Mr. Owens, next day, and 'your reverence,' says she, 'I'm come to give myself up to you, for the leg of mutton and the blanket.' 'And my poor woman,' says he, 'is it possible you would sell your soul and your religion for a leg of mutton?' 'Oh, no, your reverence,' says she, 'oh, no, dear, not without the blanket!!'"

"Well, Jem," says Pat, "I'm of your notion, that if the priests believed it themselves, they'd deny it in the chapel, in place of giving it out; but where's the use of talking, don't we know it's not true at all, and don't we know that what Mr. Owens wants is to get us to read the Bible, and to live by it?"

"Well, we know that anyway," said Jem; "but if it's all true what the Bible says of telling lies, what will be done with all the lies that's told in the chapel?"

"Well, it's hard to expect truth from them that tells lies," said Pat, "and I mind I read a speech in the newspaper, a while back, that said, the worst thing at all in the Irish was, that they mostly tell lies entirely, and won't tell a word of truth, if they can help it; and sure that's not far off the real thing."

"Aye," said Jem, "I thought that the other day, when I was at the fair of Ballybrack, and there was young Mr. Williams selling a horse, and he had old Peter M'Kenna with him, that sells for all the gentlemen, and there comes up a man and asks about the horse, and Mr. Williams just answers him fairly, and if you had seen how old Peter scoulded him afterwards; 'What made you go tell him the truth at all?' says he. 'Why; sure what I said did the horse no harm,' says Mr. Williams. 'And what do I care for harm or no harm?' says Peter; 'while you're a living man,' says he, 'never go for to tell one word of truth upon a street.' And, thinks I to myself, it's the rule of the street, sure enough, and it's liars we are entirely."

"And what else would we be," said Pat, "when we know nothing at all of what God says of the judgment on liars, and when we see the priest tell lies himself at the altar of God? Sure, is there a man in the chapel that knows that God says, that all liars shall have their part in the lake that burns with fire and brimstone? and is not that enough to show that the people ought to have the Bible, to know what God says, and what God will do?"

Who knows but that Pat and Jem, and many a poor man like them, may help to bring the Irish people to a knowledge of these things?

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st.

No anonymous letter can be attended to. Whatever is sent for insertion must be authenticated by the name and address of the writer, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee for his good faith.

We would request our valued correspondents, both Roman Catholics and Protestants, to limit the length of their communications, and not to discuss a variety of distinct topics in one letter.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, AUGUST, 1853.

In our number for June, we gave a letter from our valued and able correspondent, Mr. M'Manus, in which he appeals to Pascal, among others, as a witness and instance of the power of the religion of the Church of Rome upon the hearts of men.

In our last number we pointed out the remarkable fact, that Mr. M'Manus should have taken as an instance a nominal member of the Church of Rome, who was almost, or entirely, such as we are in doctrine.

He is not singular in this: most Roman Catholic controversialists, when called on to show the fruits of their church's teaching, do appeal to Pascal, as one of their chief instances. We think it, therefore, a matter of interest to inquire into the doctrine and position of this celebrated man.

At the time of the Reformation, there were many dissatisfied with the corruptions of the Church of Rome beside those who actually joined the Reformation. Many, who could not make up their minds to leave her, did earnestly long to correct her doctrines and practices. Many, even of the bishops at the Council of Trent, did actually advocate very Protestant notions in the council.

To meet this state of things, THE ORDER OF JESUITS was created, and they have since proved the main support of modern Romanism. Their chief business was, to watch and hunt down every tendency to Protestant doctrine among the members of the Church of Rome.

In the year 1640, there was published, at Louvain, a book, called "Augustinus," written by Jansenius, Roman Catholic Bishop of Ypres, who had died about two years before. This book was a compilation of the doctrines of the great St. Augustine, respecting the grace of God in the salvation of man. It was eminently Protestant and spiritual in its character. The Jesuits immediately attacked it; they succeeded in having it condemned by the University of the Sorbonne in Paris, and by repeated Bulls of various Popes. But there were many whose hearts sighed for the religion of the grace of God, and those were resolute in adhering to the doctrine of this book, against all the power and persecution of Jesuits and Popes. They were, of course, denounced as heretics by the Church of Rome, and are still denounced by it as heretics, for they still exist; yet they themselves have always said, that they did not separate from the Church of Rome; that all they wanted was, to hold the doctrines of grace in her communion. But that Church has always denounced "the Jansenists" (as they are called, from Jansenius), as heretics; and yet, strange to say, has never been able to drive them out of her communion, for persons holding these opinions have often been, not only members, but priests, and bishops too, in the Church of Rome, which Roman Catholics ought to remember when they boast of the unity of doctrine in their Church.

Among those who embraced the doctrine of Jansenius was the famous abbey of Port Royal in France, with its Abbess and all its Nuns, the two brothers of the Abbess, Henri Arnauld, Bishop of Anger, and Antoine Arnauld, Doctor of the Sorbonne, St. Cyran, the spiritual director of the abbey, and many others renowned for their piety and learning, such as Le Maitre, De Sacy, Nicole, &c., &c., and among the rest Blaise Pascal.

Pascal was a Jansenist, and as such a heretic to the Church of Rome, though her controversialists are so fond of claiming credit to themselves for his progress in the grace of God.

He is chiefly known to us now by his famous "Provincial Letters," which were written to expose the Jesuits, and to maintain the cause of the Jansenists against them; and a fearful picture he gives of the institution, the policy, and the principles of the Jesuits in carrying out the objects for which their order was created.

It is not their object to destroy morality, but neither is it their object to preserve it; that would be bad policy. Their design is to have all consciences subject to themselves. Since evangelical and severe maxims are suited to govern some characters, they provide accordingly for *them*; since the majority of men demand a lax and easy religion, they provide that for *them*. So they need teachers of both kinds, to suit all sorts of men, and give every one what he wishes for. By this *obliging* and accommodating conduct they embrace all. If they meet a penitent resolved to restore what he has stolen, they praise and confirm his resolution; but if one come to them who wishes to have absolution without restoring what he has stolen, it will go hard but they will find some way to manage that for him. By this they preserve all their friends, and defend themselves against all their enemies. If one reproach them for laxity, they immediately produce some books of their stricter devotion, and the *simple*, who do not look deep into matters, are content with such proofs.

This is an abstract of Pascal's statement, of the object and means of the Jesuits, in his "Fifth Letter."

And hence, says Pascal, we may understand why the Jesuits have such low notions of the grace of God; "for their morality is WHOLLY PAGAN, and nature alone is sufficient to observe it."

He gives fearful and abundant proofs, out of the books of the chief men of the order, of the truth of this fearful charge.

First, he shows their "doctrine of probability," as they call it. Their greatest writers say, that they are all agreed that if what men do is *probably right*, if there be a *probability* that it is right or lawful, that is enough to justify the conscience against sin. And they say further, that the opinion of one grave and learned author in favour of an action, is proof enough that it is, probably, lawful, and may, therefore, be done without sin. And then he shows that there is not a crime that can be thought of that has not some great Jesuit writer at hand to say that it is lawful, and may be done without sin! Thus he shows (letter seven) that numbers of their greatest authors maintain that it is lawful for a gentleman to kill on the spot any one who strikes him a blow, in order to preserve his honour; that it is lawful to fight a duel to preserve his honour; that it is lawful for servants to steal, if they think their wages too small; that priests and monks may lawfully kill those who injure them or their order; that it is lawful to kill those who speak ill of us, if we cannot stop them in any other way; that it is lawful to circulate false slanders against those who we fear may hurt us; that it is not the duty of Christians to avoid the immediate occasion of sin, if their doing so should give a handle for people talking, or be inconvenient to them.

Of these, and many other such maxims that he produces from their books, Pascal occasionally says such things as these—"Are they priests who speak them? are they Christians? are they Turks? are they men? are they devils?"—Letter 14. And again, "It is to be wished that those horrid maxims had never come forth out of hell; and that the devil, who was their first author, had never found men sufficiently devoted to his orders to publish them among Christians."

He shows, also, that it is a rule of the Jesuits,

that every confessor is bound, under mortal sin, to give absolution, even against his own conscience, to every one who can produce one of their authors to justify his crime!—Letter 5.

But it is upon the question of the necessity of loving God that Pascal is more indignant against the doctrine of the Jesuits than on any other. In his tenth letter, he reckons up all their opinions on the question—"At what time is a man obliged to have actual love to God?" One says, "before he dies;" another, "at the moment of death;" another, "when he is baptized;" another, "on festival days;" another says, "all these are wrong;" another says, "once a year;" another, "once every three or four years;" another, "every five years;" another says, "it is *probable* that he is not rigorously obliged to every five years;" another says, "the command is not so much to love God, as not to hate him!"

On this Pascal says, "They go to reverse the whole law of God. They violate the great commandment, which contains the law and the prophets; they attack piety at the heart; they take from it the spirit that gives it life; they say that the love of God is not necessary to salvation; . . they take off the anathema which St. Paul pronounces against those who love not the Lord Jesus Christ; they destroy what St. John says—that he who loves not the Lord Jesus Christ abides in death; . . . . thus they make worthy of enjoying God through eternity, those who never loved him all their lives! Behold the mystery of iniquity fulfilled."

We ask our readers to remember that we are here expressing no opinion of our own either for or against the Jesuits.

But we find Pascal appealed to by our correspondent as a proof that it is the Church of Rome that possesses the religion of the heart, and when we turn to his writings we find indeed that he did possess the true religion of the heart, the doctrine of the Gospel of the grace of God. But we find also the whole machinery of the Church of Rome—Popes, Cardinals, Colleges, Jesuits, all striving every nerve to crush this doctrine both in him and in those who taught him. We find him, in letters which for learning and proof, and wit and temper, have never been equalled in controversy, convicting them of destroying the very foundations of religion and morality. Yes, we find the Pope and the Church of Rome using all their power to the utmost to sustain these Jesuits against him, and to extinguish him and all other Jansenists. We find that the Jesuits are, day by day, getting more and more dominion over the Roman Church; and our chief desire is to revive among Roman Catholics that religion of the heart which Pascal so eminently possessed.

A COPY of a Tuam newspaper has been forwarded to us, containing a correspondence between the Rev. James Fowler, the curate of that town, and Mr. Lockhart, formerly of Oxford, and now a Roman Catholic clergyman. We cannot afford space to insert this correspondence in our columns, and content ourselves with giving a brief account of the substance of it. Mr. Lockhart, it seems, in arguing against the position that Scripture is our sole rule of faith, named certain doctrines which, he asserted, were essential parts of the Christian faith, and which were yet incapable of Scriptural proof. On the general line of argument here adopted by Mr. Lockhart we may observe that it is more calculated to make men unbelievers than to make them Roman Catholics; for if he could succeed in showing Protestants that doctrines which they had been accustomed to receive as essential parts of their faith did not in reality rest on Scriptural authority, most of them would be more disposed to reject the doctrines than to receive them without such proof. He is not the only Roman Catholic, however, who is fond of using this "kill or cure" remedy; too many of the advocates of the Roman Catholic Church, in this respect, resembling the woman whom Solomon discovered not to be the mother of the child she claimed, by her readiness to suffer it to be slain, if it were not to belong to her.

To this challenge, however, of Mr. Lockhart's Mr. Fowler replied, by referring to a number of Scripture texts, as containing the proofs required by Mr. Lockhart. The latter retorted, with an examination of Mr. Fowler's Scripture proofs, arriving at the result that not one of them was conclusive. Thereupon Mr. Fowler replied, by printing his previous letter, in parallel columns, with passages out of the Catechism of the Council of Trent, from which he had purposely borrowed the proofs in question. Mr. Lockhart still persisted in denying that the proofs were valid, and the (Roman Catholic) editor of the Tuam paper triumphed over Mr. Fowler as if he were unable to prove his doctrines on Protestant grounds, and were obliged to have recourse to Roman Catholic authorities.

It appears to us, however, that if a proof be good, it remains good, no matter who makes use of it. If what the Catechism of the Council of Trent puts forward as Scripture proofs be so in reality, they will be so still in the mouths of Protestants. And even if a Protestant were to borrow his Scriptural arguments from Roman Catholic authorities, he would still argue on Protestant grounds, as long as the arguments were founded on Scripture only.

But this correspondence of Mr. Lockhart's suggests to us an important reflection. We discover here that the Scripture proofs put forward by the Catechism of the Council of Trent, for doctrines which Protestants and Roman Catholics hold in common, are not regarded by Roman Catholics as proofs at all. They receive the doctrines on the authority of the Council, and not because they can be proved from Scripture, or, at least, they take it on the Council's authority that the texts in question *are* proofs. These proofs are like the pillars which architects sometimes place, for ornament, in front of their buildings, which, though they appear to be props for support, are, in reality, part of the structure to be supported.

Now, the reflection arises, may it not be the same with what Roman Catholics put forward as Scripture proofs of doctrines which Protestants do *not* hold? Are we not, perhaps, wasting our labour in showing that the texts brought forward in support of Purgatory or prayers to the saints do not, in reality, prove these doctrines? Probably, if we held these doctrines ourselves, and were to attempt to bring forward the same texts in support of them, Mr. Lockhart and his friends would then discover that the texts did not prove the doctrines at all, and that the authority of their Church is, in reality, the sole support which these doctrines have. We shall consider this matter hereafter.

ON THE INTERNAL EVIDENCES OF THE CATHOLIC RELIGION.

WE promised to consider, in this number, "whether the Church of Rome or the Church of England and Ireland professes the religion most suited to supply the real wants of fallen man."

We might have offered arguments from various sources to throw light upon this question; but we cannot now. Things that are seen with our eyes and felt with our hearts leave no place for argument; and the writer of this, within the last few days, and the last few hours, has witnessed scenes in which it has been given him to see with his eyes, that the Gospel which we preach "is the power of God unto salvation, to every one that believeth."—Rom. i. 16.

He has seen a man in the prime of life brought down in a brief period to the grave—one who filled a position of extensive influence, honoured and beloved by all around him, and adorning every relation in life; the head of a large and united family, who, under his ceaseless care and cheerful influence, afforded the brightest example of domestic happiness.

Oh, what a change, to see this strong man struck down, laid low by pain and weakness; to see that happy family all weeping now; to see his partner in a union whose happiness no shade had ever darkened, as she appeared to treasure up each failing breath that brought it to a close!

It was a time to try the religion of that man and family, and of the Church that taught them; it was a time to try if their's were the religion of the heart; if that religion had power to support *him* in that so sudden passage from this world's truest joys to that dark descent, that unknown journey, at which our nature shudders; it was a time to try if that religion could support *them* in that greatest of all earthly trials, that approaching desolation of that so happy home.

That face that so long had beamed, and made so many other faces beam with happiness—so sadly changed by suffering and pain—yet still more changed in this, that earthly happiness had given place to smiles of heavenly joy. All earthly thoughts were put away; no care of earthly things disturbed that breast; the objects of his earthly love were given up with cheerful confidence to the Heavenly Father's care and love, to Him whose everlasting love was *felt and known*.

One only thought and care for them remained—for wife, for children, servants, all whom he had cared for with such earnest care; and that thought was, to tell, to warn, to entreat them all, with all the fervour of a final parting—with all the calmness of an everlasting union—of that which gave him peace and joy in nature's final struggle, of that which he declared *would never fail them*, though all earthly joys should fail.

And then, to see those gushing sorrows all around him hushed into a calmness and tranquillity almost approaching to his own—to see grief itself compelled to rejoice, *because he was happy then!*

This was indeed to *see* and *feel* that the Gospel is indeed the power of God to them that believe.

And what did this? What caused this dawn of heavenly joy to shine out of that utter darkness of all human happiness? He told it himself to the writer of these lines. These were his words—"All that ever I did seems to me now no better than filthy rags in the sight of God. All my hope and confidence is in Christ my Saviour; and in Christ my Saviour I have hope, and peace, and joy."

And this faith was the source of light arising out of darkness—of joy striving against sorrow, alike in them that lived and in him that died.

Had Mr. M'Manus witnessed this striking scene, *could* he have said, in presence of such evidence of the grace and power of God, that the Church of which this man was a faithful member had only "set before his mind a dry and barren abstraction of a Deity—had held forth an empty vessel to the parched and thirsty wanderer in the desert—had stripped Christianity of all that can make it lovely and attractive?"

Had she not led him rather to an all-sufficient Saviour, who is able to keep that which is committed to him? (2 Tim. i. 12.) and to drink out of the river of the water of life, that proceedeth out of the throne of God and of the Lamb?—Rev. xxii. 1.

What else was wanting, then, to make faith a victory that overcometh the world?—1 John v. 4.

Was it masses for dead, to be offered over and over again, year by year continually, and thus proclaiming, by their own vain repetition, that they cannot satisfy? What sacrifice can then best satisfy the soul?—"Christ, who was offered ONCE, *to exhaust* the sins of many."—Hebrews ix. 28, Douay Bible. Who "by *one oblation* hath perfected *for ever* them that are sanctified."—Heb. x. 14. Or, "the self-same sacrifices, which they offer continually every year, (and which) can never make the comers thereunto perfect, *for then they would have ceased* to be offered."—Heb. x. 1, 2.

Or what was wanting then to complete the consolation that religion gave to that family under their greatest trial? Whether was it happier for them then to believe, with the Church of Rome, that those sharp but brief pains were but the entrance into ages, perhaps, of agonizing torture—ages which the Church of Rome gives no means to calculate, of which she never gives security that the torture is over, lest no more masses should be paid for—or *to believe* in the Word of God—the voice from heaven—"Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord. From henceforth now, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours."—Apoc. or Rev. xiv. 13, Douay Bible.

Many such dying scenes it has been the writer's privilege to witness; and from his heart and from the evidence of his senses he can repel the assertion, that his is "a cold and lifeless system, unable to make any solid impression on the heart and affections."

If any should be moved to say in his heart, on reading this account—"May I die the death of the righteous, and may my last end be like his," let him seek for that righteousness which Paul, the chief of sinners, found; "not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith."—Philip. iii. 9.

If any would find the "peace at the last," which this man found, let him seek it through life, as this man sought it, by "believing in Jesus."

Correspondence.

ON SAINTS' DAYS, PURGATORY, PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD, ETC.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Since you have put yourself forward as the Inquisitor of Catholic doctrines, it might reasonably be expected that you would give conclusive evidence on all those points which you have undertaken to discuss; and particularly so with regard to the doctrine of purgatory. But waiving this consideration, let me admit, for the sake of argument, that my citations from Origen are heretical; then the absurd conclusion follows, that the Saints Basil, Cyril, Gregory of Nyssa, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, with many other lights of the fourth century, are alike involved in the same heresy; for many of these Fathers explain (1 Cor. iii. 12, 13, &c.) in same manner as Origen, and nearly in the same words, whilst all of them invariably adopt the principle which it enunciates.

These latter evidences, you object, are not within the proposed limitation; admitting so, I consider it perfectly within the limits of reason to maintain that these *holy* men, whose eulogy needs not a repetition, could not, nor did not, adopt, at second hand, the opinion of a heretic, and palm it on the Church of God as a portion of the religion of Jesus Christ, as they all unanimously declare the doctrine of purgatory to be.

You admit that the silence of Scripture is the most powerful argument with Protestants against the doctrine of purgatory; with respect to the doctrine of the Protestant Church in the practice of praying for the dead, and which you maintain is the same as that of the early church, the Scripture is as silent as the grave; upon what authority, then, does the Protestant Church hold this point of doctrine?

I next find in the *Book of Common Prayer*, that the Church of England has appointed holidays for a great number of particular saints, with a distinct *service* for each day; a holiday also, for St. Michael and all the angels, and another for all the saints. What warrant of Scripture have you for all these? Did the synagogue order holidays in honour of Moses, the Patriarchs, or any of the Prophets? Did St. John the Evangelist, the survivor of all his fellow Apostles and Evangelists, order a day to be celebrated with holy solemnity in honour of any of them? On all these points the Scripture is equally silent as on the doctrine of purgatory, and hence you see the necessity to expunge from the calendar all these holidays, and not allow them to remain any longer in the very threshold of the Liturgy, at variance with the essential principles of rigid Protestant theology; also, to abolish the practice of praying for the dead, or at once admit that the Church of England retains doctrines for which she has no Scripture authority.

I have already stated that prayers were offered by the early Church in plain and direct words, *for* all who died in the Catholic communion, but I contend, on the authority of St. Epiphanius, that the intention of the Church in these prayers varied according to the relative character of the parties for whom they were offered, and until the two words *thanksgivings* and *propitiations* can merge into one common acceptation, the passage which I cited from St. Epiphanius will bear out this distinction. St. Cyprian declares (*in fine Lib. de Mortalitate*) that the saints in heaven pray most anxiously for our salvation. I ask would this holy Father pray for these saints indiscriminately with the other dead? The Bishop of Oxford, in his edition of St. Cyprian, page 271, has these remarkable words—"We doubt not but the saints in heaven pray earnestly to God, that he may have mercy on those struggling on earth." Our Saviour says to his disciples (John xiv. 2, 3,) "I go to prepare a place for you—that where I am, there you may be also;" the primitive Church knew this Scripture, and therefore can hardly be contemplated as praying to God to have mercy on the Apostles, the Blessed Virgin, &c., to grant them pardon of their sins—to grant them mercy, relief, comfort, &c., in common with the other dead.

I now respectfully submit that the passages in St. Epiphanius, connected with the heresy of Aerius, besides the practice of praying for the dead, establish two other very important facts elucidatory of the object of these prayers. First, that the Church in the time of St. Epiphanius believed that some sins were forgiven in the world to come; secondly, that the prayers which the Church offered for the dead, and the alms given to the poor, were believed, to some extent, efficacious in obtaining this forgiveness. The words of Aerius afford the most satisfactory evidence, that these three points are conjointly the object of his attack, which could not be the case if they were not then the doctrine and practice of the Church.

This dogmatizer asks, "why are the dead prayed for?" (Epiph. Hor. 75, sec. 3. Tom 1. page 908,) and had he stopped here, and made no allusion, as he subsequently does, to the object of these prayers, there might be some reason to deny that these prayers were *then* offered in the same sense in which the Catholic Church *now* prays for the dead; but again he asks (not inquiringly, but ridiculing the doctrine which he attempts to impugn)—"If the living pray for the dead, and give alms to the poor, what helps can arise to the dead from these things?" (*ibidem*) thus cavilling at the belief of the Church, that some sins were remitted after death, and that prayers, alms, &c., helped to obtain this remission. That this is obviously his meaning, is, moreover, fully confirmed by the frivolous objection which he next makes; for had he not understood the doctrine of the Church on this point to be what I stated above, regarding the object of prayers for the dead, he could not have opposed to it the following objection:—"for," says he, "if the prayers of the living can obtain pardon of sins for those who are departed out of this life, no one will live piously here, nor do any good action, but he will engage some friends, either by entreaties, or by bestowing large sums of money on them, who may pray for him after death, that his wicked deeds might not be punished in the next world" (*Ibid*).

Here, then, we have attested and confirmed by the arguments of Aerius, that the Catholic Church in his day believed that some sins were forgiven after death, and that the prayers of the living and alms were powerful auxiliaries in effecting this forgiveness; or, we have here established the essential doctrine of Purgatory; and this being an indisputable fact, I shall readily forego all controversy respecting the name. The reply of St. Epiphanius is equally explicit in proof of this doctrine. He says, "We mention in our prayers the names of sinners who are dead, that we may supplicate God for mercy of them" (Epiph. Hor. 75. Sec. 3. T. 1. page 911.); no mercy extends to the damned (Mark ix. 44); no sin enters heaven (Rev. xxi. 27). And, again, he says, "These prayers which are offered for the dead afford them help, though they may not blot out all their sins" (*Ibid*, Sec. 7. page 911.) Let sophistry show, if possible, that the saint does not teach here, that some sins may be cancelled by these prayers. Lastly, he tells Aerius that the Church has this doctrine traditionally from Christ (Sec. 8. page 912); not "*from ghost stories*," as you insinuate, and thus he intimates to him that this doctrine which maintains that the prayers of the living can obtain pardon of sins for the dead, and which he attempts to deny, forms a part of that supernatural system propounded by our Saviour to his Apostles, and that it is presumptuous in him, a *blind beetle*, so he calls him, to find fault with it. Hence, it appears, that whilst discussing prayers for the dead, we are virtually discussing the doctrine of Purgatory. And the *Translators of Du Pin*. (Cent. 7.-page 3.) assures us "that prayers were offered in the Church for the relief of the souls of the faithful departed, about two hundred years after Christ; and that these prayers of the first Christians were very warrantable and pious." *They* might have assigned these prayers a much earlier existence, for the authorities whom they cite all refer the origin of this practice either to Christ or to the Apostles; and I have shown that, in the fourth century, the doctrine of the Church respecting the object of these prayers was identically the same as the doctrine of Purgatory in the Catholic Church of the present day.

I have, again, to apologize for the length to which these observations have extended, and presuming on your usual courtesy,

I remain, Sir, yours, &c. &c. &c.

EDMOND POWER.

We must object to our correspondents filling our columns with mere assertions, without proofs. In future, our rule must be to decline inserting anything for which some proof is not offered.

Mr. Power here asserts that a long list of Fathers, whom he names, agreed with Origen about Purgatory. He gives no proof, but his own assertion, and we explicitly deny the fact. Origen believed that all who are turned into hell, men and devils alike, will finally be saved by the Purgatorial efficacy of hell fire. This was Origen's notion of Purgatory; every proof brought from him for Purgatory means this and nothing else, and this is the only Purgatory that Mr. Power can show from the Fathers of the first three hundred years.

It is wholly untrue and unwarrantable to say that the Fathers whom Mr. Power mentions, gave any countenance to this heretical doctrine.

Mr. Power also asserts of the Fathers he mentions, that "they all unanimously declare the doctrine of Purgatory to be 'a portion of the religion of Jesus Christ.'" This is mere assertion, of which Mr. Power gives no proof whatever. We call on him to give the passages from each of the Fathers he has named, in which they make this declaration. Until he do this, we are at liberty to deny his assertion.

Some of them spoke of it as a mere matter of speculation—as a thing that might be, or might not be. Is this the way they spoke of the religion of Jesus Christ?

Mr. Power is entirely mistaken in supposing that services on particular days, in commemoration of the apostles of Christ, are "at variance with the essential principles of rigid Protestant theology." He confounds things that are totally different in their own nature. We will explain this once for all. The sixth article of the Church of England and Ireland, says—"Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of faith." Article 20 says—"The Church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies." Article 34—"Whosoever through his private judgment, willingly and purposely, doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, which be *not repugnant* to the Word of God, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly.....Every particular or national Church hath authority *to ordain*, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church, ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying." Is it not clear that according to this "essential principle of Protestant theology," direct authority and proof from Scripture is required only for "articles of the faith," and not for rites and ceremonies? and how, then, is it inconsistent with this theology, to follow it exactly as we do? And yet we have direct authority to commemorate the apostles, in Heb. xiii. 7.

Prayers for the dead we have never countenanced nor vindicated farther than as they may rely on the promise and the Word of God; and as long as we do not go beyond this, how can we be taunted with admitting prayers for the dead not warranted by Scripture? God has promised to keep the souls of the faithful departed; he has promised to raise their bodies hereafter, and to make both soul and body glorious with himself. When we pray, "thy kingdom come," we pray not for ourselves alone, but for the consummation of bliss to all that shall inherit that kingdom. We hold to this principle, that acceptable prayer must be founded on the promises of God; that it is a calling upon God to perform his word; and this can never lead to prayer not warranted by Scripture. We believe that the most ancient prayers for the dead did not go beyond this, and that modern prayers for the dead do violate it grossly. That the early Church prayed for all alike who departed in the faith—apostles, martyrs, prophets—is conclusive that it was not intended as prayer to deliver out of Purgatory, but as calling upon God to perform what is yet to be fulfilled of his word. Mr. Power asks would St. Cyprian and the primitive Church pray for those Saints in heaven who now pray for us, "indiscriminately with the other dead?" We answer, "certainly not, if these prayers were prayers for getting souls out of Purgatory." But the *fact is*, that the early Church did pray for the saints in Heaven, in the same prayers and in the same words in which she prayed for all those departed in the faith; and, hence, we conclude that they were *not* prayers for getting souls out of Purgatory, but, simply, prayers to God, to fulfil his word and promises to them. *Is there any promise from God to take souls out of Purgatory?* Let Mr Power only show us such a promise, and then we will join in such prayers.

Mr. Power's argument from Aerius and Epiphanius is more deserving of attention, as being accompanied with proofs and references. We have not space to enter on it in this number, but will give due attention to it in our next. But this belongs to the fourth century: no proof has yet been produced for Purgatory from the first 300 years of the Church. That at least may now be considered as settled.

ADORING IMAGES—THE MOTHER OF GOD.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Stauracius, Bishop of Chalcedon, is reported to have said, "εικονας ως αρραβωνα της σωτηριας μου ουσας," *i.e.*, the *images* which I hold to be pledges of my salvation: and Gregory of Sinope, "σεβομενος και προσκυνων," *i.e.*, venerating and worshipping: can you name the writings in which the expressions may be found? It is remarkable that "venerating and worshipping" were the words used for that worship of the Emperor's statue, which the first Christians died rather than offer.

Not being a Greek scholar, I shall be obliged if you will inform me if the title of *Theotokos*, bestowed on the mother of Jesus, admits of any other meaning besides the generally understood one of *Mother of God*.

Yours, &c.,

WILLIAM BLOOD.

Wicklow, August 2, 1853.

Stauracius, Bishop of Chalcedon, was present at the Second Council of Nice, held in the year 787, which Council first sanctioned the adoring of images. Stauracius adopts the words from a letter which he says was written by Pope Adrian to Tarasius.—Labbe and Cossart, Concilia Generalia, vol. vii., p. 705.

Gregory of Synope was present in the same Council, and also used the words attributed to him.—Labbe and Coss., vol. vii., p. 709.

We are happy to answer the questions of correspondents when we can; but, when a correspondent gives us no reference nor clue whatever, it is very like looking for a needle in a bundle of straw. By the way, there is a great deal of straw in that Council, and chaff too—near a thousand folio columns. For several hundred years it was rejected by the Western Church as erroneous, and other Councils were held to condemn it, though now it is counted a General Council and infallible, by the Church of Rome. We shall probably have occasion to discuss the merits of this Council on some other occasion.

Θεοτοκος (Theotokos) is *not* the word that would have been used by persons who spoke the Greek language to express what the Church of Rome now means by "Mother of God." The origin and intention of the term Θεοτοκος is well known. Nestorius taught that the Son of God and the son of Mary were two different persons. This was a heresy that struck at the root of our redemption by Christ; because, according to this notion, it was the son of Mary only, a mere man, who died upon the cross; and, therefore, the

infinite value of the atonement was destroyed. This was the error that the General Council of Ephesus had to guard against; they had to maintain that the very person who was born of Mary was also the Son of God, and, therefore, God. They did this by calling her θεοτοκος, the exact meaning of which is—"she who brought forth him who was God." This was then the whole meaning and intention of the term; and *in this sense* it is held and approved by all orthodox Protestants. The sense which later Romish writers have sought to put on the term is this—that Christ in his divine nature and office is subject to Mary as his mother; and, sometimes, even attributing deity to herself as his mother—thus Bernardinus de Busti, "she understands *herself* in her son, to be *as his other self*, INVESTED WITH DEITY."—Mariale, part xii., sermon 2. It is clear that the Council of Ephesus never had any idea of using the term in any such sense as this; and it was such awful abuses and perversions of the term in later times, that led to the term itself being dropped by Protestants, although they hold firmly all that the term was at first intended to express and defend—namely, that he who was born of Mary was truly God. The church does well to invent terms to exclude from her ministry those who introduce heresies; and she does well, too, to drop those terms when they are perverted to countenance other heresies, all the while holding and preserving one and the same faith herself.

If any one wish for further proof of the real object of calling Mary "the Mother of God," we quote from another source. "From the time wherein the Virgin Mother did conceive in her womb the Word of God, she hath obtained such a kind of jurisdiction, so to speak, or authority, in all the temporal procession of the Holy Ghost, that no creature hath obtained any grace or virtue from God, but according to the dispensation of his holy mother" (Bernardin. Senens., Serm. 61, art. 1, cap. 8). Again; "Because she is the mother of the Son of God, who doth produce the Holy Ghost; therefore, all the gifts, virtues, and graces of the Holy Ghost are by her hands administered to whom she pleaseth, when she pleaseth, how she pleaseth, and as much as she pleaseth" (In the same Sermon).

Do not wonder at this, reader, that all power should really belong to her, and not to God (that is, if you can believe in these men), for the other Bernardine (de Busti), will tell you (if you can believe him), that "howsoever she be subject to God, inasmuch as she is a creature; yet she is said to be superior and *preferred before him*, inasmuch as she was his mother!"—Mariale, part xii., ser. 2.

This man was the most famous preacher of the Church of Rome in his day; and similar doctrine about "the mother of God" is now countenanced and circulated by the Church of Rome, in "the Glories of Mary;" the writer of which has lately been made a saint by the Pope.

Was it not time to drop the term "Mother of God," when it led to such teaching as this?

THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN AND THE INDEX EXPURGATORIUS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

YOUR HONOUR—Will you tell us, is it true, does bad books go to Purgatory, all as one as bad men? For there's some of the neighbours gathers into my house on an evening to read the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, and while we was reading last night, in comes Peter Connelly, that's clerk and school-master in the chapel, and mighty mad he was to see what we was reading. "And don't you know," says he, "the CATHOLIC LAYMAN is put in the *Index Expurgatorius*, by his Holiness the Pope?" And with that we all began axing him what that was at all. Well, with that, he seemed very bothered for a minute, how to tell us; but he gathered himself up, and says he, "its ignorant creatures you are that doesn't know Latin" (for he is a mighty conceited little fellow about his learning); and when we kept on axing him he began to tell us: "sure its Latin," says he; "and, sure, *index* is the Latin for what's in a book," says he; "and *expurgatorius*," says he, "of course, that's in regard of Purgatory, and so it means the list of them that's in Purgatory." And one of the boys said, "he never heard tell before of books going to Purgatory, and how would the Pope send them there at all." "And isn't it just the place for the like of the heretic CATHOLIC LAYMAN," says Peter, "where it would be burnt all out, the first blaze?" And with that Ned Gallagher says, "and was it just the one paper the Pope sent to Purgatory, or was it all the papers in a bundle?" "Why, all of them, to be sure," says Peter." "And do they be burned there?" says Ned. "To be sure," says he; "the first look of Purgatory puts them all in a blaze, and there isn't so much as a bit of tinder left you could light your pipe at." "Well, now, its clear to me," says Ned, holding up the paper, "that this one isn't burnt yet, anyway." "Well done Ned," says all the boys. "that's it anyway."

Well, there was one Mike Slattery with us, that knows the Latin, for he was at school when he was a boy with Bob Slattery, of Tralee, and it's he that was the scholar, and says Mike, "don't you see it's not *purgatorius*, but *expurgatorius*, that's in it; and what's the meaning of *ex*," says he, "isn't it Latin for *out of*, and so, if it means anything about it," says he, "it means the list of them that's *out of purgatory*. Is it forgetting your Latin you are, entirely, with all your learning?" says he. And your honour never seen a man so knocked of a heap as Peter: and he cut off as hard as he could; and, I'm thinking, it's to tell the priest on us he went. But never fear, your honour, the boys will read the CATHOLIC LAYMAN if it's at the back side of a ditch, or the bottom of a bog-hole, now we're cutting the turf. But, when he was gone, we agreed we would write to your honour, and ask if it's true that the Pope has took all the CATHOLIC LAYMAN out of the post-office, and sent them all in a big bag to Purgatory. But why would we bother your honour about it at all, when we know well enough that our paper is not gone to Purgatory at all, but just safe in the top of my hat this minute. But, your honour, will we get any more of them at all by the post-office?

Your honour's servant,

TEDDY BRIAN, of Kerry.

As far as we know, Peter Connelly is under a mistake, and more mistakes than one. It is not true that the Pope has put the CATHOLIC LAYMAN into the *Index Expurgatorius;* and if he did it in the way that Peter thinks, it would be a heavy job, for so many copies of the LAYMAN are published, that we send it to the Post-office in a dozen large sacks—each on the back of a man—as large as potato bags in a market.

But, it is an opportunity for us to explain to Roman Catholics things about their religion, that they know (as it seems) very little about.

There is a meeting of the Cardinals at Rome, called "the congregation of the Index." It is their business to read the books that are published. They keep two lists of books, one called the *Index Prohibitus;* and when the Cardinals write down a book in that list, the meaning is, that no Roman Catholic may read that book at all. They keep another list called the *Index Expurgatorius*, and when a book is put down in that list, the meaning is—that no one is allowed to read that book until it is *purged out*. And, then, some one is appointed to go over that book, and scratch out or change whatever the Church of Rome thinks contrary to faith or morals.

Some time or other we may have room to show to Roman Catholics what kind of books those Cardinals condemn, and what sort of changes they make in them; and also what kind of books they approve of without any change being made in them; with all which they will probably be not a little surprised. We can only say, at present, that the Pope and the Cardinals have lately taken the trouble to put into the prohibited index some of the school-books of the National Schools—such as the Lessons on the Truth of Christianity, the Lessons on Logic, or the Art of Reasoning, and we believe also the Scripture Extracts; all which books were approved of, as fit to be learned by Roman Catholic children, by the late Dr. Murray, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin. But the Pope and the Cardinals, in their great care for faith and morals, have never condemned or purged out such books as those of Bernardine de Senis, or Bernardine de Busti, of which we have given extracts in our answer to Mr. Blood's letter, in this number, nor the books of the Jesuits, mentioned in our present number. If the Cardinals meet a book that may lead men to read the Bible—like the Scripture Extracts, they condemn that at once; but if they meet a book that teaches that the Blessed Virgin is superior to God himself, they never purge out that.

The subject is most important, because it shows that the Church of Rome is responsible for all the teaching of her priests and members that she does not condemn, and that she must be considered as approving of it. We invite communications on the subject from those who have made it their study. That Peter Connelly should take *Expurgatorius* "in regard of Purgatory" is, no doubt, very absurd; but it is very like many other arguments in which words that *sound* like Purgatory are taken as proofs of it, though, in fact, they have nothing to do with it.

NUNNERIES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I read your remarks on nunneries with interest, and as the subject is one of great importance, I desire to call the attention of yourself and your readers to some statements relating to them in St. Alphonso Liguori's Moral Theology. St. Alphonso is, as you are aware, one of the last of Rome's saints—a Bishop; lauded by Cardinals, beatified and canonized, severally, by Pope Pius VII. and Pope Gregory XVI. His Moral Theology is the authoritative moral theology of Rome, and in his writings we shall look for nothing adverse to the monastic life. Now, in his "Homo Apostolicus," Tract vii., c. 4, s. 61, he is urging on bishops to be very careful in examining into the willingness of girls professing themselves nuns; and this is the reason which he gives—"*For the greater part of them enter the religious state, not by God's vocation, but impelled by their parents, and hence it afterwards follows that they had a restless life there, and introduce laxities into the community to the common detriment.*" And is this, indeed, so? *The greater part of nuns*, says St. Alphonso, are not called by God, and have entered upon their state of life without his vocation, and, therefore, without his blessing—not by their own will, but impelled by others; and the consequence is individual restlessness and general laxity. What an awful picture does the saint bring before us of the inside of Roman Catholic nunneries—a picture drawn by no Protestant hand, but by the great supporter of the Papacy and the Papal system in all its branches—St. Alphonso Liguori, founder of the Redemptorists! But should not the relatives of these poor restless ones arouse themselves? It may be thought that the Tridentine Excommunication is a sufficient safeguard to prevent any persons being driven into nunneries. But what denunciation is there that the subtlety of modern casuists will not escape from? Suarez, Bonacina, Filliuccius, and Liguori all agree that girls *may be compelled* to enter a monastery, in punishment for any fault, or for fear they may fall into any immodesty, or if by their presence at home they may give or receive offence.—(Hom. Ap. vii., c. 2, s. 5.) A rule, the heart of which is eaten out by exceptions, is not worth much. Relatives may have better cause to complain than they are themselves aware of; for while, on the one side, "parents who, without good and definite cause, turn away their children from the religious state in any manner, either by guile, *nr by simply asking*, or by promises, cannot be excused from mortal sin" (H. A. xiii, c 1, s. 25); and "incur excommunication if they hinder girls from professing, or taking the habit, without good reason" (H. A. vii., c. 2, s. 5)—on the other side, "although it may be becoming for children not to go away without their father's blessing, yet this is understood when there is no danger of the father averting them from their holy purpose; but since this danger almost always exists, St. Thomas, without exception, exhorts children not to use their relatives' advice in the question of religious vocation. Relations, says the saint, must be removed from consultations on this point; for in this matter, relations are not friends but enemies."—H. A. xiii., c. 1, sec. 24. Parent against child—mother-in-law against daughter-in-law—not peace, but a sword. At any rate, these are not the *main* precepts of the Gospel of Jesus, and if applicable at all after the first spread of Christianity, certainly applicable only as accidental consequences, not as things to be aimed at. But, however that may be, is there not cause for fathers and brothers to examine for themselves and see if Liguori's statement be true—if laxity and restlessness do reside within convent walls, owing to the inmates having, *for the most part*, entered upon their life without a calling from God, and by the impulse of others?

Your obedient servant,

M.

THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN IN KILPATRICK.

No. II.

IN our June number, we gave an account of a conversation which took place, in Mr. Gasteen's house, at Kilpatrick, between Mr. Townsend, and Brian Kennedy, and Tim Donovan, and how their talk was put a stop to by the priest, Mr. Sheehy, coming up. When they heard he was coming, the two men were down the hill in no time, and a hard run they had of it, until they came at last to the stile; and when they had got over into the road again, they stopped, all out of breath and laughing at each other, and Brien said—"Well, Tim, we had a great escape of it." "I don't know," said Tim; "it was seeing you run made me run, too; but I don't like making off as if I had shot at a man, when I was doing no wrong at all. I'd have liked to have heard what arguments Father Sheehy would have had to give. Sure it would only have been fair, after our listening to Gasteen's clergyman, to make him listen to ours."

"Arguments!" said Brien, "it's little arguments you'd hear from Father Pat. Sure, he often told us that arguing with Protestants was the worst thing we could do. He says we ought to turn a deaf ear to them all, and not listen to anything they have to say. Do you remember his saying, 'when any go astray from the Catholic faith, the first moment of their fall is when they begin to question, or to ask a reason for any part of the church's teaching? From that moment they are not in *danger* of losing the faith, but they have lost it already!' And didn't he tell us that it wasn't our part to enter into controversy with Protestants, as if we wern't sure that we're in the right? All we have to do is to tell them to submit themselves to the church, and, if they refuse, they must take the consequences."

"Well," said Tim, "that may be a very good way for keeping ourselves right, but I don't think it would be a very good way of bringing any of the other side round to us. There's Gasteen, as good a neighbour and as honest a man as ever lived. Would it not be a pity to think of his being damned for ever, if our speaking to him in the right way could prevent it? And yet, how could we expect him to listen to us if we only told him to think as we do, and wouldn't listen ourselves to any reason? Isn't it natural for him to say, as he did the other day, that Father Sheehy talks like a man who knew he was an impostor, and who hoped, by bullying and talking big, to prevent his claims being examined into?"

"Tim, Tim," said Brien, "it will be well if your pride does not lead you astray; I know you think you're a great controversialist. But maybe it would be better if you were to take the priests' advice, and leave controversy to them, and be satisfied yourself to believe as your fathers believed. That's what Jerry Sullivan told me when I asked him to come up and hear the CATHOLIC LAYMAN read, that he would live and die in the church his father lived in, and would never hear anything to the contrary."

"I hope," says Tim, "to live and die in the church my father lived in, too; but I am glad to say I can give a better reason than that for it. I would take the priest's advice, if they all gave the same advice; but though Father Sheehy is against controversy, Father Molony, that was before him,

was very fond of it, and it was he advised me to buy Milner's End of Controversy, and a very fine book it is. But, if I was only a Catholic because my father was one, Gasteen has as good a reason as that for being a Protestant, since so was his father."

"But, they weren't always so," said Brian; "you know there were no Protestants before Martin Luther's time: so that Gasteen's fathers before then must have been good Catholics."

"But, then," said Tim, "there were no Christians here at all before St. Patrick's time, so that his fathers before that again must have been idolaters; and, if Jerry Sullivan's were a good way of talking, they ought always to have remained so. That's a notion I got out of a book my Pat was taught at the National School, which gave me better reasons for being a Christian than ever I knew before."

"Oh!" said Brian, "that's the book that's condemned by our bishops, and they don't read it there now. Sure, they say, it was a Protestant Bishop wrote it, and, it stands to reason, it can't be fit for us to read."

"Well," said Tim, "as for that book my conscience is clear; for the time I read it was when it was approved by Archbishop Murray, whose soul's in glory now, and it was a good book in those days. But, I must say that when our priests and bishops give us one advice one year, and another the next, they oughtn't to wonder if some of us made it an excuse for doing as we like ourselves."

"Then," said Brian, "you're the man I'd think would like an excuse for that; for though you're a good Catholic in your doctrines, you're as fond of your private judgment as any Protestant."

"Nonsense," said Tim, "I only use my private judgment because I can't help it. There's sense in what Gasteen told us, that we all use our private judgment one way or another. If he uses his private judgment in rejecting the church's authority, we use our judgment (better, I hope) in submitting to it. If I am using my private judgment when I go up to have an argument with Gasteen, Jerry Sullivan is using his private judgment when he makes up his mind to listen to no argument at all. So, in spite of Father Pat's advice, I'll go up to Gasteen's the next CATHOLIC LAYMAN he gets, and I hope, with Dr. Milner's help, to give him as good as he brings."

"Well, if you do, Tim," said Brian, "I'll go, too, to hear you, though I don't quite know whether we wouldn't do better to let them alone."

And so it happened that when the next number did come Donovan and Kennedy went both up as usual to hear it read. "Let's have the 'Talk of the Road,' Denis," said they; and this number it happened to be all about the scapular, but the part that set them off talking was where Jem read "how the scapular book said that it was a grand thing for the people to be joined together in societies, because then every one in the society gets a share in all the prayers, and sacrifices, and fastings, and alms, and mortifications, and all the good works of the rest; and then how Pat scratched his head and said 'And who's the gainer by that, I wonder, or who's the loser? Why there won't be more good works among them after all, and how will they divide? If every man gets his own, and that's the fairest, I don't see the gain at all; and, if they get share and share alike, why them that does the most is the losers, and them that does nothing is the gainers'" (see p. 65).

So at this Gasteen and Bill Rogers, another Protestant that was there, began to laugh, and to attack Tim Donovan, who they knew was a member of a confraternity, and very proud of it, too; and Tim Donovan was a little taken aback and could not explain at the moment what was the gain in his sharing his good works with the rest. "But," says he, "at any rate we all share in the good works of our patron saint, and he can afford to share with us since he has more than he wants for himself." "Are you so sure of that?" said Gasteen. "I don't know," said Donovan, "what you Protestants may believe, but if you were to read the life of one of our saints, such as Saint Francis, you would acknowledge that he had done far more than enough to get him into heaven." "And do you expect," said Gasteen, "if you get to heaven, to have as high a place there as Saint Francis?" "No," said Donovan, "I am not so presumptuous as to equal myself to a blessed saint like him, that did more good works in one year than I expect to do in all my life." "Then," said Gasteen, "if his good works do more than barely get him into heaven, and if they all help to get him higher dignities hereafter than those who haven't done so much, maybe even Saint Francis wouldn't wish you to get the credit of his good works, but would rather be rewarded for them himself; for it wouldn't be fair, if they were of use to him in getting him a higher place, to let them count over again for you. I remember, when I was young, the first time my father trusted me to Loughmanagh fair to sell a flock of sheep for him, and I did it very well, as I thought, and sold them for a good price to one that I thought was a very grand gentleman, and he gave me his cheque on the National Bank for them; but afterwards, when I came to the bank for the money, they would not pay; either my gentleman had no money there or he had spent it all on himself. Well, I was greatly ashamed then of my bargain; my father managed to get the best part of the money paid, though he had a long time to wait for it, but it has made me know ever since that an order to pay money is not worth much if the man who signs his name to it has not authority to do it, and I thought of the story when I heard of your confraternity drawing on Saint Francis's good works for the use of your members. I'd like to know if you have Saint Francis's authority to do it, or if maybe he hasn't spent them all on himself; if he has, perhaps you will look as foolish as I did when the clerks at the bank gave me 'no effects' for my answer instead of the money I was to take back to my father."

At this story Bill Rogers began to laugh, but Jim Donovan became rather cross, and said—"I wish you wouldn't bring in your nonsensical stories when we're talking on a serious subject, and at any rate you can't deny that a saint may give us his intercession and be none the worse for it himself. You said before now that you pray for me and my neighbours here, and, with all respect to you, I don't see why Saint Francis's prayers shouldn't be as good as yours, or where would be the harm of my asking for them." So upon this there began a long discussion about the intercession of the saints, too long to be repeated here. A great part of the arguments made use of have appeared in the CATHOLIC LAYMAN already, and any one may find in "Milner's End of Controversy" the substance of all that Tim Donovan said. Gasteen attempted to take advantage of something that Donovan said out of Milner, viz.:—"That he might be a good Catholic without ever praying to the saints, and that there was no precept of the Church *commanding* them to pray to the saints," and he wanted to know as Christ was ready to intercede for him what more he wanted—why it would not be better to direct our prayers to him to whom we are commanded to pray, and who has promised to hear our prayers, rather than to those to whom we have no command to pray, and with regard to whom it is very doubtful whether they can hear our prayers or not (CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. i., p. 64).

"I don't neglect praying to Christ," said Tim Donovan; "and suppose even my praying to the saints was no good, where's the harm of it? there's a little time lost, and there's the end of it."

"It would be well if we were sure of that," said Gasteen, "and yet we know that there is such a thing as idolatry; the Lord is a jealous God, and does not like his glory to be given to another."

"There's no teaching you our doctrines," said Donovan. "I am not guilty of idolatry, nor any Catholic that's been rightly taught; I honour the saints, but I don't honour them with the honour that belongs to God only."

"That's just the point I'd like to argue," said Gasteen. "I suppose you'll allow that a man may be guilty of idolatry even though he does not give the *name* God to the thing he worships; many of the heathen never supposed the beings whom they worshipped to be the supreme God who created heaven and earth. God has commanded us to love Him with all our heart and soul and strength, and we are not keeping this command, if another has a higher place in our hearts; and if when we are in any trouble, it's not He that we think at once of applying to. Now, this is a sin which I think those that make it a habit to pray to the saints can hardly help falling into. I find myself, that my farm, and my wife and children, take up a great part of my thoughts, and I find it hard enough, as I dare say you do, too, to give much of my thoughts to the things I can't see; still, by reading the Bible, and by meditating on what the Saviour has done for me, I thank God I have learned to love Him; and whenever I am in trouble or temptation, it's His name that comes first to my lips; but now if I had accustomed myself to look to the intercession of the Virgin, or any other saint, it's very true I might know that any blessing she gave me was not altogether from herself, but obtained by her intercession from God; still, if I thought she could obtain anything she asked, I needn't look beyond her; it's no matter *how* she gets it if she is sure of being able to get it for me, and so it would come to pass, that, in time of trouble, it's her name and not the Lord's that would fill my mouth. I am not speaking of things I don't know. I know many Roman Catholics (there's Jerry Sullivan for one), and they are always ready with their prayers to the blessed Virgin. Now, as I don't find that they think less of their wife, or their farm, or their children than I do, I fear they must think less of God. In fact, I believe that it is only a certain portion of men's thoughts that they can in general give to the unseen world, and when the saints got more of this, God gets less."

We cannot exactly report what followed this, because, at the idea of being charged with idolatry, Tim Donovan rather lost temper, and the discussion became noisy, and soon after the party broke up, not quite in such good humour as usual.

FARMING OPERATIONS FOR AUGUST.

(*From the Irish Farmers' Gazette.*)

Being now on the eve of harvest, it will be necessary that the farmer lose no time in putting the haggard and barns in a proper state for its reception, and getting all minor routine matter out of hands, in order that his undivided attention be given to the important matter of harvesting his crops properly. Over the large tract of the centre and south of Ireland this usually is the principal harvest month, though, from the very inclement weather which prevailed during the end of last autumn, and the winter and spring months, which prevented the timely sowing of wheat and other corn crops, we by no means expect it to come in so early as usual, though in favourable localities we have seen very promising breadths of winter-sown wheat and dun oats.

Wheat should be cut *before* it is thoroughly ripe—it is usual to recommend cutting about a week previous to that period—but the better guide will be to cut, as soon as the grain, when bruised between the fingers, gives out no juice, but kneads up in a glutinous mass; when cut at this period, a finer coloured sample is secured, the flour is whiter, and, as compared with its gross weight, a greater weight of flour and less bran is obtained than when allowed to get fully matured. The grain ripens sufficiently in the stook, and the loss by shedding, inseparable from handling too ripe corn, is prevented. As soon as the grain assumes the above appearance, it will be advisable to put on all the hands possible to cut it down expeditiously, if the weather be dry; but avoid cutting in wet weather; bind in small sheaves, and stack; but do not cap or hood, unless rain threatens, when that operation should be performed without loss of time.

Barley, which, in order that it may sprout equally and at the same time in malting, must, therefore, be equally ripe, should be allowed to get thoroughly matured before cutting, which is indicated by the ear bending down, and the joints of the straw becoming dry and juiceless; as it is more liable to injury from wet than any other grain, it should be cut expeditiously, immediately bound, and stooked; but avoid stacking till properly cured, and any herbage in the sheaves thoroughly dead and dry; if not, fermentation will set in, and injure or destroy the sample.

Oats, like the wheat, must be cut before fully ripe, and while the straw still retains a little of the green colour at the joints. If allowed to get ripe, much loss and injury will be sustained by the grain shedding; for, it must be remembered, that it is the primary and heaviest grains that will fall, so that the second sample only remains in most instances.

Rye ripens generally before wheat, and is very liable to shed. When the straw, from a bright yellow, assumes a paler colour, and the bottom knots lose the green colour, it is fit for cutting. It should get as little handling as possible, being particularly liable to shed. As it melts quickly it requires immediate protection from wet and damp, and should, therefore, be bound and stacked without delay.

Peas and Beans will require close attention this month. For details, see the Operations for last month.

Mangels, Carrots, Parsnips, and Turnips will require particular attention this month, in hoeing, weeding, and trimming, and the thorough and frequent pulverization of the spaces between the rows, with the horse drill-grubber on the large scale, or the digging-forks on the small one. When these crops are cultivated extensively, a properly commanded gang should be appointed to this work, totally independent of harvest men. For if they are now neglected, and weeds get ahead, or not properly thinned, and in due time, and the intervals stirred up deeply, and thoroughly pulverized, these valuable crops, that previously have cost so much in money, time, and labour, will suffer to an incalculable degree, and the object of a clean fallow lost, to the great detriment of the succeeding crops.

Stone Turnips, or Rape, when intended to be taken as stolen crops, should be sown on the stubble lands as soon after the severance of the corn crops as possible; working the land, if not foul with weeds, with a good heavy harrow, or a light grubbing, to render the surface soft and fine, will suffice. A little guano or superphosphate, if it can be spared, will be well bestowed on these crops; but foul land will not be suitable for them till thoroughly cleansed.

Transplanting Rape.—As soon after the corn is saved, the planting out of the rape, sown for that purpose in June, should be proceeded with, the earlier this work can be completed the heavier the crop. A liberal dressing of manure should be supplied; the land may be previously prepared as if for turnips, if time and help permit, and the plants dibbled in the crown of the drill, or the land may be planted as it is ploughed; having previously put out the manure in rows, the plants are laid down, by some active boys, in every third furrow, about a foot apart, the manure is then placed on the roots of the plants, and the next furrow covers it up, and completes the process.

Manure Meadows with rich composts, before the aftergrass makes growth; a light top-dressing to new meadows now will be worth double the quantity given in spring.

Sowing Clover and Rye-grass.—This is the last month in the year for laying down land to grass or clover, whether permanently or for soiling crops. In laying down to permanent grass, sowing 4 or 5 lbs. of rape to the Irish acre will be of the utmost advantage, giving an early and nutritious bite to ewes and lambs.

Stacking.—Before bringing the grain into the haggard the premises should be put in order, and well cleared of vermin, and no facilities afforded them to get into the stacks. Whether the stacks be large or small, they should be well ventilated, by carrying one or more flues from the bottoms upwards, which should discharge into one or more horizontal ones, open to the exterior at both ends. This will effectually prevent corn from heating in close haggards, and is applicable to hay-ricks; as each stack is finished it should be at once thatched, lest rain come on.

New and Recent Works

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

Booksellers to the Queen,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

SPEECHES, PARLIAMENTARY AND MISCELLANEOUS. By the Right Hon. Thomas Babington Macaulay. 2 vols. 8vo. 16s.

HISTORY OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE EAST INDIA COMPANY. By John William Kaye. 8vo. 21s.

NARRATIVE OF A JOURNEY ROUND THE DEAD SEA, and in the Bible Lands, in 1850 and 1851. By F. De Saulcy. 2 Vols. 30s.

LORD JEFFREYS' CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE EDINBURGH REVIEW. (Uniform with Macaulay's Essays.) 1 vol. Crown 8vo. 21s.

LAYARD'S FURTHER DISCOVERIES IN THE RUINS OF NINEVEH AND BABYLON, being the results of a second expedition. With 400 illustrations. 21s.

ALISON'S HISTORY OF EUROPE. Cheaper Edition. (12 Quarterly Vols. at 4s.) Vol. I. just published.

THE APOCALYPSE ITS OWN INTERPRETER, by the application of a sound and ancient rule for the Interpreting of Holy Scripture. By the Venerable James W. Forster. 8vo. 14s.

AN EXPOSITION OF THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE GALATIANS. By Rev. John Brown, D.D. 8vo. 12s.

DISCOURSES SUITED TO THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER. By Rev. John Brown, D.D. 8vo. 8s.

THE CHERUBIM AND THE APOCALYPSE. By Alexander Macleod. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

HOMILETICS; or the Theory of Preaching. By Alexander Vinet, D.D. 8vo. 6s.

NOTES ON BOOK OF DANIEL. By Albert Barnes. 2 vols. 7s, or, in one double vol., 6s. 6d.

MEMOIR OF REV. EDWARD BICKERSTETH. Two vols. Cheaper Edition. Uniform with collected works. Price to Subscribers, 8s., Non-subscribers, 10s. 6d.

INCIDENTS IN THE LIFE OF OUR SAVIOUR, Illustrative of His Divine Character and Mission. By Rev. A. L. R. Foote. 6s.

EARNEST APPEALS: in a Series of Letters, on Subjects relating to the Present and Eternal Happiness of the Soul. 2 vols. 10s. 6d.

A SUMMARY OF BIBLICAL ANTIQUITIES; for the use of Schools, Bible Classes, and Families. By Rev. Dr. Nevin. Foolscap 8vo. 2s. 6d.

WHAT THINK YE OF CHRIST? A Series of Meditations on the Title and Offices of Our Lord. By J. G. Smyttan. Foolscap 8vo. 3s. 6d.

COTTAGE SERMONS; or Plain Words to the Poor. By Rev. Ashton Oxendon. Foolscap 8vo. 2s. 6d.

D'AUBIGNE'S HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND. Vol. 5. Post 8vo., Cloth. (Oliver and Boyd's Edition). 6s.

D'AUBIGNE'S HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND. Vol. 5. 12mo, Cloth. (Collins's Edition.) 4s. 6d.

THE NEW REFORMATION IN IRELAND, with striking facts and anecdotes illustrating the Extent and Reality of the Movement. By the Rev. L. W. Jones. With a Missionary Map. 1s. 6d.

GENESIS AND GEOLOGY; or an Investigation into the Reconciliation of the Modern Doctrines of Geology; with the Declarations of Scripture. By Denis Crofton, B.A. 2s.

> "I have taken the responsibility of recommending to the enterprising publishers, whose names appear on the title page, to republish this little work, in its present form, and thus to place it within reach of American Christians, for the following reasons:—First, because I have met with no examination of the connection between 'Geology and Genesis,' so able as this. Other eminent writers, such as Dr. Chalmers, J. Pye Smith, Harris, Buckland, Silliman, Sedgewick and Whewell, have shown great skill in the examination of the Biblical questions connected with geology, but none of them have gone so fully into the argument as Mr. Crofton. Second, because he has opened a track which may be followed further by Biblical students. I mean in the examination of parallel passages of inspiration. Finally, because his course of argument is eminently adapted to satisfy the authorized expounders of God's Word—I mean the Ministers of the Gospel—that there is no collision between 'Genesis and Geology.' Mr. Crofton has made one or two favourable allusions to an earlier production of mine on this same subject, but I cannot suppose that any one will consider so slight a reference to be a reason why I should have formed a high opinion of his work, or why I should not express it.
>
> "Edward Hitchcock, D.D."
>
> *Introduction to American Edition.*

AN ADDRESS TO THE CLERGY OF THE DIOCESES OF DUBLIN, GLANDALAGH, AND KILDARE, on the Recent Changes in the System of Irish National Education. By The Archbishop of Dublin. 8vo. 1s., by post 1s. 6d.

CONVERSIONS AND PERSECUTIONS. A Charge Delivered at the Triennial Visitation of the Province of Dublin, in the Year 1853, by The Archbishop of Dublin. 8vo. 1s. 6d., by post 2s.

MEMOIR OF DR. CHALMERS. Edited by Rev. Wm. Hanna, LL.D. Cheaper Edition. To be completed in 20 Monthly Parts, at 6d.; 4 Quarterly Parts, at 2s. 6d.; or in 2 Vols., 10s.

A WORD IN SEASON; containing an Explanation of the Prophecies in relation to the present state of Europe, a Hint to Statesmen, a Caution to Merchants, and an Advice to the Working Classes. 6d., by post 10d.

A HISTORY OF THE PROTESTANT CHURCH OF HUNGARY. Compiled from authentic documents. By Dr. D'Aubigne. 8vo. (In the press.)

HISTORY OF THE PROTESTANTS OF FRANCE, from the Reformation to the present time. By P. de Felice. Post 8vo. 5s.

ABBEOKUTA; or, Sunrise within the Tropics: An Outline of the Origin and Progress of the Yoruba Mission. By Miss Tucker. 3s. 6d.

THE DIVINE RULE OF FAITH AND PRACTICE. By Rev. William Goode. 3 vols. 8vo. New Edition. With index. 21s.

A SELECTION FROM THE CORRESPONDENCE OF THE LATE THOMAS CHALMERS, D.D. Edited by Rev. William Hanna, LL.D. 10s. 6d.

THE LAMP AND THE LANTERN; or Light for the Tent and the Traveller. By James Hamilton, D.D. 1s. 6d.

MEMOIR OF ROBERT AND JAMES A. HALDANE. By Alex. Haldane, Esq. 12s.

MEMOIR OF THE REV. W. H. HEWITSON. By the Rev. John Baillie. 5s.

SELECT LETTERS AND REMAINS OF THE LATE REV. W. H. HEWITSON. Edited by the Rev. John Baillie. 2 Vols. 10s.

A GLANCE AT COMING EVENTS, in a Series of Letters on the Millenarian Theory. By Henry Bannerman. 3s. 6d.

A SUPPLEMENT TO THE COMING STRUGGLE AMONG THE NATIONS OF THE EARTH. 8vo. 6d., by post 10d.

THE PREDICTED DOWNFAL OF TURKEY, THE PREPARATION FOR THE RETURN OF THE TEN TRIBES. By George Stanley Faber. 2s.

THE COTTAGE BY THE LAKE; or the Wilmer Family. By Matilda Wrench. 1s. 6d.

SCRIPTURE STORIES FOR CHILDREN. By Miss Parrot. 1s. 6d.

THE ART OF QUESTIONING; or, a short Analysis of the Interrogatory Methods of Instruction, designed for the use of Teachers, Pupil-Teachers, and Monitors. By W. T. Young, T.C.D. 1s.

FERGUSON'S ILLUSTRATED BOOK OF DOMESTIC POULTRY. With Coloured Figures. No. 1. 1s.

ILLUSTRATED DUBLIN EXHIBITION CATALOGUE. 10s.

LONDON TO DUBLIN; with a Trip to the Irish Lakes; interspersed with Glances at North Wales, &c. Maps and Illustrations on steel and wood. Imp. 8vo. 6s.

THE SEAWEED COLLECTOR'S GUIDE; Containing plain Instructions for Collecting and Preserving, and a list of all the known Species and Localities in Great Britain. By J. Cocks, M.D. 2s. 6d.

HANDBOOK OF ANGLING; Teaching Fly-fishing, Trolling, &c,. &c. By Ephemera. 5s.

POPULAR FIELD BOTANY. A description of British Plants. By Agnes Catlow. With Coloured Illustrations. 10s. 6d.

POPULAR BRITISH ENTOMOLGY. A description of the Insects common to the British Isles. By Maria E. Catlow. With Coloured Illustrations. 10s. 6d.

POPULAR HISTORY OF BRITISH FERNS, AND THE ALLIED PLANTS, comprising the Club-Mosses, Pepper Worts, and Horse-tails. By Thomas Moore. With Coloured Illustrations. 10s. 6d.

POPULAR HISTORY OF BRITISH SEA-WEEDS. By Rev. Dr. Landsborough. With Twenty-two Coloured Plates. 10s. 6d.

POPULAR BRITISH ORNITHOLOGY; comprising all the Birds. By P. H. Gosse. With Twenty Coloured Plates. 10s. 6d.

THE COMPLETE ANGLER. By Izaak Walton. With numerous Illustrations. 2s. 6d.

BETTS' ROAD AND RAILROAD MAP OF IRELAND. In a Case. 5s.

THE TOURISTS' ILLUSTRATED HAND-BOOK FOR IRELAND. 3s. 6d.

PLAN OF DUBLIN. In a Case. 1s.

DUBLIN; WHAT TO SEE, AND HOW TO SEE IT. By W. F. Wakeman. With Maps and Illustrations. 1s.

ENVIRONS OF DUBLIN. Coloured. In a Case. 1s. 6d.

FRASER'S GUIDE TO THE COUNTY WICKLOW. With a Map and Illustrations. 2s.

GUIDE TO BELFAST AND ITS ENVIRONS, WITH A TOUR TO THE GIANT'S CAUSEWAY. By J. Huband Smith, M.R.I.A. 2s. 6d.

A RUN THROUGH THE SOUTH OF IRELAND. With Maps and Illustrations on Steel. 1s. 6d.

A WEEK IN THE WEST OF IRELAND, GALWAY, CONNAUGHT, CONNEMARA, &c. 1s.

CONNEMARA: Past and Present. By Rev. J. D. Smith. 2s.

A HAND-BOOK OF IRISH ANTIQUITIES. By Dr. John Wilde. With Illustrations. 5s.

LAKE LORE; or, An Antiquarian Guide to some of the Ruins and Recollections of Killarney. By A. B. R. With Illustrations. 2s. 6d.

SYNOPSIS OF THE CONTENTS OF THE GREAT INDUSTRIAL EXHIBITION OF 1853. By Charles C. Adley. 6d.

*** A variety of Guide Books, Charts, Maps, &c., for Tourists in England, Scotland, Ireland, and the Continent.

In the Press, and shortly will be Published, in Two Vols., Fcap. 8vo. Cloth.

MEMOIR OF THE LATE REVEREND EDWARD BICKERSTETH. By Rev. T. R. Birks. With Portrait. Uniform with the Collected Edition of his Works.

Price to Subscribers, 8s.—Non-subscribers, Half-a-guinea.

Subscriptions received by WILLIAM CURRY and COMPANY, 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON, and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher, WILLIAM CURRY, 9 Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

August, 1853.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Gloir do Dhia añ ṗna háṗdaiḃ, agus ṗíoḋcáin air an dtalaiñ deaġċoil do na dáoiniḃ.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED THE MIDDLE OF EVERY MONTH, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. II.—No. 21. SEPTEMBER, 1853. {Annual Subscription, 2s. 6d. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
The Golden Legend—The Wizard of Samaria and his fiery Chariot!	97
Is the Church of Rome Immutable?	98
Is the Protestant Bible a corrupt and mutilated translation of the Holy Scriptures?—No. V.	99
Can the Infallibility of the Church of Rome be proved from Ecclesiastical History and the Writings of the earlier Fathers?—No. II.	99
The Marleys—A Story of Real Life—Chap. III.	100
Talk of the Road—No. XVI.	102
Blind Credulity and Reasonable Faith	103
CORRESPONDENCE—	
On the Visible Church—by Philalethes	104
Mr. E. Power on Saints' Days, Purgatory, &c.	105
On the exact position of the Priest in the Sacrifice of the Mass—by Fontium Petitor	106
On the Blessed Virgin and the Holy Ghost, by M.	106
On Persecution in Hindostan—by an Eye-witness	107
Farming Operations for September	107

THE GOLDEN LEGEND.

ABOUT ST. PETER AND THE SAMARITAN IMPOSTOR AT ROME.

THE Church of Rome, as most of our readers are aware, claims spiritual authority and supremacy over the rest of the Christian world. The argument by which the most eminent divines of that church endeavour to support this claim, is briefly as follows:—St. Peter was Bishop of Rome. Our Lord Jesus Christ conferred upon St. Peter a primacy and authority over the Apostles and other Christians. St. Peter continued Bishop of Rome to his decease, and left this authority as a legacy to his successors in that see. Hence it is inferred, that the Bishops of Rome, according to God's institution, are entitled to universal supremacy over the Christian Church—that this supremacy is indefectible and unalterable—and it is asserted, that, in fact, the Roman Bishops continually, from St. Peter's time, have enjoyed and exercised this sovereign power.

It will be seen from the above statement, (which we have endeavoured to compress into as brief a compass as possible) that the advocates of the Church of Rome are bound to *establish a great many facts*, before they can expect Protestants to acknowledge the supremacy of the Pope. Let us take, for example, the first proposition stated above—namely, "St. Peter was Bishop of Rome." Cardinal Bellarmine, in his discussion of this matter, says *—"We have four questions here to consider, 1. Was St. Peter at Rome at all? 2. Did he die there? 3. Was he bishop there? 4. Was he never translated from that see to any other?" Similar questions arise upon each of the other propositions; and ALL of these points must be clearly proved and established, before the claim of Papal supremacy can be justified.

If it can be shown that St. Peter had *no* primacy of *power* over the other apostles—if the privilege conferred on him by our Lord was a *personal* privilege, incapable of transmission to others—if antiquity is absolutely silent on St. Peter's supposed primacy—if the Church of Antioch can be proved to have a prior claim to the title of "the see of St. Peter" than the Church of Rome—if, according to some eminent writers, it is a very doubtful matter whether St. Peter was ever at Rome at all—if these or similar propositions can be maintained upon probable grounds, the whole theory of Papal supremacy is shaken to its base. For it must be carefully borne in mind, that, in the modern system of the Church of Rome, everything is decided by *authority*, not by evidence. She will not allow her people to examine for themselves into the truth of any doctrine of their religion; she prohibits all investigation of this kind as an unlawful exercise of private judgment; the only answer which she gives to such inquiries is—*The Church has so decided it, therefore it must be true.* When, therefore, the whole weight of the truth of Christianity is made to depend on the authority of the church—or of the Pope—(for the two are now, in fact, identical)—*that* authority ought itself to rest on a sure and solid foundation. It is the corner stone of the whole building. And if it can be shown that this foundation is but a loose heap of sand, without strength, solidity, or cohesion—drifted together by the winds and eddies of bygone ages—what reliance can be placed on such a basis? what becomes of the faith which is built on it? Can we be surprised when we behold this faith abandoned by Roman Catholics on the Continent, as well as at home, for secret or avowed infidelity?

It is not our intention at present to discuss at any length the question, whether St. Peter was ever at Rome. Many learned men have asserted that there is no satisfactory evidence for this fact in ancient writers, such as would bring even probable conviction to an impartial mind—much less such a clear and incontrovertible proof, as alone can serve for the basis of the all-important doctrine of Papal supremacy. If we confine ourselves to the New Testament, which is the only contemporaneous authority, and the only one on whose statements we can implicitly rely, it nowhere gives us the least reason for supposing that St. Peter was ever at Rome; nay, more, it furnishes us with many strong arguments for concluding that he *could not* have been there, at least for the greater portion of his life. Cardinal Baronius asserts that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome for twenty-five years—namely, from A.D. 43 to A.D. 68; now we have distinct evidence that St. Peter was not at Rome, during the greater part of this time. St. Paul says (Gal. i. 18), that three years after his conversion, he went to see St. Peter at Jerusalem, where he found him; fourteen years after, he again went to Jerusalem, and again found St. Peter there. During the interval, between A.D. 43 and 68, when St. Peter is said to have been at Rome, we have eight instances in which St. Paul was in communication with Rome; once by writing *to* that church, six times when writing *from* Rome, and once, during an abode of two years in that city, and on *no one* of these occasions is there the least hint given, that St. Peter was there during any portion of this time.

St. Peter was not at Rome, when St. Paul, mentioning Tychicus, Onesimus, Aristarchus, Marcus, and Justus, adds, "*these alone* are my fellow-workers unto the kingdom of God, who have been a comfort unto me" (Col. iv. 11.) St. Peter could not have been at Rome when St. Paul said, "at my first defence *no man* stood with me, but *all men* forsook me" (2 Tim. iv. 16.) He was not there immediately before St. Paul's death, when the "time of his departure was at hand," when he tells Timothy that "*all the brethren* did salute him" (2 Tim. iv. 6, 21.) The names of several are given, but St. Peter's name is nowhere to be found.

As we said before, we do not now undertake to discuss this question, which would carry us much beyond our present limits. Our object, in the foregoing remarks, was to prepare our readers for the following extracts from a document which is sometimes brought forward, even in our own day* as affording the clearest evidence that St. Peter was at Rome. The original author of the "Legenda Aurea" or "Golden Legends" is generally admitted to have been Jacobus de Voragine, Archbishop of Genoa, who died A.D. 1296. Cardinal Barrieres attaches importance to Nicephorus Callistus, Cedrenus, and other writers, who lived in the fourteenth century, as corroborative authorities upon some parts of the story. The "Golden Legends" obtained a very wide circulation in their day. The celebrity of this work was such, that it was one of the works most frequently printed in the fifteenth century, shortly after the art of printing became known.† It is not too much to say, therefore, that it must have exercised a very important influence on the popular mind, at a period when books were much more scarce and difficult of access than they are at present. Let us now see the kind of religious instruction, which an Archbishop of the Church of Rome thought fit to provide for his flock in the 13th century, and which a Roman Catholic controversialist in our day brings forward as a trustworthy authority for the decision of an important question. Our extracts must necessarily be very brief, but we will endeavour to put our readers faithfully in possession of the chief parts of the legend, so far as St. Peter is concerned.

A Samaritan impostor, named Simon Magus, is said to have lived at Rome during the reigns of the Emperors Claudius and Nero, and to have acquired an immense reputation by his witchcrafts. Among these, it may be mentioned, as we are assured by Nicephorus, Cedrenus, Cardinal Baronius, and other writers approved by the Roman Church, that "he was in the constant habit of making statues walk, of changing everything into gold, of assuming the appearance of a dragon, a sheep, or anything else he chose, and of transforming other people into all kinds of animals" (Nicephorus ii. 297). Towards the close of Nero's reign, the Samaritan was one day sitting in his study with some visitors, when he was surprised to see rush furiously into the room his immense dog, which was usually kept chained in the porch of his house, to keep off the crowds of people that were constantly flocking to his doors. What was the consternation of Simon's visitors when the dog stopped short in the middle of the room, and began to speak with the human voice, announcing the arrival of the Apostle Peter from Babylon! In their terror they exclaimed, "who is this Peter, and what mighty power does he possess?" In order to allay their apprehensions, Simon replied, "do not think this occurrence is so strange, for I can do exactly the same. Go, tell Peter to walk in," said he to the dog, "and be sure to speak to him like a man, as you have done to me." Whereupon the dog went out, and almost immediately afterwards, the great Apostle of the Jews, then nearly in his eightieth year (as Baronius tells us) entered the room, leaning on his staff, and with his gray hair falling over his shoulders.

Simon Magus now proceeded to those "diabolical artifices" as Father M'Corry calls them, which were the great business of his life. He sent for an immense bull, which was immediately brought to his hall door, and St. Peter was challenged by the wizard to a contest of miracles, in the presence of a great crowd of people. The impostor whispered something into the bull's ear, and the huge animal instantly dropped dead upon the pavement. The apostle said something, and the animal instantly resumed its legs. The people when they beheld the miracle, wondered, and exclaimed "to bring to life is a greater miracle than to kill." The historian Cedrenus adds, "many other miracles (πολλα αλλα σημεια) were performed by them not only in Rome but also in Syria." He forgets to inform us, however, of any particulars of those many miracles; or of the journey which the rival miracle-workers must have taken together, in order to pass from Rome to Syria. This was an unpardonable omission of our veracious historian.

We next find them again together at Rome, in the palace of the Emperor Nero. A young nobleman, a relative of the Emperor's, had just died, and Simon Magus was sent for to recall him to life. On entering the room, he found St. Peter there before him, who challenged the wizard to a contest of their miraculous powers, which the other promptly accepted, on the condition that if either succeeded, his rival should be put to death. The Samaritan then advanced to the bed, and stooped over the corpse. After repeating some awful incantations into its ear, the head began to move, no one perceiving the impostor's hand behind it. "See," cried every one, "he lives—they are talking to one another." "Take the Samaritan from the bed," said St. Peter, "and you will see that he deceives you." They did so, and the head dropped back inanimate. The mother of the deceased was in despair. The impostor was arrested in his endeavour to run down stairs, and the whole room was in confusion. Amidst it all, the calm tones of the Apostle were heard, uttering a few words, and immediately the deceased nobleman rushed into his mother's arms. Every one was eager to stone the impostor, but they were prevented by St. Peter. "Let him go," said he, "the exposure, the disgrace, is sufficient punishment." These occurrences are detailed, with many further particulars, by Jacobus de Voragine, and copied from him by other writers. They are also fully recorded by Father Xavier, and are mentioned, as well as the rest of this legend, by Cardinal Baronius, as incontestible facts.

As soon as the Samaritan escaped from the scene of the morning's tumult, he ran as fast as he could to the palace, demanded an audience of Nero, and implored him to send

* *Vide* Bellarm De Summo Pontif, lib. ii. c. i. et seq. tom. i. p. 231. Col. Agrip. 1615.

* *Vide* Father M'Corry's Tract, "Was St. Peter ever at Rome?" 1851.

† According to Dupin, it was printed at Nuremberg, in 1478, and 1493; at Deventer in 1479, and 1483; at Venice, in 1486; at Basil, in 1489; and at Strasburg in 1496. Our readers will remember that the art of printing came into use about 1457.

at once for that insolent Galilean. "I cannot tolerate this treatment any longer, Cæsar," said Simon Magus, in much excitement, as Peter entered; "I wonder very much that you can imagine this lying fisherman (hunc piscatorem mendacissimum) to be possessed of any power. Let me order my angels to come at once and deliver me from him." "I do not fear your angels" was Peter's reply. "What!" said Nero to the Apostle, "do you not fear one who proves true by his actions that he is one of our gods?" "If there is anything divine about him," said Peter, "let him tell what I am thinking of, or what I am going to do, and I shall first whisper to you, most excellent Cæsar, what it is." "Come close to me, then" said the Emperor, "and tell me what your thought is." "Tell them to bring me some barley bread," said Peter, in a very low whisper to the Emperor's ear, "and to give it to me without his seeing it." When the bread was brought, Peter put it in his pocket, except a little that he hid in his two hands. "Now, then," said he to the Samaritan, "tell me what I have here, and what I have been doing and saying." Our story here leaves us a good deal in the dark; but the end of the matter was, that Simon Magus, forgetting the respect which was due to the Emperor, roared out at last in a voice like thunder, "let my big dogs come and eat him up." Whereupon, two enormous dogs suddenly tumbled down the chimney and rushed at the Apostle. Peter stretched out his hands open towards them, showing them the barley bread which he had concealed. The effect of this upon the animals was to make them rush off again by the same way they came, to the great disappointment of their wicked master. Nero does not seem to have thought much of this performance. He called the Apostle and the Samaritan a pair of jugglers, and ordered them both to quit his presence (*ὡς τερατολογους και αμφοτερους εκ προσωπου αυτου θαττον εξηλασεν.* Cedrenus, Hist. Comp.)

We have only space for one extract more, out of this marvellous "Golden Legend." After an absence from Rome of about a year, Simon Magus again presented himself before Nero. "I know," said he, "most excellent Cæsar, how much right you have to question my supernatural powers, but I have not come to you this time without my proofs. Order them to cut off my head." Nero took him at his word, and the chief executioner was ordered to behead the Samaritan in the court-yard of the palace. Baronius and other writers inform us, as has been already mentioned, that the impostor was constantly in the habit of transforming himself into various kinds of animals. The executioner, when all was prepared, turned round for an instant to whet his scimitar; and, on again looking round, he saw a great ram with its head held down by the attendants. "Where is the Samaritan?" said he, fiercely. "Behold him, Sir," said the attendants, "we have never let this head go." The head was instantly severed from the body. The executioner wiped his scimitar, and said, "It is to be hoped that we shall hear no more of this juggling Samaritan." Within four or five days, however, the inexhaustible Simon Magus entered the presence chamber of the Emperor. "What is the cause of this neglect, Nero?" said he, "I have just been looking at the place where they cut off my head, and it is quite disgusting to see the blood. Do give them orders to wipe it up." The Emperor, in amazement, held out his hand, and assured him that he should never doubt him any more; but it was too late; the Samaritan was deeply offended. "Adieu," said he to Nero, as he turned to depart, "I shall leave Rome to-morrow in my fiery chariot, and you shall never see me more."

The morrow came. A fiery chariot and four (*quadrigæ igneæ*) awaited the Samaritan at a tower on the top of the Capitoline Hill. The people flocked in crowds from all parts of Rome to see the wondrous sight. The Emperor's carriage was conspicuous in the assembly; and, at an humble distance behind it, might be seen the Apostle Peter, and with him St. Paul, who, according to some accounts, had returned a day or two before from Spain. At length, the Samaritan impostor appeared upon the tower, with a crown of laurel on his head. "Farewell, Romans," said he, "I am sorry you make such fools of yourselves about those contemptible Galileans." He then mounted the chariot, and, like an enormous bird, soared aloft to the skies (ab illâ turri excelsâ avolans, in modo volucrium, sublime abiit). The Apostles looked at each other. "What shall we do?" said Paul, "he will soon be out of sight, if you do not make haste." Nicephorus relates that Peter became nervous and agitated (*εν αγωνιᾳ μαλλον ην*); but other writers suggest that his hesitation was probably intentional, in order that the Samaritan's fall might be the greater. At length the Emperor and the crowd heard the Apostle's well-known voice—"Angels of Satan," he exclaimed, "the flight has lasted long enough; let him fall, but let him live." The chariot and horses forthwith vanished into the air, and were never seen again. The impostor dropped from the clouds like a stone; and though he was not killed by the fall, yet he did not long survive it. When Nero heard of it, he ordered St. Peter to be arrested and put in prison. He considered that he had been robbed of his best friend: and thus, even after death, the Samaritan impostor persecuted the Apostle, for the emperor was terribly vindictive, and St. Peter was put to death upon an inverted cross.

Such is the "Golden Legend," regarding St. Peter's actions at Rome; and we will not weary the patience of our readers by pointing out the monstrous absurdities with which it abounds. It might, in our opinion, be more properly called, the "Brazen," than the "Golden" Legend; for it required no ordinary amount of brazen assurance in any writer, to invent such a story, and then pawn it off upon the world as a true record, intended to confirm and propagate the Christian faith. From what we know of the character of Jacobus de Voragine, Archbishop of Genoa, (who, as we before remarked, is the author of this legend), we need not wonder at the amount of barefaced, incredible lies, which it contains. He is described by Melchior Canus, an eminent Roman Catholic canonist, in no very flattering terms. "That legend" saith he, "was written by a man that had a mouth of iron, and had a heart of lead, and who had neither justice nor prudence in him. The miracles that we read there, are rather monsters of miracles than true ones."* Yet this is the narrative which Cardinal Baronius and other Roman Catholic writers consider to be a true record, which Father M'Corry asserts that a great many Roman Catholics, in England and Scotland, as well as Ireland, believe to be a real history, and, on the authority of which, he would seek to persuade us, that St. Peter lived and died at Rome! There can be but little doubt, that in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, when almost every lie could be propagated with success, the "Golden Legend" *did* contribute to spread very widely among all classes a firm conviction, that St. Peter really died at Rome; but Father M'Corry and his supporters are greatly mistaken, when they suppose that any class in the community, Protestant or anti-Protestant, in these islands, will, in the nineteenth century, accept such a frivolous guarantee as the story of the dogs and the fiery chariot, for the Apostolic authenticity of their claim of Papal supremacy; or that they will consent to rest any part of their belief, for time or for eternity, upon such a barefaced imposture.

* Vide Dupin. Hist., Eccl. vol. ii., p. 439. Dublin, 1721.

IS THE CHURCH OF ROME IMMUTABLE?

It is well known that persons who constantly make untrue or doubtful statements, end frequently by believing them, and often impose upon others as well as on themselves.

Love of truth is the best security against these evils, since it will always dispose us not to speak without consideration, and not to believe without reason. Where it is wanting, mere assertion will most commonly be accepted instead of proof, and credulity substituted for well-founded assent.

A continual boast of Roman Catholics is "the unchangeable character of their Church." We hear incessantly that "Rome is always one and immutable." Some Protestants are to be found so foolish as to believe this, and more foolish still in bearing witness to their own ignorance of very plain facts, by repeating it.

However, if questioned, they would probably answer thus:—

We mean only to express our conviction, that the Church of Rome is immutable in her persevering aggression upon the rightful liberty of mind; and consistent only in her unceasing efforts to discountenance or suppress exercise of judgment, and deference to conscience, in order to establish upon their extinction her peculiar doctrines which are inconsistent with them.

This may, indeed, be the case. But it is more candid, and less dangerous to avoid statements which require explanations.

If, by "immutability," people would have us to believe, that the Church of Rome has neither altered her practice nor her principles, it is easy to show that she has already done, and may yet do, both.

Take, as an instance, her public service. It is now conducted in an unknown tongue; formerly it was not so. Here, at all events, is a change in practice, and a most important one likewise. Now, by this change in practice, she has violated her principles. For when we ask why has she translated the Bible into Latin from the Hebrew and Greek originals, the only answer which can be given is, because the former language, and not the latter, was that commonly spoken and best understood by the people. For this same reason, her public offices were drawn up in Latin.

But, if the principle on which she formerly acted, when translating the Bible, and constructing her public services, was, that the members of her communion might thereby be enabled to understand and profit by what they read or heard, has she not, when her last Council fiated, as the only authentic version, a Latin translation of the Bible, and in continuing to conduct those services in a language utterly unintelligible to the vast majority of her members, departed from the principle which once guided her decisions?

Here, then, is an instance where practice has been altered and principle violated. The Church of Rome cannot, therefore, be "immutable."

Let us now see whether it be not possible that she may yet change still more.

The doctrine of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary is at present believed by most Roman Catholics as religiously as any doctrine of the Bible, and by many, it is to be feared, regarded as equally important.

It is, however, undeniably certain, that this same doctrine was not only not believed formerly by some of her most eminent writers, but that it was *one* of the subjects (for there were others) which occasioned long and bitter disputes between her two great orders of Dominicans and Franciscans.

This doctrine has not yet been pronounced an article of faith by the authority commonly considered (for even on this most vital matter there is neither unity of mind, nor likelihood, nor materials for it) as empowered to make, or, as it is sometimes said, declare, articles of faith.

So that, as the matter stands at present, we have in the statistics of a Church asserting its infallibility as the ground of its belief, this destructive fact—a doctrine universally believed, though unsanctioned, both for its truth and importance, by the only tribunal which can establish either. We can, indeed, safely ask our Roman Catholic countrymen, if they really do believe that any declaration of Pontiff or Council can add a single particle to their belief, either in the truth or importance of this doctrine?

If they do not, we must then ask them to consider how inconsistent it is on their part to quarrel with Protestants for doing as they themselves now do, and that is—believe without human infallibility; which is, by this instance, shown to be useless for establishing a truth, explaining its meaning, or adding to its importance.

Let us now suppose that, at some future time, the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception shall be made, or declared an article of faith.

Whether this may occur soon, as multitudes expect, or be deferred to a more convenient season, as wise folk shrewdly conjecture, we can confidently ask—where is now the boasted immutability of your Church?

The faith of a Church means the aggregate of the separate articles of belief. Increase the items and you alter the amount. We should not consider as very sane, though perhaps as very harmless, the man who, when he had added two or three stories to his cottage, should amuse himself by persisting in saying that the large house was still the little cottage. But what would we think if this same man, though warned that the former foundation was incapable of bearing the additional weight, and that, in consequence thereof, the walls were actually giving way, should peril his own and his family's life by a residence in this dangerous building, and endeavour to disprove a fact plain to all eyesight, by continuing to assert that the heavy house was but the cottage after all?

The Church of Rome has added, and may yet add many stories to the little cottage. She has altered, and may alter still farther the simplicity of "the faith which was once delivered to the saints." In doing so she has changed, and will change to the extent of these additions. But, in still claiming immutability, she confounds the house with the cottage, and when attempting to act on it, brings death to her consistency for the sake of a delusion.

When persons have been for some time working in certain mines, their constitutions are said to become so impregnated with mercury, that if a copper coin be placed in their mouths for a short time, it may be taken out apparently coated with silver.

The mercury, which gives this fine appearance to the coin is, however, killing the workman.

The Church of Rome has thus coated her coins. They come from her mouth, silvered over with the gloss of immutability. But this claim is to her, as the mercury to the miner, the cause of death. She has changed. This fact destroys the claim.

We are, indeed, sometimes asked—"Point out if you can, *when* any change has taken place." It would be easy to do so, but we may try the value of the argument by a retort. Will you deny that there are any old people in the world, because no one can tell you when a man ceases to be young and becomes old?

After all, what can thousands of poor and uneducated Roman Catholics know about councils and their decrees? Their criterion of knowledge is their reliance upon the nearest bishop or parish priest. Infallibility is for them just their testimony, and nothing more.

But these poor people think a great deal more highly of their Popes and bishops than these last do for each other's most deliberate judgments. Councils cared as little for Popes as Popes cared for Councils. For instance—The Council of Constance passed the famous decree, that the laity should be deprived of the cup, or chalice, in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Its members seemed to have cared but little that one of their Pontiffs had written long before in terms of the deepest indignation against the idea of such a thing, and said it was sacrilege.

Cardinal Wiseman seems not to consider as of any authority either the notes of the Douay Bible, or the judgment of the late Archbishop Murray, who, in common with most Roman Catholic bishops of these countries, sanctioned them.

The note to which we allude is that which relates to the words of the Lord—"The flesh profiteth nothing." (St. John vi. 64), and is as follows:—

"Dead flesh separated from the spirit, in the gross manner they supposed they were to eat his flesh, would profit nothing."

Here it stated that the Jews understood Christ in a *gross* manner, and, of course, in doing so, put a *wrong* sensoon his words. Now, Cardinal Wiseman asserts that they took the right meaning, and thereon builds an argument for

what he chooses (with most Roman Catholic writers) to call a *real* presence, which is, however, quite a distinct thing from his own doctrine of a *corporal* one.

"While the Jews understood our Saviour to speak of *really* intending to give them his flesh to eat, if they were wrong, can we suppose him to answer them by saying, that his flesh was *really* meant? Or can we, under these circumstances, imagine him to use the word at all, and that twice and emphatically? for the repetition of it in the two members of the sentence forms a true emphasis, unless he wished to be taken literally. If so, there is no other conclusion to be drawn from the sentence, than that he was speaking of a real eating of his flesh and drinking his blood."—Lectures on the Real Presence, p. 121.

It is clear now, that if the note of the Douay Bible be right, Cardinal Wiseman is wrong, both in his argument and in the fact on which it rests. This note, and the Roman Catholic bishops who sanctioned it, are at direct issue with him on the fact of the interpretation put, and intended by our Lord (according to the Cardinal) to be put upon His words.

It seems barely possible that Dr. Wiseman has never read this note, or, having read, forgot its existence. Otherwise the inference must be, that in this estimate of the superior value of his own judgment, he overlooked the evidence which this contradiction would furnish, of the slight respect which he attached to the judgment of his brother prelates, or the notes of a Bible used by the members of his communion, when they stood in the way of his arguments.

We can furnish our Roman Catholic brethren with another, and a very recent instance of disagreement among their prelates.

By a minute of the proceedings of the Board of National Education, held 8th July, 1853, "it is ordered that—The lessons on the truth of Christianity be withdrawn from the list of books published by direction of the Commissioners."

His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin, in a pamphlet just published upon the occasion of this present breach of faith with the public, makes the following statement with respect to this work, excluded by the votes (among others) of Roman Catholic bishops:—It was "not at all less the work of Archbishop Murray than ours; for he, as well as the rest of the Commissioners, deliberately recommended it. He perused it with scrupulous care, and he sent over a copy to the late Pope, who had it read to him in Italian, and found it unexceptionable." Again, with respect to "the Scripture Lessons," Mr. Carlile, in a letter recently addressed to the editor of the *Times*, thus speaks—"With regard to the two Archbishops, no half sheet was ever sent to press without their express authority."

"These Scripture Lessons were prepared, not only with the assent, but at the express wish of Dr. Murray and the other Roman Catholic members of the board, for the very purpose of being used in the common instruction, and every half sheet was signed by Dr. Murray with that view, except a few when he was from home, which were signed by a clergyman authorized by him to do so."

This book, thus deliberately sanctioned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop, met (as well as Dr. Murray himself) "with violent attacks," to use Mr. Carlile's words, from Dr. M'Hale, and was at last placed in the Index Expurgatorius.

We do earnestly press upon our Roman Catholic countrymen to consider these evidences of the respect which the prelates of their church pay to the deliberate judgments of their episcopal brethren. We put the matter in this way, because it is certain that infallibility is, and cannot, for uneducated people, be anything else ultimately, than the judgments of their bishop or priest. The decrees of councils, &c., are to them just what they are told of them. Upon the personal judgments of their own bishop or priest, they must ultimately rest. But if they do so, in defiance of the evidences which these same persons (and not Protestants) give of the slight respect which they pay to each other, we must ask them to consider whether they are acting more wisely than the poor Irishman, who, having been told something about a sun-dial, went out at night with a candle to see the hour, and came back complaining that he could make nothing at all out of it, for the shadow moved whatever way he looked at it.

Now, the infallibility of the Church is to our thousands of uneducated Roman Catholic countrymen, just what the shadow of the sun-dial was to the poor Irishman, with the priest or bishop for the candle, as fluctuating as the time shown by the perpetually shifting shadow.

IS THE PROTESTANT BIBLE A CORRUPT AND MUTILATED TRANSLATION OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES?

We have to consider now the other chief difference between the Douay and Protestant Bible—viz., the use of the word "priest."

Dr. Ward, in his "Errata," pages 46 and 46, brings forward six passages,* all relating to the Christian ministry, in all which places, in the Douay Bible, they are called priests, whereas in the Protestant Bible they are called elders. Of course Dr. Ward counts this a wilful corruption in the Protestant Bible. We give Dr. Ward's objection in his own words (p. 45):—"The English Protestants, on purpose to abolish the holy Sacrifice of the Mass, did not only take away the word *altar* out of the Scripture, but they also suppressed the name *priest* in all their translations, turning it into *elder*; well knowing that these three—priest, sacrifice, and altar—are dependents and consequents one of another, so that they cannot be separated. If there be an external sacrifice, there must be an external priesthood to offer it, and an altar to offer the same upon." And, again—"But our new pretended reformers have made the Scriptures quite dumb as to the name of any such priest or priesthood as we now speak of; never so much as once naming *priest*, unless where mention is made either of the priests of the Jews or the priests of the Gentiles."

Dr. Ward has here very accurately stated the importance of this difference. There cannot be a sacrifice without a priest. If the ministers of the Gospel are not priests, they cannot offer any sacrifice, and, therefore, there can be no Sacrifice in the Mass; but if they be priests, then they must offer sacrifice, which, of course, is to be looked for in the Mass. We think Dr. Ward quite right in this view of the importance of the difference in question between the two Bibles. The thing we have to consider is simply, whether it be a true or a false translation to put in *priests* in the passages in question. We ask our readers to consider the evidence, and to remember how much depends on it.

The Jewish religion, that which Moses gave to the people of Israel, consisted chiefly in offering animals in sacrifice to God. By God's direction, Moses set apart a class of men to offer these sacrifices. The name given to this class of men in the Greek Old Testament is ἱερεὺς *(hiereus)*. By this name they are invariably called. There was also another class of men among the Jews, to whom the name of πρεσβύτερος *(presbyteros)* was given: these were they who had any office or authority among them, but who had not power to offer sacrifice. These men were never called *hiereus*—that name was confined to those who offered sacrifice, and the name *presbyteros* was never applied to those who offered sacrifice.

In the Greek New Testament those who offered sacrifice among the Jews are ALWAYS called *hiereus*, NEVER *presbyteros*; and the ministers of the Christian religion are ALWAYS called *presbyteros*, NEVER *hiereus*. This is the fact. The Apostles and Evangelists who were inspired by God to write the New Testament, NEVER called the ministers of the Gospel *hiereus*, which meant one who offered sacrifice; but ALWAYS called them *presbyteros*, which meant one who did NOT offer sacrifice. They had their choice of the two names; both names were in common use among the Jews—one meaning a person who offered sacrifice, the other meaning a public officer who did NOT offer sacrifice; and they ALWAYS called the ministers of the Gospel by that name which did *not* mean sacrificers. Wherever the writers of the New Testament speak of the Jewish priests, they *always* used the word *hiereus*; wherever they spoke of the ministers of Christ, they *always* used the word *presbyteros*. And they did this by direction of the Holy Ghost, the spirit by which they wrote. That Holy Spirit taught them always carefully to distinguish those two orders of men by two different names, having quite different meanings.

Now, what is the difference between the two Bibles, the Douay and the Protestant?

The Douay Bible insists that the two different classes which the Holy Ghost directed the Apostles to distinguish so carefully, by two different names, shall always be called *by the same name, in the same meaning*. The Protestant Bible is careful to distinguish them by words of different meaning. Which is right? We think this a question which any plain man may answer.

The Douay Bible is the more inexcusable in this, because the Latin translation of the New Testament, which the Douay translators professed to follow, set them the example of carefully following the distinction made in the Greek. Wherever the Greek has *hiereus*, the Latin always puts *sacerdos*; and wherever the Greek has *presbyteros*, the Latin has *presbyterus*. So here is the marked distinction kept up in the Latin as well as in the Greek; and yet, the Douay Bible insists, that no distinction at all shall be observed in the English; while the Protestant Bible preserves the distinction exactly. And it is simply for following the Greek, and the Latin too, that Dr. Ward attacks it, and calls it corrupt! In all the six passages which Dr. Ward has produced, the Greek has *presbyteros*, and the Latin, *presbyterus*; and yet, the Douay Bible translates it as if the Greek had *hiereus*, and the Latin, *sacerdos*.

It is wholly false to speak of the Protestant Bible (as Dr. Ward does in the passage above quoted) as "never so much as once naming *priest*, unless when mention is made either of the priests of the Jews, or the priests of the Gentiles." In eight different places of the 5th, 7th, 8th, and 10th chapters of Hebrews, the word "priest" is applied in the Protestant Bible to Christ Himself.

This leads us to observe another marked distinction in the Greek and Latin Bibles, which the Douay Bible wilfully abolishes. Christ himself is called *hiereus* in the Greek, and *sacerdos* in the Latin, and never *presbyteros*. His ministers are called *presbyteros*, and never *sacerdos*, or *hiereus*.

Thus both the Greek and the Latin Bibles carefully distinguish the office of Christ and the office of his ministers by different names, having quite different meanings; and yet the Douay Bible insists on confounding those separate offices, under the same name, in the same meaning! and because the Protestant Bible does not follow their example, in opposition both to the Greek, and to that Latin Bible which the Council of Trent pronounces "authentic," they accuse it of corrupting the Word of God!

The Protestant Bible has also the word "priest" or "priesthood" in five places, where it is evidently applied to all Christ's people—viz., 1 Peter ii. 5 and 9; Revelation, or Apocalypse, i. 6; v. 10; xx. 6. *In all instances*, following the same rule, translating *hiereus* by *priest*, wherever they meet with it, and *presbyteros* by *elder*; so as always to make the same distinction between the offices, which they find marked so strongly in the Greek and Latin Bibles: whereas, the Douay Bible confounds and abolishes that distinction altogether.

We wish to point out carefully that it is not about the *sound* of words that we would contend, but about the distinction of offices. If it were kept in view in a translation of the Bible, that the Jewish ministers and Christian ministers are distinguished in the Greek Scriptures by different names, which have different meanings, one expressing the offering of sacrifices, and the other excluding that notion—if this were marked in the translation, as it is in the original—then we would not object to the *word* "priest" being put as the translation of *presbyteros*, provided it were understood that it was used as the translation of a Greek word that does *not* mean one who offers sacrifice, and provided some other word were used for the Jewish priests, who did offer sacrifice. What we maintain is this, that where the two offices are clearly distinguished in the original by two names, having clearly different meanings, that distinction should be made plain in the translation too. To put that distinction altogether out of the translation, as the Douay Bible does, by always giving the same name, in the same meaning, to the two different offices, is a wilful corrupting and confounding of the Word of God.

And *why* does the Douay Bible thus wilfully confound what God's Word has distinguished?

Dr. Ward has told us, in the passage above quoted, without a priest there can be no Sacrifice of the Mass. Let it once be known among Christians now, (as it was clearly known in the Apostles' days) that the Apostles were careful always to call Christ's ministers by a title which meant one who did *not* offer sacrifice, and that they never called them by the title of the Jewish priests who did offer sacrifice; let this striking distinction made by the Apostles once be known, and then the Sacrifice of the Mass falls of itself. And therefore to establish her own sacrifice, the Church of Rome has no resource but to abolish and hide that distinction which the Apostles made between the Jewish and Christian ministers. Is not this enough in itself to disprove their sacrifice?

We do not deny that the Eucharist is a sacrifice in any sense at all. There are sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving (Hebrews, xiii. 15); and all Christians are priests to offer such sacrifices as these—(1 Pet. ii. 5, 9).* In this sense the Holy Eucharist is a sacrifice, and the highest sacrifice that Christians can offer. But this is not the Sacrifice of the Mass, for it is not a sacrifice of propitiation for sin. It is not the same kind of sacrifice as the Jewish sacrifices for sin, or the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross. Neither does it require any other kind of sacrificing power in the priest, than what all Christ's people possess.

We trust we have shown that the Protestant Bible does right in distinguishing between *hiereus* and *presbyteros*; and that the Douay Bible does wrong in confounding them. We trust the time may come when the Douay Bible will be corrected in this matter too by the Protestant Bible.

In our next number we will conclude this subject, by considering whether the books called Apocrypha are really part of the Bible given by inspiration of God.

CAN THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH OF ROME BE PROVED FROM ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY AND THE WRITINGS OF THE EARLIER FATHERS?

NO. II.

In our last number we made some general observations on the uncertainty which attaches to the dogma of infallibility, and the novelty of the modern Roman Catholic doctrine of the infallibility of the Church of Rome. We proceed now to establish the latter position more in detail, and our proofs shall be derived, as we proposed, from the history of the Church and the writings of the Fathers.

Now, in order to avoid confounding things which are in themselves distinct, it must be carefully borne in mind that the infallibility of the Church of Rome does not necessarily follow from its supremacy, supposing the latter to be admitted. A spiritual supremacy over all other Churches may have been accorded to one Church, without, in the remotest degree, inferring as a consequence the attribute of infallibility. Romish theologians, however, often seem to think that they have only to establish the former

* Acts xv. 2. Titus i. 5. 1 Tim. v. 17. 1 Tim. v. 19. James v. 14; and Acts xiv. 22.

* The literal meaning of the word πρεσβύτερος is "one advanced in years." It came to be applied to persons in any public office, because men of years and experience were generally chosen for such situations. Hence it appears how correct and appropriate is the English translation, "elder."

* Of course we do not mean that laymen can celebrate the Eucharist. Consecration is confined to Presbyters.

prerogative in favour of their Church, and that the latter must follow as a necessary result.

But whilst it is true that the concession of supremacy does not necessarily imply the recognition of infallibility, it is equally true that the recognition of the latter must necessarily lead to the concession of the former. Had the Church of Rome, or any other Church, been supposed to be endowed with the Divine attribute of infallibility, it must necessarily follow that every other Church would acknowledge the spiritual supremacy of that one in which so pre-eminent a gift was lodged. It becomes, therefore, a matter of importance for us to show that the spiritual supremacy of the Church of Rome was not generally acknowledged in any such sense as the admitted claim to infallibility would imply. Now, this has been unanswerably shown by many Protestant writers, especially by Barrow, in his "Treatise of the Pope's Supremacy." Whence we conclude that the claim to infallibility was either not made or not allowed, so long, at least, as the claim to supremacy was disputed. Our argument, in short, is the following—If infallibility were supposed to reside in the Church of Rome in ancient times, the supremacy of that Church would also have been recognised. But its supremacy was not recognised. Therefore, infallibility was not supposed to reside in it.

We have said that the fact of the non-recognition of the spiritual supremacy of Rome for many ages has been amply proved by Barrow and other writers. To their works, therefore, we, for the present, refer those who wish for a full discussion of the whole subject. We shall content ourselves with noticing a few of the more prominent points connected with it.

Among the arguments adduced by Roman Catholic writers in proof of the acknowledged supremacy of the Church of Rome in early times, none is urged with greater frequency or more confidence than that which they derive from a well-known passage of Irenæus, the famous Bishop of Lyons at the close of the second century. We shall show that this passage of Irenæus, when properly understood, lends no countenance to the conclusion which is so confidently drawn from it.

In his work on Heresy (Book iii., ch. 3), Irenæus, after describing the Church of Rome as "founded by the two most glorious apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul," then adds —"Ad *hanc Ecclesiam*, propter potentiorem principalitatem, *necesse est omnem convenire* Ecclesiam—hoc est eos qui sunt *undique* fideles—in qua semper ab his qui sunt undique conservata est ea quæ est ab Apostolis traditio." Here, it is insisted by Roman Catholic divines, is a plain acknowledgment, on the part of one of the most eminent bishops of the primitive Church, of the supremacy of the Church of Rome—an unequivocal declaration that every Church "*must conform* to the Church of Rome, on account of its *more powerful principality*."* To see whether this inference be sustainable, let us examine for a moment the scope and context of Irenæus' words. He is disputing against heretics. Having first refuted them by reference to Scripture, he then proceeds to the testimony against them furnished by the Catholic Church. But how was this testimony to be procured? "It would," as he says himself, "be very tedious to enumerate the episcopal successions of *all* the Churches of Christendom." He prefers to select some *one* Church as a specimen and type of all the rest. As he was writing in the West, it was most natural that he should select a western Church; a Church generally acknowledged to have been founded by Apostles; a Church founded by the two most illustrious of the Apostles, Peter and Paul; a Church the succession of whose bishops was well authenticated and generally known; in short, the Church of Rome. He then introduces the passage which we have quoted above—"Ad hanc Ecclesiam, &c." Unfortunately, this passage is preserved to us only through the medium of an old *Latin* version of Irenæus' work. The original Greek words are not extant.

The divines of the Church of Rome, as we have already said, interpret these words to signify that "it is necessary for *every* Church to conform to *this* Church"—*i.e.*, to the Church of Rome; and they accordingly insist that a moral obligation rests upon all men to submit to her authority.

That this interpretation is not correct appears from the following considerations:—First, it is at variance with the drift of Irenæus' argument. His object is to refute heresies by appealing to the testimony of the universal Church. As an exponent of that testimony he selects *one* Church—the Church of Rome. That this selection was a fair one, and might be regarded as virtually collecting the evidence of all the Churches, he shows by reminding his readers that the Church of Rome had been founded by the two most glorious Apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul, from whom the succession of bishops might be certainly traced, and whose names he himself enumerates.

This being so, the words, "ad hanc Ecclesiam *necesse est* omnem convenire Ecclesiam," cannot mean that every Church, then and for ever *after*, must submit to the Church of Rome. Were that so, Irenæus would never have said that, "*because it would be tedious* to appeal to *all* churches," he would, therefore, appeal to *one* Church—the Church of Rome. Such a statement would have had no meaning, *if* Rome had been admittedly supreme over *all* churches, so that all churches were bound to agree with her. It would be manifestly absurd of anybody to say—It would be a tedious process to ascertain the opinions of *all* the *peers* of the realm: we will, *therefore*, appeal to the *crown*.

This sense of the original words of Irenæus being, therefore, excluded, we have next to inquire what they did mean. Most clearly this:—That on account of the *more august antiquity* of Rome—for such is the signification of the words "potentior principalitas"*—it must follow of course *(necesse est)* that every Church—that is, all believers who exist in all places *(undique)*—will agree with her, and be represented by her; or, in other words, every Church (Irenæus says) in which *(in quâ)* the tradition from the Apostles has been preserved by those who exist everywhere (*i.e.*, by Catholics, as opposed to heretics, who existed only in particular places), must naturally agree with the apostolic Church of Rome. Thus he shows that his reference to Rome is justifiable; and that by appealing to *that* Church he has virtually appealed to all orthodox churches, whose testimony may be supposed to be embodied and involved in hers.

But not only does Irenæus in this passage not countenance the doctrine of Papal supremacy, as taught by the Romish divines, but he, in fact, by implication, overthrows the foundation on which they make it and the kindred doctrine of infallibility to rest.

These doctrines they base on the words of our Lord to St. Peter (Matt. xvi. 18) "On this rock I will build my Church," maintaining that the Bishop of Rome is the successor of St. Peter as the rock of the church; but Irenæus refers to the Church of Rome, as founded by the *two* most glorious apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul; and he, moreover, enumerates the Bishops of Rome who succeeded Linus, who, he says, was first placed in that See by the same *two* apostles. This is a striking and most convincing proof that he knew nothing of the Romish theory which claims infallibility and supremacy for *St. Peter alone*, as head of the Church, and also claims the same prerogatives for the Bishops of Rome, *as successors of St. Peter*.

We do not (as we before observed) possess the original *Greek* of Irenæus in the passage first considered. We have only an old, and evidently a very literal, Latin version of it. From this version we have endeavoured, faithfully and honestly, to elicit the true meaning of the original; and we have concluded that Irenæus was totally ignorant of the lofty claims now set up for the Church of Rome. A recently discovered work of Hippolytus, a scholar of Irenæus, who had the original Greek before him, and had the advantage of personal intercourse with the writer, enables us to ascertain how he understood the passage. To this very remarkable work of Hippolytus we accordingly propose to direct attention in our next number. Meanwhile, we will conclude the present article with a notice of a passage of Tertullian, who flourished in the early part of the third century—a passage which, although cited by Roman Catholic writers in support of the claims of their Church to supremacy and infallibility, directly militates against such claims.

In his work *De Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, Tertullian refutes heretics by a line of argument similar to that of Irenæus, above described—namely, appealing to the doctrine preserved in the apostolic churches of highest character and most unquestioned succession of bishops. "Run over" (he says, ch. 36) "the Apostolic Churches in which the very chairs of the apostles still preside in their own places, in which their (*i.e.*, the apostles') authentic letters are still read, uttering the words and representing the face of each. Is Achaia," he adds, "next to thee? Thou hast Corinth. If thou canst go into Asia, thou hast Ephesus. But if thou art adjacent to Rome, thou hast Rome, where authority is at hand to us (*i.e.*, the African Church) also."†

Now, it is very remarkable that, in quoting this passage, Roman Catholic writers (*e.g.*, Messrs. Berington and Kirk) take care to omit altogether the words relating to Corinth and Ephesus, retaining only those which refer to Rome. The reason is obvious. The unmutilated words of Tertullian not only prove nothing in support of the supremacy and infallibility of Rome, but are actually inconsistent with such claims, as they speak of Ephesus and Corinth in exactly the same way as they do of Rome itself. The Church of Corinth, which enjoyed the teaching of the Apostle Paul, was to be appealed to by those who happened to be near Achaia. The Church of Ephesus, over which the Apostle John had presided, was to be appealed to by those who could visit Asia Minor. And by those who were adjacent to Italy—as were, for example, the African Christians, to whom Tertullian himself belonged—Rome was to be appealed to, as having been founded by at least one Apostle, and, perhaps, by two, and, moreover, being the only apostolical Church in Western Christendom.

It will be observed further that one of the grounds, on which Tertullian rests this appeal to the Apostolic Churches, is nearness of time to the apostolic age (apud quos ipsæ *adhuc* cathedræ Apostolorum suis locis præsident.) So that the force of this appeal would be gradually diminished in the course of time, and would ultimately be altogether lost.

THE MARLEYS.

CHAPTER III.

AFTER the scene which we detailed in our last, and the promise of Edith and Adeline to attend before the bishop, they awaited with fear and trembling the approach of the following Saturday, which was fixed for the interview. It was an encounter from which they would have shrunk in circumstances less cogent than those under which their consent had been extorted. The interval they spent between prayer and preparation—prayer for wisdom and strength, and preparation to answer a wise and learned bishop of the Church of Rome—to answer him concerning the faith which they held dearer than life itself. While conning over the plain simple texts of Scripture, which were the only weapons of their warfare, and treasuring them up in their memories, they felt like David with his pebbles and his sling going forth to meet the giant of the Philistines. They knew their own feebleness and puny strength, but their comfort was that the Angel of the Lord (Jesus Christ himself) encampeth round about those that fear him.

Early on Saturday morning, Edith and Adeline drove in, in company with their sister Marcella, to the bishop's house. They were shown in directly to his study, and a venerable, mild, and kindly old man came forward and greeted them in an affectionate and cordial manner. The bishop opened the conversation about some indifferent matters, which he discussed with a good-natured playfulness, so graceful and condescending in advanced age, when addressing itself to early youth. From these subjects he gradually approached that of some church commemoration for the following day, and then said—

"My dear children, I believe you wished to consult me about some matters which you find difficult to understand, and desired to have an explanation of, and nothing can give me greater pleasure than to remove any doubts from your minds, and enable you to enjoy the blessedness of a full and free communion with the Holy Catholic Church."

To this Edith and Adeline scarcely knew what answer to give, they were reluctant to open an attack, and to commence hostilities, and were rather waiting to act on the defensive when assailed, and they remained silent. The bishop again asked them—

"What matter was it that occasioned their difficulty in the Catholic Faith."

Edith felt she could no longer remain silent, and said—"Indeed, my lord, there are a great many subjects which have caused us both uneasiness, and have compelled us to take a part we were most reluctant to take, and which, I fear, is likely to bring us into great trouble; but, if it be the Lord's will, we cannot help or avoid it."

"My dear," said the bishop, "there is no reason why you should fall into trouble if you will only listen to instruction and advice in a teachable spirit, and not set up your own private fallible judgment against the voice of the Church."

"But, how," my lord, "can I abjure my reason, and the common sense which God has given me to be my guide to regulate my path in life, and yet believe what I know to be an impossibility, and a contradiction to plain language and to common sense, and the direct testimony of Scripture, because the Church says it is so?"

"Miss Marley, you forget that the last words of our departing Saviour's commission to his apostles were, that they should go forth teaching all things, whatsoever he had commanded them; 'and, behold,' he says, 'I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.' This is the warrant under which the bishops and pastors of Christ's Church, as the successors of the Apostles, now act. How, then, can the Catholic Church go astray?"

"No, my lord, certainly not so long as they teach those things which Christ commanded; but, if any particular body of Christian teachers have departed from the things commanded by Christ, and teach other things, it is plain we must look for the Church of which Christ speaks elsewhere, and that they are not the successors of the apostles on whom the commission has devolved."

"My dear, you seem to assume that the Holy Catholic

---

* The word "convenire" is now, by most Romish theologians, taken in the sense of "to agree," or "conform." The meaning "to resort," which some contend for, seems hardly reconcileable with fact or probability.

* *Principalitas*, in the old Latin translation of Irenæus, is used for priority of time, and is opposed to *posterioritas*. The words used by Irenæus were probably ἱκανωτέραν ἀρχαιότητα. In this same chapter the translator has rendered ἱκανωτάτη by *potentissima*. The Church of Rome was the only Western Church that was known to have been founded by Apostles. It had, accordingly, a "potentior principalitas," a mere "powerful or august primitiveness."

Again, as the old Latin version is a literal one (as appears from the comparison of it with the Greek in those passages in which the Greek has been preserved), it is almost certain that when the translator uses "*necesse est*," Irenæus wrote ἀνάγκη. Now, this word ἀνάγκη, as is well known, frequently implies a reasonable or necessary inference, and not a moral obligation. Thus, for instance, when the ecclesiastical historian Theodoret says (iv. 5) ἀνθρώπους ἀνάγκη προσπταίειν ὕντας, he certainly does not intend to assert that it is a moral duty for a man to transgress; but his meaning is that it is a natural consequence of his fallen condition—"humanum est errare."

† Percurre Ecclesias Apostolicas apud quas ipsæ adhuc cathedræ Apostolorum suis locis præsident, apud quas authenticæ literæ eorum recitantur, sonantes vocem et repræsentes faciem uniuscujusque. Proxima est tibi Achaia? Habes Corinthum. Si potes in Asiam tendere, habes Ephesum. Si autem Italiæ, adjaces Romam, unde nobis quoque auctoritas præsto est.

Church has fallen into error, and I speak now, supposing for a moment that it were possible (which God forbid) for the Church ever to err. But pray, in what particular do you conceive, if it has erred, its error consists?"

"Then, my lord, as you ask me to state my difficulties, the chief in my mind is, in respect to the Sacrifice of the Mass. Both St. Peter and St. Paul tell us that Christ died *once* for our sins," and St. Paul in the Hebrews,† tells us, 'that Christ should not offer himself often as the High Priest entereth into the Holy of Holies every year;' whereas, on the contrary, Christ was offered once to exhaust the sins of the whole world; therefore we find it impossible to believe that what is called the Sacrifice of the Mass, is a real and proper sacrifice or propitiation for the sins of the living or the dead."

"But, Miss Marley, St. Paul also tells us, that we have an altar still, and if there be an altar, there must be a sacrifice and an offering. The continuance of the daily sacrifice to the end of the world is prophesied in the prophet Malachias, and after some search through a Douay Bible, the bishop had recourse to a text book, and cited the passage—"For from the rising of the sun even to the going down, my name is great among the Gentiles, and in every place there is Sacrifice."—Malach. i., 11.

To this Adeline interposed and said, "that it appeared very far from plain that this can mean any other sacrifice than that so continually spoken of in the Book of Psalms," "The sacrifice of praise, an afflicted spirit and contrite heart,"‡ and that it certainly was not so plain as to contradict the express declaration that Christ "by one oblation, hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified,"§ and again, "where there is remission of sins, there is *no more* an oblation for sin."‖

The bishop then took up the History of Melchisedech, who brought bread and wine, and was priest of the most High God.¶

"Yes," said Adeline smartly, "but it was to Abraham he brought it forth, and not to God, and surely he made no oblation or sacrifice for sins to Abraham."

The bishop finding he was making no impression on his young pupils, and that they were better prepared at argument than he expected, nevertheless betrayed no evidence of displeasure or disappointment, on the contrary, he said, "Well, my dears, as I find your minds are not yet prepared for the due consideration of such holy things as these, I will not press them on you now, but must ask you to be more careful in reading proper books on the subject, and especially a little book which I will lend you, (so saying, he handed them Milner's End of Controversy) and I have no doubt all will be plain to your mind. Go now, and like good children, read this diligently, and all will be well. It is only some foolish notion which sometimes young people will take into their heads, that is disturbing you, and I expect to see you both settled in the faith and happy." After some more conversation like this the venerable old man gave them his blessing, and took leave of them as affectionately as he had at first received them.

Edith and Adeline rose and left the room, slowly followed by Marcella, who, when half way down the stairs, returned suddenly to the bishop and said, "Well, my lord, what do you really think of them?"

"Well, my dear, I tell you plainly, I think nothing can be worse, and that there is scarcely a hope of them for the present, as they have their minds made up, and have been furnished with arguments and books which I fear have misled them. But go home and do not break with them. Take them gently, lest you drive them to extremes, and so make bad worse. I will write to your father and counsel him to act so."

Edith and Adeline then parted from Marcella, and returned homewards. As they walked along they discussed their interview with the bishop, thus happily over, and were congratulating themselves on having passed through the ordeal without an open breach of the peace, or compromise of principle. As they went along they met the Rev. M——, who said—"So girls you have been before the bishop." "Who toldyou that?" "Oh," said he, "I know it quite well; it was discussed at our meeting on yesterday. I suppose you had an angry discussion." "No, indeed," said Edith, "on the contrary, everything went on as smooth and amicable as if we were discussing the weather."

"Miss Marley, I tell you, never you mind the outward appearances. Depend upon it, it is not all over yet; but I give you one piece of advice, and that is, *be firm*, and you will have it all your own way. This I tell you in confidence as a friend; but again, I say, be firm and calm, and they will never drive you to extremities."

"Indeed," said Adeline, "I think from the way the bishop treated us, that he intends to advise Papa not to interfere with us."

The girls returned home, and the Major never made the slightest inquiry as to the result of their interview with the bishop—in fact, he most scrupulously abstained from all allusion to the subject of religion. The following day, however, brought a letter from the bishop, in which he apprised the Major of some of the results of his conference with his daughters, and that he regretted to find they had been deeply, if not irrecoverably infected with the poison of heresy, which he could only attribute to unsuitable companions, or defective education in religious matters. He implored of him to lose no opportunity of keeping them out of the society of Protestants, and throwing them into the way of devout and well-informed Catholics, and providing them with certain religious books on controversy, which he recommended to him. He concluded, by strongly recommending him to be careful how he appeared to act with severity or coercion towards them, and rather to adopt gentle and unseen agencies, than direct and forcible means for their restoration to the faith.

This intelligence had a stunning effect upon the Major notwithstanding all his former misgivings. He tenderly loved his two youngest daughters, who were the children of his old age, and yet the thought of their apostasy was absolutely worse than their death to his mind. Every feeling of his mind revolted from the idea, and he could not let it near him. At first he regarded it as some erratic fancy, a conceit which young girls sometimes take into their heads, just to show their independence of mind; but he never doubted they would have yielded at once to the persuasion and authority of the bishop. To think that his daughters should not merely resist his own parental authority, but should absolutely confront his bishop, and set themselves up against him upon doctrines of religion, appeared the acme of superlative audacity and rebellion. His first impulse was to order them to depart from his house for ever, and go seek their fortunes elsewhere; but, he had no sooner resolved on this course, than he saw insuperable difficulties in its execution, and the yearning of natural affection, and the circumstance of their extreme youth made him pause in respect of such a step. But, as his passion cooled down, a settled, steady resolve took possession of his mind, to which every hour's reflection added strength, and to which a sense of duty to himself, and to his religion, and to the other members of his family, gave a stability, which mere passion and anger would have failed to do.

His family could not but remark that some intelligence of an unpleasant nature had reached him; all had their misgivings as to its probable cause, but nobody ventured to make an inquiry, and the Major himself was, contrary to all precedent, reserved and silent, with a solemn, settled demeanour, of melancholy and resolve.

This mood had continued for two or three days, during which the Major was confined to the house by the gout, but on the fourth day, finding himself somewhat better, he ordered the carriage at ten o'clock in the morning, stating that he had peremptory business to transact in town, and that he wished to go alone.

He took his leave of his daughters with formal precision, and not without affection in his manner. He seemed, indeed to have more of sorrow than of anger in his mind, and left the house in a hurry, as if fearful of the possibility of inquiry or interruption. When he had left, every one was on the *qui vive* to guess the purpose of his sudden and mysterious errand, and they all concluded that he had gone in to see the bishop, and have personal confirmation of the exact result of the interview of the preceding Saturday.

However, in this they were all mistaken. The Major, as soon as he was well away from Hollywood, desired to be driven to Mr. Maher, his solicitor, in —— street. Arrived there, and seated in his private parlour, in the utmost confidence, the Major announced to him that he desired to make some alteration in the disposition of his property, which he had made some few years before in a will which Mr. Maher had prepared for him.

"I suppose, Major," said Mr. Maher, "some of the young ladies are going to be married, and you are going to convert the will into a settlement."

"Yes, Mr. Maher, I am going to turn my will into a settlement, but not a settlement which will be very much for the advantage of two of my daughters."

"How do you mean, Major?"

"In fact, Mr. Maher, my two youngest daughters have disobliged me, and acted in such a manner that I can no longer treat them as objects of my affection or bounty, and I mean to cut them both out with a shilling; that's what I mean."

Mr. Maher was well aware of the Major's infirmity of temper, and had often felt the force of it on his own devoted head, when his law business was not conducted just as expeditiously or successfully as the Major's impetuous disposition demanded, and he had no doubt that this was all an ebullition of passion, which would be over on the morrow. He, however, knew that he should humour the bent of the moment, and appear to acquiesce in his wishes, or bring down on himself the wrath he was desirous to avert from another.

"Well, indeed, Major," he said, "I am sorry to hear that any member of your family should have acted in a manner to displease you, but"——

Here the Major rather impatiently stopped his deprecations, by saying, "Sir, my daughters have not only displeased me, but disgraced and degraded me before all the world."

"Disgraced you (ejaculated Mr. Maher, rather horrified at the state of matters), you do not mean that they have run away, or made unbecoming alliances."

"No, sir, not in that sense exactly, but they have thought proper to ally themselves with heretics and infidels, and to turn Protestants—the first renegades that ever disgraced my family, and they will be the last, by ——."

This was a state of things for which Mr. Maher was not at all prepared, and could furnish no plausible palliative. He was, himself, a thorough bigot, and thought no offence, in all the dark catalogue of crime, could be greater than apostasy from the Roman Catholic Church. He ventured, charitably, to suggest doubts as to the reality of the offence, and the danger of arriving at hasty conclusions as to the opinions of mere girls so young as the Major's daughters, who really, he said, did not know their own minds for five minutes together. To this the Major, with many a bitter and painful denunciation, answered, by declaring the scene which had taken place, in his own presence, with the vicar-general, and their subsequent outrageous contumacy before the bishop himself, and declared that he had firmly made up his mind that their names should be erased from his will, adding—"I will let them beg or earn their bread among their Protestant associates; but it shall never be said that I reared a Protestant an hour longer than I could help it."

"Well, Major, of course I cannot know whether you are acting on sufficient grounds or not, in disinheriting your daughters, but I trust you will reflect on the consequences of the step you propose to take in respect of females whom you cannot throw upon their resources as if they were boys."

"Sir," said the Major, "I have reflected on the consequences before I came here, and I am resolved that not one shilling of my property shall either of them ever possess; and I further beg to say that I have come here not to discuss the propriety of my resolutions, but to have them carried into effect."

To this Mr. Maher at once said—"Of course Major, I will follow out whatever instructions you give me. It is, no doubt, for *you* to satisfy yourself as to their prudence."

"Well, Mr. Maher, *that* I fancy is *my* business, and not *yours*."

Mr. Maher then inquired what the nature of the changes were which the Major had in contemplation. Whereupon the Major took out from a large pocket-book a memorandum, written out most carefully in his own handwriting, and which was to the effect that, "inasmuch as his two youngest daughters, Edith and Adeline, had departed from the faith of the Catholic Church in which he had brought them up, and had obstinately, and in contempt of his parental authority, espoused the errors of Protestantism, that he, notwithstanding his natural love and affection for his said daughters, felt bound, in conscience and duty to the said Church, and in honour to himself and his family, to revoke all bequests made in his will in favour of the said Edith and Adeline, and he declared it to be his will and pleasure that the provisions therein contained, and intended for the said Edith and Adeline should go to his grandchild, Maria Waring, only daughter of Edward Waring, Esq., on condition that she did not become a Protestant."

The Major read the memorandum in a slow and solemn voice, which faltered at times, and scarcely found utterance, when he came to the words "notwithstanding my natural love and affection for my said daughters," which showed they were no idle words of form, or empty sound, but the genuine expression of the deep sentiment of his heart.

When he had concluded, he handed the paper over to his attorney with a sorrowful gravity, like what Queen Elizabeth might have felt when she handed the death warrant of her favourite Essex to her minister of justice. The poor Major appeared overcome and exhausted at the exertion, as if his whole strength had been given forth in the effort, and when the attorney, with professional *sang-froid*, calmly rose and proceeded to lock up in his escritoire the paper which was to consign two young unprotected girls, without maintenance or provision, to the tender mercies of a cruel world—the old man felt an icy coldness pass around his heart, and the tears trickled silently down his aged face and almost melted his resolution; but shame, pride, and propriety instantly checked the generous impulse, and, rising from his seat with difficulty, he said—"Mr. Maher, I beg you will have this most disagreeable business arranged as speedily as possible, for I find I am not as strong as I used to be; and as I can seldom come into town I wish you to fix an early day for the completion."

"Well, Sir," said Mr. Maher, "everything will be ready for your execution to-morrow, if you can come in."

With this the old Major left the attorney, and with less love for him than ever he had before. Strange waywardness of human nature, that the passive instruments of our perverse humours are the first to encounter our displeasure. The charitable cloak we throw over ourselves is not wide enough to cover them.

The Major returned home, and was received with the usual affectionate greetings and marks of attention by Edith and Adeline. The arm-chair was wheeled round beside the fire, and his slippers and dressing-gown ready. He repaid these little civilities with the accustomed—"Thank you my dear;" but there was a moody cloud upon his brow which betokened that all was not right within. The Major could not play a part, or pretend to what he did not feel, and to the most casual observer it was evident that he was constraining himself under a sense of some duty, not to let out the natural feelings of his heart. However, he acted on a determined plan, and retired to his room as early as he could, announcing that

---

* 1 Peter iii. 18. † Heb. ix. 25, 28. ‡ Heb. xiii. 15. Psalm l. 19, cvi. 22. § Heb. x. 14. ‖ Heb. x. 18. ¶ Gen. xiv. 18. Douay Bible.

he should go into town again on the following morning early, on certain business.

The next day all was in readiness for the Major's departure, and he was at the hall-door, buttoning on his cloak, when a servant rode up the avenue in haste, and brought a note from his son-in-law, Mr. Waring. The hurried manner of the servant, and the illegible style of the direction of the note rather alarmed the Major. After some seconds lost in searching for his spectacles, he inquired of the servant what was the matter.

"Miss Maria, sir, has been very ill all the night, and is not expected."

The Major's blood ran cold to his heart. "Is this," said he to himself, "a judgment on me for going in to ruin my good and innocent children yesterday?" Aloud he said nothing, but desiring the servant to bring in the letter to Mrs. Marley, he drove off as speedily as he could into town. His first direction was to Mr. Waring's house, where he learned that scarcely a hope remained of his only grandchild. That she had taken ill the previous evening, and had grown hourly worse, and could scarcely hold out much longer.

The Major left the house in great affliction, and returned home without calling on Mr. Maher, sending him a message that he was unable to fulfil his engagement with him that day, but would call on the following morning. For three succeeding days the Major went into town, each day intending to fulfil his engagement with Mr. Maher, and to complete his plan of disinheriting and discarding his daughters. But, as each day arrived, his first visit was to the Warings. The child was worse and worse, and his heart failed him to go further. On the fifth day, when he called, he was informed that no hope whatever remained of the child's life. The Major returned home and found everybody in the deepest affliction at the tidings of little Maria, who was the pet of the house, and had engaged the warm affections of every individual in it. Their grief but aggravated the intense feelings of the old man's own mind, and he retired to his room. The story of David's child, which was smitten for the sin of its father, haunted his imagination, and recalled to his mind the beautiful story recorded in the Bible (which the Major very often read) when Nathan said, "Because thou hast given occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme, for this thing the child that is born to thee shall surely die. And Nathan returned to his house. The Lord also struck the child which the wife of Urias had borne to David, and his life was despaired of. And David besought the Lord for the child, and David kept a fast, and going in by himself, lay upon the ground."* In this frame, the Major felt himself convicted of sin, and thought that his crime had found him out, and judgment was awarded him for the wicked purpose of his heart to ruin his beloved children, because they had dared to worship God after the dictates of their own conscience. He earnestly prayed the Lord that the child might be spared, and his sin forgiven, and vowed upon his knees that he would no longer persecute or coerce his children, but leave them and their conversion in the hands of the Lord.

It was late in the evening, but yet the Major was not content to repair to rest without despatching a letter to his solicitor, Mr. Maher, the purport of which was, that further reflection had led him to doubt the propriety of the step he had proposed to take, and begging that Mr. Maher would destroy any draft of a will or codicil which might have been prepared pursuant to his instructions, and that nothing further should be done until he again communicated with him. A special messenger was sent into town with the epistle, and the Major felt no relief until he saw that he had fairly gone on his mission. The messenger was desired likewise to call at Mr. Warings and bring the latest intelligence respecting the child.

The return of the servant was anxiously awaited by every member of the family, but by none more impatiently than the Major, who delayed going to rest until he was informed how matters were, and after a considerable period of deep uneasiness, the messenger arrived with the first good tidings that had yet been had, and announcing that the child was slightly better and apparently rallying. After this the Major retired to sleep, taking an unusually tender leave of his family, and with a mind more free from anxiety than he enjoyed for many a day.

The morning brought better news of a more decided amendment, and every hour afterwards the child improved, until, in the course of a week, she was declared to be entirely out of danger, and soon after was playing on the Major's knees, out at Hollywood, prattling to her grandpapa as busily as ever.

From this time forth the position of Edith and Adeline underwent an entire change at home. The subject of religion was never mentioned; but all coldness and reserve on their father's part were removed, and he saluted and addressed them as warmly and affectionately as ever: a sort of tacit truce appeared to have been determined on, and each party conceded to the other, the right of acting on their own territories as they saw best; but outside their friendly circle of home Edith and Adeline had many a sneer and sarcasm to encounter, many a coldness and suspicion to feel, and many an ill-natured observation to bear. They perceived that among all their Roman Catholic friends they were regarded as aliens or deserters, and, as if tainted with some moral leprosy, their former associates, though they observed the outward courtesies of life, yet evinced a reserve that caused them to feel they were the objects of fear and suspicion, their presence a restraint, and their conversation and conduct a rebuke to the whole tenor of the sentiment and conduct of their party.

Reader, if you are advanced in years, you may have observed, that as the spring-tide of youth and prosperity recedes, it leaves many an object on the bleak shore deserted and alone. This is painful; but the rough contact with the world blunts the edge of our feelings, and we come to regard those desertions with calmness, if not with indifference. But in the earlier years of life, when our feelings are fresh, and our knowledge of the world derived, if not from the false medium of romance and fiction, from the scarcely less delusive source of our own imaginations, the disappointment of trusted friends grown cold, and loved associates turning their heads aside, is a trial that needs more philosophy to sustain than youth usually has acquired. Our national poet has beautifully expressed the sentiment we mean to convey, when he wrote—

> "Oh, colder than the wind that freezes
> Founts, that but now in sunshine played,
> Is the congealing pang that seizes
> The trusting bosom when betrayed."

This unreserved and entire trust is only reposed in early youth, and when it meets a repulse or betrayal, it is felt with a pang of bitterness which the substantial misfortunes of after life fail to inflict.

Edith and Adeline felt this with an intensity in exact proportion to their friendship and affection. Their pride sustained them in the first instance, and their deep conviction of the vital truth at issue, and their hourly increasing terror of its being compromised in the errors of Romanism, steeled their hearts to every feeling, to every coldness and withdrawal of friendship and confidence and cordiality with which they met.

But our story has, we fear, already exceeded its due limits, and therefore we hasten to its close. At home Edith and Adeline no longer experienced any difficulty or opposition, and they soon regarded with comparative indifference the coldness of those without. Their great and paramount anxiety now was on behalf of their beloved father, who had latterly betrayed unmistakeable symptoms of a speedy break up in a constitution which had endured for eighty winters. He had lived the life of a careless man—he was a perfect free-thinker in religion, though formally attached to the communion of the Roman Catholic Church. Their daily and hourly prayers were not so much that he should become a Protestant, as that he should become a Christian, and have a saving interest in the atonement of his Redeemer by a faith to lay hold on and appropriate to himself the declarations of mercy so graciously vouchsafed in the Scriptures to every one who will embrace them. The Major held up to the last, and with the characteristic vigour of his constitution and disposition never lay down until the last enemy, death, sternly seized him in his iron grasp and dragged him to his first and last bed of sickness. Still, the instinct of life, and the impulse of the natural heart of man prompted him to disbelieve that his latter end was at hand; and when Marcella, who knew too well what was approaching, suggested that the priest should be sent for, the Major rather tartly exclaimed—"What, ma'am, do you want to send me out of the world all at once?"

But, as day after day brought no relief, the Major's strength began to fail—the prospects of a near eternity began to dawn upon his mind—his heart became softened—his accents mild and gentle—and he seemed gladdened and refreshed when Edith and Adeline, improving every moment of opportunity, told him of the stupendous plan of salvation developed in the Gospel invitations of free and sovereign grace, and of the gracious invitations of mercy to the most ungodly and abandoned of sinners, and of the preciousness and priceless merits of the sacrifice of the Son of God. He listened with greedy avidity to glad tidings, which for upwards of eighty years had never reached his ears, though the sum and substance of the Gospel. He never expressed himself wearied of listening, and always welcomed their approach to his bedside, and wished their assistance in every little office of alleviation and consolation which his painful disease demanded.

Meanwhile we must not forget or disregard the feelings of Marcella, who was also devotedly attached to her father, and deeply affected by his severe illness. But, she had another sorrow far more bitter than the loss of her dearest parent; and it was this, that, although yielding to her importunities, he had about a fortnight before his death, consented to see the priest and undergo the ceremony of Extreme Unction, yet ever after, and as he grew worse, he steadily and determinedly refused to see him any more, or to admit him into his presence. Every effort of hers (and they were most assiduous and unremitting) to extract a consent had failed, although she applied herself every hour, and every moment she could spare, from the sick room, in prayer that her beloved father might not depart hence at variance with the Catholic Church. She constantly read, by his bedside, the prayers of her Church; but though he never repelled her affectionate attention he evidently regarded them not. His mind seemed absorbed in other matters, and poor Marcella could not but perceive with unutterable alarm and regret that the intercourse of Edith and Adeline was more acceptable to the Major than her own.

This went on for several days, and the Major's disease (which was an organic one) gained head every day, and all hope of his recovery had ceased, so that his death was hourly expected. His mind was still as clear and vigorous as ever, and fully conscious of his near approach to the dark valley of the shadow of death. His weakness had so far increased as to render him scarcely equal to the exertion of speaking. But on Friday evening he seemed to take a turn for the better (the sure presage of immediate dissolution), and gathering all his energies he felt sensible that this impartation of strength was the last effort and rally of expiring nature, and that the closing scene was at hand. His mind was at rest in the bosom of Jesus, and his bold heart nothing daunted by the king of terrors, he desired every member of his family to be summoned to his bedside.

A solemn and mournful scene is such an assembling, when the head of a family summons its members to bid adieu ere he sets out upon that long journey from whence no traveller returns.

When all were seated round him, the Major said in a strong and steady voice, "I have called you all together, feeling certain that my time is come, God's will be done! and I am satisfied to resign my spirit into the hands of my Creator and Redeemer. But, before I go, I wish to make such reparation as I can to you all. I feel I have been a tyrant, and did not indeed know what a blessing I enjoyed in the family I had, and I abused my authority over you all. I would only ask you now to forgive me, and you my dearest Edith and Adeline, to whom I have acted so harshly, I can make you no other amends now, but to give you my blessing, I pray God to watch over you, and I give you my free and full consent to follow your religion according to your conscience, and may God bless you all, here and hereafter."

These words were followed by a scene it would be impossible, and if it were possible, be painful to describe. The effort to the Major had perhaps exceeded his strength, and he fell into a faint. Marcella conceiving he was dying, and dying, as his last words seemed to convey, an apostate from the Catholic Church, was in terror and grief. She fell upon her knees, by his bedside, and prayed loudly in the cold formularies of her Church in the offices for the sick. The Major soon recovering, moved his hand with impatience and said faintly, "No, no, Adeline will read for me, Adeline." Marcella overwhelmed with dismay, ran wildly to her room and fell down in an agony of prayer that her father might not be taken in such a frame of mind, and the words of prayer never ceased from her lips until his last breath had departed.

Adeline offered no prayer, and resorted to no formularies, but whispered into the dying Major's ear, the consolatory text, "*There is now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus,*"* "in whom we have redemption through his blood, the redemption of sins according to the riches of his grace," and while yet repeating this last text, her hand in his, the Major gave a strong responsive pressure and all was over.

TALK OF THE ROAD.—No. XVI.

"WELL, Pat, what have you got to talk of this time?" said Jem.

"The STATION, Jem," said Pat.

"And is it at a station you were, Pat?" said Jem.

"Deed is it, Jem," said Pat, "without meaning a bit of it."

"And how did you get there at all without meaning it, Pat?" said Jem.

"Why, I was going by Pat Devine's public-house," said Pat, "and there was a deal of people about it, but I didn't know what was going on, and I just went in for a pen'orth of baccy, and there I was in it, afore I knew where it was; and then, sure enough, I seen it was Father John holding a station in the inner room; and when I got the baccy, I was making my lucky, when I heard Molly Devine, and Mary Gormly, and Sal Gougerty, and some more of the devotest women, that's always at their duties, bragging again each other what was the best thing in the Church of Rome to trust in for our salvation, and then I just stopped a bit, to hear what they would say."

"Well, I suppose they were all of the one mind any way," said Jem.

"Not a bit of it, Jem," said Pat; "there was no two of them of the one way of thinking; just one thing better than another, taking their pick and choice like; and, deed, there seemed to be a something for every one, no matter how many."

"Well, the more hope some one hit right," said Jem.

"I'm afeard not, Jem," said Pat, "for there was one thing nobody took hold to."

"And what did they take hold on, Pat?" said Jem.

"Why, Molly Devine allowed it was the Mass, 'for sure,' says she, 'that's best of all; isn't it offering the body and blood, and soul and divinity, for the living and the dead?' says she. And then Mary Gormley allowed it was the holy water; 'for sure when I have plenty of that by me,' says she, 'I don't care for charms, nor fairies nor the devil himself,' says she; 'and what need I want anything else,' says she, 'when I don't care for the devil itself, with the holy water on me?' And then Sal Gougerty allowed it was the scapular, 'for sure that'll get me to

---

* 2 Kings, xii. 14-16.

* Rom. viii. 1. (Douay Bible.)

heaven the next Saturday after I die,' says she, 'and what need I want of anything else?' says she. And old Peggy Donohue says, 'sure its confession,' says she, 'for when the priest says the Latin over me won't I be as clean of sin as the child unborn,' says she, 'and what more do I want than that,' says she, 'and what are yees all here for with your shillings, if that's not the thing?' says she. And then old Nancy Smith just riz on them all, 'and sure,' says she, 'it's astray yees are entirely; sure isn't one drop of the holy oil worth them all?' says she, 'if I get one drop of that on me before the breath is out of me, what need I care for anything else?' says she. And now do you see, Jem, what none of them thought of to trust in?"

"Aye do I," said Jem. "Sure none of them knows that it's in their own Bible that *the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth from all sin.* And isn't it the poor thing that none of them thinks of trusting in that, the creatures? and isn't it the quare thing, if the're all Catholics, that they don't all trust in *the same thing*, but one taking one thing and another another thing? but sure that's the way with them. But, Pat, now did you tell them of the blood of Christ, and you at a station?"

"Well, deed then I did, Jem," says Pat. "Says I, girls, isn't the blood of Christ the best thing at all, for sure that cleanses from all sin?"

"And how did they take that at all, Pat?" said Jem.

"Well, Jem," said Pat, "they just darned their eyes in me, as if they never heard the like of that before; but I hadn't time to hear more of it, for Pat Daly was just coming out of the room where Father John was hearing confessions, and he just got hearing what I said, so he turned round on me, and, 'Is it a Souper you are, to bring the like of that to a station with you?' says he. 'Not a bit of it,' says I; 'I takes no soup, thank God,' says I. And that's true, anyway, for not a drop of soup crossed my carcase since the Relief Committee gave it out in the famine. And I just turned round again on him, and, says I—'Are you going to tell us that the Soupers will have the blood of Christ all to themselves, and the Catholics get none of it?' says I; and with that he just quit it. Well, who do you think I seen go in next, Jem?"

"I don't know, Pat," said Jem

"Well, if it wasn't Tim Tevlin," said Pat.

"Is it him," said Jem, "the poacher and sheep stealer, that never did an honest day's work in his life, and a Ribbon-man into the bargain? What does the likes of him want of absolution?"

"Well, now," said Pat, "if Father John can wipe out a man's sins with a turn of his hand, isn't that just the man for him to try on?"

"Well, sure enough," said Jem; "but did he get absolution?"

"Well, I'll tell you about that," said Pat, "for the door stood open a minute, and I just seen it. There was the wee table, you know, with the plate on to drop the shilling in, just forenint the door, and Tim was giving it the go by. 'Where's the shilling?' says Father John. 'Havn't got it, your reverence,' says Tim. 'Go off with you and get it,' says Father John. 'And where will I get it, your reverence?' says Tim. 'What's that to me?' says Father John: 'off with you and get it.' And so Tim stood there quite easy. 'What are you waiting for there?' says Father John. 'Won't your reverence give me absolution?' says Tim. 'You'll get none without the shilling; be off out of that for it,' says Father John. So Tim stood there as easy as you please. 'What are you standing there for?' says Father John. 'Will I steal it, your reverence?' says Tim. 'Be off for the shilling, and don't bother me,' says Father John, with a screech. Well, Tim see'n Father John was minding nothing, he was that mad, and Tim had got just forenenst the table, and as he was turning round, he just drops his hand in the plate, and lifts the shilling, and walks out, and away out of the house. And, a while after, in comes Tim; and, when the next man comes out, in goes Tim. 'And have you the shilling, now?' says Father John. 'Yes, your reverence,' says Tim, dropping the shilling in the plate; 'but sure I had to steal it, your reverence,' says he. Well, you never seen a man so deaf as Father John. He never heard a word, but just says—'Down on your knees,' says he. And then the door shut to, and I seen no more till Tim comes out, looking as pleased as if he had stole the best sheep in a flock."

"Well, now, I wonder," said Jem, "would the absolution do for stealing the shilling?"

"And why wouldn't it?" said Pat, "did'nt he confess it, and get absolution?"

"Well, maybe it was as good for that as for all the rest," said Jem, "but did you go in yourself, Pat?"

"No, indeed, then, I didn't," said Pat, "but I was mighty 'feard Father John would have caught me, and lugged me in, maybe; for, a while after, out comes Father John in a hurry, and, 'Boys,' says he, 'is that Pat Doyle going down the street?' 'It is, your reverence,' says severals. 'Out with you, boys, and fetch him in to me,' says Father John. So off the boys went. Well, you know, Jem, Pat Doyle is taken up with the readers, and has quit the Mass altogether, and goes to Church; so, in he comes with the boys; and deed it's the dark corner I got into then; and then Father John says to Pat Doyle, 'Are you come to confession?' says he. 'No, your reverence,' says Pat Doyle, 'I confessed my sins to God this morning.' 'Much good that'll do you,' says Father John; 'what were you promised for turning?' says he. So Pat Doyle didn't say a word. 'Was it money?' says Father John; 'was it five pounds?' 'No, your reverence,' says Pat Doyle. 'Was it meal?' says Father John. 'No, your reverence,' says Pat Doyle. 'Was it soup?' says Father John. 'No, your reverence,' says Pat Doyle. 'And what was it you were promised?' says Father John; 'tell it out, man, before the people,' says he. 'Salvation, your reverence,' says Pat Doyle. Well, Father John looked done for a minute, anyway; and then, says he, 'Are you coming back to Mass?' says he. 'No, your reverence,' says Pat Doyle. 'And what will you and your children live on if you don't, when you were promised nothing?' says Father John. 'Please your reverence,' says Pat Doyle, 'we'll live on the blossoms of the bushes afore we go back.' Well, if I was'nt thinking what would come on Pat Doyle, or myself too, if I was caught, when who should come in but the Rev. Mr. Owens himself; for he was coming up the street, and he seen Pat Doyle fetched in to the station, and just followed him in, and he just comes right up to Father John, and says to him, 'Sir, it was I that took this man, Pat Doyle, away from your Mass, for I showed him that the sacrifice of Christ was finished on the cross, never more to be repeated; and that no Christian man should bow down in worship to a wafer. And I am ready now, sir, to show you, before the people, why no Christian man should do so, if you will undertake to show them why they should.' 'Pat Devine, where's Pat Devine?' says Father John. 'Here, sir,' says Pat. 'Is it getting my horse you are? Will he never be ready?' says Father John. 'Yes, sir, coming, sir,' says Pat Devine, and out he comes with the horse in a hurry. 'Oh, your reverence,' says Peggy Donoghue; 'sure you won't go without hearing my confession.' 'Oh! your reverence,' says Sal Gougerty, and all of them, 'won't you stop a bit for us?' 'Out of the way, women,' says Father John; 'is it all day I'll be kept here?' And up he gets on his horse, with Pat Devine holding the bridle and the stirrup, and flattering him all he could, and I peeping out of the open window: and I seen, as he rode off, that Pat Devine just turned the wrong side of his hand after him; and says he, 'The back of my hand to you, that would'nt stand up for your Church and your religion.'"

"Well, Pat," said Jem, "sure Paddy Doyle puts us all to shame, that wasn't afeard to stand up like a man."

"Well, maybe so," said Pat; "but sure why can't a man keep it all to himself, when it sets the country against him? Sure I trust in nothing but Christ and His blood, that cleanseth from all sin: but why would I go to say that out, and bring trouble on myself?"

Who knows but the time is coming, when Pat himself will say it before men? Pat does not know it, nor mean it now. But the time comes to every one that truly trusts in Christ, when something in their breasts within will *make* them confess Christ before men; for otherwise Christ would have to deny them before His Father in heaven.*

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We request our correspondent B. H. to give us his address, as, before inserting his communication, we wish for some further information respecting it.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st.

No anonymous letter can be attended to. Whatever is sent for insertion must be authenticated by the name and address of the writer, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee for his good faith.

We would request our valued correspondents, both Roman Catholics and Protestants, to limit the length of their communications, and not to discuss a variety of distinct topics in one letter.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

☞ If any of our friends could favour us with a copy or copies of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, Nos. 2, 8, or 11, to complete sets, we should be greatly obliged.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, SEPTEMBER, 1853.

THERE are but two ways of ruling the world. The one, that of reducing men to passive obedience, by practising on their fears of evil, and making them slaves; the other, by winning the affections and satisfying the convictions of rational free agents, and thus securing their voluntary obedience to well-ordered rule. These systems may be briefly called slavery and freedom. The one seeks to keep men narrow-minded, grovelling, ignorant, and superstitious; the other, to make them intellectual, spiritual, wise, and happy.

To which system does true Christianity belong? If to the former, she would do wisely, no doubt, to shut up the portals of knowledge, and to limit the field of vision, lest men, having once enjoyed a glimpse of the glorious canopy of heaven, should struggle to emancipate themselves from that tyranny which would doom them to grope in darkness and ignorance for ever, rather than peril its own selfish sway over their minds and liberties.

If, however, Christianity be a system whose power consists in its suitableness to enlighten, to elevate, to purify our race, and exacts nothing more than the voluntary obedience of reasoning free agents, the defensive armour of a shrinking or timid policy does not suit her. Let the priests of another faith ply their prudential expedients to keep the world from enlarging its knowledge, lest to the same extent they should diminish their own power. True Christianity stands in a higher and firmer attitude. She has, thanks be to God, come down to us with all the majesty of truth, and with all the grandeur of age, unsenthed by the pigmy philosophy which would, by undermining man's faith in an unseen world, reduce him to the level of the beasts that perish. The solemn march of eighteen centuries has but demonstrated more clearly that religious truth is seated on a rocky pinnacle, whose summit may, indeed, have sometimes been obscured by the clouds of error or doubt, but which has survived, and will still survive the storms of time, and remain unaltered through eternity. With such a religion as this there is nothing to hide. A half-learned and superficial public may associate with the very notion of a priesthood, the blindness and bigotry of a sinking cause, but they must be taught that Christianity is not a bigotted or a sinking cause, and that those who are able to estimate its grand simplicity, are fearless of the most thorough sifting of its pretensions, and neither require mankind slavishly to take it for granted, nor are disposed to shun a single question that can be started on the subject of Christian evidences. Again, we say, with such a religion as this there is nothing to hide. All should be above board. The broadest light of day should be made fully and freely to circulate throughout all her mysteries. Secrets she has none. Her office has been to *reveal* mysteries—to bring life and immortality to light—to make known what was before kept secret from the foundation of the world. With the frankness and simplicity of conscious greatness, she invites free inquiry, and challenges scrutiny; and whether she has to contend with the pride of philosophy, falsely so called, or to oppose herself to the prejudices of the unenlightened multitude, she is not afraid to do so on her own strength, and spurns the props and auxiliaries of superstition, of which the votaries of a weaker or doubtful faith are so anxious to take advantage. Essentially a religion of light, she is ever ready to come to the light, that her deeds may be made manifest that they are wrought in God.

We have been led into these considerations by reflecting on what appears to us to have been the cause and the probable consequences of the late modification of the system of National Education in this country, to which we have made allusion in another part of our paper—we mean the exclusion of the work on the *Evidences of Christianity*, which (after a twenty years' approbation) has at length been effected by the influence of those who would rather trust to the system of implicit faith in authority, aided by the props and aids of superstition, than attempt, by teaching mankind to think and reason rightly, to place their faith on the more solid basis of reason and knowledge. We have, perhaps, been

* See St. Matthew's Gospel, x. 33; and St. Mark, viii, 38.

also influenced by the reflection, that our own exertions to promote the cause of enlightened religion and Christian unity, have been everywhere met by the priests of Rome with a determination, as far as in them lies, to stifle thought and put down inquiry, and in some cases, at least, by misrepresentations and calumnies so gross, that none but the most ignorant can be deluded by them.

Most assuredly the time is not far off, when men who live in a free country, and know that they are no longer ignorant and superstitious, but able to use their reason, will assume courage, and venture to inquire fearlessly (we hope it may not be rashly or in an improper spirit), not merely into conflicting forms of Christian belief, but even into the truth of the pretensions of Christianity itself. We are strongly persuaded that an antidote to infidelity must be found in enlarged reason and increased knowledge, and not in the inculcation of blind faith. It is not by keeping men from investigating the evidences of religion, that they can be preserved from the dangers of scepticism and doubt; it is not by limiting education, but by extending it. The priests of a foreign system may, indeed, find it their interest to postpone the evil day of thought, and scrutiny, and free examination, by every means in their power. We warn them, however, that they may strain the cords too far, by which they would hope to restrain the multitude from pressing too curiously into their mysterious precincts. The man who has once got a glimpse of freedom, and discovered that his neighbours have acquired the same, will not be slow in allying himself with kindred spirits for their mutual benefit; men will thus strengthen one another in their common struggle for light and knowledge; and the more eagerly the priesthood of any religious system struggles for *dominion* over their minds and consciences, the more earnestly will laymen fortify themselves for the great struggle to be free. If the priests of Rome would maintain their supremacy, we tell them they must do so by a fair and manly attempt to prove their opponents wrong and themselves right; not by proclaiming all inquiry to be sinful, and denouncing those who would hear both sides, as infidels or apostates. If they would have the world to be what *they call* Catholic, they must allow their own claims to be discussed in a candid and Christian temper. They must cease from a warfare of curses, and denunciations, and instigation of popular violence, against those who (whether they be right or wrong in their opinions) are sincerely anxious to discover and propagate truth. They must, if they can, meet argument by argument, not by violence and abuse. If the press is made an instrument of disseminating error, why do they not use it to disseminate truth? If such pages as our own can be counteracted by a publication more learned, more accurate, more deeply thinking than ours, why do they not establish such a publication? We can assure them it would be read by both parties, and, if they have truth on their side, would produce them a golden harvest, both of money and fame. There is one reason—we think there can be but one—why they have not ventured, and we are bold enough to foretell why they never will venture on such a step, and it is simply this—that their wisest men know that their main strength consists in the ignorance and timid credulity of the multitude, and that the atmosphere of free discussion is not favourable to the growth of what they call piety, and we call superstition. We are sure there are many sincere and excellent, though, perhaps, shortsighted men in the Church of Rome, who would readily try, if permitted by their longer-headed superiors, to measure lances with us, as we rejoice to see some of our able and intelligent brother laymen have done, honourably and spiritedly, though, in a more limited way than we would desire in our pages; but such leaders as Cardinal Wiseman, and Dr. Cullen, and Mr. Newman are, we opine, too wise to hazard such a commission of inquiry into the truth of a Christianity, moulded after the fashion of the middle ages, and would rather leave the Bible without any other basis than the voluntary credulity of those who may be willing to accept both its authenticity and its alleged doctrines, on the assumed authority of their exclusive Church, than run the risk of teaching men to think for themselves. To men of that stamp, no doubt, any work on the evidences of Christianity, however able and unexceptionable in other respects, is objectionable in this, that it leads its readers into those regions of reason and inquiry, where proofs are looked for and *must* be provided, and out of the domains of that implicit faith in which all things are to be *taken for granted, and nothing proved;* forgetting the injunction of the Apostle—"*Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.*"—1 Thessalonians v. 21 (Douay Bible). Will any of the Bishops or Priests of the Church of Rome now come forward, in or out of our pages, to grapple with and discuss the question of the boasted infallibility of their Church? or will they trust to the old policy still, and calculate on mankind for ever continuing to *take it for granted*, without proof? We shall see.

Correspondence.

ON THE VISIBLE CHURCH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—The visibility of the Church being a subject in which every class of Christians should feel a deep interest, and which I am anxious thoroughly to investigate, without any admixture of bad feeling, and as you have repeatedly signified your willingness to have it discussed in your journal, I beg to trespass on your usual kindness in resuming the matter, and to state, most distinctly, that any apparently strong expressions I may have used were not by any means designed to irritate or to give offence, but merely to elicit from you the most powerful reply that the advocates of your system are capable of putting forward, and which, from your talents and resources, you would appear so pre-eminently qualified to give.

The "arguments to prove that Christ might have no visible Church on earth" are the best that I have invariably heard used by Protestants, lay and clerical, with whom I have been acquainted; so, for their edification as well my own, I am amply compensated for my trouble in finding such arguments rejected by you, and thrown overboard altogether.

Now, sir, as you are an avowed advocate of the perpetuity and visibility of your Church, I maintain I have a perfect right to challenge any epoch in your Church history, as naturally involving a question of the visibility. I could with equal advantage select other periods—that of Berengarius, upon which I happened to light, will answer the purpose.

You indignantly repudiate the idea of the Roman Church, and the others in communion with her, being at that time the Church of Christ; you say I have misunderstood your words on this head. If I have, you are to blame. In my first letter (CATHOLIC LAYMAN, 1853, page 9), I have put the same construction upon these words, and you then quietly acquiesced in this interpretation. You say I have mistaken the meaning of the 19th Article, which, in your sense, is "the sublimest definition of the visible Church." Is it, I ask, a definition of an nonentity, or of something that has a real being? If it be a reality, why not point out the locus of its existence, as I said before? or is it a definition of something that exists only in your own imagination? "Oh," you say, "it was all over the world, wherever there were bishops, clergy, and people," &c. (C. L., July, 1853, p. 81). Surely, sensible men of your own communion will not be satisfied with so vague and indefinite an answer, much less persons of a different religious persuasion. Then you say—"It is time to look at the great fact, that the Greek and Eastern Churches really exist, though not in communion with Rome, superior to her in having preserved the Catholic creeds without mixture or addition" (C. L., July, 1853, p. 82).

Sir, I am aware of the existence of these Churches. Am I to understand that they constituted the true Church of Christ? If I take your words in this sense, I dread a castigation for making "a part equal to the whole;" and if they are not so taken, it is to no purpose to mention the existence of these Churches—"Quo teneam vultus mutantem protea nodo."

Now, sir, as this is a new feature in our controversy, I shall propose to you this dilemma:—If these Churches were not the true Church of Christ, you have failed to point out any true visible Church of Christ at all; and if these were the true Church, I call upon you to reconcile this with the 19th Article itself, which says that these Eastern Churches had erred as well as Rome "in their discipline, ceremonies, and faith." Mind that.

But you will exclaim, "Our correspondent mistakes the meaning of the Article," which only says that the Eastern Churches had erred *too*, but not so grievously as Rome, and the Greek Church is not at all censured by the Article: so, according to our principles, "they would not cease to be *a visible Church*"

That the Greeks believe Transubstantiation and the Sacrifice of the Mass is a fact so well authenticated, that candid Protestants do not attempt to dispute its certainty. That learned traveller, William Forbes, Bishop of Edinburgh, in a treatise, entitled "Moderate and Pacific Reflections on Controversy," acknowledges that the "Greeks and Latins agree in this belief." He quotes the testimony of Greek writers. Nicetas, in his "Orthodox Treasure;" Euthymius, in his "Panoply;" Nicholas, Bishop of Methone; Simonas, Bishop of Gaza; Nicholas Cabasilas; Mark of Ephesus; and Bessarion—all these openly profess this dogma in their works. Add to these the celebrated historian and physician, Gaspar Peucrus, and the English traveller, Sandius, in his "Mirror of Europe," page 233, says—"The Greeks agree with the Romans on Transubstantiation, the Sacrifice and principal parts of the Mass."

Professor Brerewood, of London, in his "History of all the Religions throughout the World," does not venture to assert that on Transubstantiation the Greeks differ in any respect from the Latin Church. Speaking of the Assyrians, the Copts or Egyptians, the Abyssinians, he does not assert that they differ in this point from the Roman Church.

The Lutheran Olearius, in his "Travels from Muscovy," says:—"The Muscovites believe Transubstantiation; that is, that the bread and wine are truly changed into the body and blood of Jesus Christ."

Cerularius, Bishop of Constantinople, who wrote with great virulence against the Latin Church, soon after the condemnation of Berengarius, and, amongst other matters, for using unleavened bread in the sacrament, does not charge her with any error on the Eucharist.

At the Council of Florence, when the Greek and Latin Churches were reconciled and united, they had no disagreement about Transubstantiation, though all other grounds of dissension were examined. The Eastern Churches also, and particularly the Greek Church, deny the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and Son.—See Acts of the Council of Trosly, held A.D. 909, by Herve, Archbishop of Rheims, and his suffragans. This dogma is inserted into the Nicene Creed, and professed in the Fifth Article of the Church of England.

If you persist, after this, to maintain that these Churches had preserved the Catholic creeds inviolate, and that they were the true, visible Church of Christ, yours must be latitudinarian principles, indeed.

In fine, I call upon you, unequivocally, to say why Berengarius did not put himself under the patronage of these Churches. If they were the true Church, and he persecuted for truth, they would at once extend to him sympathy and protection. The distance to either place (as you will see by the map) was comparatively short, and he could thus have avoided the disagreeable alternative of being either a "weathercock or a martyr."

Sir, I hope you will give this matter of the Eastern Churches "a candid consideration." I do not see how you can reconcile my objections, without coming to the conclusion that these Churches, equally with Rome, had reprobated the new-fangled opinions of Berengarius; and that this man, at that time the only representative of Protestant principles, had not one place in this wide world, to look to for sympathy or protection, "destruction before him and sorrow behind."

Φιλαληθης.

The question between us and "Philalethes," as to the sense in which we have spoken of the Church, appears to us to be this:—We had spoken of the "Christian Church," and "the Church of Christ;" and in his last letter (CATHOLIC LAYMAN, July, 1853, p. 81), "Philalethes" put this construction on what we said—"You mean, of course, the Roman Church, and the other Churches in communion with her, which you here seemingly admit to be the true Church of Christ."

Of this we said—"We spoke plainly and evidently of *the whole Church*, and our correspondent says—'Of course, you mean a part only'" (July, p. 2, col. 1). Our correspondent now replies again to this; and his reply seems to be to this effect—"I beg your pardon for having mistaken you; I thought, when you spoke of 'the Christian Church,' you meant a part of it *only*—that is, the Roman part: but now I see plainly that you meant the other part *only*—that is, the Greek part." We really must tell our correspondent that he has mistaken us again. When we speak of the Christian Church, or the Church of Christ, we do *not* mean either part, or *any* part by itself, but we mean the whole. We have already explained our meaning in a way which we thought prevented the possibility of mistake. We mean "by the visible Church of Christ on earth," the sum total of all bishops, priests, and people, professing the Christian faith, over the whole

world; and we point to the Catholic Creeds as containing a full and concise statement of that faith.

Now, we really do not see what room there is to mistake what we mean by the visible Church of Christ on earth.

What, then, is the difference between us and Roman Catholics?

We have always thought it to be this—that *they* consider the Church of Christ to consist only of that part which acknowledges the Roman Church to be the mother and mistress of all Churches, and the Pope to be the Vicar of Jesus Christ on earth: and, of course, that all other bishops, clergy, and people that do not acknowledge this, are no part of the Church of Christ on earth. We have always thought that this is the keystone of their notion of the Church; whereas we think that there are Churches on earth, parts of the visible Church of Christ, that do not thus acknowledge the Roman Church as mother and mistress, nor the Pope as Vicar of Christ: and yet, notwithstanding, are really parts of Christ's Church on earth.

We are truly happy to see that in this essential question "Philalethes" appears to agree with us.

We pointed to the Greek Churches, which do not acknowledge Rome as their mother and mistress, and which expressly deny that the Pope is the Vicar of Christ; we pointed to them in proof that "Philalethes" was wrong in taking the expression "Christian Church," as if it meant *only* the Roman Church. And to this "Philalethes" answers—"Sir, I am aware of the existence of these Churches." Very good: then these are parts of the Church of Christ on earth, though they do not acknowledge Rome as their mistress, nor the Pope as the Vicar of Christ.

We have now good grounds for hoping that as "Philalethes" and we come to understand each other better, we shall agree in sound notions of the Church of Christ. This is the effect we hope for from a fair and candid discussion.

"Philalethes" takes some pains to prove that this Greek Church holds Transubstantiation; but he produces no proof except *the opinions of individuals*. We have already called on him to say whether he considers this method of proof, sufficient to establish the doctrine of a Church; and he has not answered us.

For instance—if we produce as many and as great authorities in the Church of Rome, saying, "The image is to be worshipped *with the same honour and worship* with which we worship those whose image it is," will he admit this as proof that this is the doctrine of the Roman Church? We ask him to answer this—"Yes," or "No."

If he will not what right has he to offer us the same proof that the Greek Church holds Transubstantiation?

How do we know that the Roman Church holds Transubstantiation? We know it thus:—She has decreed it in the Council of Trent, and has put it into her creed. We ask the same proof that the Greek Church holds it. Let "Philalethes" show us in what council she had decreed it; in what creed she has inserted it.

With respect to the case of Berengarius, which has hitherto been the main subject of "Philalethes's" letters (but of which he says so little in this letter), we beg to say, that we do not at present clearly understand how far "Philalethes" agrees with us, or how far he differs from us, about the real merits of that question. We think no good can come of any discussion in which the parties do not take the pains, each to understand the real opinions of the other about the matter in discussion. We, therefore, beg "Philalethes" to tell us exactly what his opinion is.

The question stands thus:—"Philalethes" brought forward the fact, that Berengarius was condemned, and forced to retract his opinion in various councils. We selected the most important, that which has been put in the canon law, consisting of Pope Nicholas II. and 113 bishops, held at Rome, in the year 1059. We gave the words which Berengarius was compelled to sign—that the true body and blood of Christ is, "in a *sensible manner (sensualiter)*, handled by the hands of the priest, broken and ground by the teeth of the faithful." We affirmed that the word, *sensualiter*, can mean nothing else than this, "in a way that one senses can judge of and perceive." Now, we want to understand what "Philalethes" thinks of this. Does he think that the Pope and Council were right? or does he think that they were wrong? He has not told us, and we call on him to tell us: we cannot discuss this matter with him without knowing what his opinion is. We, therefore, call on him to answer this.

Our opinion is, that he will never venture to say that the Pope and the Council were right.

And if they were wrong, and if—according to his notions—the Pope and the Council spoke the doctrines of the whole Church, where was then the visible Church of Christ, according to his notion?

But if the Pope and Council were wrong, what are we to think of those, who, on "Philalethes's" confession, placed Berengarius in a position in which he had nothing but "destruction before him and sorrow behind," merely because he did not continue stedfast in the profession of *false doctrine*?

But "Philalethes" asks, why did not poor Berengarius walk off out of the Council at Rome to Constantinople? He tells us to look at the map, and it is only a step. Well, on a small map it may be three inches; but on the ground it may be a thousand miles. It was not so easy to do this when Rome was in her glory. If this were so easy, what a fool John Huss must have been! Why did he not walk away quietly when they were going to burn him?

We have received other letters, not meant for publication, on this subject of "the visible Church." We intend, in our next number, to propose our views more fully concerning it.

ON PURGATORY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I shall now proceed to obviate your objections, and to gratify you by showing that what you reject as "*mere assertion*" can be supported by irrefragable proofs; and that what you so explicitly deny is a matter of fact. I shall begin with St. Basil, Com. in Cap. ix. Isai. T. i. p. 554:—"The words of Isaiah (Cap. ix. 19)—through the wrath of the Lord is the land burned"—declares "that things that are earthly shall be made the food of a punishing fire, to the end that the soul may receive favour and be benefitted. And the people shall be as fuel of the fire" *(ibid)*: This is not a threat of extermination, but it denotes expurgation according to the expression of the Apostle; "If any man's works burn he shall suffer loss; but himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire"—(1 Cor. iii. 15.) Truly, since our God is called a consuming fire, he will consume the wood and what vices arise from matter, which adhere to the soul in the flesh, not in the spirit. And when the fire shall have consumed the wood of sin, as it does grass, then that matter being destroyed which was fuel to the chastening fire, the Prophet says—"The burnt mountains shall repose," &c. (*ibid* Cap. x. p. 563-4). St. Gregory of Nyssa (Orat. pro defunct, Tom. II, page 166, et seq.) "But when he (man) has quitted his body and the difference between virtue and vice is known, he cannot be admitted to approach the Divinity till the purging fire shall have expiated the stains with which he was infected." Next, St. Ambrose, (Serm. xx. in Psal. cxviii. T. i, p. 1238)—"Take care that you carry not with you to the judgment seat of God, wood nor stubble which the fire may consume. Take care, lest, having one or two things that may be approved, you at the same time, have much that may give offence." "If any man's works burn, he shall suffer loss; but himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire, (1 Cor iii. 15)." "He will be saved," the Apostle said, because "his substance shall remain, while his bad doctrine shall perish." Therefore he said, yet so as by fire, in order that his salvation be not understood to be without pain. He shows, that he shall be saved indeed, but that he shall undergo the pain of fire, and be thus purified, not like the unbelieving and wicked man who shall be punished in everlasting fire. (Com. 1. Cor. T. 2. in App. page 122)." St. Jerome, (Adv. Jov. Lib. ii. tom. iv. par. ii. page 215.) says: "If he, whose work has burned and suffered loss (as the Apostle says) shall lose the reward of his labour, yet shall he be saved by the trial of fire, so he whose works shall abide which he built upon, shall be saved without fire. Thus there will be some difference in the degrees of salvation." In his comment on Isai. Cap. lxv. T. ii. page 492, he lays down this doctrine with equal perspicuity. "As we believe the torments of the devil, and of those wicked men, who said in their hearts there is no God, to be eternal; so in regard to those sinners who have not denied their faith, and whose works will be proved and purged by fire, we conclude, that the sentence of the judge will be tempered with mercy." My next witness, St. Augustine, (in Enarr. Psal, xxxvii, T. iv. page 295) bears unequivocal testimony regarding this *dogma* of Catholic faith in the fourth and fifth centuries. He says, "Cleanse me so in this life, that I may not stand in need of that purifying fire, designed for those who shall be saved, yet so as by fire. And why, but because (as the Apostle says) they have built upon the foundation wood, hay, and stubble? If they had built gold and silver and precious stones, they would be secured from both fires, not only from that in which the wicked shall be punished for ever, but likewise from that fire which shall purify those who shall be saved, yet so as by fire." The identity of sentiment, so observable in these passages, is a striking illustration of the uniformity of opinion held by the Catholic Church in the fourth century, respecting this point of doctrine. Their testimony shows, that it was then the belief, as it is now, that some souls were purified after death "before they were allowed to approach the Divinity," so that their notion of Purgatory is one and the same with that of the Catholic Church of the present day, neither of which bear any analogy to the overcharged picture of Purgatory which you give from "a Constant Reader," in page 58, vol. ii. No. 17, CATHOLIC LAYMAN; the tinting of which you set off by some florid touches of your own. The Church, at this time, prayed for the dead too, but not after the manner of the Church of England, as I shall presently show. At some future time I shall meet you on what you call the unscriptural character of the doctrine of Purgatory; but, at present, I am examining, on that point, witnesses of the fourth century; and it is most gratifying to perceive what a uniformity of opinion pervades their evidence, with respect to this doctrine, as believed and taught by the Church at that time; and thus by the seal of their corroborating testimony, they stamp on it the impress of the doctrine of Jesus Christ. I can find in these Fathers no conflicting evidence, no diversity of opinion regarding Purgatory; no speaking of it "as a thing that might or might not be;" but, on the contrary, the clearest and fullest direct evidence in its favour. This you give as mere assertion, and by your own rule goes for nothing.

That it may the more easily appear how closely the opinion of Origen on the doctrine of Purgatory agrees with that expressed in the above cited passages, I shall here subjoin his words—"But when we arrive at that place, he that brings many good works and little that is evil, this evil the fire shall purify as it does lead, that the whole may become pure gold. He that takes with him more of lead suffers the more, that he may be refined, and what little of gold there is after the purification remains. But should the whole mass be lead, that man must experience what is written.—"*The sea covered them; they sank as lead in the mighty waters.*"—(Hom, vi. in Exod. T. ii. p. 148.)

Again—"For, if on the foundation of Christ, you have built not only gold, and silver, and precious stones, but also wood, and hay, and stubble, what do you expect when the soul shall be separated from the body? Would you enter into heaven with your wood, and hay, and stubble to defile the kingdom of God; or, on account of those incumbrances, remain without, and receive no reward for your gold, and silver, and precious stones? Neither is just. It remains, then, that you be committed to the fire, which shall consume the light materials; for our God, to those who can comprehend heavenly things, is a consuming fire. But this fire consumes not the creature, but what the creature has himself built, wood, hay, and stubble. It is manifest, that in the first place, the fire destroys the wood of our transgressions, and returns to us the reward of our good works."—Hom. xvi. in Jerom. T. iii. page 231.

Those fathers of the fourth century, whose opinions I have given, either declare the established doctrine of the Church at that period, or they wrote what was untrue, or heretical. If they have given us the doctrine of the Church in their time, such doctrine must necessarily be true, unless you succeed in showing the Church heretical at that time. If they published that which was not the doctrine of the Church at that time, and wrote only to puzzle posterity, why were not these false principles *then*, or in the next age, condemned by the Church? To this proposition, I demand a direct reply; and the same I repeat with regard to the citations from Origen, against whom you have not yet given anything more convincing than *mere assertion*, or individual opinion, neither of which can be admitted as proof. You conclude, rather hastily, that the question of Purgatory, with respect to the first three hundred years of the Church, "may now be considered as settled;" this, too, is assertion, and will require to be formally proved. Origen still stands forth with the same undiminished assurance of credibility, as when I first put him forward; in the sporting phrase, I say, "You have not yet taken a feather out of him," and now he must stand or fall with those other Fathers in whose company I have placed him; yet, should I give him up as being *heretical*, it would be no difficult matter, independently of him, to prove that the Church, in the second and third century, held the doctrine of Purgatory; this I will prove when you show by proper authority, the Catholic Church, that my citations from Origen are heretical, and have been condemned.

The Catholic Church of the fourth century prayed for the *saints*, and for the others who died in the Christian faith in quite a different manner.—(Epiph. Hær. 75, sec 7, t. i., p. 911.) (St. Aug. Ench. cap. 109.) For the latter they prayed that God would grant them pardon of their sins, that he would have mercy on them; and for the former, their prayers were *thanksgivings.—(Ibid.)* "There is a way of living so good that it does not need these helps of prayers and oblations after death.—(St. Augustin Ench. cap. 109, 110.) They who need not these helps after death, namely, the saints, who bring with them, out of this world, only *gold*, and *silver*, and *precious stones*, are, at once, admitted to glory. Of them it is said (Apoc. iii. 21)—"will I grant to sit with me on my throne;" and (Apoc. ii. 26)—"I will give him power over the nations, and he shall rule them with a rod of iron." To these saints, who are already come into the kingdom of God, the supplicatory import of "thy kingdom come" is inapplicable; neither have you given any proof of the contrary. I hold, with St. Cyprian, as I have already stated, that "they pray anxiously to God for our salvation," and by their intercession for man, they exercise that power so distinctly expressed by a rod of iron. They offer up the prayers of the saints on earth to God (Apoc. v. 8.) (St. Cyril, Catech. Myst. v., n. ix. x., page 328) declares that—"The souls of the dead are relieved and comforted by the sacrifice of the altar and by prayer." If space permitted, I could supply many other quotations, equally positive, in favour of this doctrine, all proving the efficacy of prayers, &c., for the dead, and the remission of some sins in a future world; so that it is evident that these prayers, in the fourth century, did go beyond the Protestant notion of prayers for the dead; and if the Catholics have, as you say, grossly violated the ancient practice of prayers for the dead, it is truly consoling to find we are partners in that violation with these holy men named in this paper. In the next place, to my demand of a Scripture proof for holidays in honour of the saints, &c., you reply that, "Scripture proof is required only for articles of faith," and not for "rites and ceremonies," and thence you infer the Church has power to appoint holidays. Are we to understand that "rites and ceremonies" are holidays and prayers? This is precisely your argument.

If Heb. xiii. 7, be with you direct authority to commemorate the Apostles, you must admit, on the same direct

authority, that these Apostles still have rule over you; but it could be easily proved that this text is not authority for either the one or the other; so you have yet to give Scripture proof of your prayers for the dead, and for holidays in honour of the saints.

I am, Sir, yours, &c., &c.,

EDMOND POWER.

The arrival of a long letter from Mr. Power has placed us in a disagreeable perplexity, between our desire to deal courteously with our correspondent and our fear of wearying the patience of our readers with further discussion on an exhausted subject. As the best mode of reconciling our duty to both, we print Mr. Power's letter in full, and at the same time, for the convenience of our readers, we portion off those parts of the subjects which have been thoroughly discussed from those which still deserve examination.

We repeat, then, that as far as the Fathers of the first three centuries are concerned, the question is settled—settled, that is, as far as any controversy can be—when both parties are agreed as to the state of the facts, and when nothing remains but a difference of opinion.

The question proposed was—"Do any writers for the first three centuries make any mention of the doctrine of Purgatory?" and it now appears that, during the many months our columns have been open for the discussion of this question, evidence has only been able to be adduced from *one* of the many writers who flourished during the first three hundred years of our religion, and that one Origen! And we are also agreed as to the fact that Origen is in general a very unsafe guide, and that he has fallen into many heresies.

We *differ* in opinion, in that Mr. Power holds, that in the passages cited Origen expresses views exactly coinciding with the present Roman Catholic doctrine of Purgatory, and that he was also joined in these opinions by the Church of his day; while we hold that in these passages Origen only expressed a certain heretical notion of his own, in which he was neither followed by the Church of his own day nor the Church of Rome at present.

It would be hopeless to expect that this difference of opinion could be removed by further argument; and we only appeal from Mr. Power's opinion (who, under the exigencies of controversy, is scarcely an impartial judge) to that of the most learned and candid divines of his own communion, who, we have shown, agree with us, and not with him. We think that our readers will be grateful to us for closing all further discussion on this part of the subject, except such as may be calculated to throw some new light on the state of the facts, such as other passages from the Fathers of the first three centuries, which Mr. Power professes to be able to produce, and which, of course, he ought to do, and is perfectly free to do if he can.

It would seem, then, that we ought to come next to discuss the state of the facts as to the writers of the fourth century, by whose help Mr. Power proposes to interpret Origen; but there is something which must take precedence of a question of facts, and that is a question of fundamental principles. Now, in a part of his letter, to which he has invited our especial attention, Mr. Power makes it plain that the principles on which he argues the question are wholly different from ours. He says, "Those Fathers of the fourth century whose opinions I have given, either declare the established doctrine of the Church of that period, or they wrote what was untrue.* If they have given us the doctrine of the Church in their time, such doctrine must necessarily be true. If they published that which was not the doctrine of the Church at that time, why were not these false principles then, or in the next age, condemned by the Church? To this proposition I demand a direct reply."

Now, it is evident that our reply to this question must come before any discussion as to the views of particular writers of the fourth century. For suppose that we were completely successful in demolishing every passage which could be brought forward in proof of Purgatory from writers of the fourth century, Mr. Power would only have to alter the word "fourth," in the argument just cited, into "fifth," or "sixth," or "seventh," or whatever the first century may be in which he can find purgatory to have been part of the received belief among Christians. In fact, it is plain that the way Mr. Power, perhaps unconsciously, argues is—"Purgatory is part of the teaching of the Church now; the Church cannot err, and her doctrines must be always the same; therefore the statements of the Fathers of the fourth century must be interpreted so as to coincide with the teaching of the Church now, and the statements of Origen, so as to coincide with those of the Fathers of the fourth century."

Now, when Mr. Power says—"Either these Fathers declare the established doctrine of the Church of that period, or they wrote what was untrue."† We object to his statement for two reasons; first, he assumes that the established doctrine of the Church is always the same, which is denied, not only by Protestants, but also by Mr. Newman, and the other Roman Catholics who hold the doctrine of development; and, secondly, he assumes that the received belief of the majority of Christians is in every point true, which is denied by Protestants. Now, no one is at liberty to assume, in controversy, first principles denied by his opponent, otherwise the controversy falls to the ground at once. If Mr. Power were at liberty to assume that the Church of Rome is infallible, then it would be needless for him to spend his time in collecting the opinion of the Fathers about Purgatory; he might content himself with saying it is the doctrine of the Church now—that is enough. On the other hand, if we were at liberty to assume the principle of the sufficiency of Scripture, we need not appeal to the Fathers; we might say there is nothing about Purgatory in the Bible—that is enough. But there is a neutral ground on which we can meet Mr. Power, and that is, to treat the matter as a purely historical question. Without assuming the doctrinal point that the writers of the first three centuries must have believed exactly as those of the tenth century, can you ascertain from their own writings whether they believed in Purgatory or not? Can you connect, by historical evidence, Purgatory with the teaching of the Apostles, and can you show that those who learned from them held that doctrine? We have ascertained, in the course of this discussion, that if they believed in Purgatory, at least in all their writings, they said nothing about it; and *that* though there were many occasions when we might expect them to have mentioned it. There is a great gap, then, between the Apostolic teaching and the first mention of Purgatory—a gap which nothing but the doctrine of the infallibility of the Church can ever bridge over.

Having laid down these principles, we have a clear way to enter next month on the examination of the views of subsequent writers, it being understood that no testimony from the fourth century can make up for the want of earlier evidence—that we are not at liberty to assume it to be impossible that Gregory of Nyssa, or Basil ever could have fallen into error on any point; and that if Mr. Power can even succeed in proving that the Fathers of the fourth century believed exactly the same as Origen, we are free to reply, "so much the worse for the Fathers of the fourth century."

The same principles enable us to dispose of the challenge which Mr. Power repeats as to Origen, whom he says we have left untouched. Mr. Power's mistake is, that he imagines the *onus probandi* to be on us to show that the passages cited from Origen have been formally condemned; whereas, in truth, it is incumbent on him to show that the sentiments there expressed are those of the church of the time, before he can prove that Purgatory was the belief of the third century. The principle assumed by Mr. Power is, that every sentence in Origen must be understood to be in accordance with the doctrine of the Church, unless it can be showed that that particular sentence has been formally condemned. It would be untrue to assume this in the case of any one of the fathers, but it is perfectly monstrous to assume it of Origen.* Does Mr. Power imagine that there was a "Congregation of the Index" in those days, who went over the works of every eminent Christian writer, expurgating all the faulty passages, and leaving nothing but what might be safely followed by posterity? One would fancy that he must entertain some such belief, from his so often asking us either to receive the doctrine held by such and such a father, or else to show where this sentence was condemned by his successors. At all events, concerning Origen, the hero of a hundred heresies, it is enough to say that, with regard to any exposition taken at random from his works, the odds are that it is *not* in accordance with the general opinion of the church; and any one who asserts the contrary is bound to prove it.

We must not conclude without some remarks on the other subject which Mr. Power has introduced into this discussion—the necessity for a Scripture proof for church holidays, &c.; because it is an example how ignorant even educated Roman Catholics are as to the first principles of Protestants—ignorance which we hope this journal has already done some good in removing.

Protestants hold, then, that our Lord by his own mouth, and those of his apostles, revealed to the world certain truths which it deeply concerned mankind to know; and that in order that this revelation should not be lost, it was committed to writing in what are commonly known as the "Holy Scriptures." For any thing which claims to be part of this system of truth, the knowledge of which is necessary to men's salvation, they accordingly require Scripture proof.

But they hold, likewise, that our Lord formed his disciples into a society, having full powers to make regulations for its preservation and for the details of its worship, &c.; and for details of this nature they do *not* require Scriptural proof.

If any one asks us why do we religiously observe the festival of Christmas Day, or why do we make use in our public worship of such and such a prayer? then we answer, on the authority of our Church, and we never think of seeking for any other reply; but if any one were to assert it to be *necessary to salvation* to observe the festival of Christmas Day, or to say that the church could not do otherwise than command its observance, then, for such an assertion as this, we should ask for Scriptural proof, as well as for historical proof, that the church always did observe the festival in question.

We may add, that the distinction here insisted on, though sometimes lost sight of by Roman Catholic controversialists, is recognized by their best writers who always distinguish between Divine and ecclesiastical traditions.

---

* For clearness we omit in this argument the word heretical, added here by Mr. Power, the word being ambiguous. The word heresy is sometimes used to denote any grave doctrinal error; sometimes such an error as was condemned by the majority of Christians at the time when it originated. It is plain that it would be a contradiction in terms to speak of the majority of Christians as falling into heresy in the latter sense, though not in the former; and thus the word may be so used as to prejudge the great question at issue between Roman Catholics and Protestants—viz., was it possible for the majority of Christians at any time to fall into serious error on religious subjects.

† This phrase "established doctrine of the Church," being also ambiguous, it is necessary to remark that it is not pretended that the Church had established anything in the first thousand years by *any formal decision* upon Purgatory; and the question only is whether it was the *received belief of the majority of Christians.*

* The passages from Origen, which Mr. Power quotes, have been already the subject of much discussion. Not to occupy space unnecessarily, we think it enough to refer the reader to Vol. i., p. 67, 142, and Vol. ii., p. 67.

WHAT IS THE POSITION OF THE PRIEST IN THE MASS?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I have observed in your journal many remarks, at both sides, of considerable ability, on the Roman Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation, and the Sacrifice of the Mass. Such vital topics demand the most careful discussion. Both parties should distinctly comprehend the propositions for or against which they contend. Many of them have been clearly stated, and ably defended by your Roman Catholic correspondents. I am in hopes, therefore, they will explain to me their views on one of the most momentous nature, and as yet untouched by either. We know enough of the disputed change in the eucharistic elements; we know that the same propitiatory sacrifice is said to be there offered up that took place on the Cross of Calvary; but we do not yet know what exact position the *priest* who accomplishes these sacred mysteries is supposed to occupy. If that which I am about to state be really the doctrine of their church, it will be an additional obstacle to adopting their belief. If, on the other hand, it be shown not to be so, it will be a serious obstacle removed. It is, therefore, well worth their while to grapple with the subject.

The short question is this—is the priest, in the administration of this sacrament, supposed to take on himself the "person, power, and functions" of our Lord Jesus Christ? If he be so, we must require strong proof of so startling a proposition—blasphemous if falsely put forward—and if he be not, I must ask for an explanation of the following passages in the Catechism of the Council of Trent:—

"* The Sacrifice of the Mass is one and the same sacrifice with that of the Cross; the victim is still one and the same, Jesus Christ. * * * * *The priest is also the same* Christ our Lord; the ministers who offer this sacrifice consecrate the holy mysteries *not in their own*, BUT IN THE PERSON OF CHRIST. This, the words of consecration declare; the priest does not say—'This is the body of Christ,' but, this is MY body;' and thus invested with the character of Christ, he changes the substance of the bread and wine into the substance of his real body and blood."

But this may be a solitary expression, not meant to convey so strong a meaning as at first sight it bears. Yet it is strange that a few pages afterwards,† in speaking of the power of the priest in the Sacrament of Penance, it says—"The voice of the priest, who is legitimately constituted a minister for the remission of sins, is to be heard as that of Christ *himself*, who said to the lame man—'Son, be of good cheer, thy sins are forgiven thee.'"

Lest we should give this or the preceding passage a figurative turn, we meet, a few pages further on, language that seems scarcely capable of being equivocal—"In the minister of God, who sits in the tribunal of penance as his legitimate judge, he (the penitent) venerates the *power and* PERSON of our Lord Jesus Christ; for, in the administration of this, *as in that of the other sacraments*, the priest represents the character, and discharges the functions of Jesus Christ."

I ask your correspondents to consider these three passages together, and say what power is attributed to the priest, or what is wanting to his actual deification—I mean, during, and with reference to, his celebration of these sacraments. I shall reserve my remarks—if remarks be needed on such a result—till I find whether or not the plain interpretation be that of the Roman Catholic belief. If it be, I should like to see some attempt at supporting its truth; if it be not, I should remind them that the doctrine of Transubstantiation has affected to be founded on a *literal* interpretation of some texts of Scripture. In a former letter I think I have shown that this supposition is utterly mistaken. In a future I may have to observe that their official explanations of this Sacrament cannot be credited by good Roman Catholics, unless when softened and diluted by a very *figurative* interpretation.

FONTIUM PETITOR.

THE BLESSED VIRGIN AND THE HOLY GHOST.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I fear that Pat's report of the sermon in which the shocking statement was made, that the Blessed Virgin was the wife of the Holy Ghost, must have been but too true, for we find the same sort of thing affirmed, not only in Dr.

* Translated by the Rev. J. Donovan, Professor of the Royal College of Maynooth. Coyne, Dublin, 1829; p. 249.

† Page 256.

Marshall's sermon in Ireland, but in books published by authority on the Continent. I will refer your readers to a book, used in the year 1851, in a mission for the benefit of Malaga in the south of Spain, by Father Felix of Cadiz, and reprinted, with grant of indulgences, &c., by licence of Salvador Tonf, then Bishop of Malaga, now Archbishop of Granada. It is called "Novena of the Most Holy Mary, under the title of the Divine Shepherdess of Souls, Protectress of the Mission of the Capuchin Order." It consists of nine supposed offices of the Blessed Virgin in the character of Divine Shepherdess, with a meditation upon each office and a prayer. The title of Divine Shepherdess was first invented in the year 1703. Her nine offices as Shepherdess are:—1. Knowing the sheep. 2. Leading the sheep. 3. Driving away the wolves with her voice and crook. 4. Encouraging the feeble sheep. 5. Healing the sick sheep. 6. Seeking for the lost sheep. 7. Bringing back the lost sheep to the fold. 8. Assisting the sheep at their death. 9. Being an example to the sheep.

The reason why, if all this is true, our Lord speaks of himself as the Shepherd, instead of his mother as the Shepherdess, we need not here inquire, but yet it is worth knowing. To come to the point of this letter, there are appended to this Novena the Seven Mysteries of Joy, the Seven Mysteries of Sorrow, and the Seven Mysteries of Glory. The last of the Mysteries of Glory is as follows:—

"The Holy Ghost enamoured, boasts himself (Blasona) a faithful lover; burning with the flames of love, he crowns thee as his bride. It is assuredly a garland due to thee, for thou wert the most brilliant Shepherdess.

"R. Since thou art my Shepherdess, I am thy sheep—Ave Maria!"

Your obedient servant,

M.

PERSECUTION IN HINDOSTAN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Sir—There are very many promises in the Scripture addressed to the afflicted and persecuted people of God, but referring generally to the spiritual consolations to be imparted to them here, or the joys laid up for them hereafter. In one passage, however (Mark x. 29), our Lord expressly says, that those who have suffered the loss of all for his sake shall have "one hundred fold more in this present life" than they have lost. Are we to understand this literally? I think that the following anecdote may be an interesting and instructive reply to the question—interesting, as showing how a poor Hindoo convert understood it; and instructive, as holding up an example which we, who may think ourselves more advanced in the Christian life than a convert from heathenism could be, would do well to follow. The person referred to was a Brahmin, by name Dhondapa; he, with two others, were the first converts in Western India, and were baptized in the year 1825. He was sorely persecuted, almost to death. There was so much bitterness against him, that the missionary, who was the means, under God, of his conversion, feared to baptize him in his native place, but took him to Bombay, a considerable distance, for the purpose. After his baptism he returned home, but there he was an outcast. By the Hindoo law he was considered dead, and his house and land were transferred to another. His wife and children were taken from him, his relations despised and persecuted him, and none of his own people would assist him in any way. His wife was especially bitter against him, called him a devil, would not speak to him, or even walk at the same side of the road with him. The Lord raised him up friends among the Europeans. Being a Brahmin, he had never learned any trade, but he could write a little, and a Christian gentleman gave him some employment in that way, and supported him. After some years, when this friend was removed by death, another was raised up, and thus he was not suffered to want. It was during his residence with the latter friend that the little circumstance referred to took place; this was several years after his conversion, and it is worthy of remark, that at this time he sent more than half of the small sum which he received monthly for his own support to his heathen wife. Her enmity against him was no way abated, but she was in poverty and distress, and Dhondapa nobly acted out his dear Lord's precept—"Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them which hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you." In the family with whom Dhondapa was living, the Scriptures were daily read, in the Mahratta language, to the heathen servants. Dhondapa was always present, with his Mahratta Testament, and was ready to say a word, when called upon, or reply to a question. In the course of reading, the 10th chapter of St. Mark's Gospel came under consideration, and after various questions had been asked of the listeners, to ascertain how far they understood what was read, and some remarks had been made, Dhondapa was thus appealed to—"Well, Dhondapa, this is a remarkable verse, in which the Lord Jesus says that he will give 'an hundred-fold more in this present life' to those who have forsaken all for him. You have forsaken all—you have lost wife and children, house and lands; can you say that the Lord Jesus has given you a hundred-fold more in this world, according to his promise here?" Dhondapa replied immediately, with great simplicity, to the effect, that it was true that he had given up all that he had for the religion of Jesus Christ, and that he had suffered much in body and mind—that great anger had been felt towards him by his family, who had cast him from them; but God, he said, had been very good to him, giving him great joy and peace in his own mind, and also giving him fathers, and mothers, and children (referring to the friends raised up to him; "Father and mother" is the common Hindoo appellation for a protecting friend) in place of those whom he had lost since he believed on Jesus Christ, and then he paused, and added emphatically—"*He says* He gives an *hundred*-fold, but *I think* He gives a *thousand*-fold!" Was not this a striking testimony to the truth of God's promises, as well as to the simple, thankful spirit of the poor convert? and ought it not to be a lesson to us who have so many mercies—mercies to our land, mercies to our people, mercies to our families—more than the poor Hindoo? Made, too, as it was, before several heathen servants, for Dhondapa was not ashamed to confess Christ before men, one would have thought that it would have come home to their hearts (for the persecution to which they are exposed, when they profess Christ, is a great hindrance to many poor Hindoos), and have been a word of encouragement, especially to one among them, who knew the truth, but feared to "follow on to know the Lord;" but it seemed to make no impression, for until the Lord is pleased to work by his spirit, however the head may be taught, the heart remains unmoved. This is alike true, of all men, whether nominally Christian or not: our Lord teaches us that the state of the nominal Christian may be even worse than that of the heathen.—Matth. xi. 22. Perhaps another little circumstance regarding Dhondapa may be interesting, and likewise convey another lesson to us. The prophetical books of the Old Testament were not translated into the Mahratta language until some time after the New Testament, and the Pentateuch had been, and it was near twenty years after Dhondapa's conversion that he first saw the Book of the Prophet Isaiah, the first of the Prophets that was printed. A friend brought it to him from Bombay; he was greatly delighted with it, and read it through with great eagerness; he could hardly bear to lay down the book until he had finished it. "Oh!" he said; "these are sweet words, this is all *very good*, this is *the Gospel*;" and he determined to learn the book by heart. He had received the Pilgrim's Progress before this, and was very fond of reading it; but one passage puzzled him: he thought that it differed from the Scriptures. He was a very simple-minded man—it was not always easy either to make out his difficulties or to remove them. When a text from the Holy Scriptures could be brought to clear up a passage, or make a duty plain, *that* satisfied him. In this instance, the friend who tried in vain to remove his difficulty, with regard to the Pilgrim's Progress, at last said—"Well, Dhondapa, if you cannot understand this seeming difference, remember that the Scriptures are the Word of God, while the Pilgrim's Progress is only the word of man." "The word of man!" exclaimed Dhondapa, "the word of man! I thought that it had been the Word of God. I shall put it away—I do not want the word of man, I want only the Word of God!" He could say with the Psalmist—"The entrance of thy word giveth light, it giveth understanding unto the simple; oh, how love I thy law! It is my meditation all the day." May this be our happy experience; and may we be enabled also to pray, "Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law."

An Eye-witness.

FARMING OPERATIONS FOR SEPTEMBER.

(From the Irish Farmers' Gazette.)

The general ripening of the grain crops being unusually late, by from ten days to a fortnight later than the generality of seasons, renders the farming operations given in our last still appropriate, and harvest operations will, therefore, constitute the chief employment during this month; and from the very uneven and scattered way in which the grain is ripening, will most probably be extended far into the next. Much alarm has arisen during the last fortnight from an anticipated scarcity of hands in cutting and gathering in the harvest, but this is subsiding in some degree, as the men are now fast returning from the English harvest; and as our harvest is not coming in so general or so quick as hitherto, there is but little to fear, in a general way, either from a scarcity of hands, or a higher rate of wages than the farmer is able to pay. With those who may be differently circumstanced, reaping by the scythe must be adopted, at least, in part, which, if carefully performed, will be equally effective with the reaping-hook or sickle, particularly with oats if not allowed to get too ripe. Cutting with the scythe, even with some trifling drawbacks, has particular advantages, which go far in compensation; some of which are—a greater quantity of straw, from the closeness to the ground with which the scythe cuts; and this alone will be of paramount advantage, by giving an increase of fodder, as hay is now both scarce and dear; the corn will cure much sooner after the scythe than the sickle, and can, therefore, be carried and stacked much earlier, thus saving much loss of grain from handling, and also of time.

General Observations.—Avoid as much as possible cutting corn of any kind during rain or while wet, embracing every dry opportunity for that purpose; and immediately as it is cut, let it be bound in very small sheaves, and stooked. If the weather be dry, and can be depended on, laying in swathe ungathered till next day will expedite its curing, and dry up any green herbage that may be cut with the corn. Let it not be capped or hooded till towards evening, or on the approach of rain; and in stooking or field stacking, avoid making either near hedges or trees, keeping them out in the open field, exposed to free air on all sides. As it will be of paramount importance to subject the stubble to the operations of the grubber or the plough, as early as possible after the severance of the crop, let the stooks be made in straight lines, at wide intervals, so that if any delay arises in carrying home the crop; those implements may have room to work while the weather is yet dry, and the land dry and friable.

Stacking.—When fit to be carried, make the stacks with a long shank and a short head, to save thatching; ventilate those by carrying up one or more perpendicular chimneys, which should discharge into horizontal flues, open at both ends, under the eaves, and, as soon as completed, let the stack be immediately thatched.

Ploughing is an operation that no other work should be allowed to interfere with, and should be proceeded with immediately after the severance of the corn. The stubble and annual weeds, by being now ploughed down, will be converted into the richest vegetable manure, and the earth, being laid up high and dry during the winter, will be ameliorated by the influence of alternate frosts and thaws, the inorganic materials broken down and disentigrated, and the ammonia absorbed from the atmosphere, which is always charged abundantly with it, the action of the harrows or grubbers, on the first dry weather in spring, will reduce the surface to the finest possible tilth. Where the land requires subsoiling, this is the best, easiest, and most profitable period to effect it, as it will have a longer time to lie under the fertilizing effects of the weather. In lieu of a subsoil plough, a common plough, stripped of its mould-board, following in the track of the first, will do this work very efficiently; or it may be done by manual labour, by disposing six or eight men along the track of the plough, according to the speed of the horses, with good strong spades, to dig eight to ten inches deep under the depth of the plough, and throw the subsoil, if it be good, on top of that raised by the plough; or, if not of a quality to bring to the surface, turn it over to that depth in the bottom of the furrow. Before this operation is attempted, it must be understood that the land is either naturally dry, or rendered so by draining. The latter cannot be profitably effected if subsoiling do not follow.

Winter Vetches should be sown this month in breadth, according to to requirements. Mixed with rye or oats it comes into use earlier than when sown alone. Four bushels of winter vetches, mixed with four or five stone of rye to the Irish acre, will give the earliest cutting; the same quantity of vetches and oats comes in next; while a breadth sown at same time of unmixed vetches, will only be in its prime when the others are nearly consumed. Three or four lbs. of rape per Irish acre, sown at same time, will materially increase the bulk of provender, and keep the vetches from lying on the ground. In dry land the crop may be sown on the flat, but in land having a tendency to damp, ridges with open furrows will be best; a liberal dressing of manure will vastly increase the weight of crop.

Rape, sown in June last, should now be planted out, the earlier the better, and may still be sown on dry, warm soils, with a favourable aspect; but in cold, backward ones it is too late to sow, though transplanting may be proceeded with, both this and the next month.

Italian Rye-grass and Clover, for soiling early next season, should be sown this month, the earlier the better, in well-prepared, clean, rich, stubble land, after green-crops, or after early potatoes. It will come into use early in May; in some cases it will be fit for cutting some time in April, and with the assistance of liquid-manure or rich compost after cutting, yield several cuttings during the season.

Clover and Grass-seeds, intended for either meadow or permanent pastures, should now be sown; in either cases three or four lbs. of rape to the Irish acre should be sown; it will give shelter to the tender grasses, and afford a nutritious bite to sheep early in the spring, when it should be eaten down.

Wheat, on fallow lands, or after early potatoes, should be sown this month, if the land be sufficiently moist; if not, time must be given for a fall of rain, and the seed committed to the ground, when it is neither too wet nor too dry.

Bere should be sown as early as possible in dry, light, rich soil; it comes in early before the general harvest, and affords a plentiful supply of bread corn for home consumption, at a most critical time, when provisions are both scarce and dear.

Winter Dun Oats have now become one of our best established and most profitable autumn-sown grain crops, and, in many instances, has superseded wheat. It comes in early, is perfectly hardy, and yields abundantly; but it should be sown early, and the soil tolerably dry at the period of sowing, to insure success.

New and Recent Works

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

Booksellers to the Queen,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Any Book or number of Books together, *within a pound weight*, can be sent by post for 6d., and at the rate of 6d. for every pound weight additional.

THE DOMESTIC COMMENTARY ON THE OLD TESTAMENT. By a Clergyman of the Church of England; Genesis to 2nd Book of Kings. Imp. 8vo. 16s.

THE DOMESTIC COMMENTARY ON THE NEW TESTAMENT. By a Clergyman of the Church of England. Imp. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

SABBATH EVENING READINGS ON ST. MATTHEW. By Rev. Dr. Cumming. Foolscap. 5s.

HISTORY OF THE INSURRECTION IN CHINA; with Notices of the Christianity, Creed, and Proclamations of the Insurgents. By M.M. Callery and Yvan, translated from the French, with a Chapter, narrating the most recent events. By John Oxenford. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

LORENZO BENONI, OR PASSAGES IN THE LIFE OF AN ITALIAN. Edited by a Friend. Crown 8vo. Cheaper edition, 2s. 6d.

ISAAC T. HOPPER, a true life. By L. Maria Child, with Portrait. Post 8vo. 9s.

D'AUBIGNE'S HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND. Vol. 5. Post 8vo., Cloth. (Oliver and Boyd's Edition). 6s.

D'AUBIGNE'S HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND. Vol. 5. 12mo, Cloth. (Collins's Edition.) 4s. 6d.

A HISTORY OF THE PROTESTANT CHURCH OF HUNGARY. Compiled from authentic documents. By Dr. D'Aubigne. 8vo. (In the press.)

ABBEOKUTA; or, Sunrise within the Tropics: An Outline of the Origin and Progress of the Yoruba Mission. By Miss Tucker. 3s. 6d.

THE DIVINE RULE OF FAITH AND PRACTICE. By Rev. William Goode. 3 vols. 8vo. New Edition. With Index. 21s.

NOTES ON BOOK OF DANIEL. By Albert Barnes. 2 vols. 7s, or, in one double vol., 6s. 6d.

THE LAMP AND THE LANTERN; or Light for the Tent and the Traveller. By James Hamilton, D.D. 1s. 6d.

MEMOIR OF ROBERT AND JAMES A. HALDANE. By Alex. Haldane, Esq. 12s.

MEMOIR OF THE REV. W. H. HEWITSON. By the Rev. John Baillie. 5s.

SELECT LETTERS AND REMAINS OF THE LATE REV. W. H. HEWITSON. Edited by the Rev. John Baillie. 2 Vols. 10s.

THE PREDICTED DOWNFALL OF TURKEY, THE PREPARATION FOR THE RETURN OF THE TEN TRIBES. By George Stanley Faber. 2s.

AN EXPOSITION OF THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE GALATIANS. By Rev. John Brown, D.D. 8vo. 12s.

DISCOURSES SUITED TO THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER. By Rev. John Brown, D.D. 8vo. 8s.

DISCOURSES AND SAYINGS OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST, Illustrated in a Series of Expositions. By Rev. John Brown, D.D. 3 vols. 8vo. 31s. 6d.

"A Noble Work."—*Free Church Magazine.*

"They bear the impress of keen critical sagacity, of a calm, comprehensive, and independent judgment, of extensive research, of sound exegetical principles, and of the most devout and loving reverence for Him whose 'sayings' they are intended to illustrate."—*Eclectic Review.*

AN EXPOSITION OF OUR LORD'S INTERCESSORY PRAYER, (John xvii.) with a Discourse on the Relation of Our Lord's Intercession to the Conversion of the World. By Rev. John Brown, D.D. 8vo. 7s.

"This Exposition is in the Author's highest manner, the Outline is a Masterpiece, the Arguments and Illustrations perfect."—*British Quarterly Review.*

EXPOSITORY DISCOURSES ON THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER. By Rev. John Brown, D.D. 2 vols. 8vo. 21s.

"Our estimate of the value of this Work is very high. It appears to us the very best specimen of Scotch commentary that has ever been published. The doctrinal and the practical, the critical and the popular, are admirably combined."—*Kitto's Journal of Sacred Literature.*

GENESIS AND GEOLOGY; or an Investigation into the Reconciliation of the Modern Doctrines of Geology; with the Declarations of Scripture. By Denis Crofton, B.A. 2s.

"I have taken the responsibility of recommending to the enterprising publishers, whose names appear on the title page, to republish this little work, in its present form, and thus to place it within reach of American Christians, for the following reasons:—First, because I have met with no examination of the connection between 'Geology and Genesis,' so able as this. Other eminent writers, such as Dr. Chalmers, J. Pye Smith, Harris, Buckland, Silliman, Sedgewick and Whewell, have shown great skill in the examination of the Biblical questions connected with geology, but none of them have gone so fully into the argument as Mr. Crofton. Second, because he has opened a track which may be followed further by Biblical students. I mean in the examination of parallel passages of inspiration. Finally, because his course of argument is eminently adapted to satisfy the authorized expounders of God's Word—I mean the Ministers of the Gospel—that there is no collision between 'Genesis and Geology.' Mr. Crofton has made one or two favourable allusions to an earlier production of mine on this same subject, but I cannot suppose that any one will consider so slight a reference to be a reason why I should have formed a high opinion of his work, or why I should not express it.

"Edward Hitchcock, D.D."

Introduction to American Edition.

THE RELIGION OF GEOLOGY, AND ITS CONNECTED SCIENCES. By Edward Hitchcock, D.D., LL.D. 12mo. Sewed 1s. 6d.; cloth 2s.

THE ART OF QUESTIONING; or, a short Analysis of the Interrogatory Methods of Instruction, designed for the use of Teachers, Pupil-Teachers, and Monitors. By W. T. Young, T.C.D. 1s.

ALISON'S HISTORY OF EUROPE. Cheaper Edition. (12 Quarterly Vols. at 4s.) Vol. I. just published.

SIR THOMAS FOWELL BUXTON, BART., a study for Young Men. THE WIFE, OR A MIRROR FOR MAIDENHOOD, a Sketch. By T. Binney. 12mo. Sewed 1s. 6d., Cloth 2s.

A WEEK AT THE BRIDGE OF ALLAN (Stirling), comprising an account of the Spa, and a series of Six Excursions to the interesting scenery of Central Scotland. By Charles Roger, F.R.S. Scotland, Illustrated with 30 engravings, chiefly on Steel. Foolscap. 5s.

A SUMMARY OF BIBLICAL ANTIQUITIES; for the use of Schools, Bible Classes, and Families. By Rev. Dr. Nevin. Foolscap 8vo. 2s. 6d.

THE NEW REFORMATION IN IRELAND, with striking facts and anecdotes illustrating the Extent and Reality of the Movement. By the Rev. L. W. Jones. With a Missionary Map. 1s. 6d.

THE LUNAR WORLD, its Scenery, Motions, &c., Considered with a View to Design. By Rev. Josiah Crampton. Sewed 1s. 6d., cloth 2s.

THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW, No. VI. 3s. 6d.

ASSORTED PACKET OF TWOPENNY BOOKS, Containing Thirteen Books. 2s.

FORTY-EIGHT MISSIONARY STORIES FOR CHILDREN. By Harriet D'Oyly Howe. In packet 1s.

PACKET OF SCRIPTURE STORIES FOR CHILDREN. By Miss Parrott. 1s.

A BRIEF AND COMPLETE REFUTATION OF THE ANTI-SCRIPTURAL THEORY OF GEOLOGISTS. By a Clergyman of the Church of England. 6d., by post 10d.

WHAT THINK YE OF CHRIST? A Series of Meditations on the Title and Offices of Our Lord. By J. G. Smyttan. Foolscap 8vo. 3s. 6d.

HOMILETICS; or the Theory of Preaching. By Alexander Vinet, D.D. 8vo. 6s.

BETTS' ROAD AND RAILROAD MAP OF IRELAND. In a Case. 5s.

THE TOURISTS' ILLUSTRATED HAND-BOOK FOR IRELAND. 3s. 6d.

PLAN OF DUBLIN. In a Case. 1s.

DUBLIN; WHAT TO SEE, AND HOW TO SEE IT. By W. F. Wakeman. With Maps and Illustrations. 1s.

ENVIRONS OF DUBLIN. Coloured. In a Case. 1s. 6d.

FRASER'S GUIDE TO THE COUNTY WICKLOW. With a Map and Illustrations. 2s.

GUIDE TO BELFAST AND ITS ENVIRONS, WITH A TOUR TO THE GIANT'S CAUSEWAY. By J. Hnband Smith, M.R.I.A. 2s. 6d.

A RUN THROUGH THE SOUTH OF IRELAND. With Maps and Illustrations on Steel. 1s. 6d.

A WEEK IN THE WEST OF IRELAND, GALWAY, CONNAUGHT, CONNEMARA, &c. 1s.

LAKE LORE; or, An Antiquarian Guide to some of the Ruins and Recollections of Killarney. By A. B. R. With Illustrations. 2s. 6d.

SYNOPSIS OF THE CONTENTS OF THE GREAT INDUSTRIAL EXHIBITION OF 1853. By Charles C. Adley. 6d.

*** A variety of Guide Books, Charts, Maps, &c., for Tourists in England, Scotland, Ireland, and the Continent.

In the Press, and shortly will be Published, in Two Vols., Fcap. 8vo. Cloth.

I.

MEMOIR OF THE LATE REVEREND EDWARD BICKERSTETH. By Rev. T. R. Birks. With Portrait. Uniform with the Collected Edition of his Works.

Price to Subscribers, 8s.—Non-subscribers, Half-a-guinea.

II.

Preparing for Publication,

A cheap issue of the Life of Dr. Chalmers.

On 1st October there will appear simultaneously—

Part 1 of a MONTHLY issue, at 6d., to be completed in Twenty Parts.

Part 1 of a QUARTERLY issue, at 2s. 6d., containing each one volume of the Original Edition. To be completed in four such parts.

The work may therefore be had complete in either way for 10s., or in 2 vols., bound in cloth, price 12s.

*** Subscribers names received by WILLIAM CURRY and COMPANY, 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Just Published, price 3d., by Post 4d.,

A LETTER

Addressed to the Committee of Management on the occasion of the Dedication of the

NEW ROMAN CATHOLIC CHAPEL,

St. Mary Star of the Sea,

IRISHTOWN,

On August 15, 1853,

In answer to an Invitation to attend that Ceremony,

BY

REV. WILLIAM DE BURGH, B.D.,

SANDYMOUNT.

Sold by WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-st., Dublin.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON, and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher, WILLIAM CURRY, 9 Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

September, 1853.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Sloinn do Dhia añ gna hárduibh, agus síodcáin air an dtalaimh deagdóil do na dáoinibh.

Luke II. 14.

PUBLISHED THE MIDDLE OF EVERY MONTH, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. II.—No. 22. OCTOBER, 1853. Annual Subscription, 2s. 6d. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
Can the Infallibility of the Church of Rome be proved from Ecclesiastical History and the early Fathers?—No. III.	109
Does the Worship of the Church of Rome answer the true ends of Devotion?	110
The Index Prohibitus and the Index Expurgatorius	110
Is the Protestant Bible a corrupt and mutilated translation of the Holy Scriptures?—No. VI.	111
Rev. Mr. Keogh and the Protestant Bible	112
The Church Visible and Invisible	113
The Talk of the Road—No. XVII.	113
How to answer the Catholic Layman: A pugilistic Editor:	114
Correspondence—	
What Councils are General and Infallible	116
The Index Expurgatorius and the Douay Bible	116
The Catholic Layman in Kilpatrick—No III.	117
Review—	
Meditations from St. Chrysostom, translated by Robert King, A.B.	117
Farming Operations for October	119

CAN THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH OF ROME BE PROVED FROM ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY AND THE WRITINGS OF THE EARLY FATHERS?

NO. III.

In our last number we showed that the passage (of Irenæus) on which Roman Catholic divines rely most in proof of the early recognition of the supremacy of the Roman See, does not justify the conclusion which they seek to derive from it; and we promised to adduce in support of our position the authority of Hippolytus, a scholar of Irenæus, and a suffragan bishop of the Roman Church in the beginning of the third century, and who must have been well acquainted with the sentiments of his master and with the general doctrine of the Church at that day.

This Hippolytus, whom the Church of Rome has canonized as a martyr, was Bishop of Portus Romanus, or the Harbour of Rome, at the northern mouth of the Tiber.* He was contemporary with Popes Zephyrinus and Callistus, and suffered martyrdom, in all probability, under Maximin, about A.D. 236.

He was the author of a work, entitled "Philosophumena; or, A Refutation of all Heresies" (Φιλοσοφούμενα ἢ κατὰ πασῶν αἱρέσεων ἔλεγχος). It consisted, when entire, of ten books; of those ten, the second, third, and the beginning of the fourth, do not appear to be now extant. The first has been known for a considerable time, and has hitherto been printed among the works of Origen, to whom it was erroneously attributed; the remaining books (from the fourth to the tenth) were discovered in MS., and brought with several others from the monasteries of Mount Athos, in the year 1842, and were published for the first time in 1851.† The editor, M. Miller, perceived that they were part of the same work of which the first book was already, as we have said, attributed to Origen; and he, accordingly, published them as Origen's. But the Chevalier Bunsen and other eminent scholars have since shown, by most convincing arguments, that the author was not Origen, but Hippolytus.

The importance of this discovery it is hardly possible to overrate. In the sixth and seventh books the author is often treading on the same ground as that traversed by Irenæus in his work on heresies, to whom he expressly acknowledges his obligations, and from whom he frequently transcribes, either verbatim or with some alterations. We have thus in some instances the original Greek of Irenæus restored to us, where we hitherto possessed only the Latin translation: so that the recovery of this work is, to some extent, a recovery of the lost text of Irenæus. But it is with the historical portion of the work—contained in the ninth and tenth books—that we are now chiefly concerned. Here we have a portion of ancient Church history unfolded to us with which, from the lack of materials, our acquaintance has been hitherto most imperfect, and which is of the greatest importance to us, from its relation to certain questions of Christian doctrine and Church discipline which are agitated at the present time.

Let it, then, be borne in mind that the author whose testimony we are about to cite was the scholar of the great Irenæus; one of the suffragan bishops of the Roman Church; one who passed his life at or in the vicinity of Rome; one who was honoured in his day, and has ever since been honoured as one of the leading teachers of the Church; one whom the Church of Rome herself now venerates as a martyr, and commemorates as a saint; one whose statue, discovered 300 years ago, has been received in the Vatican, and placed in the pontifical library, as a mark of honourable distinction.

The testimony of such a man with respect to the Bishop of Rome in those times, must be of the greatest value and interest. Did he look upon him as the supreme head of the universal Church, to whom it was his own duty, as well as that of all other Christians, implicitly to submit? Did he venerate him as the infallible Vicar of Christ? or does he give any intimation that the Bishops of Rome were so regarded by others, or even by themselves? Does he, in short, indicate in any way that claims to supremacy or infallibility were put forth in that age?

Now, in answer to these questions, we learn, from the ninth book, that two Bishops of Rome in succession—Zephyrinus and Callistus—fell into the Noetian heresy. Noetus did not acknowledge the Son of God to be the *Logos*, or Word, and he denied the distinct personality of the Son, affirming that the Son is the same as the Father, only under a different name. These two Roman bishops, at the very beginning of the third century, lapsed into heresy on a fundamental article of Christian faith. They strenuously maintained that heresy, and propagated *by their official authority as Bishops of Rome* a doctrine which the Church of Rome herself, with all other Churches of Christendom, now declare to be heretical.

Hence it follows that the Bishops of Rome, in the earliest times of which we have any extant records, erred in matters of faith, and *in their official capacity*. And, consequently, the infallibility of the Roman See is a doctrine opposed to the truth of history.

What we have just said of the heresy of these two early Popes is remarkable enough; but it is, perhaps, still more surprising to find them enrolled among the saints and martyrs in the public liturgy of the Roman Church. "What a shock," it has been well observed, "must such a discovery give to its faith! How can it place any confidence in the records of the Breviary, or join with heartiness in the prayers tendered there for its use? Thus superstition leads to scepticism, and pious frauds prepare the way for infidelity. And yet one of the so-called reforms for which the Church of Rome is now contending is to make all Churches surrender their own liturgies to the Roman Breviary!"

And if infallibility was not an attribute of the See of Rome in the age of Hippolytus, neither was its supremacy acknowledged. When Zephyrinus and Callistus fell into heresy, and endeavoured to disseminate their false doctrine, Hippolytus resisted them, without appearing to consider himself in the slightest degree bound to conform to them in their doctrine. On the contrary, he boldly stood forth and rebuked them; and thus has given a practical reply to the question which has been raised concerning the meaning of his master, Irenæus, in the passage quoted in our last number. Hippolytus never learnt from Irenæus that every Church and every Christian must conform to the doctrine of the Church of Rome, as such. Let, then, Roman Catholics no longer urge against us the authority of Irenæus. We have in the acts of his scholar, Hippolytus, a commentary upon his words, which speaks too plainly to be misunderstood.

Nor, again, does it appear from the narrative before us, that the Bishops of Rome themselves, in the early part of the third century, entertained any notion that they were supreme Heads of the Church, to whom all other Churches were bound to submit. For though Hippolytus was charged by Zephyrinus and Callistus with being a *Ditheist* (a believer in *two* Gods), because he would not confess with them that the Father and the Son are but one Divine Being, under two different names; yet we can discover no intimation that he was accused of heresy on the ground of resisting the Supreme Head of the Church, and rebelling against the Divine authority of Christ's Vicar upon earth.

We are all aware that, according to the *theory* of the Church of Rome, the official prerogatives of a Pope are quite independent of his moral character. The monster, Alexander VI., the ferocious warrior, Julian II., the voluptuary, Leo X., were, according to that theory, no less infallible than the most pious and virtuous successors of St. Peter. Still it may suggest some thoughts as to the soundness of the theory itself, if we consider for a moment the account given by Hippolytus of the earlier life and character of Pope Callistus,* above mentioned, who, it will be remembered, filled the apostolic chair in the early part of the third century.

Pope Callistus, then, was originally a servant of a certain Carpophorus, a Christian of the Emperor Commodus' household. His master set him up as a banker, intrusting to him a considerable sum of money. Many deposits were lodged in this bank by Christian brethren and widows, upon the strength of the high character which Carpophorus bore. But Callistus turned out a rogue, embezzled the money, became bankrupt, and ran away. Having made his way to the harbour (Portus), about twenty miles from Rome, he found a ship ready to start, and embarked. Carpophorus pursued the defaulter; but when Callistus saw him approaching the ship in a boat, he threw himself overboard, and, being with difficulty saved from drowning, was delivered up to his master, who brought him back to Rome, and confined him in the *pistrinum*, or domestic treadmill of the Romans. Some time after, certain good-natured persons came to Carpophorus, and begged him to release poor Callistus, who declared that there were outstanding debts due to him, which, if he were at liberty, he could recover. Carpophorus, like a pious man, said that he did not care for his own loss, but that he was anxious about the money of the poor depositors, and, therefore, he consented to set him free. All this was only a pretext on the part of Callistus to regain his liberty. But finding that he was watched, and could not again run away, and having nothing to give his creditors, he resolved upon self-destruction; and, with this view, he entered a synagogue of the Jews, on their Sabbath day, and raised a great uproar. The insulted Israelites did not kill him outright; but, after beating him to their satisfaction, dragged him to the Roman prefect. He sentenced the culprit to be scourged, and then transported him to the mines of Sardinia. Some time after, Marcia, a devout Roman lady, who had influence with the Emperor Commodus, being desirous of doing a good work, sent for Victor, who was then Bishop of Rome, and asked what Christians had been transported to Sardinia. He gave her a list, in which the name of Callistus did not appear, doubtless because the good bishop knew what sort of character he was. Marcia obtained the letter of pardon from the Emperor; whereupon the governor of the island liberated all the Christian prisoners, except poor Callistus. He wept and prayed so hard, however, that the royal messenger prevailed on the governor to release him. When he arrived at Rome, Victor was very much annoyed and perplexed; but, to avoid scandal, held his tongue, and sent him off to Antium, giving him a certain monthly allowance. Here he remained till Victor's death, when Zephyrinus, the successor of Victor, became his patron, and made him his coadjutor, to keep the clergy in order. All went on smoothly till the death of Zephyrinus, when the insolvent banker and quondam runaway slave succeeded to the vacant throne, and signalized his episcopacy by adopting, as we have seen, the Noetian heresy. Such are the antecedents of Pope Callistus, as detailed by Hippolytus in his newly discovered work.

We cannot conclude better than with the following words of the distinguished writer from whom we have derived much of the materials of this article:†—"Great reason have all persons, of whatever nation, for gratitude

* This is the opinion of the most celebrated ecclesiastical historians and divines of the Church of Rome—*e.g.*, Baronius and Bellarmine. Le Moyne's hypothesis, that the Portus Romanus, of which Hippolytus was bishop, was Aden, near the entrance of the Red Sea, is now generally abandoned as untenable.

† The first four books contained an account of the various systems of ancient philosophy—whence the title, "Philosophumena." The next five treat of the various heresies which had appeared in the Church from the apostolic age to Hippolytus's own time—whence the second title above given. The tenth book contains an epitome of the rest.

* Roman Catholic writers have, of course, attempted to deny the identity of Pope Callistus with Callistus the heretic, spoken of by Hippolytus; but of the fact of their identity there can be no reasonable doubt.—*Vid.* Wordsworth, Hippolytus, p 81, *sq.*

† Wordsworth, "Hippolytus," p. 219.

to the Almighty God, that he has thus watched over the work of his faithful soldier and servant, the blessed martyr, Hippolytus. We, of the Church of England, may recognise in this treatise a Catholic and Apostolic—yes, and a Roman—vindicator of our own Reformation. Here, a Roman bishop, saint, and martyr, supplies us with a defence of our own religious position with respect to Rome. In his 'Refutation of all Heresies' we see a practical refutation of that great heresy of our own day—the heresy which, either directly or indirectly, is at the root of many prevalent heresies—the heresy of Papal supremacy and Papal infallibility. Whenever, then, *we* are charged by Romish divines with heresy and schism for not acknowledging the Bishop of Rome as supreme head of the Church and infallible arbiter of the faith, we may henceforth refer them to the marble statue in the Vatican, and bid them consult the treatise of St. Hippolytus. Thankful, however, as *we* ought to be for this recent discovery, perhaps they who have cause to be most grateful are the clergy and laity of Rome. Truth is to be prized above all things, especially in matters of faith. Arguments from *adversaries*, real or supposed, and especially from contemporaneous adversaries, are often regarded with suspicion, and rejected with scorn; but here the members of the Church of Rome may read a treatise, written by one whose name they love and venerate, one who has no interests to serve, no passions to gratify—a Bishop, Doctor, Saint, and Martyr of their own Church. He speaks to them from the grave, and from primitive times. May it please the same merciful Providence, which has awakened the voice of Hippolytus from its silence of sixteen centuries, to bless its accents to their souls' health! May it be so blessed from on high, that it may promote the cause of Truth, and the Unity of the Church, and the Glory of Almighty God, now and for evermore

DOES THE WORSHIP OF THE CHURCH OF ROME ANSWER THE TRUE ENDS OF DEVOTION?

THE advocates of the Church of Rome appear to rely much on the assertion that they are a more *devout* people than those of any other religion; that their practices are more agreeable to the self-denial and mortification recommended in Scripture; that God is more constantly and reverently served among them than among Protestants; and that they take more pains, and are at more cost and trouble in the worship of God, which practically evidences a good, religious mind, and one which must be most secure of God's acceptance.

We doubt not that there are many earnest and conscientious Roman Catholics who sincerely believe that the religion of the heart is not to be found, except within the pale of the Church of Rome; and as our Lord Jesus Christ has himself laid down the criterion of his true followers to be—"By their *fruits* ye shall know them. Not every one who saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that *doeth* the will of my Father which is in heaven" (Matt. vii. 20, 21) we freely admit that there is no better test of the truth of any religion than its adaptation to produce the fruits of real virtue in those who cordially and consistently embrace it.

Without venturing to prejudge a matter of such vast practical importance, we would remark, that it is not always those who make the loudest profession of religion that are the most devout or consistent in either their feelings or their lives; and that it is one thing for a Church really to advance true devotion and piety to God, and another to appear to do so, by making a *great show* and *noise* about it. Sir Edwin Sandys, whose name has already been several times referred to in this journal, has observed, that "the Church of Rome has so contrived its rules and orders, as rather to comply with and fit every temper and inclination, good or bad, than to work any real good effect on any." This observation may seem severe; but whether it be justified by fact and experience we shall presently see when we have examined a little more minutely the frame and constitution of that Church, with a view to discerning whether it be really more fitted for the exciting of true devotion, and leading a good life, than that of the Church to which we belong, and which we believe to be the true Church of Christ and his Apostles.

Before we can apply the test supplied by our Blessed Lord, we must, however, understand what is the meaning of it—*what is* DOING *the will* of our Heavenly Father? Performing "good works," says the Church of Rome. We shall discuss this hereafter; but, for argument's sake, let it pass for the present, and let us first inquire what are the *good works*, the doing of which, it is said, will gain man entrance into the heavenly kingdom?

Most dispassionate men will, we think, agree in the definition that a good work is an action useful to others, inspired by an unselfish feeling. To make a work good, there must be a pure intention as well as a generous action. In judging of other men's actions we always look beyond the mere external conduct to the internal motive which led to it. Have we not always a natural inclination to search into the intentions of those whom we see acting around us? Every one will freely admit, that patriotism inspired by vanity or selfishness is not true patriotism; that devotedness based on ambition for power or personal aggrandizement, is not devotion; liberality instigated by a desire of praise and fame, is not charity.

There are everywhere Pharisees who make long prayers—to be seen of men; who invite to feasts—those who can invite them in return. Patriots who struggle for their country—only until they are in a position to sell and to betray it. Philosophers who worship knowledge—as the high road to the Temple of Fame. Warriors who magnanimously risk their lives—for a coronet or a kingdom. Philanthropists who erect posthumous hospitals—at the expense of their posterity. Alas! how few are there whose motives will bear a close investigation. Let each one study himself, and scrutinize a little into the secret springs of his best actions, and say whether the dismal truth be not the same still that our Blessed Lord proclaimed it to be in His time—"There is none that *doeth good;* no, not one!"

What are we, then, to think of the self-satisfaction of the thousands, who are trusting to their good works as a sure passport to heaven, but this, that such men take but a superficial view of their own conduct, and give little attention to the motives by which they are actuated, thinking only of the results they produce? What care ordinary men for the purity of the spring, so long as the stream, muddy or clean, fertilizes the land?"

And yet these *practical* men, as they would be deemed, are not without their show of reason. If the heart be always to be thus searched and analyzed, say they, no one will be sufficient to bear the examination—the best men will be discouraged, and found wanting—and, after all, is not the *work* the essential matter? What else has the world any concern in? Is it not the *work* that relieves the wretched? Whether the *intention* be holy or vain-glorious, the result is the same. In either case, are not the poor and sick relieved and society benefitted? Ought we not, therefore, to applaud the act, and care little for the intention? Thus society connives at setting up a new definition of goodness, and lowers the standard of virtue to include works springing from the impure fountain of vanity and ambition—as if good works, done to be seen of men, could delude God, who searcheth the heart, and in whose sight the very heavens are unclean! Is this *doing the will* of our Father who is in heaven?

The next step in the downward path of those who look to good works to save them, seems to us to be this—"The law of God strictly enjoins us to constant vigilance over *all* the acts of our lives—to watch and pray, lest we enter into temptation." We are not to kill, nor injure, nor revenge, nor steal, nor even covet. Surely, such strict vigilance over ourselves, in every act of our lives, is impracticable, and would render life intolerable! Among good works to be done, surely a choice may be made; one may take the place of another. He to whom prayers are irksome may make it up in alms-giving—each may thus accept what he does not dislike, and overlook what is not according to his taste. Thus is a flexible law substituted for the inflexible law of God, and *good works made more easy*. This is *practical* step the second in the downward path of those who look to good works for their salvation! Is this *doing* the will of our Father who is in heaven? or is it not rather doing our own will, who are of the earth—earthy?

We have still to trace the matter further. Having got rid of the trouble of scrutinizing our motives, and allowed ourselves to choose those duties and virtues which are most palatable or easy to us, we *still* have *good works to do*, or we cannot be saved by them; and as moral works, even when confined to the mere outward act, are burdensome, and not always easy to be performed, we begin to think that the pain they cause must be acceptable to God, and that the more toilsome they are the more meritorious they must be—*suffering* is, after all, the essential point. Do we love repose and home?—let us go on laborious pilgrimages. Do we enjoy the indulgences of a well-provided board?—let us mortify ourselves with fasts and abstinences. Bodily pain is repugnant—let us scourge our flesh with voluntary flagellations. Pity, however, that we are in all these matters outdone by the Pagans themselves. Roman Catholic devotees are far exceeded by the idolatrous Indians. The Fakirs, among the Buddists, will stand with their arms stretched out, till their limbs wither. A Roman Catholic devotee will perform his stations round a stone cross upon his knees; but Indian devotees will perform a pilgrimage from one end of Hindostan to the other, prostrating themselves, and measuring the road with the length of their own bodies. The Turkish fast of Ramadan far exceeds, in severity, the fast of Lent in Europe. Perhaps, you think it meritorious to wear hair-cloth next your skin, and use the scourge; but what is that to the worshippers of Juggernaut, who prostrate their bodies to be crushed under their idol's car, and run an iron hook through their ribs, and swing themselves in the air! Here are sufferings, mortifications—shall we say merits? How have these fanatics arrived at this, but by indulging the belief, that *physical pain* may be substituted for moral works, so as to purchase by suffering the liberty of indulging their passions? Man practically feeling the difficulty of doing works truly good, tries to compound with God by *substituting works of suffering!* This is practical step the third in the downward path of those who look to good works for their salvation. Is God a demon, taking a savage delight in the misery of his creatures? Is this *doing* the will of our Father who is in heaven?

Good works of this kind being somewhat too hard for ordinary *practical* men, means must next be found to mitigate them. Piety must be *made easy*, or it will soon be out of fashion. Is fasting too severe for you?—a dispensation is ready at hand, if you will only pay for it. Do you dislike abstinence?—you may purchase the privilege of eating meat. Is there any rule so strict in the Church of Rome that it may not be dispensed with, at convenience, for money? To repeat prayers and submit to other penances is irksome; but if you be rich, and a chapel or convent to be built, is there not a means of escape which *practical* men can easily avail themselves of, and thereby escape the *punishment* of long prayers? Alas! that prayers should ever have been made so spiritless as to be imposed as a *punishment*. What a sad view of Christianity! Man prays to God as a punishment—as a punishment he asks God to bless him, and this prayer, instead of a privilege, is made a burden, and Christian men are driven to the task of *counting* prayers by rosaries, as the Bedouin Arabs in Algeria, or the Muftis at Cairo, who repeat the name of God ten thousand times in an hour, and call that piety. Would it not be as useful to have a thousand rosaries wound off by a steam engine? Is this *doing* the will of our Father which is in Heaven, or is it a still lower step in the downward path of him who looks to his *good works* to bring him to Heaven?

One step more, and we have done. There are men who believe they may do their good works by proxy. There are Moslem pilgrims who go to Mecca for other Musselmen. Are there not priests here, too, who say masses for anybody who will pay for them? Does not the Church of Rome boast she has a treasury of the funded merits of the supererogatory good works of the saints, which she will dispense at a small cost to those who need indulgences to make up for their own deficiencies? What is this but *good works done by proxy?* Alas! is *this* the way to attain Heaven, by *doing* the will of our Father who is in Heaven? and can any better proof be wanting that it is actually the truth, and that *practical* men feel it to be so, that by *their own good works* they cannot merit heaven or earn salvation?

Do we, then, wish to discountenance good works, or wish such good works to be deemed useless or impracticable? Our readers shall judge in our next; and in the meantime we would earnestly recommend to them the able tracts of Napoleon Roussel, to which we are largely indebted for many of the ideas we have here brought before our readers, and which are full of materials for thought worthy the attention of Irishmen at the present crisis.

THE INDEX PROHIBITUS AND THE INDEX EXPURGATORIUS.

A QUESTION often arises, how far it is just or fair to take books written by individual members of a Church, as proof of the real doctrine and teaching of that Church.

For instance, if we were to produce any very extravagant doctrine from a Roman Catholic writer, and to say that this was the doctrine of the Church of Rome, we would at once be told that this was unfair; that the doctrine in question was only the doctrine of that individual, and not the doctrine of the Church.

We admit that this argument is a very fair one, in a general view; for no man is bound to believe everything that every other person in the same Church with him may choose to believe.

But other circumstances may sometimes make a Church very deeply responsible for what its writers print and publish; and may make it much more difficult for individual members of that Church to free themselves from being involved in the errors published by others.

If individual members say that their Church infallibly provides for universal agreement in doctrine among the teachers and doctors of their Church, then it is not so easy for them to reply that what those teachers and doctors print and publish is only their own opinions and errors, and not the doctrine of their Church.

And if we find a general consent and agreement among a great number of the doctors of that Church, in propagating a particular opinion, then it is still harder to say that it is not the doctrine of that Church.

For instance, in the question about worshipping of images, if we were to quote Azorius, saying—"The image is to be worshipped with the same honour and worship with which we worship those whose image it is,"* and were to say that this is the doctrine of the Church of Rome, we should, of course, be told that we were arguing unfairly; that this was only the opinion of that individual doctor, and that it is not the doctrine of the Church of Rome, and that Roman Catholics do not believe in it.

Now, while we admit that one man is not to be charged with the error of another, if he really does not hold it himself, we are at least entitled to say that the Church of Rome does not succeed in preventing her most famous doctors and teachers falling into most grievous and sinful errors.

And when we show that Azorius himself says of that very doctrine (in the place above referred to)—"*This is the constant sentence of the divines;*" and when we further show that the great St. Thomas, Alexander of Ales, Bonaventure, Albertus, Richardus, Caprcolus, Cajetan, Coster, Valentia, Vasquez, and many others of the greatest authority in the Church of Rome, say the same thing, it certainly becomes much harder to clear the Church of Rome of approving of this doctrine.

But when we come further to consider the laws and in-

* Instit. Moral., par. i., l. 9, c. 6.

stitutions of the Church of Rome, her responsibility for what her authors and doctors print and publish appears to be much greater still.

Alone of all the Churches of the world, the Church of Rome undertakes to examine and decide on the merit of all books in respect of faith and morals, before she permits them to be printed and read. She undertakes not only to forbid the printing and reading of all that are bad, but she undertakes also to correct and amend all that require to be corrected, and then to give them forth with her authority and sanction, as containing nothing injurious to faith or morals.

And when we further find that she has provided tribunals over all the world to accomplish this great work, and that those tribunals are at this day actually at work in performing this task, we do not see how it is possible any longer to maintain that the Church of Rome is not responsible for the doctrines contained in the books which she thus sanctions and approves.

Our readers will see that we have been led to this subject by the letter of Mr. Brian, of Kerry, that appeared in our number for August. Our intention is now to give an historical account of the laws and tribunals of the Church of Rome about THE INDEX; and we shall afterwards go on to show what these tribunals have approved, and what they have condemned; and thus it will appear for what opinions and doctrines the Church of Rome is really responsible.

We find no general law of the Church of Rome concerning the publishing, approbation, or prohibition of books previous to the year 1515. At the fifth Council of Lateran, held in that year, under Pope Leo X., session x. (which is now counted a General Council in the Church of Rome), we find the first decree on the subject.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. xiv., p. 257. This decree mentions the late invention of printing books as the reason for this new step. The decree goes on to declare, that—"For all future times, no one should presume to print, or cause to be printed, any book or other writing, as well in our city (Rome) as in any other state or diocese, unless first diligently examined and approved by subscription under their hands, in the city (Rome), by our Vicar and the Master of our Sacred Palace; but in other states and dioceses by the Bishop, or some other qualified person deputed by him, and by the inquisitor of heretical wickedness, or of the diocese." And the decree goes on to denounce penalties against all who disobey—such as the forfeiture and burning of the books, a heavy fine upon the workmen, excommunication, the penalties of contumacy (no joke in those times), and, lastly, "the indignation of Almighty God, and of his blessed Apostles, Peter and Paul," which the Pope, no doubt, thought he had power to excite against whatever poor printer he pleased.*

This, we believe, was the first law made by the Church of Rome on the subject; but it was not the beginning of the "INDEX," for no LIST was then published of books which were "prohibited," and nothing was said about books to be corrected.

Forty-four years afterwards the first list was published, according to Van Espen (Jus Ecclesiasticum, vol. i., p. 234. Ed. Louvain and Brussels, 1700) in the year 1559, drawn up by the Inquisition at Rome, and sanctioned by the authority of Pope Paul IV. It consisted of three classes—

I. Of those writers, all whose works, upon whatever subject, although not connected with religion, are wholly forbidden; among whom (says Van Espen) the names of some Catholic writers are found.

II. Single works condemned, of writers whose other works are not forbidden.

III. Certain anonymous writings, with all writings published anonymously before the year 1519, to which are added a catalogue of sixty printers, all books published by whom, whatever the author or whatever the language, are forbidden.

It might be Chrysostom, or it might be St. Augustine; but it then became sin to read their writings, if printed by some poor printer that the Pope wished to ruin!

What is important here to be observed, concerning that decree, is this—that, by this decree, not only every bishop was hereby made an officer of the Church of Rome, to determine what books might be suppressed and what prohibited in their diocese, but every chief officer of that dread tribunal, THE INQUISITION, which so long deluged Europe with Christian blood, in every state or diocese in which that office was established. This authority, thus given to them, will be important when we come to consider the proceedings of the Inquisition in this respect.

The next step was taken at the Council of Trent. A committee was appointed (session 18) to consider how the system could be made most effectual. This committee was to report to the council; but as the council came to an end before it had considered the proceedings of the committee, a decree was passed at its last session (25th)—"that whatever was passed by them should be submitted to the Most Holy Roman Pontiff, that it should be concluded and published by his judgment and authority."

In consequence, the TEN RULES OF THE INDEX, together with a corrected list of prohibited books, was submitted to the Pope, and authorized by him. These rules are printed at the end of the Council of Trent, and have since been followed as the laws of the INDEX.

Rule IV. says, that the reading of the Bible by all persons in general does more harm than good; and forbids any one to read the Bible, even in a Catholic translation, without a licence, in writing, from the bishop or inquisitor. Those who read the Bible without this license are declared incapable of receiving absolution for sin until they give up their Bibles. Monks are forbidden to read or to purchase a Bible without a licence from the prelate of the order.

We may observe, by the way, that the title of these rules is, "Regulæ Decem de Libris Prohibitis"—that is, "Ten Rules about Prohibited Books;" and one of these ten, as we have seen, is about the Bible itself.

Rules V., VI., and VIII., provide for correcting and amending books before they are printed; and rule V. provides even for correcting the table of contents and index of a book. We will show afterwards how this power has been used.

Rule VII. forbids all books "which treat of filthy and obscene subjects . . . . except ancient books, written by heathens, *which are permitted for the sake of the elegance and fitness of the language!*"

Rule X. confirms the law passed at the Lateran Council, which we have given above, both as to the persons who were to examine and approve, and as to the penalties. It gives power to bishops and inquisitors-general to condemn and prohibit even the books permitted by these rules themselves! And the names of all books expurgated or amended are to be sent to the notary of the Sacred Universal Inquisition at Rome, and the approbation of the authorized person is to be printed in the beginning of every book.

The Bull of Pope Pius IV., confirming the INDEX then made, with these TEN RULES prefixed to it, may be seen at the end of the proceedings of the Council of Trent. It is dated March 24, 1564.

Another great tribunal was created for the same purpose, of forbidding, correcting, and approving of books, by a Bull of Sixtus V., in the year 1588. This is called, "The Congregation of the Index." This tribunal consists of a certain number of the cardinals, chosen by the Pope. It has a secretary, and a number of officers called "Consultors," chosen from the religious orders. The duty of these officers is to examine the books given to them, and to report on them. But the decision rests with the cardinals only. This tribunal has not superseded the others; bishops, inquisitors, &c., all have the same powers that they had before in their several districts; but this tribunal has power over all the world.—Van Espen, vol. i., p. 238, &c.

This tribunal is in full operation. Its decrees may be seen, from time to time, in the *Tablet*, and other newspapers. We copy the following from the *Tablet*, published on the 20th of August:—

"DECREE.

"*Thursday*, 21*st day of July*, 1853.

"The Sacred Congregation of the Most Eminent and Reverend Lords Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, by OUR MOST HOLY LORD, POPE PIUS IX., and the Holy Apostolical See, set over and delegated to the Index of Books of unsound doctrine, and to the proscription, expurgation, and permission of the same in the Universal Christian Republic, held in the Apostolical Quirinal Palace, hath condemned and doth condemn, hath proscribed and doth proscribe, or having elsewhere condemned and proscribed, hath commanded and doth command to be placed on the index of prohibited books, the following works—

[Here follow the names of four books lately published.]

"Therefore, let no one, of what degree or condition soever, presume in future either to publish, or, being published, to vend or retain, in any place, or in any language whatever, the aforesaid condemned and proscribed works; but let them be bound to deliver them to the ordinaries of the places, or to the inquisitors of heretical pravity,* under the penalties enacted in the Index of Prohibited Books.†

"Which being reported to OUR MOST HOLY LORD POPE PIUS IX., by me, the undersigned secretary of the Sacred Congregation, his HOLINESS approved of the decree, and commanded it to be promulgated. In testimony whereof, &c., &c.,

"JEROME CARD DE ANDREA,
"Prefect, Loco ✠ Sigilli.
"F. A. V. MODENA,
"Or. Pr. S. Sad. Congr. a Ser."

Now look at the whole of this vast system.

The Pope's Vicar-general, and the master of his palace have power to prohibit, amend, and sanction, all books printed in the Roman States.

Every bishop has authority to prohibit, amend, and sanction all books printed in his diocese.

Every inquisitor has the same authority in his province or district.

Their lists are to be returned to the Inquisition at Rome.

The CONGREGATION OF THE INDEX has a general power of doing the same "in the Universal Christian Republic."

We are not now inquiring whether it be right that any Church should assume to itself powers so vast, or whether it be possible that such powers can actually be exercised for the real good of religion and knowledge. We are only showing that this vast system is really in existence, and in actual operation in the Church of Rome, for more than 300 years past; in order that all may consider whether the doctrines which, in those 300 years, have never been condemned nor corrected, but always sanctioned and approved by her tribunals, are not fairly and justly to be charged upon the Church of Rome; and whether she be not really hostile to those doctrines which have been expurgated and erased out of books, as the condition of obtaining her sanction and approval and her permission that those books should be published and read.

We propose, in our next number, to show what those tribunals of the Church of Rome have done; what doctrines they have sanctioned, and what they have condemned; and we expect that our readers will look with interest for what is to follow.

✦

IS THE PROTESTANT BIBLE A CORRUPT AND MUTILATED TRANSLATION OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES?

NO. VI.

WE conclude our comparison of the Douay and Protestant Bibles, with the most important difference between them. There are seven books—Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, and first and second books of Maccabees—about which the two Bibles are at issue. The Council of Trent (decree, ses. 4) pronounces these books "of equal authority with the other books of Scripture," for proving doctrines and reforming morals; and pronounces anathema, or a curse, against all who do not receive them as canonical Scripture. The Church of England and Ireland declares that these books are not canonical, nor to be used for establishing any doctrine.

The question comes to this—were these books written by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, as the unquestionable books of Scripture were?

If these books *were* written by inspiration, then the Church of England and Ireland has mutilated the Bible by leaving out those books. If those books were *not* written by inspiration, then the Church of Rome has corrupted the Bible by putting in those books. We repeat that the question is, "did the authors of those books write them by Divine inspiration?" It must be clear that if the books were not written by inspiration at first, they could never come to be inspired afterwards; either these books were the Word of God *from the first*, or they are the word of man *now*. This, truly, is a question well worthy of being examined.

And how are we to examine it? By what evidence are we to decide?

We observe that all the books in dispute are books professing to belong to the Old Testament. Those books profess to have been written, and it is admitted that they were written before the birth of our Saviour.* If those books were then inspired, they were part of the Jewish Scriptures, and the Jews were bound to receive them as such: here, then, we have to inquire "did the Jews acknowledge these books as part of their Scripture? and if they did not, did our Saviour or his apostles reprove or correct the Jews for not receiving those books as Scripture?" This is a question that should certainly be inquired into. If the Jews did receive those books as Scripture, and if our Lord never reproved them for so doing, then we may be sure that those books were really Scripture, and that we ought to count them Scripture now. If, on the contrary, we find it to be certain that the Jews in our Saviour's time did not count these books as Scripture, and that our Saviour never reproved or corrected them for rejecting those books, then we may be equally sure that our Lord did not think that those books were Scripture. And, besides this, we may fairly inquire, "were those books looked on as inspired Scripture in the churches which the apostles founded;" we may be sure that the apostles took care that the churches should be furnished with correct copies of the Old Testament, and that the copies read in the Church in the earliest times were the right copies; and we should, therefore, inquire whether those seven books were acknowledged in the early Church as canonical Scripture.

Our readers will like to know how the facts really stood: and it may be satisfactory to them that we should give them the answer out of Roman Catholic writers of the greatest learning and character. We quote first from Du Pin, a learned doctor of the great Roman Catholic University of the Sorbonne, in Paris. His "History of Ecclesiastical Writers," which was examined and approved by that university, contains a dissertation on these books.—Vol. I., Preliminary Dissertation, sec. 2.

First, he quotes Josephus, a very learned Jewish historian, who lived about our Saviour's time, and who wrote a full history of the Jews, and he gives Josephus's account as follows:—. . . "We only receive and approve of

---

* This law did not pass without opposition. It was opposed in the Council by Alexius, Bishop of Melitanus, who said he was willing to consent as to books published afterwards, but not as to ancient books. Labbe et Coss. vol. xiv., p. 238. When we come to see how some of the Fathers have been dealt with, we may think that Alexius was a far-seeing man.

* We recommend this to the consideration of those who suppose that THE INQUISITION is not now in existence or operation.

† It is said by Van Espen, vol. i., p. 236, xix., that these words refer to the ten rules above mentioned.

* This is admitted of all these books except, perhaps, Wisdom. Some think this book was written by Philo the Jew, who lived about the time of our Saviour.

those prophets who wrote many years ago, according to the pure truth, by the inspiration of the Spirit of God. . . . . : We have only twenty-two books" (Josephus gives the list by which it appears that the seven books now in dispute were not in the list of twenty-two books, which agreed exactly with the Protestant Bible now.)

Du Pin goes on thus.—"Origen, St. Jerome, the author of the abridgment attributed to St. Athanasius, St. Ephiphanius, and several other Christian writers, do testify, that the Jews received but twenty-two books into the canon of their holy volumes."

Again—"The ancient Christians have followed the Jewish canon* in the books of the Old Testament. There are none quoted in the New Testament *but those that were received* into the canon of the Jews, and the greatest part of these are frequently cited there. The first catalogue of the canonical books made by the ecclesiastical Greek and Latin authors comprehend no more."

Again†—"The first catalogue we find of the books of Scripture among the Christians is that of Melito, Bishop of Sardis (2nd), set down by Eusebius in the fourth book of his history, ch. 26. It is entirely conformable to that of the Jews. . . . Origen (3rd), also, in a certain passage drawn out of the exposition of the first Psalm, reckons twenty-two books of the Old Testament. . . . . The Council of Laodicea (4th), which was the first synod that determined the number of the canonical books; St. Cyril, of Jerusalem (4th), in his fourth catechetic lecture;‡ St. Hilary (4th), in his preface to the Psalms; the last Canon, falsely ascribed to the Apostles (3rd); Amphilochius (4th), cited by Balsamon; Anastasius Sinaita (6th), upon the Hexameron, lib. 7; St. John Damascene (7th), in his fourth book of orthodox faith; the author of the abridgment of Scripture, and of the festival letter attributed to Athanasius; the author of the book *of the hierarchy*, attributed to St. Dionysius; and the Nicephori; follow the catalogue of Melito. Gregory Nazianzen (4th), is of the same opinion."

He then mentions several others who reckon twenty-four books, which he says St. Jerome accounts for by showing that they reckoned Ruth and Lamentations as separate books; whereas the Jews, in counting twenty-two, included Ruth in Judges, and Lamentations in Jeremiah; so that, in fact, there was no real difference between the list of twenty-two and the list of twenty-four.

Here, then, we see the proofs set down, by a learned, candid, honest, Roman Catholic doctor; and let us remember what is thus proved.

1st. The Jews did *not* count these seven books inspired Scripture.

2nd. The inspired writers of the New Testament did *not* quote these seven books; and we know that our Saviour never reproved the Jews for rejecting a part of Scripture, which, no doubt, he would have done if they had deserved it.

3rd. The ancient Christians did *not* count these books among the inspired Scriptures, seeing that twenty ancient writers and Fathers, who have left us lists, all agree in giving the list as it now stands in the Protestant Bible.

4th. The first Council that settled the list, gave the list of twenty-two books only.

All this Du Pin has candidly proved on the one side. Let us now see what he has to say on the other side.

"The *first* catalogue of the books of the Holy Scriptures, where they added some books to the Jewish canon, is that of the third Council of Carthage, held in the year 397, when the books of Judith, Tobit, the Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus, and the two Books of the Maccabees, were reckoned in the number of the canonical books. . . . . This catalogue of canonical books is confirmed by the authority of Pope Innocent I.§ in an epistle to Exuperius, and by that of a Roman Council, held under Gelasius, in the year 494, and is followed in the decree of Eugenius to the Armenians (15th century), and by the Holy Council of Trent. *All these catalogues* serve to acquaint us in general what were the books that were always believed to be certainly canonical, and which they are whose authority have been questioned by antiquity; but, nevertheless, we ought to speak of them particularly, for although they were not received in the first ages by all churches, nor reckoned by all authors in the canon of the books of the Bible, yet they were frequently cited by the ancients, and sometimes, too, as books of Scripture, and for this reason were afterwards admitted into the canon along with the first."

Here it is to be observed, that the learned Du Pin does not mention a single Father as having *left us a list* of the books of Scripture as the Douay Bible has them now. All he can say is, that some of the ancient writers have sometimes quoted one or more of those books, "*sometimes*, too, as books of Scripture;" which is certainly true. *But no Father has left us a list including these books.* ALL who have *left a list* give us the list of the Jews, in which the seven books were not.

Du Pin then goes on to examine each book of the seven by itself, giving us such comments as these—"The Book of Tobit (one of those now in the Douay Bible) is rejected in all the ancient catalogues of the books of the Bible, and not received into the number of the canonical books." "The Book of Judith is not only rejected in all the ancient catalogues of the canonical books, but it is also scarcely mentioned by the ancients," &c., &c. He gives the names of the Fathers and ancient writers who have quoted each of the seven books; and, with great candour, gives us this useful caution, "but it does not follow that all those (who quoted them) acknowledged them for canonical."*

We think it may fairly be said that this evidence in favour of these seven books is reduced almost entirely to the lists given by the Council of Carthage, in the year 397, and the Council under Gelasius, in the year 494. These are the only *lists* that have come down to us from the ancient Church, that include the seven books in the canon of Scripture.

We will examine these two Councils presently. It will be more convenient to consider first another Roman Catholic writer, of no less learning and ability—viz., Father Calmet, the learned commentator on the Scripture.

In his preface to the Book of Wisdom, one of the seven, he says:—"The Book of Wisdom was not always received by the Church as canonical, as not being admitted into the Jewish canon of Scripture." He thus tries to get over this and other objections:—"To the scruples of those who seeing antiquity wavering upon this point, have found some difficulty to persuade themselves to admit this book into the canon, we oppose the third Council of Carthage, in 397; that of Sardica, in 347; that of Constantinople, in Trullo, in 692; the eleventh of Toledo, in 675; that of Florence, in 1438, and, lastly, the fourth Session of the Council of Trent; all which expressly admitted this book into the class of Holy Scripture."

It may surprise our readers to see how many councils he refers to, where Du Pin only brought forward two besides that of Trent. The reason was, that Calmet, though very learned in other things, knew very little about the councils, while Du Pin knew them well. It often happens that men, only a little acquainted with a subject, will bring forward proofs that a man more learned will not bring forward. So it is here. The canons of the Council of Sardica are manifestly forged; and, even as they stand, they contain no list of the books of Scripture. The Council of Toledo was a little assembly of only 17 bishops, in Spain; the proof from it is only this—"If we attend to that which the Holy Scriptures says of wisdom, 'it is the splendour of eternal light,'" which words are found in the Book of Wisdom. If the other councils, as we shall show, are worth nothing, seventeen bishops, 700 years after Christ, cannot render a book inspired. The Council in Trullo is declared by Labbe and Cossart to be wholly condemned by the Popes (vol. vi., p. 1316)—an awkward authority for a Roman Catholic to bring forward. This Council did nothing but confirm the canons of the Council of Carthage, held in 397. What that was worth, we shall see presently.

The Council of Florence (15th century) said nothing at all about the books of Scripture; Calmet must have been imposed on by a forged decree, pretended to have been passed by it.

There remains of his list, only the Council of Carthage to be considered.

This Council, though not general, is of great authority. But this list of canonical books was evidently not put in by the Council itself, but by some forger in later times. This is quite plain; for the Council was held in the year 397, Cæsarius and Atticus being consuls, as the council itself relates, and yet the canon which contains the list of canonical books refers to Pope Boniface, who was not Pope until 418, or twenty years after!—(See the list of Popes in Labbe and Coss. Con. Gen. vol. xvi., p. 130.) So it is clear this list was made and put in by some one who lived so long after the council, that he had forgotten who was Pope at the time it was held.

There is further proof that this list is forged. The Council of Constantinople, in Trullo, 692, confirmed the canons of this Council of Carthage; but it also confirmed the canons of the Councils of Laodicea, which rejected the apocryphal books.—(Labbe and Coss. vol. vi., p. 1140, can. 2.)

Did those 211 bishops in Trullo mean to confirm *both* the list as it is in the Protestant Bible and, *also* as it is in the Douay Bible? That is not very likely; but if there was no list in the Council of Carthage, then those 211 bishops confirmed only the Protestant list in the Council of Laodicea.

This disposes of one of the chief authorities brought forward by Du Pin. His only other one was the council said to have been held by Gelasius, at Rome, in the year 494 (Labbe and Coss. vol. iv., p. 1260.) This council is a manifest forgery, wholly unworthy of credit. It rests altogether on the authority of Isidore Mercator, who lived in the 9th century, and who is now acknowledged by all Roman Catholics of learning to have been the most impudent and audacious forger that the world has ever seen. No writer before his time has mentioned this council or list of Gelasius. There are no authentic records that can be relied on. Some say it was held by Pope Damasus, some by Pope Gelasius, some by Hormisdas. The copies differ so much, that the Roman cardinals, appointed by the Pope to correct the Decretum of Gratian, when they came to a passage quoted from this council, had to say—"it cannot be known which is the pure and true reading."—Note of the Correctors on Dist. xv., c. 3.

This council contains long passages, word for word the same with the decretal epistle of Pope Anacletus, which it is now confessed that this Isidore forged along with about sixty other epistles from the early Popes.—(Compare with Decret. Dist. xxii., c. 2.) This council contains a list of the Patriarchal sees, also exactly agreeing with that forged epistle, making Alexandria the second; which list is directly opposed to the second General Council (Labbe and Coss. vol. ii., p. 948, can. 3), and is not found in any genuine writing of antiquity. The whole thing rests on the credit of that infamous forger. It is enough to have the canon law filled with his forgeries, as we shall show some day that it is; why should we have him corrupting our Bibles too?

Richter, the learned editor of the Canon Law, says of this council—"They are not wanting who consider the whole apocryphal." And well they may, when it is traced to Isidore.—Leipsic Ed., 1839, vol. i., p. 31.

And, after all, it is more than doubtful whether Isidore ever put any list of the canonical books into this council at all. One of the oldest copies in existence (that in the Pope's own library), gives the council without any list of the books of Scripture in it.—Berhard in Canones Gratiani, vol. ii., p. 316. So it would seem the list was put in by some later forger, in still later times!

And now we may see the reason of what Du Pin says about those lists of Gelasius and Carthage—"These definitions have *not* been followed by all authors and all Churches, until it was at last entirely determined by the Council of Trent." And Calmet says, in that preface to the Book of Wisdom mentioned above—"Some *late interpreters*, as Lyranus and Cajetan (the cardinal), did not admit it as indisputably canonical."

What! the great question, so all-important to the Church, "What books are really the Word of God to man," not settled in the Church, for 1500 years after Christ!

What could account for this? Hear Father Calmet—"The Church, always cautious and wary in her decisions, did not decree to admit them for canonical till after mature judgment, and long deliberation!" . . . . "Each Church kept to its own tradition, to admit or not to admit books, till the truth was at length discovered!" A plausible reason for the books of the *New* Testament not being immediately known to all Churches; and yet that list was very early settled. But from whom had the various churches the tradition of the Books of the *Old* Testament? Was it from the Apostles? If not, from whom has the Church of Rome that tradition now? If it were, how came those traditions to differ?

But we have shown that this tradition in the early Church was always one. We have shown from Du Pin, himself a Roman Catholic—1st, That the Jews acknowledged but two-and-twenty books; 2nd, That the Apostles quoted no book as Scripture but what was in that list; 3rd, That every list that has come down to us, except two (that of Gelasius and Carthage), counts only those same books; and we have shown strong reason to believe that those two lists are forgeries!

The fact now stands out, that there never was in the Christian Church any genuine list of Holy Scripture, which included those seven books now in the Douay Bible, until the Council of Trent drew up that list in 1546!

And then that council solemnly cursed all who reject those seven books! Cursed St. Jerome, cursed St. Cyril, cursed St. Epiphanius, and all that host of Fathers who admitted only the Jewish list! Cursed, in fact, the whole ancient Church of God!

Look at the Douay Bible now, with its seven books, based upon forgery and fraud, and established by cursing the Church of God; compare it with that Bible which still holds to the sacred list of the early Church, and say which Bible has been most faithful in preserving the Word of God pure and unmixed.

WE have seen in the *Tablet* newspaper, of September 24, a report of what took place in the Revision Court of the City of Dublin on the 20th.

It appears that the Rev. Mr. Keogh, of St. Michael and St. John's Chapel, in the City of Dublin, appeared in court in support of a claim to have the chapel-house registered. When about to give his evidence, Mr. Keogh, "declined to be sworn on the Protestant Testament." Mr. Keogh stated, "that if he took the oath on that version, the act against his own conscience, formed as it was

---

* *Canon* means the *rule* or list of the books.

† We add to the name of each author here mentioned the number of the century in which he lived, as far as it can be ascertained.

‡ As a specimen of the testimony of these Fathers, we give the following from the place referred to in St. Cyril of Jerusalem. We choose him because he was Bishop of Jerusalem, and there, at least, we may expect that the true tradition of the Old Testament books, as approved by the Apostles, would be handed down in the Church. "Learn also diligently, *and from the Church*, which are the books of the Old Testament, and which of the New: and read not I pray any of the apocryphal books." . . . "Read the TWO-AND-TWENTY books of these Scriptures; and have nothing to do with the apocryphal books. Those only study earnestly which we read confidently, even in church. Far wiser than thou, and more devout, were THE APOSTLES and the ancient Bishops, the rulers of the Church, WHO HAVE HANDED DOWN THESE. Thou, therefore, who are a child of the Church, *trench not on their sanctions.* And of the Old Testament, as hath been said, study *the two-and-twenty books*; and then, if thou art diligent, strive to remember by name as I repeat them." And then he gives the list of the books.

§ This Pope lived *before* Pope Boniface. There was another Pope, Zozimus, between them. Now we shall see that the list now in the Council of Carthage was not made until during or after the time of Pope Boniface, and it is not easy to see how Innocent could have confirmed it before it was made. We strongly suspect that this epistle of Innocent is a forgery. It is now confessed by all learned Roman Catholics, that the greater number of the epistles that pass under the names of the early Popes were forged by Isidore Mercator, and we hope to show in a future number, that this letter is no better than the rest.

* It may be mentioned that there is more countenance, in early times, for the Book of Baruch than for any other. But the testimony of St. Jerome is conclusive against it.

at present, would be so base that he might deservedly be deemed unworthy of credit."

In a case of the same kind which lately occurred at Carlow, it appeared that all Roman Catholics do not think as Mr. Keogh does. In that case it was stated, that two Roman Catholic bishops had lately taken their oaths on the very book thus refused by the witness, and that these bishops made no objection at all to it; and the barrister, himself a Roman Catholic, stated that he had carefully compared the two Bibles, and that he saw no reason at all why Roman Catholics should object to be sworn on the Protestant Bible.

For ourselves, we have no wish at all that Roman Catholics should be forced to swear on the Protestant Bible. Notwithstanding the serious errors we have shown in the Douay Bible, we still count it to be the Word of God, although perverted in some places, and dishonoured by the addition of what is not the Word of God. As friends of civil and religious liberty, we are quite willing that Roman Catholics should be allowed to swear on their own Bible, just as Jews are allowed to swear on the Old Testament.

But we think that, on so solemn and important a question, those who come forward, as Mr. Keogh has done, to say, in public court, that it is a base act to swear on the Protestant Bible, may fairly be asked to give the proof of what they say. And if they be Christian men, who have a care for the souls and consciences of others, as well as for their own, we think they ought to be ready and willing to come forward and give the reasons of what they say. We, therefore, invite Mr. Keogh, in a kind and friendly spirit, to come forward and discuss in our pages the respective merits of the Douay and Protestant Bibles. We will send him a copy of this number, and of all the numbers in which our articles on the two Bibles have appeared, and we invite him to come forward and correct anything in what we have said, which he may think that he is able to correct. He may rest assured that he will meet with perfect courtesy and fairness from us, and we trust he will come forward in a manly and straightforward way, and state his objections to the Protestant Bible.

THE CHURCH VISIBLE AND INVISIBLE.

We have been asked our meaning, in speaking of the "Visible Church of Christ," as we did in our last number; is there a visible Church of Christ and also an invisible Church? Has Christ two Churches?

We know of but one Church—the Church of Christ. But though we see that Church, in a manner, in the midst of this world, we see her not as God sees. When we try to think and to believe of that Church as she is in herself, as she appears to his all-seeing eye, we are forced to call the Church *invisible*, because *we* cannot see her as he sees. But he has provided means by which we may see her so as is fitting now for mortal eyes, for those who are to walk by faith, and not by sight; and in respect of these means of seeing her, we call her the visible Church of Christ.

We cannot give up this two-fold way of speaking of the one Church of Christ, because we know the truth of that saying of Hooker's—"For lack of diligent observing the difference, first between the Church of God mystical (that is, *invisible*), and *visible*: then between the visible, sound, and corrupted—sometimes more, sometimes less—the oversights are neither few nor light that have been committed."—Book iii., ch. 1.

The Church of Christ is *one*, from his first coming to his coming again. Those now with Christ, those still on earth, and those who are yet to be born, are one Church to him. But our present question is about that part now on earth. *Who* constitute the Church of Christ on earth, as seen by him, who seeth all things as they truly are?

First, mark the description of that Church, as given by his Spirit. We have a reason for choosing the following passages:—"Thou art all fair, O my love, and there is not a spot in thee" (Canticle, or Song of Solomon, iv. 7); "My spouse is a garden enclosed, a spring shut up, a fountain sealed; thy plants are a paradise of pomegranates"* (verses 12 and 13); "Christ also loved the Church, and delivered himself up for it; that he might sanctify it, cleansing it by the laver of water in the word of life, that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish."—Ephs. v. 25, 26, 27. These passages are selected for this purpose, not by us, but by St. Augustine.

The question is, of whom is *this* Church really and truly composed? and we turn to St. Augustine for the answer, and he answers thus:—"That number of the just, who are called, according to his purpose, of whom it is said 'The Lord knoweth them that are his; THAT is the garden enclosed, the fountain sealed, the well of living water, the paradise with the fruit of pomegranates."—Contr. Don. lib. 5, c. 27. And, again, "neither do they belong to the Church who *appear* to be within, and live contrary to Christ—that is, do contrary to the commands of Christ; nor are they to be judged to belong at all to that Church which he cleansed by the laver of water in the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing."—Lib. 4, c. 1.

* This was one of the best fruits growing in that country.

It is evident that this must be so. Wicked Popes,* wicked bishops, wicked priests, wicked laymen, are spots in the Church. Of these St. Jude says—"These are spots in your feasts of charity, when they feast with you."—Ep. verse 12. They can be no part of that Church which has no spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing. This, then, is God's view of the Church; he sees it thus: to him it is without spot or wrinkle. This Church is the spouse and the body of Christ; every member of this Church has a living union with Christ and with each other. The Spirit of Christ, proceeding from him, and dwelling in them, is that bond of union. But this inward bond of union, however real in itself (and nothing is more real), is not visible to us, and, therefore, in this respect, we call Christ's Church *invisible*.

Christ might have done no more than unite a multitude of individuals to himself by his own Spirit dwelling in each; and this would have been a real Body of Christ, known to Him; but to mortal eyes it would have been *only an invisible Church*.

But Christ has also formed those who believe in him into a visible society or fellowship, bound together by visible signs, and uniting in an outward profession of his faith. This is that "fellowship of the Apostles" in which all were required to join who believed in Christ.—Acts ii. 41, 42. And Christ has furnished this visible society which he instituted, with visible institutions, with orders of ministers, appointed and commissioned by him; for, "when he ascended upon high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. . . . . He gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers" (Ephes. iv. 8 and 11). Not all these gifts to all men, but some to all; for these are abiding gifts till the Body of Christ, that is, his true and living Church, shall come to perfection (verse 13.)

And for this unity of the visible society or fellowship Christ prayed (St. John's Gospel, xvii. 21), in that same night in which he was betrayed, "that they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us." His prayer included a visible unity that the unbelieving world could see, for the object was, "that the world may believe that thou hast sent me."

And St. Paul left a standing rule for preserving that outward unity, when he said, "I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences, contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them." (Rom. xvi. 17.)

Thus Christ gave an outward and visible form to that mystical and invisible body, which is his Church; thus he made that Church visible to us.

Hooker has well observed of the mystical or invisible Church—"Whatever we read in Scripture concerning the endless love and the saving mercy which God showeth towards his Church, the only proper subject thereof is this Church." He has well observed, too—"Even so on the other side, when we read of any duty which the Church of God is bound unto, the Church which this doth concern is a sensibly known company. And this visible Church in like sort is but one, continued from the first beginning of the world to the last end. . . . . God hath ever had, and ever shall have, some Church visible upon earth."—Book 3, c. 1.

We should consider the Church in both respects, that we may understand alike God's promises to his Church, and our duties concerning it; and we should carefully mark this difference between the Church as she is in the sight of God, and the Church as she is visible to man. As we see her, she has spots; as God sees her, she has none. She is all fair in herself, but she may appear with much foulness to us; for Christ has not chosen to make the outward fellowship perfectly answerable to the mystical Church or Body.

Writing for our Roman Catholic brethren, we may state this more boldly in the words of St. Augustine than in our own. Speaking of the visible Church, he says—"There are also *within* enemies of God, and those whose breasts the spirit of Antichrist possesses; and yet these bear spiritual and divine offices: . . . . within as well as without such are found; however, the separation of those who are within, from the perfection and unity of that love not only God knows in some, but even man in some."—De Bass., lib. 4, c. 7.

The visible form which Christ has chosen to give to his Church, is thus imperfect, in seeming to enclose multitudes who are not really members of that Church which is the spouse and body of Christ. For, as St. Paul says, "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his."—Rom. viii. 9.

And this outward and visible form in which the Church appears to us, is still further imperfect in this, that it does not always enclose, or appear to enclose, all those who are members of the living Body. So St. Augustine says, in speaking of that number of the elect who truly constitute the Church—"There are some of that number who as yet are living wickedly, and are lying even in heresies, or in the superstitions of the Gentiles; and yet even there the Lord knoweth them that are his; for, in that unspeakable foreknowledge of God, many who seem to be without are indeed within, and many who seem to be within are without. Of all those, therefore, who, so to speak, inwardly and hiddenly are within, consists that garden enclosed, that fountain sealed, that well of living water."†

The comprehensive character of the Invisible Church—that is, of the Spouse and body of Christ—as she appears in the sight of God, is still farther shown in St. Augustine's doctrine, that even schismatics, in respect of those things in which they do not separate, do still remain in connection with the Church,‡ which opinion Archbishop Bramhall adopts.—Vol. ii., p. 80, 8vo.

What St. Augustine says of heretics (Ep. 162) is also well applied by Bramhall to schismatics, who says—"It is much more true of schism, that he who is involved in schism through the error of his parents or predecessors, who seeketh carefully for the truth, and is prepared in his mind to embrace it whensoever he finds it, is not to be rejected as schismatic. This very bond of unity and preparation of his mind to peace, is an implicit renunciation and abjuration of his schism before God."—Vol. ii., page 891, 8vo.

That this preparation of the heart towards peace does really belong to the mystical body, is thus said by St. Augustine, speaking of the song of the angels (Luke, ch. ii., v. 14), "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace to men of good will," which he says would not have been sung by angels at the birth of Christ, "unless God wishes this to be understood, that they are in the unity of the body of Christ who are in the peace of Christ; but they are in the peace of Christ who are of good will."—De Bapt., lib. 4, c. 7.

In all these respects, then, while we reverence the outward and visible communion of Christ, as ordained and founded by Christ himself, and most solemnly binding on all to whom the knowledge of it is given, we see how imperfect that outward communion is, as representing the Spouse and Body of Christ, as she really is in herself, and in the sight of God. We do not therefore despise that communion; we reverence it, such as Christ appointed it to be, for we know that he would have it as a net, which catches both bad fish and good (Matt. ch. 13, v. 47 & 48). But we regard it such as he made it, not such as men pretend it to be; and we seek to impress on ourselves and others one more quotation from St. Augustine—"Certainly it is manifest that which is said, 'within and without the Church,' is to be considered in respect of the heart, not of the body" (Contra Don. lib. 5, c. 27). To be living members of Christ, united to him by his spirit dwelling in our hearts and working in them, this, and nothing less, is to be truly members of the Church of Christ.

Now, we ask our Roman Catholic readers to consider sincerely if, as St. Augustine everywhere teaches, the outward and visible form of the Church, which we see with our eyes, is so far from being a perfect form of the true and living Church, which is the body and spouse of Christ; and if, as the same St. Augustine teaches, the promises of endless mercy do belong only to the living Church, what confusion and error must arise from insisting on applying all those promises to the outward and visible Church? Yet this is what Roman Catholics are constantly doing, whenever they are desirous to prove the infallibility of their Church from Scripture.

And if the Church visible be thus imperfect, by containing a vast multitude of wicked men, who have not the Spirit of Christ in their hearts, who are not really members of the Church as God sees her; and if this multitude of the wicked may be greater or less in proportion to the sound part, and may fill her ministry and orders in greater or less proportion; then the visible Church may be more or less corrupt, at different times and different places, on that account. And though the visible representation and form of the pure and spotless Church may be thus obscured to a great extent, yet, since Christ intended that evil should be allowed to mingle, more or less, in the visible Church, we cannot, on that account, deny that he has a visible Church on earth.

We earnestly invite the attention of Roman Catholics to the foregoing statement of St. Augustine's doctrine respecting the Church; and we ask them if they can pretend to say that their visible Church, as it exists at this day, is without spot, or wrinkle, or blemish, or any such thing? Are there none in it, laymen, priests, and bishops, who are "spots and blemishes?"

* Father Paul quotes Hieronius, saying, of certain ages, "those times produced not Popes, but monsters!"—Treatise on Eccl. Gov., p. 62.

† When it was objected to Archbishop Bramhall, that St. Augustine said, "the elect before they are converted do belong invisibly to the Church," he replied—"Yes, and before they were born also."—Works, vol. i., p. 78, 8vo.

‡ De Bapt., lib. 1, c. 8, § 12.

TALK OF THE ROAD.—No. XVII.

Well, Pat and Jem were digging Mr. Nolty's potatoes, and it was a sorrowful sight to see, for half the potatoes, and more, were bad; and every one looked sad and sorry, and the poor fellows had hardly the heart to dig. And Pat and Jem had two ridges next each other; and they talked a little betimes.

"Well, Jem," said Pat, "it's not like praty-digging in old times, when praty-digging was pleasant; when every man seen his work just done for that year, and enough before him for the winter."

"Aye, Pat," said Jem, "and a bit of a fire at the rig's end, with the childer roasting the praties in the ashes; but I doubt we will never see that again."

"I wonder how it came at all, or what came on the pra-

ties at all, at all," said Pat. "Sure there was praties long enough, and never no disease in them; I wonder *how* it comes at all."

"One thing's plain enough, Pat," said Jem, "it was God done it Himself, or let it be done, surely; but still I'm wondering *why* he let it come upon poor creatures?"

"I wonder would the Bible tell us anything about it," said Pat; "I mind now reading about famines, and the Bible allowed it was God sent them, and I'm thinking it allowed, too, it was for the wickedness of the country he sent them."

"Well, sure, that's like enough," said Jem, "and we'll have a look for that same when the work's done."

Well, they could not talk a great deal, because they were so busy; but they had a word now and again. And, when they were going home,

"I wonder," said Pat, "what Father John makes it out to be for?"

"Well, I'll tell you that," said Jem, "for a man that was in chapel on Sunday told me; he said Father John allowed it was the readers done it; for that the readers was come out of the towns of Sodom and Gomorra, in England, that is the wickedest places at all; and that people coming out of them towns here is enough to bring down the vengeance of God upon Ireland entirely; and it was that done it all on the praties, by Father John's account; and, deed, as I heard, he said enough to make the people put the readers out of Ireland entirely, and out of the world too, if they only believed the half what Father John told them."

"And I wonder," said Pat, "does Father John think that Sodom and Gomorra is in England? Don't I know them places is in the Bible, and not in England? But it's little Father John minds what he says, when he thinks the people knows nothing about it. But how did the praty disease come seven or eight years ago, when there was no readers here at all, and no one thinking about the Bible? Sure, didn't all the stir about the Bible begin after the praties got bad? and how would the readers bring it afore they came themselves?"

"Well, I'm thinking," said Jem, "Father John's reason is as bad as his cure; sure, didn't Mr. Smith get a mass said for his praties one time, and it's little the better they were of it; and didn't I go to Father John the first year myself, like the fool I was then, and didn't he give me holy water to put round the heaps for a cure, and didn't every praty in it turn bad on me? and why would his reason be better than his cure?"

"Aye, and don't I mind the second year," said Pat, "when all the country was going to the Blessed Priest* up in Tullybricken, that was put out of his parish by the bishop for bad living, for blessed salt to put on their praties at setting time (and the nice little living he made for himself out of the poor creatures with his blessed salt), and didn't they all turn out one worse nor another? and after that it's little I mind what the priests say about the praty rot. Sure, it's plain enough that the Lord doesn't let on to them what he's going to do, and why would we look to them for the reason of it?"

"Well, Pat," said Jem, "I'm thinking if any reason is to be got for it all, it's in the Bible we will get it. And, sure, don't we know that nothing but God's own Word can tell beforehand what He is going to do, or the reason of anything that it pleases him to do? and them that does'nt stick to his Word, nor doesn't want the people to see it, sure, it's not them we ought to look to to know what He does, or what He means."

Well, as they were walking along, they fell in with the Rev. Mr. Owens; and when they had bid the time of day, Mr. Owens asked what they were doing; and they said, digging Mr. Nulty's potatoes; so Mr. Owens asked, how the potatoes turned out; and then, says Pat,

"Why, your reverence, the praties are bad entirely under every clod you turn up."

"Aye," said Mr. Owens, "did you never read anything like that in the Bible?"

"No, your reverence," said Jem, "but we were just wondering would it be there."

So Mr. Owens took out his Bible, and read, "Is not the meat cut off before our eyes, yea, joy and gladness from the house of our God: the seed is rotten under their clods."—Joel i. 16, 17.

"And, your reverence," said Jem, "will you tell us *why* God does the like at all, for sure it be to be Him that does it."

"That's true, certainly," said Mr. Owens; "for the Scripture says, '*The Lord hath called for a famine*, and it shall come on the land seven years.'"—2 Kings viii. 1.

"And does the Bible tell us anything about the reason of it, your reverence?" said Jem.

"Surely it does," says Mr. Owens; "listen to this;" so Mr. Owens read, "Shall there be evil in a city and the Lord hath not done it?† Surely the Lord will do nothing but He revealeth His secret unto His servants the prophets."—Amos iii. 6, 7.

"Well, your reverence," said Pat, "that's just it, we want to know the secret of it. Is it for the wickedness of the people that God does it all?"

"That is the reason that God's Word gives," said Mr. Owens; "listen to this—'Alas, for all the evil abominations of the house of Israel! for they shall fall by the sword, by the famine, and by the pestilence; then shall ye know that I am the Lord.'"—Ezekiel vi. 11, 13.

"And what sort of sins is it for? your reverence," said Pat.

"For all sins, and for all turning away from God," said Mr. Owens; "but there are some sins that are specially marked. In the next chapter we read—'Make a chain, for the land is full of bloody crimes' (ch. vii. 23;) and in ch. xxxiii. 25—'Ye shed blood, and shall ye possess the land?'"

"Well," said Pat, "if it wasn't on the road, forment that very field that Mr. Browne, the agent, was shot about land, and the people all working in that very field, and looking on, and not one of them would tell which way the men went that did it!"

"Yes," said Mr. Owens, "the people were banded together then to shed innocent blood for the possession of the land, and God has scattered them off the land since. That is a sin that cries to God against a land; and so does forgetting God, and turning away from the knowledge of his holy word and will."

"And does your reverence think it was all for the sins of the Catholics?" said Jem.

"Indeed, I do not, Jem," said Mr. Owens; "we have all had our sins and our forgetfulness of God and of His word, and His dealings are meant for us all."

"But, your reverence," said Pat, "there's one thing that puzzles me still. When God sent the curse on the praties didn't he hurt them that loved and served him, as well as them that turned away from him? and wouldn't that be enough to make them turn away from him too? sure your reverence's praties were as bad as Father John's, every bit," said Pat, scratching his head.

"We never understand any of God's dealings rightly," said Mr. Owens; "until we learn to understand his love and goodness first. 'He doth not willingly afflict or grieve the children of men.'—(Lamentations iii. 33.) The Prophet Joel, who spoke of the seed being rotten under the clods has showed us that, even to the wicked, God's vengeance is sent in mercy; just listen to this—'Therefore, also, now saith the Lord, turn ye even to me with all your heart, and with fasting, and with weeping, and with mourning; and rend your hearts and not your garments, and turn unto the Lord your God; for He is gracious and merciful, slow to anger, and of great kindness, and repenteth Him of the evil.'—(Joel ii. 12, 13.) Did you ever read our Saviour's parable of the Prodigal Son, in St. Luke's Gospel?" said Mr. Owens, turning to Pat.

"I did, your reverence," said Pat.

"And what brought him back to his father?" said Mr. Owens.

"It was the famine, your reverence, I mind that well," said Pat. (See St. Luke's Gospel, xv. 14, &c.)

"And there has been a worse famine in Ireland than any we have been talking about," said Mr. Owens; "a famine that makes souls perish; 'not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the words of the Lord.'—(Amos viii. 11.) And, don't you see, Pat, that since God sent the disease on the potatoes, He is bringing the people to seek for the Word of God; isn't that using the potatoe famine to drive out a worse famine?"

"That's truth, your reverence," said Jem.

"And don't you be afraid," said Mr. Owens, turning to Pat again, "that those that knew and served God will turn away because he sends them trials; if God means *judgment in mercy* to them that forget Him, much more to them that know Him; 'whom the Lord loveth He chasteneth,' and He tells them that to comfort them.—(Hebrews xii. 6.) And then they can say with St. Paul, 'who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or FAMINE, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? . . . In all these things, we are more than conquerors through Him that loved us.'"

So then they were come to where Mr. Owens must leave them to go his way, and he was bidding them good night kindly; and Pat stopped him for a minute, saying—

"One thing more," your reverence, "is Sodom and Gomorra in England, for Father John allows it is?"

So Mr. Owens said, "St. Peter tells us that the Sodom and Gomorra that God destroyed by fire from heaven were meant 'for an example to those that after should live ungodly;' and so wherever there are ungodly men, there is the spiritual Sodom. But if Father John meant that wherever the Bible is read, there is Sodom and Gomorra, you may judge for yourselves of that. But if Father John was wise, he would not talk so much of Sodom and Gomorra being in England, for fear we should show him, out of the Douay Bible, that Babylon is in Rome."*

So Mr. Owens bid them good night again, and the boys went home for that night, talking by the road of Mr. Owens and Father John.

* Our readers may have observed that, in Ireland, a Blessed Priest—that is, a priest who pretends to the power of working miracles—is almost always one who has been put out of his parish for immoral conduct; perhaps because he has no other way of living, and such a one has no scruple at living by lies. But these Blessed Priests are much fewer in the country than they used to be; perhaps because the people are getting more sense.

† "Which the Lord hath done?' (Douay Bible). The meaning is that all judgment is from God. The note on this verse in the Douay Bible is a good one; "He speaks of the evil of punishments of war, famine, pestilence, desolation, &c., but not of the evil of sin, of which God is not the author."

* If the reader will look at the preface to St. Peter's 1st Epistle in the Douay Bible, he will read this: "He wrote it at Rome, which figuratively he calls Babylon;" alluding to ch. v., 13.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We request our correspondent B. H. to give us his address, as, before inserting his communication, we wish for some further information respecting it.

The letter from Passage East, on Infalibillity, we regret to say, reached us too late for our present number, but will, with some other communications which we are obliged to omit from want of room, appear in our next.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st.

No anonymous letter can be attended to. Whatever is sent for insertion must be authenticated by the name and address of the writer, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee for his good faith.

We would request our valued correspondents, both Roman Catholics and Protestants, to limit the length of their communications, and not to discuss a variety of distinct topics in one letter.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

☞ If any of our friends could favour us with a copy or copies of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, Nos. 2, 8, or 11, to complete sets, we should be greatly obliged.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, OCTOBER, 1853.

THE unexampled success of our attempt to establish in this country a periodical devoted to the investigation of religious truth, in a candid and Christian spirit, has, from time to time, roused among the opponents of free inquiry, lay and clerical, an amount of irritation, which our English neighbours may find it difficult to understand; but which we, who have a better opportunity of studying the various phases of Irish character, are able to appreciate without difficulty.

The era, indeed, has passed away when men of excitable and, perhaps, ferocious habits, among the higher classes of society in Ireland, were ever ready to avenge a slight or an insult, real or imaginary, by an appeal to the sword or the pistol; and when such weapons were generally kept at inns, for the accommodation of gentlemen travellers, who might think proper to order "pistols for two, and breakfast for one," meaning, of course, the *survivor* after the morning's *amusement;* and when it was no unusual thing for two opposite counsel to fall out in court in discussing a legal point, and retire into a neighbouring field to settle it with pistols, and then return as if nothing had happened, to resume their business in a more peaceable manner, finding the bench, jury, and spectators (who well understood the cause of their absence) quietly waiting to hear which of them was killed. The days, indeed, have happily passed away when five practising barristers might have been daily seen in the Hall of the Four Courts, each of whom had "killed his man." But we were scarcely sanguine enough to suppose, as our wiser and sober-minded English friends might be disposed to do, that with the age of the "Fighting Fitzgeralds" and "Bully Egans," the lowest order of Irish minds had ceased to be excitable, or that the age of calm reasoning and dispassionate fair play, should at once have universally succeeded to that of passionate ferocity, and lawless barbarism.

The progress of education in Ireland has, indeed, wrought wonders within our own experience, but for which the success of such a paper as ours would, we well know, have been impossible; and we cannot but feel a hope for our beloved country, when we peruse not only the able and temperate letters of respected Roman Catholic correspondents, published in our pages,

but the vastly more extensive private communications from every part of this kingdom, warmly acknowledging the fairness and ability with which we have handled so many important subjects of a controversial character, and adopting almost in words the very sentiment with which we commenced our labours,* that "if the members of the Church of England and Ireland are ever to be reconciled to the Church of Rome, or those of the Church of Rome to the Church of England, it must be effected by other means, than by exciting men's passions against one another."

We have been so little accustomed to boast of our achievements, that probably it may startle some of our subscribers to hear, that so large has been the demand for our periodical, among both Protestants and Roman Catholics, that, though not yet quite two years in existence, our present issue amounts to the considerable number of 10,000 copies monthly, with every prospect of increasing circulation, in both England and Ireland.

This fact, it appears, has not only become known to those watchful guardians of the public faith, the Roman Catholic clergy (who never fail to acquaint themselves as to such matters with a vigilance which does them credit, so long as it is exercised in a legitimate way); but has at last been trumpeted forth by a portion of the press, with an excitement and an amount of vituperation, which would be in the highest degree amusing, if it were not a sad thing to contemplate any public journal, however small its circulation or weak its influence, abusing its power by, inasmuch as in it lies, exciting its readers to violence and crime.

We have now before us a copy of a local journal in which, after a tissue of abuse, which we shall not condescend to transcribe, the editor concludes as follows :—

"The funds for the gratuitous distribution of the LAYMAN come from the Exeter Hall Treasury. Copies of it have been sent to every police station in Ireland, and above 130,000 copies have been already circulated through the country, at an expense which it is really melancholy to contemplate.

"Such doings should not be allowed to go on. A stop must be put to them at once, and, as the most effective way, we would suggest the following simple one—

"Let every Catholic knock down the first man that puts into his hand a number of this vile periodical—for by doing so he gives him a deliberate insult and provocation, quite sufficient to justify a man in committing a breach of the peace."

We pass by the assertion about the Exeter Hall Treasury, of the existence of which we were previously ignorant; as, also, the assertion, that copies have been sent to every police station—as we know not on what authority our cotemporary makes such a statement, though we heartily desire that it may be true—and come at once to the admirable and simple, but perhaps somewhat ludicrous, plan of extinguishing the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, which our editorial opponent considers the most effective one.

"Let every Catholic knock down the first man that puts into his hand a number of this vile periodical! for by doing so he gives him a *deliberate insult* and provocation, quite sufficient to justify a man in committing a *breach of the peace!*"

We intend to enable our editorial friend (who appears to be as sensitive to insult, as any of the worthies of half a century ago), to begin his practice at this simple species of *knock-down* arguments, by presenting him with a copy of this number, through her Majesty's post, free of all charge, leaving it to the petty sessions at Limerick, or elsewhere, to settle the point of law, whether knocking down the post-man be a justifiable means of punishing the letter-carrier for not having opened and read, on his way from the post-office, all the newspapers addressed to the irascible editor, and ascertained accurately whether there were or not contained in any of them such a deliberate insult and provocation as would justify a man (editor or not) in committing a breach of the peace! As, however, we have no *serious* expectation that this summary method of extinguishing our journal is likely to be brought into active operation, much less before the judicial bench, we would add one word of *serious* consolation, to soothe the irritated feelings of our susceptible cotemporary.

The CATHOLIC LAYMAN has now been in existence for nearly two years. He asserts that 130,000 copies have been already circulated. If its articles have been, as he also asserts, "so meaningless and without point, that they could neither make a Protestant a whit more steadfast in his faith, nor leave a doubt in the mind of any Catholic as to the truth of the religion he professes;" if the subject be, indeed, "such as no one but a mad fanatic would give a straw for reading;" and its columns "filled with nothing but the most stupid misrepresentations and lying calumnies of Catholicity and its priesthood," Roman Catholics would, no doubt, *feel* it as an insult that such a paper should be offered to them, without being *instigated* so to do by the pugilistic editor who has so tardily come forward to vindicate the honour of Irish Roman Catholics, and he may rest satisfied that not a single number of such "a vile periodical" as he describes, would ever be read by one of them.

We fear, however, that the anger of our combative friend, who is really doing his best to effect for us, what we have ever shrunk from doing for ourselves—viz., puff us into notoriety, and increase the desire to read our "fanatical effusions," is really attributable to another cause, and it is simply this. He knows we have been and are eagerly read by all intelligent Roman Catholics (and there are thousands of them in Ireland) who wish to hear both sides, and judge for themselves, and he and the class to which he belongs are extremely angry, not with *us* who provide, but with those who read anything but what the Roman Catholic priesthood thinks proper to approve of. If our pages were returned or destroyed without being read, can our readers doubt that the editorial wrath would melt away into a chuckle of delight, at the waste of the money of the supposed "Exeter Hall Treasury," which might otherwise have gone to the support of those whom he would brand as apostates, and who have so little regard for the truths in which they have been educated, as to "sell their souls" for a mess of pottage, the much-abused "soupers" of Kerry and "jumpers" of Connemara. It is the sad fact, that the age is gone by, in which Irishmen could be insane enough to mistake friendship for insult, and calm reasoning for fanatical animosity, which rouses the spleen of an adversary whom we do not even name, but would willingly bring to a better frame of mind, were it in the power of reasoning and Christian charity to do so.

That our English friends may not, however, conceive that it is all plain sailing with us in Ireland, we must at the same time enlighten them, and gratify a correspondent, by printing, without a single comment, a letter just received from a person who subscribes himself James Willson, Skibbereen, merely adding that we are ignorant whether or not there be such a person, or whether the signature be an assumed one.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Skibbereen.

SIR—For the first time in my life your accursed journal, yclept CATHOLIC LAYMAN, came across me—sent, I suppose, by some firebrand fanatic, for the purpose, it seems, of Protestantising, infidelising, uncatholicising, or anything-ising me. I assure you, sir, that your hell-born efforts, aided by the powers of darkness, and the exchequer of heretical England, will never be able to estrange the Irish from the ancient faith. You may as well give up the unhallowed work of belieing our creed; it has withstood the attacks of all schismatics, heretics, &c., since the dawn of its establishment; and it now safely defies, and will till the consummation of time, all attempts of wicked, alien governments—all attempts of hired, vile, mean, mercenaries to shake or outroot it.

No wonder that an undying animosity should eternally exist between Catholic and Protestant, when such fiendish appliances are laid hold of by you and your well-paid "Priest Protection Society," to disseminate nothing but lies and blasphemies beyond the conception of man.

Your writings, let me tell you, are a tissue of the grossest, the basest, and the most unprincipled, unscrupulous, effrontery. There is not a scintilla of charity blended in them throughout; if there was, Catholics would listen to, and respect them; but when your LAYMEN are, from first to last, one diabolical onslaught against Christianity, Pope, and Popery—one eternal tirade of misrepresentation, lies, infamy, and slander—can you expect other than that Catholics will burn your infamous, hellish productions, and not let them pollute their dwellings? What a plausible story comes out in your last vomit about a country station and Father John! Ah! Satan himself could not produce, if he had the power (but he certainly suggested it) a more iniquitous, shameless, conglomeration of lies. I may safely say, and not without reason, that your society are in uninterrupted communication with that boy. You and they show it. Noscitur ex sociis. Depend upon it, and take it upon my ipse dixit, tho' a laic, that a just Judge will one day arraign you before his unerring tribunal for the scandal you now show those little ones, of which Christ speaks. But you have the cheek to call upon Catholic bishops and priests to prove the "boasted infallibility of their Church." With sovereign contempt they treat your challenge. You admit your Church's fallibility; therefore, she is not the Church Christ promised to be with till the end of time; and hence, by reason of her avowed fallibility, she has within her, Atheists, denying God the Father; Deists, denying God the Son; Methodists, denying the Queen's supremacy; Calvinists, asserting that murders, perjury, &c., are all God's decrees; Unitarians, denying Christ's Divinity; Presbyterians, who would fain annihilate the Church of England; and, among innumerable other sects Ghorams,† denying baptismal regeneration. Are not these the fruits of liberty of conscience, and private interpretation of the Holy Scriptures? Seven-hundred-and-fifty sects of Protestantism have been enumerated. Is this a mark of unity? Assuredly not; and not having this mark, the Holy Ghost, the Paraclete, cannot be expected to govern your Church through the mouths of her bishops. You must admit (for Protestant history cannot deny it) that, unless you wish to add another flagrant lie to the black catalogue already uttered by you, and which you will continue to utter no doubt, the murderous, the adulterous, the incestuous King Henry VIII., was the founder of your iniquitous, perjuring, anti-christian, bloated, mammon Church. Who was Luther, but an envious, a proud friar? And pride and envy were the cause of his apostacy. No sooner did he fall, than he broke his vow of chastity, and induced a nun to fall with him, and do the same: so Luther and his paramour lived and died in fornication. These were holy founders, and the faith, or, rather heresy, they spread is holy too. Yes; so holy that Luther is placed next to Christ and St. Paul. The Saviour of mankind, the Apostle of the Gentiles, and Luther—the firebrand of hell, the arch-heretic, the Apostle of Protestant, revolutionising England—put in juxta-position, would make the very Mahometans blush! But your lies are the most unblushing and barefaced. By lies and money you propagate your tottering Church. By calumniating Popes, Popery, bishops, priests, monks, nuns, the confessional—in fact, anything Catholic—all Christianity, you keep from utter annihilation the most damnable heresies, blasphemies, and abominations ever broached, spoken, or practised by men.

Whilst you pour forth such ribald denunciations against our holy religion, we cannot characterise you anything less than demons—actually devils in human shapes; for Satan, if he were to walk amongst us, could not abuse us more—could not more turn into ridicule the ceremonies of our holy religion than you do and England's hireling press. I shall take another opportunity to address you. In the meantime I hope you will favour me with a reply, if you do not let this appear in your next issue.

Having thus for once gratified our correspondent by inserting at length a letter not quite in accordance with the spirit and tone of our paper, we shall only express a hope that his next communication may be written in a somewhat milder spirit, in which case we shall be happy to give him, as we have so often given others, the best reply in our power.

We regret to add, that an able letter, written in an unexceptionable spirit, in defence of the Infallibility of the Church of Rome, reached us too late for insertion in our present number—but will cheerfully be inserted in our next.

* See CATHOLIC LAYMAN, Vol. I., p. 4.

* It is perhaps right to state the CATHOLIC LAYMAN never had the advantage of any connection whatever with this or any other society.—ED.

† Sic in original.

Correspondence.

WHAT COUNCILS ARE GENERAL AND INFALLIBLE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—In your number of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, for June, 1852, you published a short letter from me, in which I asked what authority could be produced from the Fathers of the first three centuries for Purgatory. I have since read with interest several letters and articles on the subject in your paper; and, I must say, that I am satisfied with the result, that there is no proof of Purgatory to be found in the first three hundred years of the Church. And I cannot but think that if any such proof were to be found, it would have been brought forward by some of your correspondents.

My present wish is to ask another question, which I hope you will settle for me as plainly. In the creed of Pope Pius IV., which the Church of Rome requires every one to believe, as "the Catholic Faith," I find the following:—"I also, without doubt, receive and profess all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred canons and œcumenical councils." Now, sir, I am a plain man, who asks plain questions, and expects plain answers; and I want to know what councils does the Church of Rome consider œcumenical or general (for, I suppose, they both mean the same); and where will I find the list of œcumenical councils in which I am to believe?

Now, my reason for asking is this—it is a common saying, that the man who buys a pig in a bag is a fool for his pains; and I think that is right. Would any of your readers, who deals in pigs, be content, in a fair or a market, to buy a pig tied up in a sack, the way he could neither see nor feel it, nor know whether it was good or bad? Well, I think not; and I am sure I would not. Now, my religion is of more consequence to me than anything else; and I do not like to take my religion in a bag, the way I cannot know nor see what it is. And before I can profess this creed of Pope Pius IV., like an honest man, I want to know how many general councils there are, and where I can see the list of them.

Hoping that you, sir, will give me a plain answer to this plain question.

I remain your obedient servant,

A CATHOLIC.

We are always anxious to answer our correspondents questions; and we would never have undertaken to answer such questions if we had not made a due preparation in the knowledge of books and authors.

But, we must protest against our correspondents asking us questions that no man living can answer.

At the same time we must confess our correspondent's question is a very fair one. It cannot be supposed, that our correspondent should solemnly profess to believe "all things declared by the œcumenical councils," without so much as knowing how many such councils there are, or what councils are really œcumenical according to the Church of Rome.

Every collection of councils, that we have seen, consists of many hundreds; and it is acknowledged by all Roman Catholics, that not more than twenty of these at most are really œcumenical or general, and that of the rest many are false and heretical, and many more not general or œcumenical; and it must be confessed, that it is only reasonable for Roman Catholics to ask to be informed which of these councils they do really profess to believe, in the creed of Pope Pius IV. It is certainly a most reasonable question.

At the same time we must protest, that it is a question that no man living can answer with any degree of certainty whatever.

No infallible Pope can tell what councils are really œcumenical or general; for we suppose that if any infallible Pope *could* have done so he *would*. And of this we are quite sure, that no Pope ever has attempted to do so.

No œcumenical council can do so; for though we admit that such a council did once lay down such a list, in the most solemn manner possible, yet we know that all Roman Catholics are now agreed in saying, that *that œcumenical council was wrong*.

No fallible man can do so, for though numbers of fallible men have made the best guess they could, yet they have differed so totally from each other, and they all differ so widely from the only general council that tried to lay down the list, that it is evident that they are but guesses; and who can tell which guess is right, when no infallible Pope would attempt to decide, and when the only council that attempted it is confessed, by all Roman Catholic writers, to have been wrong?

To show that we are not really shrinking from the question, nor answering in culpable ignorance, we will give some of the guesses that have been made, and let our correspondent judge.

Cardinal Bellarmine, who is one of the greatest authorities in the Church of Rome, reckons eighteen general or œcumenical councils, ending with the Council of Trent.

The collection of councils made by Labbe and Cossart, two French Jesuits, which is one of the highest authority, reckons—we really cannot say whether 19 or 20, the counting is so curious. It runs thus—

Nice I., a general council.

Sardica, a general council.

Constantinople I., the SECOND general council!

In other words, "there's one, and there's another, and there's another, and that makes TWO!!"

There was a reason for this certainly, for it is more than doubtful whether any such council as Sardica ever was held; but if put down in the list as a general council, it surely ought to count as one. Yet they put it in the list, and do *not* count it. This list also ends with the Council of Trent, and makes *with* Sardica *twenty*, *without it nineteen*. So they considered either one or two as general councils, and infallible, which Bellarmine rejected as fallible.

But, to look a little closer at this list, Labbe and Cossart reckon the Council of Constance the SIXTEENTH general council (reckoning Sardica, it should be the *seventeenth*). Well, that very Council of Constance itself does count itself the TWELFTH.

This is remarkable, as being the only case in which a general and infallible council has attempted to give a list of general and infallible councils; and it is curious to see how all Roman Catholics agree to consider it wrong.

In their 39th session that council made a solemn decree, that every Pope, at his election, should profess to hold the faith of "the general councils;" and they give the list of general councils which the Pope was to profess, and that list consists of ELEVEN—(Labbe & Coss. vol. xii. p. 241); and yet this council is now counted the sixteenth or seventeenth! How can that be? Why, Labbe and Cossart take five other councils which were held before this of Constance, and pronounce them general councils, although this infallible Council of Constance did not include them as such in its list. These councils are—Sardica, *three* Councils of Lateran, and the second Council of Lyons. The Council of Constance counted none of these general, though they are in most lists now. What presumption in fallible men, *if they really believe in the infallibility of general councils*, thus to set aside the decision of a council which they themselves confess to be infallible!

But, we have other lists still to puzzle us.

When Queen Mary came to the throne of England, and found the Church of England already reformed, she set about to bring it back into subjection to Rome. Cardinal Pole was then appointed Legate of the Pope, to reconcile the English Church to Rome; in this capacity he held a council of all the English Bishops at Lambeth, in the year 1556; and the second decree of that council, calls the Council of Florence "the EIGHTH General Council"—(Labbe & Coss. vol. xiv. p. 1737). Now this Council of Florence was held *after* that of Constance which called itself the *twelfth!* And this Council of Florence, which is called the EIGHTH by the whole English Synod and the Pope's Legate, is called, by Bellarmine, the *sixteenth!* by Labbe and Cossart, the seventeenth!! and if Sardica was counted in the list it would be the eighteenth!!! So, here is a difference of no less than TEN general councils in the list!

When that Council of Florence was first published by Abraham Cretensis, it was expressly styled THE EIGHTH; and the approbation of Pope Clement the Seventh prefixed to that first edition, called it THE EIGHTH. No wonder then that the Pope's Legate, and the English Council, called it *the eighth*. But how then can it be the 16th, 17th, or 18th now?

There are plenty of lists besides for people to guess among. For instance, when the Council of Trent was to be held, Cardinal Contareuus presented to Pope Paul III. a short account of councils already held, and he calls the Council of Florence THE NINTH. But we need not go farther with these lists; we have shown that there is no certainty at all what councils are general, and what are not. No Pope has ever attempted to decide; for Popes are so modest, or so prudent, that they never interfere while great authorities are disputing; but whenever men come to agree about a disputed point, then the Pope takes the opportunity to pass an infallible decree, because he can do it safely then when there is no one to dispute it.

We must say again, that supposing the Creed of Pope Pius IV. to be right, and that the Catholic Faith does really consist in believing all that the general councils have declared, then it is the most reasonable thing in the world that our correspondent should expect to get a plain answer to his plain question, what councils the Church of Rome holds to be general. We are very sorry that we cannot answer him; and we think it very strange and unfair that the Pope or the Church of Rome does not give a plain and authorized answer to the question.

Our correspondent must now see that in professing the Creed of Pope Pius IV., he would really (according to his own homely, but appropriate simile) be taking his faith in a bag, without the possibility of knowing what it is. No man can tell him, with certainty, *what* it is; because no man can tell him with certainty *where* it is, or in which of the councils it is to be found.

But, if our correspondent had asked us—"What councils are really general?" we should have no difficulty at all in answering that the four councils of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, were truly general, because they were always received by the whole church. It is not important to inquire whether the council at Constantinople, A.D., 553, and that held at Constantinople, A.D., 680, were truly and really general (though we think they were) because those two councils made no additional decrees about the faith. But no later councils have any pretensions to be general councils, because they were all councils only of the Eastern and Greek Churches, or only of the Latin or Western Churches.

If any one ask what decrees did those four truly general councils make about the Catholic Faith? we answer that the whole faith which they held and established is to be found in the Catholic Creeds.

We also suggest to him, that there were true Catholics *before* ANY of these councils were held. St. Peter was a Catholic, and St. Paul, and all the other writers of the New Testament; and by studying their writings (about which there is no uncertainty at all), we may learn what it was then to be a Catholic.

If any Roman Catholic, or especially any Roman Catholic Priest, will give us a list of general councils duly authorized by the Church of Rome, with proof that it is so authorized, we will, of course, be ready to publish it. But we are sensible that *we* are now asking a question that no man living can answer.

THE INDEX EXPURGATORIUS AND THE DOUAY BIBLE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—As your correspondents appear to take an interest in the subject of the Index Expurgatorius, I think it right to give you an account of a pamphlet I met some time ago, in which it was recommended to the Roman Catholic authorities to expurgate the Douay Testament. The author of the pamphlet (whom I believe to have been a Protestant) maintains that there is sufficient precedent for such a proceeding. See, for example, the expurgation of the Scripture references in Stephens's Bible (Index Exp. Vat. p. 41). And as there are many passages in the Douay Testament which appear at first sight at variance with Roman Catholic teaching, he proposes that they should be altered or expunged. I forward some specimens of the proposed alterations, which appear conceived in the spirit of the good friar who said, that if he had been by St. Paul when he was writing, he would have recommended him to leave out some ugly sentences which smelt of the faggot.

I am, sir, &c.,

A SUBSCRIBER.

I. Matt. xxii. 29.—"You err, *not* knowing the Scriptures," read "*from your* knowing the Scriptures."

John v. 39.—*Dele* "Search the Scriptures."

2 Tim. iii. 15.—*Dele* "And because *from thy infancy* thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which can instruct thee to salvation, by the faith which is in Christ Jesus."

Acts xvii. 11, 12.—*Dele* "Daily searching the Scriptures, whether these things were so," because from this it would appear that what the Apostles preached was compared with the Scripture by those who heard them.

2 Pet. iii. 16.—*Dele* "Which the unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, to their own destruction," because it would appear hence that the unlearned and unstable were in those days allowed to have the Scripture in their hands.

II. Matt. xvi. 23.—*Dele* "Jesus turned and said unto Peter, Get thee behind me, Satan: thou art a scandal unto me: for thou savourest not the things that are of God, but those that are of men."

Luke xxii. 24.—*Dele* "There was also a strife among them which of them should seem to be greater." For the Apostles must have known that St. Peter was the greatest.

Acts viii. 14.—"The Apostles sent unto Samaria Peter and John," read "Peter was pleased to go unto Samaria, and took with him John."

Gal. ii. 11.—"When Cephas was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, *because* he was to be blamed," read "*wherein I* was to be blamed."

III. 1 Tim. iv. 3.—*Dele* "Forbidding to marry and commanding to abstain from meats."

Luke iv. 38.—"Simon's *wife's* mother," read "Simon's mother."

1 Tim. iii. 2-4.—"It behoveth a bishop to be blameless, *the husband of one wife*." *Dele* "the husband of one wife." This sentence of St. Paul having been anathematized by the Council of Trent (Sess. xxiv. De Soc. Matr. Can. ix.)

Ib. v. 12.—*Dele* "Let deacons be the husband of one wife."

Titus i. 5, 6.—"And should'st ordain priests in every city. . . . If any be without crime, *the husband of one wife*." *Dele* "the husband of one wife."

IV. Jas. v. 16.—"Confess your sins *one to another*." *Dele* "one," and read "to another;" otherwise the text might be used to prove that priests should confess to the laity as well as the laity to the priests.

V. Jas. v. 15.—*Dele* "And the prayer of faith shall save the sick man, and the Lord shall raise him up." For extreme unction, which is here meant, is never given but when it is hopeless that the sick man shall be raised up.

VI. 1 Cor. xiv.—*Omn. delend.* because what it declares, concerning prayers in an unknown tongue appears inconsistent with the performance of the mass in Latin.

VII. Heb. ix. 26, 27, 28.—*Dele* "once;" for it is certain, from the decree of the Council of Trent (Sess. xxii. De Sac. Miss. Can. I. III.), that Christ is offered many times every day.

1 Peter iii. 18.—*Dele* "once," for the same reason.

The pamphlet referred to contains many other expurgations, but the specimens here given are sufficient.

[We open our columns to give the Roman Catholic authorities the benefit of our correspondent's suggestions; but we do not think they will adopt them. It is true that the alterations proposed might remove some few of the points most obviously at variance with Roman Catholic teaching; but no amount of expurgation could make the book what they would consider a *safe* one. He whose duty it is in all points to obey the Church, will only be perplexed if offered the services of another guide, claiming to have Divine authority. And even were the whole book rewritten now, so as to correspond exactly with Roman Catholic teaching, in its present form, what a check would this fixed standard be upon the future development of Christian doctrine as the Church may shape it some few hundred years hence?]

THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN IN KILPATRICK.

NO. III.

In our August number we told you of a conversation between Dennis Gasteen and Tim Donovan, which came rather to a sudden end, because Tim Donovan took offence at Gasteen's saying that, in praying to the saints, he ran the danger of committing Idolatry. However, when Tim's anger cooled down, he became only more anxious to confute his friend, Dennis. So he read a good deal on the subject out of books Priest Moloney had given him, and before the next meeting he had got such a mass of learning together as was quite enough to overwhelm poor Dennis Gasteen. He produced testimony after testimony from the Fathers, until he had got together such proofs of the antiquity and catholicity of the custom of praying to the saints, as he thought could not be resisted.

We do not think it profitable to give a detailed report of their discussion, because it was, on both sides, all attack and no defence. Tim Donovan pelted Dennis with quotations from the Fathers, and Dennis replied with texts of Scripture. And he was not inclined to listen to the quotations from the Fathers at all; "For," says he, "if prayers to the saints is so useful a thing, it is very strange that we should not be once told in the Bible to pray to them; that, on the other hand, those who worshipped *angels* should be rebuked for it (for I cannot find any instance in those days of any one praying to a *saint*), and that our Lord Jesus Christ should be always spoken of as our *only* mediator and intercessor."

"This may appear strange to you," said Tim, "because you imagine that you are to find everything in the Bible; but as I see it proved that the Church has, in all ages, invoked the intercession of the saints, if it is not in the Bible, it only shows me how little we can depend on the Bible alone for teaching us all we ought to know about the mode of worshipping God. If you will only take this book, and read the words of the holy Fathers that I have read to you, I think you must come to be of my opinion too."

"What is the use," said Dennis, "of my reading that book? How am I able to tell whether what is in it was ever said by the Fathers or not? Have we not seen in the CATHOLIC LAYMAN how many a passage that was brought up as if it was written by the Fathers turned out not to have been written by the real Fathers after all, but by people hundreds of years after, that no one knows anything about? And how many another passage, even when it was really written by those they said wrote it, turned out to have quite a different meaning when you read it along with all the rest that was joined to it, from what it seemed to have when it was taken out by itself.* I know too well the way of quoting that some of your writers have, to trust much to them, unless I knew some one that saw the very words in the books they took them from. Don't I remember how some of you tried, in the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, to make out Bishop Jeremy Taylor to be a Roman Catholic, until they printed together his own words and the words you put in his mouth. By the way, I don't think that same gentleman has ever written to them since."*

To all this Jem was positive in insisting that the quotations in his book were all fairly made, and as Dennis would not take his word for it, Tim offered to lend him the book to take up to Mr. Townsend's, and try if he could pick any hole in it.

"I tell you what will be better," said Dennis, "bring the book up yourself to Mr. Townsend's controversial class, at seven this evening, and try what he can say to it."

Now, another day Tim would no more have thought of walking into Mr. Townsend's controversial class than he would have thought of going in for his amusement into the fever hospital; but this day he was so full of spirits at the victory he and his book had gained over Dennis Gasteen, that he thought he would try their effect on Mr. Townsend too.

So, at seven o'clock, the two men went up to Mr. Townsend's school-room, and, when a fit time was come, Dennis introduced Tim, whom Mr. Townsend remembered to have met at his house before, and he told the story about Tim Donovan's book, and gave him an account, as well as he remembered, of all the arguments that had been used on both sides. So, said Mr. Townsend—

"Well, Dennis, if he makes out that the Church has, *in all ages*, made use of prayers to the saints, we must own that it will be a difficulty for us to explain how this custom should have always existed, supposing it wrong; and, on the other hand, Mr. Donovan, it would *still* be a difficulty for you to explain how it came to pass, supposing that such a practice existed in the Apostles' days, that they never gave the least hint of it in their writings."

"It may be strange," said Tim, "but I am not bound to explain it; I am safe in doing what the Church always has done."

"But, sir," said Dennis, "I want you to look at this book of his, and tell me if all these passages given here are fairly quoted out of the Fathers."

Mr. Townsend smiled, and said—"You must give me credit both for more extensive reading and a better memory than I possess if you think I could answer such a question as that off-hand. I think I told you once before what kind of sized collection the writings of the Fathers would make."

Tim's spirits rose, and he whispered to Dennis that Mr. Townsend was shirking the point, and was as much afraid of the book as himself. However, Mr. Townsend said that he had no objection to look at the book, and see what was in it; and when he had turned it over a few minutes—"How is this?" said he; "I thought you said this book would prove that the Church, *in all ages*, used prayers to the Blessed Virgin and the saints!"

"And does it not, sir?" said Tim.

"Why," said Mr. Townsend, "In the first place there is nothing here about the ages of the Church that I should like best to hear about—that is, the Apostles' age, and the times that were near them; and there is not any proof with regard even to the times when there were men alive whose fathers or whose grandfathers might have seen the Apostles. I don't see here anything, or at least anything of any weight, from any of the writers of the first three centuries; the greater part of the writers here quoted lived farther from the Apostles than we are from the times of King Henry VIII; and they got their knowledge of the Apostles' doctrines from reading their books, just as we do ourselves."

"Well, sir," said Tim, impatiently, "I'd like to keep to the point; read over these passages here, and just tell me what they prove."

"Why," said Mr. Townsend, "supposing these quotations to be fairly and honestly made (of which, of course, I can't pretend to judge without examination), they prove that the practice of asking the intercession of the saints had become general in the Church in the fifth and sixth centuries."

"Well," said Tim, with a triumphant air, "perhaps you ought to grant more than that; but that's enough for me. Take it as far down as you like—say the sixth century—you own that those great divines of the sixth century thought it right to pray to the Blessed Virgin. Now, I want you to prove them heretical in that opinion, if you can. Show me the General Council by which they were condemned, or tell me when they were cast out of the Church's communion for so believing, or when any formal censure was passed on them for this practice."

"I don't pretend to be able to do it," says Mr. Townsend.

"Well, sir," said Tim, "if they were in the wrong you *could* do it. There is not a heresy that ever was started that was not at once condemned by the Church, and the heretic that started it cut off as a rotten branch."

"And burned," said Dennis.

"See here," said Tim, not minding him, "the picture of the Apostolic tree," showing him a drawing out of Dr. Milner's book, "here I have the Catholic Church, with its noble branches of bishops, and confessors, and martyrs, and there you see how the heretics are represented as broken off on all sides from its body, from the very earliest down to Luther, and Calvin, and Muggleton, and Johanna Southcote. Now, sir, I defy you to show me any one here cast out as a heretic for praying to the saints; and as you own that the practice existed in the sixth century, I conclude that it was the doctrine of the Church, and therefore necessarily Catholic and Apostolic. There, sir, find the flaw in that argument if you can."

"The flaw," said Mr. Townsend, "is just this—that you take for granted that the Church can never err, and that her doctrine and practice have been always in all points the same. But you ought to know that this is the very chief point of difference between us and you. We hold that the doctrine of the Church, which was perfectly pure as delivered by our Lord and his Apostles, became by degrees more or less mixed with human corruptions in the course of ages; just as the little stream, which flows so fresh and sparkling out of our little lough above, collects many an impurity in its course; and when it has become a great river, and flows through the large city, some sixty miles hence, though its waters are still sufficient to support life, they are very different from those so bright and clear, which allows us to see every pebble in the bottom. We hold that, besides the erroneous doctrines whose teachers were cast out of the Church as heretics, there were other errors which were never branded as heresies, and which, though they received no formal sanction from any truly General Council, yet passed into the belief of the most eminent of the Church's teachers. The fact is, then, that the doctrines and practices of the Church of the sixth century, while they are very far indeed from being identical with those of the Council of Trent, are very far also from being identical with those of the Apostles. There, then, is my answer to you; I make you a present, as far as this question is concerned, of the sixth century; I give you St. Basil, and St. Leo, and St. Gregory; but until you can prove that the doctrines of that time were identical with those of the Apostles' time, you will not have got a step towards deciding the question."

Now, poor Tim Donovan was under the disadvantage of being here taken by surprise, and having the controversy turn on a point on which he was unprepared, for he had expected that Mr. Townsend would have endeavoured to make out that the quotations in his book were erroneous, or the translations bad, or, in short, that the saints referred to did not hold the doctrines imputed to them, and as he had never heard the idea started that St. Leo, or St. Gregory, could possibly go wrong, it quite took away his breath to hear them thrown overboard so summarily. However, he made as good a fight as he could on a sudden—"And, sir," said he, "if the Church did not hold the same doctrines in the sixth century as in the Apostles' times, will you please tell me the name of the heretic who made the change, and give me the year when he lived. Until you can do this, sir, I shall take the liberty of believing that the Church's doctrine was always the same; for I have learned from Dr. Milner that the only way you can find any support for your notions is, if you can make it out that all the Christian world went to sleep one night Protestants, and woke the next morning good Catholics; and, sir, though you may be a very fine controversialist, and very clever at proving black white, I think, with all submission, this is more than you'll be able to do."

"Thank you for the compliment," said Mr. Townsend, laughing, "but I think I can return it, for it's the argument you are using that would prove black white."

"I don't understand you, sir," said Tim.

"Why," said Mr. Townsend, "by the arguments you have been using you might prove the hair of my good friend, Mr. Driscoll, here, to be as black as a raven's."

Old Mr. Driscoll shook his head, which was, indeed, white and venerable enough. "You might have proved that, sir, easily fifty years ago, but I fear you would find it a hard matter to do it now."

"Well, but," said Mr. Townsend, "you own it was black once, and can you tell me the exact day on which it became gray? Or do you remember the night when you went to bed with your fine black head of hair, and woke up the next morning with as snowy locks as you have now? Because, unless you can give Mr. Donovan satisfaction on these points, he will not believe any change to have taken place at all, unless you can tell him the exact hour and minute it occurred. And," proceeded Mr. Townsend, "it was a pity I did not know your way of arguing last Tuesday; for there were two English farmers walking through my fields, that had come over to see if they could find a farm in this county they would like to take; and said they to me—'You have a great sight of weeds here, sir.' 'Well,' said I, 'we would call that clean enough here.' 'Perhaps you may,' said they; 'but we find that what you call cleanly farming in Ireland, we should think very slovenly in England.' Now, Mr. Donovan," said Mr. Townsend, "if I had had you to help me, I might have held out that there were no weeds there at all; for I sowed nothing but good seed there, and I defy any one to tell who put in the others, or what was the day or night they first came."

It was an unlucky illustration of Mr. Townsend's, for some of his hearers found the subject of the English farmers, and their relative modes of farming, more interesting than that he was on. "But," he continued, "What I am driving at, boys, is this:—The way to know whether St. Jerome and St. Leo taught the same as the Apostles is, to compare their writings together. You have no right to take for granted that they must of course be the same, because you may be unable to tell who changed them, or when they were changed. You have no right to be sure that the crop you find growing in the sixth century is the same exactly that was planted by the Apostles, and that it has not got a single weed mixed up with it."

"Well, sir," said Tim Donovan, rising to go away, "the upshot of the matter is, that you will never persuade me that St. Jerome, or St. Leo, were heretics, and therefore I am contented to believe as they did."

"Very well," said Mr. Townsend, rising too, "it would be better if you were contented to believe as Peter and Paul did; and as for later Saints and Fathers—though I am too honest to pretend that they thought exactly in all points as Protestants do now—you will find that they were still further from thinking exactly as Roman Catholics do now; and if you make it a rule to believe as they did, I fear Father Sheehy will not be pleased with you."

They then bid each other good night, and went home.

* Mr. Gasteen may have had in his mind CATHOLIC LAYMAN, i., 34, 67, ii. 68., &c.

* See CATHOLIC LAYMAN, i., 126.

Review.

Meditations from St. Chrysostom, on the Study of the Word of God, consisting of Passages literally Translated from his Works. By Robert King, A.B. George Herbert, Grafton-street, Dublin.

THIS little book, of which we give the title above, is one which we can cordially recommend to our readers. It is

an attempt to make known to the English reader some selections from the writings of one of the most eminent of the Fathers of the Church—one whom both Protestants and Roman Catholics agree to hold in high esteem. It contains nothing of a controversial character, Mr. King having very wisely abstained from adding much of his own, and merely permitting his author (in a very faithful translation) to speak for himself. He has, indeed, prefixed a life of St. Chrysostom, abridged from "Butler's Lives of the Saints;" but this, though written by a Roman Catholic, contains nothing that can give offence to any Protestant; so that this cheap and pretty little volume is one which a Roman Catholic might safely present to a Protestant, or a Protestant to a Roman Catholic.

We think that the first reflection which will occur to an English reader who, for the first time, examines a work which, like the present, contains tolerably copious selections from one of the Fathers, is, how imperfect an idea he can form of the spirit of their writings from the isolated passages which are quoted in books of controversy. We are informed by an ancient collector of good things, of a man who, having a house to sell, sagaciously took with him a single specimen brick, for the full information of intending purchasers. And it would be fully as easy to judge of the comforts of a house by the sight of a single brick, as it would be to form a notion of the spirit of one of the Fathers from what controversial writers produce of their works. For instance, we have ourselves, on several occasions, produced rather copious quotations from St. Chrysostom on the subject of the Word of God; and yet, we think the most diligent student of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN will scarcely be prepared to find how very anxiously this eminent Father had his heart set on "promoting the free circulation of God's holy Word among all classes of persons—how little sympathy he had with that spirit which represents them as dangerous to any—how repeatedly he urges the absolute necessity of their use for all—how earnestly he insists on the statement, that where ignorance of them exists, there, by all means, may we expect heresy to be found—how strongly he recommends the constant perusal of them by the ignorant as well as the highly educated—by the private layman as well as the studious ecclesiastic—at home in the cottage as well as in the church—how great he represents the advantages of the study to be—what a consolation in affliction, what a support under the weight of oppressive cares; and, in fine, how simply he disposes of some of the objections which have been made by people anxious to discourage the study, against the value of the free and unrestrained use of the Holy Bible."

Wishing to lay before our readers some specimens of Mr. King's translations, we have had great difficulty in selecting from so much that is admirable, and present the following passages, not as the best, but as those which first came to hand:—

Chrysostom recommends his flock to peruse carefully at home, beforehand, the particular portions of Scripture which were to be read and commented on at Church. Excuses for "want of time," or not being supplied with copies of the Scriptures, answered.

"One favour I shall ask of you before I proceed to handle the words of the Evangelist—and I must beg of you not to refuse the demand; for neither is the object of my desire anything of an oppressive or burdensome nature, nor is it an object of such a character as to benefit me the receiver only, but, [on the contrary, one which will be accompanied with advantage to] yourselves also by whom it is conferred—nay, to you perhaps it may prove far more beneficial in its tendency. What, then, is it that I would require of you? It is, that on the first day of the week, or on the Sabbath itself, you would, every one of you, take in your hands that portion of the Gospels which is to be read out among you here; and while you sit at home, read it over attentively, and often search into, and examine the contents, and study them carefully; so as to note what is plain, and what obscure; and what statements have the appearance of being contradictory to others, although not so in reality; and, in short, after having weighed all carefully, then come, thus prepared, to our meeting together, where you may hear the preaching of the Word. And the advantage likely to result from such study, both to yourselves and to us, will be not at all inconsiderable. For *we* shall not have occasion for much trouble, in making clear to you the force and meaning of the expressions used, when your mind has been already familiarized to the consideration of the terms; and you yourselves also shall by this method become much more sharp and clearsighted, not only in your hearing, or in your learning for yourselves, but even so as to become competent to instruct others also.

"For, according to the present mode of proceeding, the most part of those who attend in this place are obliged to take into their minds altogether, both the words of the text and our comments upon them. And if we were to keep acting on this plan even for a whole year together, it cannot be expected that they should reap much benefit from such a course. For how should they, when all the attention they give to the matter is bestowed merely in a passing, occasional, sort of way, and just for this short season while we are here?

"And if some will throw the blame on the matters of business and cares which engage them, and the urgent pressure of their employments, public and private—in the first place, this very circumstance is one which of itself involves no little culpability—that a man should allow himself to be encircled with such a flood of worldly affairs, and so entirely nailed to the cares of this present life, as to be unable to bestow even a brief period of leisure on matters that are of more vital consequence than all beside. Then further—that this is mere dissembling and pretence, may be argued to a demonstration from the time spent in company between them and their friends, and their frequent visits to the theatre, and the hours they spend in the assemblies, looking on the equestrian feats there;—employments in which they have not unfrequently consumed whole days.

"Thus, you have been able to find seasons in abundance for keeping company with your friends, and none of them has ever complained on those occasions, of a want of leisure from worldly business—and for these worthless amusements you can afford to forget all your excuses, and enjoy profound leisure—but if you be called on to occupy yourselves with the things of God, these are with you so much less necessary and valuable than all the rest, that you do not feel it requisite to set apart ever so small a portion of your time for giving to them your undivided attention. And are men of such a disposition worthy to enjoy the air they breathe, or to see the light of day?

"There is also another excuse employed by persons of this indolent frame, which is utterly devoid of reason—viz., that they have never gotten a Bible, and have none in their possession. And as far indeed as the wealthy are concerned, it would be ridiculous for us to spend any words on such a pretext. But as I believe that many of our poorer brethren are in the habit of using it very often, I should be glad to ask of them this one question, whether they have not every one of them gotten, complete and perfect, all the tools and implements belonging to the different trades at which they individually labour? even though they have to struggle with poverty in the most pinching form? How then is it not absurd, there indeed to set forth no excuses, but carefully to use all means to prevent the existence of impediment of any kind, in the way of their toils;—but here, where such unspeakable benefits are to be reaped, to be whining over their want of leisure and their poverty? And further, even if any be so far sunk in poverty, yet might they from the continual reading which is kept up in this place, escape from being ignorant of the contents of any part of the Divine Scriptures. King, p. 41."—*Homily ii. (al. x.) on St. John i. 4, Op., Tom. viii. p.* 62. Ed. Bened, Paris, 1718.

Chrysostom does not consider poverty a sufficient reason for being without a copy of God's Word.

"See you not the workers in brass, the goldsmith, the silversmith, the tradespeople of any class, how they keep all the implements of their trade safe and ready for use; even though hunger press them—even though poverty afflict them—still they prefer to endure all hardships rather than part with any of the instruments of their profession, and live by the sale of it. Many, certainly, have chosen rather to borrow for the support of their family and children, than to give up even the smallest of the tools of their trade. And very naturally, for they know that if these be sold, everything that concerns their trade becomes useless to them, and all the source of their gains is taken away. For while they retain these implements, it is possible for them at length to liquidate, in the course of time, the debts they are liable to, by constant working at their trades; but if, in the first instance, they were to give those implements away to others, they should not be able afterwards to contrive any means at all of relieving their poverty and hunger. And such, too, should be our disposition. For just as the implements of *their* trades are the hammer, and anvil, and pincers, exactly so the implements of our profession are, the books of the Apostles and Prophets, and all the Scripture, composed by Divine inspiration, and full of what is for our profit.

"And as these persons of whom we speak, fashion with those implements whatever vessels they take in hand, just so we, by means of these of ours, labour at our own souls, and correct what is injured, and repair what is worn out with age."—*King. p.* 16, *Op. Tom. i. p.* 736.

On such passages as these Mr. King remarks, in his short preface, that they furnish, by anticipation, a reply to a specious objection of modern date:—

"It has been often said, by men disparaging the value of the Sacred Scriptures, 'If they be of such importance to our eternal interests, how then could people be saved at all before printing was invented? How could men possibly all have Bibles in the old times, when manuscripts were more costly than gold and precious stones? Chrysostom gives us plainly to understand that he thought far otherwise; that in his opinion, if men were unsupplied, they were to be blamed; and that, had they a sufficient interest in the object, all, even the poorest, might, by a little exertion, have been furnished with the Sacred Word. But it was no wonder if, when men ceased to attach a due value to the contents of the Bible, copies became scarce, and then, as a necessary consequence, of costly price."

Chrysostom's answer to the objection that the Scriptures are difficult to be understood—The Bible written by plain men, and intended for plain people to read.

"'What, then,' says some one, 'if we do not understand the contents?' Undoubtedly, even if you do not understand the contents, much improvement in holiness accrues from the very reading of them. But further, it is impossible for you to be alike ignorant of all:—for it was for this reason that the grace of the Spirit appointed that publicans, and fishermen, and tent-makers, and shepherds, and goatherds, and unlearned and ignorant men, should compose these books, that none of the unlearned might be able to have recourse to this excuse; that the words there spoken might be intelligible to all; that even the mechanic, and the servant, and the widow woman, and the most unlearned of all mankind, might receive profit and improvement from what they should hear.

"For it was not for vain glory, like the heathen, but for the salvation of the hearers, that those authors, who from the beginning, were counted worthy of the grace of the Spirit, composed all these writings. For the heathen philosophers, indeed, and their orators and writers, not seeking the common welfare, but aiming only at their own aggrandizement, if ever they did say anything useful, did, in their usual obscurity, conceal even this in a sort of dark mist, as it were. But the apostles and prophets did quite the reverse; for what proceeded from them they set before all men plain and clear, as being the common teachers of the world, that each individual might be able, even of himself, to learn from the mere reading the sense of what they said. And foretelling this, the prophet exclaimed, '*They shall be all taught of God. And they shall not say every man to his neighbour, know the Lord, for all shall know me, from the least of them unto the greatest.*' And Paul saith—'*And I, brethren, come to you, not with excellency of speech, or of wisdom, proclaiming to you the mystery of God.*' And, again, '*My speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the spirit and of power.*' And, again, '*For we,*' saith he, '*speak not the wisdom of this world, nor of the princes of this world, that come to nought.*'

"And who is there that does not understand plainly the whole of the gospels? Who that hears that, '*Blessed are the meek, blessed are the merciful, blessed are the pure in heart,*' and so forth, will need a teacher in order to comprehend any of these sayings? And as for the accounts of miracles and wonderful works, and historical facts, are they not plain and intelligible to any common person? This is but pretext and excuse, and a cloak for laziness. You 'do not understand the contents.' And how will you ever be able to understand them, when you will not so much as take a single glance at them? Take the book in your hands, read the entire history, and when you have secured a knowledge of what is simple, come back to the obscure and hard parts over and over again. And if you cannot, by constant reading, make out what is said, go to some person wiser than yourself, go to a teacher, communicate with him about the things spoken of, show a strong interest in the matter; and if God see you displaying so much anxiety, he will not despise your watchfulness and earnestness: but even if no man teach you what you seek after, Himself will surely reveal it.

"Remember the Eunuch of the Queen of the Ethiopians, who though a barbarian by birth, and pressed by innumerable cares, and surrounded on every side by many things to occupy his attention, aye, and unable, moreover, to understand what he was reading, was reading, nevertheless, as he sat in his chariot. And if he showed such diligence upon the road, consider what he must have been when staying at home. If he could not endure to let the time of his journey pass without reading, much more would he attend to it when sitting in the house. If, when he understood nothing of what he was reading, he still would not give up reading, much less would he after he had learned. For in proof that he did not understand what he was reading, hear what Philip saith to him, '*Understandest thou what thou art reading?*' And he, upon hearing this, did not blush, nor feel ashamed, but confessed his ignorance, and says—'*For how can I, unless some man should guide me?*' Since, then, when he had not yet a guide, he was occupied even so, in reading, he therefore speedily met with one to take him by the hand. God saw his earnestness, accepted his diligence, and straightway sent him a teacher.

"'But there is no Philip here now.' Aye, but the Spirit that influenced Philip is here. Let us not trifle, beloved, with our salvation. '*All these things were written for our sakes, for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come.*' Great is the security against sin which the reading of the Scriptures furnishes; great is the precipice, and deep the gulf, that opens before ignorance of the Scriptures. It is downright abandonment of salvation to be ignorant of the Divine laws. It is this that has caused heresies—it is this that has led to profligate living—it is this that has turned things upside down. For it is impossible, impossible, for any one to come off without profit, who constantly enjoys such reading with intelligence."—*King, p.* 18. 22., *Op., Tom. i., p.* 736.

Those who strive to understand the Scriptures sure to obtain aid from the Holy Spirit.

"Let us then, I beseech of you, attend with all diligence to the reading of the Divine Scriptures; for thus shall we attain to knowledge, by constant application to their contents. For it cannot be, that he who gives his attention to Divine things with earnestness and strong desire, should ever be neglected; but even though we have no human instructor, the Lord himself, descending from on high into our hearts, will enlighten our mind, give a brightness to our reasoning faculties, reveal those things that are hidden, become our teacher in what we know not, if only we be willing to contribute our own part; for, '*call not,*' saith he, *any one master upon earth.*' When, therefore, we take into our hands the volume indited by the Spirit, let us collect our thoughts, summon up all our attention, put away from us every earthly care, and thus set about our reading with much devoutness, with much diligence, that so we may be guided by the Holy Spirit to a right understanding of what is written, and thus reap much benefit from the study.

"For that barbarian Eunuch of the Queen of the Ethiopians, surrounded as he was with so much grandeur, and driving along in his carriage, did not neglect his reading, but holding the prophet in his hands, kept attending to the study with much diligence, and this, although he understood not the contents. But, nevertheless, when he contributed all that was needful on his part—earnestness, interest, attention—he obtained a guide. And consider now, I pray you, what a remarkable thing it was, not to forget reading, even when he was going on a journey, and, moreover, when seated in his carriage. Listen to this, you that will not be persuaded to do this even in your houses, but think that the reading of these Scriptures is a needless task, and that because men have the company of a wife to occupy them, or servants to look after, or cares of other sorts of business to attend to, it is therefore inconvenient for them to take much trouble about the reading of the Scriptures. For see here an Eunuch, a native of a savage land, both of them circumstances calculated to draw one into habits of great indolence; and besides this, the man's grandeur and state, the abundance of his wealth, the very circumstance of his being on a journey, and driving in his carriage (for it is no easy matter, but a very difficult one, for a person so travelling to attend much to reading,) yet, nevertheless, his earnestness and strong anxiety removed every impediment, and he held fast to the perusal; and did not say—as many now-a-days—I do not understand the contents, I cannot comprehend the depth of what is written there—what good would there be in my taking the trouble in vain, and to no purpose, reading, when I had no one by able to guide me to the meaning? None of this reasoning entered the thoughts of that person, barbarian

as he was in tongue, yet philosopher in heart. But reflecting that he should not be elected, but would be sure to obtain help from on high, if he were to contribute his own part, and what was according to his ability, he kept reading on.

"Therefore, the Lord of mercy, beholding his earnest desires, neglected him not, nor left him unprovided for, but sent him a teacher directly.—*King, p.* 31. 35. *Hom. on Genesis, ch. xiii. Tom. iv. p.* 349.

"Observe you now what an advantage it is to apply to the reading of the Divine Scriptures with diligence and earnestness. For this was the reason why I brought before you the narrative concerning this barbarian, that there may be no one among us who would feel ashamed to imitate the example of the Ethiopian, the eunuch, that would not even on a journey neglect the reading of them. For that barbarian is fit to become teacher of us all, whether we be of those who have chosen a private life, or of the number of them that pursue military affairs, and live in pomp and grandeur—and, once for all, fit to teach every body, not men only, but women too, as being constantly at home—aye, and those too, who follow the profession of monks, that all people may understand that there is no season unsuited to the perusal of the Divine oracles, but that it is possible, not only at home, but likewise when we move about in public, or pursue our journey, or are in the midst of many persons around us, or are involved in business—to be still occupied with them, in order that when we contribute what is sought on our part, we may speedily obtain the help of one to guide us For the Lord, seeing our concern about spiritual things, will not disregard us, but will afford us the illumination [that cometh down] from on high, and enlighten our understandings."—*King, p.* 36., *Op., Tom iv.* 349.

The Holy Scriptures are the door into Christ's Sheepfold· He that useth them not, but entereth in by some other mode is a thief.

"First, he shows who is the deceiver and the thief, characterizing him thus from the Scriptures, and saying—'*Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber.*' Observe the tokens of the thief. First, that he doth not come in openly. Secondly, that [he entereth] not in the way of the Scriptures; for this is what is implied in, *not by the door.* Herein he points at both such of these as were before him, and such as were to be after him, Antichrist, and the false Christs, and Judas, and Theudas, and any other such, if such there have been.

"And appropriately enough hath he called the Scriptures a door; for they lead us to God, and open to us the way of acquaintance with God. They make the sheep. They guard them, and exclude the wolves from liberty to enter. Like some well secured door, [the Scripture] stops the way of ingress against heretics, placing us in all the security that we could wish for, and not allowing us to be deceived into error. Nor shall we, so long as we open not this [door] improperly, be easily overcome by our enemies. By means of it we shall be able to distinguish all, both such as are shepherds, and such as are not.

"And what means, *into the sheepfold?* To the sheep, and the care of providing for them; for he that useth not the Scriptures, *but climbeth up some other way*, that is, cutting out for himself a different road, and not using the legalized one, *he is a thief.*

"Here again you see him exhibiting agreement with the Father, in thus bringing forward the Scriptures for public use. To this end also said He unto the Jews, '*Search the Scriptures.*' And he adduced Moses publicly among them, and cited him as a witness, and all the prophets likewise. For '*all they,*' saith he, '*that have heard the prophets, shall come unto me.*' And '*if ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me.*' And here he suggested the same view metaphorically, by the use of words, '*climbeth up some other way*;' pointing at the Scribes, who taught for doctrines the commandments of men, and were transgressors of the law; as he himself also intimated in that reproof which He addressed to them, saying, '*None of you keepeth the law.*' Well, too, did he make use of the expression '*climbeth up,*' and not '*cometh in,*' as describing the act of a thief attempting to get over the wall, and engaged in a procedure, each step of which is accompanied with peril."—*King p* 65 (*Op., Tom.* viii., *p.* 346).

If any of our readers should imagine that the passages cited from Chrysostom are opposed to the teaching of the Church of Rome, or that the saint may have even had a sly reference to that church when speaking of *the thief* who entered not by the door of the holy Scriptures, but used some other way of access, we would beg such a reader to dismiss from his mind an impression founded only on the conduct of some modern writers in the Romish communion, but inconsistent with the teaching and practice of the ancient Church of Rome. To that Church we owe the translation of Scripture which has stood its ground the longest, and has occupied the greatest extent of territory, we mean, the Vulgate translation into Latin. This translation was, of course, not made for the benefit of those who had learning enough to read the Scriptures in the original language in which they were written; it must have been intended for the *unlearned* members of the Western Church, who had Latin then for their common language. And no doubt the learned men who translated the Bible out of Greek and Hebrew into Latin, would equally, and for the same reason, have translated it into French, or English, or Irish, if any of these had happened to be the language spoken by unlearned men in Italy in their day. And since it is a boast of the Church of Rome that her principles are unchangeable, our Catholic friends ought not to allow themselves to give credit to any of their communion who would endeavour to persuade them that the freest circulation of the Scriptures is opposed to the principles of their Church.

FARMING OPERATIONS FOR OCTOBER.

(*From the Irish Farmers' Gazette.*)

October should be the principal month for sowing wheat; if on naked fallow, properly and timely prepared last month would be better, when the land is sufficiently moist; but after clover, beans, peas, early potatoes, or vetches, the present month will be most suitable. Early sowing insures an early harvest, produces a well-harvested, bright, and plump grain, and prevents the losses sustained by late harvests, and a tempestous autumnal equinox. If sown of a naked fallow, the furrow should be from four to six weeks old, at least, to allow of sufficient consolidation; if after clover, it should be ploughed down for a fortnight, at least, to allow the furrows to close, consolidate, and the first fermentation of the rotting green clover to be over. It is now generally admitted to be advantageous to the after-crop that the clover be eaten down short, or cut close, before being ploughed in; if after peas, beans, vetches, or potatoes—provided the land has been well manured for those crops—no other preparation is necessary, than to plough up with a neat, close furrow, with a well-raised arrass, in broad sets, to give sufficient cover to the seed, if the land be dry enough to sow under the harrow; or if in narrow ridges, the seed to be lightly harrowed in, fresh mould raised from the furrows by the drill-grubber or furrow-plough, and finished by the shovel. Procure the seed as far from home as possible, and from an earlier soil than that to be sown. It should be of the present year's growth, well harvested, firm, and plump; and let no pains be spared in cleaning it from all weed seeds, in the first instance, and then pick out any mixtures, so that the sample may be pure of its kind; avoiding smutted, rusted, or mildewed samples.

Steeping.—The necessity of steeping wheat, as a preventive of smut and other fungoid diseases, has been so well established that it is not now necessary to recapitulate them. Those most effective are as follow:—Make a brine of salt and water, strong enough to float an egg, and of sufficient quantity to stand in the vessel about six inches higher than the seed; dissolve and add to the brine half a pound of sulphate of copper (bluestone) to every twenty tones of seed to be steeped, pour in the seed and let it stand forty-eight hours, frequently stirring it, and removing such seeds, from time to time, as may be found floating; then lift the seed, and set it to drain in a sieve, and, when drained, dry it well, by mixing it with some dry, finely-slaked lime; it should be mixed so thoroughly that each seed may be coated over with lime, and then passed through a sieve, which will prevent any two seeds sticking together.. It is then fit for sowing, and should not be heaped together for any length of time, lest it heat; and should unsuitable weather set in, it should be spread thinly on a dry floor, and turned over daily.

Dr. Steel, now secretary to the Royal Dublin Society, made experiments, in 1850, on the smut in wheat, and discovered the following excellent steep:—Chloride of lime 1lb., water 1 gallon; mix well together, stir it frequently for an hour, and then let it stand for a short time, draw off the clean solution, and in this steep the seed for two hours; it is then taken out, dried, and sown.

Sowing.—The modes are—First, broadcast, the most simple and the most common; in this way the land may be ploughed first in broad sets, the seed sown and harrowed in; or the land may be properly prepared, harrowed, the seed sown and ploughed in, with a light furrow, in wide sets, or in narrow ridges of about six furrows—the latter is a favourite method in Ireland, and also a good one. In some districts the land is ploughed into narrow ridges first, and after a stroke of the harrow, the seed sown, then well harrowed, and the covering finished from the furrows by the aid of a furrow-plough or drill-grubber, to raise fresh mould enough, and spread with the shovel; or the seed may be drilled, in continuous rows, with a drill-machine, after the land has been properly pulverized, and laid level with the harrows, or by ribbing with the common plough. By the latter mode the land is first ribbed, the seed sown broadcast, which falls into the open drills, and then harrowed, first lengthways with the open drills, and then lightly across. The seed comes up in drills, and is an excellent mode when the weather and the state of the land is suitable. Another mode is by dibbling, or dropping the seed in holes made by hand or machines constructed for the purpose; by this plan a great saving in seed is made, and many experiments go to prove it very productive; but in our climate the land is seldom found in a proper state to practice it on the great scale. Sowing wheat, or other corn crops, in drills has many advantages over the other modes. It gives facility of keeping the land clean, by either the hand or horse-hoe; air and light are more equally distributed through the crop, and at harvest time the work may be more equally distributed on the reapers, and there is a certainty of the work being more evenly and cleanly executed; and if to be laid down with clovers and grass seeds, the advantages are greater still, as the latter, instead of being smothered up and often destroyed almost as soon as they vegetate, have abundance of light and free air till they get perfectly established.

Winter Vetches, to stand the winter, should be sown some time this month, the earlier the better; and to insure productive crops a liberal dressing of manure will be necessary. For details see the operations for last month.

Winter Dun Oats should be sown early, not later than the middle of the month, if possible; but as dry weather when sowing is of the utmost consequence to the safety of this crop, it should be taken advantage of in getting it in, either earlier or later.

Here and Rye, if not sown previously, should be sown without loss of time.

Beans.—Russian beans should be sown by the middle of this month, in well-cleaned, deeply-ploughed, and well-manured land; the crop harvests early, and is an excellent preparation for wheat. This is also the best time to sow Mazagan beans.

Peas.—In land sufficiently dry and warm, a breadth of peas may be sown; but for a general crop, in most soils, early spring sowing is to be preferred.

Cabbages for use the latter end of spring and early summer, should be finally planted out this month; it is important that this crop should have time to make fresh roots, and get thoroughly established, before vegetation ceases; therefore, if a suitable breadth cannot be accomplished this month, it will be rather late next, and had better be put off till the first open weather in spring. The land should be well pulverized, dry, or well drained, and well manured.

Potatoes have lately suffered, and that heavily, in some places, particularly the Kemps; but the accounts are favourable in most districts regarding the safety of those called Protestants, or Scotch Downs, which are generally considered identical. Kemps taken up and either pitted or stored in houses, during the last month, though clean and free from disease, have rapidly become tainted. The present cool weather is favourable to their preservation. When taken up, keeping them dry and cool is of the first importance, and dry lofts will be the best place to store them; in pits, and on damp, ill-ventilated floors, on the ground floor, they decay rapidly. But care should be taken to cover them with dry litter, to exclude the light from those intended for table use, otherwise they will become green and ill-flavoured; those for seed are the better of being exposed. If lofts cannot be spared, the best plan will be to prepare beds of dry land, as if for planting, and pack the potatoes over it closely, but as little in contact as possible, and cover them up with six or eight inches of earth, to exclude air and frost. In this way we have kept them safe till the spring every year since the first great failure, and a rood of ground will contain the produce of several acres. Mixing peat-charcoal, or dry peat-mould mixed with lime, amongst the potatoes in store will have the most beneficial effect. If either of those modes are unattainable, and that the land is not wanted for immediate use, it will be better to let the crop lie in the land, first removing the haulm, and covering with fresh earth, and dig them out as wanted. If pits must be adopted, they should be well thatched with straw only, for some time, to exclude rain and frost, and not put together in such quantities as to endanger heating; or if straw cannot be had, cover very lightly with earth. We strongly recommend planting to proceed cotemporaneously with the lifting; in dry land they may be planted in drills, but as we find their safety depends on the free escape of the watery element, we strongly recommend the *lazy-bed* system for potato culture.

Chicory.—By the end of this month the chicory roots will be sufficiently matured for lifting. When lifted, they should be carted to a convenient washing place, washed clean, sliced and kiln-dried.

Parsnips and Carrots should be lifted and stored when the leaves begin to get discoloured; store them in heaps three or four feet wide and as many high, bringing them to a point at top, and thatch well with straw, to keep out rain and frost; some fine dry sand or dry turf-mould will keep them fresh and sound. Parsnips for table use are best left in the ground, and lifted as required.

Swedes and Mangels should be lifted and stored in a similar manner, in dry weather, as soon as ripe, which may be from the middle to the end of the month, or as soon as frost threatens. The heaps may be made six or seven feet wide, and as many high. Some brushwood laid in in layers, as the heaps are building, will be of service in preventing the heaps from tumbling down, and facilitate the thatching. If the weather be mild these roots may continue growing, or commence a new growth; but as the increase in size at such a period is chiefly watery fluid, and, from the absence of sun to elaborate the more nutritive components, the increased size is found, from experience and analysis, not to compensate for the deterioration of the more nutritive elements, and the keeping properties of the roots much injured, so that early lifting is to be recommended.

Stall-Feeding.—The cattle intended for stalls should now be housed, as the nights are getting long and cold, and the herbage weak and watery; so that by leaving them longer out, they would be rather losing than improving in condition. After housing, they should have plenty of free air, lest they perspire too much, and get cold; and let them have but moderate supplies of green food or roots in the beginning, to avoid scouring.

Milch Cows will require some extra assistance henceforth to keep them up as much as possible to their usual quantum of milk, or it will rapidly decrease. Grains, cabbages, turnips, mangel, leaves, &c., will now be in requisition, and well paid for in this way.

Store Cattle may still lay out, but should have shelter and dry lying at night.

New and Recent Works

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

Booksellers to the Queen,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Any Book or number of Books together, *within a pound weight*, can be sent by post for 6d., and at the rate of 6d. for every pound weight additional.

THE DOMESTIC COMMENTARY ON THE OLD TESTAMENT. By a Clergyman of the Church of England; Genesis to 2nd Book of Kings. Imp. 8vo. 16s.

THE DOMESTIC COMMENTARY ON THE NEW TESTAMENT. By a Clergyman of the Church of England. Imp. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

THE LAW AND THE TESTIMONY. By the Author of The "Wide, Wide World. 8vo. 12s.

MEMOIRS OF THE LIFE AND WRITINGS OF JOHN PYE SMITH, D.D., LL.D. By John Medway. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

LIFE AND TIMES OF MADAME DE STAEL. By Maria Norris, with Portrait. Post 8vo. 9s.

THE PASTOR'S WIFE. A Memoir of Mrs. Sherman, of Surrey Chapel. By Her Husband. Fcap 8vo. 5s.

THE MISSIONARY OF KILMANY. Being a Memoir of Alexander Paterson. By Rev. John Baillie. Post 8vo. 2s.

A BRIEF MEMOIR OF THE LATE MISS ROSA E. C. NICHOLSON; containing the Letters addressed to her during her illness, by the late Rev. W. H. Krause. By Rev. C. S. Stanford. 2s.

THE PUBLIC AND DOMESTIC LIFE OF THE RIGHT HONOURABLE EDMUND BURKE. By Peter Burke, Esq. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.

POPE'S WORKS; Rape of the Lock; Essay on Criticism; Epistles; Odes, &c. Illustrated. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.

SABBATH EVENING READINGS ON ST. MATTHEW. By Rev. Dr. Cumming. Foolscap. 5s.

HISTORY OF THE INSURRECTION IN CHINA; with Notices of the Christianity, Creed, and Proclamations of the Insurgents. By M.M. Callery and Yvan, translated from the French, with a Chapter, narrating the most recent events. By John Oxenford. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

HIPPOLYTUS AND THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH OF THE THIRD CENTURY; with a Copious Analysis of the newly discovered MS., &c. By W. Elfe Taylor. Fcap 8vo. 3s. 6d.

FAMILY PRAYERS. By the Author of "Morning and Night Watches." Fcap 8vo. 3s. 6d.

ISRAEL'S FUTURE; Lectures delivered in the Lock Chapel, in Lent 1852. By Rev. Capel Molyneux. 4s. 6d.

THE WORLD TO COME; Lectures delivered in the Lock Chapel, in Lent 1853. By Capel Molyneux. 4s. 6d.

THE COMPLETE SERMONS OF THE REV. RICHARD CECIL. Now first Collected. 2s. 6d.

D'AUBIGNE'S HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND. Vol. 5. Post 8vo., Cloth. (Oliver and Boyd's Edition). 6s.

D'AUBIGNE'S HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND. Vol. 5. 12mo, Cloth. (Collins's Edition.) 4s. 6d.

THE PREDICTED DOWNFALL OF TURKEY, THE PREPARATION FOR THE RETURN OF THE TEN TRIBES. By George Stanley Faber. 2s.

AN EXPOSITION OF THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE GALATIANS. By Rev. John Brown, D.D. 8vo. 12s.

DISCOURSES SUITED TO THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER. By Rev. John Brown, D.D. 8vo. 8s.

DISCOURSES AND SAYINGS OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST, Illustrated in a Series of Expositions. By Rev. John Brown, D.D. 3 vols. 8vo. 31s. 6d.
"A Noble Work."—*Free Church Magazine.*
"They bear the impress of keen critical sagacity, of a calm, comprehensive, and independent judgment, of extensive research, of sound exegetical principles, and of the most devout and loving reverence for Him whose 'sayings' they are intended to illustrate."—*Eclectic Review.*

AN EXPOSITION OF OUR LORD'S INTERCESSORY PRAYER, (John xvii.) with a Discourse on the Relation of Our Lord's Intercession to the Conversion of the World. By Rev. John Brown, D.D. 8vo. 7s.
"This Exposition is in the Author's highest manner, the Outline is a Masterpiece, the Arguments and Illustration perfect."—*British Quarterly Review.*

EXPOSITORY DISCOURSES ON THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER. By Rev. John Brown, D.D. 2 vols. 8vo. 21s.
"Our estimate of the value of this Work is very high. It appears to us the very best specimen of Scotch commentary that has ever been published. The doctrinal and the practical, the critical and the popular, are admirably combined."—*Kitto's Journal of Sacred Literature.*

NOTES ON BOOK OF DANIEL. By Albert Barnes. 2 vols. 7s, or, in one double vol., 6s. 6d.

THE LAMP AND THE LANTERN; or Light for the Tent and the Traveller. By James Hamilton, D.D. 1s. 6d.

WHAT THINK YE OF CHRIST? A Series of Meditations on the Title and Offices of Our Lord. By J. G. Smyttan. Foolscap 8vo. 3s. 6d.

HOMILETICS; or the Theory of Preaching. By Alexander Vinet, D.D. 8vo. 6s.

MEMOIR OF ROBERT AND JAMES A. HALDANE. By Alex. Haldane, Esq. 12s.

MEMOIR OF THE REV. W. H. HEWITSON. By the Rev. John Baillie. 5s.

SELECT LETTERS AND REMAINS OF THE LATE REV. W. H. HEWITSON. Edited by the Rev. John Baillie. 2 Vols. 10s.

ABBEOKUTA; or, Sunrise within the Tropics: An Outline of the Origin and Progress of the Yoruba Mission. By Miss Tucker. 3s. 6d.

A SUMMARY OF BIBLICAL ANTIQUITIES; for the use of Schools, Bible Classes, and Families. By Rev. Dr. Nevin. Foolscap 8vo. 2s. 6d.

THE NEW REFORMATION IN IRELAND, with striking facts and anecdotes illustrating the Extent and Reality of the Movement. By the Rev. L. W. Jones. With a Missionary Map. 1s. 6d.

THE LUNAR WORLD, its Scenery, Motions, &c., Considered with a View to Design. By Rev. Josiah Crampton. Sewed 1s. 6d., cloth 2s.

THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW, No. VI. 3s. 6d.

ASSORTED PACKET OF TWOPENNY BOOKS, Containing Thirteen Books. 2s.

FORTY-EIGHT MISSIONARY STORIES FOR CHILDREN. By Harriet D'Oyly Howe. In packet 1s.

PACKET OF SCRIPTURE STORIES FOR CHILDREN. By Miss Parrott. 1s.

THE RELIGION OF GEOLOGY, AND ITS CONNECTED SCIENCES. By Edward Hitchcock, D.D., LL.D. 12mo. Sewed 1s. 6d.; cloth 2s.

THE ART OF QUESTIONING; or, a short Analysis of the Interrogatory Methods of Instruction, designed for the use of Teachers, Pupil-Teachers, and Monitors. By W. T. Young, T.C.D. 1s.

TALES AND ILLUSTRATIONS, chiefly intended for Young Persons. By Charlotte Elizabeth. 3s. 6d.

THE SPECTATOR; with a Biographical and Critical Preface, and Explanitary Notes. (In four vols.) Vol. I. 3s.

NORWAY AND ITS SCENERY. Comprising the Journal of a Tour by Edward Price, Esq. 5s.

CHINA, PICTORIAL, DESCRIPTIVE, AND HISTORICAL, with some account of Ava, and the Burmese, Siam, and Anam; with nearly 100 Illustrations. 5s.

STUY VESANT: a Franconia Story. By Jacob Abbott. 2s.

CAROLINE: a Franconia Story. By Jacob Abbott. 2s.

THE COMING CONFLICT; or Rome and Russia against England. 8d.; by Post, 1s.

THE COMING REST FOR THE NATIONS OF THE EARTH. By the Author of the "Coming Struggle." 6d.; by post, 10d.

TALKING TO TABLES, A GREAT FOLLY OR A GREAT SIN. By Rev. W. C. Magee, Bath. 6d.; by post, 8d.

TABLE-MOVING TESTED, AND PROVED TO BE THE RESULT OF SATANIC AGENCY. By Rev N. S. Godfrey. 6d.; by post, 8d.

Will be Published in the second week in December. Price to Subscribers, 2s. 6d.—Non-subscribers, 3s. 6d.

LETTERS FROM SARAWAK; addressed to a Child. By Mrs. M'Dougall.

*** The Profits to be given in aid of the Church Mission, which has been established in Borneo for the last five years.

Subscribers names received by WILLIAM CURRY and COMPANY, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

In the Press, and shortly will be Published, in Two Vols., Fcap. 8vo. Cloth.

I.

MEMOIR OF THE LATE REVEREND EDWARD BICKERSTETH. By Rev. T. R. Birks. With Portrait. Uniform with the Collected Edition of his Works. Price to Subscribers, 8s.—Non-subscribers, Half-a-guinea.

II.

A cheap issue of the Life of Dr. Chalmers.

On 1st October was published—

Part 1 of a MONTHLY issue, at 6d., to be completed in Twenty Parts.

Part 1 of a QUARTERLY issue, at 2s. 6d., containing each one volume of the Original Edition. To be completed in four such parts.

The work may therefore be had complete in either way for 10s., or in 2 vols., bound in cloth, price 12s.

*** Subscribers names received by WILLIAM CURRY and COMPANY, 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Just Published, price 3d., by Post 4d.,

A LETTER

Addressed to the Committee of Management on the occasion of the Dedication of the

NEW ROMAN CATHOLIC CHAPEL,

St. Mary Star of the Sea,

IRISHTOWN,

On August 15, 1853,

In answer to an Invitation to attend that Ceremony,

BY

REV. WILLIAM DE BURGH, B.D.,

SANDYMOUNT.

Sold by WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-st., Dublin.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON, and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher, WILLIAM CURRY, 9 Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.
October, 1853.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Glóir do Dhia añ ṛna háṛduiḃ, agur ṛíoḃcáin air an ṫalaiṁ ḋeaġċoil do na ḋáoiniḃ.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED THE MIDDLE OF EVERY MONTH, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. II.—No. 23. NOVEMBER, 1853. Annual Subscription, 3s. 6d. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
Can the Infallibility of the Church of Rome be proved from the Holy Scriptures?	121
Pope Alexander VI. and King Henry VIII.	122
Does the Worship of the Church of Rome answer the true ends of Devotion?—No. II.	123
The Talk of the Road—No. XVIII.	124
The Apocrypha	125
The Land of Eyes	126
Infallibility and Common Sense	128
CORRESPONDENCE—	
Infallibility of the Church of Rome—by Mr. W. Rourke	128
On the Visibility of the Church—by Philalethes	129
Origen a heretic—by Diego	131
The Church Visible and Invisible—by a Roman Catholic	131
Farming Operations for November	131

CAN THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH BE PROVED FROM SCRIPTURE?

Once upon a time a blind man went astray in the middle of a wood, at a considerable distance from a certain large town. The paths were so entangled that, even had he the use of eye-sight, it would have been almost impossible for him to have discovered the right way; and as the wood was never traversed by any passenger, there was no hope of his obtaining any assistance. But necessity is the mother of invention. As his life depended on his getting out, his ingenuity was sharpened to such a degree that he could not be detained by any ordinary obstacle. So, after considerable thought, he invented and put in practice a very simple way of making his escape. Can any of our readers guess how? Why, he just went to the town and got a guide, and then the guide showed him the way out.

What a nonsensical story! exclaims a reader; why, if the blind man could not find his way, how could he get to the town to look for a guide; or supposing that he did, by any chance, make his way to the town, what need would he then have for a guide out of the wood? Well, really, perhaps there is some force in this objection. All we can do is, to request those readers who are so severely critical upon a poor little story, told only for their amusement, to require at least as much consistency and plausibility in the proofs offered to them of a truth, which they are told it is essential to their salvation they should believe. And now for the application of our story.

When the advocates of the Church of Rome endeavour to form a proof by arguments from reason for the infallibility of their Church, the line they generally take is to try to make out that it is impossible for men, by the exercise of their private judgment, to arrive at any certainty on matters of religion. Those who suppose that they might possibly obtain some knowledge of God's truth from the study of his Word, are told that without the authority of an infallible guide it is impossible for them to know what books deserve to be counted as Scripture; or, supposing this ascertained, that it would be impossible for them, without an infallible interpreter, to arrive at a knowledge of the meaning of the Bible. In short, the advocates of the Church of Rome represent men, without the help of an infallible guide, to be in as helpless a condition as the blind man in the wood, of whom we have just told.

But, then, unfortunately, the next thing they have to do is, to give some proof that the infallible guide actually exists, whom they represent to be so necessary. They know that they cannot expect their Church's claims to be received on her bare word alone: and so they are compelled to bring forward some proofs from reason and Scripture. But who is to judge of these proofs? Why, just the individual whose private judgment they have represented as so little trustworthy. At one time they talk as if without the Church's authority an individual could not prove by Scripture testimony such fundamental truths as the atonement or the Divinity of our Lord. At another time, they suppose the same individual capable of solving the most difficult problem in all theology—namely, the eliciting from Scripture a proof of the infallibility of the Church of Rome. This is exactly sending the blind man a long journey to look for his guide.

Now, just consider how many things the private Christian must have accomplished before he can obtain from Scripture a proof of the existence of an infallible Church. He must know—(1) That the Scripture is the Word of God—(2) That it has been brought down pure and uncorrupted to us—(3) He must be able to understand the meaning of it—(4) Supposing that he has proved from Scripture that some Church is infallible, he must know what a Church is, and what constitutes a body of men to be a Church—(5) Since there are several bodies of men calling themselves Churches, and condemning one another as guilty of error, schism, and heresy, he must ascertain which of them is that society where infallibility is to be found—(6) If in the Church selected there be different opinions as to the seat of infallibility, he must be well assured in whom this great privilege is vested before he can be bound to acknowledge and submit to it—and (7) If it be found that everything propounded by the guide selected is not alleged to be infallible, he must have some rule for knowing when his infallible guide is speaking infallibly, and when he is not. All this the private Christian must perform without the help of any infallible guide, for they are the steps absolutely necessary *in the process of finding one.* If he can arrive at certainty on these points by the exercise of his private judgment, then he may very well dispense with any infallible guide, and trust his private judgment a good deal further. If he is so skilful in diving into the mysteries of Scripture as to be able to elicit from the text—"Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church," the doctrine—The Bishop of Rome is infallible—he can scarcely require a guide to tell him the meaning of texts so comparatively plain, as "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life."

When therefore we proceed to discuss the meaning of the texts which are brought forward in proof of the infallibility of the Church of Rome, we are arguing with opponents who are beaten before the battle commences. By offering texts at all in proof of such a doctrine, they place themselves in an untenable position. They rest the authority of Scripture on the infallibility of the Church, and now they want to establish the infallibility of the Church by the authority of Scripture. This is the vicious circle out of which the advocates of Romanism never have been able to escape.

But whether they are consistent in appealing to Scripture or no, it is ground we are heartily glad to get them on; and so, without further preface, we go on to consider the passages they usually bring forward.

And first, then, we shall take a class of passages, both from the Old and New Testament, which are brought forward as describing the perfection and purity of the Church. We take as specimens, for the most part, those selected by the writer of THE TOUCHSTONE.

Isaiah lix. 20, 21.—"The Redeemer shall come to Zion, and unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob. As for me, this is my covenant with them, saith the Lord: my Spirit that is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and for ever."

Ps. lxxii. 5, 7.—"They shall fear thee as long as the sun and moon endure, throughout all generations. In his days shall the righteous flourish, and abundance of peace so long as the moon endureth."

Isaiah liv. 9.—"As I have sworn that the waters of Noah should no more go over the earth, so I have sworn that I would not be wroth with thee, nor rebuke thee. For the mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed, but my kindness shall not depart from thee; neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed, saith the Lord that hath mercy upon thee."

Eph.* v. 25, 26, 27.—"Christ also loved the Church, and gave himself for it: that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, and present it to himself, a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish."

We are content not to raise any question as to the applicability to the Christian Church of the passages here alleged from the Old Testament. None of them certainly speak in loftier language of the glories of the Church than that last quoted from the New. But then it must be remembered that the Church consists of two parts—a Church militant, and a Church triumphant: that the Church has two conditions—a present one of imperfection and trial, a future one of glory and happiness. We are not warranted in applying to the one state the promises which refer to the other. If the Church be not in a position to claim as already fulfilled the promises of her being holy, pure, and without blemish, neither may she assert for her doctrine greater perfection than for her practice. None of the prophecies quoted justify us in separating the one from the other; nay, they speak even more strongly of the righteousness and peace which was to abound in her, than of the truth by which she was to be distinguished. If, then, we prove by unquestionable Roman Catholic authority, that these promises of glory and perfection are not fulfilled in the present state of the Church, we may fairly set these texts aside as having no bearing upon the present question.

First, then, we cite the declaration of Pope Adrian II. by his nuncio, at the imperial diet of Nuremberg (1522). "We know that for a long time there have existed many abominations in this holy See, abuses of spiritual things, excesses in the exercise of jurisdiction: all things, in short, have been changed and perverted. Nor need we wonder that corruption has descended from the head to the members, from the Supreme Pontiff to the inferior prelates. We have all, that is, prelates and ecclesiastics, turned aside each one to his own way, for none of us have done well, no not one."—Rainald. Ann. Eccl. An. 1522, n. 66., tom. xx., p. 365.

Secondly, we offer the testimony of Cardinal Bellarmine—"Some years before the rise of the Lutheran and Calvinistic heresy, according to the testimony of those who were then alive, there was almost an entire abandonment of equity in the ecclesiastical judgments; in morals no discipline; in sacred literature, no erudition; in Divine things, no reverence; religion was almost extinct."—Concio xxviii. Opp. vi. 296. Colon. 1617.

We could add abundance of other Roman Catholic acknowledgments that the Church, in her present state, is very far indeed from being in a position to claim, as her own, the character of being a glorious Church, free from spot or wrinkle or any such thing.

We may, therefore, hence deduce a general caution; before we apply any statement of the Scripture to the Church, we must ascertain what part of the Church, and what state of the Church is there spoken of. It is only by not attending to this caution men have thought they had made out a Scriptural proof that the Church which voted image-worship lawful, and the Books of the Maccabees canonical, was free from error; and they might make out exactly as good a proof from the texts we have given, that the Church which had Alexander VI. for its head was free from sin.*

The next texts we shall consider are our Lord's promises.—Matthew xvi. 18.—"The gates of hell shall not prevail against it;" and Matthew xxviii. 20,—"Lo I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."

We may fairly infer from these words the perpetual existence of the Church, and that our Lord has promised it his constant protection; but there is not a word here about *infallibility.* These texts would have force, if Protestants asserted that the Church had become extinct in the sixteenth century, and that Luther had founded a new Church; but, on the contrary, they always speak of the event which then occurred as a *reformation* of the Church, implying that she existed before, though not in a pure state. Protestants believe that Christ always has been with his Church, and has never withdrawn his protection from it. There is no more signal proof of this than the history of those times; when the gates of hell made their fiercest assault against the Church, when an infidel Pope (Leo X.) was recognised as the Head of the Church; when, according to the description just quoted from Bellarmine, there was in morals no discipline, in Divine

* This passage from Ephesians is one of those cited by Mr. Rourke, and affords, according to him, an invincible demonstration that the Church never rebelled against Christ, by error, idolatry, or false worship. Does he not see that the same text affords just as good a demonstration that she never rebelled against him by sin, that she was never in such a state that religion could be said to be "almost extinct?"

Mr. Rourke adds, that if the Church was liable to err, Christ could not love her! It approaches to blasphemy to deny the love of our Saviour, because of the imperfections which we experience in this sinful world.—See infrà, p. 128.

things no reverence, religion was almost extinct. Even in those worst of times she still retained the germs of vitality: she still preserved the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel: she still was the depository of the Word of God; and when religion was re-animated in the world, it was not by the overthrow of the Church and the institution of a new society, but by the exertions of teachers from her own bosom, who had nothing to do but to clear her from modern corruptions, to claim their true place for the doctrines which had been from the beginning, using no other instrument of reformation, than the Scriptures, which she had never parted with.

Matthew xviii. 17.—"Hear the Church."

This is one of the texts which, in want of better, are sometimes brought forward to prove the infallibility of the Church. We have before had occasion to show how little it has to do with that question, and here we again print the context of the passage, that those readers who are not familiar with the Bible may be able to see how very unfair is the controversial use which has been attempted to be made of this text:—

"If thy brother trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother; but if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the Church; but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican."

Here, then, we see that the text refers not to questions of doctrine at all, but to private disputes between Christians, and especially at the time when they formed a small society in the midst of heathens. They are directed, if they fail to settle their differences amicably among themselves, or by the intervention of friends, to bring the case—not before a heathen law court (see 1 Cor. vi.), but before the Church. Of course it does not mean the Church universal, which could not possibly take cognizance of every private dispute among Christians, but the particular congregation to which the parties belonged. And either party refusing to submit to the arbitration of the Church was to be treated as a heathen—as excommunicate from their society. All this is so very plain and simple that we can scarcely acquit of dishonesty those controversialists who wrest what is said about the decisions of particular churches on points of private difference between Christians, as if it were meant of decisions of the universal Church in points of doctrine.

1 Tim. iii. 15, 16—"That thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth. And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness—God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached to the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory."

On the words "pillar and ground of the truth," applied to the Church in the foregoing text, an argument is founded in behalf of the infallibility of the Church.

As our article has already run to great length, we shall not raise a question as to whether the words "pillar and ground of the truth" refer to the Church at all; although Gregory Nyssen and other Fathers understand them here as spoken of Timothy himself, while other distinguished men read them in connection with what follows, understanding, by the "pillar and ground of the truth," those fundamental doctrines contained in the 16th verse; just in the same way that the Apostle's Creed is called by so many Fathers the pillar of the truth (Epiphanius), the foundation of the faith (Augustine), &c. But understanding the words as referring to the Church, there is no difficulty in explaining them. The Church is that body which preserves and keeps, which maintains and upholds, the Christian faith; and just as heretical congregations were the pillars and stays of falsehood, maintained and defended it, testified to it and endeavoured to continue it to posterity; just so is the Church the pillar and ground of truth; it professes the Christian faith, and maintains it as the truth of God, notwithstanding all the persecutions of its enemies.

Neither is there any difficulty in showing what the words do *not* mean. The Church is not the foundation on which the truth is built, and is not that which gives it authority and makes it be truth. On the contrary, the truth is the foundation on which the Church is built, and is what makes it to be a Church. So St. Chrysostom, on this very passage, says—"The truth is the pillar and ground of the Church," and we have Scripture testimony to the same position.—Eph. ii. 20, 21, 22; Matthew xvi. 18.

Again, nothing is more certain than that this phrase, "pillar and ground of the truth," did not, in the judgment of the early Church, imply infallibility. It is applied, as we have said, by Gregory Nyssen, to Timothy, by St. Basil to Musonius, Bishop of Neo Cæsarea, Ep. 67; to Athanasius of Ancyra, Ep. 62; by Gregory Nyssen to Basil, Or. 19; to Athanasius, Or. 23; to Eusebius of Samosata, Ep. 29. We could add to our list, but we may give instead the statement of Gregory Nyssen, that every pious member of the Church may lay claim to this title. The following is his explanation of the passage in question; and though, in our private judgment, it is not the most natural way of interpreting the text to refer the words to Timothy, yet those who have sworn (as all Roman Catholic priests have once) to interpret Scripture according to the *unanimous* consent of the Fathers, will never hereafter, we hope, venture to apply this text to the Catholic Church—"Paul, while he builds up the illustrious Timothy as a house to receive God, places in it these two pillars, on one of which he inscribes the name of faith, and on the other conscience. . . . By both these we may become such pillars as Peter, and James, and John, or if there be any one else that hath been, or shall be worthy of this name. For whosoever is perfected in these two commandments [to love God, and to love his neighbour], he is framed to be a pillar and ground of the truth, according to the language of the Apostle."—Hom. 14, in Cant. Cantic., vol. i., p. 684. Paris, 1638. Now, since it will not be pretended that Musonius, or Basil, or Eusebius, or that every pious Christian is infallible, we see that it is a modern fancy that these words "pillar and ground of the truth" imply infallibility.

We have not space for the consideration of more texts; but we have the satisfaction of thinking that we have devoted the limited space at our disposal to the discussion of those texts which the believers in the infallibility of the Church think to be the strongest in their favour. And the conclusion from the whole is, that there is not one whit more Scriptural ground for believing in an infallible Church than in an impeccable Church—that though our Lord is ever with his Church—though he has given it his Spirit, who is both a Spirit of truth and a Spirit of holiness—though that Spirit has prevented the sin and error of the world from shutting out his people from eternal life, yet that *perfect* truth or *perfect* holiness are not attainable in the present dispensation.

ALEXANDER VI. AND HENRY VIII.

IT is a matter of common observation, that when one of two rival disputants is worsted in an argument, he very frequently loses his temper, and begins to abuse his opponents, or his opponents' supposed friends and supporters. Sometimes, too, when a man feels that his cause is entirely indefensible, he is apt to have recourse to personal invective, in the hope that, by distracting the attention of his adversary from the real point at issue, he may be enabled to avoid a defeat which would otherwise have been inevitable. These attempts to make invective supply the want of argument, remind us of the story of the lawyer, who being retained in a cause in which justice was not exactly on his side, on opening his brief found only the concise instructions—"No case; abuse the plaintiff's attorney."

Our Skibbereen correspondent, Mr. James Willson, whose letter we printed at length in our last number, and from whom we have received another letter since indited in a similar spirit, appears to act on the principle just alluded to. Unwilling or unable to enter the fair field of argument, he has had recourse to the ignoble weapons of abuse and invective. Those persons who were formerly instrumental in promoting the cause of the Reformation are, of course, the objects of his bitterest censure. According to him, "the murderous, the adulterous, the incestuous King Henry VIII. was the founder of the iniquitous, perjuring, antichristian" Church of England. He stigmatizes Luther as "an envious, proud friar, the firebrand of hell, the arch-heretic." And he finally winds up his denunciations by the sweeping assertion that we have "calumniated Popes, Popery, bishops, priests, monks, nuns, the confessional—in fact, anything Catholic—all Christianity."

To the charge against ourselves, urged as it is without a shadow of proof or foundation, we shall not condescend to offer a word of reply. And we may safely leave the character of the great German reformer to the judgment of more cool and dispassionate critics than Mr. Willson of Skibbereen. It was wittily observed by Erasmus, in the life-time of Luther, in reference to the hostile attacks which were then made upon him—"Luther has committed two unpardonable faults: he touched the monks' bellies and the Pope's crown." And we may add that the deadly enmity of some Roman Catholic writers to the memory of Luther only proves how keenly they feel the fatal injury which was inflicted upon the Church of Rome by his means.

As regards the character of Henry VIII., however, and his connection with the English Reformation, we desire, more for our readers' sake than our own, to say a few words. This has always been a favourite topic with Roman Catholic controversialists, who have sought, by exposing the faults of that monarch's history, to throw discredit on the origin of the great religious movement which severed England from the Papal See. And yet, it needs but a moment's reflection to see that this question is one which is entirely irrelevant to the real point at issue between the two Churches—namely, the truth or falsehood of the doctrines which they respectively hold.

Let it be granted, for the sake of argument, that the character of Henry VIII. was as bad, and his motives as corrupt, as his worst enemies have represented them to be, we ask, what has this to do with the religious part of the controversy, the only part in which people of the present day have any real interest or concern? The character of the founder of a *new* religion may, indeed, be fairly called in question, when we wish to form a judgment as to the nature of the religious system which he taught. We may point out the features of the Mahometan creed, for example, which were impressed upon it by the peculiar temperament and position of Mahomet himself; but this analogy is totally inapplicable to the case of the English Reformation. Our readers do not need to be told that the Church of England claims to be in possession of a system of Divine truth, which was taught by Christ and his Apostles, and with which the character of Henry VIII. has as little to do as that of Confucius.

We assert, in opposition to the Church of Rome, that the sacrifice of the mass is unscriptural and unlawful: is it any answer to be told that Henry VIII. was a cruel and inconstant husband? We call in question the supremacy and infallibility of the Pope; we are met by the reply, that Henry VIII. beheaded Catherine Howard. We believe that there is but one Mediator, and that invocation of saints is forbidden: "no matter," it is said, "the Church of England was founded by a monster who had six wives!" Surely such puerile attempts to mislead inquirers from the real and momentous points at issue only indicate the inherent weakness of the adversary's cause.

But, perhaps, a more effective way of checking such a line of controversy for the future will be, to show how easily it can be retorted against Roman Catholics themselves. As the character of Henry VIII. has been so frequently brought upon the stage by Romish controversialists, it can scarcely be deemed unreasonable to compare the personal history of this monarch with that of some contemporaneous Pope. This comparison is, indeed, almost forced upon us by the arguments of one of our chief opponents. Cardinal Bellarmine, as it is well known, has specified "holiness of life of the doctors of the Church" as one of his "notes" whereby the true Church may be distinguished; and where are we to look for holiness, if not in the Church's infallible head, who claims the title of "His Holiness" as his proper and peculiar designation? Our only apprehension is, lest the ghost of the king may haunt us for our unfairness, in venturing to expect as much virtue and self-denial from a mere earthly monarch, as from the wearer of the triple crown—the vicar and vicegerent of Christ upon earth.

We propose, therefore, for the information of our readers, to draw a brief parallel between Henry VIII. and the contemporaneous (or nearly contemporaneous)* Pontiff, Alexander VI. We shall perform this task with the strictest fairness and impartiality; and for this end, the facts relating to the history of the Pope shall be taken from the most unimpeachable Roman Catholic authorities, Guiccardini, Burchard,† Moreri, Cardinal Bembo, and others.

In estimating the character of Henry VIII. we are prepared, for the sake of brevity, to admit all, or nearly all, that his enemies have laid to his charge. The most eminent English historian who has treated of his reign, declares that he was violent, cruel, profuse, rapacious, bigoted, and unjust. Lest our Roman Catholic readers should feel any undue triumph in this matter, however, we must remind them of a fact which is often forgotten—namely, that up to the very end of his life the religious opinions of this king were much more akin to those of the Church of Rome than the Church of England. In proof of this assertion, we need only refer to the atrocious Act of Six Articles, which he compelled his parliament to pass in 1539, a few years before the close of his reign.‡ By this Act all persons who denied the doctrine of the real presence *were condemned to be burnt;* and the denial of communion in one kind, of the perpetual obligation of vows of chastity, of private masses, of the celibacy of the clergy, or of auricular confession, subjected the offender to the forfeiture of all his goods and chattels, and imprisonment during the king's pleasure. It is plain, therefore, that a monarch who enforced upon his subjects, under such severe penalties, the belief of all these points of orthodox Roman Catholic belief, must have been himself at heart much more of a Roman Catholic than a Protestant.

Let us now turn our eyes from the King to the Pontiff. Roderigo Lenzuoli was descended from a noble Spanish family. On the elevation of his maternal uncle, Alfonso Borgia, to the pontificate, under the title of Calixtus III., Roderigo was called to Rome, and, taking the name of Borgia, he was appointed Archbishop of Valencia, and Cardinal of S. Nicolo. After filling these high dignities for more than thirty-five years, he was elected Pope, under the title of Alexander VI.

So far, all the advantages were on the side of the Pontiff. Henry at his accession was young and inexperienced, and just set free from parental control. Alexander VI. had for years filled high ecclesiastical functions, imposing grave responsibilities; and he had reached the mature age of sixty before he was elected to fill the Papal throne. We may naturally expect, therefore, to find the latter free from those faults and vices which disgraced the character of the former.

But how stands the case? Alexander's first act was to purchase the Popedom by the most flagitious bribery. We are told, in the diary of his Chamberlain Burchard, which

* A period of only six years intervened between the death of Alexander VI. and Henry's succession to the throne. The former event happened in 1503, the latter in 1509.

† Burchard was Master of the Ceremonies to Alexander VI., and an eye-witness of many of the events which he describes. His diary, written in a curious mixture of Latin, French, and Italian, was published at Hanover, in 1696.

‡ See the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, Vol. I., p. 121, for a full account of this public record of Henry VIII.th's religious sentiments

is still extant,* that four mules, laden with silver, were sent to one of the Cardinals, and five thousand gold crowns to another, for the purchase of their respective votes. Out of the entire conclave, there were only five Cardinals who did not sell their votes!

When Simon Magus offered money to Saint Peter for the purchase of a spiritual gift, Scripture records the Apostle's indignant reply (Acts viii. 20)—"Thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money." And yet, after the lapse of fifteen centuries from the time that Saint Peter uttered these words, what a scene do we behold in the capital of the Christian world? The office of highest rank and dignity in the Church—that office which claims to have been founded by the great Apostle himself, and which is supposed to confer the gift of infallibility—is put up, as it were, for sale, and shamelessly disposed of to the highest bidder! After this, who will venture to assert that the Church did not stand in need of a reformation?

We have seen how Alexander VI. secured his elevation to the Popedom: let us now inquire how he conducted himself in his office. Rome was filled with scenes of rapine and violence. Everything of which the clergy were possessed was, upon their decease, claimed by the Pope, as his property; so that no prelate or cardinal was allowed to make a will. The sums arising from the benefices while vacant were likewise secured; and the benefices themselves sold like common goods in a market. This abuse was carried to such a scandalous excess, that, as Cardinal Bembo observes in his History of Venice, the secular princes were obliged to provide against the evil, by prohibiting their subjects, under the penalty of banishment, from going to purchase benefices with their money at Rome.† It was with reference to these shameful transactions of the Pontiff that the well-known pasquinade (one of the first of its kind) was composed:—

Vendit Alexander claves, altaria, Christum.
Vendere jure potest; emerat ille prius.

"Alexander sells the keys, the altars, Christ himself;
He has a right to sell them—he had *bought* them before."

Cruelty was another feature in the character of this Pope. We have only space to mention a single instance.‡ The Pope having heard that Giovanni Lorenzo, a Venetian, had written some satires against him, ordered him to be seized and thrown into prison. The Venetian senate sent orders to their ambassadors at Rome to intercede with the Pope in his behalf. To this the Pope replied, "that he was sorry he could not comply with their request, because the person for whom they interceded was already put to death by his orders, and, therefore, their intercession came too late." And, indeed, it was so, for the unfortunate man had been ordered to be strangled, and thrown into the Tiber.

We are obliged to touch but lightly upon the profligacy of the Pope's private life, not for want of ample materials, but because the subject is too revolting to admit of being treated fully in a paper intended for general circulation. Henry VIII. has been charged, and justly, with sensuality, and with inhuman conduct towards his wives. But he had not, like Alexander, made a vow of celibacy, and then lived for many years in open disregard of every precept of morality. We must pass over, for the reason just assigned, the history of the Pontiff's intrigue with Vanozza, which commenced in Spain, and was continued for many years after his removal to Rome. We must pass over the history of his four sons (one of whom was the notorious Cæsar Borgia), and of his daughter Lucretia, upon whose memory, as well as that of her father and brother, the epitaph of Pontano has cast such an indelible blot.§ Without dwelling further, however, on the crimes of which his Holiness is accused, and in comparison with which Henry VIII. may be considered almost a miracle of continence, we transcribe, in the note below, an account of a scene which took place in the Pontifical Palace, on a *Sunday* evening, in October, 1502, which will give some idea of this Pope's shameless disregard of decency. As the passage is too gross to be translated, we give it in the original Latin, from the diary of Burchard, the Pope's Master of the Ceremonies, who appears to have been present at the disgraceful scene which he so circumstantially describes.‖

We hasten on to the closing scene in the life of the Pontiff. We are informed by Guiccardini, as a well-known fact, that "it was the frequent custom both of Alexander and of his son, Cæsar Borgia, to use *poison*, not only to avenge themselves upon their enemies, but still more, for the wicked purpose of robbing rich courtiers, cardinals, and others of their properties, and appropriating them to their own use."* Acting upon this plan, the Pope and his son determined to promote nine of the richest of the Prelates to be Cardinals, whom they resolved to dispatch by poison immediately after their promotion. But their scheme proved fatal to themselves. They invited the new Cardinals to sup at a vineyard, near the Vatican, belonging to Cardinal Adriano di Corneto, who, as he was extremely rich, was among the rest singled out to die by the same poison. Cæsar Borgia, in order to execute this design, sent to the Pope's butler, who was to wait at supper, some particular flasks of wine, which he had mixed with a certain poison, called Canterelle, which he had frequently made use of upon similar occasions. He gave the butler a strict charge that none should taste of it but those whom he should particularly direct.

Accordingly, on the 10th of August, the Pope and Cæsar, about the cool of the evening, came to the vineyard, where they were to sup. Some authors relate, that the Pope usually carried the consecrated host in a gold box, having been informed by a certain astrologer that while he carried the holy wafer about with him he should never die; but having now left it by accident in his apartment in the Vatican, as soon as he missed it, he dispatched Monsignor Caraffa to his chamber to bring it to him. While Caraffa was gone, Alexander being thirsty, and the weather exceedingly hot, desired the under butler to give him something to drink before he sat down to supper; the chief butler having gone to the Vatican to fetch a salver of peaches which he had forgotten. The under butler finding six particular flasks of wine in a corner, imagined that they contained better wine than the rest, and therefore poured out a glassful of the poisoned liquor, and gave it to the Pope, and Cæsar Borgia. The latter, by the vigour of his youth, and the force of the powerful antidotes given to him by his physicians, escaped the effects of the poison; but Alexander, after lingering for a week in excruciating torments, died on the 18th of August, 1503, in the seventy-second year of his age.

"The following day," as Guiccardini relates,† "his corpse was carried, according to the custom of the Popes, into the Church of St. Peter. It was black, swollen, and disfigured, exhibiting the most manifest signs of poison. The whole city of Rome ran with incredible joy into St. Peter's to gaze upon the dead body of Alexander. They could not satisfy their eager desire to behold that serpent at last crushed, who, by his boundless ambition and destructive perfidy, by numberless examples of horrible cruelty and insatiable lust, by his unheard of avarice, and indiscriminate sale of every object, sacred and profane, had infected the whole world."

The same unfavourable estimate of the character of the Pontiff was formed by the historian Machiavelli, a devoted adherent of the family of Borgia, and, therefore, disposed to dwell as lightly as possible upon the dark features of his personal history; yet even he felt himself constrained to characterize his life and conduct by three ominous words—*lust*, *simony*, and *cruelty*.‡

Such was the fearful career of Pope Alexander VI. The world, perhaps, never beheld such an example of a notorious disregard of the holiest obligations, of open and abandoned profligacy, of a daring violation of all laws, human and divine. The Christian Church had long beheld and mourned over the faults and vices of preceding Pontiffs, and had often loudly called for a reform, both in the Head and members. The Popes, for a long series of years, had disregarded these warnings, and persevered in the same reckless course of conduct; but the patience of the world at length reached its limit; the cup was now nearly full, and the flagrant crimes of Alexander and his successor, Julius, caused it at length to overflow. Within fifteen years after the death of Alexander, the REFORMATION began;. and we ask again, what impartial inquirer, after reading the history of that Pontiff, and the system of which he formed a part, will venture to assert that the Church did not stand in need of such a change?

When Roman Catholics attempt (as they often do) to draw attention away from more important questions to the personal character of those who brought that Reformation about, we think their Protestant friends will now know how to bring them speedily back to more profitable subjects of discussion, by inviting them to compare the personal character of the very worst of the reformers with that of the head of the Roman Catholic Church, His Holiness Alexander VI.

---

* Burchard, Diar. p. 3, Han. 1656.—"Quinque tantum Cardinales nihil voluerunt ab eo accipere. Dixerunt in Pontificatu voces dandas esse gratis, et non muneribus. Fertur etiam, antequam intraret in conclave, præfatum Borgiam, pro habenda voce dicti Ascanii et sequacium, misisse quatuor mulos oneratos argento ad domum Domini Ascanii, sub eo prætextu ut ibi custodiretur, dum esset in conclavi, quod argentum fuit datum dicto Ascanio pro ejus voto."

† Quam plurimi sacerdotia, quæ habera boois artibus non poterant Romæ coemerunt, quâ in urbe ejus rei consuetudo facultasque ab Alexandro instituta latè palamque invaluerat.—Vol. 2, lib. 6, p. 217. Venet 1718.

‡ Burchard Diar, p. 67, 88.

§ Alexandri filia, sponsa, nurus.

‖ "Dominica ultima mensis Octobris in sero fecerunt cænem cum Duce Valentinensi in camera sua in palatio Apostolico quinquaginta meretrices honestæ, Cortegianæ nuncupatæ, quæ post cænam choreaverunt cum servitoribus et aliis ibidem existentibus, primo in vestibus suis, deinde nudæ. Post cænam posita fuerunt candelabra communia mensæ cum candelis ardentibus, et projectæ sunt candelabra per terram castaneæ, quas meretrices ipsæ super manibus et pedibus nudæ candelabra pertranseuntes colligebant, *Papa, Dux, et Lucretia sorore sua præsentibus et aspicientibus.* Tandem exposita dona ultimo, dipioides de serico, paria caligarum, biteta et alia, pro illis qui plures dictas meretrices carnaliter agnoscerent, quæ fuerunt in aula publicè ibidem carnaliter tractatæ arbitrio præsentium, et dona distributa Victoribus."—Burchard Diar., p. 77.

"We gave in our number for October, 1852, vol. i., p. 109, a long extract from Cardinal Baronius, showing that similar enormities were perpetrated at Rome before the time of Pope Alexander VI.

* "Perchè è cosa manifesta, essere stata consuetudine frequente del Padre e sua (il Duce Valentino) non solo d' usare il veleno per vendicarsi contro agl' inimici, o per assicurarsi dei sospetti, ma eziandio per scelerata cupidità di spogliare delle proprie facultà le persone ricche, i Cardinali, e altri cortegiani." Guicear. Hist. d' Ital. Vol. iii., p. 169. Milano, 1803.

† Il giorno seguente, è portato morto secondo l'uso del Pontifici nella chiesa di San Piero, nero, enfiato, e bruttissimo, segni manifestissimi di veleno. Concorse al corpo morto d'Alessandro in San Piero con incredibile allegrezza tutta Roma, non potendo saziarsi gli occhi di alcuno, di vedere spento un serpente, che con la sua immoderata ambizione e pestifera perfidia, e con tutti gli esempj di orribile crudeltà, di mostruosa libidine, e d'inaudita avarizia, vendendo senza distinzione in cose sacre e le profane, aveva attossicato tutto il mondo. —Guiccard. lib. vi., vol. iii., p. 162-4. Milano, 1803.

‡ "Lo spirto di Alessandro glorioso,
Del qual seguirono le sante pedate
Tre sue familiari e care ancelle,
Lussuria, Simonia, e Crudeltate."
Machiav. Dec. i., vol. v., 370. Italia, 1813.

DOES THE WORSHIP OF THE CHURCH OF ROME ANSWER THE TRUE ENDS OF DEVOTION?

NO. II.

WE attempted to show in our last, by way of clearing our path towards the discussion of this momentous question, that what too often pass in the world as *good works* but little deserve that name, and that practical men *find* it to be a truth that by *their own* good works they cannot *merit heaven* or earn salvation.

The question naturally arises, do we then wish to discountenance good works, or wish good works to be deemed useless or impracticable, because we hold that no amount of good works will gain a man entrance into Christ's heavenly kingdom? This we know is a favourite assertion of the advocates of the Church of Rome against those who hold the Scriptural doctrine of justification by faith, as if it were the inevitable result of that doctrine, that men who believe in it should disregard the moral law or the code of practical benevolence which our Blessed Lord so eminently taught, both by precept and example, while on earth; as if, in short, good works must be *useless* and *superfluous*, unless as in themselves constituting the passport to heaven, or as if all must be Antinomians, or opposers of the moral law of the Gospel, who do not hold the doctrine of human merit as the foundation of salvation.

Now, we hope to be able to establish the very reverse, and not only to show that the same Holy Scriptures which plainly inculcate the doctrine of justification by faith, and teach that man's salvation is the *free gift* of God—not the purchase by man for himself, or of his own deserving—also demonstrate that without holiness no man can see the Lord, and everywhere preach the strictest and purest morality and practical benevolence; but viewing the matter in a purely philosophical point of view, we hope to show there is no other way of *doing the will* of our Heavenly Father than by simply embracing the Gospel offer of a free, unmerited salvation, which is the gift of God, through Jesus Christ.*

Does it thence follow that we would discountenance good works or deem them useless or impracticable? God forbid. It is, on the contrary, because we are persuaded that it is the only way to produce and encourage *real* good works that we can, in a spirit of what we believe to be true philosophy, embrace the doctrines of Christianity as written in the pages of Holy Writ. When you want man to do good works before his heart is renewed and rendered happy by the joy of a full pardon and free salvation, you are, in our judgment, wanting a tree to bring forth fruit before it is planted. The Gospel plants the tree by the roots and not by the branches; it sows the love of God in the heart, through gratitude for salvation, in order to produce good works, and the good works, thus produced, are the fruits of humility, instead of the fruits of pride; a small difference, perhaps, in the eye of man, who is satisfied with the outward appearances, but immense in the sight of God, who looks at the immortal soul destined to live with him throughout eternity, and has taught us, in his Holy Word, that it was not the Pharisee who fasted twice in the week and gave tithes of all that he possessed, but the Publican who smote upon his breast, saying, God be merciful to me a sinner, that was accepted with him. "I say unto you, this man went down to his house justified rather than the other: because every one that exalteth himself shall be humbled, but he that *humbleth* himself shall be exalted."—Luke xviii. 14 (Douay Bible).

There are, in fact, two classes of so-called good works—*false* good works, which are the result of fear, and *real* good works, which alone can spring from love.

What happens in all those religions which demand good works under pain of damnation? They obtain what they call good works—by *fear*. Fear is the mainspring employed in all false religions to produce goodness; fear is the great secret lever by which priestcraft, in all ages, has worked upon mankind, to keep up their influence and swell their fortunes. The great apostle, St. Paul, everywhere in his writings urges the assurance of salvation—free, full, unmerited, certain salvation—on those whose hearts he wants to rejoice, and whose life he wants to sanctify. Ask the priests of Rome when a man is sure of going to heaven? They will tell you, "never;" but they urge the fear of hell, as if they wished to preserve and speculate upon it,† as the principal means of influencing the believer, and the fear of purgatory, as if Christ had never promised pardon to the penitent thief upon the cross, and

---

* "All you that thirst, come to the waters: and you that have no money make haste, buy and eat: come ye, buy wine and milk without money, and without any price."—Isaias lv. 1. "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end. To him that thirsteth I will give of the fountain of the water of life, freely."—Apocal. xxi. 6. "And he that thirsteth let him come; and he that will, let him take the water of life, freely."—Apocal. xxii. 17 (Douay Bible).

† We have at this moment before us a book entitled "Hell Opened to Christians," illustrated by a series of engravings representing the infernal torments in a style well calculated to excite horror among the ignorant, but little likely, we think, to awaken piety or love to God in the soul of any one. We shall have occasion to deal with this tract again more fully in a future number.

as if all who felt their sinfulness (and who is there who does not?) *must* suffer the bitter pains of purgatorial fire before they could possibly claim the benefit of God's promises to the repentant sinner who believes truly in the Lord Jesus Christ, and looks to his merits *alone* for salvation. Do they ever fix the duration of purgatory? Have they even proved its existence? All is left doubtful, nothing fixed, nothing certain—fear during life, fear after death, fear always.

Thoughtful men cannot fail at times to ask, can it be possible that any of them urge this fear in order to have the opportunity of delivering man from that (imaginary) place by paid masses? To fix the duration of purgatory would be to put an end at the same time to fear, and the liberality of relations, weeping for the dead, which flows from it. If you were told that purgatory would last for your father a million of years, you would possibly have no masses said, thinking that the few you could get performed would be nearly useless. If you were told it will last only a week, you would have none said either, because your mind would soon be at rest. It is plainly the interest of those who vend masses for the dead to leave all uncertain, in order to speculate upon your fears as long as possible. We never heard of any priest deeming masses for the dead unnecessary, so long as the survivors were able or willing to pay for them. Fear is the great secret by which man would wring false good works (and real good money) from his brother man. The great secret of God, on the contrary, to obtain genuine goodness, is, to make faith spring up in man, until it gives him the assurance of salvation. God rejoices the heart in order to obtain from it works done cheerfully and with pleasure. He gives us at once free pardon, the Holy Spirit, heaven, eternity, love, happiness; so that, in our turn, moved by holy gratitude, we may be enabled to love him and to deny ourselves; not out of mercenary calculation, but out of the impulse of the heart. Jesus did not say to the praying thief upon the cross—"Tremble, thou shalt go through purgatory; tremble, and order masses to be said for thy poor, guilty soul." But he said—"*To-day* thou shalt be with me in Paradise." Not to-morrow, or a thousand years hence, but to-day; not in purgatory, but in paradise! And Jesus said it, not to a little venial sinner, but to a thief. If God then places a penitent and believing criminal in paradise, whom will He put in purgatory? What need of such a place when we are assured that "the blood of Jesus cleanseth from all sin?" What wonder, then, that none of our correspondents have been able to prove the existence of purgatory by any of the Fathers of the first three centuries, who drew their doctrines from the Holy Scriptures of God, and not from human inventions or uncertain traditions?

But to return. The religion of Christ is a religion of *love*, and not of *fear*. God demands from us confidence in his full and free mercy, until it produces in us a full though humble assurance of our salvation. He gives us a portion we can never lose, a crown of which we cannot be despoiled, an unquenchable love, an endless life; and it is when we feel ourselves assured of all those blessings, impossible to be lost, that we rejoice with exceeding joy, and say with St Paul—"Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation? or distress? or famine? or nakedness? or danger? or persecution? or the sword? For I am sure that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."—Rom. viii. 35-39 (Douay Bible).

This indeed is the great source of the peace and joy of the sincere Christian, and which strengthens and animates him in his efforts to sanctify his life, not in order to save himself, but because he *is* saved by Christ. It is the firm assurance that God has loved him, saved him, endowed him with heaven and eternity, which is the mainspring of his actions. Therefore it is that the Christian does good works with pleasure and earnestness, or rather does them without thinking anything of them, without remembering them, regretting and feeling humbled that he does no more, and regarding it as the highest privilege to be able to contribute in ever so small a degree to fulfilling the will of his God. The desire to do good works possesses him so fully that he is no longer aware of those he does, or at most he is only aware of their fewness and their imperfections; so that the grace which bestows heaven upon him, not only produces in him holy works, but also, and above all, *humility*, which presses him on to do more and better. The Christian philanthropist can do noble and generous actions out of genuine gratitude to God; the Christian patriot can practise glorious self-denial without the stimulus of ambition or of fame; the Christian philosopher can devote himself to the service of his great Master without a thought of personal aggrandizement either to his order or himself; and such, we think, *is* doing the will of our Father who is in heaven. And is it not, indeed, a wonderful and heavenly wisdom which, while it seems, by the doctrine of *free grace*, to dispense with works, is found in fact to enable and induce the penitent and believing sinner to perform them, and thus reconcile every part of that mysterious scheme, which at the same time tells us to work out our own salvation with fear and trembling, and adds, "for it is *God* who worketh in you to *will* and to do his good pleasure?"

What then, it may be said, is the difference, for both classes of theologians preach up both faith and good works? The difference is this, that one class, by holding good works to be the *foundation*, necessarily either lower the standard, by taking a superficial view of men's conduct, or substitute, as we have shewn, palatable duties for irksome ones, or sufferings for morality, with all the human results of dispensations, and indulgences, and observances done for them by others, and by some or all of these modes of self-delusion fail to do the will of God, or persuade themselves, in a spirit of Pharisaical pride, that they can *over-do* that will, and hand over their *superfluous* merits and works of *supererogation* to their fellow-sinners; while the other class, in the true spirit of Christian humility, acknowledge that, after all their exertions to fulfil the will of their Heavenly Father, they are but unprofitable servants;* they have done no more—nay, even much less—than it was their duty to do, and they are ever, like the great Apostle Paul, "forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forward to those things which are before, pressing forward toward the mark of the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus" (Philippians iii. 13, 14), ever seeking a *higher* degree of perfection, a *more perfect devotion* to the glory of God, *a more perfect* conformity to God's image and character, that they may become meet to be made partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light. Verily "by their fruits ye shall know them," and none shall ever enter the kingdom of heaven but they that *thus* "do the will of their Father who is in heaven."

We think this not only the clear doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, but even what the light of reason and the daily experience of mankind would lead a reflecting mind to expect; and we may, perhaps, illustrate our meaning by putting a practical question, which will be easily understood and appreciated by many of our readers through this agricultural country. If we were speculating on the probabilities of a man becoming energetic and industrious as a tiller of the soil, which should we think most likely to work hardest to procure an ample harvest or crop out of his farm, the tenant who owes a large arrear of rent, which he can never pay, but from whom, he knows, it will be rigorously exacted to the last farthing, or the tenant whose arrears have been freely wiped off by a wise and benevolent landlord, in the hope that he will exert himself more cheerfully and heartily to perform his engagements for the time to come? Can any one doubt the true answer? and, if not, is it not easy to see how God's way of salvation, by way of *free gift*, instead of leading to an Antinomian recklessness, and neglect of good works, is the true and only way of effecting *real* good works, done through the love of God, and in the true spirit of Christian humility, which alone can render them acceptable to "our Father, who is in heaven," and whose great design is, to make us happy with Him to all eternity?

We think, having thus cleared the ground of certain errors, which might otherwise have impeded our inquiry, we are in a position to proceed to consider the momentous question which stands at the head of these reflections; and we shall commence with a subject of deep interest to every thoughtful mind who seriously regards the happiness of his fellow creatures or the good of his own soul, and wishes to make up his mind as to the best mode of securing a heavenly inheritance, either for himself or those who are dear to him.

There is, perhaps, no point in which the Church of Rome and the Church of England and Ireland practically differ more widely than in the encouragement given by the former to what we may denominate the monastic system—the voluntary withdrawal of devout persons, of either sex, from active life, and seclusion of themselves in retired communities, in monasteries, and convents, where they are subjected, under peculiar vows, to strict rules and austerities, which the Church does not impose or consider necessary to salvation in other members of her communion. This monastic state enters so largely into the system of the Church of Rome, and is so highly prized, as if it were the only thing worthy of the name of "religious," that a person accustomed to judge of the external pretensions, rather than the internal vitality of things, might naturally be led to think that there could not be as much disposition to piety in a Church which, like that of England, makes no provision for such places of retirement for devout people, nor even countenances the existence of such monasteries or religious houses, as in a Church which treats them as if they were the only state of perfection to which true Christians can attain in this life, and encourages such institutions as if they constituted the most essential part of true religion.

There are many sincere persons, we are convinced, who are far enough from thinking that they themselves are living in a way pleasing to God or honouring to Christianity, who still plume themselves on belonging to a Church which contains in it so many thousands of "religious" persons, who devote their whole lives to religious observances, which might, indeed, be of some value if it were established, first, that those "professed" in monasteries were truly more devout and pious than all others; and, secondly, that men could be religious by *proxy*, or without personal virtue, reap the reward promised to the righteous in another world, by reason of the virtues of others; neither of which matters we think at all self-evident, but, on the contrary, requiring proof, and a degree of proof which never yet has been given of them; even if we had not, in our foregoing observations, shown strong reason to believe that *human merit* is but a false foundation for the salvation of any individual himself, much less of procuring it for another more guilty still in the sight of God.

We shall endeavour to bring forward some of our reasons for believing that the life of monks is not any great help to true devotion, or any proof that true religion prevails most where monasteries and convents most abound; much less that such institutions are necessary to the well-being of the true Church of Christ on earth.

Our first reason is drawn from the historical matter of fact, that about three centuries passed away without any mention of them in ecclesiastical history. Until the Diocletian persecution, in the end of the third century, monkery appears to have been unknown. Some, it is true, led a more than ordinary severe or ascetic course of life, denying themselves lawful pleasures at some particular times, or on some special occasions (as the Nazarites of old), to humble themselves and bring their bodies under, as St. Paul advised the married, but not always to continue so, lest Satan should tempt them; but these men were so far from binding themselves by monastic vows, that they reckoned it in a higher degree praiseworthy for such acts of mortification to be *voluntary*, than that they should, once for all, *force* themselves to it, by engaging themselves in a solemn vow, distinct from or above that of their baptism. The best and most self-denying Christians in those purer and primitive ages, neither placed perfection in beggary, by taking on themselves a vow of poverty, nor did they vow, what the Church of Rome now calls chastity, but reckoned themselves as chaste in wedlock; nor did they vow obedience to any self-selected leader, but thought it sufficient to obey the commands of God, and those whom God had placed over them, their governors in Church and State, whose lawful commands they held themselves obliged to obey, for the more regular management of the ecclesiastical body, and the more peaceable government of mankind. And many such, we trust, there still are in the world, who are far enough from assuming the cowl or the veil, but who practise a stricter devotion than others, and by their earnest and constant prayers bring a blessing upon the Church and State of which they are members, and, by the strictness and voluntary severity of their lives, do their best to make some amends for the negligence and viciousness of the age in which they live. May God multiply the number of such men, who, by voluntary self-denial and wholesome mortification, keep their bodies under, and live a strict and holy life, after the pure and holy precepts of Him who came into the world to purchase unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works, and shew us "an example that we should follow his steps."

We hope to proceed with this important subject of monastic perfection in our next number.

* "So you also when you shall have done all these things that are commanded you, say: We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which we ought to do."—Luke xvii. 10 (Douay Bible).

TALK OF THE ROAD—No. XVIII.

"Well, Jem, I have come at the place that says the Bible is hard to be understood," said Pat one day as they met.

"Well, I was looking out for that," said Jem, "but I didn't know where to find it, though I heard tell it was in it."

"Well, here it is," said Pat; and he opened his Douay Bible at 2 Peter, ch. iii., v. 16.

"Tell us, then, does it bid us not read it?" said Jem in a great hurry, for he was beginning to be afraid, after all.

"Well," said Pat, "wouldn't it be the quare thing to write a letter to a man, and to put at the end of the letter for to not read what was in it?"

"Well, that would be out of the way, surely," said Jem; "but does it tell the man it was writ to, to not show it to any one else?"

"Not a word at all again' reading," said Pat, "that I can find; it says, sure enough, that there's some things hard to be understood; but it surely does *not* say that it's best not to read."

"Who was it written to at all?" said Jem; and he laid hold of the book to see, but he couldn't make it out, for the beginning of that Epistle only says—"To them that have obtained *equal* faith with us" (Douay Bible).

"Them must be great Christians, surely," said Jem; "would it be for the likes of us at all?"

"Try your book, Jem," said Pat; for they had got a way of putting the two books together. So Jem tried his book and found it this way—"To them that have obtained *like precious** faith with us."

"Well, that would fit us better, surely," said Jem; "but how will we know about it?"

"Well, I made out who it was written to," said Pat; "for see here, at the first verse of the third chapter, he says, 'this *second* Epistle I write to you.' Now, doesn't that lay down that he wrote one before to the same people, and wouldn't that be the first Epistle? and look here," said Pat, turning over to the beginning of the first Epistle, "see here: this one is written to the strangers dispersed through Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia. And sure I met Mr. Owens's schoolmaster, and I asked him what places them were, and he told me they were all great countries, every one as big as Ireland; so you see, Jem, this Epistle

* This is the exact meaning of the Greek word which the Apostle wrote—ισοτιμον.

was written to plenty of people, and would he go for to tell them not to read what he wrote to them? And if he wrote it to such lots of people, would he tell them not to show it to any one else? And more nor that, he wrote it to the very servants themselves in all them countries; for look here (and Pat read the eighteenth verse of the second chapter, Ep. 1,)—'Servants, be subject to your masters, with all fear;' so you see yourself the letter was to the servants, too, as well as to their betters; and isn't that coming near to the likes of us?"

"Well, let us mind the place well, and see what we can make of it," said Jem; for he was taking heart again about the reading, at what Pat said. So they read, "And account the long-suffering of our Lord salvation; as also our most dear brother Paul, according to the wisdom given him, hath written to you; as also in all his Epistles, speaking in them of these things; In which are certain things hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest—as they do also the other Scriptures—to their own destruction; you, therefore, brethren, knowing these things before, take heed, lest being led aside by the error of the unwise, you fall from your own steadfastness." (Ep. 2, ch. 3, verses 15, 16, 17.)

"Now," said Pat, "if we weren't to read the Bible, wouldn't that be the place to say it in?"

"Well, that's the place it would fit, if it was to be said at all," said Jem.

"Well, and it *isn't* said, but only to take heed," said Pat.

"Well, that's true any way," said Jem, "and thanks be to God for that much itself. But still, Pat, sure it's said that the unlearned wrests the hard places to their own destruction; and sure it's little learning the like of us has."

"Well, I'm turning that over in my mind everyway," said Pat, "and I'm thinking that's said just the same of the *easy* places."

"Show me that again, Pat," said Jem; and he read that part over again, "which the unlearned and unstable wrest, *as they do also* THE OTHER SCRIPTURES, to their own destruction." "Well, that's it anyway," said Jem; "if there's any good in it at all, it's just as bad against the easy places as the hard places."

"Well now, Jem," said Pat, "what makes the priest read out the Gospel at mass in plain English? Didn't I hear it said, afore now, that the Church allows the easy places, that ignorant people *can't* wrest to their own destruction, to be read out to them in chapel, and only keeps away the hard places that they *might* wrest to their destruction for want of learning? Now if the unlearned wrests the easy places to their destruction, just the same way as they do the hard places, why would the one be read to them, no more nor the other? Answer me that now."

"Well, sure enough, Pat, you're right," said Jem; "and if *that* reason needn't stop the one, why should it stop the other? But let us see what caution St. Peter puts on it." So they read the next verse—"You therefore, brethren, knowing these things before, take heed, lest being led aside by the error of the unwise, you fall from your own steadfastness."

"Now, it's my opinion," said Pat, "if Father John had been at the writing of that verse, he would just have put down in place of it, 'Since you see the danger, *don't read the Bible*:' but you see, yourself, that St. Peter, that they allow was the first Pope, didn't say that anyway."

"True for you there, Pat," said Jem; "but let us try and make out what caution St. Peter did give us."

So they set to work at that; and says Pat, "I wonder what he means 'by the error of the unwise.' Wouldn't he tell us somewhere what that was?"

So they set to work to read over that chapter well, and at last Pat put his finger on verse 5, and, said he, "why here's people that's '*wilfully ignorant*,' and would it be them?"

"Well, them's the scoffers in verse 3," said Jem, "and see here's what they say in verse 4—'Where is his promise or his coming? for since the time that the Fathers slept, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation.'"

So they set to study that, and then Jem said, "why them is people that would get up in the last days, and scoff at the promise of Christ's coming to judgment; and here's the reason they have—everything is going on for long enough, just the way it does now, and why won't it go on for ever just the same? Now, would that be 'the error of the unwise,' I wonder?"

"Aye, and them people is *wilfully* ignorant," said Pat, "and would them be '*the unlearned*?'"

"And here's what they were wilfully ignorant about," said Jem, "about the flood that came in Noah's time, and drowned all the wicked."—(Verses 5 & 6.)

"And how would they be ignorant of that, only that they wouldn't read the Bible?" said Pat; "and sure if that's the ignorance, to not read would be the bad cure."

"Well, Pat, I'm seeing it now," said Jem; "them people *would not learn* what God did to the wicked long ago; and they *wouldn't believe* what God will do when he comes to judge the world; them's the *unlearned*, and, belike, *unlearned* means them that *wouldn't* learn;* and in course, them people, when the Scripture would come up against that, would have to twist that, till it didn't mean that: and isn't that the way that they would *wrest* the Scripture, hard places and *easy* places, to their own destruction; and doesn't that word *wrest*, show that they are doing it on purpose?"

"And now look here, where he tells us *not to be ignorant*," said Pat, pointing to the 8th verse, "and see how he makes it out that God isn't breaking his word about coming, but only waiting to save sinners; and see what things he tells them will be when Christ comes, when the fire will burn up the world itself and everything in it; and see here, won't there be new heavens and a new earth according to his promises, in which Justice dwelleth; and look, if it isn't here, that it's looking for the new heavens and the new earth that will make us diligent, that we may be found undefiled and unspotted to him in peace."

"Is there any one at all looking for *a new earth*, Pat?" said Jem.

"I never heard tell of it before," said Pat, "and how would I look for it?"

"Nor I neither," said Jem.

"Nor none of the people in this country," said Pat.

"And doesn't St. Peter say we shouldn't be ignorant of it?" said Jem.

"And why would we be ignorant of it, if it's that that's to make us diligent?" said Pat.

"And yet its one o fthe hard things surely," said Jem.

"And yet St. Peter writes about it to all them people in all them countries; and to the servants too;" said Pat.

"And where he was talking about hard things, he's just telling them hard things too himself," said Jem.

"And maybe if things is hard, there's more call for the Apostles themselves to teach us about them," said Pat.

"And maybe the hardness is in the things,* more nor in the way of writing about them," said Jem.

"And maybe no one else could speak half as plain, or as sure about them," said Pat.

"Anyway he wasn't wanting to keep the hard things off of them," said Jem.

"And it wasn't by talking to them, but just by writing to them about the hard things, for them to read it, that he wanted to keep them right," said Pat.

"Why, if he talked it to them, that might be easy forgot; and they mightn't know easy, ten years after, just what it was he said," said Jem.

"And if he only talked it to them, how would *we* get knowing what he said exactly? but when he wrote it, that does for always," said Pat.

"Maybe if he only spoke it to them, it would get about wrong; and maybe some people would allow that he said the Bible was hard, and bid us not read it," said Jem.

"Maybe if he only spoke it, and didn't write it, *that* would be the tradition in the Church of Rome now," said Pat.

"Well, that it would, with Father John anyway," said Jem; "but St. Peter spoiled that entirely by writing it."

"Well, and now for the caution he put on it all," said Pat.

"Aye," said Jem, "he bid them take heed ——."

"Stop a bit, Jem," said Pat, "I mind now them words is in it before, if we can only come on them and put them together, and see how they fit."

But Pat could not find the words, though he was sure he saw them somewhere; so Jem tried *his* book, and he found them in Chapter 1, verse 19. So they put the two books together again, and Jem said, "Well, it's *take heed* in my book, and it's *attend* in yours, and sure that's all one; and what did he bid them attend to?"

"Well, it's *the firm prophetical word* in one book, and its *the sure word of prophecy in the other;* and what's that?" said Jem.

"Sure that would be what the prophets wrote in the Old Testament," said Pat.

"Well," said Jem, "I didn't read much of that, for I found it a deal harder than the New Testament, so I let it alone; but see here, if St. Peter doesn't say of that, 'whereunto *you do well to attend*, as to a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts?' and didn't he write the letter to servants and all?"

"Then, maybe, if we attend to the hard places, there will light come out of them yet," said Pat.

"Anyway, he bid them attend well to the Bible, in the very same letter in which he bid them take heed, lest they would be led away by the error of the unwise," said Jem, "and sure that wasn't bidding them not read the Bible?"

"It seems it's them that won't think or learn about Christ's coming to judgment, that's in danger to wrest the Scriptures wrong," said Pat; "but them that's still thinking of that day more nor of this day, is to attend to the Scriptures, or how would they know about that day?"

"Well, St. Peter said the great thing about knowledge here," said Jem, and he read the second verse in the first chapter (Ep. 1)—"Grace to you and peace be accomplished *in the knowledge of God and of Christ Jesus our Lord.*"

"And where will we get that knowledge if we don't in the Bible?" said Pat; "wasn't I going to mass for forty years, and knowing nothing? and will I let any one tell me, that I didn't learn more about God and Christ once I took to the reading the Bible than ever I did in them forty years? Don't I know about the piety and the stone? don't I know about the hen? don't I know about the dove? don't I know about the Mediator? don't I know about the blood of Christ? don't I know that them that asks will get, and them that seeks will find? but what signifies talking? won't I keep to the reading?"

"Well, Pat," said Jem, "we have got nothing again the reading yet."

And if ever they do, we will tell it fairly.

* Jem is right about this: the Greek word ἀμαθεῖς means those who would not be taught, and the word "unwise" in v. 17 (*wicked* in the Protestant Bible) means those who reject and despise laws, ἀθεσμων. So the *wilfully ignorant* in verse 5, those who *will not be taught*, in verse 16, and those *who despise laws*, in verse 17, are three different descriptions of the same persons.

* Jem is quite right about this. The Greek makes it quite plain that the apostle meant, in which *things* (not in which *epistles*) there are some things hard to be understood—that is, in the coming of Christ, and the burning of the world, and the new heavens and the new earth, there are things hard to be understood.

THE APOCRYPHA.

OUR readers will probably remember what we said on this subject in our last number—we stated, that of a multitude of lists which the early Church has left us of canonical books, *only three** lists contain the Apocrypha—viz., The list in the third Council of Carthage, the list in the epistle of Pope Innocent, and the list in the Roman council, held by Pope Gelasius—and we stated that these three lists bore evident marks of being forged.

This statement has led to some private communications, which induce us to say something more on the subject.

No one seems inclined to deny our assertion, that the lists of Pope Innocent and Pope Gelasius are mere forgeries, made by others in their names, many centuries after those Popes were dead. We might almost take this part of our statement as granted; yet we will give more proof of this presently.

About the list in the third Council of Carthage, however, some of our friends are not so fully convinced, and wish for further satisfaction, which we hope now to give them.

In the first place we observe, that if *all* the other lists which include the Apocrypha are forged, then, this list of Carthage stands alone; it is THE ONLY ONE in all the records of the early Church that includes the Apocrypha as being among the books properly canonical. This alone would make it very likely that it is a forgery too; and even if not forged, this would destroy its authority. Can any one believe that the Church of Africa alone had the full Bible, and that all the other Churches in the world were wrong? Surely no one would rest his faith respecting God's Word on so absurd a proposition.

But we must examine this list of the Council of Carthage more closely.

Now, all Roman Catholic writers, who have examined the question, admit that the canon† which contains this list, could not possibly have been passed at the third Council of Carthage, held in the year 397, in which we find it now, seeing that it refers to a Pope who was not Pope until twenty years after. Now, how do they get over this? Why, they say that this canon must have been passed by some other Council of Carthage, held afterwards. Very odd, then, that we should find it in the records of this third Council, and that we should *not* find it in the records of *any other* council! But they say that in the African‡ code this canon is attributed to a later Council, held in the year 419. But this is altogether a mistake. It is true that the date, 419 (as fixed by the names of those who were then consuls), stands at the head of the African code, as we have it now in Labbe and Cossart, vol. ii., p. 1041; but this is only because the Sixth Council of Carthage, of which that is the proper date, stands first in the code: we have a copy of that Sixth Council, also in Labbe and Cossart, vol. ii., p. 1589, in which there is *no list* of canonical books; and on comparing this Sixth Council with the beginning of this code, it appears that the proceedings of the Sixth Council only extend down to the middle of p. 1049 of the code; and the list of canonical books does not come in until p. 1061; where it stands among a collection of canons taken from Councils held before 419: so there is no shadow of ground for applying this date, 419, to that list of books. And there is no previous Council from which it can be supposed to be taken, except the Third Council, held in the year 397, in which all learned Roman Catholics confess that this list could not have been passed. And in the code, as given by Labbe and Cossart, we find the reference in the margin is to that Third Council (p. 1061).

The only way to decide the question is this, to inquire whether other writers who lived at the time, or in the following ages, and who had, and used, the African canons, knew anything of such a list of canonical books being among them. If we find that all those who had, and used, the African canons for some centuries afterwards, were all in ignorance of any such list being among them, then we may be sure that the list was put in after their time.

In the first place, we have in Labbe and Cossart, vol. ii., p. 1638, a collection of 105 canons or decrees of African Councils, made after the year 423 (for it contains a letter of the African bishops to Pope Celestine, who succeeded

* St. Augustine's list does not put the Apocrypha on the same footing as the other Scriptures. We shall show this hereafter.

† The word "canon" here means the "decree" of the Council.

‡ Carthage was the chief city in Africa. The councils and canons passed there are sometimes called "Carthaginian," from the city where the Councils were held; and sometimes "African," from the country. The "African code" mean the collection that was afterwards made out of all their councils, so as to form one body of laws for their Church.

Pope Boniface in that year). If ever the list of canonical books was made by any African Council, it must have been made before that year; for the list of canonical books professes to be submitted to Pope Boniface: yet in that collection of African canons, made after Pope Boniface was dead, no list of canonical books is to be found. We, therefore, conclude that the persons who drew up that collection of 105 canons, did not know of any African canon containing such a list.

Our next witness is Dionysius Exignus, of whom we have this testimony from Cassiodorus, a very learned Roman, who, after filling the highest offices in the state, founded a monastery about the year 542, and died, in the government of it, in the year 562. "In our times was Dionysius the monk, a Scythian by nation; but altogether a Roman in manners, . . . who with great force of eloquence compiled ecclesiastical canons which at this day *the Roman Church holds in constant use.*"—Cap. 23, Divinarum Lectionum.

Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, who lived in the ninth century, also states that this collection of canons was in use in France in his day.—Du Pin. Eccl. Hist., vol. i., p. 549. Ed. Dublin, 1723.

Dionysius included in this collection *the African Code.* We ask our readers to take particular notice of this fact; and also that this collection of canons was in use both *at Rome* and *in France.*

Another collection was also made by Cresconius, an African bishop, about the year 700, which was also probably in use at Rome. In both those collections the African code was inserted. Now, the question is, was the list in question *then* in those collections? We say it was not; that those who then put the African code into their collections knew nothing of such a list being in it.

We are quite aware that the list *is* in the copies of their collection,* *as we have them now.* This does not surprise us; because if that list was forged, it was, of course, forged for the very purpose of putting it into these codes which were in use at Rome; and it was only put into the Third Council of Carthage, in order that it might be put into these collections too. *Now,* the question is, was this list in the collections which Dionysius Exiguus and Cresconius made, or has it been put into their collections in later times? We are content to rest the question on the answer to this.

And we have an answer—the plainest and most decisive that we could wish.

We have a letter from Pope Nicholas I. (Labbe and Cossart., vol. viii., p. 797), written in the *ninth* century to bishops in France—a memorable letter, which we shall have occasion to refer to again. In that letter, Pope Nicholas was arguing against those who maintain that they were not bound to receive what was only to be found in the decrees of Popes; but that they were bound only by the decrees of Councils. Against this, Pope Nicholas argues as follows:—"Why should we waste time further, since if these persons are to be listened to, neither would we now receive the Divine Scriptures themselves *of the New and Old Testament;* FOR NEITHER OF THESE IS FOUND INSERTED IN THE CODE OF ECCLESIASTICAL CANONS. . . Among the canons is found a summary of the holy Pope Innocent, by whose authority it is taught that either Testament is to be received by us, although in the *canons themselves of the Fathers,* NEITHER OF THEM† is contained, inserted as so many." Here Pope Nicholas expressly affirms that the question of the number of canonical books rested *wholly* on the list of Pope Innocent; and that there was no list of the kind in the canons of the Fathers. It is clear, then, that he knew of no list sanctioned by St. Augustine, the greatest of the Fathers, in the canons of Carthage. And since Cassiodorus has told us that the list of Dionysius Exignus, which contained the African canons, was in use at Rome long before that time, and Hincmar tells us it was in use in France *at that very time,* it is clear that there could have been no such list in the African canons then, but that it has been added since.

We have some further evidence still. We have lists of the canonical books left us by two African bishops, who lived in the next century after that Council of Carthage—Junilius Africanus, and Primasius, Bishop of Adrumetum. Speaking expressly of the books of Judith, Wisdom, and the Maccabees, Junilius asks—"Why are these books not among the canonical Scriptures? Answer: Because among the Jews, also, they were received under this distinction, as Jerome and others witness."—(De Partibus Divinæ legis lib. i. c. 3.) Primasius, in his Commentary upon the Apocalypse, c. iv., says (according to an interpretation common among the Fathers), that by the twenty-four wings and the twenty-four elders, St. John alludes to "the books of the Old Testament, which *of that same number* WE RECEIVE *by canonical authority.*"

It is clear that these two bishops had never heard of any law or decree of the African Church (to which they both belonged) *receiving six more books,* as of canonical authority. Hence we conclude that this list now in the 3rd Council of Carthage did not exist in their day.

One word now about the light which the letter of Pope Nicholas throws on the pretended list of Pope Gelasius and his Council of seventy bishops. That Council is pretended to have made a canon, or decree, containing a list of canonical books, in the year 494. Pope Nicholas, in the year 865, says there was then no such list in the canons of the Church. Put this along with the fact, which we showed in our last number (p. 112. Col. 3), that the Pope's own ancient copy of that Council of Gelasius contains *no list* of canonical books, and who does not see that the list now in it must be a forgery, put into it after the ninth century?

Now for Pope Innocent's list. It is contained in an epistle which pretends to have been written by him, in the year 405. The list of canonical books stands at the end—just the place where a forger would add it in after times. No one appears ever to have heard of that list of Pope Innocent's for FOUR HUNDRED AND SIXTY YEARS after the date of that letter! Of this we have proof. Cresconius, who wrote at the end of the seventh century, professed to show the agreement between the canons of the Councils and the epistles of the Popes: he quotes that very letter of Pope Innocent's *six* times, to show its agreement with the canons of the Councils in *six* points; but when he comes to speak of the list of canonical books, he says nothing at all of any list made by Pope Innocent, clearly showing that no such list was in that letter in his time.

We hear of Pope Innocent's list FOR THE FIRST TIME in the ninth century, AFTER a great mass of forgeries of letters of Popes (which our readers will hear of in a future number) had been published and imposed upon the Church.

Even in that age, Pope Nicholas says there was no list yet in the canons of the Church, and he then produces the list of Pope Innocent *for the first time,* and that, too (as we shall shall show hereafter), in a letter written for the very purpose of imposing those forged letters on the Church as true and genuine documents!

These be the lists that the Church of Rome chiefly relies on to prove that the Bible, as settled at the Council of Trent, was the Bible of the ancient Church!

It is almost needless to show how these three lists differ from each other; but it is useful as showing, that even when the forgeries were committed, the forgers had not themselves agreed on what books they would put into the Bible.

The earliest copies of Innocent's list contained no book of Tobit.*

The Carthaginian list contained no book of Baruch; and as it stood in the MS. copy of Cresconius's collection, and in all the Greek copies, it contained neither of the two books of Maccabees.†

The list of Gelasius, besides being wholly left out in the Pope's own copy, is given differently in almost every copy in which it is found.—(Berhard in Canon. Gratiani, vol. ii. p. 316.)

We might fairly leave it to our readers to decide upon this evidence, whether the six apocryphal books be indeed a portion of God's inspired Word, and received as such by the early Church. But the vast importance of the subject makes it deserving of still further evidence. What can be more important than to know what is truly the Inspired Word of God to man?

But the question is still further important, as involving the infallibility of the Church of Rome. If she be proved to have erred on this great and vital question, what pretence can she have to infallibility at all? If the Church of Rome has been deceived herself by forged documents, or if she have tried to deceive others by forgeries, her infallibility is equally destroyed.

Our readers, as yet even, can have but a faint notion of the abundance of proofs which the Church, for FIFTEEN CENTURIES, has left us that Rome has erred in this great point.

In our next and following numbers, we will take each century in order; and produce the testimony of all ages, all nations, all Churches, to the fulness and completeness of the Protestant Bible.

THE LAND OF EYES.

WE have had occasion, in more places than one in this number, to discuss the question of the infallibility of the Church of Rome. This is a subject to which we invite our readers' most serious attention, because it is in reality the main point of dispute between Protestants and the Church of Rome. There are, it is true, a number of articles of faith, which Rome is charged with adding to the doctrines of Christ. Still discussion on these is but a battle of outposts; infallibility is the citadel. If the doctrine of the infallibility of the Church could be clearly and certainly made out, we should be obliged to assent to all the articles propounded by the Church, however little other evidence there might be for them: nay, however strong might seem to be the evidence against them. On the other hand, if Roman Catholics were to gain the victory upon every other point (such as transubstantiation, indulgences, the necessity of confession, &c.), but to fail in proving the infallibility of their Church, that Church would be convicted of an atrocious usurpation, both in declaring itself the only Church of Christ and in setting up *her word* as equal, if not superior, to *God's word* in the Scriptures; in short, this doctrine of infallibility is like the king at the game of chess, where it matters not how many other pieces are lost or won—it is the fate of the king which decides the battle.

A doctrine so important evidently requires to be established by very good proof. And there are other facts which make it still more incumbent on us to require strong proof for this doctrine. We know that God has bestowed upon us *reason,* and we must suppose that this, like his other gifts, was intended to be used. And the Roman Church confesses that *the Scriptures* are unquestionably the Word of God, and therefore one would suppose deserving of being carefully studied by all who acknowledge their Divine origin. But, if this doctrine of infallibility be true, all exercise of the reason on religious matters becomes injurious, and the Scripture itself is reduced to a dead letter, since Christians are to put on its statements, not the meaning which the words seem to bear, but the meaning which the Church is pleased to assign to them. In this system much respect may be expressed in words for the Bible; but its position is like that of the monarch in those countries where the king reigns, but does not govern, where the king may have all the honour, but the minister has all the power. He whose interpretation of the law must not be questioned, has the same power as if he had the actual making of the law.

We only put forward these considerations as suggesting the great necessity of good proof for the Romanist doctrine. If the Scripture be the Word of God, nothing short of the clearest revelation can entitle the interpretations of sinful men (call them church or what you will) to be placed on an equality with the Bible. He who claims to interpret the law infallibly must prove his right as clearly as the lawgiver established his own; otherwise the law will be given in vain, since the interpreter whose decision must not be contradicted can make the law say what he pleases. Let those, then, who claim this power over the Scriptures prove their case as clearly as it has been proved to us that we are bound to believe and follow Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Paul, and the other writers of the New Testament. Through their writings we hear them speak every day and hour. If we are to turn away from them, in order to listen to the Pope—if it be our duty, when they say *white,* and the Pope says *black,* to take his sense as their meaning—their whole value depends on what *he* is worth: their inspiration is dross if his infallibility be not gold. Now, in plain honesty, are Rome's claims to be the infallible interpreter of Scripture equally good with those of the Scripture to be God's word? Have the Pope and his bishops as good a title to declare to us what it is that the sacred writers really say, and what they ought to have said, though they said it not, as those writers themselves had to declare the will of God to mankind? This is the case that the Romanists have to make out. If they fail, all their structure flies off in a cloud of dust.

Now, when we come to see what kind of proofs the advocates of the Church of Rome offer for this important proposition, we have reason to be amazed at their want of solidity. They present us with proofs from reason that an infallible guide would be a very comfortable thing, and would relieve us from a great deal of anxiety; while from Scripture they have not a single direct statement—nothing but the most far-fetched inferences. We suppose there is not a text in the Bible which they think speaks more decisively in their favour than the celebrated text, "Thou art Peter, and on this rock will I build my Church;" and yet see what a slender foundation it affords for the enormous castle that has been built upon it. They argue, 1st.—In this text our Lord conferred on St. Peter the prerogative of being, during his lifetime, the infallible guide of the Church. 2nd—That prerogative was continued to St. Peter's successors. 3rd.—St. Peter was Bishop of Rome. 4th.—And the Bishops of Rome are his successors. Now, as to the first proposition, we shall merely say, that whatever interpretation we give to this text must be consistent with the undoubted fact, that the Apostles did not consider St. Peter as a Head whose decisions must be implicitly followed (see Luke xxii. 24; Acts xi. 2; xv. 7; Galatians ii. 11.) But what shadow of Scripture proof can be offered for the other three propositions? St. Peter was a *rock* (as his name signified), and his faith in Christ was made the foundation of the Church, when he proclaimed it at Jerusalem, and converted about three thousand souls. But is it not a barefaced assumption to set up a succession of *rocks,* or foundations, as if the Church of Christ was to be built anew every nine years, on an average? Let the Church have been founded upon the faith of Peter; we are willing to stand on that foundation, but we will not be shifted from Pius to Gregory, and from Gregory to Pius, in never-ending succession. The very alarming consequences that have been so violently extorted from this text are well illustrated in a little parable, published a good many years ago, which we lately met with, and with which we shall close this article, leaving the interpretation to the ingenuity of our readers:—

"There was in days of yore a man who travelled in search of knowledge to distant and unknown regions. In his pilgrimage he met with strange men and strange customs; but the most curious of all his adventures was this:—He once had entered a new territory, and was approaching a large town, which rose at a distance, when, just in the act of crossing what he imagined to be the first turnpike-gate on the road, two men, one in black, the other in gray robes, stopped the way. He thought they came to ask for a foot-toll; but their demand was quite of another nature. One of them had a thick bandage in his hand; the other was furnished with a candle, some sealing-wax, and a large seal. Our traveller asked the meaning of those im-

* The list of Cresconius, however, differs very widely from the list now in the Council of Carthage, as we shall show below.
† That is, neither the lists of books of the Old Testament or the New.

* Merlin's Councils, Colon. 1530 Fo. Paris, 1535. ects.
† Justellus, Cod. Can. Eccl. Afric. can. 24, note.

jdements, and learnt with astonishment that, by the law of the country, he must submit to having the bandage placed over his eyes, sealed with the arms of the government, and then give himself up to be led by the hand as long as he lived. If ever he attempted to remove the bandage, or was found trying to peep under it, the law condemned him to death. Justly alarmed at this statement, he was turning his back upon the strangers; but they collared him, declaring that, as he had crossed the gate, he could not be allowed to return.

"As there was no hope of escape for the present, he humbly entreated to be informed why he was to be deprived of the use of his sight, and kept for life in darkness, under the flood of sunbeams which heaven poured daily upon the world. To this the eldest of the strange men made answer:—'Many generations have passed away since the throne of this country was filled by a king, whose wisdom and goodness greatly surpassed that of the wisest and best of men. This king had a minister, to whom he gave a surname, which, in the language of our forefathers, signified EYES. It happened on a certain day, that the king, sitting in council with minister EYES, and his other ministers, twelve in all, proposed a question, about which many things were said, but none to the purpose. EYES, who certainly was a very quick and able man, observing the perplexity of his brethren in office, came forward with such a short and neat answer, that the king, to express his great satisfaction, broke out into these words: EYES, you well deserve the name you bear, for you are EYES, and through your eyes all my kingdom see. These words of our king we consider as the fundamental law of this realm; and from them we conclude that it is the duty of the people to renounce their natural sight, and to see through the eyes which our king appointed for his subjects.'

"Astonished at this account, and perceiving that the two strangers were not disinclined to a little more conversation, the traveller asked whether that great man, minister EYES, was still alive? 'No, no,' replied the man in gray, with a smile; 'he has been dead nearly two thousand years.' 'Indeed!' exclaimed the traveller; 'how then can he see for all the people here?' 'You seem, my friend,' replied the man in black, 'rather dull of apprehension; do you not understand, that since EYES was to see for all other men, some one must for ever occupy his place?' 'Did your king say so?' rejoined the travellers. 'Our king did not say anything about the matter,' answered the gray man with rising anger, 'but he could not but have meant it.' 'Allow me once more to inquire,' said the traveller, 'how is it you find a supply of successors to EYES?' 'We have some notion,' said one of the turnpike men, 'of the spot where it is said that he died. We accordingly choose one of ourselves to be EYES' successor; and when we have seated the person so elected in a chair, on that very spot, we take him to be in every respect as good to see for others as old EYES himself.'

"Here the unfortunate traveller lost all patience. 'So then,' he cries, 'I am to lose the use of my eyes, because you choose to understand literally a figurative expression, which a child could not mistake. But what a huge mountain of suppositions and inferences you go on to raise on that contemptible ground! Because your old minister had a penetrating understanding, and while he lived could be what his master called him, the EYES—that is, the guide, of his people—you take upon yourselves to set up a succession of men, who, be they ever so dull and stupid, are yet to be recognised as EYES for all the world, and to have the right of blindfolding us all. But how comes it that neither of you wear a bandage? 'Your impudence deserves another kind of answer; but I will bear with you a little longer,' said the man in black. 'There are many thousands like ourselves in this kingdom; we are EYES' eyes; and through us the people are to see all that old EYES would see for them if he still were alive. But as you wish to live,' he added with great solemnity, 'let me put the bandage on your eyes, and do not be obstinate about a point established beyond all doubt, by that saying of our great king—'EYES, YOU ARE EYES, AND BY YOUR EYES SHALL ALL MY KINGDOM SEE.'"

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

The letters of Mr. O'Mara, Mr. Collette, and several other valued communications have been unavoidably postponed till our next.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st.

No anonymous letter can be attended to. Whatever is sent for insertion must be authenticated by the name and address of the writer, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee for his good faith.

We would request our correspondents, both Roman Catholics and Protestants, to limit the length of their communications, and not to discuss a variety of distinct topics in one letter.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

☞ If any of our friends could favour us with a copy or copies of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, Nos. 2, 8, or 11, to complete sets, we should be greatly obliged.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, NOVEMBER, 1853.

THE vastest truth or the vastest falsehood which has ever agitated the world, is the doctrine of the Church of Rome's infallibility. If that doctrine be true, millions of human souls have been lost for ever for not believing it. If it be false, millions of human souls have been lost for trusting to it. Surely it behoves every man, who regards his own safety and that of others dear to him, to examine this vast structure and its foundations carefully, and satisfy himself whether it be built upon a rock, and supported by pillars strong enough to bear its weight, or whether it rest on an unsound and shifting foundation, in which latter case he might discover, when too late, that he was like the foolish man spoken of by our Blessed Lord, in his Sermon on the Mount, "who built his house upon the sand, and the rains fell, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house, and it *fell*, and great was the fall thereof."—Matt. vii. 26, 27 (Douay Bible).

What an almost infinite amount of dreadful distractions, divisions, persecutions, errors, and mischiefs which have arisen in the world about the truth or falsehood of the pretensions of the Church of Rome, would have been prevented, if God had been only pleased to say in the Scriptures—"*I have constituted the Church of Rome the mother and mistress of all Churches, and made the Bishop of Rome my vicegerent upon earth, and an infallible interpreter of my will to all my people, to guide them into all truth.*" If those propositions be a true exposition of God's will, we think they would have been as plainly stated in God's written Word as it is stated, again and again, "He that believeth in the Son shall have everlasting life;" and if one could venture to trust one's reason so far as to argue that anything *must* be so, because it would be useful or fitting that it *should* be so, we can see no possible answer to the argument that it would have been wholly inconsistent with the goodness of God, and His plain desire in giving us the Scriptures, and the care of Christ over his Church, to omit in the Bible a point so all important (if it be true) as the infallibility of the Church of Rome, on which all the rest was to depend, when doctrines of so much less concernment are plainly recorded, and over and over again repeated, in the Scriptures. If God had intended the Pope or Church of Rome for so great an office, reason and common sense proclaim that He would certainly have said so, very plainly and very frequently, or if not frequently, certainly sometimes; once, at least, surely He would have said so in express terms, so that none but those who wilfully shut their eyes could fail to see it.

Those who trust their reason sufficiently to argue that there *must* be a living and speaking judge to decide differences about the interpretation of the law, because otherwise controversies would be endless, might surely as well argue that God has not given us such a judge, or He could not have failed to point him out to us, or left us in the dark as to who he is, and where he is to be certainly found.

If it were as evident and certain that God hath appointed the Pope or the Church of Rome to be the guide of faith and judge of controversies, as that the Queen hath appointed such a one to be Lord Chancellor or Lord Chief Justice, we admit such a guide would be very valuable, and easily available, to preserve the Church in unity, and conduct men's souls to heaven. But a judge that had no better *evidence* of his title to his place, than the Pope has to that which he pretends to—a judge that is doubtful, and justly questionable whether he be, indeed, a judge or not—we think would be, in all probability, likely to produce just the opposite effects, and to be himself one of the greatest subjects of controversy and difference between men, as in point of fact we actually find to be the case with respect to the Church of Rome.

Whether Protestants be right or wrong, true Christians or heretics, there are *millions* of them in actual existence in England and Ireland alone, who still deny, as their ancestors have for centuries denied, the title of the Church of Rome to guide mankind, and who will neither *take for granted* that title without proof, or assume that Church to be infallible merely because she herself says so; but who are ever ready to retort the argument—"It is necessary there should be an infallible judge, *therefore* there is such a judge: by the argument, that "God has not provided, or ever said He has provided, such a judge; *therefore* such a judge is not necessary." And, indeed, we think all fair men, who venture to exercise their understandings in *a priori* reasonings, would admit, that if the doctrine of the Church of Rome be true—that an infallible judge is of such necessity, that without him we cannot understand, and are not even bound to believe that the Scriptures are the Word of God, and that submission to that judge is necessary to our salvation—it would be a thousand times more incredible that God (to whom all our present controversies must have been foreseen) should not have left us some mention of it in the Scriptures, than the contrary proposition would be—viz., that He should have not given us such a judge at all, because He considered such a judge unnecessary for us. If we were to consider usefulness a sufficient proof of the existence of anything, by a similar argument we could clearly prove that every Pope must have been a good man, and every priest infallible, and all the translators of the Bible infallible; and, more than all, that the doctrine of the Pope's supremacy and infallibility must be engraven upon every man's heart, or at least so plainly revealed in God's written Word, that none but the most wilful and obstinate heretics could deny it, none in fact except such men as it would be, according to the same rule, fitting and *useful* were God to send down fire from heaven to consume them.

But it is not pretended by the Church of Rome, either that none of the Popes have been bad men, or that no Popes have fallen into error and made important mistakes, both in matters of fact and doctrine, or that all priests or even all bishops are infallible, or that their own Douay Bible is an infallible translation, or that the Pope's supremacy and infallibility are matters of instinct, which require no proof; *therefore* the fitness, the great utility, or desirableness of such things is clearly no proof whatever of their existence, and, by parity of reasoning, the utility and desirableness of an infallible tribunal is no proof at all of the existence of one.

The argument, therefore, from what is called by some common sense, appears to be resolvable into nothing more than what is fully answered by saying, that *wishing* is not *having*, any more than mere *assertion*, however bold, is *proof*.

Those, therefore, who would not be induced blindly to jump to a conclusion, and by the process which is called "begging the question," assume it to be mere pride of understanding which prevents Protestants from submitting to the guidance of the Church of Rome, must take the pains to examine the nature and strength of the pillars on which its pretensions rest, and see whether they are built on a rock or on the sand

remembering that a man may be very willing to follow a guide, when he first sees good ground to believe that it *is* his guide, but that, as it is *humility* to obey him whom God hath plainly set over us, so it is *credulity* to follow every one that will take on him to lead us—inasmuch as, "if the blind lead the blind," not only the leader but the follower shall perish.

We purpose in regular course examining, fully and seriatim, the various grounds and pillars on which this vast fabric of the Church's infallibility is said by her ablest advocates to rest—viz., Scripture, the Fathers, tradition, and miracles—and we think all who have the manliness and courage to examine and discuss the matter with us, in a fair spirit and unprejudiced mind, will probably ultimately come to the same conclusion at which we have ourselves arrived—viz., that it is neither necessary nor suitable to the method of God's providence and the declarations of His will, that there should be a final end and infallible judge of all controversies in this life—that what the advocates of Rome tell us was fit to be done, God hath told us He did not judge fit—that it was His pleasure to permit the Evil One to sow tares among the wheat, and heresies to arise (1 Cor. xi. 19); and that even as He thought fit to allow stones of stumbling and rocks of offence to exist for the punishment of disobedient and wicked men, so for sincere Christians, who live holily and humbly, believe and pray fervently, and seek the true way diligently, He hath not thought such an earthly judge necessary, but hath Himself provided for them another safe and certain way to all saving truth, by giving them the promise of His Spirit to guide them into all essential truth, so that they may say with the Psalmist, "Thou shalt guide me with thy counsel, and afterwards receive me into glory" (Psalm lxxiii. 24); and if they be so guided and kept by God's power by faith unto salvation (1 Peter i. 5), we think there is no reason for any one to despond for lack of guidance, but on the contrary, we may safely ask, what need a Christian desire more?

Correspondence.

INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—In the last number of your monthly journal I find the following sentence, viz.:—"Will any of the Bishops or Priests of the Church of Rome now come forward, in or ont of our pages, to grapple with and discuss the question of the boasted infallibility of their Church?" &c. (page 104.)

I beg leave to say, in answer to this defiance, that the Bishops and Priests of the Church of Rome have the requirements of their flock (lately so wonderfully increased by conversions from Protestantism) to attend to—their episcopal and sacerdotal duties to perform—and, consequently, cannot afford to lose any time by the discussion of questions which they have repeatedly, over and over again, proved to the satisfaction of every man, whose reason is not hood-winked by prejudice, and who does not allow, to use a vulgar word, the "times" of this world to overrule and nullify his firm convictions. But the Roman Catholic layman will come forward to "shiver a spear" with you; and, notwithstanding their "intellects being confined and their souls enslaved," are able to prove any article of their creed which you may assail. As an humble and unlearned member of this body, I undertake to prove, in a simple, concise, but, I trust, cogent manner the infallibility of the Church which our Lord established on earth.

This infallibility of the Church I discover in the positive and most unequivocal promises of our Lord Jesus Christ—viz., "Upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."—Matt. xvi. 18, Protestant Bible. If the Church could possibly teach errors, then the gates of hell could prevail against her, contrary to the above promise. Therefore she is infallible.

"Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world."—Matt. xxviii. 19, 20, P. B. Our Lord, addressing his twelve Apostles on the present occasion, speaks to all his ministers, successors of the Apostles to the end of time, which I think needs no proof.

Now, sir, upon that subject I form the following argument, which I defy any one to refute. Christ promises that He will be with His Apostles, baptizing, teaching, and preaching to all nations, until the consummation of time. Now, Christ cannot tell a lie; therefore, it is evident that Christ has fulfilled His promise, and that during these 1800 years past He has been with His ministers, and that He will continue to be with them to the end of time; and that he will accompany and guide them when they preach his word and administer his sacraments. Therefore, His Church is infallible.

"And I will ask the Father, and he shall give you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you for ever, the Spirit of truth."—John xiv. 16, 17, P. B.* It appears that Christ asked his Heavenly Father to bless his ministers, the pastors of his Church, with the spirit of truth for ever. Pray, sir, did Christ ever offer up any prayer in vain? And if his prayer was heard, how could the Church teach any false doctrine? Therefore, she is infallible.

"Therefore, as the Church is subject to Christ, so also let the wives be to their husbands in all things. Husbands love your wives, as Christ also loved the Church, and delivered himself up for it, that He might sanctify it, cleansing it by the laver of water in the word of life; that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish."—Ephes. v. 24, 25, 26, 27, P. B. The Church is always subject to Christ—that is, not only under him, but ever obedient to his words and commandments. Which is an evident and invincible demonstration that she never rebelled against Christ, never falleth from him by error, idolatry, or false worship. Therefore, she is infallible.

We also see by this passage from St. Paul, that Christ loves the Church, for which he suffered his passion; but if she was liable to err, He could not love her. Therefore, she is infallible.

"And if he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and publican."—Matt. xviii. 17, P. B. By this, it appears, if I refuse to hear the Church that I am an outcast, and no better than the heathen. Our Lord would never command me to hear the Church, nor punish me so severely for refusing to hear her, if that Church could teach me anything contrary to his holy law, or lead me astray, by teaching antichristian doctrines. Of this I am as satisfied as I am of my own existence. Therefore, I most firmly and undoubtedly believe that the Church is infallible.

With these plain texts of the Sacred Volume staring you in the face, how could you, with any show of reason, make Edith Marley insinuate, in the discussion between her and the Roman Catholic bishop, that the Church which Christ founded on earth departed from the things that he commanded, and taught other things?—CATHOLIC LAYMAN, page 100, September number. And here let me parenthetically observe, that you were not guided by the spirit of impartiality (pardon me for saying so) in conducting that discussion, because you make the argument against the Sacrifice of the Mass as strong and as powerful as Protestants can make it; but the argument in its defence is weak, poor, impotent. Is that fair? Is it honourable? This, however, may be excusable, but I say it is almost unpardonable to wilfully mutilate, as you have done, the text from the prophecy of Malachy, in this discussion.

In this story of the Marleys you represent the Roman Catholic bishop and Major Marley as being grossly ignorant; the former not knowing where to find, in the Bible, the Prophecy of Malachias; and the latter a Roman Catholic, having never heard a word of the Gospel of our Lord.

Now, this is a frightful calumny on both priests and people; and violates, in a shameful manner, one of God's holy and eternal commands—viz., "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour." Allow me to tell you that it is not by calumny that your journal can command the attention and respect of Roman Catholics. They treat a journal in which such appears with supreme contempt. I beg now to give a quotation, on the infallibility of the Church of Christ, from a work recently published:—

"But when He, the spirit of truth, shall come, he will teach you all truth."—John xvi. 13, P. B. "The Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of truth."—1 Tim. iii. 15, P. B. If the Church itself, as it comes out of the hands of God, is the very ground and pillar of truth, it will hardly want the reforming hand of corrupted man to put it right; it will always teach the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth; and instead of reforming this, or attempting to do so, the most precious of all the works and institutions of God, you and I must be reformed by it.

To quote all the texts that prove the holy Church of Jesus Christ to be infallible, or invested by Christ with a supreme and unerring authority in matters of faith, would be endless. I said, that we discover this unerring authority even in the dictates of common sense. Yes, common sense tells us that the works of God are perfect in their kind.

Now, the Church being most emphatically the work of God, it most assuredly must be perfect; the Church, however, must be very imperfect, indeed, if it wants the main perfection, which, as our guide and director to heaven, it must have, that of always teaching truth: that of always supplying the wants of our limited and corrupted reason: that of always carrying before our eyes the bright and Divine light of revelation.

Show us a Church which is not infallible, which owns itself fallible, wanting, of course, the main perfection which the Church of Christ must have, and you show us a Church of corrupted man, not the Church of Christ. Common sense tells us that without an infallible tribunal unanimity in faith is a thing impossible. Without a centre of unity, a fixed standard, an absolute and infallible tribunal, a living oracle to determine the mind, it is absolutely impossible that men, framed as they are, should ever come to one and the same way of thinking. Whoever renounces this infallible authority of the Church, has no longer any sure means to secure him against uncertainties, and to settle his doubts; he is in a sad and perplexed situation, tossed to and fro by every wind of doctrine.

We are confirmed in the above suggestions of common sense by our observations. Unity in faith we find nowhere but in the Catholic Church. Above two hundred millions of Catholics, scattered over the face of the earth, are perfectly one in matters of faith. We meet from the most distant parts of the globe, ignorant of one another's language, manners, &c., yet our thoughts and principles about religion and its mysteries are exactly alike. Pray is that unity to be found among those who have shaken off the authority of the Church? Since they have presumed to reform (as they call it) the Catholic Church, what do we see but one reformation on another, hundreds and hundreds of different Churches, one rising on the ruins of another, each styling itself the Church of Christ, each appealing to the Gospel for the orthodoxy of her doctrine, each calling her ministers ministers of Christ, each calling the sermons of her ministers the Word of God, &c., &c? Can we be wrong in believing that our pastors are really in possession of the power which Christ himself asserts He gave them, and which he promises shall remain with them for ever; since Jesus Christ has pledged his sacred veracity for the existence of those several powers in the Pastors of his Church, and since he has likewise promised that the very fountain of truth, the Holy Ghost, shall be and remain with those pastors for ever, we should think ourselves guilty of a great sin if we refused submission, of either understanding or will, to their decisions and their precepts; and of a most daring presumption and diabolical pride, if we would ever, for one moment, permit our limited reason to sit in judgment over the decisions and precepts of those, whom Jesus Christ declares to be guided by the Holy Ghost for ever.

Seeing, then, that the pastors of the Church of Christ have always been secured by the infinite power of God against the danger of being led astray, and leading those under their care astray into false and erroneous doctrines, we rest assured under their guidance, knowing that the understanding of the most transcendent genius can never penetrate into the mysteries of the Most High; we, both learned and unlearned, take the only safe way of submission—that path in which the Holy Spirit assures us that "the very fools cannot err."—Isa. xxxv. 8, Protestant Bible.

Now, every person whose mind is susceptible of conviction, on reading those plain texts of the Holy Scriptures, and the unvarnished comments thereon, must discover that the Church which our Lord established on earth is infallible; and I defy any man to prove that any other but the Roman Catholic Church is this true, unerring Church, which hitherto has continued "without spot or wrinkle, or any such thing," and will continue to the end of time in transcendent purity and heavenly truth. This Church will be teaching the doctrine of Jesus when the apostate temples—whose "profane novelties" distract the world—shall have ceased to exist, and, if remembered, only to be deprecated.

I am, Mr. Editor, your very humble servant,

WILLIAM ROURKE.

P.S.—May I request that you will give this letter (to which you may append, if you like, a fictitious name) a place in the next number of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, that your Protestant readers may see that there exists on earth an infallible Church.—W. R.

We cannot say that we think our correspondent's excuse of "want of leisure" is a satisfactory explanation of the obstinate silence with which the Roman Catholic clergy have hitherto shunned all controversy in our pages. Some of those in the West of Ireland, at least, we certainly think might of late have found some spare time on their hands. We find, however, in the letters we receive from the educated Roman Catholic laity, compensation for the silence of their clergy. Though the priests may think it no part of their business to satisfy the doubts of Protestants, no doubt they consider it their duty to find time to instruct their own flocks, and to supply them with the best arguments for the authority of their Church that are to be had. Mr. Rourke's spiritual guide has certainly not neglected his duty in this respect. We do not think that any priest in Ireland can supply better arguments for the infallibility of his Church than those which our correspondent has so cleverly brought forward. If, therefore,

* It is curious that though Mr. Rourke marks his quotations P. B.—meaning, as we suppose, "Protestant Bible"—none of them in reality are from the authorized version.

we show, as we hope to do, that his case utterly breaks down, and that his arguments wholly fail to establish the point which he wishes to prove, our readers need not imagine that any stronger arguments on that side remain behind.

Mr. Rourke's arguments are reducible to two heads—arguments from Scripture, and from reason, or "common sense." We have, in conformity with the plan which we had laid down for ourselves in our August number (*vide* page 86) discussed in a separate article the proofs alleged from Scripture in support of the doctrine of the infallibility of the Church, and as that article (see page 121) includes the texts brought forward by our correspondent, we content ourselves here with replying to the other topics which he has introduced in his letter.

Argument I.—"Every work of God is perfect in its kind; the Church is most emphatically the work of God, and must therefore, be perfect, and consequently must have the main perfection of always teaching truth."

If this argument were a good one, we might go on to reason in like manner thus—If the Church be perfect, it must have the main perfection of always having a perfect Head; but the Pope is the recognised head of the Church of Rome; either, therefore, any given Pope (for example, Alexander VI.*) was perfect, or else the Church of Rome is not the Church of Christ.

But though this conclusion (which follows legitimately from our correspondent's principles) may be more satisfactory to us than to him, we must confess that the argument is *not* a good one. Its fallacy is that it assumes that our "common sense" is sufficient to decide what amount of perfection any work of God must of necessity possess. Test the argument by applying it to a similar case, and the falsity of the assumption becomes at once apparent. In place of the word "Church," let us insert the word "man"—or, to make the matter clearer, imagine Adam in the Garden of Eden, to have reasoned thus concerning himself—"Every work of God is perfect in its kind; I am emphatically the work of God, declared by God himself to be very good (Gen. i. 31); consequently I must have the main perfection of always doing right." But it was only *before the fall* that this could pass for a good argument. The fall, alas, has taught us that works of God, declared by himself to have been originally created perfect, are liable to the corruption of evil. God designed *his Church* to possess perfect truth and perfect holiness, in the same way in which he designed *man* to possess similar qualities; and whenever we can give a satisfactory account of the entrance of evil into the world, we shall *then* also be able to explain why God permitted corruption to assail the doctrines and undermine the purity of his Church.

Argument II.—Without an absolute and infallible tribunal, there can be no certainty. "He who renounces the infallible authority of the Church has no longer any sure means to secure him against uncertainties, and to settle his doubts; he is in a sad and perplexed situation, tossed to and fro by every wind of doctrine."

If this argument be good, we may reason, too—"Without an infallible certainty that we *have* an infallible guide, we must be full of doubt and perplexity. "For what should we think of a man who said that he would never think it safe to live in a house unless the ground floor were built of solid stone, and yet who never troubled himself to think whether there were good foundations. For it is evident that the certainty of the man who professes that he is following an infallible guide, can never rise higher than whatever certainty he may have that his guide *is* infallible. Now, how is this proposition to be proved? Not on the testimony of the professed infallible guide himself, for it would be absurd to admit any one's claims to infallibility merely because we had his own word for it. No; it is established by the same kind of proofs from Scripture and from reason as Mr. Rourke has here employed, and as Protestants are accustomed to employ in proof of the articles of their faith. If, then, it be possible, by Scripture and reason alone, to obtain a certain proof of the infallibility of the Church of Rome (a doctrine about which the Bible is strangely silent, as we have observed elsewhere) much more may Protestants obtain, in the same way, certain proofs of their articles of faith, all of which *do* happen to be mentioned in Scripture. On the other hand, if Protestants cannot attain to any certainty for want of an infallible guide, neither can this proposition, "that an infallible guide exists," ever be certainly proved, since in the proof of it the assertion of the guide claiming infallibility cannot be admitted to reckon for anything.

It may be well to add a caution as to the sense in which we use the word "certainty." A man is not *certain* because he is *positive* in his opinions, and is free from all doubt and hesitation. It would be no recommendation to any system that its adherents were all confident they were in the right, unless it could be shown that their confidence rested on good grounds. But, in point of fact, men's confidence in the correctness of their opinions, depends more on their temperament than on the religious system to which they belong. Thus, it is not true that all members of the Church of Rome are free from all doubt. Not to speak of the infidelity which has too often arisen from her over-strained demands on men's credulity, many of the thoughtful members of her communion must be disturbed by an uneasy conviction that there is something unsound in the basis of her enormous structure. While again, as to the grand question, "Is the Church of Rome fallible or infallible?" no Roman Catholic can be more completely free from all doubt and hesitation than we are ourselves.

Again, this certainty we are speaking of is not the certainty of mathematical demonstration. God has judged fit that, in matters of religion, we should be obliged to act, not on mathematical demonstration, but on evidence of the same nature as determines our conduct in the common affairs of life; even those in which our most important earthly interests are concerned. When, therefore, we assert that proofs drawn from Scripture and reason are sufficient *(if they be good ones)* to produce certainty, without the authority of an infallible guide, we mean to say that they are sufficient to produce such a well-grounded confidence as renders doubt practically unreasonable.

Argument III.—"Without an infallible tribunal, unanimity in faith is a thing impossible. Men can never come to the same way of thinking without some living oracle to determine the mind. Unity of faith is found by experience to exist nowhere but in the Roman Catholic Church."

It certainly must be acknowledged, that the Christian world is very far from being united, but is, on the contrary, broken up into a great variety of sects. We shall not now inquire whether the points of agreement between the principal of them are not more numerous and of more importance than Roman Catholic writers would represent; but we shall admit this disunion as a melancholy fact. But now we are wholly at a loss to see how this division of the Christian world into sects affords an argument in favour of any one of them. Any one sect may, if it pleases, set itself on one side, and all the rest on the other, and exclaim, "See here is unity on the one side, and on the other dissension." Members of the Greek Church might say, "Here are all we Greeks united, while you Westerns, some of you call yourself Roman Catholics, some of you Presbyterians, &c." Or, again, the Quakers might say, "See what perfect unity there is amongst us." One of our "Friends comes from the remotest part of America or Australia, and yet our thoughts and principles about religion and its mysteries are exactly alike. Pray, is that unity to be found among you who use carnal ordinances, broken up as you are into hundreds of different Churches, each styling itself the Church of Christ?" We do not see why the argument is not as good in the mouth of the Greek Church, or of the Quakers, as it is in that of the Roman Catholics, when they triumph in the fact that they agree with themselves, and that those who disagree with them do not agree with each other.

Once upon a time a jury, after a night spent in stormy discussion, were called into court, and asked by the judge, "Gentlemen, do you agree in your verdict?" "Yes, my lord," said the foreman. "No, no," exclaimed half-a-dozen voices from the jury-box. "How is this?" said the judge. "Why, my lord," replied the foreman, "it is true, there are seven or eight wrong-headed fellows, who refuse to submit to the decision of the foreman, and who, therefore, don't deserve to be reckoned as jury-men; but, *not counting them*, we are all agreed."

We leave our intelligent readers to make their own application of the story to the manner in which Romanists make out the unity of the Church, by simply *not counting* those who differ from them.

But, perhaps, when we say that the Quakers are as much united among themselves as the Roman Catholics, it may be replied, "But they are not near so numerous." "We are two hundred millions," says Mr. Rourke; and though we believe this computation is about double the truth, there is no doubt the Roman Catholics do considerably outnumber the Quakers. We beg our readers, however, to turn back to the article in our last April number (page 40), "Are Numbers a Test of Truth?" We showed there that if truth were to be judged of by the numbers of its adherents, Romanism must be condemned, since there are more Christians who are not Roman Catholics than those who are; nay, Christianity herself must be condemned, since the Christians are far outnumbered by the heathens; and we showed that numbers cannot be used as a test of truth by any one who remembers our Lord's warning—"*Broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there are who go in thereat. Narrow is the way that leadeth to life, and few there are that find it.*"

It must be added that the unity in the Church of Rome is more apparent than real. We need not speak of the dissensions that have so often torn her communion; the debates about the superiority of a Council to the Pope—about the immaculate conception, and a hundred others, which Protestants cannot easily forget, and which we may possibly discuss more at large hereafter; but even when there is outward agreement, what is this worth unless it be the result of agreement between men who are thinking independently and judging for themselves? But the Church of Rome discourages independent examination into the truth by her members; she prefers that they should assent to her dogmas without inquiry; and where she has the power she suppresses all expressions of dissent from those who are not convinced by her authority. She thus obtains a number of voices to resound her doctrines; but what are they all but echoes of a single voice? Numbers of those whom she keeps in ignorance do agree with each other, just as in the dark all things are the same colour. It only requires light to make their differences appear. But this is not the unity which distinguishes the Church of Christ. That unity is, as a distinguished man described it, "Not the unity of belief in the bond of ignorance—nor unity of profession in the bond of hypocrisy—but unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace."

We cannot leave the subject, however, without returning our correspondent's argument. We say that the dissensions which exist among Christians are a sufficient argument that God has *not* interfered to prevent them by supplying them with a living infallible guide. Let any man say, is it a credible assertion, that God, with the view of securing absolute unity in his Church, supplied it with a living infallible guide, and yet that he so neglected to supply this guide with credentials, that considerably more than half the Christian world have, in consequence, been unable to satisfy themselves of his infallibility, and have been, therefore, as much divided among themselves as if no such guide had been given; and this when a single text in the Bible, "Receive the Bishop of Rome as the infallible interpreter of my will," would have settled the whole matter. Is it credible that God instituted an infallible Church *or purpose* to prevent disputes, and yet that he should have left the question, Is the Church infallible? the most disputed point in all theology. Would he have left it a *disputable point* where men were to settle their disputes? We conclude, therefore, that whatever be the evils of disunion in the Church, God has not thought fit to prevent them by relieving man from the necessity of searching the truth for themselves, and by imposing upon them a guide whom they could certainly know to be infallible.

Having now discussed the leading arguments of our correspondent, we are compelled, by want of space, to abstain from commenting on some of his incidental remarks, which offer a tempting subject for correction. Our conclusion, then, as to the result of the whole argument on the subject of infallibility, from reason and common sense, is—Our correspondent has succeeded in showing that infallibility is what we should fancy to be a great perfection in a Church—that if we had any infallible way of knowing where an infallible judge was to be found, it would relieve us from all need of hesitation, and would make Christians more united than they are at present. All this, however, does not *approach to* being proof that such an infallible guide exists. If so, we might make out just as good a proof that Holloway's pills would cure the cholera; since undoubtedly it would be a great benefit to have a certain cure for that disease, and would free us from much doubt and hesitation, and would prevent the doctors from differing with each other. It would certainly be a comfortable world if the mere circumstance that we should like to have a thing was a sufficient proof that we had got it.

We must be satisfied for the present with having demolished all the arguments that have been brought from reason and common sense *for* the infallibility of the Church; but did space permit, we should like to show that we can discern many reasons why God should *not* have given Christians an infallible guide. For it would be easy to prove that the result of men's having, or thinking they had such a guide, would be that the people would sink into uninquiring ignorance and neglect of the Word of God. Our remarks on this head must be reserved for some other opportunity.

*See our article, p. 123.

ON THE VISIBILITY OF THE CHURCH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Sir—In apology for trespassing still farther upon your courtesy, in resuming a protracted discussion, I beg, very respectfully, to urge again the paramount importance of the subject, and the lively interest I feel in it. Being led to expect, in last month's publication, an explicit elucidation of your opinions respecting the visibility of the Church, I felt much disappointed in finding that you had been expiscating the writings of St. Augustine, for the purpose of deducing premises, which, if once admitted, would lead to most preposterous consequences—viz., "That some lying in heresies, and in the superstition of the Gentiles, are of the number of the elect, who truly constitute the Church; and that even schismatics in those things in which they do not separate, are in connection with the Church."—(C. L. Oct., 53, p. 113.)

Relying, I presume, on some tortuous explanation of the above isolated passages, you will make room by your side for the Pelagians, the Eutychians, the Nestorians, the Sociniaus, "et hoc genus omne," the spawn of heretics, who have just as much connection with the Church as lopped off branches have with the parent tree. Far from shunning those who cause divisions (Rom. xvi. 17), you do not disown even Pagan superstitions. This, sir, I beg to retort upon you, is but your own individual opinion. I deny that it is a true exposition of Protestant doctrine, and I call upon you to prove the affirmative by such evidence as you require of others—viz., creeds, liturgies, public documents, or formularies of faith.

The residue of your somewhat elaborate dissertation amounts merely to what is briefly expressed in the 26th Article of the Church of England—"That in the visible Church the evil is ever mingled with the good, and sometimes preponderates." Though this may be, alas! too true, though the worldly and wicked may outnumber the moral, the pure, and the regenerate, still the latter will preserve the faith (Matthew xvi. 18; Isaiah lxii. 6,) and the form of sound words (1 Tim. vi. 20, 21, and 2 Tim. i.

13), to which formula, if the degenerate will not submit, the faithful will at once disenthral themselves from the degrading connection, and unite in a separate community, "fair as the moon, clear as the sun, terrible as an army with banners."—Cant. vi. 10. I appeal to candid and enlightened Protestants, if the 16th Article does not distinctly refer to such "a congregation of faithful men, among whom the pure Word of God is preached, and the sacraments duly administered, according to Christ's ordinance?" I am satisfied that my appeal is not in vain; for I find the above passage of the Canticles applied to the Protestant Reformed Churches, as they existed in the time of Luther, Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, by one of the brightest luminaries of your Church at the present day.

But to come more decidedly to the point, you must assume, as a hypothesis, that the Church of England, and the various Protestant Churches with which she acknowledges a connection, or joins communion, constitute the true visible Church of Christ upon earth; or, that they do not. If they are not the true Church of Christ, you are walking in the "the valley of the shadow of death;" and if they are the true Church of Christ, of course, this Church must have been perpetual and always visible, according to your great first principle.—(See C. L., January, '53, p. 10).

I assert, that in the beginning of the eleventh century, no Church or congregation existed professing the peculiar negative doctrines of the Church of England; or with which she can consistently identify herself; inasmuch as Protestantism, *in globo*, was condemned in the person of Berengarius. This man denied the doctrine of Transubstantiation. He stood alone, was condemned by the whole world, and had not one place under heaven to look to for countenance or support. Your Church was then invisible, and the undeniable consequence is, that it is not the true Church.

Respecting the faith of the Greek and Eastern Churches, I beg to refer you to the public liturgies in use amongst them.

The Graeco Arabic Liturgy of St. Basil, Renaudot. tom. i. p. 153.

The Coptic Liturgy of St. Basil, Renaudot. tom. i. p. 2.

The Coptic Liturgy of St. Cyril, idem. tom. i. p. 39.

The Syriac Liturgy of St. Basil. idem, tom. ii. p. 549.

The Liturgy of St. James, idem. tom. ii. p. 38, 39, with many others, including the Liturgy of St. John the Silent, used at Constantinople; some of which call the Eucharist a tremendous and unbloody sacrifice; others the life-giving flesh which Christ, our God, took from our holy Lady, Mother of God and ever Virgin Mary; others of them call it a propitiatory sacrifice, and offer it for all creatures, and for the remission of sin; and in the last-named liturgy it is expressly specified that the priest, the deacon, and the people offer, not only the marks of external adoration, by the gesture and bowing of the head, but also internal adoration, by the prayers addressed to Jesus Christ in the Eucharist. Read also pages 204 and 205 of the Hammersmith Discussion, London edition, 1841, where the eloquent and talented controvertialist, Rev. J. Cumming, unhesitatingly admits that the Greek and Eastern Churches always retained this dogma. See also, Townsend's Accusations of History against the Church of Rome, page 105, where he acknowledges that the Greek Churches, in their public liturgies, invocate the saints and the Blessed Virgin: and that they believe a purgatory, or medial state, may be seen by consulting the above liturgies.

Now, sir, if you obstinately oppose yourself to this formidable phalanx, which I have arrayed against you, eminent Protestant writers, both ancient and modern, of different countries, public liturgies and the articles of your own Church, &c., I can well afford to leave you to the indulgence of this very singular and unenviable scepticism.

In order to elicit some tangible or definite avowal from you, I have assumed successively the Roman, the Greek, and Eastern Churches to be the true visible Church of Christ. "Oh!" you say, "our correspondent, by an instinct peculiar to his tribe, is ever taking a part for the whole — we did not mean any one part, but the whole." That is to say:—The Church of Rome—the Scarlet Lady, and the Greek and Eastern Churches, denying the Holy Ghost (the error of Photius), believing transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the mass, purgatory and the invocation of saints—all these corrupt, erratic, superstitious, blasphemous, and idolatrous Churches to compose the true visible Church of Christ, 'fair as the moon, clear as the sun, terrible as an army with banners.'"

It has been asked, in derision, how many fallibles will make an infallible. *Per contra*—how many corrupt and idolatrous churches will make the pure Church of Christ—"the pillar and the ground of truth?" I need not press this argument farther. Your readers will see that you have not got out of the dilemma in which I placed you respecting the Greek and Eastern Churches; and that you did not account for the fact of Berenger's not appealing to any of them for sympathy or protection, and not adducing their authority to support his own heterodox opinions.

Besides, you must be aware that there were, at the time of Berengarius, many Greek Churches in Italy, particularly at Venice; and that the Emperor still retained possession of a part of Italy—which part obeyed the Patriarch of Constantinople; and even if this were not the case, I do not see what was to prevent Berengarius from going over to the Greeks, if they espoused his cause, as you would seem to insinuate, even when Rome was in her glory.

I will not presume to violate an established rule, by entering into the merits of the doctrine of transubstantiation, which you have shown such an anxiety to drag into the present controversy, though quite a distinct topic; but if you are not wedded to a set of opinions, or too much devoted to party interests to propose your arguments manfully, and let them stand or fall by their own merits, I am sure you can dispose of the subject of the visibility by a *coup de main;* and I shall be prepared then to investigate with you the doctrine of transubstantiation—"ab ovo usque ad malum."

Φιλαληθης.

Dated 1st November, 1853.

We cannot think that so intelligent a correspondent as "Philalethes" would have written so much to us that is quite wide of the mark, if he was clearly aware what the real point of difference between us is. His present letter enables us, we hope, to bring the matter to a point, and to set the subject in a clear point of view.

He asks us, as a very puzzling question, with what Church of the eleventh century does the present Church of England identify herself? We answer very simply—with the Church of England, to be sure. We hold that the Church presided over by Archbishop Sumner, who now fills the See of Canterbury, is identical with that presided over by Lanfrane, who filled the same see, at the time referred to by "Philalethes." We believe this to be as historically certain as it is that Dr. Wiseman, the head of the Roman Catholics in England, is not the successor of Lanfranc or Augustine, but the first occupier of a bran-new see, made about three years ago. But, then, since we do not believe in the *infallibility* of the Church, we do not hold, and are not bound to prove that the doctrines held in the eleventh century are exactly the same as those taught in the nineteenth century. We maintain that the Church of England in those days taught, in addition to the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel, some errors from which she is now happily free, though we also maintain that the Church of England, in the eleventh century, was free from some errors (as, for example, the notion of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary), with which the Church of Rome is now infected. Does not "Philalethes" now see that all he has written about the visibility of the Church does not affect our views in the least? What he has to prove is her perpetual *purity*. If he can show that it is impossible that any error whatever can be taught in any part of the Church of Christ, then, without going back to the eleventh century, the Church of England, which professes to have *reformed* herself in the 16th, is condemned at once. But *until* he has proved this, the line of argument "Philalethes" has taken is only calculated to excite prejudice against his views. He plunges into the very darkest period of the Church's history, and calls on us to believe, not as the Apostles believed—not as the primitive Church believed—but as the eleventh century believed. What force has this *until* it is proved that the belief of the majority of Christians in the eleventh century must necessarily be in every respect the same as that of Christians in the first and second? We recommend "Philalethes" to examine well the foundations of his argument, and to entertain suspicions of those who shrink from light, and who would send him to grope in the dark ages for his religion.

What we have said would, we think, be a sufficient reply; but as we should be sorry "Philalethes" should think we were disposed to treat his argument lightly, we shall go a little more fully into the matter with *him*, even at the risk of wearying some of our readers.

"Philalethes" accuses us of "expiscating" St. Augustine. If "expiscating" a man be a wrong thing to do, and if we have done it, we are very sorry; but as we really do not know what it means, we are at a loss whether to plead guilty or not.

If "expiscating St. Augustine" means quoting from St. Augustine's works passages which are contrary to the doctrine of the Church of Rome, and therefore seem "preposterous" to "Philalethes," we are then very sorry that the Church of Rome should have departed from the doctrine of St. Augustine, and that "Philalethes" should be offended at him. But if this be our offence, we fear we shall have to "expiscate" all the Fathers in turn.

"Philalethes" accuses us of "deducing premises from St. Augustine, which, if once admitted, would lead to most preposterous consequences—viz., that some, lying in heresies and in the superstition of the Gentiles, are of the number of the elect, who truly constitute the Church." Now, these were the words of St. Augustine, which we quoted—"There are some of that number (the elect) who, as yet, are living wickedly, and are lying even in heresies, or in the superstitions of the Gentiles; and yet, even there the Lord knoweth them that are his; for *in that unspeakable forehnowledge of God*, many who seem to be without are indeed within, and many who seem to be within are without. Of all those who, so to speak, inwardly and hiddenly are within, consists that garden enclosed, that fountain sealed, that well of living water."

We drew no conclusions from this; much less such preposterous conclusions as "Philalethes" seems to fancy do follow from it; but which, if he had looked at the words marked in italics, he would never have dreamed of. We only asked Roman Catholics to consider how St. Augustine distinguished between the Church visible and invisible, and we still ask them to do so.

"Philalethes" retorts that this is only our individual opinion. We say it is St. Augustine's opinion, not ours. He denies it to be "a true exposition of Protestant doctrine," and calls on us "to prove it by such evidence as we require from others—viz., creeds, liturgies, public documents, or formularies of faith." A very fair demand, provided "Philalethes" will allow us, for this purpose, the free use of *all* the formularies of the Church of England and Ireland. It was natural, perhaps, that "Philalethes" should forget the Holy Scriptures as a source of proof; but we must remind him that it is the *chief* "formulary of faith" in the Church of England and Ireland. The Sixth Article adopts all that is "read therein, or may be proved thereby." Everything relating to faith that we find in the Bible is adopted by that Sixth Article. And in the Bible we find St. Paul thus speaking of himself—"When it pleased him (God), *who separated me from my mother's womb*, and called me by his grace to reveal his Son in me." (Galatians i. 15, 16, Douay Bible.) This is exactly what St. Augustine means. St. Paul spent the first part of his life in spiritual pride, in blasphemy and persecution; yet, "in that unspeakable foreknowledge of God," St. Paul was "separated from his mother's womb;" and yet no Christian was to hear him till the Son of God was revealed in him, and so none of the preposterous consequences that "Philalethes" fears do follow from this doctrine.

The other passage in which "Philalethes" thinks we have "expiscated St. Augustine" (whatever that means) is this—"that even schismatics, in those things in which they do not separate, are in connection with the Church." Now, the facts were thus: the Donatist schism was itself founded on the notion that schism wholly separates from Christ, and from his Church, visible and invisible. St. Augustine, St. Optatus, and all the African Church, maintained the contrary; they conducted the controversy on the principle that schism does not wholly separate; they professed to treat the Donatists as still brethren in Christ, in respect of all things in which they were agreed; and the course thus taken by the African bishops was approved of at the time by the Church of Rome, and by the whole Catholic world. And we are at a loss to know why the principles of St. Augustine, Optatus, &c., should now be regarded with such aversion by the present Church of Rome, and by "Philalethes." That Donatist controversy is, indeed, most instructive in relation to the controversy of the present day; but it is too large a subject to enter on here.* We hope to treat of it fully some other time. It will then appear who now hold the opinions which Catholics held then.

We come now to the precise question between "Philalethes and us." We are disappointed that he does not yet understand us more clearly, but still mistakes our opinions. It is perhaps natural that he should not easily comprehend opinions that are so new to him; and we are willing to take all possible pains, in hopes that we may understand each other yet.

All the difficulties which "Philalethes" raises against our view of the visible Church are no difficulties at all, except on this supposition that the visible Church must of necessity be free from all error or corruption. We have said that we believe the visible Church to be subject to error and to corruption—more or less dangerous, more or less extensive in different ages and countries. "Philalethes" thinks it enough to show that this is our opinion. But what we want is, that "Philalethes" should show us that this opinion of ours *is wrong*. Until he can show us this, he cannot expect us to give up that opinion. We hope he will now understand what our opinion is; and that he will show us (if he can) that this opinion is wrong.

We are equally anxious to understand exactly what "Philalethes'" opinion is. We want to know plainly, 1st. does Philalethes think that "the visible Church must of necessity be always free from error and corruption in doctrine?" 2nd. "In the case which we are now discussing (that of Berengarius), was the Church of Rome actually right?"

It is not our fault if we do not yet understand what the opinion of "Philalethes" really is about this. We have asked him these questions as plainly as we could, and *he has not yet given us any answer.*

We now reprint here what we said in our remarks on "Philalethes'" last letter in our number for September.

"'Philalethes' brought forward the fact that Berengarius was condemned, and forced to retract his opinions in various Councils. We selected the most important—that which has been put into the canon law, consisting of Pope Nicholas II. and 113 bishops, held at Rome, in the year 1059. We gave the words which Berengarius was compelled to sign—that the true body and the blood of Christ is '*in a sensible manner* (sensualiter) handled by the hands of the priest, broken and ground by the teeth of the faithful.' We affirmed that the word *sensualiter* can mean nothing else than this, 'in a way that our senses can judge of and perceive.' Now we want to understand what 'Philalethes' thinks of this. Does he think that the Pope and Council were right — or does he think that they were wrong? *He has not told us*, AND WE CALL ON HIM TO TELL US: we cannot discuss this matter with him *without knowing what his opinion is;* WE THEREFORE CALL ON HIM TO ANSWER THIS. Our opinion is, *that he will never* venture to say that the Pope and Council were right." "Philalethes" has *not* answered this. He leaves us still

* We touched slightly on it in our July number, p. 75.

totally in the dark, whether he *does* believe, or *does not* believe, that the visible Church must be always free from error and corruption in doctrine, and that the Church of Rome was right in that question of Berengarius.

Now, this is the very question at issue between "Philalethes" and us, "whether the visible Church must always be free from error and corruption in doctrine; and whether the Church of Rome was free from error in the case of Berengarius." How can we discuss that question with him, till we know which side he takes, and what his opinion is?

If he think that the visible Church is liable to error and corruption in doctrine, then he thinks as we do, and there is no difference between us about the visible Church. If he think that the visible Church is not liable to error or corruption of doctrine, *and will tell us plainly that this is his opinion*, then we will discuss that opinion with him. But it is not possible for us to discuss his opinion with him without knowing plainly what his opinion is.

We therefore call upon him again to answer this plain question, and when he answers it, as we hope he will in our next number, we will go on with the discussion.

In like manner, if our correspondent wishes us to discuss whether the Greek Church be a part of the visible Church of Christ, we would ask him to state his own opinion whether it be a part of the visible Church or not. If he think it is, we have no difference with him; if he think it is not, we will discuss it with him. He speaks of the Eastern Churches as "denying the Holy Ghost;" we were not aware of this; but if he can show us that it is so, we will not claim the Greek Church as a part of the visible Church of Christ.

We trust our correspondent will think that we have put the question fairly now.

THE CHURCH VISIBLE AND INVISIBLE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Carlow.

Sir—In the last paragraph of "The Church Visible and Invisible" you earnestly invite Roman Catholics to the statement of Augustine's doctrine of the Church, then asking how can we pretend to say our Church is without "spot or wrinkle?" (Before I go farther, I consider this article the most temperate and candid that I have seen in any Protestant journal—it is almost Catholic.) When we quote "without spot or wrinkle," in defence of our Church, it is for her infallibility and teaching, not for the moral rectitude of her sons individually, for the cockle must needs grow among the wheat to the end of time.

You fairly remark that the Church is visible and invisible. Nothing can be more plain and simple, if you allow those that are yet to be gathered in to the true fold to be the invisible, and those that are now of the Church are visible. By their fruits you will know them.

Now, the true Church being always visible, as can be proved by many texts of Scripture, may I ask what became of its visibility at the dawning of the Reformation? Before Martin Luther was born there was a visible true Church; when he was a monk there was a visible true Church; when he broached his new doctrine there was a visible true Church; when he said emphatically he stood alone, there was a visible true Church. I stand alone! Against what? Against a Church—the true, visible Church. This was a true admission of Luther's. He stood alone—the one, solitary spark, that was afterwards to be fanned into a flame, as it were, by the four winds of heaven, and then settle down, like the lava of some burning mountain. This doctrine of Luther's was not in accordance with the then visible Church. Either Luther in person was the visible Church, or he was not. If he was the true Church, what became of the Church Catholic? for he could not then claim that title, and those that were afterwards his followers were not of his Church, visible or invisible, as they knew not his teaching while yet in the embryo of his brain. We no more contend for the infallibility of an individual than we do for the spiritual supremacy of the reigning monarch over the Catholic Church.

I am, sir, your obedient, humble servant,

A ROMAN CATHOLIC.

We sincerely thank our correspondent for his kind expressions and his candid opinion of our article; and we sincerely assure him that it is our earnest desire to be, *not only almost, but altogether* Catholic; and that any attempt to show us where we fail to be Catholic, or where we fall into any error, will always be esteemed by us as a kindness.

We are aware that many Roman Catholics do quote "without spot or wrinkle," rather in respect of the infallibility of their Church, than for the moral rectitude of her sons individually. One chief object in that article was to lead candid Roman Catholics to consider that distinction more carefully, and to examine how far it can be sustained.

We find in Scripture many great and glorious promises made to the Church of Christ. We find also a great tendency in many Roman Catholics to apply all those promises generally to the visible Church of Rome, as she now is. We show them some promises which appear to speak of the Church as without sin, and then they admit that these must be spoken of the Church as she appears in the sight of God, who alone knows who do truly and really belong to him. Then we show them other promises which speak of the Church as being without error, and we ask them to consider whether it may not also be possible that these promises, too, belong to the Church as God sees her, rather than to the Church as she is visible to man.

We ask them to consider *why* they admit that the promises of being *all holy* cannot be applied to the visible Church of Rome and to all her members; they will say—"because we see many sinful persons, popes, bishops, clergy, and laity, in her." A very good reason, no doubt. In the same way, if it should appear that the Church of Rome has really erred, then it will be equally necessary to apply, just in the same way, those promises that seem to speak of infallibility. We now ask our correspondent to consider carefully the articles now in progress in our pages about the question whether the Apocrypha be really the inspired Word of God. If, as we proceed with our proofs, he should see reason to think that the Church of Rome has really erred in this great question, he must surely then see, that promises that seem to speak of infallibility cannot be applied rightly to the visible Church of Rome; and then the article in our last paper, which he already considers "almost Catholic," may help him out of that difficulty.

We ask him, also, to consider whether the decision which the Pope and Council made against Berengarius was right or not. If he cannot venture to say it was right, why are we talking about infallibility any longer? He will find that decision again in this number, in our reply to the letter of "Philalethes."

We now ask him to consider again what he has said—"When we quote, 'without spot or wrinkle,' in defence of our Church, it is for her infallibility and teaching, not for the moral rectitude of he sons individually." Now, we think the question is—"Did St. Paul mean to say it of her infallibility and teaching?" Here are St. Paul's words, from the Douay Bible—"That he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing; *but that it should be holy and without blemish.*"—Eph. v. 27. Was St. Paul speaking here of infallibility in teaching, or of holiness in heart and life? It seems clear to us that St. Paul speaks of the latter; and if this be so, what right have Roman Catholics to insist on applying it to infallibility?

Our correspondent has not quite correctly understood the distinction between the Church visible and invisible. By the Church visible, we mean the Church as men see it; by the Church invisible, the Church as she really is in herself, and as God sees her—who sees all things as they really are. A man who makes an outward profession of believing and obeying the Gospel, without having the Holy Spirit in his heart, appears to men to be a member of the Church; but God, who looks into the heart, sees that such a one is no real member of the Church of Christ.

Our correspondent's difficulty about Luther reminds us of a famous saying about a famous case in the ancient Church. The stand which the great Athanasius made for the Catholic faith about the Trinity was thus described—"All the world against Athanasius, and Athanasius against all the world." Will our correspondent, therefore, deny the Trinity? Will he say, "How could Athanasius be the Catholic Church? and, if he were not, where was it?"

This question about Luther is, in fact, no difficulty at all to us. Luther was not a member of the Church of England and Ireland. Nor was that Church founded by Luther; nor did it even consist of followers of Luther—though agreeing with Luther in many things. Our correspondent will agree with us that there was a Church in England before the Reformation. We say that very Church rejected some errors which it had formerly held: rejecting error does not make a Church cease to be a Church; because it is not holding error that constitutes a Church. If any one can show us that the Church of England and Ireland at the Reformation rejected any part of the Catholic faith, as it was held in the first ages, then we willingly admit that she ceased to be a true Church. But no one has shown us anything of this kind yet. And how can they, so long as she holds all the Catholic creeds.

We are truly happy to see that our correspondent does not reject the doctrine of St. Augustine, or count it preposterous in its consequences. We trust that friendly and candid discussion may yet bring him and us to be Catholics altogether and alike.

ORIGEN A HERETIC.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Sir—As Mr. E. Power (most unreasonably, I think,) still asserts that you have yet given nothing against Origen, "more convincing than than mere assertion or individual opinion," will you allow me to refer him to St. Augustine de civitate Dei lib. 21. cap. 17.

St. Augustine there says—

"Illum (i.e Origenem) non immerito *reprobavit ecclesia.*"

"The Church, with good reason, hath rejected him (Origen)."

And the chief ground of this rejection he explains to be, that Origen held that *all* future punishments, even those of Satan, were purgatorial.

The Benedictine editor adds the following note:—

"St. Jerome testifies that the errors of Origen were condemned by Pope Anastasius (Apol. adv. Ruff.* and epist. 78 ad Pammach); also by Theophilus, in a Council of Alexandria; after the time of Augustine, also, by Pope Vigilius and the Emperor Justinian. The fifth (Ecumenical Council condemned the impious and absurd dogmas of Origen with many anathemas."

I know not, with this before him, how any Roman Catholic can continue to cite Origen as a faithful exponent of the Church's mind, and especially on the doctrine of purgatory.

I am, sir, yours,

DIDCO.

FARMING OPERATIONS FOR NOVEMBER.

WHEAT sowing should now be proceeded with—completed within the month, if possible; and as the season advances, the quantity of seed should be increased.

Winter Vetches should be sown, if omitted last month, and finished as early as possible; so late in the season, they are best sown in ridges, and the water furrows well cleared up.

Bere.—Winter barley and bere and rye may be sown any time during the month, either for soiling, or to stand for seed.

Beans and Peas.—The sowing of winter beans, such as the Russian or Mazagan, should be no longer delayed; and gray peas may also be sown.

Swede Turnips, Mangel-wurzel, Carrots, and Parsnips should be all lifted, and stored early in the month. For details, see Operations for last month.

Parsnips for table use are better left in the land, and lifted fresh and fresh as required; but large field crops, intended for cattle-feeding, should now be lifted and stored.

Stall-feeding.—The cattle put up last month should now be so much accustomed to hand-feeding and house-management, as to be thriving rapidly; and their daily rations of turnips, oil-cake, bean, or other meal, be generally on the increase, till they get from 6 to 9 lbs. of oil-cake, or a compound of 4 to 6 lbs. of bean-meal, and 2 to 3 lbs. of oil-cake, according to size; they must be kept dry and warm, and well-bedded down with clean straw.

Sheep, also, intended for house-feeding, should soon be placed under cover; and when just put in should have cut turnips given them, very sparingly at first, to prevent scouring, when the allowance may be gradually increased to 1½ or 2 stones, with from ½ to 1 lb. of oil-cake, bean, or barley meal daily.

Breeding Ewes, by the close of the month, should be removed from the ram, and be allowed a spacious run on their winter pastures, which should be sound and dry, with good shelter to resort to in case of storms, and free access to good, sound hay.

Lambs, also, should now have good, sweet, but not rank pastures, and free access to dry, well-littered coverd hovels, with hay, and be supplied with cut turnips, rather sparingly, just as much daily as they can eat up clean, and no more.

Stores.—Sheep should also have a liberal supply of roots and meal; and, as a general rule with all sheep, should have access to salt. The feet of sheep should also be constantly attended to, kept pared, and clean; and if there be any tendency to soreness or tenderness, dress immediately with the butyr of antimony.

Pigs.—Both fattening and stores should now have abundance of cooked food. The stores on steamed turnips and beans, with the offal from the dairy and kitchen; but those fattening should have a liberal allowance of grain with their turnips and potatoes. By the end of the month it will be a good time to send the sows to the brawn.

Grass Lands.—Continue manuring the grazing and meadow lands, with rich composts, farm-yard manure, bones, marl, or manure-gravel.

Water Meadows.—The sluices, ducts, and drains for irrigation should be looked to, and put in order; and any necessary alterations or improvements made without delay; that advantage may now be taken by those having a command of water to commence flooding the water meadows; and that those dependant on floods may be prepared to take advantage of them when they occur.

Fences.—This is a good time to plash and lay old fences; and lay out and plant new ones, when requisite.

Potatoes should still be planted in dry weather; early varieties and early planting being the best security from the disease.

Odds and Ends.—Keep the flail or thrashing-machine at work, to supply fresh straw for the stock; and, as the state of the market may advise, for the sale of grain; keep the teams either at plough or cart; go on draining and subsoiling where necessary; plough up grass lands where intended; scour out ditches and water courses; repair gates and roads; turn over compost heaps; cart home fuel, limestone, &c.; proceed with planting, felling timber, and cleansing coppices; and see that the water let over the irrigated meadows flows freely and constantly, without stagnating on the surface, and that the outlets are free and unobstructed.

* "Quid facient epistolæ Theophili episcopi? quid *Papa Anastasius in toto orbe hæreticum persequens?*" Who the heretic was that was to be thus persecuted over the whole world, we learn from the previous sentence—"Non valet apud eos super *Origenis* damnatione episcoporum auctoritas." St. Jerome Apol adv. Rufinum, lib. i. p. 196.

New, Recent, and Illustrated Works

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

Booksellers to the Queen,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Any Book or number of Books together, *within a pound weight*, can be sent by post for 6d., and at the rate of 6d. for every pound weight additional.

HEATH'S KEEPSAKE FOR 1854. Edited by Miss Power, with Illustrations on Steel. Elegantly Bound. 21s.

THE COURT ALBUM; or Book of Beauty for 1854, a Series of Portraits of the Female Aristocracy. In an Elegant Binding. 21s.

ALISON'S HISTORY OF EUROPE; from the downfall of Napoleon, in 1815, to the accession of Louis Napoleon, in 1852. Vol. 2. 8vo. 15s.

BURKE'S PEERAGE AND BARONETAGE OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE; corrected to the present time. Royal. 8vo. 38s.

THE RUSSIAN SHORES OF THE BLACK SEA, in the Autumn of 1852, with a Voyage down the Volga, and a Tour through the Country of the Don Cossacks. By Lawrence Oliphant. 8vo. With Illustrations. 14s.

MEMOIRS OF CONVICTED PRISONERS; accompanied by remarks on the cause and prevention of crime. By the Rev. H. S. Joseph. 8vo. 4s.

PRINCIPLES OF THE INTERIOR OR HIDDEN LIFE; designed particularly for the consideration of those who are seeking Assurance of Faith and Perfect Love. By Thomas C. Upham, D.D. Foolscap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

THE BYE-WAYS OF THE BIBLE. By the Rev. Richard Brown. Fcap. 8vo 2s. 6d.

BENEDICTIONS; or, The Blessed Life. By the Rev. John Cumming, D.D. Fcap. 8vo. 7s.

THE SECOND COMING OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST; and the Millenial Reign of the Saints. By the Rev. Philip Gell. Fcap. 8vo. 6d.

TRUTH SPOKEN IN LOVE; or, Romanism and Tractarianism Refuted by the Word of God. By the Rev. H. H. Beamish. Fcap. 8vo. 6s.

MEMOIR OF RICHARD WILLIAMS, SURGEON, Catechist in the Missionary Expedition to Patagonia, Terra-del-Fuego. By the Rev. James Hamilton, D.D. Crown 8vo. 5s.

THE FRONTIER LANDS OF THE CHRISTIAN AND THE TURK. By a British Resident of Twenty Years in the East. 2 Vols. 28s.

THE RECTORY OF GLENMURRAGH. By an Archbishop's Daughter. 2s. 6d.

CHALMERIANA; or, Colloquies with Dr. Chalmers. By Joseph John Gurney. 2s. 6d.

D'AUBIGNE'S HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND. Vol. 5. Library Edition. 8vo., Cloth. 12s.

ELLEN MONTGOMERY'S BOOKCASE—MR. RUTHERFORD'S CHILDREN. By the Author of "The Wide, Wide World." Fcap. 8vo. 2s.

KRAUSE'S SERMONS, Preached in Bethesda Chapel. Vol. III. Post 8vo. 5s.

LARDNER'S HAND-BOOK OF ASTRONOMY AND METEOROLOGY. Thick 12mo. With Illustrations. 16s. 6d.

LONGFELLOW'S GOLDEN LEGEND. 8vo. Beautifully Illustrated. Uniform with "Hyperion," and "Poetical Works." Bound in blue. 12s.

WORK; or Plenty to Do, and how to Do It. By Margaret Maria Brewster. 12mo. 2s.

THE CONTRAST; or, a Few Words to Professing Christians on the Use of this World. By the Rev. R. M. Davies, A.B. 18mo. 1s.

HIPPOLYTUS AND THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH OF THE THIRD CENTURY; with a Copious Analysis of the newly discovered MS., &c. By W. Elfe Taylor. Fcap 8vo. 3s. 6d.

THE DOMESTIC COMMENTARY ON THE OLD TESTAMENT. By a Clergyman of the Church of England; Genesis to 2nd Book of Kings. Imp. 8vo. 16s.

THE DOMESTIC COMMENTARY ON THE NEW TESTAMENT. By a Clergyman of the Church of England. Imp. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

DISCOURSES AND SAYINGS OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST, Illustrated in a Series of Expositions. By Rev. John Brown, D.D. 3 vols. 8vo. 31s. 6d.

AN EXPOSITION OF OUR LORD'S INTERCESSORY PRAYER, (John xvii.) with a Discourse on the Relation of Our Lord's Intercession to the Conversion of the World. By Rev. John Brown, D.D. 8vo. 7s.

EXPOSITORY DISCOURSES ON THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER. By Rev. John Brown, D.D. 2 vols. 8vo. 21s.

D'AUBIGNE'S HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND. Vol. 5. Post 8vo., Cloth. (Oliver and Boyd's Edition.) 6s.

A NARRATIVE OF LITTLE BESSIE; or Advantages of Early Religious instruction. 1d.

ALISON'S HISTORY OF EUROPE, from the French Revolution of 1789 to Waterloo (1815). Cheaper Edition. Vols. I. and II. 4s. each.

*** Subscribers' names received.

THE RELIGION OF GEOLOGY, AND ITS CONNECTED SCIENCES. By Edward Hitchcock, D.D., LL.D. 12mo. Sewed 1s. 6d.; cloth 2s.

GENESIS AND GEOLOGY; or an Investigation into the Reconciliation of the Modern Doctrines of Geology; with the Declarations of Scripture. By Denis Crofton, B.A. 2s.

"I have met with no examination of the connection between 'Geology and Genesis,' so able as this. Other eminent writers, such as Dr. Chalmers, J. Pye Smith, Harris, Buckland, Silliman, Sedgewick, and Whewell, have shown great skill in the examination of the Biblical questions connected with geology, but none of them have gone so fully into the argument as Mr. Crofton."—*Rev. Dr. Hitchcock.*

THE ART OF QUESTIONING; or, a short Analysis of the Interrogatory Methods of Instruction, designed for the use of Teachers, Pupil-Teachers, and Monitors. By W. T. Young, T.C.D. 1s. By post, 1s. 4d.

"Mr. Young brings a clear brain, and evident experience, to the analysis of his subject. Such a work was much required, and we heartily commend it to the extensive and important class for whom its subject so greatly concerns."—*The Advocate.*

"The author belongs to the more advanced school of educational reformers, and his production is replete with enlightened sentiments of a truly practical character."—*Sunday School Teacher's Magazine.*

"The design of this excellent little manual is to afford facilities to the teacher in the 'art of questioning.' The author's plan is a clear and simple one, in which the mind as well as the memory of the pupil is exercised, while the necessity of a clearly-defined and easily-understood *question* is enforced by appropriate examples, as the true source of a ready and intelligent answer."——*Christian Family Advocate.*

LIFE OF DR. CHALMERS. By the Rev. William Hanna, LL.D. Cheaper Edition. In four Parts. 10s. (Part I., 2s. 6d., already Published). To be completed in two vols., Crown 12mo., Cloth. 12s.

*** Names of Subscribers received.

POCKET BOOKS AND ALMANACS FOR THE YEAR 1854—

Christian Remembrancer. Tuck, 2s. 6d.
Scripture Pocket-Book. Tuck, 2s.
Tilt's Pocket-book Almanac. 9d. Tuck, 1s. 6d.
Tilt's Miniature Almanac. 6d. Tuck, 1s.
Tilt's Scripture Calendar. 1d.
Marshall's Ladies' and Gentlemans' Pocket-books. 2s. 6d. each.
Pawsey's, Poole's, and Carnan's Pocket-books. 2s. 6d. each.
The Christian Almanac. 6d. Gilt edges, 8d.
Tract Society Pocket Almanac. 1d.
Tract Society Pocket Almanac, interleaved. 2d.
Chamber's Memoranda; or, Bill Diary, for 1854. 8vo. 2s. 6d.
Chamber's Memoranda; or, Daily Register of Appointments, &c. Folio. 3s. 6d.

In the Press, and will be Published in December—price to Subscribers, 2s. 6d.; Non-subscribers, 3s. 6d—

Recommended by the Archbishop of Canterbury.

LETTERS FROM SARAWAK.

BY MRS. M'DOUGALL.

Addressed to a Child.

This little Work will give, in language suited for Children, a full account of the manners, customs, and religion of the Inhabitants of Borneo, Malays and Dyaks; and of the progress of the Church Mission during the first five years of its operations, with incidents of Missionary Life among the Natives.

It will be handsomely bound in Cloth, and Illustrated with Engravings from the Pencil of Mrs. M'Dougall; and will be very suitable as a Christmas Present for Children. With this view it is intended to appear about the second week in December.

*** Those wishing to secure the Work at *Subscribers' Price*, are requested to forward their Names, *at once*, to Messrs. W. CURRY & Co., Booksellers and Publishers, Dublin.

Just Published, 8vo., price 4d.; by post, 8d.,

THE CONNECTION BETWEEN CHRISTIAN FAITH AND PRACTICE; a Sermon Preached in the Cathedral Church of St. Patrick, Dublin, on Sunday, September 25, 1853, on the occasion of an ordination held by his Grace the Archbishop of Dublin. By the Rev. Cadwallader Wolseley, A.M.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY AND CO., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

NEW WORKS AND NEW EDITIONS IN THE PRESS.

I.

THE COLLECTS OF THE LITURGY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, Catechetically Explained, Compared with Scripture, and Briefly Commented on, &c.; for the Use of Families and Sunday Schools. By the Rev. Charles Miller, A.B. With Recommendatory Preface by the Bishop of Meath. Fcap. 8vo.

[Immediately.]

II.

TALK OF THE ROAD.

(Reprinted from the CATHOLIC LAYMAN.)

Forming a handsome Fcap. 8vo. Volume.

[Shortly.]

III.

THE PRINCIPLES OF ELOCUTION;

Extracted from

"The Elements of Rhetoric."

By Archbishop Whately.

With some additions and alterations.

NOTICE TO THE READER.

The present compilation from that known and justly celebrated work, "The Elements of Rhetoric," by Archbishop Whately, has been made with the kind permission of the author.

New matter has been introduced by the Archbishop; and the whole, arranged, revised, and corrected under the personal inspection of His Grace.

That this little work may be of use in exhibiting and impressing some principles of elocution, and so aiding the student to express his thoughts "*clearly, forcibly,* and agreeably," after a simple and "*natural*" manner, has been the sincere desire and aim of the compiler, who also trusts the reader may be induced to gain a deeper insight into this important branch of Rhetoric, by a careful study of Archbishop Whately's entire work.—Dublin, November 17, 1853.

[In December.]

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON, and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 28, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher, WILLIAM CURRY, 9 Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.
November, 1853.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Flóir do Dhia ain fna háidhuib, agus fíoídáin air an dtalaim deagḋoil do na dáoinib.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED THE MIDDLE OF EVERY MONTH, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. II.—No. 24. DECEMBER, 1853. Annual Subscription, 3s. 6d. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
Infallibility Subversive of Christianity	133
Hymn of Secundinus in praise of St. Patrick	134
Results of Intolerance in Spain	136
The Decretal Epistles, genuine and forged, No. I.	137
Talk of the Road, No. XIX.	137
Spirit of the Catholic Layman.—Close of One Second Year	139
Religious Inquiry in America	140
The Irish Wanderer in Search of Truth	140
CORRESPONDENCE—	
Infallibility of the Church of Rome—by Bedale	141
Prayers for the Dead and the Burial Service—by Mr. E. Power	141
Church Visible and Invisible—by a Roman Catholic	142
On the Service in Latin—by Michael O'Mara of Waterford	142
Purgatory—What is it?—by Theta	143
Forming Operations for December	143

INFALLIBILITY SUBVERSIVE OF CHRISTIANITY.

THIS somewhat startling assertion may appear, at first sight, to be nothing more than a foolish paradox, which a bigoted and benighted Protestant alone would venture to maintain; but we assure our Roman Catholic readers that we put it forward in sober seriousness, and we undertake to show them, if they will favour us for a few moments with their attention, that we have strong reasons for making the assertion. To avoid misconception, however, it may be as well to observe, that we do not mean by infallibility the infallibility of the great head of the Church, our Lord Jesus Christ, nor that of his divine Word, as recorded in the Holy Scriptures, but the asserted infallibility of the Church of Rome, wherever it may be supposed to be lodged.

With this preliminary observation we proceed to our proof.

It is an established principle of the Church of Rome, that in order to make a right use, or indeed *any* use, of the Holy Scriptures, the authority and guidance of the living infallible Church is absolutely indispensable. Dr. Milner, for example, in his well-known work, "The End of Controversy" (Let. ix.), maintains that a person who does not believe in the infallibility of the Church *cannot be certain that the Bible is the Word of God at all*, inasmuch as without this belief nothing can be ascertained respecting the inspiration, genuineness, or authenticity of the sacred volume. It is, moreover, universally held and perpetually insisted on by Roman Catholic theologians that, even admitting the fundamental points just mentioned to be settled, yet the *interpretation* of the Bible is beset with so many difficulties and doubts, obscurities and objections, that its real meaning can never be arrived at with certainty, except under the infallible guidance of the Church. A belief in the infallibility of the Church is, then, according to the Church of Rome, the sole foundation of a firm and certain belief in Scripture as the Word of God, and in all the articles of the faith. To use the words of Dr. Wiseman:* "I will explain in the simplest manner possible, the *grounds* whereupon we *found our faith*, on which we *build the doctrines which we profess;* I will examine, in other words, whether we are justified in admitting, *as the groundwork of all that we believe*, an authority, *a living authority*, established by Christ in His Church, with His security against error."

Now this is all very well, so long as Roman Catholics are engaged in controversy with Protestants, who believe the Bible to be the Word of God. In arguing with those who hold that the *written* Word of God is the sole rule of faith, it may be very convenient to exaggerate its difficulties, so as at last to make out that it is little better than an inexplicable enigma, except the infallible Church interposes. But there are other classes of opponents beside Protestants, whom it is necessary to argue with and convince—heathens and infidels, for example. What line of argument, then, is to be pursued in controversies with unbelievers of this kind? The following outline is taken from the celebrated "Theological Prelections" of Perrone, professor of Theology in the Jesuit college at Rome. In his treatise, "De Vera Religione contra Incredulos," Perrone begins† by refuting the objections raised by infidelity against the *possibility* of a revelation. He then proceeds to argue its *necessity*. We have next an elaborate discussion of the objections which have been raised against the possibility of miracles and prophecy. And here, at length, we arrive at the actual *proofs* of Christianity. The following postulate is assumed as the basis of the whole argument:—"It is, to us, firm and *certain* that Moses, and the prophets, and Christ *existed*, and that the books of the two Testaments are *genuine* and *veracious*."† He then lays down his first proposition, which is, "That Christ, by his *miracles* and *prophecies*, and especially his *resurrection from the dead*, proved his divine mission."‡ In proof of the *miracles* of Christ, he refers to the Gospels; and then, from the same sources, he shows that Christ *prophesied* the diffusion of the Gospel among all nations, the perpetuity of the church subject to the successors of St. Peter, the fall of Jerusalem, and other events. The resurrection of our Lord he establishes, in a similar way, from the New Testament at large. His second proposition, in proof of the truth of Christianity, is derived from "the excellence and sanctity of the *doctrine* of the Gospel, which most eminently confirms the divine and supernatural mission of Christ."§ He proceeds at some length to expatiate on the doctrinal and ethical precepts of our Lord, referring throughout to Holy Scripture. Again, in his treatise "On the Incarnation," directed against Jews, infidels, rationalists, and heretics, he deduces his arguments from the law and the prophets,‖ referring to the predictions of Jacob, Daniel, Haggai, Malachi, &c.; and he employs the ordinary methods of criticism to vindicate their interpretation against the objections of the adversaries.

From what has just been said, it will be perceived that Roman Catholic apologists¶ for Christianity have recourse to the same proofs of its divine origin as were employed by the ancient apologists, and which are to be found in the standard Protestant works on the subject. They appeal, and very rightly, to the books of the Old and New Testament, as authentic records of the facts and doctrines of the Jewish and Christian dispensations. The arguments from prophecies and miracles, and from the excellence of the Christian doctrine, pre-suppose, of course, the genuineness and authenticity of the sacred books, and the uncorrupted preservation of their text.

This seems to be all very satisfactory, so far. But a moment's reflection will show, that in the hands of a Roman Catholic, such arguments are utterly futile when employed to prove the truth of Christianity against a rationalist or infidel. The latter must be very ignorant indeed if he cannot reply in some such terms as the following:—"You wish to persuade me that Christianity is a divine revelation, because its founders wrought miracles, and predicted future events, and taught a doctrine which far exceeded in excellence and purity that of any former religion; and you found these assertions on the statements of a book that you call Holy Scripture. But the ablest theologians of your Church, when disputing against Protestant heretics (as you call them), have proved that the genuineness and authenticity of Scripture, and the safe preservation of its true text and its meaning, are altogether uncertain in themselves. To establish the truth of the miracles and prophecies on which you rely, you must first establish the authenticity of the text and the true meaning of Scripture, all which your own divines have proved to be questionable. If, as you yourselves maintain, there are no certain means of knowing from the writings themselves whether they are inspired or not; or whether they are or are not a record which may be implicitly depended on; or what is the meaning which they were designed to convey; or, finally, whether they have or have not been: interpolated it is plain you cannot require me to subscribe to the inferences which you draw from documents, everything connected with which is involved in so much difficulty and obscurity." "Oh!" the Roman Catholic apologist will, doubtless, reply, "these difficulties and obscurities exist only for those who do not belong to the true Church. The members of that Church have her unerring authority, and enjoy her infallible guidance in all these matters." "But how," the other will as surely rejoin, "do you prove that this Church of which you speak is infallible?" "Very easily," says the apologist; and he forthwith refers to the Scriptures as the genuine and authentic record of Christ's promises, commands, and institutions. He produces a number of *texts*, which, he says, clearly prove the perpetuity, universality, unity, and infallibility of the Church. But here, again, the infidel will reply, "You are arguing in what logicians call 'a circle;' you have proved yourselves that there can be no *certainty* of any interpretations of Scripture, except vouched for by the authority of the infallible Church; you cannot, therefore, fairly prove this authority from Scripture, since, according to your own doctrine, Scripture itself, as regards its interpretation, depends upon that authority." As the only possible means of evading this objection, the Roman Catholic must have recourse to a "distinction," and say, "The texts which I employ to prove the infallible authority of the Church are plain and indisputable, and are, in fact, the *only* texts in Scripture which do not need interpretation." The infidel will answer, "You are begging the question; and so far is what you say from being the case, that these very texts are still the subjects of discussion between you and Protestants; and it is notorious that some of the greatest of the Church Fathers have differed from each other, and sometimes even from themselves, as to the true interpretation of them. In fact, these texts are as much the subject of different interpretations as those which refer to any other of what you call the capital doctrines of your faith, such as the Trinity, the Incarnation, Transubstantiation," &c. This reduces the apologist to an awkward dilemma. If the texts upon which he builds the doctrine of the infallibility of the living Church be, notwithstanding the disputes about them, sufficiently plain and unmistakeable, then those relating to all other important doctrines may be so likewise; and thus there is no necessity for any infallible living judge in the Church. If those texts be obscure, and need an authoritative interpreter, they are insufficient to establish the authority of the Church, which Romanists themselves hold be the only certain evidence of the right interpretation, genuineness, authority, and uncorrupted preservation of the Scriptures. This, we say, is an awkward dilemma. The first alternative cannot be conceded without abandoning the field to the Protestant; if the second be allowed, infidelity is triumphant.

Roman Catholic controversialists have been, of course, often pressed with this formidable difficulty. They have, accordingly, endeavoured to evade it by resting the proof of the authority of the Church on Scripture, considered merely as an historical document authenticated by human testimony, and then employing the authority of the Church to determine its true interpretation, and to rest its inspiration.* But this leaves the difficulty in undiminished force. The infidel may rejoin, "You have yourselves proved that human testimony can be no foundation of firm and certain faith. You have shown that the meaning of Scripture is, of itself, dubious. To establish the authority of the Church on Scripture, read and interpreted according to the principles applied to ordinary compositions, would be at once to place your faith on the very basis which, when disputing against Protestants, you have proved to be unsound."

Roman Catholics, when defending their Church against the scriptural arguments of Protestants, find it necessary to involve the Scriptures in as much obscurity and difficulty as possible, and to represent the reading of them as *unnecessary* and *unprofitable*, if not *dangerous*. Thus Pighius—who was patronized by four Popes, Leo X., Adrian VI., Clement VII., and Paul III., and was regarded as one of the greatest divines of his age—calls Scripture a "*nose of wax*, which allows itself to be pulled this way and that, and to be moulded into any form you please." This is all very well against Protestants. But it is to be hoped that, in making such statements, the divines of the Church of Rome are *not aware* that they are undermining the evidences of Christianity itself. We would gladly believe that they are not conscious that their arguments against Protestants

* Lectures on the Principal Doctrines, &c. Vol. I., p. 2.

* Perrone, Prælectiones Theologicæ. Vol. I., col. 19, sq. Paris. 1842.
† Perrone, Præl. Theol. Col. 87. ‡ Ib. Col. 89.
§ Ib. Col. 109. ‖ Ib. Col. 911, sq.
¶ Perrone's arguments agree in the main with those of Huet, Bergier, Bossuet, Hooke, Bonvier, and the other Roman Catholic divines who have discussed the subject.

* This is the line of argument adopted by Perrone, Wiseman, De la Luzerne, De la Hogue, and most of the other professed writers on the subject.

may be turned by infidels against Revelation itself. If the principles of the Church of Rome be true, Christianity has absolutely and positively no rational proof whatever. Romanism entirely subverts or renders unavailing the evidences on which the early Christian writers, and the Scriptures themselves, rested the truth of the Gospel. It leaves Revelation, literally, without any evidences.

From what has been said, it is very clear that the Church of Rome is, by her own fundamental principles, unable to prove that Christianity is a divine revelation. When infidels and rationalists compare the arguments of the Romish theologians in defence of Christianity with their arguments in defence of the infallibility of the Church, they will, in an instant, detect and expose the self-contradiction of the whole system. Romish Christianity, based upon the principles which it is forced to avow in opposition to Protestantism, is, in the hands of rationalism or infidelity, weaker and more destitute of proof than heathenism itself, because it is more self-destructive. The argument for Christianity, coming from a Roman Catholic, is only calculated to afford matter of amusement and scoffing to the unbeliever. The fearful prevalence of infidelity in Roman Catholic countries is a notorious fact; may we not say that this is one of the chief causes to which it is to be attributed?

The following is the sad testimony of one who was himself the victim of this miserable sophistry. "Into the authority of the Church I very consistently resolved the certainty of my faith as a Christian, and of my scientific theology as a divine. Yet, I did no sooner allow myself to examine the question of Church infallibility, with a determination not to be intimidated by consequences, than my whole Christianity vanished like a dream. I concluded that Christianity could not be true. This inference was not properly my own. The Church of Rome had most assiduously prepared me to draw it."*

THE HYMN OF SECUNDINUS.

In the second number of this Journal we printed the original text, and translations, of the Irish hymn composed by St. Patrick, immediately after his arrival in this country, when his teaching was opposed, and his life threatened, by his Pagan enemies. We now lay before our readers a document, of nearly the same age, and no less interesting in itself, the hymn composed by Secundinus in praise of the great Apostle of Ireland, after his labours in organizing a Christian Church had been crowned with success. Of its genuineness and authenticity no doubts need be entertained.† A copy of it is preserved in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, in an ancient volume of hymns, believed by Archbishop Ussher to be a thousand years old in his own time. Another copy, written in the seventh or eighth century, exists in the Ambrosian Library in Milan, from which it was printed by Muratori in his *Anecdota Ambrosiana*. It is frequently alluded to in ancient writings, and invariably ascribed to the same author. Of Secundinus himself but little is known. The ancient Irish authorities concur in stating, that he was the son of a sister of St. Patrick, and that his father was a Lombard, named Restitutus. He arrived in Ireland, according to the Annals of Ulster, in the year 439, being sent to assist St. Patrick in his missionary labours. He usually resided at Dunshaughlin, which derives its name from himself;‡ and his death is recorded in the Annals of the Four Masters, at the year 447. In a catalogue of Bishops of Armagh, printed in Colgan's *Trias*, we find Secundinus set down as having held that see for sixteen years. If the dates already given be correct, this story cannot be true. It may, however, be accounted for, in part, by supposing that St. Patrick on some occasions intrusted Secundinus with the care of that see during his own absence on missionary circuits through Ireland; or that he permanently retained him as his coadjutor Bishop. The anonymous author of the preface prefixed to the hymn of Secundinus, in the *Liber Hymnorum*, gives the following account of the occasion on which it was composed:—Secundinus had accused St. Patrick of failing to inculcate charity; meaning thereby, that if St. Patrick had insisted more strongly upon the duty of manifesting a pious liberality by the offering of temporal goods for religious uses, more lands and possessions would have been contributed by the ready devotion of the people for the maintenance and endowment of churches. St. Patrick, vindicating himself from this charge, explained, that out of charity he had been sparing in his exhortations to charity. Satisfied by this, Secundinus asked pardon for his error, and composed the hymn for the purpose of establishing a reconciliation between himself and St. Patrick. Whether this story be true or not, is a matter of small consequence, compared with the internal character of the hymn itself. Dr. Lanigan says of it,§ that it "is well worthy of illustration, as it contains excellent allusions to the most sound doctrine and discipline; and it would be desirable that we had a more correct copy of it." In this opinion of the learned historian we fully coincide, and we think we have accomplished the first of the two objects which Dr. Lanigan has indicated, by annexing to the translation of each stanza a few references to passages of Scripture quoted or alluded to in it. These references will show that the mind of the writer was completely imbued with a knowledge of Holy Scripture, from which most of the thoughts and expressions in the hymn are drawn. As regards the exhibition of a correct text, we have made some approach towards the attainment of this end, by means of a careful collation of the different existing copies.*

The reader will observe, that throughout the hymn the present tense is used in connection with the name of St. Patrick; and no allusions are made to any circumstances that occurred at or after his decease. This does not, indeed, prove that it was written in St. Patrick's lifetime; for a careful forger, in a later age, would use the same mode of speaking. But what, to our mind, irresistibly demonstrates the genuineness of this hymn is its absolute silence respecting any miracles alleged to have been wrought by St. Patrick. All the lives of him printed by Colgan contain accounts of these miracles. The oldest lives relate the fewest miracles. The later ones, curiously exemplifying the theory of development, narrate the most numerous and astounding prodigies—whilst St. Patrick himself, solemnly recording the history of his life and labours in his *Confession*, written shortly before his death, abstains from taking credit to himself for the possession of miraculous powers. It might be said that his silence was dictated by a modest desire to avoid magnifying his character or acts. But the silence of an eulogist, composing such a hymn as the one before us, is only to be explained on the supposition that the miracles were not wrought, and that he wrote before the legends respecting them obtained currency. Or the argument may be stated in a somewhat different form. If the miracles were truly worked, every biographer and every panegyrist of St. Patrick, from his own time down to that of Joceline, might be expected to take notice of them. Attempts to prove that certain events did not take place, because a writer omits to make mention of them, are often idle, because it cannot be proved that it fell within his scope and intention to notice them. It is only where this latter link in the chain of reasoning can be surely supplied that this mode of reasoning is conclusive. In the present case, we may argue in this way with perfect safety. For a panegyrist, desiring to put forward everything that tended to the honour of the person whose praises he was celebrating, and doing so at considerable length, could not fail to state that he had publicly worked miracles of various kinds, and of the most prodigious nature, if he had really done so. Whatever such a writer neglected to notice, he would surely make mention of the miracles.

There is another omission in this hymn of Secundinus which claims attention. No mention is made in it of St. Patrick's having been sent hither by Pope Celestine.† Now, there occur in the composition occasions the most natural that can be conceived for the introduction of a reference to this circumstance, if it had actually occurred. He is said to have "received his apostleship from God" (C). "The Lord chose him to teach the barbarous nations" (D). "He was sent by God as an apostle, even as Paul to the Gentiles" (G). "He was chosen by God to watch over the people of God" (P). "The Saviour advanced him for his merits to be a bishop" (Q). "Christ chose him to be his *vicar* on the earth" (X). Here are occasions enough to mention the appointment by Celestine, if it had ever taken place. But there is not a word to this effect. On the other hand, the assertions that St. Patrick obtained his apostleship from God, and that he was our apostle, as St. Paul was the apostle of the Gentiles at large, go some way to negative the supposition that St. Patrick derived his appointment from the Pope. For a comparison is suggested between his case and that of St. Paul, who says of himself, that he was "an apostle *not of men, neither by man*, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father."—Gal. i. 1.

The reader can hardly fail to remark an expression in this hymn, which bears strongly upon the relation between the Church established by St. Patrick, and the Church of Rome. He is spoken of in the third stanza as a head of the Church, in the same sense as St. Peter was. "On him, as on Peter, the Church is built." Secundinus seems to have discerned the true interpretation of our Lord's promise to St. Peter (Matt. xvi. 18). At all events, he cannot be supposed to have read in it the title of the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff or the Roman Church.

One word more as to the topics of which all mention is omitted in this hymn. Secundinus makes no mention in this long composition of the Blessed Virgin Mary. There may have been, doubtless there was, no special reason for referring to her. But must it not appear strange to any candid Roman Catholic to find mention here of the three Persons of the Trinity, the Angels, the Apostles, the Church, the Scriptures, Earth, Heaven, and Hell, all the chief objects of the Christian faith, but not one word of the Virgin Mary? The same omission strikes us in reading the Confession of St. Patrick. In the second paragraph of that remarkable document he gives us a formal confession of his faith, a very ample paraphrase of the Christian's creed; but neither there, *nor anywhere else in his writings*, do we meet the Virgin Mary's name. Would this be the case in any composition of equal length, and on a subject relating to religion and the Church, coming from the pen of a Roman Catholic Bishop of the present day?

We must not conclude our comments upon this hymn without pointing the reader's attention to the information it conveys respecting the nature of St. Patrick's teaching. He is represented as freely communicating the Gospel (E), and (I) "He finds a treasure in the sacred volume" (S). "His words were seasoned with the Divine oracles" (T). "His seeds were the Gospels of Christ" (V). The Apocalypse and Psalms also furnished the subjects of his discourses for the edification of the people of God (Y). This is exactly in accordance with what the tenor of his writings would lead us to expect. Both his *Confession* and his *Epistle to Coroticus* are so rich in quotations from Scripture, as to prove that his mind was thoroughly stored with scriptural ideas and phraseology, and that he took a delight in imparting this treasure to others. We are also told that it was his practice to leave behind him copies of the Old and New Testaments in places where he established Christian Churches for the first time.* On this head, however, we need say no more here; the difference between ancient Irish saints and modern Roman Catholic bishops, as regards the free use of the Holy Scriptures, having been discussed at some length in a former number of this journal.†

In the Book of Armagh the recitation of this hymn of Secundinus, and St. Patrick's own Irish hymn, is mentioned as a fixed part of the solemnity observed in celebrating the anniversary of St. Patrick's death.‡ We hope that our Catholic countrymen will revive this usage, not in the superstitious expectation of thus obtaining any miraculous benefits,§ but for the purpose of keeping up a lively recollection of the scriptural character of the Church established by St. Patrick in Ireland.

HYMNUS SANCTI PATRICII EPISCOPI SCOTORUM.

A.

Audite, omnes amantes
Deum, sancta merita
Viri in Christo beati,
Patricii episcopi;
Quomodo bonum ob actum
Similatur angelis,
Perfectamque propter vitam
Æquatur apostolis.

B.

Beati Christi custodit
Mandata in omnibus;
Cujus opera refulgent
Clara inter homines;
Sanctumque cujus sequuntur
Exemplum mirificum;
Unde et in cœlis Patrem
Magnificant Dominum.

---

* Life of Blanco White, i., pp. 256, 111.

† The antiquity of this hymn has been questioned by a modern German author (Schöll, *Ecclesiarum Brittanicarum Origines*), for no better reasons than because it is alphabetical, and its style barbarous. He seems to have forgotten the existence of the alphabetical psalms; and takes no account of the fact that there have been unlearned and inelegant writers in ancient as well as in modern times.

‡ The Irish form of the name Secundinus is Sechnall; and *Domnach* Sechnaill, the *Dominica*, or church, of Secundinus, was corrupted into Dunshaughlin.

§ Dr. Lanigan's Ecclesiastical History of Ireland, vol. i., p. 295.

* Attention to the metre, such as it is, has enabled us to make some obvious corrections of the text. In each stanza there are eight lines, alternately of eight and seven syllables, hiatus and quantity being wholly disregarded; generally speaking, there is an accent on the penultimate syllable in the first, third, fifth, and seventh lines; and on the ante-penultimate, in the second, fourth, sixth, and eighth. This metre seems to be a rude imitation of the classical trochaic tetrameter catalectic.

† Neither does St. Patrick himself speak of it in his *Confession*, though he refers to the circumstances connected with his mission to Ireland. It does not appear to have been known to Muirchu Maccu Machteni (Ussher's Maccuthenius), who wrote his life of St. Patrick in the latter part of the seventh century. The headings of the chapters relating to this part of St. Patrick's history prove this more plainly than the body of the narrative. They stand as follows:—

De ætate ejus quando Iens videre sedem apostolicam voluit discere sapientiam.

De inventione Sancti Germani in Gallis, *et ideo non exivit ultra.*

De ætate ejus quando visitavit eum angelus ut veniret adhuc.

De reversione ejus de Gallis, et ordinatione Palladii, et mox morte ejus.

De ordinatione ejus *ab Amathorege episcopo* defuncto, Palladio.—*Betham's Irish Antiquarian Researches, Appendix, p. 43, corrected from the original.*

* Portavit Patricius per Sinium secum . . . libros legis, evangelii libros, et reliquit illos in locis novis.—*Betham's I. A. R., Appendix, p.* 17.

† April, 1852, vol. I., p. 37.

‡ Betham's I. A. R., Appendix, p. 36.

§ Colgan (*Trias*, p. 210) quotes passages from the lives of St. Kevin, St Colmanel, and St. Canice, for the purpose of showing that miraculous benefits were consequent upon the recitation of this hymn. One of these is so extraordinary that we cannot forbear quoting it.

"Quodam autem tempore Sanctus Cannicus volens fugere homines, sine navi suis pedibus intravit divina virtute in Insulam stagni Cre: ibique exemplo Domini quadraginta diebus, et quadraginta noctibus mansit: sed cibum humanum non habuit, nec domum; sed super nudam terram habitavit. Ipse autem non sensit famem, vel sitim neque frigus; neque pluvia sibi nocuit: Solus ergo orationibus divinis vacabat, et nemo scivit quod ibi fuit. Quodam autem die, cum esset in oratione in illa insula, vidit turbas demonum sedentes super equos secus se festinantes. Interrogante autem illo demones, quo pergerent; unus ex illis respondit ei; nos festinamus ad contendendam animam unius divitis in regione Muscraighi. Cui dixit S. Cannicus venias ad me iterum, cum fabulis, ut dicas de illa anima aliquid mihi. Cumque post pugnam ad eum rediisset dæmon, vidit S. Cannicus eum sine equo, et tristem valde: et interrogans, Ille respondit; nos victi sumus: nam vir ille tria capitula de hymno S. Patricii ante mortem, nobis nescientibus, cantavit: et perhoc liberatus est de manibus nostris."

Ex vita Sancti Cannici, c. 43.

C.

Constans in Dei timore
Et fide immobilis;
Super quem ædificatur,
Ut Petrum, ecclesia;
Cujusque apostolatum
A Deo sortitus est;
Inferni portæ adversus
Eum non prævalebunt.

D.

Dominus illum elegit
Ut doceret barbaras
Nationes, ut piscaret
Per doctrinæ retia;
Ut de seculo credentes
Traheret ad gratiam,
Dominumque sequerentur
Sedem ad ætheriam.

E.

Electa Christi talenta
Vendit evangelica,
Quæ Hibernas inter gentes
Cum usuris exigit;
Navati hujus laboris
Tum operæ pretium
Cum Christo regni celestis
Possessurus gaudium.

F.

Fidelis Dei minister,
Insignisque nuntius,
Apostolicum exemplum
Formamque præbet bonis;
Qui tam verbis quam et factis
Plebi prædicat Dei,
Ut quem dictis non convertit
Actu provocet bono.

G.

Gloriam habet cum Christo,
Honorem in seculo;
Qui ab omnibus ut Dei
Veneratur angelus;
Quem Deus misit, ut Paulum
Ad Gentes, apostolum,
Ut hominibus ducatum
Præberet regno Dei.

H.

Humilis Dei ob metum
Spiritu et corpore;
Super quem bonum ob actum
Requiescit Dominus:
Cujusque justa in carne
Christi portat stigmata,
In cujus sola sustentans
Se gloriatur cruce.

I.

Impiger credentes pascit
Dapibus celestibus,
Ne qui videntur cum Christo
In via deficiant;
Quibus erogat ut panes
Verba evangelica,
In cujus multiplicantur,
Ut manna, in manibus.

K.

Kastam qui custodit carnem
Ob amorem Domini;
Quam carnem templum paravit
Sanctoque Spiritui,
A quo constanter cum mundis
Possidetur actibus;
Quam ut hostiam placentem,
Vivam offert Domino.

L.

Lumenque mundi accensum
Ingens, evangelicum,
In candelabro levatum,
Toti fulgens seculo;
Civitas regis munita
Supra montem posita,
Copia in qua est multa
Quam Dominus possidet.

M.

Maximus namque in regno
Cœlorum vocabitur,
Qui quod verbis docet sacris
Factis adimplet bonis.
Bono præcedit exemplo
Formaque fidelium,
Mundoque in corde habet
Ad Deum fiduciam.

N.

Nomen Domini audenter
Annuntiat gentibus,
Quibus lavacri salutis
Æternam dat gratiam;
Pro quorum orat delictis
Ad Deum quotidie,
Pro quibus, ut Deo dignas
Immolatque hostias.

O.

Omnem pro divina lege
Mundi spernit gloriam;
Qui cuncta ad Christi mensam
Æstimat quisquilias,
Nec ingruenti movetur
Mundi hujus fulmine,
Sed in adversis lætatur,
Cum pro Christo patitur.

P.

Pastor bonus ac fidelis
Gregis evangelici,
Quem Deus Dei elegit
Custodire populum,
Suamque pascere plebem
Divinis dogmatibus;
Pro qua, ad Christi exemplum,
Suam tradit animam.

Q.

Quem pro meritis Salvator
Provexit pontificem,
Ut in celesti moneret
Clericos militia,
Celestem quibus annonam
Erogat cum vestibus,
Quod in divinis impletur
Sacrisque affatibus.

R.

Regis nuntius invitans
Credentes ad nuptias,
Qui ornatur vestimento
Nuptiali indutus;
Qui celeste haurit vinum
In vasis celestibus,
Propinansque Dei plebem
Spiritali poculo.

S.

Sacrum invenit thesaurum
Sacro in volumine,
Salvatorisque in carne
Deitatem pervidit;
Quem thesaurum emit sanctis
Perfectisque meritis;
Israel vocatur hujus
Anima videns Deum.

T.

Testis Domini fidelis
In lege Catholica,
Cujus verba sunt divinis
Condita oraculis;
Ne humanæ putrent carnes
Esæque a vermibus,
Sed celesti saliuntur
Sapore ad victimam.

V.

Verus cultor et insignis
Agri evangelici,
Cujus semina videntur
Christi evangelia,
Quæ divino serit ore
In aures prudentium,
Quorumque corda ac mentes
Sancto arat Spiritu.

X.

Xps illum sibi legit
In terris vicarium,
Qui de gemino captivos
Liberat servitio;
Plerosque de servitute
Quos redemit hominum,
Innumeros de Zabuli
Absolvit dominio.

Y.

Ymnos cum apocalypsi
Psalmosque cantat Dei,
Quosque ad ædificandum
Dei tractat populum;
Quam legem in Trinitate
Sacri credit nominis,
Tribusque personis unam
Docetque substantiam.

Z.

Zona Dominî præcinctus
Diebus ac noctibus
Sine intermissione
Deum orat Dominum:
Cujus ingentis laboris
Percepturus præmium,
Cum apostolis regnabit
Sanctis super Israel.

THE HYMN OF SAINT PATRICK, BISHOP OF THE SCOTS.

A.

Hear, all ye who love God, the holy merits of the Bishop Patrick, a man blessed in Christ; how, on account of his good actions, he is likened unto the angels, and for his perfect life is counted equal to the apostles.—2 Cor. xi. 6.

B.

He keepeth the commandments of the blessed Christ in all things; his works shine brightly before men, who follow his holy and admirable example; whence, also, they glorify the Lord, his Father which is in heaven.—John xiv. 15; Matt. v. 16.

C.

Steadfast in the fear of the Lord, and immoveable in faith; on whom, as on Peter, the Church is built; who received his apostleship from God. The gates of hell shall not prevail against him.—1 Cor. xv. 58; Gal. i. 1; Matt. xvi. 18.

D.

The Lord chose him to teach the barbarous nations, to fish [for men] with the nets of doctrine, to draw believers from the world unto grace, that they might follow the Lord to the heavenly seat.—Matt. iv. 19.

E.

He trades with the choice Gospel talents of Christ, which he puts out at usury amongst the Hibernian nations, destined hereafter, along with Christ, to possess the joy of the heavenly kingdom as a recompense for this labour.—Matt. xxv. 14-30; John xiv. 3.

F.

A faithful minister and distinguished messenger of God, he shows to the good an apostolic example and pattern; who preaches to the people of God, as well by deeds as by words, so that by good works he may provoke those to imitation whom he does not convert by his sayings.—1 Tim. iv. 6, 12.

G.

He has glory with Christ, and honour in this world, being venerated by all as the angel of God: whom God sent, even as Paul, to be an apostle to the Gentiles, to guide men unto the kingdom of God.—2 Tim. i. 11; Gal. i. 1.

H.

Humble, through fear of God, both in spirit and behaviour, upon whom on account of his good actions rests the spirit of the Lord: who beareth in his righteous flesh the marks of Christ, in whose cross alone he glories and sustains himself.—Gal. vi. 14–17.

I.

He diligently feedeth believers with heavenly food, lest those who are seen with Christ should faint by the way: to whom he distributes the words of the Gospel like the loaves: in whose hands they are multiplied like the manna.—Matt. xv. 32; Exod. xvi.; John vi.

K.

Who, through the love of God, keepeth his flesh pure, having prepared it to be a temple for the Holy Spirit, by whom it is constantly possessed with good motions: and who offers up his body a lively sacrifice, well pleasing to the Lord.—John iii. 3; 1 Cor. vi. 19; Rom. xii. 1.

L.

He is a great and burning Evangelical light of the world, set up on a candlestick, shining unto the whole world; a strong city of the King, set upon a hill, in which is much store of the riches of the Lord.—John v. 35; Matt. v. 14, 15.

M.

He shall be called the greatest in the kingdom of heaven who fulfils, by good works, what he teaches in his holy discourses. He goes before with a good example and a pattern to the faithful; and in a pure heart has faith towards God.—Matt. xviii. 1–3; 1 Tim. iii. 9, iv. 12.

N.

He boldly preaches the name of the Lord to the Gentiles, to whom he gives the eternal grace of the laver of salvation; for whose offences he daily prays to God, for whom also he offers up sacrifices worthy of God.—Acts ix. 29; James v. 16; Phil. iv. 18; Heb. xiii. 15, 16; 1 Pet. ii. 5.

O.

He despises all the glory of the world in comparison with the divine law, counting all things as but dung compared with Christ's table: nor is he disturbed by the violence of the thunder of this world; but rejoices in tribulation when he suffers for Christ.—Phil. iii. 8; Acts v. 41.

P.

A good and faithful shepherd of the Gospel-flock, chosen by God, to watch the people of God, and to feed, with Divine doctrines, the nation, for which, after the example of Christ, he is giving his life.—John x. 14; John xxi. 15; John xv. 13.

Q.

Whom the Saviour advanced for his merits to be a bishop, that he might exhort the clergy in the heavenly warfare, to whom he distributes the bread from heaven, along with garments, which is fulfilled in his Divine and holy discourses.—1 Tim. i. 18; John vi. 11; Matt. xxii. 11.

R.

A messenger of the king inviting believers to the marriage, who is arrayed in the wedding garment; who draws the heavenly wine in heavenly vessels, pledging the people of God in the spiritual cup.—Matt. xxii. 2.

S.

He finds in the Sacred Volume a sacred treasure, which he purchases with his holy and perfect merits; he discerns also the Godhead of the Saviour in the flesh, whence he is named Israel, beholdingGod in his spirit.*—Matt. xiii. 44; Gen. xxxii. 28, 30.

T.

A faithful witness of God in the Catholic doctrine, whose words are seasoned with the divine oracles, so that they are not corrupted like human flesh, and eaten of worms, but are salted with a heavenly savour for the sacrifice.—Mark ix. 48-50; Col. iv. 6.

V.

A true and excellent cultivator of the Gospel field, whose seeds are seen to be the gospels of Christ, which he sows from his divine mouth into the ears of the wise, and tills their hearts and minds with the holy Spirit.—Matt. xiii; Mark iv. 14.

X.

Christ chose him to be his vicar on the earth, who liberates captives from a two-fold bondage; and of the many whom he has redeemed from the bondage of men, releases numberless persons from the dominion of the devil.—Is. lxi. 1; John viii. 31.

Y.

He sings Hymns with the Apocalypse, and the Psalms of God, on which also he discourses for the edification of the people of God: which Scripture he believes in the Trinity of the sacred name, and teaches the one substance in three persons.—Rom. xv. 4.

Z.

Girt with the girdle of the Lord, by day and night, he prays without ceasing to the Lord God, receiving the reward of which great labour, he shall reign with the holy Apostles over Israel.—Is. xi. 5; Eph. vi. 14; 1 Thess. v. 17; Matt. xix. 28.

* This has reference to the ancient interpretation of the name ISRAEL, *vir, aut mens, videns Deum*. St. Jerome, though he disapproved it this etymology, allowed it to stand in his *Liber de Interpretatione nominum Hebraicorum*.

RESULTS OF INTOLERANCE IN SPAIN.

THERE is one principle of the Romish Church in which the boasted immutability of her doctrine and teaching must be admitted by all readers of history, and that is, the principle of intolerance. The same spirit which, at the present day, excludes all whom she is pleased to call heretics from the rights of Christian sepulture and prohibits the erection of a place of worship—which, in Tuscany, consigns to prisons those who dare attempt to dispute her infallibility—and which, even in our own land, calls it an insult to be invited to a discussion of her doctrines—has also pervaded her rulers at all former periods of her history, and there is hardly a country in Europe which does not afford examples of the practical application of her intolerance when possessed of the power.

In making this charge particularly against the Romish Church, it is necessary to call our readers' attention to a distinction between the intolerance of the Romish Church and that of all other religions. We believe there is no nation which has not, at some period of its existence, made a difference in political privileges between those conforming to the religion established and recognised by the state and those dissenting from it. The Greek Church in Russia—the Mahometans in Turkey—our own government in former years—all adopted this course. But the Romish Church stands alone in claiming a right to extirpate altogether those who dissent from her doctrines. And there is not a country in Europe which does not afford melancholy examples of the crimes and folly which the enforcing of her principles has led rulers to be guilty of. Nor is it an unnecessary task to recall the attention of our readers to these transactions of former years; for though we altogether deem it an invidious and false argument to impeach any religion because of the crimes of its professors in bygone years, yet, when we find the same principles actuating those who hold that religion at the present day, and enforced with the same rigour wherever they possess the power; and when we also find the exercise of that power justified by their own organs, we surely may fairly recall to mind the evils which ensued from the enforcement of their principles in past times, and may call upon Roman Catholics to ask themselves can that Church, whose principles have led to such results, be that safe and infallible guide which her priesthood would wish us to believe her to be?

Our first historical reference shall be to Spain, ever foremost in the display of bigotry and intolerance.

At the present day Spain is without industry and without commerce, dependant on foreigners for the supply of almost every production that can add comfort to existence; her finances are dilapidated, and her credit gone. Can we wonder when we find in her past history that her rulers, at the dictation of an intolerant priesthood, banished from her soil or drove into separation all those of her subjects who were most distinguished for industry and enterprise?

In the 15th century the Jews, from their wealth, their devotion to literature and science, their industry and skill, formed a most important element in the prosperity of the Spanish monarchy. In number they exceeded 160,000, and even the mass of their common people possessed a dexterity in various branches of industry which raised them far above similar classes in most other nations. But all this would not save them. In 1492 the royal confessor, Torquemada, at length extorted from the reluctant hand of Isabella the fatal decree which banished the whole body of the Jews from their homes, and stripped them of all their property. Well might the barbarian prince who saw Ferdinand and Isabella, at the bidding of a priest, sacrifice the most important and permanent interests of Spain, dispeopling it of a class of citizens who contributed beyond all others, not only to the general resources, but also to the direct revenues of the crown, exclaim—"Do they call this Ferdinand a politic prince, who can thus impoverish his own kingdom and enrich others?"

Soon was this precedent of intolerance, set by the greatest of the Spanish rulers, followed by their successors. Actuated by the same devoted zeal, and unrestrained by any feeling of compassion, Philip II. resolved that no heretic should dwell in peace within the wide circuit of his dominions. In a distant province of his vast empire, amid the swamps through which the Rhine discharges its waters into the ocean, an energetic and industrious race dwelt happy and contented on the lands recovered and preserved by their unremitting industry from the dominion of the sea. By that industry, and by the pursuits of commerce, they had added largely to the revenue and naval power of the Spanish monarchy. But they were heretics. The same independence and energy of purpose that had converted their swamps into pleasant pastures and trim gardens, had also emancipated their minds from the thraldom of Rome. Philip, in the blindness of his devotion to Rome, sent the merciless Alva to convert them from their heresy. We need not repeat here the well-known story of the cruelties of Alva, the revolt of the United Provinces, their long struggle, and their ultimate success. But we may recall to the recollection of our readers that Holland, once an obscure province of the Spanish monarchy, at the close of another century became the foremost naval power of Europe; and, though long since she yielded the supremacy of the seas to Great Britain, still, in industry, in commerce, in all that can elevate a nation, she affords a striking contrast to that Spain of which she was once an inconsiderable province.

Scarcely had the struggle with her revolted province terminated, when the successor of Philip II. meditated, and ultimately carried into execution a measure at which even the zeal and intolerance of that stern monarch was staggered. But the history of the final expulsion of the Moors, in 1609, is too full of interest to be treated cursorily.

On the Eastern side of Spain, in the sunny plains and through the valleys of Murcia and Valencia, there dwelt a numerous, a happy, and a contented people. Long subject to the kingdom of Arragon (for their conquest had been completed nearly 100 years before the union of the crowns of Arragon and Castile), they had ever been treated with kindness and consideration by their conquerors. The nobles of Arragon, on whose lands they lived, were too well aware of the value of a thriving and industrious population not to be desirous to protect them from violence and oppression; and as long as the Cortes of Arragon retained its independence, the Moors followed the pursuits of industry in security, and were, in the words of their bitterest enemy —"an industrious and laborious people, and withal very frugal and temperate."

Indeed, so jealous were the Cortes of the grasping ambition of the priesthood, and of their desire to extirpate the Moors, that they passed a law by which all disturbance of the Moors was prohibited, and also made it part of their king's coronation oath—"That he should, upon no pretence whatsoever, expel the Moors, nor force them against their will to be baptized; and that he should neither directly nor indirectly ever desire to be dispensed with as to that oath, or, in case of a dispensation, should not accept it."

At length the Cortes fell, and all power passed into the hands of the crown. Charles, indeed, had taken the oath not to disturb the Moors or accept a dispensation from the obligation of that oath; but that proved a weak and ineffectual obstacle. In 1524 a formal dispensation was sent by Pope Clement VII. releasing Charles from the obligation of his oath. The terms of that document are too important to be omitted.* After a preface of some length, it proceeds thus:—

"And we do further release your Majesty from the obligation of the oath which we are informed was taken by you in the General Estates of the kingdom, absolving you from all censures and penalties of the guilt of perjury which you might incur thereby. And we do further grant free and full power to the Inquisitors to compel all that shall contradict the same, or prove refractory, by ecclesiastical censures and other proper and lawful methods, requiring the assistance of the secular arm, if it shall be judged necessary: all ordinances, statutes, and privileges of the said kingdom to the contrary notwithstanding, though confirmed by an oath, and notwithstanding it should be provided that a release from the said oath should not be desired, nor ever be made use of if granted. And in case the Moors do persist, in the hardness of their hearts, so as not to embrace the faith of Christ within a term prefixed by the Inquisitors, they shall be commanded, upon pain of perpetual servitude and bondage, to depart out of the said kingdom; which if they do fail to do within the time, they shall be all slaves, and treated as such."

This dispensation and decree of the Papal See was not given effect to in the full measure of its atrocity at that time. The terrors of the Inquisition were first tried. As that tribunal, however, professed to exercise its jurisdiction only over those who had once been baptized, and subsequently relapsed into their former opinions, the Emperor Charles V., by an ordinance issued immediately after the receipt of the dispensation, commanded all the Moors to be baptized, and threatened expulsion on their refusal. Against this ordinance the nobles of Arragon energetically protested, but without effect; and ultimately the Moors of Valencia were forced, at the point of the sword, to profess outward conformity, and receive the rite of baptism. Thenceforth the Inquisition never wanted an annual supply of relapsed Moors to grace their *autos da fe*.

But still the great purpose was uneffected. The Moors, in the midst of persecutions, still increased in numbers, and, in 1609, were estimated to amount to 600,000 souls. At length the time arrived when full and complete effect was to be given to the Pope's decree. At length the Spanish priesthood, headed by the Archbishop of Valencia and the Cardinal Archbishop of Toledo, extorted from the weak and superstitious mind of Philip III. the fatal decree which drove out of Spain upwards of half a million of her most industrious and thriving population. The arguments and inducements held out by his clerical advisers must not be passed over in silence.

The Archbishop of Valencia, under whose jurisdiction the great body of the Moors were placed, in one of his memorials, addressed to Philip, after noticing the destruction of the Amalekites by Saul, and of the Philistines by David, thus proceeds:—

"From which examples it is manifest that your Majesty, as king, is bound in conscience to defend and preserve your kingdom, which you cannot do if you do not banish the Moors—men, women and children; out of them only the children, male and female, under seven years of age, may be dispersed among the old Christians. And it is the opinion of learned men that your Majesty may lawfully make all their children slaves; neither would your Majesty, in banishing all the Moors, do a thing that was never done by any of your ancestors; for they, in the year 1492, expelled all the Jews out of Spain, to the number of 24,000 families."

See Geddes' Tracts, vol. I, p. 60.

In another memorial the same prelate says:—

"That if, as was notorious, on an information being taken, the Moors should be found guilty of being Mahometans, they might be condemned to lose all their goods, and to perpetual banishment out of the kingdom, within a prefixed period, which ought to be short. And though it is sufficient to engage your Majesty to rid Spain of all the Moors, only to let you know that you are bound in conscience, and under the pain of a mortal sin, to do it; nevertheless, since the expelling of them will be attended with great advantages, both spiritual and temporal, I cannot forbear laying some of them before your Majesty. Amongst these advantages are these, your Majesty, by selling all the children that are under seven years old, who are reckoned to be above 30,000, will both receive a good sum of money and will gain a great many subjects, who, being sold to old Christians, will all become Christians.

"Your Majesty may either send the strongest men to your own galleys or sell them. And on this occasion I will repeat, what I have often affirmed, that your Majesty may, without any scruple of conscience, make slaves of all the Moors, and may either put them into your own galleys and mines, or sell them to strangers; and whereas their number is very great, you may, after you have supplied your own galleys and mines, sell the rest of them in Italy."

And his last argument for their expulsion was:—

"The Moors being a laborious and industrious people, do, by working cheaper than the Spaniards are able to work, eat the bread out of the Spaniards' mouths, and being also very frugal and temperate, they do contribute little to the public excise."

These memorials of the archbishop were enforced and supported by the other prelates of Valencia, who, after a

* The document will be found at length in vol. I of Geddes' Tracts, p. 39.

consultation, which lasted some months, came to a resolution which was privately presented to the king. That resolution was:—

"That the Moors of Valencia were all certainly apostates, and so obstinate, that there remained no hopes of their conversion."

This was in April, 1608, Geddes, vol. 1, p. 87.

These memorials and resolution were enforced by all the authority of the Primate of Spain. Their teaching was impressed on the King's mind by the Royal Confessor, and their effort was aided by the weakness and superstition of the royal conscience, which was instructed to believe that every portent of nature and every public miscarriage was sent to warn or punish him for the delay his own better feelings still interposed.

The Spanish priesthood at last prevailed. In 1609, notwithstanding the strong and earnest remonstrances of the Cortes of Arragon, the decree of expulsion was promulgated, and a whole people, remarkable only for their industry and manufacturing skill, for their quiet and peaceable demeanour, were at one blow deprived of their property, exiled from their pleasant homes, and driven forth, homeless wanderers, to perish in the deserts of Africa. And what did Spain gain? Her priests were no longer offended by the presence of a people who refused to listen to a religion that was forced on their attention by armed soldiers and by *autos da fe*. And the King of Spain became the sovereign of the most orthodox and the feeblest of the great monarchies of Europe.

THE DECRETAL EPISTLES.

No. 1.

THE POPES OF THE FIRST 400 YEARS, AND THE LETTERS THEY WROTE.

EVERYTHING which tends to throw light on the ancient Church of Rome is interesting alike to Protestants and Roman Catholics. Our readers, we are sure, would like to have a list of the early Popes, or Bishops of Rome, and the letters they wrote. We therefore give the list for 400 years. We give a column, showing the year in which each Pope succeeded the one before him; in the next column we state how many letters, said to be written by each Pope, we now have. It being acknowledged on all sides that some of those letters are *genuine* (that is, really written by the Popes whose names they go under), and it being also acknowledged on all sides that some of those letters are *forged* (that is, written by other people in after times, and passed off under those Popes' names, as if written by them), we give another column, showing which are forged, and which genuine. We shall afterwards show on what authority we pronounce some of them to be forgeries. We give also a column containing the references by which the letters themselves may be found in the Concilia Generalia of Labbe and Cossart.*

We do not give *as our own* the list of the Popes' names, and the years they succeeded each other; we give it as the list which Roman Catholics give for themselves. We take it from Vol. XVI. of Labbe and Cossart, p. 130. There are, no doubt, great difficulties about the list. Our readers will see in the list, that Liberius is counted the 37th Pope, and Damasus the 38th, and yet there is a Pope Felix between them! This is so in the list of Labbe and Cossart, which we copy exactly. The fact is, that Roman Catholics have never been able to agree whether this Felix were really a Pope or not. One party says he was; another party says he was not. It turns on an ugly question whether Pope Liberius were a heretic or not; and agreement about that can hardly be expected; because the proof of it is too strong to be got over by some,† and the inconvenience of it is too great to be admitted by others: so, to reconcile both parties, they put Felix's name in *the list* of Popes, and they do *not* count him in the *number*; and we, of course, adopt this arrangement. There is another difficulty, too, about Linus and Cletus, who stand second and third on the list. If (as Roman Catholics say) St. Peter was himself Pope of Rome until the day of his death; and if (as some of the early Fathers say) St. Peter himself, during his lifetime, ordained Clement as the first Bishop of Rome, it is not very easy to see how two other Popes could have come in between them. Protestants, who think that St. Peter was an Apostle to all the world, and not a Pope of Rome, may, perhaps, be able to solve this difficulty; but *it is* a difficulty to Roman Catholics. It is also a great question whether there ever were such a man as Cletus, who stands third on the list. Eusebius, the oldest ecclesiastical historian, says that Clement succeeded to Anacletus (Book III. chap. 15), and Evaristus to Clement (chap. 34), leaving no room for Cletus. And it is thought by some, that the name "Anacletus" has, by some accident, tumbled out of its proper place in the list, leaving a bit of itself behind to grow into another Pope.

There are also great difficulties about the dates at which some of the Popes succeeded. But we only mention these questions; we do not go into them; our chief business is with the letters said to have been written by the Popes; and for this purpose we are content to take the list as Roman Catholics give it, and to leave the difficulties to them. So here follows the list:—

A TABLE OF THE EARLY POPES, AND THE LETTERS THEY WROTE.

No	Names of the Popes.	Year in which each came Pope.	Number of letters written by each.	Whether Forged or Genuine.	Vol. and Col. in Labbe and Cossart, Con. Gen.
1	St. Peter (as alleged by R. Catholics)	43	2 Epistles	Genuine	Vol. I.
2	Linus ..	67	None		
3	Cletus ..	78	None		
4	Clement I. ..	91	2 to Corinth 1 to St. James 7 & others	Genuine Forged	123 82
5	Anacletus ..	101	3 Epistles	Forged	512
6	Evaristus ..	110	2 Epistles	Forged	541
7	Alexander I.	119	3 Epistles	Forged	542
8	Sixtus I. ..	130	2 Epistles	Forged	554
9	Telesphorus	140	1 Epistle	Forged	559
10	Hyginus ..	152	2 Epistles	Forged	566
11	Pius I. ..	154	4 Epistles	Forged	570
12	Anicetus ..	165	1 Epistle	Forged	580
13	Soter ..	173	2 Epistles	Forged	581
14	Eleutherus ..	177	1 Epistle	Forged	586
15	Victor I. ..	193	4 Epistles	Forged	592
16	Zephyrinus..	201	2 Epistles	Forged	603
17	Callistus I...	219	2 Epistles	Forged	609
18	Urban I. ..	224	1 Epistle	Forged	614
19	Pontianus ..	230	2 Epistles	Forged	623
20	Anterus ..	235	1 Epistle	Forged	629
21	Fabian ..	236	3 Epistles	Forged	640
22	Cornelius ..	251	26 Epistles	3 Forged 3 Genuine	668
23	Lucius I. ..	253	1 Epistle	Forged	721
24	Stephen I. ..	255	2 Epistles	Forged	729
25	Sixtus II. ..	257	2 Epistles	Forged	821
26	Dionysius ..	268	2 Epistles	Forged	847
27	Felix I. ..	270	3 Epistles	Forged	904
28	Eutychian ..	275	2 Epistles	Forged	911
29	Caius ..	283	1 Epistle	Forged	925
30	Marcellinus	296	2 Epistles	Forged	932
31	Marcellus I.	301	2 Epistles	Forged	948
32	Eusebius ..	310	3 Epistles	Forged	1381
33	Melchiades	311	1 Epistle	Forged	1395
34	Silvester I.	314	None		Vol. II.
35	Marcus ..	336	1 Epistle	Forged	470
36	Julius ..	336	4 Epistles	2 Forged 2 Genuine	475
37	Liberius ..	352	15 Epistles	5 Forged 10 Genuine	741
	Felix II. ..	356	2 Epistles	Forged	841
38	Damasus I.	367	10 Epistles	5 Forged 5 Genuine	862*
39	Siricius ..	385	5 Epistles	2 Forged 3 Genuine	1017
40	Anastasius	398*	3 Epistles	2 Forged 1 Genuine	1191

On first looking down the column in which the word "forged" occurs so often, our readers may be tempted to think that we are only trifling with the subject, and with them, and telling stories too monstrous to be believed.

This, however, is not so; we are serious, and we speak truth.

All the letters entered in our list may be read in the places referred to.

All these letters, for 300 years at least, were universally believed to have been written by the Popes whose names they bear.

All these letters which we have marked as forgeries are now acknowledged (with hardly a single exception) by all learned Roman Catholics to be forgeries indeed, by which the world and the Church were imposed on for so long. No learned men among Roman Catholics will now venture to deny all this; and we have proof enough, if any one should attempt to deny it.

Now, look at the results of this Table.

We have ONE HUNDRED AND NINE letters of forty Popes, in 400 years. EIGHTY-FOUR of these are forgeries. Only TWENTY-FIVE are genuine: and if we take away the two Epistles which were written by St. Peter, whom we consider an Apostle, not a Pope, we have only TWENTY-THREE genuine, out of *one hundred and seven*.

In saying that twenty-three are genuine, we do not vouch for all these being genuine. Some we are sure are genuine; of some, the evidence is very little (if any) that they were really written by the Popes whose names they bear; of some we have little doubt that they, too, are forgeries. But those which are doubtful are of so little consequence, that it is not worth while to dispute about them; we are therefore content to admit them, for the present, as genuine, setting down as forged those only which we find to be acknowledged as forgeries by Roman Catholics themselves. Of all which we have set down as forgeries, there is ONLY ONE of which we have not Roman Catholic testimony that it is forged.

Who are our witnesses?

The learned Du Pin, *Doctor of the University of Paris*, testifies for all in *our* list except *one*.

Labbe and Cossart, the two *French Jesuits* who collected the Councils, testify for all in one list, excepting about *five*" (and those mostly of the least consequence).

And in general, all learned men in the Church of Rome, for 250 years past, have admitted that nearly all those we call forgeries are really forgeries. Labbe and Cossart, vol. I. p. 78, name the following as making this admission:—Cardinals Baronius, Bellarmine, and Perron; Coustant, Antonius Augustinus, Lorinus, Sirmond, Ducaeus, Petavius, Marca, Bosquetus, and others, they say, too many to mention.

Devoti, Archbishop of Carthage, and Secretary to Pope Pius VII., is the latest Roman writer on Canon Law, having written in this present century, and he says, "All Catholic writers, excepting a few who would not take the trouble to examine carefully, have willingly confessed they are forged." (Institutiones, Preface, p. [illegible].

That all these witnesses are not agreed about the precise numbers of the forgeries, may be easily understood. These witnesses lived at various times during the last 250 years. Three hundred years ago all Roman Catholics held that all these letters were true: when Protestants first began to question these letters, Roman Catholics cried out at them, that the arguments they were using would prove the Holy Scriptures themselves to be forgeries! But by degrees, as the arguments of Protestants got stronger, the Roman Catholics gave up one after another of the letters, when they found they could defend them no longer; so in each age more and more of these letters were confessed to be forgeries, until the learned Du Pin, who lived about 150 years ago, and who is one of the last who has published an accurate examination of all of them, fairly gave up every one in our list, except one.† And, therefore, we may hope that some candid Roman Catholic may yet be found to give up even this one too.

If any Roman Catholic now doubt the fairness of our list, and the statement we have made, we urge it on him to take this paper straight to his priest, and to call on the priest to shame us by exposing us in our own paper. And, according to our regular practice, we promise to insert anything that may be so sent to us.

Our readers are now perhaps ready to ask, What were all these letters forged *for*? and what are they all *about*?

An answer to the latter question, what these letters are *about*, will help to tell also what they were *for*.

Our readers may like to have the answer from a Roman Catholic; we take it from Severinus Binius, Archbishop of Cologne, in Germany, who published a collection of the Councils, about the year 1608.

He was one of the last of the learned men in the Church of Rome who made a vigorous effort to defend all these letters, when all others were giving them up as hopeless. We may therefore take his evidence as to what is in them: He says "*most* of those letters of the Popes were written about *the Primacy of Peter*; the *dominion* of the Roman Church; the ordination of Bishops; that *priests* are not to be *injured* nor *accused*, nor deposed; about *appeals* being made *to the Apostolic See*." There could not possibly be a truer or fairer statement of the general contents of these letters. A very few extracts may suffice for the present.

Anacletus in his first Epistle is made to say, "We confirm the laws of the Church by our Apostolical authority."‡ It is certainly odd that Pope Clement should not have done this already.

In his third Epistle, Anacletus is made to say, "This Holy and Apostolic Roman Church obtained the Primacy, and pre-eminence of power over all Churches, not from the Apostles, but from the Lord and Saviour himself."§

Pope Marcellus is made to say, "Charges of crime are not to be brought against priests, ... for Christ is the head of the Church, and priests are the Vicars of Christ."¶ Ep. 3. And Pope Fabian says, "The Apostles determined that they (priests) should not be accused; or, if this could not be otherwise accomplished, that the accusation of them should be made very difficult—" Ep. 2. And Pope Julius is made to declare, "that all bishops, as often as they are attacked or accused in any more weighty causes, as often as may be necessary, may freely appeal to the Apostolic See, and fly to it as to their mother, that by it, as always was, they may be tenderly supported, defended and liberated."**

* The edition of Labbe and Cossart referred to in the articles in this number is that published at Paris, 1672.

† The proof of Pope Liberius' heresy may be seen in this number, in our observations on the letter of "A Roman Catholic," page 142.

* As the last Pope here mentioned succeeded in 398, and died in 402, our list embraces four centuries.

* Of some of these five it is very likely that Labbe and Cossart thought them forgeries too, but as they have not expressly said it, we do not say it on their authority.

† See Du Pin's Hist. of Eccl. Writers, Vol. I. p. 582, Ed. 1722, Dublin; and also under each Pope's name.

‡ Leges Ecclesiæ apostolica firmamus auctoritate.—Labbe & Coss. Vol. I. 518.

§ Hæc vera sacrosancta Romana et apostolica Ecclesia, non ab apostolis, sed ab ipso Domino Salvatore nostro primatum obtinuit, et eminentiam potestatis super universas Ecclesias.—Labbe & Coss. Vol. I. 525.

¶ Criminationes adversus Doctores non debere recipi. . . . Caput enim Ecclesiæ Christus est, Christi autem Vicarii Sacerdotes sunt.—Vol. I. p. 1559.

** Ut omnes Episcopi qui in quibuslibet gravioribus pulsantur vel criminantur causis, quoties necesse fuerit, litteras apostolicam appellent sedem, atque ad eam quasi ad matrem confugient, ut ab ea (sicut semper fuerit) pie foveantur, defendantur et liberentur.—Labbe & Coss. Vol. II., p. 497.

These are fair specimens of the things which Binius says the forged letters are *about*.

And now the reader may have some notion what the forged letters were *for*.

He may have a better notion of it still, when we tell him, that in the true and genuine letters of the early Popes there is nothing at all of this kind; nothing to show that Popes then either exercised or claimed the powers which they claim and exercise now; but much to show that they made no such claim.

Of course when Popes began to claim these powers, this was felt to be a great deficiency; for it gave a sad handle to people to say that Popes were usurping powers that did not belong to them; so, to put down perverse opposers, letters were forged for the early Popes, such as they *ought to have written*, if they had known their business and duties as later Popes know them now.

We can only give brief answers now, to questions which we shall answer more fully in future numbers.

Roman Catholics may also wish to know when these forgeries were first imposed on the world?—how long the world and the Church were imposed on by them?—and how they were at length proved to be forgeries? Briefly then,

1st. These letters (with a few exceptions) were first published by Antgarius, Bishop of Mentz, in France, about the year 836. No one had ever heard of most of them before.

2nd. The Church was imposed on by them until after the Reformation, or for more than 700 years.

3rd. They were proved to be forgeries, chiefly by the monstrous blunders that the forgers had made. Letters of Popes dated years after the Popes were dead—Popes quoting books and Councils that were not written or held till centuries after the Popes were dead—the evident marks that letters pretended to be written by Popes who lived centuries asunder were really written by the same person—the monstrous ignorance in the Popes' letters of the history of their own times—the absurd perversions of Scripture—the nonsensical and heretical things found in them. These, and many other marks of this kind, at length made Roman Catholics see that it was too late to try to defend them any further.

This is but a brief outline of the nature and purpose of these letters. We shall fill up this outline in future numbers. We conclude this number, as a general illustration, with some extracts from those letters, which, if true, would be of the greatest importance—viz, the letters said to be written by Clement to St. James the Apostle.

In his first Epistle to St. James, Clement recites that St. Peter, when dying, had ordained him as his successor, and had directed him to write a full account to St. James. He commences his first letter thus—". . . Simon Peter, who, for the merit of true faith, and the upholding of sound preaching, was appointed to be the FOUNDATION *of the Church*. . . ."* Clement goes on to relate how St. Peter, when about to die, had taken him (Clement) by the hand, and said to all the people, "I ordain this Clement as your Bishop, to whom alone I deliver my chair of preaching and doctrine. . . . I deliver to him that power of binding and loosing which was delivered to me by the Lord; so that what he shall have decreed upon earth, ABOUT ALL THINGS WHATSOEVER, that may be decreed also in heaven."† He then relates how Peter ordained him, and made him to sit in his own seat, and all the directions that Peter gave him, concluding his letter thus—"In the judgment of God he shall suffer the torments of eternal fire who shall have neglected THE DECREES OF THE CHURCH."‡

It has been a great puzzle to Protestants, and to many Roman Catholics too, whether Clement, as Pope and successor to St. Peter, had the command and direction of the other Apostles who outlived Peter. These letters undertake to settle the question. Besides many other directions which Clement gives to James, and powers and authorities which he confers on him, he says, in his second Epistle to St. James—"Since, as we have received from the Blessed Apostle Peter, the FATHER of all the Apostles, in what manner we ought to hold concerning the sacraments which are performed among the saints, *it becomes us* TO INSTRUCT YOU *in order*."§ He then goes on to tell him with what "fear and trembling of the clergy they ought to guard the remains of the fragments of the Body of the Lord, lest by any means it might be found to putrify in the Sacrarium,"‖ with many other directions about celebrating mass, and about the altar and its furniture, which are not found in any genuine records of the early Church, but which are not unlike those now in the Roman Missal. It is true, Clement falls short in some things; for instance, he strictly commands that if any of the consecrated bread remain, "it should not be reserved to the morrow, but be diligently consumed, with fear and trembling of the clergy;"* however, it was not bad for a beginning.

Considering that St. James was present when our Lord instituted this Sacrament, and that St. Clement was not, it might seem unnecessary for him to instruct St. James about it; but, considering further, that the subject of instruction was the mass of the ninth century, it would certainly have been new light to St. James, only that he never got the letter, as it was not written until 800 years after his death.

We deeply regret that space does not allow us here to place the genuine letter of St. Clement in full comparison with the forged ones. One specimen must suffice from that most heavenly Epistle ever written by an uninspired man.

After teaching the Corinthians out of the Scriptures, Clement goes on:—"This is the way, beloved, in which we may find our Saviour, even Jesus Christ, the high priest of all our offerings, the defender and helper of our weakness. By Him we look up to the highest heavens; and behold as in a glass His spotless and most excellent countenance. By Him are the eyes of our hearts opened, by Him our foolish and darkened understanding rejoiceth to behold His wonderful light."†

The *real* letter of St. Clement is just what a Protestant Bishop might wish to write now; the forged letters of Clement are just what a Roman Catholic Bishop might write.

But now to illustrate the proofs of forgery: Eusebius tells us that St. James died *before* St. Peter (Book II. ch. 23, 25), and Roman Catholics admit that this is true: yet here we find Clement, *after* St. Peter's death, writing to St. James!

The letters contain further proof of forgery, plain to any one who has a Bible and refers to it. For Clement, *writing to St. James*, quotes to him James's own Epistle (ch. iv. v. 10, 11, 12), as if it were the words of St. Peter! Now, no one can suppose that Clement knew the Apostles' writings so badly as to make so unpardonable a blunder in so important a letter; so that any one with a Bible could detect the forgery at once—a striking proof of God's providential care, that they who look to the word of truth shall not be deceived by the lies of man:‡ a striking instance, too, how the Church may expect to be deceived when she shuts up the Bible, for this rank and impudent forgery imposed on the whole Church for 700 years! Ay, and on part of it for A THOUSAND YEARS!! MARK THIS, Roman Catholics of Ireland; it is but a few years ago that the Church of Rome has ceased to impose this forged letter upon you AS TRUE! until a few years ago, this Epistle of Clement to St. James has been quoted as true in the notes of the Douay Bible!! For 250 years, at least, every learned Roman Catholic has known and confessed that this Epistle was a forgery, and yet all that time you had it held up to you as true in the notes of the Douay Bible! We have now before us the original edition of the New Testament, published at Rheims, in 1582, and also a Douay Bible, printed with the sanction of Dr. Troy, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, in the year 1816,§ in both which we find this note on 2 Peter, ch. i. v. 15. "ST. CLEMENT, IN HIS EPISTLE TO ST. JAMES, OUR LORD'S BROTHER, witnesseth that St. Peter, encouraging him to take, after his decease, the charge of the Apostolic Roman See, promised that after his departure he would not cease to pray for him and his flock, thereby to ease him of his pastoral burden."

See here what care the Roman Church has taken, in past time, to teach the Irish people only what is true and certain! Forgeries that she would not venture during later ages to produce to any other people in Europe, were thought good enough for you.

In our next number we will proceed to show how these forgeries came to be believed in the Church; how and by whom they were established; and the use that was made of them. Let Roman Catholics consider if this be worthy of their attention.

Those who have a greater zeal for Rome than for truth, may think it a great pity that all these proofs of the Roman system are but forgeries of the ninth century. And a great pity it would be, and a great wonder, too, if the Roman system had really been established by Christ and his Apostles, that the early Church should not have given us such testimony in support of it.

Those who regard truth will desire to see all false proofs swept away.

We have STRANGE AND STARTLING THINGS to say about these letters—MORE strange and startling than any that we yet have said. Those who dare not look at the light will, of course, look away, or shut their eyes, and will not venture to read, lest light should break in upon their minds. But those who have the courage to see light will, we know, wait for it, and read all we have to say. Let such readers remember that we do not want to leave them without a religion; we only want to clear away all the lies of men, that they may behold the truth of God's Holy Word. We want to clear away the forgeries put on the early Popes, that the Word of God, as spoken by St. Peter himself, may stand for ever. "The word of the Lord endureth for ever; and this is the word which, by the Gospel, hath been preached unto you."—1st Ep. of St. Peter, chap. i., verse 25, Douay Bible.

---

* . . . . Simon Petrus, qui veræ fidei merito, et integræ prædicationis obtenta, fundamentum esse Ecclesiæ definitus est . . . —Labbe & Coss. Vol. I., p. 82.

† Clementem hunc episcopum vobis ordino, cui soli meæ prædicationis et doctrinæ cathedram trado . . . . ipsi trado a Domino mihi traditam potestatem ligandi et solvendi; ut de omnibus quibuscumque decreverit in terris, hoc decretum sit et in cœlis.—Labbe & Coss. Vol. I. 83.

‡ In judicio Dei, ignis eterni tormenta sustinebit, qui Ecclesiastica decreta neglexerit.—Labbe & Coss. Vol. I. p. 97.

§ Quoniam sicut a Beato Petro apostolo accepimus, omnium apostolorum patre qui clavis regni cœlestis accepit, qualiter tenere debemus de sacramentis, quæ geruntur in sanctis, te ex ordine nos decet instruere.—Vol. I. 98.

‖ Qui cum timore et tremore clericorum, reliquias fragmentorum corporis Dominici custodire debent, ne quæ putredo in sacrario inveniatur.

* Quod si remanserint, in crastinum non reserventur, sed cum timore et tremore clericorum diligentia consumantur.—Labbe & Coss. Vol. I. 98.

† Labbe and Coss. Vol. I., p. 146.

‡ The following sentence, from the *genuine* letter of Clement, seems almost as if he knew the use that men would make of his name in after times, and wished to guard against it—"Look into the Holy Scriptures, which are the true words of the Holy Ghost; *ye know* that there is *nothing wicked* or FORGED *written in them*."—Ch. 45. Is not this wonderfully suitable?—Labbe & Coss. Vol. I. p. 151.

§ It is a large 4to Bible, published by R. Coyne, Dublin—"Approved of by the Most Rev. Dr. Troy, R.C.A.D."

TALK OF THE ROAD.—No. XIX.

"Well, Pat, my man, any news of Kilcommon those times?" said Jem.

"There is, Jem," said Pat, "for I was in on Monday."

"And how is matters getting on there?" said Jem.

"Why, then, it's all getting mighty quiet," said Pat, "and the readers just able to go about like any one else; and I wouldn't see any stir at all there, maybe, only for the long car."

"And what of the long car, Pat?" said Jem; "wha call had that to the Readers, anyway?

"Why, there was a gentleman out of England stopping at Mr. Owen's, and the word was gone about that it was him sent the Readers to Kilcommon, and to all Ireland; and that he was come to look after them; and, sure enough, when the long car came in, he was waiting for a seat on it; and the word went about that it was himself that was in it. Well, it was market day—and the big market it was, coming on Christmas; and I seen the town sergeant, in his blue coat and red collar, giving the people the wink, and them gathering round the car, and the gentleman on it; and they had the children in the front, and the girls and boys behind them, and the women behind them, and the men at the back of all, (for that's the plan,) and they all screeching "souper," and "jumper," and "devil," and all the names they have, at the gentleman on the car; and all the noises of the market going on too; for there was Ned Kelly, the ragman, singing the ould song 'Tear away, tear away! haul away, tear away!' and Mr. Plunket, the auctioneer, standing on the cart, selling the shawls and gowns, and the people screeching and making all the horrid noises ever you heard; and there was an old mare in the long ear, that was a wee thought "maggotty," and she wouldn't go a step with the people screeching for-nenst her; and when Billy Donaghy, that was driving, fell to laying it into her, she turned to to lashing at him; and it beat all, entirely. Well, then, Mr. Plunket, that's always setting the people on against the Readers, took to canting the souper, when he seen there was no one bidding for the shawls; so, says he, 'Going, going, going,' says he, 'a fine fat souper going—for one quart of soup!' So the people fell to shouting more nor ever; and old Billy Donaghy took to flattering them—'Oh, boys,' says he, 'sure you won't see me kilt entirely? Won't yees be easy one minute, till I get her away? Sure it's the devil's in the mare,' says he. 'You're a liar,' says the boys, 'its the devil's on the ear,' says they, 'and it's a rale Catholic mare she is; better nor you,' says they, 'to be driving what's on the car.' Well, with that if there wasn't noise enough; up comes Nick Flaherty that sells the ballads, with a new song all in strips over his arm, and him calling it through the market, 'Only wan hapeny,' for St. Patrick's hymn, only wan hapeny,' and then he fell to singing it, and of all the songs ever you heard for St. Patrick, it was the quare one, but only one verse stuck to me, and it was what St. Patrick was preaching to the heathens in Ireland:—

Have done with your fighting,
And think of your sins,
Or I'll break every bone
In your impudent skins. *

"St. Patrick's hymn, only wan hapeny;" well, just then, the police came up, and they cleared the way for the old mare, and the gentleman stood up on the car, and he takes off his hat, and gives it a whirl round his head, and says he 'Now boys, one cheer more before we go,' so, with that, they all fell to laughing and cheering him, for a pleasant gentleman as he was, so the long car drove off in the height of good humour. And I'm thinking, maybe that's the last of the bad noises in Kilcommon, for it's all getting quiet now, in spite of Father John, and Mr. Plunket, and the town sergeant too."

"Well, Pat," said Jem, "it's time for it to stop, for it was disgracing us all; and sure the people wouldn't keep it up for ever, though they'd be put up to it for a while. But sure that was the quare song for St. Patrick. I wonder what Father John would say to that."

"And what would he say to it?" said Pat, "sure isn't it the very moral for himself. Sure don't I remember, afore the famine, when the people used to be kneeling in the chapel yard, at mass; and don't I mind it as regular as the day came, how Father John, or one of the curates, would go the rounds of the chapel yard, with the horsewhip, to keep the boys and girls to their duties, and all the people in the street and the houses forenint the chapel looking on? And wouldn't it be just the moral for Father John, if that *was* the way St. Patrick did speak to the heathens? But, I doubt, if St. Patrick was a Protestant, as Mr. Owens says

* If any of our readers in the neighbourhood of Navan could get a copy of this song for us, we should be obliged.—Ed. C. L.

he was, he did'nt do the likes of that at all, for sure, the Protestants does'nt do them things."

"Well, Pat," said Jem, "them times is past anyway; the people is got past that, and they would'nt stand it now; and I don't see the horsewhip with the priests at all now, barring of an odd time at an election, or a fight, or the like of that."

"Well, its small call they have for it in the chapel-yard anyway," said Pat, "for you might play ball in the chapel itself, and the people in it."

"And is the readers doing anything in Kilcommon?" said Jem.

"Well, I hear there's a deal of people talking to them now Jem," said Pat, "and there's a deal of people goes to the controversial class now; and I went there myself that night."

"And what were they talking about?" said Jem.

"Well, it was about the Mass," said Pat, "but you would never think, Jem, what came uppermost."

"And what was it at all?" said Jem.

"Why, it was about the candles on the altar, Jem," said Pat.

"Well, was not there more in it to talk about than that, Pat?" said Jem.

"Well, there's more depending to the candles nor you think, may be," said Pat.

"Well, tell us all about that, Pat," said Jem.

"Why, the Rev. Mr. Burke (that's the missioner) he put it to them, was the wafer turned into the body and blood of Christ, and his soul and divinity too, when the priest said the words over it; and then up gets Micky Reilly the schoolmaster, that's a very learned man, and says—'Sure it is,' says he, 'for they're the words of Christ, and won't his word always do what He means?' says he. 'And does it *always* happen when the priest speaks the word over the bread?' says Mr. Burke. 'Surely it does,' says Micky. 'When the Word of Christ is spoken over the bread how can it fail?' says he. 'And did you never hear of *defects* in the Mass?' says Mr. Burke. 'How could there be defects in the Mass,' said Micky, 'when it depends on the Word of Christ, that can't fail?' says he. 'There's no defects in the Mass, nor couldn't be,' says he, 'but that's the way the Protestants are always speaking, for they can't make an act of faith, and they can't believe that Christ's Word will always do its work; but the Catholics that can make an act of faith, knows that there can't be no defects in the Mass,' says he. So the Rev. Mr. Burke takes out a book with a fine red cover, and plenty of gold on it, and 'What book is that?' says he. 'It's the Mass Book,' says Micky Reilly, when he looked at it. 'Is it the real Mass Book?' says Mr. Burke. 'It is,' says he, 'and no mistake.' 'Do you know the Latin?' says Mr. Burke. 'I do,' says he. So Mr. Burke opened a place, and says he, 'Will you read that to the meeting in English." So Micky read out mighty clever, 'It's about defects in the celebration of the Mass,' says he. Well, with that all the Catholics that was there began to look mighty quare; and Mickey read on, that 'a defect might occur in the thing that was to be consecrated, or the form that was used, or in the minister himself; and if there is any defect in them, there's no sacrament made,' says he, 'and sure enough your Reverence is right, and knows more about the Mass Book than I do,' says he. And so Mr. Burke just takes the book and turns to another page, and bids him read that; so says Mickey, 'Its about defects occuring in the ministering itself,' says he: and then Mr. Burke puts his finger on a place, and Mickey reads—'If there be not *wax* candles present,' says he, 'sure enough,' says he, 'it wont do without the wax by this,' says he; 'and if the candles isn't wax it's a defect, and the sacrament isn't made at all,' says he; so with that, up jumps Barney Daly, and, says he: 'Now I know all about it, your Reverence,' says he. 'About what?' says Mr. Burke. 'About what Father John said to the Boord of Guardians,' says he. 'And what was that?' says Mr. Burke. 'Why, I was in the poor-house,' says he, 'the times was so hard, and the Master put me over one of the wards; and he wanted me afore the Boord one day, about some business; and while I was waiting in the boord-room, in comes Father John, and whispers the Clerk, and, says the Clerk to the Chairman, his Reverence wants to address the Boord; so the Chairman says they was ready to hear him. So Father John says he wanted wax candles for the Mass, for he couldn't do it with tallow any longer,* so there was some talk about it, but in course they gave Father John what he wanted, for the Boord always does that; and the wax candles were given from that day out, for the Master still sent me for them. But now, your Reverence, what came of all them people that was going to the Mass for all them years in the poorhouse, and him doing it with the dips?' So, Mr. Burke just turned round on Mickey Reilly, 'and, what do you say to that,' says he, 'does it depend on the word of Christ only, or does it depend on the wax too?' 'Well, your Reverence,' said Mickey, 'that's the sorest thing I heard again the Mass yet.' 'And isn't it the poor thing, your Reverence,' says Barney Daly, 'to have to worship the Host, and we having no way to know, for sure and certain, what it is, at all? How did I know what I was worshipping in the poor-house? How did I know was it the body and blood and soul and divinity of Christ, or was it only just a wafer I was worshipping? and it all depending on the wax or the tallow, and I knowing nothing about that, nor Father John neither, till it was put in his head by the Protestants, maybe? And, isn't it the poor thing to be worshipping we don't know what?' says he. 'So, then,' says Mr. Burke, 'what does Christ say about that?' says he. So then I spoke up, and says I, didn't Christ say to the woman, 'you adore that which you know not; we adore that which we know' (John ch. iv., verse 22); and says I, mustn't we learn from Christ what we ought to adore, and did he ever tell us to adore the bread and wine that he blessed? and Mr. Burke allowed that was right. And then says some one, 'what candles had Christ at all, when he instituted the sacrament?' 'no candles at all,' says Mr. Burke, 'only lamps, for,' says he, 'there was no candles made in the world that time;' and you'll think it quare, Jem, to hear how he proved that, 'for,' says he, 'there was a city just covered over with ashes and cinders out of a burning mountain, just soon after the time of our Saviour, and it was dug out not long ago, and all the houses found, and the people's bones, and their duds, just all as they left them, and not a sign of so much as a tin candlestick, let alone a brass one, found in one of them, only lamps that wouldn't burn wax at all; and if they had candles, wouldn't they have some kind of candlesticks to hold them in?'"*

"Well, Pat," said Jem, "maybe that's true; but what signifies it? sure if the Word of God was to do it all, would'nt it do by tallow-light as well as by wax-light? sure that shows it isn't all right anyway."

"Well, there was more nor that, too," said Pat, "sure Mr. Burke showed us out of the same mass-book, that there was twenty other things by their own showing that would stop the sacrament being made, and things that we could'nt know nothing about; for sure one of them is if the wine is sour; and how would we know that, when we don't taste it? and then there's no sacrament made at all; or if the priest isn't minding what he's at, or if he looks off the book when he says the words; and how can we tell about them things at all? and now, Pat, how do we know at all *what* we were worshipping at the mass?"

"Well, Jem," said Pat, "I'm sure Christ would not leave us that way, not to know what we were worshipping. But sure don't we know he never told the apostles to worship the bread and wine at all, but only to eat and drink it? and if we keep to what He said, why need we trouble ourselves about what any one said afterwards?"

"That's it, Pat," said Jem; "if we stick to that we can't be astray."

So we hope to tell yet what that brought them to in the end.

* It is a fact that about the time mentioned the priests did make this demand in many workhouses. It was just after the missionaries to the Roman Catholics had called their attention to this defect in the Mass.

* This applies to two cities buried under the eruptions of Mount Vesuvius, soon after the time of Christ, and dug out in the last century; Herculaneum and Pompeii. The word translated "candle" in the Bible, does not necessarily mean such candles as we have. The Greek word is λυχνον, and the Latin *lucernæ*. The most exact English translation is "a light." The learned Roman Catholic, Calmet, says the "candlestick" in the Temple was, in fact, a lamp—See his Dictionary of the Bible, at the word "Lamp." Moses says it was oil that was used in this "candlestick—see Levit. xxiv. 2-4.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

The great mass of communications with which we are favoured renders it impossible for us to insert everything we could desire as promptly as we could wish. At this moment many articles, actually in type, including one on the Apocrypha, are unavoidably postponed.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st.

We would request our correspondents, both Roman Catholics and Protestants, to limit the length of their communications, and not to discuss a variety of distinct topics in one letter.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

We have to thank several obliging friends for assisting us with copies of Nos. 2, 8, and 11, to complete sets of Vol. I., which is in great demand. Nos. 3 and 4 have already been reprinted. If any of our friends could oblige us with additional copies of Nos. 2, 8, or 11, they would be very acceptable, and might save us the heavy expense of reprinting them, which, however, we purpose doing, if necessary.

We beg those kind friends by whose subscriptions and contributions we have been materially assisted during the past year, to remember that the subscriptions for the ensuing year are payable IN ADVANCE, and may be forwarded to Mr. Curry, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin, by Post-office orders or postage stamps. Those who wish the paper to be continued should do so without delay.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, DECEMBER, 1853.

In closing the second year of our labours, we have not only to thank our many friends and supporters for numberless favours, and our many readers for their favourable attention, but to offer up our hearfelt gratitude to God for the blessing that has hitherto attended our exertions, to promote a more calm and candid investigation of religious questions than has heretofore prevailed in our distracted country.

We trust that we have given a substantial proof of the practicability of conducting controversy in a spirit of kindness and brotherly love; and we would further hope, that the cause of what we believe to be truth has not suffered in our hands for want of charity towards those who differ from us.

Whether we have succeeded or not in settling the minds of any, who were previously in want of aid in such matters, we think we have, at least, encouraged and assisted them to pursue their all-important inquiries in the only spirit that can ever lead them to an enlightened conviction, and a real and honest satisfaction of mind upon such a subject as that of religion. Error in a matter so solemn must ever be both sad and pernicious; but no error of opinion is, in our judgment, half so pernicious or destructive as the determined bigotry which wilfully and deliberately shuts its ears and eyes against everything but its own narrow-minded prejudices, and which can see nothing but wilful falsehood and determined vice in any one who holds opinions differing from its own. We have as little sympathy with or respect for the Protestant who ignorantly cries down "Popery," as if no Roman Catholics had anything to say in their defence, and must be perversely and wilfully in love with error, as we have with the narrow-minded Romanist, who would condemn, unheard, every doctrine and practice of another Church as infidel or heretical. Truth is great, and will, no doubt, ultimately prevail; but its progress and success will never be rapid until it is cultivated in a spirit more worthy of it—a spirit of benevolence and brotherly love; a benevolence which can tolerate a difference of opinion without considering it a crime, and endure a free expression of that difference of opinion, without feeling it as an injury or an insult. Were men's minds properly constituted, the feeling towards those whom we believe to be in error would be like the feeling towards those in a state of bodily disease—a feeling of pity, not of hostility; and we should be as solicitous to bring them to truth, as the only medicine for their mental diseases, as we should be to cure their bodies of any loathsome disorder; not to show our own superiority, but simply to do them good. How happy would society be, if men argued less for victory and more for truth!

We assume no superiority over other men on the score of temper any more than of wisdom; but we commenced our periodical under a painful sense of the injury that has been done to the cause of truth and free inquiry by offences against Christian charity, and we have endeavoured to establish, by a practical example, the possibility of conducting such a periodical without degenerating into either polemic strife or personal scurrility. To say the truth, we have felt but small temptation to be led into either; and we entertain

a strong conviction, that such modes of warfare are rather expedients to cover the ignominious retreat of ignorance, than the natural weapons of men of learning and ability, whether acting on the defensive or the aggressive side. We can see nothing disgraceful in admitting an error, but, on the contrary, true magnanimity in relinquishing it, when we can no longer defend our position without resorting to ill-feeling or personal abuse. We, laymen, at least, who have nothing either to gain or lose by upholding particular opinions, would, we think, be unparonable if we did not preserve a calm and kindly temper in all our controversies.

If God has given men an infallible living guide, laymen should be but too glad to avail themselves of such guidance the moment they can discover that it is really such. If God has *not* given men such a guide, all men should be humble enough to bless God, and be contented with his infallible written word, and the assistance of his ordained ministers to interpret it aright. If God has created a purgatory, as well as a heaven and a hell, any man who disbelieves in it is to be pitied for his ignorance; but if God has *not* created a purgatory, but only a heaven and hell, those who trust in a future purgation for their sins, are under a delusion of the most pitiable kind. But what is there either in the belief or disbelief in such a guide or in such a place to arouse men's passions and engender strife? Truth accepts no homage at the expense of brotherly love, and men in vain delude themselves if they conceive, that in exciting hatred towards men they are promoting either the glory of God or the exaltation of truth. Truth can never lose by fair argument; and if any success has attended our efforts (and we have abundant and most satisfactory reasons to know that it has been great), we attribute it altogether to our fixed resolution, that whether successful or not in defending our own views, or refuting the opinions of those with whom we differ, we would still persevere in attempting to carry on our investigations in a calm and candid spirit of fair play and kindliness.

We had intended, but our space will not permit us to do so in our present number, to take a brief review of the principal topics which have been discussed in our pages, and the propositions which, we conceive, we have established. They include some of the deepest interest, and not a few of which have created great excitement in the world, and, probably, will do so to the end of time; though, doubtless, multitudes will be added to the one side or the other, according to the success or failure of the exertions made on either side to advocate the truth of their respective opinions. We feel, however, that so far from having given publication to all the materials for thought and arguments at our disposal, we are still but at the threshold of our great subject, with a large field of usefulness before us, if it pleases God to afford us time and means to cultivate it to advantage. What we have as yet done appears to us little more than to have somewhat softened prejudice, and gained a hearing among those who at present differ from us; and if our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen will but honestly and spiritedly do their part in the matter, we cannot doubt but that the rising generation in Ireland will be able to come to some agreement, one way or the other, on the great subjects which have so long distracted them; and may be able to realize that amount of Christian unity and brotherly love which befits them as fellow countrymen, and still more as the followers of that lowly but sublime exemplar, who, when He was reviled, reviled not again—whose characteristic precept was, to "love our enemies," and who practically fulfilled it, when, even amid the agonies of the cross, he exclaimed, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

RELIGIOUS INQUIRY IN AMERICA.

(From the New York Irish Evangelist.)

DIALOGUE.

Good morning to ye's, Father Donelly.

Pr. Good morning a chuachil. What's the good news with you?

John. Why, your reverence, I am in good health, but I am sorely puzzled by a small question put to me by a spalpeen on the road the other day, and I want the aid of your reverence to answer it in a sensible manner.

Pr. Ah, John, what can it be? The youth are becoming mighty shrewd in our day.

John. Well, your reverence, he asked me, "from how much sin are true believers cleansed by the blood of Christ?" Is it from a little, the half, or the whole of the sin? Now, I want your decision, your reverence, as a learned gentleman.

Pr. Well, John, as a priest, it would have been my duty merely to tell you that you have nothing to do with such questions, but the clergy; but as you have asked my opinion as a learned man, I must tell you, that as Christ is a whole Saviour, his blood or his atonement cleanses from all our sins.

John. Good, your reverence, what you say accords with 1st John i. 7 (Douay Bible), where it says—"The blood of Jesus Christ, God's Son, cleanseth from all sin?"

Pr. Ah, John, you have been reading the Bible, have you? You must stop that, or you will soon be quarrelling with your mother, the Church.

John. No, your reverence, quarrelling is not very Christian in any one. Still, if the blood of Christ cleanses the believer from all sin, I have been thinking what can be the use of praying to the Virgin, to Peter, Paul, or any other of the saints; and, especially, what can be the need for the fires of Purgatory to cleanse the soul, when Christ has cleansed it already.

Pr. There, John, there—you are going to be a heretic, and if you do not stop reading the Bible, and thinking as you do, I shall be compelled to curse you from the holy altar.

John. O, your reverence, I did not intend to offend you; the blessed book says, "Bless and curse not;" and the only example of cursing we have is, where Peter cursed and swore that he did not know Jesus Christ, and so denied him, which your reverence knows is a very wicked example.

Pr. How dare you, sir, make use of such language in my presence; don't you know that I have power to ask God to send your soul to the lowest pit of hell?

John. Yes, your reverence, but will God do your asking? Your commission requests of you to preach the Gospel, and not to curse your parishioners; that is the work of Satan, and you ought to leave it to him. But if you do, I shall appeal to Jesus Christ, our High Priest in heaven, whose blood cleanseth from all sin.

Pr. Begone—begone out of my sight, you will disgrace your church—always quarrelling with God and his word.

Pr. Begone, I say; begone out of my sight.

THE IRISH WANDERER IN SEARCH OF TRUTH.

I believe I told you in my last what my feelings were while reading the fifth, sixth, and seventh chapters of Matthew's Gospel. I admired the truthfulness and simplicity with which the Saviour taught the people; and nothing but my eagerness to know what the next chapter contained, hindered me from giving it a second reading. As I passed on to glance at the 8th chapter, my eyes became riveted on the following words:—"And when Jesus was come into Peter's house, he saw his wife's mother laid and sick of a fever. And he touched her hand, and the fever left her: and she arose and ministered unto them." —Matt. viii. 14, 15.

What! said I, Peter's wife's mother! Can it be possible that St. Peter had a wife? I read it again and again, but could come to no other conclusion than the fact, that the Apostle Peter was a married man, had a wife, kept house, lived by fishing, and occasionally had at his house the Son of God. This circumstance, small as it may appear, was to me then a surprising discovery, and suggested a thousand other thoughts, which I cannot now relate.—Amongst other things, I supposed that if it could be right for Peter to have a wife while in the company of Jesus Christ, it certainly would not be wrong for any of those who profess to succeed him in office to have one now, unless there was some law decreed by God to prohibit their having one.

But knowing full well, that the Church of Rome, which pretends to rest on Peter, regards it a much greater crime in one of her priests to marry a wife and live with her, than that he should daily commit adultery, I could not help twisting and turning this matter in my head for a great length of time. I read in the Old Testament (Gen. ii. 18), where God said celibacy was not good, and came to the conclusion that God must have somewhere else contradicted that saying, else the Church which taught that celibacy is good, contradicts their Maker, and in so many words, says we are too holy to keep the commandments of God.

It is a constant boast of the Romish priests that they hold the ancient faith and ancient customs delivered to the Apostles, but here is a very ancient custom, which they have not only neglected sadly, but they solemnly swear upon oath they will oppose during their natural life. I certainly thought all the time, they must have some good foundation, for setting aside and deadly opposing a custom, which is an immutable law of Jehovah, established for the good of man, without limitation or exception.

I kept this thing in view while reading the remaining part of the New Testament, and found, so far from its being prohibited, that the Apostles said marriage was honourable in all; that is, among all classes of society. See Heb. xiv. 4. It appears some heretics in the days of the Apostles opposed it as dishonourable in the clergy to marry and have their wife and children round them; as it was pretended they would have more care for their family than for the Church of God: and this is the very reason now urged by those who are guilty of trampling under foot this holy institution of God. But the Apostle Paul, in writing to Timothy, says no men are fit for the office of bishop or deacon who are not married men; for the man who cannot govern his own family well, cannot govern a larger family; that is, the congregation under his charge: and this he declares to be a direct revelation of the Holy Spirit. See I Tim. 3rd and 4th chapters.

When this subject is urged upon the Romish priests, they tell you at once they hold marriage to be a sacrament, and forbid it to none but those who have taken upon themselves vows of perpetual celibacy. Thus, by subtle and sophistical arguments, they evade the curious and confound the credulous. The truth is, they forbid marriage to none but the very men whom the Holy Spirit commands to marry. These men they forbid to marry, under the pretence that they have voluntarily taken upon themselves vows of perpetual celibacy.

But it is not true that these men are left to their voluntary consent in making these vows; they are compelled to make such vows before they can enter the church. No man can become priest, monk, or friar, until he makes these vows. We have known some men, who, after they had spent years in learning the priest's trade, and their parents had spent the last shilling in supporting them in college (expecting they were sowing a seed which would in a short time yield a rich harvest, for it is generally understood, if a man can make his son a priest, the fortune of the whole family is made,) come home almost broken-hearted, because they could not enter the priesthood, on account of some conscientious scruples they had about making these vows.

There is no alternative, they must make the vows, or else relinquish the idea of being a priest. Now, if these men were allowed to enter the priesthood, and it was afterward left to their own conscientious convictions, whether they would make vows of perpetual celibacy or not, whether they would live married or single, then might it be said, with truth and propriety, that they took voluntary oaths of perpetual celibacy.

The plain logic of the matter, then, is something like this. In the apostolical days, a man may be a bishop or deacon of the Apostolical Church of Christ, and have a wife and children. The Church of Rome claims to be the Apostolical Church of Christ; but no man can be a bishop or deacon of the Church of Rome and have a wife and children; therefore the Church of Rome is not the Apostolical Church of Christ. Again—In the Apostolical days, any one who believed that Jesus was the Messiah, and had faith in him, may become a member of the Apostolical Church of Christ without further taxing his conscience with traditions, vows, &c.; but no man can become a member of the Church of Rome until he believes, or swears that he believes, a numberless heap of traditions, called Apostolical, and a number of doctrines contrary both to Scripture and reason, and makes vows of perpetual celibacy (for a common Romanist is not a member of the Roman Catholic Church); therefore the Roman Catholic Church is not the Apostolical Church of Christ.

Several other things arrested my attention, which I intend to communicate to you in future numbers. Fearing that I have already trespassed on your time and room, I will break off here, which I did not intend to do when I commenced.

We copy the two foregoing articles from a New York paper, *The Irish Evangelist*, and think they afford a cheering proof that intelligent Irish Roman Catholics are using their intellects in America as well as in Ireland. Truly, the Roman Catholic priesthood seem not quite so likely to have it all their own way during the next half century, as they had during the last. The laity are beginning to bestir themselves in all directions, and there seems to be nothing but *trouble* before the priesthood in all countries where the freedom of the press exists. Where it does not, men *must* remain slaves both in politics and religion, and deserve to be so for submitting to have the doors of knowledge closed against them by the iron hand of tyranny, ecclesiastical or civil. The day will come when tyranny will be shaken off even by the most indolent and effeminate races, and then will freedom of speech and of thought gladden the sunny plains and hills of Spain and Italy. In the meantime, all true Britons, whether in England or America, have a deeply responsible duty to perform, in using the freedom of the press aright, and proving themselves

worthy of such a blessing. We think the cause of religious freedom among the Irish in America owes much to the exertions of *The Irish Evangelist*, which we have been reading for upwards of twelve months, and it would give us sincere pleasure to hear that some of our wealthier readers in England or Ireland would assist the good work in which it is engaged, by sending some pecuniary assistance to the editor and proprietor, Mr. John Hurley, No. 265, Bowery, New York, to enable him to distribute his paper gratuitously to our countrymen in America who are anxious to read and think for themselves. We agree with Mr. Hurley, that it requires very different reading from the ordinary tract to meet the wants of inquiring Roman Catholics; and while he conducts his journal in the spirit of candid inquiry and fair reasoning, he may feel secure of our cordial sympathy and co-operation.*

Correspondence.

INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Sir—The following thoughts suggested themselves to the writer on reading Mr. Rourke's letter, in your last number.

Mr. Rourke "discovers the infallibility of the Church in the positive and unequivocal promises of our Lord Jesus Christ;" but Mr. Rourke overlooks the fact, repeatedly proved in Scripture, that God's promises are *contingent*, and require that man shall faithfully and honestly endeavour to fulfil his part, no other infallible guides than God's Word and God's Spirit being anywhere revealed. Take, for instance, the call of Moses and Aaron—"I will be with thy mouth and with his mouth, and *will teach you what ye shall do*."—Exod. iv. 15. Immediately after this Moses and Aaron assembled the people, informed them of the commission they had received, and "*did signs in the sight of the people, and the people believed*."—Exod. iv. 29-31. Here, if ever, we might have acknowledged an infallible guide; yet, within a few short weeks, at the request of the people, Aaron takes the lead in a gross act of idolatry. —Exod. xxxii. 1-6. The people were weary of waiting upon God according to his own word, and desired something more tangible and exciting, and induced *him*, who should have restrained them, to join in their sin. Just so with the Church of Rome.

The Scriptures were a sufficient guide (infallible in themselves, still to be interpreted by fallible men), but the people liked not the spirituality of the simple faith: they required something more externally attractive, and their guides, seeing this disposition—seeing, also, the wealth and power that would accrue to themselves from a more gorgeous ritual—did as Aaron had done, forget God, and reared up a golden idol in his place.

Again, we are told (Deut. ix. 20), that "the Lord was very angry with Aaron to have destroyed him." He who was preternaturally called to a special mission, and promised Divine guidance in word and deed, was well nigh destroyed at its very commencement (and only saved by the prayer of another), because he was not faithful in that committed to him. Indeed, God himself declares that his promises are conditional.—"*At what instant I shall speak concerning a kingdom to build and to plant it, if it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then I will repent of the good wherewith I said I would benefit them.*"—Jer. xviii. 9, 10.

Let Mr. Rourke refer to the apocalyptic Churches, founded by the Apostles and apostolic men, and at the period when the Spirit addressed them under the presidency of the Apostle John, and he will see that the general promises of Christ do not secure infallibility to any Church, and that corporate bodies, even when under the rule of inspired heads, are not infallible. The Church of Ephesus had fallen, and was warned to repent or to be cut off. The Church at Ephesus was planted by St. Paul, who resided there "three years," earnestly preaching the truth.—Acts xx. 31. He appointed his own successor to watch over it, with whom he was in frequent communication; and shortly before his death he wrote his celebrated Epistle to them, in which he declares that they are "fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God, built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief cornerstone." Here, then, was a Church which must have participation in all Christ's promises, yet even during the life of the beloved disciple who dwelt with her she had fallen; therefore the promises of Christ, together with the inspection of its rulers, do not assure infallibility to any Church. Still Christ's promises shall never fail—he is ever with his Church militant on earth, and will so continue till, triumphant in heaven, it beholds His glory.

Another argument against the pretension to infallibility is supplied by St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans. Speaking of the Jews, he says—"Well, because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith; be not high-minded, but fear; for if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he spare not thee; behold, therefore, the goodness and severity of God: on them which fell, severity; but toward thee, goodness, *if thou continue in his goodness, otherwise thou also shalt be cut off*." This language, addressed by an inspired Apostle to the very Church of Rome, ought to have warned her against all assumption of high-sounding titles, and especially against that pretension to infallibility which belongs not to anything of earth, for if infallible, it must "*continue in the goodness of God*," and then there could be no alternative of "*cutting off*." Mr. Rourke asserts that all God's works are perfect—not absolutely so; they have all the elements of perfection, but being committed to imperfect agents they fall short of the mark. God had built up the Jewish nation and the Jewish Church; but both the civil and ecclesiastical state fell so far short of perfection that God frequently expresses His displeasure against them, and thus speaks to Jeremiah—"Behold, that which I have built I will break down, and that which I have planted I will pluck up, even this whole land." The general assertion, therefore, that all God's works are perfect after they come into the hands of man, is erroneous; but, if it were true, what can the Church of Rome plead more than Israel and Judah that infallibility should be hers?

Your obedient servant,

HEDALE.

* We are sorry to find the C. L. has not reached Mr. Hurley regularly. We are assured by our publisher that it has been regularly forwarded, as published, monthly.

ON PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD AND THE BURIAL SERVICE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Sir—Since you have so peremptorily decided (C. L., Vol. ii., No. 21., page 106), that the question of purgatory is settled, as far as the Fathers of the first three centuries are concerned, it may appear preposterous in me again to recur to a subject thus summarily disposed of, and particularly so, as the references supplied by *Diego* are intended as the seal of your adjudication; but as these references are rather indefinite in application, and convey no specific information, I shall, in the first place, and I presume not "unreasonably," request to be informed, does St. Augustine mean by saying, "the Church hath rejected Origen," that the Church hath rejected all the writings of Origen? Secondly, I find Origen in different parts of his writings maintaining the following points of Catholic doctrine—namely, the *real presence* in the Eucharist, confession to a priest, invocation of angels and saints, the primacy of St. Peter, celibacy of the clergy, a relcasement out of prison when the utmost farthing is paid, the Church alone the interpreter of Holy Scripture, authority of the Church—with other points of doctrine believed and taught by the Catholic Church of the present day: In this respect, then, I also require a decided reply as to whether any of the above-mentioned points, and, if so, which of them were condemned by the fifth Œcumenical Council? As I am not here treating controversially on these subjects, having only alluded to them for sake of illustration, I have not considered it necessary to refer to them particularly; this I can do should I come to discuss them. In noticing your remarks on the next portion of my letter I have not to contend with anything in the shape of an argument: you cautiously avoid the question at issue. To the argument which I proposed relative to the Fathers of the fourth century, and to which I now again call your attention, you only reply by frivolous objections, unfounded assumptions, or by endeavouring to represent me arguing "*unconsciously*," from the present in support of the primitive doctrine of the Church. I have selected an argument at once rigorous and conclusive, and strictly limited to one particular period; and the force of your objections to the principles on which I have established this argument vanishes on a candid examination of the passages which I cited from these Fathers, all of whom refer, either directly or by implication, to 1 Cor. iii., 12, 13, 14, &c., and to other corroborating texts of Scripture, and in them they can find the doctrine of a future purgation and cleansing by fire; a punishing, yet saving fire, plainly and unmistakeably established. Now, let me suppose a proposition illogically stated; a principle injudiciously adopted, or even arbitrarily assumed; can such informality justify you in withholding your arguments against the doctrine of purgatory? Is it because I argue the question on principles different from yours that you put your candle under a bushel, instead of dispelling what you call the superstitions darkness of your Catholic brethren? I am a Christian by profession and a Catholic by conviction; convince me that I am wrong and I will subscribe to your doctrine, and write my name Protestant.

Mr. Thorndike says of the faithful departed, "What hinders them to receive comfort, refreshment, rest, peace, and light to sustain them in the expectation of their trial, and the anxieties they are to pass through during the time of it? And though there be hopes for those that are solicitous to live and die good Christians that they are in no such suspense, but within the bounds of the heavenly Jerusalem; yet because their condition is uncertain, and while there is hope of the better, there is also fear of the worse; therefore, the Church hath always assisted them with the prayers of the living, both for their speedy trial and easy absolution, and discharge with glory before God." —(*Just Weights and Measures*, chap. xvi. p. 107.)

In this extract we have vividly set forth the belief of the Church respecting the trial of Christian souls after death, the anxieties they suffer during their trial, the practice of the Church in assisting them, &c., and their *absolution* and *discharge*—or, if you will, a pardon of their sins; and that in a third place, or before they were admitted within the heavenly Jerusalem; whilst, on the *contrary*, the burial office in the Protestant ritual excludes the idea of any such belief. It is imperative that this office be read over all (save those excepted by the rubric), and a confident hope is expressed of the salvation of all that are buried, though they may have died in a notorious state of impenitence, without any appearance or profession of reconciliation to God; they may, in fact, have lived most notoriously infamous lives—have been Deists or Atheists, and continued so to their last moments; and not having been *formally* excommunicated, it is presumed of each such person in the burial office (which cannot be refused him) being read over his remains, that he is within the *bounds* of the heavenly Jerusalem; "that when we depart this life we may rest in him, as our hope is, *this our brother doth*," is the burden of the prayer. Hence, it is evident that the Protestant doctrine of prayers for the dead is utterly different from that of the early Church, which prayed only for those who died in the sincere profession of the Catholic faith; as also from the doctrine of the Catholic Church of the present day, which refuses to pray for incorrigible, impenitent sinners. It is useless, in an affair of such importance, and when the evidence is so decidedly against you, to endeavour, by any evasive gloss, to ignore the fact, that in this *dogma* of Protestant doctrine there must be something radically wrong; and how this can be tolerated in a Church which claims to itself the exclusive privilege of being truly Evangelical, you will be called upon to explain. I ask you, was the Church founded by the Apostles so utterly defective in any of its constituent principles? I answer emphatically—No. You may reply, that the connection of your Church with the State has authorized the practice; but can that be any justification of the fact? Can it be consistent with rational charity that, on such an awful occasion, this office, in the name of religion, should be read most solemnly over the remains of a notorious impugner of religion; a debauched and abandoned libertine, or a professed unbeliever, and a hope expressed that he is with God; and that we are to be his future companions in glory? No prayer is offered to entreat comfort, refreshment, &c., to sustain him during his trial to obtain his absolution and discharge from hissins; but the presumptuous hope is expressed that he is with God.

That it may appear how just the foregoing observations are, I shall quote the opinions of some learned Divines of the Protestant Church on this same subject:—

"It must be owned, and it is too plain to be denied, that in such cases as you mention, of men cut off in the midst of notorious sins, drunkenness, adultery, murder, &c., this office is wholly improper; and sure, we need not doubt but that at length some regard will be had to the repeated desires of many of the best defenders of the Church, and this ground of objection against it be wholly removed." (Reas. of Conformity, page 62—By the Bishop of Winchester.)

Here is the evil admitted; also the inability of the Church to supply a remedy. Archbishop Tillotson says, "Was the ancient discipline of the Church in any degree put in practice now, in what shoals and herds would men be driven out of the communion of the Church" (Vol. I., Serm. 67). To the same purpose we have Dr. Wheatly (arguing the cases of *ipso facto* excommunications, p. 494), declaring "the consequence would be, we presume, that this office (the Burial Office) would comparatively be but seldom read."

This brings me to consider next your alleged charge against Catholics with respect to their ignorance of the first principles of Protestants; a charge which I think the foregoing observations have rendered wholly groundless.

Requesting you will show how the question of prayers for the dead, as I have stated, to be the practice of the Protestant Church, can be supported by Scripture authority,

I have the honour to remain,

Sir, yours in sincere Christian charity,

EDMOND POWER.

As Mr. Power finds it so hard to understand what is meant by the assertion that "the Church hath rejected Origen," we must endeavour to throw a little light on the subject by a parallel case. He will admit, we suppose, that the Church of Rome has rejected Martin Luther. Does this mean that the Church of Rome rejects every doctrine that Martin Luther believed, and that she does not teach the doctrines of the Incarnation or the Trinity, because those truths were acknowledged by Luther? Surely not. Or again, does it mean that the Church of Rome only rejects those of Luther's opinions which she specially names, and that on every other point we may be quite sure that Luther and she perfectly agree? Not that either. But the Church of Rome having rejected Martin Luther, is no longer concerned what truths he may hold, or what falsehoods he may propound; he cannot be understood as having a right to represent her sentiments. Suppose now that a Protestant were to assert that the Church of Rome held that the moon was made of green cheese, and that the angels smoke tobacco, and should give as a proof his assertion that those propositions were to be found somewhere in the works of Martin Luther, what would Mr. Power reply? He would say, unless you give me references I cannot be expected to believe on your bare word that Luther did believe these strange propositions; but even if he did, it is nothing

to me, the Church of Rome is not answerable for him. And just so with the list of doctrines which Mr. Power asks us to believe are to be found somewhere or other in the works of Origen. Whether Origen held these doctrines or no can only be decided by quotations *with references* from the works of Origen. But when we have settled this question we shall be no nearer to knowing what the Church believed in Origen's day, for no church is answerable for the opinions of those whom she rejects as heretics.

Mr. Power next gives an extract from Mr. Thorndike's writings, for what purpose we cannot at all conceive. We readily admit that this extract is more like purgatory than anything we can find in the writings of the Fathers of the first three centuries. If there had been anything in their writings so much to his purpose, we should have had it flung in our teeth at least once a month. Epiphanius, when asked why he prays for the dead, does not give at all so clear an account. But after all, did Mr. Thorndike believe in Purgatory? When Mr. Power says that he "vividly sets forth the belief of the Church," is he aware that Mr. Thorndike notoriously did not hold the belief of *his* Church on this subject. We have, in fact, here an example how dangerous a thing it is to quote from a book without reading it. The passage quoted by Mr. Power is taken from a place where Mr. Thorndike is arguing that the early Fathers did *not* believe in Purgatory! and contains his explanation why, nevertheless, they did pray to the dead.

A witness in a court of justice who swore that he perfectly knew Job Tomkins, and that he saw him commit a murder, when asked to point him out, put his rod on the head of the attorney on the other side. Mr. Power's evidence is just as valuable when he says that he finds Purgatory in the writings of the Fathers; for wherever he finds prayers for the dead, he fancies he sees Purgatory; and he is just as successful in finding Purgatory in the writings of Mr. Thorndike and Mr. Johnson as in those of Epiphanius and Augustine.

Lastly, Mr. Power contrasts the practice of the Church of England, which, in its burial service, expresses a hope that those whom she commits to the grave rest in Christ, with that of the Church of Rome, which "refuses to pray for incorrigible, impenitent sinners." Now, we believe that in this respect there is no material difference between the two Churches. We may as well say that the Church of England does not read the burial service over "incorrigible, impenitent sinners." But, then, how are we to know that a sinner died incorrigible or impenitent? We confess, in our experience, we never heard of any priest refusing money when asked to pray for one who died in his communion. We have never heard of any priest saying, "My good man, I cannot take your money; I fear it is a bad case; it would be only robbing you to take money for masses for such a reprobate as your uncle." We believe that, on the contrary, the greater the sinner, the more money and the more prayers, he would maintain, were necessary for his repose. And we do not think that the priest would be very much to blame. If we could be quite sure that any particular man who died was gone to hell, then the Church of England, we suppose, would not read the burial service over him. But if we cannot *know* this, it is only charitable to hope for the best; and, it seems in the vast majority of cases, at least, impossible that we should know it. *Post-mortem* examinations of the body may be sometimes needful for the good of the survivors; but how *post-mortem* examinations of men's *souls* could be held before interring their bodies, we are at a loss to conceive.

CHURCH VISIBLE AND INVISIBLE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Carlow, 30th November, 1853.

SIR—Of all subjects of discussion that man is interested in, that of religion is the most momentous, and deserves the calmest and sincerest investigation that the mind of man is capable of giving to it, in which I know you will concur. Now, I beg leave to say that your remarks, or rather the answer you gave to my letter on the "Church Visible and Invisible," has not satisfied me. The difficulty I placed Luther in, or rather the difficulty he placed himself in, reminds you of a famous saying about a famous case in the ancient Church—all the world against Athanasius, and Athanasius against all the world. It was a famous case, no doubt; but the saying was not. It might be better put, and with greater truth—"All the Arians against Athanasius, and Athanasius against all the Arians." Yet you cannot find a parallel case between Luther and Athanasius, any way you take it. Here you have the Council of Nice and Athanasius against Arius, and Arius and his cabals against Athanasius and the Council of Nice. You will say, after all, Athanasius was deposed and sent into banishment; very true, but the charges that caused his deposition were not those of belief as regards the Trinity, as you say, but of crimes that I know you will fairly acquit him, as church history tells us he was found innocent of all crimes of faith and morals, in the Councils of Alexandria, Rome, and Sardica. You say that this question about Luther is, in fact, no difficulty at all to you, and that he was no member of the Church of England or Ireland, nor was that Church founded by him, nor consist of his followers. Now, I confess I cannot understand this statement, so opposed to all history on the matter. Before Luther changed his views or opinions he was a member of the Church of England and Ireland, inasmuch as he was a member of the Catholic Church, and as the Church of England and Ireland were a part of that great whole, the universal Church. We deem those who profess Arianism to be the followers of Arius, no matter to what country they belong; and so of England and Ireland. Though Luther never put his foot there, you say "your correspondent will agree with us, that there was a Church in England before the Reformation"; and I ask, was it Lutheran, as it now is—is it now Catholic, as it then was? You say that that very Church rejected errors that she formerly held. Were not those the very errors that Luther opposed; and those errors the then universal Church held in common, and that the *universal Church now holds unanimous*—errors, as you call them, but, thank God, those errors, falsely so called, have the consent of hundreds of millions of human souls—those that are gone before, and those that are, which can claim, and justly too, more intellect, more deep research, more solid piety, amongst them than all the world beside. This may appear to many narrow-minded individuals a sweeping assertion; but what of numbers, you will say, if they are in error. Very true—"to the law and to the testimony." Well, then, let us go and see are those so called errors to be found therein, and were they condemned thereby. Before I go farther I think it but fair to remark, if a Scripture text is to be found for any article of belief, it ought to stand; and, to be refuted, a stronger and plainer text of Scripture must be found to do so; and if any practice in Church discipline or belief, founded on apostolic tradition, for which we have Scripture to prove the reasonableness thereof, must stand until condemned by a warrant of Scripture. Christ's commission to his apostles will alone establish the infallibility of his Church. "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth, going therefore *teach* all nations, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and behold I am with you *all days* even to the consummation of the world"—Matt. 28. I will build my Church upon a rock. The gates of hell shall not prevail against her. She is the pillar and ground of truth. My Holy Spirit will teach her all truth for ever. If the above texts will not prove infallibility, what will they go to prove? what purport were they written for? Their plain, obvious sense proclaims the infallibility of God's Church. The Church, the spouse of Christ, loved by him, and presented her to himself, without spot or wrinkle; holy, without blemish, as Paul asserts; then, as a natural inference, that Church which Christ has sanctified with his blessing, in the above words of St. Paul, must be infallible, otherwise she cannot remain holy and without blemish with regard to her teaching. When Paul says—obey your prelates, for they watch, as being to render an account for your souls, are we to slight that injunction, by allowing our minds to be driven about by every wind of doctrine that private interpretation of Scripture is sure to lead us? Take heed to yourselves, says the same Paul, and to your whole flocks, wherein the *Holy Ghost* has placed you bishops, to rule the Church of God. Now, if those bishops of God's Church were to lead their flocks into the quagmires and morasses of idolatry, by becoming the ignis fatuus thereof, would God, in charity's name, subject the sheep of his pasture to be led by them? How are we to know the true interpretation of Scripture but by an infallible judge? I will wait to see what Philalethes says of Berengarius.

I am, dear sir, yours respectfully,

A ROMAN CATHOLIC.

Our correspondent, not being satisfied with our answer to his last letter, we must now try and make it more satisfactory. He says we cannot find a parallel case between Luther and Athanasius, for, in that case, it was "the Council of Nice and Athanasius against Arius, and Arius and his cabals against Athanasius and the Council of Nice." In this our correspondent seems to think that the saying which we quoted—"all the world against Athanasius, and Athanasius against all the world"—was meant to apply to the time of the Council of Nice; but in this he is mistaken: it was applied to the state of things which existed a quarter of a century later, when the Arians were making attempts, which for a time seemed to be wholly successful, to make the whole Church Arian. During that quarter of a century the Arians had been making every effort, and in the year 359, the emperor ordered a general council to assemble to settle the question over again: the eastern bishops to assemble at Seleucia, and the western at Ariminum. The bishops assembled were, 160 at Selencia, and 400 at Ariminum, 560 in all; being *fourteen times as many* as sat in the earlier sessions of the Council of Trent, and nearly three times as many as ever sat together in the Council of Trent. The question between the Arians and the Council of Nice was, whether Christ be "consubstantial" with the Father (that is, "of the same substance"). At both Selencia and Ariminum, the bishops passed decrees that this word, "consubstantial," should henceforth be left out of the creed of the Catholic Church, thereby surrendering what the Arians demanded.

And this was not only decreed by the Councils but confirmed by the Pope. Pope Liberius, it is true, at first refused to agree to it; but, being sent into banishment, in order to obtain his return to Rome, he wrote a letter renouncing the faith of Athanasius and the Council of Nice, and declaring his agreement with the eastern bishops, who were notoriously Arians. Here are the words of his letter to the oriental bishops—"I do not defend Athanasius.... when I knew that you had *justly condemned him*, since it was *pleasing to God*. I afterwards *supplied my consent* to your sentence; and, in addition, I gave letters to be brought to the Emperor Constantius, by our brother Fortunatianus, concerning him (Athanasius) by name, that is, concerning his condemnation. Therefore, Athanasius being removed, all your decrees concerning whom *will be reverenced by me, together with the apostolic see*, I say that I have peace and unity with all of you, and with all the eastern bishops, and through all the provinces."*

Then it was that Athanasius (as well became his name, which means "the undying one") stood forth alone in defence of the Nicene faith.

Of this it is that St. Vincent Lirinensis says, "when the poison of the Arians had contaminated, not merely a small portion, but almost the whole world, so that nearly all the Latin bishops† being deceived, partly by force, partly by fraud, a sort of darkness fell over the minds of men as to what was to be especially followed in circumstances of such great confusion; then whoever was a true lover and worshipper of Christ, by preferring the ancient faith to the novel perfidy, escaped the defilement of that contagion" (Commonitorium, c. 4).

All this is no "difficulty" to us, for we believe that even when a Pope and a General Council of 560 Bishops fell, Christ had still a true Church; but if, as the Roman Catholic Bishop Milner says (End of Controversy, part II., letter 30), all Roman Catholics agree that a General Council, confirmed by the Pope, must be infallible, as representing the Universal Church—we do not see how Roman Catholics can get over this difficulty. It is certainly a greater difficulty *to them*, than it is *to us*, to tell where the visible Church was when Luther began to teach. Does our correspondent get out of this difficulty about Athanasius by saying that, though the whole Church, at the time in question, was against him, yet he had the Church of former times in his favour? Well, supposing that Luther had stood alone, and that we follow him, we should say exactly the same, that we have the Church in the time of the Council of Nice on our side. Can that defence ever lose its force by lapse of time?

But we deny that Luther stood alone, or that we follow him. Athanasius, though for a long time he seemed to stand alone, as respected public controversy and teaching, still had many on his side. So had Luther. To name no more, Vatablus, whose notes on the Bible we shall notice in another place, was a cotemporary of Luther. He, like many others, laboured to restore the religion of the Bible.

But, as we said in our last answer to our correspondent, we are no followers of Luther. We agree with him only so far as he followed the early Church, and we do not follow him at all. Our correspondent says he "cannot understand this statement, so opposed to all history on the matter." Our correspondent does not tell us *what* history, and we know of none to which it is opposed. But suppose it were, we have learned to know that "history" often tells lies; and we are free to appeal from "history" *to historical facts*. Is it a fact that the English Church has followed Luther? Were not the corporal presence of Christ in the Eucharist, and the use of images, two main questions of the Reformation? and, is it not notorious that from the commencement of the Reformation up to this day, the English Church has wholly differed from Luther on these two great points? Luther and his followers, to this day, hold the use of images, and the doctrine of consubstantiation, which differs but little from transubstantiation, both of which the Church of England and Ireland has *always* rejected ever since the Reformation. Will he tell us now that we are followers of Luther? We tell him that we follow the Word of God, and the early Church which followed it. We follow Luther not at all; and we agree with him only so far as he also followed that which we follow.

And if our correspondent supposes that Roman Catholics in England and Ireland are the Church which subsisted in England and Ireland before the Reformation, we are willing to meet him on that ground. Suppose we could go back to England and Ireland as they were in the fifteenth century, before the Reformation was established; suppose we could go to any bishop, priest, or member of the English and Irish Church in that age, and ask him to show us the creeds of his Church, the authorized statement of the articles of the Catholic faith, as held by his Church, what would such priest, or bishop, or layman have shown us? He would have handed us "the Apostles' Creed," "the Nicene Creed," and "the Athanasian Creed." If we go now to any bishop, priest, or layman of the English and Irish Church, and ask him the same question, *he hands us still* THE SAME CREEDS. But, if we go to a Roman Catholic, in England or Ireland now, and ask him to show

* Ego Athanasium non defendo..... ubi cognovi quando Deo placuit juste vos illum condemnasse; mox consensum meum commodavi sententiis vestris; literas adhæcquo super nomine ejus, id est, de damnatione ipsius, per fratrem nostrum Fortunatianum dedi perferendas ad imperatorem nostrum Constantium. Itaque amoto Athanasio, super quo statuta omnium vestrum a me cum sede apostolica suscipienda sunt; dico me cum omnibus vobis et cum universis episcopis orientalibus seu per universas provincias pacem et unitatem habere. Lab. and Coss. Gen. Con. vol. 2, col. 751, Ed. Par. 1672.

† The eastern bishops had fallen into Arianism *first*: when the Latin or western bishops fell *too*—then was the period of darkness.

us the creed of his Church, he hands us the creed of Pope Pius IV., which no one ever saw in England or Ireland before the Reformation. Which party has the same creed as the ancient Church of England and Ireland? The difference is this; one party has rejected the errors which prevailed in the Church, preserving its creed; the other has made A NEW CREED, that they may *keep to those errors.*

Now, for the infallibility of the Church. We are plain men; and our correspondent, perhaps, is a plain man too; and our readers are, mostly, plain men: we ask our correspondent to deal with this question in a plain manner. We ask him to deal with it as a matter of fact. Has the Church of Rome, *in fact*, been always infallible? Say yes or no. If he say "no," what need of further argument? If he say "yes;" we ask was Pope Liberius and his 650 bishops right? If not, what becomes of the infallibility of the Pope and a council? If they were, what becomes of the Catholic faith? We ask him were Pope Nicolas II. and 113 bishops, in the Council at Rome, right or wrong about the doctrine they imposed on Berengarius? He replies that he will wait for the answer of Philalethes: so do we:* this is a very fair answer for the present; but surely it involves his suspending his judgment until he sees Philalethes's answer. The proofs of infallibility which he gives in the meantime, he speaks of himself, as *natural inferences* from Scripture. No such inferences, nor no abstract arguments, can stand against acknowledged facts. We ask to have infallibility dealt with as a fact. Is it *a fact* that the Church of Rome *has been* infallible?

ON THE SERVICE IN LATIN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—As you are so kind as to answer anything a poor man may inquire about, I need not offer any excuse for troubling you for the purpose of trying to come by a little information.

Sir, I suppose you know that the service of our Church is carried on in Latin; and though I could not think it was right, yet as your paper says very little about it, I thought there was no harm in it in your opinion, or I thought that as the rich men and good scholars could, perhaps, make out the meaning of the Mass, it would do very well, and that it made little difference to poor creatures like us what language it was said in, if we only prayed as well as we could, and behaved ourselves till Mass would be over.

Yet, because I couldn't help thinking that it would be plainer in English or Irish, I often asked people who knew more than myself about it; and one man—a middling scholar too—told me that our Saviour said the first Mass in Latin, at his Last Supper, and that the Church doesn't wish to change it, and that if I got the Douay Testament I could find it myself. But though I got one since, I could never find out about the first Mass, though I found out about the Eucharist, and a good deal among us think—though I don't give in to it—that it is the holiest language, and that the devil, though he knows all other languages, can make no hand of the Latin, and for that reason don't choose to be losing his time in the chapel.

Mr. Editor, I found, by reading your paper, that no proof could be given from the Fathers of the first 300 years, for purgatory, and I thought there may be might be as little proof got from them in support of the Mass being said in Latin. I often wonder to hear the priest saying that many of us don't hear Mass as we ought, and that it will be so much the worse for our souls in the other world; but sure I don't think God will be hard on us, for not listening carefully to what we can't make out the meaning of. I know 'tis very little Latin the priest uses when he is asking for his dues, or telling us who is the man we should vote for at an election, and yet he don't speak so plain to us at Mass, though he threatens our poor souls if we don't hear it right.

What I want to know, Mr. Editor, is if our Saviour ever said a Mass, and in what part of the Douay Testament I could find it, and if he ordered every Mass to be said in Latin, or to be said at all. I hope to see something about it in your paper shortly, and as you are so kind as to print anything a priest may have to say, I hope some of them will give me an answer, and perhaps you will be kind enough to give me a small bit of information if the priest does not; but 'tis more to reason that he should explain it. I think an honest man ought to give a fair reason for what he does—so I hope in some short time to see an answer in your paper from a priest.—Your humble servant at command,

MICHAEL O'MARA, *of Waterford.*

We agree with Mr. O'Mara that it would be very desirable if some priest would take on him to answer his questions, and if any such explanation be sent to us, we shall gladly insert it. If not, we shall do the best we can to satisfy him ourselves.

PURGATORY—WHAT IS IT?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—There is a point connected with the subject of Purgatory that I do not remember to have seen brought forward in your pages, which yet appears to me to be of moment in the controversy. It is this, the Church of Rome has not decided *what* Purgatory is. She says "there is a Purgatory," but as to *what* it is, not one word. She has not ventured to decide whether it be *a place* or *a state*: accordingly her writers differ from each other, and even at times from themselves in their definitions. A few specimens will suffice. *Doyle's Catechism.*—"Q. What is Purgatory? A. A PLACE OR STATE of punishment." The matter here left in doubt by the doctor ("a place OR state") is positively settled by him in his *Abridgment of Christian Doctrine*, p. 115. "Q. How prove you there is a Purgatory, or a PLACE of punishment." And, again, "therefore there is A PLACE of purging and pardoning sins after this life."

Butler's Small Catechism (R. and D. Read, Belfast). "Q. What is Purgatory? A. A PLACE of punishment in the other life." This doctor's *third-size catechism* gives the answer, "A PLACE OR STATE of punishment." *The Touchstone*, 45—"Protestants will have it that there is no middle PLACE *or* STATE of souls after this life." This doubt disappears at the close of the paragraph—"therefore it must be a middle place." And in 46—"Hence follows a middle PLACE, which we call Purgatory."

Keenan's Catechism, p. 146.—"How do you prove that there is a Purgatory, or middle STATE between hell and heaven?" The same writer, in his answer to the question, "How do you reason on this?" says, "therefore, he must allude to souls in some other PLACE, which is not heaven, or earth, or the hell of the damned; therefore, that PLACE exists, and it is that which Catholics call Purgatory."

The Grounds of the Catholic Doctrine.—"Q. What do you mean by Purgatory? A. A middle STATE of souls. .....But as to the particular PLACE where these souls suffer, or the quality of the torments which they suffer, THE CHURCH HAS DECIDED NOTHING." Remembering, no doubt, this declaration, the author (Bishop Challoner) says in the course of his attempted proofs, "now this would not be true if there was no such THING as Purgatory." He was unwilling to use the word PLACE, the only one applicable, and he compromised between *place and state*, by the word *thing*. But he is forced to use *place* farther on. "Besides, a middle PLACE is also implied (1 Pet. iii. 18, 19, 20), where Christ is said by his Spirit to have gone and preached to the spirits in prison.....which prison could be no other than Purgatory." A prison being *a place*, he is forced to employ the term here, although "the Church has decided nothing about the particular place, or the quality of the torments."

This distinction between *place and state* is important; for if it be not decided whether Purgatory be a *place or state*, what right have Roman Catholics to quote passages of Scripture which imply or plainly speak of *place*, and to apply them to Purgatory? And if any Roman Catholic does decide that Purgatory is *a place*, is he not using his private judgment to settle a point which his Church, with all her boasted infallibility, has been compelled to leave undecided?

Other contradictions may be pointed out in the writings referred to:—Thus, 1 Peter iii. 19, 20, is quoted by *Keenan*, by the author of *The Touchstone*, and by the author of *The Grounds*, &c., to prove the existence of Purgatory, and of Christ's descent there to preach; while it is appealed to by *Butler* and *Doyle* (in their catechisms) to prove Christ's descent into *Limbo*. I must quote from Doyle's Catechism a few questions and their answers.

"Q. Did Christ's soul descend into the hell of the damned? A. No; but to a *place* or *state* of rest, called Limbo. Acts ii. 24, 27; Ps. xv. 10. Q. Who were in Limbo? A. The souls of the saints who died before Christ. Q. Why did Christ go down into Limbo? A. St. Peter says *to preach to those spirits that were in prison*; that is, to make known to them, in person, the joyful tidings of their redemption. 1 Pet. iii. 19."

Now, this same Dr. Doyle, in his *Abridgment of Christian Doctrine* refers to this identical passage to establish the dogma that Christ went into Purgatory; at the same time distinguishing between Purgatory and Limbo. A few questions, with their answers, from this work also, will be necessary. "Q. What means, he descended into hell? A. It means that as soon as Christ was dead, his blessed soul descended into Limbo, to free the holy fathers who were there. Q. How prove you that? A. Out of Acts ii. 24, 27; Ps. xv. 10. Q. What other proof have you? A. Ephesians, iv. 8, 9. Q. Did he not descend to Purgatory to free such as were there? A. It is most probable he did, according to the first of St. Peter, iii. 19, 20."

Here, then, we have writer against writer, and the same man against himself, and all against their Church, which was unable to decide WHAT *Purgatory is.*

THETA.

FARMING OPERATIONS FOR DECEMBER.

(*From the Irish Farmers' Gazette.*)

Wheat.—From the very wet and inclement weather which has prevailed during the period of wheat sowing, a vast breadth still remains to be sown; let every opportunity be, therefore, taken advantage of in depositing the seed, for which a good season still remains; wheat being likely to rate much higher for some time than for the past few years, and as a sufficient breadth of bread corn is and must be a paramount object, every exertion should now be made to increase it. Land already and for some time past under tillage must, of a necessity, be waited for till sufficiently dry for working under the harrows, as any attempt to plough or harrow, while saturated with wet, would be highly injurious; but lea land, when breaking up, may be sown in breadths as fast as turned up. It will much improve it to use the land-presser, to close and consolidate the soils, if it can be had; but in the event of that important implement being wanting, we would rather sow immediately after the land is turned up, than lose valuable time and fine weather for getting in the seed, waiting for the natural closing of the soils at so late a period in the season. In such cases we strongly recommend harrowing roughly, lengthways, *before sowing*, to close the deep fissures; then sow, and harrow sufficiently to cover the seed. Should a drilling-machine be available, harrow the land well lengthways, to avoid turning up the sods, and drill in the seed across the furrows. In either cases the free use of the roller, when the land will permit, will effect the necessary consolidation of the soil, and in the mean time the seed will be vegetating, and so much time gained.

Winter Vetches may also be sown; but henceforth must be cultivated on the ridge and furrow system.

Root Crops.—Proceed as the weather suits with the storage of root crops; get them in before heavy frost sets in, otherwise their keeping qualities will be greatly injured. Parsnips for table use are much better lifted fresh and fresh, as required; and carrots are greatly improved for horse consumption by storage in dry, airy places, and exposure to evaporation.

Early Potatoes.—Continue planting early potatoes in dry weather. At this season the ridge and furrow system is to be preferred to the drill, from the superior dry bed afforded during the winter; a liberal dressing of stable-dung and a six-inch cover of earth are requisite to ensure success and afford protection from frost.

Ploughing should be proceeded with vigorously when the weather and land are dry enough, so that all stubble and lea land may be turned up before the commencement of the new year.

Water Meadows.—Remove obstructions from dead leaves, deposits of silt, or other matters from the feeding and discharging drains as often as they occur, so that the water may flow regularly and evenly, and correct the levels wherever faulty, which are easily discovered when the water has been running for a few days and the land becomes in some degree saturated. If severe frost comes on, the water must be still kept running, to protect the springing grass from its destructive effects; but when the weather continues mild and open, the course of the water may be changed twice a week, if the supply is not sufficient to cover the whole breadth at once; but if the supply be sufficient, it may remain on till a scum arises, which indicates that the land is sufficiently saturated, when the water should be drawn off, and returned again when sufficiently drained off.

Fences.—This is a suitable time to form and plant new fences, and repair and lay old ones. Dig and clean about young hedges, removing the roots of docks, couch, and all perennial weeds. The application of manure will well repay the cost in the increased vigour and early efficacy of the fences.

Ewes and Lambs should be changed to fresh pastures, as often as necessary, to maintain them well, after which they should have a very moderate supply of roots, and free access to good hay, with a dry lair and shelter.

Stall-feeding.—The animals in the stalls should now be so accustomed to their quarters as to be on full keep; particular attention to cleanliness, ventilation, and regularity in feeding hours, with free and undisturbed rest, will bring them on rapidly.

Milch Cows should henceforth be kept in, except about an hour in the middle of the day, but not more, when the weather is fine and dry, for exercise. To enable them to secrete milk in anything like remunerative quantity, their food should be cooked, and given with the chill off it (but not up to blood heat), and good hay. Those far advanced in calf should be permitted to go dry.

Young and Store Stock should be henceforth well attended to; a moderate supply of roots, with a little oil-cake and sweet hay, and fresh straw, will keep them progressing, provided they have good shelter from frost and rain.

Pigs.—As those formerly put up to fatten get matured, they should be sold off, and their ranks filled up from the best of the stores, and such breeding sows as have reared their third litter. This will be a good time to send sows to the brawn.

Farm Horses, when not at the plough, may be profitably kept at carting lime from the kiln and marl from the pits to the field, where requisite, manure to the fields, and grain, as it is ready, to the market, lime, bog-stuff, sea or pit sand, &c., to the compost heaps, and in the repair of roads.

Odds and ends.—Keep the main drains and water courses free of obstruction, turn over composts, and collect materials for new ones, incorporate manures, repair roads and gates, cleanse, repair, and paint all implements not in general use, and store them under cover; thrash corn regularly to keep up a fresh supply of straw for the cattle; repair the roofs of offices, that the interior may be kept dry and warm, and make constant war with vermin.

* None has yet reached us up to the very moment of going to press.—ED.

New, Recent, and Illustrated Works

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

Booksellers to the Queen,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Any Book or number of Books together, *within a pound weight*, can be sent by post for 6d., and at the rate of 6d. for every pound weight additional.

THE COURT ALBUM; or Book of Beauty for 1854. A Series of Portraits of the Female Aristocracy. In an Elegant Binding. 21s.

HEATH'S KEEPSAKE FOR 1854. Edited by Miss Power, with Illustrations on Steel. Elegantly Bound. 21s.

TUPPER'S PROVERBIAL PHILOSOPHY. Illustrated Edition, in small 4to. The Designs by Birket Foster, Cope, Tenniel, Pickersgill and others. Cloth, Gilt. 31s. 6d. Morocco. £2 5s.

THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT, Printed on Silver, and Illuminated in the Missal Style in Gold and Colours, by M. Lepelle Du Bois Gallais. Square, 18mo. Ornamental boards, 21s.

THE PARABLES OF OUR LORD: Being a selection of the most striking Parables, enriched with gorgeous Illuminated Borders. Bound in imitative carved ebony binding. 21s.

FEATHERED FAVOURITES: Twelve exquisitely coloured Pictures of British Birds, from Drawings by Joseph Wolf. 4to. Elegantly bound. 18s.

POETRY OF THE YEAR: Passages from the Poets, descriptive of the Seasons. With Twenty-two beautifully coloured Illustrations. Imperial 8vo. Elegantly bound. £2 2s. Morocco extra, £2 12s. 6d.

WINGED THOUGHTS. By Mary Anne Bacon. With Illustrations of Birds in illuminated printing, by Owen Jones. Royal 8vo. Richly bound. 31s. 6d.

FLOWERS, AND THEIR KINDRED THOUGHTS: Illustrated by fourteen Subjects, designed and printed in Oil Colours, by Owen Jones. Royal 8vo. Elegantly bound. 31s. 6d.

FRUITS FROM THE GARDEN AND FIELD: By Mary Anne Bacon. With beautiful Illustrations of Fruit, designed and executed in colours, by Owen Jones. Royal 8vo. Elegantly bound. 31s. 6d.

GARDEN BEAUTIES; a Series of Exquisitely Coloured Floral Designs in Oil. With Sonnets printed in Gold. Imp. 8vo. Elegantly bound. 31s. 6d.

GATHERINGS FROM THE ORCHARD. With Illustrations of Fruit in highly finished Oil-coloured Printing. 4to. Handsomly bound. 31s. 6d.

TRAVELS IN SOUTHERN RUSSIA AND THE CRIMEA; through Hungary, Wallachia, and Moldavia. By Prince Anatole De Demidoff. 2 vols. Roy. 8vo. With numerous Illustrations. £2 2s.

LAYARD'S DISCOVERIES IN THE RUINS OF NINEVEH AND BABYLON: being the Results of his Second Expedition. 8vo. With 400 Illustrations. 21s.

LAY OF THE LAST MINSTREL. By Sir Walter Scott. Beautifully printed on tinted paper, with 100 Illustrations from Designs by Birket Foster and John Gilbert. Elegantly bound in blue indented cover, uniform with "Longfellow's Poems." 18s. Morocco, 25s.

LONGFELLOW'S POETICAL WORKS. 8vo. With Illustrations by Birket Foster and J. Gilbert. Elegantly bound in blue. 21s.

LONGFELLOW'S GOLDEN LEGEND. 8vo. Beautifully Illustrated. Uniform with "Hyperion," and "Poetical Works." Bound in blue. 12s.

CASTILE AND ANDALUSIA. By Lady Louisa Tennison. With numerous highly-finished Engravings and Illustrations on Wood. Imp. 8vo. £2 12s. 6d.

GREECE: Pictorial, Descriptive, and Historical. By Christopher Wordsworth, D.D. With numerous Engravings on Wood and Steel. Imp. 8vo. Elegantly bound. 31s. 6d.

THE PILGRIM FATHERS; or, the Founders of New England in the Reign of James the First. By W. H. Bartlett. With 28 Steel Engravings and 31 Illustrations on Wood. Super. Royal 8vo. 12s.

A SKETCHER'S TOUR ROUND THE WORLD. By Robert Elwes, Esq. Roy. 8vo. With 21 Coloured Illustrations from Original Drawings. Elegantly bound. 21s.

NORWAY AND ITS GLACIERS VISITED IN 1851. Followed by Journals of Excursions in the High Alps of Dauphine, Berne, and Savoy. By James D. Forbes, F.R.S.E. Roy. 8vo. With 10 Coloured Lithographic views. 21s.

THE RUSSIAN SHORES OF THE BLACK SEA in the Autumn of 1852, with a Voyage down the Volga, and a Tour through the Country of the Don Cossacks. By Lawrence Oliphant. 8vo. With Illustrations. 14s.

GROTIUS ON THE RIGHTS OF WAR AND PEACE; an Abridged Translation. By Wm. Whewell, D.D. 8vo. 14s.

VICTORIA; LATE AUSTRALIA FELIX, OR PORT PHILIP DISTRICT OF NEW SOUTH WALES; being a Historical and Descriptive Account of the Colony and its Gold Mines. By William Westgrath. 8vo. 12s.

THE LEISURE HOUR, 1853. Imp. 8vo. With numerous Wood Engravings. 6s. Extra Crimson Cloth, Gilt Edges, 7s. 6d.

ALISON'S HISTORY OF EUROPE; from the downfall of Napoleon, in 1815, to the accession of Louis Napoleon, in 1852. 2 Vols. 8vo. 15s. each.

BURKE'S PEERAGE AND BARONETAGE OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE; corrected to the present time. Royal 8vo. 38s.

HISTORY OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL ASSEMBLY, (1789). By Alphonse De Lamartine. Vol. 1. 6s.

THE BOOK AND ITS STORY; A Narrative for the Young, on Occasion of the Jubilee of the British and Foreign Bible Society. By L. N. R. 4s.

D'AUBIGNE'S HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND. Vol. 5. Library Edition. 8vo., Cloth. 12s.

D'AUBIGNE'S HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND. Vol. 5. Post 8vo., Cloth. (Oliver and Boyd's Edition.) 6s.

D'AUBIGNE'S HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND. Vol. 5. (Collins's Edition). 12mo. Sewed, 2s. Cloth, 2s. 6d.

BENEDICTIONS; or, The Blessed Life. By the Rev. John Cumming, D.D. Fcap. 8vo. 7s.

CHRIST OUR PASSOVER; or, Thoughts on the Atonement. By the Rev. John Cumming, D.D. 2s. 6d.

INCIDENTS IN THE LIFE OF OUR SAVIOUR, Illustrative of His Divine Character and Mission. By Rev. A. L. R. Foote. 6s.

THE CHRISTIAN WREATH OF PROSE, POETRY, AND ART; with 8 highly finished Oil Coloured Engravings. 5s.

THE WOOD CUTTER OF LEBANON; a Story Illustrative of a Jewish Institution. By the Author of "The Faithful Promiser." 2s. 6d.

SYMPATHY; or, the Mourner Advised and Consoled. By the Rev. John Bruce. 12mo. 5s.

A CYPRESS WREATH FOR AN INFANT'S GRAVE; with an Introduction and Essay on Infant Salvation. By Rev. John Bruce. 3s. 6d.

THE BYEWAYS OF THE BIBLE. By Rev. Richard Brown. 2s. 6d.

BLUE JACKETS; or, Chips of the Old Block. A Narrative of the Gallant Exploits of British Seamen, &c., during the present Reign. By W. H. G. Kingston. 7s. 6d.

OCEAN AND HER RULERS; A Narrative of the Nations who have from the earliest Ages held Dominion over the Sea. By Alfred Elwes. 5s.

THE BOYHOOD OF GREAT MEN. Intended as an Example to Youth. By John G. Edgar. 3s. 6d.

FOOT-PRINTS OF FAMOUS MEN; designed as Incitements to Intellectual Industry. By John G. Edgar. 3s. 6d.

THE BOY HUNTERS; or, Adventures in the Search of a White Buffalo. By Captain Mayne Reid. With Illustrations. 7s.

THE DESERT HOME; or, The Adventures of a Lost Family in the Wilderness. By Captain Mayne Reid. Illustrated. 7s.

THE YOUNG VOYAGEURS; or, The Boy Hunters in the North. By Captain Mayne Reid. With Illustrations. 7s.

PETER THE WHALER; His early Life and Adventures in the Arctic Regions. By W. H. G. Kingston. 5s.

THE CHARM: A Book for Boys and Girls. Illustrated with upwards of Sixty Engravings. 5s.

MEMOIR OF REV. W. H. KRAUSE. By the Rev. Charles S. Stanford. Crown 12mo. 5s. (In a few days.)

PETER PARLEY'S ANNUAL FOR 1854. With coloured Engravings and numerous Illustrations in Wood. 5s.

WOODLEIGH HOUSE; or, The Happy Holidays. With Steel Engravings. 7s. 6d.

ELLEN MONTGOMERY'S BOOKCASE — MR. RUTHERFORD'S CHILDREN. By the Author of "The Wide, Wide World." Fcap. 8vo. 2s.

CHAMBERS'S LIBRARY FOR YOUNG PEOPLE. 18mo. 20 different Sorts. Each containing an engraved Frontispiece. Handsomely bound. 1s. each.

MARY HOWITT'S JUVENILE BOOKS. 18mo. Thirteen different Sorts. Handsomely bound in blue. Gilt Edges. 1s. 6d. each.

THE FAVOURITE PICTURE BOOK, designed to amuse and instruct the Young. With several Hundred Illustrations. Royal 4to. With elegant Cover. 3s. 6d.

FLOWERS FROM THE GARDEN OF KNOWLEDGE. Prince Arthur's Alphabet. With many Illustrations. 1s.

*** W. C. & Co. have in Stock an extensive Assortment of Bagster's Polyglot Bibles; Church Services, &c., in plain and elegant bindings, richly mounted; together with a varied Selection of Books suited for Christmas Presents, and Premiums for Young People.

Just Published, Fcap. 8vo, neat cover, 1s.; in cloth, 1s. 6d.; in cloth, gilt edges, 2s. (*Postage 6d. extra*).

THE TALK OF THE ROAD:

Reprinted from the Catholic Layman.

Showing how the Irish People talk about Irish Doings, when they get a quiet Place at the back of a Ditch, or under a Hedge.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY AND CO., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London: WERTHEIM AND MACKINTOSH, Paternoster-row.

The Catholic Layman,

VOL. II.

WITH INDEX COMPLETE.

Neatly Bound in Cloth, Lettered, price 5s. 6d.

NEW WORKS IN THE PRESS.

I.

THE COLLECTS OF THE LITURGY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, Catechetically Explained, Compared with Scripture, and Briefly Commented on, &c.; for the Use of Families and Sunday Schools. By the Rev. Charles Miller, A.B. With Recommendatory Preface by the Bishop of Meath. Fcap. 8vo.

[Immediately.]

II.

THE PRINCIPLES OF ELOCUTION;

Extracted from

"The Elements of Rhetoric."

By Archbishop Whately.

With some additions and alterations.

The present compilation from that known and justly celebrated work, "The Elements of Rhetoric," by Archbishop Whately, has been made with the kind permission of the author.

New matter has been introduced by the Archbishop, and the whole arranged, revised, and corrected under the personal inspection of his Grace.

That this little work may be of use in exhibiting and impressing some principles of elocution, and so aiding the student to express his thoughts "*clearly, forcibly,* and agreeably," after a simple and "*natural*" manner, has been the sincere desire and aim of the compiler, who also trusts the reader may be induced to gain a deeper insight into this important branch of Rhetoric, by a careful study of Archbishop Whately's entire work.

[Shortly.]

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON, and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher, WILLIAM CURRY, 9 Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.
December, 1853.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN,

VOL. III.

JANUARY TO DECEMBER,

1854.

DUBLIN:
PUBLISHED BY WILLIAM CURRY & CO.,
9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET.
LONDON: WERTHEIM AND MACINTOSH,
24, PATERNOSTER-ROW.

INDEX TO VOLUME III.

Page.

Absolution, three different views as to the conditions of its efficacy 139
if its efficacy depends on the amount of contrition in the receiver, can the priest ever tell whether it is effectual? 139
the form at present counted essential by the Church of Rome, was unknown for the first thousand years .. 140
Agreement of nations, is it a good note of the Church? .. 112
America, what becomes of the Roman Catholics who go there? 37, 146
Apocrypha, ancient testimonies about the 1
the Jews never blamed by our Lord or his Apostles for rejecting it 2
never quoted by our Lord or his Apostles 2
the Fathers of the first three centuries clear against it 2, 8, 29
Apocalypse foretells the prevalence of heresy in the Church .. 31
Apostles who survived Peter, were they subject to the Bishop of Rome? 135
Armagh, how the See was held by one family for over two hundred years 33, 45
list of the succession of legitimate bishops in that See .. 118
Assumption, Feast of the, its history 108
Athanasius, St., a work falsely ascribed to him, unscrupulously quoted by Bellarmine, Wiseman, &c. 84
Augustine, St., his opinion as to the Rock on which the Church is built 36, 52
thought that "perhaps" there was such a place as Purgatory 72
resists the claims of Papal supremacy 111
his notes of the Church examined 112
Authority, method of teaching by, used by Protestants .. 152

Baillie, his book on Theology, once a text book in Roman Catholic seminaries, but now put in the Index Prohibitorius 151
Ballintobber, landlord's letter to 106
Ballymanus, heir of 4, 19, 58
Baronius, Cardinal, his account of the frightful state of the Church in the middle ages 58
Bellarmine, Cardinal, his testimony to the degraded state of the Roman Catholic Church before the Reformation .. 57
his monstrous paradox that the Church is bound to believe vice to be virtue, should the Pope so ordain .. 62
his reason why so few cardinals are saints 68
uses in controversy as Athanasius's, a writing which he elsewhere proves to be spurious 84
his opinion as to the imprudence of putting confidence in indulgences 82
in treatises of Purgatory uses modern revelations as a head of proof 79
Benedictines of St. Maur, an account of their labours .. 91
Berengarius, discussion as to his orthodoxy 10
Bernard, St., was not up to the scientific way of settling a dispute 115
his opposition to the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, into the support of which he is, nevertheless, pressed by Roman Catholic divines 96, 97
his disgust at hearing how the Irish bishops of his time handed down their Sees from father to son .. 45, 146
contrasted with the praises given by the Irish annalists to the same people 146
Bengnot, a French Roman Catholic, traces the doctrines and practices of his Church to a Pagan origin 115
Bible, no perfect one for 300 years, according to Roman Catholic authorities 2
how it was expurgated by the Roman Index 48
is the difficulty of understanding it an argument against reading it? 106
not given to Roman Catholics because too *easy* to understand 107
Protestant, the accuracy of its translations discussed 12, 124
one of its alleged mis-translations was taken from Pope Sixtus V. 124
Binius, his opinion about the decretal epistles 3
about the orthodoxy of Liberius 10
Bishops, according to Pope Nicholas, not to be accused of anything except there were one dozen judges and six dozen witnesses 3
and that not even if they confessed their guilt themselves 18
are the people who have to stay longest in Purgatory .. 70
Roman Catholic, how far they are able to control their clergy 25, 73
serious gap in their succession in Ireland, according to Roman Catholic testimony 94
Bobola, St. Andrew, his beatification 67
Bonald, Cardinal, his condemnation of the imposture of La Salette 120
Boulogne controversy between Dr. Moeran and two Roman Catholics 122, 133, 150
Breviary, its origin 144
forgeries which it adopts 33
fables which it contains 118, 144

Cahill, Dr., accuses the Protestant Bible of mistranslation .. 12
how his charge recoils on the Douay Bible 12
would rather see his friends reading obscene books than the Protestant Bible 25
his arguments repudiated by the "Rambler," and other English Roman Catholic authorities 25, 73
Candles, the art of kissing one explained 6
what a blessed candle is good for 7
blessed candles not heard of in the Church for nine hundred years 7
tallow candles do not spoil a Mass 6, 19
what kind of light is better than candles 7
Canon of Scripture, by what authority it was fixed 29
that given by the Fathers of the first three centuries agrees with the canon of the Church of England 2
Canonization of saints, when first exercised by the Popes .. 67
on what kind of evidence it is performed 67
Card playing, how punished in Purgatory 70
is it a fit accomplishment for a saint? 70
Catholic, who has a right to the title 86
argument from the use of the name answered 112
Church, what is meant by it 99, 100, 109
Catholic Layman, extent of its circulation 133
Celibacy of the clergy, the rule inconsistent with Scripture .. 141
not the rule of the ancient Irish Church 28
nor of the primitive Church universal 41
the direct opposite to the rule of the Jewish Church .. 141
why the attempts to repeal this rule failed 44
the rule first introduced by heretics 141
at what age a vow of celibacy may be made 104
attempts made by Roman Catholic priests to remove the restriction of 140
practically mischievous effects of the rule 140
what are the reasons why the See of Rome insists on it .. 141
physical sufferings caused by the rule 141
Chess playing punished by the Inquisition 20
Church, in what its unity consists 109
Clement of Rome, doctrine of his genuine epistles as to the state of the dead 53
the epistle falsely ascribed to him contains statements which prove that even *then* Purgatory was not the belief of the Church 52
Clergy, old Irish, married, and handed down their benefices to their children 33, 144
Colgan, his puzzle to reconcile St. Bernard's horror at the Irish married clergy with the praises given to the same people by the Irish annalists 147
Collette, Mr., his letters on Tertullian and prayers for the dead 87, 151
on the Roman Catholic Rule of Faith 53
on the Protestant Bible 124
his controversy with the Abbé Miel 120
Communion in one kind, what was the practice of the ancient Church 55
Contrition, is it necessary in order to obtain forgiveness of sin, and is it sufficient? 139
Converts to Romanism, what troubles they have 80
Cooking of documents, specimens of the 62, 68, 85
Council of Nice, neither called by, nor presided over, nor confirmed by a Pope 2
this defect attempted to be supplied by forgery .. 2
attempt to pass off forged canons as Nicene .. 111, 133
Council of Trent, how they appointed a committee to revise Gratian's "Decretum," which left in all the forgeries .. 33
how they first *approved* of the Vulgate, and then proceeded to correct it 44
if their divines had been better acquainted with Greek and Hebrew, would they have adopted the Vulgate as the authentic Word of God? 43
how it was proposed there that the priests should not take money for the sacraments; but the majority of the council would not part with the "siller" 35
Creed, novelty of the Roman Catholic 145
Crucifix, ancient and well beloved at Rome, worship paid to it .. 15
Crusades, Bull of the, what privileges it gives 20
Cullen, Dr., his pastoral respecting the Immaculate Conception, and the Assumption 97
what language he permits himself to use respecting the Blessed Virgin 1, 97
his courageous assertion that the Immaculate Conception was *always* the belief of the Church .. 97, 130
Cyprian, St., refuses to submit to the authority of Pope Stephen on the subject of heretical baptism 110

Death-beds, Protestant and Roman Catholic contrasted 22, 59
what is directed to be done for a dying Roman Catholic's soul is best, a well-managed death-bed, or a well-spent life? 62
Decretal Epistles, articles on 2, 16, 32, 68
what is meant by one? 3
by whom were they forged? 3
were the Popes a party to the impostures? 3
they were the law of the Church for 630 years .. 32
are even quoted in the Decretals of Pope Gregory IX. .. 33
what doctrines they were intended to support .. 3
De Dominis, his reasons for resigning his archbishopric .. 94
Development, the doctrine opposed to the theory of tradition 70, 73
and to the claim of immutability 73
why the theory became necessary to the defence of the Church of Rome 103
Devoti, his opinion about the Decretal Epistles 3
Discipline, how exercised in the Churches of England and Rome 64
is its exercise *essential* to the being of a Church? .. 64
Duffy, Mr., his publication, "The Young Christian's Library," reviewed 56, 104
Mr. John, his letter on the Eucharist 60
" " on Purgatory 52

Enquirer's letter on "Our Lord God the Pope" 100
Epiphanius, St., condemns the worship of the Virgin Mary 71, 83
condemns the use of pictures in Churches 83
notices the silence of Scripture as to the death of the Virgin Mary 104
Error, when it will disappear from the Church 32
is the chance of it less in the Roman Catholic Church than in the Protestant? 88
Eucharist, opinion of Fathers respecting the 31
is it a sacrifice 142
what change takes place in it 143
Excommunication, how, in early times, worldly and ill-tempered bishops excommunicated each other, the Bishop of Rome not excepted 89

Faber, Mr., his book, "All for Jesus," reviewed .. 70, 72, 79
Faith, Dr. Newman's account of Roman Catholic faith, and what kind of fruit it bears 21
Fathers, did they believe in transubstantiation 61
what is meant by their unanimous consent 51
bear witness to the plainness of Scripture 73
Flowers for the months .. 12, 29, 41, 53, 65, 76, 89, 100, 112, 125, 137, 156
Fisher, Cardinal, his testimony as to the novelty of the doctrines of Purgatory and indulgences .. 56, 72
Forgeries used in controversy by Roman Catholic divines .. 84
Formosus, Pope, what became of his fingers 117
Frauds, pious, why practised, and with what success .. 143

Gallows, is it the surest road to heaven? 61
Gates of hell, what meant by the promise that they shall not prevail against the Church 126
Gelasius, Pope, denied transubstantiation 55
condemned communion in one kind 55
Gizzard, the story of the woman with the 49
God, what is the character ascribed to him in Roman Catholic religious books 106
Gratian, his quotations from the forged Papal Epistles .. 32
his "Decretum" received by the Council of Trent as the law of the Church, and yet the forgeries retained 33
Gratitude to God, what is the best way of shewing it, is it by making ourselves miserable? 145
Greek Church, the acknowledgment of their orders by the Church of Rome proves that the clergy are not always infallible guides 42
Gregory the Great, Pope, condemns solitary masses 54
disapproves of the worship of images 56
what he thought of one bishop setting himself up as universal bishop 56
the great authority for Purgatory, specimens of the stories he tells 72
confesses the novelty of his doctrines 72
Gregory Nazianzen, was one of the first who addressed dead saints, but only rhetorically, and without any faith that they could hear him 116
Grenoble, exposure there of the imposture of La Salette .. 121
Gunpowder, its use in religious worship 67

Heli Enoch, his letter on an alleged mistranslation in the Protestant Bible 12
Heresies of early times which have been adopted by the Church of Rome 83
Hierens, the name never applied to the Christian priesthood .. 142
Hindoos, resemblance between the practices of their saints and those of the Roman Catholics 105
Holy water, its original institution 17
history of the rite 119
Hypothetical prayer, a 65

Images, how the Church of Rome expurgated those verses in the Bible which forbid the making of them 48
what sect of heretics set the example which the Church of Rome has followed 83
Immaculate Conception, articles on
history of the doctrine 97, 130, 147
long hesitation of the Church of Rome on this subject 73, 79
no foundation for it in Scripture 130
contradicted by Scripture and by the Fathers .. 130
not always the doctrine of the Church of Rome .. 147
not heard of for the first thousand years 147
Immutability, can the Church of Rome lay claim to it 93, 103
Index Expurgatorius and Prohibitorius 48
Indulgences, their late origin and abuse 56
what is meant by one 81
what is the best use to make of one 80
Bellarmine's opinion as to whether it is prudent to trust to one 81
for what length of time they are given 61
Infallibility not essential to the Church, else the Jewish Church would have had it 28, 73
the analogy of nature gives us no reason to suppose the Church would possess it 73
how the theory works in practice 10, 85
the Church of Rome does not act as if she believed her own claims to it 79
can it be proved without arguing in a circle .. 8, 122, 151
no security against heresy 31
did it prevent Pope Liberius and the Council of Rimini from making a heretical decision? 80
the claim based on forgery 16
there is no infallible decision where it is to be found .. 133
can the infallible guide distinguish between true and false revelations? 70
of the Pope, in matters of fact and of faith distinguished 148
if the Church is infallible, why did St. Paul predict an apostasy, and also warn the Church of Rome to fear lest she should be cut off? 100
from the nature of the case, cannot possibly be proved by Scripture 123
if conveyed to Peter, by the words "Thou art Peter," how was it that he afterwards denied our Lord? .. 134
Infidelity, the necessary result of the line of argument pursued by Roman Catholics 6, 7, 9
free discussion the best safeguard against it 7
in France, how originated 8
Intercessory prayer, how discouraged in the Church of Rome .. 80
Intolerance, how far is it the attribute of the Church of Rome .. 73
in France, its results 47
Investigator, his letter about Cardinal Bellarmine 62
Invocation of saints and angels, articles on .. 71, 84, 115
inconsistent with real devotion to God 68
condemned by early fathers and councils 71
first introduced as a rhetorical flourish 116
in what sense it is to be understood, according to the Council of Trent 73
whether this distinction is observed in practice .. 74
forgeries appealed to, in order to justify the practice .. 84

Page.

Jansenist controversy, some account of it 128
Jesuits, toleration practised towards them by the See of Rome.. 73
Jewish Church was God's Church and yet was fallible 28, 75, 88, 122, 152
John, Pope, his way of gaining a horse 144
Johnson, Mr., his opinions as to prayers for the dead .. 76
Joseph, glories of 49
when the worship to him was invented 49
Justin Martyr, discussion as to the correct translation of a passage cited from him in defence of the invocation of saints 84

Keenan, Mr., his attack on the character of the Reformers, how it can be retorted on himself 58
his controversial catechism 58, 71
Kildare Churchman, his letters on the Jewish Church 28, 88
Knowledge or ignorance, which is the safest? 23

Labbe and Cossart, on the decretal epistles 2
their account of Popes Stephen and Formosus, and of other popes of the tenth century 116
Landlord's letter to Ballintubber 106
Leo X., Pope, his dispute with Dioscorus, by whom he was excommunicated 69
Lepers, cure of the ten, compared by the Council of Trent with the effects of priestly absolution 139
Liberius, Pope, was he a heretic? 9, 27, 50
Lies, which side deals most in them? 57
the charge of falsehood brought against this paper, how to be met 85
Lord God, was this title given to the Pope? .. 82, 99

Mabillon, a sketch of his life 91
Manufactures of England, how they obtained a superiority over those of France 47
Marcellinus, Pope, fable of his trial before Council of Sinuessa .. 3
was he an apostate? 3, 57
if he was not, what was Pope Nicholas I.? 57
Marriage *commanded* to priests in the old dispensation—*forbidden* to priests in the Church of Rome 141
Mass, what will spoil one, and what will not .. 6, 11, 38
what is better than masses 37
Mediator, what mediators are there between God and man? .. 68
Miel, Abbé, his conversion and letters 119
his letter about the sincerity of the priests 151
Milner, his shamefully dishonest misrepresentation of the opinions of Bellarmine 62
his ignorant or dishonest use of spurious writings in controversy 84
his garbled mistranslation of Justin Martyr 85
his attempt to palliate the misconduct of the Popes of the tenth century 130
thought a bad man might make a very good Pope .. 130
Mission, what the priest's mission is like 96
Moeran, Dr., his controversy at Boulogne .. 122, 133, 150
Murray, Dr., of Maynooth, his lamentation on the "new theology" introduced into the Church of Rome by the Anglican converts 70

Nantes, consequence of revocation of edict of 46
Newman, Dr., his description of Romanism on the Continent .. 21
his account of capital executions in Roman Catholic countries 61
his statement that the death of a criminal is the happiest and the safest 61
his views received in Ireland as orthodox, but condemned by Roman Catholics in America 73
his theory of development considered .. 73, 103
Nice, Council of, neither called by, nor presided over, nor confirmed by a Pope 2
this defect attempted to be removed by forgery .. 2
Nicholas I., Pope, exerts his authority in procuring the reception of the forged decretal epistles 3
Nicholas II., Pope, his decision condemning Berengarius, can anybody say whether it was right or wrong? 10, 27
Nuns, how little girls are tempted to become 104
how nuns are tempted to become saints 105
of Port Royal, their history 127

O'Brennan, Mr., tempted to knock a man down for offering him a tract 24
O'Callaghan, Mr., sentences a tract distributer to fourteen days' imprisonment—how his decision was reversed .. 24
Orders, is it sacrilege to repeat them? If so, how is Pope Stephen VI. to be justified? 117

Pagan origin of many Roman Catholic doctrines and practices.. 115
Parents, obedience to, Romish teaching on this subject contrasted with our Lord's 105
Pasce oves 95
Patrick, St., his successors 118
were formerly not necessarily bishops of Armagh .. 149
Paul, St., his letters to Timothy and Titus gives no directions about sacrificing 142
Peter, St., the "unlearned and unstable" had the Scriptures in their hands in his time 63
had he jurisdiction over the other apostles 95
why is his wife the only holy person mentioned in the New Testament whom the Church of Rome has not made a saint of? 141
how his chains miraculously joined themselves together.. 144
Peter of Alcantara, St., his phosphoric powers 144
Philalethes, controversy with him about Berengarius .. 10
on the visible Church 26
Philip Neri, St., how his love to God broke his ribs... .. 144
how he could ascertain a person's chastity by the smell .. 144
Philomena, St., her life 56
Pius II., how he altered his opinions after he became Pope .. 44
Pius IX., worship offered by him to the ancient and well-beloved crucifix 15
Polycarp, St., refuses to submit to the authority of Pope Anicetus as to the celebration of Easter 110
Popes, supremacy of the, the claim founded on forgery .. 16
have been apostates and heretics, according to Roman Catholic historians 58
how they treated kings.. 17

Page.

Popes, two instances of the Pope's want of good nature .. 35
blasphemous titles and honours given him 82
what Pope Marcellus thought of a Pope's chance of getting to heaven.. 68
two thousand differences between two infallible Popes, Sixtus V. and Clement VIII. 44
of the tenth century, to what kind of interest many owed their election 129
can the Church get on with a madman for Pope? .. 117
can anybody give a list of the right Popes? 130
Port Royal, history of the nuns of 127
Power, Mr., his letters on Purgatory, &c. .. 63, 75, 135
Prayers offered in the Church of Rome (according to their own authorities) to persons who never existed 68
and even to damned spirits 68
for the dead do not imply a belief in Purgatory 76, 137
having no reference to Purgatory, are used, even now, in the Church of Rome 137
according to Tertullian, have no warrant in Scripture .. 86
the Church of England justified for abandoning the custom of 76
Priests, Roman Catholic, why they do not reply to our arguments 7
life of one 118, 130, 145
are they sincere? 151
conversion of one 119
in what sense can he forgive sins 139
only one true priest in the Christian dispensation .. 141
Priesthood, Christ's incommunicable 142
Processions, religious, in Spain 19
Purgatory does not rest on the evidence of Scripture .. 71
nor on that of tradition 72
but on that of asserted modern revelations 73
testimony of high Roman Catholic authorities to the novelty of the doctrine 56
a doctrine invented for the purpose of raising money .. 60
if the Pope can let souls out, why does he not do it without money being paid? 35
Roman Catholic priests have showed they did not believe in it 62
what is the average time souls have to stay there? .. 70
modern Romish additions to the Tridentine doctrine .. 79
can the souls there help themselves? 79
is it the blood of Christ or the fire which cleanses them? 118
which is it souls or bodies that go there? 118
what arrangement is made for the purgation of those who may be alive at the last day? 152
what kind of sufferings are endured there 152
a new discovery in Pope Gregory's time .. 72, 152

Rambler, The, its castigation of Dr. Cahill .. 25, 73
Reformers, were they bad men? 45
even if they were, would that prove the Reformation to be a bad thing? 45
Relics, true and false, how to discriminate 92
some account of some false ones 112, 141
how duplicates may be accounted for 141
Revelations, modern, received as governing belief by recent converts to Romanism 70
rejected by the old school of Roman Catholics .. 70
are the authority on which the belief in Purgatory has been established 72
Rich, what advantages they have over the poor in the next world, if Romanism be true 35, 60
Rivers, how saints cross them.. 141
Rock of the Church, what is it? 35
what did the Fathers think it was? 36, 52
Rockets, their use in making conversions 49
Rome, is she the mother and mistress of all Churches 110, 124, 145
effects of a residence there on a sincere Roman Catholic 120
modern worship in 15, 67, 81
Church of, has altered her faith in our own day 67, 79, 119, 147
Romanism, a compromise between Christianity and Paganism 116
Roman Catholic, letters from a 10, 100, 135
what subjects our Roman Catholic correspondents shrink from discussing 38
Rose of Lima, her life 104
Rourke, Mr., his letters on Infallibility 39, 63, 74, 87, 98, 111, 124, 152
Rule of faith, no certainty on this subject in the Church of Rome 79, 104
the new rule maintained by the Oxford converts to Romanism quite inconsistent with that of the Council of Trent 70

Sacrament, what necessary to the making of a true one, according to the Missal 10
when the number seven was first assigned to them .. 56
what sacrament confers grace, and destroys personal holiness? 143
Sacrifice, what is the only, in the Christian dispensation 143, 145
Safe way, the 113
Saints, on what kind of evidence one is made 67
who was the first Pope who canonized one 67
rough estimate of their numbers 67
how they hear the prayers offered to them 68
the Church in the fourth century had no belief that they could hear our prayers 116
how easy it was to get the title formerly, compared with the present time 104
ought *everybody* to be a saint 105
what the world would be like if every one were .. 106
Salette, the apparition of 120
its general reception by Roman Catholics 120
Schism, can the Church of England and Ireland be charged with it? 135
Scripture, does the Church of Rome encourage the reading of it? 11
practical proof how the reading of is encouraged at Rome 21
rule of the Index on this subject 11
Sebastian, St., remarkable for having four bodies 141
Self-torture, in what cases is it a virtue? 105
Sin, how is it to be got rid of? 59
do Roman Catholics believe themselves in their own method of getting rid of it? 59
Sinuessa, Council of, its forged decree that the Pope should be judged by nobody 3
Spain, how the Church property there was seized on by Roman Catholics 20
Spalatro, Archbishop of, his reasons for resigning his See .. 94
Stanislaus, St., how he could produce a dead man as a witness.. 144
how his body miraculously joined itself together .. 144

Page.

Stephen I., Pope, how his attempt to excommunicate Cyprian was received by the Church 110
Stephen VI., Pope, his infamous character 116
yet he was acknowledged as a legitimate Pope .. 117
Sucession, what constitutes it in a Church 26
failure in the succession of Roman Catholic bishops in Ireland 94
is it a sure note of the Church? 112
history of the, in the See of Armagh 118
Supremacy of the Pope, how it may be proved 151
Sure title, the 132

Talk of the Road 6, 22, 37, 49, 95, 118, 146
Tertullian calls the Eucharist a *figure* of the Lord's Body .. 51
his testimony as to prayers for the dead discussed .. 87
is he a good witness for Purgatory? 135
from whom he learned his notions about Purgatory .. 52
Tetzel, specimen of the indulgences sold by him, and of the language in which he described their virtues 82
Theodosia, St., her history 92
Thorndike cited by Roman Catholics as a witness for Purgatory 64, 76
Toleration, the duty of Christians 50
Tradition, does the Church of Rome believe on its authority any doctrine not contained in Scripture? 53
from what sect of heretics has the Church of Rome borrowed her doctrines on this subject? 83
the Tridentine theory of tradition irreconcileable with the doctrine of development 93
Transubstantiation considered 145
Trinity on earth 49
Truth, indifference to it among recent converts to Romanism .. 80

Unction, Extreme, not given to criminals about to be executed 61
therefore not considered necessary for immediate admission to heaven 61
Unity, true and false 49
how true unity is to be effected 50
Universality of the Church explained 112
Ursula, St., and the 11,000 virgins 112

Variations of Romanism 67, 79, 119
Vatablus, how his Bible was expurgated by the Index .. 48
Vergil, Polydore, his testimony to the novelty of the doctrine of Purgatory 56
Viator, his letter about the 11,000 virgins 112
Victor, Pope, excommunicated the Asiatic bishops who differed with him as to the time of the celebration of Easter, but his conduct was disapproved by the Church .. 110
Vincent de Paul, St., his success at card-playing 70
Vincent Ferrar, St., how he helped the lying-in lady .. 20
Virgin Mary, added as a fourth person to the Trinity by high Roman Catholic authorities 1, 20
Divine attributes ascribed to her by Dr. Cullen .. 1, 97
what sect of heretics introduced the worship of her into Christianity 83
her worship adopted by Christians in the fifth century, with the view of attracting Pagans to Christianity .. 116
is she Queen of Purgatory? 79
the reproof given her by our Lord 124
history of the feast of her assumption 108
where and how did she die 108
Virginity, vows of, at what age they are considered valid in the Church of Rome 57, 104
Visibility of the Church does not necessarily imply absolute purity 31
Vulgate, its history 43
reasons why it was recognised as infallible by the Council of Trent 43

Wicked men sometimes employed as instruments by God .. 58
Wimar, did he murder his three sons? 50
if he did not, who invented the lie? 50
Wine, can it be made from unripe grapes? 38
Wiseman, Cardinal, his opinion as to the propriety of using infidel arguments against Protestants 6
on reading the Scriptures 11
his visit to Rome, and what he brought back .. 81
endeavours to justify prayers to the Virgin by a passage ascribed to Athanasius, which is universally admitted to be spurious 84
his sermon about St. Theudosia.. 92
his proof of Purgatory 152
Wise old man, who he was 115
Worship paid to wooden crucifix at Rome 15
divine, offered in Church of Rome to what they cannot be sure is God 39
modern, in Rome 15, 67, 81

INDEX TO PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE

THE MEANING OF WHICH IS DISCUSSED IN CATHOLIC LAYMAN, VOL. III.

Isaiah liv. 10 ..	26, 87	Rom. xvi. 17 ..	27
Matthew vii. 13, 14 ..	112	1 Cor. iii 13 ..	72, 76
xvi. 18 ..	35, 52, 125	xi. 27 ..	124
xxvi. 26 ..	12	xii. 28 ..	135
xxviii. 19, 20 ..	27	Gal. i. 8 ..	88
John ii. 4. ..	124	iii. 22 ..	130
vi. 54 ..	75	Ephes. iv. 2 ..	63
xiv. 16 ..	27	v. 29 ..	89
xv. 26 ..	39	v. 32 ..	124
xvi. 13 ..	27	2 Thess. ii. 4 ..	82
Acts ii. 47 ..	63	1 Tim. iii. 15 ..	20
viii. 14 ..	134	Titus iii. 10 ..	27
xv. 28 ..	39	Heb. xi. 6 ..	75
xx. 26 ..	134	xiii. 17 ..	27, 41
Rom. v. 12 ..	130	Apoc. iii. 14 ..	100

ERRATA.

Page 22, column 1, line 43, for "never" read "really."

Page 125, column 2, line 2, for "reach" read "crush."

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Glaip do Dhia añ ṁa háṫoṁh, agur ṁíoṁéain air an dtalaṁ deagḋoil do na dáoiṁh.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED THE MIDDLE OF EVERY MONTH, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. III.—No. 25. JANUARY, 1854. { Annual Subscription, 2s. 6d. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
The Immaculate Conception—Dr. Cullen's Pastoral	1
Ancient Testimonies about the Apocrypha	1
The Forged Decretal Epistles No. II.	2
The Heir of Lally manus—No. I.	4
Talk of the Road—No. XX.	6
Free Discussion the best safeguard against Infidelity	7
CORRESPONDENCE—	
Was Pope Liberius a Heretic?—by a Roman Catholic—Postscript to Philalethes	9
On defects in the Mass—by A Catholic	10
Does the Church of Rome encourage the Holy Scriptures?	11
Dr. Cahill's attack on the Protestant Bible—by Enoch Hell	11
The Garden—Flowers for January	12
Farming Operations for January	13

THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION—DOCTOR CULLEN'S PASTORAL.

THE above long agitated question is not yet settled. But everything seems to indicate that it will be decided in the affirmative, and possibly soon.* Till then Roman Catholics are at liberty to discuss it.† But when once affirmed by the decree of the *infallible judge*, then, according to their doctrine, they can no longer deny, or even doubt it, without incurring the guilt of mortal sin. We sincerely believe that many pious and enlightened lay members of their communion intuitively shrink from the affirmative view.

We have already invited them to examine it in its full extent, and to declare their sentiments before it be too late—before their lips be closed for ever—before they be doomed, either to stifle the suggestions of conscience, or to be decried as heretics.

We again earnestly direct their attention to the same inquiry. And we now propose to set before them some of the inevitable consequences of an affirmative decision. For this purpose we shall quote the language lately used by two of their own prelates.

Dr. Cullen, in his late pastoral, ordering "*A Novena*," in preparation for the festival of the "Immaculate Conception," publishes the following as his view on the subject:—

"As we are about to solemnize that which, among the Festivals of the Virgin, is the first in order, and which presents her to us, in a special manner, as the *immaculate and spotless spouse of the* MOST HIGH, with whose *perfection sin is incompatible*, it becomes her clients to remove from their hearts every trace of guilt, every affection to sin." . . . "This tender mother, destined to co-operate in the great work of our redemption, will listen to the cry which her children send forth from this valley of tears. She is waiting to be intrusted with their petitions. Let us, then, fly to her with confidence, reminding her, with St. Bernard, that it has never yet been heard, that any one who had recourse to her protection, invoked her aid, implored her intercession, was left by her unpitied and forsaken. The refuge of sinners, and the comfort of the afflicted, will have compassion on her children, will plead powerfully for their pardon, and *infallibly* procure for them, if they be *faithful to her*, the rich *treasures of Divine grace*."

In the foregoing there is imputed to a mortal woman "*a perfection with which sin is incompatible*," a perfection befitting "*the immaculate and spotless spouse of the* MOST HIGH"—that is, nothing less than *perfect* holiness.

Perfect holiness cannot be ascribed to any created being. For "He putteth no trust in his saints, yea, the heavens are not clean in his sight." . . "He putteth no trust in his servants, and his angels he chargeth with folly."‡

According to the Scriptures, *perfect* holiness belongs only to the Sacred Trinity.

I. The Father is the "Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty."§ He is "the high and lofty one that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy."† "Holy and reverend is his name."‡ "There is none holy as God."§ "Thou only art holy."‖ This is assigned as a reason why all should worship him. "Exalt the Lord our God, and worship at his holy hill, for the Lord our God is holy."¶ "Who shall not fear thee, O Lord, and glorify thy name? for thou only art holy (*μόνος ὅσιος*) for all nations shall come and worship before thee."**

II. The Son is styled "The Holy One and the Just,"†† and of him it is said—"He that is holy, He that is true."‡‡

III. Of the Spirit it is only necessary to remark, that his especial title is "The Holy Ghost."

Hence, it is manifest, that to represent the Virgin Mary as possessed of "*sinless perfection*," as "*immaculate and spotless*," is to raise her to a level with the Trinity, and to entitle her to share their worship and glory.

Thus, in the passages quoted above, she is represented as "co-operating in the great work of our redemption;" as "listening to the cry which her children send forth from this valley of tears," and waiting to be intrusted with their petitions.

Nor is this propounded as a mere theory. Its practical consequences are enforced. We "are to fly to her, since it has never yet been heard that any one who had recourse to her protection was left by her unpitied and forsaken." She, "the refuge of sinners and the comfort of the afflicted, will have compassion on her children, will plead powerfully for their pardon, and *infallibly* procure for them, if they be *faithful to her*, the *rich treasures of Divine grace*."

And as the Apostle forewarns those who draw nigh unto God that, "it is written, be ye holy, for I am holy," so Dr. Cullen tells the "clients" of the *immaculate and spotless spouse of the Most High*," that in solemnizing her festival it becomes them "to *remove from their hearts every trace of guilt, every affection to sin*."

Lastly, Dr. Cullen tells us, that she "*infallibly* procures" for those that are faithful to her "the *rich treasures of Divine grace*."

The Archbishop of Freiburg has lately taken up the cause of the Pope against his Sovereign, and thus embroiled himself and his hierarchy in political difficulties and sufferings. He calls on both clergy and laity to join in prayers for succour in his distress.

"Unite yourselves, then, to us in prayer—in an incessant prayer for the Church, which suffers among us—in prayer to Almighty God, to the Father, who directs the hearts of the mighty like rivers of water—in prayer to the Eternal Son, who acts victoriously as the invisible chief of his Church—in prayer to the Holy Ghost, who is given as the consoler to the Church unto the end of ages—in prayer to the Holy Virgin, the good *mother* of *Divine graces*, who rejects none of those who implore her intercession in this valley of tears."

Here the faithful are ordered to pray to the Father, the Son, the Spirit, and the Virgin; nor is the slightest difference suggested as to the manner of praying to the different persons of this new Quaternity. The objects of supplication are, indeed, different; as they might be also, when the different persons of the Trinity are separately addressed. But the mode of addressing them, or, in other words, the worship offered, is the same to all.

Lastly, the Archbishop, as well as Dr. Cullen, ascribes to the Virgin an important office of the Holy Ghost, when he styles her "the good mother of *Divine graces*."

Taking the announcements of both prelates as a sample of what is to be expected, when the doctrine of the "Immaculate Conception" shall be added to the creed of the Romish communion, the Virgin will be constituted the *spotless spouse* of the First Person of the Trinity, the *Immaculate Mother* of the Second, and the *Infallible Dispenser* of the *Graces* of the Third. What is this but to incorporate her with the Sacred Trinity—to identify her with Deity?!!! But can the decree of a poor mortal accomplish this? Or rather, must it not bring down vengeance on those who, in this age of Scriptural knowledge, shall dare thus to tamper with the attributes of Deity?

Will enlightened Roman Catholics, then, remain passive, while priests and prelates are actively preparing the uneducated masses to acquiesce in the perpetration of this fatal crime? Will they wait till they must either break communion with their Church, or share in her guilt and condemnation? Would it not be wiser to save both themselves and her, or, at least, to endeavour to do so, by raising a manly and Christian protest against the affirmation of this long disputed doctrine?

ANCIENT TESTIMONIES ABOUT THE APOCRYPHA.

WE promised in our number, for November 1852, p. 126, column 2, to produce the evidence which all ages of the Church have left us, as to whether the six Apocryphal Books are really Scripture inspired by God. It was our first intention to give, on the one side the evidence against those books being Scripture, and on the other side what is produced as the evidence in favour of them; but, on consideration, we have resolved not to do so: for this reason; the evidence produced to prove that those books are really given by inspiration of God is so trifling, so utterly weak, that if *we* were to put it alongside of the evidence *against* those books, our readers might be tempted to think that we were not acting fairly; that we were purposely stating one side as strong as we could, and the other side as weak as we could. We, therefore, think it much better that the evidence in *favour* of those books should be stated by some Roman Catholic priest or layman, in our pages. Our readers will then be sure that each side is stated as strongly as it can be stated, and will be able to judge between them. We shall, therefore, give the evidence *against* those books being inspired, and we offer our pages to any Roman Catholic priest or layman, to state whatever evidence they can produce from the early ages of the Church in favour of the inspiration of those books.

I. The age of the Jews.

For this there is no witness equal to Josephus, himself a learned Jewish historian. And his testimony is this:—"We have only twenty-two books, containing the history of all time, which are deservedly believed in as divine: of these, five are the books of Moses, which contain both the laws and the account of the creation of man, up to his own death.....From the death of Moses to the time of Artaxerxes, who was king of the Persians after Xerxes, the prophets after Moses wrote the things done in their time, in thirteen books. The remaining four contain hymns to God, and precepts for the life of man. But from the time of Artaxerxes to our own time several have been written; but they were not worthy of like faith with those that went before, because there was not A certain succession of prophets. It is manifest, in fact, how we reverence our writings; for, such an age having already passed, neither any one has dared to add, nor to take away, nor to change. It is, as it were, implanted in all Jews from their birth to believe in these as the oracles of God....." (quoted in Eusebius Eccl. Hist., Book III., ch. 10).

It is clear from this that the *twenty-two books* ONLY were the object of faith; that these only were esteemed by the Jews as the oracles of God; that the other books written after the time of Artaxerxes were not counted by the Jews as inspired.

These *twenty-two books* were the Old Testament, as it is *in the Protestant Bible*. The six apocryphal books in the Roman Catholic Bible were among those books written after the time of Artaxerxes. We need not dwell on this, as it is confessed on all sides. But we point attention to the real question, which is this—Those six books which were not counted inspired Scripture or the oracles of God by the Jews, up to the time of our Lord's coming—were those same books declared to be inspired Scripture by Christ and his Apostles?

II. The times of Christ and his Apostles.

We have some plain facts here.

1. Neither Christ nor his Apostles ever reproved the Jews for rejecting the apocryphal books out of their canon of Scripture; which they surely would have done, if those books had been given by divine inspiration.

---

* The Head of the Roman Catholic Church has already declared himself in favour of the doctrine. See the letter of Pius IX. to all the bishops in communion with the See of Rome, given at Cajeta, Feb. 2, 1849.—CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. I., p. 5.

† Ibid. See also page 20. ‡ Job xv. 15—iv. 18.

§ Isaiah vi. 3—Revs. iv. 8. † Isaiah lvii. 15. ‡ Ps. cxi. 9.
‖ 1 Sam. ii. 2. ¶ Revs. xv. 4. ¶ Ps. xcix. 9. ** Revs. xv. 4.
†† Acts iii. 14. ‡‡ Revs. iii. 7.

2. Neither Christ nor his Apostles ever quoted those books for Scripture, as they have done the other Scriptures of the Jews.

3. Christ himself, speaking to his Apostles, did expressly confirm and approve of the Jewish canon of Scripture, as the full and complete testimony of inspiration to himself. For after his resurrection he spoke thus to his Apostles—"These are the words which I spoke unto you while I was yet with you, that all things must needs be fulfilled, which are written in *the law of Moses*, and in *the prophets*, and in *the Psalms* concerning me."—Luke, ch. xxiv., v. 44, Douay Bible.

In these words it is evident that our Saviour referred to the Jewish Scriptures, as divided into the three parts mentioned by Josephus—1st, the Books of Moses; 2nd, the Prophets; 3rd, the Book of Psalms; which was the popular name among the Jews for the third division, though containing four books, because the Book of Psalms stood at the head of it, and so gave name to the four that were joined in that part.

It is confessed, on all sides, that the six apocryphal books were not among the Scriptures which our Lord thus spoke of.

The words of our Lord in that place are thus expounded by St. Augustine himself; when speaking of the Book of Maccabees, he says—"This writing, which is called Maccabees, the Jews do *not* hold, as they hold the Law, and the Prophets and the Psalms. *to which the Lord gives testimony as being his witnesses.*"—August. lib. 2 contra Gaud. c. 23. And, again—"They demonstrate their Church in the precepts of the law, in the predictions of the Prophets, in the songs of the Psalms, that is, *in all the canonical authorities of the sacred books.*"—Augnst. de unitate eccl. c. 16.

So we have the testimony of our Saviour himself to the completeness of the Jewish canon of Scripture, and, therefore, of the Protestant Bible.

III.—The times of the Futhers.

Century II.—St. John, the last of the Apostles, died about the year 96. He is said by some to have left a complete canon of Scripture to the Church before he died, but that list is not recorded by those who have said so.

The first information we have on the subject is from Melito, Bishop of Sardis, about the year 160. Sardis was one of those seven Churches over which St. John presided, and to which he wrote the Epistles given in the second and third chapters of Apocalypse, or Revelation.

Eusebius, in his history, has inserted a letter from this Melito to one Onesimus, which is as follows—"Since you have desired accurately to know the books of the Old Testament, how many, and in what order they were written, I have laboured with all diligence to fulfil that . . . . therefore when I was in the East, and came to the place itself in which these things were formerly preached and done, I learned diligently the books of the Old Testament, and I send you a list of them subjoined beneath: these are the names—five books of Moses, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy; Joshua, son of Nun; Judges; Ruth; four books of Kings;* two of Paralipomena;† the Psalms of David; the Proverbs of Solomon, which is also called Wisdom; Ecclesiastes: the Song of Songs; Job; the prophets Isaiah and Jeremiah; the twelve prophets in one Book; Daniel, Ezekiel, Ezra."—Eusebius Ecc. Hist., lib. iv., c. 26. In this last Book of Ezra, the Fathers commonly included the Book of Nehemiah, as the two are on the same subject; as Lamentations was added to Jeremiah. So here, in the earliest list left us by the Fathers, we have precisely the list of the Protestant Bible now; and we find in it none of the six apocryphal books which the Church of Rome has added to the Bible.

Justin Martyr wrote about the same time, or a little later—viz., about the year 164. He has left us no list of Canonical Books; but we have something from him, inasmuch as he never quotes any of the apocryphal books, nor makes any mention of them; and while accusing the Jews, against whom he wrote, of many other things, and even of altering or leaving out some verses of Scripture, he never accuses them of rejecting any whole books of Scripture.

Century III.

Origen held some errors which we do not follow; but, of the early Christians he was the most learned in the Scriptures; and he is a good witness as to the fact what books were counted Scripture in his day; for of all the charges brought against him, none was of mutilating the Bible. He says—"It should be known that the books of the Old Testament are twenty-two, as the Hebrews (the Jews) have delivered;" and then follows the exact list of books in the Protestant Bible. He makes no mention of Judith, Tobit, Ecclesiasticus, or Wisdom; but he says—"the Maccabees are outside of these."—Quoted in Eusebius, book vi. ch 25. Melchior Canus, a learned Roman Catholic bishop, confesses—"Origen, with the Hebrews, rejects these six books from the canon—Loc. com. lib. 2, c. 10 & 11.

Julius Africanus lived about the same time. We have nothing written by him except a letter to Origen,‡ all his other works having been lost. In that letter he undertakes to prove that the story of Susannah is a fable. In that we think he went too far; but it is clear proof that he did not consider it to be the inspired Word of God. But this story (besides the six books) is now in the Roman Catholic Bible, being added to the Book of Daniel.

Tertullian lived about the beginning of this century. He says, alluding to Apocalypse or Revelations, c. iv, v. 8, "The *number* of the wings signifies that the ancient books were *those well-known four-and-twenty.*" (Cont. Marcion, book 4, c. 7). Where we should note that St. Jerome has explained that those Fathers who counted twenty-four books, have not really made the Scripture greater, but only counted Ruth and Lamentations as separate books, instead of joining them on to Judges and Jeremiah—(Jerome in Prologo Galeato).

These are the testimonies that we have found on this subject in the first three centuries of the Church. In all those centuries we find no trace of any Christian having ever dreamed of reckoning the six Apocryphal Books, now in the Roman Catholic Bibles, a part of God's inspired Word to man. If any proof in favour of those books can be found in those three centuries, we call on all Roman Catholic priests and laymen, who may know of it, to produce it in our pages. If none such should be produced, it will be clear to our readers that no such proof exists.

Now, we ask our readers to consider, is it likely that our Lord and his Apostles should have left the Church in such gross ignorance, that no bishop, priest, or layman in it, for 300 years, should seem to have had any notion of a complete list of the books of Scripture; but, that all who have left us lists should have given us incomplete and imperfect lists?

And, if there was no perfect Bible in those 300 years, how did the Church of Rome come by it in later times?

We will continue this evidence, century by century, until, we trust, our readers will be satisfied on the subject.

* Two of them are called the Books of Samuel in the Protestant Bible.

† Called Chronicles in the Protestant Bible.

‡ In the works of Origen, vol. ii.

DECRETAL EPISTLES.

No. II.

SHOWING HOW THEY CAME TO BE BELIEVED, AND HOW THEY WERE USED.

We proceed now to show how it was brought to pass that the Church was imposed upon by the forged epistles, pretended to have been written by the early Popes; and to what extent the Church was really imposed on by them.

We must first say a little more of the extent to which this system of forgery was carried. In our last number, we gave the list of forged and genuine Epistles, down to the year 400.* We cannot continue the list further in the same form, because the documents, both genuine and forged, get too numerous to be so dealt with in our pages. Those who examine the Bibliotheca Floriacensis, and other such collections, may have some idea of the vast extent of this system of forgery. Almost every collection that we examine brings to light new instances, and leads to the conclusion that almost every abbey and monastery adopted the system, and forged for itself whatever charters, or privileges, or confirmations it desired to possess. Along with this was a system, perhaps not less extensive, of altering and "cooking" genuine documents, to make them support whatever the forgers wished; but of this we shall treat separately hereafter.

With respect to these forgeries, it is impossible to deal with all of them together. We take for our present subject the collection published in the 9th century, under the name of "Isidore Mercator," noticing others only when produced by Popes of the 9th century.

This collection contained nearly all the forged Epistles which are given in the list in our last number. It contains, also, some forged Epistles of Popes who lived after the year 400, up to the time of Pope Gregory the Great, about the year 700: and also many councils, mostly genuine, but some doubtful, or forged.

Accounts vary a little about the publication of this collection. Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, in the middle of the 9th century, states that they were first published by Rieulphus, Bishop of Metz, who got them out of Spain, in the beginning of that century. Benedict, a Deacon of the Church of Metz, appears to have published them about the year 836, by order of Autgarius, who succeeded Riculphus as bishop. The name of "Isidore" seems to have been given to the collection in hopes that it might pass for the work of Isidore, a famous Bishop of Seville, in Spain, in the 7th century; but it is now confessed by all that the collection is none of his.†

* We fell into an error in that table in setting down no Epistles to Pope Sylvester, who stands No. 34 in the list. We were led into this error by Labbe and Cossart not having placed this Pope's Epistle under his name, as he does with all the others. But there is among the records of the Council of Nice, as given by them, a letter from that council asking the Pope to confirm their proceedings, and a letter from Pope Sylvester agreeing to do so.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ii., p. 58. There is also a Roman Council under Sylvester (111rd), in which he confirms what was done at Nice (page 410). These three documents are all forgeries. The forgers evidently felt that it was a fatal defect in their system, that the Pope should neither have called, nor presided in, nor confirmed, the first and greatest of the General Councils; and they thus tried to supply that defect.

That the letters are forged, see Labbe and Cossart, marginal note.

That the Council is a forgery, see the learned Benedictine monk, Coustant, "Epistolæ Rom. Pontif.," appendix, p. 55.

Coustant also pronounces the letters forged, page 51; and he gives another forged letter of Sylvester (page 37) from the Bibliotheca Floriacensis.

† For this account see Du Pin, Eccl. Writers, vol. I., p. 583. Ed. Dublin, 1723. See also Labbe and Cossart, vol. I., p. 79 and 80.

Now for the use that was made of this collection, and the countenance that was given to it.

On this subject we find two opposite statements by Roman Catholic writers.

1st. That of Devoti, Archbishop of Carthage, and secretary to Pope Pius VII., who complains, "There is no one who does not know what triumphs the heretics make about these Decretals, and what a crop and material is thence taken for crafty and malicious calumny against the Apostolic See, as if she herself (Rome) had some part in the fraud of Isidore, and studied to overthrow the ancient discipline, and enlarge her own authority by his inventions."* He then states that all Catholic writers, except a few, had, of their own accord, and willingly, confessed that all that rested on the authority of Isidore alone were forged, and he goes on to say, that these Catholic writers also "show that no authority was interposed, no zeal shown, no care nor solicitude by the Roman Pontiffs, in publishing them; but that the whole thing was done, they being ignorant of it, and not thinking about it."†

The other account we take from the learned Jesuits, Labbe and Cossart, who made the famous collection of the councils; which statement they profess to adopt from the work "De Concordia Sacerdotii et Imperii," written by Peter De Marca, the Archbishop of Paris, whom they justly pronounce "the most learned of all the students of the Papal law;" and this account is as follows:—

"To the ancient law, confirmed by the consent of the universal Church, there succeeded *a new law*, which began to be published from the year 836: and Nicolas I. and the other Roman pontiffs, earnestly exerting themselves, by degrees it prevailed by use through the provinces of the west. That law is comprehended in the collection of Isidore."‡

Here it will be seen that an Archbishop of Paris, and two distinguished Jesuits, have made that very statement, which Devoti is angry with "the heretics" for making; they expressly affirm what Devoti denies, that the Popes did make use of the forgeries, and that it amounted to thrusting out the ancient law of the Church, and introducing a new one.

It may surprise some that the Jesuits, who have ever been the greatest supporters of Rome, should have made such an avowal; it does not surprise *us*. The Jesuits are wise master-builders: when the house is built, they take down the scaffolding, lest it should rot, and grow unsightly, and perhaps even involve the house itself in its own decay. In the same page to which we have referred, the Jesuits express their astonishment that Archbishop Binius, of Cologne, and Turrianus (another Jesuit), and other most learned men, "could have approved of those Decretal Epistles, in such a light of ecclesiastical learning." They do *not* express any wonder that those very learned men should have approved of what they must have known to be forgeries; but, that they should have done it when the world could see through it, was to them astonishing. In such a light of knowledge, Jesuitical wisdom itself suggested the candid avowal of the forgery.

Had those, who thus fully avowed the forgery, gone on to renounce all doctrines and practices which were established by those forgeries, and which had no other foundation, we should have no more to wish for, and these papers would never have been written; but, while the house stands, we must show with what scaffolding it was built, and on what foundation it rests. We shall have to show hereafter how many of the things, about which Roman Catholics and Protestants are now disputing, have their origin and foundation in the forged epistles. But our present business is with the question, which statement is the true one, that of Devoti, or that of Labbe and Cossart.

When Roman Catholics see what opposite statements are made by their own greatest writers, some saying that the Popes and the Church of Rome had nothing to do with establishing these forgeries; others saying expressly that it was the Popes themselves that accomplished it by their own efforts; and when they see even archbishops of their own Church ranged on opposite sides of this question, which so deeply affects the very foundation of the Roman system, and the laws of the Roman Church, they must needs be anxious to know which is right: is the Roman system really founded on the Word of God that cannot lie? or was it introduced in ages of ignorance by the help of forgeries, only worthy of the father of lies?

This seems to us to be the real import of the question, which of those statements is true.

We have no hesitation in saying that the statement of

* Nemo ignorat, quot de his decretalibus hæretici triumphos agant, quanta exiode seges, ac materia sumatur callidæ et malitiosæ calumniæ contra Sedem Apostolicam, quasi ipsa in fraude Isidori partes aliquas habuerit, ejusque inventis antiquam disciplinam evertere, suamque auctoritatem amplificare studuerit.—Jus Canonicum, preface, p. iv. and v., first published at Rome, 1804, and republished at Rome, 1837. We quote from the latter.

† Nullam a Romanis Pontificibus in iis evulgandis interpositam fuisse auctoritatem, nullum adhibitum studium, nullam curam, et solicitudinem, imo rem totam gestam fuisse, iis ignaris, nec opinantibus. . . p. v.

‡ Antiquo juri universalis ecclesiæ assensu roborato, successit *jus novum*, quod ab anno 836, publicari cœpit: et adnitente Nicolao I. et cæteris Romanis pontificibus paulatim usu invalnit per occidentis provincias. Jus illud comprehensum est collectione Isidori. . . . . ." Labbe and Coss., Con. Gen. vol. i. col. 78, ed. Paris, 1672. The italics are their own.

the Archbishop of Paris, and the Jesuits Labbe and Cossart is strictly true; that as soon as those forged epistles were published, the Popes of the ninth century set to work with their utmost efforts to have those forgeries believed and accepted as genuine laws of the Church, and that they succeeded *in imposing them as law* on the Western or European Church; and that this was the origin, this THE CHARTER OF THE PAPACY.

It is in no careless or reckless spirit that we make this assertion. With great labour and pains we have carefully read through and noted all the papal epistles, true and false, of the first nine centuries, about 2,000 in number. We were sincerely prepared to learn the truth on this great question, on which ever side it might lie; and we are now prepared to prove the truth to our readers.

Before we submit to them that proof, we must ask them to understand what is meant by a "Decretal Epistle." It means *more* than an "Epistle." It means an epistle which is also a "decree." The great principle which the forgeries relied upon establishing was this; that every bishop in the Church of God should act according to the Pope's decisions; that whenever a question arose not already decided by the Pope, the bishop who had to decide it should write to the Pope for his decision; and that every other bishop should act on that decision. Hence, every such letter of the Pope was to be a law or decree to the Universal Church, whence it was called a "*Decretal* Epistle."

We have now to show what use the Popes of the 9th century made of the forged decretal epistles.

Let us first call to our readers' recollection the contents of the forgeries, as stated by their last great advocate, Severinus Binius, Archbishop of Cologne.*

1. The primacy of Peter (and his successors).
2. The dominion of the Roman Church.
3. The ordination of bishops.
4. That priests (or bishops) are not to be accused.
5. About appeals to the apostolic see.

The question now is, did the Popes of the ninth century make use of the forgeries of Isidore to establish these things?

In answering this question we shall observe this order:—

1st. To give the places in which the Popes of the 9th century appealed *by name* to these forgeries to establish their claims.

2nd. The places in which they insist on the forgeries being received as a whole.

3rd. The places in which they adopt the doctrines and objects of the forgeries without naming them.

4th. How these forged letters were kept up as the law of the Church in after times.

The first two only can be considered in this paper.

We take now the 8th Epistle of Pope Nicolas I., written about the year 865, to the Greek Emperor Michael.

The case it was written about was this: Ignatius, Archbishop of Constantinople, had been accused of crimes, and had been tried and deposed by a Council at Constantinople. This method of proceeding was according to the ancient law of the Church.

Pope Nicolas then wrote this letter to the Emperor, to say that an archbishop could only be tried and judged by the Pope; that was the *new law*, as laid down by the forgeries of Isidore. Here, then, we find the Pope thrusting out the old law of the Church to bring in the new one.

Let us see now what his proofs were.

"If it further please you to know anything of this, which may allure you, order that the words of the ancient father and venerable doctor, Dionysius the Areopagite, to Demophilus, should be recited to you; who decreed that it was a wicked thing that a priest, offending even in a matter of religion, should be judged by those who were less than him, or inferior to him, lest anything out of order should be done in the Church of God, and its state should be confounded in anything. But hitherto we have shortly proved that our brother and co-minister, Ignatius, ought not to be judged by his suffragans and subjects, nor, moreover, to be easily reproved. But, now, it will not be irksome to us, nor will it be impossible to us, to show you, BY DIVINE INSPIRATION (if, however, you be willing to hear), that none can be rightly subject to judicial decisions by those who are of inferior degree or order. Since in the time of Diocletian and Maximinian the Emperors, Marcellinus, Bishop of the city of Rome, who afterwards became a distinguished martyr, was so far compelled by the Pagans that, having gone into their temples, he placed incense on the fire,† on account of which thing, a council of many bishops having been collected, and inquiry made, the Pontiff confessed that he had done this thing. None of them, however, dared to give sentence against him, since they all very often said to him 'Judge your cause with your own mouth, not at our judgment;' and, again, 'Do not be heard in our judgment, but conclude your cause in your own bosom;' and, again, they say, 'Since you shall be justified by yourself, or you shall be condemned out of your own mouth;' and, again, they say, 'The first see shall not be judged by any one.' Hence, also, the above mentioned confessor of Christ (Pope) Sylvester, made degrees in the bosom of a synod, 'that no presbyter should make any accusation against a bishop, nor any deacon against a presbyter, nor any subdeacon against a deacon, nor an acolyte against a subdeacon, nor an exorcist against an acolyte, nor a reader against an exorcist, nor a doorkeeper against a reader. Nor shall the highest prelate be judged by anyone, since it is written, the disciple is not above his master.'"‡

Our readers will see how many of the things which Binius says the forged Epistles are chiefly about, are supported by that one quotation in that passage of Pope Nicolas' letter.

The documents quoted in it are three:—

1st. The letter of Dionysius the Areopagite, to Demophilus.

2. The Council of Sinuessa, about Pope Marcellinus.

3. The II. Council under Pope Sylvester.

Those three documents are all forgeries.†

The letter of Dionysius the Areopagite is not one of the collection of Isidore; but is acknowledged by all Roman Catholics to be a forgery.

Neither is the Council of Sinuessa in Isidore's collection; but the decrees of Sylvester's Council are in Isidore's bundle. These two councils are, perhaps, the most outrageous forgeries to be met with.

There is a difference in the way in which Pope Nicolas quotes the two last, as compared with the first. He says nothing about "inspiration" when quoting the letter of Dionysius; but before he goes to the other two, he expressly states that he is going to prove his point by "Divine inspiration." The reason of this difference will become plain hereafter, when we shall have to show that one great object of these forgeries, and of the Popes who made use of them, was to have it believed that the "Decretal Epistles," forgeries and all, were written by Divine inspiration. Dionysius was not a pope, and therefore inspiration is not claimed for the forgery in his name; Marcellinus and Sylvester were popes, and, therefore, inspiration is claimed for the forgeries put upon them.

Roman Catholics, think of this! Pope Nicolas I. not only quotes these forgeries, but he vouches for them that they are given by "Divine inspiration." Are we not justified in having said, that we had STRANGE AND STARTLING THINGS to say about these forgeries? Who would expect to find a pope quoting them, and vouching that they were given by Divine inspiration!

If those forgeries were really inspired (which we do not deny), were they inspired by the God of Truth? Or were they given by the inspiration of the Father of lies? Is forgery *his* work, or God's?

Let us return to Pope Nicolas; before we leave this letter, we give one more instance from it. Pope Nicolas quotes Sylvester, saying: "Neither by the emperor, neither by *all the clergy*, neither by kings, neither by the people shall the judge be judged."‡ By "the judge" is here meant the Pope. So when Pope Liberius became an Arian (as we showed in our last number, vol. II., p. 142, col. 3, and also infra p. 10) it was beyond the power of the whole clergy to judge of that. They had nothing for it but to submit to the decision of an Arian Pope! But this quotation, too, is taken from the forged Council of Isidore, which we mentioned above.§

Again, in his 30th Epistle to the Bishops in the kingdom of Lotharius, in France,* Pope Nicolas quotes a long passage from that forged epistle of St. Clement to St. James, of which we gave a full account in our last paper. This, too, is one of the forgeries in the collection of Isidore, and this passage he gives as the words of *St. Peter* himself, related by Clement in his epistle.

Again, our readers will remember that one of the things that Binius says these forged epistles are about is this, "that priests are not to be injured *nor accused.*" And we showed in our last number that it was the object of those forgeries to prevent all accusations of bishops or priests, or, at least, *to make such accusations very difficult.* Let us see how Pope Nicolas carries out this object, and how he proves it.

First, for preventing such accusations, Pope Nicolas says—"Sixtus, the Chief-priest of the Apostolic See, is described to have condemned Euphemius, a Bishop, laying nothing else to his charge for deposing him, but only that he had made an accusation against his own prelate (or Metropolitan), Polychronius, of Jerusalem."† This was enough certainly to stop accusations altogether; but the document which Pope Nicolas here referred to (de Expurgat. Sixti Papæ III., c. 8¶) is a gross and utter forgery.

Second, if accusations cannot be prevented, they must be made very difficult; and so Pope Nicolas says, in his 22nd Epistle, to Salomon, King of the Britons:—

"We appoint that there should never be any condemnation of bishops, unless either before the legitimate number of bishops, which consists of twelve, or the sentence certainly proved by SEVENTY-TWO *fit witnesses*, who may be such as are competent to accuse, and who first take an oath on the four sacred gospels of Christ, that they will depose nothing falsely, as our blessed Sylvester and the Holy Roman Church is seen to hold."§

Our readers will see how well calculated this law was to make accusations of bishops *very difficult.* What chance could there be of proving any charge against a bishop when *six dozen* witnesses were required! We will show, again, how greatly this and such other things tended to have these forgeries believed and established. But our business now is with the use actually made of the forged epistles by the Popes. How did Pope Nicolas I. prove the necessity of seventy-two witnesses? He refers to Pope Sylvester for it. And we find it word for word in the 2nd Council under Sylvester, c. 3.,‖ which is also in the forgeries of Isidore.

Nor is Pope Nicolas I. the only Pope who has expressly quoted, by name, these forged documents in the collection of Isidore. His predecessor, next but one, Pope Leo IV., has also quoted that last passage, which Pope Nicolas quoted from Sylvester. We have but two letters of that Pope Leo IV., and in the second of these we find that passage given as Sylvester's¶ (Labbe & Coss., Vol. VIII., p. 31).

And the successor of Nicolas I., Pope Hadrian II., quoted them also; for when he was consulted about a bishop being translated from one diocese to another, he thus answers, in his 32nd Epistle:—"Since Pope Anterus says in his Epistle, when some consulted him about a bishop being removed from one state to another....." And then follows a long passage about St. Peter being translated from Rome** to Antioch, &c., &c., taken word for word from the Epistle of Pope Anterus,†† which is also one of the forgeries in the collection of Isidore.

When we come to show how the Popes adopted and used these Epistles without expressly naming them; and, still further, when we come to speak of Epistles which are most probably forgeries, though not yet acknowledged by Roman Catholics as such, it will be seen how greatly this list may yet be increased. In the meantime we think our readers will consider it proved that the Popes of the 9th century did quote these forgeries, and did appeal to them as genuine, in support of their claims.

But it was not merely by quoting them now and then that the Popes tried to have those forged documents believed and received in the Church. Pope Nicolas expressly insisted that ALL of them should be received and obeyed as laws of the Church.

After those forged decretals had been published, and

---

* See our last number, Vol. II. p. 137, col. 3.

† This was the great trial of the early Christians in times of Pagan persecution: they were required to cast incense on the fire on the altar in the Pagan temples, as a proof that they were worshippers of idols. In spite of Pope Nicolas, we do not believe that Pope Marcellinus really did this. St. Augustine, in his book against Petilian the Donatist, c. 16, disproves the story. How came Pope Nicholas I. to propagate such a calumny against his predecessor? We shall see a little farther on.

* "Sed si adhuc placet aliquid de hoc nosse, quod delectet, antiqui Patris et venerabilis doctoris Areopagitæ Dionysii ad Demophilum verba vobis recitari præcipite: qui etiam in causa pietatis delinquentem sacerdotem nefas sancit a minoribus, vel ab inferioribus judicari, ne fiat in ecclesia Dei aliquid inordinatum, et status ejus in aliquo confundatur. Verum hucusque quod a suis suffraganeis, atque subditis frater et comminister noster Ignatius non debuerit judicari, sed nec facile reprehendi, breviter comprobavimus. Nunc autem divina inspiratione non nos pigebit, nec nobis impossibile erit, ostendere vobis (si tamen audire velitis) non posse quemquam rite ab his, qui inferioris dignitatis, vel ordinis sunt, judicialibus submitti diminutionibus. Siquidem tempore Diocletiani et Maximiniani Augustorum, Marcellinus Episcopus urbis Romæ, qui postea insignis martyr effectus est, adeo compulsus est a Paganis, ut in templum eorum ingressus, grana thuris super prunas poneret. Cujus rei gratia collecta numerosorum concilio episcoporum, et inquisitione facta, hoc ab eodem Pontifice egisse confessus est. Nullus tamen eorum proferre in eum sententiam ausus est, cum et sæpissime omnes perhiberent, tuo ore judica causam tuam; non nostro judicio. Et iterum: noli, aiunt, audiri in nostro judicio, sed collige in sinu tuo causam tuam. Et rursus; quoniam ex te, inquiunt, justificaberis, aut ex ore tuo condemnaberis. Et iterum dicunt; prima sedes non judicabitur a quoquam. Hinc etiam superius memoratus confessor Christi Sylvester, fecit gradus in gremio synodi ut non presbyter adversus episcopum, non diaconus adversus presbyterum, non subdiaconus adversus diaconum, non acolytus adversus subdiaconum, non exorcista adversus acolytum, non lector adversus exorcistam, non ostiarius adversus lectorem, aut accusationem aliquam: neque Præsul Summus a quoquam judicabitur; quoniam scriptum est, non est discipulus supra magistrum.

Labbe and Coss. vol VIII., col. 306 and 307.

† That all the works that go under the name of Dionysius the Areopagita (the same mentioned in Acts xvii. 34), and this letter to Demophilus among them, are forgeries, see Du Pin, History of Eccl. Writers, vol. I., p. 52-54. Edition 1723. Dublin.

That the Counc l of Sinuessa is forged, see Du Pin, vol. I. p. 591. See also Constant Appendix, p. 27.

Pope Nicolas' last quotation is taken from the Second Roman Council, under Sylvester, can. 3 That this Council is a forgery see Labbe and Cossart, vol I., col. 1514, marginal note.

Our readers will, of course, understand that we do not give here *all* the proofs of forgery; but only such references as are sufficient to judge by.

‡ Neque ab Augusto, neque ab omni clero, neque a regibus, neque a populo, judex judicabitur.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. VIII., p. 305 and 306.

§ Labbe and Cossart, vol. I., p. 1555.

* Labbe and Cossart, vol. VIII., p. 433.

† Sixtus Apostolicæ sedis antistes Euphemium episcopum damnasse describitur, nihil aliud in depositione illius objicions, nisi quod Polychronium Hierosolymitanum episcopum pontificem suum accusaverit.—Nicolas ep. 8, Labbe and Coss., vol. viii., p. 305.

‡ This document is in Labbe and Cossart, vol II., p. 1275. That this is a forgery, see the Benedictine monk Constant, Epistolæ Rom. Pontif., appendix, p. 111.

§ Nullam damnationem episcoporum esse unquam censemus, nisi aut ante legitimarum numerum episcoporum, qui si per XII episcopos, aut certe probata sententia per LXXII. testes, qui tales sint, qui et accusare possint, et prius ad sacra Christi quatuor evangelia sacramenta præstent, quod nil falsum deponant, sicut nobis beatus Silvester et sancta Romana tenere videtur ecclesia.

Labbe & Coss. Vol. VIII., p. 509.

‖ Labbe & Coss. Vol. I., p. 1549. By this same decree, 44 witnesses were required against a priest, and 36 against a deacon! The ancient law of the Church was thus laid down by St. Paul himself: "Against a priest receive not an accusation but under *two or three* witnesses"—1 Tim. ch. 5, verse 19. Douay Bible.

¶ Du Pin says it is not certain that these two letters were written by Pope Leo IV., neither is he certain that they were not written by him. Eccl. Writers. Vol. II., p. 141.

** Labbe and Coss. Vol. VIII., p. 933.

†† Labbe and Coss. Vol. I., p. 630.

after he himself had quoted them (as we showed above), Pope Nicolas wrote his 42nd Epistle to all the bishops of France. It appears from that letter that the French bishops were refusing to admit the Decretal Epistles as laws; for Nicolas accuses them of having said "that those decretals of the ancient pontiffs were not contained in the whole body of the code of canons."* Nicolas goes on to argue that this is no reason why those decretals are not to be kept, "since among the canons themselves it appears that one decree of blessed Leo is inserted, in which all the constituted decretals of the Apostolic See (by which he means Rome) are so commanded to be kept, that if any-one shall have offended against them he may know that pardon is to be denied to him."†

We shall have to show hereafter what is the real application of such decrees as this of Pope Leo I., and how dishonestly they are used: it is enough to observe now that Pope Leo I. wrote it only to the bishops of Campania, in Italy, who, being within his patriarchate, were lawfully subject to his authority. And Leo I. wrote it 400 years before the forgeries of Isidore were heard of in the world. Yet Pope Nicolas brings it forward as if it applied to France and to all the Christian world; and he produces it as if Leo I. had intended to apply it to those forgeries which were not written until so long after.

That Pope Nicolas did produce it in support of the forgeries of Isidore is what we have now to prove.

After quoting that decree of Leo I., Pope Nicolas goes on thus: "But in saying ALL *appointed decretals*, he passed by NO ONE of the decretals that are appointed, which he did not command to be kept; and, again, in asserting of ALL *our predecessors*, he exempted NO ONE of the Roman Pontiffs who was before himself, whose appointed decretals he did not so command to be kept by all."‡

Now, considering that this universal confirmation *of all decretals of all Pontiffs* was made by Nicolas *after* the forgeries were published, *and after he himself had quoted them as true and* INSPIRED, is it not clear that what he here said was intended to establish the forged decretals as well as the true ones?

But we have further proof still that it really was the forged decretals that Pope Nicolas was labouring to establish, for he goes on thus: "The holy and most eloquent Pope Gelasius agrees to this most blessed Pope Leo, thus saying, 'We decree that the Decretal Epistles, which the most blessed Popes of the city of Rome, in different times, gave on the consultation of different fathers, are to be received with veneration' In which, it is to be observed (so Pope Nicolas goes on) that he did not say the Decretal Epistles which are reckoned among the canons, nor only which the modern Popes gave out, but which the most blessed Popes, *in different times*, gave from the city of Rome. But, *different* times being mentioned, the holy man comprehended even those times which, by the multiplying persecutions OF THE PAGANS, with great difficulty permitted the causes of bishops to be brought to the Apostolic See."§

Let it be observed that it is the professed object of Pope Nicolas here to establish the Decretal Epistles written by Popes *in the times of Pagan persecution*. Now, the Pagan persecutions ceased at the accession of the Emperor Constantine, in the year 306. It was, therefore, the Decretal Epistles written by Popes *before* that year that he was endeavouring to establish as the laws of the Church. And now we recall the fact that there are not now, and were not then, any Decretal Epistles of Popes who lived before that year, *except the forged ones*. We refer our readers to the table of Popes' Epistles, given in our last number, in which they will see that there are *only five* genuine Epistles of Popes who lived before the year 306—viz., two of Clement, and three of Cornelius: *none* of these are *Decretal* Epistles—that is, none of them profess to lay down *laws*. All Decretal Epistles previous to that year are forgeries. And if any one should say—"Perhaps, in the time of Nicolas there were some genuine Decretals, written in the time of Pagan persecution, which are since lost, and it might have been of them Pope Nicolas was speaking," we have witnesses to disprove this. We have a collection of Decretal Epistles made by Dionysius Exiguus, about the year 530, in which he professes to "have collected the constitutions of the former Prelates of the Apostolic See with what care and diligence he could."* And he could find none older than the year 385. To this collection was added, by some other person, about the year 730, the Decretals of the Popes who lived after Dionysius Exiguus;† and that collector, too, found none of earlier date. Another collection was made at Rome by Cresconius about the year 700,‡ and he, too, found none of an earlier date. In the letters of Pope Nicolas I., and the other Popes of the ninth century, we find no trace of their having had any Decretal Epistles older than 306, except the forged ones; we know that they had the forged ones, for they have actually quoted them. When, therefore, Pope Nicolas insisted that the Decretal Epistles of Popes, who lived in the time of the Pagan persecutions (that is, before the year 306), were all to be received, it is clear that it was of the forged Decretal Epistles he was speaking; and that those were the decretals which Pope Nicolas I. was labouring to establish as the laws of the Church. We ask our readers to consider now if we have proved these three things—

1st. That Pope Nicolas, and the Popes who preceded and followed him in the ninth century, did actually quote the forgeries, actually referring by name to epistles and councils which are now universally acknowledged to be forgeries?

2nd. That Pope Nicolas professed to produce these forgeries by Divine Inspiration!

3rd. That Pope Nicolas laboured to impose those forged Decretals and councils upon the Church as its law!

We might now leave it to our readers to judge whether the statement of Archbishop Devoti, on the one hand, that the Popes were no way involved in the guilt of these forgeries; or the statement of the Archbishop of Paris and the Jesuits Labbe and Cossart, on the other, that it was by the exertions of Pope Nicolas, and the other Popes of the ninth century, that the forgeries were established, be the true one.

But we have further proof still. The multitude of places in which the Popes of the ninth century have laboured to support the doctrines and objects of the forged Epistles, without expressly naming or quoting them; and further, still, the manner in which these forgeries were continued *for ages* as the laws of the Roman Church.

This will be the subject of our next paper; and we hope it will be found as deeply and as generally interesting, to those who seek for truth, as anything we have yet said on the subject.

THE HEIR OF BALLYMANUS.—No. I.

In the beginning of this century there did not live, perhaps, a better specimen of the fine old Irish gentleman than Denis Macmanus, of Ballymanus. Descended as he was from an ancient race of Irish kings, and professing the same religion as his numerous tenantry, he was almost worshipped by the people whom he governed with patriarchal sway. When he issued his commands, few of them troubled their heads to inquire whether they were in conformity with the law of the land, or with God's law either. Ill-betide the unfortunate messenger who should venture to execute the king's writ on the Ballymanus domains. But if you entered those territories without any legal or hostile intent, you were sure of meeting with unbounded hospitality. Little question was made who you were or why you came; whether your taste was for hunting, or shooting, or fishing, ample provision was made for your amusement; and in the evening you assembled, with a score of others, round his hospitable board, where the claret flowed like water, and where all was profuse abundance. It is true that if, in the simplicity of your taste, you preferred whiskey punch, you might not find it so easy to gratify your predilection; and some were ill-natured enough to say that this was because claret was got on credit, while whiskey and sugar had to be paid for with ready money. But you were little disposed for any captious fault-finding in the presense of one so jovial as your host. No man told a better story or sang a better song; and he had the art of making all about him thoroughly comfortable. His enemies said nothing worse of him than that his temper was a little warm, and it is certainly true that he had, in conformity with the habit of his days, been *out* seven times.

It may be imagined that such a character as we have described was not the most prudent manager of his affairs. Having found his estates but very moderately dipped when he succeeded to the possession of them, he had no difficulty in raising, by mortgage, such sums as he needed; and parsimony and self-denial not being among his virtues, this was an expedient to which he often had recourse When, therefore, contrary to what might have been expected, this hard-living, hard-riding fire-eater died quietly in his bed, in the fulness of a good old age, his son, O'Brien Macmanus, found the income yielded him by the estates which he inherited very disproportionate to the amount of his nominal rent-roll. He could ride for miles round without going off the property which called him master, yet, now that war prices were no longer to be had, it was only by unremitting attention that he could make both ends of the year meet, and, as he complained, he scarcely got agent's fees for the management of his own estates. O'Brien Macmanus was, indeed, a man of another school and another generation from his father. An active man of business, strictly just in all his dealings, and not apt to be liberal with money that did not belong to him, he was very far from being as popular as his recklessly improvident predecessor. It is to be hoped that he found in the bosom of his family some consolation for his inferior popularity among strangers. He was fortunate in the possession of a wife who idolized him, and four as fine children as ever man was blessed with—three daughters and one son, Frank, the hero of the present narrative.

Frank was universally declared to resemble his grandfather much more than his father. He was of an ardent, impulsive temperament; one who threw his whole soul into everything he undertook; an enthusiastic sportsman, and so adventurous a rider that his mother often trembled with apprehension for her only son, the sole surviving hope of the family; but his father declared that he would not have the lad checked; and the tenantry exclaimed that it did their hearts good to see fine old Denis come to life again. Frank was more than seventeen before he was called to more serious pursuits by a conversation which his father held with him.

"Frank," said he, "as long as you were a boy I have given you full fling, and allowed you to amuse yourself as you pleased. It is time now you should think of something else. With the blessing of God, I may live still for a good many years, and I should be sorry that you were dangling on here, living a life of mere amusement. You know how I have been crippled by the state in which your grandfather handed the property over to me; and now, were I to die, I must either leave your mother and sisters without provision, or else give the estates over to you more encumbered than I found them myself. It would break my heart if these lands, which Cromwell did not succeed in wresting out of the hands of the Macmanuses, were now scattered from us through our own improvidence. I have been fighting a hard battle to clear off some of our incumbrances, yet, I have made no progress, and the times are getting worse; so it is plain you must do something else to restore the fortunes of our house. I had been thinking of the army for you, which I know you would like best; but it is, really, too expensive a profession. Since I should find it hard to get the ready money to push you on, it is not a profession in which you would make your fortune in a hurry. So, I see nothing for it but the bar: and, really, considering what good abilities you possess, and how well our family is known, and how many there are who would be delighted to serve one of your name, I don't think you can fail to succeed. I don't despair to see you making a handsome income of your own, and that before you come into the property you will have gold enough to ballast these dirty acres from flying away, as they now seem likely to do.

Frank warmly assented to his father's proposal, and from this time a great change took place in him, and he became as ardent a student as he had before been a sportsman. In his natural disposition he had more genius for poetry than law; but the boy's imagination was fired with the thought of building up the fortunes of an ancient house, and he pursued the project with all the vehemence of his impetuous character. He was duly sent up to the University, not without many misgivings and warnings on the part of his mother, lest the purity of his faith should be sullied in that heretic institution. There, however, he found no one to trouble him with controversy, and the only way in which his early opinions were shaken was, that he found heretics, in close contact, not such repulsive animals as he had imagined from a distance. He found there, among Protestants, many honourable competitors and some warm friends, and several of the prejudices he had conceived to their disadvantage were unconsciously dissipated. He left College after a career of much distinction, and, with what he valued perhaps more than University honors, the reputation of being the most brilliant orator of the Historical Society. He was, indeed, in danger of being led to depend too much on his ready command of language, and on the glowing images with which his fancy embellished every case in which he took a lively interest (and that, in truth, was every case he undertook to defend); but he had fortunately some judicious advisers, who warned him that real eminence at the bar could only be obtained by hard study, and must have for its foundation a thorough knowledge of law. Accordingly, when he went over to London to eat his dinners, he entered a conveyancer's office, and, after some months of vigorous study, began to love, for their own sake, those intricacies of the law which he had at first regarded merely as the ladder by which he was to climb his way to fortune. He required, indeed, some little self-denial to apply himself to study as diligently as he did; for his father being a well-known member of parliament (the representation of his native county had been hereditary in his family since long before the Union), Frank received many invitations from old friends or political connections of his father. He went, however, but little into society, determined not to allow the seductive gaieties of a London season to encroach upon the time which he had rigidly set apart for study. His most intimate companion was an Englishman, named Cornwall, some ten or fifteen years older than himself,

---

* Quæcunque quidam vestrum scripserint, haud ita decretalia prisorum Pontificum in toto codicis canonum corpore contineri descripta.....—Labbe and Coss. Vol. VIII., p. 799.

† Quoniam inter ipsas canones unum B. Leonis capitulum constat esse permixtum, quo ita omnia decretalia constituta sedis apostolicæ custodiri mandantur, ut si quis in illa commiserit, noverit sibi veniam negari. Pp. 799, 800.

‡ Dicendo vero omnia decretalia constituta, nullum de decretalibus constitutis prætermisit, quod non mandaverit esse custodiendum. Et rursus asserendo omnium decessorum nostrorum, nullum Pontificum Romanorum, qui ante se fuerit, excepit, cujus ita non præceperit decretalia constituta ab omnibus custodiri. Labbe and Coss. vol. VIII. p. 800.

§ Consonat autem huic beatissimo Papæ Leoni sanctus et facundissimus in decretis suis Papa Gelasius, ita inquiens: Decretales epistolas, quas Beatissimi Papæ diversis temporibus de urbe Roma, pro diversorum patrum consultatione dederunt, venerabiliter suscipiendas decernimus. In quo notandum, quia non dixit decretales epistolas quæ inter canones habentur, nec tantum, quas moderni pontifices ediderunt; sed quas beatissimi Papæ diversis temporibus ab urbe Roma dederunt. Dictis autem diversis temporibus, etiam illa tempora vir sanctus comprehendit, quæ crebrescentibus paganarum persecutionibus ad sedem apostolicam deferri causas episcoporum difficillime permittebant. Labbe and Coss. vol. VIII. p. 800.

* Præteritorum sedis apostolicæ præsulum constituta, qua valui cura diligentiaque collegi.—Bibliotheca Veteli et Justelli. Ed. Paris, 1661, vol. I., p. 183.

† The same, p. 249. ‡ The same, p. 456.

with whom he became acquainted from occupying the same chambers with one of his fellow-pupils, at the conveyancer's just mentioned. Except on the principle that love is greatest between persons of opposite dispositions, it was not easy to account for the friendship between the two; for Cornwall was silent and reserved, cold and cynical. He was interested, however, by the young man's freshness and simplicity, and honest enthusiasm; while Frank looked up with unfeigned admiration to his friend's experience and knowledge of the world and literary reputation, Cornwall being well known as one of the most effective writers for a leading newspaper.

In this manner the months of Frank's first residence in London passed rapidly away, and the close of the season found him a little fatigued by severe study, and by no means indisposed for relaxation. Under these circumstances, he gladly accepted an invitation (which he possibly might at no time have had virtue to resist) from Lord Robert Blair, the son of an old friend of his father's, and who had himself twice enjoyed the celebrated salmon fishing at Ballymannus, to spend some time at Glenarvon Castle, in the Highlands, and thence to join him in some deer stalking expeditions. Having paid a short visit to Ballymannus, he rejoined his friend in Scotland, where one of his romantic character found abundant enjoyment both in the noble Highland scenery—then seen for the first time—and in the unusually exciting nature of the sport which he was partaking. There was something peculiarly captivating to his fancy in the scenery of those deer forests (forests, indeed, by courtesy), in those hills whose huge masses bounded his landscape, in those vast solitudes where the cry of the moor fowl was the only sound of life; so devoid of human habitation, that he could scarcely imagine himself still in the United Kingdom, and not in some untrodden prairie of America. Nor was he inaccessible to the lower pleasures of proving his skill in the use of the rifle, and of showing that in speed and endurance he was not surpassed by his more practised companions.

But our business now is not with the success of his sport, but with an incident which occurred to him after his return to Glenarvon, and not many days before his purposed return to the south. He was returning one day from a solitary ride when he was startled by the rush of a red deer, at no great distance from him, and at the same time by hearing cries of distress. The cause, as he afterwards learned, was as follows:—A gentleman and lady were driving in a little carriage through a part of Glenarvon grounds, accessible to strangers, when, on a turn of the road, they came full on the monarch of the forest, apparently prepared to dispute their further progress. Aware that it was a season at which it was imprudent to irritate him, they drew up, when he retired into a little hollow, on one side of the road; on their venturing, however, to proceed slowly forward, the deer, as if insulted by their nearer approach, charged full down on them, and plunged his antlers into the breast of one of the horses of their carriage. The wounded animal gave two violent kicks, and then both horses rushed furiously on, and, after a course of a few hundred yards, ended by overturning the carriage, fortunately before they reached a precipitous part of the road, where a fall might have been attended with more dangerous consequences. Frank, who had not been in time to be more than a helpless spectator of the catastrophe, hastened to render his assistance to the sufferers. He found the postillion severely bruised, both by the fall and by the struggles of the now nearly expiring animal; the gentleman, who was advanced in life, was also considerably shaken; the lady had escaped unhurt. Having given all the help in his power, Frank hastened to the Castle for further assistance, and soon returned, accompanied by Lord Robert, who expressed to the strangers his concern for the misfortune they had met with, and, in his father's name, pressed them to take refuge in the Castle for the present. Circumstanced as they were, they had scarce any alternative. The gentleman proved to be a Mr. Hartwell, a merchant, of London, well known for his wealth and princely munificence, who, accompanied by his only daughter, had been taking a tour in the Highlands.

When it was found that, beyond the loss of the horse, the accident would not be attended by any dangerous consequences, it afforded to the young people at the Castle no unwelcome addition to their topics of conversation. It was discussed whether the deer had come down to avenge the death of his slaughtered cousins on the hills, or whether he was merely enjoying his customary amusement of man stalking; but, above all, the singular beauty of the young lady, introduced into the Castle in so romantic a way, made Frank an object of good-humoured raillery. They were sure his modesty must have suppressed some part of the story; it was impossible that he had been a mere spectator of the fair lady's peril; he had surely engaged in single combat with her brute assailant, and, like the Master of Ravenswood, delivered father and daughter by a shot from his trusty rifle. And, to say the truth, before the few days of their stay at Glenarvon were over, Frank himself was strongly tempted to wish that he had made his entry on the scene in some more striking manner, calculated to give him stronger claims on the gratitude of his new acquaintance. Edith Hartwell was a person who, even encountered under more commonplace circumstances, was likely to fascinate a less ardent imagination than Frank's, and though much of her time was occupied in attendance on her father, who was more bruised than they had at first imagined, her filial solicitude did not lower her in Frank's eyes, and if he saw less of her on this account, perhaps he thought the more. He had no reason, however, to complain that the little services he had been able to render were unappreciated, and he received at parting a warm invitation to renew his acquaintance next winter at London.

Our readers will be surprised to learn that, although Frank was as anxious to increase his legal knowledge next year as he had been before, and although there could be no doubt that needless visiting would unduly encroach upon his time, still he did not neglect to avail himself of this invitation—nay, nor of others which succeeded it—that he found, as much time for prosecuting his acquaintance with the Hartwells, as if he had been the merest lounger about town; that he discovered that his health had suffered last year from too much confinement; that he, in consequence, made numberless journeys on the Norwood road, which, as he encountered no friend by the way, could, of course, only have been undertaken for the sake of exercise; that when over his law books fits of dreaming and castle-building used to seize upon him; even the singularly interesting Fearne could no longer enthral his attention, nor save his margin from being pencilled with occasional E's. In short, the honest youth was smitten with a disease from which many of his betters before him have suffered, and was, in plain English, desperately in love. Some, however, take the disease in a milder, some in a more virulent form. Frank was not one of those who can linger on for years in a slow fever, and before the summer days had come round again, his affairs had come to a crisis. We have no space to bestow on the details of his suit, but hasten on to the result.

And first, with regard to the most important person, Edith herself, Frank had in her heart a powerful advocate in his favour. By his first appearance he had relieved her from a moment of as torturing suspense as she had ever undergone in her life. When she extricated herself from the ruins of her shattered vehicle only to find her two companions insensible—uncertain of the extent of their hurts, unable to give them effectual assistance, and apprehensive of a fresh assault from the animal who had caused all their trouble—it seemed to her that the prayer which she murmured to heaven for aid was almost instantaneously answered by the timely coming up of Frank to her assistance. And it may be imagined that, with Frank's prepossessing exterior, pleasing manners, ardent feelings, and eloquent words to clothe them in, the impression first made was not effaced by a closer acquaintance. Frank's father, again, who was at the time in London, gave the match his hearty approval. He was sorry for the difference of the religion; he supposed the girls must follow their mother, but of course the boys would be brought up Catholics, and an heiress would suit the Ballymannus estate remarkably well. But other of the parties concerned were not disposed to look so lightly on the question of religion. Mr. Hartwell, although Frank had always been a prime favourite, and though his approbation had been given to the straightforward manner in which, before breaking the matter to Edith, Frank had communicated to him the exact circumstances of his father's estate, yet groaned with horror at the thought of his daughter marrying a Roman Catholic. Probably had his daughter pleaded earnestly with him, he might have found it hard to refuse her anything. But whatever Edith's heart might suggest, her reason was on the side of her father. Sincerely pious, and warmly attached to her own religion, she felt that a marriage with one who could not sympathize with her in the feelings which she held most sacred, could never be a happy one. The difference of opinion on points of vital moment must be a lasting cause of misery, and it was better to suffer a little at the time by struggling with her feelings now than to suffer all her life long. Accordingly she acquiesced in the decision which her father communicated to Frank, that though, in other respects, he had never seen any one whom he would prefer for his son-in-law, yet that difference of religion was an insuperable obstacle. This view of the case, bitterly unacceptable as it was to Frank, he found was shared by his own mother. "My dearest child," she wrote, "it grieves me to write what I know will give you pain, and I fear you will think me unreasonable to raise any objections to a match which has your father's approval, only that you must know I have nothing so much as your real happiness at heart. It would delight me to see you married to such a woman as you describe Miss Hartwell to be, if she were of the true religion, but I fear marriage with a Protestant can bring you no happiness, either in this world or the next. Only consider, dearest Frank, if you loved your wife (and I am sure you would never marry any one whom you did not love tenderly), how could you ever enjoy a moment's happiness when you must know that if death were to separate her from you it would separate you to all eternity. It seems to me a frightful thing to centre your affections on one living outside the pale of the true Church, out of which there can be no salvation. And believe me, Frank, you can have no perfect union with one who despises all we hold in reverence. Think what occasions for future discord you are creating. How can you ever agree, for instance, in the education of your children? She will not like to see her children brought up in what she will think idolatry, and you, I know, will never consent to anything so sinful as to allow a child of yours to be trained to despise the saints, and blaspheme the Mother of God, and be brought up to be lost for ever. It would be better for you, Frank, to suffer many a pang now, than to have such an one as this to answer for at the last day. But, dearest child, I would gladly think that there may be a hope of your obtaining your happiness in a way in which your conscience will find nothing to condemn. If she loves you as you say she does (if she does not she is not worthy of you) she must surely be willing to listen to the arguments for the truth of the religion you believe. Could she not be persuaded to see our friend Mr. Oldham? Surely some of the evidence which he found irresistible ought to have weight with her. If I could see your Edith thus brought into the bosom of the Catholic Church, there is no greater happiness than your union with her would give to your own fond mother."

This letter of his mother's, brought Frank to a pause and comfort. Up to that time, he had never thought seriously on the subject of religion, and had conformed carefully with all the observances of that in which he had been brought up, rather as a matter of course than from any strong feelings of his own on the subject. It pained him, therefore, to find, that in his mother's feelings as well as Edith's, the difference of religion was not so easily to be so lightly got over as he had imagined. But the idea suggested by his mother, of Edith's possible conversion, gave infinite consolation to one of his sanguine temperament. He founded on it many delightful dreams; and already enjoyed, in imagination, the triumph of bringing home, as his wife, such a woman as Edith, and one who had been reconciled to the Church by himself. So, having obtained a promise of assistance from Mr. Oldham, he wrote next day to Mr. Hartwell, entreating to change his determination; trying to convince him that the prejudices which he and his daughter entertained against his religion arose only from ignorance as to what he really believed; and imploring that they would not condemn him unheard, but would give an interview to himself and his friend, Mr. Oldham, and hear from them their own lips what their faith really was. This letter drew an indignant exclamation from Mr. Hartwell. "Why, Edith, he actually wants to make a Papist of you!" and vehement expressions of surprise at its being thought possible that he would ever consent to such an interview. Mr. Hartwell, however, was one of those persons who expend all their obstinacy in the vehemence of their first loud and indignant refusal, and who are not proof against subsequent continued entreaty. Edith, in particular, was never known to plead with him in vain; and when she gently urged on him the unreasonableness of allowing it to appear that they were proof against all argument, and determined to condemn Romanism without knowing why or wherefore; and the bad effects which such conduct would have in confirming Frank in his own opinions; when she represented to him how candid and fair-minded he was; and how likely it was, that if he could be brought in this manner to have a few conversations with good Mr. Peterson, the interview might have a very different result from what Frank anticipated; Mr. Hartwell at last gave way.

"But only on condition that Mr. Peterson is present," said he, "otherwise it would be too much to expose an inexperienced girl like you to the wiles of so practised a disputant as Mr. Oldham."

Even with this help, however, the combatants were far too unequally matched. Mr. Oldham was a man of considerable learning, of great ingenuity, of unsurpassed intellectual courage (no man could occupy with more hardihood a paradox which ordinary men would pronounce untenable, and defend it with greater ability); and having been a clergyman of the Church of England, it is to be supposed he was in full possession of all the arguments that could be urged on both sides of the question. Mr. Peterson, on the other hand, was a very sincere, zealous, but unlearned, little man, earnest and impressive in his pulpit expositions, indefatigable in visiting the sick and infirm; but he was not a learned divine. He was well acquainted with the Bible, but not with many books of theology. He had, it is to be supposed, read something on the Romish controversy, before being admitted to holy orders, but he had never come in contact with a Romanist since; nor did he at all understand how any one, who acknowledged the authority of Scripture, could find anything to say in defence of such a system.

The conference which took place was shorter and less satisfactory than the persons who had brought it about expected. Mr. Oldham manifested some disagreeable surprise on being introduced to a Protestant clergyman, and seemed little inclined to speak until Mr. Peterson, in a manner, challenged him to the combat.

"I rejoice, sir," said he, "to have an opportunity of hearing from your own lips your reasons for a change which, to me, seems inexplicable. I cannot understand how any one who has had, from his youth, the privilege of reading the Word of God, could embrace the doctrines of the Church of Rome. You must have known God's command, not to make any graven image or bow down to it; and yet, you have joined a Church which encourages the worship of idols, and throws God's command to that contrary into the back ground. You know the declaration of Scripture, that there is but one Mediator between God and man; and yet, you have joined a Church which has a thousand mediators between God and man. You exalt the Virgin Mary (of whom the New Testament says so little) to the rank of almost a fourth person in the Blessed

Trinity. You were taught in the Bible, that our Lord offered but one sacrifice for sin, and by *one* offering perfected for ever them that are sanctified; and now you teach that his sacrifice is repeated a hundred times a day. You were taught in the Bible, that the blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin, and now you teach that it is only a part of sin which the blood of Christ removes; and you have a dozen other inventions for cleansing from sin—masses, and penances, and indulgences, and purgatory; and, in fine, while our Lord commanded all men to search the Scriptures, you hide them from your people, and tell them they can be saved as well without them, and you only give them to them when you cannot help it."

Mr. Oldham somewhat coloured at this harangue; but he answered calmly—

"I do not know, sir, whether you expect that I should discuss with you in detail each of the passages of Scripture which, in your private judgment, seem opposed to the teaching of the Church. I content myself with replying, that the Church interprets these texts differently from you, and that, therefore, you must be wrong. Before I could consent to allow you to plead the authority of the Bible, on your behalf, I must learn from you what you know about the Bible, or where did you get the book you call by that name, and how you know it is inspired, and what right you have to interpret it?"

"Sir," said Mr. Peterson, alarmed at having the whole ground on which he was standing, thus summarily cut from under his feet, "I hope I have not to do with an infidel. I consider that the inspiration of Scripture is common ground, on which we both agree, and which I never expected to hear called in question by any one who had any right to the name of Christian. As for my right to interpret it, I imagine, that when God sent a message to mankind, he was able to express that message in intelligible words; and that he intended those to whom it was sent, should take the trouble to know it and understand it."

"Do not suppose," said Mr. Oldham," that I deny or doubt the inspiration of Scripture. I believe it on the firmest of all grounds, indeed, on the only possible solid ground, namely, the authority of an infallible Church. In the golden words of St. Augustine:—'Evangelio non crederem nisi auctoritas ecclesiæ me commoveret.' But then I receive all else that comes to me on the same authority, and I hold that she who gave me the Scriptures, has a right to interpret them for me as she pleases."

"Do you mean," interrupted Mr. Peterson, "that she has a right to interpret 'one Mediator between God and man,' 'a hundred mediators between God and man?' or 'the sacrifice of Christ once offered,' 'the sacrifice offered every day?' or 'the blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin,' 'cleanseth from a small part of our sins?' Because, if this be the case, the interpretation supersedes the text, and the sooner the Bible is got rid of the better. I might make a shift to believe on the Church's authority, that there is such a place as Purgatory; but as for believing that it is in the Bible, or that the writers of the New Testament knew any thing about it, this, as long as I have the use of my eyes and my reason, is a feat altogether beyond me."

"I have already said," replied Mr. Oldham, "that I will not be seduced off my vantage ground, to discuss with you the meaning of particular texts, nor shall I consider whether if it be true that the New Testament writers do not mention a doctrine, this is any reason why the Church is not afterwards to teach it; what I assert is, that I have solid grounds for receiving the Bible, and that you, who reject the Church's authority, have no ground by which you can believe, with the certainty of faith, that the Bible is inspired. You give your people the Bible, and tell them that it is the Word of God without offering them any evidence for it. Tell them, however, what you please, and, at best, they have the word of fallible man for it. This can give no certainty, and vague and slight must be the belief in inspiration which has no better foundation. The infidelity of the present day searches and tries all your so-called evidences, and finds them wanting. In short, no infallible Church, no Bible. If you abandon her guiding, doubt and disbelief are the necessary consequence."

"This is the first time," said Mr. Peterson, "I have been accused of neglecting to offer evidences for my belief. I should have thought that the proofs from miracles and prophecy for our religion, with which you must be well acquainted, are too strong to be shaken."

"Such arguments as those," replied Mr. Oldham, "are at the mercy of every new scientific discovery. Electricity and mesmerism are every day furnishing new implements for uprooting what you make the foundation of your faith.* Men can now explain by natural causes what was once deemed miraculous, and, outside the Church, reluctance to admit a miracle is the characteristic of the age. You yourself, though you profess to believe the Scripture miracles, reject other miracles, the evidence for which is as convincing."

"What miracles," cried Mr. Peterson.

"Why, for example," said Mr. Oldham, "to speak of miracles of our own day, the melting of the blood of St. Januarius at Naples, the supernatural motions of the picture of our Lady of Rimini, the miraculous appearance of our Lady of La Salette."

* Thus far Mr. Oldham appears to have borrowed all his arguments, and many of his words, from Dr. Wiseman's Essay on the Catholic Doctrine of the use of the Bible.

"The evidence for these impostures as decisive as the evidence for the Scripture miracles!" cried Mr. Peterson, his hair standing on end with amazement.

"Mind, I don't say there is the *same* evidence exactly for both," said Mr. Oldham. "*I* find the evidence for both conclusive; *you* reject the one set of miracles without any examination into evidence at all. Now, infidels, who do the same with regard to the Scripture miracles, are far more reasonable than you. There may be an *a priori* difficulty in conceiving of the existence of a supernatural power; but that such a power, once proved to exist, should go on exerting itself, is no difficulty at all. The Scripture miracles have broken the ice for all that follow."

"The evidence for the winking picture at Rimini as decisive as that for the Scripture miracles!" repeated Mr. Peterson, walking about the room, and not yet recovered from his horror; "unhappy man, if you are really sincere in what you say, God has surely sent you 'strong delusion that you should believe a lie.'"

Mr. Oldham rose with dignity; "I have been always averse to controversy," he said. "I only came here to-day at the earnest request of my young friend, in the hope of satisfying the doubts of a lady, in whose salvation he was strongly interested. I have been most unwillingly drawn into a controversy, from a continuance of which, in the spirit into which it has now fallen, you will allow me to say, I can anticipate no beneficial effects. I shall, therefore, crave your permission to retire."

He bowed and left the room, and Frank felt himself constrained to follow. They walked for some time in silence. At last Frank said, "I am sorry, father, that there has not been a better result of a controversy into which I fear I have been the means of entrapping you unpleasantly. And I fear I can scarcely ask you to come again; and yet I am most anxious to learn what impressions your arguments have made, and most desirous to follow them up, only that I doubt my own competence to do so."

"I see no objection to your continuing the controversy, if you have the opportunity, with the young lady herself; only, have nothing to do with that poor creature, Peterson. And the course you must take is very simple: do not be led off into discussing particular doctrines. Press her with the simple point of the necessity of submission to the authority of the Church. Show her that without an infallible Church there can be no certainty and no unity. Show her the infinite variety of opinions, some of them absurd, some wicked, into which those who reject the Church inevitably fall—and their total want of evidence for the authority of the book which they profess to take as their guide."

"But," said Frank, "this line of argument appears to me like sapping the foundation of the Bible, and like a cruel attempt to throw Protestants into infidelity."

"It may seem cruel and unfeeling," replied Mr. Oldham; "but it is infinitely more charitable than to leave Protestants to the repeated sin of blaspheming God's Spouse, and trying to undermine the faith of our poor Catholics.* No, the only way to force them to embrace the Church is to leave them no alternative but despair. It was this course," added he, "which made me what I am."

(Continued in page 8.)

* Here Mr. Oldham is stealing from Dr. Wiseman again.

TALK OF THE ROAD.—No. XX.

"Sore weather, Pat, for the creatures that hasn't the turf," said Jem, when they met in the snow.

"And mighty hard on some poor old-fashioned creatures that hasn't any little praties they had out of the ground yet," said Pat.

"Well, there's not many that lazy now, Pat," said Jem.

"'Deed," said Pat, "the old song is nearly out now, and time for it; you mind that, Jem:

> First there was three weeks of frost,
> And then there was three weeks of snow;
> And the praties was like to be lost,
> For want of a moderate thow."

"Ay, Pat," said Jem, "I mind having to sing that myself in old times. But the people is getting to look after things better, since trouble came on them. And not one thing alone; for aren't we learning to look after the Bread of life too?"

"But what will we do at all, Jem, about that man behind the doore?" said Pat.

"Why, then, I'm thinking, Pat," said Jem, "why wouldn't we just go to the Rev. Mr. Burke, and tell him out what the man behind the doore said?"

So off they went to the Rev. Mr. Burke (for the snow had stopped the work), and when they asked to see him, they got into his room; and he asked them what they wanted. So Pat spoke—

"Your reverence, we were in a house, and we were talking over what your reverence said about the candles, and there being no sacrament made at all when the candles wasn't made of wax; and that it was only bread and wine the people was worshipping when the candles wasn't wax. And there was a man behind the doore, listening to us; and he just come out on us, and said your reverence was wrong entirely; and that would only be a sin and a shame for the priest, not to look better to the candles, and it wouldn't spoil the mass at all; and so your reverence was out entirely; and then we just allowed we would come and ask your reverence about it."

"Well, of course, I might be wrong," said Mr. Burke: "I don't set up to be infallible: what I say is for people to examine and enquire about; not for them to swallow, right or wrong; and we ask Roman Catholics to come and examine it, and set us right whenever they can; but I will look again," said Mr. Burke.

So he took down the mass-book, and read it very carefully, and he allowed the man behind the door was right, and that if ever the bread and wine *were* turned into the Body and Blood of Christ at all, it will do with tallow candles as well as with wax, and that it is only a shame and a sin to the priest if he does not take care about the candles.

"So then," said Pat, "your reverence allows now, that if we could only be sure that if the bread and wine *could* be turned into the body and blood of Christ at all, then we might be sure that it *would* be done at every mass, no matter what was wrong."

"No," said Mr. Burke, "I did not say that. I only admitted that a mistake about the candles would not stop it; but there are other mistakes that *would* stop it; and that *would* prevent any man *ever* being able to know whether the change was really made at any mass, even supposing the change could be made at all."

"As what, your reverence?" said Pat.

"If the grapes that the wine were made of were not ripe," said Mr. Burke, "then, the mass-book itself allows there would be no sacrament made at all, and the people would be worshipping only plain bread and wine."

"And how would we know if the grapes were ripe?" said Pat.

"Well, now, that's worse again," said Jem; "why, if it was only the candles, sure we could see that for ourselves, if they were made of the right thing. But how will we ever know at all whether the wine was made of ripe grapes? Sure we can't taste it, and if we did itself, its hard for the like of us to be judges of that."

"And maybe the priest might be a bad judge of wine himself, too," said Mr. Burke, "and then only think what might happen, even if the mass-book is right."

"But how will we know if your reverence is right this time," said Pat, scratching his head; "sure you were wrong about the mass-book last time, and how will we know if you be right now?"

"Oh, Pat," said Jem, "havn't we the right way to know about it now? Sure won't we just take it to the man behind the doore, and see what he can say again it?"

"Quite right," said the Rev. Mr. Burke, "that's just what we want; that everything we say should be examined: and have we not asked the priests to come and hear what we say, and to correct as much as they can of it. And you may be sure they would do it if they could. I would rather you went to the priest and asked him about what I say of the wine; but if you cannot do that, just ask the man behind the door."

"Well, your reverence," said Jem, "it's better and better; for sure *we* durstn't go to ask the priest; but sure enough, the man behind the door can ask the priest; and won't the priest put *him* up to all he can? So now we are just in the right way to get satisfaction about everything."

So they were going away to look for the man behind the door; but Mr. Burke stopped them for a little more talk about candles.

"And," said Mr. Burke, "what about kissing the candles, boys?"

"Anan, your reverence," said Pat.

"What about kissing the candles?" said Mr. Burke.

"And what about that, your reverence?" said Pat.

"Did you never kiss a candle?" said Mr. Burke.

"No, your reverence," said Pat.

"Did you never get a candle, on Candlemass-day?" said Mr. Burke.

"Well, there mightn't be too many candles, and it didn't come to my turn," said Pat.

"And did you never see any one kiss them?" said Mr. Burke.

"Well, I did see the old creatures kissing their candles," said Pat; "but sure the mass-book would not tell them to do that?"

So, Mr. Bourke took down the mass-book, and opened it at the mass for Candlemass-day, and he read out the directions how the candles were to be sprinkled with holy water three times, and incensed three times, and how the celebrant was to distribute them "to the clergy, one by one, and then to the laity, all bending their knees, and *kissing the candle*, and the hand of the priest."*

"And it seems to be of more importance than you think," said Mr. Burke; "for here is a book to teach us *how* to kiss the candles right, and it is approved by Cardinal Wiseman, in England; so it ought to be right."

So he took down a book off the shelf, called "CEREMONIAL ACCORDING TO THE ROMAN RITE,† and he showed them this in the first page:—

* . . . Et aliis clericis singulatim per ordinem, ultimo laicis, omnibus genuflectentibus, candelam et manum celebrantis osculantibus. . . . Missal, p. 406, Ed. Coyne, Dublin, 1845. Oct. cum. approbatione ordinarii.

† Translated by Hilarius Dale, from the work of Baldeschi, "Master of Ceremonies of the Basalica of St. Peter at Rome." Published by Dolman, London, 1853.

"APPROBATION.

"We hereby approve of this translation of Baldeschi's work on the ecclesiastical ceremonies.

N. CARD. WISEMAN.

"Westminster, Aug. 2, 1853."

So, then, Mr. Burke read to them, out of page 159—"Before the celebrant turns towards the people, the second master of ceremonies should give notice to the highest dignitary of the choir, in order that, vested in the usual habit of the choir, without stole, according to a decree of the sacred congregation of rites, of Feb. 14, 1705, he may stand in readiness on the highest step, to give the candle to the celebrant. This candle is given to him by the deacon, who kisses it, but not the hand of the priest. The celebrant also kisses it on receiving it, and afterwards presents it to the subdeacon, who receives it with the ordinary kisses, and deposits it on the altar. The celebrant, having afterwards taken another candle," &c.; and so the kissing goes on.

"And, your reverence, was that always done in the Church?" said Pat.

"Well, I suppose," said Mr. Burke, "it could not be older than the blessing of candles on Candlemass-day."

"And how old is that?" said Pat.

"Here is a book, written by a very learned Roman Catholic, who searched for that," said Mr. Burke; "and he says he could find nothing about it in any of the service-books of any Church, for 900 years after Christ. But stay," said Mr. Burke, "the man behind the door might say I was wrong, so I will write it out for you to give him;" so he wrote them a paper, which we will print at the end of this.

"And will your reverence tell us what are blessed candles good for?" said Jem.

"I cannot tell you much about that," said Mr. Burke. "This book* says, indeed, (p. 233) that in lesser churches the priest 'sits upon a seat prepared on the gospel side (of the altar), covers, and gives an instruction to the people upon the institution of this solemnity, upon the mystic significations, *and the advantages of blessed candles*;' but the book does not give the discourse, so I cannot tell what is in it. All I know about it is, from a form of blessing candles, printed at the end of the mass-book (p. xcvii.) where the priest prays over them thus:—". . . Let them (the candles) receive such a benediction by the sign of the holy cross, that in whatever places they are lighted or placed, the princes of darkness may depart, and tremble, and fly in consternation, with all their ministers, from those habitations; nor presume any more to disquiet or molest those who serve thee, the Omnipotent God."

"And what does your reverence think of that prayer?" said Jem.

"I think," said Mr. Burke, "that God hears the prayer of faith; and the prayer of faith must be *founded* on the *Word* or *promise* of God. St. James says (ch. iv. 7, Douay Bible), 'Resist the devil, and he will fly from you;' and St. Peter himself says of the devil, 'whom resist ye, strong in faith' (1 Peter, v. 9). These are God's promises about driving away the devil; but no apostle says, 'light candles to drive away the devil;' if we resist him and pray to God to accomplish his own promise, *that* is the prayer of faith that God will hear; but if we light candles, and pray that candles may drive away the devil, *that* prayer rests on human inventions; it has no promise from God; it cannot be the prayer of faith."

"Well, your reverence," said Jem, "I think that's right; and if blessed candles was the thing to keep away the enemy of souls, would Christ and his apostles have left his Church *without them* for NINE HUNDRED YEARS?"

So Pat and Jem were going away, when Mr. Burke called out to them—"Will you go and buy blessed candles now?" And Pat answered him—"Your reverence, I would rather put the money in a Douay Bible: doesn't Christ himself say, 'I am the light of the world; he that followeth me walketh not in darkness, but shall have the light of life?' and wasn't that said before there was any blessed candles at all? And isn't *that* better nor candles?"—John viii. 12.

So as they were going out of the door, Mr. Burke said, "Now be sure you show the paper to the man behind the door, and tell him every word I said."

"Never fear, your reverence," said Pat; "we will surely."

So we think the man behind the door has it by this time; and whatever he sends us to print, we will print it, without even asking his name; and we hope he will get the priest to help him.

The paper given by Mr. Burke to Pat, to show to "the man behind the door."

"De benedictione cereorum nulla fit mentio apud Amalarium, Valfridum, et vulgatum Alcuinum, qui cereos tantum a Pontifice dari asserit. Sed neque in Gelasiano, Gregoriano, Gellonensi, aliisque supra nongentos annos scriptis sacramentariis aliquid ea de re extat. In antiquo missali ecclesiæ Taronensis ante annos 800 scripto unica *ad luminaria benedicenda* reperitur" . . .—(Tractatus de antiqua ecclesiæ Disciplina se," by Edmund Martene, a Benedictine monk. Edit Lugdun, 1706; p. 117.)

Which we thus translate, for the convenience of our readers:—

"Concerning the *blessing* of wax candles, *no mention is made* in Amalarius, Walfrid, or the Vulgate copy of Alcuin, who only states that wax candles were *given* by the Pope; neither in the Gelasian, or Gregorian Sacramentaries, or in that at Gello, or in others, written above 900 years ago, is there any mention made about that matter. In an ancient missal of the Church of Tours, written about 800 years ago (i.e., about 906), one only mention is found about blessing candles."

* "The Ceremonial," mentioned above.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

The great mass of communications with which we are favoured renders it impossible for us to insert everything we could desire as promptly as we could wish. At this moment several articles, actually in type, are necessarily omitted for want of room, though we have incurred considerable expense in giving some extra pages in our present number.

A letter from Mr. Rourke reached us too late for present number but will be inserted in our next. To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st.

We would request our correspondents, both Roman Catholics and Protestants, to limit the length of their communications, and not to discuss a variety of distinct topics in one letter.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

We have to thank several obliging friends for assisting us with copies of Nos. 2, 8, and 11, to complete sets of Vol. I. which is in great demand. Nos. 3 and 4 have already been reprinted. If any of our friends could oblige us with additional copies of Nos. 2, 8, or 11, they would be very acceptable, and might save us the heavy expense of reprinting them, which, however, we purpose doing, if necessary.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, JANUARY, 1854.

IN commencing the third volume of our periodical we feel that it is unnecessary to detain our readers with any lengthened statement of our plans and intentions for the coming year. Our course for the last two years lies before them; and the reception we have met with gives us every encouragement to pursue steadily the path we have hitherto trod. The principal object for which our paper was established was the discussion, in a candid and Christian spirit, of the momentous points of difference between Protestants and Roman Catholics. In the conduct of this controversy we have studied to exclude from our pages all intemperate and abusive language, and (as far as human frailty would permit) we have endeavoured to contend, not for victory, but for truth. We have ever felt that the errors of those who mistake on questions which concern their eternal salvation, are a subject for pity and not for anger; and we know that it would be a miserable victory on such subjects as these, to make the worse appear the better reason, and to gain a momentary triumph, which must be followed by bitter remorse hereafter. Accordingly, it has been our constant care to deal fairly with those who differ from us. We have cheerfully printed and given our best consideration to every letter which has been addressed to us by Roman Catholic correspondents, requiring only that such letters shall contain arguments, and not mere vulgar declamation or personal scurrility. In the articles which have emanated from ourselves we have always desired to consider the *strongest* arguments that could be advanced on the Roman Catholic side of the question; and we have sought such arguments in the authorized statements of that Church, and in the works of her best writers. Should our Roman Catholic friends find that we omit to notice any strong argument on their side of the question, bearing on a subject of which we treat, they may be assured the omission is not intentional; and they will do us a service (even when they may not feel competent to write on the subject themselves) by referring us to the places in the works of their divines containing the arguments which they may think we ought to have attempted to answer.

Our reason for the course we have followed is simple enough. It is because *truth* is our only object, and because we are persuaded that the more thoroughly truth is searched and examined into, the more clearly will its evidence appear. It is only falsehood which shrinks from the light and dreads to face inquiry.

We feel, however, that we have some reason to complain that we have got no assistance in our inquiries from those who claim the office of guides to truth for the people. We have addressed repeated invitations to the Roman Catholic clergy, offering to open to them our pages for a temperate statement of their arguments in defence of their faith. Since every number of our journal meets with many thousand readers, it might be supposed that such an offer as this would be acceptable to any of them who desired the extension of their religion, and who supposed that that extension could be effected by the use of reason and argument. But as yet, no Roman Catholic clergyman has accepted our offer, and we are forced to add, that the means which that body employ to secure the allegiance of their flocks is, generally, *not* the use of reason and argument, but the inculcation of blind submission to authority, and too often the suppression of free discussion by personal abuse, and, when practicable, by physical force. They surely must have some account to give for conduct so likely to raise a prejudice against them in all impartial minds—conduct not like that of men who knew they had truth on their side, which would bear to be searched and looked into, but like that of people who, for personal ends of their own, desired, at all hazards, to detain men in one particular set of opinions.

Some of them have endeavoured to explain the course which, as a body, they have followed, by drawing an alarming picture of the errors into which some, not members of their Church, have fallen; and by thence inferring that submission to authority is the only mode of preserving men in the truth, but that free discussion must lead to unbridled scepticism and infidelity. The fear of infidelity is one of the principal instruments they employ to detain wavering minds in their communion. To those who are inclined to doubt, they say—believe all we tell you, or you shall believe nothing. In their arguments with Protestants, several of their divines borrow their weapons from the hands of infidels, and in the recklessness with which they defend their peculiar tenets, at the expense of our common Christianity, remind us of the conduct of pirates, who would rather blow up the vessel of which they have unlawfully taken possession, than yield it back to its rightful owners.

We should never have undertaken the labour and pains which the conduct of this journal, for the past two years, has involved, if we had not some better prospect to look forward to than the fearful gulf of hopeless unbelief. It is precisely because we believe that we are ourselves in possession of truths which will make men "wise unto salvation," and which can be proved by the clearest evidence, that we invite others to a full examination of the grounds of our conviction. We are assured that the course we adopt is the only effectual safeguard against infidelity—the only way to give men a firm hold of the truth.

If a system is presented for a man's acceptance which contains truth, mixed up with error, how is he to separate the latter from the former, if he has always been in the habit of yielding a blind submission to authority? And when he discerns, as he is always in danger of doing, the falsity of parts of the system which he believes, will he not run the risk of rejecting the whole system together, and thus of sacrificing, perhaps, several important and fundamental truths?

The danger to which we have just adverted is by no means an imaginary one: it was fatally verified in France at the close of the last century. In the reign of Louis XIV. there was a large body of Protestants in France, and considerable freedom of opinion existed in that country. This was a state of things which found no favour in the eyes of the spiritual advisers of the French King. They never ceased importuning him to banish all the Protestants from his kingdom, and thus to put down freedom of discussion by physical force. Their efforts were but too successful. By the revocation of the edict of Nantes several hundred thousand Protestants were driven from France, and many of those who remained were forced, by the terror of death, to abandon the religion of their fathers, and become members of the Church of Rome. For a time, therefore, the system of enforcing a compulsory silence with regard to religion, seemed to have succeeded, and the priests and ministers of Romanism appeared to have every thing their own way. But what was the result? The human mind will not long brook the shackles by which authority would seek to restrain it; men must and will think for themselves. The intelligent part of the French population soon began to have a vivid perception of the errors of the Romish system; and having no practical acquaintance with any other form of Christianity, rejected all the truths of the Bible, and plunged into open infidelity. No amount of unbelief which has ever existed in a Protestant country can compare for a moment with the fearful spectacle which France presented in the closing years of the eighteenth century, when every feeling of respect for Christianity was obliterated, and when death was publicly proclaimed to be an "eternal sleep." It is absurd to suppose that this giant monster of unbelief could have sprung up in a moment: it was only the removal of the restraints imposed by the iron hand of authority, which then unveiled the doubts that had long lurked in the minds of thinking men, and having never been encountered by reason, at length hurried them to the most extravagant absurdities.

We now think that we have shown that by our readiness to "give a reason of the hope that is in us," we are not only no friends to unbelief, but give the most convincing proof of the strength of our faith in the truths which we profess. A man who believes that the piece of gold in his purse is genuine metal and of full weight, will be ready, when called on, to allow it to be weighed, and have its purity tested; and by doing so, he evinces his faith that the coin is what it professes to be; but the man who will neither make the trial himself, nor suffer others to do so, inevitably gives rise to a suspicion that he does not himself believe that his coin is pure, unadulterated gold. And so it is with the doctrines of religion. St. Paul admonished his hearers to "prove all things, and hold fast that which is good;" and those persons are no true friends to Christianity, but rather the reverse, who would deter others from following this precept of the apostle. We have shown above how Roman Catholic teachers lead their hearers to infidelity, by inculcating a blind submission to authority; and on a future occasion we will show how they do so more directly by the nature of the arguments which they employ.

THE HEIR OF BALLYMANUS.

Continued from page 6

When, however, Frank next saw Edith, he did not find it easy to carry on the line of argument which his friend had suggested. He found her pained and shocked rather than perplexed by the course of reasoning which Mr. Oldham had followed on the previous day. He found her belief that the Bible was the Word of God rooted too strongly for him to shake. She said that independently of all external testimony, the force with which its words had been brought home by the Holy Spirit to her heart, gave her assurance that it came from God; and Frank, though he did not think this satisfactory, did not like to distress her by questioning it. Again, he could make no impression on her by arguments drawn from the difficulty of understanding the Bible. No doubt, said she, there is much in the Bible that I do not understand: but is that any reason why I should not make use of what I can?—I can find my Saviour in it, I can learn from it the way of salvation; it tells me that it was written to make me wise unto salvation; every time I study it I draw from it fresh lessons in heavenly wisdom, and shall I be justified in rejecting them, only because my curiosity cannot be gratified on some points on which I might desire information?

As Frank found himself fail in making an impression on Edith, his own faith began to waver in one dogma which it had hitherto never occurred to him to question, the impossibility of salvation out of the Church of Rome. The more he thought of Edith, so pure, so gentle, so wholly free from thought of self, whose whole happiness seemed to consist in giving happiness to those about her, the more shocking he felt the idea that she must be lost for ever. Hitherto he had imagined that outside his own Church there might be morality, but could be no real piety; and yet it seemed to him now that the piety of Edith was as real and as sincere, her devotion as fervent as —— yes, he could not deny it—as even that of his own mother.

He ventured to ask Mr. Oldham whether it was certain that none without the Church could be saved. There can be no doubt of it, said Mr. Oldham, whose merciless logic never feared to look a consequence in the face. It is true that all our doctors make an exception for the case of invincible ignorance; and some of them, who seem afraid to follow out their principles, would fain represent all ignorance as invincible which has not been actually conquered. But in my opinion those in this country who have been called on to submit to the Church, and who have had full opportunity for learning her claims on their obedience, and yet refuse to submit, are absolutely without excuse. It may be very dreadful, but I fear it is true.

Frank's reason was without reply, but his heart refused to assent. He redoubled his endeavours, however to convince Edith, and finding that Mr. Oldham's plan of bringing her into the Church by the use of infidel arguments was eminently distasteful to her, he prepared to meet her on her own ground. For surely, said he to himself, since the Church has in each case decided rightly, it cannot be difficult to show that her decisions are agreeable to Scripture and reason, and history. And accordingly he laboured for several weeks at the study of the whole controversy with all his characteristic energy; but he was sadly disappointed in the result of his inquiries.

And when next he came to Mr. Oldham it was with the complaint. Father, said he, I find that whatever be the arguments to prove that the Church *cannot* err, it is more and more forcing itself on my mind that she actually *has* erred. I shall only mention two points which I have lately studied particularly. First, as to the canon. It seems to me as certain as any fact in history, that our Lord and his Apostles used the same books of the Old Testament Scripture which were admitted by the Jews with whom they argued; and that the canon of the Jews did not include the books which are called apocryphal, and does not to this day. I find that all the earliest catalogues of canonical books given by Christian writers do not include these books. The early Eastern Church is unanimous against them. In the west, the learned St. Jerome declares that the Church reads those books, but does not receive them into the number of the canonical Scriptures. Even those who do call them canonical regard them as inferior to the rest. In the Council of Trent itself the divines acknowledged their inferiority, so that it seems to me that the final decree of the Council on this subject is glaringly at variance with historic truth. Again, with regard to the religious use of images, it seems to me that if we are to take the words of Scripture in their plain natural sense, it is absolutely forbidden. The early Christians certainly understood it so; they would not tolerate from the heathen apologies for the use of images, precisely the same as those we are forced to employ ourselves; and many of them superstitiously believed the very trade of the statuary to be absolutely unlawful. I find images at first only introduced into churches for ornament, and for the historical information of the unlearned; and yet that even this innocent use of them was violently opposed by eminent bishops of the Church. I find the veneration of images only established, after the most violent opposition, at the second Council of Nice, and that by arguments the most absurd and unfair that can be imagined. And when I see the extravagant superstition to which image worship has given rise among the unlearned, it is forcing itself on my mind, that on this point also the Protestants are right, and the Church wrong.

Mr. Oldham listened in speechless horror, and then replied—

"I am deeply grieved, Frank, but scarcely surprised at the result of the course you have taken. The only question you, or any other layman, have to consider is, that of the authority of the Church. It is not for you to re-open questions which have been long since tried and decided by higher authority than yours. The only result of such a course would be to land you in hopeless infidelity."

"But," urged Frank, "these are all questions of mere historical fact, which I have studied with great care, and on which I think my education as a lawyer renders me peculiarly qualified to form an opinion."

"My dear Frank," returned Mr. Oldham, "suppose, now, that I were to qualify myself by several weeks' hard study to pass a judgment upon the Lord Chancellor's last decision, I have no doubt I could find plenty of ingenious arguments to prove that his judgment was quite erroneous: nay, I have no doubt that I could make out a plausible case to show that the whole law is a gigantic system of fraud, got up solely for the profit of the lawyers. No doubt, in my proof, I should fall into abundance of errors, which you or any other practised lawyer would detect at once; but, notwithstanding, my arguments would seem to the unlearned very plausible and convincing. But, however, do you not think it better that we should each stick to his own profession? I shall be content to take my law from you, when I want it, and, in the meantime, you may be content to take the doctrines of religion from those who are authorized to teach them."

Frank went away silenced for that time, but he returned some days after—

"Father," said he, "since our last interview I have been endeavouring to submit to the authority of the Church my own judgment as to the meaning of Scripture, and as to the facts of history; but, you will allow that the authority of the Church, to which so great a sacrifice must be made, ought itself to rest on a strong foundation. Now, I want you to assist in strengthening my faith in this great truth; for it seems to me useless to think of proving it from Scripture, since I know that Scripture depends altogether for its authority on the infallibility of the Church. I suppose it must rest ultimately on the evidence for the first miracles of our religion, and yet, you hinted the other day that infidels could explain these away by the help of electricity and mesmerism."

Mr. Oldham replied—"I know that some of our divines do appeal to Scripture in order to prove the infallibility of the Church, but I shall not be so inconsistent as to suppose that Scripture can have any authority without the foundation of the Church; nor shall I treat the texts which speak of the Church as if they were the only ones, plain, and evident, and easy to be interpreted by private judgment. Nor again shall I bewilder you by an appeal to miracles or prophecy: such a course, I know, must inevitably end in incurable scepticism. No, Frank, your doubts are not to be removed by reasoning; they are to be got rid of by penances, by believing, and praying. Surrender your mind to the truth: throw yourself into the system, and you will find the act bring its own evidence with it. A simple-minded woman, like your mother, to whom it never occurred to doubt the truth of our religion, has greater certainty of its truth than those who are able to answer the subtlest arguments heretics or infidels have invented—than Bellarmine, or Wiseman, or Perrone. The authority of the Church is not a thing to be proved by sorites, and enthymemes, and syllogisms; it is a doctrine which comes wafted to us in full tradition on the western breeze; and holy fathers re-echo it in intellectual expressions, and it is poured to and fro in broken harmonies, in closets and on the house-tops: and sacred virgins repeat it to us in their calm, sweet voices, and monks, spare with fasting, resound it in their deep rich tones; and it pervades us like an atmosphere, and fills every corner of each Catholic heart. And can heretics find evidence like this in all the works of Paley, or Grotius, or Chalmers, or Sumner!"

Frank was awed by his friend's eloquence, the general drift of which he understood, though, perhaps, he did not understand the exact meaning of each particular phrase; and Mr. Oldham went on to say—

"Frank, I fear that it is your heart, not your head, which suggests these difficulties to you."

"Nay, father," cried Frank, "there you do me injustice; the Catholic religion is twined round every fibre of my heart. I could not abandon it without doing violence to my earliest impressions and my heart's best affections. I should break the heart of my mother; I should wound to the quick my sisters and my other relatives, who look up to me as the representative of an ancient family, whose allegiance to the Catholic faith has never wavered. No, father, I can almost say that, be her doctrines true or be they false, the dearest wish of my heart is, that Edith could be prevailed on to embrace them."

"Then," replied Mr. Oldham, "my advice to you is, to withdraw your mind wholly from controversy; to content yourself with prayers to the Blessed Virgin for Miss Hartwell's conversion, and for the satisfying of your own doubts; and to practise the penances which, at your next confession, I shall impose on you."

To a certain extent Frank followed this advice: he was diligent in prayers and in the practice of austerities, some recommended by his confessor and many added by him-

self; but, except on condition of c[illegible] to see Edith, he could not withdraw his mind from controversy; and the more he thought on the subject the more his doubts increased.

His friend Cornwall, of whom we have before spoken, and whose ch[illegible]nders he now shared, had been the confidant of Frank's love for Edith, and had given his full measure of sympathy to his sufferings from the obstacles which had interfered between him and his happiness. He had also been made acquainted with his religious struggles; but on this subject he was scrupulously reserved, and cautiously abstained from saying anything. At last, one day, Frank broke out—

"I wish to heaven, Cornwall, you would lay before me some of the evidence on which you believe your religion; for I long to believe something; and yet it seems to me that an infallible Church is the necessary foundation for all religion; and since it is forcing itself on my conviction that the Church has erred, I find my whole Christianity slipping from me like a dream."

"Nay," returned Cornwall, drily, "I can only repeat to you Oldham's advice—believe, and do not examine."

"What," cried Frank; "this advice from you!"

"It is the only advice for your happiness, however," replied Cornwall. "If you once examine into evidences, you will surely end in infidelity. Oldham is an old College friend of mine, and we both came to that conclusion many years ago."

"Then, good heavens!" cried Frank, "if so, why are you not a Catholic?"

"I said, Mac, that the advice was necessary for *your* happiness. I did not say it was necessary for mine; or, perhaps, for I shall not pretend that my creed is a happy one, there may be other things I value more. However, I believe that a certain belief is necessary for the happiness of almost all women, and of many men, among whom I have always reckoned you one. And the only method I know of maintaining such a belief, is not to pry too curiously into its foundations. 'Where ignorance is bliss,' you know," added he, smiling.

"I can have no happiness on these terms," returned Frank, indignantly. "My happiness can never be the bliss of ignorance; it must have truth for its foundation. Yes! I agree with you," said he; "though I value happiness, there are things I value more. I value honour more; I value truth more."

"Well, Frank, my poor fellow," said Cornwall, "I pity you for what you are undergoing: I went through it myself once. I am not fond of talking of my history; but since you have forced it from me, you shall have it. It will not keep you long. You have heard a great deal of the converts that have been made to your Church, at the University to which I belong, but you do not hear anything of those who have been spoiled in the process. Grape-juice, when the fermentation is carried on a little too long, makes not good wine, but sour vinegar. The manufacturers then, I believe, throw the vinegar away, and say nothing about it. Oldham and I were of the same standing, and were great friends. We both sought for some deeper and more solid foundation for our religion than is afforded by the Anglican Church. We both came to the conclusion, that all examination into the evidences of Christianity must have anbelief for its result. But there we parted. The same medicine, you remember, which wrought a miraculous cure on Don Quixotte proved nearly fatal to his unhappy squire. I had an unlucky share of mathematics in my education, which Oldham had not; and this has given me the habit of asking for evidence, and not believing without proof. I cannot mesmerize my mind into faith, as Oldham does, nor browbeat my understanding into believing. My belief must be founded on reason and argument. It would be no recommendation to me to be told, such a person is a most worthy and excellent man, but pray do not inquire into his character, for as sure as you do, you will arrive at the opinion that he is a scoundrel. So, of the two alternatives, Popery and infidelity, Oldham has chosen one, and I the other. It is ridiculous to believe, that if the evidence for the Bible fails, any evidence for an infallible Church can be found. But I am wiser than some of my friends, and keep my doubts to myself; and, perhaps, if the truth were known, Oldham and I do not much disagree; and he does not believe more than myself."

"Oh! monstrous," cried Frank; "I cannot with patience hear you impute insincerity to a man so holy as Mr. Oldham."

"Holiness in your Church," said Cornwall, "is a quality attributed to those who can master the grosser bodily appetites; but you think too little of the virtues of the mind, such as truth and charity. That I am not unjust to Mr. Oldham, only consider the principles he has avowed during his whole life. Long before he left the Church of England, he expressed his approbation of the system of 'Double Doctrine,' avowed by some of the Fathers; of their *στρατηγία* and *οἰκονομία*: of their rule for speaking the truth only to those who are fit recipients, but when consideration is necessary, then being false or uttering a falsehood. And he acted on his principles. You know how, for three or four years, he professed himself a member of the Church of England, when he, in reality, held the doctrines of your Church; how he justified himself for speaking, not the language which he believed to be true, but the language which a consensus of great divines had made him safe in speaking, or the language which was necessary to his position. Now, when he professed his belief in the melting of the Blood of [illegible]narius, and to the winking picture at Rimini (things which I have heard you say your own father laughs at), what certainty have you that he is sincere? He may be only trying to 'throw himself more fully into your system,' or speaking the language which a consensus of your divines has made safe for him, or which is necessary for his position. How can you know that you are in possession of the esoteric meaning of his statements? Some time since he represented that our choice lay between Anglicanism and Romanism; that, if Rome could be resisted, it could be by no other means; and simple men who rejected, with[illegible] horror, the idea of his being a Romanist in disguise, thought such passages as these decisive proof of his faithful adherence to Anglicanism; and yet, now we know that his real meaning was, that Romanism was true, and Anglicanism only the least weak of all the attempts which had been made to resist it. In like manner, when he tells us now, that our choice lies between Romanism and scepticism, that if infidelity can be resisted, it can be by no other means, how do you know but that his meaning is, that Infidelity cannot be resisted at all; and that Romanism only supplies the strongest of those cordials, which weak minds find necessary to their happiness?"

By such insidious assaults as these, Frank's confidence in his former instructor was weakened; and the doubts which he had battled off before poured in again. His religious belief had hitherto altogether rested on submission to authority, and now that his faith in that authority had been disturbed, the whole fabric tottered from its foundation. When Cornwall told him that Christianity was not founded on reason and argument—that its evidences would not bear looking into—that it was a mere development of religious sentiment, but that its facts could only be received by those who would blindly swallow whatever their instructors were pleased to teach them; Frank seemed to hear over again, in a new form, the very lessons which Oldham had taught him before. Is it any wonder that, as Frank had before *believed* without reason, so now, pushed by Oldham and pulled by Cornwall, he began to *disbelieve* without reason, and was preparing to reject Christianity, without ever once having looked into the evidences on which it rested? He seemed to himself, too, to have been admitted to a kind of freemasonry, and to have suddenly become aware of the hollowness of the professions of many of his Roman Catholic friends, whose sincerity he had never questioned before. A few even confessed their scepticism, but said, that as long as they kept their doubts to themselves, and outwardly adhered to the Church, they caused their friends no unhappiness, and their priests were satisfied with them. And now, as Frank was settling fast into unbelief, the temptation came upon him—why should he be debarred from happiness by his profession of a religion which he did not believe? Perhaps had Edith been penniless, the temptation might have been a strong one; but he shrunk with loathing from the idea of appearing to barter his religion for gold. He knew, likewise, that a change in his outward profession would break his mother's heart, while Edith, herself, if she knew his real sentiments, would be rendered more unhappy by a union with him, than even if he remained a Roman Catholic. And he could not think of living in a life-long hypocrisy to her.

So his visits to Norwood became less frequent; and his spirits failed, gloom seemed settling over him, and he shrank from the subject of religion; for he could not bear to wound Edith's gentle heart by a profession of his true sentiments. And Edith marked the change, and hoped that it arose from a gradual change in his religious convictions, and her prayers for his enlightenment became daily more fervent. But all the time the cloud was settling deeper and blacker on Frank's mind.

At last he felt that the end could be no longer delayed. He wrote, in few and simple terms, that having given long and earnest thought to the subject of religion, he found it impossible to arrive at that unity of religious opinion with her, without which he could not hope to make her happy; and that, therefore, he was constrained to acquiesce in her decision that all must be at an end between them.

He had to write his letter twice, for his first copy was blistered by his tears; and then he threw himself on his bed, and writhed in agony. The blackness of darkness was upon his soul. He had been forced to abandon all those hopes of a brighter eternity, which once had afforded him glorious visions of bliss. And having lost his faith of happiness in the next world, he had now given up all his prospects of happiness in this; and his conscience seemed to tell him, that in both he had only followed the dictates of truth and honour. But he found in his heart an unutterable void.

(To be continued.)

Correspondence.

WAS POPE LIBERIUS A HERETIC?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Carlow, Jan. 2, 1854.

SIR—You have driven the infallibility of the Church to be tried and sentenced by historical facts, as you call them, and God only knows in what garb they have come to us. Are these human records infallible? Are they to be now placed above the immutable Word of God? Or are we to arraign the Holy Scriptures before an historical tribunal? Or are we again to make [illegible] a criterion? And if his veracity is found wanting by the cold tribunal, what is to follow? I have honestly and fairly challenged you to fight the infallibility of the Church of God with weapons from the armoury of God—the Scriptures. But these, as you have them, you have chosen for your arms of defence, and you think I will be mortally defeated if I meet you so equipped. The facts you have put forward are two—the creed, of course, from the written acts of the Church, from the first year of our Lord to the sixteenth century—and, if these said facts are proved no facts at all, may we then go back to Scripture. The last paragraph in your answer to my last letter, seems to be the point at issue. This position you have chosen, is dangerous ground; dangerous indeed as those you have made. It would be all very well and legitimate, no doubt, if you were treating on electricity or feeling with some abstruse theory on geology, *a priori*, then would be your proper course; by-and-bye we will be proving religion by the galvanic battery, as it is being tested by geology, but with what result is useless to enquire. Well, here we meet on your own historical domain. The first Council of Jerusalem, A.D. 351, *contained no heresy*. Constantius banished Liberius from his popedom because he would not confirm the Milan assembly, A.D. 356, he [illegible] now nearly three years confined at Berea, the Bishop of Aquileia induced him to sign the first formulary of Sirmium, and the condemnation of Athanasius *(which was of a legal nature)* without violating the Catholic faith. He came to Rome amidst the acclamations of the Roman populace, who cried out, "One God, one fold, one head:" the Arian Pope was driven therefrom. Now, being at liberty, and in his see, he condemns the Arian heresy, writes a letter of reconciliation to Athanasius—see Theodoret. In the year 359, the Arminum Council assembled to the number of four hundred; of those, eighty were Arians. The profession of faith that the Arians brought with them, the terms there concerning Christ, were Scriptural, though it could be construed into an Arian or a Catholic sense. The word consubstantial not being found in Scripture, the Arians artfully omitted; three hundred and twenty of the bishops rejected the formula, and anathematized Arius, his doctrines, and adherents; but Constantius ordered Valens, his faithful abettor, to direct his powers to gain the bishops, and Taurus, his wily prefect, to detain them in durance, vile at Ariminum, till they had signed the Arian formulary. Valens assured them, that he differed not with them in belief, only in the word "consubstantial," not being found in Scripture; he added, on their signing the aforesaid formulary, depended the peace and union of Christ's Church. After subscribing, they dispersed to their different sees; but finding the Arians had published a creed, in the Arian sense of the word, they immediately wrote against it, denying that they had agreed to it, or signed it, as published by Valens, &c., but thought that the divinity of Christ was fully borne out in the body of the creed, without the word consubstantial. It is not my intention to gloss over the weak actions of those bishops, for I find them *fully condemned by Pope Liberius*, and the bishops of Italy, Britain, Gaul, Dalmatia, Greece, Africa, the Islands, and nearly all the Oriental Churches. Now, here were four hundred bishops at this Council of Ariminum, *without the Pope*—a body without a head! At this time there were *upwards of two thousand bishops in the Christian Church*, scattered as they were in the above countries; deducting the Arminum Council from the full number of bishops, leaves upwards of one thousand six hundred, with their lawful head, Pope Liberius, condemning the actions of the said Council of Ariminum (see Athanasius's letter to the Emperor Jovinian). Can it be said now of the saint, with any truth, that he stood alone? I maintain there is no analogy between him and Luther; he (Luther) left the body of the Church, Athanasius stood with it. I defy any man to prove that Liberius sinned against faith; he was somewhat temporising in his actions, as seen above. The Church flourished during his pontificate, as you will find. —Fact number one disposed of.

The case of Berengarius, placed in your columns, for the last three months, as a difficulty to Roman Catholics, as regards the infallibility of their Church, surprises me very much, and the silence of "Philalethes" may seem to you a confirmation of it. I make bold to say it is no difficulty at all to "Philalethes," whoever he may be. The word "consubstantial," placed in italics, is set forward as the touchstone of infallibility. You contend that this word can mean nothing else than this—In a way that our senses can judge as I perceive; but can you contend that the bishops meant nothing else? Berengarius is well known in ecclesiastical history by his falling into this pestiferous heresy, which brings his name before us now, and was (his heresy) unknown to the Christian Church up to his time? This heresiarch was of a vacillating disposition; for, when cited to appear before a council, was sure to recant, and consume his writings on the subject, showing all the demonstrations of repentance. The Bishops at Rome [illegible] this formula (your second fact); it was put in this stringent form, that the wily man could not get out of it, and when subject to the Catholic sense, is purely orthodox. An isolated word or passage, without the aid of the context, or spirit of the treatise that it is taken from, stands very awkward in the hands of an unfriendly critic. The word

sensualiter is there set down in opposition to Berengarius's spiritual presence, not in the Caphanite* sense of the word; for we have proof positive it could not, as the good bishops then had. One of our senses hears the word, "this is my body," and we believe it sensibly [aye, burns into the very soul]. This sense hears, the word was made flesh, and we believe it true, and so of all the great dogmas of Christian belief; and I may ask by what other channel does religion come to us but by this sense of hearing? What has the feeling of touch to do with it, the sense of smell to do with it, or sight, or taste? We hear and believe—and this is said to be Protestant doctrine.—Fact number two disposed of.

I am, dear sir, yours respectfully,

A ROMAN CATHOLIC.

We ask our correspondent to consider the purpose for which we called on Roman Catholic controversialists "to deal with infallibility as a matter of fact; has the Church of Rome, in fact, been always infallible?" Putting the question thus does *not* imply that men can be infallible judges of the truth or falsehood of what God reveals. It does *not* "make Christ a criminal."

But all men do and must form some judgment, one way or the other, whether the Church of Rome be really infallible or not. And we think that every man who undertakes to support either side of the question, may fairly be required to say whether he does actually believe in the practical truth of that which he tries to support in argument. "Philalethes" brought forward the decision of Pope Nicolas II., and his 113 bishops, about Berengarius, as an infallible decision. We put it to "Philalethes" to say, "did he really believe that decision of Pope Nicolas II. and his council to be true and infallible?" and "Philalethes" has never ventured to say that he does believe it to be infallible. We call that dealing with infallibility as a question of fact; and we cannot see how it "arraigns the Holy Scriptures before an historical tribunal," or "makes Christ a criminal."

Our correspondent, however, undertakes to answer on two matters of fact; and his doing so does seem to us to prove, that he does not really feel that method of argument to be so very impious and wicked as he states it to be.

First, He enters, in a long argument, to prove that Pope Liberius did not give in to Arianism. But in that argument he never once alludes to the main document, which we produced—namely, Pope Liberius's *own letter*, in which he condemns Athanasius, and professes communion with the Arian bishops. We give that quotation here again:—

"I do not defend Athanasius . . . . when I knew that you had justly condemned him, since it was pleasing to God, I afterwards supplied my consent to your sentence; and, in addition, I gave letters to be brought to the Emperor Constantius, by our brother Fortunatianus, concerning him (Athanasius) by name—that is, concerning his condemnation. Therefore, Athanasius being removed, all your decrees concerning whom will be reverenced by me, together with the Apostolic See, I say that I have peace and unity with all of you, and with all the Eastern bishops, and through all the provinces."†

Our correspondent undertakes to prove that Pope Liberius did not give in to Arianism: but he does not venture to notice this letter.

To make this matter plain to him, we call his attention to the fact that the Emperor Constantius, to whom Pope Liberius wrote to say that he had condemned Athanasius, was himself an Arian, bent on establishing Arianism in the Church. Was that the man to whom a Pope should write, "That he had condemned Athanasius?" And the Eastern bishops, to whom the Pope wrote that letter, and *with whom* he professes to be now in *peace and unity*, were also Arians! Was this not becoming an Arian?

But to help our correspondent a little more to understand that letter of Pope Liberius, we give him here the opinion of Severinus Binius, Archbishop of Cologne, upon that letter. Our readers will remember that this Binius was the man who tried to defend the forged epistles when all others were giving them up; and they may be sure he would not give up the case about Liberius, if there was any chance of being able to deny it. And here is what he says on that letter:—

"This is that true and genuine epistle of Liberius, which, being basely and shamefully overcome by the tediousness of exile, and the fear of death (after two years of exile, and Felix being substituted for him in the pontifical see), he wrote to the Easterns, signifying that he approved the sentence given against Athanasius by their suffrages—*that he admitted the Arians to his communion*, and approved as Catholic the confession of faith published at Sirmium."‡

In that same place, Binius quotes (among other ancient testimonies) St. Jerome, speaking of the matter thus:—

"Liberius being conquered by the tediousness of exile, subscribing to HERETICAL pravity, entered Rome as a victor."§

Where, note, that St. Jerome says nothing of the fear of death; for which, indeed, there was no ground: it was exile that made Liberius subscribe to heresy; and, subscribing to heresy, enabled him to triumph as *Pope*, over his rival.

It was but natural that our correspondent should avoid noticing a letter which even Binius could only notice with such a confession; but our correspondent must try his hand again, if he would prove that Liberius never fell into Arianism. And we beg of our correspondent not again to overlook that letter of Pope Liberius, which tells us about it.

2nd. Our correspondent undertakes to answer for "Philalethes" (which "Philalethes" has not attempted to do for himself), about the confession which Pope Nicolas II. and the Roman Council compelled Berengarius to sign. We stated, that the Pope and Council compelled Berengarius to say—that the true body and blood of Christ was "in a sensible manner (sensualiter) handled by the hands of the priest, broken and ground by the teeth of the faithful." Our correspondent does not deny that they *said* this, and made Berengarius say it; but he asks, "Can you contend that the bishops *meant* nothing else?" Well, in our simplicity, we thought an infallible tribunal *must* mean what it said. Just consider the position of a Church, with an infallible tribunal, liable *to say* something quite different from what it *meant!* In that case, every man must judge of the truth for himself *before* he can venture to hear the infallible tribunal; and when he hears it, he must be prepared to say, "This infallible tribunal has *said* what was wrong; it must have *meant* something else." Surely, such a tribunal would be a snare, and not a help.

Just take this instance. The tribunal *said*, that the body of Christ is, "*in a sensible manner*, handled by the hands of the priest, broken and ground by the teeth of the faithful." Oh, no! says our correspondent, the tribunal *meant* to say, "that it is the sense of hearing which hears the word, 'this is my body!'" So, if you change *every other word* in the sentence, then the great word *sensualiter* may safely and properly stand in the sentence, but not otherwise. For our part, we would rather seek for the meaning of the Word of God, than have to make such wild guesses at the meaning of an infallible tribunal which cannot even *say what it means.*

Our correspondent concludes thus:—"I may ask, by what other channel does religion come to us, but by this sense of hearing? *What has the feeling of touch* to do with it?

We answer this from the Douay Bible (Luke xxiv. 39), where our Saviour said to his disciples who doubted about the truth of his resurrection, "HANDLE and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as you see me to have."

We hold this up to our Roman Catholic readers, as a solemn warning, that they who undertake to maintain the evidence of transubstantiation, are driven to deny the proof on which our Saviour himself placed the fundamental doctrine of his religion—even his own resurrection!

POSTSCRIPT TO "PHILALETHES."

It was our correspondent "Philalethes" who first brought forward in our pages the case of Berengarius and the infallible decision of Pope Nicolas and his council. Four letters of "Philalethes," on this subject, were received and inserted by us in the past year:—1st, in January, page 9; 2nd, in July, page 81; 3rd, in September, page 104; 4th, in November, page 129. In our observations on the last two, page 105, and page 130, we called on "Philalethes," in the plainest terms, to answer this question:—"Does he think that the Pope and council were right, or does he think that they were wrong?" *He has not answered this;* and both our December and January numbers have now appeared, since we last called on him to answer, without our getting any reply to this question.

It does strike us as very strange that "Philalethes" should produce the judgment of a Pope and Council, as a decision that must be true, and yet that, when we ask him "does he really himself believe it to be true," he should not have one word to answer.

We now beg, in a friendly manner, to represent to "Philalethes" the *appearance* which his correspondence must present to ourselves and others, if he allows it to come to an end in so unsatisfactory a way.

What can we or our correspondents think but this—that while "Philalethes" was actually arguing for the infallibility of Pope and Council, he had in his own mind a secret consciousness that both Pope and Council together were fallible and wrong?

What can we think of his last letter, but that he was striving to throw dust in other people's eyes, to prevent their seeing what he himself did feel—that Pope and Council together are fallible and liable to err?

Sorry should we be to think this of any of our correspondents. We do not think it yet; we know what allowance is to be made for men; we know how far theories may impose on us, till we come to test them by facts. But we do, in a friendly and earnest manner, represent to "Philalethes," that the only way he can now free himself from this appearance of insincerity, is to come forward and state in our pages, whether he think Pope Nicolas II. and his Council were *right* or *wrong* in the confession which they compelled Berengarius to sign. Our pages are open to him still, to set himself right.

ON DEFECTS IN THE MASS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I do not know whether I should attribute to ignorance or intention the numerous errors concerning the celebration of mass which are to be found in "Talk of the Road," No. XIX., which appears in your December number of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN. It will be generally allowed, that among the members of the Catholic Church no doubt or hesitation is felt as to the efficacy of that holy sacrament as it is presented to their faithful view. It is not, therefore, to be wondered at that those who wish to turn them from their religion use their best endeavours to inject doubts and scruples into the minds of the ignorant and unwary, as to the sublime truth contained in this capital doctrine of the Catholic faith—the real presence of Christ in the sacrament of the mass, as they see it daily administered. But, to the point. In the latter part of this "Talk of the Road" Mr. Burke ("missioner"), is represented as drawing out of his pocket a Roman Missal, at a controversial class meeting, and handing it to a certain Mickey Reilly, a "very learned man," as the story tells; but, surely, a very ignorant man, as the sequel will show, with the request that he would read out for the meeting, into English, that passage of the rubric concerning defects in the celebration of mass, which states that wax candles should be present. The words are—"Si non adsint luminaria cerea." It is contained in article X. of the rubric, the title of which is, "De defectibus in ministerio ipso occurrentibus." This passage produced a great effect on Mickey, and still greater on the meeting; for we find, according to the report, that one Barney Daly stated that, often as he had heard mass in the poorhouse he could not be certain whether it was a mere wafer or the true sacrament he worshipped; nay, rather, he might be sure of the contrary; for the opinion of the meeting, and of the learned Mickey Reilly, sanctioned by the missioner, was, that if wax candles were not present, "the sacrament is'nt made at all." Now, this missioner had either read the rubric, or he had not. If the latter, he was guilty of great presumption in taking the Missal out of his pocket at all. If the former, I will show that he was guilty of great dishonesty in leaving his poor hearers under a great delusion. I shall have to trouble you, sir, and your readers, to attend to a somewhat lengthy quotation from the rubric. It is, in fact, the preface at length. "Sacerdos celebraturus, omnem adhibeat diligentiam, ne desit aliquid ex requisitis ad sacramentum Eucharistiæ conficiendum. Potest autem defectus contingere ex parte materiæ consecrandæ, et ex parte formæ adhibendæ, et ex parte ministri conficientis. Quidquid enim horum deficit, scilicet materia debita, forma cum intentione, et ordo sacerdotalis in conficiente, non conficitur sacramentum. Et his existentibus quibuscumque aliis deficientibus, veritas adest sacramenti. Alii vero sunt defectus qui in missæ celebratione occurrentes etsi veritatem sacramenti non impediant, possunt tamen aut cum peccato aut cum scandalo contingere." Of which the following is a literal translation:—

"Let the priest about to celebrate use all diligence, that nothing be wanting of those things which are required to make the sacrament of the Eucharist. A defect can occur in respect of the matter to be consecrated, in respect of the form to be used, and in respect of the minister who performs; for, whatever of these be wanting, to wit, the proper matter, the form with intention, and priestly order in him who performs, no sacrament is made. *Yet these* (viz., three conditions) *existing, although certain other things be wanting, the true sacrament is present. There are other defects which may occur in the celebration of mass, although they do not hinder a true sacrament; when they do happen, they must be called a sin or a scandal.*"

From this, then, it appears, that the conditions essential to a true sacrament are—1st. "Materia debita;" 2nd. "Forma cum intentione;" 3rd. "Ordo sacerdotalis in conficiente." In the tenth article of the rubric, there occurs the mention of a great number of defects, in the lower sense of the word, which cannot occur in the celebration, without great offence or culpable negligence on the part of the priest. Among these occur wax candles. "Si non sint luminaria cerea." I have no doubt, nor can any sensible Catholic have a doubt, that tallow candles, or "dips," as they are contemptuously called, would, under the exigency of the case in question, here answer as well as wax, for the service of the mass to the faithful poor.

Having stated the case, and its refutation, without touching on other topics in No. XIX., on which much could be said,

I remain, sir, your obedient Servant,

A CATHOLIC.

We think our correspondent quite right upon the point of the candles. We think that the word "defect," is used in the rubric of the mass, for things that *do* prevent transubstantiation taking place, and *also* for things that *do not* prevent transubstantiation taking place. And this double use of the word in that rubric has led other Protestants into an error, as well as Mr. Burke, the missioner.*

We have often invited Roman Catholics to correct any erroneous statement about their religion that may appear in our pages; and we thankfully accept at their hands any such correction. We are sure that it will give confidence and satisfaction to our readers to see, that what we publish

---

* Sic. in MS. Query Capharnaite?

† Labbe and Coss., vol. ii., p. 751. Ed. Paris, 1672. The Latin was given in our number for December, p. 142, col 3, note.

‡ Hæc est vera illa et germana epistola Liberii, quam tædio exilii mortisque metu turpiter et ignominiose superatus, post exactum biennium Exilii, Felicemque in sede pontificia subrogatum, scripsit ad orientales, significans se latam contra Athanasium sententiam suo suffragio comprobare, Arianos ad communionem admittere, editamque Sirmii professionem fidei, veint Catholicam approbare.—Given by Labbe and Cossart, in the place referred to above.

§ Liberius tædio victus exilii, in hæreticam pravitatem subscribens, Romam quasi victor intravit. Same reference.

* See supra, page 6.

is thus carefully watched, and corrected, when we do publish anything requiring correction. They will then know that what stands uncorrected and unquestioned may be relied on.

We think the notion among Protestants, of the necessity of wax candles at the mass has arisen latterly from the general demand made for them from the Boards of Guardians of workhouses, since Protestants called attention to the necessity for them.* And hence it was too hastily assumed, that the object of their anxiety was to remedy a "defect" that was fatal to the mass, and not merely a "defect" which only involved (to use our correspondent's own words) a "*great offence or culpable negligence on the part of the priest.*" And sufficient care has not always been given to ascertain the precise value of the "defect" from "the rubric of the mass," which certainly is not the simplest document in the world.

Having now frankly admitted the error which appeared in our pages (as we shall always be ready to do), we ask our correspondent to consider as frankly the real effect of the correction of such an error; we ask him to do so, because he seems inclined to build more on it than it can carry. He seems to take for granted, that he has now proved "that among the members of the (Roman) Catholic Church, no doubt or hesitation is felt (or need be) as to the efficacy of that holy sacrament, as it is presented to their faith." Now, we frankly admit, that (IF *transubstantiation be really true, and if the rubrics of the mass may be relied on with* DIVINE FAITH) no Roman Catholic need have any doubt or hesitation, *so far as the candles are concerned.* But is it still a question, whether they ought not reasonably to feel some doubt and hesitation *upon other points*, as to *what it really is* to which they give divine worship?

Our correspondent is evidently a perfect master of this rubric, and we beg to ask his opinion on the following case. Suppose that the wine used was not really made of grapes (de vite), or suppose the wine had been made from sour or unripe grapes (de uvis acerbis, seu non maturis expressum), is the sacrament "made" in that case? We expect our correspondent will admit, that in such a case the bread is NOT changed into the body of Christ, and the wine is NOT changed into the blood of Christ. In that case, then, the people give to *mere* bread and wine "the worship of Latria, which is due TO THE TRUE GOD.† Now, what knowledge have the people whether the wine was made from grapes that were ripe, or from grapes that were not ripe? or whether the wine was made from grapes at at all? They cannot judge of that for themselves, for they are never allowed to taste the wine. They must trust to the priest for that. Can they be sure of his judgment? They do not *see* the priest taste it until *after* he has consecrated it. Can they be *sure* that the priests, who have committed "great offence or culpable negligence" about the candles, did always taste the wine? And if the priest did taste the wine, is every priest an *infallible* judge of the fact, whether the grapes, from which that wine was made, were really ripe or not? We believe it to be a fact (and we mention it only as a fact, and not as an offence), that the usual beverage of an Irish priest is whisky-punch; and that many of them seldom taste wine in their lives. How can they be judges of whether the grapes were ripe or not? It is also notorious, that most of the wine sold in country towns in Ireland was never made of grapes at all, but concocted in this country. And this manufacture is brought to such perfection, that even a good judge of wine cannot tell, with certainty, whether it is made of grapes or not.

How is the wine provided for mass in the workhouses? We believe it is generally paid for out of the rates, and purchased by the master's boy in the next shop in a country town; a shop in which, perhaps, no wine really made of grapes was ever sold.

Yet, our correspondent must confess, that if that wine be not really made of grapes, and of ripe grapes, too, the people at mass in the workhouse are giving divine worship to a mere piece of bread and wine.

And now, we ask, what degree or kind of certainty is necessary, that the bread and wine are really turned into the body and blood of Christ, before we may worship it? Will any certainty *less* than DIVINE FAITH be enough? And if it be necessary to have divine faith that this change has really taken place, then is it not necessary to have the certainty of divine faith, that the wine was really made of ripe grapes? And how can any one have "divine faith" that the wine bought in a country shop was really made of "ripe grapes?" And if he cannot have this, how can he have "divine faith" that that wine is really turned into the blood of Christ? And if he have not this, how can he have "divine faith" that it is really "the body, and blood, and soul, and divinity of Christ" that he is worshipping? And if he have not this faith, how can his worship be an "act of faith?"

Let it be remembered, what Roman Catholic controversialists say to Protestants: "You can never make an act of faith (they say) because you have not divine faith that the Bible is the Word of God; and when you have not divine faith for the *first* step, you cannot have it for any after." Now, we ask Roman Catholics to consider, can any Roman Catholic have as much faith or certainty, that the wine, sold in a country shop, was made of RIPE grapes, as a Protestant has, that the Bible is the Word of God? If not, what certainty can a Roman Catholic have, that that wine is really turned into the blood of Christ? We invite our correspondent to answer this question, and to set us right, if we are wrong.

Our readers will, of course, understand, that we do not say this as if we believed transubstantiation to be true. Our object is to inquire, what certainty Roman Catholics have, *even if transubstantiation were true*, that the change has really taken place at that particular mass at which they worship?

This is only one particular, out of many, out of which doubt may arise; but one is enough at a time, and we ask our correspondent to solve it.

* We are ourselves acquainted with several members of Boards of Guardians who were present when the Roman Catholic chaplains made the demand for wax candles. And all these demands were made much about the same time.

† Latriæ cultum, qui vero Deo debetur.—Council of Trent, Sess. XII. chap. 3.

DOES THE CHURCH OF ROME ENCOURAGE THE HOLY SCRIPTURE?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I take the liberty of troubling you for a few moments respecting a subject which you have again and again stated in the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, and supported by proofs (or asserted proofs), derived from (professedly) the authorized edicts of the Church of Rome, and the statements made by her ecclesiastics—among the rest, by Cardinal Wiseman, in his tract, which was analyzed in your columns in June and July last, the subject being the circulation of the Holy Scriptures in Roman Catholic countries, which you have said (sustained, as stated), is forbidden, and, as much as possible, prevented. I am led to these observations by the perusal of the *Weekly Telegraph* for November 17, 1853, in which the subjoined assertions are made, and which are impossible to be reconciled with yours, so contradictory do they appear:—

The *Weekly Telegraph* says—"In no Catholic (Roman?) country is there a law against the circulation of the Scriptures. In every Catholic (Roman?) country the circulation of the Scriptures is encouraged. It is a gross, &c., invention to assert the contrary. D'Aubigne asserts that there was no version of the Bible in the German language previous to the time of Luther. There was an Italian version made by Nicolai Malerie in 1471, another by A. Buccioli in 1523, and that is promoted by all means within the command of the Church, of Popes, Cardinals, &c., &c, an Italian version by Anthony Martini, a version which received the sanction of Pius VI., and that has been printed times *innumerable!! (?)*" The editor certainly qualifies his statements by the following:—"The circulation of the Scriptures, however, is a very different thing from a circulation of a *perversion* of the Scriptures." Diodati's version is, according to the Rev. Dr. Dixon such a one. He says, 'Calmet observes, that in the same way as in his French Bible, Diodati's has rather given a paraphrase, than a version in the strict sense." As I, by all means, desire to elicit truth, will you be pleased, *if possible*, to refute this, and give clearly the *proofs*, on which it can be based—your former statements of the withholding of the Bible from the people in their own language, in Roman Catholic countries, and a contradiction of the editor of the *Weekly Telegraph's* assertions, as quoted above. Or, if you have already made the subject clear, by referring to the places.

I am sir, yours respectfully,

WILLIAM MURPHY.

Our correspondent's desire to be furnished with proofs of the anxiety of the Roman Catholic Church to withhold the Scriptures from the people in their own language may be very easily gratified. We begin with the rule laid down by the order of the Council of Trent, which may be regarded as the most authoritative standard of the Church of Rome, in this as well as other matters.

The Fathers of the Synod ordered that an index of the prohibited books should be laid before the then Pope, Pius IV., who approved of it, and it was published with the rules placed at the head of it, as by the orders of the Council itself. The fourth rule was as follows:—

"Whereas, it is manifest by experience, that, if the Holy Bible, translated into the vulgar tongue, be allowed indifferently to any body, there will, on account of men's rashness, arise from hence a greater detriment than advantage . . . . if any one, without a license, presume to read or keep by him the Bible, he shall be disqualified to receive the absolution of his sins, till he deliver it up to the ordinary." —*Regulæ Indicis S.S. Synodi Tridentinæ jussu editæ, De libr. prohib. reg.* 4.

This does not look very like an "*encouragement* of the circulation of the Scriptures," which the Editor of the *Weekly Telegraph* asserts to prevail in all Roman Catholic countries. But, let us hear Pope Clement VIII's annotations on this rule of Pius IV.:—

"This law is not to be so understood as if by it the bishops, inquisitors, or heads of convents were invested with power to grant licenses to read, buy, or keep the Bible translated into vulgar language, seeing hitherto, by the order and practice of the Holy Roman and Universal Inquisition, the power *had been taken away from them*, to grant licenses to read, or keep the whole Bible in the vulgar tongue, or any other part of the Holy Scriptures, of the old or new Testaments, published in any vulgar language, even not so much as the summaries or compendiums of the said Bibles, or books of the holy Scriptures, translated into any vulgar language; all which is to be inviolably observed."

By the fourth rule of the Index, a bishop or inquisitor had power, in certain cases, to give a written license to read the Bible; but here we see, that by this interpretation of Clement VIII., a bishop has in reality no such power, and that if a Roman Catholic wants permission to read the Scriptures, or even a summary or compendium of the Scriptures, in his own native tongue, the bishop cannot give him leave, but he must seek it from the "Holy Roman and Universal Inquisition." After this decision of Clement VIII., we need not wonder to find a prohibition in the Index of "all Bibles penned in any vulgar language whatsoever" (biblia vulgari quocunque idiomate conscripta); and yet, according to the editor of the *Weekly Telegraph*, it is a *gross invention* to assert that the Church of Rome does not *encourage* the circulation of the Scriptures!

That the Council of Trent really intended to prohibit the promiscuous reading of the Holy Scriptures appears further from the most authentic writers. Alphonsus a Castro, who had been one of the members of that assembly, says expressly (Lib. I. contr. Hær. c. 13.) that "one of the parents and springs of heresies was the translation of the holy Scriptures into the vulgar language, and, therefore, bestows great praises on the edict of Ferdinand and Elizabeth, king and queen of Spain, by which *they had forbidden, under the severest penalties*, either to translate the holy Scriptures into the vulgar languages, or to keep any translation made of them, under any pretence whatever." Sixtus Senonsis says plainly, that "*to allow shoemakers, fullers, &c., to read the Scriptures, is to give that which is holy unto the dogs, and to cast pearls before swine.*" Cardinal Bellarmine, the great oracle of the Roman Catholic Church, writes as plainly as he well can to the same effect. "We maintain," says he (speaking, apparently, the settled doctrine and opinion of his Church on this point) "that the Scriptures ought NOT to be read publicly in the vulgar tongue, nor allowed to be read indifferently by everybody." (Quod contendimus est, non debere publice legi lingua vulgari, nec passim omnibus permitti legendas Scripturas lingua vulgari. *De controv.*, tom. I., p. 70. Prag. 1721).

We are well aware that the Gallican Church has held that the rules of the Index, which place a restriction on the circulation of the Bible, were never received in France by public authority, and are not generally binding. But, upon this point, it will be sufficient to quote the opinion of Dens, who was for a long time, and is still, for aught we know, the standard authority at Maynooth. "According to Steyaeret," says he, "the law (i.e. the fourth rule of the Index) was received and observed (with some variety, according to the peculiar genius of nations) in by far the greatest portion of the Catholic world, *nay in the whole of that part of the world which is completely Catholic. It was more dispensed with only where Catholics lived among heretics.*" (Solum ubi inter hæreticos degendum fuit, plus in dultum est. Dens vol. ii., p. 103).

We believe that in this passage Dens has, unwittingly, told the true state of the case, or, to use the vulgar phrase, "has let the cat out of the bag." As long as the Church of Rome had all the power in her own hands she placed restrictions and prohibitions on the reading of the Scriptures; and these restrictions are only relaxed where heretical Protestants will not let her have altogether her own way.

The last authority which we shall quote, is one which we think even the editor of the *Weekly Telegraph* will find it hard to disavow. Cardinal Wiseman, in his "Catholic Doctrine of the use of the Bible," a book published only last year, writes as follows (page 20):—

"If, therefore, we be asked why we do not give the Bible indifferently to all, *and the shutting up of God's Word be disdainfully thrown in our face*, we will not seek to elude the question, or meet the taunt by *denial*, or by attempts to prove that our principles on the subject are not antagonistic to those of Protestants. *They are antagonistic, and we glory in avowing it.*" This passage, we think, needs no comment.

We think we have said enough for the present to enable our correspondent to satisfy himself of the truth or falsehood of the assertion of the editor of the *Weekly Telegraph*, that "the circulation of the Scriptures is *encouraged* in every Roman Catholic country." We hope to take another opportunity of adverting to some other parts of his letter.

ON DR. CAHILL'S ATTACK ON THE PROTESTANT BIBLE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Your Roman Catholic readers may have seen a letter signed D. W. Cahill, D.D., in the *Tablet* of the 17th ultimo, which charges the Protestant Church with the shameless crime of "mistranslating, subtracting" from "and adding to the most important passages of both the Old and New Testament." Happily the writer descends from generalities, and selects, as a proof, one text—viz., Matt. xxvi. 26, from the authorised or Protestant version of the Holy Scriptures, by which he hopes to establish his sweeping charge. A failure, then, in his proof in this text which

he has selected, would naturally throw suspicion on the rest of his assertions.

The Protestant translation—viz., "And as they were eating, Jesus took bread and blessed *it*, and brake *it*, and gave *it* to his disciples," is thus given by the writer, and his proof is as follows:—"Here you introduce the pronoun 'it' three times, in order to carry the antecedent—'bread'—as it were, through the whole text, and, therefore, show that it was this said bread the Apostles eat. Now, the pronoun 'it' is not found in the original; and thus the Protestant Church, with a palpable and shameful interpolation, corrupted the Greek text, in order to make out a lie to meet their absurd doctrine on this vital point." Would, then, the pronoun "it," if there by expression, establish a truth? and why should not its existence by sense and implication in the text (if this can be proved) equally establish that Jesus brake and gave, and the Apostles ate bread. Now, in answer to this grievous charge of interpolation brought against the Protestant Church, I would remark that the Douay translation, as well as the authorized version of the Holy Scriptures, frequently introduces pronouns after verbs, which introduction the genius of the English language requires; and I must call attention to the marked contrast between the Protestant Catholic and Roman Catholic Churches in introducing them: the authorized version habitually expresses them in a different type, in order to advertise the reader of the introduction of these pronouns; but the Douay translation habitually expresses such pronouns in the same type as the rest of the text; so that the reader, in the latter case, is unaware of the addition, while the reader of the Protestant translation, called by the Rev. Dr. Cahill, a "forgery of the Bible," receives intimation of the fact. Now, if the mere introduction of the pronoun '*it*' after verbs is sufficient to establish Protestant corruption of the Bible, what will Roman Catholics say, if it is true, that the Roman Catholic Church is guilty of similar corruption. Refer, then, Roman Catholic readers, to the original Greek of Acts xxvii. 35; compare it with your Douay Bible—viz., "taking bread, he gave thanks to God in the sight of them all, and when he had broken IT he began to eat,"* and you find the Roman Catholic Church guilty of that very crime (if it be one) charged by the reverend writer against the Protestant Church, for the pronoun "it" in the translation is not found in the original Greek, nor yet in the Latin Vulgate,† authorized by the Church of Rome; and, therefore, the Rev. Dr. Cahill, in accusing us, brings the charge of shameful interpolation equally against the Douay Bible; and I expect the reverend writer, in his next letter (if he be impartial), will arraign his Church as guilty of putting forth (to use his own words) "a forgery on the Holy Ghost," "a slander on Christ," "a libel" on "God."

Again, I refer your Roman Catholic readers to the eighteenth chapter of Genesis, 28-32 verses, inclusive, Septuagint (Tig. Helv.,) 1730, Vulgate (Paris ed., 1851); Compare the Septuagint and your so-called authentic Vulgate with the Douay translation, and in these five verses the Septuagint and the text authorized by Pope Clement VIII., is corrupted by the Douay translators, if the introduction of the pronoun "it" be a corruption; for after the verbs "destroy" and "do," the fatal prononn "it" is introduced (shamefully interpolated, will Dr. Cahill say), five times, in these five consecutive verses; and, therefore, if the charge be well founded, both Churches are guilty, and especially that Church which professes ability to give an infallible interpretation of Holy Scripture, and an authentic translation, and yet gives expletives as part of the original.

But I hope now to show, to the satisfaction of your unbiassed readers, and the Roman Catholic laity among them, that Holy Scripture shows us that the object of the verbs "blessed," "brake," and "gave," in 26th Matthew, 26th verse is *bread*, and that our Blessed Lord gave the said bread which he took (whatever it represented) to his disciples, bidding them to eat it. Turn to Luke xxiv. 30, and compare with 35th verse of same chapter; the former tells us Jesus took bread, blessed, and brake, and gave; the latter informs us how the two disciples "knew him in the breaking of" [what he blessed and gave] "bread." And now I call in the valuable aid of the note on this text in Macnamara's Roman Catholic Bible, and in the Rhemish Testament, part of which I transcribe, for in recent editions of the Douay Bible it is prudently omitted. "'Took bread,' the Fathers, in divers places, take this to be meant of the Sacrament.' 'And that it should be meant of the Holy Sacrament the form of solemn taking the bread into his hands, blessing *it*, breaking *it*, and reaching *it* to his disciples (exceeding proper to the consecration, and common to none other vulgar benediction, nor anywhere used but in Christ's miraculous multiplying the loaves), and the singular effect in notifying Christ unto them, do prove." Here, then, Roman Catholics have the 30th verse explained, and the pronoun "IT," which is not expressed in the text in this administration of the Lord's Supper, as recorded by St. Luke, they are taught should be supplied to complete the sense, and convey the true signification; for if the text is, "He took bread, and blessed, and brake, and did reach to them," the comment of the Roman Catholic Church, where the pronoun "it" is *three times* inserted after the participles of the three verbs used in the text ("blessing it, breaking it, reaching it"), is that this terrible and corrupting pronoun "it," must be virtually or in signification in the passage, and that, therefore, it does carry the antecedent 'bread,' as it were, through the whole text; and, therefore, shows that it was this said bread the disciples "eat." If, then, the Protestant Church has inserted the pronoun "it" in Mat. xxvi. 26, she is taught by the Rhemish Testament, note on Luke xxiv. 30, that if she does express "it" in her authorized translation, she gives only the true sense—viz., that which the Roman Catholic version says is implied; and that the reverend accuser of our Church, when he asserts that she, "with a palpable and shameful interpolation corrupted the Greek text," is convicted, by the note of his own Church, of making a charge which he ought to know is untrue.

Has, then, the Roman Catholic Church corrupted with a palpable and shameful interpolation the Greek text in Acts xxvii. 35? No; every tyro in Greek, who is not utterly blind, is aware that, while ancient language omit generally the pronoun after the verb, the modern require its insertion. The authorized version, then, of the Protestant Church, by the testimony of the Rhemish note, is correct in teaching that our Lord, in the Sacrament, took bread, "blessing it, breaking it, reaching it," and so administered bread to his disciples—viz., the said bread which he took; and I should wish that the reverend doctor would tell his spectators, when next he takes bread, what is the thing which he takes, blesses, breaks, and reaches to them; whether it is nothing or something; and, if the latter (before consecration), what that something is. What it was our Saviour broke and they ate, is distinctly stated by his two disciples on their return from Emmaus, for they inform the twelve how he was known of them "in the breaking of bread."*

ENOCH HELI.

* In the Greek, και κλασας, ηρξαρο εσθιειν.

† In the Vulgate, Et cum fregisset, cæpit manducare.

* εν τη κλασει τα αρτου.

FLOWERS FOR JANUARY.

THE GARDEN.

IN our monthly articles on farming operations it has been our custom to give our readers something useful as regards the worldly affairs in which many of them are occupied. The flowers that periodically visit our earth, and with which Ireland is so richly decked, present a subject certainly of some interest to every one of us, and though it is not quite so practical a one, in a temporal sense, as farming, it may, perhaps, be made more permanently instructive, by opening out some of the varied associations with which it is linked. The plan of our paper, as announced in our earliest number (17th January, 1852), forbids us to undertake anything "merely to amuse the listless portion of the public, or to while away an idle hour;" but we greatly deceive ourselves if the simple flowers of the field and garden cannot suggest suitable topics of inquiry, reaching beyond the sphere of our earthly existence, which it has been our effort to prosecute in a spirit of fairness and friendliness, and in selecting for our subjects the "stars of the earth"—the purest, happiest remembrancers of our first estate—

> "Least changed of all
> That of the passed immortal tells"

we are hoisting ensigns of peace upon which we trust the rude blasts of discord may never blow.

It was a thought worthy of a poet, that in paradise each flower was a spirit's home, and that when all else had departed after the fall, the spirits lingered still among the flowers. Something like this idea, with more or less of the colouring of fancy and imagination, has pervaded every nation of the east and west, and has attributed to the flower-spirit a language expressive alike of the liveliest and deepest sentiments of the soul. But no writers have drawn more largely than the inspired penmen of the Sacred Volume on the flowers of the field and its verdant vesture to preach short sermons on practical subjects. Thus the transitory condition and uncertain tenure of human life and happiness is set forth in many a passage, such as that of Job—"Man cometh forth like a flower, and is destroyed."—Job, xiv. 2 (Douay version); or of King David—"Man's days are as grass, as the flowers of the field, so shall he flourish, but the mercy of the Lord is from eternity to eternity upon them that fear him."—Psalm cii. 15, 16. In the same strain the Prophet Isaias contrasts the passing glory of man with the enduring Word of God—"All flesh is grass, and the glory thereof as the flower of the field. The grass is withered and the flower is fallen, because the Spirit of the Lord hath blown upon it. Indeed, the people is grass, the grass is withered, and the flower is fallen, but the Word of our Lord endureth for ever."—Isaias xl. 6, 7 8. And, not to multiply instances, how beautifully has our Blessed Lord himself taught the lesson of the watchful providence of God, and the folly of human carefulness and worldly anxiety, when he said—"Consider the lilies of the field how they grow, they labour not, neither do they spin. But I say, that not even Solomon, in all his glory, was arrayed as one of these. And if the grass of the field which is to-day, and to-morrow is cast into the oven, God doth so clothe, how much more you, O ye of little faith."—Math. vi. 28, 29, 30. And Solomon, whose surpassing glory was instanced by our Lord, surrounded, as he was, with all the glories of nature and of art, when he thought to pourtray a coming Saviour, selected "*the rose of Sharon and the lily of the valley*," while, under the emblem of a garden enclosed, he describes the Church of Christ—*i. e.*, the believing people of God collectively—"My sister, my spouse, is a garden enclosed, a fountain sealed up. Thy plants are a paradise of pomegranates with the fruits of the orchard." We have, therefore, sufficient warrant to lay hold on the flowers of the field and garden, and extract from them morals of practical wisdom if we can.

A very distinguished philosopher quaintly said, it was God Almighty himself who planted the first garden. No doubt the same Almighty power planted the everlasting hills, reared the stately forests, and spread the glittering firmament above, and the enamelled meadows beneath. But the sacred narrative, while it details the creation of the heavens, and the earth, and the moon, and the stars, and the living creatures of the earth, and, last of all, man, in God's own image, and proceeds to describe how God had endowed him with the dominion over all, winds up the wondrous history with this simple announcement:—"And the Lord God had planted a garden eastward in Eden, and there he planted the man whom he had formed," as if to say, that though God had given man the wide world for his inheritance, he fixed his habitation in a garden of his own planting, a peculiar spot, where he might walk and hold converse with his Creator. In another verse of the Book of Genesis it is called "the Garden of the Lord. In the Douay version of the Bible it is called a "paradise of pleasure." In the poet's lofty song it is described thus:—

> "In this pleasant spot
> A far more pleasant garden God ordained.
> Out of the fertile ground he caused to grow
> All trees of noblest kind, for sight, smell, taste;
> And all amid them, stood the tree of life,
> High, eminent, blooming, ambrosial fruit
> Of vegetable gold.
> From the sapphire fount the crisped brook
> Rolling o'er orient pearl and sands of gold,
> With mazy error, under peodant shade,
> Ran nectar, visiting each plant, and fed
> Flowers worthy of paradise."

Such is the description given of the garden of God in which man was placed, "that he might dress it and keep it." Here no noxious weeds or poisonous plants could mix with the wholesome herbs and flowers of God's own planting; and though man's eye might expatiate on the scenes of endless fertility, and wander towards the forest glades that lay beyond and outside, his home and habitation were to be in the garden which God had given him.

As truly as God had planted for the use of man, a garden in the world of nature, so has he, in the world of grace, provided him with a hallowed spot, "which his own wisdom planted, his own Spirit watereth, and in which God's own Son is continually walking, and where he meeteth those that seek him, and revealeth the glories of his power, and the riches of his goodness." Where, the reader may ask, is this garden?

It is in the Holy Scriptures, the "lively oracles" of God, which the Douay Bible declares to be "*the words of life*," from which the simplest, plainest man can learn all the concerns of eternity, the love of God, and his righteousness and justice, the lost state and condition of man, and how he has polluted his soul by sin, and forfeited his innocency and glorious patrimony by his rebellion against his Maker, and the redemption of both purchased by the blood of God's co-equal Son, for all those who come unto him by faith.

What a blessed privilege, then, to have access to this "Garden of the Lord," to be enabled to consult "the words of life" themselves, to hear God Almighty speaking, as he spoke to our first parents, and to Abraham, Moses, and the prophets—to read the words of him who spoke as man never spoke before, and in language addressed to sinners as humble and as ignorant as any one of us; to read the history of his life, miracles, death, and glorious resurrection—to pause over the annals of the early Church, and the sowing of its seed in the blood of the martyrs; to read the triumphant testimony of a dying Stephen, the zealous earnestness of a repentant Peter, the commanding eloquence of a fearless Paul.

> Here mines of knowledge, love, and joy
> Are opened to our sight;
> The purest gold without alloy,
> And gems divinely bright.

One of our most distinguished oriental and classical, scholars, who was versed in the literature of every language, said of it, "The volume of the sacred Scriptures, independently of its Divine origin, contains more sublimity, purer morality, more important history, and finer strains of eloquence than can be collected from all the books, in whatever language they may have been written."* The great philosopher of the human mind describes it in few words—"It hath God for its author, salvation for its end, and truth, without any admixture of error, for its matter."† The Douay Bible itself speaks of it in these glowing terms:—"The law of the Lord is unspotted—converting souls—faithful—giving wisdom to little ones—rejoicing the heart—enlightening the eyes."—Psalm, xviii. 8, (Psalm, xix. 7, Protestant Bible). "Thy word is a lamp to my feet—a light to my paths—it giveth light—it giveth understanding to little ones."—Psalm, cxvii. 105, 130. "The

* Sir William Jones. † John Locke.

holy Scriptures, which can instruct thee to salvation. All Scripture inspired of God—profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice, that the man of God may be perfect, furnished to every good work."—2 Tim. iii. 15, 16, 17. Now, if this be the testimony of the Roman Catholic Bible itself, as to its own value, what right have the priesthood of the Church of Rome to prevent her people reading what God, in their own Bible, declares to be so instructive, so profitable, so pure, so faithful, so enlightening, so enlivening? Why forbid them entering upon the holy paths of inspiration, tasting those streams of grace and mercy, those living waters which she herself calls "the words of life?" Why must they not enter this garden of the Lord? Is it because some enemy might have entered and sowed poisonous seed, and planted noxious herbs therein? On this pretext she forbids her people to read the Protestant Bible, and warns her bishops to turn away their flocks by all means from these *poisonous pastures?** But why does she not invite them to enter into the *sweet* and *wholesome pastures* of her own Bible? In Italy and Spain, where she has it all her own way, why is the Roman Catholic Bible never seen, if it be so instructive, so enlightening, so cheering as their own Douay Bible says it is? Why is the reading of the Bible proscribed and prohibited? Why is it that the vast majority of her people throughout the world have never read nor heard one chapter of it, but what they hear read from the altar in an unknown tongue? Is it because unlearned and unstable men may (as St. Peter says) wrest them to their own destruction? St. Peter said, what every man of common sense must know, that unteachable and unstable, wavering men might, and would, and will, wrest St. Paul's Epistles, as well as other Scriptures, to their own destruction; but, does St. Peter say the Bible, or any one of St. Paul's epistles, is a dangerous book to any reader, however humble? If he had said so, he would have been at variance with St. Paul, who, at the conclusion of one of these very epistles which St. Peter designated as containing things hard to be understood (*e. g.* about the second coming of our Lord, but not certainly harder than the Trinity, the incarnation of Christ, the origin and permission of sin), says, "I charge you by the Lord that this epistle be read to ALL the holy brethren."—1 Thess. v. 27. One of the earliest bishops of Rome, Clement, (as we noticed in our last number, p. 138), said, "Look into the Holy Scriptures, which are the true words of the Holy Ghost; ye know that there is nothing wicked or forged written in them." What security is there in reading a book of such a character as this, when we find that of the one hundred and seven current decrees and letters, palmed off as the genuine decrees and letters of the early popes, but twenty-three are genuine, and at least eighty-three of them are confessed forgeries, and admitted by every learned Roman Catholic to be audacious fabrications, by which the Church of Rome was imposed upon for several enturies!!

We, therefore, ask again and again why has the Church of Rome excluded her people from the Garden of the Lord and branded its hallowed enclosures with the epithet of *poisonous pastures?* Is it because the Scriptures are against her, that she must be against the Scriptures? It is hard to conceive why she discredits its authority as an unsafe and dangerous guide, and will not suffer it to speak for itself, but obscured with glosses and interpretations, while the Protestants appear to have no fear of any honest-minded man, however simple or unlearned, being poisoned by the *words of life*, or led into error by the words of truth. We know very well that dishonest and double-minded men will wrest the Scriptures, the plainest words that ever God spoke, as they will everything else, to their own destruction. Judas perverted the personal teaching of our blessed Lord to his own greater damnation. Our daily food, our liberty, the fire that burns on our hearth, may be abused and perverted by perverse and wicked men, and become instruments of evil and confusion. The Apostle tells us, that science, falsely so called, has done so, which some professing have erred concerning the faith."—1 Tim. vi. 20. We know that wine, which maketh glad the heart of man, may become an element of evil. David and Solomon commend its virtues, and direct its use. Isaias and St. Paul speak of its excess. The Bible thus prescribes the use of it; it recognises its capability of abuse, but yet St. Paul says no more than "Be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess." Would it not, then, be a very absurd inference to draw from all this, that because wicked and ungodly men abused the gifts of God, and because the Scriptures cautioned them against such an abuse, they were therefore to abjure them altogether, or only to touch them when prescribed by a physician?

But the most curious fact connected with this prohibition of the free circulation and reading of the Scriptures is this, that the only matter in respect of which the Church of Rome it apprehensive of the *unlearned* and *unstable* going astray is in respect of *reading the Bible*. Now, Protestants are very fearful lest *unlearned* and *unstable* people should mistake the sanction which the Church of Rome gives to the worship of images for a sanction of idolatry. They also think that nothing is more to be apprehended than that an ignorant, unlearned man may confound the supreme worship due to God alone (*latria*) with the secondary and inferior worship said to be due to the Blessed Virgin Mary (*hyperdulia*), or, that again, with the still lower worship said to be due to St. Joseph and the canonized saints of the Church (*dulia*). The Church of Rome admits that any mistake about these important and puzzling distinctions would involve the mortal sin of idolatry. And yet it appears to have no apprehension or concern about these matters, though so wonderfully alarmed when the people read the Scriptures, as they are commanded by the Scriptures to do. Is there not more danger to the unlearned in image-worship, or in giving to the Blessed Virgin the honor which God claims exclusively for himself? The use of indulgences, many people think, is apt to be wrested by the unlearned and unstable to their own destruction, because they may be perverted to a license to sin; yet the Church of Rome has no alarm as to these. It appears to be suspicious of nothing doing harm but the Bible.

But can it be that God, the source of all wisdom and knowledge, so far failed in his high purpose that he has inspired chosen men to write and to publish a revelation so exceedingly unsafe and unfit to be read by the mass of mankind, the very people for whom it was intended, and to whom it is addressed, that if men obey God's express commandment to search it and to read it, "more evil than advantage will arise thence?" We submit this plain question to every man of common sense in the country, and we leave the answer with himself.

But our readers may justly say, we have broken faith with them, and said very little about flowers. True it is; but, dear reader, remember that the flowers of January are "few and far between;" and that even the very grass itself is stationary; and well it is so, if the old saw be true—

> "If the grass grows in Janiver,
> It grows the worse for it all the year"

The snow is still upon the ground while we write, and the few flowers that have ventured to appear are almost all frozen and dead. Not so, however, one hardy, venturesome flower, fitly called the Gem of January, the winter Aconite (*Eranthus hyemalis*),

> "With buttercup-like flower that shut at night,
> Its green leaf furling round its cup of gold,
> Like tender maiden muffled from the cold."

This beautiful flower, with its glossy yellow petals resting on its fresh leaves of clearest green, starts into life, in the very depth of winter, as if—

> "Nature her pencil dipt in gold,
> Bedecked it in a night."

Its bright blossoms are doubly welcome as they greet our steps, just as the old year has passed away, and the new one opened. It is the earliest harbinger of spring, the herald of reviving nature, sent before the Snowdrop and Crocus have yet appeared, sweetly assures us that flowers of brighter hue are at hand—

> "Ere thy sisters fair are waking,
> Deep on earth's dark bosom sleeping;
> Ere the chains of winter breaking,
> Loose the streams their might is keeping,
>
> "With a smile that well had greeted,
> Light, and song, and summer bower,
> On the sheltering calyx seated,
> Shines the yellow petalled flower."

Its popular name of Aconite is derived from a Greek term (*ακονιτον*) applied to it, as the poet, Ovid, tells us, because its flowers grow close to the earth and the rocks. The old writers called it Yellow Wolfsbane, because, like all flowers belonging to the ranunculus tribe, it is acrimonious and poisonous. The ancients considered the Aconite the deadliest of all poisons known to them; and Ovid describes its first invention by Hecate in a scene that might parallel that of Shakspeare's cauldron of the witches in Macbeth. However, the skill of science has enabled the physician to apply this poisonous herb to the relief of human maladies in different ways. Under the name Wolfsbane and deadly Aconite, it was known as a poison acting on the nervous system, especially the brain, producing frenzy; under its modern name of Monkshood, it is a valuable cure for the most excruciating disorder of the nervous system called *neuralgia*. So it is with the natural heart of man, out of which proceeds nothing but what is poisonous and wicked, according to our Saviour—"For from the heart come evil thoughts, murders, thefts, false testimonies."—St. Matt. xv. 19, until the Great Physician comes, and says—"I will give you a new heart, and put a new spirit within you."—Ezechiel xxxvi. 26. "As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, unless it abide in the vine, so neither can you, unless you abide in me. I am the vine, you the branches, he that abideth in me and I in him, the same beareth much fruit, for without me ye can do nothing."—St. John xv. 4, 5. This is what is meant by the scriptural doctrine that good works are the fruit of acceptance before God, and justification through faith in Jesus Christ; and that good works cannot precede this acceptance or justification, much less can they conduce or co-operate to procure it. In this sense a man, before he stands justified in the sight of God, can do no work good or acceptable to him—a man, after he is justified by faith will inevitably produce the fruits of holiness.

> "And now is man, a seed that breeds,
> Or sweetest flowers or rankest weeds
> Flowers, lovely as the morning light
> Weeds, deadly as the Aconite."

FARMING OPERATIONS FOR JANUARY.

(From the Irish Farmer's Gazette.)

We cannot too frequently advocate the great utility and necessity of early ploughing or digging stubble or other lands, for the reception of the spring crops. We would, therefore, remind our readers, that wherever this important operation remains undone, it should be no longer delayed. In warm climates the soil is greatly ameliorated, disintegrated, and broken down by the sun; and in cold climates the same process results from the alternate action of the frosts and thaws. A deep furrow is desirable; the action of frost on heavy clay lands renders it loose and friable, and the more roughly it is thrown up the greater will be the surface exposed to the action of the atmosphere; but such lands should not be ploughed up when wet, as that would render them still more tenacious and adhesive. They should be ploughed up early, when in a moderately dry state, and, if possible, before December closes; besides, the horses should now be employed in carting out manure, from the farm-yards to the headlands of such fields as are intended for green crops, and the manure securely banked up, bottomed, and covered over with rich, dry earth, or bog-mould. This would be also a good time, if frost sets in, or the land be not very likely to rut, to cart out marl and other dressings for grass lands.

Old grass lands, which are intended for lea oats or other crops, should now be ploughed up, and finished without delay, so as to afford time for the sods rotting, and the perfect closing and consolidation of the furrow-slices.

Spade Husbandry—It is evident that the foregoing directions for winter ploughing are only applicable to those who have a sufficient number of stout horses to do the work properly. This the small farmer does not possess; and, indeed, in the case of small farmers generally, the possession of a horse is a great evil. It induces him to scratch over his land, rather than to give it the necessary deep ploughing, because he has not the means of working it properly; and besides this, as the horse must be maintained some way or other, it is too often the case that this is done out of what ought to be used by the family. From inability to keep them in working order, we always find horses belonging to the smaller classes of farmers to be most wretched animals, unable to drag themselves along, much less to assist in cultivating the land in a proper manner. If a beast be required by a small farmer, we would prefer using a bullock; for he can be more easily kept than a horse, will do his work as efficiently, and, when not required, can be fattened and sold, whereas the old, worn-out horse is totally worthless. For the small farmer, however, the most efficient mode of culture is by the spade. This simple instrument can be used under all circumstances, costs nothing for its keep, and, when properly used, is much more efficient in the culture of the soil than the best-appointed plough. The great importance of spade husbandry, and its complete adaption to the case of the small farmers of Ireland, are only now beginning to be fully recognised. In allotting the size of farms we think that they ought to be either of such a size as can be conveniently cultivated under a proper rotation of crops, by means of the spade—say, five Irish acres—or that they shall be sufficiently large to give at least one pair of stout horses ample employment. There should not be any medium; for such would only cause the occupier to keep one, or, perhaps, two worthless animals, and the cultivation of those farms can never be so perfect as when cultivated entirely by spade labour, or by proper draught horses.

Wheat.—Where there is a considerable breadth of wheat still unsown we would urge some extra exertion in committing it to the earth without delay; it is still a good time, but will require an additional quantity of seed as the season advances, so as to prevent the plant tillering at a later period, and thereby retard the ripening of the crop.

Bere may be sown in rich, dry, and early soils, for either a grain or soiling crop.

Rye may be sown on cold, backward, or mountain soils, for grain or soiling crops, provided the soil be dry, or rendered so by water furrowing.

Vetches.—By the end of this month vetches may be sown, in warm, rich, and dry soils, if the weather be dry and open.

Peas may be sown any time this month, in dry and open weather, without manure, if the land be in tolerable condition; but if otherwise a moderate dressing of manure will improve the crop materially.

Beans may be sown by the middle or end of the month, on strong land, if not wet; if the land has not been well manured for a previous crop, it should get a liberal dressing. Although peas and beans may be sown this month, with every chance of success, we would prefer the next month, particularly if the present one should not turn out dry.

Ewes in lamb require careful treatment. This being the coldest month in the year, dry lying, shelter, and wholesome, nutritious food, are absolutely necessary to keep the flock in health; avoid giving frozen turnips, and in their stead give abundance of hay.

---

* See encyclical letter of of Pope Pius XII., published in 1824; and see the Roman Catholic Bishop Kenrick's candid testimony to the excellence of the authorized Protestant version, vol. I, CATHOLIC LAYMAN, p. 42. We have carefully compared the Douay and Authorized Version of the Bible in several numbers of the 2nd volume of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, from which the reader will see that the difference is so unimportant, that we are quite satisfied to take our quotations from the Douay version on most vital points of controversy.

New, Recent, and Illustrated Works

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

Booksellers to the Queen,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Any Book or number of Books together, *within a pound weight*, can be sent by post for 6d., and at the rate of 6d. for every pound weight additional.

BURKE'S PEERAGE AND BARONETAGE OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE; corrected to the present time. Royal 8vo. 38s.

THE RUSSIAN SHORES OF THE BLACK SEA, IN THE AUTUMN of 1852, with a Voyage down the Volga, and a Tour through the Country of the Don Cossacks. By Lawrence Oliphant. 8vo. 14s.

THE PRIVATE JOURNAL OF SIR GEORGE LARPENT, Judge-Advocate-General to the British Forces under the Duke of Wellington, during the Peninsular Campaign in 1812-14. 8vo. 15s.

DISCOVERY OF THE SITE OF THE DESTROYED CITIES OF THE PLAIN, SODOM AND GOMORRAH; Narrative of a Journey in Syria, and round the Dead Sea, now for the first time accomplished. By F. De Saulcey. 2 vols. 8vo. 30s.

THE TURK AND THE HEBREW; OR, THE RULE OF THE CRESCENT. A Story of Real Events and Living Persons. Post 8vo. 10s. 6d.

A POPULAR ACCOUNT OF THE ANCIENT EGYPTIANS. Revised and abridged from his larger work. By Sir J. Gardner Wilkinson, D.C.L., F.R.S., &c. 2 vols. 8vo. with 500 Wood Engravings. 12s.

NORWAY AND ITS GLACIERS VISITED IN 1851. Followed by Journals of Excursions in the High Alps of Dauphine, Berne, and Savoy. By James D. Forbes, FR.S.E. Roy. 8vo. With 10 Coloured Lithographic, views. 21s.

SCANDINAVIAN ADVENTURES during a Residence of upwards of Twenty Years, with an Account of the Northern Fauna. By L. Lloyd, Esq. With upwards of 100 Illustrations. 2 vols. Royal 8vo. 42s.

LIFE IN ABYSSINIA: being the Personal Narrative of Three Year's Residence and Travel in that Country. By Mansfield Parkyns. With Map and Illustrations. 2 vols. 8vo. 30s.

HISTORY OF THE EARLY CHRISTIANS, with an Account of their Struggles and Martyrdom, and the Final Triumph of Christianity. By Samuel Elliot. 2 vols. 8vo. 25s.

A HISTORY OF THE INSURRECTION IN CHINA; with Notices of the Christianity, Creed, and Proclamations of the Insurgents. By Dr. Yvan and M. Callery. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

THE CROSS AND THE DRAGON; or, the Fortunes of Christianity in China, with Notices of the Secret Societies of the Chinese. By J. Kesson. Post 8vo. 6s.

D'AUBIGNE'S HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION. Vol. V.—"The Reformation in England." 8vo. 12s.

D'AUBIGNE'S HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY. Five vols. in One. 8vo. cloth, 8s. Gilt Edges, 9s.

HISTORY OF THE PROTESTANT CHURCH IN HUNGARY, FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE REFORMATION TO 1850. With reference also to Transylvania. With an Introduction by Dr. D'Aubigne, 8vo. 10s. 6d.

JAEQUELINE PASCAL; OR, CONVENT LIFE IN PORT ROYAL. Compiled from the French of Victor Cousin, &c. By H. N. 5s.

THE PSALMS RESTORED TO THE MESSIAH. A COMMENTARY ON THE BOOK OF PSALMS. By Rev. R. H. Ryland. With a Commendatory Notice, by the Bishop of Cashel. 6s.

MEMOIR OF THE LATE REV. EDWARD BICKERSTETH. By the Rev. T. R. Birks. Cheaper Edition. 2 vols., fcap. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

MEMOIR OF THE LIVES OF ROBERT AND JAMES A. HALDANE. By Alexander Haldane, Esq. 8vo. 12s.

MEMOIR OF THE REV. W. H. KRAUSE, A.M., Bethesda Chapel, Dublin, with selections from his Correspondence. By Rev. C. S. Stanford. Crown 8vo. 5s. 6d.

INCIDENTS IN THE LIFE OF OUR SAVIOUR, Illustrative of his Divine Character and Mission. By Rev. A. L. R. Foote. 6s.

CHRIST OUR PASSOVER; or, Thoughts on the Atonement. By the Rev. John Cumming, D.D. 2s. 6d.

THE LAND OF THE FORUM AND THE VATICAN; or, Thoughts and Sketches during an Easter Pilgrimage to Rome. By Newman Hall, B.A. Fcap. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

THE ART OF QUESTIONING; or a Short Analysis of the Interrogatory Methods of Instruction, designed for the use of Teachers, Pupil Teachers, and Monitors. By W. T. Young, T. C. D. 1s. By post, 1s. 4d.

"Mr. Young brings a clear brain and evident experience to the analysis of his subject."—*The Advocate.*

"The author belongs to the more advanced school of educational reformers, and his production is replete with enlightened sentiments of a truly practical character."—*Sunday School Teacher's Magazine.*

"The author's plan is a clear and simple one, in which the mind as well as the memory of the pupil is exercised, while the necessity of a clearly-defined and easily-understood *question* is enforced by appropriate examples, as the true source of a ready and intelligent answer."—*Christian Family Advocate.*

WORK; or Plenty to Do, and how to Do it. By Margaret Maria Brewster. 12mo. 4s.

THE TENT AND ALTAR—SKETCHES OF PATRIARCHAL DAYS. By Rev. Dr. Cumming. 9s.

DAILY BIBLE ILLUSTRATIONS—THE APOSTLES AND EARLY CHRISTIAN CHURCH. By Dr. Kitto. 6s.

THE ROYAL PREACHER—AN EXPOSITION OF ECCLESIASTICS. By the Rev. James Hamilton, D.D. 2s. 6d.

A DEFENCE OF "THE ECLIPSE OF FAITH." By its Author. Being a rejoinder to Professor Newman's Reply. 5s. 6d.

WORD PICTURES from the BIBLE; or, Scenes from Scripture History Depicted, and their Practical and Doctrinal Teaching Asserted and Enforced. By G. H. Taylor. 4s. 6d.

CHURCH PARTIES. An Essay. Reprinted from the *Edinburgh Review*. 1s.

EPISCOPAL COUNSEL upon MINISTERIAL DUTIES. By the Bishop of Ossory. 1s. 6d.

THE ETERNAL DAY. By the Rev. Horatius Bonar, D.D. 2s.

WHY WEEPEST THOU? or, the Cry from Ramah Hushed by the Voice from Heaven. By the Rev. Dr. Macfarlan. 2s. 6d.

THE WORDS OF JESUS. By the Author of the "Faithful Promiser." In Cover 8d.; Cloth, 1s.

RELIGION IN HEART AND LIFE; or, the Fruits of the SPIRIT. By Rev. Frederick George Barton. 3s.

THE SUCCESSFUL MERCHANT; Sketches of the Life of Mr. Samuel Budgett. By William Arthur, A.M. 2s. 6d.

FAR OFF; or, AFRICA AND AMERICA DESCRIBED. Part II. By the Author of "Peep of Day." 5s.

LILLY GORDON—THE YOUNG HOUSEKEEPER. By Cousin Kate. 4s. 6d.

MEMORABLE WOMEN—The Story of their Lives. By Mrs. Newton Crosland. 6s.

THE CHRISTMAS STOCKING. By the Author of "The Wide, Wide World." 2s.

LIVES OF THE QUEENS OF ENGLAND. By Miss Strickland. New and Revised Edition. With numerous Portraits. Vol. 1, post 8vo, 7s. 6d. (To be completed in 8 monthly volumes.)

THE HEIR OF REDCLYFFE. By the Author of "Henrietta's Wish." Two vols. fcap. 8vo. 10s.

THE PILGRIM FATHERS; or, the Founders of New England in the Reign of James the First. By W. H. Bartlett. With 28 Steel Engravings and 31 Illustrations on Wood. Super. Royal 8vo. 12s.

THE PRIEST AND THE HUGUENOT; or, Persecution in the Reign of Louis XV. Translated from the French of L. F. Bungener. Two vols. post 8vo. 12s.

SPEECHES OF THE RIGHT HON. THOMAS BABINGTON MACAULAY, M.P. Revised and corrected by himself. 8vo, 12s.

ALISON'S HISTORY OF EUROPE; from the downfall of Napoleon, in 1815, to the accession of Louis Napoleon, in 1852. 2. Vols. 8vo. 15s. each.

Just Published. Price 6s. No. 1.—New Series,

OF

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND QUARTERLY REVIEW.

A Quarterly Journal of Theology, Art, Science, and Literature, for the United Church of England and Ireland.

This long-established Periodical has become the property of a body of Clergymen and gentlemen who are resolved to spare neither labour nor expense to make it an able, powerful, and decided organ for the Evangelical portion of the Church.

All questions of Theology will be discussed in a fair and Scriptural spirit, bearing in mind the full meaning of that article of the Church which declares Holy Scripture to be the sole authority for matters of faith.

Special attention will be paid to the circumstances and necessities of Ireland, and to the History and Progress of the Episcopal Church in America.

American and Continental Literature will receive due attention; and it will be the object of the conductors that no important work published abroad, and especially in Germany, shall escape notice.

CONTENTS:

I. Missions in India.
II. The Condition of the Poor.
III. Ferguson's Discourses.
IV. Recent French Novels.
V. Syria, its Creeds and Prospects.
VI. The Irish Difficulty.
VII. Beecher's Conflict of Ages.
VIII. Professor Maurice and King's College.
IX. Quarterly Report of Facts and Progress.
X. Literature of the Quarter Reviewed and Classified.

Agents for Ireland—William Curry and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

Just Published, Part I. Price 1s.

POPULAR CHRISTIAN COMPANION TO THE BIBLE.—THE CHRISTIAN CYCLOPÆDIA. By the Rev. James Gardiner, M.D & A.M., Author of "A Commentary on Christ's Sermon on the Mount." "Memoirs of Christian Females," "Memoirs of Eminent Missionaries," &c.

☞ The Volume will contain 900 pages, Imperial 8vo, double columns, and will be issued in Fifteen Monthly Parts, at One Shilling Each.

Subscribers names entered by William Curry and Company, 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Just Published, Fcap. 8vo, neat cover, 1s.; in cloth, 1s. 6d.; in cloth, gilt edges, 2s. (*Postage 6d. extra*).

I.

THE TALK OF THE ROAD:

Reprinted from the Catholic Layman.

Showing how the Irish People talk about Irish Doings, when they get a quiet Place at the back of a Ditch, or under a Hedge.

II.

The Catholic Layman,

VOL. II.

WITH INDEX COMPLETE.

Neatly Bound in Cloth, Lettered, price 5s. 6d.

"We most heartily rejoice in the extensive circulation of such a paper—a paper, be it remarked, whose pages are open to *free* inquiry from *Roman Catholics* as well as from Protestants; an arrangement as wise as it is liberal. This expansive spirit, on the part of the Editors of 'THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN' has been fully appreciated by many well-educated Roman Catholics, and has tended greatly to its success; and, we are free to confess, that the correspondence from this class of readers, not only enhances the *usefulness* of the paper, but the *interest* of it also, while the very circumstance that it is largely taken advantage of, points to a *brighter* future for poor, misguided, misgoverned Ireland."—*Rugby Paper.*

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY AND CO., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London: WERTHEIM AND MACKINTOSH, Paternoster-row.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON, and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher, WILLIAM CURRY, 9 Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.
January, 1854.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Gloir do Dhia an na hárduibh, agus síodcáin air an talamh deaghoil do na daoinibh.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED THE MIDDLE OF EVERY MONTH, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. III.—No. 26. FEBRUARY, 1854. { **Annual Subscription, 2s. 6d. Payable in Advance.**

CONTENTS.

	Page.
Modern Worship in Rome	13
The Forged Decretal Epistles—No. III.	16
The Heir of Ballymanus—No. II.	19
Talk of the Road—No. XXI.	22
Freedom of Discussion, and the Court of Queen's Bench	23
The "Rambler" versus Dr. Cahill	24
CORRESPONDENCE—	
On the Visible Church, by "Philalethes"	25
On Pope Liberius, by "A Truth seeker"—Postscript to a Roman Catholic	27
Was the Jewish Church the Church of God in its day, by "A Kildare Churchman"	28
Cardinal Wiseman and the Apocrypha	28
Flowers for February	29
Farming Operations for February	29

MODERN WORSHIP IN ROME.

We have hitherto found some difficulty in adverting as we could have wished to the ritual of the Church of Rome. We were desirous, for many reasons, to direct the attention of our readers to those parts of the ceremonies of that Church which we consider justly liable to censure, and to state the grounds on which our opinions were formed. The pressure of other topics, however, of equal or greater importance, has hitherto engrossed all the available space at our command; and, besides, a sincere feeling of anxiety to deal fairly and impartially with the religious usages of our Roman Catholic readers, imposed some peculiar restrictions on us, arising out of the nature of the subject which we wished to discuss.

Notwithstanding the boasted unity and immutability of the Church of Rome, it is not an easy matter to find out those parts of her ceremonial which are of general obligation, and for which she may be held fully responsible. There are so many rites and usages proper to particular countries, so many peculiar observances, such a multitude of local ceremonies, that we could not feel sure that, however well-grounded our censures might appear to ourselves, the ingenuity of our opponents might not, nevertheless, discover some shift or excuse by which these censures could be evaded. If we cited some objectionable practice, recommended by St. Bonaventura, or some other equally venerable divine, we might be told that the practice in question never was universal, and that it had now become nearly obsolete. If we described any superstitious custom of recent origin, another line of defence would probably be resorted to. "No Church," it might be said, "can be fairly held responsible for the religious practices of *all* its members. Some indulgence must be allowed to the infirmities of human nature. The Church does not always sanction what she is occasionally obliged to permit." And thus, while professing to be unchangeable, the Church of Rome is able, with dexterous versatility, to accommodate herself to the wants and wishes of each succeeding age, while she has never wanted ingenious defenders to justify every new phase which she may think proper to assume.

It was, therefore, with considerable interest that we read, in the *Tablet* of the 26th of November last, an account of a ceremony which had recently taken place at Rome, in which Pope Pius IX. was the principal performer—namely, the translation of the holy crucifix of Campo Vaccino. The account originally appeared in the French newspaper, *l'Univers*, from which it was translated in the *Tablet*; so that we were here presented, by two unexceptionable Roman Catholic authorities, with a picture of modern Romanist worship, fresh from the Eternal City, and sanctioned by the presence and authority of the Pope himself. But before proceeding further, we must endeavour to give some account of the ceremony, and of the circumstances which occasioned it.

It appears that, over the door of the Mamertine prison in Rome, there has been, for many years, a very ancient wooden crucifix, which has long been held in great veneration by the inhabitants of that city. The writer in the *Univers* states that a constant tradition attributes to Pope Sylvester I. the first establishment of a crucifix in this spot. He does not venture, however, to claim for the present crucifix such a remote antiquity, probably for the very sufficient reason that its form and artistic character prove it to have been made at a comparatively recent date. The writer then proceeds as follows:—

"But whatever may be its origin and antiquity, the *worship* yielded to the holy crucifix of Campo Vaccino *is universal at Rome*, and is transmitted from generation to generation. The fathers teach it to the children, and, in all the misfortunes and all the trials of life, *the first idea is almost always to have recourse to the holy crucifix*, the object of such general veneration, and *the source of so many favours*. It is, above all, in sickness that the *succour of the holy image is invoked* with more confidence and more eagerness. It is not uncommon, during the fine season, half an hour after the Ave Maria—that is to say, after the coming on of night—to meet in the streets little bands of the faithful, going devoutly bare-footed, and reciting the chaplet in a loud voice. These are the workmen and artisans who, after the labour of the day, repair in pilgrimage to the holy crucifix, to beg the cure of a parent, of a friend, of a neighbour, dangerously ill."

We beg the attention of our readers to the foregoing extract, which we have copied *verbatim* from the *Tablet*, and in which we have merely underlined one or two sentences. We have here a faithful representation, fresh from Rome, of the state of religion in that city at the present day, supplied to us by an unprejudiced Roman Catholic witness; and how sad and melancholy is the picture! We will not now enter upon the question of the unlawfulness of image worship, further than to repeat our solemn and deliberate conviction, which we have expressed at length in a former number of this journal,* that any use of images in religious worship is forbidden by God himself in the Second Commandment, and that those who use them incur the risk of great and deadly sin. But we cannot forbear from one or two remarks, in connection with our present subject.

Some of our Roman Catholic correspondents† have endeavoured to excuse the practice of image worship in their Church by the plea that the images are only used as *helps* to devotion, and that the worship always terminates on the object represented by the image. This excuse passes over altogether in silence the Scriptural prohibition of image worship; and, further, we do not believe that one Roman Catholic in a hundred ever makes the metaphysical distinction between the image and the Being represented by it, which the excuse presupposes. We need no better proof of this fact, than the passage from the *Tablet* which we have quoted above. The "ancient wooden crucifix" is throughout spoken of as the object of the people's prayers; but no hint is given that the thoughts of the worshippers ever ascended to God the Father, or the Lord Jesus Christ. No idolater of ancient Rome ever bowed down before his wooden idol with more earnestness than the modern Roman seems to bend his knees before the wooden crucifix which has taken its place.

Again, it is instructive to notice the wide-spread influence of this melancholy perversion of true spiritual religion. The "worship yielded to the holy crucifix" is said to be "universal" at Rome. Parents and children, young and old, come before it to present their homage. In the trials and misfortunes of life their "*first idea*" is to have recourse to the holy crucifix as the "*source of the favours*" which they hope to receive. Can it be possible that the people of Rome are taught to believe that God will only hear the prayers which are offered up before one particular piece of senseless wood? Do they imagine that the crucifix itself can hear their prayers, or be a "source of favour" to any of its worshippers? If not, why do they make it their "*first idea*" to "*invoke the succour*" of this holy image, as if the piece of wood could help them in sickness or any other emergency? But if, as we would fain hope and believe, they are not so utterly besotted as to imagine this, whence arises the earnestness of their devotion to this particular image? Is not the ear of the Almighty open to receive the prayers of sincere Christians, in *whatever* place they are offered up? When our Blessed Lord was giving his disciples a command how they should pray, did he tell them to set up a wooden crucifix and pray before it or to it? No! but his command was this—"Thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret; and thy Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly."—(Matt. vi. 6.)

But we must return to the crucifix of the Campo Vaccino. The sanctuary in which it was placed was, it seems, too small to receive the numerous faithful who came every hour to venerate it, and a more suitable and spacious place must be found. Rome has, we are told, three hundred and sixty-five Churches—one for every day of the year; but these were not enough; they wanted a new one for the relic which happens just now to be in fashion. Here, however, a sad dilemma arose. The wooden crucifix belonged, as was natural, to the guild of joiners, carpenters and other workers in wood, who considered it their most precious treasure. They felt the need of a new sanctuary for the object which they so much prized; and yet they could not be persuaded to remove it from a place which it had occupied for centuries, over the Mamertine prison, where, according to tradition, St. Peter and St. Paul were confined. At length, the difficulty was solved, by what the writer in the *Univers* calls "a happy inspiration," which was neither more nor less than the simple expedient of breaking down a wall, and thus making an opening into a pretty crypt under the Church of St. Joseph. Here, therefore, a marble altar was erected, at the back of which, in a circular niche, the holy crucifix was to be placed.

When the new locality was ready, the obvious course would have been, to transfer the sacred relic at once from its old to its new abode, which were only a few yards apart. But the guild of carpenters were averse to this summary method of procedure. They desired the translation of the crucifix to be made with all due solemnity, "and with a proof, which will remain in the history of the *pious image*" (we quote *verbatim* from the *Tablet*) "as one of the most glorious testimonies of the gratitude of the people of Rome." Accordingly, they would be content with nothing less, than that the crucifix should first be carried across the entire city, in solemn procession, to the Church of St. Charles, where it abode fifteen days. The time, however, was not idly spent. "One may well say" writes the editor of the *Univers*, "that the holy crucifix, during the fifteen days that it passed in the Church of St. Charles, *has fulfilled the office of an eloquent preacher*." The writer's veneration, it would seem, is so intense, that he unconsciously personifies the object which is so dear to his heart. The crucifix is a holy crucifix, a pious crucifix, it fulfils the office of an eloquent preacher, it is the source of health to the sick, of succour to the afflicted, of aid to the distressed. Could more be said of St. Peter or St. Paul, if they were alive?

At length Sunday, November 6, arrived, on which the crucifix was to be borne back in procession to its new sanctuary. And now the laudable exertions of the guild of carpenters were rewarded with the presence and co-operation of an eminent personage, whose aid they had not ventured to expect. "A few days before Sunday, November 6, it began to be whispered in Rome that the Holy Father, Pope Pius IX., would assist at the procession. On Sunday morning people went even farther, and said that the Holy Father would *preach* to the people on the arrival of the holy image. One may judge of the joy and astonishment of the population on receiving this good news." The Popes, it seems, have been so little in the habit of addressing the people from the pulpit, that it was no wonder that the good citizens of Rome were rather astonished on the present occasion. Public rumour, however, for once proved a true prophet. The Pope did actually preach and take part in the procession, which is thus described by the writer in the *Univers*:—

"The sacred pageant was opened by a detachment of firemen, and closed by a platoon of Capitoline guards. All the streets were canopied. An immense multitude filled them, giving the most expressive signs of veneration, respect, and love. All the city of Rome followed, or beheld as it it passed *the ancient and well-beloved crucifix, the worship and devotion of which their ancestors had bequeathed to them*, and which they will transmit to their children of the most distant generations. When the shrine had arrived at the base of the stairs of the Church of San Luca, at some paces from the flight of steps on which the Holy Father stood, in rochet, stole, and pallium

* See CATHOLIC LAYMAN for November, 1852 vol. i, pp. 122, 123.

† *Vide* especially the letters of "Sidrach" in the CATHOLIC LAYMAN for February and April, 1853, vol. ii., pp. 21, 45.

of red velvet, *he bowed before the holy crucifix, and venerated it devoutly.*"

Here we must pause. If our readers do not feel that the whole scene which has been just narrated is utterly opposed to the nature of true spiritual religion, as it is described in the New Testament, any attempt of ours to convince them of the fact must, we fear, prove unavailing. We can scarcely wonder at the intense devotion displayed by the people of Rome towards their favourite crucifix, when we see the Pope himself, their supreme, infallible guide in all matters of religion, as earnest in his devout veneration as the most ignorant member of his flock. But what we do wonder at, is, how any persons, with the Word of God in their hands, can believe for one moment that the religion of Rome in the present day, such as it has been just described, is the religion of the Bible. We have seen how the whole population of the city, headed by their chief spiritual guide, assembled together for a solemn act of devotion. And to what are their prayers addressed? To the Most High God, who declares himself to be a hearer of prayer? No! but to "an ancient and well-beloved wooden crucifix!"

We earnestly request our Roman Catholic readers to read over their Douay Testaments, and if they can there find any mention of St. Peter or St. Paul acting as the Pope is above represented to have done—if they can find *any one instance* of religious worship offered to an image, or the name of a crucifix so much as mentioned—we will freely acknowledge ourselves to be in error. We say nothing, for the present, of the prohibition of image worship in the Second Commandment; we will simply ask our readers one qnestion:—if the worship of a crucifix be indeed an essential part of Christianity—nay, if, as we have seen, it be considered the *most* essential part of religion in Rome—how came it to pass that there is not one word about it in the Bible? Does not this one fact prove how widely the modern Church of Rome has departed from the simplicity of the Scriptural and Apostolic worship? And if this be so, another question arises, are her members *safe* in remaining in a church which has corrupted the pure faith and practice which she received, and which has gone so widely astray from God's ordinances? That worship only is pleasing in God's sight which is rendered according to his own revealed will; and what that will is our Blessed Lord has plainly declared to us (John iv. 24). "GOD IS A SPIRIT, AND THEY THAT WORSHIP HIM, MUST WORSHIP HIM IN SPIRIT AND IN TRUTH."

DECRETAL EPISTLES.—No. III.

WE showed in our last number that the Popes of the ninth century did adopt the forgeries which were put upon the early Popes; did quote them; and did appeal to them as being inspired by God for the government of his Church.

Our object is now to show how those Popes of the ninth century, even where they did not expressly mention the forgeries, did carry out and support the various novelties which the forgeries were designed and contrived to introduce. And here we shall choose for our examples those things which are most important in themselves, and which Protestants and Roman Catholics are equally concerned to understand.

INFALLIBILITY.

The keystone of the Roman system is infallibility. Had the forgeries anything to do with that?

In the third letter forged for Pope Felix I. he is made to say—"This holy and apostolic Church of Christ, mother of all Churches, which is proved by the grace of Almighty God never to have erred from the path of apostolic tradition, nor has succumbed, depraved by heretical novelties, but, as in the beginning she received the rule of Christian faith from her authors, the chiefs of the apostles of Christ, she remains unhurt for ever, according to the divine promise of the Lord himself, the Saviour," (1) (quoting Luke, xxii. 31, 32).

This same passage is repeated over again in the letter forged for Pope Marcus, where it is thus introduced:—"The holy Roman Church, which has always remained, and the Lord providing for it, and the blessed apostle Peter bringing aid, will remain for the future immaculate," (2) &c. And in consequence, these forged letters lay it down in various places, that all are to follow the faith of Rome.

Here is certainly a fair statement of the claim of Roman infallibility. Some Roman Catholics may think it a pity that it is only a forgery of the ninth century.

They may also think it a pity that none of the Popes of the first eight centuries made any such claim. But this we undertake to affirm, having read all their letters.

We have often shown in our paper the weakness of the arguments in support of the infallibility of Rome. *Now*, we go farther—we ask Roman Catholics to consider whether the claim itself be not wholly based on forgery and fraud?

(1) Hæc sancta et apostolica mater omnium Ecclesiarum Christi Ecclesia, quæ per Dei Omnipotentis gratiam, a tramite apostolicæ traditionis nunquam errasse probatur, nec ab hæreticis novitatibus depravanda succubuit, sed ut in exordio normam fidei Christianæ percepit ab auctoribus suis, apostolorum Christi principibus, illibata fine tenus manet, secundum ipsius Domini salvatoris divinam pollicitationem," &c.—Labbe and Coss., vol. i., p. 911.

(2) Sancta Romana Ecclesia, quæ semper immaculata mansit, et Domino providente, et B. Petro Apostolo opem ferente, in futuro manebit.—Labbe and Coss., vol. ii., p. 471.

But if it will satisfy Roman Catholics to learn, that, as soon as the forgery appeared, the *following* Popes did take it up, and carry it out with all their might, we can, at least, give this much satisfaction to any one who will be satisfied with it:—

Pope Nicolas I., in his eleventh epistle to Photius, says of Popes—"For the Holy Spirit, whose vessels they were, could not give forth any but sweet things by those whom it had filled." (3)

In his 70th epistle (to "Hincmar and the other bishops in the kingdom of Carolus," in France), Pope Nicolas says—"She herself (Rome) from the time that the Christian religion began to be spread, has preserved unmutilated the things which she once received in Peter, her patron and founder, and has taught them uncorrupt through the other climates of the world: nor was any found, in so many revolutions of ages, who detracted from her traditions, or presumed to oppose them." (4)

Those who can believe this latter statement, may believe the forgeries themselves.

Pope Nicolas goes on (p. 473)—"Whether were we ever found inventors of any novelty? Whether have we ever transmitted any other things than those which pertained to their salvation, and to the common state of the Church? Whether were we ever heretics? For although, indeed, we do not deny that we are sinners, thanks to God, we by no means recognise ourselves as polluted by the dregs of any error." (5)

Was Pope Nicolas guilty of no novelty in imposing these forged epistles on the Church? Was Pope Liberius polluted with no dregs of error, when he condemned Athanasius, and became an Arian? (See our answer to a "Truth-seeker" in this number, p. 28.)

Of course, Pope Nicolas does not fail to draw the practical conclusion from all this. "The entire number of all believers seeks for doctrine, demands the integrity of faith, the loosing of crimes, from this holy Roman Church, which is the head of all Churches." (6)

INSPIRATION OF THE POPE.

Here we may fitly introduce the claims which Pope Nicolas makes, to speak by divine inspiration and revelation. For it is only by God putting thoughts into the heart, and words into the mouth, that man can be infallible.

In his eighth epistle to the Greek Emperor Michael, Pope Nicolas says—"We are going to write to your potency, *the Lord inspiring us.*" (7)

Again, in his forty-seventh epistle to Carolus Calvus, giving directions to a council what inquiries they were to make about some priests, he tells them, "To act in such a way that the thing may be laid before us (the Pope), by the relation of all the bishops who assemble; and thus, then, without doubt, *wait for what the Lord shall have revealed, to be defined by us.*" (9)

But his successor, Pope Hadrian II., brought this doctrine to perfection in his thirteenth epistle to Lotharius, King of Lorraine in France. "With unwearied exertions, opening our apostleship's *mouth, full of the grace of the seven-fold Spirit.* . . . O renowned King Lotharius, we admonish your excellency with paternal affection." (10)

And when Pope Hadrian II. took on himself to give away the kingdom of Lotharius, when Lotharius was dead, writing to the great men of that kingdom, he professes to anticipate the devil with his directions—"which precepts humbly obeying, like all who from the beginning pleased God, you may be able to be saved, the Lord saying in the Gospel, 'If any one love me, he will keep my word, and my Father will love him, and we will come to him and make one abode with him.'" (11) Where observe that the Pope requires for his own commands in temporal matters, that obedience which Christ requires for his own word; and the Pope says this was the way of salvation from the beginning!

In the same way Pope Nicolas I., in his ninth epistle to Michael the emperor, applies to those who receives the Pope's commands, the words of our Saviour, Luke xi. 28.—"Blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it." (12)

Our readers may have some notion, from this instance, of what the religion of Rome was in the middle ages, and how it was established.

They may see why Pope Nicolas was so anxious to have it thought that the forgeries put on the early Popes were divinely inspired; it was that his own words, in their turn, should pass for inspired too. Here we have the origin and the extent of the Roman claims to infallibility.

SUPREMACY BY DIVINE RIGHT.

The primacy and supremacy of Rome over all Churches is another fundamental point of the papacy.

The Forgers made Anacletus say, in the third epistle—"This holy and apostolic Roman Church obtained the primacy and pre-eminence of power over all Churches, not from the apostles, but from the Lord and Saviour himself." (13)

Again, they make Pope Julius II. say (in his second epistle), of Rome—"In which the Lord placed the principality of the whole Church." (14)

We might quote more, but space prevents us; let us see, with equal brevity, how Pope Nicolas applies it. In his 70th epistle (to Hincmar, and other bishops), Pope Nicolas says—"On account of the primacy of the Roman Church, conferred on Peter by the gift of Christ." (15)

And in his eighth epistle to Michael the Emperor—"Therefore, those privileges were given to this holy Church by Christ; they were not given by synods." (16)

When we come to examine how genuine documents have been altered and "cooked," it will be seen how probable it is, that this doctrine also owes its origin to the forgeries.

A POPE'S PRAYER.

But we cannot leave this eighth epistle of Nicolas without showing a specimen of a Pope's prayer, which occurs in it. We ask our readers to consider first this prayer of St. Paul for those whom he taught, taken from the Douay Bible, Ephesians, i. 18, &c.—"The eyes of your heart (being) enlightened, that you may know what the hope is of his calling (Christ's), and what are the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints, and what is the exceeding greatness of his power towards us, who believe." . . . Consider now and compare the Pope's prayer:—"We beseech Almighty God, that he who has disclosed to you the mystery of the knowledge of himself, would grant you also to know fully his own dispositions, by which the holy Church manages her secret, and what, and how great, and what sort the privileges of the Roman Church are, and from whom they took their beginning." (17).

In these two prayers, reader, you may see the whole difference between the times of Apostles and the times of Popes.

Neither may we leave out the threat which helps out the Pope's prayer—"If you set up your efforts against the privileges of the Roman Church, beware lest they be turned against you; it is hard for thee to kick against the goad." (18) Our readers will recognise these last words as those which our Saviour himself spoke to Paul; and these words the Pope takes to himself. (Acts ix. 5, Douay Bible.)

Neither can we omit Pope Nicolas's assertion, that the General Council of Nice acknowledged that all things were conferred on her (the Roman Church) by the word of the Lord;" (19) which every one, who ever read the Council of Nice, knows to be false. Pope Nicolas quotes this from a letter of Pope Boniface, which, we shall show hereafter, lies under strong suspicion of being forged.

POPES' POWER OF CONDEMNING TO HELL.

But to proceed:—A consequence of primacy given by God, and directed by divine inspiration, is spiritual power—not the power of excommunication exercised in the early Church, but something more, as we shall see.

Our readers will remember the passage which we quoted in our first number from the forged epistle of St. Clement. "In the judgment of God, he shall suffer the torments of *eternal fire*, who shall have neglected the *decrees* of the Church." (20) It would be strange if the Popes who estab-

(3) Spiritus enim Sanctus, quorum vasa isti fuerunt, non potest nisi dulcia per hos, quos repleverit, eructare.—Labbe and Coss., vol. viii., p. 373.

(4) Cum ipsa, ex quo cœpit Christiana religio dilatari, quæ semel in Petro patrono ac institutore sue suscepit, immutilata tenuerit, et incorrupta per alia climata muudi docuerit: nec apparuerit quisquam per tot saltem seculorum curricula, quia ejus traditionibus derogavit, aut obviare præsumpserit.—Labbe and Coss., vol. viii., p. 472.

(5) Nunquid nos alicujus novitatis inventores extitimus? Numquid alia nisi quæ ad salutem ipsorum, et ad communem Ecclesiæ statum pertinebant, transmisimus? Numquid nos hæretici aliquando fuimus? Nam licet nos peccatores quidem esse non denegemus, quotumlibet tamen errorum fœce pollutos, Deo gratias, minime recognoscimus.—Labbe and Coss., vol. viii., 473.

(6) Universitas credentium ab hac sancta Romana ecclesia, quæ caput omnium est Ecclesiarum, doctrinam exquirit, integritatem fidei deposcit, criminum solutionem. . . . Labbe and Coss., vol. viii., p. 283., Ep. 6, to Photius.

(7) Ad potentiam vestram, inspirante Domino, scripturi.—Labbe and Coss., vol. viii., p. 293.

(9) Agite quo nobis omnium episcoporum qui convenient relatu pandantur; et ita dein quod Dominus revelaverit a nobis definiendum procul dubio præstolamini.—Labbe and Coss., in Con. Suess., vol. VIII., p. 814.

(10) Os Apostolatus nostri, septiformis Spiritus gratia plenum . . . O inclyta rex Lothari, vicibus indefessis aperientes, excellentiam tuam paterno monemus affectu.—Labbe and Coss., vol. viii., p. 911.

(11) Quibus humiliter obedientes, sicut omnes qui ab initio Deo placuerunt, salvi esse possitis, dicente Domino in Evangelio, si quis diliget me, &c., from John 14, 23.—Labbe and Coss., vol. viii., p. 917.

(12) "Magis beati sint qui audiunt verbum Dei, et custodiunt," Itaque audite serenissime Imperator voces Legatorum nostrorum, vel voces literarum nostrarum audite patienter, audite tranquille. . . . —Labbe and Coss., vol. viii., 327.

(13) Hæc vero sacrosancta Romana et Apostolica Ecclesia, non ab Apostolis, sed ab ipso Domino Salvatore nostro primatum obtinuit, et eminentiam potestatis super universas Ecclesias.—Labbe and Coss., vol. i., p. 528.

(14) Ubi Dominus Ecclesiæ totius posuit principatum.—Labbe and Coss., vol. ii., p. 480.

(15) Christi munere propter primatum Ecclesiæ Romanæ in beato Petro concessum . . .—Labbe and Coss., vol. viii., p. 473.

(16) Ista igitur privilegia hujus sanctæ Ecclesiæ a Christo donata; a synodis non donata.—Labbe and Coss., vol. VIII., p. 314.

(17) Sed Rogamus Omnipotentem Deum, ut qui suæ cognitionis vobis reservavit mysterium, tribuat quoque nobis ad plenum suas dispositiones, quibus sancta Ecclesia moderatur arcanum, et quæ sint, vel quanta, et qualia privilegia Ecclesiæ Romanæ, et ex quo cœperint exordium. —Labbe and Coss., vol. viii., p. 314.

(18) Si . . . contra privilegia Ecclesiæ Romanæ nisus vestros erigitis, cavete ne super vos convertantur. Durum quippe est vobis contra stimulum calcitrare.—Vol. viii., p. 314.

(19) Omnia denique novarat hujc, Domini sermone, concessa.—Labbe and Coss. vol. viii., p. 803, Ep. 42, to all bishops of Gaul.

(20) In Judicio Dei, iguis eterni tormenta sustinebit, qui Ecclesiastica decreta neglexerit.—Labbe and Coss., vol. i., p. 97.

lished the forgeries had not attended to so important a point. Consequently we find Pope Nicolas thus concluding a letter in which he confirms the privileges of the Archbishopric of Rhemes—"If any one, by a daring attempt, be the person great or small, shall have presumed to act contrary to this our apostolical *decree*, let him know that he is bound by the chain of anathema, a stranger from the kingdom of God, and condemned with all impious persons to the punishment of *eternal fire*."(21)

Now hear Pope Hadrian II., who succeeded Nicolas. In his 22nd epistle (to Hincmar), written about the Popes undertaking to give away the kingdom of Lotharius, he pronounces this sentence on any one who resists—"Bound with the chain of anathema, deprived of the name of Christianity, he shall be altogether placed with the devil, whom he imitates in this."(22) Hear Pope Hadrian again—"*not only* he shall be tied with the bonds of excommunication, BUT ALSO bound with the chain of anathema, he shall be destined to hell with the devil."(23) Mark, in this last passage, that this power of casting into hell is *not* the same as excommunication, but something additional to it. Where did these Popes get this power? What CHARTER could they show for it? Not the Scriptures, certainly; for it is of God alone that the Scripture says—"Fear Him that can destroy both body and soul into hell."—(Matthew x. 28, Douay Bible.) It was in the forged letter of Clement, and in that alone, that they found this power conferred on them; and having once persuaded people to believe that that forged letter was given *by divine inspiration*, they, of course, set about to condemn to hell themselves.

We trust our having traced this claim to its origin in the forgeries of the ninth century, may be some relief to those who are now subject to the threat of being turned into hell by priestly domination.

THE POPE SUPREME JUDGE.

Another invention which had a main share in establishing the Papacy, was the claim of the Pope, that he was appointed by God himself to be the only judge of bishops, and that God had given him the power of hearing appeals from the judgments of all other bishops, and of reversing their decisions. The gaining of this was the great practical victory of the Papacy over the Church.

We have partly shown already (in our second number) how the Popes established this by means of the forged epistles, and space does not permit us to go into it again. The claim to have this power *by divine right*, and from God himself, appears to have originated from those forgeries. Any previous claim of this sort was of more modest dimensions, as resting on the decrees of the Church, not on the gift of God—that lesser claim rested wholly on a canon of the Council of Sardica, which canon was most probably itself a forgery, as we shall show hereafter. That whole claim, therefore, from first to last, was based wholly on forgery; yet it is one of the main pillars of the Papacy.

We might say and prove the same of the Pope's claim to having always possessed and exercised the rights of calling and confirming councils. But it is impossible to use all our materials now; we must treat of this claim separately some other time.

But in the multiplicity of materials we may diversify our subject. Suppose we try "Holy Water."

ORIGINAL INSTITUTION OF HOLY WATER.

We must first ask our readers to consider the following passage of Scripture (Hebrews ix., 13 and 14, Douay Bible), where St. Paul argues thus from the Jewish sacrifices—"For if . . . . the ashes of an heifer being sprinkled, sanctify such as are defiled, to the cleansing of the flesh; (24) how much more shall the blood of Christ, who, by the Holy Ghost, offered himself unspotted unto God, cleanse our conscience from dead works to serve the living God?"

After considering this passage, our readers will be able to appreciate the following passage from the forged letter of Pope Alexander I., which is THE ORIGINAL INSTITUTION OF HOLY WATER:—"We bless water, mixed with salt, sprinkled on the people; that all sprinkled with it may be sanctified and purified; which also we command to be done by all priests. For if the *ashes of an heifer, sprinkled with blood, sanctified and purified the people*, MUCH MORE water, mixed with salt, and consecrated with divine prayers, *sanctifies and purifies the people*." (25) Our readers will see in this, that HOLY WATER is here put into the very place, and established by the very proofs, which St. Paul assigns to the BLOOD OF CHRIST!

If our readers will now look back to the "Talk of the Road," chapter 16, (26) they will see what teaching the poor Irish woman, Mary Gormly, was following when she maintained that holy water was the best thing in the Church of Rome to trust to for salvation. Here is what poor Mary Gormly said, "Sure when I have plenty of that by me, I don't care for charms, nor fairies, nor the devil himself; and what need I want anything else, when I don't care for the devil itself, with the holy water on me." Let us see what authority poor Mary Gormly had for that, in the forged decretal which instituted holy water; "It turns away the plots of the devil, and defends men from the wiles of the evil spirit."(27)

How many poor Irish people are ignorantly following a religion invented by the wicked forgers, and established by the Popes of the ninth century! and what need there is that these things should be exposed!

For, we repeat, this is THE ORIGINAL INSTITUTION of "holy water."

Our witness for this is Martene, a monk of the order of St. Benedict, and one of the most learned writers of the Church of Rome on rites and ceremonies. We have before us his book "On the ancient Discipline of the Church in Celebrating Divine Offices, exhibiting the various rites and uses of different churches of Italy, Germany, Spain, England, and chiefly of France, gathered out of various pontifical books of the more distinguished churches; out of sacramentaries, missals, breviaries, rituals, ordinaries, or consuetudinaries as well manuscript as printed; from various decrees of councils, statutes of bishops, sayings of holy fathers, and very many other approved authors."(28)

Now, hear the testimony of this very learned Roman Catholic, who had searched so deeply and laboriously into every source from which information on this subject could be derived:—"Concerning the solemn benediction of salt and water to be made on every Lord's day, I do not remember that I have read anything before THE NINTH CENTURY, in which Pope Leo IV. has these few words in his homily of the pastoral care (29).

In Goar's "Rituale Græcorum," a collection of the oldest Greek liturgies, made by a missionary of the Pope, there is a service for consecrating holy water. Martene rightly judged this to be later than the ninth century. We allude to it here only for the sake of the note which Goar gives on it. Speaking of the institution of holy water, he says—"It acknowledges as its author, Pope Alexander, who presided over the Church in the time of Trajan, writing in the epistle ascribed to him, ch. 5. . ." (30). And then follow the words, which we have given above, from the forged epistle. This is the testimony of one employed by the Pope on an important mission.

Having thus found the origin of holy water in the forged decretals, we have to show how it was established in the ninth century.

After those forged decretals were published, Pope Leo IV. published his "Homily of Pastoral Care," which is, in fact, the Pope's order to the whole clergy how to perform their functions. And in it we find—"On every Lord's day, bless the water before mass, with which let the people be sprinkled; and for this have a proper vessel." (31).

This is the first genuine authority in the Church of Rome, that Martene could find, for blessing holy water for general use; and it appeared *just after* the forged decretals had been published.

And after Hincmar, Archbishop of Rhemes, had been drilled by Pope Nicolas I., in the ninth century, we find the following in his directions to his clergy:—"That on every Lord's day each presbyter, in his own church, before the solemnization of mass, should make blessed water, in a neat vessel, and fit for so great a ministry; with which let the people entering the church be sprinkled; and let those who wish receive it in neat little vessels of their own, and sprinkle it through their houses, and their farms, and their vineyards; also over their cattle and upon their fodder, and, moreover, upon their own food and drink." (32)

We now leave it to our readers to decide on what authority this use of holy water rests—whether it be a part of the religion of Christ, or a part of the religion invented and imposed by forgery and fraud in the ninth century. (33)

TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

The modern doctrine of transubstantiation, too, may probably owe its establishment to the same source.

In the forged epistle of Pope Damasus we find him speaking thus, when forbidding accusations of priests:—"Who are nearer to God, *and who make the body of Christ with their own mouths*." (34) We find no such words in any genuine letter of any Pope before the ninth century. But *after* these forgeries were published in the ninth century, *then, and not before*, the controversy about transubstantiation immediately arose. This, certainly, is very remarkable; but this subject is too large to be fully entered on here.

Our readers may be amused to see how Pope Nicolas made use of "the keys" with the Empress Eudoxia, when he had failed with the Emperor; he writes to her—"As she hoped that the blessed apostle Peter, the key-bearer of the kingdom of heaven, should always be propitious to her house," that she would strive for him with the Emperor, "like a brave virago." (35) One knows not which her faith in the key-bearer, or the delicate compliment to her female vanity, would have the greater effect.

But space compels us to put aside a mass of materials which we have prepared; which, however, may be of use on future occasions. Still, we cannot pass over the Pope's method of dealing with kings, after the forged decretals had come to be believed.

POPES' DEALINGS WITH KINGS.

Here, too, the foundation was laid in the forgeries. The second forged epistle of Pope Marcellinus has the following:—"It shall not be lawful for the Emperor, or any one observing piety, to presume anything contrary to the divine commands, nor *to do anything* which is opposed to the evangelic, prophetic, and *apostolic* rules. . . . Nor shall anything stand which may have been done contrary to the constitution of evangelical, prophetical, or apostolical doctrine, *or to their* SUCCESSOR, or of the holy fathers. (36)

There is a similar passage in the VIth Roman Council, under Pope Symmachus, in the year 504 (37), with this difference, that nothing is said there about *the successor of the apostles*. And our business is chiefly with the doctrine laid down in the forged epistle of Marcellinus, that nothing done by the Emperor against the *successor of the apostles*, that is, the Popes, shall stand.

Observe here another principle laid down in the forged epistle of Pope Damasus; speaking of persons who act contrary to the canons, he is made to say—"Such presumption is manifestly one kind of those who blaspheme the Holy Ghost, since it acts against him by whose impulse and grace those same holy canons were given." (38)

We can now understand why Pope Nicolas, writing to the Greek Emperor Michael, spoke of a letter in which that Emperor had resisted the Pope's orders, as being "full of all wickedness *and blasphemy*, and contrary to the disposition of God, in which he preferred the privileges of the Church and See of Rome, to the privileges of all Churches, by his own ineffable providence." (39) And when the Emperor said, in his own defence, that none of his predecessors had thought it necessary to apply to Rome for directions, the Pope replies—"the more shame for them!" (40)

---

(21) Si quis autem temerario ausu, magna parvave persona, contra hoc nostrum apostolicum decretum agere presumpserit, sciat se anathematis vinculo esse innodatum, et a regno Dei alienum, et cum omnibus impiis æterni incendii supplicio condemnatum.—Labbe and Coss., vol. viii., p. 490, Ep. 6, Appendix I.

(22) Vinculis anathematis obligatus, nomine Christianitatis privatus, cum diabolo, quem super hoc imitatur, omnino locabitur.—Labbe and Coss., vol. viii., p. 921.

(23) Non solum excommunicationis nexibus innodabitur, verum etiam vinculis anathematis obligatus in gehenna cum diabolo deputabitur.—Labbe and Coss., vol. viii., p. 921.

(24) In Numbers, xix., 2 & 17, our readers may see the account of the Jewish institution here referred to by St. Paul.

(25) Aquam enim sale conspersam populis benedicimus, ut ea cuncti aspersi, sanctificentur ac purificentur; quod et omnibus sacerdotibus faciendum esse mandamus. Nam si cinis vitulæ asperso sanguine populum sanctificabat atque mundabat, multo magis aqua sale aspersa, divinisque precibus sacrata, populum sanctificat atque mundat.—Labbe and Coss., vol. i., p. 546, Ep. 1., cap. 5.

(26) CATHOLIC LAYMAN, Number for September, 1853, page 102, column 3. Also, page 133 of the "Talk of the Road," published separately.

(27) Insidias diaboli avertit, et a phantasmatis versutiis homines defendit.—Last reference.

(28) TRACTATUS DE ANTIQUA ECCLESIÆ DISCIPLINA in divinis celebrandis officiis, variosque diversarum Ecclesiarum ritus et usus exhibens, Italiæ, Germaniæ, Hispaniæ, Angliæ et maximè Galliæ, collectus ex variis insignium Ecclesiarum libris Pontificalibus, Sacramentariis, Missalibus, Breviariis, Ritualibus, Ordinariis, seu Consuetudinariis, cum MS. tum editis; ex diversis conciliorum decretis, episcoporum statutis, sanctorum patrum dictis, aliisque probatis auctoribus permultis.—Studio et opera Domni Edmundi Martene, Presbyteri et Monachi Benedictini e Congregatione S. Mauri. Lugduni, 1706.

(29) De solemni salis et aquæ benedictione singulis diebus Dominicis faciendâ, non memini me legisse aliquid ante seculum IX., quo Leo Papa IV. in homilia de cura Pastorali pauca hæc habet.—Page 58.

Martene goes on to say, like a good Roman Catholic, that of course he does not doubt that the use of holy water is more ancient; but his proofs for this are too trifling to need notice.

His testimony that no trace can be found of a service for blessing the water, before the ninth century, is all we want. The water for *baptism* was blessed, and it is probable that a superstitious use was made by some of that water. But this was a private superstition, not an institution of the Church. It was probably the object of the forger to turn that unauthorized superstition into a Church institution.

(30) Ille authorem agnovit Alexandrum Pontificem Trajani temporibus Ecclesiæ præsidentem, epistola ipsi ascripta, cap. v., scribentem, &c.—Goar Rituale Græcorum, p. 451, Paris, 1647.

(31) Omni die dominica ante missam aquam benedictam, unde populus aspergatur; et ad hoc proprium vas habeto.—Labbe and Coss, vol. viii., p. 31.

(32) Ut omni Dominico die quisque presbyter in sua Ecclesia ante missarum solemnia aquam benedictam faciat in vase mundo et huic ministerio convenienti, de qua populus intrans Ecclesiam aspergatur, et qui voluerint in vasculis sua mundis ex illa accipiant, et per mansiones, et agros, et vicos, super pecora quoque sua, atque super pabula eorum, nec non et super cibos et potum suum conspergant.

Hincmari Archiep. Rhemen. Capitula ad Presbyteros parochiæ suæ. A.D. 852.—Labbe and Coss., vol. viii., p. 569.

(33) It may be right to mention that, in what is called "the Apostolical Constitutions," there is what professes to be an institution of holy water by St. Matthew the apostle, himself.—Labbe and Coss., vol. i., p. 495. This is notoriously a forgery of the middle ages. These "Apostolical Constitutions" are, in fact, a very ancient liturgy of the Church, with many such forgeries stuffed into it, probably in the ninth century.

(34) Qui proximiores sunt Deo, et qui proprie ore corpus Christi conficiunt.—Ep. 4 to Stephen and the Council of Africa.—Labbe and Coss., vol. ii., p. 874.

(35) Tanquam fortis virago.—Ep. 15 to Eudoxia the Empress.—Labbe and Coss., vol. viii., p. 886.

(36) Non licet ergo imperatori, vel cuiquam potestatem custodienti, aliquid contra mandata divina presumere: nec quidquam quod Evangelicis propheticisque et Apostolicis regulis obviat, agere . . . . nec quidquam quod contra evangelica, vel prophetica, aut apostolica doctrinæ constitutionem, successorumve eorum, sive sanctorum patrum, actum fuerit, stabit.—Labbe and Coss., vol. iv., p. 936.

(37) Labbe and Coss., vol. iv., p. 1373.

(38) Talis enim presumptio manifeste unum genus est blasphemandum Spiritum Sanctum; quoniam contra eum agit, cujus impulsu et gratia iidem Sancti editi sunt canones.—Ep. 1 to Aurelius.—Labbe and Coss., vol. ii., 863.

(39) Plena erant omni pravitate, atque blasphemia et contra ipsam dispositionem Dei, in qua Ecclesiæ sedisque Romanæ privilegia, cunctarum ecclesiarum privilegiis sua ineffabili providentia præmisit.—Ep. 5 to Michael.—Labbe and Coss., vol. viii., p. 813.

(40) Et hoc dictum quasi nostrum fuerit opprobrium, eo quod eadem apostolicam in nullo quærere antecessores vestri dignati fuerint, cum magis eorum fuerit decorum.—Ep. 8, to Michael.—Labbe and Coss., vol. viii., p. 296.

But tho Greek Emperor was a long way off, and the Pope could do nothing but abuse him; not so in France. The great empire which Charlemagne had founded in France and Germany was now broken up, and divided among three weak and worthless men. It was a grand opportunity for bringing forged decretals into play; and the Popes did play off those weak fools against each other with matchless skill, taking part in turn with each against the rest, until he had weakened and broken them all. Let us follow, as one instance, the ups and downs of poor King Carolus.

He has given some offence; and the Pope "writes, specially chiding and admonishing, and, at the same time, *ordering* him." (41) This seems to have a good effect, for in the next letter to Carolus himself the Pope praises his humility highly. (42)

Times were changed; for, before forged decretals came out, it was kings of France that praised the humility of Popes. Thus, about the year 795, just before the forged epistles came out, Charlemagne, the Emperor, writes to Pope Leo. III.—"The letters of your excellency being read, and the decretal document heard, we greatly rejoiced, as I confess, whether in the unanimity of your election, or *in the obedience of your humility*. . . ." (43)

But let us follow poor King Carolus; he has been setting up for himself, and the Pope has brought him to his knees; and King Carolus writes—"We would not by any means set that man over the aforesaid Church (which French kings always did, till the forged decretals came out), before we had consulted you, *to whom we commit all our counsels, our wife, our children, our kingdom, and all our property*. . . ." (44)

A Christian bishop might say to such a king, "I want your soul for God, and I want neither your kingdom nor your property." But Pope Nicolas had not so learned the forged decretals; and so he answers, "Anew we discover evidently the marks of the faith with which you burn (*not* to Christ *but*) towards the Holy Roman Church; reading the letters of your excellency, which *distil honey instead of words!*"(45) Aye; is that the Pope's honey!

But King Carolus loved honey too; and when King Lotharius was dead, Carolus claimed that kingdom also, which the Pope wished to give to another. Then followed the threats of hell-fire and the devil, of which we have spoken already.

Carolus is in more trouble: his son Caroloman has rebelled against him, and Carolus has banished him. Caroloman flies to Rome, and will be ever obedient to the Pope; so we have a letter from Pope Hadrian II., to Carolus, pronouncing him "worse than a wild beast," (46) and ordering him to restore his son to all his honours, *and to his paternal affection, until* the Pope shall send legates to enquire into the merits of the quarrel! So the king must not even be angry, till the Pope knows why.

King Carolus is on his bended knees again, but in a very grumbling humour. So the Pope writes to him, after a little flattery about the "praise-worthy love and modest wisdom" of King Carolus—"You have sent to us a tumultuous clamour, nor do we find that you have heard with patience the admonitions and corrections of our pontificateship; truly it appears that you are as yet somewhat wanting in perfect love."(47) The Pope, of course, wishes to have him perfect, and thus states the treatment he intends to adopt—"Therefore, since we desire to have you a perfect man, and pleasing to God in all things, like a wise father, who does not cease to whip with a severe scourge his most dear son, *even when not offending*, lest when feeling secure, he might boldly mix himself up with unlawful crimes."(48)

Who would not be the son of so loving a father? But unreasonable Carolus murmurs still, and writes a murmuring letter to the Pope; to which the Pope replies again—"no murmurer (against the Pope) receives the kingdom of God." (49) Of course not, if the Pope have the key. But the Pope is very civil now, for he has heard this good report of King Carolus, "that you fervently wish and desire to exalt this first see of Peter the prince of apostles; to honour and to enrich with many gifts his vicar, and the clergy entrusted to him." (50) And the Pope adds, in all sincerity, "I so love such virtues in you, as I do my own soul!" (51)

But should such virtues in a weak and worthless king go unrewarded? Not so; the Pope gives his promise now to make King Carolus emperor! (52) a fair height for Popes to have risen to by the judicious use of forged epistles!

POLICY OF THE FORGERS.

But our readers may wonder how it was possible that forgeries so gross and blundering as these appear to be, could ever have been successfully imposed on the world, and on the Church as its laws; to say nothing of the fact, that the deceived were then as ignorant as the deceivers; it must be acknowledged that while the blunders of these forgeries are gross in the extreme in everything that required the smallest knowledge or learning, they are yet constructed with consummate skill for making their way in such an age of crime and lawless violence. To the few who mourned over the general corruption and depravity, those forged laws held out the hope of restoring peace and virtue, by the Pope's authority; at the same time to the wicked and lawless, who were the great majority, it covertly offered complete impunity for all their crimes.

The first are thus appealed to, in the forged letter of Pope Zephyrinus—"We have received such boldness from the Lord the founder of this holy see and apostolic Church, and from the blessed Peter, prince of apostles, that we labour with diligent affection for the universal Church, redeemed with the blood of Christ; and that we succour all the servants of the Lord, and by our apostolic authority bring help to all who are living piously." (53)

It were no great wonder if some pious persons should think these promises worth trying, when all else appeared to fail them. And this was not forgotten by Pope Nicolas, who says (not forgetting also some other things)—"For the privileges of the Roman Church are, that I should so speak, the remedies of the whole Catholic Church of Christ; the privileges, I say, are the arms of Peter against all attacks of wickedness, and the bulwarks and documents of the priests of the Lord, and of all, in short, who stand in high place, yea, of all who are afflicted with various evils by those same powers."(54)

But for one appeal made in the forged Decretals to the lovers of peace and virtue, we find twenty to those whose reliance was on the high hand of crime and violence. Among such appeals there is nothing that the forged Decretals labour at more earnestly, than in offering complete impunity for crime to priests and bishops. Our readers will remember the great object of making accusations of priests and bishops impossible, or at least, very difficult;(55) but they do not yet, perhaps, know what an object it was in that age to priests and bishops to be secured from the consequences of their own crimes and violence. The following law may let them a little into the state of things. We take it from the Capitula of the Emperor Charlemagne. First we have (Title II., cap 1) "The supplication of the people to Charlemagne, for the sake of the priests, that they shall not go against the enemy or to battle."(56) In which they state, "We have seen some of them wounded among the enemy, and in battle, and we have known some of them to be killed;"(57) and they very properly add, "The Lord knows when we see them in such places, terror seizes us;"(58) and they entreat him to stop this for the future.

We have, then, the decree of Charlemagne (cap. 3) granting what they ask; "We altogether, and in all things, prohibit the servants of God to carry armour, or to fight, or to go in the army, or against the enemy."59

The law may have been effectual during the reign of that great emperor; but in the confusion that followed the breaking up of his empire, matters became still worse; and impunity to bishops and priests, for crimes of violence, still more valuable.

Neither do our readers yet know how complete was the impunity offered to them. We have spoken of the six dozen witnesses; (60) but suppose a bishop should be surprised into confessing a crime, would he not be liable to punishment? This, too, was provided for by Pope Nicolas in his letter to Salomon, King of the Brittons, where, after laying down the law that seventy fit witnesses were necessary, he goes on to consider the case of those who had confessed the crimes of which they were accused; "who, although they are said to have confessed some crimes, *it may be believed* that they acknowledged only, through force or fear, and did not confess what they did not do, what they had not even heard, because they saw lay men and all seculars, together with the king, conspiring against them. Since he who pronounces what he says with his mouth only, and not with his heart, *does only speak, and not confess;* although that does not appear a just confession, which is not called forth by a legal examination."(61) So, although the bishop had confessed his crime, he could not be punished unless the *seventy witnesses* could be got! It may be imagined what an inducement such a law was to bishops to support the forged decretals, in an age in which laws were required to keep bishops from carrying arms; and in which arms were carried more often for expeditions of private plunder and revenge, than for public warfare. But it was not this only that was an inducement to bishops, there was also the law that for all crimes whatsoever bishops could be tried by the Pope only, or could appeal to him; (62) and the practice of the Pope to deal very gently with all criminals who appealed to him; which, for brevity sake, we shall treat under the head of laymen.

For laymen, too, were invited to appeal to Rome for gentle treatment for the crimes they had committed. One or two instances is all that we have room for.

One Wimar had murdered his three sons; and he fled to Rome for refuge, and told what he had done. Pope Nicolas sends him back with a letter to his bishop Rivoladrus, stating, that he had a great number of people coming to him about such things, which, of course, made him more sad than he could tell (but no great wonder when he had opened a shop for them): but, however, he goes on: "of whom we moderate some things, because he has *devoutly* hastened to entreat the favour of the prince of apostles, our nourisher."63 The Pope, accordingly, goes on to to say what his penance should be; part of it is, that he may wear his shoes on his journey home; but that he must not wear shoes for three years after—say, a year for each murdered son!

Again, one Eriarth had fled to Rome for refuge, of whom Pope Nicolas says: "He related to us, indeed, that he had killed a priest and monk in no way worthy of death."(64) The Pope goes on to say how severe his penance ought to be according to the canons; but he adds—"But, considering the devotion of his faith, or because he has hastened to the favour of the apostles, *we have acted more mildly with him.*"(65) Thus it was always with the greater criminals who fled to Rome for sanctuary. But if any, accused of lesser crimes, refused to submit to the jurisdiction of the Pope, or to plead their cause before him, their condemnation was ready, and the devil and hell-fire their portion. No crime, however great, was serious in those who acknowledged the privileges of Rome. No crime unpardonable but resistance to Rome. Nothing indifferent but moral crimes, in which the interests of Rome were not concerned. We often find those Popes hinting to their legates not to trouble them too much; and when a poor legate, perplexed with all the crimes he saw around, applied to the Pope with a list of them, and the murder of wives among them, to know how he was to deal with them, Pope Nicolas replies—"Slayers of their wives, since you do *not* add of adulteresses, or any thing of that kind, what else are they to be reckoned but homicides (in an age when homicide was little thought of), and to be brought to penance for that."(67) And even here Pope Nicolas has mercy, for, in saying that marrying again is prohibited to such, he adds, "excepting to *young men*"!(68) *It would be* a pity not to let *them* marry, when they had got rid of their old wives!

None but those who know the fearful state of those lawless times can estimate the effect of every criminal, both

---

(41) Specaliter rescripsimus increpantes et admonentes pariter et jubentes.—Ep. 34, to Rothadns.—Labbe and Coss. vol. viii., p. 420

(42) Cum vos tantæ humilitatis, tantæque devotionis incurvatione, sub potenti manu Dei ad reverentiam præcipuorum ipsius apostolorum flecti conspicimus.—Ep. 35, to Carolus.—Labbe and Coss., vol. viii., p. 421.

(43) Perlectis excellentiæ vestræ literis, et audita decretali chartula, valde, ut fateor, gavisi sumus, sea in electionis unanimitate, seu in humilitatis vestræ obedientia.—Labbe and Coss., vol. vii., p.1128.

(44) Nolnimus anteqnam vos consnleremus, cui omnia nostra consilia, uxorem, prolemque nostram, regnum, universaque nostra committimus . . . ullo modo filium prædictæ ecclesiæ præponere.—Epistle of King Carolus to Nicolas I.—Labbe and Coss, vol. viii., p. 812.

(45) Excellentiæ vestræ literas, quæ pro verbis mella stillabant, perlegentes, denuo fidei, qua circa sanctam Romanam flagratis Ecclesiam, comperimus patenter insignia.—Labbe and Coss., vol. viii., p. 813.

(46) Etiam bestiarum feritatem excedens.—Ep. 29 to Carolus.—Labbe and Coss., vol. viii., p. 929.

(47) Tumultuosum nobis clamorem misistis, nec sane patienter pontificii nostri monita et correptiones audisse comperimus; liquido patet vos adhuc perfectæ aliquid caritatis minus duntaxat habere.—Ep. 33, to Carolus.—Labbe and Coss., vol. viii., p. 934.

(48) Unde quoniam te virum perfectum, et per omnia Deo placentem habere cupimus, ceu prudens pater, qui carissimam filium suum, etiam non delinquentem, ac quando securus existens, flagitiis se audacter commisceat illicitis, flagello severo affligere non desistit . . . —Ep. 33—Labbe and Cass., vol. viii., p. 935.

(49) Regnum Dei nullus murmurans accipit.—Ep. 34, to Carolus.—Labbe and Coss., vol. viii., p. 937.

(50) Optaresque ferventer et desiderares hanc principis apostolorum Petri primam sedem exaltare, honorare, multisque muneribus vicarium ejus, et clerum sibi commissum, ditare.—Ep. 34.—Labbe and Coss., vol. viii., p. 937.

(51) Talea virtutes sic diligo in vobis, sicnt animam meam.—Same page.

(52) Nunquam acquiescemus, exposcemus, aut sponte susciplemus alium in regnum et Imperium Romanum nisi telpsum.—P. 938.

(53) Tantam a Domino, hujus sanctæ sedis et Apostolicæ Ecclesiæ fundatore, et B. Petro principe apostolorum, accepimus fiduciam, ut pro universali Christi sanguine redempta Ecclesia, impigro laboremus affectu, et omnibus Domino famulantibus succurramus, et cunctis pie viventibus apostulica auctoritate opem feramus.—Ep. 2.—Labbe and Coss., vol. i., p. 605.

(54) Privilegia namqua Romanæ Ecclesiæ totius sunt Chrlati, ut ita dicamus, remedia Ecclesiæ Catholicæ. Privilegia, inquam, Patri arma sunt contra omnes impetus pravitatis, et munimenta atque documenta Domini sacerdotum, et omnium prorsus qui in sublimitate consistunt, imo cunctorum qni ab iis in potestatibus diversis afficiuntur incommodis.—Ep. 31, to King Carolus.—Labbe and Coss., vol. viii., p. 411.

(55) Number for January, 1854, p, 3, col. 3.

(56) Supplicatio populi apud Carolum Magnum, pro sacerdotum causa, ne in hostem aut pugnam pergerent.—Labbe and Coss., vol. vii., p. 1162.

(57) Quosdam enim ex eis in hostibus et prœliis vulneratos vidimus, et quosdam perisse cognovimus.—Same reference.

(58) Novit Dominus, quando eos in talibus videmus, terror apprehendit nos . . .—Same reference.

(59) Servis Dei per omnia omnibus armaturam portare, vel pugnare, aut in exercitum at in hostem pergere, omnino prohibemus . . . —Labbe and Coss., vol. vii., p. 1165.

(60) Number for January, 1854, p. 3. col. 3.

(61) Qui etsi crimen aliquod confessi esse dicuntur, potest credi quod vi vel formidine fassi tantum, et non confessi fuerint quod non fecerant, quia videbant laicos et seculares quosque una cum rege contra se conspirantes, quod nec saltem audierant. Siquidem qui ora tantum, et non corde profert quod dicit, non confitetur, sed loquitur: quamvis non videatur justa confessio, quæ non legitimo provocatur examine.—Nicolas Ep. 22, Appendix I., Labbe and Cossart, vol. viii., p. 510.

(62) We have noticed this briefly in the quotation from the 2nd forged letter of Pope Julius, in our number for December, 1853, p. 137, col. 3.

(63) Quorum quædam temperavimus, eo quod suffragia apostolorum principis nutritoris nostri postulare devoto festinavit.—Ep. 17, to Rivoladrus, Appendix 1, Labbe and Coss., vol. viii., p. 503.

(64) Ferebat ac utique quendam presbyterum atque monachum nihil eum morte dignum occidisse.—Ep. 24, to Hincmar, Appendix 1.—Labbe and Coss., vol. viii., p. 513.

(65) Sed devotionem ejus fidei considerantes, sive quia ad suffragia apostolorum festinaverit, humanius cum illo peregimus.—Same page.

(67) Interfectores suarum conjugum, cum non addis adulterarum, vel aliquid hujusmodi, quid aliud nisi homicidæ habendi sunt, ac per hoc ad pœnitentiam redigendi?—Ep. 19, to Rodulphus, Appendix 1., can. 5.—Labbe and Coss., vol. viii., p. 505.

(68) Quibus conjugium penitus denegatur, excoptis adolescentibus. —Same page, can. 5.

lay and clerical, being thus engaged by his worst interests and passions to support "the privileges of Rome." It was enough, in such an age, to account for the reception of the forgeries.

And well Pope Nicolas knew how to drive home this argument to such men, when they resisted him. "What has happened to Rothadus to-day, how do you know that it may not happen to any of you to-morrow? So the apostle admonishes, saying, 'let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall.' But if it should happen that I speak prophetically, to whose help, I ask, would you fly?" (69)

Nor can we overlook the exaltation of their order, held up as a powerful motive to such bishops and priests. Hear the forged decretal of Pope Stephen, speaking of bishops:—"They are called the THRONES OF GOD, therefore, they ought not to be moved, nor afflicted, nor disturbed. Therefore, *of them* the prophet says—'The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth the work of his hands.'" (70)

The prospect of such impunity and such exaltation, was too great a temptation for such bishops and priests; and no wonder that the majority of them came in by degrees to support such convenient forgeries.

RESISTANCE.

But, after all, if the establishment of these forged epistles was, indeed, the introduction of a new law thrusting out the old, as Labbe and Cossart, and De Marca have said, it would be strange, even in an age of such ignorance and lawlessness, if no signs of resistance appeared. The Popes of the ninth century would not exaggerate such resistance, and, therefore, from them we take the account of it.

In many places, at first, the Pope's letters would not even be read in the councils of the bishops. Pope Nicolas complains grievously of this in his letter to the clergy of Constantinople (72); and again, speaking of Hincmar of Rhemes, and other bishops (73); so in east and west, he found this difficulty even to get his letters read.

Often, too, the Pope laments like this:—"We have seen the injury of holy Peter, and the diminution of the privileges of the apostolic see." (74)

His expostulations to the bishops of the chief countries of Europe, would be touching in a better cause; he describes the "bishops of France as inflamed by the brands of the zeal and envy of the devil." (75) He thus addresses the Bishop of Germany:—"Neither after we arisen, had begun to cast, far and wide, the arrows of the divine quiver against wickedness of this kind, have you diligently cared to labour with us. When did your labour appear in this? Where was your assembly, or where did your sacerdotal zeal shine forth? . . . When did you give a bark for these things? . . . When did you stand *with us* like the marshalled lines of cumps? When did you praise the Lord *with us* in the choir? . . When have we sung *together*? &c." (76)

And when Pope Nicolas first tried to assume to himself the power of calling councils for France, and wrote to ask each of the three kings to send two bishops to attend his council, they unswered, rather whimsically—"That the greater part of all the bishops were on guard, night and day, against the sea-pirates, and, therefore, could not come." (77) But they do pluck up courage, too, to say, that no necessity requires that they should send them. (78)

Forgery and fraud did *not* gain the battle without opposition. But forgery and fraud did triumph, and the victory was complete; and, under the effects of that victory, the Church has groaned to this day.

CONCLUSION.

We shall show, in our next number, how those forgeries of the ninth century were maintained and perpetuated as the law of the Church in after ages.

(69) Nam quod Rothadus hodie contigit, unde scitis quod eras cuilibet non eveniat vestrum? Sic apostolus admonet dicens: qui putat se stare videat ne cadat, quod si contigerit ut verbis utamur prophetiis, ad cujus rogo confugietis auxilium?—Nicolas to the bishops of the Synod of Sylvanectis, Ep. 32.—Labbe and Cost., vol. viii., p. 417.

(70) Throni enim Dei vocantur: ideo non debent moveri, aut affligi, vel perturbari. De ipsis ergo ait propheta; cœli enarrant gloriam Dei, et opera manuum ejus annuntiat firmamentum.—Stephen, Ep. 1., Labbe and Coss., vol. i., p. 735.

(72) Spretis monitis nostris, ac epistolis sibi a nobis coram tota ecclesia nostra datis.—Ep. 10.—Labbe and Coss., vol. viii., p. 354.

(73) Diversis aliis pro hac eadem causa nostris epistolis per nonnullos directis crebro contemptis.—Ep 40, to Carolus.—Labbe and Coss., vol. viii., p. 792. See also the letter of Rothadus, p. 788.

(74) Injuriam Sancti Petri, sedis apostolicæ privilegiorum imminutionem. . . . perspeximus.—Nicolas to Synod of Sylvanect.—Labbe and Cost., vol. viii., p. 416.

(75) Gallorum Episcopi, zeli et invidiæ diaboli facibus accensi.—Nicolas.—Ep 39, to clergy and people of Rome.—Vol. viii., p. 791.

(76) Nec postquam nos erecti sagittas divinæ pharetræ jaculare adversus hujus modi pronefas longe lateque cœpimus, nobis collaborare sollicite procurastis. Deinque ubi super hoc labor vester apparuit? Ubi concursus, vel ubi sacerdotale studium claruit? . . . quando pro ea latratus dedistis? . . . . . vel quando nobiscum ut castrorum acies ordinati stetistis? quando nobiscum Dominum in choro laudastis? . . . quando cantavimus simul?—Nicolas, Ep. 88, to the bishops in the kingdom of Louis.—Labbe and Coss., vol. viii., p. 416.

(77) Majorem partem episcoporum omnium die noctuque, cum aliis fidelibus tuis, contra piratas maritimos, invigilare, ob idque Episcopi impediantur ventre.—Ep. 27, to Louis and Carolus.—Vol. viii., p. 403.

(78) Ut episcopos de regnis vestris ad synodum Romam mittendi necessitas non postulet.—P. 401.

One word now to our readers. We have often had occasion to entreat our Roman Catholic correspondents not to grope for the religion of the Gospel in the ages we have been speaking of, and those that followed. Will they give us credit now for having had good grounds and reason for the earnest advice we gave?

After the insight we have given them now into the religion, the policy, the craft, and the villainy of those ages, will they now give greater heed to our earnest and affectionate warning, founded on the labour we have gone through for their sakes, to seek for no gospel of their salvation in the inventions and the wickedness of those ages; but rather to seek for it where it may be surely found—in the words of our Blessed Lord himself, and the writings of his truly inspired ministers.

ERRATUM—In Decretal Epistles, No. II. (Vol. II., No. 24, January 1854), page 2, col. 2, a clerical error occurred in giving 700 for the date of Pope Gregory the Great; it ought to have been 600. In the line next but one above that, after the words "forged Epistles," the words "besides many genuine ones," were accidentally omitted.

THE HEIR OF BALLYMANUS.—No. II.

AFTER the events narrated in our last chapter, Frank had but little inclination to remain in London; and in as short a time, therefore, as he could contrive it, was again at Ballymanus. He seemed to himself to have grown several years older since he had last been there. It was not so long since he had left home a light-hearted, thoughtless boy, and now he returned distracted by the profoundest doubts, disappointed of his dearest hopes, and convinced that life had no more happiness in store for him. His sisters, too, he felt that he had suddenly outgrown. When he was last at home their affection had been every thing to him; and, though they were younger than himself, they had been his constant companions, and their society was all he then deemed necessary for his happiness. Now he found himself introduced into a new world, into which they could not enter, and their love appeared too cold to his exalted feelings. It was from his mother alone that he sought for sympathy and consolation, and it is needless to say he sought it not in vain. To his mother he returned dearer than ever; the sacrifice he had made for her and for his faith was one which she thought could not be repaid by too much love and gratitude: she had been always proud of him, but now she believed that no hero of monkish romance had exhibited more stubborn virtue, or stood proof against more seductive temptations; and Frank could not find courage enough to open his whole heart to her, but silently winced under praises which he knew he did not deserve. But this concealment of his doubts, dictated though it was by a reluctance to give pain to those he loved, was deeply painful to himself, reserve being alien to his natural disposition, which was communicative and eager for sympathy. He thought of taking counsel with the priest of his parish; but quickly shrunk from the idea. Mr. O'Driscoll was, indeed, a perfect contrast to Mr. Oldham, to whose spiritual guidance Frank had been now for some time accustomed. Oldham was a scholar and a gentleman, of much delicacy of feeling, and one who could enter into Frank's state of mind, and appreciate the difficulties that perplexed him. Mr. O'Driscoll was a rough, vulgar man, much more skilled in cursing a heretic than in confuting one; not destitute of coarse humour; a pleasant companion over a tumbler of whiskey punch, and one who, when he addressed his flock from the altar on the subject of the Soupers, could stir them to mirth as well as indignation, and make them feel that the pelting the readers out of the parish was not only a very pious act, but good fun besides. Frank looked with a lenient eye on these proceedings, for, though he had lost much of his faith in his old religion, his sympathies were with it still; but yet, he felt that this foul-mouthed *alumnus* of Maynooth was not a man to whom he could open his heart, or of whom he could take counsel in his perplexities. He tried, but with ill success, to disclose the state of his mind to his father. But Mr. Mac Manus was a practical worldly man, who had small inclination to listen to his son's speculative doubts. He did himself abuse the priests and priestcraft most heartily; Mr. O'Driscoll, just then, was in especial disfavour, for he had taken Mr. Mac Manus to task on one of his recent votes, and it was rumoured that he and his brethren meant to throw him overboard at the next election, and bring in an English lawyer, who had lately come over to Romanism; but, when Frank touched on the *doctrines* of his religion, his father promptly advised him not to trouble his head about such matters. If he had supposed that his son meant to abandon the outward communion of the church, he would have been seriously alarmed at a step so disgraceful to the family; but he was amused, and vexed, and impatient at the notion of his troubling himself to inquire into the evidence for the claims of his church, or for her doctrines. In fact, he considered the safety of his soul to be his priest's concern and not his; and he would be quite content if the priests were but half as scrupulous, not to interfere with him in worldly matters, as he was not to intrude on their department.

And thus Frank's doubts, repelled from external manifestations, preyed only the more upon his mind, and he was obliged to own to himself that he had not found in home the peace and comfort he had anticipated. The image of Edith, too, he found it impossible to banish from his heart; it was in vain that he told himself that it was foolish and unwise to think any more of her; still to her his thoughts reverted, and never had her image seemed to his fancy more dazzlingly fair; never had she seemed to him more worthy of his affection than now that she was lost to him for ever. His spirits, consequently, continued to be dejected, and his bodily frame, though naturally strong, began to show traces of the violent mental agitation to which he had, for some time, been subjected; until the alteration became so manifest as to excite the affectionate alarm of his mother, who insisted on calling in medical advice. The physician, an old friend of the family, and who was acquainted with the fact of Frank's matrimonial disappointment, pronounced the case one not to be treated by medicine, and recommended change of air and scene as the best restoratives. A continental tour was proposed, and the plan met Frank's ready concurrence. It had been among the earliest of his boyish wishes to travel over some of those foreign places, the description or the history of which had most kindled his imagination; and now he had an additional motive for travel. He said to himself that he was probably doing his religion an injustice by judging of it as it appeared in these kingdoms, where it was in the midst of heresy, and where it had been so long in a position of civil inferiority; and he was anxious to compare English and Irish Romanism with the same religion abroad, where it had freer opportunities for its developement. Spain was the country to which he first directed his steps, some members of his family having emigrated thither in the preceding generation, and their descendants being still settled at Seville. We shall not attempt to describe the view of Cadiz from the sea, though its beauty was one of Frank's first impressions of Spain; we must refer to other travellers for descriptions of scenery, and content ourselves with mentioning a few of the religious peculiarities which attracted Frank's attention.

He had not, indeed, been half an hour landed at Cadiz before he became aware that he was in a Roman Catholic country. He was on his way from the water-side to his hotel, accompanied by the Gallician who had been the victor in a fierce scuffle with his brother porters for his modest baggage, when, on the tinkling of a hand-bell being heard, his guide arrested his steps, dropping on his knees, and exclaiming, "It's his Majesty." Frank, who did not at first think of the bell indicating anything more dignified than the approach, perhaps, of a postman, asked if the king was coming, not himself seeing any necessity for expressing his respect in so abject a manner; but, on his guide repeating indignantly, "God, God," Frank recollected enough to guess (a conjecture which was afterwards confirmed), that the bell denoted the passage of a priest with the consecrated wafer to some dying man; he, therefore, joined his companion in the kneeling posture, and both of them, with all others in sight, continued kneeling and beating their breasts until the tinkling of the bell died away in the distance. Frank soon became familiar with this custom, which he thought very edifying, as a proof of the general piety and faith of the people.

Another scene which he encountered a few days afterwards did not give him equally favourable impressions of the devotion (at least, as far as its outward signs were concerned), of this Catholic people. It was a grand religious procession, to the sight of which Frank had looked forward with interest; such solemnities not being possible to be publicly celebrated in England or Ireland. But he was not at all prepared for so much irreverence and indecorum as were exhibited. There were, indeed, a few in the front of the procession who did seem to remember what they were engaged in; but the majority appeared all alive for amusement, and (what shocked Frank most) some of the younger members of the procession were whistling merry tunes, in chorus, while their pious leaders were chanting the sorrows of the Blessed Virgin—

> Cujus animam dolentem,
> Contristatam et gementem,
> Pertransivit gladius.

Indeed, anything more discordant than the musical part o the performance could hardly be conceived, and the want of harmony did not escape the criticism of some of the natives; for a forward youngster planted himself right in front of the procession, and twirled his hat on the point of his stick, exclaiming contemptuously—"*Aquella grande musica.*" The general appearance of the procession was far from imposing. Those in front carried large wax candles, and as there was a moderate breeze, their hands and clothes were all covered, in somewhat a ludicrous manner, with the melted wax. The image of the Virgin which was borne with them had rather a rickety and unsteady motion, and the propriety of images being one of the points on which Frank's doubts had been earliest excited, he could not help thinking of some of the descriptions that the prophets gave of heathen images—"They bear them upon the shoulder, they carry them and set them in their place and they stand; from their place shall they not remove—they must needs be borne because they cannot go."—Is. xlvi. 7; Jer. x. 5. The ceremony concluded with a kind of catastrophe—one of the tapers, being awkwardly carried, set fire to the splendidly-embroidered silk canopy which was carried in procession. The priest made his escape, precipitately, from under it, and for an instant there was some consternation among the beholders; yet in a few moments their natural levity gained the ascendancy; shouts of laughter were heard,

and a number of jokes were made on the occasion, some of them, to Frank's ears, bordering on profanity. He retired interested in the show he had seen, but not able to look on it as a religious or an edifying ceremony.

About this time he heard that the relation to whom he was commended did not happen to be just then at Seville, so he allowed himself to be prevailed on by a young Spaniard, whose acquaintance he had made, to join him in taking the steamer to Malaga, where he further accompanied him to the boarding-house in which he took up his quarters, Frank's object being to perfect himself in the use of the language. He met daily at dinner there five or six lay Spaniards, together with one or two priests. Frank's prejudices were somewhat shocked, the very first day of his dining there, which chanced to be Friday. Now, in spite of all his free thinking he had always been a strict observer of the regulations of his Church, and whatever might be his secret opinion as to her claims, it would have cost him some uneasy sensations to eat meat on a forbidden day. What was his surprise to see those about him actuated by no similar scruples, but consuming flesh heartily, with perfect disregard of the obligations of the day. Frank first thought, he must have miscounted the day of the week; but learned, with surprise, that it really was Friday, and that the regulations of the Church there permitted the indulgence.

"But how can this be," inquired Frank, "for, with us there can be no greater sin than to eat meat on a Friday; and, even a man starving with famine would not be allowed to take, on that day, soup which had been made from meat."

"Nay," replied Frank's friend, Don Luis B., "why did not your ancestors render as good service to Holy Church as ours did. Here you have only to purchase a 'Boll of the Crusades,' getting your name duly inserted, at the small charge of two reales (about sixpence), and you are free for a twelvemonth from a great many inconvenient obligations. Small as the charge is, the Church must make a good thing of it, since every one buys one, and you must have a new one every year. Between ourselves," added he, "I take the benefit of the bull, although I have not got mine renewed this year; for it cannot be any very great sin when a matter of two reales would set it all right."

"But," inquired Frank, "how can you get absolution if you neglect a regulation so very easy to be complied with as this?"

"It will be time enough to think of that," replied Don Luis, "when I ask for absolution: I never go to confession."

"Never go to confession!" exclaimed Frank, somewhat startled.

"No,' said Don Luis. "Who does? Until lately, indeed, you could not be admitted to any post under government without producing a certificate that you had been at confession. However, even then, such certificates could easily be bought at the low price of a peseta (about 10d.); and now we have a liberal government, nothing at all of the kind is required."

"And do you mean to say," insisted Frank, "that nobody now goes to confession?"

"When I say nobody," replied his friend, "I speak of the majority of the men; the women are regular enough: it must be owned they have more piety than we; but, besides, no girl can be married without producing certificates of her regular performance of this duty; and, as girls usually like to get married, this is one motive which prevents their being as remiss as we are."

As the conversation became general Frank was more and more astonished at the want of respect for religion exhibited by the company. They all seemed to take pleasure in badgering the poor priests, who ate their dinner nearly in silence, and took the assaults made on them with great good temper. The compulsory confessions, the purchaseable certificates of confession, the celibacy of the clergy, the immoral lives of many of them, were touched on. They went on to scoff at some of the doctrines of religion, and Frank, who, in all his doubts, had always felt a distaste for scoffing and profanity, found himself taking part with the priests against the others. He expressed surprise at the freedom of their language.

"Why," said Don Luis, "you must not wonder if we take a little amends now for the time our tongues were tied. There was a time when we were obliged to be more cautious. There is a friend of mine in Seville, whose uncle, in the days of the Inquisition, had four months imprisonment, and was once put to the question, for playing chess." "Is playing chess a sin?" asked Frank; "If so, I fear I may run some little danger myself." "The gentleman of whom I speak," replied Don Luis, "used to play chess with his daughter every evening; but, unfortunately, got a servant girl from the country, who accused her master of sorcery, stating that they were very irreligious; never had prayers, and used to spend every evening in mysterious incantations, using figures of devils and horses to conjure with. At the dead of night the family were surprised by a visit from the familiars of the Inquisition, who examined every member of the household in separate rooms; they found the box, but not the men, for the servant girl had intimated her suspicions to a fellow-servant, who had told the daughter, and she, very unwisely, threw the men away. The master of the house was taken away, and only obtained his liberty, four or five months afterwards, in a popular outbreak."

Frank expressed his suspicion that his friend was playing tricks upon travellers, in passing off such a romance for true history; but Don Luis asseverated that it had all really occurred; and was, he added, a much truer story than many a legend which the priest would tell them.

Frank, who had earned the priest's good opinion by the vigour with which he had taken his part in the discussion, had some further conversation with him in private, and learned some things which surprised him not a little. He learned that there had been a general confiscation of church property two or three years before; that all that he had been accustomed to hear spoken of, as the worst deeds of Henry VIII. and Protestantism, had been perpetrated in his own days in this Catholic country; that monasteries and convents had been seized on, and monks and nuns turned out into the world, being allowed a small pittance for their subsistence, and that pittance not even punctually paid; and finally, that there were several bishops in exile on account of their opposition to the government measures. Frank expressed his astonishment that Catholics should be guilty of such sacrilege. "They are not Catholics," replied the priest, "but infidels." And yet this only altered the grounds of Frank's astonishment; he had always been accustomed to hear of infidelity as the growth of Protestantism; but here, if the priest was to be believed, had infidelity grown in such luxuriance, in the most Catholic country in Europe, that the infidel party had become the dominant one, and had been able to dispose of the church revenues as they pleased. It should be added, that when Frank talked the matter over afterwards with Don Luis, the latter maintained that the necessities of the country fully justified the government in the measures they had adopted; while he asserted that the immoral lives of many of the monks had made them fall unpitied. "There were several," he said, "in Malaga who notoriously had families. They took vows of chastity, and they were not chaste; they took vows of poverty, and they were avaricious; they took vows of humility, and they were proud; they have deeply injured the faith of a religious people."

To return to the priest's conversation:—He went on to complain of one frightful consequence of the present state of things. There was, he said, a great part of Spain where the bishops were in exile, and where, in his private opinion, valid sacraments could not now be had, and in which the minds of the faithful were, at any rate, disturbed by serious doubts as to the validity of them, which, in the case of such sacraments as penance and matrimony, must give rise to cruel anxiety. Many, in consequence, abstain from confession altogether.

"But," asked Frank, "have not the dean and chapter power to appoint a vicar-capitular in the absence of the bishop?"

"Certainly;" replied his clerical friend, "but there are many conditions attached to this power, a want of compliance with which renders the appointment, and consequently the jurisdiction, null or doubtful, and communicates the same defect to all acts and minor authorities that have emanated from it. Now, when we see a man administrating the see whom we do not consider fit for the office, how can we tell but the consent of the chapter may have been extorted by force, or whether their choice may not be *ipso facto* null by common law."

"Really," said Frank, "I fear we are very thoughtless and careless in Ireland; we never dream of those numerous conditions which you say must be fulfilled; nor do we reflect how a single defect in the appointment of a bishop would vitiate all acts emanating from his authority. We are apt to take for granted that all our priests' acts are valid, without inquiring at all into the matter."

As the priest, who was a simple minded man, became more communicative, he fulfilled Don Luis's prediction as to the number of legends he would tell. He was very eloquent on the virtues of a miraculous image in his church, and on the history of some favourite saints—of which a certain St. Rita was the most conspicuous. Frank thought he could divide his Spanish friends into two classes—those who believed every thing and those who believed nothing. The mistress of the house in which he boarded belonged to the first of these two classes. A single sample of the stories narrated by her will suffice. The good lady was just then in a certain interesting condition, and placed her chief confidence, on her approaching perils, in the succour of St. Vincent Ferrer. On Frank's asking why this saint should be supposed more likely than another to assist on such an occasion, he learned the following history:—"Being applied to on a certain occasion, by a young married lady, whom the idea of approaching maternity kept in a state of constant terror, the good natured saint desired her to dismiss her fears, as he was determined to take upon himself whatever inconvenience or trouble there might be in the case. Some weeks had elapsed when the good monk, who had forgotten his engagement, was heard in the dead of night roaring and screaming in a manner so unusual, and so little becoming a professional saint, that he drew the whole community to his cell. Nothing, for a time, could relieve the mysterious sufferings, and though he passed the rest of the night *as well as could be expected*, the fear of a relapse would have kept his afflicted brethren in painful suspense, had not the grateful husband of the timid lady, who was the cause of the uproar, taken an early opportunity to return thanks for the *unconscious* delivery of his consort." It is very natural, then, that so experienced a saint should be the one generally applied to by Spanish ladies when about to encounter the perils of childbirth.

We have devoted so much space to the account of Frank's stay at Malaga, that we must touch but lightly on his sojourn at Seville. The kindness and hospitality he met with from his friends there were all that he could have desired, and he soon felt himself almost at home. Religion, too, presented itself to him in a more favourable aspect than at Malaga; the moral character of the clergy stood higher, and the noble cathedral appeared to him to be in itself sufficient to inspire feelings of devotion. The first day he visited it he thought he had never seen a cathedral crowded before; such a multitude in London he thought could not have been kept in order without the presence of policemen; yet he withdrew the comparison on missing, as he soon did, his pocket-handkerchief. He was somewhat scandalized, too, by the amount of laughing and talking which, despite of notices posted in the church, prevailed in the sacred edifice; and the ladies had a habit of closing their fans with a loud report, producing a succession of pops, which did not at all assist his devotion. He heard an eloquent sermon, the only part which struck him as unusual being the doxology, with which the preacher concluded—"Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost, and to the Most Sacred Virgin. Amen." The next time he visited the church when a crowd was expected he took the precaution of placing his handkerchief in a breast pocket; and certainly he did feel a pull at his skirts, but on turning round saw no one but a man on his knees, absorbed in devotion; it was some time after, and in a different part of the building he felt a second pull, and on turning, beheld the same man. On this occurring a third time, he said, very gravely, "good man, there is nothing;" at which the thief himself kept his countenance steadily; but another, who seemed to be a confederate, was much amused.

We should fill the whole paper were we to put down every thing which Frank saw different from English and Irish customs, and therefore hasten to tell briefly, that after a considerable stay in Spain, which, by the new turn it had given his thoughts, had been of great service to his health and spirits, Frank passed into France. His stay in that country was not nearly so long as it had been in Spain, nor had he equal facility for becoming intimate with the people; yet, the general characteristics were the same—gross superstition and credulity among the uneducated, heartless scepticism among the more enlightened; only that as far as he could observe, the proportion of the latter class to the former was larger in France than in Spain. Indeed, it was almost always from French literature that his Spanish friends had derived their infidelity.

Switzerland was the country to which Frank next bent his steps, and it was amid her beautiful scenery that he derived the benefit of complete restoration to health, being induced by it to exert his mind somewhat less, and his body a great deal more than he had done for some time. He made there, too, the acquaintance of Mr. Graham, an English clergyman, who had afterwards considerable influence on his mind. Their acquaintance began from sitting next each other at a table d'hôte, when both being good walkers, fond of adventure, and ardent admirers of the glacier scenery, they agreed to join each other in an expedition over a difficult pass, not very commonly crossed. Their first communication with each other on religious subjects arose out of their being on a Sunday at the Hospice of the Grimsel, when Mr. Graham proposed to read prayers for the English who were in the house, and Frank, whose religion was not known, was invited with the others. At home he would not have liked to enter a Protestant place of worship, but here he was not sorry for the opportunity of learning somewhat more of a religion which, because it was Edith's, he never could think very harshly of. Frank could not help contrasting the humble apartment, the scanty congregation, the absence of ceremony, with the imposing ritual of his own Church, such as he had seen it when one of the crowded assembly who worshipped in the magnificent cathedral of Seville; yet it occurred to him to ask himself whether he were not now joining in a more reasonable service, as well as whether the quiet good sense of Mr. Graham's own brief remarks were not to be preferred to the impassioned appeal which had been made to his feelings by the friar who preached at Seville. Frank did not afterwards conceal from Mr. Graham his religious sentiments, and he defended the cause of Romanism against him in more discussions than one; the chief temptation to which he was now exposed being, that he was in danger of losing his earnestness, and arguing too much for argument's sake.

Mr. Graham and Frank travelled into Italy together, and after some stay at other cities, of which we shall here give no account, at length arrived at Rome. There they enjoyed in abundance classical antiquities and religious ceremonial; Mr. Graham seeking for more of the latter than Frank, who had become familiar with much of it in Spain. One morning that Mr. Graham had some engagement of this kind, in which Frank did not care to accompany him, the latter thought of a plan for surprising his friend, and gaining a victory over him in one of the discussions they had had together. Mr. Graham had pressed on Frank the inferences to be drawn from the dread which his Church displayed of the Holy Scriptures; her fear lest her members should study it; her consciousness that the conclusions which any unprejudiced reader would draw from the Bible

would be in opposition to the sentiments of the Church; and the probability that the reason his Church was against the Bible, was because she knew the Bible was against her. Frank had met him by denying that his Church *was* against the Bible. He said that he had himself been freely permitted to study it, and was courageous enough to maintain that his Church had always *encouraged* the reading of the Scriptures. Remembering that he had heard that there was an authorised Italian translation of the Scriptures, he thought he could effectually demolish his friend's case by bringing home to him an Italian translation of the Bible purchased at Rome under the eye of the Pope himself. The first bookseller he went to, on being asked whether he had a Bible, answered stoutly in the affirmative; and Frank chuckled to himself to think how simply he had broken down Mr. Graham's case; but the book on being fetched turned out to be Calmet's Dictionary of the Bible, the bookseller insisting that this was the sacred volume itself; and Frank, after many efforts, was obliged to leave his shop without being able to convince him of the contrary. In several other shops where Frank searched, when he asked for the Bible he got the answer—"Non è permesso" or "è prohibito;" but he at length succeeded in finding a copy of Martini's translation, which, however, turned out to be contained in twenty-four volumes, and for which he was asked 105 francs! Not liking to pay so much for his friend's enlightenment, he asked was there not some cheaper and more portable edition, but was assured by the bookseller that no such thing would be permitted, as it might then get into circulation among the common people, and he read by them indiscriminately. Frank felt in his mind that the next time he argued on the subject with Mr. Graham, he must change his ground; he thought of maintaining that the people had no need of the Bible since they were taught all the facts and doctrines of it in the services of the Church and the sermons of her teachers. But, on reflection, he was obliged to own that if the people did become acquainted with a great deal of truth in this way, they swallowed also a quantity of fable on the same authority. His Spanish friends, for instance (that is to say the *believing* part of them), were not more fully persuaded of the truth of the fact that our Lord was crucified between two thieves, than they were that the name of one of them was Demas, that he had attempted to rob the Blessed Virgin in her flight into Egypt, but, impressed by something in her appearance, had treated her courteously; had recognised her when on the cross, had implored her intercession, and solely in consequence of that intercession been forgiven by our Saviour. And Frank thought to himself Mr. Graham would ask him if this is the way in which the *facts* of Scripture were dressed up for the use of the people, whether it was not probable that the *doctrines* of the Bible were equally ornamented.

Frank's meditations on his arguments were interrupted by meeting Mr. Graham himself; and on hearing that he was on his way to visit a neighbouring Church, he agreed to accompany him. But he had there a still more unexpected meeting. He could scarcely believe his eyes when he recognized in an ecclesiastic who was present his friend Mr. Oldham, though when he thought of it he remembered that he knew of his intention to visit Rome, and that it was only the time that was uncertain. Frank followed Oldham when he left the church, and was cordially greeted by him. He presented his friend Mr. Graham to him, whom Mr. Oldham, though considerably the senior of the two, was pleased to say he remembered at Oxford. Their religious views, indeed, had at one time not been very different. When Mr. Oldham had, on the invitation of the young men, come with them to their lodgings, which were close by, Mr. Graham could not forbear saying that when he had last seen him in Oxford, he little thought it would be in Rome they were to meet again.

"Yet why should you wonder," replied Mr. Oldham, for Rome is the great centre of unity to which all true Catholics must, sooner or later, make their way. From what I remember of you, I trust you, too, have found your way here in heart, as well as in body."

"I must hasten to undeceive you," returned Mr. Graham. "If I had any dissatisfaction with my own Church before, it has been removed by the sight of Romanism abroad; many things which I had thought to be our own peculiar misfortunes, I have found to be the inevitable results of human nature. I have discovered, in short, that I might go further and fare worse."

"Strange," replied Mr. Oldham, "that the very same aspect of things has only supplied me with fuller confirmation of the Divine origin of our faith, since I see that it has developed the same religious character everywhere; in all ages—in modern Italy and Spain, and in medieval England. I should hope, therefore, that if you state your difficulties I could easily remove them."

"You need scarcely ask for my difficulties," replied Mr. Graham. "Are not the countries which have retained Romanism notoriously behind the age? they have not kept up with the march of civilization; they are ignorant, and in a measure barbarous; they have the faults of barbarians; they have no self-command; they cannot be trusted; they must be treated as slaves or they rebel; they emerge out of their superstitions in order to turn infidels. The sword, not the law, is their ruler. Wherever I travelled I became conscious of the change in a moment when I passed from a Protestant into a Roman Catholic country. The latter countries are spectacles of idleness, slovenliness, want of spirit, disorder, dirt, and dishonesty. There surely must be something in their religion to account for this; and is it not plainly that it keeps them children, and then, they being children, keep to it?"

"If this be your only difficulty," said Mr. Oldham, smiling, "it is not a very formidable one." You quite mistake the mission of the Church: she was sent into the world to save men's souls, and not to promote mere civilization; and we are not to find fault with her if she does not accomplish a work which she has never undertaken. She would infinitely rather save the soul of one single wild bandit of Calabria, or whining beggar of Palermo, than drive a hundred lines of railroad through the length of Italy, or carry out a scheme of sanitary reform in every town of Sicily, except so far as those works tended to some spiritual good beyond them. You might as well blame the State for not making saints, as find fault with the Church because she does not invent a steam engine or construct a tariff."

"I fear you misapprehend the point of my objection," replied Mr. Graham; "I certainly never imagined that the Church ought to encroach on the province of the State, and undertake the constructing of railroads and tariffs; but the fact which struck me was that your religion had a tendency to impede the State in carrying out *its* proper office; that the character which it developed was incapable of exertion and self-reliance. Your Church forbids freedom of thought; teaches men to be religious by proxy, and to look to their priests to save their souls for them; and is it strange if they should exhibit in worldly matters the same character which she has trained them to in religious matters? However, I would readily grant that you had given a sufficient apology, if it could be proved that your Church's neglect of men's bodily interests arose from her solicitude for the good of their souls, though indeed it might seem strange that God had so ordained matters that the two should be incompatible. But I have found your religion equally wanting if you test it by the moral character of her people; a lie, for example, is thought nothing of if it serve a convenient purpose: you must look in heretic England, if you want men who venerate truth and honour, and whose words may thoroughly be depended on."

"If you form a low estimate," said Mr. Oldham, "of the virtue which is developed by our Church, it is only because the Church has very different views of offences from the world. The world, now-a-days, sets a high value on honesty, fairness, honour, truth, and benevolence; virtues, no doubt, comprehended in the teaching of the Church; but still which are the fruit of nature as well as of grace, and do not necessarily imply grace. Now, though the Church exacts these virtues in their fulness from her saints; in the case of ordinary men she has no warrant or encouragement to enforce upon them more than those habits of virtue, the absence of which would be tantamount to their separation from God; she knows that if she attempts more she might lose all; she exhorts men, no doubt, against those sins which are disorders and disfigurements of the soul; but she directs her efforts against those which are absolutely incompatible with contrition and absolution. And, as I said, her scale of offences is very different from the world; she considers consent, though as quick as thought, to a single unchaste wish as infinitely more heinious than any lie which can possibly be fancied. Take a mere beggarwoman, lazy, ragged, filthy, and not over scrupulous of truth; if she is chaste, and sober, and cheerful, and goes to her religious duties, she will, in the eyes of the Church, have a prospect of heaven, quite closed and refused to the State's pattern man; the just, the upright, the generous, the honourable, the conscientious—if he be all this, not from a supernatural power, but from mere natural virtue. Excess of drinking is one of the world's most disgraceful offences; but if it do not proceed to the loss of reason, the Church thinks it far less sin than one deliberate act of detraction, even though the matter of it be truth. And not unfrequently does a priest hear a confession of theft which he knows would sentence the penitent to transportation if brought into a court of justice, but which he knows, too, in the judgment of the Church might be pardoned, on the man's private contrition without any confession at all.

"I have certainly no inclination," replied Mr. Graham, "to dispute with you the possibility of pardon without confession to a priest; but I am, on the whole, deeply grieved at what I have heard from you. I had observed that among the mass of your people lying, and drunkenness, and dishonesty are regarded as mere peccadilloes, quite trifling matters; and now I find that this is not *in spite* of the teaching of your church, but that this tone of feeling is the very one which your statements of her doctrine (guard them as you will) have a tendency to produce. However, I am quite willing to pass from the subject of mere mundane morality; and to consider not so much what your church fails to perform, as what she actually does effect. Her teaching does produce a certain very definite character on nations and individuals, and that character, instead of being too spiritual or too religious, is just the reverse. Roman Catholics, whether in the north or in the south, in the middle ages or in modern times, exhibit the combined and contrary faults of superstition and profaneness. They are rude where they should be reverent, jocose where they should be grave, and loquacious where they should be silent. Religion is made both free and easy, and yet formal. Superstitions and false miracles are at once preached, assented to, and laughed at, until one really does not know what is believed or what not; or whether anything is believed at all. The saints are lauded, yet affronted. Take mediæval England or France, or modern Belgium or Italy, it is all the same; you have your boy bishop at Salisbury, your lord of misrule at Rheims, and at Sens your feast of asses. Whether in the south now or in the north formerly, you have the excesses of your carnival. Legends, such as that of St. Dunstan's fight with the author of evil at Glastonbury, are popular in Spain, in Germany, and in Italy, while in Naples or in Seville, your populations rise in periodical fury against the celestial patrons whom they ordinarily worship.

"I readily acknowledge," said Mr. Oldham, "that there is a character of our religion so specific and peculiar as you have described, which cannot be ascribed to anything but the genius of Catholicism itself. But I turn all this into an argument for me, and I say, that this is the very phenomenon which must necessarily result from a revelation of divine truth falling upon the human mind in its existing state of ignorance and moral feebleness."

"Perhaps," said Mr. Graham, somewhat astonished, "I have not sufficiently explained what I have observed of the practical working of your religion."

"I perfectly understand you," returned Mr. Oldham; "and if you will listen to the explanation I am about to give, you may say, when I have done, whether I have not observed as well as you, and whether I am not willing to state what I have observed as broadly and distinctly as yourself. The key to the whole difficulty is, that you should clearly understand that faith is one thing and obedience another. As men may know that they ought not to steal, and yet deliberately take what is not theirs, so may they be gifted with a simple, undoubting, cloudless belief—that Christ, for instance, is in the blessed Sacrament—and yet commit the sacrilege of breaking open the tabernacle and carrying off the consecrated particles, for the sake of the precious vessel containing them. It is because Protestants know nothing of faith, that they cannot understand the state of things in a Catholic country, where, whatever other graces may be lost, faith still generally remains, and the people exhibit knowledge without love. A wicked Catholic is not so, because he disbelieves in hell, as a wicked Protestant may; this is to him an incontestable fact, brought home to him by that supernatural faith with which he assents to the Divine Word, speaking through Holy Church; his thoughts take a different turn; he looks up to our Blessed Lady; he knows, by supernatural faith, her power and goodness; he turns the truth to his own bad purpose, and makes her his patroness and protectress against the penalty of sins which he does not mean to abandon. Hence the stories, which I have no doubt you meant to repeat to me, of highwaymen and brigands devout to the Madonna. And their wishes leading to the belief, they begin to circulate stories of her much desired compassion towards impenitent offenders; and these stories, fostered by the circumstances of the day, or confused with others similar, but not impossible, for a time are in repute.* Thus, the Blessed Virgin has been reported to deliver the reprobate from hell, and transfer him to purgatory, and absolutely to secure from perdition all who are devout to her—repentance not being considered as the means. Or they have thought, by some sacred relic, to be secure from death in their perilous and guilty expeditions. In short, vice does not involve a neglect of the external duties of religion. Faith appears among us in the wicked as well as in the good. I saw you look contemptuously at the pilgrims to-day—a mixture of pilgrim and beggar, or pilgrim and robber, or half gipsey, or three-quarters boon companion, or, at least, with nothing saintly or religious about them. They will let you wash their feet and serve them at table; and the hosts have more merit for their ministry than the guests for their weariness. Yet all, saints and sinners, have faith in things invisible, which each uses in his own way.

You may object, perhaps, to the profanity of our people. Listen to the conversation, you will say, of the multitude, or of any private party. What strange oaths mingle with it! God's heart, and God's eyes, and God's wounds, and God's blood. You cry out, how profane! Doubtless; but do you not see that the special profaneness above Protestant oaths is the necessary result of that insight into the invisible world which you have not. Your people would be as varied and fertile in their adjurations as a Catholic populace, if they believed as we."

Mr. Graham did not interrupt; and Mr. Oldham went on.

"If you keep this explanation in mind, you will be able to account for many of the things which you say shock you in Catholic countries. You enter into one of the churches, perhaps, and you turn your eyes to a confessional. The penitents are crowding for admission, and they seem to have no shame or solemnity about the errand on which

* We observe that Mr. Oldham, desirous, it may be supposed of making the best possible defence for his cause, has, all through this conversation, copied, almost *verbatim*, the apology for religion on the continent, given by Dr. Newman in his 8th and 9th "Lectures, on the difficulties felt by Anglicans in submitting to the Catholic Church."

* It may be necessary to repeat that for the pictures of religion on the Continent, here given, Mr. Oldham was indebted to Dr. Newman's Lectures, before alluded to, delivered about three years after his leaving the Anglican Church, with the view of inducing others to follow his example!

they are come; till at length, on a penitent's turning from the grate, one tall woman, bolder than a score of men, darts forward, from a distance, into the place he has vacated, to the disappointment of the many who have waited longer than she. You almost groan under the weight of your imagination, that a soul so selfish, so uncollected, must surely be in very ill disposition for so awful a sacrament; you look at the priest, and he has on his face a look almost of impatience, or of good-natured compassion at the voluble and superfluous matter which is the staple of her confession. The priests, you think, are no better than the people. My dear brother, do not be so uncharitable and unphilosophical. Things we thoroughly believe we treat as things which occur every day, whether they be of this world or of the next. Impatience and rudeness are faulty, no doubt; yet they do not prove the absence of faith, nor yet of love, or of contrition. Well, you turn away, half satisfied, and what do you see. There is a feeble old woman, who first genuflects before the Blessed Sacrament, and then steals her neighbour's handkerchief or prayerbook, who is intent upon his devotion. You are shocked, yet what does this prove? Faith does not force obedience. She worships, and she sins; she kneels, because she believes; she steals, because she does not love; she may be out of God's grace, but she is not altogether out of his sight.

"You come out again, and mix in the idle and dissipated throng, and you fall in with a man in a palmer's dress selling false relics, and a credulous circle of customers buying them as greedily as though they were the supposed French laces and India silks of a pedlar's basket; one simple soul has bought of him a cure for the rheumatism or ague, which might form a case of conscience. It is said to be a relic of St. Cuthbert, but only has virtue at sunrise, and when applied, with three crosses, to the head, arms, and feet. You pass on, and encounter a rude son of the Church, more like a showman than a religious, recounting to the gaping multitude some tale or vision of the invisible world, seen by brother Augustine of the Friar Minors, or by a holy Jesuit preacher, who died in the odour of sanctity, and sending round his bag to collect pence for the souls in purgatory; and of some appearance of our Lady (the like of which has never been before or since), but on no authority except popular report, and in no shape but that which popular caprice has given it. You go forward, and you find preparations proceeding for a great pageant or mystery; it is a high festival, and the incorporated trades have each undertaken their special religious celebration: the plumbers and glaziers are to play the Creation; the barbers the Call of Abraham; and at night is to be the grandest performance of all—the Resurrection and Last Judgment, played by the carpenters, masons, and blacksmiths: heaven and hell are represented—saints, devils, and living men; and the *chef d'œuvre* of the exhibition is the display of fireworks to be let off as the *finale*. 'How unutterably profane,' again you cry. Yes, profane to you, my dear brother—profane to a population which only half believes—not profane to those who believe wholly. They gaze, and in drinking in the exhibition with their eyes, they are making one continuous and intense act of faith.

"You turn to go home, and in going you pass through a retired quarter of the city. Look up at those sacred windows: they belong to the convent of the Perpetual Adoration, or to the poor Clares, or to the nuns of the Visitation. Seclusion, silence, watching, adoration, is their life day and night. Where will you find such a realised heaven upon earth? Yet that very sight has acted otherwise on the mind of a weak sister, and the very keenness of her faith, and wild desire of approaching the object of it, has led her to fancy, or to feign, that she has received that singular favour vouchsafed only to a few elect souls; and she points to God's wounds as imprinted on her hands, and feet, and side, though she herself has been instrumental in their fabrication.

"And now, as you have listened to me so patiently, I have only to say, in conclusion, what a merciful providence it is that faith and love are thus separable, as the Catholic creed teaches. If sin not only threw the soul out of God's favour, but at once emptied it of every supernatural principle, we should see in Catholics, what is so common in Protestants, souls brought back to a sense of guilt—frightened at their state, yet having no resource, and nothing to build upon. When the poor Protestant is overcome by sin, his doctrinal views vanish, he adds sin to sin, and his best aspirations come to nothing. But the Catholic knows just where he is, and what he is to do; no time is lost when compunction comes upon him, but while his feelings are fresh and keen he can betake himself to the appointed means of cure. Thus he may be ever failing; but yet he wipes off his guilt again and again; and even if his repentance does not endure, and if he has not strength to persevere, he is never getting worse, but ever beginning afresh.

"But, above all, let death come suddenly upon him, and let him have the preparation of one poor hour, and what is the Protestant to do? I am not speaking of the more serious part of the community, but of a man taken at random in one of our vast towns. The minutes hasten on, and, having to learn every thing (supposing him desirous of learning), he can practise nothing. His thoughts rise up in some vague desire of mercy, which he is unable to analyze. He asks for some chapter of the Bible to be read to him, but rather as the expression of his horror and bewilderment, than as the token of his faith; and then his intellect becomes clouded, and he dies. How different is it with the Catholic! He has within him almost a principle of recovery, certainly an instrument of it. He may have spoken lightly of the Almighty, but he has ever believed in him; he has sung jocose songs about the Blessed Virgin and the saints, and told good stories about the evil spirit—but in levity, not in contempt; he has been angry with his heavenly patrons when things went ill with him, but with the waywardness of a child who is cross with his parents. He has absented himself from his Easter duties, years out of number, but he never denied he was a Catholic. He has laughed at priests, and slandered them to others, but not as doubting the divinity of their function, and the virtue of their ministrations. He has attended mass carelessly and heartlessly, but he was ever aware what was there before his eyes, under the veil of material symbols. So, when the news come to him that he is to die, and he cannot get a priest, and the ray of God's grace pierces his heart, his thoughts at once take shape and order, and he knows precisely what to do. He addresses himself to his crucifix; he interests the Blessed Virgin in his behalf; he betakes himself to his patron saints; he calls his good angel to his side; he professes his desire of that sacramental absolution which, from circumstances, he cannot obtain; he exercises himself* in acts of faith, hope, charity, contrition, resignation, and other virtues suitable to his extremity. The enemy rushes on him to overthrow the faith on which he is built; but the whole tenor of his past life, his very jesting and his very oaths have been overruled to create in him a habit of faith, girding round and protecting the supernatural principle. And thus, even one who has been a bad Catholic may have hope in his death, to which the most virtuous of Protestants—nay, dear sir, the most correct and most thoughtful in your communion, however able, or learned, or sagacious, if he have lived not by faith, but by private judgment, are necessarily strangers."

There was a pause when Mr. Oldham had concluded, and then Mr. Graham replied, "I did, indeed, do you an injustice when I thought that you had not observed the working of Romanism on the continent. You have described it more graphically than I could have done—more so than, perhaps, the fear of giving offence, or of meeting denial would have permitted me to do, even had I been able; but when I have acknowledged the fidelity and liveliness of your descriptions, my praise ceases, and I must, in candour, express my utter disappointment at the ill success of the defence you have made for your system; it was, in short, no defence, but a confession and an adoption of the worst enormities that have been imputed to it."

"What was the difficulty you professed to answer? I endeavoured to apply to your Church's doctrine our Lord's test—'By their fruits you shall know them,' and I complained that the religion taught by your Church, even when practised most scrupulously, did not tend to produce holiness of life. You reply by admitting the fact most fully, and defending it. You assert that faith does not necessarily imply obedience; nay, that it ordinarily is separate from it in fact. All the glorious things that the Scripture says of faith you apply to the faith of devils, who believe and tremble; whose knowledge is accompanied by no love, and elicits no obedience. You boast of the universality of faith in these countries: I have not seen it. I have seen much credulity and much scepticism, but little faith. By faith I understand (and I use no novel language) not bare historical belief, such as may exist in the ungodly; but the habitual raising the mind above the things of sense, the habitual looking unto God, and trusting in him through Christ—a grace which differs only from obedience as the spring differs from the stream which issues from it. There is nothing of which I am more certain than that if the faith of your Church is one which has no tendency to produce works, the faith of your Church is not the faith of the Gospel.

"What was the description you gave me of the repentance taught by your Church? Which will enable a man to live in constant sin, without being injured by it—though ever falling, to wipe off his guilt again and again, and so never to get worse, but to be always beginning afresh. Is such language as this intended to remove or to confirm the prejudice I had entertained, that whatever be the theory of your penance and absolution, the practice is that the sinner is hardened by hopes of impunity, believing that he has the power, at any moment, to wipe off the old score of sin, and to be at liberty to begin a new one."

"But all you said before was brought to a climax by the contrast with which you concluded. As you spoke I shuddered to hear, as it were, a revelation of the very mystery of iniquity—a systematic plan for enabling men to secure the rewards of the service of God, while they employ their lives in the service of the devil. You complained of our Church, because she did not provide any means by which one of her members, after a life spent in wickedness and forgetfulness of God, might find a peaceful and happy death-bed, and die the death of the righteous, without having lived the life of the righteous. And you triumphed in contrasting the ease with which a 'bad Catholic' could, on his death-bed, find in his jests and his oaths his best safeguard, and by calling the Virgin, and the saints, and his good angel to his side, open to himself an assured prospect of heaven. Is this a scheme to have emanated from a God of infinite holiness and purity? Or did you think to terrify me by telling me that the prospect of heaven which may be enjoyed by such a man as you have described is denied to me and the most virtuous in my communion? I fear not your threats, for I hear from your lips not the language of the prophets of God, but the very characteristic abominations of the false prophets of old—'With lies you have made the heart of the righteous sad, whom God hath not made sad, and you have strengthened the hands of the wicked, that he should not return from his evil way, by promising him life.'" (Ezek. xiii. 22.)

Mr. Oldham was about to reply, but just then the bells of the neighbouring church rung out, at which he started, and saying it was his hour of prayer, took a hasty leave. When he was gone, Mr. Graham involuntarily exclaimed—"Is it possible that he really believes in the set of opinions he professes! With what unction he described the practical working of your religion in the countries where it has had opportunity to develope itself! and what a miserable failure was his attempt to reconcile this with your Church's claim to sanctity! Is it possible that he could not know how much more mischief he was doing his cause by his vivid pictures of its difficulties, than good by his efforts to explain them. I fear you and your friends must regard him as one of the unruly elephants in the battles of old, which, in their ponderous flight, trampled down in all directions the forces they were brought up to support. And yet, perhaps, after all, he is scarcely to be blamed, for though the defence he offered is a failure, what better is to be had?"

Frank was silent, for he, too, while Mr. Oldham was speaking, could not help recalling to his mind some of the suspicions which Cornwall had formerly suggested. Nor had Mr. Oldham any immediate opportunity of explaining himself to them, for they did not meet again during the brief remaining period of Frank's stay in Rome. But the account of Frank's return to England must be reserved for another occasion.

* It may be proper to explain that by an act of faith, &c., is meant the repetition of a certain form of words.

TALK OF THE ROAD—No. XXI.

WELL, Jem," said Pat, "I had a talk with a neighbour, and I want to tell it to you."

"Well, Pat, let us hear it," said Jem.

"Well, Jem," said Pat, "it was with Neddy Boylan, about the Readers and the Bible; and Neddy allowed it was just folly for the people to be listening to them at all; for sure, says he 'Aren't we better as we are?' Well, with that I asked him was the Bible the Word of God at all? And he allowed there was no saying again that. And then I asked him wouldn't the religion that agreed with the Word of God be better than the religion that was against it. Well, he allowed that, too; 'and now,' says I 'what way have you for knowing that the priest's religion is better, by the Word of God, than the parson's? Sure the priest won't let you look into the Bible to see if his religion is in it; and doesn't the parson offer to *show* you *his* in the Bible; and doesn't that itself look as if the parson had the best of it by the Bible?' 'Well,' says, he, 'Maybe it does for that matter, but I don't want to know nothing at all about it; sure ain't I better as I am?' says he. 'Arrah man,' says I, 'do you mean to tell me that it is better not to know which religion is true than to know it?' 'Well,' says he, 'if I don't know it, isn't it the priest's look out,' says he; 'and if I did know it, wouldn't it be my own look out,' says he; 'and so ain't I better as I am,' says he, 'knowing nothing about it at all?' 'And do you mean to tell me', says I, 'that if your religion is not the right way of salvation, that it's the priest will be damned instead of you, and you get salvation without being in the right way for it?' 'And do you mean to tell me,' says he, 'that God will lay all the blame on me that knows nothing at all about it myself, and only just does what the priest bids me, that *ought* to know better nor ever I can know? And,' says he, 'don't you mind Pat Brady that has the son that's a dummy, and innocent, and didn't Pat teach the creature to steal praties? and when them both was up afore the bench for it, didn't the magistrates say they wouldn't punish the dummy creature at all, cause he didn't know nothing at all; and they laid all the punishment on the man that taught him, and he knowing nothing himself, the creature, and do you mean to tell me,' says he, 'that the merciful God will be harder on the poor creatures that knows nothing, and only does as they are bid, than the magistrates was? Sure I won't believe that at all,' says he. 'Well,' says I, 'Neddy (when I considered a bit), it doesn't seem to me to be like that at all. Sure the dummy *couldn't* know the differ of what was right and wrong; and sure its you that *won't* know it, Neddy,' says I; 'and sure that's not the same at all; and sure, Neddy,' says I, 'if you was to go and be a dummy on purpose, and to try to make your own self a fool, the way you could steal praties, sure the magistrates wouldn't let *you* off for THAT, Neddy? I'm thinking it's the worse they'd give it to you, if they knew that you *wouldn't* know the differ of right and wrong, Neddy,' says I. 'And how *would* I know the differ if there's no one to teach me,' says he; 'and sure isn't it a Souper I'd be called if I would ask the priest to teach me out of the Bible?' says he. 'Well, sure enough, it was that way long enough,' says I; 'but it isn't that way now; for sure there's Mr. Owens, and there's the readers that's come, all

willing and ready to show us that their religion is in the Bible; and now, if the priest will just do the same, sure then we can see for ourselves what religion is in the Word of God.' 'Well, that's just it,' says he, 'and that's just the reason why I wish the readers was hunted out of the country,' says he. 'And how would you know then,' says I, 'which religion is true?' 'And isn't that just what I don't want to know?' says he. 'Sure,' says he, 'before the readers came, weren't we just as safe as the dummy, not knowing nothing, and not having no way of knowing nothing, and weren't we quite quiet and easy; and now,' says he, 'every time the readers pass my door, don't I feel that they are just putting it on myself to know what religion is right, and just leaving me with no excuse for putting it all on the priest; and now,' says he, 'weren't we better as we were? and why would the readers be coming here to put it all on ourselves, when it wasn't on ourselves before?' 'Well, Neddy,' says I, 'by that way of reckoning, wouldn't it be the fine thing if Jesus Christ had never come into the world at all to show us the way of salvation?' 'And how's that?' says he, 'sure I didn't go for to say the like of that at all?' 'Well,' says I, 'sure we could all say then that we know nothing at all about what religion was true, and that we hadn't no way to know; and sure we could put it all on Adam, that sinned; and on God, too, that let us be born in sin, and gave us no knowledge; and sure if it's a fine thing to know nothing,' says I, 'wouldn't that be the way we would know nothing at all; and wouldn't it be the finest of all?' 'Well, I didn't mean that,' says he; 'but sure the readers is putting it on me to know for myself, and sure it wasn't put on me before?' 'And didn't Jesus Christ, when he came into the world, put it on people to know him, and to judge for themselves that it was him? and didn't he put it on them to know if his religion was true? and didn't he put it on them to search the Scriptures to find out if it was Him that was in it? and didn't he put it on them to repent, and to turn to Him, and to believe in Him? and why wouldn't the Word of God do just the same now,' says I 'when it comes to our own doors?' So I seen he was studying, and he couldn't get over that; 'so,' says I to him, 'Neddy,' says I, 'just tell me, *was it worse* for the people then, for Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the world, to come to them?' 'Well,' says he, 'I don't know what to say to it, and I would like for somebody to tell me.' 'Well,' says I, 'I think it was *better* for them that would hear and learn from him, for sure they found salvation,' says I; 'and I'm thinking,' says I, 'it *was worse* for them that *wouldn't* learn, for sure then they had no excuse,' says I; and with that I just got out my Bible before he could stop me, and I showed him what Jesus Christ said himself—"'This is the judgment, because the Light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than the light'" (John, iii. 19, Douay Bible). 'And is it that way with the readers?' says he. 'Well, it was that way with the apostles,' says I, 'for here is what St. Paul says of himself and the rest of them,'—"We are the good odour of Christ unto God, in them that are saved, and in them that perish; to the one indeed we are the odour of death unto death, but to the the others the odour of life unto life" (2 Cor. ii. 15 and 16). 'And is it that way with the readers?' says he. 'It's that way,' says I, 'with the word that Jesus Christ spoke, and that's in the Bible; so I'm thinking,' says I, 'it's always that way with them that offers to show us the Word of God.' 'Well that's just what was angering me against the readers,' says he. 'Take care that same wouldn't anger you against the Word of God,' says I. 'I doubt it would,' says he, 'if I gave in to it any more.' 'Well don't,' says I; 'sure it's come to your door now, and you can't put it away if you would: just turn to it,' says I, 'and see if it isn't for life and salvation to them that receives it.' 'That's what I'll have to do,' says he, 'and I knew myself it would come to that,' says he, 'cause I was so angry at it;' so there's my story, Jem."

"And a good story, too, Pat," said Jem; "you handled it well; and I believe there's a deal of people in the country that has got that notion; they *feel* the readers is putting it on themselves to know what religion is true, and they don't feel yet that it is the knowledge of the way of salvation that the readers is putting on them. But I suppose, Pat, it be to be that way at first; and sure its something when the people begins to feel that itself; for sure when that begins to work in them a bit, they won't be able to turn it off. But did you ask the man behind the door, Pat, about what the Rev. Mr. Burke said of the wine that wasn't made of ripe grapes? and what did you get out of him?"

"Oh, just not one word," said Pat. "I knew he was there, and I shouted it to him, and he heard it all and wouldn't say one word, good nor bad."

"Well, that's enough, Pat," said Jem; "Mr. Burke is right this time, anyway."

So they went home for that night, and, no doubt, will be talking again.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

The great mass of communications with which we are favoured renders it impossible for us to insert everything we could desire as promptly as we could wish. At this moment several articles, actually in type, are necessarily omitted for want of room, though we have incurred considerable expense in giving four extra pages in our present number.

We are reluctantly obliged to postpone Mr. Rourke's letter, though already in type, on account of its great length, but hope to insert it in our next. To diminish the chances of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st.

We would request our correspondents, both Roman Catholics and Protestants, to limit the length of their communications, and not to discuss a variety of distinct topics in one letter.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscribers. Any one receiving any number of the journal which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS AND FRIENDS.

We have to thank several obliging friends for assisting us with copies of Nos. 2, 8, and 11, to complete sets of Vol. I., which is in great demand. Nos. 3 and 4 have already been reprinted. If any of our friends could oblige us with additional copies of Nos. 2, 8, or 11, they would be very acceptable, and might save us the heavy expense of reprinting them, which, however, we purpose doing, if necessary.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, FEBRUARY, 1854.

Our readers may, perhaps, recollect our noticing, in October last, a notable expedient for putting down our somewhat troublesome periodical, suggested by a provincial journal, whose editor appears to be more remarkable for irritability than ingenuity—viz., the summary one of *knocking down* the first man that put into his hand this "vile periodical"—as being "a deliberate insult and provocation quite sufficient to justify a man in *committing a breach of the peace!*"

We ventured on that occasion to express our conviction that this summary method of extinguishing our journal was rather unfair to that useful class of our fellow-subjects, the letter-carriers of her Majesty's Post-office, and was, we thought, not very likely to be brought into active operation, much less before the judicial bench at petty sessions or elsewhere—and as we have not yet learned that any of our very useful friends, the postmen, have suffered in the cause, we presume that our editorial opponent's advice has not yet been taken, even at Limerick, as far, at least, as the CATHOLIC LAYMAN is concerned.

It appears, however, that in the same month of October, a certain Mr. Martin Andrew O'Brennan, who describes himself as proprietor of the collegiate seminary, Bolton-street, in the city of Dublin (instigated probably by the advice of our Limerick cotemporary, then just published), determined to try the point of law as to what would amount to "a justification for committing a breach of the peace" in such matters; and having been handed by one Wm. Smyth, handbill distributor, in Lower Sackville-street, on the evening of the 14th of October, a certain printed paper, inviting him to attend a controversial sermon in St. Luke's Church, on Sunday evening, the 16th of October, on the subject of "The Supremacy of St. Peter," he was afforded a fitting opportunity; whereupon, quoth Mr. O'Brennan (we quote from his own affidavit made in the course of the proceedings, after mentioned), "on ascertaining the nature of the handbill, and taking into consideration what deponent regarded as the premeditated insolence of the prosecutor (said Smyth), in his manner and gesture, when thrusting said bill into his hand, defendant was very indignant, and his *first impulse* was (following, of course, the advice of our pugilistic friend), to have *struck* the prosecutor; but on a moment's consideration, he thought it more becoming to have the prosecutor given in charge for his misconduct, which evidently and manifestly tended, *in defendant's opinion*, to provoke a breach of the peace." Thereupon he, Mr. O'Brennan, handed over the culprit, Smyth, into the custody of a policeman, and had him carried off to the Capel-street Police-office, where he swore informations against him, before Mr. Hugh O'Callaghan, one of the metropolitan divisional police magistrates, who, without hesitation, agreeing, of course, in his view of the law with our Limerick cotemporary, bound over poor Smyth in heavy recognizances to keep the peace, or to submit to imprisonment for fourteen days!

Great was the joy, of course, of our pugilistic friend, who deemed this one step at least gained in carrying out his plan of *knock-down* arguments, the *point of law* being now *satisfactorily* decided, and the courage to carry it out, whether against bill-stickers, CATHOLIC LAYMEN, or letter-carriers, being all that was now required to put an end to the *nuisance of free discussion* upon such offensive and dangerous topics as are treated of in our pages.

Great, also, was the laudation bestowed on the legal acumen and impartiality of Mr. O'Callaghan, who was forthwith held up as an example worthy of imitation by all her Majesty's justices of the peace throughout the length and breadth of Ireland, some of whom might, perhaps, require enlightenment, as not happening to possess the experience or legal ability of the said Mr. O'Callaghan.

Having ourselves been not a little amused at the whole matter, we took the trouble to cut out a number of articles from certain public papers of that date, which joined in chorus to give Mr. O'Callaghan a regular ovation; and we now present our readers with a few extracts, out of many:—

(From the Nation.)

"Two or three days ago a tract distributor, employed by a controversial minister in St. Michan's parish, while practising his profession in Sackville-street, thrust one of his anti-Papal documents into the hands of our Catholic fellow-citizen, Mr. M. A. O'Brennan. Anxious to test the legality of such an offensive proceeding, Mr. O'Brennan had his assailant arrested forthwith, and brought before a police magistrate; and the magistrate decided that the prisoner should be bound over in heavy recognizances to preserve the peace, or submit to an imprisonment of fourteen days. *A simple and effective remedy has thus been found for the entire system of modern missionary tactics, and we trust the lesson will not be lost upon our provincial friends.*"

(From the Dublin Evening Post.)

"We refer to a police report, in our fourth page, for *an important and well-timed judgment, pronounced by Mr. O'Callaghan, the presiding magistrate in Capel-street Division, which cannot fail to give a decided check to the intolerable nuisance of tract distribution in the streets and public highways.* The party charged in this instance for offensive behaviour, in the *forcing* of publications insulting to the Roman Catholic religion, in a way calculated to lead to a breach of the peace, was ordered to give bail, or, in default, to suffer a certain period of imprisonment.

"The parties employed in this disreputable occupation, appear to have laboured under the delusion that they enjoyed complete impunity, as if there were no means to protect the public from annoyance and interruption whilst engaged in their lawful occupations. *The case to which we now refer will convince them of the contrary; and, as there is no chance for martyrdom and its gains in such shabby practices, we doubt not that the decision of the worthy and intelligent magistrate will operate as a salutary preventive in future. It would have been well, perhaps, if some such cooling process had been applied to the recent marauding crusade of the Hundred Scotch Gospellers, who caused so much excitement and some disturbance amongst a peaceable and industrious community.*"

(From the Tablet)

"We think Mr. O'Brennan is entitled to the thanks of the Catholic public for his spirited and successful effort to *abate the disgusting nuisance of thrusting offensive, often blasphemous, tracts into the hands of persons passing through the public streets.* The report of the proceedings,

which we copy from the *Freeman*, is worthy of the attention, not only of Catholics, but of *those magisterial and other officials who, in various districts of the country, have shown a disposition to support the proselytizers in their course of outrage upon the Catholic community.* Mr. O'Callaghan's decision has, we observe, given mortal offence to the bigots, fanatics, and infidels; *but no one doubts that it is perfectly in accordance with the law of the land, and with the duty of a justice of the peace.*"

(From the Telegraph.)

"A very important decision was delivered last week, by Mr. O'Callaghan, the able and impartial magistrate, who truly dispenses justice in Capel-street Police-office. In a case that was brought before him, Mr. O'Callaghan declared that the circulating, and hawking about, and putting into the hands of persons passing along the roads, placards, circulars, or handbills, containing expressions offensive to the feelings of any religious community, was a *legal offence*, subjecting the person convicted of it to *imprisonment.*

"We recommend to the country magistrates—to those who have neither the experience nor the legal ability of Mr. O'Callaghan—*to study his words and to imitate his example.* We hope, also, that those who have the command of the police in every district in Ireland, *will learn from the dicta of Mr. O'Callaghan, as to persons circulating offensive controversial tracts, what is the course of conduct incumbent upon them to pursue as 'preservers of the peace.'*

"But there is another class of persons to whom this decision of Mr. O'Callaghan should teach wisdom, for no word of man can instil into their hearts the meekness of charity—and these are the circulators and distributors of that insolent and scandalous publication, THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

"We do not know but the publisher of that insulting paper is liable to be brought before the bench for seeking to provoke Catholics to commit a breach of the peace. For the present we tell them the decision of Mr. O'Callaghan should be a warning to them. If with that warning they persist in insulting Catholics, then they may rest assured the insult will not be long tamely submitted to."

We have not, indeed, met with a single Roman Catholic paper disapproving of Mr. O'Callaghan's decision, or which did not hold up his conduct as not only legal, but worthy of being followed by all the magistrates in Ireland.

Alas! for the poor CATHOLIC LAYMAN! What hope remained left for it, or its free but friendly discussion of the points in controversy throughout our beloved country! We had done something, we thought, to soften asperity, and introduce a better tone into such matters; but now we were to be at the mercy of every irritable opponent of free discussion, who could bring himself to swear, before Mr. O'Callaghan or any other "experienced and able" magistrate, that the CATHOLIC LAYMAN "*annoyed* him, or was *repugnant to his religious feelings*"! and if we were not *knocked* down in person, or by proxy, we were, at least, to be subject to the *cooling process* of entering into recognizances or suffering fourteen days imprisonment! How happy, however, it was for us that "the *experimentum in corpore vili*" was not tried first upon *us*, but on poor W. Smith, the handbill distributor in Lower Sackville-street!

The wheel of fortune, however, goes round, and great are the vicissitudes which at times occur, even in the history of divisional metropolitan magistrates and their triumphal ovations.

Smyth, the bill distributor, though an humble man, earning (honestly, as he thought) a shilling a day in his vocation, bethought himself of trying the soundness of Mr. O'Callaghan's legal knowledge, by applying for a writ of *certiorari* (as it is called), whereby the proceedings might be brought in the way of appeal before the highest court of criminal judicature in this kingdom of Ireland—her Majesty's Court of Queen's Bench. To that court Smyth accordingly applied, and a very learned argument took place before that court, during which two eminent Queen's Counsel, on the part of Mr. O'Callaghan, left no ingenuity or exertion untried to prevent a revision of the decision in question; but the Court unanimously decided that the *certiorari* must be granted, and, accordingly, ordered the adjudication and informations to be returned into the said Court of Queen's Bench without delay, which was accordingly done. We extract the following report of the ulterior proceedings from one of the daily papers:—

"Yesterday (28th January), Mr. Whiteside, Q.C., applied to quash the order and informations taken by Mr. O'Callaghan, obliging W. Smyth to enter into recognizances to keep the peace towards Mr. M. A. O'Brennan, schoolmaster, for the alleged offence of handing him a handbill, in Sackville-street, "repugnant to his religious feelings.' He said that a minute or two would put the court in possession of the facts, and they were facts important to be known. The informations sworn before the magistrate stated that Martin A. O'Brennan came before Hugh O'Callaghan, one of the divisional justices of the police of Dublin metropolis, and deposed on his oath, 'that on the 14th of October instant, at Lower Sackville-street, the prisoner W. Smyth, annoyed the complainant, by handing him a paper repugnant to his religious feelings.' That was the whole crime disclosed by the informations (laughter), and it was for the court to say if they disclosed any offence.

"Judge Crampton inquired if the return to the *certiorari* had been regularly set down for argument?

"Mr. Whiteside—Why, *there is nothing to argue*, and I understand that Mr. M'Donagh does not intend to argue that the magistrate's order could be sustained.

"Mr. M'Donagh, Q.C., on the other side, said, as he wished to save the time of the court, although he could have insisted upon the case being set down, upon a consilium, which would delay the hearing of the motion, he did not mean to put the other side to any inconvenience.

"Mr. O'Hagan, Q.C., who was with Mr. M'Donagh, said, he felt there were *technical* (?) difficulties in sustaining the order of the magistrate. They *meant to say nothing but submit to the quashing of the proceedings.*

"Mr. Napier, Q.C., on the part of the prosecutor, said, that *the case was to be decided on the substantial facts*, and it was perfectly clear from them that the proceedings were illegal and unwarranted.

"*The Chief Justice*—There is only one question before us, and having referred to the documents appearing on the face of the return, counsel felt, and very properly, that it would be a *mere waste of time* to argue in support of the validity of the proceedings. The order of the magistrate and other proceedings must therefore be quashed.

"*Judge Crampton.*—It is perfectly clear from the documents that the magistrate *had no jurisdiction whatsoever* to pronounce the order which he made.

"*Judge Moore.*—It is our duty to quash the order, and discharge the prosecutor's recognizances."

Thus ends Mr. Hugh O'Callaghan's ovation! and we fear our Limerick cotemporary must now exert his ingenuity to discover some *other* summary expedient for extinguishing the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, or that freedom of discussion, which has always been considered by British subjects as their inalienable birthright, notwithstanding the rash decision of a Dublin stipendiary police magistrate, and the premature applause of the *Telegraph*, the *Dublin Evening Post*, the *Freeman's Journal*, the *Nation*, and the *Tablet*, is likely to go on as successfully as ever!

Since, however, we should be as reluctant to countenance any *abuse* of the sacred privileges of free discussion, by circulating anything *really insulting* to any class of our fellow-countrymen, as if we were ourselves as sensitive as Mr. O'Brennan appears to be; and lest we should be thought to encourage any *such* publications (which our readers by this time know would be contrary to the first principles on which we ourselves act), or lest our readers should suspect her Majesty's Court of Queen's Bench, (the highest court of criminal judicature in the land,) of having given countenance to anything justly objectionable, we have taken the trouble to procure a copy of the handbill in question, which was literally as follows:—

"INVITATION TO ROMAN CATHOLICS.

"The Rev. J. O'Carroll, A.B., S.T.C.D., will preach (God willing) in St. Luke's Church, Coombe, on Sunday evening, October 16, 1853, at seven o'clock.

"Subject—Supremacy of Peter.

"How can St. Peter be the rock, or foundation of the Church, when he himself says, that 'Christ is the chief corner stone?"—1 Pet. ii. 6, Roman Catholic Bible.

"How can the Pope of Rome be successor to St. Peter, when Peter never was Bishop of Rome, and is never acknowledged as such in the Holy Scriptures? How can the Pope, or any human being on earth, pretend to be head of the Church, without blasphemy, when Christ is head of the Church *now*? 'Christ is the head of the Church.'—Eph. v. 23, Roman Catholic Bible. 'But I would have you know that the head of every man is Christ.'—1 Cor. xi. 4, Roman Catholic Bible.

"How was it that all the disciples disputed among themselves which should be the greatest, if Christ had before that time, as it is said, constituted Peter the prince of the Apostles?—Compare Matt. xvi. 13, &c., with Mark, viii. 27, &c., and ix. 33, Roman Catholic Bible.

"If Peter had been first granted supremacy, why did James and John afterwards seek the highest places in the kingdom of God?—Compare Matt. xvi. 13, &c., with Matt. xx. 20, &c., Roman Catholic Bible.

"If Peter was the Pope, why was he called to account for his conduct by certain believers at Jerusalem?—Acts, xi. 1, &c.; and why did he not preside and deliver sentence instead of James at the council?—Acts, xv. 1-19, Roman Catholic Bible.

"Roman Catholics are earnestly and affectionately invited to attend."

On the back was printed the following:—

"THIS IS THE QUESTION.

"1. Why do the Protestants take such pains to teach Roman Catholics the religion of the Roman Catholic Bible, while the Roman Catholic priests never teach the Roman Catholic people the religion of their own Roman Catholic Bible?

"2. Why do the Roman Catholic priests shrink from proving their religion out of the Roman Catholic Bible?

"3. Why are the Protestants so willing to prove their religion even out of the Roman Catholic Bible, while the priests are afraid of that same Roman Catholic Bible?

"4. How, then, can Roman Catholics believe that their religion is the Christianity which is taught in the Roman Catholic Bible?

"HOW IS A SINNER SAVED?

"This is the great question—

"'WHAT MUST I DO TO BE SAVED?'

"Why is it that no Roman Catholic priest will give to this all-important question the same answer as was given by St. Paul to the Philipplan jailor—'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved and thy house?'—Acts, xvi. 31.

"Another great question—

"WHAT IS THE TRUE WAY TO HAVE PEACE WITH GOD?

"The answer is given by St. Paul—'Being justified by faith let us have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ.'—Romans v. 1, Roman Catholic Bible.

"Friends and fellow-sinners hear the Word of the Lord."

We confess we can scarcely understand (if any such *questions* are ever to be discussed), how they could be couched in language *less* insulting. That Protestants should be prohibited from *asking questions* at all is, no doubt, what a certain class of persons in this country would wish, if they had the power to effect it. The old mode of *putting* Protestants to THE QUESTION is, of course, another matter. If they could effect that too, their triumph would be complete.

THE *RAMBLER* *versus* DR. CAHILL.

WE have been called on, by several valued correspondents, to notice a letter on Transubstantiation, published by the Rev. Dr. Cahill, Roman Catholic priest, in the "*Whitehaven Herald*," and subsequently reprinted in full in the *Tablet* newspaper of 17th December last, as an authoritative document, published by an able Roman Catholic controversialist of the present day, whose influence among the lower orders, at least, has been for some time by no means inconsiderable. We have always been sincerely anxious to grapple with the writers of the Church of Rome who most truly represent her real opinions, and are able to adduce the strongest arguments in support of them; and if we could have satisfied ourselves that Dr. Cahill's arguments or mode of controversy would be recognized by the authorities of the Church of Rome as a true statement of her belief and sentiments, we should long since have singled out Dr. Cahill and his publications as fit subjects for our criticism, though engaged as we are in promoting a kindly and Christian method of conducting controversy, it has always been to us a matter of surprise and regret that such a method of controversy as Dr. Cahill delights in should have met with so much applause from any class of Irish Roman Catholics.

It appears, however, that things which are supposed to be good enough for Ireland will not go down in England, or, perhaps, a juster view of what controversy ought to be is arising in both countries, for we have just seen in the *Rambler*, a Roman Catholic Journal and Review, published in London, which has reached its thirteenth volume, and is said to be read by nearly every educated Roman Catholic in Great Britain and Ireland, an article *repudiating* Dr. Cahill and his mode of controversy in the strongest language.

That our readers may judge for themselves how Dr. Cahill's letters are thought of by the most respectable

Roman Catholics in England we re-print the following extracts from the above-named publication (the *Rambler*) for the present month, headed :—

"DR. CAHILL'S LETTER ON TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

'*Letter of the Rev. Dr. Cahill to the Rev. J. Burns, Protestant Minister, Whitehaven, 7th December*, 1853. *Published in the* 'Whitehaven Herald,' *and subsequently in the* 'Tablet,' *of December* 17, 1853.

"In our last number we offered our readers some remarks on the various means of which we can avail ourselves for the conversion of Protestants; and we specified certain instruments of conversion, which, as it appears to us, are applicable to the few, but not to the many. Dr. Cahill's letter to Mr. Burns, of Whitehaven, supplies an example of one particular mode of attempting the conversion of unbelievers, which we did not then specify, because, happily it is rare amongst us; and further, because its demerits must be patent to all but the most superficial observers. The letter before us, however, presents so striking an illustration of the perils of platform and newspaper controversy, that it is impossible altogether to pass it over without comment. In thus remarking upon Dr. Cahill's treatment of the awful doctrine which is the subject of his epistle, we shall endeavour to restrain our own language within the closest limits of moderation of which the case will allow, both from respect to Dr. Cahill's sacred office and from a sense of the deep importance of the questions involved. We must, however, candidly acknowledge, that it is with feelings of real shame and distress that we have seen the statements contained in this letter, sent by their author to the columns of a Protestant newspaper, with the professed object of expounding the consistency and rationality of the Catholic faith, in prominent contrast with the absurdities and self-contradictions of Protestant heresies. Of the general tone and style of the letter we need say but a few words. Anything more unfortunately chosen as a means of winning the ignorant or the unbelieving to the faith of the Church, we can scarcely conceive. The devout and charitable Catholic, who, for the sake of the cause defended by the writer, might be disposed to overlook defects produced by the zeal of an advocate, could feel nothing but pain and wonder at Dr. Cahill's words; what, then, must be the impression produced on the minds of those who will make no allowances; who are disposed beforehand to account us ignorant, crafty, and irreverent, and who, while blind to the follies and inconsistencies of their own opinions, would exact from Catholics an almost superhuman measure of learning, acuteness, and self-command? We can only say, that we would not for the world that this letter should be seen by any Protestant friend or acquaintance who was in any degree awakened to a sense of the delusions in which he had been educated, and was turning a wistful eye towards the Catholic religion as the one, true, and holy faith given by Almighty God to man.

"Take, for instance, the astounding assertion, that he 'would prefer that a Catholic should read *the worst books of immorality*' than a Protestant Bible! If any of our readers have not already seen Dr. Cahill's letter, they will lift up their hands in astonishment, and question the accuracy of our quotation; nevertheless, we assure them that we are giving the exact words. Conceive, then, the effect of such a statement on the readers of the newspaper for which this letter was specially written. What story of Catholic wickedness will they not henceforth believe? What tale of priestly licentiousness will from this time be too monstrous for their credulity? The Protestant Bible has abundance of errors, it is true, and some of them of very serious importance; but is it not a violation of all common sense and decency, to pretend that a Catholic had better read the filthy productions of obscenity than the book in which these mis-translations occur? Is there a priest in the United Kingdom who would bear out Dr. Cahill in such a notion? Would not all, with one accord, denounce it as a perfect portend in the domain of morals and casuistry? We do not believe that Dr. Cahill himself would *act* on what he says. We do not believe that he would see a Catholic reading an obscene publication with more equanimity than he would see him reading the Protestant Bible. He is carried away by the excitement of newspaper controversy, and is betrayed into exaggerations which, in other moments, he would be eager to condemn. This single passage alone in his letter is a proof of the perils with which newspaper and platform contests on religious subjects are surrounded. We do not say that such subjects ought never to find their way into the columns of a Protestant journal, or that controversial discussions on theological topics ought never to be undertaken in public; but universal experience bears us out in alleging that such modes of treating the most sacred and delicate of subjects are rarely useful; and that, when they are undertaken, they require a sound head, a cool judgment, a disciplined temper, a prudent tongue, a contempt for clap-trap, and a desire to convince opponents, rather than to elicit the applause of indiscriminating admirers.

"What, then, must we think of the snares which beset the 'popular' controversialist, when we turn to the paragraph of Dr. Cahill's letter, in which he asserts that the miracle of Transubstantiation is 'a very common occurrence with God, and may be called *one of the most general laws of nature*?' He is carried away by the unfortunate desire to bring down the infallible mysteries of faith to the level of human capacities; and which has led him into statements which, viewed merely as rhetorical illustrations, are inaccurate and worthless; but if looked upon as destructive of Catholic doctrine, are shocking to the last degree. Led on by the desire of confounding his adversary, he is like a boy playing at snowballs, who mingles dirt and stones with the pure snow, in order to hit his antagonist the harder blows. While heaping on the head of this Mr. Burns every epithet of scorn and contempt, for his stupidity, his ignorance, and his 'untheological' blunders, he proceeds to put forth the following exposition of the doctrine of transubstantiation."

After giving a long extract from Dr. Cahill's letter, the *Rambler* proceeds, p. 173.

"Setting aside, moreover, the theological bearings of Dr. Cahill's language, as an argumentative illustration of the mystery of the Real Presence it is worthless, and can serve only to mislead. The wonder of Transubstantiation is this, that, while the substance is changed, the visible and tangible accidents remain. How, then, does it assist faith to compare this supernatural condition of a visible object with natural changes, in which the substance remains and the accidents are changed? The difficulty, to human reason, in the Catholic doctrine, *is the non-alteration in the accidents*. In all chemical changes the accidents *are* more or less altered, and heretical unbelief asserts that no transubstantiation can take place without such alteration; and Dr. Cahill's illustrations will serve to confirm such unbelief. Protestants will reiterate their assertion that the whole doctrine is unmitigated nonsense, and that Catholics themselves do not know what they mean. Catholics, on the other hand, will reply to such illustrations, that they are in direct violation of the injunctions and declarations of the Catechism of the Council of Trent, in which we are taught that *we have no example of the change wrought by Transubstantiation, either in natural changes or in the creation of things*. '*Illud sæpissime a sanctis Patribus repetitum fideles admonendi sunt, ne curiosius inquirant, quo pacto ea mutatio fieri possit. Nec enim percipi á nobis potest, nec in naturalibus mutationibus, aut in ipsâ rerum creatione ejus rei exemplum aliquod habemus*' (Cat. Conc. Trid. pars 2, c. iv. 9, 41.)

"Dr. Cahill, however, is not content to stop here. He actually goes on to 'illustrate' this sacred mystery by a new 'explanation' of the Incarnation itself, which is a virtual denial of the very foundation of the Christian faith.

. . . . . .

"Is it not mournful to reflect that in these days, when every one's eyes are turned towards the Church and her teaching, the columns of a Protestant newspaper should be filled with declamations on the very foundation of our faith, which, if they have any meaning at all, are a plain denial of the doctrine, which every child may read in the creed of St Athanasius, that 'our Lord Jesus Christ is man, *of the substance of His mother*?'—p. 174.

. . . . . .

"Of the letter of Mr. Burns, which has called forth this reply from Dr. Cahill, we know nothing more than is to be gathered from the extracts which the latter has prefixed to his rejoinder. Mr. Burns appears to be a person of the 'evangelical' school, who cannot help 'preaching,' even when writing to a Catholic priest. We dare say his whole production is foolish enough, and as 'untheological' as Dr. Cahill considers it to be; but we must say that, as far as Dr. Cahill has enabled us to judge, there appears to be nothing in it which should have provoked such contumely and violence as he has poured forth. On the contrary, there are indications of more modesty of thought than is common among persons of Mr. Burns's school; and which should naturally have called for a simple and kind-hearted explanation of Catholic doctrine, rather than for a storm of contempt. '*I think*,' says Mr. Burns, 'the soul can no more feed on flesh and blood than on bread.' Surely such a statement, so expressed, required something different from a whole broadside of abuse."—p. 175.

It is not merely the *Rambler*, however, that judges thus of Dr. Cahill's letters. The *Tablet* of Saturday, February 4, contains a letter from Dr. Cahill, written in his usual style, in answer to a letter written by the Rev. Edward Walford, lately a clergyman of the Church of England, but now a convert to Romanism. We have not seen Mr. Walford's letter, for the *Tablet* does not publish *that*, though it gives Dr. Cahill's reply; but Dr. Cahill gives us the following extracts from the letter of Mr. Walford :—"Now, sir, whatever means God may bless to the advancement of the Catholic religion in England, it is quite certain that false statements are not among them, and I cannot but deplore, in common with many other converts of the Catholic faith, the recklessness and uncharitable assertions which Dr. Cahill, a priest of the Catholic Church, is not ashamed to utter against the Protestant clergy." And, again, "When we urge upon them (the Protestants) the claims of the Catholic Church, and the superior fruits of holiness to be found within her pale, we are silenced by an allusion to the last speech, or letter of Dr. Cahill, who, surely, as a Catholic priest, would be doing equal service by teaching some of the Church's children in our semi-heathen towns, as by delivering fierce controversial lectures, and writing letters of ignorant and unchristian invective."

Mr. Walford, in changing his religion, does not think that he should cease to regard truth or be a gentleman. Dr. Cahill seems to think otherwise; for he accounts for Mr. Walford's letter, by telling him that he is "only half converted"! Of course Dr. Cahill thinks that *every one* who is wholly converted, should prove it by using such language and arguments as Dr. Cahill's, and by speaking of Protestants as Dr. Cahill does.

We shall not trouble our readers with the unblushing self-glorification with which Dr. Cahill endeavours to console himself for the rebuke he has received. But there is another point worth mentioning. The *Rambler* says that we are not to suppose that Dr. Cahill's speeches and letters are approved by the Roman Catholic priests or bishops.

"We assure our non-Catholic readers that Dr. Cahill alone is responsible for the statements he puts forth, that there is no foundation whatever for the prevalent Protestant notion that he is to be taken as a chosen champion of the faith; but, on the contrary, that a very large proportion of the Catholic clergy and laity regard much of what he says *as pernicious and untrue*. Why, then, it will be said, is Dr. Cahill *allowed* thus to compromise the whole community of which he is a member?" (p. 176).

The *Rambler* goes on to say that the only reason that the Roman Catholic bishops do not stop Dr. Cahill is, "lest an unwilling subject should recalcitrate hopelessly;" in plain English, lest he should rebel against authority, and begin to kick like a vicious horse that nobody can stop!

After all the boasted *unity* of the Church of Rome, then, it appears, there is dissension enough within its pale. They have champions in one country whom they repudiate and are ashamed of in another, and can keep in subjection those priests only, however mischievous or heterodox, who are *willing subjects*, and not given to rebel or recalcitrate hopelessly! While, however, the *Rambler* excuses the Roman Catholic bishops and clergy for "permitting Dr. Cahill to write and lecture as he does," Dr. Cahill, on the other hand affirms, that his sermons have been preached, and his speeches made, on the "invitations of dozens of bishops, and hundreds of priests," to all of whom he can refer for their approval.

We trust this is but the vapouring of the man, and not the stating of a fact; and venture to hope that the time is coming when all Roman Catholic priests will see that controversial discussion, to be read or listened to, *must be* carried on in the method of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, and not in the method of Dr. Cahill. We trust, therefore, our friends will excuse us for not selecting Dr. Cahill's publications as matters to be replied to, at least, till he is recognized by his Roman Catholic brethren as a fit representative of their views, and learns to conduct controversy in a more temperate and Christian spirit.

Correspondence.

ON THE VISIBLE CHURCH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Extreme pressure of business alone has precluded the possibility of my paying earlier attention to your remarks on my letter in the November edition of your paper. I regret that my observations should be, as you say, calculated to excite prejudice. Unfortunately, early prejudices are not easily subdued. Bishop Burnet says it is a noble effort of the greatest minds to shake off the prejudices of education; notwithstanding, as I have abstained from setting myself up as an advocate of any particular Church, and have contented myself with reasoning on doctrines abstractedly, I flatter myself there are many enlightened Protestants who will examine my arguments impartially, having flung, as I do, all such feelings of prejudice to the winds.

From a retrospective view of our controversy, it appears that I have so far prevailed as to establish against you at least, that the Church of England, as at present existing, is disowned by every Church, congregation, and society of Christians in the eleventh century. After sending me, in my search of truth, from Rome to Greece, Antioch, Alexandria, and the whole round of the eastern Churches—Copts, Muscovites and all—finding your principles rejected by each, you are constrained to cower under the patronage of Lanfranc. This pious and learned man was one of the most formidable opponents of Berengarius, against whom he wrote a book, expressly, in the very beginning of which he inveighs against Berengarius as an arrogant innovator, who began to broach opinions opposed to the whole world—"Superbiæ fastu plenus, contra orbem sentire coepisti"—and that he composed a work in opposition to truth, and to the persuasion of all Churches. "Contra Catholicam veritatem, contra omnium ecclesiarum opinionem, scriptam postea condidisti." In the 22nd chapter of his book Lanfranc thus expostulates with Berengarius :—"Ask all those who have any knowledge of Latin; ask the Greeks, the Armenians, and all Christians, without exception, of whatsoever nation, they will answer you that they hold the same faith that we profess." And Guitmond, Bishop of Averse, a disciple of Lanfranc, says, in his 3rd book against Berenger, that he had not a single little town or little village favourable to his innovation, and that before Berenger had thus got mad no one had ever got mad after the same fashion—"Notissimum est hoc tempore priusquam Berengarius insaniret, hujusmodi insanias nenquam fuisse."

You say the present Church of England is identical with that presided over by Lanfranc. As few will be inclined to

believe *the ipse dixits* of individuals, however respectable, it remains for you to show the unbroken succession of your bishops from Lanfranc, and I doubt if even this will avail you; for I have demonstrated that you have not identity of doctrine, which is the true succession. St. Augustine says—"He that holds the same doctrine is of the same chair, and he who is an enemy to the doctrine is an enemy to the chair"—*Vide* 22nd, Orat. pro Athanas. (Paris, 1788.)

It will then be a polemical paradox for your ingenuity to reconcile how the propagation of the opinions of Berengarius can claim a succession from Lanfranc, who stigmatized and condemned them. Conscious that this position is like the rest, untenable, you adopt the theory, "that the Church need not of necessity be pure; that she is subject to error and corruption of doctrine, more or less dangerous, more or less extensive, in different ages and in different countries." This is perfectly intelligible, now at length; but if you are an accredited organ of Protestant opinion, it is evident, from the circumspection you have used in hazarding this opinion, that, after so many centuries of invention and refinement since the Reformation, you have not agreed among yourselves to concoct a regular theory of the visibility; that you have been depending on circumstances, and the penetration and perseverance of your correspondents to develope this your theory, or rather to extort it from you, at least that you felt some timidity on the subject. Such vacillation is inconsistent with professions of undeviating straightforwardness, and with the sublime sentiments embodied in the spirit of the LAYMAN.

If you once admit the principle of the moral and doctrinal corruption of the Church, you open the door indiscriminately to all the heretics since the days of the apostles. You cannot draw a line of demarcation between the horde of heretics, and the several Churches of the eleventh century, which I have shown, upon your principles, to be corrupt, erratic, superstitious, blasphemous, and idolatrous. How will you reconcile the idea of such a chaotic amalgamation of heresy and schism, of superstition, blasphemy, and idolatry with the lofty promises made to the Church of the Messias? I humbly conceive that your ability and talents will be inadequate to the task. This is a startling picture of the true visible Church of Christ. These are the consequences which, with prophetic certainty, I foresaw from your application of the passages which you had expiscated, or episcated, from St. Augustine. It hurts me not how mercilessly you have applied the lash of your criticism to an expression coined in a more illustrious mint than that of my obscure pericranium. No one in his senses doubts "the unspeakable forcknowledge of God," whereby he foresees future possibilities and events, such as the election of St. Paul, or of any other human being; but that such persons, whilst unconverted, or perhaps indifferent to any such thing, form a portion of the true Church, is what I will not subscribe to. Your method of proving this to be a true exposition of Protestant doctrine is singular, viz.—"the 6th article adopts all that is 'read in Scripture, or may be proved thereby.' I find this point in Gal. i., 15, 16." Hence it must be Church of England doctrine. In your major proposition you have misquoted the words of the Article, and, by substituting another minor proposition for yours, the Arians, or any other heretics, may prove themselves to be members of the Church of England. They should be obliged to you for so extraordinary a metamorphosis of the sixth Article.

Scripture passages on this point are quite plain—"A heretic, after the first and second admonition, avoid" (Tit. iii. 10). "Shun those who cause divisions" (Rom. xvi. 17). "Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof, from such turn away" (2 Tim. iii. 5). "If there come one unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed" (2 John x.). Hear St. Augustine himself concerning schismatics, the Novatians and the Donatists—"They who believe the incarnation, passion, resurrection, and divinity of Jesus Christ, yet, if they do not communicate with the whole, wherever it is spread, it is evident they are not in the Catholic Church" (Lib. de unit. Eccl., cap. iv.). And, again—"All those who believe in Jesus Christ what faith teaches, but differ about his body, the Church, so that their communion is not with the body, but with some separate part, it is manifest they are not in the Catholic Church, and by reason of the few things in which they are not with us, the many things in which they are with us, avail them not." (Idem. cap. 3). The Donatists denied the efficacy of the sacraments administered by wicked men—(*vide* Confessio Augustana, Art. viii., Quid sit Ecclesia.) So much for *your* Biblical research, and for your *accuracy* in transmitting "the opinions which St. Augustine and Catholics then held."

Now, though I unhesitatingly admit that every individual Church is liable to "error and corruption in doctrine," I maintain that God has distinctly promised that he will have and keep a congregation of faithful men, free from error and corruption, to administer the sacraments, and to preach the Word of God in its purity, such as the compilers of the Thirty-nine Articles must have had in contemplation. This society, though they may be reduced to few in number, yet, having the Holy Spirit in their hearts, and God's never-failing Word to support them, will preserve the faith (1 Tim. vi. 20) and the form of sound words (2 Tim. i. 13), which they shall commit to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also (2 Tim. vi. 2). And though the gates of hell should rise up against them, as in the case of the Arians against Athanasius, the agitation would inevitably convulse the face of society, producing a moral and religious revolution from which the faithful must come forth as gold from the furnace, repelling from them the unsound portion with a centrifugal power, and shine forth, "fair as the morn, clear as the sun, terrible as an army with banners."—Cant. vi. 10. It is a matter of necessity, that many unregenerate and wicked men be tolerated in this communion of saints, whilst they subscribe to the orthodox formulary of faith, according to the eighth article of the Augsburg Confession, above cited, for "in a great house there are not only vessels of gold and silver, but also of wood and of earth, and some to honour and some to dishonour (2 Tim. ii. 20); see also (1 Tim. iii. 15, and Rom. ix. 21).

Protestant controversialists boast that they are glad to catch Roman Catholics upon Scripture ground. Now, I cheerfully meet you on Scripture ground exclusively, anxious for the triumph of truth, and indifferent as to any ulterior object; and, for the sake of brevity, which with me is a great object, I will select only a few out of numberless passages of Scripture.

"Obey your prelates and submit yourselves," says the apostle (Heb. xiii. 17). Here is an injunction without qualification or limitation of time or place, from which it is most evident that the congregation of faithful men among whom the pure Word of God is preached, and the sacrament duly administered according to Christ's ordinance, must be perpetual and always visible; as the apostle would not command us to obey teachers of error and superstition, of blasphemy and idolatry.

St. Paul calls the Church "the pillar and the ground of truth" (1 Tim. iii. 15). All must admit that this refers to the Church visible, in which the apostle was giving Timothy, the bishop, instructions "how to conduct himself," as he says, "in his own absence." This establishes the moral and doctrinal purity of the Church of Christ, as corrupt and erratic Churches could neither support truth, nor be supported by truth.

Next (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20)—"Go teach all nations," &c. This most palpably refers to the Church visible; for Christ promises to be with the preachers, teachers, baptizers. If they could be invisible the whole order of the ministry, and even the martyrs may be invisible. Let no one say that this promise is confined to the Apostles. No; they were not to preach and baptize to the end of the world except through their lawfully constituted successors in the ministry. It is repugnant to common sense that He should be with apostates and idolaters; such an opinion is inadmissible, unless sanctioned by most positive and unequivocal assurance of Scripture.

(John xiv. 16, and xvi. 13) "I will ask the Father, and he will send you another comforter, to abide with you for ever," and "to teach you all things." The Apostles were not to live for ever in this life, except in their successors: hence this also refers to the Church visible.

Does the ever-memorable passage—"The gates of hell will not prevail against it" (Matt. xvi. 18) refer to the invisible Church? By no means; the Ephesians, to whom St. Paul wrote, were visible, and so will the true Church of Christ, "the household of faith," to the end of time, be, in the same manner, "growing, and framed, and built upon the foundation of the prophets and apostles, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone" (Eph. ii. 19, 22).

Our Saviour is the head of his body, the Church (Col. i. 18), the spouse and everlasting husband (Eph. v. 23, &c.); so that she must be undefiled and pure, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing. If any person should say that this refers to the Church invisible, I refer him to the "Controversial Manual," published by the British Reformation Society, page 113 (Loudon edition, 1846), where, as a dissuasive from certain Roman Catholic devotional practices, the above passage is very pathetically applied to the visible society of Christians.

Read also, in the 54th chapter of Isaiah, the most solemn and encouraging, the most unlimited, unrestricted, and most unqualified promise of perpetual purity to the visible Church in successive ages (verse 9) "As I have sworn that the waters of Noah should no more go over the earth, so have I sworn that I would not be angry with thee, nor rebuke thee."

Verse 10—"For the mountains shall depart and the hills be removed; but my kindness shall not depart from thee, nor the covenant of my peace be removed from thee, saith the Lord, that hath mercy on thee" Verse 15—"Behold they shall surely gather together, but not by me, whosoever shall gather together against thee shall surely fall for thy sake;" and (lix. 21)—"My spirit that is upon thee, and my words that I have put into thy mouth shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and for ever." And, again (lxii.) 6—"I have set watchmen upon thy walls, O, Jerusalem, which shall *never* hold their peace day nor night." You would have these watchmen converted into "dumb dogs who bark not," in allowing the Church to be swamped with apostasy and idolatry without concentrating around them the faithful few, raising their hands and voices against corruption and error, and making their denunciations reverberate from shore to shore of each benighted and devoted land, till their testimony had been silenced by the torture of the scaffold or the flame.

In the Nicene and in the Apostles' Creed we profess our belief in the one holy, Catholic, and Apostolical Church. It is one by being "one body" (Rom. xii. 5), and "one spirit" (1 Cor. xii. 4 to 13). See, also, Eph. iv. 4, 5, 6, and it is holy by purity of morals, and preserving inviolate the doctrine of the apostles. No one can deny that this refers to the visible Church, as Bishop Pearson says in his exposition of the Creed—"The necessity of believing the Holy Catholic Church appears first in this, that Christ has appointed it as the only means to eternal life. Christ never appointed two ways to heaven, nor did He institute a Church to save some, and make another institution for other men's salvation. There is no other name given under Heaven by which we can be saved but the name of Jesus; and that name is no otherwise given under Heaven than in the true Church."

I call upon you, now, to establish the theory of the moral and doctrinal corruption of the Church, by texts of Scripture, equally plain, obvious, and incontrovertible, at least as those I have adduced; and, also, to enter into an analysis of these latter passages, *seriatim* and *singulatim*, and to show that they are irrelevant to prove the contrary opinion. In so doing, if you resort to tortuous or far-fetched interpretations, I do not say that it will excite prejudice, for that would be unworthy; but I say it will excite the commiseration of every man of understanding and Christian philanthropy.

Respecting the Greek Church, I should have said, denying the Filioque procession, instead of "denying the Holy Ghost, the error of Photius." The latter clause should have qualified the former and rendered it intelligible; however the difference is not important in the present discussion. They are both fundamental errors.

My motives for not hitherto noticing the difficulty you have started as to the meaning of the word *sensualiter* were—first, I had resolved to adhere most strictly to the rule you had prescribed of "confining each letter to some one subject" (CATHOLIC LAYMAN, January 18, 1853, p. 10), one subject being more than I could do justice to within the narrow limits to which I am necessarily restricted. Next, I have been under the impression that your object was to lead me into a by-battle about Transubstantiation, which design I had resolved to frustrate, till you should have disposed of the subject of the visibility.

In the first place, then, I assert, most confidently, and without fear of contradiction, that *sensualiter* does not mean perceptible to the senses externally. *Sensibiliter* would be just the word for that precisely.

Secondly, *sensualiter* (if recognized at all) must mean *in a manner capable of gratifying the animal passions*, or *of perceiving the enjoyment of such passions internally*. I appeal to classical scholars to say whether this translation is not quite correct.

Thirdly, as the word *sensualiter* is not found in any vocabulary of words, either obsolete or post-classical, it is improbable that learned men, living in that region of classical literature, should be betrayed into such a solecism. I have never seen the place from which you quote, nor is there a great probability that I ever shall; but it occurs to me that it should be *essentialiter*, *i.e.*, substantially, which is the identical word used in the Council of Plaisance, where the doctrine of Berengarius was condemned (Tom. 10, Conc. Lab. p. 502). Any scholar will immediately perceive how it may happen, by an aphaeresis of the first syllable *es*, and a transmutation or mistake of *u* for *i*. Such errors are frequent in transcribing, and even in print. I am satisfied that the emendation I have suggested is both rational and correct.

Hoping you will have the kindness to insert this letter in the next number of your periodical, I remain,

Φιλαληθης.

Dated 3rd February, 1854.

Our correspondent, of course, admits the distinction between the "articles of faith" and other religious opinions, for the Church of Rome admits it. If our correspondent had attended to this distinction, he might have left out a great part of his letter.

We conceive that the succession of a Church, as considered between the Roman Catholics and us, consists in a succession of its bishops, clergy, and people, holding the same articles of Christian faith: but we do not hold it necessary to the succession of a Church that all *other* opinions about religion should be the same at all times. We have always stated this distinctly, and without hesitation.

We say the Church in England holds the same articles of faith—the same Catholic creed—which were held in the Church over which Lanfranc presided; and that the present Archbishop of Canterbury has succession from him. And we think this enough to establish that it is still the same Church, although other religious opinions may have varied in it. "The succession of doctrine," as a necessary essential, must be confined to "articles of faith"—that is, "the Catholic creeds." We have no difficulty in showing that we got our "articles of faith" from the early Church. Roman Catholics cannot show that they got their articles of faith from the early Church. So our succession in doctrine is clear, and theirs is not.

Take, for instance, the public and solemn profession of his faith, which Pope Pelagius I., on being appointed to the See of Rome, in the year 555, made to Childebert, King of France. It contains the whole sum and substance of the three Catholic creeds, now held in the Church of England, the Apostles Creed, the Nicene, and the Athanasian: but not one word of the additional articles now in the

Roman Catholic creed. And then Pelagius adds, "THIS, therefore, IS MY FAITH." We can now take up that confession of Pope Pelagius, and say, as he said, "this is my faith." A Roman Catholic who takes it up must say, "this is only *part* of my faith; it is essentially defective, for it leaves out the very things which are most essential to being a Roman Catholic at all!" Which has preserved the succession of doctrine unchanged?

The succession of bishops in the Church of England and Ireland, and the succession of Roman Catholic bishops in England and Ireland, we are quite ready to discuss and compare; but as a separate subject.

Now, for our communion with the whole Church. We adopt the illustration which our correspondent produces—the case of the Catholics and Donatists. The Catholics always said to the Donatists, "we are ready to communicate with you on the principles laid down in the Word of God—the principles heretofore held in the Church." The Donatists refused those terms, and said, "we will not communicate with you unless you adopt our notions." The Church of England and Ireland, now and always, said to to all other churches, "we are ready and anxious to communicate with you on the terms of holding the ancient and Catholic creeds, and doing all things lawful by the Word of God." The Church of Rome answers, "we won't communicate with you unless you profess all the things which we have added to the ancient creeds; nor unless you adopt all our practices, whether consistent with God's Word or not." Which party hold the principles of the Catholics, and which of the Donatists? Has our correspondent forgotten the address of St. Augustine, and all the Catholic bishops of Africa, to the Donatists, which was given in our number for July, 1853, p. 80. "If, therefore, it be inquired concerning the Church—what it is—how great it is—what sort it is—*the Divine Scriptures alone are sufficient to point her out.*" Is not this what we say now? and do not Roman Catholics say that we must find the Church first, before we can use the Scriptures?

If our correspondent had attended to our statement that the profession of the articles of the Catholic faith—that is, of the Catholic creed—is essential to being any part of the visible Church, he surely would not have written such a passage as this—"If you once admit the principle of the moral and doctrinal corruption of the Church, you open the door indiscriminately to all the heretics since the days of the apostles; you cannot draw a line of demarcation between the horde of heretics, and the several churches of the 11th century." We reply that we *have* distinctly drawn the line of demarcation, and that line is the ancient Catholic creeds. Those who deny the articles of the Christian faith contained in those creeds, are out of the visible Church altogether; those who hold these articles, and yet bring in other religious errors, are corrupt. Why cannot our correspondent hold both these statements together? What contradiction is there between them?

We are not the first to hold that the whole visible Church, while it does not actually deny the articles of the faith, is yet liable to error. We learn this from St. Vincent of Lirins, Commonitory, c. 3, who plainly foresaw the danger—"What, then, shall a Catholic Christian do . . . . if some new infection goeth about to corrupt, not in this case only a little part, *but the whole Church?* Then, likewise, shall he take care to cleave unto antiquity, which can now no more be seduced by any crafty novelty." Would any one write thus, who thought it impossible that error should creep into the Church?

We now come to our correspondent's texts of Scripture:—

"A heretic, after the first and second admonition, avoid"—Titus iii. 10. Does that mean "avoid a man who holds the ancient Catholic creeds as the articles of his faith?" If not, how does it apply to us?

"Shun those who cause division"—Rom. xvi. 17. We offer to communicate with the Church of Rome on the basis of holding the ancient Catholic creeds, as the articles of our common faith: the Church of Rome refuses to communicate with us, unless we will consent to add new articles of faith to the ancient Catholic creeds. Who causes the division?

We agree with our correspondent, that God will always "have and keep a congregation of faithful men." Who were they in the days of Pope Liberius and the councils of Ariminum and Seleucia? *That* seems to be like the real question between "Philalethes" and us. We take the answer from St. Vincent of Lirins, who wrote about the year, 434. "Then, whoever was truly a lover and a follower of Christ, by preferring ancient faith before new error, was untouched with any spot of that infection."—Commonitory, c. 4.

But, our correspondent challenges us to the discussion of scripture texts, and we gladly comply.

"Obey your prelates, and submit yourselves," says the apostle, (Heb. xiii. 17). Here is an injunction without qualification of time or place." "Well, it needed no limitation to the Hebrew Christians *at that time*, when St. James was just dead, and Simeon had succeeded him as Bishop of Jerusalem. But what? No limitation at any time or place? Not in the time of Pope Liberius, or at Ariminum or Seleucia? That surely is too much! Let us be willing to learn the limitation from the same apostle in another place (1 Cor. xi. 1)—"Be ye followers of me, as I also am of Christ." But surely not when Popes and prelates deny him!

"St. Paul calls the Church "the pillar and the ground of *the* truth." (Our correspondent leaves out the word in Italics, although it is in the Douay Bible, which he quotes). But St. Paul goes on instantly *to specify* that truth of which the Church is the pillar and support; it is "the mystery of godliness—God manifest in the flesh." God has ever had, and ever will have, a visible Church to support that truth in the world. But St. Paul does *not* say that the visible Church shall never adopt erroneous opinions or practices in other matters of religion.

"Go teach all nations, &c."—Matthew xxviii. 19. Ah, that little "&c."! It covers words which our Saviour spoke in the same breath, but which Roman Catholics do seldom quote. "Teaching them to observe all things *whatsoever I have commanded you.*" The promise to be with them all days, extended to such teaching, and no further. He *commanded* the apostles and those who followed them so to teach; he did *not promise* that Popes and Councils should never teach otherwise in anything.

John xiv. 16 and xvi. 13. We firmly believe that our Saviour promised his Spirit "to teach you all things," not only to the apostles and those who followed them in the ministry, but to all who believe in Christ. We do not believe that all priests, all councils, and (least of all) all popes, have always been willing to receive and follow that teaching; and where they do not, they go astray from the truth.

Matthew xvi. 18, will be treated of elsewhere.

We are not acquainted with the "Controversial Manual," published by the British Reformation Society; nor would we consider its authority binding on us.

For a general answer to the passages produced from the prophecies of the Old Testament, we must refer to our answer to a "Celbridge Inquirer," when he produced similar ones, vol. i., No. 11, p. 130. Nov., 1852. Those prophecies are often *capable* of being applied to a future as well as to the present state of the Church. If no passage can be produced from the New Testament to prove that the visible Church must always be free from error, then we have no warrant for applying the Old Testament prophecies in such a way.

Our correspondent asks for some Scripture proof that the Church is subject to error. We refer him to St. John's Epistles to the Seven Churches (Revelation or Apocalypse, c. ii. and iii.), and to St. Paul's address to the clergy of Ephesus, (Acts xx. 30.) We could give many, but must be brief. What St. Paul wrote to the *Church of Rome* is, perhaps, most to the point, and is sufficient—"Thou standest by faith, be not *high-minded, but fear.* For if God hath not spared the natural branches (the Jews) (take heed) *lest he also spare not thee.* See, then, the goodness and the severity of God; towards them, indeed, that are fallen, severity; but towards thee the goodness of God, if thou abide in goodness, *otherwise thou also shalt be cut off.*"—Romans xi. 20, &c. *Could* the apostle have written thus to the Church of Rome, if Christ had promised that the Church of Rome should *never* fall from faith, or be cut off?

Our correspondent seems to find it much harder to answer questions about the visible Church of Christ than we do. We asked him "is the Greek Church a part of the visible Church of Church; yes, or no?" He refers to the Greek Church, but does not answer this. If he cannot answer it, surely his notions of the visible church must be much more perplexing to him than ours are to us.

But the great question we asked him was about the confession which Pope Nicolas II. and his council of 113 bishops, compelled Berengarius to sign. "Philalethes" brought this forward as an instance of the things in which we are bound to obey our prelates. In September last, and again in November, we asked "Philalethes," did he believe that decision of the pope and prelates to be right or wrong. Even now his answer to this is not very plain: he says the word "*sensualiter*" ought not be there, and the word "*essentialiter*" ought to be in its place. We take this as a confession that it is impossible to defend the decision of the Pope and council, while this word stands in it. So far so good. Well, there is no denying that the word "*sensualiter*" is in the decision as it now stands in the canon law. But "Philalethes" thinks the Pope and Council never could have written that word there, and we must take it out, and put another word in its place. The word, he says, is not "classical," and "it is improbable that learned men, living in that region of classical literature, should be betrayed into such a solecism." We beg to assure "Philalethes" that in the 11th century, "classical literature" was wholly forgotten and unknown at Rome. The Latin of Popes and Councils at that time is as far from being classical as it is possible for Latin to be. "Philalethes" must not expect to find all the words they used in classical dictionaries; and if he will look at Du Cange's glossary,* he will find that the word *sensibiliter* is no more there than the word *sensualiter*; but if he will take the trouble of consulting either Dr. Andrews's or Mr. Riddle's Latin-English Lexicons, following the Latin-German Lexicon of Dr. W. Freund, he will find the kindred word *sensualitas* translated "the capacity of sensation—sensibility" which quite agrees with our translation of the word *sensualiter*—"in a manner appreciable by the senses."

The proof is beyond all dispute that *sensualiter* was the word really put in the Confession by Pope Nicolas II. and his bishops; for it was put in the canon law, and no copy of the canon law ever had any word but *sensualiter* in it. We have the first edition, printed in 1472, which has that word; and so has every copy since. In the year 1580 the Pope appointed twenty-four of the most learned men in the Church of Rome to correct the canon law; they spent sixteen years in the task. They got the oldest copies of the canon law from all parts of Europe, some as old as the time it was written, and every copy they found had the word "sensualiter;" and they left that word in it; and the Pope, by a solemn bull,* forbid any one ever to alter one word of it. So here is proof past all question that "sensualiter" is the real word.

We are satisfied now that our correspondent *feels* that that confession, with the word "sensualiter" in it, was false and heretical, and that Berengarius was *not* bound in conscience to subscribe to it at the command of his prelates.

But, then, how can "Philalethes" now go on to contend that Christ has given such a promise to the prelates of being always right—that we must always, in every thing, submit to what they say, "without qualification, or limitation of time or place?"

ON POPE LIBERIUS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Will you be pleased to permit insertion to the following observations, assured, as I am, your only object (as, believe me, it is emphatically mine), is the solution of the truth. I therefore trouble you with these remarks, with reference to the alleged heterodoxy of the Pontiff Liberius, and which has been discussed in yours of January and December.

In the number for December, 1853, page 142, it is said, "At *both* Selencia and Rimini the bishops passed decrees that the word 'Consubstantial' should be left out of the creed of the Catholic Church, thereby surrendering what the Arians wanted." Now, on consulting the "History of Decline, &c., of Roman Empire," I find it mentioned that the Selencian Council, "after four days unavailing debate, separated *without any definite conclusion.*" The Rimini Council, held in A.D. 359-60, appears to have signed a formulary, "reluctantly obtained, partly by force, sophistry, and cold, and distress, &c.," by Valens, &c., Illyrian bishops, and the Prefect Laurus, who "deceived the honest simplicity of the Latin bishops by fraud," and got them to sign a captious creed, in which some expressions, susceptible of an heterodox sense, were inserted, in the room of the 'ὁμοούσιος,' or 'Consubstantial.'" As soon as Valens, &c., had received it, and the bishops had dispersed to their dioceses, he published it in the Arian sense; which they no sooner discovered than they immediately protested against such an interpretation, and "rejected it with disdain and abhorrence," and "the orthodox creed was more firmly replanted in the Churches of the west."

In view of all this evidence, this proof, how can the Rimini Council be charged with heterodoxy in *doctrine*—in doctrine, simply? Respecting the allegation of heterodoxy against the Pontiff Liberius, he does not appear to have been at Rimini: that is granted, and what is more, must have been in banishment in Thrace, *at the time of its sitting*, (having been so for *three years*, from 357 or 356?) NOT for refusing to sanction *its* decrees, *but* those of another council. Therefore, in view of this conclusion, the *letter* to which you refer, and which he certainly wrote to Constantius, had reference to the decisions of the Milan Council of A.D. 355 and 356, *not* to Rimini at all, which Milan Council was convened to ratify the decrees of Tyre Synod, held in 336, A.D., in which Athanasius, Archbishop of Alexandria, had been sentenced to exile, on false charges, universally admitted such, and having no ostensible relation to articles of Christian *doctrine*, and with the breaking a chalice, imprisonment of six bishops, and even homicide!!! In view of these facts, Liberius's letter does not imply or prove any heterodoxy in *doctrines*, as far as I can perceive. His letter certainly exhibits *more* anxiety to regain his former position, and also great weakness, and deficiency of what was to be expected from a Roman Pontiff, the *head* of the Christian Church—high, unbending Christian *moral principle*—inasmuch as he most culpably betrayed and deserted the cause of a highly injured and calumniated Christian brother and archbishop, who, by his noble and firm determination, maintained his conscientious convictions in their integrity, during forty-six years, twenty of which he passed in exile, "almost every province of the empire successively a witness to his merit and sufferings," "displaying a superiority of character, and abilities,

* Labbe and Cossart, vol. v., p. 803. Edition, Paris, 1672.

* Glossarium Mediæ et Infimæ Latinitatis, Paris, 1846.

* We have a copy of the Bull of Gregory XIII., before us, prefixed to the edition of the *Corpus Juris Canonici*, published at Lyons in 1671, from which we transcribe the following extracts:—

"Ut omnem omnibus aberrandi ab ea occasionem subtrahamus . . . quod nulli omnino hominum totius orbis liceat hujusmodi libris dicti juris canonici sic *de mandato nostro* recognitis, correctis et expurgatis quicquid addere, detrahere, vel immutare aut invertere, nullave interpretamenta adjungere, sed prout opus hujusmodi Romæ nunc impressum fuit, semper et perpetuo integrum et incorruptum conservetur, statuimus sanctimus et ordinamus.

"Datum Romæ apud Sanctum Petrum sub annulo Piscatoris die prima Julii MDLXXX., Pontificatus nostri anno nono."

This copy, like all the others—and we have consulted eight different editions, all published by authority—has the word "sensualiter" twice over.

&c.," has had his name transmitted to posterity, commanding our admiration, and thereby forms a most striking *contrast* to that of the Pontiff Liberius, who deserted him to an unjust persecution of the Arians. I find the historian states that Felix, Liberius's rival, was irregularly chosen, by the influence of the eunuchs of the palace, and that "a general assembly being convened, the clergy bound themselves, by a public oath, never to desert his predecessor, never to acknowledge the usurper, Felix," and to which they adhered until Liberius's return. This does not look as if he had been recognised as Pontiff during Liberius's banishment.

I am your obedient servant,
A TRUTH-SEEKER.

Moira, January.

Nothing can be more agreeable to us than to enter into discussion with so candid an inquirer. Our object, like his, is truth; and we shall ever be ready to admit a mistake, when it is shown to us; but as yet we do not see that we have made any mistake in this matter.

"The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," is not just the kind of authority for our pages. The author, Gibbon, was an *infidel;* and it was his great object to place every thing relating to Christianity in such a light as might lead others to become infidels too. And this wicked desire has led him often to give the grossest misrepresentations of the opinions and doctrines which have prevailed in the Church. And about the facts of the case, Gibbon is too late a witness; he wrote 1400 years afterwards; his statements are worth nothing, except so far as he took them from ancient historians. It is much shorter and more satisfactory to go to the old historians at once. On such a question, we greatly prefer Roman Catholics to infidels; and we prefer ancient Catholics to both.

We take our correspondent's facts in the order he places them in.

I. *The Council at Seleucia.* One hundred and fifty bishops were collected there; thirty were for abolishing the Nicene Creed; altogether one hundred and twenty were for putting out the word, "of one substance with the Father," the words which, alone, Arians never could get over, and which the Council of Nice had adopted for that very reason. Scarcely a voice appears to have been raised at the Council in favour of the faith of Nice. Some one proposed to adopt the creed which the Arians had drawn up at Antioch, in opposition to the creed of Nice. That proposal was adopted; the thirty withdrew, and composed a most heretical creed of their own; the one hundred and twenty subscribed the creed of Antioch. We take this account from the ecclesiastical historian, Socrates, who wrote his history about 80 years after the event. Book ii. ch. 39.

II. *The Council at Ariminum or Rimini.* There is no doubt whatever about the creed which was adopted at this council. It was the third creed of Sirmium—a creed drawn up under the personal direction of the Arian emperor, Constantius; and this creed was *unmistakably* Arian.

Accounts differ about the way in which this creed came to be adopted. One account seems to imply that a majority carried the Arian creed, in the first instance, and that a large minority always continued steadfast against it. Another account, more generally received, both by Roman Catholics and Protestants, states, that most were in favour of the Nicene creed at first, and that all signed the Arian creed in the end. But about the fact, that the Arian creed was adopted, there seems to be no dispute.

In our number for December, p. 142, col. 3, we noticed the account given by St. Vincent, of Lirins, who wrote about seventy years after the event—"Almost all the bishops of the Latin tongue deceived, partly by force, partly by fraud" (1st Commonitory, ch. 4.) In his 2nd Commonitory, ch. 29, he speaks of the great care taken at the Council of Ephesus—"lest there might, by chance, some profane novelty creep in, as happened at *that perfidious meeting* in Ariminum." The Jesuits Labbe and Cossart call this council "that assembly of Arians." Du Pin calls it "this council whose beginning was glorious, and end deplorable."

III. *About Pope Liberius.* Our correspondent says he was *not* at Rimini—"that is granted:" but that he was then in banishment for having refused to sanction the decrees of the Council of Milan, which council passed no decrees about faith, but only condemned Athanasius of crimes.

To this we reply:—

1st. All the Catholics of Milan treated the case of Athanasius as a question of faith. It was an Arian device to treat it only as a question of facts.

2nd. Both Socrates and Sozomen, the oldest and best ecclesiastical historians of that period, give us lists of the persons who were banished at the Milan Council, and neither of them include Pope Liberius. There is no reason to think that he was at that council at all (Soc., b. 2, ch. 36, Soz., b. 4, ch. 9).

3rd. Socrates states expressly that Liberius was at the Council of Ariminum, and that he was banished for refusing to subscribe the creed adopted in that council. (Book 2, ch. 37.) Sozomen gives two different accounts, one seeming to represent Liberius as banished a little before the council at Ariminum, the other expressly stating that he was banished at the council. It may be that both these accounts intended to apply to his banishment at the council. (Book 4, ch. 11, and 19).

The famous letter of Liberius was *not* intended to confirm the decrees of Milan: this is plain; for the letter is addressed to the *eastern* bishops, and proposed to confirm *their* decrees, whereas the decrees of Milan were passed by the *western* bishops.

But a further quotation from that same letter of Pope Liberius may serve to settle the question about him. After condemning Athanasius, the letter goes on—"My lord and fellow brother, Demophilus, who has vouchsafed, of his own benevolence, to expound the true and Catholic faith, which was treated, finished, and received *at Sirmium*, by many brothers and fellow bishops of ours, this I receive *with a willing mind*, contradicting it in nothing." (Epis. 7, Labbe and Coss., vol. ii., p. 751.)

We know it is disputed *what* creed that was which Liberius signed; for there were *three* different creeds drawn up at Sirmium. But it matters little, for all three were Arian—all three expressly intended to get rid of the ever-memorable decision adopted by the Council of Nice against Arius.

But who was that Demophilus who expounded the true faith to the Pope, and got him to sign the creed of Sirmium? He was an ARIAN BISHOP! How benevolent it was of him to teach the Pope, and with what praiseworthy humility the Pope submitted to be taught by that Arian bishop! But we know something more of Demophilus; he is expressly named both by Socrates (Book 2, ch. 37), and Sozomen (Book 4, ch. 17), as one of those who produced in the Council of Ariminum, and succeeding in passing there, the *third* Sirmian creed, drawn up under the direction of the Arian Emperor Constantius.

Now, *whenever* it was that Liberius was banished, it is clear that the *end* of his banishment, and his subscribing to the creed of Sirmium, was *after* the Council of Ariminum. *What* creed of Sirmium would Demophilus then expound to the Pope? Clearly, we think, that *third* creed which Demophilus had himself proposed and signed at Ariminum. And it was by the Empress's orders that Demophilus made the Pope sign this creed. What creed would the Emperor ask the Pope to sign? Would he ask him to sign either the first or the second, both of which the Emperor had himself rejected and condemned? Or would he ask the Pope to sign the third creed, which the Emperor himself had got drawn up and approved? We do not want to be positive in a question that is disputed; nor is it necessary for us to be so, as all three Sirmian creeds were Arian; but it certainly is our opinion that it was the *third* creed of Sirmium—that is, the creed which was passed by Ariminum—that Pope Liberius signed. And it is to be observed that all the ancient fathers who wrote of the matter, St Athanasius himself, St. Hilary, St. Jerome, all speak of Liberius as having fallen into heresy.

So the case stands thus: the Emperor summoned a general council; the eastern bishops to meet at Seleucia, the western at Ariminum. Nearly 600 bishops met. They decreed, in both places, to reverse the most important and essential point of the decision made at Nice against Arius; and the Pope confirmed their decisions. Yet Roman Catholics must all acknowledge that Pope and Council together were wrong in an essential article of the Christian faith.

We say with confidence that if that Pope and council had decided in favour of the Nicene faith, it would have been regarded, to all generations, as a LAWFUL GENERAL COUNCIL. Why is it NOT so regarded? Simply because it decided wrong. If a Pope and a general council decide right, we are to follow them; if they decide wrong, we are to regret their decision. The decrees of a council are to be tried by the Catholic faith; the Catholic faith is to be supported, but *not* to be *tried*, by the decrees of councils.

If Ariminum, Seleucia, and Pope Liberius had decided right, would any Catholic ever have denied them the character of a true and lawful general council? Why do we deny them that character but because we see that they decided wrong?

If Roman Catholics confess, as they do, that both Pope and council here were wrong; how can they turn round on us and say that Pope and council *must* be *always* right?

P.S.—We have received another letter from our correspondent, who signs himself "A Roman Catholic," on the subject of Pope Liberius. It is rather long, and contains more subjects than suit a letter for our pages. But we should certainly have published it, only that we had already fully answered its principal point about Pope Liberius, in our remarks on the foregoing letter of "A Truth-seeker," before the other letter was received. Our readers would hardly approve of the same things being said twice over in our pages. In this letter "A Roman Catholic" gives up the decision against Berengarius, which he defended in his last. He now says "We do not hold Pope Nicolas and his 113 bishops to be a general council, and, therefore, we do not hold ourselves accountable for their decision." It is, however, an awkward fact, that this decision was put into the canon law of the Church of Rome, as our readers will see in our reply to "Philalethes," and remains there to this day. If the Church of Rome do possess infallibity, why does she not use it better?

It is well for our correspondent that he lives in a Protestant country. In Rome or Spain he would stand a good chance of being treated as a heretic for setting up his own private judgment against a Pope and 113 bishops; and if the Synod of Thurles had the government of Ireland, they would hardly allow him to say that there could be no infallibility without a general council. Will the decision of the Pope about the Immaculate Conception be infallible when it is made? or may it be like Pope Nicolas and his 113 bishops?

WAS THE JEWISH CHURCH THE CHURCH OF GOD IN ITS DAY?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—It is gratifying to see that the doctrine of Infallibility occupies so much of your space. It is *the question.* It is the baseless dogma on which rests the whole Papal superstructure. Leaving other points to yourself and your able correspondents, I will address myself to a favourite argument in its support, frequently put forward by Romish controversialists. A writer in one of your late numbers, Mr. Rourke, thus expresses it:—"If she (the Church) was liable to err, He (Christ) could not love her," p. 128. Because Romanists think it *advantageous* that the Church should be a living, speaking, infallible guide, they conclude that she *must* be so; and then they assume that God could not love her if she were not secured from error. Must God's Church, then, at all times, be infallible? If it be, at any time fallible, is it plain that God cannot love her? Was the Jewish Church God's Church, when the prophet Malachy uttered the oft-quoted words, "The priest's lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth: for he is the messenger of the Lord of Hosts?" If God loved this Church, must it have been infallible? If so, then, its sentence must have been true—that Christ was an impostor. Mr. Rourke may take whichever horn of the dilemma he pleases. Either Christ was an impostor, or God's then Church was fallible; either God's Church, though loved, was fallible, or the Jewish Church, though God's Church, could not have been loved by him, seeing that he willed to leave her liable to error. So much for *a priori* arguments. Because Romanists think infallibility convenient, they must needs support it by pretending that infallibility is of the essence of a Church; and, by so doing, they un-Church the people of God before our Lord's time; and, to hide the monstrousness of this, and such other conclusions, they take the Bible out of the hands of the people.

Of course, those who stop at nothing, will find a way out of this as well as out of any other difficulty. God could love his *ancient* Church without its being infallible; but not so the *modern.* But is this reasonable? Or is it essentially necessary that *the Christian* Church should be infallible, but not so requisite that the *Jewish* should? But how know these men so well with what attributes it behoved the Allwise to endow his Church? Is it less than presumptuous to tell the world, that God could not have acted except in the manner which, to them, seems the best?

They have, no doubt, another way of escaping this difficulty. The Jewish Church, they will say, ceased to be infallible. *when it first pronounced a wrong decision.* This, I should think, we could know ourselves, without needing their acuteness to discover it for us. But the question is, why they were deprived of infallibility *prior* to their pronouncing this, their first faulty sentence? That the Jewish Church should have been once infallible; and yet, should have been deprived of that gift *just prior* to its deciding upon Christ's pretensions, seems extraordinary. If ever there was a point upon which infallibility in the judge was important, it was that, the truth or falsehood of claims to the Messiaship. It is vain to say, that the grave nature of present questions makes a living, infallible judge necessary; no occasion could ever arise more momentous than when the Church was called upon to receive, or reject, the Son of God, presenting himself before her in human form.

If Romanists pretend, that the Jewish Church forfeited infallibility on account of her unfaithfulness to the trust committed to her, why might not any particular part of the Christian Church be deprived, for the same reason, of her privilege? Were not Rome, and the Churches in communion with her, sunk very low in the middle ages, not to speak of any other period of her history? Their own divines are compelled to own and lament this. But why is it incredible that God should make his guidance, both to us and the Jews, dependant upon the careful use we make of the light which we enjoy? We may regard each separate branch of the Church as liable to error; and yet trust that all branches will never unite in renouncing any fundamental of Christianity. But, whatever our hopes may be, let us not presume to say, that if God loved his Church, he could not possibly have left it devoid of a gift, which it is probable it never enjoyed for the 4,000 years before Christ; and which *it is certain* that it had lost *before* it rejected our Lord's pretensions to be the promised Messiah and the Saviour of the world.

I am, sir,
Your obedient servant,
A KILDARE CHURCHMAN.

CARDINAL WISEMAN AND THE APOCRYPHA.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—As you invite any Roman Catholic priest or layman to state in your pages the evidence for the books called apocryphal, you will, probably, have no objection to print and take into consideration the following summary of the

evidence for them, contained in the last number of the "Dublin Review."

"The question of the Deutero-canonical books was investigated with the utmost care at the Council of Trent. Both early and late Councils were referred to in favour of the existing Catholic canon, together with the writings of SS. Cyprian, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Basil, and other fathers. The Protestants had claimed certain of the fathers as on their side; *the Catholics answered, that when they wrote, the matter had not been fully investigated or decided on by the Church.* The Protestants had asserted that the books in question had formed no part of the Hebrew canon; the Catholics maintained that they had been received with the utmost reverence by the Hellenistic Jews, and that the earliest Christian writers and martyrs, as Barnabas, Clemens Romanus, Polycarp, and Irenæus, refer to them in the same manner as to other parts of Scripture. They quoted St. Augustine:—'We must not omit those books which we know to have been written before the coming of Christ, and which are received by the Church of the Saviour himself, although they be not received of the Jews.' Now, assuredly, the Church, notwithstanding her conviction of her own infallibility, used all those human means for arriving at the truth which God accords to us as a secondary instrumentality. Neither did she stand alone in her judgment. The East has confirmed the decision of the West; and, in 1672, a Greek Synod, held at Jerusalem, under the Patriarch Dositheus, acknowledged, as canonical, the same books to which the Council of Trent had already attached that character."—Dublin Review, xxxv. 307, January, 1854.

I shall only add, that when you assert that several writers, for the first 300 years, did not consider those books inspired, you appear to me to prove what learned Roman Catholics do not deny. Witness the sentence in the above which I have marked in italics. Dr. Milner says ("End of Controversy," letter ix.):—"It was not until the end of the fourth century, that the genuine canon of Holy Scripture was fixed, and then it was fixed by the tradition and authority of the Church, declared in the third Council of Carthage, and a decretal of Pope Innocent I." Again, Mr. Newman says ("Essay on Development," p. 160):—"On what ground do we receive the canon, as it comes to us, but on the authority of the Church of the fourth and fifth centuries? The Church of that era decided—not merely bore testimony, but passed a judgment on former testimony—that certain books were of authority." Does it not appear then, sir, that we have got an answer to your question—"If there was no perfect Bible in the first 300 years, how did the Church of Rome come by it in later times?" Answer—By the authority of the Council of Carthage, and the decretal of Pope Innocent I.

I am, sir,

A SUBSCRIBER.

Our correspondent appears to have taken this account from a great authority, the "Dublin Review," which is known to be under the direction of Cardinal Wiseman. It seems to us fairly to admit that the Church for 400 years did not believe the Apocrypha to be inspired. This is just what we said ourselves; and is this all the answer we are to get? Either the whole Church of Christ was wrong for 400 years about the Bible, or the Church of Rome is wrong about it now. Which is most likely?

FLOWERS FOR FEBRUARY.

SURLY winter has not yet departed, and the month of February, far from being all sunshine, has many an hour

"Of solemn gloom,
Ere yet the lovely spring assume
Sole empire; with the lingering cold
Content divided sway to hold."

Under this bare and chilly aspect appears the SNOWDROP, winter's timid child, with its solitary flowers drooping gracefully over its parent breast of drifted snow.

Its botanical name is "*Galanthus nivalis*" (milk-flower of the snow). The French call it *Pierce-neige*, or snow piercer. The monks called it our "Lady of February." Whether it be a natural wild flower of the British Islands has been doubted. Mackay's *Flora Hibernica* says it is scarcely indigenous in Ireland. It is certainly to be found in the woods and meadows of England now; but had it been a wild flower in the days of Ben Jonson and Shakspeare, it is passing strange that its chaste and simple beauties should have found no place in *their* groups of wild flowers—with the primroses and daffodils. They make the primrose the first flower of spring; whereas we all recognise the modest little Snowdrop, as "the morning star of flowers"—the first visitant that greets us as chilly winter is retiring at the approach of genial spring. While yet the surface of the earth is covered with snow,

"We behold the snowdrop white
Start to light,
And shine in Flora's desert bowers."

The Snowdrop thus appearing, under the changeful sky of early spring, is "an emblem of human life, and frail as fair." Its life among us is short, and transient, and very soon

"The night breeze tears its silky dress,
Which, decked with silvery lustre, shone;
The morn returns not it to bless;
The gaudy crocus flaunts its pride,
And triumphs where its rival died."

But still, even in its short passage through life, it reads lesson. It appears to arise from its bed of snow to tell us, that while winter, in the economy of nature, has its own especial office, and its gloom and its cold are the necessary preparations for the spring time and summer, and though the songs of birds are mute, and the sun is clouded with dark and frowning clouds, and the hoar frost spreads its mantle all around, the spring is coming, and, like hope, it points to a season more bright than the present.

"So piety, upheld by faith and hope,
Endures serene the passing storm of life,
With eye intent on heaven,
And thought already there."

Long since has the Snowdrop been regarded as the emblem of *Consolation*. What is its anti-type with us? Is it the consolation for which that just and devout man, Simeon, was looking, which, when he had seen, he exclaimed, "Now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, because mine eyes have seen thy salvation" (St. Luke, xi. 25, 26). This was none other than "*the Christ of the Lord.*" He was emphatically called the *Consolation of Israel.* So was he the consolation of the early Christian Church, in the apostolic days, for St. Paul says, "So our consolation abounded by Christ" (2 Cor. i. 5); and, as a most solemn appeal to the Philippian Church, he writes, "If there be, therefore, any consolation in Christ." In vain do we search the Old and New Testament Scriptures for any allusion to the consolation presented to her people by the Church of Rome, the Virgin Mary, and the saints in life, and purgatory and masses in death. And how should we expect to find such? If St. Paul be right, our consolation *aboundeth* in Christ; and again he declares that God in his mercy hath vouchsafed to make a solemn oath, "that we might have a strong consolation who have fled for refuge to take hold upon the hope that was set before us" (Heb. vi. 18); this hope being "Jesus Christ, who is our hope" (1 Tim. i. 1). "Christ in you, the hope of glory" (Col. i. 27).

The first rival of the Snowdrop, is the gaudy Crocus, so called by the Greeks, from the saffron colour of one of its species. The French, for the same reason, call it "saffran printanier." Mackay says, that if not indigenous in Ireland, it has been naturalized in our meadows, and grows plentifully in many parts of Ireland, especially about Dungannstown. Gerarde, perhaps, is more accurate when he states, that "this pleasant plant that brought forth yellow flowers" was first introduced into these Islands in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. It has since spread over the meadows of many parts of England, and near Nottingham and the silvery Trent whole acres are to be seen covered with its rich mantle of bright purple. The Crocus is certainly a native of the middle and southern parts of Europe and the Levant; and in our rambles through the mountains and valleys of Switzerland we have met with fields of the wild purple autumnal crocus, almost within the precincts of the eternal snows. The mountain pass from Martigny to Chamouni, by the Col de Balme, about midway up, presents one of the most luxuriant fields in the world of Crocus, in company with wild anemones, violets, and harebells. We raised the bulbs and transplanted them to an Irish soil; but, alas! they withered and died. The Crocus generally, when taken up, appears dry and shrivelled, as if it could never again put forth its rich flowers and green leaves, but yet, at the approach of spring, it awakens to life. So it is with the Christian: his life is hid—all may seem dark and dead, but there arises light out of darkness; the spirit of joy replaces the spirit of heaviness, and the plant of peace is watered with the dew of heaven.

The pretty little HEPATICA (*Hepatica triloba*), now also appears in our borders, opening its flowers somewhat later than the Snowdrop and Crocus; it derived its name from the lobe, or liver (hepar) shape of its leaves. Formerly it was called Noble Liver-wort, and Herb Trinity. It is indigenous to most parts of Europe, though not, perhaps, to the British Isles; but still with us it has long been a familiar favourite. In the Canadas it is called the Snow Flower, as it is the first flower of a Canadian spring. It has many varieties, of all kinds of colour, and through all the shades of blue and red, from pearl colour to the deep azure of the sky, and from rose colour and peach blossom to purple; and after its flowers are gone, its ivy-shaped leaves are an enduring ornament through the open months of the year.

The Hepatica is a peculiar flower, and somewhat of an oddity in its habits. Gardeners say that if it be removed from its parent bed on which it has been grown from seed, it languishes and changes this bright native colour into a sickly hue, which it never recovers until restored to its former situation.

Its appearance has long been regarded as an unerring indication of the temperature of the earth, showing when seed time has arrived; and, therefore, it cannot be wondered at, that the return of this lovely little flower to our parterre is always welcomed with gladness, as reassuring us of the innate vitality of vegetable life. Perhaps from this cause it has become the emblem of *Confidence.*

"The Hepaticas are blooming fair,
The hue of constancy they wear;
So bright their vestments blue,
That fancy deems the lovely dye
Was stolen from the azure sky,
And painted by the dew.

"Soon as the hope of spring is told,
Their blossoms in his path unfold,
The glowing sun to woo,
And prove the symbol true;
Thus humble Confidence is given
To the first promises of heaven."

But where is our confidence to be placed? In human nature, human merit, or human works? or in dead men, and women, canonized as saints? or in angels, or in the Virgin Mary, or the Apostle Paul, or the Apostle Peter? David tells us, "*God* is the confidence (or hope) of all the ends of the earth" (Psalm lxiv. 5—65th Psalm of authorised version). Solomon tells us, "The Lord shall be thy confidence" (Prov. iii. 26). The Prophet Micah tells us, "Put not confidence in a guide"—meaning a human guide—(Micah, vii. 5). St. Paul tells us, "Rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh" (Philipp. iii. 3). St. John tells us, "And now little children abide in him (Christ Jesus) that when he shall appear, we may have confidence, and not be ashamed before him at his coming" (1st Epistle St. John xi. 28). If this be true, all those who have placed their confidence in beads, or rosaries, or scapulars, or penances, or works, or angels, or saints, or purgatory, or any other thing than Christ Jesus, will be ashamed before him at his coming. May that not be the case, reader with you, nor with me.

FARM OPERATIONS FOR FEBRUARY.

(From the Irish Farmers' Gazette.)

EVERY preparation for the season's crops should be put into active operation this month; draining and subsoiling, and the first ploughing and digging, if not finished by the first of the month, should be brought to a close without delay.

Spring Wheat should be sown not later than the middle of the month; no time should be lost, therefore, in getting in the seed at every favourable opportunity. As the season advances, a little increase in the seed will be necessary, so as to prevent tillering, so that it may ripen early and evenly together. Thin sowing at this period will have the effect of promoting second growths at too late a period, and thereby an unevenly ripened sample. From 30 to 40 barrels of lime, or from 2 to 3 cwt. of guano, spread evenly and harrowed in along with the seed, should there be a doubt as to the land being sufficiently rich, will much assist in advancing the crop to maturity.

Beans should be sown early in the month, to make certain of a remunerating crop; they should invariably be sown in drills 2½ feet apart, to allow of being horse-hoed, and dibbled in at four inches bean from bean, but the drill-machine saves much labour and seed. Beans, when sown thin, grow short, and pod freely down to the ground; but if sown thick, they grow tall, do not pod well, and are late in ripening, from the want of sun and air. A strong loam is the best soil for beans, and if well manured they are a good preparation for wheat the next season, which is then found to grow to less straw, produce a good head, with a plump, well-matured grain. The Russian is now allowed to be the hardiest sort; but any of the following may be relied on for a good crop—Tick, Heligoland, and Egyptian, for cattle; and the early Managan, long-pod, or Windsor, for human consumption. Quantity of seed per Irish acre, 3½ bushels, sown broadcast, or 2 bushels drilled.

Peas for an early crop may be sown now. The same culture as that recommended for beans is applicable to peas; but the land suited to them should be lighter and drier than that in which beans may be sown; they will give good crops on all stubble land that is not too much exhausted; but if they can be afforded a little manure, it will amply remunerate for its application. The kinds best adapted for cattle-feeding are—large gray, early gray, partridge, and Pennsylvanian; for human consumption, early Charletoo, double-blossomed May, or Prussian blue pea.

Oats.—Black oats may be sown about the 12th, but the white sorts are best deferred sowing till the end of this, or the beginning of the next month.

Potatoes.—Every dry opportunity should be taken advantage of to get this valuable crop planted, previous to their wasting their strength in pushing out their shoots. The early-ripening sorts should be chosen for this purpose, amongst the best of which are the early Bangors, ash-leaved kidneys, Kemps, pretty Betties, and purple kidneys.

Parsnips may be sown any time this month, in a deepened and properly-pulverised soil, well manured with well-decomposed manure, or rich compost, which should be well and deeply incorporated with the soil. They should be sown in drills 21 inches apart, and the plants afterwards singled out to 8 inches plant from plant; sown now they will come in early, but the general crop need not be sown till the first or second week in March; but a dry seed-time should not be passed over if it occur a week or ten days before that period. The common and the Jersey hollow-crowned, are the most usually sown: but there is a variety particularly adapted to shallow soils, called the turnip-rooted; from 4 to 5 lbs. will sow the Irish acre, if the seed be good.

Odds and ends. Keep a sharp look out after the mouths of the under drains, and clear away all stoppages, and cause all defects to be immediately remedied or repaired. Keep adding to the manure-heaps, prepare and cart dry earth for fresh composts, to make a base and coverings for the sides of the farm-yard manures, and turn over old ones. See that the store stock in the yards and sheds are abundantly supplied with fresh-thrashed straw and turnips. Continue to scour out drains and ditches where practicable; repair hedges and plant new ones.

New, Recent, and Illustrated Works

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

Booksellers to the Queen,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Any Book or number of Books together, *within a pound weight*, can be sent by post for 6d., and at the rate of 6d. for every pound weight additional.

THE RUSSIAN SHORES OF THE BLACK SEA, IN THE AUTUMN of 1852, with a Voyage down the Volga, and a Tour through the Country of the Don Cossacks. By Lawrence Oliphant. 8vo. 14s.

RECORDS OF TRAVELS IN TURKEY, GREECE, &c.; and of a Cruise in the Black Sea with the Capitan Pacha. By Admiral Slade. 8vo. 14s.

THE RUSSO-TURKISH CAMPAIGN OF 1828-29; with a View of the present State of the Eastern Question. By Colonel Chesney. 12s.

THE TURKISH QUESTION:—The Czar and the Sultan—The Cossacks and the Turk—The Turks in Europe. 2s.

PHILIPS' MAP OF THE FRONTIER PROVINCES OF TURKEY, RUSSIA, AND AUSTRIA, THE BLACK SEA, &c. In case. 1s.

THE HISTORY OF YUCATAN, from its Discovery to the close of the Seventeenth Century. By Charles St. John Fancourt, Esq. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF CHRISTOPHER ANDERSON. By his Nephew. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

MURRAY'S BRITISH CLASSICS. The Works of Oliver Goldsmith. Edited by Peter Cunningham. 4 vols. 8vo. 30s.

LIVES OF THE QUEENS OF ENGLAND. By Miss Strickland. New and Revised Edition. With numerous Portraits. Vol. I., II., post 8vo, 7s. 6d. each. (To be completed in 8 monthly volumes)

D'AUBIGNE'S HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION. Vol. V.—Subject:—"The Reformation in England." 8vo. 12s.

D'AUBIGNE'S HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY. Five vols. in One. 8vo. cloth, 8s. Gilt Edges, 9s.

HISTORY OF THE PROTESTANT CHURCH IN HUNGARY, FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE REFORMATION TO 1850. With reference also to Transylvania. With an Introduction by Dr. D'Aubigne, 8vo. 10s. 6d.

THE CROSS AND THE DRAGON; or, the Fortunes of Christianity in China, with Notices of the Secret Societies of the Chinese. By J. Kesson. Post 8vo. 6s.

ISRAEL IN EGYPT; or, the Books of Genesis and Exodus. Illustrated by existing Monuments. 6s.

"THE KINGS OF THE EAST;" an Exposition of the Prophecies, determining from Scripture and from History the Power for whom the mystical Euphrates is being "dried up." With an explanation of certain other Prophecies concerning the Restoration of Israel. 7s.

THE EXPERIENCE OF LIFE. By the Author of "Amy Herbert." 7s. 6d.

THE NET IN THE BAY; or Journal of a Visit to Moose and Albany. By the Bishop of Ruperts' Land. 4s. 6d.

LECTURES ON FEMALE SCRIPTURE CHARACTERS. By William Jay. 6s.

THE REV. WILLIAM JAY. A Memoir. By the Rev. S. S. Wilson. With an Appendix containing Remarkable Passages selected from his Discourses. 3s. 6d.

WORK; or Plenty to Do, and How to Do it. By Margaret Maria Brewster. 12mo. 4s.

THE TENT AND ALTAR—SKETCHES OF PATRIARCHAL DAYS. By Rev. Dr. Cumming. 9s.

DAILY BIBLE ILLUSTRATIONS—THE APOSTLES AND EARLY CHRISTIAN CHURCH. By Dr. Kitto. 6s.

CHRIST OUR PASSOVER; or, Thoughts on the Atonement. By the Rev. John Cumming, D.D. 2s. 6d.

THE LAND OF THE FORUM AND THE VATICAN; or, Thoughts and Sketches during an Easter Pilgrimage to Rome. By Newman Hall, B.A. Fcap. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

THE ETERNAL DAY. By the Rev. Horatius Bonar, D.D. 2s.

WHY WEEPEST THOU? or, the Cry from Ramah Hushed by the Voice from Heaven. By the Rev. Dr. Macfarlane. 2s. 6d.

THE WORDS OF JESUS. By the Author of the "Faithful Promiser." In Cover 8d.; Cloth, 1s.

RELIGION IN HEART AND LIFE; or, the Fruits of the SPIRIT. By Rev. Frederick George Barton. 3s.

THE SUCCESSFUL MERCHANT; Sketches of the Life of Mr. Samuel Budgett. By William Arthur, A.M. 2s. 6d.

FAR OFF; or, AFRICA AND AMERICA DESCRIBED. Part II. By the Author of "Peep of Day." 5s.

CHRIST AND CHRISTIANITY: a Vindication of the Divine Authority of the Christian Religion, grounded on the Historical Verity of the Life of Christ. By William Lindsay Alexander, D.D. 4s.

MARY, THE HANDMAID OF THE LORD. By the Author of "Tales and Sketches of Christian Life in Different Lands and Ages." 2s. 6d.

THE SACRAMENTAL AND PRIESTLY SYSTEM EXAMINED; or, Strictures on Archdeacon Wilberforce's Works on the Incarnation and Eucharist. By Charles Smith Bird. 4s. 6d.

THE CHARACTERISTIC DIFFERENCES OF THE FOUR GOSPELS, considered as Revealing Various Relations of the Lord Jesus Christ. By Andrew Jukes. 2s. 6d.

LETTERS FROM SARAROAK, Addressed to a Child; being an accurate description of the Manners, Customs, and Religion of the inhabitants of Borneo, Malays, and Dyaks, and of the Progress of the Church Mission during the first five years; with Incidents of Missionary Life. By Mrs. M'Dougal. 3s. 6d.

JACQUELINE PASCAL; or, CONVENT LIFE IN PORT ROYAL. Compiled from the French of Victor Cousin, &c. By H. N. 5s.

THE PSALMS RESTORED TO THE MESSIAH. A COMMENTARY ON THE BOOK OF PSALMS. By Rev. R. H. Ryland. With a Commendatory Notice, by the Bishop of Cashel. 6s.

MEMOIR OF THE LATE REV. EDWARD BICKERSTETH. By the Rev. T. R. Birks. Cheaper Edition. 2 vols., fcap. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

MEMOIR OF THE LIVES OF ROBERT AND JAMES A. HALDANE. By Alexander Haldane, Esq. 8vo. 12s.

MEMOIR OF THE REV. W. H. KRAUSE, A.M., Bethesda Chapel, Dublin, with selections from his Correspondence. By Rev. C. S. Stanford. Crown 8vo. 5s. 6d.

INCIDENTS IN THE LIFE OF OUR SAVIOUR Illustrative of his Divine Character and Mission. By Rev. A. L. R. Foote. 6s.

THE TWO BROTHERS, AND THE TWO PATHS. By Rev. Philip Bennet Power. 1s. 6d.

POOR HENRY; or, the Pilgrim Hut of Weisenstein. From the German of Dr. Barth. By S. A. M. 1s.

THE KNOT OF TO-DAY, AND A HAND TO UNDO IT. A Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and to the Clergy and Laity of the United Church of England and Ireland on "Church Revival." 1s. 6d.

MEMOIRS OF THOMAS CHALMERS, D.D., LL.D. By his Son-in-Law, the Rev. Wm. Hanna, LL.D. Part I. II. 2s. 6d. each.

THE CHRISTIAN CYCLOPEDIA; or, Repertory of Biblical and Theological Literature. By Rev. Dr. Gardner. Part I., II. 1s. each.

EXCELSIOR: HELP TO PROGRESS IN RELIGION, SCIENCE, AND LITERATURE. Part I., II. 6d. each.

*** The names of subscribers received for these two new monthly periodicals.

THE NECESSITY FOR AN INTERMEDIATE SYSTEM OF EDUCATION BETWEEN THE NATIONAL SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES OF IRELAND. By the Rev. Professor M'Cosh, D.D., Queen's College, Belfast. 6d.

DOD'S PARLIAMENTRY COMPANION. 1854. 4s. 6d.

THE ART OF QUESTIONING; or, a Short Analysis of the Interrogatory Methods of Instruction, designed for the use of Teachers, Pupil Teachers, and Monitors. By W. T. Young, T.C.D. 1s. By post, 1s. 4d.

THE IRISH CHURCHMAN'S ALMANACK, 1854. With the Lessons for every Sunday in the Year, &c., &c. 1s.

THE CHEMISTRY OF COMMON LIFE. By James F. W. Johnston. Parts I., II., III. 1s. 8d.

SELECTION OF HYMNS FOR SABBATH SCHOOLS AND CHRISTIAN FAMILIES. By the Rev. Andrew A. Bonar. Cloth, Gilt. 9d.

FAITH AND CRITICISM; or, Dependance on God, and Independence of Man. By Dr. Merle D'Aubigne. Being the Address delivered by him at the opening of the New College, at Belfast. 6d.

THE DAWN OF LIGHT; or, Scripture Truths for Infant Minds. 1s.

A PEEP INTO THE FAMILY OF MRS. DELMAR; or, a Book for Me and my Children, on National and Important Subjects. 5s.

THE ROYAL PREACHER: an Exposition of Ecclesinstes. By Rev. James Hamilton, D.D. Cheaper Edition 2s. 6d.

A VERSIFIED DESCRIPTION OF THE GREAT INDUSTRIAL EXHIBITION in Dublin, 1853, in a Letter from I. Donoghoe to his Brother Dan. Edited by — Scribler, Esq., of Scribblestown Castle. 6d.

THE PROTESTANT IN IRELAND, IN 1853. Fcap. 2s. 6d.

THE BOOK AND ITS STORY; a Narrative for the Young, on occasion of the Jubilee of the British and Foreign Bible Society. By L. N. R., with an introductory preface, by Rev. T. Phillips. Fcap. 4s.

TWELVE LETTERS ON TRANSUBSTANTIATION; containing two challenges to the Rev. Dr. Cahill. By James C. L. Carson, M.D. 6d.

NEW WORKS AND NEW EDITIONS.

I.

THE COLLECTS OF THE LITURGY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND; catechetically Explained, compared with Scripture, and briefly Commented upon; for the use of Families and Sunday Schools. By Rev. Charles Miller, A.B., with Recommendatory Preface by the Lord Bishop of Meath. Fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

II.

THE TALK OF THE ROAD:

Showing how the Irish People talk about Irish Doings, when they get a quiet Place at the back of a Ditch, or under a Hedge. Fcap. 8vo., in neat cover, 1s.; cloth, 1s. 6d.; cloth gilt, 2s.

III.

THE REFINER'S FIRE; or Why am I Tried? 32mo. 1d.

IV.

THE PRINCIPLES OF ELOCUTION; Extracted from "The Elements of Rhetoric," by Archbishop Whately; with alterations and additions. The whole arranged, revised, and corrected under the personal inspection of his Grace. Fcap. 8vo. (Immediately.)

V.

A COMPLETE ENGLISH AND IRISH DICTIONARY, for the use of Students at Trinity College, Edited by Rev. Professor Foley, T.C.D. Demy 8vo. (In the press.)

VI.

The Catholic Layman,

VOL. II.

January to December, 1853. Royal 4to., bound, 5s. 6d, With complete Indices.

VII.

A SERMON TO CHILDREN, Preached in Trinity Church on Thursday, January 5, 1854. By Rev. John Gregg, A.B. (Shortly.)

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY AND Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London: WERTHEIM AND MACKINTOSH, Paternoster-row.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON, and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher, WILLIAM CURRY, 9 Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

February, 1854.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Gloir do Dhia an fna hárduibh, agus fíoḃcáin air an dtalamh deagḋoil do na dáoinibh.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED THE MIDDLE OF EVERY MONTH, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. III.—No. 27. MARCH, 1854. { Annual Subscription, 3s. 6d. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
Does the Visible Church never Corrupt The true Doctrine ?	31
The Forged Decretal Epistles—No. IV.—The Canon Law	32
The Old Irish Clergy—No. III.	33
The Parish Priest and his Parishioners	35
Talk of the Road—No. XXII.	37
The Cause of our Success. Proposed reprint of the Catholic Layman—Vol. I.	38
Correspondence:	
On the Defects in the Mass, by "a Catholic"	28
On Infallibility, by Mr. Rourke	39
Flowers for March	41

DOES THE VISIBLE CHURCH NEVER CORRUPT THE TRUE DOCTRINE?

There has been latterly a good deal of correspondence in our pages to prove the visibility of the Church—a doctrine which yet we have never meant to deny. The argument has, however, had the effect of developing the true differences between us and our correspondents; and it has turned out that the only point we really disagree on is, not the *visibility* of the Church, but its constant *purity* in doctrine. Christianity has always visibly existed since its establishment, patent to the eyes of the world; we believe that it will never cease to so exist—that the gates of death or destruction will never prevail against it; but we do not hold, with our Roman Catholic correspondents, that the Christianity which is thus visible has been, or will be, always free from errors in doctrine.

Nor can we admit, with them, that a Church necessarily ceases to be the visible Church of Christ—or a part of it—only because it adds to the essential tenets of our faith others that are erroneous, or because some mistaken or conflicting opinions prevail amongst its members.

The question has most properly been argued on an authority which we both believe to be inspired, that of the Sacred Scriptures; and it is, therefore, worth while to observe what account they give of this matter, either as historic facts, or by way of prophetic warning. The writings of the New Testament are spread over nearly the first century, when Christianity had the benefit of being taught by living infallible guides, and when, therefore, if infallible guides could ever guard against error, we might expect a perfect visible Church, and a complete exemption from heresies. Yet, what is the account given by the inspired historians? Even before the ascension of our Lord we find a false tradition accepted amongst the brethren—namely, that St. John was not to die.—John xxi. 23. The very Divinity of Christ was denied.—Jude 4. The cardinal doctrine of the Resurrection was questioned—1 Cor. xv. 12. Many "false prophets were gone into the world."—1 John, iv. 1.* St. Paul tells us of the Church of Corinth, that there were "contentions among them" (1 Cor. i. 11); and, again, that there were "schisms."—xi. 18. Nay, there were even "false apostles," claiming their miraculous powers ere the true had passed from the earth.—2 Cor. xi. 13. Many had "erred concerning the faith."—1 Tim. vi. 21. There was even then a tendency to a veneration of angels, of such a kind as was condemned by the apostle.—Col. ii. 18. Thus, too, the whole Church of the Colossians was censured for paying an undue regard to festivals and ordinances, "which things have, indeed, a show of wisdom in superstition and humility, and not sparing the body, not in any honour to the filling of the flesh."—Col. ii. 20 and 23. The Church of the Galatians is similarly censured for laying too much stress on the "observance of days and months, and times and years" (Gal. iv. 10), and at the same time receives a general rebuke for its lapse from the truth; "O senseless Galatians, who hath bewitched you that you should not obey the truth?" (iii. 1.) Speaking of the great apostacy which, at some period of the world's history, was to overshadow the whole of Christendom, St. Paul expressly tells us that the seeds were already then sown—"for the mystery of iniquity already worketh."—2 Thess. ii. 7.

Now, on these passages, as well as on those we are about to cite, the remark is too obvious to require any argument, that the presence of living infallible guides was insufficient to prevent errors insinuating themselves into Christianity; yet the great *desirableness*—as it appears to human reason—of such an effect, is the chief argument with Roman Catholics for assuming the *existence* of such an authority; and there is moreover this distinction, that, while the presence of several Apostles in the first ages supplied many and unquestioned tribunals of infallible reference, the Roman Catholic Church does not claim more than one, and cannot point out where exactly that is to be found. What, therefore, the Apostles failed to accomplish, it can hardly hope to acchieve; and what then becomes of the common argument in favour of the existence of such an infallible tribunal, from its supposed efficacy? We should also observe, that the Apostles, while reproving the Churches for their errors, do not condemn them as thereby hopelessly cut off from the body of the visible Church.

But if such errors could take root, in the lifetime of the Apostles, we might naturally expect a far greater number to prevail in after ages, when deprived of the light of these living oracles. Accordingly, we read many prophetic warnings, that such would indeed be the case. Some of these are spoken of individuals, some of great numbers, some of entire churches, while some are specially directed to the Clergy or teachers. St. Paul, in his affecting address at Ephesus to the assembled "ancients of the Church," warns them that "of their ownselves should arise men speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them."—Acts xx. 17 and 30. So St. Peter tells us—"There shall be amongst you lying teachers, who shall bring in sects of perdition."—2 Peter ii. 1 and 2. And he adds, what would seem to indicate the probable extent of their success, "and *many* shall follow their riotousness, through whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of." In the "latter times" we learn that such errors were to spread to an alarming extent—"Evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, erring and driving into error."—2 Tim. iii. 1 and 13. And similar language is found in St. Jude, 18 and 19. We need not cite St. Paul's rebuke to the whole Church of the Corinthians, who grossly distorted so important a doctrine as that of the Eucharist. Nor is his language addressed to the Church of Rome itself, that of overweening confidence, but rather of solemn warning against her possible fall from truth. "Thou standest by faith; be not high-minded, but fear. For if God hath not spared the natural branches, fear lest perhaps he also spare not thee." "See then . . . the goodness of God, if thou abide in goodness; otherwise thou also shalt be cut off."—Rom. xi. 20 and 22. We need only refer to the similar tone of solemn warning addressed to entire Churches of Asia in the Apocalypse, particularly those of Pergamus, Thyatira, and Laodicea.—Apoc. ii. 14 and 20, and iii. 16.

We have purposely reserved the lessons which we think are meant to be taught in the remaining chapters of the Apocalypse, both because we consider them of peculiar importance, and because we are anxious not to have our meaning misunderstood. These lofty and mysterious prophecies have been so variously interpreted in their details, and have been applied so often in a manner likely most keenly to wound the feelings of Roman Catholics, that they are too apt to turn from them as either unintelligible or dangerous. We are not about to launch into such tangled disputations; we are rather anxious to draw from the sacred text the inferences that seem designed by its inspired writer to have been prominently taught us from the parts, that all may agree in considering as sufficiently clear. And, we may remark, that this is a portion of Scripture which Roman Catholics are peculiarly at liberty to study for themselves; for their Church has never made any authoritative interpretation of it, and any explanations, therefore, that individuals may adopt cannot be a presumptuous exercise of their private judgment, as their authoritative guide has as yet furnished no other to them. Their tenets do not bind them to wholly refrain from interpreting for themselves, but only from doing so contrary to the teaching of their Church.

Now, the first thing that will strike as extraordinary those who look on this book as too dark and enigmatical for general reading is, that it itself states the very reverse. It opens with the emphatic declaration—"Blessed is he that readeth and heareth the words of this prophecy."—Apoc. i. 3. It repeats almost the same words towards its close (xxii. 9), and concludes with a solemn denunciation that shows the importance of its every line. "If any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life" (xxii. 19).

It is plain, therefore, that there is some peculiar blessing or advantage in religious knowledge, to be gained by the study of this book, and as it cannot be *wholly* from those passages that are but dimly guessed at, through the purposely obscure language of prophecy, it must be derived principally from those striking features which all who read carefully can gather from its more obvious portions. We shall endeavour, then, shortly to see what these are, and what are the lessons they inculcate.

Now, Roman Catholic commentators differ as to whether its prophecies are already principally fulfilled, or still remain principally future; but few of any side doubt that it is meant to give a prophetic sketch of the then known world (ἡ γη), the then empire of Rome, and that portion of the earth which has since been almost synonimous with Christendom, and within whose limits the struggles and doctrines of the Church visible, of Christianity itself, have been mainly decided. It comprehends the most striking epochs from its establishment to its final consummation at the close of the world.

In all this history, amid the religious ruin it so forcibly describes, we should naturally expect some mention of a mighty, infallible, visible, ecclesiastical establishment, preserving the majority of mankind in constant truth, if indeed any such were to so exist. Its mere silence would be very significant; the omission to point out so obvious and secure a refuge from perplexity and error, looks as if none such were known to the inspired writer. And, accordingly, how different is the picture actually drawn! It consists of a series of woes inflicted by Providence on Christendom, ever repeated and recurring, war, desolation, pestilence, and famine, which are throughout tacitly presumed to be sent by the Almighty as scourges to chastise the errors of the vast majority. There is hardly a chapter which tells of these terrible visitations that does not assume that the greater part of men are sunk in depravity as well as falsity of doctrine. The true believers, on the contrary, are described as few, as persecuted for ages, as often hid from the eyes of men, and as even at times so completely overwhelmed as to leave God without a witness upon earth.

In the limits of this article it would be impossible to follow out the whole train of this history, dark in its particular references, but clear in this general result. But one or two passages will especially illustrate our meaning. The period of 1260 days is repeatedly mentioned, both here and in the confessedly parallel prophecies of Daniel, during which a great heretic power should be predominant. In the prophet Daniel, as in many other prophetic writers, the day is conceded to mean a literal year, and it is difficult not to attach the same meaning to the word here. This at once gives us a vast period, during which the dominant Church was to be also heretic.* The true believers are described as "two witnesses" (the least number that could testify to any fact in the Jewish law), and as "clothed in sackcloth," the emblem of suffering.—Apoc. xi. 3. Even these two are finally overcome and destroyed (xi. 7). This persecuting power that has thus destroyed them will, for the 1260 year-days, be dominant and triumphant. "And it was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them; and power was given him over *every* tribe, and people, and tongue, and nation" (xiii. 7). So, too, we find the Church of God, as the note in the Douay Bible correctly explains the emblem of the "woman" (c. xii. 1.), described as driven into "the wilderness" (xii. 6 and 14), where she is hid during these 1260 year-days from persecution. There may, indeed, be true servants of God during that time, but they do not form the visible Church, or its ecclesiastical power. The avenging angel was to smite mankind with successive chastisements, but man's blindness and crime was to obstinately continue; "and the rest of the men, who were not slain by the plagues, did not do penance from the works of their hands"—ix. 20.

Now, let any one candidly read not only these few passages, but the entire history of the Church, as it was un-

* All the verses cited in this article are taken from the Douay Translation.

* It is worth observing, to meet a surmise that might arise in the minds of our Roman Catholic readers, that no one sign of this Mystic Babylon can be made to agree with the characteristics of Protestantism.

folded to the prophetic gaze of St. John, and see if he can discover any sign of a perfect, continuous, never-ceasing, never-erring, visible Church establishment, numbering the greater part of the inhabitants of Christendom amongst its followers, and at some periods apparently embracing the whole—a glory which the Church of Rome alone ventures to claim for herself; or does not he rather read that truth and purity were to be exceptions amid general and grave error, ever persecuted, and for some time overwhelmed, falsehood ruling the religious world for ages, and, for a season, God's truth left without a witness with the courage or the power to proclaim it?

This is the lesson, we think, which is most palpably taught, and which carries the promised blessing to those who learn it; one that must have brought consolation to the bosoms of many, who found themselves often alone, amid a world of error. As the New Testament tells us, had already begun to happen in the days of the Apostles, the Apocalypse reveals the continuance and growth of the like mixed system of good and evil, in which for long the evil should predominate, till the second coming of Christ should effect a retributive change. And so, too, during the long centuries past—as, perhaps, for many still to come—we find the Church visible foreshadowed in the sacred book, as history in fact records the event, as ever stricken with punishments, swept by the fierce Goths and savage Hun, exhausted by its struggles with the Saracen and the Turk, and prostrate beneath successive conquerors, the unconscious instruments of God's wrath. Assuredly, not yet have been fulfilled those prophecies, often triumphantly quoted by our Roman Catholic correspondents, in which it is described as perfect in righteousness, as free from sin, as resting in tranquillity and peace, when wars and tribulations shall have passed away. Yet, it is these prophecies, and these alone, which ever speak of the visible Church as perfect in doctrine, and free from error. They, however, supply us with an obvious test: WHEN SIN IS BANISHED, ERROR WILL DISAPPEAR—but not till then; when a Church of men can show itself *impeccable*, it may then claim to be *infallible*. Meanwhile, revelation agrees with history in showing that perfection in either way has not, yet at least, been attained by the Church, as it is seen by the eye of man.

DECRETAL EPISTLES.—No. IV.

HOW THE FORGED EPISTLES WERE USED IN THE CANON LAW.

WE gave in our last number, the labours of the Popes of the ninth century in establishing the forged Decretals as the law of the Church. We did not proceed beyond Pope Adrian II. The succeeding Popes no longer laboured to establish the forgery: that was now accomplished, and they thought only how they could use the vast powers which forgery had acquired.

Thus Pope Sylvester II. restores Arnulphus to the archbishopric of Rheims, of which he had been deprived for his crimes; not from any consideration of the welfare of the Church, but "that Peter may have free power of loosing, and that the dignity of the Roman glory may shine forth everywhere; wherefore, we have thought it fit to assist you, Arnulphus, Archbishop of Rheims, deprived, *for whatever excesses*, of your pontifical dignity . . . . ."(1) The Pope goes on to restore him to all his honours, making no stipulation whatever for his repentance or his absolution; but saying, "Let our authority protect you upon every side, EVEN THOUGH GUILT OF CONSCIENCE OPPRESS YOU!"(2) As if it were necessary to the dominion which falsehood had established, that it should triumph, not only over public decency and virtue, but over the voice of God in the conscience of man! And, to crown all, Pope Sylvester concludes with pronouncing anathema against any succeeding Pope who should alter this decree!(3)—a worthy use of power so acquired.

And the eloquence of those Popes, and its application, may be judged of from this specimen, taken from the same Pope's first epistle to Azolinus, Bishop of Laon:—"O Juda, magistri proditionem innovans, et Pontificalem gloriam nostris temporibus deturpans!"

Some Popes of the *next* ages deserve more notice, and may receive it from us hereafter; but our present subject is too extensive to let us dwell on any individual Popes. We undertook to show, in this number, how the forged Epistles and councils were THENCEFORWARD continued and maintained as the laws of the Church of Rome.

For this purpose we take the book, called "The Decretum of Gratian."

This Gratian was a monk, of the monastery of St. Felix, in Bononia, and he published this book in the year 1151. It is a vast collection of everything that he could find, having the force of law or the weight of authority in the Church. Fathers, councils, formularies, Papal decrees, and epistles—all are collected here, not from the original writers, but from the various compilations which Gratian found in use at that time as books of Church law. The variety and contradictions of those former collections were found so inconvenient, that Gratian resolved to bring them all together in one book; and this book had such success, that it became the standard work on the law of the Roman Church.

It has been disputed whether this book was confirmed and authorized by the Pope when it came out. Two ancient authors of credit, Trithemius and Machiavel, say that it was so authorized; others deny it. We think that the latter are correct, and that the book was not authorized by the Pope. Still, the fact is confessed, that it was universally adopted in all the courts of the Roman Church. Our witness is Archbishop Devoti, Secretary to Pope Pius VII., the latest Roman writer on Canon law. Devoti wished to allow this Decretum of Gratian as little authority as possible, *because* it quotes the forgeries; yet he confesses that "scarcely had the work of Gratian come forth into light, than it was held in such esteem by all, that it was read publicly in the schools (of law), *and produced in court as part of the common law.*"(4) If we consider the law books received in our own courts of law, we may easily understand how this might happen to a book not authorized by law. No book has greater authority in British courts of law than "Coke upon Littleton;" yet that book never was confirmed by act of parliament, nor by any law. Yet all courts receive that book as the law of the land, not because Sir Edward Coke had any authority to make laws, but because he gave the best and most accurate statement of the things that were law before he wrote his book. It was precisely the same with Gratian; he collected everything which he found already admitted as law in the Papal courts, and therefore the Papal courts universally adopted his book as the standard work on their law. Carrying out this object, Gratian adopted the forged Decretals into his collection, because he found them already acknowledged in the Roman courts as the law of the Roman Church. Those Decretals did not become law, because he put them in his book; but he put them in his book because he found them law already. We admit the statement of Devoti (p. 376) "concerning the authority of the Decretum (of Gratian); it is to be thus held, that all things which are related in it have the same force as if they were viewed apart from the Decretum. Therefore, whatever force the places of Holy Scripture, the decrees of Popes and of General Councils have by their own quality and nature, the same they retain in the Decretum; but the others, by being put into the Decretum, do not obtain that authority which they have not of themselves."(5)

It follows from this, that *genuine* Decretals of Popes in the Decretum, are still law, but forged Decretals in the Decretum are not law, merely because they are found in it. It follows, also, that the forged Decretals, which are in the Decretum of Gratian, *while they were believed to be genuine*, were universally regarded as the laws of the Church.

So the fact stands thus; in the year 1151, Gratian found the forged Epistles of the Popes universally received in the Papal courts as the law of the Roman Church; Gratian adopted them as such, and the Roman courts adopted his book; and, for at least FOUR HUNDRED AND THIRTY YEARS AFTER (as we shall presently prove), and probably some time longer, no one ever doubted that these forged Epistles were genuine, or ever questioned that they were a part of the law of the Roman Church!

We shall now show briefly to what extent, and with what object, the forged Decretal Epistles figured in the Decretum of Gratian.

We confine ourselves (for reasons given in our former numbers) to the Decretal Epistles of the Popes of the first 400 years, of which we gave a list in our first number, printed in the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, December, 1853.

Our readers will remember that we showed in that list that there are 84 forged Epistles for those 400 years, and 23 epistles commonly reputed genuine.

Of the 84 forgeries, Gratian quotes 65.

Of the 23 called genuine, Gratian quotes ONLY ONE, and that one, if not forged, is most probably "cooked."

Our readers may remember what we said in our first number, that while the forged Epistles give just what Roman Catholics wish to find in the early ages, the genuine Epistles of those ages do *not* give any support to the Papacy. Hence, they may understand *why* Gratian quotes so many of the forged, and so few of the genuine.

But to come to particulars: this book, the Decretum, is divided into larger divisions (which in modern days would be called chapters), and these are subdivided into smaller divisions, called "canons."

Of these canons, THREE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FOUR are taken from the Decretal Epistles of the first 400 years.

Of these three hundred and twenty-four, THREE HUNDRED AND THIRTEEN are forgeries, ONLY ELEVEN genuine; if, indeed, that one Epistle be really genuine.

We confine ourselves to our list of the 400 years. Were we to take in the forgeries of later Popes, and the number of passages from books that were never written by the authors whose names they bear, we should, perhaps, double the number.

But, compare these THREE HUNDRED and THIRTEEN forged canons, with the number of canons which Gratian took from the Scriptures—from the Old Testament, THIRTEEN; from the New Testament, just NINE.

Each canon is *to prove* some point in the law of the Church of Rome; whereby our readers may see that it was then, as it is now, much easier to prove the papal system from lying stories, than to prove it from the Word of God.

Now, let us see what did Gratian use these forgeries to prove.

In Distinctions (or, as we might call them, chapters) XXI. and XXII. he brings forward proofs for the supremacy of Rome. In Dist. XXI. can. 2, he quotes the forged Epistle of Anacletus. "..... the sacerdotal order began from Peter, because the Pontificate in the Church of Christ was given to him first ....."(6)

In canon 3 he quotes the Decree of Gelasius about approved and apocryphal books, as follows—"..... the Roman Catholic and Apostolic Church was set over the other Churches by no synodical decrees, but obtained the primacy by the evangelical voice of our Lord and Saviour....."(7)

Again, in Dist. XXII., canon 2, he quotes the forged Epistle of Anacletus (which we gave in our last number). "The Holy Roman and Apostolic Church obtained the primacy and pre-eminence over all Churches, not from the apostles, but from the Lord himself, our Saviour....."

Again, in Dist. XCIII., canon 3, Gratian quotes St. Cyprian, saying—"he who deserts the See of Peter, on which the Church is founded, let him not trust that he is in the Church."(8) But these words were never written by St. Cyprian; they were put into his writings by the forgers many centuries after his death.

As far as we have been able to find, these are all the proofs which Gratian brings from the first eight centuries in support of the supremacy by divine right, of the Roman Church. *And they are all forgeries.* All his other proofs for it are taken from Popes or other writers of the NINTH and following centuries.

Here we have the confirmation of our opinion, which we hope yet to prove still further, that the supremacy by divine right originated from the forged Decretals of the ninth century, and that all former Popes and writers were ignorant of it.

In support of the authority of the forged Decretals, Gratian, or some one for him, transcribes, Dist. XIX. c. 1, that whole argument of Pope Nicolas I. (which we gave at the end of No. II., January 1854, p. 4, col. 1), in which Pope Nicolas insists on people receiving the Decretal Epistles, written in the times of pagan persecution; which it is impossible to apply to any but the forged decretals.

For the divine inspiration of the Pope's decrees, Gratian (Dist. XXI. canon 7) produced that passage of Pope Nicolas (given in our second number, January 1854, p. 3, col. 1), in which Pope Nicolas produces the forged story about Pope Marcellinus as being given by divine inspiration.

But Gratian brings another proof (Dist. xix., canon 6) for the divine inspiration of the Pope's decrees, which deserves attention. This canon has a heading to it—"The Decretal Epistles are to be reckoned in *among the* CANONICAL SCRIPTURES"! The canon itself consists of a passage which St. Augustine wrote about the Holy Scripture itself, which passage Gratian altered, so that it might apply to the Decretal Epistles of Popes!

Four hundred and thirty years after, this passage was altered to run as St. Augustine wrote it, by correctors whom we shall speak of presently, but those correctors left the heading as Gratian wrote it!

That the Pope only has the right of calling councils, Gratian proves (Dist. xvii., Canons 1, 2, 3, 5) from the Decretal Epistles of Pope Marcellus, Pope Julius I., Pope Damasus, and Pope Pelagius II.—all forgeries.

That the sacrifice of the mass is a propitiatory sacrifice for the taking away of sin, Gratian proves (de Consecr. Dist. ii., Canon 7) from a Decretal Epistle of Pope Julius I., "every crime and sin is blotted out by these sacrifices offered to God;"(9) and also from Pope Alexander (Canon 8)—"nothing can effect more in sacrifices than the body and blood of Christ, nor is any oblation more powerful than this, but this excels all . . . . ."(10) Both these Epistles are acknowledged forgeries.

For the ceremonies and rules to be observed at the mass, many of which are very like those now observed, Gratian gives canons, many taken from the forgeries; as from Clement (de Consecr. Dist. i., Canon 14). Clement again, Canon 39; Sixtus, Canon 41; Stephen, Canon 42; Sylves-

(1) Ut Petro solvendi libera sit potestas, et Romanæ gloriæ ubique fulgeat dignitas. Quapropter tibi Arnulpho Remensi archiepiscopo, quibusdam excessibus pontificali honore privato, subvenire dignum duximus . . . . Ep. 2 to Arnulphus.—Labbe and Coss., vol ix., p. 778.

(2) Nostra te ubique auctoritas muniat, etiam si conscientiæ reatus accurrat.—Same epistle.

(3) Statuentes apostolica censura sub divini obtestatione judicii, et anathematis interdictione, ut nulli unquam nostrorum successorum pontificum, vel aliæ quælibet magnæ parvæque personæ, hoc nostrum privilegium infringere liceat.—Same epistle.

(4) Vix Gratiani opus in lucem prodiit, tanta ab omnibus in pretio habitum est, ut in scholis publice legeretur, atque in Foro tanquam pars communis juris proponeretur.—Devoti, Jus Canonicum, ed. Rom., 1837, vol. i., p. 373.

(5) De auctoritate Decreti sic habendum est; omnia quæ in eo referuntur, vim eandem habere, ac si seorsim e Decreto spectentur. Itaque loca sacræ Scripturæ, decreta Summorum Pontificum, et generalium conciliorum, quam sua indole et natura vim habent, eamdem in Decreto retinent; cætera vero auctoritatem, qua per se carent, in Decretum translata non consequuntur.—Devoti, Jus Canonicum, vol. i., p. 376.

(6) . . . . A Petro Sacerdotalis cœpit ordo, quia ipsi primo pontificatus in ecclesia Christi datus est. . . .

(7) Romana, Catholica et Apostolica Ecclesia nullis synodicis constitutis cæteris ecclesiis prælata est, sed evangelica vuca Domini et Salvatoris nostri Primatum obtinuit.

(8) Qui Cathedram Petri, super quam fundata est Ecclesia, deserit, in Ecclesia se esse non confidat.

(9) Omne crimen atque peccatum oblatis Deo sacrificiis deleatur.

(10) Nihil in sacrificiis majus esse potest, quam corpus et sanguis Christi, nec ulla oblatio hac potior est, sed hæc omnes præcellit.

ter, Canon 46; Telesphorus, Canon 48; Anacletus, Canon 59; Lucius, Canon 60; Anastasius, Canon 61; Alexander de Consecr. Dist. iii., Canon 1; Clement, Canon 23—all forged; besides many more never made by the Popes whose names they bear. From whence our readers may have some notion how the ceremonies of the mass did multiply so fast, and how the mass came to be so different from the simplicity of the Supper of the Lord, as it was celebrated by the Lord himself, and by his apostles after Him.

But we might go on for ever at the forgeries in this Decretum of Gratian. We stop at one instance more—HOLY WATER; for which Gratian quotes that passage of the forged letter of Pope Alexander (which we gave in our last number), *and that alone* (de Consecr. Dist. iii., Canon 20).

All these things Gratian found as acknowledged laws of the Roman Church, in the year 1151; and therefore he put them into his book. All these things continued in his book as undoubted and unquestioned laws of the Roman Church for at least four hundred and thirty years, and, perhaps, a good deal longer.

And this brings us to a fact in the history of the Decretum of Gratian, which shows far more strongly than we yet have shown it, the vast influence and authority which this book had acquired in the Church; and how little notion any one had, during all those centuries, of doubting or questioning all the forgeries in it.

At the end of the Council of Trent, about the year 1563, Pope Pius IV. (the same who drew up the creed of the Roman Catholic Church), was authorized by the Council of Trent to revise the Roman Missal and Breviary. About the same time, he undertook to revise and correct the Decretum of Gratian. For this purpose, he selected a number of the most learned cardinals and doctors in the Roman Church, to whom he committed that task. His successor, Pius V., added others; so that *seven* cardinals and *seventeen* doctors were employed, of whom two afterwards became popes.

These twenty-four most learned men spent more than *sixteen years* of most diligent labour in correcting the Decretum of Gratian, which they finally accomplished in the year 1580, under the pontificate of Pope Gregory XIII. There cannot be stronger proof of the vast importance and authority attached to this book in the Church of Rome.

What did those learned men do with the forgeries?

It is true, they do correct a forgery now and then, but not the forged Decretals. For instance:—Dist. xix., Canon 9., has this heading—"Anastasius, being rejected by God, was struck by the Divine Will;" which heading the canon itself seems fully to support. Now, this Anastasius was a pope, and the correctors may well have wondered how Gratian came to put in such a story about a Pope. They did not know that the real story which Gratian, no doubt, meant to give, and probably did give, was just the contrary, that some enemy of Pope Anastasius was thus struck by God. Probably some transcriber afterwards made the blunder in making a new copy. But the correctors, knowing nothing of this, pronounced, without hesitation, in the note which they added, that this story was a forgery. This shows that they felt that it was a part of their duty to point out forgeries in the Decretum of Gratian.

Yet of the THREE HUNDRED AND THIRTEEN canons taken from the forged Decretals of the first 400 years, and of all the other canons taken from other similar forgeries, they never pointed out one as being a forgery!

On the contrary, they everywhere seek to uphold the authority of the forged bundle of Isidore.

They state in the preface which they prefixed to the Decretum, that Ignarus, Archbishop of Rheims, affirms, that it really was the famous Isidore, Bishop of Seville, in Spain, who made this collection, which, if true, would be strongest proof that the forged Decretals were genuine; and they do not say that it is not true.

They appeal to the *testimony* of the writer of this forged collection, "as Isidore himself testifies."

In many of their notes on forged canons, they speak of the forger as if he were a person of credit, and of the forgeries, as if they were genuine." (11)

Having done all this to support the credit of the forgeries, and having never given the smallest hint that any doubt was, or could be thrown on all these forged canons, they say in their preface, respecting the diligence with which the work was done, that "after this scarcely any one can err *so as to follow uncertain things for certain*, or to hold suspected those which were certain, as if they were uncertain." (12)

Had they no *suspicion*, when they wrote that passage, that Isidore's Papal Decretals might be forged? Was it possible that during 16 years spent in examining these canons, and comparing them with the monstrous and absurd forgeries which Isidore had concocted (and it is evident that they *did* compare them *carefully*), that no suspicion should ever have arisen in their minds?

They were in constant communication with Antonius Augustinus, Archbishop of Tarracon in Spain, the most learned man of his day, and from him they received a great part of their materials; and he certainly knew of grounds of suspicion, for he had observed that the Epistles of the early Popes did actually quote laws of the Roman emperors, which laws were not made for several hundred years after those popes lived! And he does not understand how this could be done!

But whether the correctors suspected the forgery or not, is of little consequence. If they did *not*, then we have proof how universally the forgeries were believed and accepted as the law of the Church: if they *did* suspect it, then we have proof that they did everything in their power to prevent others suspecting it; and that, notwithstanding their suspicions, they put forward the forged decretals in the Decretum, as things that no man, or no court of the Church of Rome, need hesitate to accept as genuine and true.

And the Decretum of Gratian, when thus corrected, was published by authority of a bull of Pope Gregory XIII., who had himself been one of the correctors before he was Pope.

That bull was dated, July 1, 1580, and in the beginning of it Pope Gregory gives, as the reason for correcting the Decretum, the duty of his office "to provide with all zeal and diligence for retaining all Christians in the true and Catholic faith, especially in these so grievous and calamitous times (the Reformation), and, therefore, that, in the first place, is to be attended to and provided for by us, that we may take away from all every occasion of wandering from it." (13)

To accomplish this purpose he sends forth the Decretum of Gratian, with all its forgeries, sustained with fresh credit, and greater approbation; and to provide for the enduring continuance of those forgeries, he inserts this enactment into the bull, "that it shall not be lawful to any one to add anything to this work, or to change or to alter anything, or to add any interpretation; but as it is now printed in this our city of Rome, let it always and for ever be preserved whole and unaltered." (14) And this bull is always printed in the front of the Roman edition of the Decretum of Gratian.

But it was too late for Pope and Cardinals to make these forgeries perpetual. A mighty power had arisen, and was rolling onward, destined to sweep before it, in the next half century, the frauds and forgeries of seven hundred years. The reformers began, not long after, to question and convict the forgeries, and one by one all the most learned men of the Church of Rome were driven to admit the barefaced imposture which, so short a time before, they had sought to bolster up. In 50 years more the victory of truth over falsehood was complete; yet, even when the great battle was thus lost and won, the more zealous champions of the Roman Church, Turrianus the Jesuit, and Binius the Archbishop, made a last desperate effort to retrieve the day, and restore the reign of forgery in the Church. And Binius again ventured to defend the forged epistles of the Popes as being "consecrated by their own antiquity and the reverence of the whole world; filled with gravity, doctrine, and holiness; confirmed by the testimony and use of posterity of all ages; in style and discourse, written most agreeably to apostolic men; interpreting the holy Scripture according to that sense which holy mother Church has held and holds, which is to be bravely upheld to martyrdom in time of persecution by the example of our Saviour Christ; most usefully written for confuting the heresies of our times." (15)

The very arguments by which we now hear men attempting to defend the very things which those forgeries introduced and established!

But the time for ruling by forgery was gone by, and Labbe and Cossart, wiser Jesuits than he, thought it was madness to defend the forgeries any longer, in such a light of ecclesiastical knowledge.

The forgeries are not now the law of the Roman Church, by reason of their being in the Decretum of Gratian, since the forgery is confessed. But they stand there still, as a monument to remind us that for 700 years the Roman Church maintained her doctrines by their help, and never abandoned them until Protestants had made it impossible to maintain them longer.

And now, in looking back on this awful delusion of the Church for so many ages, it does seem to us, that if Protestantism were ever so bad a thing, and if the Church of Rome had power to abolish it from the world with a breath, it might still be prudent for that infallible Church to keep a few Protestants still, just to preserve her from being for ever deceived through the presumption and the ignorance of her own infallibility.

But we have not done with forgeries, for we grieve to say that Roman Catholics have not done with them *yet*. The next Book in the canon law of the Church of Rome is, "The Decretals of Pope Gregory IX." It is a book of far higher legal authority with them than the Decretum of Gratian; for their latest canonist, Archbishop Devoti, says of it, and the other books that followed it, "Whatever, therefore, is contained in them makes law." (16) The reason is, because these books were actually drawn up and sanctioned by authority in the Church of Rome, which the Decretum was not.

Now, we might hardly think of looking for the forged Epistles of the early Popes in these Decretals of Pope Gregory IX., because that book was intended to be a collection of the *later* Decretals, Gratian having already embodied the former. Yet a few of the earlier have strayed into it; we have observed five; one attributed by mistake to Stephen, but really from the Epistle of Sixtus I. (17); 2. another from Stephen I. (18); 3. another from Stephen, II. (19); 4. another from Felix II. (20); 5. another from Felix I. (20). All five are from the forged Epistles, and this in the book of which the latest Roman Canonist says that everything in that book is law!

We have not, in our reading, seen it noticed that the forgeries are quoted in this Book of the Decretals of Gregory IX., and we call the attention of the learned to the fact.

But Roman Catholics are not yet clear of these forgeries. The Church of Rome still uses these forgeries *to direct and govern the daily prayers* of her priests and members. The Roman Breviary directs the daily prayers of the Church of Rome. The Council of Trent formally authorized Pope Pius IV. to correct that Breviary. He did correct it, and issued a bull commanding the use of it so corrected. In the service for April 26th, and in that for December 31st, what does the reader suppose we find? Why, the two lying stories which Pope Nicholas I. produced as being given by divine inspiration!—the forged Council of Marcellinus, and the forged Council of Sylvester!

These are not the only forgeries in the Roman Breviary—the daily prayers of the Roman Church. There are heaps of them, taken from the pontifical book, which had a very similar origin with the forged Decretals.

Roman Catholics, read the Roman Breviary, and think of these things.

Then turn to Clement, whom you call St. Peter's successor, and call to mind his striking words in his *genuine* Epistle, "Search into the Holy Scriptures, which are the true words of the Holy Ghost. Ye know that there is nothing wicked or forged written in them" (21).

(11) See the notes of the Correctors on Dist. xvi., c. 4 and 12; Dist. xxii., c. 2; Dist. i., c. 16.

(12) "Ut quisquam errare, atque incerta pro certis sequi, certa vero pro incertis suspecta habere post hac queat.

(13) . . . . ut omni studio diligentiaque omnes Christifideles his præsertim tam gravibus calamitosisque temporibus in recta et Catholica fide contineare curemus, ac propterea id in primis nobis agendum et providendum sit, ut omnem omnibus aberrandi ab ea occasionem subtrahamus.

(14) Ac ne cuiquam liceat eidem operi quicquam addere, vel immutare, aut inveriere, nullave interpretamenta adjungere, sed prout in hac nostra urbe Roma anno impressum fuit, semper et perpetuo integrum et incorruptum conservetur.

(15) Epistolas Decretales antiquitate sua et totius mundi reverentia consecratas, omni gravitate, doctrina et sanctitate refertas, testimonio et usu posteritatis omnium sæculorum confirmatas, stylo ac sermone Apostolicis viris convenientissimo exaratas, sacram Scripturam juxta eum sensum quem tenuit et tenet sancta mater ecclesia interpretantes, ad martyrium tempore persecutionis Christi Domini nostri exemplo fortiter sustinendum, ad hæreses sui temporis redarguendum altissime scriptas. . . . .—Labbe and Cossa, vol. i., p. 76.

(16) Quidquid igitur in iis comprehenditur, legem facit.—Jus Canon., vol. i., p. 379.

(17) Lib. v., Tit. 7, c. 1.

(18) Lib. v., Tit. 41, c. 7.

(19) Lib. v., Tit. 1, c. 1.

(20) Lib. v., Tit. 1, c. 2.

(21) Εγκρυπτετε εις τας γραφας τας αληθεις ρησεις πνευματος του αγιου· ιστιασθε ὁτι ουδεν αδικον ουδε παραπεποιημενον γεγραπται εν αυταις.—Labbe and Cossa, vol. i., p. 132, erratum.

THE OLD IRISH CLERGY.

NO. III.

THAT the principle of hereditary succession to ecclesiastical benefices was applied, in a very remarkable and exclusive way, to the Office of Successor of St. Patrick, at Armagh, from an early period in the tenth century to a corresponding period in the twelfth century—or, in other words, for about 200 years, counted from A.D. 926, or thereabouts, to A.D. 1129, or somewhat later—is not only a point admitted on all hands, but one also which has attracted much attention, and given rise to no small discussion. But that the same system was more or less acted on as a much earlier period, among the official personages connected with the Church in Armagh—that it was in operation there, in fact, from the very first foundation of the place, and among the highest dignitaries who flourished in it, appears to be indicated by evidence in the *Annals* not much less palpable or certain than what applies to the later history of the same church, although this evidence in the former case has attracted little or no observation.

Let us look at each case by itself, taking them in chronological order. Out of the names connected with Armagh during the first period, *i. e.*—the one ending at A.D. 927—the following selected catalogue appears to include all such as are most worthy of notice in illustration of the subject before us:—

A.D. 525. Ailill, Bishop of Armagh, of the tribe of Hy-Brasil, died.

A.D. 535. Oilill, Bishop of Armagh, who was likewise of the tribe of Hy-Brasil, died.

[The Hy-Brasil territory, Dr. O'Donovan considers (*Note*, A.D. 525.) to have been co-extensive with the present barony of O'Neilland East, Co. Armagh, on the south of Lough Neagh, where the Banu enters that lake.]

A.D. 557. Phelimy Finn, Abbot of Armagh, died.

[Ware says that he was born in the territory of Hy-Nellan, or O'Neilland.]

A.D. 587. St. Caorlan, Bishop of Armagh, died; ["born in a territory called Hy-Niellan,"—*i.e.*—O'Neilland. *Ware.*]

A.D. 606. Hugh, son of Colga, Chief of Oriel and of all

the Oriors, died on his pilgrimage, at Clonmacnoise, [*i.e.*, resigned his crown, to end his days in religious retirement. So saith Colgan, AA. SS., p. 732.]

A.D. 620. Ronan, son of Toole, lord of the Oriors, died.

[The Oriors, as Dr. O'Donovan observes (*Note* A.D. 606), were in the eastern part of the ancient Oriel, and co-extensive with the present baronies of Orior, Co. Armagh.]

A.D. 660. St. Tomene, son of Ronan, Bishop of Armagh, died.

[He was, according to Ware, "a man of noble birth," being son, probably, to the lord Ronan, mentioned at A.D. 620, or else to another Ronan, lord also of the Oriors, but son to the Hugh mentioned at A.D. 606. This Ronan, son of Hugh, is not mentioned by the Four Masters, but is by Adamnan, in his life of S. Columba, *Book* 1, *Chap.* 43. The name Ronan is not very common in the Annals, and the only one specially identified in them, in connection with the north of Ireland, in the sixth century, or the seventh, is the Ronan whose name occurs at A.D. 620, whose territory being in the present Co. Armagh, it is very probable that he was the father of the last-named prelate.]

A.D. 704. Flann Feola, son of Scanlan, Abbot of Armagh, died.

[He was, according to Harris's *Ware*, of the race of Colla-da-chrioch, brother to Colla Uais, monarch of Ireland, A.D. 327; and Brasal, head of the Hy-Brasil family, was great grandson of the same Colla-da-chrioch.]

A.D. 729. Sweeney, son of Cronnmael, son of Ronan, Bishop of Armagh, died June 21st. He was of the Hy-Niallain tribe.

[He seems plainly to have been a nephew of Tomene, or Thomian, above named at A.D. 660. Of his family Dr. O'Donovan remarks here:—"This tribe, who furnished so many archbishops to the See of Armagh, were seated in the present baronies of O'Neilland, County Armagh."]

A.D. 757. Kelepedair, Abbot of Armagh, died. He was of the Hy-Brasil tribe.

A.D. 771. Fardaery, Abbot of Armagh, son to Sweeney, son of Ronan, son of Cruanmael, died.

[He was evidently a near relative to Tomian, A.D. 660, and Sweeney, A.D. 729. His grandfather, Ronan, may, perhaps, have been brother to the latter. Dr. O'Donovan remarks of him, that he is set down as Archbishop of Armagh, in the catalogue in the Psalter of Cashel, and that he succeeded in 758. Generally, it may be remarked, that the persons called Abbots of Armagh, in the *Annals*, are considered to have been the same with the Primates of Ireland, although there is much reason to doubt the accuracy of the prevalent views entertained on the subject.]

A.D. 779. Kearney, son of Sweeney, Prior of Armagh, died.

[He appears to have been son to Bishop Sweeney, A.D. 729. In the *Annals of Ulster*, at A.D. 783, he is called *equonimus*, (*i. e.*, for *œconomus*, 'house steward') of Armagh.]

A.D. 791. Hoey, son of Kearney, *œconomus* of Armagh, died.

A.D. 792. Dudalche, son of Sionach, Abbot of Armagh, died.

A.D. 806. Conway, son of Dudalche, Abbot of Armagh, died suddenly.

A.D. 807. Torbach, son of Gorman, Scribe, Lector, and Abbot of Armagh, died.

[He was son to Gorman, Abbot of Louth, and father to Egan, Abbot of Louth, according to what we have seen already, in the first of these papers on the subject under investigation.]

A.D. 808. Toichea Ua Tierney, of Tir-Imclair, Abbot of Armagh, died.

A.D. 812. Cumusgach, son of Kearney, *Economus* of Armagh, died.

A.D. 825. [The Four Masters record at length, under this year, how Cumuscach, son of Cahal, Lord of Oriel, deposed Owen Monaistreach from the primacy, to put in his own maternal half-brother, Artri: whereupon Owen appealed to Niall Caille, supreme King of Ireland, to defend his rights; which Niall accordingly did, with bloody slaughter of the Oriel men, among whom fell Cumasgach also; and Owen, regaining the primacy, held it for nine years after, with the aid of the secular power—*i. e.*, of his friend Niall: so little idea had the Irish in those days of appealing for the settlement of such a question to any foreign ecclesiastical tribunal.]

A.D. 829. Sweeney, son of Farney, Abbot of Armagh for the space of two months, died. [The *Annals of Ulster* call him Sweeney, son of Foranan. See at A.D. 834 below.]

A.D. 831. Rathyal, son of Sweeney, priest of Armagh, died.

A.D. 834. A change of Abbots at Armagh,—viz., Forannan of Rath-mic-Malais being substituted in the room of Dermot Ua Tierney.

A.D. 841. Murray, son of Kearney, Economus of Armagh, died.

A.D. 863. Kearney, son of Farney, prior of Armagh, died.

A.D. 867. Flann, son of Ferchair, Abbot of Lann Leire, and Œconomus of Armagh, died.

[His father Ferchair seems to have been, without doubt, the Abbot of Lann Leire, who died in A.D. 848.]

According to Keating, O'Conor, and others, the brothers known as the three Collas (sons of Hector Devlen, son of Carbery Liffeachair, supreme King of Ireland, A.D. 268) overran and conquered for themselves vast territories in Ulster, in A.D. 331 or 332, destroying withal the royal palace of Emania, or Eamhain Macha, now the Navan Fort, close by Armagh. Colla Dachrioch, one of the three, became ancestor of the MacMahons of Monaghan, the Maguires of Fermanagh, and the O'Hanlons and MacCanns of Armagh; and his great-grandson Brasal, as we have seen above, became progenitor of the Hy Brasil or Clann Brasil family, who were anciently settled in the present O'Neilland in that county. In this royal race appears to have been vested the chief power and interest connected with the prerogatives belonging to the Successor of St. Patrick, his office, and appointment, from the earliest period, for many successive ages. Thus may we understand the mode in which there came to be so many of those dignitaries from the district of O'Neilland, the family of Hy-Brasil, and the race of Colla Da-chrioch. And it would seem to have been nothing else than an opposition to this powerful influence, on the part of the Owen mentioned at A.D. 825, that involved him in that struggle, in defence of his claims as a member of a different family, which occasioned so much bloodshed and destruction as is noticed in connection with the history of that year. That family influence greatly affected, if it did not wholly regulate, the successive appointments to the primacy and other offices referred to in the above extracts, they certainly appear strongly to indicate. But the principle was not, perhaps, then, either so exclusively acted on, or so productive of abuses in other ways, as in the period which follows: and this may possibly have been one reason why the circumstance, as connected with the former period, has attracted so very little attention, while so much has been bestowed on its results as exhibited in the history of the latter.

Proceeding now to this latter portion of the subject, we find, in the corresponding part of the Annals, *i. e.*, from an early part of the tenth to the middle of the 12th century, the following entries, bearing more or less on it:—

A.D. 925. St. Maelbride, son of Torman, successor of Patrick, &c., died at a good old age.

A.D. 936. Two successors of Patrick—viz. Joseph, scribe, bishop, and anchorite, the wisest of the Irish, and Maelpatrick, son of Maeltila, bishop and wise man, who had been Abbot for five months, died.

A.D. 946. Casey, son of Ailche, Bishop of Cinel-Owen, *i. e.*, Tyrone, died.

A.D. 957. Casey, of Drumhorry, son of Dulgen, successor of Patrick, a bishop eminent among the Irish, died.

A.D. 965. A change of Abbots at Armagh—viz., Dudalche in the place of Murray of Slievegullion.

A.D. 966. Murray, son of Fergus, successor of Patrick, died. Casey, son of Murchadan, Bishop of Armagh, died.

A.D. 980. Conaing Ua Flannagain, vice-Erenach of Armagh, died.

A.D. 982. MURRAY, son of Murechan, prior of Armagh, died.

A.D. 983. Murray Ua Flannagain, lector of Armagh, died.

A.D. 985. A great riot in Armagh on the Sunday before Lammas, &c., in which was killed a son of Traynor,

A.D. 993. MURECHAN of Bodoney, successor of Patrick, made a visitation of Tyrone, &c.

A.D. 994. Clerken, son of Leren, priest of Armagh, died. Maelmury, son of Scanlan, Bishop of Armagh, died.

A.D. 998. Dudalche, son of Kellach, successor of Patrick and Columkille, died June 2nd.

A.D. 1001. Traynor, son of Kelchan, prior of Armagh, killed. A change of Abbots in Armagh—viz., Maelmury, son of Hoey, substituted in the room of Muregan of Bodoney.

A.D. 1003. HOEY Ua Flannagain, Erenach of the Strangers' Asylum in Armagh, and of Clonfeacle, and a sage of repute among the people of Ireland, died.

A.D. 1006. Arvey, son of Cosgry, Bishop and Scribe of Armagh, died.

A.D. 1010. Murray, son of Crechan, successor of Columkille, and lector of Armagh, died.

A.D. 1011. Scoly, son of Clerken, noble priest of Armagh, [died of an epidemic.]

A.D. 1015. Flannagan, son of Conaing, Vice Erenach of Armagh, died.

A.D. 1020. MAELMURRY, son of Hoey, successor of Patrick, head of the clergy of all the north-west of Europe, and Head of the Dignity of the Western World, &c., died, and AWLEY was appointed successor of Patrick by the laity and clergy.

A.D. 1022. Malachy the great [King of Ireland], &c., died at Cro-Inis, in Lough Ennell, in the 73rd year of his age, on Sunday, September 2nd, after earnest penitence for his transgressions and offences, after the receiving of the body and blood of Christ, and after having been anointed at the hands of Awley, successor of Patrick: for he, and the successor of Columkill [*i. e.*, Abbot of Derry,] and the successor of Kiaran [*i. e.*, Abbot of Clonmacnoise,] and most of the seniors of Ireland, were in attendance upon him, and sung masses and hymns, psalms and canticles, for the welfare of his soul.

A.D. 1032. MAELTILA, Bishop of Armagh, died.

A.D. 1039. Murray, son of Flanagan, Vice Erenach of Armagh, died.

A.D. 1044. Niall Ua Kelehan, lord of Hy-Brasil, and his brother, *i.e.*, Traynor, were blinded by the sons of Madden, through treachery and guile.

A.D. 1049. AWLEY, successor to Patrick, died; and DUDALEHE, son of MAELMURY, son of Hoey, succeeded to his place, from the office of Lector. And Hugh Ua Forrey succeeded to the Lectorship.

A.D. 1053. Dulgen, noble priest of Armagh, died.

A.D. 1056. Hugh Un Forrey, chief Lector and eminent Bishop of Armagh, died.

A.D. 1061. Conaing, Vice Erenach of Armagh, died.

A.D. 1063. Madden Ua Kelehan, prior of Armagh, died.

A.D. 1064. DUDALEHE, son of Maelmury, successor of Patrick, died, after choice penance; and MELISA, son to AWLEY, succeeded to the abbacy.

A.D. 1068. Colman Ua Crechan, lector of Armagh, died.

A.D. 1069. Flannagan, son of Hugh, Vice Erenach of Armagh, died after a well-spent life.

A.D. 1075. CUMUSGACH Ua Heron, abbot of Armagh, died.

A.D. 1077. Elva, wife to the Lord of the Oriors, and successor of Moninna [*i.e.*, Abbess of Killeavy, near Newry], died.

[N.B.—She was, no doubt, sister to the Conaing mentioned at A.D. 1061, above, he being called in the *Annals of Ulster* 'Conaing,' son to Innavar, and she, in like manner, 'Elva, daughter to Innavar.' Dr. O'Donovan's remark on her is as follows:—"This is an instance of a married woman being successor of St. Moninne."]

A.D. 1089. Gilpatrick Ua Kelehan, vice-abbot—*i. e.*, prior, of Armagh, died.

A.D. 1091. MELISA, successor of Patrick, died after penance, on December 20th; and DONALD, son of Awley, was immediately appointed in his stead.

[This Donald was brother to Melisa, both being sons of Primate Awley (A.D. 1049, and A.D. 1064, sup). A sister of theirs is thus noticed in the Annals of Ulster, at A.D. 1078:—"Dunesa, daughter to Awley, the successor of Patrick, and wife to the King of the Oriors, died." See the entry at A.D. 660, above, and the note there.]

A.D. 1096. Maelpatrick, son of Arvey, Bishop of Armagh, died.

A.D. 1099. Kencorach Ua Boyle succeeded to the bishopric of Armagh, on Whit-sunday.

A.D. 1105. DONALD, son of Awley, exalted successor of Patrick, &c., died. . . . KELLACH, son to Hugh, son of Melisa, was appointed to the successorship of Patrick by the election of the men of Ireland, and took his orders on St. Adamnan's day.

[The death of Kellach's father, "Hugh, son of Melisa, successor of Patrick," is noticed in the *Annals of Ulster*, at A.D. 1095, but omitted by the Four Masters.]

A.D. 1106. Kencorach Ua Boyle, Bishop of Armagh, died.

A.D. 1108. Hugh, son of DUDALEHE, one entitled to succeed to the office of successor of Patrick, and who was Vice Erenach of Armagh, died.

A.D. 1113. Flannagan, son to MELISA, entitled to become successor of St. Patrick, died after unction and choice penance.

A.D. 1129. KELLACH, successor of Patrick, &c., . . died. . . . MURTAGH, son of DONALD, was thereupon appointed to the successorship of Patrick.

A.D. 1132. MAELMOGUE Ua Morgair—[*i. e.*, the famous St. Malachy,] sat in the successorship of Patrick, by desire of the clergy of Ireland. . . . . Maelbride, son of Dulgen, noble priest of Armagh, &c., died August 27, aged 80.

A.D. 1133. Conaing, son of DUDALEHE, Vice Erenach of Armagh, died. . . MURTOGH, successor of Patrick, made a visitation of Tyrone, &c.

A.D. 1134. Melmogue Ua Morgair made a visitation of Munster, &c. . . . MURTOGH, son of DONALD, son of AWLEY, successor of Patrick, died, after the victory of martyrdom and penance [*i. e.*, died penitent and triumphant over all his earthly troubles]. NIALL, son of Hugh, was appointed to the successorship of Patrick. A change of abbots took place in Armagh, Maelmogue Ua Morgair being substituted for Niall, &c.

A.D. 1135. Flann Ua Shinney, warden of the Staff of Jesus [*i. e.*, the Crosier of St. Patrick, supposed by the Irish to convey to the possessor a title to the primacy], died. Maelmogue Ua Morgair, successor of Patrick, bought the Staff of Jesus, &c.

A.D. 1136. Maelmogue Ua Morgair, successor of Patrick, visited Munster. A change of abbots took place in Armagh, Niall, son of Hugh, being substituted in place of Maelmogue. . . Maelmogue resigned the successorship of Patrick for the sake of God.

A.D. 1137. A change of abbots in Armagh—viz., the Erenach of Derry [Gelasius] in place of NIALL, son of Hugh.

A.D. 1139. NIALL, son to Hugh, son of MELISA, successor of Patrick for a time, died, after earnest penitence.

Among the prelates, whose names occur in the latter part of this list especially, the system of hereditary succession comes out in a very plain and striking light. Hoey, an Erenach of Armagh, who died in 1003, was father to

Maelmury, primate in 1020, who, dying in this latter year, was immediately succeeded by Awley. After him comes, A.D., 1049, Dudaleibe, son to primate Maelmury aforesaid; next, A.D. 1064, Melisa, son to primate Awley. Then, A.D., 1091, Donald, another son to primate Awley. After him, A.D. 1105, Kellach, or Celsus, grandson to Melisa. Then, opposed by Malachy, but still acknowledged as primate in the Irish Annals, Murtogh, son to Primate Donald, A.D. 1120; and, after him again, A.D. 1134, Niall, son of Hugh, and brother to Primate Kellach.

How much longer this interesting family succession might have gone on inheriting the chief place of dignity in the Irish Church, according to their national system of Tanistry, had not such a course been interrupted by extraneous causes, it is impossible to say. But what was thought of the system when it began to attract attention abroad, and how it came to be altered, will appear in what is to follow.

(To be continued).

THE PARISH PRIEST AND HIS PARISHIONERS.

Times of controversy are often times of trouble and annoyance to the religious instructors of the people. We sometimes think that the Roman Catholic clergy of the present day must look back with a sigh of regret to the comparatively quiet and tranquil lives which their predecessors passed in this country eighty or one hundred years ago; or, still more, to that long period of repose, which lasted from the seventh to the fifteenth century, and to which ill-natured writers have given the name of "the dark ages." In those days, the clergy led an easy life; their peace was undisturbed, and their slumber was unbroken by the angry storms of controversy. There were but few books, and no newspapers or penny posts, in those days. What little learning there was, was altogether in the hands of the priests, just as it was in ancient times among the Egyptians; and the clergy could teach the people *what* they pleased, and *how* they pleased, without fear of reproof or contradiction. If they chose to tell their flocks that purgatory or extreme unction were taught by our blessed Lord, in the gospels, the people were sure to believe them; for but few of them, from the prince to the peasant, were able to read, and fewer still had a copy of the Bible in their possession. If a priest, in his sermon, were to quote the authority of St. Augustine, or St. Chrysostom, or any other of the ancient fathers, in proof of the Pope's infallibility, he might be absolutely certain that his assertion, whether true or false, would be implicitly believed; for there was no one to contradict him. In short, with regard to all matters relating to books or learning, the people were in the condition of blind men, who, if they wished to know anything at all, were obliged to see with the priest's eyes.

Now, however, the case is widely different. Knowledge is not confined to the priesthood; the schoolmaster is abroad; and mankind can no longer be kept in the leading-strings by which, in olden times, they were wont to be led. Men have learned to read, aye, and to think for themselves; and it is no wonder that religion, the most important of all concerns, should now begin to occupy much of their thoughts. Now-a-days, if a priest, in his sermon from the altar, quotes a passage from scripture (though it is commonly said that this is not a very usual occurrence), many of his hearers have their Douay bibles at home, and can quickly tell whether the priest be right or wrong. If he brings forward any argument from the fathers, for the authority of the church, the people need not take *his* word for it. They can read the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, or they can go to some controversial sermon, or, in some other way they can contrive to learn both sides of the question; and those of them who are really in earnest, and anxious to be taught the truth, can lay their doubts before the priest, and ask him to remove their difficulties. From all that we can learn, however, the priests in general are not at all fond of this. They do not like to be asked questions, and no wonder; for the questions are often puzzling questions, and require a good deal of learning to answer; and the joint sagacity of the parish priest and the coadjutor are often unequal to the task, especially if they happen to have forgotten what they learned at Maynooth. And then, if by any chance they should happen to be drawn into an argument with a Protestant clergyman or layman, in the presence of any of their own flock, it is a very unpleasant thing for them to be beaten, (for such accidents will sometimes happen, even in the best regulated parishes), and to be then obliged to scold and to get angry. When people lose their temper, it is generally a sure sign that they are getting the worst of the argument. This happened not long ago to the parish priest of Ballymartyr, the day he preached his sermon about "the Rock of the Church." But, before I tell you the story, I had better explain, in the first place, how the matter came about.

Ballymartyr is thought by some persons to be the prettiest village in all Munster. It is many years since I have been there, and I do not know what changes the famine or the emigration may have made in it: but, when I knew it, it was quite a pleasure to walk or ride through it, from the contrast which it afforded to most Irish villages. It consisted chiefly of one long street of white-washed cottages, most of which were models of neatness. At one end there was a handsome nobleman's place, the road to which was bordered by a double row of tall old trees, whose long branches had interlaced, and, in summer time, proved an effectual screen against the burning rays of the sun. The old church stood on a little hill, overlooking one end of the village; and at the other, a large new chapel had recently been erected. Altogether, it would be hard to meet with a calmer or a prettier spot.

In olden times, the Protestant clergyman and the parish priest, Father O'Reilly, used to get on very peaceably together. The former, to his shame be it said, was a careless, lazy man, who did not look after his own flock, much less the Roman Catholics. He contented himself with going through the ordinary services in church, and allowed the priest, unchecked and unheeded, to carry off, from time to time, many members of his small congregation. This was chiefly done by the promotion of mixed marriages; when these took place, the children, almost as a matter of course, went to mass; and it is in this way, as every body knows, that so many persons in Ireland are now Roman Catholics, whose grandfathers or grandmothers were Protestants. In our own day, the Protestant clergymen do their duty better, and the children of mixed marriages are often taught and brought up as Protestants, which is the reason, I suppose, why Archbishop Cullen, in his last jubilee pastoral, has pronounced such a bitter condemnation of these marriages. Had that prohibition always been in force, Ireland would have been, for the most part, a Protestant country now.

However, the old clergyman at last died, and a new one, the Rev. Mr. Smith, came to Ballymartyr, in his stead. He was a hard-working, active man, up early and late, who knew every house, and almost every person in his parish, and had a kind word for everybody. He established a relief society, to distribute food and clothing to the poor; he got up schools, and provided the best masters for them; and, in short, he left nothing undone to promote the welfare of the people. The old churchyard, as I have said, was on a hill-side, overlooking the little village; and sometimes, when any person died, and the country people, as will often happen, came in crowds to his funeral, Mr. Smith would stand on a tumbstone, with his hat off, in such a position that the wind carried what he said, and would speak a word in season to them, about death and eternity, and their immortal souls, and would direct them to Jesus, the only Saviour of sinners. Emboldened by the kindly reception he met with on these occasions, and encouraged by the attention with which his remarks were received, he, at last, ventured to hold some evening lectures in his church, to discuss, in a friendly way, the principal points of controversy between the Churches of England and Rome. He is now gone to his rest, having been carried off by the famine fever, which he caught while carrying food to a starving Roman Catholic family; but his memory is still fondly cherished by the warm-hearted people among whom his life was spent.

Among the persons who used sometimes to go to these lectures, was a respectable farmer, named John Mahony. This man bore a high character among his neighbours for steadiness and good conduct. He lived in a neat cottage, at the far end of the row of trees before mentioned, and was looked upon, by Father O'Reilly, as one of the best members of his flock. He was never absent from his place at mass; his Easter dues were punctually paid, and his house was always one of the "stations" visited by the priest in his annual rounds. Some time, however, before the date of our story, one or two circumstances had occurred, which rather weakened Mahony's confidence in Father O'Reilly. One night, his wife Norah, whom he dearly loved, was taken dangerously ill—so much so, that she was not expected to live many hours. The distracted husband sent a messenger in all haste for the priest, to administer to her the last rites of the Church. The way was long, and the night wet and tempestuous, and Father O'Reilly, though not in general an indolent man, could not bring himself to leave his fireside, and persisted in saying, that the case was not so urgent as was supposed. To satisfy the importunity of the messenger, he gave him the vessel containing the holy oil,* and promised to be at the house early the next morning. When he arrived, however, Mrs. Mahony was dead.

The grief of John Mahony for the loss of his wife was much increased by the injury which he believed she had suffered from the absence of Father O'Reilly, and his vexation was augmented when the priest asked what seemed to him to be a very large sum as the price of the masses to be said for her soul. Father O'Reilly was not commonly a griping man; but the new chapel which I before mentioned had cost more money than he expected, and the balance must be made up some way or other. Mahony would have given all he possessed in the world if he thought it would save his departed wife a moment's pain; but somehow the priest's carelessness about extreme unction made him doubt whether the masses would really help her out of purgatory. Mr. Ferguson, a gentleman of considerable learning, who lived near Mahony, and used often talk with him on the road, once made a remark on the subject which caused a very deep impression. "There are two things," said Mr. Ferguson, "which I think, if I were a Roman Catholic, I should never like in the Pope, because they seem to me to argue a great want of good nature. The one is, that he can see his children wrangle so fiercely about the sense of Scripture, and yet will not give one the infallible meaning of every place that is controverted; and the other is, that he suffers so many souls to lie in purgatory when he may let them all forth if he please, which yet he will not do, unless money is paid him." Mahony's oldest little boy used to bring home his Douay Testament from school, and his father happened one day to take it up, and opened it at the place in the Acts (chapter viii. 20), where St. Peter said to Simon Magus, who offered him money—"Keep thy money to thyself to perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money." "Deliverance from purgatory," said Mahony to himself, when he read these words, "is surely the gift of God; and can the priests be the true followers of St. Peter if they refuse to say masses unless they are paid for them? Is it not too bad that the advantage which the rich have over the poor in this world should last even beyond the grave?"*

These feelings were shared by others in the parish besides John Mahony; but the circumstances above-mentioned caused them to take a stronger hold of his mind than of the rest. The doubts which he began to entertain of the truth of the Roman Catholic system were considerably strengthened by what he heard at one or two of Mr. Smith's lectures. He took more interest than he had hitherto done in the discussion of the points of difference between the two churches, and he used sometimes talk the matter over with one or two of his neighbours of an evening, after the work of the day was done. Father O'Reilly quickly discovered that several of his flock were beginning to think for themselves, and the discovery caused him no small alarm. He had denounced Mr. Smith's lectures from the altar; but the curiosity of the people had been excited, and although they stopped attending them for a time, after a little while they came as freely to the lectures as before. What was Father O'Reilly to do? After long deliberation, when he found that he could not silence Mr. Smith, he determined to try and meet him at his own weapons, by taking up the controversy himself. Accordingly notice was given in the parish that on the following Sunday, after last mass, Father O'Reilly would preach a sermon on the authority of the Church. Great interest was excited by this notice, and the chapel was crowded to excess.

Father O'Reilly took for his text the well-known passage of St. Matthew's Gospel (xvi. 18)—"Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church." On these words he delivered a long and clever address to his flock; in the course of which he did not spare the Bible-readers, who were causing him so much trouble and uneasiness. "Protestants," said he, "are always talking about the Bible, and arguing out of the Bible; but why won't they listen to *all* that the Bible says? Did not our Blessed Lord declare, in words so plain that the children yonder can understand them, that St. Peter was to be the rock on which the holy Catholic Church was to be built?—'Thou art Peter,' said he. Now, Peter means a rock; and will any man tell me where this rock is to be found, except in our holy father the Pope and the Catholic Church? Stand out before me and the congregation, any of you that go sneaking along in the dark to listen to Parson Smith. 'Tis well seen that you are ashamed of what you're doing, leaving the Church in which you were born and bred, to follow a ranting Methodist like him. Stand out before me, and tell me, if any of you can, on what rock is Parson Smith's Church built? Can he claim any share in St. Peter, when, as everybody knows, the name of Protestant was never thought or heard of until the time of the turncoat, Luther, about three hundred years ago? You say you want to belong to Christ's Church; and how can you belong to it, if you leave the Church that is built on St. Peter, the rock and foundation-stone that Christ himself laid? And where would you look for St. Peter's Church, if not in the holy Church of Rome? The blessed St. Peter lived at Rome, and died at Rome. His bones are under the high-altar, where the Pope himself says Mass. The Catholic Church is not like your new-fangled Protestant sects—it is as old as St. Peter himself; it has existed from the very beginning of Christianity! it has grown and spread to the farthest corners of the world, and the gates of hell shall never prevail against it!"

This, and much more to the same purport, and sup-

* A similar occurrence happened, a short time since, in the West of Ireland. The survivor shortly after became a Protestant. The writer had an interesting conversation, about three summers ago, in Switzerland, with an intelligent Chamouni guide, which shows how sensitive Roman Catholics are to these instances of neglect. "There are seven priests," said he, "in Chamouni; sometimes they all go off together to the town of Serroz to amuse themselves; and if any person is sick, he may die during their absence. Now, the priests are always telling us that if we die without the rites of the Church, we shall be badly off in the next world, and yet they go away themselves, and expose us to this very danger. They must either be very hard-hearted men," he added, "*or else they cannot believe what they tell us.*"

* If our friend Mahony's reading had extended to the history of the Council of Trent, he would have seen that some of the learned fathers of that body were quite of his way of thinking. They proposed to decree that the sacraments should be given for nothing, and that not only should the priest ask for nothing, but that he should accept of nothing. "Freely ye have received," said the Gospel (Matt. x. 8), "freely give." Their advice, however, was rejected by the rest. The great majority of the venerable men who composed the Council could not find it in their hearts to assent to such a liberal scheme, which would for ever dry up some of the richest sources of their wealth. Their feelings, in fact, seem to have corresponded pretty closely with those of the miser in "Old Mortality"—"I canna do it, Allie, I canna do it—I canna part with the siller." And so they left the old usages and abuses as they found them.—Vide Father Paul Sarpi, Hist. Conc. Trid. lib. ii. § 57.

ported by a good deal of learning, was delivered with great energy—for Father O'Reilly was terribly in earnest—and he ended by denouncing a heavy curse against any person who should venture to go near Mr. Smith for the future. The crowd of people dispersed: some praised Father O'Reilly up to the skies, for they had never heard him preach such a sermon before, and the unwonted display of learning had quite overcome them. "Isn't he the great preacher entirely!" said one to another. "What a power of larning he has in his head! Well, it is a fine thing, surely, to have a priest that knows all the ould writers, with the big, jaw-breaking names! No one ever heard the like of *that* from Parson Smith. Poor man! 'twould be long before he could preach such a sermon; he speaks so simple-like, that he's fit only for the children to listen to. Father O'Reilly would settle him at once."

John Mahony was, of course, in his place in chapel that morning, and was one of the most attentive listeners to the sermon. He was a good deal perplexed by Father O'Reilly's confident assertions, that all the old writers, from the earliest times, acknowledged St. Peter to be the rock of the Church. "If the only true Church," thought he, "is built on St. Peter, and if the Church of Rome is built on him, and the Pope is his successor, mustn't we be safe if we stay in that Church? Sure, all the learned people that lived long ago can't be wrong; and why should we give up the old Church, even though the priests are careless, griping men?" As he was walking slowly home, intent on these thoughts, he met Mr. Ferguson on the road. The latter had heard some rumours about the sermon, and was curious to know what Father O'Reilly had said. Mahony was glad of the opportunity of telling his doubts to a clever, sensible man, like Mr. Ferguson; and almost before this gentleman had time to put a few questions to him, Mahony began to relate the scene which took place in the chapel, as well as he could remember it. He was just in the middle of the sermon, when who should come up but Father O'Reilly himself, looking rather heated, after his morning's work. The parish priest was on pretty intimate terms with Mr. Ferguson, for he was naturally of a sociable turn; and besides, one of the near relatives of the latter was a wealthy Roman Catholic, at whose house they frequently met. The following conversation then took place:

Mr. Ferguson.—Good morning, Father O'Reilly, I hear you had a fine congregation at Mass to-day.

Father O'Reilly.—True for you, Mr. Ferguson, and glad would I have been to have seen you in the front of them all, by the side of your worthy uncle. Who knows but you may become a Catholic yet?

Mr. Ferguson.—My friend Mahony has been telling me a little of the sermon you preached; and there are one or two things that I would be glad to have cleared up, if you have time to listen to me now.

Father OReilly.—With all the pleasure in life.

Mr. Ferguson.—Is it not the case, Father O'Reilly, that every parish priest, when he gets his benefice, takes a solemn oath that he will never interpret Scripture, except according to the *unanimous* consent of the ancient Fathers?

Father O'Reilly.—It is the case; and this is the great advantage which the Catholic Church possesses over all the Protestant sects. A Protestant parson may turn and twist Scripture as he pleases, according to what he calls his private judgment; but we know that we must be right, when we follow the unanimous teaching of the great doctors of the Catholic Church.

Mr Ferguson.—Mahony tells me that you were proving in your sermon to-day, that St. Peter is the rock on which Christ said he would build his Church. Now, do all the Fathers agree in this interpretation of St. Matthew's words?

Father O'Reilly.—Certainly they do—that is, not exactly *all*; there may be one or two, perhaps, that differ a little; but they are not worth mentioning. Tertullian, Cyprian, Gregory Nazianzen, Epiphanius, and all the great divines of the Church, all teach that St. Peter was the rock.

Mr. Ferguson.—The reason I ask you the question is, that I was lately reading on this very subject; and I copied in my note-book some of the passages I met with, that seemed to *deny* that St. Peter was the rock. Perhaps, as you are fresh from your sermon, you might be able to explain them to me.

So saying, he pulled his note-book out of his pocket, and began to turn over the pages. Father O'Reilly began to feel a little uneasy. The fact was, that, notwithstanding his confident manner, his learning was by no means profound, and he was rather alarmed by the cool, quiet, determined way, in which Mr. Ferguson was going on. However, as Mahony was obviously listening with eager interest to the conversation, he felt that it would never do for him to shrink from the discussion. The conversation then proceeded as follows:—

Mr. Ferguson.—The learned writer, Origen, who lived about 200 years after Christ, in his explanation of this very text in St. Matthew, writes as follows*—"He is the Rock, whosoever is a disciple of Christ. If thou thinkest that the whole Church is built by God upon Peter alone, what wilt thou say of John the son of Thunder, and of each of the other apostles? Shall we dare to say that the gates of hell shall not prevail only against Peter? Or are the keys of the kingdom of heaven given only to Peter?"

Now, what do you say to this, Father O'Reilly?

Father OReilly.—Oh! every one knows that Origen was a heretic. Who would go to learn the doctrine of the Catholic Church from the like of such a fellow as that?

Mr. Ferguson.—Well, I am willing to admit that Origen, with all his learning, *did* hold some strange notions; yet, for all that, he seems here to speak good common sense. And though he was a heretic on some points, yet many of your own divines, Father O'Reilly, are very glad to praise him, and make much of him, because in two or three places, he talks like a man who had some glimmering notions about purgatory, (which was the chief subject, by the way, on which his opinions were condemned as erroneous by the ancient Church). But we will let Origen alone. Have you any fault to find with St. Augustine?

Father O'Reilly.—No; St. Augustine was a sound orthodox father, and he is one of the chief authorities I quoted in my sermon. Did you ever read what he says in one of his discourses (Serm. xv., de Sanctis) "The Lord called Peter the foundation of his Church; and, therefore, the Church deservedly venerates this foundation stone on which the lofty ecclesiastical edifice is built?"

Mr. Ferguson.—Yes; I know Cardinal Bellarmine quotes that passage; but if you had looked into the edition of St. Augustine's works, published by the learned Benedictine editors, they would have told you that this discourse was none of Augustine's. But I suppose you were misled by your Breviary which makes the very same mistake as Bellarmine.

Father O'Reilly.—Well, you cannot deny that he wrote the following words (Psalm. cont. par. Don.)—"Reckon up the priests who have sat in the seat of Peter. This is the rock which the gates of hell cannot conquer."

Mr. Ferguson.—Did you never read the Retractations of St. Augustine, Father O'Reilly?

Father O'Reilly.—No!

Mr. Ferguson.—For if you had, you would have seen that this eminent Father changed his mind upon the interpretation of this very text. "I wrote in a certain place," saith he, "of the Apostle Peter, that the Church was built upon *him*, as upon a rock;" but I know that afterwards I very frequently expounded our Lord's words—"Upon this rock I will build my Church"—as referring to *Christ*, whom Peter confessed, saying—"Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God." Of *these two opinions, let the reader choose whichever is the most probable.*"* Now, did you give your congregation this liberty of choice, Father O'Reilly?

Father O'Reilly.—No! why should I? Cock them up with a choice indeed! What right have they to choose, when the Catholic Church has already settled the question?

Mr. Ferguson.—Well, you see St. Augustine, at any rate, thought that Christian people had a right to choose for themselves in this matter. But there is another passage in which he expresses his meaning yet more plainly, in his comment on the last chapter of St. John's Gospel (Tract cxxiv.), "The Lord said, 'upon this rock I will build my Church,' because Peter had said 'Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God.' *Upon this rock*, saith he, *which thou hast confessed*, will I build my Church. *For the Rock was Christ, on which foundation even Peter himself was built.* 'For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ' (1 Cor. iii. 11)."† There is no possibility of mistaking the meaning of these words: even a child could understand them. But I fear I am trying your patience, Father O'Reilly, so we will go on if you please to another orthodox writer. Did you quote St. Chrysostom as one of your authorities?

Father OReilly.—No; I do not think I did.

Mr. Ferguson.—Well, perhaps, you were right, for I fear any reference to St. Chrysostom would have rather spoiled your argument. In his comment on this text (Matt. xvi. 18.), he says—"Upon this rock I will build my Church—*that is, on the faith of his confession* (*τουτεστι τη πιστει της ὁμολογιας.*)‡ And again, in his homily on St. John (i. 49) "Christ saith, that he would build his Church on Peter's confession."§ And I could give you the names of a whole host of fathers—Hilary, Cyril of Alexandria, and many others‖ who agree with St. Chrysostom in his interpretation. One of them in particular, Theodoret, remarks very sensibly—"Our Lord permitted the first of the apostles, whose confession he fixed as a prop and foundation of the Church, to be shaken."¶ He seems to have thought that if Christ had fixed St. Peter's *person* as the foundation of his Church, instead of his confession, the Church would have been shaken when Peter so shamefully denied his Lord. Perrone, a distinguished controversial writer of your own Church, in giving an account of the opinions of the fathers on this text, reckons up seventeen as interpreting our Lord's words of St. Peter's person directly; while of those who interpret them as referring to Peter's confession of faith, there are no less than forty-four!** So now, Father O'Reilly, what becomes of your "unanimous consent of the fathers," which you are sworn to follow in the interpretation of Scripture?

Father OReilly.—How can you expect me to mind all that the fathers have said? They may have been mistaken sometimes; and we are only bound to follow them, when the doctrine which they deliver agrees with that of the Catholic Church.

Mr. Ferguson.—What you have just said reminds me of a story I once heard about a lady who was excusing herself, to a friend, from the charge of having acted contrary to her husband's injunctions—"I promised," she said, "to obey my husband; and so I will, gladly, if he will only let me have my own way!" So, in like manner, you are willing enough to follow the fathers, on condition that they will only teach in accordance with what you believe to be the doctrines of the Catholic Church. But what you will say if I can produce you the authority of a Pope who contradicts what you said to-day in your sermon?

Father O'Reilly.—That is quite impossible! The Catholic Church has always taught the same doctrine, and always steadfastly maintained that the person of the blessed Apostle Peter was the rock on which it was founded.

Mr. Ferguson.—Perhaps you think so; but, nevertheless, Pope Gregory the Great thought differently. "Persist," saith he, "in the true faith, and establish and fix your life upon the rock of the Church—*that is upon the confession* of blessed Peter."*

Father O'Reilly.—I declare, Mr. Ferguson, you are enough to drive a man out of his senses! How can I tell that you havn't been quoting a pack of lies to me, taken out of some heretical book?

Mr. Ferguson.—Well, Father O'Reilly, I am quite ready to give you exact references to all my authorities when you are at leisure; and, as you are so hard to be persuaded, perhaps you would like to know that Pope Leo I. and Pope Felix III., and Pope Adrian I., and various other popes, all agreed, more or less, with Pope Gregory the Great; so that if the doctrine of the Church of Rome is not now what it was in their time, perhaps it has changed for the worse, that's all. But there is one question more which I would like to ask you before we part. Did you ever know that the Council of Trent declared that it was Peter's confession, and not Peter's person, which was the rock of the Church?

Father O'Reilly.—Do you mean to say, that you know the doctrine of the Council of Trent better than I do? Well, some people's impudence is surprising!

Mr. Ferguson.—Don't get angry, Father O'Reilly. Anger will never help a man a bit nearer to the truth. I was quite serious in what I said about the Council of Trent. In its third session, speaking of the Nicene Creed, it says, "Wherefore the Council has thought good that the symbol of faith, which the Holy Roman Church makes use of, as being that principle wherein all who profess the faith of Christ must necessarily agree, and that firm and *only foundation against which the gates of hell shall never prevail*, be expressed in the same words in which it is read in all the Churches."† Here you see that the Council of Trent declares, that the faith of the Church, as embodied in this creed, is the rock and foundation of the Church. Now, the Nicene Creed is fully and cordially believed by the United Church of England and Ireland, as well as by the Church of Rome; and, therefore, even by the showing of the Council of Trent, the members of the Church of England rest upon the one true foundation. But we do not need to rely upon the word of any man, or any set of men, in a matter of such vital importance. We are told in the Bible (1 Cor. iii. 11), "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." He is the "tried corner stone" (as he is called by St. Peter in his first Epistle), which was laid by God himself (1 Pet. ii. 6); and, if we build our hopes of salvation on him, we shall be safe for time and for eternity. Whatever be the exact meaning of the text in Matthew, whether the "Rock of the Church" be the confession of Peter, or Christ, whom he confessed, or Peter himself making this confession, one thing is clear from this, as well as other passages of Scripture, that *Christ alone* is the foundation on which a Christian ought to build. If we look away from Christ, and seek to rest the fabric of our hopes upon any fallible and contradictory interpretations of the fathers, or upon any branch of the visible Church, which is liable to error and corruption in the lapse of centuries, we may find out our mistake when it is too late"!

Father O'Reilly's *patience* had long been exhausted, and his temper was too much ruffled to allow him to reply, after the ill success of his previous efforts. He snatched the bridle from the hand of Mahony, who, all this time, had been leading his horse, and rode off without even the courtesy of bidding Mr. Ferguson good bye.

---

* We have thought it right to supply the references to Mr. Ferguson's quotations. The above passage is found in Origen, Tom. iii. p. 524-5. Paris, 1739.

* Op. S. Aug., vol. i., col. 32, Par. 1679. † Ib. vol. iii., col. 822.
‡ Op. S. Chrys., vol. viii., p. 615. Paris, 1838.
§ Ib. vol. viii, p. 138.
‖ Super hanc igitur confessionis petram ecclesiæ ædificatio est.—Hil. de Trin., vi. It would be tedious to cite all the passages
¶ Op. Theod. Ep. lxxvii.
** Vide Perrone, Præl. Theol. t., 911—"Prima classis complectitur eos patres qui verba Christi Matt. xvi. de Petri persona directe intellexerunt; tales sunt xvii. Secunda classis eos exhibet patres qui exponunt eadem Christa verba, *Tu es Petrus*, &c., de fidei confessione a Petro edita, quatuor nempe supra quadraginta."

* "In verâ fide persistite, et vitam vestram in petrâ ecclesiæ, hoc est, in *confessione* beati Petri apostolorum principis solidate." Op. Greg. M. Ep. iii., 33.

† Quare symbolum fidei, quo sancta Ecclesia Romana utitur, tanquam principium illud, in quo omnes qui fidem Christi profitentur necessario conveniant, ac fundamentum firmum ac unicum, contra quod portæ inferni nunquam prævalebunt (Matt. xvi.) totidem verbis, quibus in omnibus ecclesiis legitur exprimendum esse censet.—Decret. S.S., Conc. Trid. Sess. iii.

TALK OF THE ROAD—No. XXII.

"Well, Jem, what's the talk about now?" said Pat.

"America letters, Pat," said Jem.

"Signs by, you got one, Jem," said Pat.

"'Deed then, I did, from my daughter, Biddy, that went out a year ago; and the good daughter she is, sending me two pounds to put wee duds on the childer, and she'll send more when she gets it," said Jem.

"Well, America is the fine place," said Pat, "sure its long till she would make that here."

"There's a deal that does well there, Pat," said Jem; "but, I doubt, there's a deal too that goes there, and wishes themselves home again."

"Well, I never heard tell of that, Jem," said Pat; "there's hardly an America letter I hear of but has money in it."

"Aye, Pat," said Jem, "sure enough the creatures write when there's money to send; but then there's a deal that never writes at all, and that's more like as if they had nothing, than as if they forgot them they left in Ireland."

"Well, that's true, I'm sure," said Pat, "for sure it's good for the heart to think how them that goes remembers them that is left; and I marked that often, that them that doesn't write or send money, is seldom heard of in the neighbours letters. But how comes it, Jem, that they wouldn't write?

"Well, Pat," said Jem, "I heard something of that, and I mind it well. A while back I was waiting for the railway at Glasson, and there was a nice old gentleman standing on the platform, talking to a man; and he *was* a gentleman to look at, for his face looked as if it had seen all weathers, and his long white hair, and his clear gray eyes, that looked as if they had seen all the world; and the life there was in that old man, you would wonder to see it in one so old. And it was about *that* he was talking, how it came that so many that went there out of Ireland didn't write home; it was about the years of the famine and the fever he was talking, how the creatures took out the fever with them in the ships; and there was an island in America that was turned into an hospital, and all the ships had to put the people there; and he was there in the island, and I'm thinking maybe he was taking care of them, and I hope he was, for he was a kindly-feeling gentleman; and I heard him tell how he seen ninety-six of them buried in the one grave. And to hear him speaking, and him striking his stick on the ground, you would think the dead was rising up again afore his face, and him speaking. And it just come into my mind then, it was no wonder there was so many that was never heard tell on more; for sure the old mothers and the sweethearts in Ireland might think long afore they would get word nor tidings of the poor boys and girls that was buried in that grave."

"Well, that's the sad story, Jem," said Pat, "but sure, I mind myself, when Johnny Davis, the whitesmith, went out, with his wife and the five children—and they all took the fever, and went to hospital—and maybe it was in that island; and when he got well, and found them all dead, he just took his passage by the next ship, and came home to the old forge, a lone and sorrowful man; and I mind well the words I heard him say—'I went out full, and the Lord hath brought me home again empty;' but I don't know were them words his own, or where did he get them."

"Well, I can tell you that, Pat," said Jem: "he got them words in the Book of Ruth, in the Bible, the beautifullest and feelingest story that ever was told; nothing could beat it; and I'm often thinking there's nothing can come across us but we'll find the right words for that in the Bible, if we only knew where to look for it; and that story of Ruth is worth your reading; it goes to the heart clean."

"Well, I'll look for that next, Jem," said Pat; "but sure when we do hear of them that goes to America, isn't it the blessed thing to hear how they think of them they left in Ireland, and how good they are to them, and how they think long of the old country and the old places. I mind now, when I went up to Meath, with some cattle, last spring, and I just called in to see Biddy Farrelly, that's my mother's brother's daughter, and she showed me a letter she got from Mary Brady, that's a cousin of her's; and Mary was gone out two years, and was doing well, and she said she wanted to get married; but there wasn't a Meath boy in all that country she was in, and she said she would never marry none but a Meath boy; so she just writes home to Biddy Farrelly (for she knew that Biddy had the good heart), and she tells her to look out for a Meath boy that's a good son, and didn't drink, and she sends home seven pound ten, to get him a new suit, and send him out to marry her. So Biddy had got a clean, decent boy, in Meath, and was just sending him out, in a new suit, to be married upon Mary Brady. And, now, doesn't it show how they think of the old place and them so far off?"

"Well, Pat," said Jem, "it does one good surely to know how they think of the old place; but there's one thing they learn to think of new. I hear there's a deal of them that goes out that takes to reading the Bible. Now, I mind the letters that old Ned Flanagan showed me that he got from his daughter. Well, in the first letter he got she told him she was in a good place and doing well; but one thing was breaking her heart, for there was no chapel, nor priest, nor Mass within thirty miles of her. So, says she, 'Father dear, won't you try and get a Mass or two said for me in Ireland, and I will send the money to pay for them when I get it.' Well, its little money old Ned had, and maybe he would have thought better to spend it on duds for the children that was almost naked; but anyway he hadn't it, and so he be to wait for the masses till he got the money; for you know, Pat, 'no money no Mass.' So the next letter comes a month after with two pounds in it to keep him and the children warm, and at the end of it, says she, 'Father, dear, there's no hurry about the Masses, and you needn't get them said till I write again.' Well, a month after there comes another letter, with more money, and, says she, 'Father, dear, you needn't mind the Masses now, for I'm took to reading the Bible, and I find that better nor Masses.' So, you see, the Masses were done without, Pat, after all."

"Well, Jem," said Pat, "sure we needn't go past Father John's own sermon for that, when he read us Father Mullen's letter,* out of America, and preached against any of the people going to America any more; and told them they might as well turn Protestants at once, and sell their souls to the devil, and turn Bible-readers; and sure he made it out that there wasn't one in ten that kept to the Church of Rome there; but, sure enough, Jem, that didn't stop people going, for all that; and I'm thinking there's many a one goes, just for that same reason, because Father John told them there was plenty there to make it easy to do as they liked; and now I mind what a man told me that went to Liverpool to see his daughter off to America; there's a Protestant clergyman in Liverpool, and it's just his business to attend all the America ships that's going off; and there's a steamer that takes all the America ships down the river, pulling them with a rope; and the clergyman goes off with every ship, and comes back by the steamer; and he's reading the Bible, and talking, and praying with them as far as the steamer goes; and this man went down with his daughter, to come back with the steamer; and there was a priest, too, on board, but whether he was going to America with that ship, I did not hear; but the clergyman had them all reading the Bible, and talking to them; and the priest was looking mighty cross, at the end of the ship; and at last the priest comes for'ad, and, says he to all the people, "Is there any Catholics there?" says he. "Yes there is, severals, your reverence," says the people to him. "Well," says he, "I command all Catholics to go away out of this, and not to listen to this stuff any more;" well, with that the clergyman spoke up, and says he, "It's the Word of God himself that I am reading to you, my friends, and you are going to begin life again in the new world, and I want you to begin it new, with the word and the blessing of God;" and, with that, he asked them all to kneel down, and pray with him for that blessing; and man, woman, and child knelt down with him, and not one went away, barring the priest himself. Now, doesn't that show, that once they are out of Ireland, the people is free and willing, too, to listen to the Word of God?"

"But, Pat," said Jem, "if it's that way out of Ireland (and sure Father John himself let on that it is), why couldn't it be that way in Ireland too?"

"That's what I'm studying, Jem," said Pat, "and I don't see it plain yet; but sure that's worth the studying."

And if they see their way to that, it may help other men to see it too.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

The great mass of communications with which we are favoured renders it impossible for us to insert everything we could desire as promptly as we could wish. At this moment several letters, actually in type, are necessarily omitted for want of room, in consequence of the great length of Mr. Rourke's letter.

We would request our correspondents, both Roman Catholics and Protestants, to limit the length of their communications, and not to discuss a variety of distinct topics in one letter.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st.

To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal, which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

* We noticed this letter of the Rev. Mr. Mullen, R. C. Curate of Clonmellon, which was published in the *Freeman's Journal*, in our number for September, 1852. He calculates the numbers lost to the (R.) Catholic Church in America at 1,990,000, or, in round numbers, TWO MILLIONS.

NOTE.—It may interest our readers to know, that we ourselves saw the letters that Pat and Jem were speaking of; and we were present, too, when the old gentleman struck his stick on the ground, and told of the grave of the poor Irish emigrants. We hope that many of those who died, may have commenced their voyage with the prayers of that Liverpool clergyman.—EDITOR C. L.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, MARCH, 1854.

THE value of our periodical appears to be every day more generally felt, and the most flattering letters have lately reached us from various parts of America, expressive of a wish that agents, for the sale of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, should be appointed there—a proposal which we think worthy of our serious consideration.

Teeming, however, as the public press does, with numerous ably-conducted religious periodicals, we think we should delude ourselves if we attributed the almost unexampled success of our paper merely or principally to any superior talent or learning on the part of its conductors; though we should not have had the presumption to attempt such a paper, if we had not endeavoured to secure the co-operation of those whose abilities and acquirements, in our opinion, best fitted them for such a task.

The true reasons of our popularity, we think, consist in the fairness and novelty of the plan we adopted, which had something in it suitable to the times in which we live, when earnest men, wearied with watching mere intellectual gladiators struggling for personal or party victory, can alone be satisfied by *bona fide* exertions to arrive at truth.

The plan we adopted from our very first number, and which we have honestly carried out to the best of our power ever since, was to allow perfect fair play to those who differ from us, without compromising our own opinions or principles; not like other journals driving our opponents to find the best means they could of meeting our arguments in other periodicals, which might not be accessible to the great majority of our readers, and which might never be seen by them, but fearlessly offering them our own pages, in order to afford them every facility to refute our arguments, and convince us of the correctness of *their* doctrines if they could. In short, we desired that either we should *convince* our Roman Catholic friends, or that they should *convince* us—not on the points on which the Roman Catholic Church and all the Reformed Churches which we think have any claim to be recognized as branches of the one great Catholic Church agree—viz., the three *ancient* creeds (the Apostles', the Nicene, and the Athanasian), but on the points in which they differ—viz., the twelve points contained in the comparatively new creed of Pope Pius IV., drawn up after the last sitting of the Council of Trent, in 1563.

Now, in order to produce conviction, neither party could hope to succeed without practising gentlemanly and Christian courtesy towards each other, and we rejoice to think how little acrimony is to be traced on either side in our pages. We give our correspondents full credit for the general tone of their communications, and think, the only subject for regret is, that they have grappled only with a few points, and have left untouched many of the most important subjects, which we have most elaborately dealt with.

To illustrate this by a few instances, we would ask why no attempt has ever been made in our pages to support the doctrines of Auricular Confession, Invocation of Saints, withholding the Eucharistic Cup from the laity, Indulgences, compulsory Celibacy of the clergy, the inspiration of the books called by us Apo-

cryphal, the alleged superior accuracy of the Douay version of the Scriptures, and many others. Surely, our able Roman Catholic correspondents cannot think it right or charitable to let all we have said, from time to time, on those important subjects, pass without any answer. Whether their object be the conversion of Protestants to what their Church calls truth, or the protection of Roman Catholics from what the Church of Rome holds to be error, they cannot be altogether silent on such topics, unless they are willing to have them considered indefensible. It is in vain that they would support the credit of their Church, by writing, however ingeniously or ably, on a few points, if they shrink from the discussion of multitudes of others, which, if our arguments cannot be answered, or got over by countervailing and stronger arguments on the other side, must, in every fair and rational mind, subvert the whole system of infallibility, by proving that the Church of Rome *has erred*, and is unable to defend a variety of her own dogmas. If the decrees of the Council of Trent, which took twenty-five sessions (spread over eighteen long years) to arrive at, were based upon satisfactory reasons and arguments, and we know that much argument and discussion took place at that council during its most protracted sittings (whether it was free or fairly conducted is another matter), those reasons and arguments ought to be capable of being reproduced, and the experiment should be tried whether the best and most cogent of them might not possibly satisfy fair men still, without asking them to give up the use of their own reason, by servilely adopting the results of that of other men centuries ago.

We feel sure that if none of our highly-gifted and able correspondents will undertake the task, it is not for want of zeal or learning, but because they are not able to *satisfy their own minds* that the best arguments they can find in their ablest controversial writers will stand the test of a full and fair examination, such as we are accustomed to bestow on the subjects treated of in our pages. If we be wrong in this, we shall rejoice to find ourselves mistaken.

Again we say, our pages are open to every Roman Catholic bishop or priest in Great Britain or Ireland (and the more able and learned the better we shall be pleased) who will, in a spirit of candor and Christian love, come forward to support the dogmas of his Church by calm reasoning out of the Holy Scriptures, or the Primitive Fathers—and we can assure any such writer that he will be dealt with in an equally candid and friendly spirit, and that he will be treated with all the respect due to men earnestly desiring the propagation of what they sincerely believe to be true. We believe there are some able and high-minded men among the Roman Catholic priesthood, who would willingly see the Church of Rome reformed, if they could venture to express their real sentiments, without drawing down on themselves not only the anathema of their superiors, but the terrors of an ignorant rabble. Perhaps, the time will come, and that not very distant, when the reign of despotism and lawless intimidation may yield before the all-powerful influence of education and enlightened principles, and when priests and their flocks will co-operate cordially with one another, to promote the reign of peace, and mutual goodwill, and brotherly love, and when all will enjoy that *true civil and religious liberty*, which would leave every man free to worship God after the dictates of his own conscience, and when pains and penalties will no longer be the portion of those who venture to use the faculties which God has bestowed on them upon the most important and interesting of all subjects, involving in their consequences (whichever Church be true), the safety of millions, and, perhaps, among others, of their own immortal souls.

We shall unceasingly labour for a "consummation so devoutly to be wished", and, we trust, our friends and readers will do their part also, in so glorious a struggle.

PROPOSED REPRINT OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN—VOL. I.

Though, through the kindness of friends and correspondents, we have been enabled to complete sets of our first volume for a considerable number of new subscribers, the demand has so far exceeded the supply, that we have been reluctantly obliged to disappoint many of those who applied for them, though we have, at considerable expense, already reprinted several numbers. It is now proposed to reprint vol. i., if a sufficient number of copies should be ordered, within the next two months, to indemnify the publisher against heavy loss. Vol. ii., neatly bound and lettered, price 5s. 6d., can be had at once, and those desirous of having vol. i., also at the same price, are requested, *without delay*, to signify their wishes to the publisher, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

Correspondence.

ON THE DEFECTS IN THE MASS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—In the January number of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, you inserted my remarks on the misrepresentation of the Doctrine of the Mass in the Talk of the Road, No. xix. I have to thank you for your fairness in so doing, and also for the candid manner in which you admit Mr. Burke's mistake, as to that defect in the mass, on which he founds his attack on the Catholic faith. In the course of your remarks you dwell upon another defect, which you state to be of such a nature as to render it impossible for the people to know whether a true sacrament is *ever* administered, and that, therefore, their faith is vain. In "Talk of the Road," No xx., the same line of reasoning is pursued, in language, I must observe, less courteous, and, therefore, less calculated to persuade, than yours. You conclude by calling on me to solve the difficulty. This friendly invitation I felt bound to accept, being persuaded that the truth can never suffer by fair and temperate discussion; I intended to appear in the February number, if you allowed me that privilege, but many engagements prevented me from preparing a letter for your paper in time. My silence, I find, has reassured Mr. Burke and his friends, for Jem says to Pat, in "Talk of the Road," No. xxi., Mr. Burke is right this time, anyway." You must allow me, sir, to make some extracts from your remarks in order to state the difficulty which you require me to solve. "Suppose," you say, "that the wine was not made of grapes (*de vite*), or suppose the wine had been made of sour or unripe grapes (*de uvis acerbis seu non maturis expressum*), is the sacrament made in that case?" And, again, "what knowledge have the people whether the wine was made of grapes that were ripe or unripe, &c.; they must trust to the priest for that; can they be sure of his judgment? . . . . . And if the priest did taste the wine (*i.e.*, before consecration) is every priest an *infallible* judge whether the grapes, from which the wine is made, were really ripe or not?" In all this you seem to put the selection of wine, of a certain flavour, or degree of sweetness, on the judgment of the priest, and that in case his judgment fails, the sacrament, according to the rubric, is not made. Allow me to tell you, sir, you are in error: The rubric requires no such judgment—no such discrimination, in order to the completion of the sacrament; for a convincing proof I need only refer to sec. 2, art. iv., de defectu vini, "Si vinum cœperit acescere vel corrumpi vel fuerit aliquantum acre, &c.—conficitur sacramentum, sed conficiens graviter peccat,' which, in English, is, "If the wine begin to be sour, or decomposed, or acid, &c., *the sacrament is made*, nevertheless, the priest who celebrates is guilty of a grievous sin"—of grievous sin in not making proper and decent preparation for the celebration of so august a mystery. The sum of the matter is this, there are two kinds of defects, as I have already pointed out; those, namely, which are *capital*, in consequence of which, if they exist "non conficitur sacramentum," and others which are defects in a lower sense, which do not hinder the sacrament, which ought not to occur in the celebration of such divine mysteries, and cannot occur without great sin and scandal. Few in number, and simple in character are those defects which may be called capital. In my last letter I quoted them in the words of the Rubric—viz., 1st, proper matter; 2nd, form, with intention; 3rd, priestly order. The question between us refers to the first of these, namely, "proper matter," which the rubric requires shall be *wheaten bread*, and *wine made from grapes*. In this the Catholic Church follows the institution of our blessed Lord, and does not feel itself at liberty, in any the least degree, to vary from that form of matter which He, on so holy an occasion, vouchsafed to consecrate. This is but reasonable, and cannot be objected to by Protestants of the Established Church; for I find, on consulting the order for administering the communion, in the Book of Common Prayer, that bread and wine is the matter directed to be used; and, with regard to the bread, that it shall be "the best and purest wheat bread that can conveniently be gotten." I think I am safe in saying, that if any minister of the Established Church, either through madness or impious design, substituted for bread and wine a piece of cheese and a bottle of vinegar, no one in the congregation would consent to receive the communion in such a manner administered, or would consider that the sacrament, even according to his view of a sacrament, was administered at all. I beg to state that I do not propose this case with the slightest wish to offend, but merely as an illustration of my case. And, now, with regard to the "sour, or unripe grapes," I wish to show that the design of the Church, in her rubric, is simply this—that the matter shall be wine, and not vinegar or any other liquor whatever. Let us read sec. 1. art. iv. "Si vinum sit factum penitus acetum, vel penitus putridum, vel de uvis acerbis seu non maturis expressum, vel ei admixtum tantum aquæ ut vinum sit corruptum, non conficitur sacramentum," which, in English, is—"If the wine has become *perfect* vinegar or *perfectly* putrid, or if it has been made of sour or unripe grapes, or if so much water has been mixed with it as that it has become *decomposed*, the sacrament is not made." I need hardly remind the educated reader of this letter, that by the process of "acetous fermentation," that which is wine to-day may, in a few weeks, become vinegar, which not only, in common *parlance*, but also in a scientific sense, is *a totally different substance*. Even to the unlearned understanding of Jem and Pat I think I can make this matter plain by a familiar household illustration. Mrs. Burke, suppose, wishes to prepare a few gallons of vinegar, for pickling; she dissolves a stone of sugar in ten gallons of water, adds a little barm, and lets the vessel stand in a warm place. In the course of some weeks that which was sugar becomes, by a strange chemical process, very good vinegar, a substance of a perfectly different nature, quite unfit to use for those purposes for which sugar is required, and *vice versa*. To complete this case, I shall have to treat my readers to a little more science. Wine is the fermented juice of the grape, the fermentation being arrested in that stage called vinous or *alcoholic*. If the fermentation proceed farther—*i.e.*, into the stage called acetous, the substance becomes vinegar, and, accordingly, in the manufacture of wine, it is absolutely necessary that the grapes from which the wine is expressed shall be *perfectly ripe*, if otherwise, the product will be vinegar, not wine. To fortify this statement I shall quote a very respectable authority—viz., Dr. Ure's Dictionary of Arts and Manufactures—Article, Wine—"It is known," he says, "that *a few green grapes* are capable of spoiling a whole cask of wine, and, therefore, they are always allowed to become *completely ripe*, and even sometimes to undergo a species of slight fermentation before being plucked, which completes the development of the saccharine principle." The first paragraph, therefore, in article iv., amounts to this, that vinegar must not be used; that if anybody should so far dare to pervert our blessed Lord's institution, "non conficitur sacramentum." The next paragraph is exegetical, and leaves no doubt of this. Wine *somewhat* acid or *somewhat* decomposed, may be used without detriment to the sacrament, but certainly not without sin to the priest, who is bound by reason and sacred obligation not to engage in such divine mysteries without due preparation. The Church is as anxious, by strict and well-defined terms, to guard against heretical practices as against heretical doctrines; nor should this anxiety be wondered at when we reflect on the profane extravagances of some of the ancient heretics. The Encratites or Hydroparastatæ, because they thought it sinful to drink wine, consecrated water, the Artotyritæ offered bread and cheese. Some, animated, as the decree of the ancient council well expresses it, by a schismatical ambition, offered milk, others honey and water, some substituted pulse for bread, others pressed juice from grapes into the chalice at the time of celebration. Nor have these profanities ceased in modern times, as there is a well authenticated case of a sect of tectotallers in the United States, who, for the same reason as the ancient Encratites, have rejected the use of wine in their so-called communion, and have substituted—what? Let the reader guess. Raspberry vinegar and water. I do not know what Mr. Burke will say to this; but of this I am sure that no sensible and candid member of the Established Church can blame our rubric for requiring that the matter shall be wheat bread and grape wine; and that, for decency's sake, and the respect justly due to so divine a mystery, the best and purest quality of each "that can conveniently be gotten" shall be procured.

I remain, sir, your obedient servant,

A CATHOLIC.

P.S.—In the course of your remarks, you hastily put forward as a matter of fact that which you think is probable, "how is the wine provided for mass in the workhouses," you say, "we believe it is generally paid for out of the rates, and purchased by the master's boy in the next

shop, in a country town." Allow me to tell you that this is not the fact.

We have again to express our gratification at the very dispassionate and candid manner in which our correspondent writes, creditable alike to himself, and to our paper, which serves as a vehicle for such letters.

We have shown our own readiness to correct an error. Our correspondent will also bear with us while we keep our argument to the point.

We have *not* complained of the Church of Rome for taking due care that the sacrament of Christ should be celebrated according to Christ's own institution—that is, with real bread and wine. We never objected to any care that can be taken for securing this. On the contrary, our great objection to the Church of Rome is where she presumes to change what Christ appointed, as when she denies to almost all communicants that cup of which Christ said—"Drink ye all of it."

The point in question is this—when a Roman Catholic attends a mass, and bows down and worships the bread and wine, taking that bread and wine to be CHRIST HIMSELF, can he be sure (even supposing transubstantiation to be possible at all) that it has really taken place at that mass?

If he cannot be infallibly certain of it, there must be something wrong in the doctrine of the Church of Rome; for it is not credible that God should require us to worship something as God, without giving us the means of knowing certainly whether the thing which we worship is really God or not.

We pointed to the rubric of the mass, which expressly says, that if the wine be made "of grapes not ripe, the sacrament is not made." In that case the people are clearly worshipping mere bread and wine, and if they have no certainty that the grapes were ripe, their worship cannot be an act of faith, even if transubstantiation be true.

Our correspondent does *not* tell us *how* the people can be *certain* that the grapes were ripe. He only *says* that the meaning of it is that *wine* is to be used, and not vinegar; but that is not the meaning of the words "made of ripe grapes." There are *other* words expressing that the wine is not to be used after being turned into vinegar; but these words which we quoted and argued from, say that the wine must be made of *ripe* grapes. Our correspondent argues as if all wine made from grapes not fully ripe (*maturis*) would be vinegar and not wine. This is not the case. A few green grapes may spoil the flavour of a cask of wine, but do not turn it into vinegar, or make it cease to be wine. If our correspondent were to travel in the north of France or Switzerland, and taste the wine at the roadside inns, he would find abundant proof that wine may be made from unripe grapes and yet be wine still, and not vinegar.* And the rubric of the mass says that if such wine be used the sacrament is not made, and then, of course, the people are worshipping nothing but mere bread and wine, and that with the worship which is due to the true God!

And now, again, we ask our correspondent, when he goes to any mass, what *certainty* has he that the wine then in the cup was really made of ripe grapes? If he can have no certainty of this, how can he be certain that transubstantiation has taken place? How he can be certain that the bread and wine *at that mass* has really been turned into the body and blood of Christ? and if he be not *certain* of this, how can he fall down and worship it?

But we put another question to him also. The wine must be made *de vite*, of the vine. Now, it is notorious that a large proportion of what is sold in this country as wine was never made *de vite*, of the vine, and the imitation is often so perfect that a good judge of wine may be deceived by it; perhaps not one priest in twenty would be capable of detecting the difference. Our correspondent must admit that if such wine did get into the cup, no sacrament would be made, there would be no transubstantiation, nothing to worship but mere bread and wine. When our correspondent goes to mass what certainty has he that such wine has *not* got into the cup? If he can have no certainty about this, what certainty can he have that the bread and wine is really turned into the body and blood of the Lord? What certainty can he have that he is worshipping Christ, and not mere bread and wine.

We asked him this question, too, as well as about the ripe grapes; and now we beg to point out to him that he has not said one word in answer to this. We ask him to seek for truth with courage equal to his moderation and candour, and to try what answer he can give to this.

We will then be willing, if he wish to pursue the search for truth, to examine the doubts that must arise from the doctrine of the Church of Rome about "the intention of the priest."

---

* That wine may be, and is often made from unripe grapes, even in England, might be proved by many authorities; let the following extract suffice, from "Accums Art of Making Wine from Native Fruits." London, 1820. Page 70—"As no bad flavour is communicated by the husk, or even by the stems of the grape, this fruit may be safely taken *in any stage of ripeness* in which it can be most conveniently obtained. Unripe grapes may be obtained where the vine is largely cultivated, from the thinning usually practised on the branches in this country, where the vines are under cover. Dr. Macculloch recommends to wait till the grapes show a *tendency* to ripen, or till the advance of the cold season shows that no further change can be expected."

ON INFALLIBILITY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I beg to tender you my best thanks for your kind consideration in giving a place in your journal to my simple letter on the infallibility of the Church of Christ. May I request a continuance of your indulgence, whilst I bring forward a small portion of what remains "behind" on that interesting and all-important subject.

First, allow me to correct a mistake into which you fell, by supposing that the initials "P.B.," with which I marked the major part of my scriptural quotations, meant Protestant Bible. Now, they meant no such thing; it was "pure Bible" for which they stood. I am glad you say that the quotations thus marked are not from the authorised version.

I will begin by giving a passage from the Acts of the Apostles, which alone would be sufficient to establish the infallibility of the Church—viz., "For it hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us, to lay no farther burden upon you than these necessary things."—Acts xv., 28, P.B. The holy councils of the Church, lawfully kept for determination or clearing of doubts, or condemning of errors and heresies, or appeasing of schism and troubles, or reformation of life, and such like important matters, have ever the assistance of God's Spirit, and, therefore, cannot err in their sentences and determinations concerning the same, because the Holy Ghost cannot err, from whom (as you see here), jointly with the council, the resolution proceeds. We learn, also, that in the councils, especially (though otherwise and in other tribunals of the Church, it be also verified), Christ's promise is fulfilled, that the Holy Ghost should suggest to them, and teach them all truth, and that not in the Apostles' time only, but to the world's end. For so long shall councils, the Church, and her pastors, have this privilege of God's assistance, as there are either doubts to resolve, heretics to condemn, truths to be opened, evil men to be reformed, or schisms to be appeased.

"But when the Paraclete cometh, whom I will send you from the Father, the Spirit of Truth, who proceedeth from the Father, he shall give testimony of me; and you also shall give testimony, because you are with me from the beginning" John xv., 26, 27, P.B. "We learn by this passage that our Lord vouchsafes to join together the testimony of the Holy Ghost and of the Apostles; that we may see the testimony of truth jointly to consist in the Holy Ghost and in the prelates of the Church. "But when he, the Spirit of Truth, is come, he will teach you all truth. For he shall not speak of himself, but what tidings soever he shall hear he shall speak; and the things that are to come he shall show you."—John xvi., 13. Ever note that the Holy Ghost in that he is promised to the Church, is called the Spirit of Truth, which Holy Spirit, for many other causes, is given to divers private men, and to all good men to sanctification; but to teach all truth, and preserve in truth, and from error, He is promised only to the Church, and chief governor, and general councils thereof; and this spirit is contrary to the spirit of error, heresy, and falsehood. Therefore, the Church is infallible, and, consequently, cannot fall into apostacy. "For it is not you that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaketh in you."—Matt. x., 20, P.B. "As for me, this is my covenant with them, saith the Lord, my Spirit that is upon thee, and my words, which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, said the Lord, from henceforth and for ever. Arise! shine, for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee. For behold, the darkness shall cover the earth, and gross darkness the people; but the Lord shall arise upon thee, and his glory shall be seen upon thee. And the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising," —Is. lix., 21, and lx., 1, 2, 3, Protestant Bible. These are passages, sir, every word of which sets forth, with perfect lucidity, the infallibility of our Lord's Church; and the whole is a plain and positive prediction that that infallibility was to be perpetual, and last to the end of the world. "He said, therefore, to them again: Peace be to you. As the Father hath sent me, I also send you; receive ye the Holy Ghost."—John xx., 21, 22. "He that heareth you heareth me, and he that despiseth you, despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me."—Luke x., 16, P.B. Therefore, the Church is infallible; because to hear the bishops and prelates of Christ's Church, is to hear Christ himself; and to despise them, is to despise him.

"Remember your prelates, who have spoken the word of God to you; whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation."—Heb. xiii. 7. We are here warned to give great regard, in our belief, to the holy fathers, doctors, and glorious bishops gone before us in God's Church; not doubting but they, being our lawful pastors, had and taught the truth; of whom St. Augustine says —"That which they found in the Church, they held fast; that which they learned, they taught; that which they received of their Fathers, the same they delivered to their children." The faith and teaching, then, of the prelates of Christ's Church, who are the legitimate successors of the Apostles, must indisputably be infallible; otherwise the Holy Scriptures would never command us to hear them, and to follow their faith. Again—"Obey your prelates, and be subject to them. For they watch as being to render an account of your souls; that they may do this with joy, and not with grief. For this is not expedient for you."—Ibid., v. 17. "There is nothing more inculcated in the Holy Scriptures, than obedience of the lay people to the priests and prelates of God's Church in matters of faith, conscience, and religion. Whereof the Apostle giveth this reason, because they have the charge of men's souls, and must answer for them; which is an infinite pre-eminence and superiority, joined with burden, and requires marvellous submission and most obedient subjection from all that are under them and their government." It follows, of course, that their teaching is infallible. In the name of goodness, if they were fallible, would we be commanded to obey and be subject to them? "Sanctify them in truth," says our Lord.—John xvii., 17. "Christ prayeth that the Apostles, their successors, and all that shall be of their belief, may be sanctified in truth. Which is no desire that the Church may ever have the Spirit of Truth, and be free from error. Which prayer of Christ had not been heard if the Church might err." If anything, said God, be hard and doubtful, thou shalt come to the priest of the Levitical race, and thou shalt follow their sentence. The lips of the priest shall keep knowledge, and the law thou shalt require of his mouth. Ask the law of the priest. See Dent. xvii., 8, &c. Much more must we refer all to our bishops and pastors whom God has placed in the government of his Church, with much larger privilege than ever he did the old priests over the synagogue.

"For no man ever hated his own flesh, but nourished and cherished it, as also Christ did the Church."—Eph. v., 29. "It is an unspeakable dignity of the Church, which the Apostle expresseth often elsewhere, but especially in this whole passage, to be that creature only for which Christ effectually suffered; to be washed and embrued with water and blood issuing out of his holy side; to be nourished with his own body; to be his members; to be so joined unto him as the body and members of the same flesh and substance to the head; to be loved and cherished by him, as wife by husband; yea, to be his own most dear spouse, taken and formed out of his own side on the cross, as Eve, our first father Adam's spouse was made of his rib. This incomparable excellency of the Church, so beloved by Christ, and so inseparably joined in marriage with him, proves to every man of common sense, that she is infallible—that is to say, can never err, can never be divorced from her dear Spouse for idolatry, heresy, or other abominations." This Church, sir, is the pillar of truth, the establishment of all truth; therefore, it cannot err. It has the Spirit of God to lead it into all truth, unto the world's end; therefore it cannot err. It is built upon a rock, hell-gates shall not prevail against it; therefore, it cannot err. Christ is in it till the end of the world; he has placed in it Apostles, doctors, pastors, and rulers, to the consummation and full perfection of the whole body, that in the meantime we be not carried about with every blast of doctrine; therefore it cannot err. He has prayed for it, that it be sanctified in truth, that the faith of the chief governor thereof fail not; it is his spouse, his body, his lot, kingdom, and inheritance, given him in this world. He loveth it as his own flesh, and it cannot be divorced or separated from him; therefore, it cannot err. The New Testament Scriptures, sacraments, and sacrifice cannot be changed, being the everlasting dowry of the Church, continued and never rightly made use of in any other Church but this, our Catholic Church; therefore, it cannot err. Lactantius says—"It is the Catholic Church only that keepeth the true faith and worship of God; this is the fountain of truth; this the house of God; this the temple of faith; whither if any man enter not, or from which if any man go out, he is a foreigner and a stranger from the hope of everlasting life and salvation." St. Cyprian says—"That the Church never departeth from that which she once hath known." St. Irenæus says, that—"The Apostles have laid up in the Church, as in a rich treasury, all truth." And that "she keepeth, with most sincere diligence, the Apostles' faith and preaching." It would be endless to recite all that the holy Fathers say of infallibility; all counting it a superlative, and most vicious, pernicious absurdity to affirm that the Church of Christ may err in faith and religion. Our Lord says to his Church—"How beautiful art thou, my love, how beautiful art thou. Thou art all fair, O my love, and there is not a spot in thee. Thy lips, my spouse, are as a dropping honeycomb; honey and milk are under thy tongue, and the smell of thy garments as the smell of frankincense. Behold, thou art fair, my beloved, and comely." "Who is she that cometh forth as the morning rising, fair as the moon, bright as the sun, terrible as an army set in array? Who is this that cometh up from the desert, flowing with delights, leaning upon her beloved."—Canticles. Yes, the Church has Christ for her support, and leans upon his infallible promises that the gates of hell shall not prevail against her. After all these passages I have given from Holy Writ, which indubitably prove the infallibility of the Church of Christ, you cannot longer, without confusion, maintain that she is fallible. I defy you to show me one passage, one text, one word in the Sacred Volume which justifies the belief that the Church may err in matters of faith. I asserted that if the Church was fallible (that is, liable to err—to teach erroneous, antichristian, idolatrous doctrines), Christ could not love her. If that approaches blasphemy, I assert, reassert, iterate, and reiterate it. If

she taught, or were capable of teaching such doctrines, she would cease to be the beloved spouse of Christ, and would be full of spots and wrinkles.

May I trespass on your space and courtesy a little more, for the purpose of answering your and Bedale's objections to infallibility. You assert, that "if the Church be perfect, she must always have a perfect head." To show, then, that she always had not a perfect head, you point to the immoralities of Alexander VI. But what do that Pope's moral imperfections make against the perfection and infallibility of the Church's teaching? I fearlessly answer that they make nothing. His criminal conduct only proves that Popes are subject to human frailties in common with the rest of mankind; and that no power or authority affords sufficient security against the corruption of human nature and the influence of the passions. St. Peter denied our Lord: but did his weakness prejudice the other Apostles? No. Neither do the crimes, moral or other, of individual Popes prejudice the perfection of the Church. Our Lord foresaw the shortcomings of some of them; what he says of the Pharisees and Jewish doctors may be said of them—"Saying, the Scribes and the Pharisees have sitten on the chair of Moses. All things, therefore, whatsoever they shall say to you, observe and do; but according to their works do ye not, for they say and do not."—Matt. xxiii., 2, 3, P. B. St. Augustine, on this verse, says—"Did our Lord Jesus Christ, for the Pharisees, find any wrong to the chair wherein they sat? Did he not commend that chair of Moses, and, preserving the honour of the chair, reprove them? For he saith—'They sit upon the chair of Moses, that which they say do ye.' Neither for the Pharisees did our Lord command the chair of Moses to be forsaken, in which verily he figured his own, for he commanded the people to do that which they say, and not to do that which they do, and that the holiness of the chair be in no case forsaken, nor the unity of the flock divided, on account of the naughty pastors."

Although, in their capacity as men, the Popes have many times exhibited proofs of their weakness and corruption, yet, as heads of the Church, and in connection with the universal Church, they have, during these eighteen hundred years, taught one and the same Catholic doctrine. Liberius, of whom you spoke so much in your last number, in persecution, might yield; Marcellinus, through fear, might commit idolatry; Honorius might fall to heresy; and, more than this, some Judas might creep into the office; and yet, all without prejudice to the infallibility and perfection of the Church, or even to the office and seat, "in which," says St. Augustine, "our Lord hath set the doctrine of truth." So your first objection to infallibility, on being touched, ascends in subtile vapour.

I asserted that every work of God is perfect. You denied it, and fled like lightning, leaving your shadow behind, to the tomb of our primogenitor, whom you exhumed and planted against me, to sustain your blasphemous denial. But permit me to tell you that you gained nothing for your far-fetched argument, because Adam, in leaving the Garden of Eden, was as perfect a man in shape, form, and manly beauty as when he was created. His fall, then, did not deprive him of perfection. "Bedale" says, in your last number, that the works of God are not absolutely perfect. I beg to refer him and you, Mr. Editor, to the books of Job, Ecclesiastes, Psalms, and Ezechiel, where you will see that the works of God are declared to be perfect. I also beg leave to refer ye to the eighth verse of the sixth chapter of the Canticles, where your Lord says that his Church is perfect—"One is my dove, my perfect one is but one." If, after this, you persist in asserting that the Church of Christ is fallible, imperfect, I must only have a feeling of pity for your incredulity. God, also, calls his Church eminent. "Thus," saith the Lord God, "I myself will take of the marrow of the high cedar, and will set it. I will crop off a tender twig from the top of the branches thereof, and I will plant it on a mountain high and eminent."—Ezec. xvii., 22., P. B. What, I ask you, do all these titles—high, eminent, glorious, holy, spotless, beloved, fair, comely, beautiful, bright, perfect, &c.—which our Lord confers on the Church prove? I fearlessly maintain that they prove infallibility; and I may safely advance, and assert, without fear of being refuted, that none, not even one of these characteristic epithets could, justly, be applied to the Church, if she was fallible—that is, liable to lead the flock committed to her pastoral care from the rich, old pastures into new and sterile ones. I said that—"Without an infallible tribunal unity in faith is a thing impossible, and that unity is found, by experience, to exist nowhere but in the Roman Catholic Church." "Oh," you replied, "the Quakers are united." I emphatically deny it. Because each one, in that and every other sect, is allowed to interpret Scripture according to his private fancy; and will any rational man say that such unscriptural liberty is calculated to produce perfect unity? No; it is an absolute impossibility that anything but "individual unity" (hardly that) could be attained by such means. For instance, it is not long ago that two Protestants, of this town, had a very tart, acrimonious discussion on capital points of belief; one maintaining that such and such were the Scriptural doctrines, and the other as stoutly and as fearlessly maintaining that they were not.

> "So high at last the contest rose,
> From words, they almost came to blows."

And what threw your correspondent and the by-standers into almost breathless, convulsive laughter, was the fact that, a few moments before, when arguing against a Roman Catholic, these unpacific dialecticians declared that their thoughts and principles about religion and its mysteries were "exactly" alike. Such is the unity that exists in the sects of the Christian world. "Light is only required to make their differences appear." That is what you call the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. Individual unity. This is very far from being the unity of the Spirit of Truth and concord, which resides in, and distinguishes the Church of Christ—the holy Catholic Church. We read of spirits of discord. I wish you joy of their agreement. Perfect, collective unity, I repeat, is nowhere found to exist but in the one Church. Our Lord, to secure this unity, has furnished his Church with an infallible guide, which will preserve it until time shall be no more. You assert that our Lord has given this guide no credentials; and you add, if you found in your Bible such a text as this—"Receive the Bishop of Rome as the interpreter of my will," you would believe in the infallibility of the Church over which he presides. But what is your "receive" to these texts of the Holy Bible—"Thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven."—Matt. xvi., 18, 19. "But I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not; and thou being once converted confirm thy brethren."—Luke xxii., 32. "And the names of the twelve Apostles are these—The first Simon, who is called Peter," &c.—Matt. x., 2. "Simon son of John, feed my lambs—Simon, son of John, feed my sheep."—John xxi. These are a few extracts from the credentials which our Lord has given to the Bishop of Rome and to the Church, of which he is the head, to which your "receive," &c., is not worthy to be compared. St. Bernard says—"Why did our Lord shed his blood? Truly to redeem those sheep, the care of which he committed both to Peter and also to his successors, the Bishops of Rome."

You will never be able with all your fine arguments, to disprove the infallibility of the Church of Christ, because the odds are too much against you. On one side there is the testimony of Scripture, tradition, the Fathers, and reason; against which are "set in array" only tinsel arguments, which are the glare of false philosophy and the offspring of sophistry.

I now "come to the bower," or wood, in which you placed a blind man, and I sat down to laugh at the facility and apparent pernicity with which you got him from thence to the town without a guide; thereby endeavouring to prove the existence of a conductor to be entirely unnecessary. You forgot, in the meantime, to inform your readers that there was a learned Ethiopian, whose sight was unimpaired, in that very wood, and being asked could he find his way out, replied—"How can I unless I am guided." The Bereans, too, were in this wood, endeavouring to find the true way, but could not until two authorised guides pointed out to them the right path, in which they walked, and found it led to the town. It is written in universal characters in that wood, that the true paths thereof are so difficult to be found, from which the volatile and those void of knowledge deviating, are led to destruction; thereby implying, unmistakably, the absolute necessity which exists for a guide.

It is also written in the wood, that the private pathfinder can never arrive at the true path, because he does not put himself in communication with the makers thereof.

If, as some of your corps say, St. Augustine, St. Jerome, St. Austin, and many other ancient luminaries, went astray in that wood, how is it possible, I ask, that your "fear coach" could get to the town so easily as you say? I say that he could never get there, but would be tossed to and fro, torn, and eventually destroyed by his own pride and presumption in trusting his unstable judgment in opposition to the guides appointed to conduct him safely to the town. That is my answer to your humorous parable.

"Bedale" refers me to the Apocalyptic Churches, and particularly to the Church of Ephesus, for the purpose of showing that infallibility of teaching depended on conditions. Now, if he had read carefully the second chapter of the Apocalypse, from the first to the seventh verse, he would see that that particular branch of "Christ's Church," though fallen in charity, still preserved the true faith, and hated the deeds of the heretical Nicolaites, which our Lord says he also hated. He also refers me to the promises made to Moses and Aaron, notwithstanding which the latter fell into idolatry. But he signally failed to establish a parallel case between Aaron and the Church of Christ, to which our Lord promised the Spirit of Truth to remain with her for ever; and that the words which he had put in her mouth should not depart out of her mouth for ever. These promises were never given to Moses, Aaron, nor the old priesthood; consequently, if they fell, it would be superlatively preposterous to infer that the Church might fall. "Bedale" asserts that God's promises are conditional. I answer, that if this objection had any force, it would prove a great deal more than "Bedale" designs. For if the promises of Christ, which were addressed immediately to his Apostles, be only conditional, it follows that the Apostles had not an absolute promise of being always assisted by the Holy Ghost; which, in effect, would undermine all they either taught or wrote—that is, the whole New Testament.

He also says—"What can the Church of Rome plead more than Israel and Judah that infallibility should be hers?" I answer this question with St. Paul (Heb. viii., 6), that Christ "is the mediator of a better covenant, which is established upon better promises." It is very certain the the synagogue was never styled "the pillar and ground of truth;" nor had she a Divine assurance that "the gates of hell should never prevail against her." On the contrary, her fall in rejecting the Messias was positively foretold by the prophets; as that he should be a "stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence to both houses of Israel," &c.—Isah. viii., 14. So that if the synagogue had ever any promise of infallibility, it was not to be perpetual. But of Christ's Church, the royal Psalmist says—"They shall fear thee as long as the sun and moon endure throughout all generations."

"Bedale" with all his might endeavours to draw a parallel between Aaron and the Church of Rome, saying—"The people were weary of waiting upon God according to his own words, and desired something more tangible and exciting, and induced him, who should have restrained them, to join in their sin. Just so with the Church of Rome. The Scriptures were a sufficient guide, but the people liked not the spirituality of the simple faith; they required something more externally attractive, and their guides, seeing this disposition, did as Aaron had done, forget God, and reared up a golden idol in his place." Now, this is the grossest calumny I have yet seen. I publicly defy "Bedale" to bring forward the least proof to sustain his charge!!! He cannot, surely, be so unreasonable as to think that your readers will believe his mere, unsupported assertion. I challenge him to show me where or when the Church of Rome reared up the golden idol like Aaron. Did "just so!" It must be thinking about "Jim Crow" he was when penning that sentence. It is plain to be seen that he is on the wrong side when he could not answer my arguments without having recourse to calumny of the basest description.

The Church of Rome, sir, which is the one, holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church of our Lord Jesus Christ, whose faith is spoken of in the whole world, and her obedience published everywhere (St. Paul), did never and will never rear up "Bedale's" golden idol, but will ever be subject (Eph. v. 24) to her Divine founder, ever loved by him (v. 25), ever glorious, holy, and without blemish.—(v. 27.) She will be, until the termination of ages, as beautiful as the Aurora, as luminous as the noon-day sun, and as fair as the moon.

I am, Mr. Editor, your very humble servant,
Passage of Waterford. WILLIAM ROURKE.

P.S.—Were it not that I have already unpardonably trespassed on your space, I would undertake to answer the questions of Mr. O'Mara (who is, I may say, a cohabitant of mine), which appeared in your last. I will do so, however, on a future occasion.

In printing the above letter from Mr. Rourke, we must confess ourselves rather disappointed. From the ability and clearness displayed in his previous letter, we had expected, on the present occasion, some brief and cogent arguments in defence of the infallibility claimed by the Church of Rome. In his present declamatory and lengthy epistle, confident assertion and re-assertion, iteration and re-iteration, stand in the place of proof; and the small quantity of argument really contained in it, seems, to our plain understanding, well nigh lost in a misty cloud of words. Perhaps, however, Mr. Rourke is hardly to be blamed, if, having expended all his good arguments in his former letter, he had nothing better left than some long extracts from his common-place book.

We shall make no excuse for having supposed that Mr. Rourke used the letters "P. B.," in the same way as other writers of his Church. If Mr. Rourke deals in riddles, we do not; and we opine, that few of our readers, Roman Catholics or Protestants, would have guessed, unless Mr. Rourke had himself enlightened them, that the initials "P. B." were not meant to designate the Protestant Bible, but the Roman Catholic Douay version. We pass by the sneer with which Mr. Rourke terminates the passage, correcting and enlightening us in this particular. To follow Mr. Rourke through all the mazes of his dictatorial, rather than argumentative epistle, would far exceed the limits of our pages; but we think we need look for no better illustration of the manner in which some controversialists are wont to build an immense fabric upon a very small and insufficient Scriptural foundation than one or two of the examples with which the foregoing letter supplies us. Let us take, for instance, his first extract out of the 15th chapter of the Acts. It would, of course, be impossible to know the meaning of any passage of Scripture without referring to the passage, and looking at the context in which it stands. Our readers, then, on referring to the chapter of the Acts just mentioned, will find that the facts narrated in it are as follows:—Certain Jewish converts had come down from Jerusalem to Antioch, and informed the Christians of that city that they must be circumcised and keep the law of Moses. The people of Antioch, desirous to know whether this was really the case, sent up a deputation to the Church at Jerusalem to ask for their decision upon what was then a very important question. The apostles and elders met together at Jerusalem, and decided that the observance of the law of Moses, was *not* made obligatory upon Gentile, converts, either by the authority of the Holy Ghost or by the power which our Lord had left to his apostles to make regulations for the government of his Church. This is the plain meaning of the passage quoted by Mr. Rourke; and

we now request our readers to turn back to his letter and see what a structure he has built upon this narrow foundation. Let them compare the two lines of what the Bible actually *does* say, with the seventeen lines which, according to Mr. Rourke, it *ought* to have said. For, undoubtedly if councils in every age were as certain of infallible guidance as the apostles were, it would have been but reasonable to expect to find in Scripture some such declaration and assurance of their infallibility as Mr. Rourke *professes* to have found in this 15th chapter of the Acts—with how much or how little reason our readers can now judge for themselves.

The next passage quoted by Mr. Rourke is an equally convincing illustration of his power of seeing deeper into the meaning of Scripture than his more matter-of-fact neighbours. Our readers will have the goodness to refer to the extracts from the 15th and 16th chapters of St. John's Gospel, which commence Mr. Rourke's fourth paragraph —"But when the Paraclete cometh, whom I will send unto you from the Father—the Spirit of Truth, who proceedeth from the Father—he shall give testimony of me; and you, also, shall give testimony, because you are with me from the beginning." "But when he, the Spirit of Truth, is come, he will teach you all truth; for he shall not speak of himself, but what tidings soever he shall hear, he shall speak, and the things that are to come he shall show you."

Now, listen to the meaning which Mr. Rourke has extracted out of these simple words. "To teach all truth, and preserve in truth, and from error, he is promised *only* to the Church, and chief governor (!) and general councils (!!) thereof; and this spirit is contrary to the spirit of error, heresy, and falsehood; therefore (!!!) the Church is infallible." If St. John had really intended, in the above passages, to give an assurance of the infallibility of the "chief governor," and "general councils" of the Church, we humbly venture to think he would have used a little plainer language, and not left us to the somewhat precarious guidance of Mr. Rourke's logical skill, in such an (if true) all-important matter.

We proceed to Mr. Rourke's next proof of infallibility, which he finds in Hebrews xiii. 7—"Remember your prelates, who have spoken the word of God to you; whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation." Mr. Rourke here appears to maintain that it is the duty of Christian people, in all cases, as another of our correspondents (Philalethes) roundly asserts, when he calls it "an injunction without qualification, or limitation of place or time,"* to obey their prelates. If so, there can be but little doubt what the duty of the people of Ireland was at the period of the Reformation. At that time the great majority of the prelates embraced the reformed faith, and their successors, the Protestant bishops, are now, unquestionably, the prelates whom the Roman Catholics of the present day ought to obey. "No, certainly not," says Mr. Rourke. And why? we may beg leave to ask him. "Because," he would reply, "the Protestant prelates are not in communion with the See of Rome." But then, we may venture to suggest, does St. Paul say a single word about the See of Rome in the passage quoted above? And yet some such reference to the See of Rome is absolutely necessary, to enable Mr. Rourke to defend the position which he has taken up.

In charity to our readers, we must excuse ourselves from going over texts and arguments which have already been sufficiently discussed in our paper before, merely referring them to some of the pages where our articles are to be found.† They have had a sample of Mr. Rourke's power of finding *new* meanings in what appears to ordinary persons to be plain and simple passages of Scripture; and we could have found it quite as easy to adduce specimens of these far-fetched, if not impossible, interpretations in those parts of his letter on which we forbear to comment. We had asked, for instance, that he should produce any one single text which attributes an infallible authority to the *Bishop of Rome;* and he thinks that he has satisfactorily done this by citing one or two passages which speak of the precedency of the Apostle *Peter*—*e. g.*, Matt. x. 2 —"And the names of the twelve apostles are these, the first Simon, who is called Peter."

As to Mr. Rourke's other speculative arguments about the perfection of the Church, we can but repeat our former assertion, that there is not a text which appears to prove that the Church must possess perfect purity of doctrinal teaching, which would not also prove, by similar reasoning, that it should possess perfect purity of life and conduct. Mr. Rourke *admits* that the Church of Rome often possessed a very faulty head—as, for instance, Alexander VI.—but *denies*, at the same time, that it taught any faulty doctrine. We believe that the only ground for this distinction was this, that the one fact was too stubborn to be dealt with, whereas the other might be plausibly denied by a dexterous controversialist. And here, not to weary our readers, and exceed our space, we take our leave of Mr. Rourke for the present.

* See last number, page 26.

† See CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. ii., pages 82, 113, and 121.

FLOWERS FOR MARCH.

MARCH, with its many weathers, has, for once, come in like a lamb; it is to be hoped it may not go out like a lion. A few weeks have made a wondrous change in the length of the day and the face of nature. The feathered tribes have nigh recovered their mirthsome voices, and the air is glad with their song. As we go abroad, the honeysuckle meets us with its winding sprays, the chesnut tree is bursting its winter shield, and the wild flowers of the wood and field are around our feet.

The foremost among the wild flowers of the spring is the PRIMROSE (*primula vulgaris*), called the prime (first) rose of spring, from the early flowering in the field of this

"Offspring of a dark and sullen sire,
Whose modest form so delicately fine
Was nursed in whirling storms,
And cradled on the wilds."

The pale-eyed, peering, little primrose loves to dwell in woods, hedge-banks, and pastures, and to hide its beauties under the bramble shade. It has many varieties; white, lilac, crimson, double and single, all beautiful exceedingly. The cowslip, also, was ranked, by Linnæus, as belonging to the primrose family. Their lovely sister, the evening primrose, appears much later in the season. It is called the evening star of flowers, from its peculiarity of expanding after the vesper hour.

"In this glimmering earth-born star we read
The hope that, as its beauteous bloom
Expands to glad the close of day;
So, through the shadows of the tomb,
Shall breathe forth mercy's ray."

David had a foresight of this ray of mercy in the tomb. He said, boldly, "Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil; for *thou* art with me; *thy* rod and thy staff they comfort me (Psalm xxiii. 4). He is speaking of one whom he calls "the Lord, my Shepherd;" explained by our blessed Lord Jesus Christ himself, when he said, "*I* am the good shepherd" (John x. 14). Could we but realize that he is with the Christian pilgrim in his passage to that unknown bourne whence no traveller returns, and that his rod and his staff will be there to comfort and support him, the purgatory of the priests would have few terrors; masses for the dead, and prayers to saints and angels would never be thought of; and our people would apply themselves directly to the great High Priest, who has made one sacrifice and oblation of himself for their sins once and for ever, and now sits on the right hand of power to make intercession for them.

The primrose is generally found in company with the VIOLET (*viola odorata*). The name of the violet is said to be acquired from the strength of its perfume (*violendi*). The common violet (*viola odorata*), with its flowers of dark purple, is found in the woods and hedge-banks throughout the country. Between Killiney Hill and Bray they are abundant, and around Finglas. Another variety, the *viola hirta*, grows by the sea-side and on banks of sand, as at Portmarnock, and the coast near Dublin from Clontarf to Kilbarrick; it is also plentiful in the woods of Blarney, in the county Cork. The marsh violet (*viola palustris*) is met with in the marshy ground around Glenerce, and near the Waterfall of Powerscourt. Another of its species is called *viola clandestina*, from its habit of modest seclusion, hiding itself under its green, dark leaves, or under the grass, till betrayed by its sweet odour.

We need not say that the dark, blue violet has been ever a favourite with poet, peer, and peasant. Its colour was the great object of imitation among the ancient Romans—

. . . . . "Quid placet ergo?
Lana Tarentino violas imitata veneno."

Its perfume gave Shakspeare an illustration of the sweet sensations produced by music—

"It comes o'er me like the scent
That breathes upon a bank of violets,
Stealing and giving odour."

Another poet has sung of its modesty and meekness—

"When the spring comes with her host
Of flowers, the flower beloved the most
Shrinks from the crowd that may confuse
Her heavenly odour and virgin hues.

It joys and cheers whene'er I see
Pain on earth's meek ones press,
To think the storm that rends the tree
Scathes not thy loveliness."

The mighty men shall be humbled, and the eyes of the lofty shall be humbled (Isaiah v. 15), yet the Lord forgetteth not the cry of the humble (Psalm xix. 12), but giveth grace and exalteth him (1 Peter v. 5; Matthew xviii. 4). Accordingly the Apostles exhort us to put on and be clothed with humility as with a daily garment.

Another field flower of March is the DAFFODIL (*Narcissus pseudo Narcissus*) the asphodèle of France. It is the Lent lily and daffydowndilly of the early English poets. It opens its yellow chaliced flower in the commencement of the month in the woods and meadows, and along the banks of streams; and though Mackay says, he had never seen the true daffodil in a wild state in Ireland, we believe that others have been more fortunate. The poet's Narcissus and the Jonquil, so well known for their fragrance and beauty, flower in May. They are wild flowers in England, but naturalized with us, and the poet's Narcissus now grows in the open field in the county Cork.

The daffodil is a very transitory visitor, it speedily concludes its growth, and hastens away.

The MEZEREON TREE (*daphne mezereum*) now also presents its pretty sweet-scented pink flowers, clustered round its bare stem—

"Though leafless, well attired, and thick beset
With blushing wreaths investing every spray."

It is a native of our own isles, though only first noticed when imported from abroad. When its leaves are some time gone, it produces its scarlet berries, contrasting with the light pale green of its leaves.

Another early blossoming shrub of our gardens is the ALMOND TREE (*amygdalis communis*), which just now appears clad with a deep roseate bloom like the peach blossom. Its flowers and perfume have caused it to be cultivated with us, though it is in this country incapable of ripening its fruits, which we know of only from the sweet and bitter almonds of Jordan and Smyrna. In Palestine, the almond tree is a conspicuous object in the spring, and its blossoms cover the face of the land. It is associated with many interesting events in Scripture history. When Jacob was separating his flocks from those of Laban, it was rods of the almond tree that he employed. Solomon introduces the almond tree in a very touching connection in Ecclesiastes xii. 1, when enforcing the exhortation—"Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy youth"—by presenting to the mind the sudden decline of human life and strength, under the emblem of "the flourishing of the almond tree," the buds of which, when full blown, and having accomplished their purpose, suddenly change from a deep rose colour to white, and then wither and fade away. "When the almond tree shall flourish, and the grasshopper shall be a burden, and desire shall fail; *because man goeth to his long home*"—

"His locks were white as driftet snow,
(Or as the almond tree doth show)
When fully spread upon the leafless tree."

From much the same reason the almond tree is employed in another place (Jeremiah i. 2), to illustrate the promptitude of God's judgments, as it is there called "the hastening tree," from the suddenness with which it puts forth its blossoms, while its branches are yet bare and unclothed with foliage. So, again, in the controversy of Moses and Aaron with Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, it was the blossoming of Aaron's rod of almond tree, yielding almonds, that determined his title to the priesthood. This blossoming is as good a text as ever appeared on the Romish controversy, as to the office and calling of the priesthood. It is sadly perverted in the note in the Douay Bible on Numbers xvi. 2, which says, "that the crime of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, who rebelled respecting God's appointment as to the priestly office, was schism and rebellion against the authority of the Church, and pretending to the priesthood without being called to it, as is the case of all modern sectaries." The narrative itself will tell a different story to any of our friends who will read, in the Douay Version, the history of the transaction. Korah and his brethren were Levites, or ministering servants to the people in holy things, as are the pastors of the Christian Church now, set apart for the ministry of the Gospel; but not content with this, Korah and his fellows aspired to something more—to be sacrificing priests, and to fill the office of Aaron, the great type of Jesus Christ. This is exactly the position of the Romish priesthood, who, not content with the service of the tabernacle, and standing before the people to minister among them, must usurp the office of the priest (or *sacrificing* minister); whereas with us Christ our Passover is sacrificed.—1 Cor., v. 7. And Christ having appeared for the destruction of sin by the sacrifice of himself (Heb. ix. 26, Eph. v. 2), it has been done once and for ever. "For by one oblation he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified" (Heb. x. 14). "Nor yet that he should offer himself often as the high priest entereth into the holies every year with the blood of others."—(Heb. ix. 25.) This being so, the rebuke of Moses to Dathan would seem more fitting to the Romish priesthood than to the modern sectaries. "Is it a small thing unto you, that the God of Israel hath joined you to himself, that you should serve him in the service of the tabernacle, and should stand before the congregation of the people, and should minister unto him, that you should challenge to yourselves the priesthood also."—Numb. xvi. v. 9, 10.

We can scarcely close without saying a word about our national emblem the SHAMROCK (*seamrag*, trefoil in Gaelic). Mackay, in his Flora Hibernica, pronounces the shamrock, which Irishmen wear on St. Patrick's Day, to be the *trifolium repens* (Dutch clover of agriculture). It flowers in summer, and is to be found in our meadows and pastures in the spring. Its leaflets are accurately disposed in triplets; and the four-leaved shamrock is so rare that an old Irish superstition attaches to the finder of it the power of magic—

"I'll seek a four-leaved shamrock
In all the fairy dells;
And if I find the charmed leaves,
Oh, how I'll weave my spells."

Everybody knows wherefore St. Patrick is supposed to have adopted the shamrock as the national emblem of Ireland —namely, that being at a loss for an illustration of the Trinity, when preaching to the heathen Irish, he turned round and his eye rested on the shamrock. St. Patrick's teaching must have been very different, indeed, from that of Archbishop Cullen, one of whose latest pastorals adds another person to the Holy Trinity. Writing of the Blessed Virgin Mary, he says—"This tender mother *destined to co-operate in the great work of our redemption* will listen to the cry her children send forth from this valley of tears." St. Patrick taught his hearers that the work of redemption was planned by God the Father, performed by God the Son, and applied to the hearts of the Christian by God the Holy Ghost; but here we have a fourth co-operating power. Dr. Cullen has the gift of magic if he can educe from the Scriptures that which St. Patrick could not, that the Virgin Mary in any manner whatsoever co-operated in the redemption of mankind. Those who agree with Dr. Cullen should present him with the four-leaved shamrock on each anniversary of St. Patrick's Day.

New and Recent Works

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

Booksellers to the Queen,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

BURKE'S PEERAGE AND BARONETAGE FOR 1854. Revised and corrected to the present time. Royal 8vo. 38s.

THE RUSSIAN SHORES OF THE BLACK SEA, IN THE AUTUMN of 1852, with a Voyage down the Volga, and a Tour through the Country of the Don Cossacks. By Lawrence Oliphant. 8vo. 14s.

RECORDS OF TRAVELS IN TURKEY, GREECE, &c.; and of a Cruise in the Black Sea with the Capitan Pacha. By Admiral Slade. 8vo. 14s.

THE RUSSO-TURKISH CAMPAIGN OF 1828-29; with a View of the present State of the Eastern Question. By Colonel Chesney. 12s.

HISTORY OF RUSSIA, from the Earliest Period to the Treaty of Tilsit, (1807). By Robert Bell, Esq. 3 vols., fcp. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

THE RUSSIANS OF THE SOUTH. By Shirley Brooke. 1s.

TURKEY AND CHRISTENDOM: An Historical Sketch of the Relations between the Ottoman Empire and the States of Europe. 1s.

THE SECRET HISTORY OF THE COURT AND GOVERNMENT OF RUSSIA, under the Emperor Alexander and the present Czar, Nicholas. By J. H. Schnitzler. 2 vols. 8vo. 16s.

TRAVELS IN SIBERIA. By S. S. Hill, Esq. With a large coloured Map of the Russian Empire. 2 vols. post 8vo. 24s.

PROGRESS OF RUSSIA IN THE WEST, NORTH, AND SOUTH. By David Urqhart. 1s. 6d.

WYLD'S MAP OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE, THE BLACK SEA, AND THE FRONTIERS OF RUSSIA AND PERSIA. Coloured, 2s. 6d.; mounted and in case, 4s. 6d.

WYLD'S CHART OF THE NORTH SEA AND THE BALTIC. 5s.

PHILIPS' MAP OF THE FRONTIER PROVINCES OF TURKEY, RUSSIA, AND AUSTRIA, THE BLACK SEA, &c., with a detailed Map of the River Danube, showing the Fortified Towns, &c., along its course. In case. 1s.

PHILIPS' CHART OF THE MEDITERRANEAN, with detailed Plans of the Bays of Gibraltar, Genoa, Marseilles, &c. 1s.

PHILIPS' CHART OF THE NORTH SEA AND THE BALTIC, with detailed Plans of Cronstadt, Revel, &c. 1s.

THE TURKS IN EUROPE: A Sketch of Manners and Politics in the Ottoman Empire. By Bayle St. John. 7s. 6d.

TURKEY AND THE TURKS. By Rev. Archibald Boyd. 6d.

THE TURKISH QUESTION:—The Czar and the Sultan—The Cossacks and the Turk—The Turks in Europe. 2s.

HISTORY OF THE PROTESTANT CHURCH IN HUNGARY, FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE REFORMATION TO 1850, with reference also to Transylvania. With an Introduction by Dr. D'Aubigne. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

"THE KINGS OF THE EAST:" An Exposition of the Prophecies, determining, from Scripture and from History, the Power for whom the mystical Euphrates is being "dried up." With an explanation of certain other Prophecies concerning the Restoration of Israel. 7s.

THE CROSS AND THE DRAGON; or, the Fortunes of Christianity in China, with Notices of the Secret Societies of the Chinese. By J. Kesson. Post 8vo. 6s.

WORK; or Plenty to Do, and How to Do it. By Margaret Maria Brewster. 12mo. 4s.

MY SCHOOLS AND MY SCHOOLMASTERS; or, the Story of my Education. By Hugh Miller. post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

PHYSIOLOGY IN HARMONY WITH THE BIBLE, Respecting the Value and Right Observance of the Sabbath. By James Miller, F.R.S.E. Fcp. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

ROME AND THE GOSPEL. By the Rev. Dr. Morgan, Belfast. Fcp. 8vo. 2s.

RUSSIA UNDER THE AUTOCRAT, NICHOLAS I. By Ivan Golovine. 2 vols. 10s.

HISTORY OF OLIVER CROMWELL AND THE ENGLISH COMMONWEALTH, from the Execution of Charles I. to the Death of Oliver Cromwell. By M. Guizot. 2 vols. 8vo. 28s.

THE HISTORY OF THE FRENCH PROTESTANT REFUGEES, from the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. By Charles Weiss. 8vo. 14s.

A BATCH OF WAR BALLADS. By Martin F. Tupper. 6d.

ALGERIA: the Topography and History—Political, Social, and National—of Fremch, Africa. By J. Reynell Morell. 8vo. 6s.

LETTERS FROM SARAWAK, Addressed to a Child; being an accurate description of the Manners, Customs, and Religion of the inhabitants of Borneo, Malays, and Dyaks, and of the Progress of the Church Mission during the first five years; with Incidents of Missionary Life. By Mrs. M'Dougal. 3s. 6d.

THE NET IN THE BAY; or Journal of a Visit to Moose and Albany. By the Bishop of Rupert's Land. 4s. 6d.

THE GREAT SACRIFICE. By Rev. John Cumming, D.D. 5s.

THE COMFORTER. By Rev. John Cumming, D.D. 2s. 6d.

CHRIST OUR PASSOVER; or, Thoughts on the Atonement. By the Rev. John Cumming, D.D. 2s. 6d.

THE TENT AND ALTAR: Sketches of Patriarchal Days. By Rev. Dr. Cumming. 9s.

DAILY BIBLE ILLUSTRATIONS: The Apostles and Early Christian Church. By Dr. Kitto. 6s.

THE PSALMS RESTORED TO THE MESSIAH: A Commentary on the Book of Psalms. By Rev. R. H. Ryland. With a commendatory notice, by the Bishop of Cashel. 6s.

INCIDENTS IN THE LIFE OF OUR SAVIOUR ILLUSTRATIVE OF HIS DIVINE CHARACTER AND MISSION. By Rev. A. L. R. Foote. 6s.

THE WORDS OF JESUS. By the Author of the "Faithful Promiser." In Cover, 8d.; Cloth, 1s.

RELIGION IN HEART AND LIFE; or, the Fruits of the SPIRIT. By Rev. Frederick George Barton. 3s.

THE ROYAL PREACHER: an Exposition of Ecclesiastes. By Rev. James Hamilton, D.D. Cheap Edition 2s. 6d.

THE BOOK AND ITS STORY: a Narrative for the Young, on occasion of the Jubilee of the British and Foreign Bible Society. By L. N. R. With an Introductory preface, by Rev. T. Phillips. Fcap. 4s.

THE DAWN OF LIGHT; or, Scripture Truths for Infant Minds. 1s.

A PEEP INTO THE FAMILY OF MRS. DELMAR; or, a Book for Me and my Children, on National and Important Subjects. 5s.

THE NECESSITY FOR AN INTERMEDIATE SYSTEM OF EDUCATION BETWEEN THE NATIONAL SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES OF IRELAND. By the Rev. Professor M'Cosh, D.D., Queen's College, Belfast. 6d.

THE ART OF QUESTIONING; or, a Short Analysis of the Interrogatory Methods of Instruction, designed for the use of Teachers, Pupil Teachers, and Monitors. By W. T. Young, T.C.D. 1s. By post, 1s. 4d.

MEMOIRS OF THOMAS CHALMERS, D.D., LL.D. By his Son-in-Law, the Rev. Wm. Hanna, LL.D. Vol. I. 6s.

MEMOIR OF THE LATE REV. EDWARD BICKERSTETH. By the Rev. T. R. Birks. Cheaper Edition. 2 vols., fcap. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

MEMOIR OF THE LIVES OF ROBERT AND JAMES A. HALDANE. By Alexander Haldane, Esq. 8vo. 12s.

MEMOIR OF THE REV. W. H. KRAUSE, A.M., Bethesda Chapel, Dublin, with selections from his Correspondence. By Rev. C. S. Stanford. Crown 8vo. 5s. 6d.

THE SUCCESSFUL MERCHANT: Sketches of the Life of Mr. Samuel Budgett. By William Arthur, A.M. 2s. 6d.

LIVES OF THE QUEENS OF ENGLAND. By Miss Strickland. New and Revised Edition. With numerous Portraits. Vols. I., II., III. post 8vo, 7s. 6d. each. (To be completed in 8 monthly volumes.)

D'AUBIGNE'S HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION. Vol. V.—Subject:—"The Reformation in England." 8vo. 12s.

D'AUBIGNE'S HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY. Five vols. in One. 8vo. Cloth, 8s., Gilt Edges, 9s.

EXCELSIOR: HELP TO PROGRESS IN RELIGION, SCIENCE, AND LITERATURE. A Monthly Magazine, Conducted by the Rev. James Hamilton, D.D., London. Price 6d.

*** The names of subscribers received.

In a few days will be Published, Second Edition, price 6d., by post, 10d.,

A VERSIFIED DESCRIPTION OF THE GREAT INDUSTRIAL EXHIBITION in Dublin, 1853, in a Letter from I. Donoghoe to his Brother Dan. Edited by —— Scribbler, Esq., of Scribblestown Castle. 6d.

Dublin: WM. CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Lately Published,

WILLET'S "SYNOPSIS PAPISMI." New Edition. Edited by the Rev. J. Cumming, D.D. Ten vols., 8vo. Price £3.

London: JAMES MILLER, 17, Berner's-street, Oxford-street, and all Booksellers.

Fcap 8vo, cloth, 2s.

THE CONFESSION OF ST. PATRICK (translated from the original Latin), with an Introduction and Notes. By the Rev. Thomas Olden, A.B., Curate of Knocktemple, in the Diocese of Cloyne.

Dublin: JAMES M'GLASHAN, 50, Upper Sackville-street. London: JAMES NISBET and Co., Berner's-street.

Just Published,

Second Edition, with additional Facts and Anecdotes, in limp cloth, 1s. 6d., or in cloth, 2s. 6d.,

POOR PADDY'S CABIN; or, SLAVERY IN IRELAND. A true Representation of Facts and Characters. By an Irishman.

"We could desire nothing better for the British Empire, and indeed for the interests of mankind everywhere, than that 'Poor Paddy's Cabin' may have a circulation as extensive as Mrs. Stowe's beautiful narrative. The story on which the incidents are engrafted is in the highest degree interesting and gratifying, and it would do more good within the British Islands, if found in every hand, than even 'Uncle Tom's Cabin has done for the cause of Negro Emancipation in the New World!"—*Standard.*

"The Author, whose long residence in Ireland, and intimate acquaintance with the habits and feelings of the people, enable him to draw a true picture of the state of things in this hitherto neglected and most unhappy country, has, with considerable discretion, scrupulously avoided hurting the feelings of individuals, by any personal allusions. His censures are directed against the *systems* and *principles*, that prevail in Ireland."—*Morning Herald.*

London: WERTHEIM and MACINTOSH. Dublin: WM. CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Just Published, Price 3d.,

CHILDREN IN HEAVEN; A Sermon to Children, preached in Trinity Church, on Thursday, January 5, 1854. By the Rev. John Gregg, A.B.

II.

Price Twopence.

GOOD TO BE DONE, AND WHO SHOULD DO IT; A Sermon preached in Trinity Church, on Sunday, January 1, 1854. By the Rev. John Gregg, A.B.

III.

Price Twopence.

A CURE FOR CARE. A Sermon preached in Trinity Church. By the Rev. John Gregg.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Just Published, Price 3s.,

THE TWO SUFFERERS; a Record of Facts, from the Chamber of Sickness and Death. By the author of "Memorial of Christian Affection," "Token of Love to Little Children," &c.

London: Published by J. H. JACKSON, Islington Green; and SEELY'S, Fleet-street.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON, and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher, WILLIAM CURRY, 9 Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.
MARCH, 1854.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Tláir do Dhia aiñ ṗna háṗuiḃ, agur ṗíoḋċáin air an ḃealaiḋ deaġċoil do na ḋáoiniḃ.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED THE MIDDLE OF EVERY MONTH, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. III.—No. 28. APRIL, 1854. { Annual Subscription, 3s. 6d. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

PAGE.

The Vulgate 43
On the Constrained Celibacy of the Clergy—Dialogue IV. . . 44
The Old Irish Clergy—No. III. (continued from page 35) . . 45
How far is the Reformation effected by the characters and motives of the Reformers? 45
Results of Intolerance in France—Revocation of the Edict of Nantes 46
The Index Expurgatorius 48
Talk of the Road—No. XXIII. (The Glories of Joseph.) . . 49
Toleration and Unity 49
CORRESPONDENCE:
Pope Liberius and Infallibility, by a Truth-seeker . . . 50
Primitive Fathers on the Holy Eucharist, by Mr. John Duffy . 51
On the Unanimous Consent of the Fathers, by J. R. D. B. . 51
On Purgatory and the Fathers of the first three centuries . 52
What are the points of faith which the Roman Catholic Church requires to believe, and which are not in the Bible? by Mr. Collette 53
Flowers for April 53
Farming Operations for April 53

THE VULGATE.

Two Hindoos are said to have disputed once about the meaning of a speech which the Queen of England had just addressed to Parliament, in which there was some important reference to Indian affairs. The one had derived his knowledge from a translation of the speech into Bengalee, the language spoken in the province of Bengal; while the other had read a Hindostanee version, which had been made from a Persian translation; the Persian language having been for a long time used in all government offices in India. The Bengalee version of the speech flatly contradicted the Hindostanee version; and each of the disputants stoutly maintained that *his* translation gave the true account of what the Queen had really said. The dispute might have been indefinitely prolonged, and would probably never have arrived at a satisfactory termination, were it not for the fortunate intervention of a third person, who happened to know English, and who had in his possession a copy of the *Times* newspaper, containing the speech itself. The production of this document to the two disputants at once settled the question, and restored harmony between them. The story verified the old adage, that "the stream is always clearer, the nearer the fountain head."

Now, if any of our Roman Catholic readers, who may be in possession of a Douay Bible, will open the title page, he will see that it is said to be translated from "the Latin Vulgate." It would be natural for him, when he reads these words, to feel some curiosity to know what is this Latin Vulgate, from which the Word of God, the message of the King of kings, has been translated into his own mother tongue. It may occur to him to ask, was Latin the original language in which the books of Scripture were written? But a very moderate amount of knowledge will show him that this could not have been the case. Moses, and David, and Isaiah did not write in Latin, but Hebrew—in truth, the Latin language scarcely existed in their time. Again, when we come to the New Testament, we find that St. Peter and St. Paul wrote in Greek, not in Latin; and, in fact, there is not a single book, of either the Old or New Testaments, that was originally written in the Latin tongue.

When these facts have been ascertained, the question still remains to be answered—Why was the Douay Bible translated from the Latin Vulgate? Our inquirer will naturally say, would there not have been less risk of mistakes and inaccuracies, if the translators had gone at once to the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, and the Greek text of the New. Why, he may ask, did they go to the Vulgate at all? What need was there of looking to a *translation* of what Isaiah or St. Paul wrote, when they had the original words of these inspired writers written in the language in which they thought and spoke? It would have been just as reasonable for the Hindoos of our story to have relied upon the accuracy of their Bengalee or Persian translations, when they might have read the Queen's own words in the English tongue.

Our readers might puzzle themselves for a long time in searching for the true cause of this seemingly strange anomaly, which we will now proceed to explain to them. Before doing so, however, we will first state, in a few words, what was the origin of the Latin Vulgate.

In the period which immediately succeeded the first preaching of Christianity, translations of the Scriptures were made into most of the languages which were spoken in the then civilized world. The Christian pastors and teachers were everywhere anxious that their flocks should be able to read and study the Word of God for themselves. No fears were then entertained, lest the people should make a bad use of their knowledge. The early bishops and martyrs would, at once, have silenced all such doubts by our Blessed Lord's words (Matt. iv. 2)—"It is written, not in bread alone doth man live, but in every word that proceedeth from the mouth of God." In those days, Latin was the language spoken at Rome, and throughout the greater part of the western world; and in the second and third centuries, there appear to have been, not one, but *several* Latin translations of the Scriptures in common use, derived, probably, from some one original version. Printing, of course, was unknown in these times, and each copy of a book had to be separately written out, in which process, if the transcriber was a careless man, several mistakes might arise. In this way many of the Latin versions had become so corrupt in the fourth century, that the eminent scholar, Jerome, was induced to make a new translation from the original Hebrew and Greek. Jerome's translation at first met with considerable opposition. He was pronounced a heretic, and accused of falsifying the Word of God. Gradually, however, the value of his version became recognised by eminent scholars who succeeded him; and towards the close of the seventh century, it was generally received in all the churches of the west, from which circumstance its name of Vulgate—*i.e.*, the common or vulgar translation—was derived.

In this state matters stood for a long time, until at length, in the sixteenth century, the Council of Trent, among other matters, commenced to frame its decrees about the Holy Scriptures. The first question raised for discussion was, in what written document was the Word of God contained? This does not seem to be a question about which much difference of opinion ought reasonably to exist. A writer, whether inspired or not, commits his thoughts to paper. Is it in Hebrew? Then it is in Hebrew, and in Hebrew alone, that you are sure of having his thoughts, all his thoughts, nothing but his thoughts. Is it in Greek? Then it is in Greek that you will find what he meant. If you do not understand these tongues, nothing is more natural than that you should make use of a translation; but if you do understand them, why should you be prevented from going to the book as it came from the hands of the author? The only rational pretext for setting up a translation in place of the original work would be, by proving that the translation is of absolutely perfect accuracy. But if you have to do with an inspired book, the only ground on which we can reasonably assert that the translation is equal to the original, is to show that the translator is inspired as well as the original author.

And, accordingly, this was the view of the case taken by the most learned members of the Council of Trent. Louis de Catane* in particular, laid great stress on the well-known opinions of the eminent scholar, Cardinal Cajetan. This able writer was in the habit of saying, that to listen to the Latin text was not to hear the Word of God, which is infallible, but that of the translator, who was liable to error, and might deceive; he added, that Jerome himself, the author of the Vulgate, was in the right when he asserted, that to write the Books of Scripture needed the inspiration of the Holy Spirit; but to translate them into another language was a matter involving merely the exercise of ordinary talents. It was acknowledged, indeed, that if the Council of Trent were infallibly certain that their deliberations were guided by the Holy Spirit, and if they themselves undertook the task of revising the Latin Bible, they might then order their translation, so made, to be an infallible authority in matters of faith, but that they had no right to pronounce such a decision about Jerome's Vulgate, of the accuracy of which they could not be sure.

But these reasons, however strongly urged, failed to convince the understandings of the venerable men who composed the majority of the council. They had an innate horror and dread of Greek and Hebrew, and no wonder, for, perhaps, nine out of ten of them did not understand a line of either, but in Latin they were more at home; they felt somewhat like a sailor who is unwilling to trust himself to the perils of the wild ocean, when he has a safe anchorage at which he may ride securely. There was another cause which increased their antipathy to the two great original languages in which the Word of God had been composed. Many of the early reformers were eminent scholars, and used frequently to appeal to the Scriptures in their original tongues; and, as a matter of course, the venerable bishops of the council transferred a part of the hatred with which they were wont to regard the reformers, to the languages which the latter knew, but which, to themselves, were a dead letter.

An eminent historian* has given us the following sketch of a sermon, preached about the rise of the Reformation, which represents in a vivid light the horror with which the "new learning," as it was called, was regarded by the old-fashioned clergy of those days—"A new language," said a monk from the pulpit, "has been discovered, which is called the Greek. It must be carefully avoided; this language is the mother of all heresies. I see in the hands of many a book written in that tongue, it is called the New Testament; it is a book full of briars and vipers. As for Hebrew, those who learn it immediately become Jews."† These two tongues, *new*, because they were old, were looked upon as intruders; and venerable priests, grown grey in the recital of their missals and breviaries, asked indignantly what right Greek and Hebrew, forsooth, had to come and disturb the old familiar Latin, in the throne which it had so long occupied. Nay, even Cardinals themselves were not exempt from the prevailing prejudices; and in the year 1502, when the famous Bible of Alcala was published, in which the Vulgate was printed between the Hebrew text and the Greek text, Cardinal Ximenès did not scruple to assert, that it was an exemplification of Christ between the two thieves.

The Council of Trent, therefore, eventually decided that the Latin Vulgate of Jerome—that very Vulgate which had gained the writer the imputation of heresy in his own day—should now be pronounced the true text of the Holy Scriptures, and that nobody, under any pretext, should dare or presume to reject it. "If," said they, "we allow of a reference to the Greek or Hebrew text, we shall be kept in perpetual hot water. The grammarians will throw everything into universal confusion. They will then become the arbiters and judges of our faith; and bishoprics and cardinalships must be given to those pedants, to the exclusion of theologians and canonists. How can the inquisitors proceed against the Lutherans, unless they know Greek and Hebrew? These heretics will quickly say that the translation is wrong, and that the original text speaks in quite a different manner. Thus a door will be opened for the admission of every quirk and subtilty which a grammarian, either through malice or ignorance, may take it into his head to put forward and defend, by some rule of syntax, or other paltry evasion."‡ In order, therefore, to prevent simple, grammarians from giving the law to bishops and divines, the whole council—fathers, prelates, and archbishops—decided almost unanimously to approve the Vulgate version, as the *authentic* text of Sacred Scripture.§

Their conduct, it must be allowed, was natural enough, however indefensible on grounds of right reason, and unworthy of men professing to act under the immediate guidance of the Holy Spirit. However, having come to this decision, they seemed to feel that having erected the Vulgate,

* Vide Father Paul Sarpi, Hist. Conc. Trid., lib. ii., sec. 31.

* Sismondi, Hist. des Français, vol. xvi.

† We may remark, in connection with this subject, that we once met with a saying, current about the times of which we have been speaking, which exactly tallies with the discourse of the worthy monk given above—"To know Greek," it said, "is a heretical offence: to know Hebrew, is a diabolical one." (Scire Græca, hæreticum: scire Hebraica, diabolicum.) We have lost the reference to the original authority.

‡ In the above account of the differences which existed in the Council of Trent on this subject, we have not, in the slightest degree, exaggerated the plain and truthful statement of Father Paul Sarpi, who gives the names of those who spoke on the question, and the arguments which they employed.—See his Hist. Conc. Trid., lib. ii., secs. 31-33.

§ "Sacrosancta Synodus statuit et declarat, ut hæc ipsa vetus et Vulgata editio——pro authentica habeatur, et ut——quam emendatissime imprimatur."—Decret. S.S. Conc. Trid., Sess. iv.

for the first time, to the pinnacle of perfection, as an authentic exposition of the mind of Holy Scripture, it would be but prudent, to say the least of it, to make every endeavour that it should be made as accurate as possible. The Council of Trent first *approved* of the Vulgate, as the authentic text of Scripture, and then decided that it should be *corrected!* Ordinary people may think, perhaps, that they ought to have reversed this order, that they should have corrected first, and approved after; but there is no accounting for tastes. We profess merely to give a faithful account of the course which the council did actually take on this question. Their conduct would have been more rigidly consistent, though certainly not a whit more reasonable, if they had *denied* the faults of the Vulgate, and proclaimed it at once infallible and perfect, than to declare it inviolable, even while confessing its faults, and that it was about to be corrected.

The task of correction went on but slowly. Towards the close of the Council, Pius IV. appointed a commission which made some little progress in the work. Pius V. renewed it and accelerated its labours. Gregory XIII., who succeeded him, appears to have thought the reformation of the calendar a business of more pressing importance than the reform of the translation of the Holy Scripture. Twelve years afterwards, Sixtus V. ascended the Papal throne, and found the work still incomplete. With characteristic energy he urged the matter forward, and, at length, at the beginning of 1589 (a quarter of a century after the close of the Council of Trent), the Pope announced, by a Bull that the work was drawing to a close. The new Vulgate was printed under his own eyes, at the Vatican, and the Pope himself revised the proofs. "We have corrected them with our own hands," he says in the preface (nostra nos ipsi manu correximus). At length this wonderful work, the work of four Popes and five and twenty years, appeared in 1590. In the Papal Bull, which begins on the fourth page, the text of this edition is pronounced "the true, legitimate, authentic, and indubitable text;"* and all persons who should presume to alter it are threatened with "the indignation of Almighty God, and of the blessed Apostles, Peter and Paul.†"

A glance at the volume was enough to show the folly, not to say impiety, of such boastful presumption. "When the work appeared," says Hug, an eminent Roman Catholic writer, "it was impossible that it should not have given occasion for criticism and pleasantry. Many passages were found, particularly in the Old Testament, *covered with slips of paper*, on which new corrections had been printed; others were scratched out, or merely corrected with a pen. In fine, the copies issued were far from all presenting the same corrections."

It was clear, therefore, that the work should be done over again. Sixtus V. died; and the Romish theologians endeavoured to suppress the work entirely, and to substitute a new edition in its stead. Urban VII. lived only twelve days; Gregory XIV. made but little progress in it; Innocent IX., who reigned only two months, seems to have taken no part in it; and the completion of the work was reserved for Clement VIII., who published it in 1592. This new edition was also declared authentic, and accompanied with similar threats of excommunication against any who should presume to alter its text.

When these two editions—that of Sixtus V. and that of Clement VIII.—came to be compared, it was quickly found that there was the greatest diversity between them. Clauses were found in the one which were omitted in the other. They even contradict one another in various passages; and, in short, it was found that *the two books differ in more than two thousand places!*

Here was a nice difficulty for the advocates of Papal infallibility to solve! Sixtus V. and Clement VIII. had each declared that *his edition* was authentic and indubitable; and they had both denounced the heavy curse of Almighty God upon any one who should dare to assert the contrary.

But how, then, were the Romish divines to get over the awful, startling fact of the *two thousand discrepancies?* The most eminent divines were consulted. It was a difficulty which required all their cleverness and ingenuity to surmount—a real Gordian knot, which none but very sagacious casuists would ever dream of untying.

At last Cardinal Bellarmine took the matter in hand. If any one could defend the fortress of Papal infallibility, he was certainly the man to do it.

"Si Pergama dextrâ
Defendi possent etiam hâc defensa fuissent."

He is said by Hug to have owed his canonization as a saint to his publication on this question. And now the reader will ask how did Bellarmine get over the difficulty? By a very simple expedient. He proposed that all the blame should be laid upon the printer! Thus the honour of Pope Sixtus V. was saved: all the imperfections of his Vulgate were—errors of the press. Errors of the press! Surely nothing but the hardest necessity could ever have induced a writer of Bellarmine's great abilities to resort to an excuse so utterly weak and untenable. Did not Sixtus V. himself say, in the preface to his own Vulgate, "that he had corrected the sheets with his own hand?" The old and new editions, moreover, differ in many places where there was *no* error of the press in the former. The latest historian of the Vulgate on the Continent* does not hesitate to to call the assertions of Bellarmine on this point "*lies and pious frauds*," a decision which, we regret to say, appears fully borne out by the plain facts of the case. How much more manly and straightforward would Bellarmine's conduct have been if he had frankly avowed that his task was hopeless, that there were differences between the Sixtine and Clementine Vulgates which no ingenuity could reconcile. But, alas! such an admission would have been a heavy blow to the Romish dogma of Papal infallibility—a dogma which Bellarmine was resolved to defend at all hazards and in the face of the most incontrovertible facts. By his preface to the Clementine Vulgate, Bellarmine may have succeeded in gaining the honour of canonization as a saint in the Church of Rome; but we fear that he thereby justly forfeited his character as an honest man and an impartial inquirer after truth.

We cannot avoid contrasting the conduct of the two Popes who issued these "*indubitable, authentic*," and yet *contradictory* editions of the Holy Scriptures to the world with that of the translators of the authorized version of the English Bible about twenty years later, in the year 1611. The latter make no boastful pretensions to infallibility; they utter no imprecations against their opponents; their own names are not once alluded to; they merely tell us that the great object of their labours was, "that out of the original sacred tongues, together with comparing of the labours, both in our own and foreign languages, there should be one more exact translation of the Holy Scriptures into the English tongue." The new translation was to be "more exact than its predecessors;" but perfect accuracy was, perhaps, unattainable, and to this they made no claim. However anxiously we may desire to possess a perfectly faithful version of the Word of God, yet we have reason to feel deeply thankful that our faith does not depend upon an absolute agreement in every particular between the original text and the translation into our own tongue. It has often been remarked, that of all the books in the world the Bible is, perhaps, less dependent than any other upon the skill of its translators, so far, at least, as regards its general tone and purport. While it calls for the exercise of the highest abilities and more than repays all the labour that can be expended on it, yet the great leading truths which it contains are such as *cannot* be obscured, even by the most careless version. A sinner who feels his need of salvation can learn, even from a very inaccurate translation of the Scriptures, that "the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin" (1 John i. 7), and that "there is no other name under heaven given to men whereby we must be saved"—Acts iv. 12.

We entreat those of our readers, who may have leisure and opportunity, to examine for themselves the facts we have cited above, and then to consider how far they are consistent with the boasted claims of the Church of Rome, either for herself or for the Pope, to be the sole, supreme, infallible judge, both of the letter and sense of Holy Scripture. We think we have said enough to show that the decision of the Council of Trent was contrary to reason and common sense; and as regards the rival Pontiffs, Sixtus V. and Clement VIII., who could not refrain from uttering curses while sending forth into the world the Scriptures of the God of Mercy and Love, we leave them to the real or pretended influence of their own rash denunciations.

DIALOGUE ON THE CONSTRAINED CELIBACY IN THE CHURCH OF ROME, BETWEEN TWO ITALIAN GENTLEMEN.—No. IV.

Eustachio.—According to what you have said hitherto, it is clear that from the earliest times of the Christian Church the clergy, as well as the laity, had an undoubted right to marry. Now, if it be true that the long possession of anything secures enjoyment of it to the possessor, the Church of Rome cannot in reason forbid the marriage of her clergy.

Salviano.—Long possession is, sometimes, pleaded even in matters of religion. Why, the Church of Rome uses this very pretence, and says that our reformers have wronged her, whilst by their reformation they have tried to take away her purgatory, her masses, and many other things of which she boasts a long possession. This is not the place to enter into controversy about our reasons for having protested against such doctrines. I only ask you how (admitting the theory of long possession) Rome has taken away the right of marriage from the clergy, a right which they possessed for more than a thousand years? She may, perhaps, assert that this right was not well founded; but how can that be, when it was granted them by God himself, and when so many holy bishops and priests have taken advantage of it?

Eustachio.—But tell me, was there none who ever thought of once more permitting the clergy to marry? I think I have heard it said that many have urgently required this.

Salviano.—Ah! dear friend, it was soon perceived what would be the fruits of the new law of celibacy. St. Bernard says, "take away from the Church" (observe that Rome, by the word Church, means the clergy), honourable matrimony, and it will be filled with keepers of concubines (Bernard, serm., 66 in Cant.). In the 13th century, Bishop Durandus, in prescribing the method of reforming the Church, gave his advice, that it would be useful if, by a council, marriage should be granted to the priests, seeing that up to that time they were forced to chastity *in vain*; and that that might be easily brought about, inasmuch as the Greek Church still possessed this right, and that the Church in general acted upon it in the time of the apostles—De modo concilii celebrandi, art. 46. Æneas Sylvius himself says—"Perhaps, it would not be the worse that many priests should marry; many might be saved in conjugal priesthood who are destroyed in a barren presbytery" (In actis concil. Basil, lib. 2): and Baptista Platina explains the sentiments of this author in these words—"The clergy have been forbidden to marry for good reasons, but for better ones should this privilege be restored to them" —(In vita Pii II., fere in fine).

Eustachio.—Truly, this was the speech of an honest man. What I wonder at is, that Æneas Sylvius, when he became Pope Pius II., never thought of abolishing the celibacy of the clergy. I think that he should have considered it his duty to restore to them that of which they had been unjustly deprived by others.

Salviano.—You are right, but you must consider that Æneas Sylvius and Pius II. are very different. It is one thing, in fact, to be a man, and another to be a Pope. Æneas Sylvius, as a man, did not speak *ex cathedrâ*, when he said that the right of marriage should justly be restored to the priests; but, as a pope, his own interests being changed, his mind was changed along with them. In fact, if he had corrected the error, by setting aside the ordinances of his predecessors, Papal infallibility would have fallen, on which Gregory the Seventh having built was desirous thus to enforce his law. Gregory exclaimed, "*I cannot err;*" and Pius, by abrogating his law, would have made it plain to all men that he did err, at the very time in which he asserted that he could not err. Æneas Sylvius, as Pope, did not wish that the clergy should marry, although, as a man, he himself had children without being married.* I might, also, adduce many other of your popes for whom it would have been much better if they had lived in the holy state of matrimony. Innocent VIII. was the father of four sons and four daughters. I need not say anything about Alexander VI., Sixtus IV., and very many others.

Eustachio.—I think I have heard it said, that even in the Council of Trent there was a request made that the right of marrying should be restored to the clergy.

Salviano.—Certainly, many distinguished persons pledged themselves to present to the Council of Trent a memorial to this effect. Charles, Duke of Austria, son of the Emperor Ferdinand I., and Albert, Duke of Bavaria, did all that was in their power to procure for the clergy once more the right of contracting marriage; and their ambassadors demanded it loudly in the council. The same was done by Henry II., and by Charles IX., kings of France, who took great pains to promote this object. The aforesaid Emperor Ferdinand I. made strong entreaties about it to the council; and even to his death considered that it was only just to grant marriage to the clergy. But all his endeavours having been vain, Maximilian I., by means of Count Prosper, made the same request of the pope. This monarch brought forth very weighty reasons to induce him to grant the marriage of the clergy; but these too were fruitless, and did not make the least impression upon the mind of the pontiff. The Council of Trent turned a deaf ear to these most just requests, as also to many others, made by a number of the princes, for the restitution of the cup, so that the holy supper should be administered to all with bread and wine, as it was ordained by Christ, and according to the custom of the Church for many ages. It was requested, likewise, that divine service should be celebrated in the churches in the vulgar tongue, so that it might be understood by the people, but all these remonstrances were useless.

Eustachio.—At other times, however, the popes were not ashamed to retract their errors; one pope abrogated the laws of another pope, one council corrected the decrees of another council; it seems, however, that the popes who directed the Council of Trent, by sending the Holy Spirit to it from Rome, would not yield one jot; in fact, in spite of all the protests that were made to them, and all the prayers and entreaties addressed to them by people of every degree, they could not be brought to decree that Rome should grant that to the clergy, which was granted to them by God.

Salviano.—I have told you that the popes are very different men from the first holy Bishops of Rome, and that in the councils men sat who were very different from those who took their seats in the holy Apostolic assemblies. The fathers of the Council of Trent imagined that they were infallible, and their watchword was "we will not yield; we will not give in to the Lutherans; if we yield in one point only, we shall prejudice all the others; if we yield one single tittle, how shall we maintain in future that the Church of Rome is infallible?" Could there have been asked of this council, anything more just than the restoration of the cup to the people in the Lord's supper? The authors

---

* "Vera, legitima, authentica et indubitata."

† "Si quis autem hoc attentaro præsumpserit, indignationem omnipotentis Det ac beatorum Petri et Pauli Apostolorum ejus se noverit incursurum."

* Van Ess, Geschichte der Vulgata, p. 324.

* His reply to his father, who reproved him for having had a child, is so grossly indecent that I cannot bring myself to put it into English.—Translator.

of this request had nothing else in view than to see the holy supper of the Lord administered according to the command of Jesus Christ, and according to the custom of the Church for many ages. But, notwithstanding *that*, these very reverend fathers were most obstinate in their refusal. Do you know why? Because Rome had approved of communion under one kind only, and they wished to make it appear that that Church was infallible.

Eustachi.—This seems impossible; but at all events the Council of Trent must have decreed something concerning the marriage of the clergy. It must, at least, have given some satisfaction to those who demanded that they should be left at liberty to marry or not as they pleased.

Salviano.—In the 24th Sess. (which was the eighth under Pius IV.), in the 9th canon, the fathers of the Council of Trent thus decreed—"If any one shall say that clerks constituted in sacred orders or regulars who have solemnly professed chastity, are able to contract marriage, and that, being contracted, it is valid, the ecclesiastical law or vow notwithstanding, &c., let him be anathema." Among the canons which were made in that same session, there is one which excommunicates all those who shall say that the Church has not power to dispense with the impediments of contracting marriage in some of the prohibited degrees (Can. 3). Now what is this Church except it be the pope, who permits a man to marry his sister-in-law? Is it the church? No; the Church has the name of this power, but the pope possesses it in fact. Pius IV., who was the last ruler of the council, and author of these canons, gave Philip II. permission to marry his own sister. St. John the Baptist said to Herod, "It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife" (St. Matthew, xiv. 4.); but if that incestuous union was condemned by St. John, I suppose it might, for all that, by a particular dispensation, be allowed by the pope, for what is the Baptist himself when compared with his Holiness? A Roman council, moreover (celebrated under Gregory III.), thunders forth its interdicts, in the 5th canon, against the incestuous. It says—"If any one shall take in marriage his brother's wife, let him be anathema:" and all the fathers cried out three times "let him be anathema." But the Council of Trent (Sess. 24th, Canon 12), by adjudging every marriage case to the clergy, takes away the impediment—"If any one shall say that matrimonial causes do not concern ecclesiastical judges, let him be anathema." We must be very blind, if we do not see that this is a hurt to society and to secular government. In ancient times the sovereigns made the laws about matrimony, and St. Augustine (de civit. Dei lib., 15, cap. 16), and St. Ambrose (epist. 66), are our witnesses that Theodosius Cæsar was one of those who did so.

(To be Continued.)

THE OLD IRISH CLERGY—No. III.

(Continued from page 35.)

The exertions of the Church of Rome to strengthen her system of discipline, by the prohibition of marriage among the clergy, at the close of the eleventh and commencement of the twelfth centuries, are matters with which students of church history are familiar. Less generally known to them, perhaps, is the (however, not less certain) fact, that the first propagation in Ireland of the influence in support of which such efforts were made, was owing to the settlement of the Danish invaders in the country; one of whom, Gille, educated at the Norman abbey of Bec, and afterwards bishop of the Danes of Limerick, brought over with him, from France, those predilections for the whole system of the Church of Rome which he had there imbibed; and his activity and zeal being such as to gain him, in the course of time, the appointment of *first Pope's legate for Ireland*, his exertions in that capacity appear to have been the instrument, more than any other, of securing for the principle and system of Papal supremacy a firm foundation in this island.

Kellach, or Kelly (called also Celsus), successor of St. Patrick, whose name occurs at A.D. 1105, &c., above, was an earnest adopter of the views propagated by Gille, as was in a still higher degree the famous Malachy, or Melmogue, whom he nominated as his successor to the primacy: this act, although not a very canonical one, indicating sufficiently Kellach's adoption of the new system, which led him thus to exert himself, in defiance of all rights claimed by other members of his family, to alienate from them the succession to the primacy, to which their hereditary title had been through many generations so firmly established. But his efforts to break this national custom could not be expected to be let pass without violent opposition.

Malachy, on his way to Rome, in A.D. 1139, and again when returning to Ireland on that occasion, and once more, just before his death, in A.D. 1148, paid three successive visits to the great St. Bernard, at Clairvaux, which gave the latter an opportunity of inquiring with great interest into the state of the Irish Church, and learning from his visitor much concerning her circumstances that was curious and worthy of note, especially to one educated under so different a system as that under which Bernard had been brought up. Among other things, Malachy gave him a particular account of the hereditary succession which had so long been regulating the appointments to the primacy in Ireland, and of the efforts at length made to break it, in which he was himself so much interested. But in giving this recital Malachy seems to have confined his information to the case of Armagh, either not mentioning at all that this mode of succession was common and generally prevalent in Ireland, or else, perhaps, describing it as carried out in Armagh in an exclusive way, which led to abuses not so much to be observed elsewhere. This appears from the circumstance that St. Bernard, in his *Life of Malachy*, attacks with much fury the Armagh family succession, but makes no allusion to the operation of the same system in other places in Ireland. With regard to the former, his observations are to the following effect:—

"A most atrocious practice had been established, by the diabolical ambition of certain people of noble rank, that the holy see [*i.e.*, of Armagh] should be obtained by hereditary succession; for they would allow none to be bishops there save such as were of their own tribe and family. Nor was it for any short period that this execrable succession had been going on, some fifteen generations having already been exhausted in such villainy. And so firmly had this wicked and adulterous generation established their unholy right (or wrong, rather, deserving to be punished by the worst death), that although there were at times no clergymen to be found of their blood, yet bishops they never were without. In fine, there had already been before Celsus, eight persons, who were married and without orders, yet still men of education. Hence arose throughout Ireland all that relaxation of Church discipline, powerlessness of censures, and annihilation of religion aforesaid."

Celsus, therefore (or Kellach), anxious, according to St. Bernard, to remedy these evils, nominated Malachy for his successor; who, however, did not immediately nor easily obtain the office. "For, lo, of the wicked race, another, named Murtogh, seizes on the post, who for five years, by the aid of the secular power, settled himself on the Church, not a bishop, but a tyrant." And his "presumption," Bernard says, maintained this condition of "ecclesiastical adultery" (a Church with two bishops appearing to him like a wife with two husbands) for three years (see A.D. 1129, 1132, above); after which Malachy secured in part the "successorship of Patrick," in spite of the "numbers, power, and ambition of that noble family who had now for about 200 years kept possession of the sanctuary of God." He could only, however, act in the office *through the country*, being excluded from appearing in Armagh by the power of his adversary, Murtogh, so long as he survived.

Murtogh dying A.D. 1134, "one Niall" (Nigellus—*i.e.*, *blackish*), says St. Bernard, "yea, a thorough black, seized upon the see. For Murtogh, while yet alive, had made provision to this effect, against his own soul, that, going out of the world to be damned, he might have for heir one in whom he could still persist in adding to his works of damnation; for this latter, too, was of that damned race, a kinsman of Murtogh's."

What a strange contrast between the Irish obit of Murtogh, as above given from the *Four Masters*, at A.D. 1134, and the obit of the same individual in St. Bernard's Latin *Life of Malachy*. According to one, "Murtogh, Successor of St. Patrick, died penitent—yea, triumphant;" according to the other, "Murtogh—no bishop, but a tyrant, an ecclesiastical adulterer—went from this world to be damned, yet still to live in an heir, provided for the purpose of adding to his deeds of damnation!" Why this difference? It arises, simply, dear reader, from the different feelings of the parties telling the same story in their different ways—it being told, in the first case, by men who looked at the matter simply in an old Irish and national point of view; in the other case, by one who viewed it as a zealous member of the Church of Rome as then existing, and seeking to establish her influence in Ireland.

Our next paper will, we hope, throw some further light on the matter so far elucidated in the present one.

R. K.

HOW FAR THE REFORMATION IS AFFECTED BY THE CHARACTERS AND MOTIVES OF THE REFORMERS.

It has been usual with Roman Catholic controversialists, since the time of the Reformation, to attempt to throw discredit on the Reformation itself by vilifying the characters of the principal persons who were engaged in bringing it about. Luther, Calvin, Zuinglius, Cranmer, and Knox have been charged with almost every crime that has disgraced the most infamous of men; and the vocabulary of malignant abuse has been exhausted to supply epithets sufficiently vile for such pestilent disturbers of the established order of things. These charges, it is needless to tell any one who knows anything whatever about the subject, have been met and refuted, over and over again. The most irrefragable evidence has been adduced, not from friends of the reforming party, but from impartial historians, and even from *enemies*, showing that the charges in question are either pure inventions, or such gross misrepresentations of facts as to be destitute of any force as proofs. Yet these charges still continue to be brought forward. Like the giant in the fable, each successive overthrow only seems to lend them new life and vigour. Thus, in a recent Roman Catholic Catechism,* which, it appears, enjoys an extensive circulation, the very first page that we open contains a choice selection of the old stories about Luther, by which it was attempted to drag him down to the level of the heretics, the magicians, and unnatural monsters who, it is admitted by Baronius and Bellarmine, found means to seat themselves, from time to time, in the chair of St. Peter. In this Catechism, we ourselves soon recognised all our old acquaintances—the stock stories which we had occasion, some time since, to track through many a dusty folio, until we left them overwhelmed, as we thought, by a weight of opposing evidence which no wise Romanist would now venture to resist. It was, therefore, not without some surprise that we found them all furbished up anew, and marshalled in imposing array, just as if they had never before been challenged and refuted. At first, we felt inclined to be somewhat provoked at this cool ignoring of all that had been said and written upon the subject; but, upon second thoughts, we saw reason to change our mind, and rather to rejoice that these ancient calumnies were again raked up and paraded with such affected triumph. In matters of every-day life, when two rival causes are submitted to our judgment it is usually regarded as a presumption in favour of one of them, when its opponents, instead of assailing it with legitimate arguments, endeavour to raise a prejudice against it by abusing its advocates, and blackening their characters; and we are, on the other hand, irresistibly led to suspect that there must be something radically unsound in the cause of those who indulge in such personalities, and seek to divert attention from the facts and reason of the case to discussions either entirely irrelevant, or, at least, of very secondary importance. We recognise, at once, the well-known tactics of unscrupulous advocates, and we conclude that a cause which needs such advocacy, must be inherently weak and bad. This, we think, is the result to which, in ordinary disputes, every impartial and sensible looker-on is inevitably led. And the presumption becomes a certainty, when it further appears that the individuals so attacked have already satisfactorily vindicated their characters from the aspersions cast upon them, and that the charges, so pertinaciously insisted on, are nothing better than exploded calumnies. Unfair dealing of this kind, at all times reprehensible and offensive, becomes doubly so in matters of religion. Every right-minded man feels instinctively that the sacredness of the subject ought to protect it from the pollution of such base and dishonourable devices. And yet, unfortunately, it is too true that the proverbial bitterness of religious strife has nowhere more frequently displayed itself than in this very mode of procedure. When the doctrines of the Reformation proved too stubborn to be refuted by argument, the characters of the Reformers were assailed by every vile calumny which the malignity of defeated controversialists and the wrath of an offended hierarchy, conscious that their system had received a fatal wound, could devise. These accusations were, as we have said before, met and answered as soon as they were made. But they form too inviting a topic for popular declamation to be given up merely because they are groundless. Accordingly, Mr. Keenan and other controversialists of the same stamp gloat over them with manifest delight, and retail them for the benefit of those who are ignorant enough to believe that they are all unquestioned facts.

Nor is this the only unfairness of which inquiring Roman Catholics, no less than Protestants, have to complain in this matter. A moment's reflection will show that besides the suspicious charges which are sought to be palmed upon the ignorant as established facts, there is also a gross fallacy at the bottom of the argument deduced from them. The argument is the following:—The *Reformers* were bad men; therefore the *Reformation* must be a bad thing, and its doctrines must be false. No reasonable man requires to be told that this conclusion is not necessarily true, even admitting the assumed fact that the authors of the Reformation were worthless men, influenced by selfish and bad motives. Let us just apply the same argument to one or two other cases in which party bias does not interfere to warp our judgments. The Barons of England, in the time of King John, were licentious, lawless, and selfish men; therefore, *Magna Charta* is worthless. The Crusaders were, for the most part, greedy and unprincipled adventurers; therefore, the religion of which they were the champions—viz., Christianity—is false; and the faith against which they fought—viz., Mahometanism—is true. Every one, including, probably, Mr. Keenan himself, would at once exclaim that this reasoning is invalid. And yet, the argument of Roman Catholics against the Reformation and in favour of their own system, from the supposed bad characters of the promoters of the former, is, in principle, not one whit more sound.

We might let the matter rest here, as even the general answer just given is abundantly sufficient for the vindication both of the Reformers and the Reformation. We are not, however, disposed to stop at this point, but we shall proceed to examine the question more in detail; and we undertake to show not only that the assumed facts are false, and that the argument founded upon them is nugatory; but that, if it be admitted to be valid, it puts into Protestant hands a weapon which may be wielded with the most deadly effect against the very system which it was framed to uphold—viz., the system of the Papacy.

We have then two distinct assertions to deal with—*first*, that the principal Reformers were selfish, worthless, and wicked men; and, *secondly*, that the fact of their being

* "Controversial Catechism," by Rev. S. Keenan. Edinb., 1851.

so necessarily vitiates everything which proceeded from them. We will discuss the second point first, because if it be once shown that such an inference is untenable or proves too much, the cause of the Reformation, about which we are more concerned than about the characters of its promoters, remains unshaken, whatever may be said or thought of the motives or acts of the Reformers.

Now, in the first place, it is most important to bear in mind that Luther and the rest of the Reformers did not seek to set up a system of *their own devising* in opposition to that of Rome. They objected to certain received dogmas and practices that they were unscriptural and opposed to the teaching and usages of the best ages of the Church. Their professed design was to free the existing Church from the corruptions which had gradually overspread it in the lapse of ages, and to bring it back to the simplicity and purity of primitive times. This design they sought to effect by directing men's attention to Holy Scripture, as the authentic record of the Divine will, and asking them to judge for themselves whether the doctrines and practices against which they protested were or were not conformable to the letter or spirit of the Gospel. No matter, then, what their motives or what their private characters may have been, such was the professed object of the Reformers, and such were the means which they employed to compass it. To the written Word of God, as the sole ultimate standard of truth, and to the teaching of the primitive Church, embodied in the Creeds, the Reformers ever appealed, utterly rejecting the notion that they intended, like the heretics and schismatics of old, to call in question those doctrines for which clear Scriptural warrant could be produced, or those institutions and rites which could be shown to have been established by sufficient ecclesiastical authority and not to be contrary to Holy Scripture.

Against such a design, prosecuted by such means, it is utterly idle to object that its promoters were influenced by base and unworthy motives. Admitting, for argument's sake, that the existence of such motives is compatible with the pursuit of such an end, every one sees that the excellence of the latter is not compromised by contact with the former. It is unnecessary to appeal to Scripture in support of so self-evident a proposition. If Scripture proof were wanting, it exists in abundance. Thus, our Blessed Lord says to His disciples and the multitude, "The Scribes and the Pharisees have sitten on the chair of Moses. All things, therefore, whatsoever they shall say to you, observe and do; but according to their works do ye not: for they say and do not"—Matt. xxiii. 2, 3. Here a broad line of distinction is drawn between the doctrine taught, and the teachers of it. If the former be *Scriptural*, it is to be received with all attention and reverence, even though the life and conversation of the teachers may be in direct opposition to what they inculcate. And, in fact, it is, as every one knows, a fundamental tenet of the Roman Catholic, as well as of the Protestant Church, that the efficacy of the Sacraments is not impaired by the unworthiness of those who administer them. Again, St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Philippians, alludes to certain persons who were then preaching Christ in opposition to himself, and under the influence of strife and envy; but so far is he from deprecating such preaching, or warning his Philippian converts to beware of teaching coming from such a source, as necessarily dangerous and false, that, on the contrary, he rejoices at it. His words are as follow—"Some, indeed, even out of envy and contention; but some also for good will, preach Christ: some out of charity, knowing that I am set for the defence of the Gospel. And some out of contention preach Christ, not sincerely; supposing that they raise affliction to my bands. But what then? So that by all means, whether by occasion or by truth, Christ be preached; in this also I rejoice, yea, and will rejoice" —Phil. i. 15, &c. If St. Paul had reasoned—with reverence be it spoken—as Mr. Keenan and those who agree with him do, he must have denounced the doctrine of such teachers as necessarily heretical and dangerous. They taught out of contention and strife and envy (the very motives attributed to the Reformers); and yet the apostle rejoiced that even from such motives Christ was preached. The doctrine he approved, while he condemned the unworthy motives of those who inculcated it.

But, in truth, such reasoning as that of Mr. Keenan is based on principles which involve an utter disregard of all that we learn from the Bible and from the course of God's natural providence, relative to the means which He employs in order to bring about His purposes. We need not now dwell on the numberless examples, furnished by the social and political history of the world, of means apparently most inadequate to, or even positively unfitted for, the accomplishment of certain ends, yet being the very means by which those ends were attained. We prefer to notice one or two of the numerous cases recorded in the Bible, which illustrate the great truth, that His ways are not our ways, nor His thoughts our thoughts.

Who would have believed, beforehand, that a hard-hearted and unfeeling tyrant would be selected as the means of displaying Jehovah's power and glory to all the earth? And yet, so it was. God himself says to Pharaoh—"Therefore have I raised thee, that I may show my power in thee, and my name may be spoken of throughout all the earth."—Exod. ix. 16, comp. Rom. 9, 17. Who would have conjectured, before the fact, that a greedy soothsayer—perhaps an enchanter—would have been chosen as the person to bless the hosts of the living God? Yet so it was. The evil purposes of Balaam were overruled by Divine appointment, so that his employer, Balak, was forced to exclaim in the bitterness of disappointed wrath—"I called thee to curse my enemies, and thou, on the contrary, hast blessed them three times."—Numbers xxiv. 10.

Let us now consider, for a moment, whether the New Testament history lends any support to Mr. Keenan's principle, that we are competent judges beforehand of the means by which God may be expected to effect His ends. We say Mr. Keenan's principle, because his argument against the Reformation, from the supposed unworthiness of the reformers, ultimately resolves itself into the position just stated. Let us then take as the most obvious tests of the correctness of his reasoning, the cases of our Blessed Lord and His disciples. Is anything more opposed to the received notions of the adaptation of means to ends, than the fact that the author of a new religion, destined to become co-extensive with the limits of the world, should have appeared among a people proverbially despised, and separated by civil and religious institutions from all the rest of the world? And yet the Redeemer was a despised Jew. Nay, more, he was a poor Galilean, despised even by the Jews themselves. Accordingly, his countrymen rejected him (and, on Mr. Keenan's principles, very naturally) on the ground—"Can any good thing come out of Galilee?" Dr. Newman—of whom, as a convert, the Church of Rome is so proud—will suggest to Mr. Keenan another Scriptural fact, connected with the Messiah, still more opposed to antecedent probability—"Is it not," says Dr. Newman,* "very strange, and very significant, that our Lord and Saviour, the immaculate Lamb of God, should be descended not only from virtuous Ruth, the *Moabitess*, but also from *incestuous* Tamar?" We earnestly commend this "significant" fact to the attention of Mr. Keenan, and those who argue as he does.

And if we pass on from our Lord to his Apostles, we find a further illustration of the fact that the means employed by Divine Wisdom, are often antecedently improbable. What more unlikely than that a few ignorant Galilean fishermen should have been commissioned to revolutionize the world by the preaching of the religion of one who had been just condemned to the most ignominious of deaths? Might not any Jew or heathen have fairly argued, on the principles of Mr. Keenan—"It is utterly impossible that an all-wise and all-powerful Being should intend to accomplish a vast religious revolution by such means as these?" The Jew might add, still reasoning as Mr. Keenan does—"If Jehovah designed to effect a reformation of the Mosaic law, he would, doubtless, employ as His instruments the authorized heads and teachers of the established religion, the divinely-instituted priesthood, and the great ecclesiastical Council of the nation, presided over by the High Priest. An irregular movement, such as you Peter, James, John, and the rest of you, are agitating, must be the result of delusion or of fraud." Such would be the natural inference, on the principles adopted by Mr. Keenan. But hear what God himself says, speaking by his inspired Apostle, St. Paul—"But the foolish things of the world hath God chosen, that he may confound the wise; and the weak things of the world hath God chosen, that he may confound the strong. And the base things of the world, and the things that are contemptible hath God chosen; and things that are not, that he might bring to nought things that are; that no flesh should glory in his sight."—1 Cor. 1, 27, &c.

And this suggests a word, in conclusion, regarding the case of the Apostle Paul himself. What more unlikely beforehand, than that the mightiest champion of the Christian faith, the great Apostle of the Gentiles, should have been chosen from among that sect which was noted at once for the bitterest animosity against the religion of Jesus, and the most bigoted attachment to Judaism? And yet, so it was. Saul, of Tarsus, "a strict Pharisee, a blasphemer, a persecutor, and contumelious" (1 Tim. i. 13), was selected "as a vessel of election to carry Christ's name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel."—Acts ix. 15.

It is, we trust, unnecessary to guard ourselves against the misconception that, in anything that has just been said, we intend to institute a comparison between the *characters* of the Reformers on the one hand, and those of our Lord and His apostles on the other. We utterly disclaim any such intention. Our object has been, to show the unsoundness of the *principles* in Mr. Keenan's *argument* against the doctrines of the Reformation, derived from the seeming unfitness of the means then made use of to effect an end really designed by God. And if the facts and considerations just adduced be carefully weighed, they must, unless we are greatly mistaken, cause any reasonable man to pause before he assents to principles opposed to what we learn from God's dealings in Providence as well as in Revelation.

In our next number we propose to show how dangerous a weapon this argument of Mr. Keenan's (admitted to be valid) puts into our hands against the doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome itself.

* Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church, p. 438.

RESULTS OF INTOLERANCE—REVOCATION OF THE EDICT OF NANTES.

In a former number of this publication we called the attention of our readers to the intolerance of the Roman Catholic system in all former periods of her history, and we pointed out that the boasted unity of that Church was really founded upon the extermination of all its opponents. The example we then brought forward as illustrating the application of their system and its results was Spain, and we showed how intimately the intolerance of Rome, as carried out in that country, was connected with the decay and present prostration of that once potent and flourishing monarchy.

Our next instance of the same result, flowing from the same causes, shall be drawn from the history of France, and though this connection may not at first sight appear so obvious, we do not doubt that a little consideration will satisfy any impartial mind, that the fall of the French monarchy, the expulsion of the Bourbons, and the anarchy and confusion that has existed in that country for the last fifty years, may, in a great measure, be traced to that act of Louis XIV. so applauded at Rome, so startling to Protestant Europe—namely, the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes.

In France, far advanced as she was amongst the nations of Europe in the arts and sciences, the Reformation had originally made great progress. The birth-place of Calvin and of Le Fevre, the reformed doctrines had also found favour with many of the nobles, and had been embraced by the sister of the king, and by several of the princes of the blood. We are not going to recount here the scenes enacted in that country in the 16th century; the horrors of St. Bartholomew; the long civil war which the French Roman Catholics, instigated by the Court of Rome and aided by the Spaniards—the hereditary enemies of the French monarchy—carried on against their lawful sovereign because he was a Protestant, are too well known to need recapitulation here; but we propose to take up the history of French Protestantism at that period when the intestine discords of France were at length healed by the establishment of Henry IV. on the throne, and by the peace which, founded on the Edict of Nantes, secured to the Huguenots the right of worshipping God in the way their consciences allowed them.

That edict was promulgated in the year 1598, and for a period of thirty years that followed it, the Huguenots, instigated by ambitious chiefs, and distrustful, perhaps, of their old enemies, abused its provisions, and laid themselves open to the charge of rebellion and insubordination. In 1629, however, the vigorous measures of Richelieu, and the capture of Rochelle, left the Huguenots without the ability of giving further resistance to the government, and thenceforth, deserted by their former leaders—the Condes, the Turennes, and the Rohans—they devoted themselves entirely to the arts of peace. A recent French author, M. Weiss, who has written their history, says—"Compelled to apply themselves to agriculture, trade and manufactures, they abundantly compensated themselves for the other restraints imposed upon them. The vast plains they possessed in Bearn and the western provinces were covered with rich harvests. In Languedoc, the cantons peopled by them became the best cultivated, and the most fertile, often in spite of the badness of the soil. The skilful vine-dressers of Berri restored its former prosperity to that district. Those of the Pay Messin became the *elite* of the population of more than 25 villages; the gardeners of the same province brought their art to a degree of perfection previously unknown. The Protestants who dwelt in towns devoted themselves to manufactures and trade, and displayed an activity, an intelligence, and, at the same time an integrity which perhaps has never been surpassed in any country. In Guienne they took possession of almost the whole of the wine trade. In Alencon almost all the trade passed through the hands of about 4,000 Protestants. Those of Caen resold to English and Dutch merchants linen and woollen cloths manufactured at Vere, Falaise, and Argentan. The important trade which Metz maintained with Germany was almost entirely in the hands of the Huguenots. It was also to the Protestants that France owed the developement of its maritime trade at Bordeaux, La Rochelle, and the Norman ports. In the provinces of Picardy, Champagne, Normandy, the Isle of France, in Touraine, Lyonnais and Languedoc, it was they who created the most important manufactures." Previous to the Revocation of the Edict, we are told by the same author, "France possessed the finest woollen manufactures, and shared with the English, Dutch, and Italians, the rich trade in cloth. At Sedan the manufacture of arms, of implements of husbandry, of scythes, buckles, and, in general, of all kinds of steel and iron articles, had become very considerable. The fine hats of Caudebec found an immense sale in England and Germany. They were manufactured exclusively by Protestant workmen. The beautiful paper manufactures in Auvergne and the Angoumois were also in their hands. It was the Protestants who gave to France the magnificent linen manufactures that so long enriched her north-western provinces. Such was the extent of this manufacture, that in one branch of it alone, the English bought, at Morlaix, every year, 4,500,000 livres' worth, a fact verified by the register of the duties they paid for the stamp on their export from the kingdom. The silk manufactures of Tours and Lyons, so flourishing in the middle of the 17th century, are also said to have owed nearly all their splendour to the

industry of Protestant workmen." Such, we are told, was the position of the Protestants prior to the Revocation of the Edict.

It now remains to notice what the Revocation actually was, and its results. From 1662 down to 1685, a series of measures were adopted, all tending to the injury of the Protestants. They were gradually excluded from all public employment, prohibited from entering any profession, and assailed in the daily exercise of their religion, in the education of their children, and in the management of their families. In 1680 a royal declaration forbade Catholics to embrace the reformed religion under penalty of the galleys for life. An edict of 1681 allowed children to abjure at the age of seven years; and if a child of that age could be induced to enter a church, to kiss an image of the Virgin, or make the sign of the cross, any of these acts was sufficient to justify the taking the child from its parent, and compelling them to make an allowance for its maintenance, proportionate to their supposed ability. In the same year, 1681, began also the dragonnades, which meant the quartering of soldiers upon the Protestants, with an unlimited license to plunder and oppress them;* and to this treatment all the provinces in the kingdom were, in turn, subjected. At last, in October, 1685, the Edict of Nantes was revoked. By the Edict of Revocation the temples of the Protestants were directed to be demolished, and all exercise of their worship to cease, as well in private houses as in the castles of the nobles, under pain of confiscation of body and goods. Ministers who refused to be converted were ordered to quit the kingdom within fifteen days, under pain of the galleys. Protestant schools were to be closed; children born after the publication of the edict were to be baptized by the parish priest, and brought up in the religion of Rome. A period of four months was granted to refugees to return to France and abjure; that term expired, their property was to be confiscated. All the provisions of the law, regarding relapsed converts, were confirmed; and, to complete the iniquity of this decree, it was also ordered, "Under pain of the galleys, for men, and of imprisonment, confiscation of goods, for the women, that no Protestant should quit the kingdom, or carry their goods abroad." Such was the terms of the edict that revoked the Edict of Nantes. All the Protestants who could escape, and who preferred exile to a denial of their religion departed, and though we are told by the author, from whose work we quote, that it is now impossible to ascertain the exact number who left, yet he computes, that out of one million at least 250,000 or 300,000 left France. In a celebrated memorial, addressed to Louvois in 1688, Vauban deplores the desertion of 100,000 men, the exit of 60 millions of livres, the ruin of trade, hostile fleets recruited by 9,000 of the best sailors in the kingdom, hostile armies by 600 officers and 12,000 soldiers inured to war.

Nor was this all that France suffered by the Revocation. What France lost others gained, The emigrants carried to England, to Ireland, to Holland, and to Prussia, the industry, the knowledge, and the skill which had hitherto enriched France. And we shall now proceed to enumerate the various manufactures which owed their origin and success in this country to the Huguenot refugees:—

It appears an ascertained fact, that in consequence of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, In 1685, 70,000 manufacturers and artisans, who came principally from Normandy, the western maritime provinces, Lyons, and Tonraine, were dispersed throughout England, the greater number of whom established themselves in London, in the neighbourhood of Soho, St. Giles, and the uninhabited parts of Spitalfields, which were almost exclusively peopled by them, and which still are inhabited by their descendants. The English are indebted to them for many new branches of industry, and the improvement of others. Thus, for instance, before this period, nothing but a very common description of paper was made, and from the Continent, chiefly from France, the superior qualities of glass and hats were imported, and many other articles in common use. It was to the French emigrants, that the English are indebted for the manufacture of the superior qualities of the above articles, as also for the lighter make (tissue) in linens, woollens, and silks; also, for brocades, satins, velvets, clocks, watches, cutlery, hardware, locks, spits, surgical instruments, and children's toys. The Bill of Rights, which in 1680 rendered the liberty of the people sacred, and secured the property of the individual, added still more to the influence exercised by the French artificers, and became the signal for the unprecedented extension of English manufacture, commerce, and navigation. Of all the manufactures introduced by the refugees into England, none became so extensive as that of silk. It was at Blackfriars, in Canterbury, that some intelligent artisans from Tours and Lyons first established themselves. In 1694 their numbers had so increased that they possessed already 1,000 looms, giving employment to 2,700 workmen. The principal number, however, ended by establishing themselves permanently at London, in the neighbourhood of Spitalfields; from this their manufacture spread to Dublin, where it flourished to an unexpected degree. Thus, at this period, England and Ireland presented the ever memorable examples of a manufacture which owed its origin to a foreign country—the materials employed in it all coming from abroad—and yet arriving at such a state of advancement as to equal, sometimes even to surpass, the productions of the very places where it had so long been cultivated. Models of looms, similar to those used in the towns of Tours and Lyons, were brought over by the French artisans, who instructed the English in the improved method of weaving; they taught them how to manufacture brocades, satins, thick black silks (known as Padua silks), watered silks, black and fancy velvets, and mixed materials of silk and cotton.

The embroidered silks, which, at the close of the seventeenth century, were produced by the London manufacturers, were due to the industry, almost exclusively, of three refugees, named Lausen, Mariscot, and Monoceaux. The artist who furnished the designs was, in like manner, a refugee, named Baudouin; and a common workman, of the name of Mongeorge, brought over to them from Lyons, the secret, lately discovered there, of giving a gloss to taffetas. The French Ambassador, Barillon, made him (at the express command of Louis XIV., transmitted by the Minister Louvois) the most attractive offers to induce him to return to his country; it was too late. This secret, which, by a happy accident, Octavio Mai had discovered, which had raised his fallen fortune, and had since that time become a source of wealth to the whole of the Lyons manufacturers, had been made public. The English had been, in the habit, until this time, of purchasing every year 200,000 crowns worth of black lustred taffetas, manufactured expressly for England, and known by the name of English taffetas; 150 cases, each weighing from 400 to 500 pounds weight, were frequently, during one fair, exported to England. The British Government (after the Revocation) tripled the duty, which, until then, had been put upon this article on its entrance into England. It cost the French merchants, soon after this, fifty-three per cent. to get these taffetas into that country. In 1698 they were entirely prohibited. From the close of the seventeenth century, the English manufacture supplied not only its own home consumption, but that of other countries, with taffetas, and various other kinds of silks, formerly supplied by France. By the invention of the stocking loom, the English were enabled to export, even to Italy, quantities of silk stockings, and at advantageous prices. It is stated by Keyles, the traveller, who, in 1739, travelled over Europe—that in the kingdom of Naples, when a shop-keeper wished strongly to recommend his silks, he maintained they were of English manufacture. During the whole of the eighteenth and half of the nineteenth centuries England witnessed the increase, year by year, of her revenues, by means of that fine manufacture bequeathed to her by the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes.

The importations of raw silk which England brought from abroad was about one million pounds weight; at the present day it exceeds 5,500,000 pounds weight. In 1820, the acknowledged value of the silk stuffs exported to Germany, Belgium, Holland, the United States, and even to France, amounted to £371,000; in 1847, to £978,000; and in 1849, the exportation to France alone of articles of silk, of English production, was 4,000,000 of francs

Previous to the Revocation the intelligence of the manufacturers of Lyons, and the expertness of its artizans, had placed that town foremost in rank for its manufacture of satins, taffetas, velvets, and damasks. The looms of Italy, little by little, had yielded to this formidable rivalry, and France seemed destined to keep the monopoly of this fine manufacture, when religious persecution forced more than one-half of its weavers to expatriate themselves. Let us bear in mind that in 1698 the number of looms at Lyons had decreased from 11,000 to 4,000; that the 8,000 looms at Tours were reduced to 1,200; its 700 mills to 70; its 40,000 workmen to 4,000; its 3,000 ribbon looms to less than 60; and instead of its 2,400 bales of silks, not more than 700 to 800 were consumed in the capital of La Tonraine.

Before the Revocation, the English were in the habit of purchasing, in Normandy and Brittany, a great portion of the sail-cloths employed by them. In 1669 this article alone cost them £171,000. It was also in the above-named province that they procured bleached linens, which they sold again in the West Indies. In 1681 the elders and deacons belonging to the French Church, in Threadneedle-street, supplied funds for the establishment of a manufactory of bleached linens at Ipswich, where a considerable number of refugees were granted permission by Charles II. to found a colony. It was a Protestant, named Bonhome, one of the most clever of the manufacturers in flax materials in Paris, who extended this branch of industry in England, and taught the English the manufacture of sail-cloths. In 1685 fresh refugees added the manufacture of sail-clothe to that of bleached linens, established four years previously at Ipswich. Other linen manufactures were established in different towns throughout England; the result was a great decrease in the sale of these fabrics, both in Brittany and Normandy. The shopkeepers at St. Malo made a complaint to Bonrepaus on the subject. Twelve years later the trade in bleached linens, at Morlaix, had diminished two-thirds. At Brest and at Landernau the trade in hempen cloths had almost entirely disappeared. Not only Protestant operatives, but a vast number of Roman Catholics, had crossed the Channel to follow their masters. There must have been at least 4,000 who left the towns of Rennes, Nantes, and Vitré; had they continued in France, they must have found themselves reduced to the necessity of abandoning their trade and cultivating the soil, like many of their former companions.

The splendid linen manufacture of Coutances totally disappeared. The entire number of manufacturers and operatives had in succession emigrated to Jersey or Guernsey, and thence to England; and, of the 20,000 working men who manufactured fine linens at Laval, upwards of 14,000 had left the kingdom.

The minister Seignelay felt deeply the decline of a branch of industry but lately so flourishing in France, and by his orders ten pistoles were offered by Bonrepaus to every operative at Ipswich who would return. To accomplish his end more surely, Bonrepaus represented himself as the partner of a wealthy manufacturer, who promised to ensure to them a far more lucrative employment in their own country. Through cunning and falsehood, he ultimately succeed in ruining the manufacture of sail cloth at Ipswich, and then that of bleached linens. He expended on this grand exploit 300 crowns. Several other factories were destroyed in a similar manner, through his malicious exertions. Bonrepan's endeavors, however, did not last beyond the reign of James II., and on the Revolution of 1688, new manufactures of sail-cloth and bleached linens were established by the refugees in England and Ireland, where William III. fostered with all his power the introduction of this admirable trade. Printed calicoes were, for the first time, manufactured in England in 1690, by a refugee who established a manufactory on the Thames, near Richmond. A second, and a much more considerable one, was established at Bromley Hall, in Essex, which was removed to Lancashire. Other factories for printed calicoes were established near London at the beginning of the eighteenth century. They became a fresh loss to France—a fresh source of wealth to England.

The earliest manufacture of fine linens called "Cambrai linens," from their having originally been made in that town, was introduced by the refugees. Previous to the Revocation, the English were in the habit of purchasing yearly to the amount of £200,000 of these. It was, therefore, with extreme satisfaction that they received the operatives from Tournay and Cambrai, who brought them this beautiful manufacture. Many of these established themselves, later, in Scotland, when the town of Edinburgh granted to them, in 1730, five acres of land, on which to erect a large factory for the weaving of cambrics. The quarter once inhabited by them bears still the name of Picardy.

After the reign of Elizabeth, numerous Protestant artizans, who had come from Flanders, Brabant, and France, established themselves in London and Sandwich, and thence dispersed themselves through all the manufacturing towns of England, where they carried on a manufacture of serges, flannels, and woollen cloths. This last manufacture was particularly extended and improved by the refugees. It was stated by the members of the houses of Lords and Commons, in a conference in the year 1703, and in justification of the aid granted to the Protestant outlaws, that to them they were indebted for the establishment of many new and useful manufactures, and for the improvement of the old, so much so, that during the last few years the exportation of woollens had exceeded, by upward of £1,000,000 sterling, the exportation of this article under Charles II.

The first manufacture of carpets in England, after the manner of the "Gobelins," was established by an old Capuchin monk, who had been sent over by his superiors as a missionary. Discouraged, probably, by his want of success in his endeavours at conversion, he became a Protestant, and, under the name of Parisot, founded a carpet manufactory at Fulham. He was assisted in the undertaking by the English nobility, who lent him the sum of £10,000. The first attempt was unsuccessful; the manufactory was sold; but a refugee, named Passavan, having bought it at a low price, removed it to Exeter, where he carried it on prosperously, aided by some of the artizans from the "Gobelins," who had been tempted over by the promises of his predecessor. Bonrepaus, writing in 1686, from London, says—"The other manufactures established in this country are the *hats* of Candebec, and the manner of dressing chamois skins." The manufacture of hats was really one of the most important with which the refugees endowed England. It had been in France almost exclusively in the hands of Protestants; they alone possessed the secret for the composition used in dressing rabbit, hare, and beaver skins; they alone held the commerce of the fine quality of hats, made at Candebec, so much in fashion in both England and Holland. After the Revocation, the greater number of these manufacturers withdrew to London, carrying with them the secret of their art, which was thus lost to France for upwards of forty years. It was not until the middle of the eighteenth century that a French hatter, named Mathieu, after having worked for a long time in London, gained possession of the secret brought over by the refugees, carried it back with him to his country, and generously imparted it to the hat manufacturers of Paris, and founded an extensive factory in the Faubourg St. Antoine. Before this fortunate theft, the French nobility, and all who piqued themselves on any degree of elegance, wore none but those of English manufacture; and even at Rome the cardinals caused their hats to be procured from the celebrated manufactory at Wandsworth, established by the refugees. In England, the felt hats, made by the French, and known by the name of Carolines, had become so much the rage as to excite the jealousy of the English hatters, who in vain complained of a preference bestowed on hats which were (according to them) both inconvenient and inferor to their's in quality and durability.

The only paper manufactured in England before the Revocation was produced by the manufacturers of Kent, particularly from the extensive establishment at Dartford; it was a brownish, coarse kind of paper. The first manufactories of superior qualities of white paper were established in London in 1685 and 1686, by French tradesmen who came from Castelfaloux, Theirs, and Angouleme principally, which, in consequence, lost three-fourths of its paper mills. Barillon succeeded (by the same means as those employed by Bonrepaus) in destroying the manufactories founded by them in their adopted country. He distributed amongst the workmen of one factory alone to the amount of 2,800 francs, in order to decide them on returning into France. Six months after, he announced to Louis XIV. that he had expended 1,150 francs in order to induce 500 workmen who remained behind to recross the Channel. In the reign of William III., however, all these factories which had been destroyed were re-established by the Protestants, and England finally remained in possession of this branch of industry.

With these facts before us is it possible to disconnect the fall of the French monarchy with the fatal edict of 1685? The century that elapsed from the promulgation of the edict of Nantes in 1598 to its revocation in 1685 saw the French monarchy increase in power and consideration, and the close of that period saw France the arbiter of Europe. Another

* Some idea of the draggonades may be formed from the following statements of one of the sufferers, Jacob de Bye: "Six devils of dragoons fell to my charge, and afterwards 15 others, who, having shut me up in a room, made me eat and drink with them, sending for all sorts of dainties from the inns, flooding the floors with the best of wines, and as soon as night came, beginning to break and burn our furniture. That done, they set me in a chair, saying, with many foul expressions—'Thou dog of a Huguenot, you know that the king orders us to do all the evil your accursed body is capable of enduring; if you wish to be spared give us two louis d'ors a man.' The money was given. An hour afterwards one of the worst threw the money at his head, saying—'Dog of a Huguenot, I prefer to return thee thy money, and to torment thee.' They then put me in a chair near a great fire, took off my shoes and stockings, and burned my feet, letting the tallow of the candle drop upon them."

century passes and the French monarchy, though, during that period, it might boast the outward unity of its subjects, falls under the weight of those financial difficulties, which, undoubtedly, were aggravated, if not created by the loss of trade and commerce that followed that fatal Edict of Revocation. And who is there that does not read, in that subsequent history, the retribution that has followed on that great crime? The Bourbons and the great and wealthy Church, that then conspired to extirpate Protestantism, are proscribed and driven from France, and if again restored, restored to an uncertain and precarious dominion. The so-called heresy, supposed to be extirpated, still flourishes. And if the promise so often arrogated by the Church of Rome, that the gates of hell shall not prevail against her, be indeed intended for any visible church, who can put forward a stronger claim to the fulfilment of that promise than that persecuted Church which has outlived the massacre of St. Bartholomew, the dragonnades of 1681, the proscription of 1685, the persecution of a century, and still numbers its members by hundreds of thousands, and can show, amongst its professors, many of the most distinguished names in France.

THE INDEX EXPURGATORIUS.*

WE showed in our number for October, 1853, vol. II., page 110, column 3, what a vast and comprehensive system of tribunals the Roman Church, for three hundred years past, has provided for judging of books.

The duties of those tribunals are, as we then showed—

1. To condemn and prohibit such books as they will not permit to be read at all.

2. To correct books which they may think capable of being corrected, by blotting out and altering whatever they think fit.

3. To give a formal sanction, on the part of the Church, to such books as they think fit to be read.

Hence we have—1. The Index Prohibitorius, or list of books that are not to be read at all.

2. The Index Expurgatorius, or list of passages to be corrected in books before they may be read.

3. The approbation prefixed to each book published in countries where these laws of the Church of Rome can be enforced.

We then undertook to show what kind of things the Church of Rome sends forth to be read with the express approbation of those tribunals. This, of course, is to be shown from the "approbation" printed in the beginning of the books published.

We undertook also to show what sort of things the Church of Rome condemns, and will not allow to be published and read, when she can stop it.

This may be shown either from the list of prohibited books, or the list of expurgated books. But it is best to show it from the latter list; for this reason: if we take *a passage* from a prohibited book, and say "The Church of Rome forbids this," Roman Catholics may fairly say, "The Church forbids *the book*, but does not say for what particular things she forbids it; and it may be that it was not for this particular passage that she forbid it, but for some other heretical things contained in it;" and this might be true enough. But in expurgated books the matter is made plain, because the Index Expurgatorius expressly points out the very passages that are to be blotted out or altered; and these are, of course, the passages that the Church of Rome considers heretical, or dangerous to faith or morals; and we, therefore, find here exactly what she condemns.

There is, however, a difficulty in choosing the Index Expurgatorius. For while the Index Prohibitorius, or list of forbidden books, was always published freely to the world, the Index Expurgatorius was as carefully concealed. The reason is evident. It was desirable that every one should know what books were forbidden; but when the books of some great man were altered, by cutting out some passages, and changing others to an opposite meaning, it was not desirable that every one should know that; it was thought much better that people should not know that the Church of Rome had found occasion to alter his writings; but that they should think they had the real opinions of that great man, when in fact they only had the opinions which the correctors permitted him to give, or put into his mouth for him. Hence, the Index Expurgatorius was carefully kept secret. It is true, they had to print it, in order that all those who had to see that books were corrected, might know how to do it; but all these persons were strictly required to keep the printed index quite secret. It was only by accident that copies were at first discovered, and it is possible that there are many such lists of expurgated books not yet published or known.

When the first Index Expurgatorius was discovered, this was found on the back of the title page—"By the decree and command of the Duke of Alba, let care be taken that no one, except the king's head printer, should print this Index; nor that he, nor any other, should publicly or privately sell it, *or have it*, without permission from the ordinaries" (*i.e.*, the bishops). A diploma of Philip the Second, King of Spain, forbids copies of the Index to be given to any but the examiners of books, who were not to lend it, nor let any one take a copy of it. Gretzer, the Jesuit, says, this Index was not made "that it should be read and made common by everybody, but by those only to whom the duty of correcting and expurgating books was committed."—De Jure et More prohib. libr. p. 17. And he asks—"What was that Index to other people?" (p. 11.) However, notwithstanding all precautions that could be taken, copies of some lists came to light, and were published; which we shall use from time to time.

We can, in this number, give but one or two instances; but more will follow hereafter.

We take as our first instance of the things which the Church of Rome wishes to blot out, the Bible of Vatablus. Of course the correctors could not think of blotting passages out of the Bible itself; but they would think notes on the Bible a fair subject; and the Bible then most used by the learned, was the Bible which had the notes of Vatablus in it.

We extract the following account of this book from the learned Roman Catholic, Du Pin.* Vatablus, who was a a Roman Catholic, was the most learned man of his time in the Hebrew language. The French King, Francis I., made choice of him to be Regius Professor of Hebrew. He made so learned lectures on the Sacred Scriptures that people came from all parts to hear them. He spoke his lectures, and did not write them. His hearers took down in writing many of his notes on the Old Testament. Robert Stephens, a famous printer in Paris, got these notes collected, and printed them in a Bible. Du Pin says of these notes—"These notes are very useful for the understanding of the text; because there are few difficult passages but what he explains in a few words, according to the most natural sense." However, as the printer was a Protestant, the book got a bad name, and was condemned by the University of Paris, who, as Du Pin says, "were not sufficiently acquainted with the Hebrew tongue." However, "the doctors of the university of Salamanca (in Spain) were more favourable to this work (though Roman Catholics also), and caused the text and the notes of Vatablus's Bible to be printed in Spain, with approbation. Stephens defended them against the censures of the divines of Paris, and since that time they have been almost generally received, and approved of by men of learning."

Such a commentary on the Bible, of course, attracted particular notice, and it is expressly mentioned in the 3rd of the Ten Rules, drawn up by the committee of the Council of Trent, and sanctioned by Pope Pius IV. "But if any notes are circulated with versions of this kind which are permitted, or with the Vulgate edition, SUSPECTED PLACES HAVING BEEN EXPUNGED by the faculty of theology of any Catholic university, or by the general Inquisition, they (the notes) may be permitted to those persons, to whom the versions are permitted; *upon which conditions* the whole volume of the Bible, which is commonly called the Bible of Vatablus, or parts of it, may be conceded to pious and learned men."†

Of course a book which was of such importance as to be specially mentioned in this rule, would be corrected with more than ordinary care. It was accordingly corrected by the master of the Pope's Palace, who, as our readers have seen in our number for October (vol. II., p. 111, col. 1), was the person whose duty it was to correct books at Rome. A copy of that Vatican Index has been published,‡ and there we find what corrections were thought necessary.

On the 18th chapter of Exodus, Vatablus's Bible had this note—"Moyses secundum leges Dei judicat lites populi;" that is—"Moses judges the people according to the laws of God."—See verse 16. On this the Index Expurgatorius says—"Deleantur illa verba"—"let those words be blotted out!" Now, really it is hard to see what harm there could be in that note. Every one must admit that what the note says is quite true; but, perhaps, the note might have put it into some one's head to think, that if Moses in old times went *by the laws of God*, the priests ought to do so now.

In the 26th chapter of Leviticus, the Bible of Vatablus had this note on the margin, or edge of the page—"Sculptilia prohibet fieri"—"he forbids graven things to be made;" and on this the Index says—"deleatur illud"—"let that be blotted out!" Well, now, really this precaution might seem almost useless; for the very same thing is found in the very first verse of the chapter itself. In the Latin Bible itself, which the Council of Trent pronounced authentic, the first verse has this in it—"Non facietis vobis idolum et Sculptile"—"you shall not make to yourselves any idol or graven thing."—Douay translation. Now, what great harm was it to put a note on the edge of the page beside this verse—"He forbids graven things to be made?" Was this note any worse than the word of God itself? Yet the master of the Pope's palace tells the booksellers at Rome that they shall never sell a copy till that note is blotted out! But some one will ask, what great use could there be in blotting out the note, when they dare not blot the words out of the Bible itself? We answer; the use of putting a note beside a verse in the Bible, is to call people's attention to that verse: the use of blotting out the note is to prevent people's attention being called to that verse. Surely it was bad enough to have those words in the Bible, without having people's attention called to them in that way.

Again, in the 4th chapter of Deuteronomy, these two notes were, in like manner, placed in the margin—"Exhortation against any similitude to be adored"—"that images should not be made which might be adored." "Let that be blotted out," says the Index, of each! Now, considering that the Douay Bible itself thus translates verse 16, of that chapter—"Lest perhaps being deceived you might make you a graven *similitude*, or *image* of male or female," those notes do not seem more worthy of being blotted out than the words of the Bible itself. The offence of those notes was, that they called people's attention to what was in the Bible.

Again in the seventh chapter of the 1st Book of Kings,* there was this note in the margin—"Serviendum soli Deo"—"God only is to be served;" and, of course, the Index says as before, "Let those words be blotted out!" Now the Douay Bible itself translates the third verse of that chapter thus:....."prepare your hearts unto the Lord, and *serve him only*....." What harm then to put this note beside that verse, "God only is to be served?" Why blot out these notes, except it be that calling people's attention to these verses of God's word strikes terror into the hearts of the Pope and tribunals and officers of the Church of Rome?

Again, the first verse of the 66th chapter of Isaiah stands thus in the Douay Bible—"Thus saith the Lord, Heaven is my throne, and the earth my footstool; what is this house that you will build to me, and what is this place of my rest?" Beside this verse the Bible of Vatablus had this note—"God dwelleth not in temples made by hand." Now, it so happens that this note was not made by Vatablus: it was made by the Martyr St. Stephen, speaking by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost; so we read in the Douay Bible, Acts vii. 48—"The Most High dwelleth not in houses made by hand, AS THE PROPHET SAITH, *Heaven is my throne, and the earth my footstool, &c.*" So it was the Martyr St. Stephen that made that comment on that verse of Isaiah, the Holy Ghost inspiring him to do so; and all that poor Vatablus did, was to take that note, and place it beside the verse to which the Holy Ghost applied it. But this was more than the master of the sacred palace could stand; so he put his thumb upon that—"LET THAT BE BLOTTED OUT."

What reason could there be but this, that if the note of St. Stephen on that verse of Isaiah be true, the consecrated wafer cannot be the Lord Jesus Christ, and transubstantiation is false?

Now, let the reader turn back for a moment to that third rule of the Council of Trent, which directed how the notes in the Bible of Vatablus were to be corrected—"*Suspected places having been expunged:*" what was there *to suspect* in these notes? What design could have been suspected in them, except a design to call attention to what is in the word of God? *That*, then, was the object of "suspicion" at Rome.

We might give many more instances from this book; but we must be brief. Still we cannot pass by the Index; for the Church of Rome corrects the Index of a book too, for fear it should help people to find what is dangerous to faith or morals. Rule V. provides expressly for this; and in that Vatican Index Expurgatorius we find the following direction about the Index in the Bible of Vatablus:—"In the indexes of these books of the Old and New Testaments, let the subjoined propositions be blotted out as SUSPECTED." We give here two or three of the suspected propositions in italics, (and marked thus: Prop.) placing after each, the verse of the Bible to which it may be supposed to refer.

Prop.—*He who believes in Christ shall not die eternally.*

Verse—"God so loved the world, as to give his only begotten Son; that *whosoever* believeth in him may not perish, but may have life everlasting."—John iii. 16, Douay Bible; see also chapter v. 24, and chapter xi. 26.

Prop.—*Hearts are purified by faith.*

Verse—"Purifying their hearts by faith."—Acts xv. 9, Douay Bible.

Our readers now see what things Rome suspects, and wishes TO BLOT OUT, by means of the tribunals and the laws which she has established for judging of books.

Now for what she sanctions and approves by those same tribunals; and here for the present we must be very brief.

Our readers may remember a paper quoted by us, in our last article on this subject (vol II., p. 110, col. 3), from Azorius—"The image is to be worshipped with the same honour and worship with which we worship those whose image it is."—Instit. Moral. p. 1, l. 9. c. 6). The sanction of the tribunals of the Church of Rome has been given to the works of Azorius, and it is printed in them; and the tribunals never thought it necessary *to blot out that*. Let Roman Catholics compare this fact with the notes above given about worshipping images, *which they have blotted out*.

We stated in our number for August (vol. II., p. 91, col. 3), that the great Pascal, himself a Roman Catholic, has collected these opinions, among others, out of the works of the Jesuits—"That it is lawful for a gentleman to kill on the spot any one who strikes him a blow, in order to preserve his honour; that it is lawful to fight a duel, to preserve his honour; that it is lawful for servants to steal, if they

* This paper would have appeared before as promised, and has actually been in type for several months, but want of room obliged us to postpone it.—Ed. C. L.

* History of Eccl. writers, vol. iii., p. 399. Ed. Dublin, 1723.
† Rule III., printed at the end of the Council of Trent.
‡ We take it from an exact reprint, published by the Rev. R. Gibbings. Dublin, 1837

* Called the First Book of Samuel in the Protestant Bible.

think their wages too small; that priests or monks may lawfully kill those who injure them or their order; that it is lawful to kill those who speak ill of us, if we cannot stop them in any other way; that it is lawful to circulate false slanders against those who we fear may hurt us; that it is not the duty of Christians to avoid immediate occasions of sin, if their doing so should give a handle for people talking or be inconvenient to them;" also (In p. 92, col. 1), that "the command is not so much to love God as not to hate him."

All these horrible opinions Pascal found in books *approved and sanctioned* by the authorized tribunals of the Church of Rome!* Those tribunals had not thought it necessary to blot out any of those things! The books of the Jesuits pass easily; not like the Bible of Vatablus. The Jesuits are "safe men"—they will never teach that "images are not to be worshipped," or that "God alone is to be served," or that "hearts are purified by faith," or that "he who believes in the Lord Jesus Christ shall not die eternally;" and, therefore, the Jesuits are not objects of suspicion at Rome, and the Church of Rome does not think it necessary *to blot out* the greatest idolatries and impieties that they can publish in their books.

We shall return to this subject again; and in the mean time our readers may learn, from the examples we have given, something of the real object and practical working of that vast system which the Church of Rome has established of forbidding, correcting, and approving of books by her authorized tribunals. They may see as in a glass what doctrines the Church of Rome wishes to blot out from the minds of her members, and what doctrines she is willing to circulate among them.

TALK OF THE ROAD—NO. XXIII.

"Jem," said Pat, "do you mind the talk we had about the 'Glories of Mary?'"†

"I do, well, Pat," said Jem, "that won't be forgotten easy."

"Well, Jem," said Pat, "I have got a match for it anyway."

"And what is it, Pat?" said Jem.

"Why, then, it's the 'Glories of Joseph,' the husband of Mary," said Pat.

"Ay," said Jem, "and had he glories too?"

"Why, you know, in course Jem," said Pat, "sure a man wouldn't be behind his wife, you know."

"Well, but Pat," said Jem, "it isn't the same; for sure the Blessed Virgin was the real mother of Jesus Christ, but Joseph wasn't his father."

"Well, Jem, here's the book," said Pat, pulling a little book out of his pocket, with "The Glories of St. Joseph"‡ printed in big letters on it.

"Sure enough, there it is," said Jem; "what's coming now at all?"

Perhaps our readers are saying just the same; and if they read on they will know.

"Why, just listen to the sense of this, Jem," said Pat, "doesn't the book make Joseph as great as the Blessed Virgin herself? Just read this, man;" and so Jem read, "If, therefore, she be a princess, he is a prince; and he is also king wherever she is queen"—p. 15. "And now, Jem," said Pat, "isn't she the queen of heaven; and isn't it plain by the book that Joseph is the king of heaven?"

"Well, Pat, there's a big IF in that," said Jem.

"Sure there is, Jem," said Pat, "and don't I just want you to take the big IF along with you all through? IF *she is* the Queen of heaven sure her husband *be* to be the King.

"Well, Pat, I see it now," said Jem, "and sure enough there's more reason in you nor in the book; it's a great IF entirely."

"And in course, Jem," said Pat, "there's more follows on that; read this here;" so Jem read—"O rich Joseph, to whom God himself becomes a beggar!"—p. 16.

"Well, Pat," said Jem, "that does beat all; I wonder how any living man durst write it!"

"Well, Jem," said Pat, "sure it follows quite natural, out of the big IF: will you read this now." So Jem read—"God helps us in all necessities by St. Joseph, as by his plenipotentiary, to let us understand, that as he was subject to him in all things upon earth as to a father, *so he was the same in heaven*, granting whatever he asked"—p. 47. "Now," said Pat, "isn't Joseph king in heaven, if God himself is subject to Joseph there?"

"Oh, Pat," said Jem, "it's too bad entirely for any Christian to listen to: I wonder the Irish people does not rise up at once again such things."

"Maybe the people is waiting for the priests and bishops to rise up again such things," said Pat; "sure, it is the bishops and priests that ought to put down books that teaches such shocking things again the Christian faith."

"Well, Pat, that's past waiting for. Sure, don't I see here in the first page, that it's printed by Grace, the great Catholic bookseller, and sure, the Bishops would have only to say the word to stop it at once."

"But who ever heard the bishop or the priests say one word against such books as that, Jem?" said Pat. "Sure they keep all that for the Bible. And, sure, look here at the end; here's all the indulgences that the popes give to every one that stands up for Joseph. Why, here's one that gives an indulgence of 300 days in purgatory to every one for every time that he prays to *Jesus, Mary, and Joseph*, all together. Why, how could the priests or the bishops go again that?"

"That's plain, Pat," said Jem; "we must quit all they say and do, to keep to Christ alone."

"Well, there's more things in it, Jem," said Pat, "sure Jesus, Mary, and Joseph is the Trinity on earth! (pages 17 and 26); and Joseph was the handsomest man at all; why wouldn't he? Sure the book says Jesus Christ wouldn't take an ugly man to be his father, but one as handsome as himself."—page 20.

"Stop there, Pat," said Jem, "till I find what the Bible says about Jesus Christ." So Jem found it in Isaiah liii. 2.—"There is no beauty in him, nor comeliness, and there was no sightliness that we should be desirous of him." "So you see, Pat," said Jem, the book is only inventing lies."

"Well, Jem," said Pat, "here's a place to tell how easy devotion to St. Joseph is; it's just the easiest thing at all; only a picture, or a bit of a prayer or two. 'Deed he doesn't ask much for all he does."

"And what does he do at all?" said Jem.

"A deal of things," said Pat. "If there's anything lost, it's only to go to St. Joseph (p. 84), and he'll look till he finds it; and, sure, that would keep him busy in Ireland itself, let alone the rest of the world. Or if there's a match to be made between a boy and a girl, only get St. Joseph at it, and it's done (p. 127); and he can put his hand to anything; for if a girl is in love, it's only to go to St. Joseph, and he'll put that out of her head in nine days (p. 108); and if a couple want children, Joseph's the man, though he had none of his own (p. 128); and he's the best man-midwife at all (p. 127); and for saving the agents from the ribbonmen he beats the scapular all out;* for see here's a story of a man that was shot with a blunderbuss, with thirty slugs in it, and every slug went into his body, and three of them staid in his belly, and one of them was beat flat on his nose, and he wasn't a hair the worse; and sure the man that wrote the book says, that the man that was shot told him the story himself"—p. 132.

"Well, Pat," said Jem, "I'm thinking one or other of them was a mighty great liar, and no mistake."

"Well, Jem," said Pat, "there was a convent, and no nuns going into it, and St. Joseph got them a young lady, with a good fortune, and the book says 'which favour will never be forgotten by that community.' Sure enough it's girls with fortunes they take in, and not poor unfortunate creatures that it would be the place for."

But, Jem, here's something that is good; it's about the interior or spiritual life in the soul; and it makes out this spiritual life is faith, hope, charity, religious adoration, thanksgiving, humiliation—p. 95.

"Well, Pat," said Jem, "I think that's as true as if it was in the Bible."

"So it is, Jem," said Pat. "But see here, Jem, what the book says next." So Jem read (p. 99), "in a community of three score *religious*† you will scarce find six true interior persons; and amongst a hundred religious men, or five hundred *seculars*,‡ it would be hard to find ten such as we speak of, who are eminent in their interior life, and make their desire of perfection their chief endeavour."

"Well, Pat," said Jem, "that's the sorest thing I heard yet again the convents and the priests; I wonder how did it get into the book at all."

"Well maybe it isn't easy to write a book, and let no word of truth get into it at all," said Pat; "but there it's down in the book, however it got in."

So Pat went on—"Well, Jem, here's quare things; there's a great day for St. Joseph every year in Canada, and just read the story." So Jem read (p. 73)—"Also many dozens of great rockets, twelve at a time, resting somewhile between each dozen. At the close of the evening the governor of Quebec (accompanied with all his officers, in sight of a great number of savages who live round the country come to see the solemnity) puts fire to these machines; the wonderful sight whereof gives great occasion to the savages to honour and esteem St. Joseph, for whom they perceive the Christians have so great a veneration."

"Well," said Jem, "that beats all ways ever I heard of making Christians of savages; but I never heard tell of it in any of the letters the people wrote home."

"Well, I suppose it's an old story now," said Pat; "and sure if all the savages is converted, there would be no more call for rockets. But here's a story as quare, about a lady called Margeret de Chateau, who had a great regard for Jesus, Mary, and Joseph; and now read that, Jem," said Pat. So Jem read—"After she was dead, she was opened, and in her heart they found three precious stones, on which were engraved the three objects of her love."—page 51. "Now, Jem," said Pat, "do you believe there ever was a woman that had her heart full of little stones, just like the gizzard of an old fowl?"

"Well, 'deed, Pat," said Jem, "I don't believe God Almighty ever made a woman with a gizzard instead of a heart. But what will the Catholic books come to at all?"

"Well, Jem," said Pat, "hear the advice that the Blessed Virgin gives, however the book got at it." So Jem read (page 120)—"Wherefore if we desire her to advise us *what is best* TO SECURE OUR SALVATION, we cannot doubt but she will say, 'be devout to St. Joseph; love my dear spouse, St. Joseph.'"

"Oh, stop, stop, Pat," said Jem, "I can't stand it any more; to think us poor Irish is let to read such books, to set us so far astray about our salvation, and the Word of the living God kept off us. Oh, doesn't it cry out against them that allows it? Will there never be no light nor knowledge from God, to them that's kept in darkness and the shadow of death?"

"Well, Jem," said Pat, "it's enough to give one a heartscald again the Church of Rome, sure enough; but I'll only look out one thing more: here's a whole chapter to explain why the worship of St. Joseph was so late getting into the Church. Why, the book says that, '*in the primitive ages no mention is made of any particular devotion to this saint* (p. 29); and it says, *I cannot, therefore, but own that this marked devotion towards St. Joseph is only of late standing*' (p. 29); and the book makes out that no one did worship Joseph for 1,400 years after Christ (p. 30), and that was all '*for St. Joseph's greater honour*' (p. 35); and it allows that St. Teresa '*was the first who set up the standard of devotion to St. Joseph*' (p. 48); and 'deed, Jem," said Pat, "when I came to that, I thought to myself, it's little call we have to trust to the saints, if they set us that far astray."

"Well, Pat," said Jem, "if any prays to St. Joseph after that, it's their own faults; but how will it be with the priests that never says a word against such books, and with the bishops that doesn't stop the Catholic booksellers from printing the like?"

Plenty of such books there are, printed and circulated for the Irish people to read instead of the Bible. And if Pat and Jem should talk of any more of them, our readers may like to hear of that too.

* Some propositions from the writings of the Jesuits were condemned at various periods subsequent to the year 1650; which condemnations we may probably have to refer to again; and the order itself was abolished in 1772. But as the propositions quoted by Pascal were all taken from books formally approved by the Church of Rome, and as the order itself has been restored to the highest favour and power in the Church of Rome, we feel at liberty to use the approbations actually given to them. The variations of the indexes, sometimes approving and sometimes condemning the very same things, will be shown hereafter.

† CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. i., page 40. 1852.

‡ "Glories of St. Joseph, from the French of Father Paul Barrie. Printed by Richard Grace, Catholic Bookseller, Dublin, 1843.

* See CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. ii., 1853, p. 66.

† The word "religious" here means nuns. The passage shows how improper it is to use the word of all who are members of an order.

‡ "Seculars" here means priests.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We have been obliged to postpone several valuable letters, from both Roman Catholics and Protestants, from want of room.

We would request our correspondents, both Roman Catholics and Protestants, to limit the length of their communications, and not to discuss a variety of distinct topics in one letter.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 0, Upper Sackville-st.

To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal, which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, APRIL, 1854.

THERE is no subject of deeper interest to every humble follower of Jesus Christ, than the promotion of Christian unity. Truth is one, and all those who have embraced the true faith of the Lord Jesus Christ, must, to the same extent that they have sincerely adopted it, become a real part of the *one* spiritual fold under the *one* spiritual shepherd. Like all other virtues, however, this virtue also has its counterfeit. There is unity of faith, which must be internal and real, and there is unity of profession which may be external and unreal. How often, under circumstances unfavourable to the development of truth, has the one passed, and been mistaken for, the other?

Those who have watched our progress since the commencement of our labours, will not suppose that we are in love with religious controversy for its own sake. We think controversy only tolerable when conducted in a mild and

Christian spirit, and with a sincere anxiety to arrive at truth. Want of unity in the Christian world unhappily exists; the fact is a sad one, but it is still a fact. Is it according to the will of God, that *disunion* should continue? We earnestly think not—any more than it is the will of God that *vice* should continue. God permits, but does not approve of either disunion or vice. He would, assuredly, have us all brought to unity of belief, as well as to virtue in practice; but *how* does He design that this unity should be effected?

Time was, when it was thought that unity was to be brought about by ecclesiastical authority wielding the arm of the secular power, extirpating heresy by the extirpation of heretics. Those days are gone by, and we think no good or wise man would wish for their return. The religion of Christ was not founded by the sword, nor can any part of it be defended or inculcated by the sword. Every attempt to do so inflicts a grievous wound on Christianity itself.

Men's minds cannot be coerced. Pains and penalties, denunciations and calumnies may coerce men into silence, but can never convince the understanding or soften the heart. The secular arm may be invoked to punish the body, but it is powerless to convince the intellect of a single mind. Christianity was never advanced by violence, and it would be against its essential character that such a mode of propagation should be attempted. And if Christians were never allowed even to persecute Pagans into Christianity, surely *a fortiori* it must be unlawful, and against the first principles of true Christianity for any one set of Christians to persecute another. The folly, indeed, of such religious persecution is as great as its wickedness, and almost always recoils upon the persecutor, by creating sympathy and popularity towards the cause of the oppressed.

All men can admit this when it comes to be their own case—the minority are always for toleration. It has been well said by an acute observer, "that no man who was himself under the rod did ever think it lawful to have opinions forced or heretics put to death, and yet many men, who have themselves escaped the danger of the fire and faggot, have changed their opinion just as the case was altered, and their party uppermost."

The wickedness and folly, however, of religious intolerance remains the same, whether the dominant party holds true or incorrect opinions; and the history of mankind demonstrates that persecution never put down a single error, and has ever been found rather to encourage the persecuted in holding fast the proscribed opinions than to deter them from it.

But, then, we may be asked, though violence and force cannot conquer religious error, may not less extreme pains and penalties do so? Experience proves, too, that this is not the case, for such expedients are either despised and set at nought by those against whom they are directed, or they drive men into mere external profession, and make them hypocrites; they cannot, and never did *convince* a single mind.

What, then, remains but the gentler and nobler resources of Christian wisdom, and the mildest toleration? If we would have true unity, we must *persuade* and not coerce. Let men but once adopt this golden rule, and they will find it equally applicable to all men, in all places, at all times. Let men but speak the truth (or what each man thinks truth) in love, and as sure as the God of the Christian is a God of truth and love, he will give success to those who advocate *His* cause, and Truth will prove mighty and prevail. This we feel persuaded is God's way of producing unity; and the only way in which it can ever be approximated to. Man's way has been tried long enough, and has egregiously failed; and the differences which have sprung from its path of blood and shame, are as lamentable proofs of human frailty, as the rancour and animosity of religious differences, are proofs of the fallen nature of our race.

These are the grand principles on which we have striven to act, and which we shall never cease to inculcate, in our endeavours to promote the cause of truth and real unity; and they will be found equally applicable in favour of our Roman Catholic brethren when they are in the minority, as to those who differ with the Church of Rome, when it is in the ascendant.

But it will be said, might not unity be effected more simply still, if all men would but voluntarily yield their private views and opinions to those of God's Church? We answer, no doubt, *if all* men would but voluntarily yield their private views and opinions to that of any one man, or set of men, of course there would be unity, but it would not necessarily be the unity of truth. But what prospect is there that men will voluntarily give up the privileges of thinking beings, and delegate to any other the power to think for them. They would not if they could. We doubt whether they could if they would. A blind man may be content to be led by one who can see, a weak man may consent to be carried by a strong one, an ignorant man may save himself trouble by acting on the knowledge of the wise, especially if he be too indolent or stupid to acquire knowledge for himself; but that men who are not blind, or weak, or indolent, or stupid, should ever agree, as a body, absolutely to yield their right to think, and learn, and judge for themselves, to any other, is to suppose that the nature of the human mind is totally different from what it is actually and practically found to be. Education has been progressing for several centuries; and is it possible to expect that as the world gets more advanced in civilization and general education, men should become more passive and subservient to authority, instead of more active minded and independent? All history proves the contrary; and though improved and enlarged education, and fair and free discussion may, and we trust will, bring active-minded men to agree together better as to what is truth, and thus advance the cause of unity, the result of enlarged and diffused education can never render men more willing to submit to *mere authority* in matters of either reason or religion. If the existence of an infallible guide was a self-evident truth, or a matter easy of proof to any fair mind of ordinary capacity, it would, of course, be only perverse and wicked men who could dispute it. The difficulties, however, of *proving* any Church to be infallible, and of persuading seriously-disposed religious men voluntarily to submit to mere Church authority as the regulator of their belief, are necessarily great, and we are convinced that the amount of proof necessary to establish the infallibility of any Church to a mind not previously *determined to take it for granted*, must and ought to be greater than would be sufficient to establish any other religious opinion, simply because the subject of inquiry is in its consequences immeasurably of more importance than any other single opinion could be. We may follow any ordinary guide of good recommendations confidently, who will allow us, at the same time, to use our own ears and eyes to assist us in our faith, but we must be well assured indeed of the character and powers of the extraordinary guide, who would ask us to shut our eyes and stop our ears, that he might lead us by the hand with more security. We do not say that men may not reasonably wish for, and examine whether there be an infallible guide, to follow whom would lead to unity; but we do say that the claims of any set of men to such infallibility require the clearest proof and closest scrutiny, if men in their search for unity would escape the risk of ruin. At any rate until it can be established to the satisfaction of all intelligent and candid men, that God has delegated to an infallible church the exclusive right to judge of religious truth, as His means of producing unity of belief, the practice of toleration is obviously an indispensable duty, and the right to inquire into, and discuss freely the preliminary question, whether God has or has not constituted such a tribunal for the settlement of controversies, and what that tribunal is, and what are its limits and nature, must be a right inherent in, as well as a duty incumbent upon, every rational being.

We have already partially discussed this deeply important subject, but purpose recurring to it again, and we trust, in a perfectly impartial and candid spirit.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

A CORRESPONDENT writes to us that several Roman Catholics in his neighbourhood meet to read the CATHOLIC LAYMAN; but that they do not give us full credit for telling truth. For instance, he says, "in the February number for 1854, page 18, column 3, there is a story about one Wimar, who murdered his three sons!" This, they say, is all a lying fabrication of the LAYMAN, and of Labbe and Cossart, to whom reference is made.

Now, Labbe and Cossart were two French *Jesuits*, not very likely to enter into a plot with the CATHOLIC LAYMAN; especially as they lived 180 years ago. But we took that story from a letter written by Pope Nicolas II. We call on the Roman Catholic priests to tell those Roman Catholics, *in our pages*, whether Pope Nicolas *did* write that letter, or *not*. If the priests say Pope Nicolas did *not* write that letter, we will discuss that with them. If the priests say Pope Nicolas *did* write that letter, very good. If the priests say *nothing*, let Roman Catholics judge of that for themselves.

Correspondence.

POPE LIBERIUS AND INFALLIBILITY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I have reconsidered the subject of the alleged heterodoxy of the Pontiff Liberius, in the fourth century, and am fully convinced he did not wilfully lapse into Arianism, but was entrapped into the reception of the *Sirmium formulary by the sophistry* of the Arian bishops and the emperor's other satellites, *as the Council of Rimini had been*. This appears more evident by the use of the words, "to expound the true Catholic faith," &c., which occur in his letter of reconciliation. He was evidently a weak-minded man, and, in great measure, destitute of moral courage, and fond of ease and peace. Gibbon expressly says—"Liberius, Oscius, Paulanus, Dionysius, Eusebius of Vercellæ, Lucifer, and Hilary of Poitiers, were banished by the Emperor Constantius; and refers to Ammianus, xv. 7; Theodoret, 1, ii., c. 16; Athanasius, tom. i., p. 834–837; and Hilary, Fragment i. I am fully convinced this is the correct position of events. His or the heterodoxy of the Rimini Council cannot be proved; as, though they made a false step, it was obtained by sophistry and fraud, which mistake they BOTH repudiated when the Arian party published the creed in the Arian sense, to which SENSE neither had agreed. The real question is, if a Pontiff or a Pontiff and Council be INFALLIBLE in matters of *doctrine*, can either or both be deceived in the manner they *evidently* were? If INFALLIBILITY is *not sufficient to* PREVENT their understandings from such or similar deceptions, on such or similar subjects, can there be such a thing as infallibility at all? Is it not mere delusion, and the mere creation of a deceived fancy? My individual opinion is, that out of the region of the mathematics, absolute certainty, such as would amount to infallibility, is unattainable by mortal man. I send this as a postcript to my former, and am, sir,

Your obedient servant,
A TRUTH-SEEKER.

Moira, February 23, 1854.

THE SENTIMENTS OF THE PRIMITIVE FATHERS AND DOCTORS OF THE CHURCH ON THE HOLY EUCHARIST.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—In the second age, St. Ignatius, bishop of Antioch a disciple of the apostles, who suffered martyrdom about the year 107, in his epistle to the Christians of Smyrna, calls the Eucharist "the flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ,

which suffered for our sins, and which the Father raised by his bounty." Thus this disciple of the Apostle wrote, who certainly know the meaning of their doctrine. In the same age St. Justin Martyr, in his apology to the heathen Emperor for the Christian religion, affirms, "that as our Saviour Jesus Christ was himself by the word made flesh, and took for our salvation both flesh and blood, so we are taught that the eucharist is the flesh and blood of the same Jesus incarnate." (Apolog. 2. ad Antoninum.) Would any man in his senses write thus to a heathen if he understood Christ's words in a figurative sense? In the same age, St. Irenæus, in his fifth book (chap. xl.) against heresies, speaking of the bread and wine says—"that by the Word of God they are made the Eucharist, which is the body and blood of Christ." In the third age, St. Cyprian, in his sermon on the Lord's supper, says, "the bread which our Lord gave to his disciples being changed, not in shape, but in substance, by the omnipotency of the word, is made flesh." He likewise says (Lib. de Orat. Domini) "that in the eucharist we eat Christ's body, and drink his blood." In the same age, the learned Origen tells us (Hom. 7, in Levit.) that "in the old law the manna was a figurative food (in senigmate); but now the flesh of God is meat (in specie) in reality, as he himself says, 'my flesh is meat indeed.'" He speaks no less plainly in many other places. In the same age, Tertullian says (L. 4, Cont. Marcion, c. 40) "that the bread which Christ took at his last supper, and distributed to his disciples, he changed into his body." In the fourth age, the great St. John Chrysostom delivered in more clear terms the doctrine of the Catholic Church. In his eighty-third homily upon St. Matthew, he has these excellent words: "let us everywhere believe Almighty God, nor contradict him, though what he says seems contradictory to our reason and sense. His words cannot deceive us; our senses are easily deceived: his words never err; our senses are frequently mistaken. Since, therefore, he says, 'this is my body,' let us be persuaded of it. He who did these things at his last supper, the same now performs them; we are only his ministers; it is he who sanctifies; it is he who transmutes or changes these things." Thus writes St. Chrysostom, whose words are equally plain in several places of his excellent works.

Let us now give ear to St. Ambrose, another famous doctor of the Church, in the same age, in his book, "De his qui mysteriis initiantur," chapter the ninth—"Perhaps you will say," says he, "I see quite another thing. How do you assure me that I receive the body of Christ? And this is what remains for us to prove. How great," says he, "are the examples which we used to show—that it is not the thing which nature formed, but the thing which the blessing has consecrated, and that the blessing has greater force than nature, because by the blessing even nature itself is changed." Afterwards he instances, or makes mention of the change of rods into serpents, and of water into wine, and thus pursues his discourse: "if," says he, "the words of Elias were powerful enough to command fire down from heaven, shall not, therefore, the words of Christ be able to change the nature of the elements? You have read of the whole creation—he said, and they were made; he commanded, and they were created; the word, therefore, of Christ, which could make out of nothing that which was not, cannot it change those things which are into what they are not?" Thus, St. Ambrose, not only proposes but proves the doctrine of the Catholic Church. In the same age, St. Gregory Nyssen, in his catechistical discourse, professes the same faith. "I do believe" says he, "that, by the word of God, the sanctified bread is changed into the body and blood of Christ."

In the same age, St. Cyril, patriarch of Jerusalem, discourses thus of the Eucharist (Cat. Mys. fourth)—"Do not consider it," says he, "as mere bread and wine, for now it is the body and blood of Christ, according to our Lord's own words." Again, "Judge not the thing," says he, "by the taste." And, a little after, "knowing," says he, "and holding for certain, that the bread and wine which we see is not bread, although it taste like bread, but it is the body of Christ." What Catholic of this present age can express in plainer terms than this saint has done, our faith of transubstantiation? In the fifth age, that great doctor of the Church, St. Augustine, in Psalm thirty-third, says—"How David could be carried in his own hands we know not, but in Christ we do; for he was carried in his own hands, when, at his last supper, he gave to his disciples his own body and blood, saying—'This is my body;' for he then carried his own body in his own hands."

Every one of these fathers, dear sir, which I have here quoted, lived above thirteen hundred years ago, and were certainly better qualified to know the sense of the Scriptures, and doctrine of the apostles, than those who came but lately into the world. And all the rest of the fathers, in all succeeding ages, unanimously agreed in the same doctrine; so that this article of our faith is as ancient as the apostles.

The institution of the blessed Eucharist is related in three different evangelists, viz., by St. Matthew (c. xxvi. v. 26.); by St. Mark (c. xiv.); and by St. Luke (c. xxii.); and St. Paul, in his first epistle to the Corinthians (c. xi.). Here dear sir, we may expect to find something decisive on this point. I shall now conclude, dear Mr. Editor, by exhorting every one to "remember the days of old; consider the years of many generations. Let us ask our elders, and they will tell us. Let us stand in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein;" for there is no other way, our divines tell us, which can conduct us safely to the joys of heaven.

Dear Mr. Editor, be pleased to give me an answer to this letter, that I may know your opinion also on this subject.

Your humble and obedient

JOHN DUFFEY.

Our correspondent has requested us to state our opinion on the passages which he cites from the fathers, relating to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. We have been put to some trouble by his omission of the editions and pages of the volumes to which he refers, as we cannot, in general, undertake to discuss passages which are quoted so vaguely as those given in his letter. In consequence of the crowded state of our columns, our remarks must necessarily be very brief.

Our correspondent asks—"What [Roman] Catholic of the present age could express our faith in transubstantiation in plainer terms than St. Cyril, and others of the Greek and Latin fathers?" In order to ascertain, therefore, whether the ancient fathers really believed in transubstantiation, it is necessary, in the first place, to call to mind the definition which the Council of Trent have given of this word. It is, say they, "a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of our Lord Jesus Christ; and of the whole substance of the wine, into the substance of his blood" (Conc. Trid. Sess. xiii. Can. 2). And to the same effect, the catechism of the Council of Trent declares, that, "not only the true body of Christ, and whatever pertains to the character of a true body, as bones and sinews (ossa et nervos), but that Christ, whole and entire, is contained in this sacrament" (Cat. Rom. II. iv. § 33). Bearing these things in mind, let us examine the passages cited from the fathers by our correspondent.

His first authority is Ignatius, who says that "the Eucharist is the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ." Does this passage necessarily imply, that the substance of the bread is *changed* into the actual body, bones, and sinews of our Lord? Surely not. St. Paul, in speaking of the rock in the wilderness, says—"*That rock was Christ*" (1 Cor. x. 4). And how does St. Augustine interpret these words? "The thing that signifieth," saith he, "is commonly called by the name of that thing that it signifieth; therefore is it that St. Paul saith, 'The rock was Christ.' For he saith not, the rock signified Christ, but, the rock was Christ, as if the rock had been Christ indeed; whereas, *touching the substance it was not so, but so it was by signification*" (per substantiam non hoc erat, sed per significationem.—Op. Tom. iii. col. 516). It is in this manner that Ignatius calls the Eucharist "the flesh of our Saviour Christ;" not physically, but as St. Augustine saith, "The sacrament of Christ's body, *after a certain manner of speech*, is the body of Christ" (Secundum quemdam modum, sacramentum corporis Christi corpus Christi est, sacramentum sanguinis Christi sanguis Christi est.—Op. Par. 1679; Tom. ii. col. 267).

Again, St. Chrysostom, in writing of the sacrament of baptism, says, "St. Paul showeth in this place (Heb. ix. 19), the blood (of Christ) and the water (of baptism) are *the same*" (δεικνυσιν ενταυθα το αυτο ον και αιμα και ὑδωρ.—Tom. xii. 228, Par. 1838). Does he mean that the water of baptism is *changed* into Christ's blood? Certainly not; but each borrows the name of the other; because they are joined together in one mystery. The water is called Christ's blood, because it is a sacrament of that blood; and so Ignatius writes, that the Eucharist is the flesh of Christ, because it is the sacrament of his body.

That this is the true principle upon which this and other similar passages are to be interpreted, is evident from a passage in the epistle of the same writer, Ignatius, to the Romans, § 7:—"The drink of God I desire, even his blood, *which is* incorruptible love and eternal life" (το αἱμα αυτου, ὁ εστιν αγαπη αφθαρτος και αιωνιος ζωη.) Is, then, the blood of Christ actually incorruptible love and eternal life? No, surely; but it is the sacramental pledge and token of these blessings, to all faithful believers. A physical change or transmutation, or an assertion of actual identity, would, in this case, be simply absurd.

The fallacy which we have just pointed out, runs through most Roman Catholic interpretations of the passages of the Fathers which are quoted on this subject. Whenever an ancient writer states that Christians, in the Eucharist, partake of the body and blood of Christ, Roman Catholic controversialists at once exclaim, "This writer must have believed in transubstantiation." But this is a great mistake. The Church of England holds just as firmly as the ancient Fathers ever did, that "the body and blood of Christ are *verily and indeed* taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's supper" (Catech.); but the whole question turns on the *manner* of the reception. When any ancient Father of the first five centuries can be produced, who states, as the catechism of the Council of Trent does, that the bread and wine are changed into the *body, blood, bones, and sinews* of Christ, we will be content to avow our error, but not till then.

We need not dwell on the passage which our correspondent quotes from Justin Martyr, as its real meaning will be sufficiently evident from what we have just said. A few lines before, Justin had said, "This food is among us called the Eucharist, for we take not these as common bread, or as common drink." Do not these words sufficiently imply that Justin considered the sacramental element to be still *bread*, after consecration, although it was no longer *common bread*? and if this be so, is it not plainly manifest that he could not have believed in transubstantiation?

The same remarks apply to Irenæus. In the passage quoted by our correspondent, (which is in lib. v. c. ii., p. 400, Ox. 1702), that ancient Father had said, that "the Eucharist is the body and blood of Christ." But if our correspondent had taken the trouble to refer to one or two other passages of the same writer, even he, we should imagine, could not have mistaken his true meaning. Thus, for example, Irenæus writes (lib. iv. c. 34, p. 327)—"Bread, which is from the earth, receiving the vocation of God, is now not common bread, but the Eucharist, consisting of two things, an earthly thing and a heavenly thing." (Qui est a terra panis, percipiens vocationem Dei, jam non communis panis est, sed eucharistia, ex duabus rebus constans, terrena et coelesti.) Irenæus, like his predecessor Justin Martyr, and his successor Cyril of Jerusalem, denies that, after consecration, the eucharistic bread and wine are any longer common bread and common drink; but he speaks, as the voice of antiquity fully teaches, of their moral or sacramental change from a secular application to a holy purpose, not of their physical or material change from mere bread and wine into Christ's literal body and blood—a change, which the fact of his calling the sacramental element bread, *after* consecration, sufficiently disavows.

Hitherto, our correspondent had gone pretty regularly through the list of the Fathers, but now he makes a great jump, from Irenæus to Cyprian. Was there, then, no writer of eminence between these? There was; one of remarkable ability, whom Cyprian was wont to call his master, the well-known Tertullian. And does not Mr. Duffey refer to him? He does, a little lower down; but we request the special attention of our readers to the fact, that he *stops short* in the middle of a sentence, which, if quoted entire, would, instead of *proving* transubstantiation, have furnished a conclusive argument *against* it, so far as Tertullian's authority goes. The passage, as quoted by Mr. Duffey, runs thus—"The bread which Christ took at his last supper, and distributed to his disciples, he changed into his body." Here Mr. Duffey's quotation stops; but what follows in the original? "he changed into his body, saying—This is my body"—*that is a figure of my body!* (Corpus illum suum fecit, hoc est corpus meum dicendo, id est, figura corporis mei. *Adv. Marc.* iv. 40, p. 458, Par. 1675.) What will Mr. Duffy *now* say to the authority of this ancient writer, one of his own chosen witnesses?

If, according to Tertullian, the sacramental elements were only changed into a *figure* of Christ's body, it is pretty plain that he could not have believed, as the Catechism of the Council of Trent declares, that the bread and wine are actually changed and transmuted into the flesh, bones, and sinews of the Lord Jesus Christ—that is, he was no believer in transubstantiation. Is it fair or reasonable, we ask, to quote an ancient writer as holding a particular doctrine, when, if his words were given entire, they would prove that he held the very opposite? Mr Duffey's letter is written in such an earnest and candid spirit, that we entirely acquit *him* of any dishonesty in this matter. He has borrowed the quotation, we have no doubt, from some controversial book, the name of which, for the sake of his own character, he ought to send us. The original author who stopped so conveniently short when it suited his purpose, was certainly no lover of truth, and we grieve to say, this is not the first occasion on which we have detected Roman Catholic writers in similar dishonesty of quotation.

But Tertullian does not stand alone. Precisely similar language regarding the Eucharist is found in St. Augustine, whom Mr. Duffey claims as one of his authorities. He, too, writes as follows:—"Our Lord doubted not to say—'This is my body,' when he gave a *token* of his body." (Non dubitavit Dominus dicere, hoc est corpus meum, cum daret *signum* corporis sui. (*Op. Tom.* viii. col. 124.) It is clear, from this passage alone, if there were none others, that St. Augustine was no believer in transubstantiation.

Our remarks have run to such a length on this interesting subject, that we are unwillingly obliged to defer the consideration of the other passages cited by Mr. Duffey to some future opportunity. We had intended especially to prove that St. Ambrose, whom our correspondent claims so triumphantly as one of his main authorities, had to be *expurgated* by the Romish editors in one important passage, which was utterly irreconcileable with the dogma of transubstantiation. We hope to refer, however, to this topic hereafter; meanwhile, what we have said will, we trust, enable our correspondent and our Roman Catholic readers generally, to perceive in what sense the Fathers, in the old time, understood these words of our blessed Lord—"This is my body."

WHAT IS THE UNANIMOUS CONSENT OF THE FATHERS?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—The 2nd article of Pope Pius IV.'s creed thus concludes:—

"Nec eam [Scripturam] unquam nisi juxta unanimem consensum Patrum accipiam et interpretabor;" which Mr. Butler translates—"Nor will I ever take or interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers."

Perhaps you or some of your Roman Catholic correspondents would kindly explain the meaning of the (apparently) plain word "unanimous."

If it means, as it generally does, "agreed in or to *by all*," it would seem that the opinion of even *one* Father in the explanation of a text, must, if opposed to *all* others, be sufficient to prevent any use being made of that text by members of the Church of Rome.

Take, for example, the principal text brought forward by that Church in support of St. Peter's primacy, and its own infallibility—"And I say unto thee that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church.—St. Matt. xvi. 18, R. C. version.

The note on this text in the Douay Bible says—"By the plain course of the words *Peter* is here declared *to be the rock* upon which the Church was to be built."

St. Chrysostom and St. Augustine give a directly contrary interpretation. St. Chrysostom says (Op. Tom. vii., Benedictine ed., p. 548)—Τῇ πέτρᾳ· ταυτεστι τῇ πίστει τῆς ὁμολογίας—(The rock, that is the *faith of his confession*. See also Opp. Tom. viii., p. 785-6.)

St. Augustine says (Serm. 66, cap. ii., de verbis Evang., Matt.)—"Tu ergo, inquit, es Petrus, et super hanc petram quam confessus es, super hanc petram quam cognovisti, dicens, Tu es Christus Filius Dei vivi, ædificabo ecclesiam meam." "Thou, therefore, he says, art Peter, and upon *this rock which thou hast confessed*—upon this which thou hast recognized, saying, Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God—I will build my Church." (Op. S. Aug. Tom. v. col. 415, ed. Ben.)

Again (Serm. de sanctis. 295, i.)—"Super hanc petram ædificabo fidem, quam confiteris. Super hoc quod dixisti, Tu es Christus Filius Dei vivi, ædificabo ecclesiam meam." (Tom. v. col. 1194.)

"Upon this rock I will build the faith thou didst confess—upon *this which thou hast said*, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God—I will build my Church.

A Romanist who holds the creed of Pope Pius IV. cannot, I think, interpret this passage in opposition to Chrysostom and Augustine, and is, therefore debarred from the interpretation given by the Romish note.

J. R. D. B.

We do not see how this difficulty is to be got over. If we could have the unanimous consent of the Popes on this passage of Scripture, it still would not come up to what the creed of Pope Pius requires. Yet, even this much consent we cannot have, though one would think that the Popes, at least, might agree among themselves about the interpretation of this passage, but they do not. Some of the Popes say Christ is the rock; some say Peter is the rock; some say the See of Rome is the rock. Pope Gelasius, in the 5th century, alluding to Matthew xvi. 18—"that word which promised that the gates of hell should never prevail against the *confession* of the blessed apostle Peter." So here the confession of faith in Christ is the rock (Ep. 1, Labbe and Coss., vol. iv., p. 1158); and Pope Gregory the Great says, "found your life on the rock of the Church—that is, on the *confession* of blessed Peter, the chief of the apostles" (Labbe and Coss., vol v., p. 1157); and Pope Hormisdas says—"when many have separated themselves from the firmness of that rock, which is Christ." (Labbe and Coss., vol. vi., p. 1459); and Pope Felix III. represents St. Peter himself as speaking thus of Christ—"who promised that the gates of hell should never prevail against his Church, founded *on my confession*" (Labbe and Cosss., vol. iv., p. 1053). That confession was—"thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." We believe that the confession of this is, indeed, the rock on which Christ founded his Church.

Can any of our correspondents give us the interpretation of these words—"on this *rock* I will build my Church," according to the creed of Pope Pius IV., that is, according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers?

PURGATORY, AND THE PRACTICE OF PRAYING FOR THE DEAD, PROVED FROM THE FATHERS OF THE FIRST, SECOND, AND THIRD CENTURIES, ETC.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—The writings of the holy Fathers of both the Eastern and Western Churches, most clearly prove, that, from the earliest dawn of Christianity, the belief of a purgatory was general in the Church. Tertullian, the famous champion of the Christian religion, who lived in the second age, says, "No man will doubt but that the soul doth recompense something in the places below."—Lib. de Anima. c. 58. And, again, in his book, "De Corona Militis," "We make yearly oblations for the dead." St. Clement, in the same age, tells us St. Peter "taught them, among other works of mercy, to bury the dead and diligently perform their funeral rites; and also to pray and give alms for them."—Epist. 1st. de St. Petro. In the third age, St. Cyprian says, "It is one thing being cast into a prison, not to go out thence till he pays the utmost farthing—another, presently to receive the reward of faith; one thing, being afflicted with long pains for sins to be mended and purged long with fire—another, to have purged all sins by suffering."—Epis. 52, ad Anton. In the same age, Origen says—"Though a releasement out of prison be promised, St. Mat. v., yet it is signified that none can get out from thence but he who pays the utmost farthing."—Epist. ad Roman. et Hom. iii. St. Luc. In the fourth age, St. Ambrose says—"But where, as St. Paul says, 'yet so as by fire' he shows, indeed, that he shall be saved, but yet shall suffer the punishment of fire; that being purged by fire he may be saved and not tormented for ever, as the infidels are, with everlasting fire."—Cap. iii. Ephes. ad Cor. In the same age: "This is that (says St. Jerome) which he saith thou shalt not go out of prison till thou shalt pay even thy little sins."—Matt. v. In the same age, St. Cyril, of Jerusalem, says, "We beseech God for all those who have died before us, believing the obsecration of that holy and dreadful sacrifice which is put on the altar to be the greatest help of the souls for which it is offered."—Catech. Mystagog. v. Again, in the same age, the above-quoted St. Jerome says—"These things were not in vain ordained by the apostles, that in the venerable and dreadful mysteries of the mass, there should be made a memory of those who have departed this life; they knew much benefit would hence accrue to them."—Hom. iii. Epist. ad Phil.

Indeed, Mr. Editor, it would fill volumes to quote all those passages from the holy Fathers, which prove the belief in a third place, and prayers for the dead to be coeval with Christianity

Those I have quoted, lived twelve, thirteen, and fourteen centuries before the Reformation, and were, of course, as good judges of genuine apostolical tradition as the gentlemen of the Reformation could be.

If these holy and learned doctors, some of whom were the immediate successors of the apostles, did not think themselves guilty of superstition in praying for the dead, but declared, that in doing so they followed and obeyed the ordinances of the apostles, neither do we think ourselves guilty of superstition, in believing and doing, as they did. "He who sowed sparingly, shall reap sparingly; and he who soweth in blessings, shall also reap of blessings."—2 Cor. ix. 6.

He then who soweth so sparingly in this world as to remain, in his dying moment, indebted to the Divine justice, will after his death be compelled to pay to the last farthing what, by more serious endeavours, he might have paid in this world.

You will, I hope, excuse the length of this letter; I could not make it shorter; and you, Mr. Editor, have inquired so often for those authorities that I have produced from the first, second, and third centuries, &c., for the support of our doctrine, that I think in fairness you ought to insert it, and give your readers a view of what is to be said on the other side. I am a constant reader of your pages.

I remain, sir, your humble and obedient servant,

JOHN DUFFY.

We have to apologize to Mr. Duffy for having postponed inserting the above letter, though in type a considerable time, in consequence of the great pressure of other matter.

If our correspondent be, as he says, a constant reader of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN he must be aware that the two subjects to which his letter relates—purgatory, and prayers for the dead—are perfectly distinct, and he must know that it is useless to endeavour to prove the antiquity of the doctrine of purgatory by passages which merely speak of prayers for the departed. We admit that the practice of prayers for the dead was introduced into the Church at an early period, though not in the first century; but we confidently deny that any support can be got for the doctrine of purgatory from the writings of orthodox Fathers of the three first centuries. In the early Church, prayers were made for the departed, not indeed that God would deliver their souls from purgatory, but that He would give them a blessed sentence in the day of judgment; that He would hasten the resurrection, and so on. These prayers were offered, in fact, for the greatest saints, those whom no one ever supposed to have been in purgatory, for the apostles and martyrs, and even for the Virgin Mary herself. We could show this abundantly by citations from the Fathers, and the ancient liturgies; but we must not weary our readers by recurring to a point which has been frequently insisted on, and we conceive fully established in the pages of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Let us proceed to consider the passages adduced by our correspondent. The first quotation is from Tertullian; and here we may remark that the heading of our correspondent's letter, "Purgatory, and the practice of praying for the dead, proved from the Fathers of the first, second, and third centuries, &c.," is scarcely appropriate, because, as will presently be seen, there is no passage cited from the genuine works of any writer earlier than Tertullian, who was born in the middle of the second century. Let us see, however, what is the value of Tertullian's evidence. The first passage is from his *Treatise de Animâ*, c. 58. "No man will doubt but that the soul doth recompense something in the places below." Now, will our correspondent believe us when we state that the great Roman Catholic controversialist, Bellarmine, brands as heretical the views as to the state of the departed, put forward by Tertullian in this same *Treatise de Animâ*, and in the very chapter from which the above quotation is taken. Such, however, is the case (see Bellarmine, de Ecclesia Triumphante, l. 1.); but as we Protestants would not be much influenced by Bellarmine's decision, as to what was or was not heresy, we must explain why we attach no importance to this assertion of Tertullian. There lived in the second century a man named Montanus, who made a considerable stir in the Church. He took up the monstrous notion that he was himself the COMFORTER promised by Christ to his disciples, and he pretended to be able to prophesy, under the influence of divine inspiration. Notwithstanding the absurdity of this and other opinions which he held, he had many followers, and, among others, Tertullian. Now, in the very next sentence to that quoted by our correspondent, Tertullian justifies the assertion he has made by a reference to Montanus, under the name of the Comforter! Can it be maintained that a statement so supported is deserving of any attention?

The next passage is also from Tertullian, from his Book de Coronâ Militis.—"We make yearly oblations for the dead." Though this passage might be cited to prove the practice of prayer for the dead in Tertullian's time, it is obvious that it does not bear at all on the doctrine of purgatory.

The next passage—that from Clement—we are unable to verify, as our correspondent has given us no reference; but we have do doubt that he means to refer to the first of the series of epistles of Clement, of Rome, to St. James, which epistles are now universally admitted to be spurious. As our attention has been directed to this letter, we think it worth while to give an extract, which will show that, even in the late period at which this forgery was perpetrated, no idea of a purgatory, such as is now believed in by Roman Catholics had entered into the Church. The following words are put by the writer of the epistle into the mouth of St. Peter (p. 7, L. Paris ed., 1544), "With regard to those who could not completely fulfil the rule of righteousness, but have left some traces of wickedness, their bodies, indeed, are dissolved, but their souls are preserved in joyful and happy places, that in the resurrection of the dead, when they have been reunited to their bodies, purified by the very dissolution, they may enjoy their eternal inheritance for the good deeds they have done." From this it would appear that in those comparatively late times no means of purification after death were believed in, beyond bestowing on the risen souls purified and glorified bodies in place of their present ones. It is obvious, too, that the passage of the pseudo-Clement, which our correspondent has quoted, even if it were genuine, would not give the least support to purgatory.

A well-known passage from Cyprian is next quoted; but if our correspondent will refer to the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. ii, p. 68., June, 1853, he will find the true meaning of this passage, as explained by a learned Roman Catholic commentator, and he will see that it has no reference whatever to purgatory.

The next passage is from Origen. Here again we must refer our correspondent to former discussions in the CATHOLIC LAYMAN (see vol. ii., pp. 56, 67, 105). If he will take the trouble of consulting the articles referred to, he will see what were Origen's views as to the punishments of a future life, and how they differed from the modern Romish doctrine of purgatory; he will learn, moreover, that Origen was condemned as heretical on this very point.

Our correspondent next cites passages from Ambrose, Cyril, and Jerome, who, as every one knows, flourished in the fourth century. As Mr. Duffy's object was to prove purgatory and prayers for the dead from the Fathers of the three first centuries, it would be as irrevalent for us to discuss, as it was for him to introduce, quotations from writers of the fourth century. However, if it was desirable, something might be said about all these passages too.

Let us now review the proofs which our correspondent has brought forward—that purgatory and prayers for the dead were held and taught by the Fathers of the first three centuries. He does not quote a single passage from the genuine remains of any Father of the first century. Of the passages from writers of the second or third centuries, two only seem to give any support to the doctrine of purgatory, and neither of these from orthodox Fathers. The remaining passages quoted, either have no reference to purgatory, or are taken from writers later than the third century. Mr. Duffy does not profess to be a scholar, and he may say, that if he was, he could furnish more ample evidence of the truth of his opinions; but we can assure him that, if he had the learning of Bellarmine, the evidence for purgatory, which he could extract from writers of the first three centuries, would be meagre in the extreme.

Our correspondent has given no quotation from any of the genuine works of the Apostolic Fathers. In truth, it would be impossible to find in their writings any proof of the doctrine of purgatory. Surely, their silence on this doctrine, of such vast importance if true, is very remarkable. It may be said, that to argue from their silence is not very convincing; but there are cases in which the silence of a writer on a subject may be a most conclusive proof that he knew nothing about it. If the introduction of a topic be necessary or pertinent, the fact of its not being introduced goes a long way to show that the writer was ignorant of everything about it. Now, we could refer to passages in the Apostolic Fathers where the mention of purgatory could hardly have failed to be introduced, if the existence of it had been known or believed in at the time. For instance, Clement, when expressly treating of death and the resurrection (I. Ep. ad

Cor. sec. 24, 27), would inevitably have alluded to purgatory had he believed in its existence; but he is totally silent on the subject. The absence of any allusion to purgatory here is almost as clear a proof that Clement did not believe in the doctrine, as if he had expressly alluded toit, to repudiate it. Moreover, there is a passage in his second epistle to the Corinthians, which, if the epistle be genuine, *demonstrates* that he knew nothing about purgatory—*vide* II. Ep. ad Cor. 8. The testimony of Ignatius is equally cogent. The following passage occurs in his epistle to the Magnesians, sec. 5.—"When our existence here is at an end," he says, "*there are two states set before us*—a state of death, and a state of life—and every one shall depart to his appropriate habitation." We ask if it can be conceived possible that the doctrine of purgatory was included in the creed of Ignatius?

WHAT ARE THE POINTS OF FAITH WHICH THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH REQUIRES AND WHICH ARE NOT NAMED IN THE BIBLE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Will some one of your Roman Catholic readers favour me with a plain, honest, and straightforward answer to the following question?

Roman Catholics are taught to believe that the BIBLE is not a sufficient rule of faith; that TRADITION is of equal authority with the Bible. It follows, of a consequence, that there are POINTS OF FAITH which, for our salvation as Christians, are necessary to be believed, and which are not contained in or taught by the Bible, but established by tradition.

The question I wish to put is—What are the POINTS OF FAITH which the Roman Catholic Church requires us, as Christians, to believe as necessary to salvation, which are not revealed in the *Scriptures*, but established by *tradition?*

To assist the inquiry, I would beg to call the Roman Catholic reader's attention to the copious references to Scriptural authority cited in the index accompanying the octavo edition of the Bible, sold by Richardson, and sanctioned by Dr. Wiseman.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
C. H. COLLETTE.

FLOWERS FOR APRIL.

THE spring is come, and we may welcome it in the language of Solomon—"So the winter is past, the rain is over and gone; the flowers appear on the earth; the time of the singing of the birds is come, and the voice of the turtle is heard in our land; the fig tree putteth forth her green figs, and the vines with the tender grape give a good smell."—Canticles ii. 10-13. With us the rich blossom of the peach tree, and the white flowers of the pear, the apple and the cherry tree convert our orchards, gardens, and shrubberies into groves of flowers, while the hedges are becoming white and radiant with the blossoms of the blackthorn or early sloe (*prunus spinosa*).

"Sweet April, many a thought
Is wedded unto thee, as hearts are wed.
Nor shall they fall, till to its autumn brought
Life's golden fruit is shed."

The soft refreshing showers of April and its alternating sunshine bring forth a host of primroses, violets, wild anemonies, and hyacinths, spread, like a rich and gaily-variegated carpet, over our woods and meadows.

Not the least of these is the wild HYACINTH (*hyacinthus non scriptus*), with its long, blue, bell-shaped petals so gracefully curled. It is to be met with flowering under the shadows of trees, and near the flowing stream of a rivulet, which breathes its soft fragrance as it glides along in the stillness of its retreat.

"Shade loving hyacinth, thou comest again,
And thy rich odours seem to swell the flow
Of the lark's song, the redbreast's mirthful strain,
And the stream's tune."

The wild hyacinth is sometimes confounded with the harebell or bluebell of the heath-lands. The garden hyacinth (*hyacinthus orientale*) is derived from the Levant and the Holy Land. It has become a familiar in-door acquaintance from its early flowering in water, and the variety and richness of its colours. It was an old favourite of the poets, who have given it, accordingly, a classic origin—

"Apollo, with unwitting hand,
Whilome did slay his dearly-loved friend,
Young Hyacinth, the pride of Spartan land,
And then transformed him into a purple flower."

Hence the flower has been associated with the sombre sentiment of death—

"The deep blue tincture that robed it seemed
The gloomiest garb of sorrow,
As if in its eye no brightness beamed,
And it never in clearer moments dreamed
Of a fair and calm to-morrow."

There is no feature of the Christian revelation more distinctive than the manner in which it presents to us the King of terrors, so different from the view given of it by the superstitions of heathenism and of all other systems of false religion.

Although the Bible is very plain in its declaration that sin first entered, and then death by sin (Rom. v. 12), as its wages (Rom. v. 23), and that we all by nature had the sentence of death in ourselves (2 Cor. i. 9), we are not allowed to dwell upon the dismal topic, which is brought home to our observation, from year to year, in our neighbourhood, our acquaintance, and in our family circle. We are rather directed to one who abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel (1 Tim. i. 10); and we are invited to look forward to that time when the prophecy shall be fulfilled, that he should "swallow up death in victory, and wipe away tears from all eyes."—Isaiah xxv. 8. This time is thus spoken of by St. Paul—"We shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised, and we shall be changed. When this mortal shall put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written. Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? Thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory, through our Lord Jesus Christ."—1 Cor. xv. 55. It is very remarkable how little the Church of Rome enters upon this glorious subject: her whole attention seems directed to a supposed intermediate state of purgation or punishment, of which St. Paul must assuredly have known nothing, or he would have said something.

The ANEMONE (*Τανεμόνε*) *ανεμος*, wind-flower, also makes a permanent figure in the flora of April, both in the field and in the flower-garden. It is supposed to be named anemone or wind-flower from its quivering in every breeze, or, as some suppose, because it opens its flowers to the wind; but this latter explanation is considered apocryphal by botanists. They are all, certainly, a hardy race, growing naturally, in high and exposed situations, and blooming at an early period of the year. They freely bare their petals to the cold embrace of an ungenial east wind.

The wood anemone is better known in the woodlands of England than with us. Its simple white flowers, slightly tinged with pink, are spread in great profusion on the surface of the woods.

"Anemonies, weeping flowers!
Dyed in winter's snow and rain;
White the leaf-strewn ground again,
And make each wood a garden then."

There are two other species of anemone indigenous to these islands, but not often met with—The blue mountain anemone (*anemone pulsatilla*), with dark purple leaves and silky stem, and the yellow anemone (*anemone ranunculoides*), with soft flowers, sometimes found nodding among the moss and the dry leaves under the trees.

The beautiful garden anemonies which show such varieties of colour through so many months of the year, are all natives of the east. They now dazzle the eye with their brilliant scarlet, and now please it with their soft purple and lilac tints fading into white. Foremost among them is the poppy anemone (*anemone coronaria*), white, with a red ring round its centre; and the star anemone (*anemone stellata*), and that which is commonly called the garden anemone (*anemone hortensis*), both of which are purple, with a white centre, and from these there spring all the varieties which our gardens

"With rubies flaming and with living gold"

can boast.

Like the hyacinth, the ancients prized the anemone so highly that they attributed to it no ordinary birth. Their poets traced its origin to the time when Venus, in her grief at the death of her favourite, Adonis, mingled her tears with his blood, and thence sprung, as they said, the first anemone. It is still a very favourite flower in the east, and is highly esteemed by our florists at home, not only for its beauty and hardiness, but still more from yielding to our management, so as to flower almost at any season, according as we keep the roots above ground; as, by planting them every successive month, they can be made to bloom almost throughout the year. The anemone prefers a fresh loamy bed, of a heavy nature, rather than a light soil; but with all its hardiness, and like many a rustic beauty, it languishes in the town, pure air being indispensable to its health, indeed to its existence, as we have more than once lamented to find, when healthy, luxuriant plants introduced into our town garden in high hope and promise, have immediately declined and perished.

The anemone is also a natural barometer, closing its petals when the air is moist and rain at hand. It is like many other flowers, affected by the alternations of day and night, and on the approach of evening, it droops and closes up till sunrise.

"The flower enamoured of the sun,
At his departure hangs her head and weeps,
And shrouds her sweetness up and keeps
Sad vigils, like a cloistered nun,
Till his reviving ray appears,
Waking her beauty, as he dries her tears."

Among the Persians the anemone was supposed to possess some magic charm, and the first flower that was found in the fields, in the spring, when gathered and kept, was fancied to be a preservative against pestilence. The Christian's amulet is mentioned by David—"He that dwelleth in the secret place of the Most High shall abide under the shadow of the Almighty. I will say of the Lord he is my refuge, and my fortress, my God, in him will I trust, surely he shall deliver thee from the snare of the fowler, and from the noisome pestilence."—Psalm xci. 1, 2, 3.

Then there is the AURICULA (*auricula primula*), blooming side by side with the hyacinth. Its botanic name is auricula ursi, or *bear's-ear*, from the shape of its leaves. The richness of its flowers has associated it with the sentiment of pride.

"Arrayed in sporting dust and velvet pride,
Like heroes at state arranged in splendid row,
The proud auriculas their lustre show."

Kindred with the auricula is the POLYANTHUS, *of* numbered dyes (*primula elatior*); it is, in fact, a variety of the wild primrose, though differing widely in its colours, and mode of flowering in clusters. Its prevailing colours are red, claret colour, and lilac.

We have not space to notice the stately crown imperial, with its drooping bell-flowers, and coronal of leaves; the pretty speedwell (*veronica*), with its flowers of cerulean blue peeping through the hedges, nor the Iris "of all hues," the symbol of eloquence among the ancients; but we would say a hasty word on the Pansy.

The PANSY, in its native state of wildness, is the *viola tricolor*, or heart's-ease of the fields. Though variously tinted, its petals are generally of purple, yellow, and white—whence it derives its name of three-faces-under-a-hood. As we roam through the fields in spring,

"Their triple boast, the white,
The purple, and the gold do far outvie
The eastern monarch's garb."

They stand out well from the mass of green, and, again, they appear among the stubble of our corn-fields in harvest, as fresh and rich as in the early days of spring. This rustic beauty is the parent stock of all the florists' splendid pansy flowers—the deep purple, the maroon, the yellow, and the white. It is one of the strongest exemplifications of the beneficial effects of proper and well-directed culture. We see this also in the lower order of animals and in mankind itself. And how strongly must not David have felt this, from this his fervent and constant prayer throughout the entire of the Psalms—"Oh, teach me thy paths; teach me thy ways; teach me thy statutes; teach me thy judgments; teach me thy will; teach me good judgment;" and then, in another Psalm, he gives the other side of the picture—"Blessed is the man whom thou teachest out of thy law."—Psalm xciv. 12. This law is to be found in the Scriptures, given by inspiration, which our Lord directed the Jews to search, and the Apostle Paul commended the Bereans for studying.

FARMING OPERATIONS FOR APRIL.

(From the Irish Farmers' Gazette.)

THE spring's work should now be considerably in advance, if the unusually fine seed time we have enjoyed for sometime has been taken advantage of, though, from various uncontrolable causes, much may yet have to be done.

Spring Wheat.—It is too late now, and has been so for the last fortnight, to sow any of the usually recommended white wheats for spring sowing; but this is the proper month to sow the true April wheat (Triticum æstivum), which is a red or yellow bearded wheat. It may be sown in any soil usually sown with wheat, comes in early, and yields well. The grain is inclined to be coarse; but some experience in its culture and knowledge of its habit may lead to much improvement.

Winter-sown Wheats will require hoeing, harrowing, and rolling during the month. When strong and luxuriant, it will require eating down with sheep or mowing.

Barley should be sown and completed early in the month, and when sown with clovers and grasses, should be well rolled afterwards.

Carrots and Parsnips.—Where the intended breadth has not been sown, no time should now be lost in doing so, remembering to germinate the seeds, as directed in last month's calendar, which will give to the middle of the month to get in those valuable root crops.

Flax should now be sown, the land having been previously well-pulverized, and all root weeds gathered and removed. To insure a level surface and even covering, the land should be rolled before sowing. Three and a-half to four bushels of seed should be sown to the Irish acre, and well harrowed in, first up and down, and then across, with light harrows, to disperse the seed evenly. Finish with the roller, if the soil be dry enough without sticking to the roller. Clover and grass seeds are sometimes sown with the flax crop; but the flax manufacturers object to it as being injurious to the plant, but recommend substituting carrots, sowing them in drills, on the flat, which may be hoed and cleaned after pulling the flax.

Spring Vetches.—Sow a breadth commensurate with requirements in July and August. Sow about the beginning of the month, and again at the latter end, and mix some oats and rape with the vetches.

Beans and Peas will require hand-hoeing sometime during the month.

Cabbages.—Finish planting out the general crop of cabbages, and sow more seed to produce plants to put out in June and July.

Potato planting should be proceeded with with all possible despatch. Those planted in the autumn will soon be making their appearance, and if in lazy-beds should have some fresh earth cast over them from the furrows to protect them from frost, which will be fatal to the young shoots if exposed to it. If planted in drills, they should be carefully harrowed down, before coming to the surface, the drills should then be set up again with the double mould-board plough.

New and Recent Works

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

Booksellers to the Queen,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

THE FIRST RESURRECTION: Being Comments on 1 Cor. chap. xv. By the Rev. Robert Noble. (Immediately.)

THE DOMESTIC COMMENTARY ON THE HOLY SCRIPTURES. By a Clergyman of the Church of England. 4 vols. Imp. 8vo. £2 15s. 6d.

CHRISTOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, and a Commentary on the Messianic Predictions. By E. W. Hengstenberg. vol. 1. 10s. 6d.

INCIDENTS OF TRAVEL IN CENTRAL AMERICA, CHIAPAS AND YUCATAN. By the late John Lloyd Stephens. With numerous Engravings. 8vo. 12s.

GRATITUDE: an Exposition of the Hundred and Third Psalm. By the Rev. John Stevenson. 8vo. 6s.

THE BIBLE IN THE COUNTING HOUSE: a course of Lectures to Merchants. By the Rev. H. A. Broadman, D.D. 8vo. 5s.

LEILA ADA, THE JEWISH CONVERT: an authentic Memoir. By Osborne W. Trenery, Heighway. 3s. 6d.

SELECT EXTRACTS FROM THE DIARY, CORRESPONDENCE, ETC., OF LEILA ADA. By Osborne W. Trenery, Heighway. 3s. 6d.

THE BUD OF PROMISE: a Memoir of Eliza H. M. Græme. By the Rev. D. Pitcairn. 3s. 6d.

THE RUSSO-TURKISH CAMPAIGN OF 1828-29; with a View of the present State of the Eastern Question. By Colonel Chesney. 12s.

THE RUSSIAN SHORES OF THE BLACK SEA, IN THE AUTUMN of 1852, with a Voyage down the Volga, and a Tour through the Country of the Don Cossacks. By Lawrence Oliphant. 8vo. 14s.

PROGRESS OF RUSSIA IN THE WEST, NORTH, AND SOUTH. By David Urquhart. 1s. 6d.

THE RUSSIANS OF THE SOUTH. By Shirley Brooke. 1s.

TURKEY AND CHRISTENDOM: An Historical Sketch of the Relations between the Ottoman Empire and the States of Europe. 1s.

RUSSIA AND THE RUSSIANS; comprising an account of the Czar Nicholas, and the House of Romanoff, with a sketch of the Encroachments of Russia from the reign of the Empress Catherine. By J. H. Cole. 21st Fusileers. 2s. 6d.

THE BOOK AND ITS STORY: a Narrative for the Young, on occasion of the Jubilee of the British and Foreign Bible Society. By L. N. R. With an Introductory preface, by Rev. T. Phillips. Fcap. 4s.

WORK; or Plenty to Do, and How to Do it. By Margaret Maria Brewster. 12mo. 4s.

MY SCHOOLS AND MY SCHOOLMASTERS; or, the Story of my Education. By Hugh Miller. post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

THE HISTORY OF THE FRENCH PROTESTANT REFUGEES, from the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. By Charles Weiss. 8vo. 14s.

HISTORY OF THE PROTESTANT CHURCH IN HUNGARY, FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE REFORMATION TO 1850, with reference also to Transylvania. With an Introduction by Dr. D'Anbigne. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

THE CROSS AND THE DRAGON; or, the Fortunes of Christianity in China, with Notices of the Secret Societies of the Chinese. By J. Kesson. Post 8vo. 6s.

D'AUBIGNE'S HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION. Vol. V.—Subject:—"The Reformation in England." 8vo. 12s.

D'AUBIGNE'S HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY. Five vols. in One. 8vo. Cloth, 8s., Gilt Edges, 9s.

THE NET IN THE BAY; or Journal of a Visit to Moose and Albany. By the Bishop of Rupert's Land. 4s. 6d.

INCIDENTS IN THE LIFE OF OUR SAVIOUR ILLUSTRATIVE OF HIS DIVINE CHARACTER AND MISSION. By Rev. A. L. R. Foote. 6s.

THE WORDS OF JESUS. By the Author of the "Faithful Promiser." In Cover, 8d.; Cloth, 1s.

THE PSALMS RECORDED TO THE MESSIAH: A Commentary on the Book of Psalms. By Rev. R. H. Ryland. With a commendatory notice, by the Bishop of Cashel. 6s.

THE GREAT SACRIFICE. By Rev. John Cumming, D.D. 2s. 6d.

THE COMFORTER. By Rev. J. Cumming, D.D. 2s. 6d.

CHRIST OUR PASSOVER; or, Thoughts on the Atonement. By the Rev. John Cumming, D.D. 2s. 6d.

THE TENT AND ALTAR: Sketches of Patriarchal Days. By Rev. Dr. Cumming. 9s.

MEMOIRS OF THOMAS CHALMERS, D.D., LL.D. By his Son-in-Law, the Rev. Wm. Hanna, LL.D. 2 Vols., 12s.

MEMOIR OF THE LATE REV. EDWARD BICKERSTETH. By the Rev. T. R. Birks. Cheaper Edition. 2 vols., fcap. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

MEMOIR OF THE LIVES OF ROBERT AND JAMES A. HALDANE. By Alexander Haldane, Esq. 8vo. 12s.

MEMOIR OF THE REV. W. H. KRAUSE, A.M., Bethesda Chapel, Dublin, with selections from his Correspondence. By Rev. C. S. Stanford. Crown 8vo. 5s. 6d.

THE SUCCESSFUL MERCHANT: Sketches of the Life of Mr. Samuel Budgett. By William Arthur, A.M. 2s. 6d.

LIVES OF THE QUEENS OF ENGLAND. By Miss Strickland. New and Revised Edition. With numerous Portraits. Vols. I., II., III., IV., post 8vo, 7s. 6d. each. (To be completed in 8 monthly volumes.)

MEMOIR OF THE REV. JOHN PYE SMITH, D.D., L.L.D. By John Medway. 12s. 6d.

DAILY BIBLE ILLUSTRATIONS: The Apostlse and Early Christian Church. By Dr. Kitto. 6s.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES; THE MOSLEM, AND HIS END; THE CHRISTIAN AND HIS HOPE. By the Rev. John Cumming, D.D. 1s. 6d.

NUNS AND NUNNERIES. Two Lectures. By the Rev. Hobart Seymour. 1s. 4d.

THE MYSTERY SOLVED; or, Ireland's Miseries; the Grand Cause and Cure. By the Rev. Marcus Dill, D.D. 2s. 6d.

THE HISTORY OF ENGLAND, from the Invasion of Julius Cæsar to the End of the Reign of George II. By Hume and Smollett. With Continuation to the Accession of Queen Victoria. By the Rev. T. S. Hughes. Vol. i. 4s. (To be completed in 18 monthly vols.)

ST. PATRICK AND THE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH IN IRELAND. By the Rev. W. P. Walsh. Third Edition. 6d.

THE NECESSITY FOR AN INTERMEDIATE SYSTEM OF EDUCATION BETWEEN THE NATIONAL SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES OF IRELAND. By the Rev. Professor M'Cosh, D.D., Queen's College, Belfast. 6d.

THE ART OF QUESTIONING; or, a Short Analysis of the Interrogatory Methods of Instruction, designed for the use of Teachers, Pupil Teachers, and Monitors. By W. T. Young, T.C.D. 1s. By post, 1s. 4d.

PHILIPS MAP OF THE FRONTIER PROVINCES OF TURKEY, RUSSIA, AND AUSTRIA, THE BLACK SEA, &c., with a detailed Map of the River Danube, showing the Fortified Towns, &c., along its course. In case. 1s.

PHILIPS' CHART OF THE MEDITERRANEAN, with detailed Plans of the Bays of Gibraltar, Genoa, Marseilles, &c. 1s.

PHILIPS' CHART OF THE NORTH SEA AND THE BALTIC, with detailed Plans of Cronstadt, Revel, &c. 1s.

JOHNSTONE'S MAP OF THE SEAT OF WAR in the Danubian Principalities, the Black Sea, &c. 1s.

JOHNSTONE'S CHART OF THE BALTIC, with enlarged plans of Kronstadt and St. Petersburgh. 1s.

WYLD'S MAP OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE, THE BLACK SEA, AND THE FRONTIERS OF RUSSIA AND PERSIA. Coloured, 2s. 6d.; mounted and in case, 4s. 6d.

WYLD'S CHART OF THE NORTH SEA AND THE BALTIC. 4s.

WYLD'S CHART OF THE THEATRE OF WAR, on an enlarged scale. 3s. In case, 5s.

WYLD'S PLAN OF CRONSTADT, with its Fortifications and Batteries. 1s.

Lately Published,

WILLET'S "SYNOPSIS PAPISMI." New Edition. Edited by the Rev. J. Cumming, D.D. Ten vols., 8vo. Price £3.

London: JAMES MILLER, 17, Berner's-street, Oxford-street, and all Booksellers.

Just Published, No. II., Price 6s.,

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND QUARTERLY REVIEW.

CONTENTS:

I. Convocation.
II. American Painters.
III. Prophet and Seer.
IV. Life Assurance.
V. Cholera, and its Causes.
VI. Cathedral Reform.
VII. Tractarianism in London.
VIII. Russia, its Power and Prospects.
IX. Quarterly Journal of Facts and Progress.
X. Literature of the Quarter Classified and Reviewed.

London: Sampson Low, and Son. Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY AND CO., 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET.

Just Published, New Edition, Price 2s. 6d.,

THE COLLECTS OF THE LITURGY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND,

Catechetically Explained, Compared with Scripture, and Briefly Commented upon, with the Date and Origin of each Collect annexed. For the use of Families and Sunday Schools.

By the Rev. Charles Miller, A.B.,

With Recommendatory Preface by the Bishop of Meath.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY, 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET. London: Wertheim and Mackintosh.

Just Published,

Second Edition, with additional Facts and Anecdotes, in limp cloth, 1s. 6d., or in cloth, 2s. 6d.,

POOR PADDY'S CABIN; or, SLAVERY IN IRELAND. A true Representation of Facts and Characters. By an Irishman.

"We could desire nothing better for the British Empire, and indeed for the interests of mankind everywhere, than that 'Poor Paddy's Cabin' may have a circulation as extensive as Mrs. Stowe's beautiful narrative. The story on which the incidents are engrafted is in the highest degree interesting and gratifying, and it would do more good within the British Islands, if found in every hand, than even 'Uncle Tom's Cabin has done for the cause of Negro Emancipation in the New World!"—*Standard.*

London: WERTHEIM and MACINTOSH. Dublin: WM. CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Just Published, Price 3d.,

CHILDREN IN HEAVEN: A Sermon to Children, preached in Trinity Church, on Thursday, January 5, 1854. By the Rev. John Gregg, A.B.

II.

Price Twopence.

GOOD TO BE DONE, AND WHO SHOULD DO IT: A Sermon preached in Trinity Church, on Sunday, January 1, 1854. By the Rev. John Gregg, A.B.

III.

Price Twopence.

A CURE FOR CARE: A Sermon preached in Trinity Church. By the Rev. John Gregg, A.B.

IV.

Price Twopence.

THE WAY OF ESCAPE: A Sermon preached in Trinity Church, on Sunday evening, January 1, 1845. By the Rev. John Gregg, A.B.

V.

GOOD NEWS FOR THE POOR: A Sermon preached in Trinity Church, on the 11th December, 1853. By the Rev. John Gregg, A.B.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON, and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher, WILLIAM CURRY, 9 Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

APRIL, 1854.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Θlóιρ νο Dhια αñ γηα hάηνωιδ, αgυγ γíννċáιη αιρ αη νċαlαιη νeαgċoιl νο na νáoιmδ.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED THE MIDDLE OF EVERY MONTH, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. III.—No. 29. MAY, 1854. { **Annual Subscription, 3s. 6d. Payable in Advance.**

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
The Infallible Church not Infallible	55
The Life of St. Philomena—"The Young Christian's Library"	56
How far is the Reformation affected by the characters and motives of the Reformers—No. II.	57
The Heir of Ballymanus—No. III.	58
Is the Scaffold the safest way to Heaven?	61
CORRESPONDENCE:	
Cardinal Bellarmine and the CATHOLIC LAYMAN—by Investigator	62
On Infallibility—by Mr. Rourke	63
On Prayers for the Dead and the Burial Service—by Mr. E. Power	63
Flowers for May	65
Farming Operations for May	65

THE INFALLIBLE CHURCH NOT INFALLIBLE.

In Dr. Johnson's interesting tale of Rasselas, prince of Abyssinia, with which many of our readers are, doubtless, familiar, one of the most amusing chapters is that which records the fate of the ingenious artist, who attempted to discover the method of making wings. Before his project was quite ripe for trial, we are told that, in the course of a conversation with the prince, he drew a vivid picture of the new pleasures of which mankind would shortly be put in possession, as the result of his fortunate discovery. "With what delight," said he, "will a philosopher, furnished with wings, and hovering in the sky, see the earth and all its inhabitants rolling beneath him! How it must amuse the spectator to see the moving scene of land and ocean; to survey, with equal security, the marts of trade, and the fields of battle! How easily shall we then trace the Nile through all his passages, pass over to distant regions, and examine the face of nature from one extremity of the earth to the other!"

Rasselas, we are told, modestly suggested some doubts of the practicability of the design. He hinted that the imagination of the artist prevailed over his skill, and that it suggested rather what he *wished* than what he *knew*. His fears, however, were dismissed as groundless. "Nothing," replied the artist, "will ever be attempted if all possible objections must be first overcome." At length, the wings were finished, and the time came to make trial of them. The attempt was made, and the adventurous artist waved his pinions for flight; but, alas for the vanity of human wishes! in an instant he dropped into the lake beneath, and the prince had much difficulty in drawing him to land.

We have often thought that the incident just related is an apt illustration of the modern Romish theory of infallibility. Nothing can be more attractive than the picture which Bishop Milner, and other Roman Catholic writers, draw of the blessings arising from the possession of an infallible guide in all matters of religion. "How delightful," say they, "to feel oneself raised, as on eagle's wings, above the atmosphere of doubt and uncertainty, which envelopes poor, benighted Protestants, dimly groping after truth! How satisfactory to be able to survey, in calm security, the contentions of rival sects, and the angry warfare of religious parties! If borne aloft by the principle of infallibility, how easily can we trace the stream of orthodox doctrine from its earliest origin, and discern the distant regions over which the Catholic Church is spread, from one extremity of the earth to the other!"

> Felix, qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas,
> Atque metus omnes et inexorabile fatum
> Subjecit pedibus, strepitumque Acherontis avari.

All this is, doubtless, very pleasing and very delightful to think of and write about; but the mere fact of our *wishing* for such an infallible teacher as would save us all trouble in religion, does nothing towards assuring us that God has actually given us such a guide. We have seen that the artist, in the tale, often consoled his mind with similar visions, when he was employed in his attempt to provide for mankind organs which God did not see fit to bestow upon them. The wings, however ingeniously contrived, failed to accomplished the purpose for which the artist designed them; and the question naturally arises, does the infallibility, claimed by the Church of Rome, actually realize the delightful promises its advocates make on its behalf? We shall endeavour to lay a few facts before our readers, which will enable them to answer this question for themselves.

Whence, then, arises the necessity for an infallible guide, and what is the great advantage to be derived from one? Roman Catholic divines always take for granted that the great mass of mankind are utterly unable to arrive at the knowledge of the truths of revelation for themselves. They assume that God must be supposed to have provided for all men a safe and easy method of attaining to religious truth—in other words, an infallible guide. From these premises they conclude that this guide can be no other than the Church of Rome, which they always identify with the whole Catholic Church. They boldly assert that the local Church of Rome has always taught the pure doctrines of Christianity, from the time of St. Paul to the present day; that she has never fallen into the *slightest error or heresy*—in short, that all her authoritative statements may be implicitly embraced, as setting forth those important truths which will make men wise unto salvation. Here, then, they tell us, is the infallible guide we need. If we listen to her, we are secure from the seductions of false doctrine; if we tread in her footsteps, we are in no danger of going astray.

But is it a fact, that the Church of Rome has never varied in her doctrines or teaching? Has she never put forth contradictory statements upon vital questions of religion? A Church which claims infallibility must of necessity be always the same. One instance of contradiction is enough to destroy all reliance upon her testimony, just as one plain, unequivocal lie is fatal to a man's character for veracity. Jesus Christ, the great head of the Church, is "the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever" (Heb. xiii. 8), and it follows, that all the doctrines which claim Him as their author, and rest upon His authority, must necessarily agree.

Let us, then, suppose the case of some honest, sober-minded Christian, whose sole anxiety is to be taught the truth. He is told, that the Church of Rome claims to be infallible, and that he may safely place himself under her guidance. He sets his mind, therefore, to learn the doctrines propounded by that Church from the earliest times; he prepares to soar aloft upon the wings of infallibility, that he may contemplate, as from some lofty eminence, the broad stream of Catholic doctrine flowing down from the first ages of Christianity, and taking its rise in the city of the seven hills.

But, when he tries to spread his wings, is the attempt successful? or, to drop the metaphor, does our inquirer find that the Church of Rome is, in point of fact, infallible? Alas! far from it. Let us hear the evidence of one of the acutest thinkers and ablest writers of the seventeenth century, one who certainly had no prejudices against Romanism, for he was himself, in early years, a Roman Catholic*—"I see plainly, and with mine own eyes, that there are Popes against Popes, councils against councils, some Fathers against others, the same Fathers against themselves, a consent of Fathers of one age against a consent of Fathers of another age." The theory of the Church of Rome being an unerring, infallible guide in religion, like many other theories, looks very well upon paper, and has a plausible, captivating look as long as it is not tested by *facts;* but let any adventurous inquirer, who is in search of truth, and wishes for some better evidence for his religion than the mere word of a priest, only try to put this principle of infallibility to the test—let him attempt to spread his wings, and he finds, on a sudden, that they *won't work*. A host of Popes and Cardinals, councils and divines, pour their discordant blasts upon his head from all the four winds of heaven; and fortunate will he be if, as the result of his rash experiment, he is not plunged deep beneath the dark waters of hopeless infidelity.

We have said that, as a matter of fact, the Church of Rome cannot be infallible, for that she has contradicted herself at various times in the statement of important doctrines of Christianity. General assertions, however, rarely carry conviction along with them, unless they are supported by proofs. We proceed, therefore, to substantiate our charge, by citing a few of these contradictory statements, with the authorities on which they rest. We take, for the sake of convenience, the catechism and decrees of the Council of Trent, as the most authoritative exposition of the doctrines of the modern Church of Rome; and by a comparison of these decrees with the recorded opinions of some of the ancient Popes and divines of that Church, even the most unlearned of our readers will be able to judge whether Romanism is as infallible as she pretends. We give accurate references, as usual, to all the authorities which we quote.

1. And first, concerning the important doctrine of *The Eucharist.*

The *modern* Church of Rome teaches as follows:—"By the consecration of the bread and wine, the whole substance of the bread is converted into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and the whole substance of the wine is converted into the substance of his blood; which conversion is suitably and properly called transubstantiation."—Decret. Conc. Trid., Sess. xiii., c. iv.

Now, listen to the doctrine of the *ancient* Church of Rome.

Pope Gelasius (A.D. 492) writes as follows:—"The sacraments of the body and blood of the Lord, which we receive, are divine things, because by these we are made partakers of the divine nature. Nevertheless, *the substance or nature of bread and wine ceases not to exist;* and, assuredly, the *image and similitude* of the body and blood of Christ are celebrated in the performance of the mysteries."†

Is it possible for two statements to be more directly opposed to one another than these?‡

2. *Communion in one kind.*

The *modern* Church of Rome teaches thus—"If any person shall say, that it is required either by the precept of God, or for necessity of salvation, that all the faithful in Christ shall partake of the holy sacrament of the Eucharist in both kinds, *let him be accursed.*"—Decret. Conc. Trid. Sess. xxi., can. 1.

Now, let us hear what was the custom and practice of the old Roman Church on this point.

S. Thomas Aquinas says, that, "according to the *ancient custom of the Church, all men,* as they communicated in the body, so they also communicated in the blood."‡

The testimony of Cassander, the famous Romish ritualist, is still more express to the same effect—"In the Latin Church, for above a *thousand years*, the body of Christ and the blood of Christ were separately given, the body apart, and the blood apart, after the consecration of the mysteries."§

These authorities show pretty plainly the *novelty* of the decree of the Council of Trent, on the subject of half communion. The following extract, from Pope Gelasius, is equally plain, as to its *unlawfulness*:—"We find that some, having received a portion of the holy body only, do abstain from the cup of the holy blood, who, doubtless (because they are bound by I know not what superstition), should *receive the whole sacrament, or be driven from the whole; for the dividing of one and the same mystery cannot be done without great sacrilege.*"‖

---

* Chillingworth.

† Certe sacramenta quæ sumimus corporis et sanguinis Christi, divina res est, propter quod et per eadem divinæ efficimur consortes naturæ; et tamen esse non desinit substantia vel natura panis et vini. Et certè imago et similitudo corporis et sanguinis Christi in actione mysteriorum celebrantur."—Gelasius, de duabus naturis in Christo. Bibl. Vet. Patrum, tom. viii., p. 703. Lugd., 1677.

‡ The contradiction between the sentiments of Pope Gelasius and the Decree of the Council of Trent, is, indeed, so glaring, that Baronius and Bellarmine were obliged to resort to the desperate expedient of attempting to prove that the treatise above named was not written by *Pope* Gelasius, but by some other man of the same name! The Roman Catholic historian, Du Pin, however, to his credit be it spoken, possessed more honesty than the brace of Cardinals. He exposed the hollowness of this "pious fraud," and proved incontestably that the work in question was rightly ascribed to Pope Gelasius.—Vide Du Pin, Eccl. Hist., vol. i., p. 520. Dublin, 1723.

‡ "Secundum antiquæ ecclesiæ consuetudinem, omnes, sicut communicabant corpori, ita communicabant et sanguini."—S. Thom. in Joannem, cap. vii., sec. vii., p. 363. Paris, 1640.

§ "Occidentalis vero, sive Romana Ecclesia mille amplius annis continuis, non aliter quam sub duplici hac specie in conventu Ecclesiæ sacramentum hoc Dominici corporis et sanguinis administrasse legitur, idque in pane et vino, atque adeò separatim.—Cassander, de Sacr. Commun., p. 1075. Paris, 1616.

‖ "Comperimus quod quidam, sumpta tantummodo corporis sacri portione, a calice sacri cruoris abstineant; qui proculdubio (quoniam nescio qua superstitione docentur obstringi) aut integra sacramenta percipiant, aut ab integris arceantur; quia divisio unius ejusdemque mysterii sine grandi sacrilegio non potest provenire."—Corpus Juris Canonici, De Consecr., Dist. II., cap. 12, tom. i., col. 1918. Lugd., 1671.

It is quite plain, that the curse of the venerable Fathers of the Council of Trent would have lighted on the head of poor Pope Gelasius, if he had had the ill fortune to have been alive in their time.

3. *Solitary masses by a priest.*

The Council of Trent decreed as follows:—"If any person shall say, that masses, in which the priest alone communicates sacramentally, are unlawful, and, therefore, ought to be abrogated, let him be accursed."—Decret. Conc. Trid. Sess. xxii., can. 8.

But, the ancient Church of Rome taught the very reverse. Thus, for example, the Romish canon law tells us, that Anacletus, Bishop of Rome, decreed "that all present should communicate, or else be turned out of the Church: for so the Apostles did order, and the holy Church of Rome observeth."*

And Gregory I. *forbids* the priest to celebrate the Eucharist alone—"A priest," saith he, "should *never* celebrate the mass alone; for as the mass cannot be celebrated without the salutation of the priest, and the answer of the people, it ought, consequently, by no means to be celebrated by a single individual."†

We may well ask, *which* is infallible, Pope Gregory the Great or the Council of Trent?

4. *The Seven Sacraments.*

The doctrine of the Council of Trent runs thus—"If any person shall say, that all the sacraments of the new law were not instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ, or that they are more or fewer than seven, let him be accursed."—Decret. Conc. Trid., Sess. vii., can. 1.

But we are assured, on the unexceptionable authority of Cassander, "that we shall not likely find any writer before Peter Lombard [who lived about 1130] that did define the number of the sacraments!"‡ And the famous canonist, Alex. de Ales, states particularly, with regard to *confirmation*, that "this sacrament was instituted in the Meldensian Council."§ Did the Church not know how many sacraments it had before the twelfth century, or was it left to Peter Lombard and the Meldensian Council to inform it upon a matter of such vital importance to every Christian man? And yet, notwithstanding all this, the Church of Rome claims to be *immutable* as well as *infallible!*

5. *Worship of Images.*

In the catechism of the Council of Trent we read as follows—"The priest is to teach that it is lawful to have images in churches, and to give them honour and *worship*."‖

The worship of images, however, was forbidden in the most express terms by Pope Gregory the Great. In a letter to Serenus, Bishop of Marseilles, he writes—"*Forbid, by every means in your power, the worship of images.*"¶

Ordinary persons will, perhaps, be of opinion that the doctrine of Pope Gregory the Great, in the sixth century, corresponds more nearly with God's law, as laid down in the Second Commandment, than does the doctrine of the Council of Trent. One thing, however, is pretty clear, that Pope Gregory and the Council cannot *both* be right.

6. *Supremacy of the Pope.*

The earliest assumption by a Pope of the title of Universal Bishop of the Christian Church, appears to have been by Boniface III., in the beginning of the seventh century. At a later period Gregory VII. declared "that the Roman Pontiff alone can be properly called universal."** In the fourteenth century Pope Boniface VIII. published his famous Bull, "*Unam Sanctam*" (which was inserted in the Canon law) to the following effect—"We declare, say, define, and pronounce it to be *absolutely necessary to salvation, for every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff.*"††

This decree asserts the Pope's claim to the office of universal bishop, in very clear and unmistakeable terms. And in conformity to it we find that, at the end of the Bull of Pope Pius IV., confirming the decrees of the Council of Trent, the first signature is—"Ego Pius, Catholicæ Ecclesiæ Episcopus"—*i.e.*, "I, Pius, Bishop of the Universal Church," standing at the head of a long list of cardinals and ordinary diocesan bishops.‡‡

Now let us hear the sentiments of Pope Gregory the Great, in the sixth century. The Bishop of Constantinople had laid claim to this title of Œcumenical or Universal Bishop, whereupon Pope Gregory writes as follows—"I earnestly admonished my brother and *fellow-bishop*, that if he had any regard for the peace and concord of the Church, he would abstain from this *foolish* title. For I confidently assert, that whoever calls himself, or desires to be called, Universal Priest, *is the forerunner of Antichrist*, because he proudly sets himself above others."*

If any of our readers, after comparing the foregoing extracts, should see cause to agree with Pope Gregory the Great, we must confess that we think they could not be very greatly blamed. But, between such contradictory and discordant opinions, not of one, but of several Popes, we ask again, *where* lies the infallibility?

7. *Indulgences.*

The Council of Trent decreed as follows—"The power of conferring indulgences was given by Christ to his Church; and the Church hath made use of this power in *the most ancient times.*"†

When we turn to Cardinal Cajetan, however, what do we read?—"Concerning the rise of indulgences," saith he, "if any certainty could be had, it would aid us in discovering the truth; but *no authority of sacred Scripture, or of ancient Greek or Latin Fathers hath brought this knowledge to us.*"‡

If there be no mention of indulgences in Scripture, or any ancient writer, with what face could the venerable fathers of the Council of Trent make the bold assertion we have quoted above?

8. *Purgatory.*

The decree of the Council of Trent, on the subject of Purgatory, is singularly moderate, considering the generally confident and sweeping manner in which this grave assembly of divines scattered their anathemas on other subjects. They assert merely "that there *is* a purgatory."—(purgatorium esse, *Sess.* xxv.) The catechism of the Council went a little farther, and speaks of "the *fire* of purgatory, in which the souls of the pious expiate (their sins) by torture, for a definite time."§

Now, what doctrine was taught by the *ancient* Church of Rome, with regard to the state of souls after death? Let us begin with the respectable authority of Pope Gregory the Great. In his commentary on Job, he writes as follows:—"At the moment of death, either the good or the evil spirit seizes upon the soul as it departs from the prison of the flesh, and *keeps it for ever with itself, without any change.*"‖ Does this passage look as if Pope Gregory (whatever his precise sentiments may have been) believed in the *modern* Romish doctrine of purgatory?

But, perhaps, the testimony of the old writer, Polydore Vergil, is still more express on this point. (His statements, we may observe in passing, were considered of such dangerous tendency, that they came under the ban of the Roman Index Expurgatorius.). They are as follows:—

"For what cause, or by what authority, indulgences were first introduced into the Church, has given modern divines a great deal of trouble. In a subject which is by no means clear, I think it better to use the testimony of John, Bishop of Rochester [Bishop Fisher], in a work which he wrote against Luther. 'Many persons,' saith he, 'are inclined to place but little reliance upon indulgences, because their use seems to have come in rather late in the Church.' And, then, he adds—'No orthodox [Roman Catholic] doubts whether there is a purgatory, concerning which, nevertheless, *there is either no mention or the very rarest mention in ancient writers* (nemo certo dubitat orthodoxus, an purgatorium sit, de quo tamen apud priscos nulla vel quam rarissima fiebat mentio). To this day, purgatory is not believed in by the Greek Church. As long, then, as there was no anxiety concerning purgatory, no one looked for indulgences; for all the value of indulgences depends upon it. *If you take away purgatory, what use will there be in indulgences?* Indulgences, therefore, began when people began to entertain fears about the torments of purgatory.' These things, saith the Bishop (Fisher); but you, my reader, may, perhaps, think the subject of so great importance, that you might expect more certainty in the matter from the mouth of God" (quæ tu fortè cum tanti sint momenti, ut magis certa ex ore Dei expectabas).¶

We cordially concur in opinion with old Polydore Vergil. A subject of such vital importance to the peace and happiness of every true Christian is surely one, if there be any, or which we might expect some certain authority in holy Scripture, some reliable information in ancient writers. But, alas! Bishop Fisher tells us, there is none or next to none. During several centuries, it would seem, the people never frightened themselves about purgatory, but, at last, the priests, or somebody else, put them all in a state of alarm, and then they began to look for indulgences. For, as the old bishop very candidly asks, If you take away purgatory, what use will there be in indulgences?

One use, indeed, there was of indulgences, to which we can now only briefly allude. The Council of Trent condemned all "disgraceful traffic" in indulgences (pravos quæstus omnino abolendos esse, *Sess.* xxv.), thereby tacitly admitting that they had been disgracefully bought and sold, in many parts of Christendom. If the priests, for a series of ages, were covetous men—if they could frighten the people generally into the belief of a purgatory which had no existence, and could persuade them to buy indulgences, in order to deliver themselves or their friends from these visionary torments, we can see, even without the aid of Bishop Fisher, how the belief of both purgatory and indulgences gradually crept into the Church.

We are sorry to leave our readers in purgatory, but our limits warn us that we must conclude for the present. We have merely touched on a few of the most obvious topics, on which the ancient and modern Church of Rome are directly at variance. If there be even one such point (and every scholar knows that there are several) what becomes of the boasted claim of Romish infallibility? To find even one plain error and contradiction in a Church calling itself infallible, is to overthrow the pretended authority of that Church. For what is the usual reason given for forsaking other Churches, but because they are fallible? What is the reason why some few go over to the Church of Rome, and why most of its members remain in it, but because she is (as they are made to believe) infallible? But if, with her infallibility, she has mistaken error for truth; if with her certainty she contradicts herself; if she was one thing in one age, and another in another, then there is the same or greater reason for all such persons to quit the Church of Rome, as there seemed to be at first for them to embrace it, or continue in it.

ST. PHILOMENA.

As ardent lovers of our country, we feel a warm sympathy with all those who labour for the benefit of Ireland, and especially with those who exert themselves in the department of labour in which we are ourselves employed—namely, the diffusing religious information among the people. It was, accordingly, with some interest that we watched the results of an announcement, made by Mr. Duffy, at the commencement of the present year, when he declared his intention to issue weekly a series of "Sweet little books," each number containing the life of some saint or great servant of God, to be published at the low price of one penny, and so to place edifying and instructive reading within the reach of the very poorest classes. But we found that, however heartily we approved of the general character of this plan, we could by no means bestow the same commendation on the manner in which it was carried out. In fact, when we pronounce it desirable to circulate religious information at a cheap rate among the people, we consider it absolutely essential that the information circulated shall be *true*. But we fear the compilers of Mr. Duffy's little volumes hold the historic accuracy of their biographies to be a matter of minor importance, and that they believe, that a work containing the life of a saint must be sure to be edifying reading, even though its details be as pure fiction as any novel writer of the present day has imagined. Several of these tracts would be reduced to very narrow dimensions indeed, were we to pare away from them all that was mere legend, unsupported by any historical evidence. We felt, however, that it was rather a delicate matter to criticise these mixtures of truth and falsehood, lest in assailing the falsehood we should be represented as enemies of the truth to which it was joined, or lest in exposing a legend told of a saint we should seem to throw ridicule upon the venerable saint himself. But there is one volume of the "Young Christian's Library" which we can review without being troubled with any fear of this kind; and in calling our readers' attention to the LIFE OF SAINT PHILOMENA we can assure them beforehand, that the task of separating the parts of the story which are true from those which are false is one which will not be attended with the slightest difficulty.

But who is Saint Philomena? exclaims one of our ignorant Protestant readers. Saint Philomena, you should be ashamed not to know, is one of the most popular saints of the present day on the Continent, and it will not be Mr. Duffy's fault if she is not so in Ireland too. There is a fashion about saints as about everything else, and before the commencement of the present century (for reasons hereafter to be explained) Saint Philomena had not a single votary to demand her intercession. Now, however, after fifteen centuries' inactivity, she has commenced working miracles, resolved to make up for lost time, and, as we have said, counts her worshippers by thousands in Spain, and France, and Italy. In the sketch of her history which we give, Mr. Duffy is our chief authority, though we borrow a few particulars from a French and

---

* "Peractâ consecratione, omnes communicent qui noluerint ecclesiasticis carere limitibus: sic enim et apostoli statuerunt, et sancta Romana tenet ecclesia."—Corp. Jur. Can., tom. i., col. 1917. Lugd., 1671.

† "Sacerdos missam solus nequaquam celebret; quia aicut illa celebrari non potest sine salutatione sacerdotis et responsione nihilominus plebis, ita nimirum nequaquam ab uno debet celebrari."—Cassander, Liturg. p. 83. Paris, 1616.

‡ "Nec temere quenquam reperias ante Petrum Lombardum, qui certum aliquem et definitum sacramentorum numerum statuerunt."—Cassander, p. 951. Paris, 1616.

§ "Institutum fuit hoc sacramentum spiritus sancti instinctu in concilio Meldensi."—Alex. Ales, Op. Omn., vol. iv., p. 109. Venet, 1575.

‖ "Non solum autem docere in ecclesia imagines habere, et iis honorem et cultum adhibere, ostendet parochus, . . . verum etiam maximo fidelium bono ad hanc usque diem factum declarabit."—Cat. Conc. Trid., pars iii., c. ii., qu. 24.

¶ "Adorari vero imagines, omnibus modis veta."—S. Greg. Ep. lib. i., ep. xiii., vol. ii., col. 1161. Paris, 1705.

** "Quod Solus Romanus Pontifex jure dicatur universalis."—Greg. vii., Ep. lib. ii., ep. 55. Harduin Concil, Tom. vi. pars i., p. 1304.

†† "Subesse Romano Pontifici omni humanæ creaturæ declaramus, dicimus, definimus, et pronunciamus omnino esse de necessitate salutis."—Corp. Jur. Canon. Extrav., lib. i., tit. viii., cap. 1. Tom. ii., p. 394. Paris, 1687.

‡‡ Decret. Conc. Trid., p. 221. Lipsiæ, 1852.

* "Eundem verò fratrem meum et cœpiscopum meum studiose admonere curavi, ut si habere pacem omnium concordiamque desiderat, ab stulti vocabuli se appellatione compescat . . . Ego autem fidenter dico, quia quisquis se universalem sacerdotem vocat, vel vocari desiderat, in elatione suâ antichristum præcurrit, quia superbiendo se cæteris præponit."—S. Greg. Op., vol. ii., col. 881. Paris, 1705.

† "Cum potestas conferendi indulgentias a Christo ecclesiæ concessa sit, atque hujusmodi potestate divinitus sibi tradita antiquissimis etiam temporibus illa usa fuerit."—Decret. Conc. Trid., sess. xxv., cont.

‡ "De ortu indulgentiarum, si certitudo haberi possit, veritati indagandæ opem ferret; verum quia nulla sacræ scripturæ, nulla priscorum doctorum Græcorum aut Latinorum auctoritas scripta hanc ad nostram deduxit notitiam."—Card. Caj. Opusc., tom. ii., fol. 46 verso. Venetiis, 1580.

§ "Præterea est purgatorius ignis, quo plorum animæ ad definitum tempus cruciatæ expiantur."—Catch. Conc. Trid., pars. i., qu. iii.

‖ "Quia cum humani casus tempore, sive sanctus, sive malignus spiritus egredientem animam claustrâ carnis acceperit, in æternum secum sine ullâ permutatione retinebit."—S. Greg. Mag., Op., vol. i., col. 255. Paris, 1705.

¶ Polyd. Verg., de inventor rerum, lib. viii., c. i., p. 476. Amstel, 1671.

from a Spanish life of this saint, accounts of which we have met with.*

St. Philomena is said to have suffered martyrdom on the 10th August, A.D. 286, in the reign of the Emperor Diocletian. She was the daughter of a king who (our author has discovered) reigned at this time over a little state in Greece. Her mother was also of royal lineage. Both her parents were idolators, and, being childless, never ceased to offer sacrifices to their gods, that they might obtain offspring. Their prayers were long unsuccessful, until a Roman physician named Publius, who resided in their palace, prescribed baptism, and promised them children if they would consent to embrace Christianity. They agreed to the conditions, and on the 10th of January (for we follow an author at no loss about details), obtained, in a daughter, the reward of their faith. She was baptised Philumena, a name, as to the derivation of which we should doubtless mistake, had it not been made the subject of a divine revelation from the saint herself to an Italian nun. It signifies (we are informed by Mr. Duffy) the "friend of light," being derived, apparently from the Greek φιλεω, and the Latin *lumen*, light. Possibly half her name may have been given by her Grecian parents, and the other half, by the Roman physician who had foretold her birth.† Well, Philomena lived very happily with her parents, until she was turned twelve years of age, when her parents brought her to Rome, whither her father was obliged to repair, in order to renew his allegiance to the Emperor Diocletian, who, at that time, threatened Greece with an unjust war. No doubt, secular historians are misinformed when they represent Greece as a peaceable province of Diocletian's empire. No sooner had the emperor seen Philomena than he determined to make the child his empress, and he assured her father, that he might banish from his mind all fear of war; and that in return for the hand of his daughter, he would set all the forces of the empire at his disposal, and confer on him, and on his country, the greatest advantages. The parents, delighted with this proposal, found an unexpected obstacle; and this was, that the pious little girl had taken the precaution to make a vow of perpetual virginity *two years before!* In vain did her father urge that she was too young to contract such an engagement, and persuade her to become an empress, and to seat herself on the greatest throne in the world. In vain did he utter "the most wicked threats." In vain did her parents cast themselves on their knees to her, saying, with tears in their eyes, "Daughter, loved daughter, have pity on thy father, thy mother, thy country, our subjects." "No, no," she replied, "God before father, or mother, or country;" and adhered to her vow with a firmness which plunged her mother into despair.

Her baffled parents handed her over to the emperor, who proceeded to attempt to gain her heart by other methods. The first step of his courtship was to load her with chains and cast her into a dungeon of his palace, where she remained for thirty-nine days (without eating anything, according to the Spanish account), and, strange to say, without being more favourably disposed towards her royal suitor than before. Scourging was the next mode of ingratiating himself which he tried. In the presence of a great number of the officers of his court, he caused her to be so striped, that her bleeding body was soon beaten into one wound. He had her then thrown back into prison, sure that she must die in a few hours, but he was deceived, for two angels poured into her wounds a balsam which, in a moment, perfectly healed them. Diocletian ascribed this cure to his god Jupiter, who, he thought, was determined that Philomena should be his empress; and he endeavoured now, by the highest promises, to bring her to this view of the case—but all in vain. Then ensued an extraordinary conflict between Diocletian, who was determined to destroy Philomena, and the angels, who were determined to protect her; a conflict in which, wonderful to tell, the emperor obtained the victory. First, he ordered his attendants to tie an anchor round her neck, and to cast her into the Tiber; but the angels cut the cord, let the anchor fall into the river, (where it remains to this day), and bore Philomena, on their wings, dry to the bank. Not moved by this failure of his attempt, Diocletian caused her to be dragged through the streets of Rome, and ordered, that a shower of arrows should be discharged at her; and, then, directed her, bruised and dying, and with blood trickling over all her limbs, to be thrown back into her dungeon; but Philomena had good healing flesh, and, after a refreshing sleep, awoke up perfectly well. The emperor, then, ordered the arrow experiment to be repeated in his presence, but this time the bows and arrows were useless, and could not be got to act. He then caused the arrow-heads to be heated in a furnace, and tried again; but now the fiery arrow-heads recoiled on those who shot them—killing six of them, and wounding others. The persevering tyrant next tried beheading. What the angels were about this time does not appear; one would think that, if they were not resolved to persevere to the end in defeating the tyrant's attempts, it would have been more merciful to allow the saint to die at the first attempt, without putting her to all the torture they reserved her for: but possibly Philomena, like a cat, had a certain number of lives, and when these were exhausted nothing more could be done for her. However this may be, her head was cut off, on Friday, August 10, A.D. 286, about three o'clock in the afternoon.

Our readers need not be shocked, if we cast some contempt upon this story, in our manner of narrating it. We trust, that we should not be guilty of any want of reverence in dealing with the life of a true saint, or in discussing stories of miraculous events, for which there was a scintilla of historical evidence; but, on the present occasion, we are dealing with a pure, religious romance. For where do our readers suppose St. Philomena is first to be heard of, or what is the authority for the legend we have just narrated? We need scarcely say, that it is not to be found in Eusebius, or any of the ancient ecclesiastical histories. Our readers will search, in vain, for it among any of the collections of acts of martyrs; or among the stories of Simeon Metaphrastes; nor does the name of Philomena occur among the saints, whose lives are given in the voluminous collection of Bolland. *It is not pretended* that the legend we have given, can lay claim to much more than twenty years' antiquity!!

In the year 1805, Francis de Lucia, a priest of the kingdom of Naples, came to Rome, in search of relics, for the use of his church, at Mugnano del Cardinale, about six leagues from Naples, and was supplied with bones from that fertile source, the catacombs of Rome. The Roman Catholic narrators of the life of St. Philomena, tell us that in the place where these bones were found, was the following fragment of an inscription:—

". . . *Lumena Pax tecum Fi.* . . ."

The bones were removed to Mugnano, and, if we are to believe Mr. Duffy, at once commenced performing miracles, of which he only mentions one, we suppose the most remarkable, "copious showers of rain," which were absolutely necessary (and, perhaps, not very surprising) "after long-continued heats."

But all this time the good priest, Francis de Lucia, had the discomfort that the saint who adorned his church was anonymous, and that he knew nothing of her history. His ingenuity soon overcame the first defect: he remembered that some eastern nations read their letters from right to left; it is true, the inscription we have given does not become more intelligible if read backwards—"If mucet xap anemul." However, a compromise might be made between the eastern and western ways of writing, by putting the last syllable first, and so he got for his saint the pretty name of Filumena, or—as they have it in France—Philomène. Still her history remained a mystery, until we are told a workman, a priest, and a Neapolitan nun had revelations on the subject. The story, as we have given it, is in the form in which it was enlarged in the year 1832, by the nun, who, it should be mentioned, was under the spiritual direction of the same priest. The Irish people are assured by Mr. Duffy that these revelations have undergone a rigorous examination from "the ecclesiastical authorities, who have pronounced them to bear all the marks by which true revelations are distinguished from false!"

Mr. Duffy, however, abstains from entering into details as to the miracles performed by St. Philomena, some account of which we take from the French life.*

Her first miracle was to paralyze the limbs of the priest who accompanied her relics to Naples, and who had seated himself somewhat irreverently on the chest which contained them. She next played a series of somewhat undignified tricks on those who were preparing a shrine for her. As fast as her measure was taken, she got a few inches longer, so that, says the author, they continually mistrusted some new trick on the part of the *amiable providence*.

This same shrine, when borne in procession shortly afterwards, though too small for the saint's body, was too large for the lanes through which it had to pass. The difficulty was met, not by a shortening of the shrine, but by a miraculous widening of the lanes! A little afterwards, one of her worshippers, having lain-in of a dead child, loaded the saint with insults, and got rid of her image. St. Philomena harboured no resentment, and raised the child to life. Another time, disputing a soul with the demons, she is said to have pleaded with God in the following terms:—"If this person be not restored to life, I shall be no more honoured (on ne me fêtera plus) in this country, and I am jealous of this honour; I do not wish to be deprived of it."

We shall not pursue our quotations further; enough has been said to show that the process of legend-making and miracle-inventing is not confined to the depth of the dark ages; but goes on with full vigour in the Church of Rome at the present day. But we must not omit to add that Mr. Duffy concludes his story with a prayer:—"St. Philomena, thou lover of innocence, pray for me! Above all things, obtain for me purity—inviolate purity! Obtain for me," &c., &c. We think it mournful at any time to see our fellow-countrymen addressing to departed saints the prayers which ought to be offered to our Lord himself, but it is still more shocking to see them taught by their instructors to address their supplications to a being as purely imaginary as Marmion or Don Quixote!

We are favoured occasionally with *anonymous* letters, in which the writers give us the *impracticable direction* to send them no more numbers of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN—assigning as their reason their abhorrence of the *lies* with which our pages are filled. We cannot forbear a melancholy smile, as we imagine the writer of such a letter, *after* having despatched his angry missive through the post against the lying CATHOLIC LAYMAN, sitting down in simple good faith to study, in the sweet little book enthusiastically recommended to him by the *Freeman's Journal*, the *Tablet*, the *Nation*, and the *Telegraph*, the veracious story of St. Philomena.

HOW FAR THE REFORMATION IS AFFECTED BY THE CHARACTERS AND MOTIVES OF THE REFORMERS.—No. II.

In our last number we made some remarks on the invalidity of the reasoning by which the characters and motives of the Reformers, presumed to have been bad, are converted into an argument against the Reformation itself. We now proceed to show, as we then proposed, that such reasoning, admitted to be valid, may be retorted, with fatal effect, against the Church of Rome.

But there is a general preliminary observation which we desire to make, in order to avoid any misconception of our real views upon this subject. We do not deny, on the contrary we confess, with sorrow, that the Reformation was attended with many excesses on the part of some of those who *really* abandoned the communion of the Roman Church. We say *really*, because, as is well known, some of the most atrocious crimes which are laid to the charge of the earlier Protestants, both in Germany and England, were committed by, or at the instigation of, secret agents of the Church of Rome, who feigned devotion to the Protestant cause; adopting this—we can scarcely forbear from calling it *infernal*—policy, in order to excite odium against the Reformation. Confining our attention, however, to what we admit to have been genuine Protestant excesses, we assert, fearlessly, that they are not fairly chargeable upon the Reformation, but upon the system against whose corruptions it was the reaction. Every one, who knows anything of human nature and of history, is well aware that it would be impossible, without special miraculous interference, that such a mighty revolution as the Reformation effected, could be brought about without many and lamentable disorders. Men sunk in gross ignorance, intellectual and religious, and degraded by long spiritual slavery, when light suddenly breaks in upon them, and when the pressure of external restraint is abruptly removed, have a natural tendency to rush into the opposite extreme of licentiousness, both of thought and action. The sober and rational enjoyment of liberty, whether of mind or body, is not the work of a day or of an age. It is a thing of slow growth, and requires careful education, and gradual training. As individuals do not attain to the experience and sobriety of manhood, without passing through many preparatory stages, so a people, when suddenly released from the helplessness and dependence of spiritual childhood, do not and cannot at once arrive at spiritual maturity. History teaches us that no great revolution has ever yet been effected without violent excesses on the part of some of those who were engaged in it. And more especially has this been the case in great *religious* movements, wherein all the strongest feelings and passions of our nature are brought into play. Christianity itself formed no exception to the general rule. Our blessed Lord, foreseeing the social convulsions to which it would give occasion, and with a view to anticipate the offence which would thence arise, distinctly said, "Do not think that I came to send peace upon earth; I came not to send peace but the sword."—Matt. x. 34. And the history of the early church informs us that out of the universal agitation and ferment which men's minds then underwent, there sprang, even during the life-time of the apostles, a multitude of wild and fanatical opinions, which threatened the very existence of the infant religion. Who will venture to assert that these attendant evils cast any imputation on the purity and perfection of the Gospel system? And yet, the argument which concludes against the Reformation, from the excesses and abuses to which it gave occasion, might, with nearly the same force, be employed against Christianity itself. When Luther arose, the characteristic doctrines of the Gospel, viz., the utter inability of man to save himself, and the efficacy of faith in the one, perfect, and sufficient atonement of Christ, were well nigh lost. Morality had all but perished from the earth. This is not *our* assertion, but that of the most devoted partizans of the Church of Rome. Hear, for example, what Bellarmine says, "For some years before the Lutheran and Calvinistic heresies were propounded, there was not (as contemporary authors testify) any security in ecclesiastical judgments, any discipline with regard to morals, any knowledge of sacred literature, any reverence for divine things; there was not almost any religion remaining."* Is it surprising that men born and brought up under such a system, should not, when released from it, exhibit the moderation

---

* We do not happen to have met with these foreign little books ourselves, but the Spanish tract is translated by Mr. Meyrick in his "Practical working of the Church of Spain," while accounts of the French one are given by De Potter, (Histoire du Christianisme, tom. vi., p. 250), and by Rev. R. Scott, in the appendix to his "Twelve Sermons."

† We notice that the French account makes the saint derive her name "Filia luminis," daughter of light. Mr. Duffy probably saw that the name was obviously Greek, the initial F being only the Italian equivalent for Ph. But what presumption in him to attempt to improve on a divine revelation! At all events our readers will observe that there is precisely the same evidence for these etymological prodigies, as for the other marvels recorded above.

* Vie et miracles de Sainte Philomène, vierge et martyre, surnommée la thaumaturge du dix-neuvième siècle, traduit de l'Italien sur la 15e edition, par M. J. F. B. de la Compagnie de Jesus. Approuvé par Mgr. l'evêque de Fribourg. Paris, 1835. Cited by De Potter, as above.

* Bellarmini Concio. xxviii. Oper. tom. vii., col. 296; Colon, 1617.

and sobriety which characterize those who have long enjoyed the blessings of rational liberty, morality, and pure religion? So far are the occasional excesses, which unhappily disfigured the revival of religion in the 16th century, from being any real reproach to *it*, that we unhesitatingly assert they are chargeable on the corruptions which disgraced the mediæval system of Papal Rome. Every accusation uttered against the licentiousness of the Reformation recoils with augmented force upon that Church against the intolerable scandals of which outraged humanity at length rose in arms.

So much in reference to the general charges brought against the Reformation, on the score of the heretical opinions and wild excesses of the Anabaptists and other fanatical sectaries. Let us now turn our attention to the special case of the leading Reformers themselves. The principles of the Reformation, it is argued, must be false, because Luther, Calvin, and the rest, were, individually, ungodly men. It is impossible to imagine that God would have permitted such men to be instrumental in reforming his Church, supposing it stood in need of reformation. The scriptural answer to this objection has been already virtually given in our last number. To what was there said we may now add, that the Old Testament furnishes us with a striking example of God's employing, for the reformation of his ancient Church, the agency of a man, who at the very time was committing a great sin, and continued to commit it as long as he lived. We allude to the case of Jehu. He destroyed the worshippers of Baal, and executed the divine vengeance on the house of Ahab. But he still upheld the idolatrous worship of the golden calves; that great abomination which is specially designated *the* sin of Jeroboam. The following words deserve our best attention, as bearing upon the point before us:—"And the Lord said to Jehu: Because thou hast diligently executed that which was right and pleasing in my eyes, and hast done to the house of Ahab according to all that was in my heart: thy children shall sit upon the throne of Israel to the fourth generation. But Jehu took no heed to walk in the law of the Lord the God of Israel with all his heart; for he departed not from the sins of Jeroboam, who had made Israel to sin."—4 Kings x. 30, 31. No sin alleged against the Reformers is comparable for enormity to that which Jehu habitually practised. And yet he was a reformer chosen of God. By the special appointment of Jehovah he was anointed king over Israel.—4 Kings ix.1—3.

But let us admit, as we said before, that the purity of the Protestant faith is vitiated by the supposed sinfulness of those who in the sixteenth century promulgated it. This amounts to a virtual recognition of the principle that sanctity of life is an essential note of a true Church. Let us, then, examine the result of this principle when applied to the Church of Rome, carefully bearing in mind that this Church boasts that she, and she alone, possesses one attribute of Deity—the attribute of infallibility. It is important also to remember that while (strange as it certainly is) there is no unanimity respecting the seat and organ of that asserted infallibility, the ultramontane Romanists claim it for the successor of St. Peter. The Pope, then, according to the universally received doctrine of the Church of Rome, is the organ of the faith of Christendom; and, according to the most influential party in that Church, he is the infallible organ. In his case, then, if anywhere, we should surely expect to find purity of life as well as purity of doctrine. If the character of the Reformed Churches must be identified with that of Luther and the other Reformers, who claimed no supernatural exemption from human weaknesses, much more must the character of the Church of Rome be involved in that of its infallible rulers. Any reasoning which would justify us in arguing from the unworthiness of the Reformers to the necessary worthlessness of the Reformation, will apply with tenfold force to the wickedness of Popes viewed in connection with the purity of the Church of Rome. Well, then, what do we learn from the inexorable records of Ecclesiastical History? As early as the fourth century Pope Marcellinus, if Pope Nicholas I. is to be believed, terrified, by the fear of death, apostatized from the faith, and sacrificed to heathen idols! The successor of St. Peter, the vicar of Christ, became—an idolater!* In the same century, somewhat later, Pope Liberius, weary of banishment, subscribed to the Arian heresy! The successor of St. Peter, the vicar of Christ, became—a heretic!† Poor Cranmer has been branded with every vile epithet that could be thought of, because, when threatened with an agonizing death, he, in a moment of weakness, was induced to renounce the reformed faith: an act which, almost immediately after, he bitterly lamented, and testified his abhorrence of at the stake, by the well-known action which even Voltaire has panegyrized as being more intrepid and magnanimous than that of the ancient Roman. Cranmer's momentary apostacy furnishes rather a dangerous triumph to the advocates of the Church of Rome, so long as the cases of Popes Marcellinus and Liberius stand on record. Cranmer, under the fear of death, abandoned—be it so—the Protestant faith, professing still to be a Christian. Pope Marcellinus, under the same fear, abandoned his God, and sacrificed to idols. Cranmer, to avoid the lingering tortures of fire, subscribed a renunciation of the peculiar doctrines of the Reformation, retaining the common doctrines of Christianity. Pope Liberius, to escape the tedium of banishment, subscribed to the deadly heresy of Arius. Passing over the cases of Pope Anastatius II. in the fifth century, and Pope Vigilius in the sixth, who have both been charged with heresy,* we next come to Pope Honorius, in the seventh century, who was condemned as a Monothelite heretic by the sixth and seventh general Councils,† and anathematized as such by at least two Popes—viz., Agatho and Leo II.‡ Leo's words are, "We anathematize also Honorius, who did not enlighten this apostolic church with the doctrine delivered by the Apostles, but attempted to subvert the undefiled faith by profane treachery."

The state of the Roman See during the tenth century, as described by Baronius, the great papal Annalist, is frightful to contemplate. In his preliminary observations§ to the tenth century, he writes thus.—"A new age begins, which, from its asperity and barrenness of good, has been usually called the iron age; from the deformity of its exuberant wickedness, the leaden age; and from its poverty of writers, the dark age. Standing on the threshold of which, we have deemed it necessary to premise something, lest the weak-minded should be at all scandalized if he sometimes should happen to behold the *abomination of desolation* standing *in the temple*. Scarcely can any one believe what unworthy, foul, execrable, and abominable things the sacred Apostolic See has been compelled to suffer. . . . Oh shame! Oh grief! how many monsters, horrible to be seen, were intruded into that seat which is to be reverenced even by angels! What tragedies were there enacted! With what filth was it her fate to be besmeared who was herself without spot or wrinkle! With what stench to be infected! With what loathsome impurities to be defiled, and by these to be blackened with eternal infamy!" And, again,‖ "What was then the face of the Holy Roman Church! How unutterably foul! When harlots, at once most infamous and all-powerful, ruled at Rome; at whose will, Sees were changed, bishops presented, and—what is horrible to hear and utter—their paramours intruded into the chair of Peter." During that tenth century alone, thirty Pontiffs occupied the papal chair, each succeeding one, for the most part, surpassing, if possible, his predecessor in abominable crimes. The mind sickens in reviewing the enormities of these monsters of wickedness. John XII., to select one name from the revolting list, who ascended the papal throne in 956, was convicted by a Roman Synod, convened by the Emperor Otho the Great, of almost every enormity to be found in the catalogue of crime—blasphemy, perjury, profanation, impiety, sacrilege, simony, adultery, incest, murder.

Twenty years later, 974, came Boniface VII., whom Baronius brands as a murderer and a robber. One Roman historian, Cardinal Benno, tells us that in the interval between Pope Silvester II. and Gregory VII. (999–1073), five of the popes, including these two, were magicians. Platina, the biographer of the popes, goes farther, and says that magic was practised by *all* the popes from Silvester to Gregory. The heinousness of this practice must not be estimated by reference to our modern notions. It must be remembered that, in the ages under consideration, magic was universally regarded, even by those who practised it, as connected with satanic agency. Of Silvester, in particular, Platina informs us that, impelled by ambition and a diabolical lust of power, he obtained the pontifical dignity by the assistance of the devil, on the condition of doing homage to the evil spirit, and consigning his soul to everlasting perdition after death. Towards the close of the 15th century, Pope Sixtus IV. occupied the papal chair. He has been charged with unnatural crimes; and it is recorded that he devised a new mode of replenishing the sacred treasury—namely, the establishment of brothels in Rome! It would be superfluous to say a word about Pope Alexander VI. A Romish historian was obliged to combine three of the most atrocious monsters to be found in the annals of Pagan Rome, in order to obtain anything like a parallel to the enormities of Borgia. Nero, Caligula, and Heliogabalus, must be united in order to shadow forth the character of—if it may be said without impiety—this vicar of Christ. His successor, but one, Julius II., scarcely, if at all, fell short of his wickedness. Perjury, poisoning, assassination, drunkenness, unnatural crime, were laid to his charge. He was, moreover, a ferocious and merciless soldier. It was a saying of those times that the earth drank in more blood in a single day, shed through his means, than he himself, and his fellow-revellers, had drunk wine during his whole pontificate. This worthy successor of the Apostles is said, when once leading an army against his enemies, to have flung into the Tiber the keys of St. Peter, with the words—

> Cum Petri nihil efficient ad prœlia claves,
> Auxilio Pauli forsitan ensis erit.

To conclude this dismal retrospect. Some of the infallible depositaries of the Roman Catholic faith were, we are informed by credible witnesses, unbelievers, and even Atheists! Picus Mirandula, who wrote towards the end of the 15th century, tells us of one Pope who, denying that there was a God, confirmed his miserable impiety by the vile means through which he obtained possession of the popedom, and the equally execrable manner in which he conducted himself as Pope. The same author speaks of another Pope who, while living, declared to one of his friends that he did not believe in the immortality of the soul. But after his death he appeared to the same person, telling him that he had found, to his endless misery and torment, that the soul which he deemed to be perishable was immortal.*

It is with much reluctance that we sully our pages with particulars of this kind. From such revolting details every right-minded man instinctively recoils. To the Christian, jealous for the honour of his most holy faith, such abominations are a source of mingled indignation, shame, and sorrow; while to the infidel they furnish matter for a triumphant scoff, or a malignant sneer. We would willingly consign such dismal records of the past to the oblivion which is their fitting doom; and we would leave those wretched men who disgraced not only the name of Christian but our common humanity, to the judgment of Him whose honour they have impiously blasphemed, and whose eternal laws they have trodden under foot. But controversialists of the stamp of Mr. Keenan will not permit us to do so. They compel us to drag forth from their foul obscurity these deeds of darkness. When they brand the Reformers as heretics, because they dared to quit a communion in which, from the palace of the Vatican to the cell of the monastery, from the Pope to the mendicant friar, and thence through every fibre of the social and religious system, vice and immorality were practised and unblushingly avowed; and withal arrogate to that communion the august epithet of *holy*: when they cast in our teeth the invented crimes of a Luther, a Calvin, and a Cranmer, and exclaim in a tone of malicious triumph—"Behold the apostles of Protestantism! Can the religion be true which had such advocates?" we are obliged, when engaged with those who cannot or will not see the invalidity of such an inference, to retort the argument. And to do so, we are compelled to re-open the polluted pages of history—not *our* historians but their own—and point out to them there, scenes of iniquity perpetrated by the supreme rulers of a Church claiming to be exclusively holy and infallible, before which the vilest accusations which deadly hatred has been able to invent against the Reformers dwindle into utter insignificance.

Let any candid Roman Catholic, of plain common sense, peruse the history of the Popes, and then let him say whether he feels inclined to press the argument against the Reformation from the supposed unworthiness of the Reformers.

THE HEIR OF BALLYMANUS—No. III.

Not long after the meeting with Mr. Oldham, which we recorded in our last chapter, the time of Frank's stay in Rome expired, and he turned his steps homewards. His health and spirits had certainly profited by his travels, but we fear that he had not changed for the better in other respects. He was no longer the sincere and earnest inquirer after truth he once had been. What he had seen on the Continent had convinced him that the religion he there saw developed, contained more of human invention than of revelation from God; yet he sought for nothing purer or better. The disappointment in which his first anxious search for religious truth had ended, had a tendency to give him a distaste for such investigations; while again he was unconsciously influenced by the example of many whom he met abroad, who believed no more than himself, and yet who observed the conformity with the religion of their country, which prudence dictated, only avenging themselves for their compliance by many a bitter jest on it in private. Thus Frank, too, had fallen into a light and careless way of talking on religious subjects; he could enjoy a jest at the expense of the religion he professed; yet, if a serious attack were made on it (by his friend, Graham, for instance), he preferred to turn off the discourse by some sportive answer, rather than encounter the risk of becoming again a prey to those anxious doubts which had once so cruelly disturbed his repose.

When, however, he again set foot on English ground, many slumbering emotions were stirred up. During his year or two of absence, he thought he had taught himself to look calmly back on his acquaintance with Edith, as belonging to a chapter in his life now closed; and when he remembered the tumultuous passions which had then agitated him, it was with such feelings as those with which the traveller, who has escaped one of the fires which sweep over an American prairie, might survey the scene over which the flame had passed, while scarce yet composed from the agitation which he had undergone, and still not fearing that the charred and blackened soil around him could afford materials for such another conflagration. Now, however, as he drew near to London, the feelings which had filled his mind when he had been last there, naturally took possession of it again. While he was abroad, his correspondents had been able to tell him nothing of Edith; and now (useless though, he said to himself, it was to entertain any curiosity regarding one of whom he ought to think no more), he could not refrain from constant speculations—was she then in London? Was it possible he might meet her? How was it likely

---

* Platina, in Marcellin. p. 39.
† Athan. Ep. ad Solet., tom. i., 368. Hieronym. Chronicon. oper. tom. viii., c. 796.

* For Anastasius vid. Damas. Pontif. ap. Labbe, tom. v., c. 403, and for Vigilius vid. Liberat. Brevlar., cap. 22. Galland. Bib. Pat., tom. xii., p. 156.
† Vid. Labbe, tom. vii., c. 977; tom. viii., c. 1205.
‡ Vid. Labbe, tom. vii., c. 600, 1156.
§ Baron. Ann. Eccles. An. 900
‖ Ann. Eccles. Ann. 912.

* Pic. Mirand. de Fid. et Ord. Cred. Theor. 4.

she would behave if they did chance to meet? Had she forgotten him? Had it cost her as severe a struggle as it had done him, to think of each other with indifference? He acknowledged that it must be better for her peace of mind if she had succeeded in such an attempt, and yet much as he deplored her welfare, he felt that it would give him only pain if he found, when he met her, that she had discovered this road to happiness.

On his return to his old quarters in London, he was cordially welcomed by his friend, Cornwall. Strange that two people who seemed to have such pleasure in seeing each other, should have borne their separation with so much equanimity, and that not a letter should have passed between them all the time Frank was away. Cornwall had now a hundred questions to ask him, and made him tell all the history of his travels and of his opinions; and Frank told all without reserve, having now himself fallen into the tone of sceptical indifference, which had, at first, shocked him in Cornwall. They had talked long that evening, when Frank became the questioner, and said, "I suppose it is useless to ask you if you can give me any intelligence of the Hartwells?"

"No," returned Cornwall; "you know that I have no opportunity of hearing anything of them. But, indeed, there is one thing which I fear you will be angry with me for not having told you before, and that is, that Mr. Hartwell himself called here to inquire for you about a month ago."

"Mr. Hartwell called here!" cried Frank, "you surely must mistake."

"Well," said Cornwall, "to speak accurately, an old gentleman called here, for he gave no name; but I opened the door for him myself, and having once seen him with you, and not forgetting faces easily, I know that it was he."

"Tell me all at once," cried Frank impatiently; "really, Cornwall, this was the first thing I should have heard from you on my coming."

"I have nothing to tell, man," returned Cornwall; "he asked for you, and I told him that you were travelling on the Continent. I asked him whether he wished to leave any message for you, though you know that I should have been puzzled to send it to you if he had, for you had not given me any address; however, he said that he had no message to leave, and went away."

"But," said Frank, "did you ask him no questions? did you not find out something for me about Miss Hartwell?"

"What could I ask him," said Cornwall; "he had not even told me his name. Was I to say, I know you are Mr. Hartwell; and I have been informed of all the history of the engagement between your daughter and Mr. MacManus; pray tell me something about her."

Frank did not exactly know what to answer, but he felt more cross and out of humour with Cornwall than he had ever felt in the whole course of their friendship before; nor did he care now to pursue the conversation with him, for he wanted to meditate on the news he had heard, and the more he thought of it the higher his spirits rose. That, after his intercourse with the family had been formally broken off, Mr. Hartwell should have himself taken a step to renew their acquaintance, was a fact of no ordinary significance. What could have been the cause? Had Edith's affection for him triumphed over all other considerations? or was it possible that, on reflection over the arguments with which he had assailed her religion, her views might have changed, and that a difference of religious profession need no longer separate them. Whatever were the origin of this overture, Frank was determined it should end in nothing but good; his ideas, as to the importance of religion, had so far declined in strength, that he condemned himself for having foolishly trifled away his happiness before, when he allowed such a matter to separate between them. Now he would be wiser; he would allow her to enjoy peaceably the religious sentiments which she found necessary to her happiness; she would no less make a good and affectionate wife to him; it was by no means essential that they should think exactly the same; and Mr. Hartwell's visit to him convinced him that he had still such an interest in her heart as would enable him to persuade her to take the same view of the case that he did. And, then, he returned to his former amusement of castle building; arranged in a thousand delightful ways, their meeting, and the welcome he was to receive; smoothed down every difficulty in one manner or another, and invariably conducted his little romance to the orthodox old-fashioned termination. After such agreeable meditations, when he met Cornwall next morning, all his little irritation had vanished, Cornwall himself making full atonement by putting the same favourable interpretation on Mr. Hartwell's visit; and Frank had only one thought to make him uneasy—the feeling, namely, that he could not, with propriety, go out that instant to call on the Hartwells. However, he wrote without delay to Mr. Hartwell, informing him of his return from the Continent, and saying that what he understood of Mr. Hartwell's having lately called on him, encouraged him to ask permission to wait upon them. When he had sent his letter, Frank had great difficulty to restrain his impatience so as to wait quietly for the answer, and not, without further permission, take the well remembered road to Norwood. The answer came, however, as rapidly as could reasonably have been expected, and was even more kind and affectionate in its tone than Frank had ventured to hope; but in other respects very unlike his anticipations. The note it contained was, in short, that Edith had suffered for some time from a heavy cold, which had resulted in inflammation of the lungs, and that there now were hold out no expectations of her recovery. Mr. Hartwell explained that he had called on Frank at a time that Edith had expressed a wish to see him once more, but that she felt on consideration that his seeing her again would only give him needless pain, and, therefore, declined receiving his proposed visit. There were enclosed a few lines traced by Edith's own hand, in which she took as it were a solemn final leave of him. She reminded him how, in his arguments with her, he had asserted that whatever religion one might live in, the Roman Catholic was the only one so free from doubt and uncertainty, as to be able to afford firm support in the hour of death; and, she said, that she had wished to tell him that, now with the full prospect of eternity opening before her, she needed no other stay than the promises of God, which the Scriptures had made known to her, and which she had found fulfilled in her own experience. She had proved it was a God of truth who had spoken the words—"When thou passest through the waters I will be with thee, and through the floods they shall not overflow thee." Knowing that it would be too painful to him to hear this from her own lips, she had written it to him; and she added, that having constantly prayed for his enlightenment, and for his being brought to a knowledge of the truth, she was convinced her prayers would be heard in God's own time. She concluded with fervent prayers for his temporal and eternal happiness. Frank scarce knew what he read; he felt the paper grow dim before his eyes; so sudden a change from dreams of fancied happiness to a reality of misery was almost more than he could bear. Notwithstanding the kind of refusal his proposal to call on the Hartwells had met with, he flew to their residence with all the speed he could command. On the way, he found it hard to believe the truth of the news he had heard; it was so difficult to connect the idea of death with that of one whom he had left so full of health, and life, and animation. The first sight, however, of Mr. Hartwell, was enough to bring home to him the reality of what he had been told; he looked so perceptibly older, and so bowed down with sorrow. Frank was admitted, without difficulty, to Edith's presence, and was more shocked at the sight of her than he had been at all prepared for. Her form was frightfully wasted away; her blooming complexion had faded, and was replaced by a ground of death-like paleness contrasted with two hectic spots on her cheeks, her strength had visibly departed, while an incessant cough seemed to banish all hope of her restoration to health. We cannot report what passed at this interview. Frank scarcely knew himself. It was, however, the first of several, as he continued in daily attendance on her. But before he had had time to recover from the stunning and bewildering effects of the shock he had received, he proved by experience the truth of the remark, that misfortunes never come single; for he had a letter from Ireland informing him of the alarming illness of his mother, and imploring him to hasten home without delay.

It was, perhaps, the only summons which would have drawn him from Edith's presence at such a crisis; but in obeying it, he had the consolation of having been told by Miss Hartwell's physician, that though his hopes of her ultimate recovery were but faint indeed, she had somewhat rallied, and nothing portended any very speedy termination of her illness. Accordingly, within an hour or two from the time of his having got the letter from home, he was on his road to Holyhead; and, travelling day and night, arrived at Ballymanus. His first eager inquiries were met by the reply, that his mother was still alive, but that this was all which could be said.

He flew to her apartment, but was met at the door by his weeping sisters, who told him that the parish priest and his curate were with her, and that their directions and his mother's own desire were, that the presence of her relatives was not to disturb the tranquillity of her dying moments. Frank disregarding what they said pushed into the room, and found his mother perfectly sensible; her dying features lighted up with a gleam of pleasure as he pressed to her embrace, and she murmured "God bless you Frank—thank God that I have seen you before I die." On Mr. O'Driscoll, however, expostulating warmly with Frank for touching one who had received the last rites of the church, his mother said, "Go Frank, I dare not think of anything earthly now;" and she turned her eyes from him to fix them on a large image of the Virgin and child, which had been placed full in her view, at the foot of the bed. Frank suffered himself to be led out of the room by one of the priests, while the other resumed at his mother's side the suggestion of holy thoughts to her mind. "I cheerfully accept all the pains which thou dost prepare for me in purgatory. It is just that fire should punish in me all the insults I have offered to thee. O, holy prison when shall I find myself shut up in thee, secure of never again being able to lose my God? O, holy fire when wilt thou purify me from so many stains, and render me worthy to enter the land of bliss. Mary, my hope, assist me; pray to Jesus for me; Mary, my mother, assist me at this moment. St. Joseph come to my aid. St. Michael the archangel defend me. My guardian angel assist me. O, Mary, my hope after Jesus, in thee I trust. In thee, O lady, have I trusted, let me never be confounded." Frank knelt by his sisters outside the door, holding in his scarcely conscious hands a book of devotions for the dying, which had been placed in them. He read what was necessary to be done for his mother's welfare, and he was assured everything was attended to. "First, during the agony, the dying should be frequently sprinkled with holy water; secondly, they should be frequently made to kiss the crucifix and an image of Mary; thirdly, they should endeavour to gain as many indulgences as possible, by the use of medals and scapulars; fourthly, it is necessary to suggest to the dying some sentiment of contrition, of resignation, of oblation of his pains to God, of confidence in the passion of Jesus Christ, and in the intercession of Mary; fifthly, the dying should frequently invoke the most holy names of Jesus and Mary, and should frequently repeat the prayer, "Mary, mother of grace, &c.; sixthly, during the agony, the persons who are present should frequently say the litany of the Blessed Virgin for the dying person." At length he heard the louder and louder tones with which Mr. O'Driscoll seemed to pursue the departing soul with the ejaculation "Jesus and Mary to you I give my heart and soul;" and in a moment more he was told that all was over.

When nature's grief had had its course, Mr. O'Driscoll, before leaving the house, wished to say some words to Frank of welcome home, and of comfort for his bereavement. But Frank could not listen to him, and cried "It was cruel of you to separate us from my mother." "It would have been more cruel to her had I permitted you to stay, returned Mr. O'Driscoll. There is nothing on which the blessed St. Lignori insists more than on the exclusion of relatives who might excite emotions in the dying person. What human soul, when taken without proper preparation from this world, is fit to meet its God? Good a woman as your mother was, she needed the preparation I was giving her. She had heard from my voice the pardon of the church. I had cleansed her in the last sacrament from all relics of sin; and it was my business, then, to see that no intrusion of worldly emotion should after that produce a thought which needed pardon." Frank's heart was too full to reply, and he turned away in silence. He passed, in a dreary kind of dull vacuity of thought, the interval between his mother's death and her funeral; his heart seemed chilled to stone, and he found it impossible to collect and fix his thoughts. His sisters, who had been deeply and violently affected at first, yet seemed to feel a different kind of grief from his. His father, again, who had been fondly attached to his wife, bore his loss with a silent dogged resolution, and directed everything with his usual self-possession. He seemed to derive little support from the consolations of religion, and once when Mr. O'Driscoll comforted him by the assurance that his wife would soon be in glory, he turned short away; but Frank heard him mutter, "I hope I have some better reason to think so than your saying so; you promised more than that last week to Tom Connor that was hanged for shooting the agent." Frank heard with satisfaction that, in conformity with his mother's last wishes, considerable sums were to be devoted to charitable objects, and that a large amount was to be expended in masses for the repose of her soul.

After the funeral, Frank, in spite of remonstrances, returned to London almost as rapidly as he had come. Never did he feel more in want of calm and quiet, yet it seemed fated that he was not to enjoy repose. In the carriage in which he sat were two other passengers, one, as it turned out, an Oxford convert to Romanism, the other a missionary employed by a society for the conversion of Roman Catholics; and the two engaged in a loud and angry controversial discussion. The Englishman seemed to take a peculiar pleasure in shocking the prejudices of his opponent, and in avowing his belief in everything which the other thought most monstrous and incredible; nor did the Irish gentleman betray any peculiar tenderness for the feelings of his antagonist. Of all the subjects which they might have chosen for discussion, they selected the one most painful to the feelings of Frank—namely, purgatory, and prayers for the dead; and Frank, though he sunk back in his seat and feigned sleep, was yet obliged to listen. The Oxford man when challenged to produce his proofs of purgatory, told with the gravest face, stories of holy monks who, passing by mount Etna, heard the wails and groans of the spirits there confined; he told of spirits who had appeared to their friends completely enveloped in flames, but who, after an interval, during which they had been prayed for by their friends, had been seen again with flames only reaching to the waist; then again only up to the knees, and so on to their complete liberation: with other tales of the same kind which, effectual as they had been in fastening the belief of purgatory on a dark and credulous age, showed strange in the light of the nineteenth century.

The missioner replied that he knew of but one purgatory—namely, the blood of Christ, which cleanseth from *all* sin; and he asserted, that Roman Catholic teachers do not believe themselves in the efficacy of the means of cleansing from sin, which they had invented. "First," said he, "you receive from the priest absolution from your sins; then, you purchase remission of them yourself, by

---

* Liguori's Instructions and devotions for the dying, pp. 17, 27. Derby's edition.

the performance of the penances he has appointed, and it may be by austerities of your own besides, and yet still you feel that you are not cleansed from your sins; you daily hear masses, and you believe that you have daily offered up, on your behalf, a repetition of that inestimable sacrifice which was once offered on Calvary; and yet your sins cleave to you still. Well, you purchase, perhaps, from the Pope himself, a full and plenary indulgence for the remission of all your sins, and yet you dare not think you are cleansed from your sins yet. Well, on your deathbed, you have your absolution repeated to you; you receive the sacrament of Extreme Unction, which is said to remove all relics of sin; one would think you had got rid of them now, but no, you have to enter into purgatory, there to endure torments the most intense in degree, continuing you know not how many thousand years; nor can your dearest friend know when he has said masses enough to get you out. Why, I should never have a moment's peace, if I believed in such a religion; if I had to look forward to such sufferings for myself, and if I believed that those of my friends who had departed this life in the Lord, were enduring them now. How I should work to get money! that would be the only consolation I should have; for yours is, indeed, the gospel for the rich. Woe unto you, poor, for you must work out your full time in purgatory. Blessed are you, rich, for you can pay money to get yourselves out of purgatory, and to help your friends out too. Why, sir, your priests themselves do not believe this doctrine. Do you think if they did, and if they had the feelings of men, they would not spend the greater part of their time, in saying masses for the benefit of the souls confined there, instead of waiting until they are paid money for doing so. Sir, money is at the bottom of the whole scheme; and a better engine for raising money never was devised. I remember hearing of a Presbyterian minister who was complaining to the parish priest, with whom he was on good terms, that he could get no money from his flock. 'Why don't you rent an acre of purgatory from me,' said the priest; 'you would find it bring in more than all your gospel sermons?'"

To such a tirade as this the Englishman replied in equally unmeasured terms, concluding by recommending his opponent not to trouble his head about purgatory, for that he was sure of going further and faring worse; and denouncing to him, in the most positive manner, the infallible certainty of the eternal damnation of all those who were ontside the pale of the true church.

"Purgatory," said he, "is a matter which you and your friends have nothing at all to do with."

Fortunately, just here, the train stopped, and Frank betook himself to another carriage, leaving the disputants to carry out the controversy between themselves, at their leisure.

From the miserable torpor into which Frank had fallen he was first roused by Edith herself. When next she saw him, ever regardless of herself, she seemed unconscious of the pain her own disease caused her, in her endeavour to comfort Frank for the loss he had sustained; while he found his heart melted by her warm and affectionate sympathy, he felt that he could now think and talk of his sorrows, as he poured his griefs without reserve into her bosom. But still, the more he felt her power to console him for the bereavement he had met with, the more hopeless was he of consolation under that which he feared he was destined to suffer; the deeper his sense of the value of her affection, the greater the pain with which he thought on the treasure which had been shown him, and seemingly placed within his grasp, only, as it appeared, to be snatched from him for ever. When he passionately expressed such feelings to her, she replied—

"I know, dearest Frank, how severely you have been tried, and I know it is only too probable that there may be another trial in store for you; but remember you are in the hands of a God who doth not afflict willingly. Believe me, your chastenings are sent with gracious purposes for your benefit; He knows how to bring good out of seeming evil. No chastening," she added, "for the present, seemeth to be joyful, but grievous; yet, afterwards it bringeth forth the peaceable fruits of righteousness in them who are exercised thereby."

Frank heard without believing, yet his levity on religious subjects had been banished; for he felt that there, if anywhere, was to be found consolation under the trials he was enduring. Yet, he felt no inclination to seek for comfort in the religion in which he had been brought up. It was not merely that such arguments as he had heard in the railway-carriage convinced him that her doctrine as to the state of the dead contained no real comfort for sorrowing friends; but ever since he had been on the Continent his faith in Romanism had received a wound which nothing could heal; the fabric, however sightly, he was convinced had no foundation, and could afford no solid consolation.

Still, he was not more satisfied with the kind of comfort which Cornwall could supply him.

"I cannot understand the mystery of existence," cried Frank to him, one evening, impatiently. "Without Christianity I see no grounds for looking forward to a future state; and yet, without such a state what a mystery are the sufferings of this life! As for my own trials, severe as they are, I dare not say I do not deserve them. But look at the Hartwells; there is a man whose whole life has been spent in acts of most munificent benevolence, and who deserves to be happy as much as any man, and yet, see how his whole happiness has been wrecked, and the object on which he centered all his affections likely to be torn from him. And poor Edith herself, if ever there was an angel of goodness upon this miserable earth, she is one; whose whole happiness seems to consist in adding to the happiness of others, and yet, how much she has suffered! If she endured in our separation the tenth part of what I had to bear, it was enough to destroy her peace of mind; and now I fear she is likely, after much bodily suffering, to be removed from this world without tasting any of its enjoyments. Cornwall, do these things admit of any explanation on your system?"

Cornwall was, at first, reluctant to answer this appeal, but, on being pressed by Frank, at length replied—

"The matter admits of a very simple explanation, though I cannot promise that you will find it satisfactory. The world is governed by general laws, and we have no right to expect those laws to be suspended because their operation in particular cases may be painful to us. In a country where pulmonary diseases carry off so many per cent. of the population, I do not see that the case of an individual being so carried off is one which requires explanation; nor does the matter become more difficult even though she be very beautiful, or very amiable, or though her father be very munificent, or though she be tenderly beloved by you, since these are all circumstances which do not at all affect the matter."

Frank winced a little at this explanation, but replied—

"It is in the existence of these general rules that I find my difficulty. Why is it that no piety or virtue can stay the ravages of the destroyer? Is it not necessary to believe that they whose share of happiness in this world is so much less than that of others who far less deserve it, shall receive some compensation in a future state of existence?"

"That is a very pretty theory," replied Cornwall, "but *where is the proof?*"

Frank could not deny the force of this question; and it was one which fastened itself on his mind. He was conscious that this subject of "proofs" was one to which he had given no attention at all. As he had at first believed all the doctrines of the church in which he had been brought up without troubling her for proofs, so, when he became convinced that that church was not a trustworthy guide, he rejected all her doctrines indiscriminately; but now the importance which he felt belonged to the subject urged him to sift the matter more closely, and to examine which of her doctrines could be *proved*, and which not. He began to study books on evidences, and thoroughly examined the reasons which the advocates of Christianity had offered for their belief. In these investigations he met with much help from Mr. Peterson, of whom his opinion had considerably altered since their last meeting. Then he was prejudiced against him as a hot, and not very successful controversialist; now, from constantly meeting him, in attendance on Edith, he had come to know him as a kind and sympathising friend. And, after some time spent in these inquiries, Frank began to find rest for the sole of his foot. He came to see that there was no reason to doubt the veracity of Peter, or to disbelieve the facts to which he bore testimony, whatever fables may have been countenanced by Peter's alleged successors; that, even though a purgatory could be shown to be a vain imagination, heaven and hell would remain substantial realities; that there was reason to believe in the efficacy of prayers offered through Christ, however little ground there might be for hoping for an answer to those addressed to the Virgin Mary, or to St. Philomena. Frank's progress in religious convictions was rapid; the pressure of the trials to which he had been subjected made him as it were live fast; while he was, no doubt, unconsciously influenced by the faith manifested by Edith herself; so calm, so intelligent, so triumphant, that Frank felt it more and more impossible to doubt the reality of that of which she seemed to have so distinct a perception. It was only after the greater part of his scepticism had been thus banished, that he found courage to avow to Edith, what the exact nature of his religious difficulties had been, and that while she had supposed he was erroneously believing too much, in reality he was believing too little. He told her, too, how one of the arguments which had led to his change of opinions, had been the thought how far below her deserts was the portion of happiness which she herself seemed destined to enjoy in this world; and that, therefore, some compensation must be in store for her.

Edith replied, that she hoped he had been influenced by some better arguments; for my own experience is, she said, that even were there no other life I must own that I have been in this world far happier than I deserved; why I have never formed a wish that my father was not anxious to anticipate and to gratify; and as for the disquietude you say you have caused me, do you think, Frank, I wish that I had not known you? Whatever sorrows our acquaintance may have caused me, I would not change even those sorrows for many of this world's pleasures. And, on the other hand (she pursued), I cannot tell you what comfort your presence with me these last few weeks has given me; I own that when I thought how desolate my poor father would feel without me, I had felt it hard to submit to God's chastening hand, to feel that He doeth all things well. But now, since I have seen how my illness has been blessed to you, and how it may be the means of bringing you to live closer to God, I feel overpowered by a sense of His goodness in forgiving my rebellious thoughts, and condescending to let me see part of the reason for His dispensations. I know there may be other gracious purposes which I know not of, and I feel that I can trust to Him for all things. I can trust my whole soul to Him who died for it, and I can trust those I leave behind to Him. If He smiteth He also can bind up, and His hands can heal.

It was but a week after this that, on Mr. Peterson's arranging to administer the Lord's Supper to Edith, on the following day, she had the exquisite gratification of hearing Frank ask whether he might venture to join with them. He expressed a sense of great ignorance, and feared he was unworthy of that holy rite. Yet Mr. Peterson did not repel him, as to his acknowledgments of sin he joined a desire to forsake it, and professed sincere faith in Jesus as his only mediator.

Edith had not, for a long time, appeared so well as on the evening of this day, her spirits were higher, and she seemed filled with a serene and holy joy. Frank, finding the improvement continue for a day or two, began to indulge hopes of the possibility of a rally; so much the greater was the shock three days afterwards, when coming to the house early, he perceived, at the first aspect of the servant who admitted him, that he had come to a house of mourning. Long as he had been preparing for this event it fell upon him now with all the suddenness of an unexpected calamity; nor was he, for some time, able to inquire the particulars of what had taken place. When he could ask for further information, he was told that Edith had retired to rest the night before seemingly as well as she had been for some time previously; the attendant, who lay in the room with her, had slept for a couple of hours, when she heard her mistress call; she rose, but could be of no assistance; there were a few inarticulate sounds, a few faint struggles, and Edith had entered into peace. It need not be told how acutely Frank felt this failure of his hopes of earthly happiness; yet, though the blow was severer than any he yet had suffered, it seemed as if there were no poison in the wound; his grief was without bitterness, while, no doubt, he was supported himself by the efforts he made to support and comfort Mr. Hartwell. There was a time when he would have been shocked and distressed at what he would have thought the unprepared manner of Edith's death; yet now he felt how far surer was the confidence which could be felt in the case of one whose life had been one of communion with God, and constant readiness to enter his presence, than any which would be derived from all the preparation which could be made when the speedy approach of death was announced. And he involuntarily contrasted the death of Edith with the last moments of his mother. As for the latter, while he trusted that her soul was saved through her sincere faith in Christ, imperfect as was her knowledge of him, he yet grieved to think how her faith had been clouded, and her dying moments disquieted through a want of knowledge of the complete efficacy of his sacrifice. Her deathbed was haunted by a sense of sin unatoned for; and charms were sought in vain, to drive the spectre away—holy water, and blessed medals, and scapulars, and indulgences, and crucifixes, and cries to her guardian angel, and to the Blessed Virgin, and to the other saints; still the inexorable justice of God appeared unsatisfied, and threatened to lead her off to regions of torment less dreadful than hell, only because hope was not banished from them. Contrasted with this scene of superstitious gloom how bright appeared the light which shone round Edith's parting-days. Deep as was her conviction of sin, no less firm was her faith that for her sins Christ had, by his one oblation of himself, made a full, perfect, and sufficient atonement; the knowledge of this banished all her doubts and fears, and enabled her to echo the apostle's language—"I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed to him against that day."

With bleeding heart Frank followed to the grave these remains which were, as it were, the shattered casket where he had vainly stored his treasures of earthly happiness. It was deeply painful to him to be present at that scene, yet, it would have been more painful to him to have remained away; he felt a choking sensation, when the words were read—earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust, as he heard the dull sound of the falling clay separate for ever in this life between him and his beloved; yet, his ears drank in the words of peace and hope, from the solemn service then heard for the first time. He had read indeed, before, the lesson (I Cor. xv.), yet never till then, did he feel the full force of the apostle's argument, which binds in indissoluble connection the resurrection of Jesus and that of his people; which assured him that our Lord was but the *first fruits* of them that slept, and that as surely as Jesus was raised up from the dead, so surely, them which sleep in Jesus, God will bring with him. When he turned away still there lingered about his ears, like a strain of sweet music, those accents which spoke of the "sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life," which forbade us to be sorry, as men without hope, for them which sleep in Jesus; still he seemed to hear the voice which said, "blessed are the dead, which die in the Lord, even so saith the spirit, for they rest from their labours." And ere he had left the cemetery he had forced his lips to utter, and taught his heart, in some measure, to feel, "The Lord gave and the Lord hath taken away, blessed be the name of the Lord."

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We have received a valuable letter on Purgatory from Mr. Collette, which we regret to be obliged to postpone till our next number.

A communication, headed "Talk of the Wall," has been forwarded to us, founded on a pretended letter from one Publius Lentulus to the People and Senate of Rome, a well-known forgery which could not deceive any scholar of ordinary learning. We should feel curious to know in what Roman history the writer found such a letter! If our correspondent should favour us with any future communication in the way of argument, we hope he will do so in his own name, as we fear the insertion of a bad imitation of the Talk of the Road would scarcely be acceptable to our readers, especially in the present crowded state of our pages.

We would request our correspondents, both Roman Catholics and Protestants, to limit the length of their communications, and not to discuss a variety of distinct topics in one letter.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st.

To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal, which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, MAY, 1852.

It is a *general* doctrine of Christianity, not one peculiar to any section of it, that our present life is a state of probation for a future one.

By a state of probation we do not mean merely, that our future interest is now depending, and depending on ourselves, and that we have scope and opportunities in this life for that good and bad behaviour which God will reward or punish hereafter—we mean further, that we are in this life in a state of discipline designed for our improvement in those characters of virtue and piety, which are admittedly a necessary qualification for the happiness of heaven—that this life is a state where our characters must be put to the proof, and our good qualities confirmed and strengthened, if not formed and produced, and that none but those whose characters are thus fitted for Heaven can ever enter it.

We believe that no Christian of any denomination will deny that one of the surest tests of *true* religion is, that its doctrines and practices are those best fitted to encourage habits of piety, and the practical principle of virtue. No Christian, or, indeed, any one acquainted with human nature, will deny that vicious indulgence is not only criminal in itself, but that it depraves the inward constitution and character; or can doubt, on the other hand, that the moral principle gains additional strength by exercise, and that virtuous self-government is not only right in itself, but also improves the inward constitution and character of those who use aright the opportunities given them of forming those virtuous habits which alone can fit us for the enjoyment of God's presence in heaven. These, we think, are propositions universally recognized and professed by all Christians, and our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen, we doubt not, will be ready enough to assert and believe that they are truths which lie at the basis of all religion, and will, probably, add that they are especially inculcated and provided for in their own.

What we wish at present to call the attention of our readers to is, a practice of the Roman Catholic Church which appears to us to be utterly at variance with these general principles, and which would exalt mere emotions and feelings of a transient character, caused, perhaps, by fear, or some other great and temporary excitement, into the same rank with or even above the excellency of virtuous habits, and a well-spent life.

We are far from saying that such are the views of all Roman Catholics, and are sure that many intelligent and educated Roman Catholics would repudiate any such idea. The question, however, is, whether the natural tendency of Romish teaching is not inevitably, at least in the minds of the uneducated and unenlightened classes, to lead to such conclusions.

Let us try the truth of our statement by a particular case.

It would appear to us from Roman Catholic books of devotion, and their instructions for the dying, that according to their ideas, there is nothing so important to a sinner's salvation as to elicit particular thoughts and emotions in the hour of death, and that a *well-managed death* is practically of more importance than even a well-spent life.

In speaking of the case of malefactors capitally executed, Dr. John Henry Newman in his eighth lecture,* draws a lively picture of the execution of a culprit in a (Roman) Catholic state, who, up to the last moment is obdurate, and has shown no signs of contrition :—

"The crowd about the scaffold is occupied with but one thought, whether he has shown signs of contrition; various reports are in circulation, that he is obdurate, that he has yielded, that he is obdurate still. The women cry out it is impossible; Jesus and Mary will see to it; they are sure he will submit himself to his God before he enters into His presence. However, it is, perhaps, confirmed, that the unhappy man is still wrestling with his pride, and though he has that illumination of faith which a Catholic cannot but possess, yet he cannot bring himself to hate and abhor sins which, except in their awful consequences, are, as far as their enjoyment, gone from him for ever. He cannot taste again *the pleasure of revenge, or of forbidden indulgence*, yet he cannot get himself to give it up, though the world is passing from him. The excitement of the crowd is at its height; an hour passes, the suspense is intolerable, when the news is brought of a change, that before the crucifix in the solitude of his cell, at length, not unhappy any longer, the *happy* criminal has subdued himself; has prayed with real self-abasement; has expressed a charitable thought towards those he has hated; has resigned himself lovingly to his destiny; has supplicated pardon; has confessed with all his heart, and placed himself *at the disposal of his priest* to make such amends, as he can make, in his last hour to God and man. . . . . The news comes; it is communicated through the vast multitude at once, and I have heard from those who have been present, never shall they forget the shout of joy which burst from every tongue and formed itself into one concordant Ave of thanksgiving, in acknowledgement of the grace vouchsafed to one so near eternity."

Mr. Newman then proceeds :—

"It is not wonderful, then, to find the holy men, who, from time to time, have done the pious office of preparing such criminals for death, so confident of their salvation. So well convinced was Father Claver of the eternal happiness of almost all those whom he assisted, that speaking once of some persons who had delivered a criminal into the hands of justice, he said, 'God forgive them, but they have secured the salvation of this man at the probable risk of their own.'"—Page 213.

We consider the passages, above quoted, as startling in the extreme, and inevitably lead to the conclusions we have stated.

That the crowd of spectators at the terrible ceremonial should rejoice at the news that the criminal had confessed his guilt, and become penitent, even at the last moment, is natural and proper. Anything, of course, is better than obduracy and cherishing the most malignant passions to the last moment; but that Mr. Newman should speak of *eternal happiness*, or have cited Father Claver's convictions with approbation, would appear to us to be almost incredible, if we had not found the following still more extraordinary passage in the preceding page 212 :—

"It is good for human beings to die as infants, before they have known good or evil, if they have but received the baptism of the Church; but next to them—who are the *happiest*? who are the *safest*? for whose departure have we more cause to rejoice and be thankful than for theirs, who, if they live on *are so likely to relapse into old habits of sin*—but who are taken out of this miserable world in the flower of their contrition, and in the freshness of their preparation—just at the very moment when they have *perfected themselves in good dispositions*, and *from their heart* have put off sin and have come humbly for pardon, and have received the grace of absolution, and been fed with the bread of angels, and thus, amid the prayers of all men, have departed to their Maker and their Judge!"

* Lectures on certain difficulties felt by Anglicans in submitting to the Catholic Church—Burns and Lambert, London (second edition), 1850.

We ought not to forget in this place, that according to the established rules of the Church of Rome, one at least of the so called-sacraments, that of *Extreme Unction* has been withheld from the individual who is "*so happy* and *so safe*"—for that rite is only administered to such as are in danger of death by *sickness* and never either to a criminal about to be executed, or to a soldier going into the field of battle.—(See Catholic Layman, vol. i., p. 130.)

We should almost have believed that Father Newman's imagination and powers of description had got the better of his judgment in the above passages, and that such notions were only prevalent in foreign countries, and did not extend to our own, but for a recent occurrence in Ireland, which we think deserving of notice—we mean the late remarkable execution in Monaghan of the murderers (we should rather say the *hired assassins*, for so they were proved to be,) of the unfortunate Mr. Thomas Douglas Bateson—Bryan Grant, Neil Quin, and Patrick Coomey, who were convicted on the clearest evidence at the last spring assizes, the two former as the actual perpetrators of the crime, and the latter as an accessory before the fact.

Quin, we are told in the papers of the day, among others, in the *Tablet* of the 15th of April, had been of a daring, reckless turn of mind, so much so, that it is said he was found playing at ball with his brother, near a house in which an inquest was holding on the body of a man with whose murder the coroner's jury found him guilty. With one single exception, we are told, there was not the slightest exhibition of grief, either on the part of the culprits or their friends. Quin parted from his newly married wife, the evening before his execution, with the utmost apparent indifference; on that morning they partook largely of an excellent breakfast; two of them were found smoking, and all three appeared in the best of spirits. Coomey said, "he never felt so happy as he did at that moment, with the confidence before him in a brief time of meeting with his Savour." Quin said "that if a reprieve should come he would not accept it, as he should never be better prepared to die than he was at that time." "*They both expressed their forgiveness* of their prosecutors!!"

On Sunday morning they were allowed to converse together for a short time, and the Governor then inquired if they had any declaration to make, which they might wish published after their death. They replied they had not made up their minds on the matter. As the fatal hour approached, they appeared still more elated with the sense of their position. The subsheriff having expressed himself sorry to see three men in their position, "Sorry," said one of them, in a tone of surprise, "why, it is glad you should be, sir!" and each of them shook the narrator by the hand, and expressed "a hope that when he was about to die, he would be as fully prepared for it as they were!" The subsheriff then asked if they had any statement to make to him in relation to the offence for which they were about to die? "No," said Coomey, "*Our Saviour said nothing when he was executed!*" We shall give the rest *verbatim* from the *Tablet*.

"When they arrived in the press-room Quin said—'Hell cannot now scare us.' (When the hangman pinioned his arms), 'He's doing the best job ever was done for us.' (To the reverend gentlemen), 'We return you many thanks, gentlemen; will you not give us your blessing before we go?'

"Both reverend gentlemen then blessed them.

"Rev. Mr. Smith—'Remember the penitent thief on the cross! *In one moment you'll be* IN HEAVEN. You have eternal happiness within your reach.'

"Quin—'Mary, Mother of God, receive us! Prepare heaven for us!'"

We need go no further with the dreadful narrative. The wretched men were hurled into eternity evidently expecting that Mary could

the next moment receive them into heaven, and without, it will be observed, a prayer to JESUS, even in that dreadful moment.

That these unfortunate men sincerely believed what they were taught by Mr. Smith and his brethren, we cannot doubt; but that it was a frightful delusion under which they laboured, and that such delusions, if encouraged, cannot fail to encourage crime, and confound all national sentiments of virtue and vice among the illiterate classes, we think self-evident to every rightly constituted mind. These cold-blooded murderers did not even make the poor amends of a public confession of their guilt, or even a suitable display of contrition for it, which, as far as it went, might have tended to deter others from following their atrocious example. There is not one feature in the case which looks like a *change of heart and character;* or affords a well-founded foundation for the belief that if they had survived, "they would not have relapsed into their old habits of sin."

We have no doubt that the instructions of Roman Catholic confessors, to condemned malefactors, attain their end with mechanical perfection. When once assured that their portion in this life is closed, (even though they have spent their lives alike regardless of the laws of God and man, and gratified every evil passion and inclination,) the very worst and most degraded men will doubtless gladly enough employ any means which they are assured will obtain for them happiness in the next world too; and will eagerly seek for absolution, which they are assured will wipe away all their guilt, and convert them from criminals into saints and martyrs. But that there is any warrant, in either Scripture or common sense, or even in the peculiar doctrines of Romanism, for holding out such men as the *happiest* of men, who have *Heaven in their grasp*, and for whose departure we have *most* reason to rejoice, does appear to be, not only unsound, but dangerous in the extreme.

Pray does the Rev. Mr. Smith believe in *purgatory?* and, if so, what did he mean by telling Quin he should be *next moment* in *Heaven?* What must have been the teachings of Mr. Smith and his co-adjutors, appears too plainly from the results upon the wretched criminals, whose minds seem to have been wholly relieved from all such notions as that of expiating the temporal consequences of their guilt in purgatorial fires; and yet, if either Mr. Smith or Quin believed in purgatory at all, how could they hope that such a man could escape its ordeal?

We, of course, would not wish to convey an idea that it is not in the power of God to forgive the sins of the greatest criminal at the latest hour of his life, or to deny that such a conversion, however late, *may* be sincere, and include a real change of heart. The case of the penitent thief on the cross is proof of the reverse. But we would guard our fellow-countrymen from being led away by a misapplication of that case, to others wholly unlike it, as the Rev. Mr. Smith appears to have been. It has been well said that, "there is one such instance given in the Holy Scripture that none might *despair;* there is *but* one, that none might *presume.*" We think, however, it is too often overlooked, that the case of the penitent thief was an extreme one; and that the faith manifested by him was of so extraordinary a character that we have more occasion to wonder at its being produced, than that, having been produced, it should be so rewarded. He confessed Christ before men at a moment when no other voice was raised in his behalf; when no other was able to discern the spiritual character of the Messiah's kingdom; when all his disciples had forsaken him and fled. We should remember, too, that the pardon of the penitent thief was pronounced, not by a fallible man, but by one whose eye could pierce the minutest secrets of the heart, and probe the sincerity of his penitence, when he expressed his "fear of God," and acknowledged the "justice of his condemnation," and prayed the Lord to "remember him when he should come into His kingdom."—St. Luke xxiii. 40, 42.—Douay Bible. We think there is a vast difference between that and any other case, and that it is presumptuous in the highest degree for any mere man to promise forgiveness of sins in consideration of confessions, which may have been (and probably were) extorted only by an experience of the judgments that those sins had brought upon him. None can have a right to promise Heaven, but He who could judge, not by the outward appearance, but was able to discern in the humility, and faith, and patience of the thief on the cross, the embryo of those graces which would have developed themselves in a holy life, had he been spared.

It may tend, no doubt, to exalt the powers of the priesthood in the eyes of the ignorant and vulgar, to represent them as able, in a few moments, to exalt the greatest criminals into saints, immediately fit for heaven, by the sacraments of penance and the Eucharist, without even the further sacrament of extreme unction; but we think our readers will agree with us that such assumptions are presumptuous in the extreme, and calculated only to degrade Christianity, and do a grievous injury to society at large.

We feel deeply convinced that no thoughtful and intelligent Christian, of any denomination, can believe that a *well-managed death* can be, in God's eyes, a substitute for a *well-spent life*, or doubt that such scenes as we have described are calculated to do infinite injury to the cause of both truth and virtue.

The only preparation for death suitable to Christians placed in a state of probation like this, and which we have any sound warrant for believing will be effectual, is not the having excited any particular feelings and emotions, or even the most unseemly and irrational transports in the hour of death, but a daily life of prayer and watchfulness, acting constantly with reference to God's holy will, and seeking every opportunity to cultivate those virtuous habits of mind which alone can render us meet to be "partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light."

Correspondence.

CARDINAL BELLARMINE AND THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Turn, if you please, to volume i., page 98 of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, and candidly say, have you or have you not made an honest use of the passage quoted at the top of column 3, from the writings of Bellarmine, and purporting to contain the real sentiments of that gifted controversialist? You make him to teach that—"If the Pope through mistake should command vice and forbid virtue, the church would be bound to believe that vice is good and virtue evil, unless she would sin against conscience," and then you add, "!!!" by way of expressing your horror at the monstrous assertion. But what, Mr. CATHOLIC LAYMAN, will your readers say, when I tell them that this is a garbled extract, and that, with all the caution and honesty in the matter of quotations for which you pride yourself, you have manifestly committed yourself here (I will not *yet* say advisedly) to a false one, for which I call upon you to make the *amende honorable* in your next number. But now to the proof, which I shall give you in the ipsissima verba of Dr. Milner, End of Controversy, Richardson's edition, page 436, note—"The following is a specimen of Barrow's and Tillotson's chicanery, in their Treatise of the Supremacy—Bellarmine, in working up an argument of the Pope's infallibility, says, *hypothetically*, by way of proving the falsehood of his opponents doctrine, that 'this doctrine would oblige the church to believe vices to be good and virtue to be bad, in case the Pope were to err in teaching this.'—Bell. de Rom. Pont., l. iv., c. 5. Hence these writers take occasion to affirm that Bellarmine *positively teaches* that—'if the Pope should err by enjoining vices, or forbidding virtues, the church would be bound to believe vices to be good and virtues evil.'—p. 203. This shameful paralogism has been taken up by most subsequent Protestant controvertists!!!"

Should you refuse to publish this letter, or seek to evade the difficulty in which I have placed you, I shall esteem all your past and future professions of honesty and straightforwardness "velut æs sonans aut cymbalum tinniens."—1 Cor. xiii. 1.

I remain, sir, your very humble,
Though watchful servant,
INVESTIGATOR.

Galway, April 21, 1854.

Whatever may be the merits to which "Investigator" can justly lay claim, *watchfulness* is the very last to which we should have expected him to make any pretensions. The article of which he complains was published in September, 1852. An interval of more than a year and a half, therefore, has elapsed, during which our correspondent's vigilance has slumbered; and now that he has roused himself from his nap, he seems to us to be in the condition of those who are suddenly awakened from sleep, and for some time do not see things very clearly.

Had he been awake, and watching our proceedings, all the intervening time, we think he would have known us better than to suppose that we would "refuse to publish his letter, or seek to evade the difficulty [whatever that may be] in which he has placed us."

We do not at all profess to be infallible, and looking back at the immense number of authorities and references which we have cited since the commencement of our labours, we suppose it not impossible that, notwithstanding all our care and diligence, we may have made occasional mistakes. All that we can do is, to invite our readers, some of whom are "watchful" enough, to call our attention to any inaccuracies they may discover; and when such are pointed out, we shall never be ashamed to make a manly acknowledgement of them. But we hope, before we conclude, to prove to "Investigator" that, in the present instance, we have no occasion for any such acknowledgement.

"Investigator" charges us with making a "garbled and false extract" from Bellarmine, in our number for September, 1852. We there gave the original Latin text, at the foot of the page, accompanied by a reference to the exact paragraph of Bellarmine's works where it was to be found. One would think that before bringing such a grave charge as that of a "false" quotation, "Investigator" must have gone to Bellarmine's works and found we had cited him unfairly. If he consulted Bellarmine, he could not have been very wide awake when he did so, as the proposition which we quoted is clearly maintained by the Cardinal in the place referred to. But the truth, we believe, is, that "Investigator" never went farther than "Milner's End of Controversy;" and we hope that what we have now to say will give him a lesson how he puts any confidence, for the future, in that very dishonest writer.

The charge of "garbling" brought against us, on Milner's authority, appears to be this: that we represented Bellarmine as *positively teaching*, as his own opinion, that if the Pope should err, by enjoining vices, or forbidding virtues, the church would be bound to believe vices to be good and virtues evil; whereas, in truth (if we are to believe Milner), Bellarmine said of the doctrine of his opponents, "*this doctrine would oblige* the church to believe vices to be good and virtues to be bad, in case the Pope were to err in teaching this." Now, what will our readers think of Milner's effrontery when we tell them that these words, "this doctrine would oblige," are not to be found in Bellarmine, that there is nothing equivalent to them, that they are not even implied by the sense of the passage, and that Bellarmine's words are literally and exactly as we gave them. This is something far worse than "garbling." A writer may, without intending any dishonesty, accidentally omit, in a hasty quotation, words which affect the meaning of the passage; but, deliberately to *insert* words which completely alter the sense, is a piece of "chicanery" for which we cannot imagine any excuse.

It is quite true that this passage occurs in a place where Bellarmine is "engaged in proving the falsehood of his opponent's doctrine." The same may be said of almost any sentence in the cardinal's controversial writings. But the sentence quoted by us is no part of the doctrine of his opponents: it is part of his own principles, by the help of which he confutes his adversaries, and if it were denied, his whole argument would fall to the ground.* Why, he not only "positively teaches" the proposition we attributed to him, he also proves it. His proof runs as follows:—The church is bound in doubtful matters to acquiesce in the judgment of the Pope, to do what he commands, and not to do what he forbids: now since she would plainly sin against conscience if she did what she believed to be a vice, or abstained from what she believed to be virtues, therefore, she is bound to *believe* that to be good which the Pope commands, and evil which he forbids. Consequently, if the Pope should err in commanding vices, and prohibiting virtues, then the church is bound to believe virtues to be bad, and vices good, unless she would sin against conscience.

It seems to us that the cardinal's proof is quite conclu-

* To explain the matter in logical language—Bellarmine asserts a hypothetical proposition, and proceeds to argue from the remotion of the consequent to the remotion of the antecedent. Of course such an argument would break down if the hypothetical proposition itself were not true; yet his defenders suppose that, because he denies the consequent, he denies the hypothetical propositon itself. A want of logical acumen this which would have made Cicero lose his patience.—*Vide* De off. lib. iii. c. 9.

sive; once admit his principle (a principle clearly his own, not that of his opponents), that the church is bound to acquiesce in the judgment of the Pope, and the conclusion which Milner thinks it better to deny than to defend, follows at once.

But Milner replies, Bellarmine is here speaking *hypothetically*. To be sure he is speaking hypothetically, and we cited him as speaking hypothetically. We fancy Milner wished his readers to suppose that "speaking *hypothetically*" means saying something that one does not believe, or is not sure of, and does not wish to "teach positively." For the benefit, then, of our unlearned readers, we beg to explain that a hypothetical proposition means nothing more than a sentence with an *if* in it; and that one may be as sure of a hypothetical proposition, and teach it as positively as any other. We may be quite sure that, "if there is no rain we shall have a bad harvest," even though we are not at all sure whether it will rain or not, or whether the harvest will be good or not. Now, whatever virtues there may be in the cardinal's "*if*" we have faithfully preserved.* We do not accuse him of saying that Popes are in the habit of commanding vices, and forbidding virtues: neither do we charge him with maintaining that the church is bound to believe virtues to be good, or vices evil; it is quite beside the question to discuss what his opinion may be on either of these points; but we re-assert, advisedly, that Bellarmine maintains—what we admit to be, in logical language, a "hypothetical proposition," but still a very monstrous one, and worthy of as many notes of exclamation as we may choose to affix to it—viz., that "IF the Pope should so far err as to command vice, and to prohibit virtues, then the church would be bound to believe that vices are good, and virtues evil!!!"

We now call on "Investigator" to refer to Bellarmine himself, and to try whether he can find any trace of the words which Milner has interpolated. We look with some curiosity to see whether he will make us the "*amende honorable*" for the unfounded charge he has brought against us, or whether he will "seek to evade the difficulty in which he has placed"—*himself*.

* A curious instance of the reckless manner in which Roman Catholic divines have come to the defence of Bellarmine, is afforded by Dr. Wiseman, or some other writer in the "Dublin Review," edited by him. Dr. Wordsworth having cited this same passage from Bellarmine, the reviewer writes—"What would Dr. Wordsworth say of us if we were to charge him with the following opinion, which we give in his own words—'The infidel might justly assert that all our religion is a bare groundless faith.' We have done with his book only what he has done with that of Bellarmine, suppressed the hypothetical clause." It is quite true that the process by which the reviewer got this doctrine out of Dr. Wordsworth's book was by mutilating a sentence, and leaving out the hypothetical clause; but Dr. Wordsworth does not treat the cardinal in like manner, but copies his *if* as faithfully as we did ourselves.

ON INFALLIBILITY.

[In our March number, we inserted a letter from Mr. Rourke, so extremely long, that we were obliged to omit several valuable communications from other respected correspondents. As he has now sent us another letter, of almost equal length, we trust he will not be offended, if we break it up into paragraphs, and make a few brief remarks on each, as we go on. Our printer has directions to insert as much of the letter as he can find room for.—ED.]

"TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

"SIR—I again beg to tender you my meed of thanks for your kindness in giving my last letter a place in your periodical. I read with sorrow and not with anger, your observations on that letter, which clearly showed that you had lost equanimity in replying to it. Now, I would say, let us argue dispassionately, in a Christian spirit, and with that charity which 'is not easily provoked.' Let us 'be kindly affectioned one to another with brotherly love.'"

[We should be sorry if any of our readers had good reason to suppose that the tone of our comments on Mr. Rourke's former letter exhibited a want of proper equanimity. All we said was—that Mr. Rourke's second letter was very long, and declamatory, and dictatorial, rather than argumentative. We think so still; and hope it was no breach of Christian charity to say so, especially when we, in the same paragraph, praised the ability and clearness of his previous letter. We can hardly regret having said so much, since Mr. Rourke's present letter is considerably more to the purpose.]

"When I entered the field of controversy with you, Mr. Editor, I did so as a simple, unlearned member of the Catholic Church, and not as a logician or a theologian; so if my style of writing be quaint, and my language destitute of rhetorical and argumentative flourishes, your readers, I hope, will not be surprised, nor yourself disappointed."

[To this we have only to say, that we beg, in future, Mr. Rourke will favour us with as many arguments as he pleases, and as little as possible of the "rhetorical flourishes."]

"Having said so much by way of preface, I will, with your permission, resume my subject, by giving, first, a quotation from the Holy Book, which irrefragably proves the infallibility of the Church of Christ. The apostle of nations, in writing to the Ephesians, says 'that God has not only placed in his church, apostles, prophets, and evangelists, but also pastors and teachers'—Eph. iv. 2. For what end? 'For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ."—Eph. v. 12. How long? 'Till we all come to the unity of faith.'—Eph. v. 13. For what end? 'That henceforth we be no more like children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive.'—Eph. v. 14. This is evidently spoken in reference to the people who are here taught—first, that the pastors of the church are appointed by God himself to be their guides in faith; secondly, that these guides shall continue in the Church of Christ without ceasing to the end of the world—'till we all come to the unity of faith;' thirdly, that, in all controversies of religion, it belongs to these guides to fix the wavering judgment of the people, against all the wicked arts of impostors and seducers, and that, by consequence, the faithful ought to rely on their directions with an entire confidence. For the apostle says—'We are of God: he that knoweth God heareth us; he that is not of God, heareth us not. By this we know the spirit of truth, and the spirit of error.'—1 John iv. 6. For unless they may be safely depended on, they would not fully answer the end of their institution; the people, especially the ignorant, upon every new and difficult debate, would be left in uncertainty, and might even suspect their guides to be their seducers."

[We have now, again, to complain that Mr. Rourke mixes up very plain texts of Scripture with very doubtful comments of his own. Every member of the Church of England readily assents to the statement of the apostle, that God has appointed pastors and teachers in his church, and that the office of such teachers is to instruct and edify the people, who are the body of Christ. But what the apostle does *not* assert is, that such pastors and teachers cannot possibly fall into error, and that in every difficult debate the people may always absolutely depend on them without any uncertainty, or any necessity of inquiring for themselves. Now, a divine of the Church of Rome cannot consistently adopt Mr. Rourke's interpretation of this passage; for the Church of Rome acknowledges the orders of the Greek Church. There are about fifty millions of Christians whose pastors (according to the Romish theory) teach fatal error; whose "guides *are* their seducers;" and on whose directions the "people *cannot* rely with an entire confidence." It is plain, therefore, that any texts which merely assert that God has appointed an order of clergy for the teaching of the people, cannot be interpreted to mean, that the directions of such clergy can be followed implicitly without risk of error.

It is scarcely necessary to say, how irrelevant is the text cited from St. John's epistle, from which Mr. Rourke seems to infer that every clergyman of the present day is as divinely inspired as were St. John and his brother apostles.]

"But blessed for ever be the mercy of God who has settled upon earth a visible church, which is the pillar and ground of truth, against which the gates of hell shall never prevail; and to which he has promised the Spirit of Truth for ever. So that I leave any one to judge whether they who refuse to submit their private reason to the authority of this Church, be not in danger of being self-convicted at the great tribunal of God; and I leave it to him to consider whether any man can hope to attain salvation who lives wilfully out of the communion of that church which Christ came to establish for the salvation of mankind, and of which it is said—'The Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved.'—Acts ii. 47. If all men had but faith enough to believe the church established by Christ himself, to be our guide, and humility enough to submit their judgment to her's, there had never been any heresy in the Christian world. Which, as it shows, on the one hand, the excellency of Christ's institution, so, on the other, it is a dreadful instance of the pride and misery of mankind, who had rather lose heaven by presumption, than gain it by following better lights than their own."

[This paragraph is pervaded by Mr. Rourke's old fallacy, that what is said in Scripture of the church must necessarily be understood of the Church of *Rome*—a church which actually *did not exist* at the time to which the passage in Acts ii. refers! We are as certain as Mr. Rourke is, that no man can rationally hope to attain salvation who lives wilfully out of the communion of the true Church of Christ—of which, it is said in that chapter—"The Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved."]

"Well, I have given you nearly twenty passages from the Divine Book which clearly, ay, irrefutably prove the infallibility of the Church of Christ. But you cannot see infallibility in those passages. I will tell you why you cannot see it. Because (I do not mean the slightest offence), you are walking in 'the valley of the shadow of death,' and because you are 'blind without sleep.'"

[This passage contains only "rhetorical and argumentative flourishes;" we do not think it necessary to give any reply to it, beyond assuring Mr. R. that it does not disturb our "equanimity" in the least. Whether it be consistent with Christian charity to charge one's opponent with wilful blindness to what is irrefutably proved by the Holy Scriptures, we leave to the judgment of our dispassionate readers.]

"Pardon this digression. To continue, we believe that in the Gospel is recorded a part, and, indeed, a very small part, of what Christ did and preached during his visible existence on earth.—See John xxi. 25.

"We believe the authors of those Gospels to have been inspired by the Holy Ghost, and, therefore, we believe every word contained in them, as proceeding from the fountain of truth. As we believe the Gospel of Christ to be a divine book, so we believe that none but a divine authority can expound the same. We shudder at the idea of bringing that divine book before the tribunal of limited or corrupted reason, and we candidly confess that, although we were provided with a greater share of wisdom and knowledge than Solomon possessed, we should still be unequal of ourselves, to the task of understanding and explaining the Gospel, or other parts of Holy Writ. In this we are confirmed by St. Peter, who says that 'no prophecy of the Scripture is made by private interpretation.'—2 Peter i. 20. As we believe that Holy Scripture is the Word of God, so we believe that Holy Scripture, misrepresented, is not the Word of God, but the word of corrupted man; and that Scripture is often misrepresented, we are obliged to believe, from the assertion of St. Peter, who tells us that the unlearned and unstable wrest the Scriptures to their own destruction.—See 2 Peter iii. 16. And likewise from our own observations. For, as "common sense" tells us, that the Holy Ghost cannot be the author of contradictory doctrines, so it tells us that numbers of doctrines, preached pretendedly from Scripture, must be false, as they stand in contradiction to other doctrines drawn from the same Scripture."

[Mr. Rourke here draws very strange conclusions from the principles which we hold in common with him. We all agree, that the Scriptures were given by the inspiration of God, for the instruction of his people; He knew the extent of man's ability, and He surely had power to express those doctrines which He deemed it needful for man to know, in such language that a man of humble and teachable mind could understand them. But, Mr. Rourke seems to proceed upon the principle that the greater the wisdom of him who speaks, the greater the difficulty of understanding the meaning of what he says; so that while any peasant can understand what a priest speaks or writes, not even "the wisdom of Solomon can understand or explain" what is written by the inspiration of God himself.

Mr. Rourke quotes two passages from the second Epistle of St. Peter, in support of his views. The first of these is plainly irrelevant. According to Mr. Rourke's own translation, the passage states, how prophecy is "made," not how it is to be explained; which meaning appears, to be confirmed by the concluding words of the verse, which Mr. Rourke has omitted to cite—"for holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." The second passage is a very favourite one with Roman Catholic controversial writers; but familiar as we are with Mr. Rourke's interpretations of Scripture, we needed no formal proof that it is very possible to wrest texts of the Bible to a sense very different from what the writers intended. But, notwithstanding this, a moment's examination of the text, from 2 Pet. iii. 16, proves two points—one, that in St. Peter's time, the "unlearned and unstable" had the Scriptures in their hands, contrary to the modern practice of the Church of Rome; the other, that the remedy given by St. Peter for such risk of misinterpretation was *not* to close up the volume of Scripture altogether, and trust to the interpretation of the church, which is the plan Mr. Rourke would suggest, but (see the following verse) "to grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ"—a knowledge which can only be acquired by the constant study of those very Scriptures which are able to make us wise unto salvation.

We quite agree with Mr. Rourke in the concluding assertion of the paragraph, that "the Holy Ghost cannot be the author of contradictory doctrines," and this is one of our reasons for believing that either the ancient or modern Church of Rome must have erred grievously from the true faith. If Mr. Rourke will refer to an article in our present number on this subject, he will find it proved, beyond the possibility of contradiction, that, upon several most important points, the ancient and modern Church of Rome do put forward contradictory doctrines. If the ancient Church was right, then the modern Church of Rome is in great error. If, on the other hand, the modern doctrines be true, then the Church of Rome could not always have been infallible. Mr. Rourke is at liberty to select whichever horn of the dilemma he pleases.]

(To be continued in our next).

ON PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD AND THE BURIAL SERVICE.

WE received some time ago a letter from Mr. E. Power, for which we were unable to make room in our last two numbers. Finding that its unmanageable length rendered it uncertain whether it could be inserted in the present number, we have been unwilling to postpone it any longer, and have, therefore, had recourse to the same expedient, as in the case of Mr. Rourke; printing half of it now, and leaving the other half for next month.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—That Mr. Thorndike did not hold the belief of the Church of England on the subject of prayers for the dead, is notorious from the passage which I cited from his writings; and hence the purpose for which I cited that passage (though you could not conceive it), and to which I have so palpably and exclusively applied it, must be self-evident—namely, to show how oddly the doctrine laid down therein contrasts with that of the burial office; for if the doctrine advocated by this learned Protestant be orthodox,

that of the burial office cannot be so too, and *vice versa*. In this respect it is then, I grant, dangerous to quote from Mr. Thorndike's book, and bring forward a passage developing a system of prayers for the dead so manifestly different from that of the Protestant Church, but dangerous to the burial office only. We have here, also, a decided proof of the incongruity of doctrinal opinions, which marks the principles of Protestants; principles which, while their advocates endeavour to apply them to the support of one particular form of belief, are equally available in defence of every other system, how contradictory soever. You assert that, with regard to the burial of impenitent sinners, there is no material difference between the Churches of England and Rome; but you are compelled to defend your practice, in this respect, by the saving interrogatory, "how are we to know that a sinner died incorrigible and impenitent?" This may be considered a very rational query regarding your Church, which is utterly deficient of the discipline established by Christ and his apostles, for punishing notorious sinners, but it does not establish on this head (the burial of impenitent sinners) the uniformity of the two Churches. You allege, "we never heard of any priest refusing money when asked to pray for one who died in his communion;" but as this is an expedient to throw dust in the eyes of your readers, and in no respect applicable to the subject of debate, permit me to set the matter right, by asking, have you ever heard of a priest accepting money for praying for incorrigible, impenitent sinners, who, by their notoriously wicked lives, separated themselves from his communion? I could, if necessary, supply instances of the refusal of Christian burial to the remains of persons excluded from the Catholic Church, on account of their impious lives, when conscience could not nor would not be sacrificed to *mammon*.

Following your example, I now maintain, on the contrary, I have never known a minister to refuse to read the *Burial office* over the remains of any one offered for interment. I never heard of him alleging "*it is a bad case;*" "I could not, with a safe conscience, read this *office* over the remains of N—. L—., who lived in a state of concubinage fully thirty years, and up to the day of his death, I could not, under such circumstances, prostitute religion to so vile a purpose; to the encouragement of vice; to the pardoning of lukewarm sinners, and to the disedification of the good and the virtuous." No; but with an affectation of religious solemnity, he recites, "For as much as it hath pleased Almighty God of his great mercy, *to take unto himself the soul of our dear brother departed*," &c.; and "we give thee hearty thanks, for that it hath pleased thee *to deliver this our brother*," &c.; and "that when we depart this life we may rest in him as *our hope as this our brother doth*," &c. These words you read over all that are buried, incorrigible, impenitent sinners included: the law compels you, and the terrors of a prosecution are an *argumentum ad hominem* too powerful to be resisted.

In CATHOLIC LAYMAN, Vol. ii., No. 20, page 93, you assert, "prayers for the dead are never countenanced nor vindicated further than as they may rely on the promise and Word of God; and as we do not go beyond this, how can we be taunted with admitting prayers for the dead not warranted by Scripture?" I confess I have no desire to disturb your equanimity again, yet, I cannot forbear asking what warrant of Scripture have you for these prayers, in cases such as this I have now stated? a case to which, when I fill up the blanks, I can fearlessly challenge contradiction. I have already alluded to the want of discipline in the Church of England; your annual wishes (*Commination office*) although of about 300 years' standing, have not yet attained the object wished for. Thus the Protestant Liturgy affords *prima facie* and incontestable evidence of a total want, in the Church of England, of that *godly discipline* so strictly enforced in the primitive Church. You cannot subject sinners to "*open penance;*" you cannot reprove an unworthy member, and dismiss him from the Christians' community; and hence, I agree with you, that it is impossible to know whether notorious sinners in your Church become truly penitent or not before their death.

This want of discipline is admitted by *Dr. Wake*, in a sermon at *Whitehall*, 1690, on 1 Tim. v. He says—"The great *temper and moderation* of our present discipline, that I do not say *some defect in it* permits not us (*the clergy*) to make a severe inquiry into sin, and punish it, as St. Paul commanded Timothy to do. We cannot call sinners publicly into the Church, and lay open their crimes to them, and rebuke them before all, that others also may fear. But the civil magistrate hath great opportunities of supplying *this defect;* and, no doubt, *God will require it so much the more at their hands*, in that it is *now no longer in ours*." Hence the Church of England, independently as a Church, having no authority to rebuke notorious sinners, or to separate them from her communion, cannot pretend to exclude the remains of such from the rites of burial prescribed by law. Another Protestant authority complains thus of this want of discipline—"The Church of England hath, for 200 years, *wished* for the restoration of *discipline*, and yet it is but an *ineffective wish*. For nothing has been done towards introducing it, but rather things are gone backward."—*Bingham's Antiq. sub Ann*, 1719, b. 15, cap. 9. sec. 8.

I could adduce innumerable quotations to the same purpose, and all of them from Protestants whose zeal for the *Reformed* Church places them beyond the reach of suspicion; yet I shall only add one more—"The restoring of the ancient discipline is earnestly desired by the Church of England in her office of *Commination*—but with due submission be it spoken, methinks it looketh too much like dissembling with God, and imposing on the people, to have this passage stand in our *public Liturgy*, and read solemnly once a year, and yet no attempt made towards the restoring of this *godly* and *much wished-for*, but still *neglected discipline*."—*Ellesley's Caution against ill company*, 1705, *pref. pages* 2, 3. Thus, we have corroborating evidence, the most satisfactory and conclusive, that the Church of England has not now, nor had not at any period since the Reformation, that true Christian discipline which our Lord himself ordained, to preserve his Church, pure and free, from corruption; and which is as evidently an essential principle of the true Church, and an ordinance of Christ, as any other portion of his religion.

St. Paul says (Heb. xiii. 17), that pastors must account for the souls of their flocks, but *Bishop Wake* tells us God will require this account at the hands of the civil magistrate; yet, taking *Timothy* as an exemplar of all true Christian bishops, and admitting the Scripture as the infallible Word of God, it must be confessed that the discipline of the Church of Christ, with respect to notorious sinners, is as irrevocably the same to day as in the days of *Timothy*, and that the clergy have the same or equal authority to rebuke, to exhort, and to chastise, by penitential discipline. In this conclusion I am supported by the authority of the Church of England, which defines the Church of Christ thus:—"The true Church hath always *three notes* or marks, whereby it is known—pure and sound doctrine, the sacraments ministered according to Christ's holy institution, and *the right use of ecclesiastical discipline*."—*Hom. on Whitsunday, part* 2, *page* 393.

From these observations I am incidentally led to notice another peculiarity of the Church of England. By her own definition of the *true Church*, it appears that three essential properties are required as constituent and inherent principles so intimately and inseparably connected with its very nature and institution, that, without them, it cannot continue to be the Church of Christ; and I have shown, from unexceptionable authority, the *Protestant Liturgy* and the testimony of Protestant divines, that *one essential property* of the true Church is wanting in the Church of England; therefore, by her own doctrine, she cannot be the true Church of Christ.

Thus, have I given you another instance of my knowledge of Protestant principles, with which, I venture to affirm, ninetynine ont of every hundred Protestants are as little acquainted as they are with the affairs passing in the moon. I presume I have satisfied you as to the object for which I quoted from Mr. Thorndike's work; not that I *fancied* I could find prayers for the dead and purgatory proved thereby; but to show that learned Protestants cannot be satisfied as to the orthodoxy of the burial office, and therefore, they advocate other systems of prayers for the dead.

(To be continued.)

[We must commence by explaining the allusion to Mr. Thorndike, for the benefit of our new subscribers. In our last volume, Mr. Power discussed with us, in several letters, the question, what evidence could be adduced in support of the doctrine of purgatory. And among other authorities he brought forward first, a passage from Mr. Johnson's "Unbloody Sacrifice;" and more recently, another from the writing of Mr. Thorndike. Now, when we referred to the places cited by Mr. Power, we felt bound, in charity, to believe that he had taken his quotations secondhand, without once turning to the original of the passages quoted. Both the one writer and the other were engaged (in the very passages which Mr. Power says, "vividly set forth the belief of his church") in proving that the ancients did *not* hold the doctrine of purgatory, and in explaining the object of the prayers for the dead which they admit, were used in the church, at an early period. As we have had often occasion to do the same thing ourselves, we expect, at some future time, to see garbled extracts from our pages, introduced into Roman Catholic manuals of controversy, and to find the CATHOLIC LAYMAN cited among other Protestant testimonies to the truth of the doctrine of purgatory. On our pointing out the way in which Mr. Power had been misled as to Mr. Thorndike, our correspondent has not acted with the candour we had hoped for; and instead of plainly confessing that he had been deceived by an unfaithful quotation, he shifts his ground and tells us that he cited Mr. Thorndike only for the purpose of showing how opposed his views were to those of the burial service!

Strange, if this were the case. Mr. Thorndike lived and died a clergyman of the Church of England; and if he had occasion to bury any one, we have no reason to suppose that he ever used any other ritual. We may say, too, for ourselves, that we cannot discover any contradiction between the sentiments cited from him, and the doctrine of the Church of England, expressed in the burial service. But whether there be or not, is a controversy with which we certainly shall not occupy our pages. For what is Mr. Thorndike to us? Supposing that it were true, that while holding the office of clergyman of the Church of England, he in reality believed the doctrines of the Quakers, or of the Socinians, or of the Church of Rome, how does it affect our position? Is Mr. Thorndike the founder of our religion? Supposing we could show that Cardinal Wiseman was a Mahometan in disguise, would Mr. Power think it necessary to turn Turk? It may be an interesting subject of inquiry to ascertain the exact private opinions of individual modern divines; but we cannot give up any of the space of this journal to topics of mere literary curiosity; and we would desire all our correspondents to confine themselves to the points really at issue between the Church of England and the Church of Rome.

Mr. Power proceeds next to a topic, which is nearly as irrelevant to the question of purgatory as the opinions of Mr. Thorndike—viz., the general question of church discipline. We beg to remind our correspondent that this journal was established for the purpose of discussing those important doctrines, upon which the Church of England differs from the Church of Rome, and not those upon which honest members of the Church of England may lawfully differ among themselves. It is obvious, from Mr. Power's quotations from Church of England writers, that the question which he raises is one of the latter class. We had some doubts whether it would not have been better to have, at once, reduced his letter to limits more suited to the size of our journal, by the omission of all his remarks on this subject; and the only reason which deterred us from adopting this course was the fact, that he seemed to attach considerable importance to them, and we were, therefore, unwilling that any of our correspondents should have reason to charge us with even the semblance of unfairness or partiality. While we are willing to admit, that the discipline of the Church of England might be made more strict than it is, we deny altogether the justice of Mr. Power's sweeping censures against her on this point. Before we are obliged, however, to inquire what portion of truth there may be in these censures, we must ask our correspondent does he seriously maintain, that "true Christian discipline is evidently an *essential* principle of the true church;" or, in other words, that if Christian discipline be wanting, or inefficiently exercised, the church necessarily ceases to exist? To us such a course of argument, in an advocate of the Church of Rome, appears absolutely suicidal.

In the very first page of that well-known Roman Catholic work, "Bossuet's Variations," what do we read? Speaking of the beginning of the sixteenth century, he says—"A reform of ecclesiastical discipline had been wanted *several centuries before*. 'Who will grant me,' says St. Bernard, 'before I die, to see the Church of God such as she had been in the primitive times?'" Disorders had still increased since that time. The disorders of the clergy were represented in this manner to Eugenius IV. by Cardinal Julian. "These disorders," said he, "excite the hatred of the people against the whole ecclesiastical order; and should they not be corrected, it is to be feared lest the laity should rise against the clergy; . . . for it will be said," proceeded he, "that the *clergy are incorrigible*, and will apply no remedy to their disorders." Mr. Power sneers at the Church of England for her annual wishes for reformation of about 300 years' standing; but here we see that the Church of Rome, according to the acknowledgement of one of the ablest of her own controversial writers, needed a reformation of ecclesiastical discipline for *several* centuries. From a period of time long anterior to St. Bernard, down to the sixteenth century, the state of the church of Rome was getting worse and worse, until, at last, according to the confession of one of her own cardinals, there was much risk that the people would consider the clergy quite *incorrigible*. Or, if the authority of Bossuet be considered insufficient, let our readers turn to the extracts from the ecclesiastical annals of Cardinal Baronius, under the dates A.D. 900 and 912, which we had occasion to quote in another article in our present number, p. 58.*

Other citations to the same effect have been given, vol. 2, p. 121. For example, the declaration of Pope Adrian VI.:—"For a long time there have existed many abominators in this holy see, abuses of spiritual things, excesses in the exercises of jurisdiction; all things have been changed and perverted. Corruption has descended from the head to the members, from the supreme pontiff to the inferior prelates." And still more to the point, is the confession of Bellarmine, which we cited in the same place:—"Some years before the rise of the Lutheran and Calvinistic heresy, according to the testimony of those who were then alive, there was almost an entire abandonment of equity in the ecclesiastical judgments: *in morals, no discipline;* in sacred literature, no erudition; in divine things, no reverence—religion was almost extinct."—Supra, p. 57.

May we not now retort upon Mr. Power his own argument, which he advances so triumphantly? and may we not say, that we "have shown, from unexceptionable authority, and the testimony of [Roman Catholic] divines, that one essential property of the true church is wanting in the Church of [Rome]. Therefore, by her own doctrine, she cannot be the true Church of Christ."

But enough of such painful pictures, which Mr. Power's argument has compelled us to bring forward. We should be unwilling to close these remarks without pointing ont to Mr. Power, and to our other readers, what we believe to be the true state of the case, as regards this difficult question of church discipline. Our Lord's parable of the tares and the wheat has always foreshadowed the state of the church in each successive age—the evil ever mingled with the good. All human devices to effect an entire separation between these two opposing elements must of

* The original Latin text of these extracts from Baronius is given at length in the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, for October, 1852, vol. i., p. 109.

necessity prove inefficacious; and the important practical question is, whether the system of the Church of Rome, which *professes* to effect this separation, does not in reality produce more moral injury upon the minds of hypocrites and others, whom no discipline can reach, and whom she allows to remain within the pale of the church, than the course adopted by the Church of England, of throwing the responsibility of the state of each individual Christian more directly and immediately upon himself. A member of the Church of England is under no temptation to harden himself in sin by the knowledge that the clergyman who reads the church service over his grave may, in accordance with the ritual, express a charitable hope of his future state. He knows that such an expression can exercise no influence whatever upon his condition in the unseen world. Very different, however, is the effect of the practical working of the Romish system, as we see it constantly before our eyes. The most pious saint that ever lived could not express a more confident hope of eternal happiness and salvation than is put forth continually by blood-stained criminals of the Romish faith, as they stand on the scaffold to pay the penalty of their evil deeds. We ask, can that system be true which enjoins and authorizes vice thus to claim the blessings which should belong only to virtue?

FLOWERS FOR MAY.

Happy, joyous May! loveliest and cheeriest month of the year, with its gleams of bright sunshine and shadows of soft green light, its thousand commingling voices above and around, calling upon all nature to join in the chorus of praise and thanksgiving to him "who maketh his sun to shine upon the good and the bad, and raineth upon the just and the unjust."—Matt. v. 4, 5 (Douay Bible). Is there one so dull and thankless as not to respond to the call?

"Wake! for shame! thou sluggard heart,
Wake! and gladly sing thy part,
Learn of birds, and streams, and flowers,
How to use thy nobler powers."

As we saunter out on a May morning to welcome the approaching summer, it is not to the cultivated parterre or the formal flower garden that our steps incline, but to the open fields and meadows. At all times agreeable to the eyes, and refreshing in the dreariest months of winter, they are now invested with richer and peculiar attractions. Daisies, and buttercups, and cowslips overspread the grass, and the hedges are whitening with the hawthorn. The DAISY, however, claims the first place in our attention in a May meadow; on entering which, we are sure to meet the "wee, modest, crimson-tipped flower" in myriads around our feet, in starlike spangles on the green carpet of nature. Some one has called it the Robin red-breast of flowers.

The term daisy, as spelt in old English (day's-eye), wrapped up in a word, a piece of simple, natural poetry. It expressed that the flower, like the eyes of other wee and pretty things, grows sleepy at the decline of day, and closes at the evening fall. The peasant who first gave this descriptive appellation to the "bonny gem," had the fancy of a poet, as much as a Chaucer, of whom it is said that he used to lie in the fields all day long to watch the daisy open its round eyes in the morning and close them in the evening.

The botanical name of the daisy is *Bellis perennis*, or pretty perennial. The French call it *Petite Marguerite* (little pearl), and *Paquerette* (Easter flower). The Italians call it *Pratolina* (meadow flower), and *fiore di primavera* (spring-tide flower). It was once a flower of great renown, and worn by valiant knights and gentlemen. It was the device of the unhappy Margaret of Anjou, and afterwards of the celebrated Margaret of Valois, the sister of Francis the First, and friend of Erasmus and Calvin. So that, however humble may be its birth and estimation with those who regard nothing as rich but what is rare, the common daisy flower has been valued highly by those who could associate true nobility with simplicity of nature. Were we to attempt a description of it, our readers would imagine we were undertaking a very superfluous task; but familiar as it is, there are many who have never stooped to examine a daisy just before it has opened and scattered its leaves, and while its florets, each tipped with a delicate rose-colour, are clustered into one group, forming a cynosure of beauty that might compete with anything to be found in the garden or greenhouse. Examined through a microscope, nothing more perfect can be seen, and its exquisite beauty and symmetry can then only be appreciated.

"Who but he who arched the skies,
And pours the day-springs living flood,
Wondrous alike in all he tries,
Could rear the daisy's purple bud.

Mould its green cup, its wiry stem,
Its fringed border nicely spin,
And cap the gold-emtossed gem
That, set in silver, gleams within.

And fling it, unrestrained and free,
O'er hill and dale, and desert sod,
That man, where'er he walks, may see
In every step, the stamp of God."

But, surely, we need not appeal to the appliances of science to create an interest in favour of the daisy—

"'Tis Flora's page, in every place,
In every season fresh and fair,
It opens with perennial grace,
And blossoms everywhere.

On waste and woodland, rock and plain,
Its humble buds unheeded rise—
The rose has but a summer reign,
The daisy never dies."

So sung a Christian poet,* who, within the last few days has been summoned hence, to join his sweet harp with those around the throne of God, where no doubt he is singing with a loud voice continually, "Worthy is the lamb that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing."—Apocalypse v. 12. The daisy was no unworthy theme for a Christian poet in his passing pilgrimage on earth. Its very name was fraught with recollections of happy childhood; it leads him back to his early days of innocence and simplicity, when he roamed through fields and meadows in search of daisies, and buttercups, and cowslips. It is emphatically the child's own flower; and, with propriety, has been made the emblem of that pure and happy innocence which belongs to a child:—

"Type and emblem thou may'st be
Of that rare simplicity
Which, in every Christian mind
Should its place of resting find;
Mingling, with its scorn of state,
Meekness to the rich and great,
Faith to rest on in the way,
Hope to lend its cheering ray;
Conscious that the hand which tries
All its latent energies,
Can, with more than equal power,
Bear it through temptation's hour,
Still the conflict, soothe its sighs,
And plant it 'neath congenial skies.
Such the lesson thou may'st meet
In the daisy at thy feet."

Our blessed Lord told his disciples that except they were converted and became as little children, they should not enter into the kingdom of God.—Matt. xviii. 3. For of such is the kingdom of God.—Mark ix. 14, 15. He told Nicodemus that except a man be born again, of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot see the kingdom of God.—John iii. 5. He did not mean merely that they were to become pure, and simple, and innocent as children, although this may also be true metaphorically, but he plainly, and over and over again, taught them, that they must experience a new birth, actual and literal, not by entering the second time into their mother's womb, but by being born again of the Spirit of God—the Holy Ghost. This may read strange in the eyes of our Roman Catholic readers, as it sounded strange in the ears of Nicodemus, until he was taught by his blessed Master not to marvel at the saying.

As the month advances, the fields are in a blaze of buttercups and cowslips, reminding us, as somebody has said, of the descent of Jupiter in a shower of gold. The BUTTERCUP or king-cup (French, *Pied de coq*, cocksfoot, and *bouton d'or*, gold-button) is a species of ranunculus or crowfoot (*Ranunculus bulbosus*). It derives its name of buttercup or butter-flower, from its being supposed that its flower imparts the yellow colour to the butter at this period of the year, being taken as fodder by the cows. This, however, is a popular error, the buttercup, like all the ranunculus family, being very acrid and pungent in its taste, so much so, that neither cows nor horses will touch it for food. This general supposition is just about as true as that the fairies use the flower of the buttercup for their goblets, which, doubtless, many good people once believed.

"And fairies now, no doubt, unseen,
At silent revels sup,
With dew-drop bumpers toast their queen,
From crow-flowers' golden cup.

The COWSLIP (*primula veris*) is now also in rich profusion in our meadows. This "*fragrant dweller of the lea*" is distinguished from the primrose by the smaller size of its tall and pensile flowers. A line of Ben Jonson betrays the homely derivation of its name, when he speaks of

"Bright day's-eyes, and the lips of cows."

The oxslip is another species of the same family; but with somewhat larger flowers, and, no doubt, has its name from a similar association.

The HAWTHORN, or white-thorn, was called, in old Saxon, the hedge-thorn. Before the change in the calendar, May-day did not happen till about the 12th of our present month, and then the hedges were white with the pearly blossoms of the hawthorn, which was thence called "the May." It was a custom of the olden times, on a May morning, to go to the woods at break of day, and bring away boughs of the hawthorn, and hang them on every door. This was supposed to have been a remnant of Druidical superstition; but, apart from that, it was a natural and interesting custom. We believe some such custom still lingers in Greece.

Though we must pass many flowers unnoticed, yet must we say a word respecting the LILY OF THE VALLEY (*Convallaria magalis*). What can surpass the beauty of its delicate bells, as they hang, half-hidden in the shade of its broad, green leaves! This sweet-scented, modest little flower is sometimes associated with our Lord's comparison of the lilies of the field and Solomon's splendour. This, however, is a mistake, as the lily which suggested the comparison is generally acknowledged to be the scarlet martagon lily, which is very plentiful in the fields in Syria.

"But not the less, sweet spring-tide flower,
Dost thou display thy Maker's power,
His skill and handy-work.
Our western valley's humble child,
Where in green nook of woodland wild,
Thy modest blossoms lurk.

What though nor rare, nor art be thine,
The lea's to pie, the thread to twine,
Yet born to bloom and fade,
Still, love, a lovelier robe arrays,
Than o'er in Israel's brightest days,
Her wealthiest kings arrayed."

* The poet, James Montgomery, who died on 30th April last.

FARMING OPERATIONS FOR MAY.

(From the Irish Farmers' Gazette.)

This being the month most appropriate for general green cropping, it will be of most importance, in order to get them sown in proper time, that all other routine work should be previously disposed of.

Barley.—Sowing should, therefore, be finished without delay. The surface should be worked very fine for this grain to insure an even braird; it may be sown broadcast under the plough, or ribbed or drilled in—in whatever way it may be deposited, no time should be lost in this dry weather in covering, and immediately rolling, so as to prevent evaporation and preserve as much of the natural moisture in the land as possible; steeping the seed from 24 to 36 hours in soft water, to forward germination, will be of much benefit, but it will require careful watching in the steep, as in warm close weather, it will vegetate much quicker than when it is cold and harsh; as soon as it shows symptoms of sprouting it should be sown, and carefully covered without delay.

Grass and Clover Seeds.—Barley is the best grain crop to sow grass and clover seeds with, which should be sown immediately after the barley is covered, then bush harrowed and rolled, all small seeds are more equally dispersed, and covered by having the land rolled previous to sowing, but should be finished with the roller.

Mangel-wurzel.—This crop, which is of the greatest possible value with carrots, to those who would have plenty of good milk and butter during the winter, without that offensive taste which all the turnip tribe invariably communicate, requires a deep, rich, friable loam, or a moory soil, and cannot be grown to perfection without the aid of a plentiful supply of farm-yard manure. After the drills are formed and well rolled, the seeds may be dibbled in, two or three seeds in each hole, at from fifteen to eighteen inches apart, in rich and sheltered soils; and at from twelve to fifteen inches apart, in soils not so rich, or more exposed, or sown in a continuous line by the turnip-harrow, adjusting the holes to allow the seed to pass. The seeds should be steeped in soft water for at least forty-eight hours; set to drain; and dried with wood or other ashes, or fine, dry rabbit-sand; the dibble-holes should not exceed 1½ inches deep. A very expeditious sort of dibble has been figured repeatedly in the GAZETTE; it will be found at page 159, of volume lii. It is usual with some to sow the mangels at half the above distances, with the intention of removing every second plant, when they begin to touch or incommode each other, and which gives an abundant supply of green feeding. When sown in a continuous line the plants are afterwards singled out to the above distances. The best time to sow mangels is between the last week in April and the 20th of May. The ordinary quantity of seed required is about 4 lbs. per Irish acre; the long red gives the heaviest crop in good, deep ground; the globe varieties are the best for ordinary soils: and the best for keeping is the orange globe. Mangels may also be sown in raised drills in beds; we prefer making the drills across the beds to making them lengthways, as by having them across, all the necessary operations of forming, manuring, sowing, thinning, hoeing, weeding, &c., can be performed from the furrows, between the beds, without putting the foot upon the bed.

White Globe or Norfolk Turnips.—When required for early sheep feeding, a breadth of white turnips may be sown by the middle of the month, which will come in by September, and be of great service.

Dale's Hybrid and Aberdeen Turnips may be sown from the middle to the end of the month.

Carrots and Parsnips will now require much careful attention, in hoeing and weeding; if sown early, and their progress strong, they will require thinning by the end of the month.

Chicory may still be sown till the tenth of the month, in drills prepared as if for turnips.

Spring Vetches.—Breadths suitable to the consumption of the above valuable soiling crop should be sown once a fortnight. Mix the vetches with about one-fourth of oats, and about 4 lb. of rape, it adds considerably to the bulk of the provender, and serves to keep the vetches off the ground.

Rye and Winter Vetches.—The former will be coming into use early in the month; the latter at later periods. As fast as they are consumed the land should be turned up and prepared for turnips.

Pigs.—Fat pigs should be disposed of before the month commences, and all others kept in store condition. Green clover, vetches, &c., may be given them in their yard, or if a clover field can be exclusively devoted to this stock, they will be maintained in health, strength, and good growing condition, till the end of the season, when food, more adapted for fattening, comes in plentifully. This is a good month to admit sows to the boar, that farrowing may take place in time for the young ones to get a good size and hardy before cold weather sets in.

New and Recent Works

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

Booksellers to the Queen,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

THE RUSSIAN SHORES OF THE BLACK SEA, IN THE AUTUMN of 1852, with a Voyage down the Volga, and a Tour through the Country of the Don Cossacks. By Lawrence Oliphant. 8vo. 14s.

RUSSIA AND THE RUSSIANS; comprising an account of the Czar Nicholas, and the House of Romanoff, with a sketch of the Encroachments of Russia from the reign of the Empress Catherine. By J. H. Cole, 21st Fusileers. 2s. 6d.

THE RUSSO-TURKISH CAMPAIGN OF 1828-29; with a View of the present State of the Eastern Question. By Colonel Chesney. 12s.

THE HISTORY OF THE FRENCH PROTESTANT REFUGEES, from the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. By Charles Weiss. 8vo. 14s.

HISTORY OF THE PROTESTANT CHURCH IN HUNGARY, FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE REFORMATION TO 1850, with reference also to Transylvania. With an Introduction by Dr. D'Aubigne. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

ALISON'S HISTORY of EUROPE, from the fall of Napoleon, in 1815, to the Establishment of Military Government in France, in 1852; being a continuation of his former celebrated Work. Vols. I., II., and III. 8vo. 15s. each.

CHRISTOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, and a Commentary on the Messianic Predictions. By E. W. Hengstenberg, D.D. Vol. I. 10s. 6d.

THE EARLY PROPHECIES OF A REDEEMER; from the first Promise to the Prophecy of Moses. Considered in Six Discourses. By Rev. W. De Burgh, B.D. 8vo. 5s.

EXAMINATION OF MR. MAURICE'S THEOLOGICAL ESSAYS. By Robert S. Candlish, D.D. Crown 8vo. 6s.

OUTLINES OF SACRED PROPHECY. By Rev. T. R. Birks. New Edition. 5s.

THE SCARLET MYSTERY; or, Rome Unmasked. By J. G. MacWalter. 3s. 6d.

THE LIFE OF MRS. SHERWOOD. Edited by her Daughter. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

HOPE DEFERRED, NOT LOST; a Narrative of Missionary effort in South America. With Journals of Captain Gardiner, &c. 5s.

CAUTIONS FOR THE TIMES. Edited by the Archbishop of Dublin. 8vo. 7s.

MEMOIR OF RICHARD WILLIAMS, Catechist to the Patagonian Mission. By the Rev. Dr. James Hamilton. 12mo. 5s.

A MEMOIR OF THE REV. W. B. JOHNSTON, Missionary at Regent's Town, Sierra Leone. 5s.

OF THE PLURALITY OF WORLDS. An Essay. 8vo. 8s.

FRIENDS IN COUNCIL. A Series of Readings and Discourses thereon. 2 vols. Cheaper Edition. 9s.

COMPANIONS OF MY SOLITUDE. Cheaper Edition. 3s. 6d.

THE CHEMISTRY OF COMMON LIFE. By James F. W. Johnston. Vol. I. 5s.

ALISON'S HISTORY OF EUROPE, from the French Revolution in 1789 to 1815. Cheaper Edition. Vols. I. to V. 4s. each.

DISCOURSES ON THE CHRISTIAN REVELATION, viewed in connection with Modern Astronomy. By the late Thomas Chalmers, D.D. Fcp. 2s. 6d.

THE BIBLE IN THE COUNTING HOUSE: a course of Lectures to Merchants. By the Rev. H. A. Broadman, D.D. 8vo. 5s.

STORR'S FAMILY PREACHER. Short practical Sermons for Home. 4s. 6d.

CHALMERS'S DAILY SCRIPTURE READINGS. 2 vols. 10s.

CHALMERS'S SABBATH SCRIPTURE READINGS. 2 vols. 10s.

MEMOIRS OF THOMAS CHALMERS, D.D., LL.D. By his Son-in-Law, the Rev. Wm. Hanna, LL.D. 2 vols., 12s.

BRADLEY'S PRACTICAL SERMONS for every Sunday and Principal Holiday in the Year. 8vo. 12s.

BRADLEY'S SERMONS on some of the Trials, Duties, and Encouragements of the Christian Life. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

ROBERTS' PLAIN SERMONS for all the Sundays and Chief Holidays of the Year. 2 vols. 10s.

ROBERTS' PLAIN SERMONS for all the Sundays and Chief Holidays of the Year. Second Series. 2 vols. 18s.

THE DOMESTIC COMMENTARY ON THE HOLY SCRIPTURES. By a Clergyman of the Church of England. 4 vols. Imp. 8vo. £2 14s.

MATTHEW HENRY'S EXPOSITION ON THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT; with numerous Maps and Illustrations. 3 vols. 4to. Whole calf. £3 17s. 6d.

WORK: PLENTY TO DO AND HOW TO DO IT. By Margaret Maria Brewster. 4s.

CYCLOPÆDIA OF UNIVERSAL BIOGRAPHY; with numerous Illustrations. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

GRATITUDE: an Exposition of the Hundred and Third Psalm. By the Rev. John Stevenson. 8vo. 6s.

CHRIST IS ALL; a series of tracts. By the Venerable Archdeacon Law. No. 1—8. 1d. each.

MY SCHOOLS AND MY SCHOOLMASTERS; or, the Story of my Education. By Hugh Miller. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

FIRST IMPRESSIONS OF ENGLAND AND ITS PEOPLE. By Hugh Miller. 7s. 6d.

THE LONDON PULPIT. By James Ewing Ritchie. 4s. 6d.

THE NEW IRISH PULPIT; or Gospel Preacher. New series. 3s. 6d.

The PSALMS Restored to MESSIAH; a brief Commentary. By the Rev. R. H. Ryland. With Preface, by Bishop of Cashel. 6s.

LESSONS and TRIALS OF LIFE. By the Author of "Bertha's Journal." 6s.

MEMOIR OF THE LIVES OF ROBERT AND JAMES A. HALDANE. By Alexander Haldane, Esq. 8vo. 12s.

MEMOIR OF THE REV. W. H. KRAUSE, A.M., Bethesda Chapel, Dublin, with selections from his Correspondence. By Rev. C. S. Stanford. Crown 8vo. 5s. 6d.

MEMOIR OF THE LATE REV. EDWARD BICKERSTETH. By the Rev. T. R. Birks. Cheaper Edition. 2 vols. Fcap. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

THE BUD OF PROMISE: a Memoir of Eliza H. M. Græme. By the Rev. D. Pitcairn. 3s. 6d.

THE NET IN THE BAY; or Journal of a Visit to Moose and Albany. By the Bishop of Rupert's Land. 4s. 6d.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES; THE MOSLEM, AND HIS END; THE CHRISTIAN AND HIS HOPE. By the Rev. John Cumming, D.D. 1s. 6d.

LEILA ADA, THE JEWISH CONVERT: an authentic Memoir. By Osborne W. Trenery Heighway. 3s. 6d.

SELECT EXTRACTS FROM THE DIARY, CORRESPONDENCE, ETC., OF LEILA ADA. By Osborne W. Trenery Heighway. 3s. 6d.

THE BOOK AND ITS STORY: a Narrative for the Young, on occasion of the Jubilee of the British and Foreign Bible Society. By L. N. R. With an Introductory preface, by Rev. T. Phillips. Fcap. 4s.

A PORTRAITURE OF THE LATE REV. WILLIAM JAY, of Bath; an outline of his mind, character, and pulpit eloquence, &c. By the Rev. Thomas Wallace. 3s. 6d.

AN APPEAL TO THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF YORK, ON THE UNCONDEMNED HERESIES OF ARCHDEACON WILBERFORCE'S BOOK, entitled, "The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist." By the Rev. J. Taylor, M.A. 2s.

PLAIN SPEAKING. First series. Being forty short, Large-type Tracts. By the Rev. J. C. Ryle, B.A. In packet. 1s.

HOME TRUTHS. First, Second, and Third Series. By the Rev. J. C. Ryle. 3s. 6d. each.

THE BISHOP, the PASTOR, and the PREACHER. Three Biographical Lectures on Latimer, Baxter, and Whitfield; with introductory preface, on some Wants of the present Day. By Rev. J. C. Ryle. (*In the Press.*)

TRACTS FOR CHURCHMEN. Seventeen Numbers. In packet. 1s.

THE GLORIES OF MARY, from the Italian of Alphonsus Liguori; with the approbation of Cardinal Wiseman. 2s.

THE POLISH LANCER; or 1812. A Tale of Napoleon's Invasion of Russia. By Louis Rellstab. 1s. 6d.

JOHNSTON'S CHART OF THE NORTH SEA, and the BALTIC, with the Countries adjoining; and Enlarged Plans of Cronstadt and Revel. 1s.

JOHNSTON'S MAP OF THE SEAT OF WAR, in the Danubian Principalities. 1s.

JOHNSTON'S NEW MAP OF THE BLACK SEA, CAUCASUS, CRIMEA, ETC., with enlarged plans of Sevastopol and the Bosphorus. 1s.

Lately Published,

WILLET'S "SYNOPSIS PAPISMI." New Edition. Edited by the Rev. J. Cumming, D.D. Ten vols. 8vo. Price £3.

London: JAMES MILLER, 17, Berner's-street, Oxford-street, and all Booksellers.

Just Published, Fcap. 8vo., Price 2s. 6d.

I.

THE FIRST RESURRECTION: Being Comments on First Corinthians, chapter xv. By the Rev. Robert Noble, A.M., Vicar of Athboy.

II.

Fcap. 8vo., cloth, price 1s. 6d.

THE PRINCIPLES OF ELOCUTION: Compiled from "The Elements of Rhetoric, by Archbishop Whately." With considerable additions and alterations.

III.

New Edition, Fcap. 8vo., cloth, Price 2s. 6d.

THE COLLECTS OF THE LITURGY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND,

Catechetically Explained, Compared with Scripture, and Briefly Commented upon, with the Date and Origin of each Collect annexed. For the use of Families and Sunday Schools.

By the Rev. Charles Miller, A.B.,

With Recommendatory Preface by the Bishop of Meath.

IV.

Fcap. 8vo., Neat Cover, Price 1s.

Cloth, 1s. 6d.; Cloth, Gilt Edges, 2s.

THE TALK OF THE ROAD: Showing how Irish people talk about Irish doings, when they get a quiet place, at the back of a ditch, or under a hedge.

V.

Royal 32mo., Price One Halfpenny each.

Stories about the Mission Work in Ireland.

I. The Bright side of a Dark Cloud.. II. Biddy Lacey. (The Series to be Continued.)

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Just Published,

Third Edition, Price 1s. 6d.; or in full cloth, Price 2s. 6d

POOR PADDY'S CABIN; or, SLAVERY IN IRELAND. A true Representation of Facts and Characters. By an Irishman.

London: WERTHEIM and MACINTOSH. Dublin: WM. CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

New Cheap Edition of the

WAVERLEY NOVELS.

12mo. Fancy Boards, Price 1s. 6d. each.

This Series of the highly popular Works of Sir Walter Scott, is in preparation, and will be printed from a new, clear type; each Volume containing a complete Novel. The issue will commence on the First of June, with "WAVERLEY; or 'Tis sixty years since," and be continued in every alternate month.

Subscriber's names for the Series received by

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY, 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, Dublin.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON, and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher, WILLIAM CURRY, 9 Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

MAY, 1854.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Ɖlóir do Dhia añ pna háṙouiḃ, agur píoḃcáin air an ḃealaiṁ deaġċoil do na ḋáoiniḃ.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED THE MIDDLE OF EVERY MONTH, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. III.—No. 30. JUNE, 1854. { Annual Subscription, 2s. 6d Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

PAGE.

Modern Worship in Rome—No. II.—St. Andrew Bobola . . 67
Decretal Epistles—No. V.—How Genuine Documents have been cooked and altered 68
The Variations and Revelations of Romanism—Faber's "All for Jesus" 69
The Invocation of Saints—No. I. 70
What is the Evidence on which Purgatory is believed? . . . 71
Toleration and flexibility of the Church of Rome 73

CORRESPONDENCE:

Mr. W. Rourke on Infallibility and the Rule of Faith . . 74
On Purgatory—by Mr. E. Power 75
Flowers for June 76
Farming Operations for June 77

MODERN WORSHIP IN ROME.—No. II.

SAINT ANDREW BOBÒLA.

On the 30th of October, 1853, the Metropolitan Cathedral of St. Peter's, at Rome, was the scene of a grand and imposing ceremonial. On that day, as we learn from the *Tablet* newspaper, of the 17th of December last, "upwards of six thousand tapers studded the vast surface of the apse of St. Peter's, like so many stars, or rather constellations; for multitudes of them, in that vast expanse, had the appearance of but single lights. The form which the illumination took, was that of a monstrance, or reliquary, the centre of which was reserved for a picture." There is, perhaps, no religious body of ancient or modern times which understands the art of producing a scenic effect, or exciting strong emotion amongst large masses of people, so well as the Church of Rome. The picture, of which the writer in the *Tablet* speaks, was kept judiciously concealed from public view, until a particular period of the ceremonial, doubtless for the purpose of stimulating the curiosity of the spectators, and adding to the interest of the scene. At length, the covering of the picture was suddenly withdrawn; and, in an instant, we are told, "the vast assemblage, who assisted at the ceremonial, were on their knees. At the same moment, a double choir pealed forth the 'Te Deum,' which was accompanied by a discharge of cannon from the neighbouring fortress of St. Angelo." One circumstance alone was wanting to crown the events of the day, and to stamp upon them the solemn sanction and approval of Romish infallible authority—namely, the presence of Pope Pius IX. But this defect was but momentary; for the writer in the *Tablet* takes care to inform us, that "in the afternoon there entered the Church the Holy Father, accompanied by his cardinals and chamberlains, to *pray before the picture*."

But what was the cause of all this state and ceremony? Whom, or what, did the picture represent? Whence arose the necessity for this vast expenditure of wax-light and gunpowder? The Russians we know, sang a "Te Deum" after blowing up the Turkish ships at Sinope; but to ordinary people, the admixture of double choirs and "brazen-mouthed" cannons (as they are called by the *Tablet*) appears somewhat incongruous. In the ancient, pure, and apostolic times, we know that St. Paul was very anxious that "all things should be done decently and according to order" (1 Cor. xiv. 40); but we think that, had he seen the six thousand tapers, and heard the roar of the cannons, he would have rubbed his eyes and said—"Is this the 'reasonable service' which I enjoined eighteen centuries ago, in my Epistle to the Church of Rome?"

We fear our readers would be a long time in guessing the cause of all the strange demonstrations to which we have alluded; and we do not like to keep them any longer in suspense. Be it known then, that on the day aforesaid, according to the *Tablet*, "a new member was added to the celestial company—a new patron, friend, and intercessor was given to the Church on earth." In short, the ceremony in question was "the Beatification of Saint Andrew Bobòla."

But here a new difficulty starts up. Some of our readers, who are innocent of any deep acquaintance with the mysteries of the Romish martyrology, may be tempted, in their ignorant simplicity, to ask, What *is* a Beatification? On this point, it must be confessed that the writer in the *Tablet* does not speak with the accuracy and precision that might be desired. He tells us, indeed, that the Beatification of a Saint is "the climax of an anxious process, and the beginning of a new devotion;" but he leaves us altogether in the dark upon the nature or origin of this "anxious process;" nor does he condescend to inform us why the devotion to be offerred to a newly-made saint should be ushered in with thousands of wax-lights, and the roar of the cannon of St. Angelo.

For ourselves, we will candidly confess, that when we were informed, on such unquestionable authority, that a Beatification was "the climax of an anxious process," we felt a lively interest to learn something more upon a subject so strange and mysterious. The writer in the *Tablet* tells us that he was an eye-witness of the whole proceeding; and, therefore, we expected some clear and accurate information from such a trustworthy source; but, as we went on, our expectations were sadly disappointed. "The ceremonial of a Beatification," he writes, "is as Impressive as it is simple and natural. It just embodies one's scattered ideas of what it ought to be." What the ceremonial *ought to be*, however, this writer does not think fit to tell us. It appears to have embodied his own "scattered ideas;" and, indeed, we do not wonder that the noise of the cannon and the glare of the wax-lights should have scattered the ideas of most of the spectators. Whether such accompaniments can be properly described as "simple and natural" in a solemn religious ceremony, is more than we will take upon ourselves to affirm, although we are willing to admit, upon the testimony of the *Tablet*, that this appears to be the modern fashion of performing sacred ceremonies in Rome.

Leaving, therefore, the writer, whose remarks we have quoted, to collect his "scattered thoughts" as he best can, we proceed to give our readers all the information within our reach, with regard to the new saint, Andrew Bobòla, accompanied by a few remarks on the origin of saintly beatification, and the objections to which such a practice is liable.

After a careful examination, we cannot discover any trace of the canonization of saints until the beginning of the ninth century. Eight hundred years ran their ample round, and left the Christian Church ignorant of the imposing ceremonial which now stamps the impress of Papal infallible authority upon the supposed intercessory powers of a new saint. "It is not certain," says the Roman Catholic writer, Ferraris, "who was the first Pope who canonized saints. Many hold that the first canonization, solemnly celebrated, was by Leo. III., in the year 804."* The Church of Rome claims to be *immutable*, as well as *infallible*; but how far the introduction of a new and solemn act of saintly canonization, which, according to her own authors, was unknown for eight hundred years, is consistent with such claims, we leave our impartial Roman Catholic readers to determine.

Let us now come to Father Bobòla. From the account in the *Tablet*, he appears to have been a Polish Jesuit, who fell a victim to the fury of some members of the Greek Church, in 1657. The object of his murderers was to wring from him a renunciation, not of Christianity, but "of the Holy See." Failing in this attempt, they put him to death, with circumstances of great cruelty.

It is far from our wish or intention to cast the slightest disrespect on the memory of any person who lays down his life in defence of what he conceives, however erroneously, to be an essential doctrine of the Christian faith. We know, however, that false religions have had their martyrs, as well as Christianity; and, unless we are prepared to pass a verdict of indiscriminate eulogy upon the Hindoo or Mahomedan, as well as the Christian martyr, we must consider the *truth* of the doctrine for which the supposed martyr lays down his life. This is the only test which can be applied to such cases, if we wish to arrive at a sound and impartial conclusion.

Now, even according to the account of the *Tablet*, Bobòla was not asked to deny any of the essential tenets of the Christian faith. He died, it would appear, in defence of the honour of the See of Rome. This may be a very natural reason why the Pope and cardinals should now be anxious to confer upon his memory all the honour in their power to bestow; but it is no reason whatsoever why Christians, all over the world, should be called upon to address their prayers to this new-found mediator. The honour of any See is closely connected with the character of the individual who occupies it; and, if we remember right, the name of the Pope, in 1657, was Alexander VII., an arbitrary and overbearing pontiff, of the stamp of Hildebrand. Had the Pope been Alexander VI., would Bobòla have deserved credit for defending the honour of a See filled by such a monster of iniquity?

But when we examine more closely into the account given of the death of Bobòla, it would appear that no small share of doubt rests on the whole transaction. We are informed by the *Tablet* that a few years ago an honest Dominican friar was sent by the Pope into Poland, to pick up what stray facts he could learn with regard to the history of the so-called martyr. He must have been a bold man to have ventured into the jaws of the ferocious Emperor Nicholas, in defence of the character of a democratic Polish saint. He did not escape unpunished, however, for the Emperor sent him into exile for life. We hope, that when the proper time arrives, the worthy Dominican father will himself receive the honours of canonization, which he was the means of procuring for Andrew Bobòla.

Nothing daunted by the dangers before him, the Dominican set to work vigorously, in the execution of the task assigned to him, and took down the depositions of *two hundred witnesses*, on which the Beatification was to be founded. But what was the result of his researches? Let us hear the frank confession of the writer in the *Tablet*. "No cause ever triumphed over greater obstacles. *It was all that the most anxious search could do, to scrape together the requisite materials.*" This, then, is the kind of evidence, collected from hearsay, after the lapse of a couple of centuries, on the authority of which the Pope and Church of Rome now think fit to add a new saint to the long muster-roll of canonized intercessors!

Let us test the value of such evidence, by an example from ordinary life. Suppose that the Pope and cardinals were to take it into their heads to make a saint of Shakspeare (we shall presently see that worse saints have been prayed to), and that they decided on sending a Dominican friar to Stratford-on-Avon, to take the depositions of two hundred witnesses, respecting the chief events of the life of that illustrious author—we ask, what would such evidence be worth? Yet the only difference in the two cases is, that Shakspeare lived in the beginning, and Bobòla in the middle, of the seventeenth century.

A popular manual of Roman Catholic devotion is now open before us; and in reading over the long list of saints to which prayers are directed to be offered, we are irresistibly reminded of the complaint which the heathen writer, Lucian, in the second century, puts into the mouth of one of the pagan deities, respecting the vast increase in the number of gods and goddesses in his time. "A great number of foreigners," saith he, "as well Greeks as barbarians, who, without being in any wise qualified for our civic privileges, have found means clandestinely to get themselves enrolled in our register-book, and to arrogate to themselves the divine dignity, have so crowded heaven, that we are overstocked with a tumultuous rabble of people, collected from all quarters, of every nation, language, and tongue. And these intruders have insolently presumed to shove out the ancient and true deities from the first seats, and to seat themselves, contrary to all propriety and ancient usage, in their places, and claim precedency of adoration on the earth."† When a simple-minded Roman Catholic is directed to address his prayers to Saint Fabian, Saint Pantaleon, Saint Hermenegildus, Saint Apollonia, Saint Anastasia, Saint Scholastica, in what respect is he much the wiser, than if he were told to pray to the man in the moon? And yet, the saints we have mentioned are by no means the most obscure in the voluminous records of the lives of the saints.

In the seventeenth century, the number of Roman Catholic saints was estimated, by one of their own authors, at between forty and fifty thousand.† How many of

* Non certo constat, quisnam fuerit primus Summus Pontifex, qui solemniter Canonizationem Sanctorum celebraverit. Nam multi tenent, quod prima Canonizatio solemniter celebrata fuerit a Leone III., A.D. 804.—Ferraris Bibl. Prompt. Veneratio Sanctorum, Tom. vii., § 19, p. 269. Bonon., 1758.

† Vide Lucian Opera. Tom iii., page 536. Amstel, 1743.

† Vide Calendarium Benedictinum, ad Dec. 26, apud Gibbon, vol iii., p. 219. London, 1788. See also the testimony of Dr. Jackson—"The order of St. Bennet (as may appear by a begging brief sent some few years out of Spain here into England by the provincial or general of that order) doth brag of fifty thousand saints, all Bennet's disciples." Jackson's works, vol. i., p. 235. London, 1673.

these saints are genuine, and how many fictitious, we have, of course, no means of determining. That some of these so-called saints never existed at all, can be proved from the testimony of Roman Catholic writers; we content ourselves, for the present, with the following extract from the eminent Romish ritualist, Cassander—"There is," saith he, "another error, not uncommon; that neglecting, in a manner, the ancient and known saints, the common people worship more ardently and diligently the new and unknown [is not this the very complaint that Lucian makes?], *of whose holiness we have but little assurance;* and some of whom are known to us only by revelation, insomuch *that of several of them it is justly doubted, whether ever there were any such persons in the world.*"* Those of our readers who remember the remarks which we made in our last number, on the history of St. Philomena, will readily perceive that the censures of the learned Cassander are just as applicable in the nineteenth century as they were in the sixteenth.

But even granting that any supposed saint was a real man or woman, and not a fabulous myth, every earnest, honest-minded Roman Catholic, who is anxious that his prayers should not go astray, may naturally expect some answer to the further question—what assurance have we that this canonized mortal really *is a saint?* Is it not possible that very awkward mistakes may occasionally happen? May not a Roman Catholic congregation address their prayers to a saint, as if he were in heaven, who, in reality, occupies a very different place in the world of spirits?

It is obvious that this uncertainty, if it be not removed, must considerably impair the zeal of all rational worshippers. We are sorry that we can promise our Roman Catholic readers no help in this difficulty. We once read a story of a certain individual who was about to pray to St. Cuthbert, when he suddenly bethought himself that, perhaps, St. Cuthbert was no true saint. This doubt sorely perplexed his mind for a while; and, at length, he settled the matter by offering up his prayer hypothetically—"O Saint Cuthbert, *if thou be a saint*, pray for me" (si sanctus sis, ora pro me). Ferraris, indeed, tells us that many choice doctors hold that it is an article of faith that a Pope cannot err in the canonization of saints.† But it is obvious, from the way in which he makes this statement, that many other choice doctors think differently; and thus it is quite clear that, in this so-called infallible Church, there is no certainty to be had in a matter of such daily practical importance.

When Cardinal Bellarmine was once asked how it happened that there were so few cardinals in the catalogue of saints (santi), he wittily replied, "perche vogliono esser santissimi"—*i.e.*, "because they wish to be most holy."‡ The elegance of the repartee can only be appreciated by an Italian scholar; but the meaning is, that the desire of being Popes (that is, of bearing the title of Most Holy Father) prevents the cardinals (out of whom alone the Popes can be elected) from aiming at true holiness. The remark of Bellarmine contained a severe satire upon the low intrigues and disgraceful cabals which the cardinals employed in order to be made Popes. But Bellarmine's uncle, Pope Marcellus II., went a good deal farther than this; for he is said to have remarked one day, as he sat at table, "I do not see how those who sit in St. Peter's chair, can be saved."§ Matters, it is to be hoped, have mended since the time of Pope Marcellus II.; but it does not seem very likely, to say the least of it, that these men who, according to the opinion of one of their own members, are almost past the hope of salvation, can possess a very critical power of discriminating the merits or demerits of a candidate for the honours of canonization.

The danger we are considering is by no means an imaginary one. We have the authority of Bellarmine himself that very unpleasant accidents have sometimes occurred in this very matter of saint-worship. He tells us, on the testimony of Sulpicius, of the following remarkable occurrence which happened to St. Martin:—This latter individual had long entertained strong doubts of the propriety of the devotions offered by the people in his neighbourhood to a supposed saint. One day, when St. Martin was at his prayers, the ghost of this personage appeared to him, and frankly confessed "that *he was a damned spirit;* that when alive, he had been a robber, and that he had suffered death for his crimes by the hand of the public executioner."‖ Nor was this a solitary instance; for Bellarmine goes on to tell us that a similar occurrence happened in the time of Pope Alexander III. We by no means pledge ourselves to the truth of these stories; but we should like to know can the Church of Rome give any proof, beyond her own bare word, that all the fifty thousand saints, now on her catalogue, are really in heaven?

But, lastly, supposing that Saint Andrew Bobòla, and his brethren, are actually where the Church of Rome says they are, the most important question of all arises, *can they really hear the prayers that are offered up to them?* If they do not, then the prayers might just as well be addressed to Jupiter, or Hercules, or any other of the fabulous gods of antiquity. The Church of Rome, indeed, *says*, that the saints hear the prayers of mankind, and the Council of Trent, as usual, pronounces a sweeping curse on all who presume to assert the contrary: but the point is, can the Church of Rome *prove* what she says? Can she adduce any Scripture command or authority for her doctrine? Alas! nothing of the kind. How, then, do Romish divines get over this difficulty? By a very ingenious theory, which would be amusing, if the subject were not of such awful and momentous importance. Their theory is this. Some devout Roman Catholic, Paddy Murphy for instance, addresses a prayer to Saint Lawrence O'Toole for some blessing that he wants. Saint Lawrence cannot hear a word of the prayer; but, in some time after (how long, the Romish doctors do not state), God informs the saint, that Paddy Murphy has been praying to him; and tells him, at the same time, the substance of the prayer. And thereupon Saint Lawrence intercedes with God on behalf of Paddy Murphy. Such is, without any exaggeration, the theory of Bishop Milner, and other eminent Roman Catholic writers upon this question.* We do not presume to set bounds to the omnipotence of God; but, at the same time, we can have no reason for believing that God will exert his power, unless He has *told us* that he will do so; much less ought we to make a *bare possibility* the groundwork of our prayers.

That sinful man cannot draw near to a pure and holy God, without the intervention of a mediator, is a doctrine in which Protestants and Roman Catholics, the Church of England and the Church of Rome, are fully and cordially agreed. But when the question arises, who this mediator is, then our differences begin. The Church of England takes her stand on the inspired authority of St. Paul, "There is one God, and one Mediator of God and man—the man Christ Jesus."—1 Tim. ii. 5. The Church of Rome, without any authority from Scripture, has interposed angels, saints, and the Virgin Mary, between man and God. Now, if a man had to cross a broad and rapid river, we ask our readers, would it be wiser for him to make use of one solid stone bridge, which has stood for hundreds of years, or to trust himself to the frail and insecure support of thousands of reeds and rushes?

Is there any blessing which a Roman Catholic hopes to receive from saintly intercession, which the Lord Jesus Christ has not promised to give to those who come to *Him?* Has he not said in the Gospel, "*Whatsoever* ye shall ask the Father in my name, that will I do?"—John xiv. 13. Do we distrust the love and compassion of the Lord Jesus? But are we not bone of his bone, and flesh of his flesh?—Ephes. v. 30. Has not St. Paul assured us, as if for the very purpose of removing all such doubts, "We have not an High Priest, who cannot have compassion on our infirmities, but one tempted in all things like as we are, without sin. Let us go, therefore, *with confidence* to the throne of grace."—Heb. iv. 15.

If we dare not say, in the face of such plain testimonies of Scripture, that any saint in heaven can prevail when Christ alone cannot; if we would be ashamed to own that we think any one can love us more dearly than He who gave himself for us, and redeemed us with His own most precious blood; we ask again, what profit is it, that leaving this fountain of living water, we should run to the broken cisterns of the merits and intercession of our fellow-creatures, which can hold no water?

We invite our Roman Catholic readers seriously to ask themselves, what notions they have of God, or what is their idea of prayer? Must they not acknowledge, if they think on the subject at all, that prayer is a solemn outpouring of the heart to a superior being, from whose hand we expect the highest blessings; and whatever being is so addressed in prayer by any man, is, practically speaking, *that man's god.* It is useless to invent refined distinctions on this question. If a man had a hundred hearts, indeed, he might, perhaps, bestow one upon God, another on the Virgin Mary, and so on; but this is not the case. Each man has but *one* heart, the *whole of which* God claims for himself. "My son, give *me* thine heart," is the solemn demand of Holy Scripture—Prov. xxiii. 26. The best and highest affections of man's nature are all too poor for our heavenly Father; but whoever bestows a portion of his religious worship upon any created being whatever, be it saint or angel, or the Blessed Virgin, robs God of that honour which is due to him alone. "Offer to *God* the sacrifice of praise, and pay thy vows to the most high, and call upon ME in the day of trouble, I will deliver thee and thou shalt glorify me."—Ps. xlix. 14, 15. In the face of such a solemn command as this, it is at our own deep and awful peril, if we venture to address our prayers to any created being whatever.

Our remarks on this deeply-interesting subject have already, we fear, run on to an undue length; but as we are anxious to show that the views we have stated are no novelties, but that they were held by the Church from the earliest times, we beg to refer our readers to a distinct article, in our present number, on the Invocation of Saints.

---

* Est et hic error haud infrequens, quòd veteribus et compertis sanctis propemodum neglectis, novos et incognitos vulgus hominum ardentius et impensius colat, de quorum sanctitate obscurius constat, et nonnulli per revelationes tantùm innotuerunt, atque adeò de quibusdam an unquam in rerum naturâ fuerint, meritò dubitetur.—Cassander, Consult, p. 971. Paris, 1616.

† "Hinc plurimi classici Doctores tenent quod sit de fide, quod Papa non possit errare non solum in canonizatione, sed etiam in beatificatione."—Ferraris ut supra, § 15.

‡ Vide Bayle's Dictionary, vol. iii., p. 171. London, 1735.

§ "Non video quomodo qui locum hunc altissimum tenent salvari possunt."—Onuphrius, in Marcello II., apud Ancillon, Mélange Critique de Literature, tom. i., p. 329. Bayle ut supra.

‖ Orante Martino, apparuit anima ejus qui ibi celebrabatur, et confessa est, se animam damnatam esse latronis cujusdam, qui pro suis sceleribus extremi supplicii pœnas luerat."—Bellarm. de Sanct. Beatit., lib. i., c. vii., tom. ii., p. 284. Col. Ag., 1615.

* *God is able to reveal* to the saints the prayers of Christians who address them here on earth."—End of Controversy, p. 337, London, 1842.

DECRETAL EPISTLES.—No. V.

SHOWING HOW GENUINE DOCUMENTS HAVE BEEN COOKED AND ALTERED.

In our late numbers, we have shown what multitudes of forged epistles have been imposed upon the world, under the names of ancient Popes, and vouched for as true by Popes in after ages. We showed also the ruling object of all those forgeries—to establish the antiquity of the supremacy of Rome.

We propose, now, to show, very briefly, another and a more dangerous kind of deception which has been practised on the world, from the same source, and for the same purpose—viz., the manner in which *genuine* documents of antiquity have been altered and "cooked," to serve the purposes of the forgers.

Every one who knows the history of railway accounts, in the present days, knows what "cooking" means. It consists in putting into genuine documents and accounts various items which are false; and putting them in in such a way that the generality of men cannot distinguish which are false and which true; so that, seeing the greater part true, they are gulled into believing that the whole is true; by which wicked practices multitudes of persons have been ruined. This is the way that the genuine documents of antiquity have been dealt with by the Church of Rome for her own purposes. We call this more dangerous than forging whole documents, and whole bundles of documents; for this reason:—Few men are capable of forging a whole document, from end to end, so that it shall escape detection. Something always creeps in which enables an acute examiner to detect the forgery. But it is very much easier, in copying out an ancient document, to put in some title, or sentence, or phrase, which serves a forger's purpose as well, and yet gives no such handle for detection of the fraud.

Every one knows that the oldest copies we now have in the world of ancient writings, are generally but copies made in the ninth century (that fruitful age of forgery) of the original writings themselves. Many of these copies were made in the Pope's own library, or in those monasteries and churches in which the art of forgery was then so extensively cultivated.

Of course those who *forged* whole documents, would not scruple *to alter* true and genuine documents (when they were copying them) to serve the same purpose of forgery. There are now in the world very few documents written before the ninth century, excepting ancient copies of the Scriptures; of most other writings we have only copies made in that great age of forgery.

All scholars who have studied these documents know that the copies we now have are full of alterations and passages put into them by dishonest copiers, which it is now most difficult and often impossible to detect.

Our business is to show some instances of this; and to show the purpose for which it was done; and to put men on their guard against supposing that *everything* they meet with in a copy, made in the ninth century, of an ancient writing, must needs be true and genuine.

Here is our first instance:—In the fourth general council—the Council of Chalcedon—held in the year 451, a famous case was tried and decided. An Archbishop of Alexandria, named Dioscorus, one of the chief patriarchs of the Church at that time, was accused of heresy, and was condemned and deprived of his archbishopric; Pope Leo I. being one of his accusers.

Among the epistles of Pope Leo I., we find a letter, professing to have been written by Pope Leo to the bishops of France, after this trial took place; to which epistle is subjoined a copy of the sentence on Dioscorus,* sent to those bishops by that Pope for their information. This letter and sentence is given by Pithœus, from a copy which he got in the Abbey of Corbey, in France, a place rather noted for the manufactory of forgeries for advancing the interests of the Church of Rome.†

Now, it happens that we have also a copy of this same sentence in the acts of the Council of Chalcedon itself; and it is very interesting to compare that sentence, which we find in the acts of the council, with that copy which Pope Leo I. is said to have sent to the bishops of France.

There are important differences between them.

In the sentence as it stands in the acts of the council, Dioscorus is described as *ανθενησας*, or, as it is translated in Labbe and Cossart, "præsumens sibi primatum;"—that is, claiming primacy to himself; which words are omitted in Pope Leo's copy of the sentence.

Again, in this sentence against Dioscorus, as it stands in the acts of the council, we find this laid to the charge of Dioscorus, that "he also ventured to pronounce an excommunication against the most holy and most blessed Leo, Archbishop of great Rome."‡

Now, in the copy of the sentence which Pope Leo I. is said to have sent to the bishops of France, there is not one word of all this; nothing *there* to show that Dioscorus, of Alexandria, claimed primacy for himself; nothing

---

* Labbe and Coss., vol. iii., p. 1,418, ep. 94.

† Labbe and Coss., vol. iv., p. 424.

‡ *στολμησε δε και ακοινωνησιαν επαγορευσαι κατα τον αγιωτατου και οσιωτατου Αρχιεπισκοπου της μεγαλης Ρωμης Λεοντος.*

Præsumpsit enim at excommunicationem dictare adversus sanctissimum et beatissimum archiepiscopum magnæ Romæ Leonem.—Labbe and Coss., vol. iv., p. 425.

there to show that Dioscorus pronounced a sentence of excommunication against Pope Leo.

We will show further on, that the copy, in the acts of the councils, is the true and genuine one. We ask now, what was the motive for omitting in the copy, which Pope Leo is said to have sent to France, all mention of these things?

The reason is plain. The Pope of Rome now claims the primacy over the whole Church; and it is awkward to let it appear that, in claiming this primacy, the Pope of Rome is only doing what the worst and most vicious of the archbishops of the other patriarchal sees did also. So the well-skilled forger, who made the copy, struck that out, because it looked ill. Again, the Pope now claims power to excommunicate all other bishops and archbishops, but no archbishop is to have power to excommunicate the Pope; but in this sentence it does appear that Dioscorus, of Alexandria, did excommunicate the Pope. In fact, this was a common thing in the ancient Church; if two worldly-minded and ill-tempered bishops quarrelled, they excommunicated each other; and it made no manner of difference in this proceeding, if one of them was Bishop of Rome. But in after ages it was thought a very ugly thing, to let it be seen, that in ancient times other bishops did take as much liberty in excommunicating the Pope, as the Pope took in excommunicating them; and *it was* a very ugly thing, if the Pope's claim to supremacy be true. So, of course, the fact that Dioscorus excommunicated the Pope was to be cut out of the sentence passed on him; so the forger who made the copy cut it out accordingly.

But if you cut something out of a sentence, it is only fair to put something else in, to make up the difference. The forger felt this, and he acted accordingly; for in that "cooked" copy we find things that are *not* in the original sentence, in the acts of the council. In the copy of Pope Leo we find the Pope declared to be "the head of the Universal Church," and the "door keeper of the kingdom of heaven;"* of which things there is not one word in the genuine copy of the sentence in the acts of the council.

But, now, our readers may ask us, how do we know which copy of this sentence on Dioscorus, of Alexandria, is the true and genuine one? How do we know that the copy, which Pope Leo I. sent to France, is not really the true one?

We are prepared to answer this question. Pope Nicolas I., who lived in the ninth century, in his 8th epistle (which we have so often quoted before) quotes that sentence passed on Dioscorus; and he quotes from it the very words which are *not* in the copy sent by Pope Leo I. to France. "He pronounced an excommunication against the holy Pope Leo."† And Pope Adrian, who succeeded Nicolas in that ninth century, in his letter to Ignatius, Patriarch of Constantinople, quotes the same thing from that sentence in the very same words in which it is now found in the Latin translation of the sentence, as it stands in the acts of the council. "He also presumed to pronounce an excommunication against the most holy and blessed Leo, Archbishop of great Rome."‡

So it is past all question that the sentence as it stands, in the acts of the council, with the mention of this excommunication in it, is the true and genuine sentence passed on Dioscorus, who, it is clear, did excommunicate Pope Leo, and, therefore, the copy of this sentence, which Pope Leo I. is said to have sent the bishops of France, is a false copy, altered by some forger. It is falsified in leaving out the mention of this excommunication, and it is falsified also in bringing in the Pope as the head of the Universal Church, and the doorkeeper of the kingdom of heaven.

Who falsified and "cooked" that copy? Was it Pope Leo I. in the fifth century? We do not think it was. It is true, the Popes took to forging very early. Pope Zozimus, and Pope Boniface, and Pope Celestine, in the beginning of the fifth century, were all concerned in a forgery plot. But many of the early Popes were free from such wicked practices; and none, perhaps, was less likely to be guilty of such a thing than Pope Leo I. It is clear that the copy of the sentence which Pope Nicolas and Pope Adrian had at Rome, in the ninth century, was the true one, having all about the excommunication in it; and, therefore, it is plain that Pope Leo had not cut the excommunication out of the copy belonging to the popes at Rome. What then are we to think of that copy which Pope Leo I. is said to have sent to the bishops of France, which has not the excommunication in it? Why, simply this, that since the ninth century, some one has made free with the epistles of Pope Leo, and "cooked" them. Some one who copied out Pope Leo's epistles since, the ninth century, has cut out all about the excommunication, and put in all about the Pope being head of the Universal Church. This is a great fact to know, for it is one which throws light on a great many other facts of the same kind. When we read other epistles of Pope Leo, and find in them other mentions of the Pope being the head of the Church, we are to remember that we have not the actual letters which Pope Leo wrote; we have only *copies* which some one else made of those letters, 400 or 500 years after Pope Leo was dead; and we have proof above, that the person who made those copies had a trick of sticking into Pope Leo's letters, that the Pope was head of the Church, when Pope Leo himself, had written no such thing; and, therefore, whenever we find any such thing in Pope Leo's letters as we now have them, it is but a piece of ordinary prudence to suspect that it was the forger who put that in, and not Pope Leo. And this is what every one should keep in mind who reads the writings of the early Popes, as we now have them. All these writings have come to us through the hands of unscrupulous forgers; all the oldest copies that we have of those writings, were made in ages when forgery was thought to be good service to God; and we must read and examine them with due caution accordingly.

Now for another letter of the same Pope Leo (19th Labbe and Coss. vol. iv., p. 38.), written to the Emperor Theodosius. We have two copies of this letter also, the second being at page 43. By a happy mistake, these two copies were formerly mistaken for two different letters; and, therefore, both have been preserved, so that we can compare them. But they are clearly two different copies of the same letter, as Labbe and Cossart admit;* and the latter, they say, does not agree with itself, so we take it to be the cooked one: the first and genuine one begins thus:—"From the letters of your excellency, which long since you sent to the See of the blessed Apostle Peter, for your love of the Catholic faith, we have received so great confidence that truth and peace will be defended by you. . ."†

Now, mark how the forger transformed this in the other copy:—"In councils celebrated formerly and from the beginning, we have received such confidence from the blessed Peter, chief of the Apostles, that we have authority for defending the truth by our peace. . . . ."‡

Observe that in the genuine letter the Pope, derives his confidence from the emperor, and it is the emperor who defends the truth. This was a most common and usual way for the early Popes to write to the emperors, of which we have many instances in their genuine letters; but this would not serve the forger; so he altered it to say, that the Pope derived his authority from Peter, the prince of Apostles, and that the Pope was the defender of the truth.

It is worth observing that this forged passage, beginning "olim et ab initio," was a favourite one with the forgers. We meet it in several of the forged decretal epistles; and we have now good reason to suspect it when we meet it in Popes' epistles, which have hitherto passed for pure and uncorrupted.

But it is not only Popes' epistles that have been thus cooked. General councils have been treated in the same way. Cardinal Baronius and Binius have put into the General Council of Chalcedon a whole act about Domnus, a deprived bishop, all of which is forged. This act is not found in the original Greek copies; and it provides for the maintainance of this Domnus, whereas the 5th general council has actually put it on record that this Domnus was dead years before that Council of Chalcedon was held! Where did they get this act? They got it where plenty of such things have been got. "This act is written in an old Latin copy *in the Vatican*." Such *old* copies have been fitly called "true Gibeonites, who come to impose on us with mouldy bread and tattered shoes."

In like manner have the canons of the great Council of Nice, which all true Christians reverence, been forged and corrupted at Rome. This we may return to some other time.

We have said enough to put our readers on their guard, about authorities produced in favour of Rome from these ancient writings. But nothing we can say in so short a compass can give any idea of the vast extent to which this system of corrupting and "cooking" the genuine writings of antiquity has been carried; or of the necessity which yet exists for the learned directing their attention to this. Forged writings have, to a great extent, been detected; though even here something certainly remains to be done. But in detecting the forged passages which have been inserted into genuine writings, comparatively little has yet been done. This task, indeed, can never be perfectly performed; but each additional step that can be made in it, puts us more upon our guard against being deceived by such wicked arts.

We have ourselves spent much time and labour in this examination; and we have reason to believe that we shall be able to show, that all the passages in favour of the Pope's supremacy, which are found in even those epistles of the early Popes, which yet pass for genuine, were either put therein by the forgers, or stand in so great suspicion of having been so put there, that no reasonable man can put any confidence in them. What we have thus collected is too long for a journal like ours; but if these papers should come to be published in a separate form, the proof of what we now say may be given to the world.

Again we call on our readers to remember the prophetic words of St. Clement in his genuine epistle, "Search into the Holy Scriptures, which are the true words of the Holy Ghost; ye know that there is nothing wicked or forged written in them."

* Sanctus ac Beatissimus papa caput universalis Ecclesiæ Leo. . . ecclesiæ regni janitor nuncupatur.—Labbe and Coss., vol. iv., p. 1,419.

† Excommunicationem in sanctum Leonem papam dictavit.—Labbe and Coss., vol. viii., p. 308.

‡ Præsumpsit enim et excommunicationem dictare adversus sanctissimum et beatissimum magnæ Romæ Leonem.—Labbe and Coss., vol. viii., p. 1,014.

* Marginal note, p. 43, Labbe and Coss., vol. iv.

† Literis Clementiæ vestræ, quas dudum ad beati Petri Apostoli sedem pro Catholicæ fidei amore misistis, tantam fiduciam sumpsimus defendendæ per vos veritatis et pacis. . . . Labbe and Coss., vol. iv., p. 38.

‡ Olim et ab initio in concilis celebratis tantam nos percipimus a beatissimo Petro Apostolorum principe fiduciam, ut auctoritatem habeamus ad veritatem pro nostra pace defendendam. . . . —Labbe and Coss., vol iv., p. 43.

THE VARIATIONS OF ROMANISM.

It is a favourite boast of Roman Catholic controversial writers, that their Church is "one and unchangeable," and they are fond of contrasting the immutability of her doctrine with the variations which they say have taken place in the opinions of rival communions. It becomes, then, an important question to ask, are there grounds for this boast? Is it a fact that the Church of Rome has never varied in her doctrines or teaching?

In the first article of our last number, we took some pains to compare the doctrines of the Council of Trent with those taught by the Church of Rome in earlier times; and we there named several subjects with reference to which it can be proved that a marked change has taken place in her teaching. We could easily add to the list there given, but we wish now to speak of the change that has taken place in Romish teaching *since* the Council of Trent; and which is steadily going on in our own day, and before our very eyes. Some of our Roman Catholic readers may be surprised at being told, not only that the doctrines of their Church have changed, but that they are still in process of changing; and people in general find it hard to understand that a change has taken place in the opinions of any body, if they do not hear of any violent schism in it. But the case is just like that of a man whom we are in the habit of meeting every day; his personal appearance seems the same one day as it did the day before, and we take no notice of any alteration; while yet, probably, another person, who should meet the same man after the absence of a few years, would at once be struck by a visible and marked change in his appearance. Now, we assert that, just in the same manner, there has been a progressive change—silent and gradual, but steady—in the doctrinal teaching of the Church of Rome; and that this change is going on now as steadily and as rapidly as ever. The Fathers of Trent taught and believed many things for which we can find no warrant, either in Scripture or in the writings of the early Fathers; but, then, again, there are many things taught and believed in the Church of Rome at present, for which there is just as little warrant in the Council of Trent. We are sure that any one who will take up any of the popular books of devotion in use among Roman Catholics, will find in them a number of statements of facts and doctrines for which it is just as hard to find any foundation in the teaching of the Council of Trent, as it is for the Tridentine doctors to find a foundation in Scripture for *their* decrees. Nor is the change which has taken place confined to single doctrines merely—such as that of the immaculate conception of the Blessed Virgin; a doctrine which the Council of Trent did not venture to assert, but which is now generally believed by Roman Catholics. There is a far more fundamental difference—one touching the very question of the rule of faith. We assert, and hope to prove to the satisfaction of our readers, that there is not a greater difference on the subject of the rule of faith between the teaching of the Church of England and that of the Council of Trent, than there is between that of the Council of Trent and of modern Roman Catholic divines.

We have now lying before us the third edition of a Roman Catholic book of devotion, called "All for Jesus, or the Easy Ways of Divine Love," by the Very Rev. F. Faber, superior of the London Oratory. As this Mr. Faber was originally a member of the Church of England, it may, perhaps, be imagined that he may not be accurately acquainted with the doctrines of his new Church, and that the sentiments he expresses may not be fully in accordance with her teaching. We think it well, then, to begin by telling our readers how our attention was drawn to the book; and when we add, that it appears from the preface to this third edition that it has received the revision of one of the Roman Catholic bishops, no doubt can remain that it is in accordance with the belief of a large number, if not of the majority, of Roman Catholics of the present day.

It was in preparing another article for our present number, that we had occasion (see page 67) to refer to the *Tablet*, of last 17th December; and, in glancing through its columns, we chanced to meet with an article containing bitter complaints of the silence observed by Protestants with regard to Roman Catholic books of theology.

"The Oratorians write books of the most splendid genius, and commanding power; books, for instance, like Father Faber's 'All for Jesus,' of which two large editions were exhausted in one month; but not a hint is whispered of it in the Anglican journals. They dare not review it; dare not even allude to it. They do what they can; and try to ignore what all the world is telling about. A feeble sneer at oratorian devotions, in the *Guardian*, or *English Churchman*, is all the opposition they venture to make; because to say more would excite curiosity and be dangerous."

On reading the above, it struck us, that we had been as guilty as the *Times*, or the *Guardian*, or the *English Churchman*, in omitting to give our readers any account of the work of Father Faber, here alluded to; but the cause of our silence was certainly not want of courage to review the book, but (shall we confess it?) sheer ignorance

of its existence. It was certainly shameful in us to be ignorant of what "all the world was talking about;" and, yet, we think "all the world" must bear some share of the blame for not having talked a little louder.

We have, then, accordingly, made ourselves acquainted with Father Faber's book, and have found in it a number of curious things, some of which we hope to lay before our readers hereafter. Any one who turns over its pages will find in it a number of statements of doctrines and facts, which would have been as new to the Fathers of Trent as they are to ourselves. But we must reserve to another occasion an examination of the particular facts and doctrines to which we allude; what we have at present to do with, is the *authority* on which they rest.

Any question as to particular doctrines, is subordinate to the grand question concerning the rule of faith; for any difference on this subject will be sure to give rise to differences respecting particular doctrines. Thus, most of the differences between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, take their rise in their differences as to the rule of faith. The Church of England and the Council of Trent *agree* in taking for their rule the Word of God, whether as communicated by our Lord himself to the Apostles, or as written by them under the dictation of the Holy Ghost. But they *differ* on the point where this Word of God is to be found. The Church of England asserts, that it is all contained in Scripture; the Council of Trent asserts, that the teaching of our Lord and his Apostles has been also handed down in the tradition of the Church. And so it is very natural that the Church of Rome should believe many things, which the Church of England does not believe; for the fundamental principle of the former is, that there are some parts of our Saviour's teaching handed down by tradition, which are not recorded in Scripture; and such things the Church of Rome is bound to believe, while the Church of England denies their existence.

But, now, Mr. Faber, and those Roman Catholics who agree with him, are not satisfied with the double rule of faith adopted by the Council of Trent. He teaches many doctrines, of which the Council of Trent makes no mention; and the reason is, that he not only takes for his rule of faith the Word of God, as communicated by our Lord to the Apostles, and handed down in the Church by Scripture or tradition, but he further receives, as having a right to govern his belief, *revelations*, asserted to be made by our Lord, to different individuals, from time to time. We copy, almost at random, a few specimens of the proofs Mr. Faber advances for his assertions; but there are scarcely half a dozen consecutive pages in the book which would not furnish us with quotations as much to our purpose.

"Our Lord told St. Gertrude, that as often as any one says to God—my love, or my sweetest, or my best beloved, and the like, with a devout intention, he receives a pledge of his salvation, in virtue of which, if he perseveres, he shall receive in heaven a special privilege of the same sort, as the special grace which St. John the Evangelist, the beloved disciple, had on earth."—Page 60.

"Our Lord said to St. Teresa, that one soul, not a saint, but *seeking* perfection, was more precious to him than thousands living common lives."—Page 117.

"St. Gertrude was divinely instructed, that as often as the angelic salutation is devoutly recited by the faithful on earth, three efficacious streamlets proceed from the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, most sweetly penetrating the Blessed Virgin's heart. Then, from her heart gain," &c.—Page 104.

"St. Matilda ventured to say to Jesus, 'Lord, if Gertrude's life is so perfect, how is it she cannot bear the defects of others, and exaggerates them so much?' Our Lord, with admirable sweetness, replied—'It is because she cannot bear the least stain on her own heart, that she feels so keenly the failings of her neighbours.'"—P. 323.

"Once more, let us listen to the testimony of God himself. [!] A holy man pressed God, in prayer, to reveal to him what it was in which His Divine Majesty took so much pleasure in His beloved Gertrude. God vouchsafed to reply," &c.—P. 323.

"On another occasion, when St. Gertrude was suffering one night from weakness, she ate some grapes, with the mental intention of refreshing our Lord in herself. He, on his part, took this as a royal gift, and said to her—In this I confess that you have recompensed me for the bitter potion which I, for your sake, took upon the cross; for now I suck unspeakable sweetness out of your heart; for with how much greater purity of intention you recreate your body for my glory, with so much the more sweetness do I acknowledge myself recreated in your soul."—P. 174.

"Among the revelations made to Sister Francesca, it was told her that immense numbers of souls issued from Purgatory on the evening of All Souls Day; and that they were mostly those who were near to glory among whom God distributed the suffrages of the Universal Church on that day."—P. 44.

"We find, from the revelations of St. Francesca, that among some hundreds of cases, by far the greater majority suffered [in Purgatory] thirty, forty, or sixty years. Here are some of the examples:—A holy bishop, for some negligence in his high office, had been in Purgatory fifty-nine years before he appeared to the servant of God; another bishop, so generous of his revenues that he was named the alms-giver, had been there five years, because he wished for the dignity; another bishop had been forty; a priest, forty years, because through his negligence some sick persons had died without the sacraments; another, forty-five years, for inconsiderateness in his ministerial duties; a gentleman, fifty-nine years, for worldliness; another, sixty-four, for fondness for playing at cards for money* ; another, thirty-five years, for worldliness. Bishops seem, upon the whole, according to her revelations, to remain longest there, and to be visited with the extreme of rigour."—P. 367.

At pp. 356, &c., there is a passage too long to extract, from which it appears that the true nature of the sufferings of Purgatory was first made known, by revelations, to St. Catherine of Genoa, in, we believe, the sixteenth century.

The quotations we have given, and which could be multiplied indefinitely, are enough to show that Mr. Faber is not content with the Council of Trent's *double* rule of faith; but that he regulates his belief by a *triple* standard—Scripture, and tradition, and modern revelations. These last, it will be perceived, he cites as decisive arguments; nay, calls on his readers to listen to them as the testimony of God himself. And it is certain that Mr. Faber is not singular in this, for most Roman Catholic books of devotion, not intended to be placed in Protestant hands, act in precisely the same manner. But, perhaps, it will be said, the belief in these revelations is optional; the Church has not decided; and one may be a loyal member of the Roman Catholic Church, and yet refuse to give credence to the dreams of Francesca or of Gertrude. But this is not a subject on which the Church of Rome can, with any consistency, allow of a difference of opinion among her members. Her controversialists correctly remind us that it is the prime duty of every Christian to give implicit assent to the Word of God, no matter by what channel made known to him. He must, of course, receive everything contained in Scripture; but if any part of the Divine teaching has been conveyed by tradition, he is equally bound to make himself acquainted with it, and to give his assent to it. And, just in like manner, if God has made any new revelations to St. Gertrude or St. Francesca, in the same manner as He did to St. John or St. Paul, it is no longer a matter of indifference whether Christians receive them or not; they are bound to receive them with precisely the same affection and reverence with which they receive the books of Scripture. The Church of Rome need be at no loss (if her pretensions be well founded) to distinguish true from false revelations: for what is the use of an infallible guide, if this guide is unable to distinguish the revelations of God from the doting of silly old women? When, then, we see some members of the Church of Rome rejecting such tales as we have quoted from Mr. Faber, and others governing their belief by them, it is manifest that that Church is only dissembling a schism, when she tolerates difference of opinion within her communion, on a question so momentous as that of the rule of faith. There is not a greater difference between the Church of England rule (Scripture alone) and the Tridentine rule (Scripture and tradition) than there is between this latter rule and the new Oxford rule—Scripture, and tradition, and modern revelations.

When once this new rule is adopted, there is an end of the boast that the Church of Rome is the old Church and teaches the old doctrines. Now, while the Church of England is simple enough to be satisfied with the old religion, such as Peter and Paul taught it, and their hearers received, the modern Church of Rome boasts of a religion, with the latest improvements, by Teresa, and Catherine, of Genoa; and, no doubt, still further additions may be expected to be made to their creed by further revelations, from time to time. We have said that all parties in the Church of Rome do not equally assent to the stories we are speaking of.† The party, however, who hold views so fatal to their Church's claims of unity of doctrine, has gained great predominance of late years, chiefly through the exertions of the Oxford converts to Romanism, who have almost all embraced the most extreme views in their new communion; and to whom it is owing that a great change has taken place in our time in the tone of doctrine held by Roman Catholics in these kingdoms. This may be accounted for by the manner in which these conversions were generally made. The persons alluded to had been principally influenced by the use of arguments borrowed from infidels, and had been brought to believe that if they used their reason and private judgment in religious matters, the inevitable result would be hopeless scepticism. Startled at such a result, they hastily threw themselves blindfold into the arms of the guide who promised to conduct them to truth; ready to receive, with indiscriminating credulity, all that this guide might be pleased to set before them; nay, persuaded that the greater their readiness to believe without or against evidence, the higher their faith. We are bound to believe these gentlemen, or, at least, the majority of them, to be sincere in their profession; and, yet, if there were any of them who remained infidels at heart, we can imagine no more subtle or more effectual way for leading others into infidelity than that which they have adopted; yielding equally ready assent to the miracles of Scripture, and the legends of mediæval saints; accepting with equal reverence the revelations made to Paul and John, and those made to St. Francesca or St. Catherine.

There was only one point which their faith hesitated to embrace. Some of them were acquainted with the writings of the primitive Fathers; accordingly, they said to their new spiritual guide, propound to us authoritatively any doctrine you please, and we are prepared to accept it; only you will do us a favour if you will not oblige us to assert that the primitive Church taught the same. We will submit if you insist on it; but we confess we find this a little too strong. Do us the favour of permitting us to call your doctrines a development* of primitive Christianity; if you will only grant this, ecclesiastical history will present no difficulties to us; it will be easy to believe that your doctrines resemble those of the early Church as much as an oak resembles an acorn, or a butterfly resembles a caterpillar.

The prayer was granted—the converts were admitted on their own terms; yet, we are sure many of the old Roman Catholic divines must see with consternation the revolution which their new allies are making in their theology. We notice, for example, that Professor Murray, of Maynooth, in the preface to the last volume of his Theological Essays, seems not a little discontented with the extreme views of his new converts, who suddenly became wiser than their teachers.

"I shall not be at all surprised to find myself denounced by certain doctors of the new theology as a *heretic*, for some expressions in the preceding paragraph; just as one of my learned colleagues (a professor of the *old* theology) was denounced as a *Protestant*, for saying, of Lord Jeffrey, in the 'Dublin Review,' for last July, that he was not only a great, but a *good* man. Now-a-days there are a few individuals who, with their heads hardly dry from the waters of baptism, come out with their frantic and infallible theories, and denounce every man as unsound in the faith who does not square his language to their consecrated standard of speech."—Vol. iv., page 9.

We pity poor Dr. Murray, for we greatly fear his lamentations are in vain; and that his "old theology" is in a fair way of being superseded by the "new theology" of his dangerous associates.

We call, then, on our Roman Catholic readers to make their choice between the old religion and the new. Will they be satisfied with the doctrine of the Council of Trent, that the Word of God was completed in the teaching of our Lord and his Apostles? Will they be content to believe as Peter and Paul taught, and as the early Church believed? or will they embrace the new Oxford Divinity, that the doctrine of the primitive Church requires to be *developed;* and that to the revelation of St. John, which closed the canon of Scripture, must be added the revelations of St. Francesca, St. Gertrude, and St. Catherine?

THE INVOCATION OF SAINTS.

THOUGH we have, from time to time, alluded to the important subject which stands at the head of this article, we believe we have not yet considered it fully in our pages, either in a theological or a historical point of view; both of which are, we think, well deserving of attention; forming, as this doctrine undoubtedly does, one of the most striking points of distinction between the two Churches of England and Rome.

We must begin by saying a word upon the true nature and limit of the controversy between them.

The real point at issue is not, whether it be right or wrong to honour or commemorate the saints; but whether Roman Catholics are right or wrong in *invoking their aid* in the solemn offices of *prayer*—which Protestants call *saint-worship*.

So far is it from being true that the Church of England disregards or dishonours the true saints of the primitive Church, that any one who will take the trouble to look through the Book of Common Prayer, according to the use of the United Church of England and Ireland, will find not only special offices (collects, lessons, epistles, and gospels) for St. Stephen, St. John the Evangelist, St. Andrew, St. Thomas, St. Matthias, St. Mark, St. Philip and St. James, St. John the Baptist, St. Peter, St. James the Apostle, St. Bartholomew, St. Matthew, St. Michael and all Angels, St. Luke, St. Simon and St. Jude, and the Conversion of St. Paul, but days actually set apart to commemorate the Annunciation, and also the Purification, of the Blessed Virgin Mary—enough, one would think, to refute the calumny, so often reiterated by Romish controversialists against Protestants, that they revile the Blessed Virgin, and treat her as an ordinary woman.

They will also find, if they examine the order for evening prayer, in the same book, that the "Magnificat," or

* Could this have been St. Vincent de Paul, who is recorded by his contemporaries to have been a very agreeable man, only that he cheated at cards?

† How little credence is given to such stories by the *old* Roman Catholics, appears from the quotation we have already made from Cassander (see page 68). He pronounces the existence of several popular saints uncertain, because they are known to us *only by revelation!* But if he thought these alleged revelations to be authentic, what greater certainty could he, or any one else, have than the Word of God himself?

* The following curious passage from Mr. Faber, p. 180, is a good illustration of the diversity of opinions, in the Church of Rome, and of the notion now prevalent, 'that the farther we come away from the Apostles' times the nearer we get to true Christianity. "In like manner, Schram, in his Mystical Theology, censures, as almost heretical, ejaculations which St. Francis, of Sales, quotes with tenderness and relish. Yet, in *doctrinal* matters, it may be safer *for us* to follow the colder and more cautious author. *Besides he wrote later.*"

Song of the Virgin, taken from the 1st chapter of St. Luke's Gospel, is one of the appointed hymns directed to be read or sung immediately after the 1st lesson, in which it is expressly stated that "all generations shall call her blessed."

It is, therefore, obvious that the Church of England honours the Blessed Virgin and other undoubted saints of the primitive Church; and that the point of difference between her and the Church of Rome is, whether the latter does not err as to the kind of honour due to her and them.

The Church of Rome is not satisfied with *giving honour* to the saints, according to their dignity, but she *suppliantly invokes* their aid; and the question which remains is, what does this *invocation* mean or imply? and is it warranted by either Scripture, or reason, or the practice of that comparatively pure age of the Church, by which we have tried so many other peculiar doctrines of the Church of Rome—the first three centuries?

The Council of Trent (sess. xxv., de Invoc.) expressly asserts that "it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke the saints, and to resort to their prayers, aid, and help, for obtaining benefits from God."*

Now, what does this *invocation* mean or imply? Mr. Keenan, whose controversial catechism we have before alluded to, asserts, roundly, that "(Roman) Catholics do *not* ask grace from the saints; they merely *ask* the saints to pray that God may grant them all necessary graces, through Christ." They say, when addressing God, "Have mercy on us; forgive our sins;" but, when addressing the Blessed Virgin, or the saints, "Pray for us." Whether this be practically true, we shall see presently; but we would first inquire, what *invocation* means?

"To invoke the saints suppliantly," as recommended or enjoined by the Council of Trent, is, in plain English, to call on the saints in our prayers, or to *pray to them;* and that *prayer* to any unseen being involves religious worship, we think will scarcely be controverted by the most zealous advocate of the Church of Rome. Whether the prayers be to them as *intercessors* merely, or as the *direct dispensers* of grace, assistance, and safety, or whether they amount to what the Church of Rome attempts to distinguish as Latria or not, without doubt such prayers are an act of religious worship, very different in kind from any mere honour, or petition offered to any fellow-creature on earth, however elevated in power or rank.

That the Fathers thought prayer a mode of addressing God alone, is proved by numberless passages in which they uniformly define it with express reference to God and no other.

Tertullian, A.D. 190, says in his apology for the Christians of his time—"Those things I may not pray for *from any other, but from Him* of whom I know I shall obtain them; because, both it is *He* who is alone able to give, and I am he unto whom it appertaineth to obtain that which is requested, being His servant, who observe Him alone."†

Clemens Alexandrinus, A.D. 200, defines prayer by its relation to God.

"Since there is but one good God, both we and angels *pray to Him alone*, that those good things may be given us which we want, and those continued which we have."‡

So Origen, A.D. 230, in his writings against Celsus, (who had said of the dæmons that they belong to God, and in that respect were to be prayed to, that they may be favourable to us), thus replies—"Away with Celsus's counsel, saying, that we must pray to dæmons; for we must pray to him who is God over all; and we must pray to the Word of God, his only begotten Son, and the first-born of all creatures; and we must entreat him, that he, as High Priest, would present our prayer to his God and our God."§

"Prayer," says St. Basil, A.D. 370, "is a request of some good thing, which is made by pious men unto God."‖

"Prayer," says Gregory Nyssen, A.D. 380, "is a conversing, or a conference with God."¶

"Prayer," says St. Chrysostom, A.D. 400, "Is a colloquy, or discourse with God."**

"Prayer," says John Damascen, A.D. 780, "Is an ascension of the mind unto God, or a request of things that are fit from God."††

Now, as the Holy Scriptures assuredly do not teach us, any more than the early Fathers, to *pray* to saints, either as benefactors or intercessors, the next question is, what did the early Fathers think of *invocation?* did they distinguish it from prayer? and did they, or not, consider it a form of worship properly due to God only?

We need not here go back even so far as the third century, for the great St. Athanasius, in the fourth century, is conclusive on the matter. "We are," says he, "truly worshippers of God; because we *invocate no one of the creatures*, nor any mere man, but the Son, who is, by nature, from God, and true God; made man, indeed, yet not the less, therefore, the Lord himself, and God, and Saviour."*

So Novatian, a presbyter of the Roman Church, in the third century, argues that Christ is God, *because* he is everywhere invoked. "If Christ was only a man, how, *when invocated, is he everywhere present;* for omnipresence is the nature not of man, but of God?"†

So St. Ambrose, A.D. 390, in his funeral oration on the Emperor Theodosius, says—"Thou alone art to be *invocated*, O Lord; thou are to be requested to supply the want of him in his son."‡

Irenæus,§ A.D. 180, in his second book against heretics, says—"As the Church has freely received from the Lord, so does she freely minister; nor does she do anything by *invocation of angels*, nor by incantations, but purely and manifestly directs her *prayers to God*, who made all, and calls upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ."

So Origen (cont. Cels. lib. v., p. 580, opera. Benedict. Ed. Paris, 1733) says—"All supplications, and prayer, and intercession, and thanksgiving, we must offer up to God, who is above all, through the living Word of God, who is a High Priest, superior to all angels. To *invocate* angels, indeed, when men know so little about them, were itself irrational; but, even on the supposition that we were ever so well acquainted with such mysterious wonders, still this very supposed knowledge, while it was setting forth their nature and their respective offices, would forbid us presumptuously to pray to any other than the all-sufficient Deity, through the Son of God our Saviour."

We shall merely add here the canon of the Council of Laodicea, A.D. 361, the decrees of which were received and approved of by the whole Church (cap. 35)—"That Christians ought not to forsake the Church of God, and depart aside and *invocate* angels; therefore, if any man be found using this secret *idolatry*, let him be accursed, because he hath forsaken our Lord Jesus Christ."‖

In the epitome of the canons which Pope Adrian delivered to Charles the Great, this decree is thus abridged—"Ut anathema sit, quicumque relicta ecclesia angelos colere, vel congregationes facere præsumpserit." "That whosoever, leaving the Church, did presume to worship angels, or to make meetings, should be accursed."

This condemnation of prayers to angels as idolatrous was occasioned by a sect of heretics in the fourth century, who, for the purpose of exercising this unlawful worship of praying to angels, held private meetings, separate from those of the Church, in which it was not permitted; and no one ever doubted that the Council would have equally condemned, on the same principle, prayers to saints, if such had been practised in their time.

In all these passages the essential identity of religious *invocation* and *prayer* is clearly implied; and it clearly never entered into the conception of any of these ancient Fathers, that we could *pray to* any being without *worshipping* them.

The very word *adoration* is obviously taken from *adorare*, which literally is *to pray to*.

Now, would it be possible to show more strongly that it was deemed by the Church of the first, second, third, and fourth centuries, that *invocation* was a thing *proper* to God only; and that it necessarily implied the *omnipresence* of the Being invocated? which would be obviously to ascribe one of the attributes of Deity to a creature, a thing which could not be done without impiety, or, indeed, idolatry.

Let us next hear the great St. Augustine, A.D. 400—"Let not our point of religion be the *worship of dead men;* for though they lived piously, still they are not to be so accounted of, as seeking from us any such honours; but they rather wish us to worship Him, through whose illumination they rejoice that we should be associates of their merit. They are to be honoured, therefore, on account of *imitation; not to be prayed to*, on account of religion."¶

A further reason for not praying to them might be mentioned, which no less a writer than Cardinal Cajetan candidly acknowledges, viz:—"*That we have no means of certainly knowing whether the saints hear our prayers*" (which would destroy, at one blow, the whole system of invoking them), "though," adds the cardinal, "we piously believe this to be the case."** Why there should be any piety in believing a thing without any proof either from the Holy Scriptures, or the ancient Fathers of the Church, we are at a loss to imagine, unless *piety* and *credulity* are to be deemed identical!

We would add one more out of many early authorities, that of St. Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis, in the Island of Cyprus, in the fourth century (A.D. 370), who, after censuring, at great length, the Collyridian heretics, for inventing the Blessed Virgin as a sort of goddess, and declaring that Christians ought not indecorously to venerate the saints, but rather Him who is their Sovereign Lord and Master, sums up the whole with the following admonition, which is perhaps scarcely less needed in the present day than it was in the days of the nascent Collyridian heresy:—"Let Mary be held in honour; but let the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost be worshipped. *As for Mary, let no one worship her.*"††

We think we are now in a position to assert, that the *invocation* of saints was not the practice of the ancient Church in primitive times, unless some of our learned Roman Catholic correspondents are able to overthrow the authorities we have quoted (which, of course, they will do, if they can), either by proving that we have misrepresented or mistaken them, or by showing from other writers of the same or earlier dates, that such writers as Irenæus, St. Athanasius, St. Epiphanius, St. Ambrose, and St. Augustine do not truly represent the opinions of the primitive Church on the subject. It is difficult, indeed, to imagine how any men, who have sworn to abide by the unanimous consent of the Fathers, can dare to appeal to Catholic antiquity in justification of praying to any created beings, in the face of such authorities as we have above cited.

We propose in our next number to proceed to consider what has been said by the principal controversial writers of the Church of Rome, which we think will corroborate, instead of countervailing, what we have above written, when we find to what shifts they are driven in their attempt to trace back the present practices of their Church to the times of our Lord and his Apostles; and we shall also endeavour to show in what manner the corrupt practice of saint-worship gradually was introduced, and to what lengths it has led its votaries even in the present day.

WHAT IS THE EVIDENCE ON WHICH PURGATORY IS BELIEVED?

The very important question, which we have put at the head of our present article, is one which has been so frequently discussed in our pages, that it is now time to examine what is the result of our inquiries. And first let us see—*Is Purgatory believed on the evidence of Scripture?* Only one of our correspondents (vol i., p. 45) has attempted to bring forward any Scriptural authorities for the existence of such a place. We found it easy to show, however, that the texts that he alleged were quite irrelevant; and, in order not to be suspected of urging weak objections to his proofs, we stated our arguments in the words of Natalis Alexander, an able and learned Roman Catholic divine. We may state, then, as the result of our inquiries, that *there is not a single mention of Purgatory in the whole of the New Testament.* Now, could this be so, if the writers of the New Testament knew of the existence of such a place? If the pains of Purgatory can be shortened by men's prayers and penances in this life, how is it that the Apostles never appear to have given their converts a word of instruction, as to the means of escaping these sufferings hereafter? They wrote also, to men suffering severe persecutions; and, yet, among all the consolations they offered them, they never seem to have thought of reminding them how their sufferings in this life would abridge the time of their punishment in Purgatory.

Well, but, perhaps, the silence of Scripture may be supplied by tradition. Let us examine then,

Is Purgatory believed on the evidence of any of the orthodox writers of the first three centuries? Here, again, we have to answer that not a single quotation in proof of Purgatory has been established; and *that* certainly not for want of pains on the part of our Roman Catholic correspondents. They have given us quotations from later writers; they have given us quotations from heretical writers of the first three centuries; they have proved from orthodox writers that *prayers for the dead* were used at an early time, in the primitive Church; but of Purgatory, not a word. We feel, then, that we are justified in concluding, that in whatever manner the belief in Purgatory came into the Church,

---

* "Bonum atque utile suppliciter eos invocare et ob beneficia impetranda a Deo, ad eorum orationes, opem, auxiliumque confugere."

† Apologeticus adversus Gentes, cap. 30, p. 67, ed. Rigalt. Paris, 1635.

‡ ὅθεν εἰκότως ἑνὸς ὄντος τῇ ἀγαθῇ θεοῦ παρ᾽ αὐτῇ μόνη τῶν ἀγαθῶν τὰ μὲν δοθῆναι τὰ δὲ παραμεῖναι εὐχόμεθα ἡμεῖς τε καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι.—Strom. l. 7, p. 853, Opera. Ed. Potteri. Oxon. 1715.

§ Origen Cont. Cels., lib. 8., oper. tom. i, Bened. ed., p. 761. Paris, 1733.

‖ Basil. Orat. in Julittam Martyr., Op. tom. ii., p. 35.

¶ Greg. Nyssen, Orat. i., de oratione.

** Chrysost. in Genes., homil. 30, Op. tom. i., p. 301—*vide* same, lib. i., De orando Dem. Op. tom. ii., p. 778.

†† Damascen de fide orthodox, lib. iii., c. 24.

* Ἀλλα ἀληθως θεοσεβεις, ὁτι μηδενα των γεννητων, μη δε κοινον τινα ανθρωπον, αλλα τον εκ Θεου φυσει και αληθινον Θεου υιον επικαλουμεθα. Athan. Contr. Ar. Orat. iii., Op. Tom. i., p. 582. Ben. Ed. Paris, 1698.

† Si homo tantummodo Christus, quomodo adest ubique locus atus, cum hæc hominis natura non sit sed Dei, ut adesse omni loco possit. Si homo tantummodo Christus, cur homo in orationibus mediator invocatur, cum invocatio hominis ad præstandam salutem ineficax judicetur. —Novat. de Trin. c. xiv., Page 747, Oper. Tertull. Rigalt. Paris, 1635. This treatise was frequently attributed to Tertullian or Cyprian, even in the time of St. Jerome, as he remarks, Catalog. Script. Eccl., c. 81, and Apolog. Cont. Ruffin. lib. ii. Natalis Alexander has shown that the doctrine of this treatise is sound.—Hist. Eccl., sæc. ii., Dissert. ix., art. iv. Tom. iii. p. 411. Paris, 1714.

‡ Sed tamen in solus, Deoque, *invocandus* es; tu rogandus, ut omni in filiis repræsentes.—Ambrose, op. tom. ii., p. 1207, Bened. ed. Paris, 16.0.

§ Nec *invocationibus* angelicis facit aliquid, nec incantationibus, nec reliquâ prava curiositate, sed mundè et pure et manifeste *orationes* dirigens ad Dominum, qui omnia fecit, et nomen Domini nostri Jesu Christi *invocans.*—*Advers. Hæres.* lib. 2 (c. 57), c. xxxii, ed. Bened., p. 166. Paris, 1710.

‖ Ὁτι ὀυ δεῖ Χριστιανους ἐγκαταλειπειν τὴν ἐκκλησιάν τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἀπιέναι καὶ ἀγγέλους ονόμαζειν ἐπισυναξεις ποιεῖν, ἅπερ ἀπηγόρευται. Εἰτίς οὖν ευρεθη ταύτην τὴν κεκρυμμενην εἰδωλολατρείαν σχολάζων ἔστω ἀνάθεμα· ὁτι ἐγκατέλιπε τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστον, τον υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ εἰδωλολατρείᾳ προσῆλθεν.—Concil. Laod. Can. 35. Pandectæ Canonum Apostol. Oxon., 1672. p. 468.

¶ Non sit nobis religio cultus hominum mortuorum. Quia, si pie vixerunt, non sic habentur, ut tales quærant honores: sed illum a nobis coli volunt, quo illuminante lætantur meriti sui nos esse consortes. Honorandi sunt ergo propter imitationem, non adorandi propter religionem."—August. de ver relig. c. lv., Oper. vol. i. p. 786. Bened. Ed. Paris, 1679.

** Certa ratione nescimus, an Sancti nostra vota cognoscant, quamvis pie hoc credamus. *Cajetan in secundam secundæ* Quæst., lxxxviii., art. 8. Aug. Taur. 1541, p. 411.

†† Ἐν τῳ ὄντι Μάρια· ὁ εἷς Πατήρ, καὶ Υἱὸς, καὶ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, προσκυνεῖσθω· τὴν Μάριαν μηδεὶς προσκυνειτω.—Epiph. Cont. Hær., lib. iii., tom. ii., hær 79, p. 1061. Paris ed., 1622; Colon, 1682—"Honoretur sanè Maria: Pater vero, Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus adorantur—Mariam adorare nemo velit."

it was *not* derived by tradition from Christ and his Apostles.

Is there no mention of Purgatory prior to the fourth century? Certainly there is. The *heathens* had a doctrine very much resembling it. We have quoted a statement from Plato (vol. i., p. 16); and a correspondent (vol. ii., p. 58) has sent us Virgil's description of *his* Purgatory, which corresponds almost exactly with the notions as to the state of the dead now entertained in the Roman Catholic Church. Here, then, we begin to get an answer to the question—If the notion of Purgatory was not derived from Christ and his Apostles, where did it come from? We find reason to suspect that this doctrine was one of the importations from a heathen philosophy, with which the simplicity of the Gospel was corrupted.

But who imported this heathen doctrine into Christianity? Our correspondents have enabled us to answer this question, too. They have pointed to some writers, notorious for their heretical opinions, as the earliest Christian authorities, which can be adduced in support of this doctrine. Origen, who was well learned in heathen systems of philosophy, had speculations concerning the state of the dead, which, in some measure, resemble those now held in the Roman Catholic Church. He believed in a Purgatory, but one of far greater efficiency than hers; he thought there was no sin too great for the fires of his Purgatory to purge out, and that even the devil himself would, in process of time, be rendered pure enough for admission into the kingdom of heaven. In short, Origen's Purgatory was what we call hell, only that he believed there would be an end to its duration. Another Christian writer, notorious for the unsoundness of his views on some subjects, has been brought forward in support of Purgatory—we mean Tertullian. But Tertullian expressly tells us that he learned this notion, not from the Church, but from a wretched fanatic, named Montanus, by whose pretensions to inspiration, Tertullian was unfortunately deceived.

The conclusion, then, to which the labours of our correspondents have led us is, that writers notorious for the unsoundness of their doctrines, are responsible for the introduction of this notion into the Christian Church.

So much for the first three centuries; but what as to those succeeding? Well, we maintain that after this time notions resembling Purgatory may be found in the speculations of individual writers, but that Purgatory was no part of the doctrine of the Church during the fourth and fifth centuries.

It was natural that the curiosity of man should busy itself with speculations as to the state of the soul after death; and it was not wonderful that the notions entertained by a writer of so much learning and ingenuity as Origen should obtain considerable circulation; but we hold that whatever may have been the private opinions of individual writers, their notions did not receive the sanction of the Church. We can prove this, first, by negative evidence: the absence—namely, of all mention of Purgatory from the creeds, and from the canons of councils of the Church, for many centuries. We prove it further from the vagueness and the uncertainty of the language of those who express any opinion at all resembling those held in modern times concerning Purgatory. We have already alluded to the embarrassment of Epiphanius (see vol. ii., p. 68), when asked why he prayed for the dead. Instead of answering plainly, "to get their souls out of Purgatory," as any one would who believed in the existence of such a place, he makes a far less satisfactory defence, and takes his stand principally on the impropriety of deviating from a custom established in the Church. We could show, also, how unsettled the views of these writers were as to the efficacy of these prayers; some even holding that the pains of the damned were alleviated by the prayers of the Church. But we shall not need to go farther than Augustine. This eminent Father lived at the end of the fourth and the beginning of the fifth century. If the doctrine of Purgatory formed part of the doctrine of the Church in his day, he could not have failed to have known and believed it. If, therefore, we can show that he had nothing to offer on this subject, but guesses and probable conjectures, the conclusion is inevitable that the doctrines of Purgatory formed no part of the system of Christian truth which had been handed down to him by his predecessors. How far this is the case, our readers will judge from the following extracts:—

Augustine takes pains to argue against those who held Origen's notions of a Purgatory which should, in time, remove all men's sins, and who defended themselves by appealing to 1 Cor. iii. 13. Augustine, in reply, interprets the wood, hay, stubble, spoken of, as representing the over-great love which the faithful bear to the things of life; and the fire as representing that temporal tribulation which causes them grief by the loss of those things whereupon they had fixed their affections. "But," he proceeds, "whether in this life only men suffer such things, or whether some such judgments also do follow after this life, the meaning which I have given of this sentence is, as I suppose, not inconsistent with the truth.'*

Again, he writes, "That some such thing should take place after this life is *not incredible*, and whether it be so may be a subject for inquiry, and may be either found or may remain hidden: that some of the faithful, through a certain Purgatorial fire, are so much the more slowly or sooner saved by how much more or less they have loved these perishing goods."*

We give one more quotation to the same effect. "If it be said that in the interval between death and the day of judgment the spirits of the departed suffer a fire—not felt by those who have not had such dispositions and affections in their mortal life, that their wood, hay, and stubble shall be consumed, but felt by those who have carried with them buildings of this kind; whether they feel the fire of transitory tribulation burning those secular affections (which are pardoned from damnation) in this world only, or both here and there, or, therefore here that they may not feel it there—I do not contradict it, for, *perhaps, it is true.*"†

PERHAPS it is true!! So, then, in Augustine's time, so late as the beginning of the fifth century, notions akin to Purgatory had not got beyond "perhaps." This is an argument so decisive against the claims of Purgatory to rank among articles of faith, as to outweigh dozens of quotations on the other side, if it were possible to produce them. All that such quotations could prove, would be that there was such a place as Purgatory, in the private opinion of the writer cited; but if the Church had any tradition on the subject, Augustine would not have needed to speak with a "perhaps" on the matter.

But how, then, did Purgatory attain the rank of an article of faith? Is theology a science which admits of discoveries? and is it possible to obtain in the sixth century a knowledge of truths which those who were taught by the Apostles were ignorant of? There is no evidence for Purgatory unless it be asserted that it is possible for late ages to find out something which the first centuries were ignorant of; and, accordingly, some Roman Catholic divines have been bold enough to make this assertion. We quoted (vol. ii., p. 68) the honest confession of Cardinal Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, "Whoever reads the commentaries of the ancient Greeks, will find no mention, as far as I can see, or the slightest possible concerning Purgatory. Nay, even the Latins did not all at once, but gradually enter into the truth of this matter. . . . For a while it was unknown; at a later date it was known to the Church universal; then it was believed by some, by little and little, partly from Scripture, partly from revelations." *Assert. Luther. Confut.* 18.

When we quoted this passage before, we added that the revelations here spoken of, by which Purgatory is proved, were, in plain English, neither more nor less than ghost stories. As this explanation has not been relished by some of our Roman Catholic readers, we proceed to establish our assertions, although in order to do so we must come down as low as the sixth century.

To prove, however, that we are going to the right place, we cite the following from Mr. Faber's work elsewhere referred to:—

"The dialogue of St. Gregory the Great may be considered as the *chief fountain* of the devotion to the holy souls in all succeeding ages; and Father Peter Faber used to say that, although St. Gregory was a saint, who should be loved and honoured, on many accounts, yet on none more than this, because he had so lucidly and transparently handed down to us the doctrine of the purgatorial fire. For he thought that *if St. Gregory had not told us so many things of the holy souls*, the devotion of subsequent ages would have been much colder in their behalf."—Page 385.

Now, Pope Gregory founds his doctrine of Purgatory, as Cardinal Fisher has it, on Scripture and revelation; only that there is very little of Scripture and a great deal of revelation. What he quotes from Scripture tells rather *against* than *for* Purgatory. When asked whether we are to believe in the existence of a purgatorial fire after death, he replies—"The Lord says in the Gospel, 'Walk while ye have the light.' He says, also, by the prophet, 'I have heard thee in the accepted time, and have called thee in the day of salvation;' in explanation of which text, the Apostle Paul says, 'Behold, *now* is the accepted time, *now* is the day of salvation.' Solomon, likewise, says, 'Whatever thy hand can do, work with all thy might; for there is neither work, nor knowledge, nor understanding, nor wisdom in the grave whither thou art hastening." . . From which sentences we must infer that such as any one departs hence, such shall he appear in the day of judgment." So far Pope Gregory's Scripture arguments conclude against Purgatory; but he goes on—"However, we must believe that there is a purgatorial fire for some trifling faults, inasmuch as the Truth says, that 'if any man speak blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, it shall be forgiven him neither in this world nor in the world to come;' from which sentence we are given to understand that some sins may be remitted in this world and some in the next. . . . But, yet, as I said, this last can only be believed of some very small and trifling sins, such as idle words, immoderate laughter, &c., which do not seem grievous faults, but will become grievous matters after death if any one neglect them while yet in this life. For when St. Paul says that Christ is the foundation, he adds, 'If any man build on this foundation,' &c. (see 1 Cor. iii.) Now, though this may be understood of the fire of tribulation in this life, yet if any one understand it of a fire of future purgation, he ought to consider carefully that *he* is saved by fire, not who builds on it lead or iron—that is, heavy and grievous sins; but wood, hay, stubble—that is, small sins, such as the fire can easily consume. You should know, too, that no one shall obtain any purgation by fire for his small sins, unless he has merited, by his good actions in this life, that he shall obtain it there."* —*Dialog.*, lib. iv., c. 39.

Such is Gregory's Scripture proof of Purgatory. It will be perceived that the general tenor of Scripture is pronounced by him unfavourable to the doctrine; that he is induced to admit it by a very illogical inference from the text which says that the sin against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven in the next world, from which he gathers that some other sins shall; and, lastly, that he thinks the celebrated passage of St. Paul, in 1 Cor., *may* be understood of Purgatory, though it admits of another interpretation.

The kind of Purgatory which Pope Gregory admits of, falls very far short of what is now commonly believed in the Church of Rome, being only adapted to the purgation of the very smallest sins of those who have earned a claim for admission by their good actions in this life. There are a great many of those for whom Masses are now said and paid for, who would not be thought good enough for admission into Pope Gregory's Purgatory.

But the chief stress of Gregory's proof of Purgatory lies on *revelations*. He admits the novelty of his teaching on this head. His collocutor, Peter, asks him, ch. 40—"What is the reason that in these last times so many things are known about souls, which were before concealed, so that the future world appears to disclose itself by open revelations and visions?" To which Gregory answers—"Just so; for as this present world is approaching to an end, so much is the next world touched by our very nearness to it, and is disclosed by more manifest signs."

As, however, we find that Pope Gregory, who died A.D. 604, 1250 years ago, was mistaken in supposing himself near to the end of the world, it is possible that he may have been also mistaken in the credence which he gave to ghost stories on that supposition; and any one who will take the trouble to look over his Dialogues, will find the good Father more remarkable for simple credulity than for wise discrimination. We shall give a couple of specimens of his stories. The reader will observe that he does not speak of Purgatory as a *place;* but he describes the souls as suffering in parts of this earth. We suppose that Purgatory being newly opened in his time, it had not then become worth while to set up a separate establishment, and the souls were like prisoners out on tickets-of-leave before it had become worth while to build a prison for them.

The first story we cite is of one Paschasius, a deacon of the Church of Rome, a man of wonderful sanctity, bountiful in alms-giving, and remarkable for self-denial. However, in a contested election for the bishopric of Rome, he voted on the wrong side—for Laurentius against Symmachus—and persisted in his preference to his dying day. He worked a miracle at his funeral—a demoniac touched the "dalmatic" placed on his bier, and immediately recovered. Notwithstanding, some time after, Bishop Germanus having been ordered by his physicians to use the hot baths of St. Angelo, when he went into the baths, found the said Paschasius standing there. So he was greatly surprised, and asked him what so great a man was doing there? To which Paschasius replied, that he was in that place of punishment for no other reason than because he took the side of Laurentius against Symmachus. But he begged Germanus to pray for him, telling him that he would know that he had been successful, if he did not find him there on his next visit. And, accordingly, Germanus did *not* find him there when he came again.

Hot baths seem to have been the favourite substitute for Purgatory in Pope Gregory's time. He tells another story about a Presbyter, who lived near Civita Vecchia, and was in the habit of using hot baths; and who one day on going in found a certain unknown person prepared to wait on him, who took off his shoes, took his clothes from him, brought him towels when he came out, &c. This went on so often that the Presbyter said to himself one day, I must not behave shabbily to that man who waits on me so devotedly at the baths; but I must take

* Sive ergo in hac vita tantum homines ista patiantur, sive etiam post hanc vitam talia quædam judicia subsequantur: non abhorret, quantum arbitror a ratione veritatis iste intellectus hujus sententiæ."—De Octo Dulcitii Quæstionibus, Quæst i. See also De Fide and Operibus, cap. 16.

* Tale aliquid etiam post hanc vitam fieri incredibile non est, et utrum ita sit quæri potest, et aut inveniri aut latere; nonnullos fideles per ignem quendam purgatorium, quanto magis minusve bona præcuntia dilexerunt, tanto tardius citiusve salvari."—Enchirid, cap. 69.

† Post istius sane corporis mortem donec ad illum veniatur, qui post resurrectionem corporum futurus est damnationis et remunerationis ultimus dies, si hoc temporis intervallo spiritus defunctorum ejusmodi ignem dicuntur perpeti, quem non sentiant illi qui non habuerunt tales mores et amores in hujus corporis vita ut eorum lignum fœnum et stipula consumantur; alii vero sentiant qui ejusmodi secum ædificia portaverunt, sive ibi tantum, sive hic et ibi, sive ideo hic et non ibi, sæcularia, quamis a damnatione venialia, concremantem ignem transitoriæ tribulationis inveniant, *non redarguo, quia forsitan rerum est.*—*De Civ. Dei., lib* xxi., c. 25.

him a present. So he took him two of the offertory cakes. He found the man there as usual, and was waited on by him as before. And when he was dressed and going out he gave the man the present he had brought, by way of thanking him, begging him to take it kindly in token of charity. But the man, sorrowing, said, why do you give me this, Father? It is holy bread, I cannot eat it. I was once the master of this place, and have been sent here for my sins. If you wish to do me any good, offer it to God for me, and you will know your prayers are heard, if, when you come to bathe next, you do not find me here. Then he vanished, and the Presbyter saw by his vanishing that he who he thought was a man, really was a ghost. And when he came back after a week's prayer and Masses the man was no longer to be seen.

Now, we shall not discuss here what credit is due to these stories; our object in bringing them forward here is to show exactly on what foundation Purgatory rests, and at what a late period the belief of it was introduced into the Church. We have said elsewhere, that some modern Romanists have forsaken the Tridentine standard for a *triple* rule of faith—Scripture, tradition, and revelation. Now, the proof for Purgatory from Scripture and tradition altogether breaks down; and we wish it to be clearly seen that *asserted revelations* formed the ground on which the doctrine was first received, and by means of which its belief was fastened on the Christian Church for a number of years.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We have been obliged to postpone several articles and letters from want of room.

We would request our correspondents, both Roman Catholics and Protestants, to limit the length of their communications, and not to discuss a variety of distinct topics in one letter.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st.

To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal, which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, JUNE, 1854.

The intolerance with which the Church of Rome is often charged by her opponents has not unfrequently been defended as necessary to uphold her unity and immutability, which unity her advocates say could not be maintained were she to tolerate differences within her pale, as other Churches, not endowed with the same Divine authority, are compelled to do.

We have little doubt that the principal attraction which has drawn some men of respectable attainments from the Church of England to that of Rome, has been the idea of the much-boasted unity and immutability of the latter, with the stricter discipline exercised in upholding them.

That the Church of Rome, however, is *tolerant* enough, and even *flexible* enough, towards all who will even nominally submit to the all-important doctrine of her supremacy, appears to be pretty well practically understood in the present day, as, indeed, in all ages.

Great as her power has been and still is, there is always a wary prudence used in its exercise.

Of this we might give many instances, but let a few suffice—some of which we shall take from the conduct of the Holy See towards large classes, the rest from the conduct of the hierarchy towards individuals.

Those who have read the Catholic Layman since its commencement, will remember the signal *toleration* shown by the See of Rome towards the protracted and angry combat between the Franciscan and Dominican orders, touching the much-disputed doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary—which, after 300 years' discussion, with all the acknowledged prepossessions of the Holy See in its favour, has never yet, we believe, been definitively determined by the Church of Rome.

A similar *toleration* has been evinced by the Holy See towards the order of the *Jesuits*, who have, from time to time, published books containing the most dangerous and indefensible doctrines, not one of which has ever been prohibited by the Church of Rome, though she professes to condemn and prohibit the use of all bad books, and publishes, from time to time, such prohibitions in her Index Prohibitorius.

How are we to account for such toleration; and how is it consistent with her intolerance and persecution towards every attempt at reformation? Simply because she does not feel powerful enough to measure her strength with large and influential bodies within her own pale; and, therefore, could not prudently venture on what she knew would have been a vain attempt to put down a schism between two angry and powerful parties, both of which were willing to acknowledge her nominal supremacy, as long as she did not venture to exercise it against themselves; and because, in like manner, the Jesuit order is willing to give cordial support to all her pretensions, so long as she does not interfere with the doctrines and principles on which their system is founded.

Let us glance now at her dealing with individuals. The last week has witnessed the solemn inaugural profession of faith of the Very Rev. Dr. John Henry Newman, as rector of the newly-founded Roman Catholic University of Ireland. On this occasion the Most Rev. Dr. Cullen, titular Archbishop of Dublin, pronounced a discourse, in which, in the same breath, he proclaimed the unchangeable character of the doctrines of his Church, and held forth Dr. Newman as a man distinguished for his profound learning, as well as for his virtues and piety; while it is notorious, from Dr. Newman's own works, that he ventures to differ most widely from the Church of Rome on, at least, one cardinal point of the gravest importance to her theory and pretensions—her much-boasted immutability. In his celebrated essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine, Dr. Newman maintains that God did not intend that the form of doctrine, received in the Church, should be at all times the same; that He left in his Church an authority of *developing* new truths from those known before; so that it is not needful that Romish Christianity and Apostolic Christianity should be one and the same thing—that, in point of fact, they are two different things; thus throwing overboard the whole theory of Apostolic tradition as constituting, together with the Scriptures, the rule of faith, and resting everything on the inherent power of the Church to declare authoritatively what she thinks right, independently of both Scripture and tradition.

All Romish controversialists, except Dr. Newman, have contended that the Church of Rome has been *immutably* the same in doctrine in all ages, and that whatever she holds at this day is identical with what she derived in the earliest times from our Lord and his Apostles, either through the written Word, or oral tradition from the Apostles themselves.

Now, how comes the Church of Rome, through one of her highest officials in Ireland, to adopt this new-light theologian (converted, after a fashion of his own, to the Church of Rome) as a profound divine, worthy of being placed at the head of an establishment for the education of the Catholic youth of Ireland? Is it possible that the Roman Catholic authorities in this country can approve of, and intend to adopt, Dr. Newman's *novel* views? In America, Roman Catholic writers have seen very plainly that Dr. Newman's views are quite inconsistent with those which represent Catholic truth as always the same, and as handed down unchanged, by tradition, from the earliest ages; but in this country, he is the selected instructor of the Catholic youths of Ireland notwithstanding, and publicly vaunted as a man of the most profound wisdom and learning.

Is not this a proof how far toleration may be carried in the Church of Rome, where it suits her purpose, and when it is thought wise to conciliate an individual who is likely to be influential or useful in the maintenance of her system, on the terms merely that he is willing to "recognise the Church of Rome to be the mother and mistress of all Churches, and vow obedience, absolute and entire, to the Roman Pontiff, and confess as faith all that the Catholic Church teaches?"

Had the principles set forth in the essay on Development been published by a Protestant, the book would, doubtless, have been placed long since in the Index Prohibitorius; but, being written by one willing to acknowledge himself an obedient son of the Mother Church, he is vaunted as a profound divine, and inaugurated as the principal of a Catholic University.

Another instance will be in the minds of such of our readers as happened to peruse the observations of the *Rambler* on Dr. Cahill, copied by us in our February number.

Dr. Cahill had written on the doctrine of transubstantiation in a manner utterly heterodox and inconsistent with the teaching of the Council of Trent. The *Rambler* exposed his erroneous teaching in the strongest and clearest manner, and assured the world that a very large proportion of the Catholic clergy and laity regard much of what he says as pernicious and untrue! "Why, then, it will be said," continues the *Rambler*, "is Dr. Cahill *allowed* thus to compromise the whole community of which he is a member? Why do the bishops and clergy permit him to write and lecture as he does? Why do not those who disapprove come forward and protest against his being accepted as a model of a Catholic controversialist?"

The explanation of the *Rambler* is worthy of attention. It is as follows (p. 176):—

"We reply, that the common idea that Catholics are like a regiment of soldiers on the field of battle, every one of them acting in obedience to orders, is a pure figment of the Protestant imagination. Knowing that we have a discipline and code of law, that we do regard our bishops as the successors of the Apostles, and that we profess the utmost unity in matters of faith, the world jumps to the conclusion that every bishop is invested with power equivalent to the very highest which ultramontane theology ever attributed to the Pope himself. A Catholic bishop is not an autocrat with uncontrolled power over the actions of his spiritual subjects. He administers and enforces the laws of the Church, and beyond these, whatever power he has, is a species of moral influence, arising from the weight justly due to his sacred office and character. At the same time, the fact that it is a moral influence, and not a legal right (by the word *legal*, meaning a right secured by the laws of the Catholic Church), makes it necessary that it should be employed with great care and prudence, and not pushed too far, lest an unwilling subject recalcitrate hopelessly. Accordingly, as a matter of history, we find that Catholic prelates—imitating the wisdom of the Holy See—are often backward to interposing in cases where Protestants expect their instant interference with the strong arm of authority, and if the future be like the past, this rule will continue to be observed to the end of all things."

Now, what is this, but simply that the Church is so tolerant, or rather so prudent, that she is ready to overlook anything in an unruly and unmanageable subject, even when confessedly propagating things, "*pernicious and untrue*," if he be only, willing, *nominally*, to submit himself to the *unexercised* authority of the Church and the Holy See.

The toleration, however, of the Church of Rome extends much farther than omitting to put in the Index Prohibitorius, books of an evil or erroneous tendency; it permits both bodies of men and individuals to teach, and inculcate in practice, many things quite at variance with her authorized dogmas and formularies.

We may instance the vast difference which she tolerates and connives at, between the theoretical and practical modes of invoking the saints. The former is laid down distinctly by the Catechism of the Council of Trent, part iv., chapter vi., question 3.—Aliter Deum, aliter sanctos implo-

ramus—"For we do not implore God and the saints in the same manner. We pray to God that He would either give us good things or deliver us from evil things; but from the saints, because they are in favour with God, we ask that they would undertake to be our advocates, to obtain for us those things from God which we stand in need of. Hence, we use two forms of praying, different in kind; for to God we properly say—"Have mercy upon us; hear us;" but to the saints—"Pray for us."

That this distinction is not followed in practice is notorious. Take the following specimens from the devotional works of St. Bonaventure, a saint canonized in 1482:—

"O, thou blessed Virgin, our salvation is placed in thy hands. Remember our poverty, O thou pious one! Whom thou willest, he shall be saved; and he from whom thou turnest away thy countenance, goeth into destruction."—S. Bonav. Op., Tom. vi.; Cantica ad B. Virg. instar Hab. 3, p. 480 (correctly 492). Ed. Lugd., 1668.

Again:—

"Therefore, O empress, and our most benign Lady, by the right of a mother *command* thy most beloved son, our Lord Jesus Christ, that he vouchsafe to raise our minds from the love of earthly things to heavenly desires, who liveth and reigneth—JURE MATRIS IMPERA tuo dilectissimo filio."—Opera, Tom. vi., p. 466. Lugd. 1668.

We notice another sample of saint-worship, from a French life of St. Philomena, published at Avignon, in 1836, and received since the publication of her life, in our last number (for which we are indebted to the kindness of a friend):—

"Faithful and glorious martyr, have pity on me, exercise on both my soul and my body the ministry of salvation, of which God has judged you worthy more than me; you know the number and diversity of my wants; behold me at your feet, full of misery and hope. I solicit your charity, great saint! Grant me my prayers, bless me," &c., &c.

Is this nothing more than the "Ora pro nobis?"

It would be easy to multiply instances of the wide difference between the practice and the theory of the Roman Catholic Church with reference both to doctrinal and devotional teaching.

For the present we cannot proceed with the subject further, but propose returning to it again; and, in the meantime, beg to call attention to the article, in our present number, on the Variations of Romanism.

REPRINT OF THE *CATHOLIC LAYMAN*—VOL. I.

We are happy to be able to announce to such of our friends as have hitherto been disappointed in completing their sets, that we have reprinted (at very considerable expense) the first volume of our periodical, in consequence of the numerous applications for it, which we were unable to meet. In a few days Vols. I. and II., or either of them, may be had, neatly bound and lettered, on application to the publishers, Messrs. Curry, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin; or, Messrs. Wertheim and Macintosh, Paternoster Row, London.

Correspondence.

MR. ROURKE ON THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH AND THE RULE OF FAITH.

(Continued from page 63.)

We believe that true faith is indispensably necessary for salvation—"He that believeth not, shall be condemned" (Mark xvi. 16); and "Without faith it is impossible to please God."—Heb. xi. 6.

We believe that Jesus Christ, requiring faith as necessary for salvation, must have provided us with adequate means to obtain faith—that is, to believe, without doubting, all those things which he has taught and instituted as necessary for salvation. If Jesus Christ has not provided us with such means, he must be a hard master indeed, as he would require of us what we could not otherwise perform.

We believe that Jesus Christ has established his Church for the above purpose—namely, as the supreme tribunal to regulate our faith; or, in other words, to keep the precious deposit of revelation unaltered, to explain to us (without any possibility of error) the meaning of every part of Holy Writ necessary for salvation, and, likewise, to preserve and transmit to posterity undefiled all that part of Christ's divine doctrine, which was only delivered by word of mouth, either by Christ or by his apostles, according to these words of St. Paul—"Therefore, brethren, stand firm, and hold the traditions which you have learned, whether by word or by our epistles."—2 Thess. ii. 14 (it is the fifteenth verse in your Bible). By this text we see that the unwritten Word of God, transmitted to us by tradition, is entitled to the very same respect as the written word.

We think it absurd to assert that Jesus Christ has taught or preached nothing essential but what is written in a few pages of the Gospel. We do not find in the Gospel the instructions which our Lord gave his apostles during the forty days that he appeared to them after his resurrection; and yet it is beyond all doubt, that during these forty days—the last spent with his apostles—he instructed them particularly in all the mysteries of his kingdom and of his Church.—See Acts i. 3. These last instructions which Christ gave his apostles before parting, and when they were about entering on the arduous duties of the ministry—these last instructions, I say, were not lost, although not recorded in the Gospel; they form a part of that precious deposit entrusted to the Church, and have, by an uninterrupted succession of pastors, been transmitted, undefiled, to our present days, and will be thus transmitted to the most remote generations, even to the consummation of time. We believe, then, that the Church of Christ is the supreme judge in matters of faith, both to determine the true sense of Scripture, and to settle our belief with regard to that part of Christ's doctrine delivered by word of mouth. Whenever the Church has pronounced, the controversy is settled, doubts vanish, and we are as certain as if our Lord himself had spoken.

Common sense tells us, sir, that the Gospel could not have been intended as the supreme judge to fix our belief in matters of faith. First, because it may be misunderstood. The many contradictory doctrines drawn from Scripture prove that it is often misunderstood, and even in matters which Christ declares as an indispensable condition of salvation. Witness the following—"Except a man be born again, of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter the kingdom of God."—John iii. 5. "Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you."—John vi. 54. "Without faith it is impossible to please God."—Heb. xi. 6.

You will readily acknowledge that these several texts, although directing us to certain things, as an indispensable condition of salvation, are interpreted in contradictory ways, and, of course, misunderstood. Some find in the Gospel the necessity of baptism for salvation; others find in it salvation without baptism; some find in it the necessity of receiving the flesh and blood of Christ; others find that Christ gave us nothing but bread and wine as memorials of his death; some find in the Gospel that faith alone will save; others discover in the Gospel the insufficiency of faith alone; some find in the Gospel absolute and unconditional predestination; others reject it, as impious and blasphemous.

Now, sir, are all these right? Or will it be said that it is immaterial which of these contradictory opinions we embrace? No, sir; common sense tells us that Holy Writ was not given us to be misunderstood, that when misunderstood it leads us astray; whereas it was intended to guard us against the misfortune of being led astray. Common sense tells us, then, that Scripture, being a dead letter, a dumb book, which cannot explain itself, Christ must have provided some visible and living authority, some supreme and unerring tribunal to explain Scripture, and that this is, and can be no other than the Church.

A second reason why Scripture cannot be our supreme judge in matters of faith is, because there are many that cannot read.

A third reason—The gospels and epistles were not written for many years after the Church of Christ was established, and spread among many nations. For many hundred years after that, the art of printing, not having been discovered, the Holy Scripture could not be in many persons' hands; and yet, during that time, the precious deposit of faith was as well kept as it has been since Holy Writ is in the hands of everybody. Yes, sir, and better; everybody cannot read, but everybody, learned or unlearned, can submit to the Church, transmitting to both, by the assistance of the Holy Ghost, the doctrine of Christ, uncorrupted, and in its primitive purity. Here, sir, is a mode of instruction adapted to everybody's capacity.

A fourth reason—If I must take up my creed by reading Scripture, I must be satisfied that the book which is put into my hands, and called the Holy Scripture, is really the genuine Scripture, as written by the apostles. I, a poor, illiterate man, not having enjoyed the benefit of a liberal education, hardly acquainted with my own language, how shall I know whether the English Bible you put into my hands is a faithful translation of the original Hebrew and Greek or not? I shall have to take your word for it!! If I do, my faith then, to use a homely phrase, is pinned to your sleeve. But no, sir, I cannot submit to do so, because I find material differences in different translations of the Scriptures; of course, I am kept in suspense, if I know of none but a barely human authority in support of each of the different translations.

These are sufficient reasons to induce us to believe that Holy Writ was not intended to be our supreme judge in matters of faith, and to convince us that Christ, our Lord and Saviour, has provided us with a living, visible, and supreme authority, to settle all our doubts, with regard to the true translation of Scripture, the true sense of it, and, likewise, with regard to many other essential matters not to be found in Holy Writ, but delivered by tradition. It is plain then, that the Church which our Lord established on earth, is this living, visible, and supreme authority; and if it be asked where this authority resides, we answer, in the body of Christ's ministers, the pastors of his Church, and the lawful successors of those pastors whom he appointed, and invested with full authority to discharge the functions of his ministry. To that body of pastors we look for heavenly instructions; in them we see the successors of Jesus Christ, invested by him with the same authority which he had received from his heavenly Father—"As the Father hath sent me, I also send you."—John xx. 21. Can you, sir, or "Bedale," or the "Kildare Churchman," or Mr. O'Mara, prove me to be in error for putting full confidence in the assertions and promises of our Lord, and in thus believing that the Spirit of Truth never has departed, and never will depart, from the pastors of Christ's Church? No; you will never be able to do so, because all things shall pass away, but Christ's Word will remain: Jesus Christ yesterday, to-day, and the same for ever.

The true minister of Christ, speaking of the name of his divine master, must speak with authority, with certainty, without any hesitation, on all the different mysteries of religion on which he is obliged to instruct his flock.

The apostles of Christ, scattered over the globe, preached one and the same doctrine, because Christ was with them.—Matt. xxviii. 18-20. The ministers of Christ, in 1854, scattered over the globe, preach, likewise, one and the same doctrine, because Christ is still with them. "I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world."—St. Matt.

The apostles of Christ received the confessions of the faithful—see Acts xix. 18. They had received from Jesus Christ the power of forgiving and retaining sins—see John xx. 22, 23. The ministers of Christ, in 1854, likewise hear the confessions of the faithful, because they have no idea that Christ ever deprived them of that power. The apostles of Christ submitted to the decisions of the whole Church, because they knew the Church to be guided by the Holy Ghost.—Acts xv. 23. The ministers of Christ, in 1854, likewise submit to the decision of the general councils of the Church, because they know that the Holy Ghost is as much with the Church now as he was immediately after her institution. In short, we do not conceive why less spiritual powers should be attributed to the ministry of Christ in 1854 than in the year 100 or 300, &c., for at all times, and in all ages, the ministry is, most assuredly, intended for the same functions.

Is it not a pity, sir, that things on which our salvation depends should be only matters of opinion? It is my opinion, says one, that children may be saved without baptism; it is my opinion, says another, that God is too merciful to damn souls for ever; I think, says a third, that it is immaterial what a person believes, or what religious creed he adopts, so he leads a good life. It is your opinion, and you think! Pray, are you certain? and if you are not certain in matters of such weight, how can you be happy? Oh! will you leave it to the day of judgment to disclose whether you were right or wrong? Or, will you not rather renounce that fallible guide—your limited and corrupted reason—which never can give you certainty in matters of revelation, and apply for spiritual knowledge to the fountain of eternal truth, the holy Catholic Church, guided by the Holy Ghost, that you may no longer feed on opinions and uncertainties, but repose in the bosom of certainty.

I now must conclude, as I fear I have already disregarded your request to be brief.

Hoping you will have the kindness to insert this "misty cloud of words" in the next number of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, I bid you farewell for a month.

I remain, sir, in sincere charity, your Christian friend,

WILLIAM ROURKE.

The important question raised by Mr. Rourke in this part of his letter, and on which his remarks, for the most part, turn, is briefly this—Is, or is not, Holy Scripture the supreme and sufficient rule in matters of faith? If this question be decided in the affirmative, it is obvious that all Mr. Rourke's arguments fall, at once, to the ground. We have discussed this question before, on more than one occasion; and we are now obliged, in reply to our correspondent's letter, to enter upon it again at some length.

Mr. Rourke's argument involves this fundamental assumption, that God, in giving a revelation to mankind, must necessarily have taken measures to guard it from all possible misconception or perversion, at least in essential points. This assumption we must explicitly deny. It is refuted by the analogies of the patriarchal and Jewish revelations, and it is also contradicted by the general analogy of God's dealings with us in the most important matters connected with our temporal well-being. In the case of the patriarchs, we do not find that any provision was made for the *necessary* and *infallible* understanding of the few and essential truths then communicated to mankind. On the contrary, though God kept up the memory of Himself by *repeated* revelations—to Adam, to Enoch, to Noah—we find that so universally was religion corrupted

in the age of Abraham (only a few centuries after the Flood), that it became necessary to make a new revelation to him; his father and ancestors having lapsed into idolatry—Joshua xxiv. 2. For a period of, at least, 2,000 years, the world was left—*not* without divine revelation—but without permanent miraculous interposition to prevent men from misunderstanding and abusing it. Was such interposition less necessary then than now? Were men's souls of less value in the earlier than in the later ages of the world? We must have some better reason than an *à priori* assumption to assure us of this.

But, perhaps, an essentially new state of things was introduced by the Jewish dispensation. Here, at least, perhaps, a permanent, infallible guardian was vouchsafed to the Church. Far otherwise. And, yet, surely, if ever there was a Church upon earth, that might appear to have good grounds for asserting its claim to the privilege of infallibility, it was the Jewish. It had a divinely-instituted ordinary ministry. It had divinely-commissioned extraordinary teachers—the prophets. It enjoyed, in the Shekinah, the visible presence of God. And, yet, so far was this highly-favoured Church from being infallible, that when our Lord Jesus Christ came, to whom Moses and all the prophets gave testimony, the supreme ecclesiastical tribunal deliberately rejected him, and condemned him to death. *Their* authoritive exposition of the Scriptures was this.—"We have a law, and by our law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God."—John xix. 7.

The Jewish Church did not then possess the attribute of infallibility, although it was, no less than the Christian Church, chosen and founded by God, and charged with the custody of His sacred oracles. Was it because the Jewish Church needed this attribute less than the Christian? Surely not. If the Gospel revelation, by which life and immortality have been fully brought to light, requires an infallible interpreter, much more must the dark and imperfect revelations of the Old Testament have required one.

The natural capacities of men for understanding the things of God were, at least, as feeble before the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, as they are now, with the aid of that Divine Spirit illuminating their minds and hearts. Accordingly, if infallible guidance be needed now, so it was then. But it was not then vouchsafed. Therefore, the powerful argument of analogy is against the *a priori* assumption that God must have granted an infallible guide to the Christian Church.

But besides the special analogies derived from the preceding revelations, against the notion of an infallible preservative against the risk of falling into religious error, there is also, as we have said, the general analogy of God's natural government of the world. We find by daily experience that in the most essential matters relating to our temporal welfare—matters involving, not only our comfort and prosperity, but our very life itself—God has not seen fit to protect us from the risk of falling into dangerous and even fatal errors; and that prudence, and caution, and painstaking, are, generally speaking, absolutely indispensable, in order to insure our worldly welfare. The analogy of nature, therefore, shows us, that if the Scriptures could be properly understood without any trouble or risk of mistake upon man's part, and were rendered incapable of being perverted to bad purposes, they would be extremely unlike the rest of God's gifts to man, and so would give rise to a doubt very difficult to satisfy—namely, whether they came from God at all.

We most freely admit that Holy Scripture contains many things obscure and difficult, and that unless it be studied in a spirit of sobriety and caution, and, above all, of humble docility and earnest prayerfulness, it may lead, as it unfortunately has too often led, to dangerous and even fatal errors. We also freely allow that the exposure of mankind to these dangers, in a matter so momentous as their eternal salvation, and the necessity of constant and even painful vigilance to escape them, is far from what we should naturally desire, and far from what, judging merely upon principles of human wisdom, we might expect in a revelation from God. But when we reflect upon what experience naturally tells us of God's dealings with us in His ordinary government of the world, and upon the nature of His former revelations to mankind, we perceive at once, that His ways are not our ways, nor His thoughts our thoughts.—Isaiah lv. 8. We shall merely observe, that the very same line of argument which would prove the necessity of an infallible expounder of all the difficulties of Scripture, would equally prove that no such difficulties should exist at all; just as the assumed necessity of a universal infallible remedy for all diseases would lead inevitably to the conclusion that no such thing as disease could have any existence in the world. If, instead of acquiescing in what God has done, we presume to speculate upon what He might have done, according to our shortsighted notions of fitness and propriety, we shall end by denying that the world is governed by God at all, if we do not proceed to the length of sheer Atheism. Protestants do not profess to be wiser than God. They accept with humble thankfulness the revelation which He has vouchsafed to grant them, whatever the difficulties may be with which it is or seems to be encumbered.

We may now proceed to apply what has been said above, to some of the particular points noticed in Mr. Rourke's letter. If we pass over such of his statements as relate to *tradition*, considered as a rule of faith, it is not because we feel any difficulty in replying to them; but because they constitute an independent topic of discussion, and, therefore, require to be treated distinctly, as they have been already at large in this journal. On the present occasion, we will confine ourselves to what he says concerning the *written* Word, and the office of the Church relative to it.

We agree with Mr. Rourke that one purpose for which our Lord established the Church, was to "keep the precious deposit of revelation unaltered," and to transmit it to posterity. The Church of England declares, in her 20th Article, that "the Church is a witness and keeper of Holy Writ." We deny, however, that the Church is invested with the attributes of infallibility, in interpreting Scripture. *Firstly*, because it is not necessary that she should possess it. *Secondly*, because no one can infallibly determine that infallibility does exist; and, even admitting its existence, it is still a disputed question among Romanists themselves *where* it is to be found, and what is its organ. *Thirdly*, because it would be practically useless, unless every individual Christian was himself infallible.

1. Infallibility is unnecessary. Mr. Rourke, following the mass of the writers of his Church, says, that "Scripture being a dead letter, a dumb book, that cannot explain itself, Christ must have provided some visible and living authority, some supreme and unerring tribunal, to explain Scripture, and that this is, and can be no other than the Church." And, as a proof of this assertion, he notices the contradictory interpretations which have been given of three texts, relating to the necessity of baptism (John iii. 5), to the necessity of receiving the flesh and blood of Christ (John vi. 54), and the necessity of faith, in order to please God (Heb. xi. 6).

Now, in the first place, with regard to any doubts, difficulties, or obscurities, which may embarrass the essentials of salvation (and with these alone, even according to the Romanist view of the matter, we are concerned), we find, upon careful examination, that they are not of such a nature as to concern our *practice*, or the duties which we owe, either to God or to each other. The side of Christianity which looks towards us, and with which alone we are properly concerned, is sufficiently plain and easy of comprehension to every honest, humble, and patient inquirer after truth. Love to God; faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, as the one perfect and sufficient atonement for the sins of the world; and in the eternal Spirit, as the sanctifier of all that believe in Jesus—all this, with purity of life, and love and charity to our neighbour, stands inscribed upon the pages of Scripture, in characters that all may read and understand. The writings of the Fathers are full of passages in which the plainness and simplicity of Scripture, under this aspect, are declared. Thus, St. Augustine says—"God has made the Scripture to stoop to the capacity of babes and sucklings."—Enarr. in Psal., viii. 8. And, again—"In these things that are plainly delivered in the Scriptures, are found all those things that concern faith and practice."—De Doctr. Christ., book 2, cap. 9. St. Chrysostom also says—"What necessity is there for discussion? All things are plain and simple in the Holy Scriptures; all things necessary are evident."—Hom. ii. in 2 Thess. And, again, after observing that the heathen philosophers sought their own glory, and, therefore, spoke obscurely, he adds—"But the Apostles and prophets did everything the reverse of this; for, being the common teachers of the whole world, they set before all, the things that they delivered, in clear and plain terms, to the intent, 'that every one might be able, *even by himself*, to learn what is said, *from the bare reading*.'"—De Lazar., conc. iii., sec. 2, 3. And, to cite no more, St. Basil says—"Whatever seems to be spoken ambiguously or obscurely, in some places of Holy Scripture, is cleared up by what is universally acknowledged in other places."—Ascet. Quæst., 267.

Such is the testimony of some of the greatest of the Christian Fathers. They knew, and we know too, that there are speculative difficulties in Scripture, and in the aspect of it which regards the nature and councils of the Most High, which no finite intelligence can ever comprehend; and which, therefore, no interpreter of Scripture, however infallible, could possibly remove. These are among the "secret things [which belong] to the Lord our God."—Deut. xxix. 29.

But, secondly, in reference to the particular instances cited by Mr. Rourke, we answer, that with respect to the first of these—the general necessity of baptism to salvation—our Church acknowledges it quite as fully as the Church of Rome; and *that*, not because of any infallible interpretation of the passages in which the ordinance is commanded, but because the testimony of Scripture itself is perfectly clear and explicit. If some sectaries have rashly presumed to interpret the words in senses different from, or contradictory to, their obvious import, this no more proves the necessity of an infallible interpreter to ascertain the true sense, than an arbitrary and ungrammatical interpretation of some passage in a Greek or Latin author, proves that it is impossible for a sober and sound scholar to determine the true meaning, unless he is supernaturally assisted to do so.

Again, with respect to the Eucharist, we need not now discuss the question, whether the passage quoted by Mr. Rourke (John vi. 54) refers to it at all or not (as some Roman Catholic divines, including Cardinal Cajetan, have maintained); for whatever *difficulties* there may be in the passage are felt as much by Roman Catholics, who profess to *have* an infallible guide, as by Protestants. For there are just the same *differences* among Roman Catholics as to the meaning of this text as among Protestants. But waving this question, we reply, as before, that the Church of England holds, that it is generally necessary to salvation, that each professing Christian should receive the sacrament of Christ's body and blood; and this necessity she infers from what she concludes, without any pretence to infallibility, to be the clear and express command of Holy Scripture, contained in the words of our Lord's institution, recorded by the Evangelists and by St. Paul; and by the comments of St. Paul upon the institution itself. The great question on which she is at issue with the modern Roman Church, relates not to the *reality* of Christ's presence in the sacrament (which she admits as fully as the most devoted Roman Catholic), but to the *nature* of that presence. She holds with the ancient Church that the body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner; and that the means whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith—Art. xxviii. The mediæval doctrine of transubstantiation she rejects as "repugnant to the sense of Scripture, and subversive of the nature of a sacrament." Here, as in the case of baptism, before noticed, the false explanation given by some individuals or sects of the nature of the Lord's Supper, only proves their want of reverence for the plain statements of Scripture, but by no means implies that the true sense cannot be elicited without an infallible tribunal to pronounce upon it.

Lastly, with reference to the statement in Heb. xi. 6, "without faith it is impossible to please God;" every one who believes the Scripture to be God's Word admits this. The Church of Rome, infallibly-guided, as she says, maintains that works, along with faith, are necessary as the means whereby a sinner may be justified, or have his sins forgiven. The Reformers deem St. Paul's assertion—"we account a man to be justified by faith, without the works of the law" (Rom. iii. 28), a sufficient warrant upon which to base their fundamental doctrine of justification by faith only in the atonement of Christ, without works, as a *meritorious* ground of acceptance with God. They regard works as the necessary *fruits* of faith, and as an indispensable evidence that the sinner has been justified or pardoned through the merits of Christ, and is now being sanctified by the operation of the Holy Spirit of God. This grand scheme of salvation may be derived from Scripture by any simple-minded and humble reader of its pages; and if some persons have fallen into solifidian or antinomian errors, they have done so, not because of the obscurity of Scripture, but because of their own perverse wills. The remedy for such errors is not the introduction of an infallible tribunal, but the honest and candid study of the Divine Word; the true meaning of which, it seems, in this case, at least, impossible for any single-minded and teachable reader to misapprehend. At all events, if an infallible interpretation be necessary, we may fairly conclude that the Church of Rome has not yet arrived at it, inasmuch as her system of justification virtually sets aside the atonement of Christ, and assigns his place in the mediatorial office to a man's own works.

The great length to which our remarks have run, obliges us to omit some other arguments on which we wished to enlarge, and to postpone the discussion of some of Mr. Rourke's arguments on which we have not yet touched. We have the less scruple in doing so, as our readers will find every one of Mr. Rourke's objections put forward and satisfactorily answered in our correspondence with Mr. Aylmer in our first volume.

And we hope, that another time, Mr. Rourke will not "disregard our request to be brief." For his own sake we think he ought to do so. We are glad to be favoured with his communications, and should wish his arguments to be read and considered by our readers; and, yet, judging from the difficulty we found ourselves in getting through his prolix epistles, we fear that the temptation to skip may be too strong for many of our subscribers. A long letter, wandering over the entire of an extensive subject, not only leaves a vague impression on the reader's mind, but makes it impossible to give a short and pointed reply; arguments put clearly and concisely, are both more likely to be read, and it is more easy to judge whether they are or are not satisfactorily answered.

ON PURGATORY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

(Continued from page 64.)

When you insinuate my want of success, in finding purgatory in the writings of Augustine, you seem to forget that this Father says, "Cleanse me so in this life, make me such that I may not stand in need of that purifying fire, designed for those who shall be saved, yet so as by fire. And why, but because (*as the Apostle says*) they have built upon the foundation, *wood, hay, and stubble*. If they had built *gold*, and *silver*, and *precious stones*, they would be secured from both fires; not only from that in which the wicked shall be punished for ever, but, likewise, from that fire which shall purify those who shall be saved by fire. But because, it is said, he shall be saved, that fire is thought lightly of; though the suffering will be more grievous than anything men can undergo *in this life*"—Enar. in Psal. xxxvii., t. ix., p. 295. This, I maintain, without the slightest colouring of *fancy*, is, in verity, in an undeniable reality, the doctrine of purgatory itself. All

the Fathers of the fourth century, whom I have already cited, refer with equal perspicuity to 1 Cor. iii. 12, 13, 14, 15, in evidence of this doctrine. They advance no opinion but what is supported by positive texts of Scripture; and as faithful interpreters of the Word of God. I adopt this *testimony* in preference to that of any man, however learned, of the present day; and with them I can find the doctrine of purgatory; not in any opinion of their own, either dogmatic or speculative, but in the Scriptures.

My argument, founded on the evidence of these Fathers, remains uncontradicted and uncontradictable. You have advanced nothing to the contrary which amounts to an argument; unless irrelevant and unfounded objections and assumptions, can be called arguments. Your attempt to bring the Fathers into disrepute is rather too stale a device to pass for current in the meridian of the nineteenth century. Your charge against priests for taking money for masses for the dead, is another of your arguments against purgatory! These and such like arguments you oppose to the evidence of these venerable and learned witnesses, of the fourth century; the most learned age of the Church of God. Then last, the dramatic agency of *Job Tomkins* and his witness, an invincible proof that you have nothing to offer in reply to my arguments; and a happy illustration of your position in this controversy, that of an ignorant or an interested witness.

The writings of both the Latin and Greek Fathers most clearly prove, that from the earliest dawn of Christianity, the belief of purgatory was a dogma of Catholic faith; and that the Church always offered *propitiatory sacrifice* and prayers entreating pardon for those who had died in the Christian faith. *Mr. Johnson* whom you charge me with quoting "*unfairly*," admits (*page* 291, *Unbloody Sacrifice*) that the ancient Church offered *propitiatory sacrifice for* departed souls. This doctrine he allows, is obviously and unmistakeably set forth in all the *Liturgies;* "there is, I suppose, no Liturgy without them"—that is, propitiatory devotions for the dead. He next refers to the authority of the Fathers in favour of this same doctrine and practice, by which he fairly grants, that this was the doctrine of the Church from the first to the fifth century, inclusive.

But, while Mr. Johnson admits, candidly, that such is the doctrine of the Liturgies, and that the same has the wisdom of the Fathers to support it, and was, by consequence, the doctrine of the Church in this time, he tells us that those "sentiments of the early Church will be thought but only too great;" but this information came too late; nor does he find it *convenient* to prove that the Church erred in this respect. It is worthy of remark that while Mr. Johnson thus admits the plain, obvious meaning of the Liturgies and the Fathers, you as peremptorily deny the *propitiatory* doctrines of the ancients; but while he proves the fact from existing monuments, you adduce no authority of more weight than your own *dictum;* it is merely your opinion. Page 292, he tells us "the ancients did not use those prayers, as if they thought of a purgatory;" but this we must take on his word alone. Again, "They did not allow these prayers for such as they thought ill men;" hence they were not in the pitiable condition of the Church of England; they were capable of discovering whether a sinner died *impenitent* or not; they did not pray indiscriminately for all.

Same page. "The ancients believed the Eucharist a *propitiatory* sacrifice, and, therefore, put up these prayers for their deceased friends in the most solemn part of the Eucharistic office," &c.; there is no intercessary prayer for the dead, in the Protestant Liturgy. I will show, on a future occasion, that the Church of England does not at all pray for the dead. Again, "Upon whatever grounds it was, the primitive Church received this custom of praying for the dead, it is certain they had this notion of the propitiatory nature of the Eucharist from the Scriptures, and even from Christ Jesus himself," &c.; not as you maintain "*from ghost stories.*" It is useless to tell me these are *mere assertions*, and not arguments. I maintain we have in Mr. Johnson's references documentary evidence of a truly indestructible quality; evidence that he cannot pretend to ignore; that can stand the test of the most refined criticism; and that scatters to the winds every argument you have attempted to deduce from these venerable records in favour of the Protestant system of prayers for the dead.

When Mr. Johnson claims the early Church for maintaining the doctrine of prayers for the dead, as set forth in the Liturgies, and in the Fathers, he establishes an invincible argument that the doctrines of the Church, in this respect, was then totally different from that of the Protestant Church, to which he belonged. From Chrysostom, Hom. 3, in Ep. ad Philip, which he cites, it is evident the ancient Church believed that "the Apostles did not in vain command those things, that in the venerable and dreadful mysteries the dead should be remembered; for they know they would derive considerable advantage from them."

In Hom. 41, in Ep. 1. ad. Cor. he might find this same Chrysostom teaching that "the dead may be helped by prayers, and supplications, and alms, and offerings; because these things were not instituted in vain. Let us, therefore, help them; for we have before us the expiatory sacrifice of the world. Therefore, we ask confidently for all; and we name them (*the other dead*), with the *martyrs, confessors*, and *priests*. For we are all one body; though some members be more excellent than others. And it may happen that we may obtain a *total pardon* for them, by *prayers*, by *oblations*, by the *saints* who are named with them." He next cites St. Augustine declaring that "the souls of the dead are relieved by the piety of the living when the sacrifice of the Mediator is offered for them."—*Vid. in loc.* He might have added, from St. Augustine also, "That when the sacrifice of the altar or alms are offered for the faithful departed; for the very good, they are *thanksgivings;* for those not very good, they are *propitiations;* and that for those whom they profit, they are either a total remission of sins, or a more tolerable punishment." The other Fathers whom he quotes, are all vouchers of the same doctrine. Here, then, we find these venerable witnesses of the ancient Church positively maintaining a state of souls after death, wherein they are helped, favoured with a pardon of some sins, and mercifully dealt with by means of prayers, alms, and the holy sacrifice of the altar; and declaring that this was the doctrine and practice of the whole Church in their time; and that it was ordained by Christ and his Apostles. Hence, it is evident, that *Popery*, so far as regards the doctrine of purgatory, did not come into the world after the fifth century; and that, considering the testimony of these Fathers, whom Mr. Johnson cannot refuse to be members of the true Church, though he attempts to impugn their principles, it cannot be denied that Christianity, as it stood in the second, third, fourth, and fifth centuries, was something very different from modern Protestantism; and that it bore, in truth, a very close resemblance, in all material points, to the religion of the present Roman Catholic Church. Thus it is manifest, you will be compelled to relinquish all claim to the Fathers of the first four centuries, until you establish your title by adducing proofs of a more cogent character than those I have noticed; nor shall I offer another observation on the subject of purgatory until my statements shall have been first set aside by a more powerful authority than *Job Tomkins, et hoc genus omne.*

I have to apologize for the unusual length to which those observations have carried me; I shall, in future, confine myself to narrower limits.

I am sir, yours, with respect,
EDMOND POWER.

Mullinavat, March 1, 1854.

We have good hopes of coming to an agreement with Mr. Power at last. He praises the Fathers for "advancing nothing but what is supported by positive texts of Scripture;" for founding their doctrines, "not in any opinion of their own, either dogmatic or speculative, but in the Scriptures." If after so long asking in vain for proofs of Purgatory from the Fathers of the first three centuries, we get at last "positive texts of Scripture," Mr. Power has a fair chance of making converts of us. But, alas! the "positive texts of Scripture" dwindle down to one, whose reference to Purgatory Mr. Power will find it very hard to make out; and which is certainly not a *positive* text—if by that Mr. Power means a perspicuous one by which, Purgatory can be decisively demonstrated. Cardinal Bellarmine calls the text one of the most difficult and most useful in Scripture; and we believe its usefulness to him consisted in its difficulty. There was, in fact, a Scripture text in want of explanation, and a doctrine sadly in want of Scriptural proof. What could be more convenient than to pair them off together?

We refer to vol. i., p. 45, for a full discussion of the text, where it will be seen that several eminent Fathers interpret the passage without any allusion to Purgatory. However, now we shall only concern ourselves with St. Augustine's interpretation of the passage, and shall give a little fuller account of his views respecting it than Mr. Power (or the book from which he copied) thought proper to do. St. Augustine begins by telling us that the text is very difficult to be understood; that it was, no doubt, one of those passages in St. Paul's epistles which are "hard to be understood, and which the unlearned and unstable wrest to their own destruction." In fine, he says that he would prefer to hear the sentiments of others of more understanding and learning than himself. [Fateor me malle audire intelligentiores et doctiores.] If he is called on, however, to state his own opinion, the substance of it is this:—The being saved by fire, does not refer at all to those who die in grievous sin; and with regard to the rest, the fire spoken of is to try the work of *all*—as well of those whose work remaineth as of those who suffer loss. [Here we may remark is an important difference between the fire in 1 Cor. iii. and the Roman Catholic purgatorial fire, which does not try the works of the saints at all.] He goes on to explain the fire mentioned by the Apostle by referring it to the fire of earthly tribulation, and its different effects on those who sit loose to the world, and those who have suffered their affections to be too much engrossed by it. The first class, when deprived of earthly blessings, only lose that on which they have not set their hearts; the second class suffer great pain under similar privation; yet, inasmuch as they do not love these earthly things *more than Christ*, their final salvation is not hazarded.

St. Augustine goes on to say, that whether it be in this life only that men suffer such things, or whether something similar may take place after death; in either case, the explanation of the passage he has given is not far from the truth; in either case—that is, the interpretation which he was combating would be excluded—viz., that all sinners will eventually be saved so as by fire. If our readers will turn to the passages where St. Augustine discusses this question (viz., De fid. and op. Cap. 16, Enchirid. cap. 69. De Civ. Dei Lib xxi., c. 25), some of which we quote, in another article, p. 72, they will find, we think, that we have fairly represented his meaning. The truth is, that it was St. Augustine's *private opinion*—which he states in different places, with various degrees of confidence—that there might be some kind of purgatory after this life; but the hesitation he occasionally expresses that the doctrine "is *not incredible*"—that, "*perhaps*, it is true"—prove decisively that in his time the Church had no definite tradition on the subject.

In all the rest of Mr. Power's letters there is not a single quotation in proof of Purgatory. All is taken up with the old story—prayers for the dead. In his manner of conducting this controversy Mr. Power is like an artful shopkeeper, who, when not provided with the article asked for, tries to pawn off on his customer the thing most like it he has got. How often are we to tell Mr. Power that prayers for the dead are not Purgatory, and that many prayed for the dead who did not believe in Purgatory at all. In order to prove this, we need not go further than the instances Mr. Power has himself selected—Mr. Thorndike and Mr. Johnson: both believed that prayers for the dead was a laudable custom, not inconsistent with the teaching of the Church of England, and neither of them believed in Purgatory.

But Mr. Power objects, that because the Liturgy of the Church of England does not contain prayers for the dead, while such prayers are to be found in the primitive liturgies, therefore her Christianity must be very different from that of the first centuries. Now, such an objection cannot, with any consistency, be put forward by a member of the Church of Rome. For the position of that Church can only be defended by claiming for the Church of the present day a power to deviate in her public services as widely as possible from the practice of the primitive Church.

The Church of Rome acknowledges that the primitive Church used to communicate in both kinds, and yet she denies the cup to the laity. It is certain that the prayers of the primitive Church were always in a language understood by the people, and yet the prayers of the Church of Rome are in a language which but one in a hundred in this country understands. These are points in which the Church of Rome makes no scruple to deviate, not only from the practice of the primitive Church, but also to run counter to express directions of Scripture. How, then, can she find fault with the Church of England if she sees fit to discontinue prayers for the dead, for which Scripture contains no command at all?

We believe that the Church has full power to alter any parts of her ritual not enjoined in Scripture, if they are found to be practically inexpedient; and we think that the Church of England has very wisely discontinued the practice of prayers for the dead when they came to be mixed up in the minds of men with the belief that even those who had died in Christ were exposed to the most frightful torments in another state, and when this belief was made the engine for extorting money, in the most oppressive manner, from the sorrowing survivors.

FLOWERS FOR JUNE.

WE are now in the flowery month of June, and so abundant are the fair claimants on our attention, that our entire paper would fail to afford space sufficient to give them even a passing notice. So true is it, that

> "He who would sing the flowers of June
> From the gray morn to blazing noon,
> Would find his summer daylight fail,
> And leave half told the pleasing tale."

But though we cannot notice all, we have no difficulty in selecting, as pre-eminent over others, the ROSE of June—the most commonly diffused, as it is the most generally admired, and cultivated of flowers. There is no considerable part of the earth, excepting Australia and South America, in which some one, or more of its 2,000 varieties, are not to be found; and, perhaps, further research may bring to light some representative of the family, even in this southern hemisphere.

It is somewhat remarkable, that the rose bears the same name in almost every language in Europe. It is the *rose* in English, French, German, and Danish; *rosa* in Italian and Spanish, as it was in the Latin; *roza* in Russian; *ros* in Irish and Welch; and *rodon* in the Greek. It seems as if its singular beauty had communicated its own identity to the language of civilized nations, and exempted it from the curse and confusion of Babel, that mankind might have one term in common to designate this one flower. If words be the coins that represent our thoughts and ideas, then this word fully realizes the project of a distinguished Irish prelate for an universal coinage, recognised and accepted by all civilized nations. But the rose has not only secured for itself a name of universal currency, but it has even stamped that name upon nations and countries. The beautiful island of Rhodes derives its name from the multitude of roses that grow upon it; and Syria is supposed to have acquired its name from a corruption of a word signifying the land of roses. And how many countries have claimed as their own some one variety of the rose. There is not only the rose of Damascus, which might, perhaps, be considered its birth-place, the Damask Rose (Rosa Damascena) imported into England

from the Levant; and the delicate Chinese rose (*Rosa Indica*), which grows wild around Canton; and the French rose (*Rosa Gallica*), with its large open, flat, flowers; and the Provence rose (*Rosa Centifolia*), called from its numerous petals, closely folded over each other, like the cabbage; after which homely but respectable vegetable it is usually called. The Provence rose has for one of its varieties the beauteous moss rose, invested with a veil of moss to protect it from the chilly air of our northern latitude, which it loses when removed to the milder atmosphere of southern Europe. Then to come nearer home, we have the Scotch rose, with its varieties of pretty blush roses; and Ireland has her own peculiar rose, as we find in Mackay's "Flora Hibernica," the *Rosa Hibernica*, a small species of the family. So the Bourbons of France had their rose, well known by its rich, dark velvet leaves; and the royal houses of York and Lancaster had their roses; the York rose, red, and the Lancaster rose, white; and those rival emblems instead of being peaceful sisters, have confronted each other on the deadly battle-field, and were through four successive reigns, dyed in the noblest blood of England, in the memorable struggles, called the "War of the Roses," until the two royal houses and roses were united in the persons of Henry VII., of Lancaster, and Mary, of York. Since that happy event, the national badge of England has been the two roses of York and Lancaster united.

But not the least interesting of the roses is the wild dog-rose (*Rosa Canina*) found in our hedgerows, and among the heather, at this time of the year, in full and glorious blow. No garden rose surpasses it in the richness of its perfume; and it forms the sound and homely stock on which are engrafted all the varieties of rare and exotic roses cultivated by florists.

The ancients had a custom at their convivial meetings of suspending a white rose over the doorway, to indicate that nothing which passed at the feast was to transpire beyond. Hence, the white rose became the emblem of silence, and anything spoken under the rose (*sub rosa*) is expected not to be disclosed.

Our readers would be wearied were we to collect the allegorical and fanciful allusions to the rose to be found in the poetry of all nations, especially in the east where an annual festival is celebrated in honour of it.

In the sacred Scriptures, too, the rose is mentioned always with distinguished honour. The prophet Isaiah (who wrote more clearly of Christ, and the plan of free, full, perfect, and entire salvation, through his precious blood-shedding, than any other of the prophets) describes the flourishing character of Christ's kingdom, by the blossoming of the rose. The world is compared to the wilderness; but when the Sun of Righteousness shall have come, it is said "the desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose. It shall blossom abundantly, and rejoice even with joy and singing; the glory of Lebanon shall be given unto it; the excellency of Carmel and Sharon; they shall see the glory of the Lord and the excellency of our God. And an highway shall be there, and a way, and it shall be called, the way of holiness; the unclean shall not pass over it; no lion shall be there, nor any ravenous beast shall go thereon; but the redeemed shall walk thereon, and the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs, and everlasting joy upon their heads; they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away."—Isaiah xxxv. This is a very beautiful connection in which to find the rose mentioned; but can we pass from it without inquiring what is this *way of holiness* spoken of by the prophet, as about to be introduced when Christ should come. The answer is to be found in two short passages of the Bible (as well in the Douay as in the Protestant Version)—"I am *the way*, and the truth, and the life," says our Lord, in St. John's Gospel, xiv. 6. "Christ Jesus who of God is made unto us wisdom, *righteousness*, and sanctification, and redemption," says St. Paul, 1 Cor. i. 30. This is the *way of holiness* which Isaiah foretold, and which has come to pass in the person of Christ Jesus.

In another place, Christ is represented as addressing his Church under the figure of a rose—"I am the rose of Sharon."—Canticles ii. 1. Sharon was the name of several delightful spots in Canaan, noted for the excellency of their roses; and as the rose was deemed superior in loveliness to all other flowers, so Christ presents himself to his believing Church, as combining in his person, character, office, and mediation, every excellency.

The LILY, next to the rose, is the flower, perhaps, most of all invested with traditions and associations of the past. It is, both in fiction and fact, a formidable rival of the rose. It is even said that the flowers once elected the lily as their queen, but afterwards deposed her in favour of the rose.

The white lily (*Lilium candidum*) appears this month in all its beauty and purity. It can scarcely be the lily mentioned in the Canticles or Song of Solomon, or in our Lord's Sermon on the Mount, as it does not grow, as a wild flower in Syria. The fields of Palestine do abound with a species of amaryllis, generally supposed to correspond with our scarlet Martagon lily (*Lilium Chalcedonicum*), and which, especially in Galilee, was in flower at the season of the year when our Lord delivered his discourse on the Mount, and alluded to the lilies of the field as surpassing the splendour of Solomon in the beauty of their attire. In the Canticles or Song of Solomon, the lily of the valley or of the lowly places, is introduced, perhaps, as an emblem of the humiliation of Christ, in taking our nature upon him, and dwelling among sinful men.

The lily (*Fleur de lis*) was the heraldic device of the French monarchy, during the long reign of the Bourbon family.

So the BROOM, a much humbler plant, was the device of a haughtier race—the Plantagenets of England. The "bonnaie broom" (*Genesta scoparia*), now in luxuriant blossom, with its myriads of golden flowers glittering over hill and heather, and gladdening the heart of the former, who regards its luxuriance as an earnest of a plenteous harvest, gave to the family which so long occupied the throne of England their patronymic of Plantagenet, *Planta genista*. One tradition maliciously reports that an ancient warrior of the race acquired the name as a soubriquet, having submitted to an ecclesiastical admonition, in the shape of a flagellation with a birch rod. Another tradition—we hope more veracious—tells that Geoffry, Earl of Anjou, having once placed a sprig of the broom in his helmet on the day of battle, thence acquired the name of Plantagenet. Be this as it may, no haughtier race ever swayed the sceptre of England than that which adopted its name and device from the lowly broom.

It is generally supposed that the same shrub is referred to in Scripture, in the history of Elijah, when the prophet, fearing a wicked woman (Jezebel), and mistrusting the power and faithfulness of his God, fled into the wilderness, and sat down under a juniper tree (*Rothem*, or broom shrub), and cried—"It is enough now, O Lord, take away my life, for I am not better than my fathers." Sad instance of human weakness and unbelief; and yet the angel of the Lord was at hand, and, while the prophet slept, touched him, and said, "Arise and eat."

That the broom plant is that referred to is rather confirmed by the poet Virgil, who speaks of the humble broom as giving grateful shelter to the cattle from the burning rays of the southern sun.*

We have another native of the heather and moorlands, hills and commons, in the FURZE (*Ulex Europæus*), whose bright-yellow flowers are known to us all, greeting us, from May till September, with their sweet perfume. With us the furze is an evergreen, and hardy enough to bear the coldest winds and frosts; but in more northern climates it will not grow; and the great naturalist, Linnæus, in vain attempted to introduce it into Sweden. It is the poor man's flower and also the poor man's firing, and affords him a more fragrant fuel, than his rich neighbour can command. In Russia, the furze is cultivated in greenhouses as a rare exotic, and Linnæus is said to have fallen on his knees, and thanked God for its loveliness, when first he beheld it; and yet how little, comparatively, do we prize it or the best gifts of God when they are most profusely bestowed.

The French call it *Jonc marine*, from its thriving so well on the sea shore; the Scotch call it *gorse*, and the Irish call it *whin*. There was discovered, about forty years ago, in the Marquis of Londonderry's park, in the county of Down, a very curious variety of the wild furze, with double flowers, now called the *Irish* whin—a very luxuriant and well furnished plant for the garden or shrubbery, and now propagated in nurseries.

Passing from the heather to the woods and bye-ways, we meet the fragrant SWEET-BRIER rose (*Rosa rubigenosa*)—the eglantine of the poets. It is a genuine member of the rose family, though very wild in its nature, and truly emblematic of simplicity. Here we also meet the rich red and yellow clusters of the HONEYSUCKLE, or woodbine (*Caprifolium*, so called from its goat-like propensities of climbing). Along the ditches we may also meet the wild scarlet POPPY. The common red poppy (*Papaver rhœum*) was in more esteem with the farmers of the olden times than it seems to be with the more matter-of-fact men of our day. They regarded the flowers of the poppy among their wheat as a guarantee of the richness of the soil and the success of their cultivation. Now-a-days the poppy is regarded as a most troublesome intruder, and the very emblem and personification of impudence; and, in truth, the poppies do look so proud and saucy, that, without much stretch of the imagination, we might fancy them singing—

> "We little red-caps are among the corn,
> Merrily dancing at early morn.
> We know that the farmer hates to see
> Our saucy red faces—but here are we.
> We pay no price for our summer coats,
> Like those slavish creatures, barley and oats.
> We don't choose to be ground and eat,
> Like our heavy-head neighbour, gaffer wheat.
> Who dare thrash us, we should like to know,
> Grind us, and bag us, and use us so?
> Let meaner and shabbier things than we
> So stupidly bend to utility."

But yet the reaper comes, in due season, to reap the wheat; and then the poor popples shake in their scarlet coats; and well they may, for while the corn is safely gathered and garnered up, the poppy weeds are cast into the fire to be burnt. What an emblem of the arrogance and pride of so many of our poor worldlings, who flaunt for a while in the summer sun of prosperity, and fancy they are the ornaments of the earth, and know not that, but for the righteous few, whom they despise, they would not be suffered to grow one hour, and are spared because the harvest time has not yet arrived, and that until then they cannot be separated without injury to the wheat.

Passing again from the roadside to the meadow and riverside, we meet a sweet and lowly little flower, known to everybody by the engaging name of FORGET-ME-NOT (*Myosotis palustris*), or water *scorpion* grass. It is most commonly found along the margin of a running stream, or in marshy places; another species of it is found in the fields (*Myosotis arvensis*). A great deal of poetry has been written about the forget-me-not, much too sentimental for our pages; but every lover of flowers must, one time or other, have admired a little flower with brilliant blossoms of intense, clear blue, like a turquoise, and a small, rich golden centre, fringing the banks of a stream during the summer months, though he may not have written verses upon it, or sung as Coleridge did of

> "The blue and bright-eyed flowret of the brook,
> Hope's gentle gem, the sweet forget-me-not."

One of the many legends accounting for the name of the forget-me-not, as it is narrated by a bishop, in verse, we being laymen may venture to give in prose. It says the name was taken from the dying words of a gallant knight who was drowned in the rapids of the Danube, while attempting to gather the flowers for a lady, on the banks of the river. Miss Strickland, the historian of the Queens of England, has lately given a more historical, if less romantic, derivation to the name. She says that one of the royal Plantagenet princes, the banished Henry of Lancaster, gave the flower to his fair hostess, the Duchess of Bretagne, as a parting appeal to memory, with his watchword, "Souvenyne vous de moy," and thus enlisted her active and valuable assistance and sympathy in his behalf. The forget-me-not thus became not only the emblem of remembrance, but an historical flower, like the fatal roses of York, Lancaster, and Stuart, the lily of Bourbon, and the violet of Napoleon.

With the sentimental trash, of which volumes have been indited, respecting the forget-me-not, we profess to have no sympathy; but yet it is impossible to take the sweet little flower from the hand of a friend or loved one, without paying tribute to the sentiment interwoven with its name. If our thoughts of others were to last no longer than while they are present to the eye, life would lose one of its holiest and happiest employments. The forget-me-not, as a gage of friendship to a parting friend, seems well to say—

> "Oh, think of me in the calm, holy hour,
> Devotion's own, when thou in prayer art bending.
> On thee may heaven every blessing shower;
> Still let our prayers, though absent, thus be blending.'

This sort of remembrance we find abundantly exemplified in the Scriptures. Paul, writing to Timothy, says—"I thank my God that, without ceasing, I have remembrance of thee in my prayers night and day."—2 Tim. i. 3. Again, to the Colossians, St. Paul writes—"We do not cease to pray for you, and to desire that ye might be filled with the knowledge of his will."—Col. i. 9. The same Apostle appeared to set a like value on the prayers of others for himself, for he writes to the Thessalonians—"Finally, brethern, pray for us, that the Word of God may have free course and be glorified, even as it is with you."—2 Thess. iii. 6; and also he wrote to the Hebrews—"Pray for us." Heb. xiii. 18. This, however, is a very different matter from praying for the dead, for which no warrant is to be found in the Scripture, and we read of no prayers for the departed Stephen, nor the many early Christians who have died in the lifetime of the Apostles.

* "Humilesque genestæ
Aut illæ pecori frondem aut pastoribus umbras
Sufficiunt."

FARM OPERATIONS FOR JUNE.

(*From the Irish Farmers' Gazette.*)

THE present genial, dropping weather, if properly taken advantage of, must greatly facilitate all farming operations—the baked-up earth absorbing every drop of moisture, and as it falls slaking the hardened clods, and enabling the harrows, rollers, and clod-crushers to reduce them to the finest possible tilth, for the reception of either seeds or plants. The utmost exertion is, therefore, now necessary in forwarding all those operations, and in getting in all seeds and plants suitable to the season.

Carrots and Parsnips will require close attention. The same directions given for the management of Swedes and mangel are applicable to carrots and parsnips, with this difference, that the plants should be singled out to eight or nine inches, plant from plant. Spare no exertions in the extirpation of weeds, for if allowed to get a-head while the plants are young, no after-culture will restore them.

Beans and Peas, if sown in drills, will require horse-hoeing, and a little fresh earth thrown up to the plant by the double mould-board plough.

Buckwheat may be sown on exhausted land, after being ploughed and thoroughly cleaned for the purpose of ploughing it in as green manure, as a preparation for wheat or other corn crops, the crop should be rolled down with a heavy roller, and ploughed in when in flower.

Cabbages should be planted before the end of the month to insure a remunerative crop; they require good, deep land, and plenty of manure.

Potatoes should be kept thoroughly clean and well earthed up; but after the tops are grown long, the crop should not be trespassed amongst.

New and Recent Works

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

Booksellers to the Queen,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

MORE WORLDS THAN ONE. The Creed of the Philosopher, and the Hope of the Christian. By Sir David Brewster. 6s.

THE LAND OF SINIM; or, China and Chinese Missions. By the Rev. William Gillespie. 5s.

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY; with an Inquiry into the Causes of its Inefficiency: with a especial reference to the Ministry of the Establishment. By the Rev. Charles Bridges, A.M. Eighth Edition; corrected and enlarged. 10s. 6d.

PITCAIRN; the Island, the People, and the Pastor. By Rev. Thomas Boyles Murray. 3s.

FIRST FRUITS OF AN EARLY-GATHERED HARVEST. Twelve Sermons by the Rev. Moore Macintosh, A.B. With an Introductory Memoir by the Rev. Arthur Rowan, D.D. 3s.

LECTURES DELIVERED BEFORE THE YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION, IN EXETER HALL. 1853-54. 4s.

AN INQUIRY INTO THE ORGANIZATION AND GOVERNMENT OF THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH. By Rev. Albert Barnes. 2s.

CLAUDE, THE COLPORTEUR. By the Author of "Mary Powell." 7s. 6d.

THE CONDITION AND PROSPECTS OF THE GREEK, OR ORIENTAL CHURCH. By George Waddington, D.D. 3s. 6d.

THE RUSSIAN SHORES OF THE BLACK SEA, IN THE AUTUMN of 1852, with a Voyage down the Volga, and a Tour through the Country of the Don Cossacks. By Lawrence Oliphant. 8vo. 14s.

RUSSIA AND THE RUSSIANS; comprising an account of the Czar Nicholas, and the House of Romanoff, with a sketch of the Encroachments of Russia from the reign of the Empress Catherine. By J. H. Cole, 21st Fusileers. 2s. 6d.

THE RUSSO-TURKISH CAMPAIGN OF 1828-29; with a View of the present State of the Eastern Question. By Colonel Chesney. 12s.

TURKEY, RUSSIA, THE BLACK SEA, AND CIRCASSIA. By Captain Spencer. With Coloured Illustrations and a Map. 6s.

LIVES OF THE EMPEROR OF RUSSIA, NICHOLAS I.; AND THE SULTAN OF TURKEY, ABDUL MEDJID KHAN. By the Rev. Henry Christmas. 2s. 6d.

CYCLOPEDIA OF BIOGRAPHY, containing the Lives of the most Ramarkable Individuals of all Times and Nations. Edited by E. Rich. With 150 Illustrations. 12s. 6d.

TRANSCAUCASIA. Sketches of the Nations and Races between the Black Sea and the Caspian. By Baron Von Haxthausen. 18s.

HOME TRUTHS: being Miscellaneous Addresses and Tracts. By the Rev. J. C. Kyle. 3rd Series. 3s. 6d.

EXAMINATION OF MR. MAURICE'S THEOLOGICAL ESSAYS. By Robert S. Candlish, D.D. Crown 8vo. 6s.

HOPE DEFERRED, NOT LOST; a Narrative of Missionary effort in South America. With Journals of Captain Gardiner, &c. 5s.

THE HISTORY OF THE FRENCH PROTESTANT REFUGEES, from the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. By Charles Weiss. 8vo. 14s.

ON THE PLURALITY OF WORLDS. An Essay. 8vo. 8s.

LECTURES ON ARCHITECTURE AND PAINTING, delivered at Edinburgh, in November, 1853. By John Ruskin. 8s. 6d.

ORR'S CIRCLE OF THE SCIENCES. A Series of Treatises on the Principles of Science, with the application to Practical Pursuits. Vol. I. 2s. 6d.

THE MUSEUM OF SCIENCE AND ART. Edited by Dr. Lardner. Vols. I. and II. 1s. 6d. each.

THE CHEMISTRY OF COMMON LIFE. By James F. W. Johnston. Vol. I. 5s.

LESSONS and TRIALS OF LIFE. By the Author of "Bertha's Journal." 6s.

WORK: PLENTY TO DO AND HOW TO DO IT. By Margaret Maria Brewster. 4s.

THE LADY UNA AND HER QUEENDOM; or, Reform at the Right End By the Author of "Home Truths for Home Peace." 7s.

THE WORKS OF THE REV. SIDNEY SMITH. New Edition. 3 vols. Fcap. 8vo. 21s.

THE BOOK AND ITS STORY: a Narrative for the Young, on occasion of the Jubilee of the British and Foreign Bible Society. By L. N. R. With an Introductory preface, by Rev. T. Phillips. Fcap. 4s.

THE WORKS OF SIR JAMES MACRINTOSH. New Edition. 3 vols. Fcap. 8vo. 21s.

CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL ESSAYS. By the Right Hon. Thomas Babington Macaulay. 3 vols. 21s.

ALISON'S HISTORY of EUROPE, from the fall of Napoleon, in 1815, to the Establishment of Military Government in France, in 1852; being a continuation of his former celebrated Work. Vols. I., II., and III. 8vo. 15s. each.

THE LIFE OF MRS. SHERWOOD. Edited by her Daughter. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

MEMOIR OF THE LIVES OF ROBERT AND JAMES A. HALDANE. By Alexander Haldane, Esq. 8vo. 12s.

THE BUD OF PROMISE: a Memoir of Eliza H. M. Græme. By the Rev. D. Pitcairn. 3s. 6d.

MY SCHOOLS AND MY SCHOOLMASTERS; or, the Story of my Education. By Hugh Miller. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

CHALMERS'S DAILY SCRIPTURE READINGS. 2 vols. 10s.

CHALMERS'S SABBATH SCRIPTURE READINGS. 2 vols. 10s.

MEMOIRS OF THOMAS CHALMERS, D.D., LL.D. By his Son-in-Law, the Rev. Wm. Hanna, LL.D. 2 vols. 12s.

PLAIN SPEAKING. First series. Being forty short, Large-type Tracts. By the Rev. J. C. Ryle, B.A. In packet. 1s.

GRATITUDE: an Exposition of the Hundred and Third Psalm. By the Rev. John Stevenson. 8vo. 6s.

SYNONYMS of the NEW TESTAMENT. By Rev. Richard Chenevix Trench. 5s.

A SELECTION of ENGLISH SYNONYMS. Edited by Archbishop Whately. 3s.

ON THE STUDY of WORDS. By Rev. Richard C. Trench. 3s. 6d.

ON THE LESSONS in PROVERBS. By Rev. Rd. C. Trench. 3s.

A NEW DICTIONARY of SYNONYMS, arranged in alphabetical order. By D. L. Mackenzie. 3s. 6d.

QUICKSANDS on FOREIGN SHORES. Edited by Mrs. Whately. 3s. 6d.

THE DENS of LONDON: Notes and Narratives of a Six Years' Mission among them. By R. W. Vanderkiste. Cheap Edition. 1s. 6d.

BLACK'S GUIDE BOOKS for TOURISTS; with Road Maps and numerous Illustrations:—
I. England, 10s. 6d. II. Scotland, 8s. 6d. III. Ireland, 6s.

HANDBOOK of ANGLING: teaching Fly-fishing, Trolling, Bottom-fishing, and Salmon-fishing. By Ephemera. 5s.

THE SEASIDE BOOK: being an Introduction to the Natural History of the British Coasts. By W. H. Harvey, M.D. New Edition. 5s.

A BOOK for the SEASIDE. With numerous Engravings. 3s. 6d.

A POPULAR HISTORY of BRITISH SEA-WEEDS, with Notices of some of the Fresh-water Algæ. By Rev. D. Landsborough. 10s. 6d.

A POPULAR HISTORY of BRITISH FERNS, comprising all the Species. By Thomas Moore. Coloured Illustrations. 10s. 6d.

JOHNSTON'S MAP OF THE SEAT OF WAR, in the Danubian Principalities. 1s.

JOHNSTON'S NEW MAP OF THE BLACK SEA, CAUCASUS, CRIMEA, ETC., with enlarged plans of Sevastopol and the Bosphorus. 1s.

JOHNSTON'S CHART OF THE NORTH SEA, and the BALTIC, with the Countries adjoining; and Enlarged Plans of Cronstadt and Revel. 1s.

Lately Published,

WILLET'S "SYNOPSIS PAPISMI." New Edition. Edited by the Rev. J. Cumming, D.D. Ten vols. 8vo. Price £3.

London: JAMES MILLER, 17, Berner's-street, Oxford-street, and all Booksellers.

About June 15 will be published,

THE INSPIRATION OF HOLY SCRIPTURE, its Nature and Proof. Eight Discourses preached before the University of Dublin. By William Lee, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College.

Dublin: JAMES M'GLASHAN, 50, Upper Sackville-street. London: RIVINGTONS, Waterloo-place.

A SERMON FOR THE TIMES.

Just published, price 6d., or by Post.

A Sermon, preached at Evington, Parish of Painstown, in the Morning, also, at Carlow, in the Evening, on the Day of General Fast and Humiliation, April 26, 1854. By the Rev. William L. Pownall, A.M.

(Published by request; the profits to be devoted to the Irish Society.)

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY AND Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street. Carlow: THOMAS EDWARDS.

Just Published, Fcap. 8vo., Price 2s. 6d.

I.

THE FIRST RESURRECTION: Being Comments on First Corinthians, chapter xv. By the Rev. Robert Noble, A.M., Vicar of Athboy.

II.

Fcap. 8vo., cloth, price 1s. 6d.

THE PRINCIPLES OF ELOCUTION: Compiled from "The Elements of Rhetoric, by Archbishop Whately." With considerable additions and alterations.

III.

New Edition, Fcap. 8vo., cloth, Price 2s. 6d.

THE COLLECTS OF THE LITURGY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND,

Catechetically Explained, Compared with Scripture, and Briefly Commented upon, with the Date and Origin of each Collect annexed. For the use of Families and Sunday Schools.

By the Rev. Charles Miller, A.B.,

With Recommendatory Preface by the Bishop of Meath.

IV.

Fcap. 8vo., Neat Cover, Price 1s.

Cloth, 1s. 6d.; Cloth, Gilt Edges, 2s.

THE TALK OF THE ROAD: Showing how Irish people talk about Irish doings, when they get a quiet place, at the back of a ditch, or under a hedge.

V.

Royal 32mo., Price One Halfpenny each.

Stories about the Mission Work in Ireland.

THE BRIGHT SIDE OF A DARK CLOUD.
BIDDY LACY.
FLOWERS TRANSPLANTED.
THE SHORES OF LOUGH CORRIB.
THE FIRST SCHOOLS IN CLIFDEN.

(The Series to be continued).

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY AND Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London: WERTHEIM AND MACKINTOSH.

CHEAP ISSUE

OF THE

SELECT WORKS OF DR. CHALMERS.

Edited by the Rev. Wm. Hanna, LL.D.

In Monthly Parts, at . . . . 1s. 0d.
In Half Volumes—two each quarter, at 2s. 6d.
Quarterly Volumes, cloth . . . 6s. 0d.

Part I. and first Half Vol., commencing with Lectures on the Epistle to the Romans, on 1st July, 1854.

Subscribers supplied by WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON, and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher, WILLIAM CURRY, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

JUNE, 1854.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Gloir do Dhia an fna hárduib, agus síodcáin air an dtalamh deaghoil do na dáoinib.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED THE MIDDLE OF EVERY MONTH, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. III.—No. 31. JULY, 1854. { Annual Subscription, 3s. 6d. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

PAGE.

The Variations and Revelations of Romanism—No. II. . . 79
Modern Worship in Rome—No. III.—Indulgences . . . 81
Extravagant of Pope John XXII.—Our Lord God the Pope . 82
Are the Doctrines and Practices of the Reformed Churches or those of the Church of Rome the more obnoxious to the charge of Heresy? 83
Spurious Works attributed to the Fathers—St. Athanasius and St. Basil 84
The Invocation of Saints—No. II. 84
General charges against the CATHOLIC LAYMAN—Proofs challenged—An honest Capuchin Friar's Plan for putting down Slander . 85
CORRESPONDENCE:
On Purgatory—by Mr. Collette 86
On Infallibility—by Mr. Rourke 87
Must the Divinely authorized Interpreters of a Revelation be necessarily infallible?—by a Kildare Churchman . . 88
Flowers for July 89
Farming Operations for July 90

VARIATIONS OF ROMANISM—No. II.

WE are told in the "Vicar of Wakefield" of a worthy lady who would never allow her daughters to go about without gold in their pocket; but the poor girls only carried the guinea in their purse under strict orders that they were on no account to change it, and were never to spend a penny of it. For our part, we would rather have a shilling that we might spend, than a guinea that we were only to make a brag of.

Now, we have good reason for thinking that the boasted infallibility of the Church of Rome is like Miss Primrose's guinea—intended for show, and not for use. We refer those of our readers, who have preserved our early numbers, to an article in our first number, "Does the Church of Rome believe in her own infallibility," for some of the grounds of our opinion. They will there see how the Church of Rome allows her members to work out their controversies among themselves, precisely in the same way as members of communities which do not profess to be infallible—they will see how she shuffles and evades decisions on disputed questions, and how the disputants themselves do not care to obtain a decision from her, as they would if they really sought to know the truth, and believed that she was able to declare it to them—and they will see how, on the other hand, the disputants interpose delays, and endeavour to prevent her deciding in favour of their adversaries, because they know that, though her ultimate decision will not necessarily be the truth, they will be bound to submit to it. The infallibility, then, in short, of the Church of Rome is a treasure which she is fond of boasting of, when in controversy with those who make no pretensions to it, but which when it is required by her own members she will not spend a penny of.

A remarkable instance of this economy of the Church of Rome is afforded by the controversy of the Immaculate Conception. Mr. Newman, somewhere or other, apologizes for the dissensions between Roman Catholics somewhat as follows:—"Catholics dispute among themselves as long as the infallible judge is silent; the judge speaks, and then all controversy is hushed." Now, he would have been far nearer to the truth if he had altered the order of the latter two clauses, and said—"All controversy is hushed, and then the judge speaks." There was a time when this subject of the Immaculate Conception was the subject of the fiercest disputes; when each of the contending parties charged each other with deadly heresy; when private Christians, puzzled by the opposite statements of learned men on both sides, must have turned anxiously to the infallible judge, in the hope to learn from him the true doctrine which they were to believe; but all this time their infallible guide was silent. He trimmed and wavered between both parties, and sought to make peace between them, without giving a triumph to either. Was this like the infallible guide of Christians? or would the most ignorant layman have acted very differently if he had the misfortune to be the governor of a body, divided into two powerful parties, and were called on to pronounce a decision between them, on a subject he knew nothing about? Now, however, that it is a subject Roman Catholics have ceased disputing about; now that a decision can give no information to anybody; now that every one knows beforehand what way the decision will go; *now*, we understand, the Pope intends to be kind enough to pronounce judgment on this subject—we fear we shall gain as little knowledge from the directions of such a guide as from the predictions of the celebrated infallible prophet who undertook to tell the winner of every race—after the race was run.

We are not so unreasonable as to expect that an infallible guide (if such a thing there be) should pronounce a decision on *every* subject which may chance to become a matter of discussion among Christians. Some points may be debated which are matters of mere speculation, and on which the Almighty has vouchsafed to give us no certain information. On such topics we think it would be no disgrace to one professing to be the infallible guide of Christendom, were he also to keep silence. But there are other matters respecting which we may be sure that one appointed by God to teach his people, without risk of error, cannot fail to be correctly informed. For instance, we should not credit the pretensions of one who claimed to be an infallible guide, if he were unable to settle the canon of Scripture; and if he could not distinguish between true Revelations from God, and the heated fancies of silly enthusiasts. Both within and without the pale of the Church of Rome, it has happened that persons whose thoughts have been much occupied about religion, have supposed themselves to be favoured with miraculous communications from God. Such persons were St. Theresa, Johanna Southcote, St. Gertrude, &c. Now, among Protestants, persons of this kind do not find it easy to get any one to listen to their pretensions; they are joined by no sober-minded person; they collect a few foolish people, for a while, into a small sect; and, in a few years, there is an end of them. But, in the Church of Rome, these pretenders not only gather a larger band of followers, but they meet with no opposition, even from those of their communion who do not believe in them. Few Roman Catholics would grudge any honours (not even excepting the title of saint) given to a pious woman of this kind, even though they think it no part of their faith to believe in her asserted Revelations.

Now, what we wish to point out is, that there can be no medium in this matter. Any one who claims to have received a Revelation from God, must be either as much deluded as Johanna Southcote, or as much inspired as St. Paul. We believe what St. Peter and St. Paul taught, not because they said it, but because God communicated their doctrine to them; and if there be any one else to whom God has revealed truths, we are bound to receive such truths with the same reverence and assent which we give to what was taught by the Apostles themselves. We complain, then, that there is in the Church of Rome a mass of teaching which claims to be Revelation from God himself, and which, as such, demands our unhesitating allegiance; that no Roman Catholic can tell, with the certainty of faith, whether such claims are well founded or not; that a difference of opinion on this subject prevails among them; and that their infallible guide has never been able to solve the difficulty. In short, there prevails in the Church of Rome the greatest uncertainty as to the grand question of the RULE OF FAITH.

There is in the Roman Catholic Church a mass of teaching which claims to be founded on direct Revelations from God, given to men and women, on whom that Church has bestowed the highest title of saints, and yet no Roman Catholic can tell, with the certainty of faith, whether these are true Revelations, or mere fanatical delusions. Why does not their infallible guide come forward and solve this difficulty? Is it that he does not know how?

The authority of these asserted Revelations is not a mere speculative question; for doctrines are founded on them; and, indeed, on them is based a great part of the teaching given by Roman Catholic pastors to their flocks. We shall take as an example to illustrate our assertion the doctrine of Purgatory, on which we made some observations in our last number. We there expressed our conviction that the belief even in the existence of such a place as Purgatory, had its origin in legends and in stories of visions and revelations. We could, if space permitted, give many examples of the kind of stories which were devoutly believed in the middle ages, and which were instrumental in fastening the belief of this doctrine on the minds of the people. Many of our educated Roman Catholic readers, we are aware, would give as little credence to such stories as we do ourselves, and will indignantly deny that such legends had any share in fostering their belief in Purgatory. And yet, how often may we observe that a man's belief in an opinion may remain even long after he has ceased to give credence to the stories in which his belief originated? How many a one who has heard in the nursery stories of ghosts and apparitions, will tremble in the dark, long after he has been convinced of the falsity of the stories out of which his fears have originated? Just so, the belief in Purgatory has survived the legends out of which it took its origin; and the arguments which educated Roman Catholics now advance in its behalf, from Scripture and tradition, are only an afterthought, contrived to afford some more plausible account of their belief than that which facts will justify.

We propose, however, in the present article, to deal not with the mere Tridentine doctrine of Purgatory, but with the improvements that have been made in the doctrine *since* the Council of Trent, and with the doctrine as at present popularly taught by priests of the Church of Rome.

The Council of Trent (whose rule of faith embraced only Scripture and tradition), though not wanting in courage to build a large fabric of doctrine on a narrow enough foundation of Scripture and history, yet, on this doctrine of Purgatory, was able to assert nothing more positive than the vague statement, "that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls detained there are helped by the prayers of the faithful." But modern Roman Catholics are not contented with so scanty information; and as their rule of faith embraces not only Scripture and tradition, but new revelations as well, they have access to lights which the Fathers of Trent had not. We take from Father Faber's book, "All for Jesus," of which we gave some account in the last number, the following points of doctrine concerning Purgatory, which were unknown to the Council of Trent, but are now propounded on the authority of Revelations, for the undoubting assent of the Roman Catholic laity. And our readers must remember, that the book from which we quote only treats of Purgatory incidentally; we could much enlarge our list did we make use of a work treating professedly of that subject.

We request our readers to turn back to our article on the "Variations of Romanism," in the last number, and they will find in the quotations there given how much of the doctrine of Purgatory, as taught by Father Faber, is based on asserted Revelations; and we only add here his proof of the antiquity of this line of argument. "In the subject matter of Purgatory we may, with the less scruple, make use of such Revelations, from the example of so grave an authority as Cardinal Bellarmine himself, who, in his treatise of Purgatory, as I have already said, adds always some private Revelations as a distinct head of proof"—p. 396.

We now give a list of some of the new points of doctrine taught by Mr. Faber on this authority.

(1) The Virgin Mary is Queen of Purgatory, and the Archangel Michael is her prime minister.

"Look at that vast kingdom of Purgatory with its Empress Mother, Mary"—p. 8.

"Mary's kingdom of Purgatory."—p. 9. "The glorious secretary of that wide realm, the blessed Michael, Mary's subject."—p. 9. "That still, calm, patient realm, over which Mary is crowned as Queen, and Michael, as the perpetual ambassador of her mercy."—p. 355. [Mary is] in a particular sense, the Queen of Purgatory"—p. 373. "St. Michael, Prince of Purgatory, and our Lady's Regent"—p. 376.

We should like to know on what authority Mr. Faber states all this?

(2) The souls in Purgatory cannot help themselves; Jesus cannot help them, and (what appears to Mr. Faber still more astonishing) even the Virgin Mary cannot help them; they depend altogether on us; they depend more on earth than on heaven.

"The state of the holy souls is one of the most unbounded helplessness. They cannot do penance; they cannot merit; they cannot satisfy; they cannot gain indulgences; they have no sacraments; they are not under the jurisdiction of God's vicar, overflowing with the plenitude of means of grace and manifold benedictions. They

are a portion of the Church without either priesthood or altar at their command"—p. 369.

"In what strange abandonment of supernatural suffering has the love of Jesus left them! He longs for their deliverance—yet He has tied His own hands, or nearly so. He gives them no more grace; He allows them no more time for merit; He prevents them from meriting; nay, some have thought they could not pray. How, then, stands the case with the souls in the suffering Church? Why it is a thing to be meditated on when we have said it—they *depend almost more on earth than on heaven, almost more on us than on Him.*"

"They lie like the paralytic at the pool. Not even the coming of the angel is any blessing to them, unless there be some one of us to help them. Some have even thought they cannot pray; anyhow, they have no means of making themselves heard by us, on whose charity they depend.* Some writers have said that our Blessed Lord will not help them without our co-operation; and that our Blessed Lady cannot help them, except in indirect ways, because she is no longer able to make satisfaction, though I never like to hear of anything our dearest Mother cannot do"—p .368.

It is remarkable that it does not shock Mr. Faber to hear of the Saviour's hands being tied; but the moment it is asserted that the Blessed Virgin is equally powerless, then his feelings are revolted.

"God has given us such power over the dead that they seem, as I said before, to depend almost more on earth than on heaven"—p. 349.

"Beautiful is the helplessness in which, for the love of us, Jesus mostly wills to be, with regard to His dear sponses in Purgatory, whose entrance into glory His heart is so impatiently awaiting"—p. 350.

We again ask, what is the authority on which the doctrines here taught rest? Have they any foundation in Scripture or antiquity? It is too easy to point out the interest which certain persons had in propounding it. It was a natural thought to occur to men, when asked to expend their money in masses for the souls of their departed friends in Purgatory, that the love of Jesus, to the souls whose sins were forgiven for His sake, could not suffer them to undergo any needless suffering; and that we might safely trust Him to grant them their release the moment the time of their purification was accomplished. We can readily understand how a Roman Catholic priest might become alarmed lest a notion should become prevalent so destructive to his chief source of gain; yet we are amazed at the courage of him who first dared to counteract this opinion, by asserting that Jesus wished to relieve the sufferings of those souls, but was not able; that He had tied His own hands, and put it out of His power; and that, in the prayers offered on earth now consisted their only resource.

(3) The third point of novel doctrine propounded by Mr. Faber is, that we may not only pray for the souls in purgatory, but may do any good work for the benefit of any particular soul, and forward it for his use and benefit with as great certainty of its reaching its destination as we have with regard to a letter sent through the Post-office.

"In this devotion it is His hands we are moving as we would move the unskilful hands of a child [!!]. Dearest Lord, that He should let us do these things! That He should let us do with his satisfactions what we will, and sprinkle His precious blood as if it were so much water from the nearest well! That we should limit the efficacy of His unbloody sacrifice [!], and name souls to Him, and expect Him to obey us, and that He should do so"—p. 350.

"It [a Christian soul] can speak up to heaven and be heard and obeyed there. It can spend the satisfactions of Jesus as if they were its own, and can undo bolts and bars in Purgatory, and choose by its own determinate will whom it will liberate, and whom it will pass over."—p. 95.

"The difficult doctrine of satisfaction is no difficulty to the faith of this devotion. It moves about in it with the greatest ease, makes its own arrangements, transfers its satisfactions hither and thither, one in one direction, another in another, making quite sure of God being agreeable to it all"—p. 379.

"It acts, with regard to indulgences, as if they were the most inevitable natural transactions of the world. It knows of the unseen treasure out of which they come, of the unseen keys which open the treasury, of the indefinite jurisdiction which places them infallibly at its disposal, of God's unrevealed [How can any one know what God has not revealed?] acceptance of them, and of the invisible work they do, just as it knows of trees and clouds, of streets and churches—that is, just as certainly and undoubtingly; *though it often can give others no proof of these things, nor account for them to itself*"—p. 379.

After this honest confession, it would be cruel to ask Mr. Faber on what authority he holds this doctrine. We shall, however, amuse our readers by quoting from Mr. Faber (p. 42) a practical puzzle arising out of it. Supposing you can send an indulgence to any soul in Purgatory you please, and you have no friend at the time in very pressing need of one, to whom had you better send one? "There was an old Spanish Jesuit, who could not for the life of him make up his mind whether it was better to gain an indulgence for the soul in Purgatory that was most neglected and forgotten, or for the soul that was nearest to its release and entrance into glory. There was a puzzle; both were sweet acts of charity; but which was the sweetest? which would Jesus most approve? He was such a kind-hearted man that good father, that he inclined very much to the poor, neglected soul, just because it was so neglected: it went to his heart to pass over that forgotten soul. But at last he decided in favour of the other; and now see the reasons—(1) Although it seems the greater mercy to offer it for the other soul, because it is most in want, seeing that it is in greater misery; notwithstanding, charity is a greater virtue than mercy; and it is a greater act of charity to offer the indulgence to the soul that was most just, and loved God most—looking singly to the greater glory of the Divine Majesty as the maker of that soul—for it is nearest to its entry into heaven, where it will at once begin to glorify God immensely by its praises and its bliss.

(2) Again, the soul is not properly the full conquest of Jesus till it is safely landed in heaven; and was it not better to keep the poor neglected soul waiting in Purgatory than to keep Jesus waiting in Heaven? and besides, all this sadness about passing over the forgotten soul, would it not make Jesus smile; and something would be done for that poor soul.'

(3) And now comes the most practical reason of all—

"Furthermore, thought the good old Jesuit, the sooner this soul, that is so near heaven, gets into heaven, the sooner will it begin to gain all manner of graces from God for *my* soul, and for the souls of sinners upon earth. And so away went the indulgence to the soul that was nearest its release, not without a very fervent sigh, and a very wistful look to Mary, and a very comfortable suspicion that Jesus would do something extra for the poor forgotten soul." But the good old Jesuit forgot that (if Mr. Faber's theory be true) the Redeemer had tied up his own hands. The Jesuit might do one thing or other with his indulgence, but he could not do both. If he chose to employ it in the way most profitable to his own soul, he had no grounds for his comfortable suspicion that the forgotten soul would be the better of his good wishes when he denied it more solid comfort.

Another question discussed by Mr. Faber is, whether is it better, when we gain an indulgence, to keep it for ourselves, or to give it to the souls in Purgatory. Mr. Faber decides in favour of the latter course; first, because the merit we acquire by the charity of giving away an indulgence will do us more good than the indulgence would, were we to keep it for ourselves. This is something like the charity of the greedy little boy who proposed to himself the question, is it better to spend my penny in buying a cake for myself, or in giving it to this blind beggar? He decided on giving it to the beggar, because he knew that his aunt, who was with him, would be sure to give him sixpence to reward his benevolence.

Another of his arguments is, that, by keeping the indulgence for ourselves, we should be a long time out of the interest of our money. It may be thirty or forty years before we get to Purgatory, and, meanwhile, the indulgence is doing no good to anybody. Suppose we send it on to Purgatory, and get some soul into Heaven with it, he will be bound, in honour and gratitude, to do more for us, by his prayers (which will then be all-powerful) than will make up to us the value of the indulgence which we have lost.

"*The suffering of the holy souls is without any gain or profit to themselves,** whereby they can increase their merits; and so long as they are detained in Purgatory so long is the Heavenly Jerusalem deprived of her citizens, and the Church upon earth of her protectors and advocates with God. Hence comes another point of this devotion. The soul that we release from Purgatory is laid under a particular obligation to us, both because of the singular benefit it receives from entering all the sooner into glory, and, also, because of the tremendous sufferings from which it is delivered. Thus, it is bound to obtain for its benefactors perpetual graces and blessings from God. The blessed know that the good they have received is infinite, and being most grateful, they strive to show gratitude proportionate to the greatness of their enjoyment."—p. 47.

And so he goes on to prove that prayer for the souls in Purgatory is a very good speculation; and with refined and elaborate selfishness turns the whole of the practice of intercessory prayer into an advantageous mercantile bargain. It need scarcely be said that, in this point of view, prayer spent on a poor sinner on earth (who is supposed to have no greater influence with God than yourself) must be much less advantageously invested than if given to a soul in Purgatory. And this is the conclusion at which Mr. Faber arrives. He tells us (p. 345) of a dispute between two friars, as to the comparative merits of prayer for the dead, and for the living. The following is the argument which decides in favour of the former, in preference to praying for sinners:—"Sinners,' said Fra. Benedetto, 'were bound with the chains of their own will. They could leave off sinning if they pleased. The yoke was of their own choosing. Whereas, the dead were tied hand and foot against their own will in the most atrocious sufferings. Now come, dear Fra. Bertrando, tell me—Suppose there were two beggars, one well and strong, who could use his hands, and work if he liked, but chose to suffer poverty rather than part with the sweets of idleness; and the other, sick and maimed, and helpless, who, in his piteous condition, could do nothing but supplicate help with cries and tears—which of the two would deserve compassion most, especially if the sick one was suffering the most intolerable agonies? Now, this is just the case between sinners and the holy souls. These last are suffering an excruciating martyrdom, and they have no means of helping themselves. It is true they have deserved these pains for their sins, *but they are now already cleansed from those sins.* They must have returned to the grace of God before they died, else they would not have been saved. They are now most dear, inexpressibly dear to God; and surely charity, well-ordered, must follow the wise love of the Divine will, and love most what He loves most?

"Fra. Bertrando would not give way, though he did not see quite a satisfactory answer to his friend's objection. But the night following he had an apparition, which it seems so convinced him, that from that time he changed his practice, and offered up all his masses, prayers, and penances, for the holy souls.' It would appear as if the authority of St. Thomas might be quoted on the side of Fra. Benedetto, as he says—'Prayer for the dead is more acceptable than for the living, for the dead are in the greatest need of it, and cannot help themselves as the living can.'"

We shall not follow Mr. Faber further, although he proceeds to confirm his conclusions by the "unimpeachable authority of St. Teresa." It appears to us, that if the devil himself were desirous to contrive a means of abolishing the practice of men's intercessory prayer for each other, he could not have found a better expedient than by propagating the doctrine here taught by Mr. Faber. Just as if some malignant being were desirous of preventing a medicine being applied to the relief of some sick patient, he could not find a more effectual method of wasting the medicine than if he could persuade the nurse-tender to try the effect of pouring it down the throat of a corpse.

The length to which our article has run obliges us to stop short in our quotations from Mr. Faber, although there were several other passages which we had marked for citation. Our readers, however, have now had a specimen of one of the most modern and most popular books of Roman Catholic devotion, the first edition of which sold off in a month; and the commendations of which, in the *Tablet*, we quoted in our last number.

They have had enough to show them how very different a thing, the religion which is popularly taught to Roman Catholics, is from that laid down by the Council of Trent, and defended by Roman Catholic controversialists; and it would appear that some of those who have in recent times changed to the Roman Catholic Church have been very disagreeably surprised at finding their new religion so different from what they had been led to expect. We must make room for one more quotation from Mr. Faber's book—his picture of the distresses of a convert (p. 267):—

"They have obeyed grace grudgingly. When they were safe in the Church, they would see difficulties everywhere, from the Pope and Roman manners downwards, imaginary evils surrounded every step. There was temporal unhappiness; and was the faith worth it? There was the annoyance of learning a new religion and new ceremonies; and this made them snappish. The preachers said such strong things; and they must complain to a score of people of this, as if everything was to be suited to them. It was the Assumption, and the dear, good Irish wanted to hear of their Mother's coronation; but, then, this important convert was at church, and should have been consulted. It was so unkind, so injurious, in his or her presence, to say our Lady had twelve stars on her head. Were they planets or fixed stars? The whole matter is full of difficulties. Really, preachers should be more careful! Then in the confessional it was all so uncomfortable, so coarse, and vulgar, and matter-of-fact. Thus, from one cause or other, the poor convert has been miserable ever since conversion."

Should these pages chance to meet the eye of any Protestant who has dreamed of joining the Roman Church, we advise him to study well this picture, from the hand of one who ought to know, of the happiness of a convert. Let them consider well how they will like the confessional, and all the rest of it, *before* they take the step of embracing the Romish faith. But we must make on the extract just given one concluding reflection, which has been forced on us at almost every page we read of Mr. Faber's book. How completely has he lost the faculty of discriminating truth from falsehood, or even preferring truth to falsehood; so that when he is about to make a statement, the very last question that seems to occur to him is, *Is this true?* Thus, for example, if an honest man were considering whether he ought to say in a sermon that the Virgin Mary had twelve stars on her head, we conceive that he ought to decide the question on no other grounds than this—"Is the thing *true* or not?" Mr. Faber seems to consider the question on no other grounds than, on the one hand, "Would the dear, good Irish like to hear the thing said?" and "would this important convert be offended at it?" on the other. And the whole book is,

*. It is here taught that the souls in Purgatory depend exclusively on our prayers, and yet that they have no means of making themselves heard by us, and asking us to pray for them. It occurs to us, then, to ask, supposing it were true that we on earth depend on the prayers of the faithful in heaven, what greater reason have we to think that we have any means of making ourselves heard by them, when we ask them to pray for us?

* We ask our readers to read the above statement, and that marked in italics a little lower down, and say whether they can believe that a God of infinite love would expose the souls redeemed by his grace to sufferings so *unprofitable* as those described above?

In like manner, one tissue of unprincipled, reckless assertions, for which one seeks in vain for proof or evidence.

We have much sympathy for, what we believe to be, the errors of our brethren who have been brought up in the Roman Catholic religion, and who having been trained from childhood to believe in its doctrines, now use their adult reason—not in seeking for truth, but in seeking for arguments to defend the conclusions from the belief of which they cannot wean themselves.

But the case is very different with those who have given up Protestantism for Romanism. They have been able to arrive at this result only by shutting their eyes to the truth, and abandoning all exercise of their reason, and swallowing down implicitly whatever may be proposed to them by those whom they have thought proper to receive as authorities. And so they generally present the pitiable spectacle exhibited by Mr. Faber in his book, being wholly unable to discriminate between truth and falsehood; given over to strong delusion, that they should believe a lie. We can only pray God to have mercy upon them, that they may recover themselves from the snare of the devil, who have been taken captive by him at his will.

MODERN WORSHIP IN ROME.—No. III.

INDULGENCES.

Cardinal Wiseman has at length returned to England, after a residence of several months at Rome. Various speculations were put forward in the newspapers as to the cause of his protracted absence from his diocese; and some persons went so far as to say, that some cogent reasons, connected with pecuniary matters, rendered it unlikely that he would ever return; but the Cardinal's presence in England is a sufficient reply to all such uncharitable surmises. We are by no means sorry that he is once more amongst us. We like a bold and manly antagonist; and we cannot forget that, some years since, when all England was ringing with indignation on the occasion of the Papal aggression, Cardinal Wiseman had the courage to come forward, in the face of the country, and to attempt a justification of the bold step then taken by the Court of Rome—a step of which he was supposed to be the chief adviser, and by which he was certainly one of the greatest gainers. We are no friends to the assumption of undue authority, which the Church of Rome has recently made in these countries; but, at the same time, we cannot but acknowledge that we would far rather have to do with open and avowed opponents, like Cardinal Wiseman or Archbishop MacHale, than the soft, smooth, and occasionally unscrupulous antagonists of the past generation—such as Bishop Milner.

Cardinal Wiseman's first step, on his return from the Eternal City, was to issue a pastoral letter to the clergy and people of his diocese, which is given, at some length, in the *Tablet* of the 17th of June last. We took up the paper with a good deal of curiosity, as we were anxious to have the latest and most authentic intelligence of what the Pope and Cardinals were doing at Rome; and, moreover, we wished to learn what subjects were considered by Cardinal Wiseman himself as the most pressing and important, on such an interesting occasion.

When the father of a family pays a visit to the metropolis, we all know how eagerly the children look forward to his return; how they talk of the things that he is likely to bring home with him; and with what eager curiosity they look on, as he pulls out of his pockets the toys and presents which he has selected for each. It must have been with some such feelings, we doubt not, that the faithful people of Westminster took up Cardinal Wiseman's pastoral letter. After such a protracted absence, they must surely have anticipated that he would not return to his diocese without bringing them back some mark of regard and remembrance from the city which Roman Catholics are fondly wont to regard as the metropolis of the Christian world. In this feeling we ourselves, in some degree, participated. We knew that Cardinal Wiseman had recently taken part in the solemn inauguration of the relics of a new saint, at Amiens, in France,* whose bones had been dug up not long since, out of the catacombs of Rome; and when such presents were to be had, we thought it unlikely that the Cardinal would return to his own flock at home, without some pledge and token of Pontifical favour, to indemnify them for all the obloquy they had lately endured in the cause of the Church of Rome.

We glanced hastily over the earlier part of the pastoral, in which the Cardinal expresses in suitable terms his thankfulness for his safe return. "Before all things, dearly beloved," saith he, "we give thanks to God, that he has been pleased to bring us back safe, after a long absence, to resume the labours of our unworthy ministry among you." He then goes on to announce his intention of holding a diocesan synod at Westminster, which was shortly to commence its sittings, in order to settle some matters of pressing importance. At length, after passing over some other topics, we came to the close of the letter. Every one knows that the most important part of a lady's letter is generally to be found in the postscript; and we thought it not unlikely that the Cardinal, coming fresh from Italy, "la terra di donne e di gentilezza," might have imitated this laudable example. We hoped that he would tell us something about the last Saint that was canonised, or the last procession at which the Holy Father assisted, or the last new doctrine which the Pope and Cardinals had agreed upon; nay, perhaps, we thought it even possible that he might be able to announce to us that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, after a contest of so many centuries, had now, at last, been authoritatively declared to be a fundamental tenet of the infallible Church.

But, alas! we were sadly disappointed. The last clause of the Cardinal's letter runs as follows:—"We hereby grant to every one of the clergy or laity who shall recite the hymn of the Holy Ghost, 'Veni Creator,' in Latin or English, between the publication of this, our pastoral letter, and the close of the synod, to obtain for us the light of the Divine Spirit, *an indulgence of one hundred days each time.*"

And is this all that the Cardinal brings back from Rome? Only one hundred days' indulgence! Really, this appears to be a very stingy and shabby proceeding on his part. One hundred days! Why, in the old Sarum Office of the Virgin,* we find mention made of an indulgence for no less than 90,000 years. "Thys three prayers be wrytten in the chappelle of the holy crosse in Rome, otherwise called Sacellum sanctæ crucis septem Romanorum, whoo that devontly say them shall obtayn 90,000 years of pardon for dedly synnes, graunted of our holie Father, John XXII., Pope of Rome." We think the Pope might have made them the full hundred thousand, when his hand was in. Perhaps he thought that some little economy was requisite, even in a Pope.

This, however, is not all. The recipient of the liberality of John XXII. was obliged to say three prayers for his Indulgence; but Cardinal Bellarmine tells us how a full plenary indulgence may be obtained, without saying any prayers at all. "We see," saith he, "that the *very greatest indulgences* are sometimes given for the most trifling reasons—as, for instance, when a plenary indulgence is given to every individual of the crowd that stand before the door of St. Peter's on Easter Sunday, when the Pope blesses the people." "Videmus interdum pro causâ levissimâ dari indulgentias maximas, ut cum datur Indulgentia plenaria omnibus qui ante fores Basilicæ Sancti Petri astant, dum Summus Pontifex in die Paschæ populo solemniter benedicit."—Bellarm. de Indul., lib. i., cap. xii., tom. ii., p. 453. Col., 1615.

It is right, however, to add, that Bellarmine appears to have found some difficulty in swallowing the belief of these wholesale indulgences. "If," saith he, "indulgences, granted without sufficient reason, are not good and valid, the Christian people would be grievously deceived by their pastors;"† an assertion, to the truth of which we most cordially assent.

Granting, however, for the moment, that the Pope does *not* deceive the good people of Rome, when he promises them a plenary indulgence for standing at the door of St. Peter's on Easter Sunday, does not the lavish profusion with which the gifts of the Church are bestowed abroad, contrast strangely with Cardinal Wiseman's niggardly and parsimonious distribution of the same gifts at home? At Westminster, a devout Roman Catholic offers up a prayer to God, and obtains a hundred days' exemption from the burning torments of Purgatory. At Rome, an Italian, who, perchance, never prays to God at all, obtains a clear quittance, perhaps of several thousand years' purgatorial tortures, merely by enduring for a moment a little pushing and jostling in a crowd! We ask our readers, in all sincerity, can such things be true? If they are, we must fairly avow, that the grounds and reasons of them are beyond our comprehension. If they are *not*, we can only repeat, with Cardinal Bellarmine—"the Christian people must be grievously deceived by their pastors."

We have, on more than one occasion, brought the general subject of Indulgences before our readers,‡ but the mention so recently made of them in Cardinal Wiseman's Pastoral, induces us to revert to the subject again; and we shall endeavour, in our remarks, to afford our readers some help in enabling them to form their own opinion upon a question which, if true, is of such vital and practical importance.

Many years ago, in wandering along the streets of Rome, our attention was frequently arrested by a Latin sentence which we saw deeply cut in stone over the porticoes of many of the countless churches which meet the eye at every step. The sentence ran thus:—

INDULGENTIA PLENARIA, QUOTIDIANA, PERPETUA, PRO VIVIS ET MORTUIS, TOTIES QUOTIES.

—*i.e.*, "A plenary, daily, perpetual indulgence for the living and for the dead, as often as they are wanted." Often, as we read these words, the inquiry suggested itself to our mind, What *is* an indulgence? On what authority does it rest? Is there any Scriptural authority for this usage? These questions we shall endeavour briefly to discuss.

And, firstly, what is an indulgence? On this point the Council of Trent was prudently silent. It tells us that the use of indulgences is very salutary for Christian people, and approved of by the authority of sacred councils (indulgentiarum usum Christiano populo maxime salutarem, et sacrorum conciliorum auctoritate probatum, *Sess.* xxv.); but it cautiously abstains from telling us what an indulgence is—nay, more, it is forced to admit that very great abuses have been introduced into the Church by their means. Cardinal Wiseman, however, is more explicit than the Council of Trent. He states* very clearly his opinion, both what an indulgence is not, and what it is. "Many persons," saith he, "will be inclined to incredulity when I tell them, that an indulgence is *no pardon for sin of any sort*, past, present, or future. It is no more than a remission by the Church, in virtue of the keys, of a portion, or the entire, of the temporal punishment due to sin."

The learned Cardinal seemed to be well aware that this statement was one which his readers would be inclined to disbelieve, and which, therefore, he was bound to make with the utmost care and precision. And, yet, when he tells us so positively, that "an indulgence is no pardon for sin of any sort," we think that he must have relied greatly on the ignorance or simplicity of his readers. Pope Boniface VIII., as is well known, issued indulgences on a large scale, in connection with the Jubilee which he celebrated in the year 1300; and in what form of words were they drawn up? We find them given as follows in the canon law—"Non solùm plenam et largiorem, immò plenissimam concedimus omnium suorum venlam peccatorum."† "We grant not only a full and more abundant, but a *most plenary pardon of all sins.*" So, likewise, Clement VI., in his Bull for the Jubilee of the year 1350, granted to the recipients of his indulgences, that "they should obtain a most plenary pardon of all their sins."‡ Sixtus IV. also, calls them "indulgences and remissions of sins."§ We have before us an extract of a form of indulgence granted by Leo X., taken from the well-known Roman Catholic writer Ferraris,‖ where several examples of a similar kind are given. The form of words made use of in these indulgences is very generally as follows:—"We mercifully grant in the Lord a plenary indulgence and remission of all their sins, by these presents, to be valid for all future times, with a power of applying the same plenary indulgence to the souls in Purgatory."¶

Now, we ask any of our readers, what is the plain meaning of the words "plenary remission, to be valid for all future times, of all their sins" (plenariam omnium peccatorum suorum remissionem)? Do they, or do they not, mean that the sins of the man to whom they are addressed are fully forgiven? If they *do*, then with what face can Cardinal Wiseman assert, that "an indulgence is no pardon for sin of any sort, past, present, or future?" If they do *not*, how can the Popes for many hundred years be exonerated from the charge of using language upon the most solemn of all subjects, which was calculated to lead Christian people into the most fatal error, in reference to the pardon of their sins in the sight of God?

Cardinal Wiseman was fully aware of this difficulty, which, indeed, lies at the bottom of the whole Romish theory of indulgences. It was, therefore, impossible for him to avoid taking some notice of it; and we invite the special attention of our readers to his reply. "When an indulgence," saith he, "is said to be a remission or forgiveness of sin, *the phrase applies only to the outward guilt*, or that portion of the evil, whereof the ancient penitential canons took cognizance."** There is no weapon more convenient for a controversial writer than a bold assertion, to help him in disposing of an awkward fact, or evading an unmanageable argument; and, certainly, few writers are more expert in the use of this weapon, or have had recourse to it more frequently, than the Cardinals of the Church of Rome. The phrase *forgiveness of sins*, it seems, applies *only* to the outward guilt! Now, we ask any impartial persons who have read the extracts we have quoted above, how can they possibly believe this statement of Cardinal Wiseman's? If the forgiveness of sins, spoken of in the indulgences, meant only an exemption from the penitential discipline of the Church, why was it not so stated in these documents? Why was a form of words made use of, the most complete and comprehensive that could possibly be employed? The indulgence is called "plenaria remissio," a plenary remission; "plenissima venia," a most full pardon; "omnium peccatorum," *of all sins.* And what is Cardinal Wiseman's comment on these words? "The forgiveness of sins applies *only* to the outward guilt"! "An indulgence is *no pardon for sin of any sort*, past, present, or future"!! Well may the learned Cardinal anticipate the incredulity of his readers, when he makes such statements as these. We ask him, if he really wished to convey to any man the idea that his sins were entirely pardoned in the sight of God, would it be possible for him

* S. Theodosia. The ceremony took place, we believe, on the 12th of October last.—*vide* the *Tablet* of that month.

* Horæ B. V. Mariæ secundum usum Sarum, fol. lxii. b. Printed at the expense of the University of Paris, 1526.

† "Si indulgentiæ sine causa satis magna concessæ non essent ratæ, Christianus populus á Pastoribus suis graviter deciperetur."—Bellarm. Ibid.

‡ *Vide* Catholic Layman, vol. i., p. 114, vol. ii., p. 6.

* *Vide* Lectures on the Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church, col. ii. p. 71. London, 1836.

† Extravag. Comm., lib. v., c. i, De pœnit. Corpus Juris Can., vol. iii., p. 349. Lugduni, 1671.

‡ Suorum omnium obtinerent plenissimam veniam peccatorum. Id., cap. ii., vol. iii., p. 353.

§ Indulgentias et remissiones peccatorum. Id. cap. iv., vol. iii., p. 354.

‖ *Vide* Ferraris, Bibl. Prompt. sub voce. "Indulgentia," Tom. iv., pp. 98, 111. Bonon., 1754.

¶ "Plenariam omnium peccatorum meorum indulgentiam et remissionem misericorditer in Domino concedimus, præcordibus perpetuæ futuris temporibus valituram, cum facultate etiam eandem plenariam indulgentiam applicandi animabus in Purgatorio."—Ferraris ut supra, p. 98.

** Wiseman's Lectures, *ut supra*, p. 81.

to use language more full, comprehensive, and unmistakable, than that which we have quoted above from the authorized indulgences, not of one, but of several Popes? Is this a specimen of the *infallible teaching* of the Church of Rome, which Christian people are expected to receive in blind and unresisting submission? We confidently appeal to our readers whether, in the whole course of their experience, they have ever met with an instance of more gross and glaring contradiction?

But we need not rely merely on the language of the Papal indulgences. The history of the Church, for the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, proves, conclusively, the meaning which the Church of Rome then *intended* the people to put, and which they actually did put, on the indulgences issued in her name, and with her express sanction. Of this, the ancient writer, Gobelinus, furnishes us with a remarkable proof.* He says that the preachers of indulgences told the people, to encourage them to deal with them, that the indulgences were not only *à pœnâ*, but *à culpâ* too—*i.e.*, not merely from the temporal punishment of sin, but from the fault itself, which deserved eternal punishment. This made the people look into them; and not finding those terms, but only a most plenary remission, they were unsatisfied, because they were told the fault could only be forgiven by God alone; but if they could but once find that the Pope would undertake to clear all scores with God for them, they did not doubt but the indulgences would be worth their money. "Whereupon," adds Gobelinus, "*those very terms were put into them;*" then the wiser men thought these were counterfeit, and made only by the pardon-mongers; but, upon further inquiry, they found it otherwise.

We may add another example from the general form of absolution, sold by Tetzel, under the direct authority of Leo X.† We need scarcely recall to the recollection of our readers, that the shameful sale of indulgences, by Tetzel and others, was the immediate cause of the Reformation in the sixteenth century. The absolution concluded as follows:—"I restore thee to the holy sacraments of the Church, and to the unity of the faithful, and to the innocence and purity conferred on thee by baptism; so that the gates of punishment may be closed against thee at thy departure, and those of the joys of Paradise be opened. Or, shouldest thou not presently die, *let this grace remain in full force, and avail thee at the point of death.* In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.—F. B. Johannes Tetzel, Sub-commissarius, manu propria scripsit."

Can any unprejudiced person read these words without being convinced that the Church of Rome, at that time, plainly and unquestionably intended to persuade the vulgar, that whoever purchased one of these indulgences obtained the remission of all his sins, and the certainty of everlasting happiness? It cannot be disputed that the indulgence professed to confer an entire absolution, not only from all past, but also from all future sins. It is impossible, with any shadow of reason, to affix any other meaning to the concluding paragraph. The dilemma, therefore, to which Cardinal Wiseman is reduced is as follows:—either the doctrine of the Church of Rome is the same now as it was in the time of Tetzel and Leo X., or it is not. If it be the *same*, then Cardinal Wiseman is not to be believed when he tells us that "an indulgence is no pardon for sin of any sort, past, present, or future."—If it be *different*, then the Church of Rome must have changed her doctrine since the sixteenth century, and, consequently, she cannot be infallible.

We have given a specimen of the language of the documents which Tetzel sold; but we really feel some reluctance in reproducing some passages of the harangues which he is said to have addressed to the people, and in which he magnified the value of his indulgences:—"At the very instant that the money rattles at the bottom of the chest, the soul escapes from Purgatory, and flies liberated to heaven. . . . . I would not change my privileges for those of St. Peter in heaven; for I have saved more souls by my indulgences than the Apostle by his sermons. . . . . Reflect that for every mortal sin, you must, after confession and contrition, do penance for seven years, either in this life or in Purgatory. Now, how many mortal sins are there not committed in a day, how many in a week, how many in a month, how many in a year, how many in a whole life! . . . . Alas! these sins are almost infinite, and they entail an infinite penalty in the fires of Purgatory; and now, by means of these letters of indulgence, you can, once in your life, in every case except four, which are reserved for the Apostolic See, and afterwards in the article of death, obtain a plenary remission of all your penalties and all your sins. . . . There is no sin so great that an indulgence cannot remit; and even if any one (which is, doubtless, impossible) had offered violence to the Blessed Virgin Mary, mother of God, it is as clear as day-light that if he only procures an indulgence, all will be forgiven him!"‡

We should be sorry to hold the Church of Rome responsible for the daring impiety of such language as we have quoted above; but at the same time, we feel convinced, that Tetzel only carried out to their logical conclusion the *principles* which had been laid down by various Popes and Doctors before his time. We have not space to dwell on the fearful abuses and enormities to which such doctrines—proclaimed, be it remembered, by an ordained priest and authorized teacher of the Church of Rome—gave rise throughout Germany. When the princes of of the Empire were assembled at the Diet of Nuremberg, they made a complaint of their grievances to the Pope; and, in speaking of indulgences, they unanimously state, as the *least bad* consequence of them, "that the people were cheated of their money by them;" they then go on to point out far more considerable evils arising from the same pernicious source. "*Christian piety*," they say, "*was destroyed by them;* all manner of wickedness did spring from thence; men were afraid of committing no kind of sins, when at so cheap a rate they could purchase a remission of them."*

We must conclude, for the present, with noticing a prudent piece of advice about indulgences, given to members of the Church of Rome, by Cardinal Bellarmine. "Though the Church," saith he, "may have power to give indulgences, yet they may want their effect in particular persons, and, therefore, all *prudent Christians* do so receive indulgences, as withal to satisfy God for their sins."† We hope there are many such "prudent Christians" in Cardinal Wiseman's diocese. The plain meaning of Bellarmine's advice, if he had the courage to speak plainly, is this—that prudent Christians are too wise to believe in indulgences, and that none but fools rely on them; for if there were anything but fraud and imposture in them, why may not a prudent Christian trust a Church which he believes infallible? If Pope Pius IX., on next Easter Sunday, gives a plenary indulgence to every person in the crowd standing at the door of St. Peter's, at Rome, we desire to know why a prudent Christian of that Church may not, yea, ought not to rely upon his word? Does he suspect the head of his Church may cheat and abuse him? If he does, what becomes of infallibility? If he verily believes that the Pope cannot err, and will not deceive, why must not his word be taken? We know not how these things pass current among prudent Christians of the Church of Rome; we would only invite all sincere and earnest members of that Church, who may read what we have written, to contrast the dangerous and contradictory statements of her Popes and divines, on the momentous subject of the forgiveness of sins, with the short and simple statement of the inspired Word of God—"The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from ALL SIN."—1 John i. 7.

OUR LORD GOD THE POPE.

DOMINUS DEUS NOSTER PAPA.

THIS startling, not to say blasphemous, statement was found, during a period of two hundred years, in the Canon Law of the Church of Rome. It occurred in the Gloss upon the Extravagant of John XXII. entitled "*Cum inter.*" The Gloss was to the following effect—"To believe that our Lord God the Pope has not the power to decree as he has decreed, is to be deemed heretical."‡ This fearful assertion was naturally laid hold of by the Reformers: and the result of their comments upon it was that the word "God" ("Deus") gradually disappeared from the Gloss, and is now no longer found in the editions of the Canon Law. That modern Roman Catholics should feel anxious to repudiate such a sentiment is not wonderful, when we bear in mind the following points:—

1. St. Paul, speaking of the "Man of Sin," says (2 Thess. ii. 4), that "he sitteth in the temple of God, *showing himself as if he were God.*"

2. Pope Gregory the Great, writing of Antichrist, says, "since he is a damned man and a wicked§ spirit, he *lyingly asserts that he is God.*"—Greg. in Job., c. 34.

3. Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury in the 11th century, also speaking of Antichrist, uses the following words—"He shall feign himself to be religious, that he may deceive men under the colour of piety. Yea, *he shall say that he is God:* and he shall *cause himself to be adored*, and shall promise the Kingdom of Heaven."—Anselm in 2 Thess. ii.

4. Long before this, Irenæus, speaking of Antichrist, says, "Being an apostate and a robber, he *wishes to be adored as God.*"—Iren., Contr. Hær., Lib. v., c. 25.

5. The heathen emperor Domitian headed his proclamations with the words "*Your Lord God* Domitian."—Sueton. in Dom., c. 13. And, similarly, the monster Caligula called himself "*Deus Optimus Maximus.*"—Sueton. in Calig., c. 22.

We might expect that when the Reformers urged these and similar points in their controversy with Rome, the Papal authorities would repudiate, as soon as it could be conveniently done, a sentiment which, however useful in the middle ages, could no longer with safety be avowed as the teaching of the Church. It had performed its part in the great work of building up the edifice of the divine supremacy of the Pope, and might, for the future, be discarded. Yet it seems to have been judged prudent to proceed gradually in the matter. To have at once expunged the obnoxious word *Deum* from the Gloss, would have been too great a concession to the impertinent scruples of Bishop Jewell and other troublesome opponents of the Papal system. Accordingly, when Pope Gregory XIII. appointed a commission in 1582 (nearly twenty years after Jewell had drawn the attention of Europe to the fact that the Pope was God), for the purpose of preparing a new edition of the Canon Law, and with directions to "revise, correct, and expurgate," not only the Text but the Glosses, from unintentional errors as well as designed corruptions, the edition, so prepared (and *which is, to the present day, the standard edition*), retained the word *Deum*, without even so much as the usual "*Caute lege*" in the margin. The explanation of this deliberate retention of the word is, doubtless, to be found in the dogma of the spiritual supremacy of the Pope *de jure divino*, combined with the Papal motto of "no retreat" ("nunquam retrorsum"). A few years later, however, that is to say, in the beginning of the 17th century, we have the Jesuit Endæmon Joannes actually denying that the word "God" (Deum) was to be found in the original MS. of Zenzelini, the writer of the Gloss in question. As this MS. is deposited in the Vatican Library, and is carefully concealed from the prying eyes of Protestants, we are obliged to take this denial on trust. How little reason there is for believing Endæmon's unsupported assertion may be seen by consulting Archbishop Abbott's reply, in his *Antilogia*, cap. 5. Indeed, the candid Mr. Charles Butler seems to admit that this was his impression also, when, in his "Justification" (p. 126), he attempts to justify the phrase "Our Lord God the Pope" upon what he considers Scriptural principles, while he, at the same time, allows that "it is in bad taste." Mr. Butler was well aware that, although the word "*Deum*" has been carefully excluded from the more recent editions of the Canon Law, there are abundant other proofs of the title in question being applied to and accepted by the Popes during the middle ages. He knew that Pope Nicholas I., in the 9th century, had said—"It is sufficiently evident that the secular power cannot bind or loose the Pontiff, who, it is clear, *was called God* by the pious Prince Constantine; and it is manifest that God cannot be judged by men."—Dist. 96, can. 7, Satis evidenter, Decret. Gratian., Prima Pars.* Mr. Butler doubtless knew also that the famous Chancellor Gerson had said of the Popes, in the early part of the 15th century—"In imitation of Lucifer, *they wish to be adored as Gods.* . . . They neither fear God, nor reverence man."—De Conc. Gen., Oper. vol. ii., p. 27. Mr. Butler knew further that Christopher Marcellus, addressing Pope Julius II., in the name of the Council of Lateran (1512), made use of the following portentous words—"Do thou take care that we lose not the salvation, the life and breath which thou hast given us. For thou art our shepherd, thou our physician, thou our guide, thou, in short, *a second God upon earth* (tu denique alter Deus in terris).—Harduin ix., 1651." Mr. Butler knew that Cardillus, in his defence of the Council of Trent, calls the Pope an *earthly God* (terrenus Deus). Mr. Butler was acquainted with the ceremonies observed at the inauguration of a Pope: the following account of which is taken from an official authentic source,† published at the close of the 17th century:—

"After the election and proclamation, the Pope, attired in the pontifical habit, is borne in the pontifical chair to the Church of St. Peter, and is placed *on the High Altar*, where he is saluted for the third time by the cardinals, by kissing his feet, hands, and mouth. In the meantime the Ambrosian Hymn (*Te Deum*) is sung. The *adoration* being finished, and the hymn over, the dean of the Sacred College chaunts some versicles and a prayer; then the Pontiff descends from the altar, and is carried to the Vatican Palace." The ceremony takes place in the *Church* of St. Peter. The Pontiff is placed upon the *High Altar* of that Church, a spot consecrated, according to the Romish theory of the Eucharist, by the actual presence of the body, soul, and divinity of the Son of God. He sits upon that High Altar, using it as his footstool. And there, enthroned as a king, he is *adored* as a God! Adored by the cardinal princes of the Roman Church, who kiss the feet which rest on the altar of the Supreme! And that this is no obsolete usage any one may satisfy himself, by reading the account given of the inauguration of the present Pope, Pius IX., in the *Univers*, of the 27th of June, 1846.

Such being the *practice* of the Church of Rome at the present day, it may well seem an unnecessary concession to the heretical Reformers to have expunged the word "God" from the Gloss in the Canon Law. But upon nearer consideration the policy of doing so becomes apparent. The formal retention of such a sentiment would, undoubtedly, have proved a very great scandal in this inquiring age; while at the same time care is taken to keep up, in *reality*, by the practice of the Church of Rome, the claim which, in *words*, has been withdrawn.

---

* Gobelini Personæ Cosmodrom. Æt. 6, c. 86., p. 278. Francf. ed., 1599.

† *Vide* "Forma absolutionis plenariæ," apud Gerdesium, *Monumenta Antiquitatis.* Tom. i., no. vii., B. p. 74.

‡ This last assertion is so monstrous that we deem it right to give it in Tetzel's own published words, in which he deliberately maintained and defended it:—"Sub commissariis insuper ac prædicatoribus veniarum imperare, ut si quis per impossibile Dei genetricem semper virginem violasset, quod eundem indulgentiarum vigore absolvere possent, *luce clarius est.*" Positiones fratris J. Tezelii, quibus defendit Indulgentias contra Lutherum, Theses 99, 100, et 101.

* *Vide* Centum Gravamina, in Fascic. Rer. Exp. et Fug. p. 354. London, 1690

† Bell. de Indul., l. i., c. 12, vol. 3, p. 888., col. 2. Prag., 1721.

‡ Extravag. Joan. xxii., Tit. xiv., Gloss. in cap. iv.

§ We follow the reading "nequam," instead of the common one, "nequaquam."

* It is a very significant fact, that while Bellarmine quotes the first clause of this sentence as far as the word "Pontiff," in proof of the supremacy of the Pope, he carefully omits the latter part.—Bellarm. de Sum. Pontif., lib. ii., c. 26.

† Notitia Congreg. et Tribunal. Curiæ Romanæ. a. it. Lettenburg, 1683.

ARE THE DOCTRINES AND PRACTICES OF THE REFORMED CHURCHES, OR THOSE OF THE CHURCH OF ROME, THE MORE OBNOXIOUS TO THE IMPUTATION OF HERESY.

BELLARMINE, in the seventh chapter of his Treatise upon the Notes of the Church,* asserts, that the Protestant doctrines are nothing else than a revival of certain heresies which had been condemned by the Church in former ages. And in order to establish this position, he enumerates twenty heresies, to each of which he professes to find a parallel in the writings of Luther and Calvin. This assertion, it is needless to say, did not pass unchallenged by writers upon the Protestant side; and we hope, in a future number, to show how triumphantly they refuted it.† But they did something more than this. They retorted the assertion, and showed that many of the characteristic doctrines and practices of papal Rome were most strikingly similar to those of the ancient heretics; and even of the very heretics included in the above-mentioned catalogue of Bellarmine. Our Roman Catholic readers will, we trust, bear patiently with us while we bring forward some proofs of this position, which, doubtless, will appear to many of them a very startling one. The subject is one of very great importance, and ought not to be dismissed without further inquiry, merely because it may be a disagreeable one. We shall not attempt to enumerate all the cases in which a coincidence between the doctrines and practices of the Papacy and those of heretical sects has been pointed out. More than forty-five such instances have been noticed, and it would not be difficult to add to the number. At present we shall content ourselves with indicating a few cases as examples of the rest.

First—The ascription of the title "God" (*Deus*) to the Popes, in the Canon Law,‡ has certainly, to say the least of it, no warrant from Scripture; and has no parallel in the past history of the Church, except the claim to divine honours made by Simon Magus, whom Irenæus calls the father of all heretics.

Another point of resemblance between the doings of this arch-heretic and those of papal Rome, is to be found in the wholesale and shameless practice of simony, (a crime which derives its name from what is recorded of Simon, Acts viii. 19, sq.), by which the Roman Curia was disgraced, prior to the Reformation. Thus, in the beginning of the fourteenth century, Gul. Durandus, one of the highest authorities of the age, says,§ that "in the Roman Church, simony reigns as if it were no sin." A little later in the same century, Marsilius of Padua, the most eminent jurist of those times, tells us,‖ that "at Rome there is a concourse of simoniacal persons from every quarter, seeing that heaven and all the elements are sold there—*Earth*, as often as the bodies of the dead are to be committed to the grave; *water*, to which the name lustral is given; the *air* and sound of bells; the *fire* of candles." "The merits," he adds, "of the living and the dead are sold; hymns, sacraments, priesthoods are sold; in fine, the remission of sins itself is sold." Still later in the same century, the famous poet, Petrarch, writes thus¶ "Simon Magus, together with his wife, Simonia, has come to life again in Rome." And, to quote no more, we have the following striking testimony from Baptista of Mantua, General of the Carmelites, and one of the most distinguished men of his time (the beginning of the sixteenth century). Speaking of Rome, he says—

> ....."Venalia nobis
> Templa, sacerdotes, altaria, sacra, coronæ,
> Ignis, thura, preces, coitum venale, Deusque."

Which, literally translated, is "For sale with us are temples, priests, altars, sacred rites, crowns, fire, incense, prayers, heaven, God."

Secondly—The *Valentinians* (a branch of the Gnostic heretics) taught that *Scripture* was *imperfect*, and that, consequently, *Tradition* was *necessary*, in order to ascertain the truth. Speaking of these heretics, Irenæus says,** "when they are convicted out of the Scriptures, they turn and accuse the Scriptures themselves, on the ground that they (the Scriptures) are not correct, and want authority, and do not harmonize with each other; and they assert that the truth cannot be discovered by those who are ignorant of tradition." Those who are at all familiar with Roman Catholic works on controversy, will be struck with the remarkable resemblance which exists between these Gnostic views of Scripture and those which are laid down in the works alluded to, in order to establish the necessity of tradition as a part of the rule of faith, co-ordinate with Scripture. Thus, for example, we read in a work of standard authority†† the following words, "The Scriptures are, as some one, no less truly than wittily, has observed, like a nose of wax (cereus nasus) which may be easily twisted every way, and like a leaden rule which may readily be bent to any shape one pleases. To these Scriptures we must, accordingly, apply the inflexible rule, the authority and common sentiment of the tradition of the Church: which tradition," he adds, "is the very rule of truth and piety, more efficacious than Holy Writ. The Scriptures," he further informs us, "may easily be applied to favour any impious opinion." The man who penned these fearful words, Albert Pighius, was patronized by four successive Popes, to one of whom he dedicated the work from which they are taken. He was employed on confidential embassies by the Roman See, and was regarded at Rome as one of the greatest divines of his age (beginning of sixteenth century).

In connection with this subject, we may add what Irenæus tells us (Lib. i. c. 24) of the Carpocratians, another Gnostic sect—viz., that they defended their own tenets by pretending that our Blessed Lord had privately communicated *certain doctrines* to the Apostles which were to be *reserved and kept secret* from the general body of Christians, and to be communicated only to those who were worthy to receive them: to which privileged class they (the Carpocratians) of course belonged. Arius and Eutyches defended their heresies by a similar appeal to tradition: which led Basil the Great, to say, "that it was a manifest falling away from the faith, and a proof of arrogance, either to reject anything of what is written, or to introduce anything that is not." The famous *Disciplina Arcani*, or Discipline of the Secret, by which it was once thought, (before the doctrine of development was invented), that the silence of primitive antiquity respecting the characteristic doctrines of the Church of Rome could alone be successfully accounted for—this discipline, as explained and employed by the controversial writers of the Church of Rome, finds its exact prototype in the Carpocratian doctrine above described. And it is not a little remarkable, that the very same text which these Gnostic heretics employed in support of their tenet of a reserved secret doctrine—viz., John xvi. 12—is still one of the standard texts brought forward by Roman Catholics, in order to prove the insufficiency of Holy Scripture.

Thirdly—We learn from Irenæus (Lib. i., c. 24) and Epiphanius (Lib. i., Hær. xxvii.) that the *worship of images and pictures* of Christ and the Apostles was another characteristic of the Gnostic heretics. We are not, accordingly, surprised to find that the latter Father was a most uncompromising Iconoclast. The story told by Epiphanius himself, in his celebrated letter to John Bishop of Jerusalem (Epiph. oper., Tom. ii. 314), is well known, and may be seen in page 50 of the LAYMAN of last year. "I went," he says, "into a certain Church to pray; and I found there a veil, hanging on the doors of the Church, having the likeness of Christ, or some saint painted on it. So when I saw the likeness of a human being hanging in the Church of Christ contrary to the authority of Scripture, I tore it, and gave directions to the keeper of the place to roll up some poor person in it as a winding sheet." We do not wonder at the indignation of this eminent father of the fourth century, when we remember that he himself expressly notices image-worship as a characteristic of the deadly heresy of the Gnostics. Few of our Roman Catholic brethren are aware, that when they prostrate themselves before a picture or an image, even of Christ himself, they are imitating the practice not of the primitive Church, but of the early heretics; and that instead of following the injunctions of the great Church Fathers, in this particular, they are running directly counter to them.

Fourthly—It is an indisputable fact, attested by Irenæus, Tertullian, Clemens Alex., Theodoret, Augustine, and others of the Fathers, that the notion of extraordinary sanctity, being connected with *celibacy and asceticism*, originated with heretics. Scripture does not contain a syllable which can be tortured into a *general* warrant for such practices. On the contrary, the whole spirit of the New Testament is directly opposed to such a mere carnal religion. As to the heretical origin of the practices adverted to, we shall be very brief; because, as before said, the fact is incontestable. Thus, the *Marcionites*, as we learn from Tertullian and Clemens Alex., highly commended celibacy. Epiphanius informs us that the *Encratites* did the same; though, he adds, their practice was not always conformable to their teaching. "Continentiam jactant," he says, "fallaciter omnia facientes. Nam et inter mulieres reperiantur, et mulieres undiquaque decipiunt, et simul cum iis vivunt." Would to God such scandals were confined to the heretics. But in an evil hour the Church adopted their practices, and similar results followed. Every reader of ecclesiastical history knows but too well what is meant by γυναικὶς συνεισακτοι, mulieres subintroductæ. We have no wish to dwell upon the fearful immoralities to which the celibacy of the clergy has at all times, from its first introduction, given rise; and which have drawn down the condemnations, not only of every virtuous writer in every age, but of numerous Councils, beginning with the Œcumenical Council of Nice itself. Suffice it to say, that a restriction, unnatural in itself and heretical in its origin, has borne fruits worthy of its parentage.†

Fifthly—We will conclude this article with noticing one more Roman Catholic *practice*, which may also be traced to a *heretical origin*. And it is the more important to remark this, because the practice in question seems to be gaining ground every day; and threatens, ere long, to absorb, practically, every religious act whatsoever, whether prescribed by Scripture or enjoined by the usages of the primitive Church. I mean *Mariolatry*, or the worship of the Virgin Mary. We have already, in the preceding volumes of the LAYMAN, examined at length what Scripture and the early Fathers tell us of the Blessed Virgin, with a view to ascertain whether we are now justified in offering her worship; and the result of our investigations has been, that we must look elsewhere than in Scripture or the records of the primitive Church, if we would find any precedent for such worship. This, in itself, must be a startling fact to a simple-minded, confiding, Roman Catholic, who believes, without inquiry, on the credit of his teachers, that he has as much reason to worship the Virgin as he has to worship her Divine Son. But how much greater must be his astonishment to learn that, whilst the Scriptures and the practice of the universal Church, from its foundation to the present hour, are his warrant for the one act of worship, the earliest precedent for the other that can be produced from antiquity is the idolatrous worship offered to the Virgin by a set of female heretics, or fanatics, called *Collyridians*, who, as we learn from Epiphanius (Hær. 78, 79), lived in the 4th century. The name is usually derived from a Greek word (κολλὺρα) denoting a cake, this being the offering which her votaries presented to the Virgin, perhaps in imitation of the idolatrous worship paid to the Moon by the ancient Jews (who followed their *heathen* neighbours), as mentioned in Jeremiah xliv. 19. This is, then, the earliest instance of that homage which is due to God and Christ *alone* being rendered to the Virgin. The words of Epiphanius himself, condemning the heresy in question, (which we cited in our last number), are most important; "Let Mary be *honoured*; but let the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit alone be *adored*. *Let no one adore Mary.*' Now, let any candid Roman Catholic compare with this injunction of the pious Bishop of Cyprus the following passages, taken from sources which reflect the authorized teaching of his own Church, and let him then say whether he believes that, with the exception of the cake, Epiphanius would have recognised any difference between the degree of worship which he condemns in the Collyridian heretics, and that which is now paid to the Virgin by the Church of Rome. The passages to which we refer are the following, taken at random from a number of others equally strong:—

1. In the Encyclical Letter of Pope Gregory XVI., written in 1832, the following passage occurs:—

"We address this letter to you, Venerable Brethren, on this most joyful day, when we solemnise the festival of the triumphant Assumption of the Holy Virgin into Heaven, that she, whom we have experienced as our *patroness and deliverer* amidst the greatest calamities, may also *propitiously assist us whilst we write, and by her celestial inspiration may guide us to such counsels as may be most salutary to the Christian Church.*" That the attributes of Deity are here ascribed to the Virgin appears plainly from a comparison of the following passages of Scripture—Ps. cxliii. 2 (Douay Vers.); Ps. xxxix. 18; Is. xi. 2.

2. In the Litany of the Blessed Virgin, to the repetition of which Indulgences were attached by three Popes, we read the following prayer:—

"We fly to *thy protection*, Holy Mother of God, *despise not our prayers* in our necessities, but *deliver us*, at all times, *from all evils*, glorious and blessed Virgin." Let us compare with this what the Psalmist writes, speaking of *God*, Ps. lx. 10 (Douay Vers.) And let us remember that our Lord himself taught us to pray to His Heavenly Father to "deliver us from evil."

3. The following prayer is extracted from the writings of Cardinal Bona, one of the most learned ritualists of the Church of Rome, and who was intimately acquainted with the spirit of her teaching:—

"Oh most sweet Virgin Mary, Mother of God and our Lord Jesus Christ, *refuge of sinners*, and *mother of mercy*, I commit myself this day and evermore to thy peculiar *protection* with most humble devotion. Place me near unto thee, and protect *me from all my enemies, visible and invisible.* Say unto my soul I AM THY SALVATION. [The very words which David addresses to Jehovah, Ps. xxxiv. 3, Douay Version.] Direct me, thy servant, in all my ways and actions. Console me in all my griefs and afflictions. Defend and preserve me from all evils and dangers. Turn thy face unto me when the end of my life shall come; and may *thy consolation* repose my spirit in that tremendous hour. [David's confidence in that hour was placed upon Jehovah, Ps. xxii. 4, Douay Version.] *Thou canst do all that thou wilt in heaven and earth* [our Lord says, that all power in heaven and on earth was given to himself, Matt. xxviii. 18], *nor can any resist thy will* [applied by St. Paul to God, Rom. ix. 19]: for thou obtainest from the Almighty whatever thou seekest. *Hear*, therefore, and *receive my prayers*, and despise me not when I confide in thy mercy. Behold, *I fall down before thee*, most gracious Virgin, *I fall down and worship* IN THEE thy Son [adore in to Filium tuum]," &c.

If the Virgin were a fourth person of the Godhead, it would be difficult to conceive any terms stronger than these in which divine honour could be rendered her.

---

* Disputat. de Controv. Fid. Tom. ii., p. 112, sq. Pragæ, 1721.

† For a full discussion of this subject, see, amongst others, Gerhard Loc. Theol., tom. xi., p. 333. Ed. Cotta, 1772. Field, of the Church, book iii., ch. 22, sq.

‡ See the preceding article.

§ De Modo. Celeb. Conc. Gen., part. ii., tit. 10.

‖ Def. Pac., part ii., c. 24.

¶ Dial. de Rem. Cur. Evit.

** Iren. Cont. Hær., lib. iii., cap. 2.

†† Pighius de Controv., lib. iii., c. 2.

* Basil de Fid., c. 1.

† The *Manichæans* allowed the less perfect members of their body to marry, but imposed celibacy on the more perfect. The same distinction is made in the Church of Rome. The laity are allowed the use of their natural liberty; the monks and secular clergy, as being more perfect, are obliged to take vows of celibacy. The parallel is, unfortunately, closer still. Like the Encratites, the Manichæans did not practice what they taught, so that Augustine says—"They do not prohibit concubinage, but only marriage." Compare with this the notorious concubinage of the clergy, who were too perfect and holy to marry like other men, including St. Peter himself.

In the Church of Rome, then, the Virgin receives divine worship of the same kind as was paid to her by the heretical Collyridians. And no other precedent for such worship can be found in the early history of the Church.

The subject, of which we have thus briefly treated in this article, is a very large, and, it is needless to add, a very important one. We commend it most earnestly to the attention of our Roman Catholic brethren, and we entreat them to look well to the foundations of those peculiar doctrines and practices which they have been taught to believe have been transmitted from the Apostolic times, and even from the Apostles themselves, to the present day; but many of which, we solemnly and deliberately repeat it, may be ultimately traced to heretical sources.

SPURIOUS WORKS ATTRIBUTED TO THE FATHERS.

ST. ATHANASIUS AND ST. BASIL.

THERE is, perhaps, no way in which learned men could do a greater service to the cause of religious truth, or promote the cause of primitive worship more effectually, than by clearing the field of Christian antiquity of those spurious and noxious weeds which the enemy of truth has, from age to age, sown so artfully, choking in many cases the genuine and good seed, and in others mingling subtle poison with the wholesome fruits of God's truth—we mean, clearing the genuine works of eminent writers of the primitive Church from the spurious and apocryphal ones, which during past ages have been pawned upon them by either ignorant or dishonest men.

We think we should do a good service to our unlearned fellow-countrymen, both Roman Catholic as well as Protestant, if we could furnish them with a catalogue of works which once passed as unquestioned writings of eminent Fathers of the Church, but which have since been detected and discarded by learned Roman Catholics as doubtful or spurious, and which, therefore, ought never to be relied on by controversialists, without, at least, noticing that, as *authorities*, they cannot safely be relied on by any one desirous of arriving at the truth.

We purpose to give here one or two instances of spurious writings, which will be found not unimportant on the subject we have been considering—the *Invocation of Saints*.

ST. ATHANASIUS, the great champion of the Catholic faith, who was born A.D. 296, and died A.D. 373, left behind him, for the edification of the world, a number of works, admitted by all to be genuine, which demonstrate that he was a man of the most glowing piety, but a piety centering in God alone; and that he placed his whole hope and confidence, in life and in death, in the mercies of God, through the merits and mediation of Jesus Christ, our *only* Mediator, Advocate, and Saviour. We have already given our readers a passage from St. Athanasius (see No. 30, p. 71), which shows what his views of prayer were; and we are satisfied that there is not a single passage to be found in his genuine writings giving countenance to any worship of the Virgin, or any other saint, or any belief in her or their power and intercession, or any invocation of any of them, even for their prayers.

We here challenge our Roman Catholic correspondents and their friends to produce any passage from the works of this eminent saint and champion of the faith to contradict what we have said; and, we are sure, they will do so, if any such passage is to be found.

The importance of having such a passage from so great an authority as St. Athanasius on the subject, if it were possible to find one, cannot be more strongly demonstrated than by the use which has been made by the most eminent Roman Catholic controversialist writers of a Homily formerly ascribed to that Father; but which has long been rejected as spurious by the most learned authorities among Roman Catholic writers, as we shall proceed to prove.

The homily referred to is to be found in the second volume of the Benedictine edition of St. Athanasius's works, p. 393 to 401,* and is entitled "*On the Annunciation of the Mother of God;*" or, as it is given in the Latin translation, "Sermo in Annuntiationem Sanctissimæ Dominæ nostræ Deiparæ."

Our first witness is Cardinal Bellarmine, who declares this treatise to be spurious, and that the evidence against it is so strong, that no one can doubt but that the author of it must have seen the decrees of the Councils against Nestorius, Eutyches, and the Monothelites, none of which were held until after St. Athanasius's death.†

Our second witness is Cardinal Baronius, in his letter to Thomas Stapleton, dated Rome, November, 1592, in which he deliberately decides against the genuineness of this homily, and fixes its date, at the very earliest, subsequently to the commencement of the seventh century, three hundred years after Athanasius attended the Council of Nicæa. (See this well-known epistle in full, in the same volume of the works of St. Athanasius, above cited, p. 391.)

Our third authority is that of the learned Benedictine editors themselves, who, in their second volume, page 390, not only declare this homily to be unquestionably a forgery, assigning the reasons for their decision, but fortify their own judgment, by quoting, at length, the letter of Baronius, written more than a century before.

The Benedictine editors begin their preface thus—"That this discourse is spurious, THERE IS NO LEARNED MAN WHO DOES NOT NOW ADJUDGE. The style proves itself, more clear than the sun, to be different from that of Athanasius. Besides this, very many trifles show themselves here unworthy of any sensible man whatever, not to say of Athanasius, and a great number of expressions unknown to Athanasius, so that it savours of lower Greek. And, truly, his subtle disputation of the hypostasis of Christ, and on the two natures of Christ, persuades us that the writer lived after the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon (held in 431 and 451—St. Athanasius died in 372), of which councils, moreover, he uses the identical words, whereas his dissertation on the two wills in Christ seems to argue, that he lived after the spreading of the error of the Monothelites" (which did not arise till A.D. 630, under the reign of Heraclius).

After such a decisive judgment of these most eminent writers, that the homily in question is spurious, that the evidence of it was as clear as the sun, and that no learned man could hold otherwise, one would think that no Roman Catholic writer, having the least pretension to learning and honesty, would have ever ventured to rely on it again as an authority in controversy, or a guide in practice.

Yet, how stands the case? The very same Cardinal Bellarmine, who has himself condemned it as a forgery, the evidence of which is irresistible, actually has the effrontery (or, at least, has been guilty of such *unpardonable negligence*) as to cite this very homily, as the authority of St. Athanasius* for the invocation of saints, without the slightest allusion to its admitted spuriousness, or even as to any doubt or suspicion being attached to it; and, in like manner, again cites it without any qualification whatever in proof of the antiquity of the Feast of the Annunciation, on which occasion this homily was alleged to have been delivered by Athanasius.†

Can any more instructive lesson be given to intelligent and honest inquirers, as to the necessity for caution touching the genuineness of the authorities relied on by their instructors, than to find such a man as Cardinal Bellarmine thus *self-convicted* of relying on a spurious work, given up by all learned Roman Catholics, and, amongst others, by HIMSELF?

Cardinal Bellarmine does not, however, stand alone in this painful position.

Will our readers believe that CARDINAL WISEMAN, in the middle of the nineteenth century, has been guilty of the same negligence or dishonesty in quoting the same homily as the genuine work of St. Athanasius, without the faintest shadow of an allusion to the combined judgment of Baronius, Bellarmine, and the Benedictine monks, or even to any suspicion being entertained of its being a forgery!

It is painful, even to an opponent, to be obliged to expose such reckless misrepresentation; and were not truth at stake, we should gladly draw a veil over what must assume the character of a personal charge against a person whose authority seems to have the highest place among our Roman Catholic brethren. Truth, however, calls on us fearlessly to lay open the expedients by which the worship of the Virgin Mary is attempted to be defended in our own country, and our own times; and Cardinal Wiseman owes it to his own character, to explain to the world, if he can, how he could have made such use of the homily in question. Now for our proof.

The cardinal (then Dr. Nicholas Wiseman, Bishop of Melipotamus) thus introduces and comments upon extracts from this spurious homily, in his lectures, vol. ii., p. 108. London: Booker, 1836.

"St. Athanasius, the most zealous and strenuous supporter that the Church ever possessed of the Divinity of Jesus Christ, and, consequently, of his infinite superiority over all the saints, thus enthusiastically addresses his ever-blessed mother—'Hear, now, O daughter of David; incline thine ear to our prayers; we raise our cry to thee—remember us, oh! most holy Virgin; and, for the feeble eulogiums we give thee, grant us great gifts from the treasures of thy graces—thou that art full of grace. Hail, Mary, full of grace, the Lord is with thee; Queen, and Mother of God, intercede for us.' "Mark well," continues Dr. Wiseman, "those words, 'grant us great gifts from the treasures of thy graces,' as if he hoped directly to receive them from her. Do Catholics use stronger words than these? Or did St. Athanasius think or speak with us as with Protestants?"‡

What will our candid readers think, when we tell them that these passages are from the very homily in question, and that Cardinal Wiseman refers for his authority for these passages to the very Benedictine edition, and the identical volume of the works of St. Athanasius, which contains the irrefutable proof of their spuriousness!—Page 401, vol. ii.

Cardinal Bellarmine may have possibly cited the homily before he discovered its spuriousness; though this is not likely, for in his preface to the reader, prefixed to the volume in which the treatise De Scriptoribus Eccl. occurs, printed at Cologne, A.D., 1617, he commences by stating that he had written this treatise forty years before. But what defence can CARDINAL WISEMAN make for referring to a homily, which, if he had ever read it *in his own edition* he must have known had been given up as spurious for the last 250 years?

We shall be happy to hear what the Cardinal, or any of his friends or admirers, have to say in his defence, before we finally pronounce upon what appears to us to be utter recklessness, if not dishonesty; and as usual, our columns are open to any one who wishes to exculpate the Cardinal from the charge now made against him, or any others which we may feel obliged to make in our pages.*

Our next instance is one which we can dispose of more summarily.

SAINT BASIL, Bishop of Neocæsarea, died about A.D., 378. All Christians, whether in the earliest ages from his own times, or in more modern days, have agreed to do his memory honour; he is often appealed to under the title of the Great Teacher of truth, and acquired the name of the Great Basil, in contradiction to the multitude of bishops and pastors of the same name who succeeded him in other times, and were fully forty in number. We need scarcely be surprised, therefore, to find many confessedly spurious works ascribed to him; and the world is deeply indebted to the labours of the learned Benedictine editor, M. Julian Garnier, who has done so much towards the separation of the supposititious from the genuine works of this eminent writer.

In vol. iii., p. 69, Bened. Ed., Paris, 1730, the epistles attributed to St. Basil are arranged in three classes. First, those written by St. Basil before he was made bishop, A.D. 370; second, those which he wrote after he was bishop of Cæsarea, between 370 and 378; third, those without date, including many doubtful, and some spurious.

In page 462, vol. iii., appears one addressed to Julian the Apostate, numbered by the Benedictine editor 360, but originally printed as No. 205.

It is unhesitatingly ranked by the learned Benedictines, not merely as doubtful, but spurious; and no one, we apprehend, could open the book without, at once, noticing that it is so—for at the top of the page in which it occurs, are the words, printed in large capitals—S. BAS. CÆSARIÆ CAPPADOC. ARCHIEP. EPISTOLÆ SPURIÆ.—See page 462, tom. iii. Benedict., Paris, 1730.

The epistle in question is also specially condemned, and the reasons given in the life of St. Basil, prefixed to the same work (c. viii., p. lxiii).

Let us now see the use made of this spurious epistle by eminent writers of the Church of Rome.

Dr. Milner, in his defence of saint worship, in his "End of Controversy," letter 35, page 353, cites two passages only from the primitive Fathers which have the slightest bearing in support of the doctrine. The first passage, which is from Justin Martyr, our readers will find commented on in another article in our present number, page 85.

The second passage purports to be from ST. BASIL, and is as follows:—"I invoke the Apostles, Prophets, and Martyrs to pray for me, that God may be merciful to me, and forgive me my sins. I honour and reverence their images, since those things have been ordained by tradition from the Apostles, and are practised in all our Churches." Dr. Milner's reference is to Epis. 205, *Paris* edition (but without specifying the date).

Now, what is this 205th epistle but the very one to Julian the Apostate? and, we ask, did the Rev. Dr. Milner, who wrote in 1802, ever take the trouble of reading the epistle he thus quotes, or of looking at what the Benedictine editors, who wrote seventy years before, said of its undoubted spuriousness?

If Dr. Milner had the Benedictine edition before him when he wrote, we must pronounce him guilty of actual dishonesty, in concealing the fact that deprived the quotation of any authority; if he had not, what rashness was it for a man to assume the title of "*ending controversy*," when he did not even take the pains of knowing what the best writers of his own faith had written before him on the principal authority he relied on!

Truly, we cannot but be astonished at the risks which controversialists of the Church of Rome will run, when attempting to trace back the present practices of their Church to the times of our Lord and his Apostles; and whatever judgment our candid Roman Catholic readers may form of the fairness or the learning of Cardinal Wiseman or Dr. Milner, we think they must admit that the authorities relied on by such writers, require to be examined into with the utmost caution, before they allow themselves to adopt them as proofs that the modern doctrines of their Church agree with those of the Catholic antiquity of the primitive ages.

THE INVOCATION OF SAINTS.—No. II.

WE undertook, in our last number, to proceed to consider what has been said by the principal controversial writers of the Church of Rome, in support of their doctrine on this subject.

* Athanas. Opera, Tom ii., Benedict. ed. Paris, 1698.
† Bellarmine De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis. Cologne, 1617. Opera, Tom. vii., p. 50.

* Bellar., Tom. ii., page 295, De Sanct Beat. Lib. i., chapter xix., Cologne, 1615.
† Bellar., vol. ii., p. 338. De Cultu Sanct., lib. iii. c. xvi. Cologne, 1615.
‡ Dr. Wiseman's note refers to Serm. in Annunt., t. ii., p. 401, which is the exact volume and page in the Benedictine edition of 1698.

* We are amused to find, that though Messrs. Berington and Kirk, in their original work on the Faith of Catholics (London, 1830, p. 431) give the selfsame extract from this spurious work—falsely attributed to St. Athanasius—and cite it in the same way from the Benedictine edition, (*Serm. in Annunt, Tom ii., p.* 401), they have been discreet enough in their third and *greatly enlarged* edition, of 1846, to omit all allusion to it—see p. 344, vol. iii., where, under the head of Invocation of angels and saints, it ought to have been introduced between Eusebius and Hilary.

For the present, we shall limit our inquiries to two of the most conspicuous writers in the present century—Dr. Milner and Cardinal Wiseman.

We have already disposed of two of the principal authorities which are quoted by those distinguished writers, in another article, in our present number—the spurious Homily of St. Athanasius, and the spurious Epistle of St. Basil to Julian the Apostate, to which we beg to refer our readers —p. 84.

Bishop Milner, in his 35th letter, in the "*End* of Religious Controversy," page 353, cites but one genuine passage in any way bearing on the point; but it is one entitled to the greatest weight, if truly stated, being no less than that of JUSTIN MARTYR, whom Dr. Milner represents as writing thus—

"We venerate and worship the angelic host and the *spirits of the prophets*, teaching others as we ourselves have been taught." Surely, exclaims the reader, this is worth all you have said on the other side; for it shows that Justin Martyr attests that the Christians of his time, only forty years after the death of St. John the Apostle, venerated and worshipped both the angelic host and the spirits of the departed prophets; nay, more, attests that they had been taught so to do by their predecessors, which brings the testimony up to the very lifetime of St. John!

What, however, will our good readers think of the honesty and accuracy of Dr. Milner, who thus tries to *end controversy* on the subject, when we show them, by reference to the original, which Dr. Milner avoids, of course, that the passage is not only a grossly garbled one, but clearly mistranslated, and that Justin Martyr, in fact, never said any such thing as Dr. Milner imputes to him.

The passage referred to, and intended to be cited by Dr. Milner, occurs in Justin's first Apology, where having stated, that the Christians could never be induced to worship the demons, whom the heathens worshipped and invoked, he proceeds thus—"Whence also we are called Atheists (men without God); and we confess that, with regard to such supposed gods, we are Atheists, but not so with regard to the most true God, the Father of justice and temperance, and of the other virtues, without any mixture of evil. But both HIM and the SON, who came from Him, and taught these things to us, and the host of the other good angels accompanying and made like to Him, and the PROPHETIC SPIRIT, we reverence and worship, honouring them in reason and truth; and, without grudging, delivering the doctrine to every one who is willing to learn as we were taught."*

Now, whatever doubt a Greek scholar might possibly entertain as to the true translation of this passage in other respects, as to which we shall say a word presently, how any man of Milner's pretensions could have dared to transmute ΠΝΕΥΜΑ *τὸ προφητικὸν*, (the prophetic Spirit of God, worshipped by the primitive Christians, as He is still, as the third person of the Blessed Trinity), into the disembodied *spirits of the prophets*, is somewhat amazing! But what will not those who value short-lived victory more than permanent truth venture upon, in the vain hope that the ignorance of their readers may save them from the exposure they merit?

We admit that there is some ambiguity in the other part of the passage, and are aware, as Dr. Milner must also have been, that the ablest critics in the Roman Church are much divided as to the proper translation of the clause relating to the angels; some translating it as we do, "Him [God] and his Son who came from him, and taught us and the army of good angels those things, and the Holy Spirit we venerate and adore;" and others, "Him and his Son who came from him, and taught us those things, and the army of good angels and the Holy Spirit, we venerate and adore." The former making the word "taught" govern the words, "the army of the other good angels," while the latter makes the words, "revere and worship" govern the word, "angels." Supposing, however, each of these constructions to be possible grammatically, that the latter cannot be the true interpretation, will, we think, be clear to any one who plainly and closely considers the matter. To suppose it, would be to impute to Christians the practice of paying to the host of angels, the selfsame reverence, worship, and honour, which we pay to the Holy Trinity, the Supreme Father, His ever Blessed Son, and the Holy Spirit, and even placing the angels before the third person of the Trinity. All will revolt from such an interpretation, as not only impious, but contrary to the principles professed by the most celebrated Roman Catholic writers; and every candid man must, we think, admit, that if Justin Martyr had intended to represent the holy angels as objects of religious worship (which in no other passage of his writings is there the slightest trace of), he would have selected some more appropriate place for so stating, and would not so violently have thrust the mention of them among the Persons of the ever blessed Trinity, assigning to them a place between the second and third Persons of the eternal hypostatic union!

Feeling this strongly, and anxious to avoid the charge of impiety, some writers (and, among others, the Benedictine editor of Justin)† have attempted to draw a distinction between the two verbs in this passage, "reverence and worship," alleging that the lower degree of "reverence" expressed by the latter, applies to the angels; whilst the former verb, implying the higher degree of worship, alone relates to the Godhead. But this distinction rests on a false assumption; for the two words (*σεβόμεθα*) we reverence, and (*προσκυνοῦμεν*) we worship, are used equally to convey the idea of the highest religious worship, as is familiar to every scholar, who has studied the Septuagint and the Greek Testament.‡

In determining the true meaning of an obscure passage, grammatically susceptible of two different acceptations, the author himself is often his own best interpreter; and if he has expressed, in another place, the same leading sentiment, without the same obscurity, and free from all doubt, surely, the light borrowed from that passage ought to be used to fix the sense of the ambiguous one, and establish the author's consistency?

Now, Justin, in the very same treatise, a few passages further on, again defends the Christians against the same charge of being Atheists, and on the selfsame ground—first, "that they worship the Father, who is maker of all; secondly, the Son, proceeding from Him; and, thirdly, the Holy Ghost." In both cases he refers to the same attributes of the Son, as the teacher of Christian truth, and of the Holy Ghost, as the Prophetic Spirit. The following extracts are the only parts necessary for our present purpose—"Who of sound mind will not confess that we are not Atheists, reverencing, as we do, the Maker of the universe, and Him who taught us true things, and who was born for this purpose—Jesus Christ crucified under Pontius Pilate. . . . Instructed, as we are, that He is the Son of the true God, and holding Him in the second place; and the Prophetic Spirit in the third order, we, with reason, honour."‡ In which passage he makes no mention or allusion whatever to the angels, either before or after the Holy Spirit.

We would also, in confirmation of this view, refer our readers to another passage in the same treatise, No. 17, in which Justin distinctly says, "We adore God alone." (*Θεὸν μὲν μόνον προσκυνοῦμεν.*)§

We have no doubt, therefore, that the true meaning of the passage, cited in so unfair and garbled a manner (to say the least of it) by Dr. Milner, in his "End of Controversy," is as follows—"Honouring in reason and truth, we reverence and worship Him, the Father of Righteousness, and the Son (who proceeds from Him; and instructed in those things both ourselves, and the host of the true good angels following Him, and made like unto Him), and the Prophetic Spirit"—in which interpretation we follow the learned Grabe and Langus, entitled the interpreter of Justin, and other eminent writers.‖ (See S. Justini Apologia Prima cum Latina Joannis Langi versione. Edit. a J. E. Grabe, Oxoniæ, 1700, p. 11.)

We have now, we think, at least, said enough to satisfy our readers that Dr. Milner's version of the passage is not to be depended on, and that Justin Martyr cannot be considered an authority for the invocation of Angels. As to the invocation of Saints, there is not a suggestion, we venture to assert, from one end of his work to the other.

We had intended to proceed in our present number with another great controversial writer, Cardinal Wiseman, who has, in several articles, attempted to defend the practice of saint-worship; but this would embark us in a disputation too long for the state of our pages, and may, we think, be judiciously postponed till our next, especially as we have already alluded to a quotation of Cardinal Wiseman, in another article (see p. 84), which we desire to give him and his friends an opportunity of explaining before making any further attack upon the character of his authorities.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We would request our correspondents, both Roman Catholics and Protestants, to limit the length of their communications, and not to discuss a variety of distinct topics in one letter.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st.

To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal, which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, JULY, 1854.

THE connection between personal interests and systems of opinions has ever proved the greatest source of intolerance, as well as the greatest obstacle to the progress of truth in the world.

It is this clashing with their personal interests which has so often led the priesthood to represent a departure from their dogmas as the worst of crimes, and made them so ready to defend, by other than intellectual means, any doctrines with which their interest, power, and importance are closely interwoven.

We can scarcely, therefore, be surprised that the Roman Catholic priesthood in Ireland should avail themselves of all the means in their power to deter the laity from reading any publication likely to promote discussion as to the true nature and character of their authority, or the truth and accuracy of the doctrines which they teach.

That they should iterate and reiterate in private to individuals, and in public in their chapels—in neither of which ways it is possible for us to join issue with them—that our journal is a tissue of lies and calumnies, is no more than we expected; and the vagueness and sweeping character of the assertion constitute, perhaps, its best refutation.

To meet charges of such a nature by counter assertions, that we have never wilfully stated a single falsehood, or distorted a truth, would, of course, carry no additional conviction to the mind of any one, and we shall not, therefore, waste time, by a vain attempt to persuade those whose prejudices induce them to condemn unheard all who differ with them.

We cannot refrain, however, from quoting a passage from the celebrated Pascal, when defending himself against the calumnies propagated by the Jesuit Fathers against the Jansenists:—

"Other sorts of slander are rather too easily discredited; but you have those of a more subtle character, in which you abstain from specifying particulars, in order to preclude your opponents from getting any hold, or finding any means of reply—as for example, when Father Brisacier says that 'his enemies are guilty of crimes which *he does not choose to mention*,' would you not think it were impossible to prove a charge so vague as this to be a calumny? An able man, however, has found out the secret of it, and it is a Capuchin friar, Fathers—Father Valerian, of the house of the Counts of Magnis. He had happily succeeded in converting Prince Ernest, the Landgrave of Hesse-Rheinsfelt; your Fathers, however, seized, as it would appear, with some chagrin, at seeing a sovereign prince converted without their having had any hand in it, immediately wrote a book against the friar, and, also, circulated a letter against him, in which they said—'Ah! we have such things to disclose as will gall you to the quick! If you don't take care, we shall be forced to inform the Pope and cardinals about it.' This manœuvre was pretty well executed, and, I doubt not, Fathers, but you speak in the same style of me; but take warning from the manner in which the friar answered it in his book, printed last year at Prague—'What shall I do,' says he, 'to counteract those vague and indefinite insinuations? How is it possible to refute charges which have never been specified? Here, however, is my plan—I declare, loudly and openly, to those who have traduced me, that if they do not discover these crimes before the whole world, they are notorious slanderers, and most impudent liars. Come forth, then, mine accusers! and proclaim your lies upon the house tops, instead of telling them in the ear, and keeping yourselves out of harm's way by so telling them. In the meantime, I shall content myself with declaring MENTIRIS IMPUDENTISSIME. If the charges they make against me be true, let them prove it; otherwise they stand convicted of falsehood, aggravated by the grossest effrontery. Their procedure, in this case, will show who has the right on his side. I desire all men to take particular observation of it; and beg to remark, in the meantime, that this precious cabal, who will not suffer the most trifling charge, which they can possibly repel, to lie upon them, make a show of enduring, with great patience, those from which they cannot vindicate themselves, and

---

* τον αληθεστατου και παγρος δικαιοσυνής και σωφροσύνης . . . . . ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνόν τι καὶ τον παρ ἀυτου υἱον ἐλθόντα και διδαξαντα ἡμᾶς ταῦτα και τὸν τῶν ἄλλων ἑπομένων και ἐξομοιουμένων ἀγαθῶν ἀγγέλων στρατὸν πνευμα τε το προφητικον σεβόμεθα και προσκυνοῦμεν.

Et colimus quidem nos talium qui habentur Deorum esse expertes et atheos, sed non veritatis Illius Dei; *Patris* videlicet justitiæ et temperantiæ et virtutum aliarum: verum hunc ipsum et qui ab eo venit, atque hæc nos et aliorum sequentium et assimilatorum bonorum angelorum exercitum docuit Filium et Spiritum Propheticum colimus et adoramus, rum rationi et veritati venerantes, atque unicuique discere volenti et edocti sumus, candide tradentes.—*Justin Martyr*, Apologia Prima, p. 11, cum notis Thirlbii, 1722.

* Opera. Justin. Paris, 1742; Præfat. Pars. II., cap. iv., p. xxii.

† Exod. xxxiv. 14; Ps. xciv. (xcv.) 6; 1 Sam. (1 Kings) xv. 25; 2 Kings (1 Kings) xvii. 36; Heb. i. 6; Acts xviii. 7, 13, xix. 27.

‡ Bened. Ed., Paris, p. 51.

§ Bened. Ed., p. 54.

‖ Any one who desires to investigate the matter further will do well to consult Bishop Kaye's excellent work on Justin Martyr, p. 59 (Second edition, London, 1836); and Mr. Tyler's Primitive Christian Worship, p. 107 to 114.

conceal, under a counterfeit virtue, their real impotency. My object, therefore, in provoking their modesty by this sharp retort, is to let the plainest people understand that, if my enemies hold their peace, their forbearance must be ascribed, not to the meekness of their natures, but to the power of a guilty conscience. Thus, has this honest friar discovered the secret of shutting your mouths; and it must be employed, on all occasions, when you accuse people without proof. We have only to reply to each slander as it appears in the words of the Capuchin, *mentiris impudentissime*—you are most impudent liars."

Without, however, resorting to the expedient of the good Capuchin friar, there are some practical tests, we think, by which intelligent readers, however distrustful of those with whom they have been taught to differ in matters of religion, will find no difficulty in satisfying themselves, whether our pages are trustworthy, or whether we are guilty of the charges of deliberate falsehood and calumny, with which those whom they have been accustomed to consider their spiritual guides have so unsparingly and unjustly assailed us.

First, we would call the attention of our readers to the fact, that we have never yet, though two years and a half in active and most extensive circulation, been once detected in a false statement, a garbled quotation, or any other intentional unfairness, either in argument or assertion. Our readers, who have traced our progress, cannot fail to have perceived that we have been, all through, most carefully watched by men, most able and willing to expose the slightest inaccuracy, or semblance of unfairness of any species whatsoever; and who would willingly displace us from the high ground on which we have taken our stand, as champions of fair play, and candid inquiry, and expose and disgrace us for insincerity and untruth, if they could.

If, therefore, we have not been detected, or held up to the deserved infamy which awaits dishonesty and imposture, it is not owing to our opponents being ignorant of what we write, or being either unable or unwilling to defeat us, if it were possible to do so, by so summary a method as that of exposing, in any way, the conduct of our journal as discreditable to the character of its conductors.

Secondly, we would remind our readers that not one of the able Roman Catholic writers who have come forward, so earnestly, to defend the doctrines of their Church in our pages, have ever charged us with falsehood or fraud, while they have done their best to confute our arguments, and establish their own.

Thirdly, not a single Roman Catholic periodical has yet ventured to impeach a single statement we have made, or authority we have cited, though some of them have, in general terms, reiterated against us their wholesale charges of falsehood, calumny, and blasphemy, with all the virulence and foul-mouthed invective which the English language can supply.

One charge only has ever been made against our paper, which is at all of a tangible character, and that is, that its title is a false one, and calculated to deceive an unwary reader.

Upon this we would say a few words, and a very few will suffice for our complete justification—for, in our judgment, we think we could not have chosen a title more suitable.

As to its having misled a single reader, we boldly call on our opponents to point out a single number from the commencement of our labours, which could have left any reader in doubt whether the conductors of it were members or opponents of the Church of Rome. That we were dissentients from the Church of Rome, though candid and moderate opponents, ready to hear and discuss all that could be said in her favour, and anxious only to discover and lead others into truth, was apparent to all. The most bigoted monopolist of the title Catholic, never was or could have been led into misconception as to our real views and convictions.

We have, again and again, disproved the right of any denomination of Christians, however numerous, to arrogate to themselves *exclusively* the title of Catholic or Universal. We think the Greek Church, the Roman Church, the English Church, the Lutheran Church, are all branches (though some of them corrupt branches) of the one Catholic Church; but none of them alone, exclusively, has a just claim to arrogate to itself that venerable title; and it is because we would permanently record, in the most practical manner, our continued protest against the ill-founded claim of any *particular* Church to be the *whole* Church of Christ; that we deliberately selected a title which claims for ourselves, while it concedes to our Roman Catholic readers also, the title to which we think both entitled, of members of the *Catholic* Church of Christ. We ourselves claim, in the language of the Liturgy and prayers of the Church of England and Ireland, to be members of the "one Catholic and Apostolic Church," and we never will consent to waive that title, while we hold fast to the only ancient creeds and symbols of the primitive faith—creeds which we hold in common with all Catholics (Greek or Roman) throughout the world.

In the very first number of our paper, we defended our claim to the title when stating, explicitly, that there were several doctrines which all sincere Roman Catholics and Protestants hold in common, which might, with truth, be called Catholic (*i.e.*, universal) opinions, and demonstrated that our Roman Catholic brethren could not, consistently, deny the title of Catholic to any who are sincere believers in the Trinity, without setting at defiance both the voice of antiquity, and the language of one of the authorized formularies of both Churches—the Athanasian Creed—which is clear and explicit, where it says, in terms the most express, "This is the Catholic faith, that we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity."

If the Roman Catholic priesthood of Ireland or England have any other charge to make against us, let them bring it forward manfully, in a fair spirit, and we shall rejoice to discuss the matter with them with Christian forbearance and candour; if they will not do so, but continue their present vain and inconsistent attempt to ignore our existence, while, at the very time, they are falsifying their own policy by denouncing us as liars, we shall be driven at last to retaliating on them by saying, in the words of the honest Capuchin friar, "*mentiris impudentissime.*"

Correspondence.

IS THE DOCTRINE OF PURGATORY TAUGHT BY THE EARLY FATHERS?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.*

SIR—I find the subject of Purgatory revived in your April number, by a Mr. John Duffy (No. 28, p. 52). The question was raised in your journal, Vol. I, Nos. 6 and 7, when you published a letter of "A Catholic," who wished "to know, once for all, if it (Purgatory), *was* or *was not* the doctrine of the Church of Christ in the first ages." He limited his inquiry to the writers of the "first three centuries." Mr. W. C. Search undertook to supply the information required (see Vol. I, No. 7, p. 81): and among the alleged authorities he quoted Tertullian, as follows:—

"I. Among the apostolical traditions received from the Fathers, we have oblations for the dead on the anniversary day.—*De Corona Militis*, p. 209."

"II. In his treatise on Monogamy, cap. x., p. 155, he advises his wife, 'Pray for the soul of your departed husband, entreating repose to him, and participation in the first resurrection—making oblations for him on the anniversaries of his death.'"

In your observations on these two passages, you state that the doctrine of Purgatory is not proved by them, and, therefore, think it unnecessary to inquire whether they "do really allude to Purgatory or not." You seem to admit that Tertullian believed in Purgatory after he became a heretic; that he learned the doctrine from an acknowledged heretic, Montanus; and the books from which the passages in question are cited were both written *after* he became a heretic. Every candid inquirer after Catholic truth must admit this to be a sufficient reply to the citations of Mr. W. C. Search. Mr. John Duffy, however, recurring to this subject, again quotes one of the above passages from Tertullian, and again in his (Tertullian's) book, 'De Corona Militis,' 'We make yearly oblations for the dead.'" To Mr. Duffy's citation you observe—"Though this passage might be cited to prove the practice of prayer for the dead in Tertullian's time, it is obvious that it does not bear at all on the doctrine of Purgatory." But as Tertullian speaks of a *custom* then existing in the Church, among some Christians, I think the passages deserve a little further investigation and explanation than that given by you, particularly as more than one great principle is involved in them. From firmly-rooted prejudices and preconceived notions, our Roman Catholic lay brethren are too apt to construe silence into a defeat. Your correspondents will still believe, and will re-quote, when opportunity offers, the passages in question as *proofs* that the *modern* Roman doctrines of Purgatory and praying for the dead *did exist in the third century*. Romanists appeal to these passages as proofs of an alleged historical fact; and you will permit me, therefore, to make a few additional observations as supplementary remarks to your answers.

It will be observed that Mr. Search quotes more fully than Mr. Duffy; I will, therefore, direct my observations to Mr. Search's citation; they will apply with equal force to Mr. Duffy's still more garbled extract.

I. I have to complain of two serious *amissians* from the first quotation, which very much affect the force and sense of the passage; and *first*, Mr. Search has omitted the words, "and not enforced by the positive words of Scripture," after the word "Fathers." He gives the *page*, without naming the *edition* from which he quotes. But if he consults, among other editions, Edit. Rothomagi, 1662, p. 289, he will find the missing passage. But as I will not accuse Mr. Search of intentional dishonesty, we must take for granted that he has quoted this passage from some Roman Catholic book of controversy. You, sir, have already shown him the danger of relying on such books for proofs, when he comes to measure swords with us, Protestants. (See No. 9, p. 107; No. 10, p. 119.) For their satisfaction, I would refer Mr. Search and Mr. Duffy to the handbook of Romanists—namely, "The Faith of Catholics," by Kirk and Berrington. They will find, in page 354, of the edition of 1813, and p. 356, edit. 1830, the passage in question thus translated:—

"Among the apostolical traditions received from the Fathers, *and not enforced by the positive words of Scripture*, he reckons oblations for the dead on the anniversary day."

The omission of these few words is very significant. Here is an admission, by the author quoted, that the custom in question is *not* enforced by Scripture. Tertullian reckons this among many other ceremonial usages (many of which are wholly relinquished by the Roman Church at the present day) as a matter of *discipline*, and not as a point of Christian *faith*. The book, "De Corona Militis," was written in defence of a Christian soldier, who declined to wear a crown or garland which his companions in arms wore as a direction from the emperor, and as an honour or mark of distinction, when the conduct of the Christian soldier was inquired into. The context of the passage is as follows:—

"It is easy forthwith to demand, where it is written, that we should not be crowned, but truly, where is it written that we should be crowned? for when the opposite party demands the authority of Scripture for our opinion, they, in fact, predetermine that their own side ought to possess the authority of Scripture for theirs. For if it shall be said, that it is lawful to be crowned, because Scripture does not forbid it, with equal justice may it be retorted, that it is unlawful to be crowned, because Scripture does not enjoin it. How shall discipline act? Shall it receive both opinions, because neither is forbidden? or shall it reject both, because neither is commanded? But, it may be said, that which is not forbidden is freely permitted. Yea, rather, that is forbidden which is not freely permitted.

"And how long shall we thus spend our labour to no purpose, while there exists, on our side, immemorial observance, which, by anticipating the ground, has made the principal point in the case. If no Scripture has determined the matter, it is certainly confirmed by usage, which, without doubt, flowed from tradition. For how could anything be frequently practised, if it had not been previously handed down? But thou sayest, even in the holding out of tradition, written authority is to be demanded. Let us inquire, therefore, whether tradition, though unwritten, ought not to be received. We should not hesitate to adopt the negative of this question, were the matter not prejudged by examples of other observances, *which we vindicate without any support from writing, by the authority of tradition alone*, from thence by the protection of custom."

* We have to apologize to the writer of the following valuable letter for so long delaying its insertion. The crowded state of our columns must plead our excuse.—Ed.

Tertullian then proceeds to enumerate some ceremonial usages of the Church, as not being taught or prescribed by Scripture, or Divine revelation, and among them "*oblations for the dead, for their birth-days to heaven, on the anniversary day.*" Or, as Mr. Search gives it, oblations for the dead on the anniversary day; and Mr. Duffy—"We make yearly oblations for the dead." Tertullian then concludes with these words—"If for these, and other such like regulations, you demand the law of the SCRIPTURES, *none can be found, (si legem expostules Scripturarum, nullam invenies*). Tradition will be held up before you as originating, usage as confirming, and faith as practising them."

Now, it must be observed that Roman Catholics have also quoted this first passage in proof of the antiquity of Roman Catholic "masses." Modern Roman oblations for the dead, and masses for the dead, are almost inseparable; and it is now, also, produced as proof, that the doctrine of Purgatory was believed in the 3rd century. I ask Mr. Search and other Romanists, lay and clerical, whether they are ready to stand by the testimony of Tertullian—namely, that there is no warranty in Scripture for their doctrines of Purgatory and masses, and prayers for the dead? I do not think they will dare to make so wide an admission; and if not, they must entirely renounce the testimony of Tertullian. It may not be amiss to notice, that when Tertullian is talking of a matter of *faith*, as necessary to be believed, he uses a very different strain; here he makes a direct appeal to SCRIPTURE, and rejects all other authority. He "adores the fulness of Scripture." "Whether all things were made of any subject matter, I have as yet read nowhere. Let those of Hermogenes' shop show that it is written; if it be not written, let them fear that woe which is allotted to such as add or take away."* We now can appreciate the value of the omission of the words which refer to the Scriptures in the first part of the quotation.

With this second rebuke Mr. Search will be a little more careful before he quotes, second hand, from books of which personally he seems to know nothing, and I trust Mr. Duffy also will profit by the lesson.

II. I now come to the second part of the first passage quoted.

I cannot discover from whence Mr. Duffy borrows; but Mr. Search adopts the translation given by Kirk and Berrington—"We have oblations for the dead on the anniversary day." I now accuse Mr. Search of another serious omission. I have given above the proper translation—"We make oblations *for their birth-days to heaven* on the anniversary days." The original passage is—"Oblationes pro defunctis, *pro natalitiis*, annua die facimus."

To understand the meaning of this passage, a few words of explanation will be necessary. I hope to make it clear, that the *oblation* referred to was not the modern sacrifice of the mass, nor was it offered for souls in Purgatory. Martyrdom, among the early Christians was considered a passport to heaven. The persecutors, we read in Eusebius' history, endeavoured to destroy all traces even of their dead bodies, to prevent the survivors giving them burial; but what could be saved were honourably interred by the Christians, who, adopting the old Greek custom, celebrated their memory about their tombs, to encourage the survivors to fortitude and perseverance. We then read of the *anniversary festivals*, or commemorations of the day on which martyrs suffered, called the *days of Nativity*, as they were on that day born to a new life. By reason of the great persecutions these meetings became very frequent. At these assemblies prayers were offered up and thanksgivings that the martyrs had gained a victory, their names were rehearsed, the eucharist celebrated, almsgivings, which were afterwards called *oblations*, were then made to the poor. These alms were made in fruits, corn, wine, &c. That these *oblations* were *doles* or *gifts* only in kind is evident from the explanation given in the canons of the councils of Carthage and Vaisons.† A simple narrative is given in the Epist. Smyrn.—"We can never abandon Christ nor serve another; we adore Christ as the Son of God, and we cherish the martyrs as the disciples and followers of our Lord; we solemnize the day of their nativity, which is the day of their death, in remembrance of such as have conflicted for the truth, and in order to the exercising and exciting others to imitate their example. We hope to be made capable of the like graces, and, at last, copartners and fellow-sharers in the same glory." There is also a very remarkable passage in one of the books attributed to Origen—"Let us observe, O friends, what a change has taken place in men. For the ancients (Greeks) celebrated the natal day, loving one life, and not hoping another after this. But now we do not celebrate the *natal day*, because it is a begioning of gifts and temptations; but we celebrate *the day of death*, inasmuch as it is a laying aside of all gifts, and an escape from all temptations. We celebrate the day of death, because those die not who seem to die. Wherefore, we both observe the memorials of the saints, and devoutly keep the *remembrance* of our parents and friends which die in the faith; *as well rejoicing for their refreshing* [which cannot be in Purgatory] as requesting also for ourselves a goodly communion in the faith. Thus, therefore, we do not celebrate the day of birth; because they which *die* shall live for ever, and we celebrate it, calling together the religious persons with the priests, the faithful with the clergy; inviting, moreover, the needy and the poor, feeding the orphans and widows, that our festivity may be for a MEMORIAL OF REST to the souls departed (ut fiat festivitas nostra in memoriam requiei defunctis animabus, quorum memoriam celebramus) *whose memory we celebrate*, and to us may become a sweet savour in the sight of the eternal God"‡

That these commemorations and oblations were offered for, or in memory of martyrs, then actually enjoying *eternal happiness*, is evident from the writings of Cyprian, who professed himself to be a pupil of Tertullian, and a great admirer of his writings.†

Referring to certain martyrs, Cyprian says—"Finally, also, take note of the days on which they depart from life, that we may be able to celebrate their commemoration among the anniversaries of the martyrs: although Tertullus, our most faithful and most beloved brother, according to the usual anxiety and care which he shows to the brethren in every kindness and labour of love . . . has written, and does write, and signify to me the days on which in prison, OUR HAPPY BRETHREN, by issue of a glorious death, PASS TO IMMORTALITY; and oblations and sacrifices are here celebrated by us, on account of their commemorations, which we shall speedily hold in company with you, the Lord being our protector." (‡)

In the 37th Ep., p. 73 (edit. as before), he says—"Sufficiently blessed are those of you, who, journeying by these footsteps of glory, have already departed from life; *and the path of virtue and faith having been completed, have arrived* AT THE PRESENCE OF THE LORD (ad complexum et osculum Domini), the Lord himself rejoicing."

Ep. xi. p. 23.—"Torments which do not readily dismiss to a crown, but torture until they overthrow; unless that some one, rescued by the Divine majesty, should expire amidst the very torments, having *obtained glory*, not by termination of punishment, but by the quickness of dying." Again, in the 31st Ep. p. 62, he talks of others dying "confessing Christ." "The world having been abandoned, to have sought heaven—men having left to stand among angels—and all secular hindrances having been burst asunder, now to be placed, liberated, *in the presence of God*, to hold fast WITHOUT ANY DELAY a heavenly kingdom."

From passages such as these, which might be multiplied, we can at once comprehend the meaning of Tertullian's words, when he speaks of oblations for the dead, on these anniversary days of commemoration.

According to the modern Roman doctrine, *all* the faithful—all those who die in the faith of Christ—go to Purgatory, before they can be in a fit condition to appear before God; and the Trent Catechism distinctly asserts this imaginary receptacle to be a place of suffering, and which Bellarmine, and a host of writers, describe to be of a most horrible nature. This modern Purgatory, therefore, could not be the place where the martyrs, &c., named by Tertullian and Cyprian, and others, were consigned, when they offered up their "oblations" on the anniversary days of their death, as they evidently believed them to be in happiness. Cyprian even expressly states them to be in the presence of their Lord.

The second part of this first quotation in question I have translated—"We make oblation for the dead, *for their birth day to heaven*, on the anniversary day." Mr. Search has omitted to translate the word "pro natalitiis," which omission destroys the true sense of the phrase, "oblationes pro defunctis, *pro natalitiis*, annua die facimus." In adopting the translation of *natalitiis*, "*for their birth-day to heaven*," I only follow authorities of his own church. De la Cerda, the Jesuit, on this passage, says—"By *natalitia* Tertullian means the days on which Saints, dead to the world, are born to heaven."§ And another Roman Catholic, Priorius, says—"By *natalitia* Tertullian means the solemnities accustomed to be held in honour of martyrs, on the day on which, being dead to the world, they were born to heaven. From whence we make oblations on the annual day—that is, yearly."‖

The omission of the word *natalitia* (if intentional) is most obvious; for its appearance in the proper place clears the passage of all difficulties. Thus, then, we now come to the truth—*first*, that the ceremony spoken of is not warranted by Scripture, which we discover not from Mr. Search's version of it, but by consulting the original text; and, *secondly*, that the ceremony itself had no reference whatever to the doctrine of Purgatory, the truth of which also becomes apparent by the substitution of a word also omitted or suppressed by Mr. Search, as also by Mr. Duffy.

III. I observe that the word "apostolical" prefixed to "tradition," is a gratuitous addition made by Mr. Search or his adviser. The word does not appear in the original, and is unwarrantably foisted in, for very obvious reasons.

Thus, then, in the quotation of two lines and a half, we have two serious omissions and one interpolation, all *apparently* intentional, and inconsistent with that accuracy and good faith which should be scrupulously observed in religious controversies.

With your permission I will take the second quotation another time.*

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

C. H. COLLETTE.

London, 2nd May, 1854.

* Adore Scripturæ plenitudinem.—*Tert. Adv. Hermog*, cap, 22, Edit Rothom. 1662, p. 417. "An autem de aliqua subjacenti materiâ facta sint omnia, nusquam adhuc legi. Scriptum esse docuit Hermogenis officina. Si non est Scriptum, timeat væ illud adjicientibus aut detrahentibus destinatum.—*Ibid., ibid.* See Edit. Paris, 1664, p. 247.

† See Scultet. Med. Theol. Petrum. Amb. 1603, p. 307.

‡ Orig. Oper. Studio Erasmi, Basil, 1536, tom. I. p. 800, ex off. Frobeu.—Lib. iii., comment. in Job.)

† See Jerome, vol. iv., pt. ii. p. 115, edit. 1684.

‡ Ep. xii., edit. Oxon. 1682, p. 27. Tom. ii.

§ Tertullianus intelligit per natalitia dies, quibus sancti, mundo mortui nascuntur cœlo. De la Cerda e soc. Jesu, *in loc.* Tert. Op. Paris, 1624, p. 657.

‖ Prior, in Loc. Tert. Oper. Rig. et Prior. Annotat. adject. Lutet. 1664, p. 102.

ON INFALLIBILITY.

WE have received a long communication from our respected correspondent, Mr. Rourke. He finds it hard when his pen is set going to get it to stop; however, he has kindly divided his communication into three portions, each of reasonable length. We strongly recommend his example, in this respect, for imitation by our other correspondents. We can often find room for a short letter, when a long one is obliged to stand over, month after month, from the mechanical difficulty of making room for it without displacing other more pressing matter. And a correspondent, thus dividing his letter, will not injure his chance of seeing *both* parts appear in the same number, should the state of our columns admit it.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Accept my sincere thanks for your kindness in inserting my long letters, on the infallibility of the Church of Christ, in your widely-circulated journal. I beg leave to send you another letter on the same interesting subject; but it will be a short one, as I will not, for the future, "disregard your request to be brief." I most earnestly and affectionately call the attention of your truth-seeking readers to the following passages from the Sacred Volume, which invincibly and irrefragably prove the infallibility of Christ's Church. But, before I open the Holy Book, will you permit me to say that I did not, in my last letter, charge you with wilful blindness, as you declare. My meaning was that, as the Jews reading the Old Testament, by reason of their blindness, cannot see Christ in the Scriptures, but shall, when they believe in him, and have the cover removed, perceive all to be most plainly done, and spoken of him in their law and Scriptures; even so the opponents of the Church of Christ, having a far greater cover of blindness and incredulity over their hearts, in respect of the Catholic Church, which they impugn, than the Jews have concerning Christ, cannot see, though they read, or hear the Scriptures read, ever so much, the marvellous evidence of the Catholic Church and truth in all points; but when they shall return again to the obedience of the same Church, they shall find the Scriptures most clear for her and her doctrines, and shall wonder at their former blindness.

Here follow the passages above alluded to:—"For this is as the waters of Noah unto me; for as I have sworn that the waters of Noah should no more go over the earth, so have I sworn that I would not be wroth with thee (the Church), nor rebuke thee. For the mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed, but my kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed, saith the Lord, that hath mercy on thee. And all thy children shall be taught of the Lord, and great shall be the peace of thy children. In righteousness shalt thou be established: thou shalt be far from oppression, for thou shalt not fear; and from terror, for it shall not come near thee. No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper; and every tongue that shall rise against thee in judgment, thou shalt condemn. This is the inheritance of the servants of the Lord, and their justice with me, saith the Lord."—Is. liv. 9, 10, 13, 14, 17.

Our Lord again says—"I, the Lord, do keep it (the Church), I will water it every moment; lest any hurt it, I will keep it night and day."—Isai. xxvii. 3. These are passages, sir, which, as I have said in the preface, irrefutably prove the infallibility of the Church of Christ. How, you must tell your readers, can she err if the Lord cannot be angry with her, if she is founded in righteousness, if her children are taught of the Lord, if his covenant cannot be removed from her, and if he keeps and waters her continually with heavenly truth?

Again, St. Paul says—"Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you, let him be accursed."—Gal. I. 8. Now, I ask, whether the Apostle did not here claim an infallibility in what he had preached? whether in these words he allowed the Galatians to believe that he had been under a mistake? or whether it be not plain that he demanded an entire submission to the doctrine he had taught them? and how far, then, was St. Paul from encouraging the private judgment of any man to

* Your correspondents may now consult "Pope's Roman Misquotations," which will enlighten them further on the subject. London, 1849.

control his decisions, since he would not allow it even to an angel from heaven, but pronounced those accursed that should pretend to reform the doctrine he had preached?

Common sense tells us, sir, that without subordination there can be nothing but confusion in either Church or State, and that without an authority which all are bound to acknowledge there can be no subordination—that shaking off the yoke of authority to become one's own guide in the affair of religion, must tend to pride, to obstinacy, and to every species of religious phrensy;—that those famous heresies, which have from time to time distracted the Christian world, have all arisen from this want of submission;—that it is the essential character of every heresy to be maintained in opposition to the Church's authority;—which gave St. Augustine occasion to say that he might indeed err, but would not be a heretic; meaning that he was secured from heresy by his disposition of ready obedience to the Church. Common sense tells us that the bulk of mankind, through their ignorance, their weakness of understanding, and their several avocations, being incapable of examining the Scriptures, or of judging for themselves, must unavoidably rely upon authority. From these motives of plain reason the Roman Catholic is sufficiently convinced that to be guided by authority is his indispensable duty; if it be his duty, it is, therefore, what God requires of him; and surely by doing what God requires of him, he cannot go astray. Thus, even, without any help from Scripture, the Roman Catholic is assured he cannot be misled by following the authority of the Church.

But he who differs from the Roman Catholic Church has every reason to fear being led astray, by interpreting the Scripture according to his own opinion and judgment, when he considers that to be mistaken in opinion is what daily happens to thousands and thousands in other matters less difficult than those of religion. Is not this even what he himself must say of all those who, following their own opinion as he does, yet differ from him? Is it not even the nature of man to be liable to error of judgment? And what privilege can he plead to be exempt from the common lot of mankind? Is it that he seeks the truth with more candour and sincerity than others do? Such a notion, however he may flatter himself with it, must appear presumption and folly in the eyes of others. Moreover, by persuading himself he cannot go astray in his own interpretation of Scripture, he assumes to himself that infallibility he denies to the Roman Catholic Church. Besides all this, he has to encounter against the certainty of his opinion an argument which cannot possibly fail to make the deepest impression on any unbiassed mind. I mean that the sense he gives the Scripture is contrary to the sense in which it is understood by all the wise and learned men the Roman Catholic Church comprises within its pale, and contrary to what is acknowledged to have been believed by all Christendom, at least for several ages. If, after all this, he persists in saying that he is sure he is right in following his own opinion and judgment, we can only beseech God to give him what Solomon begged of the Almighty for himself—that is, a docile heart. But it is sufficiently plain to whoever is open to conviction, that he has no just cause to be assured he is not mistaken in his opinion, and of course that he has no reasonable grounds of certainty with regard to his faith.

To sum up all in a word—faith is, of its own nature, certain and infallible. Opinion is not. Whatever persuasion, therefore, is built on opinion, cannot be faith. Hence, there can be no true or real faith but what is grounded on authority—that is, not only the authority of God revealing (which all sects pretend to), but also the authority of the Church, as the only sure channel through which the sense of revelation is conveyed to us.

As this letter is comparatively short, the "temptation to skip" cannot be very strong for your readers. You will soon hear from me again.

I remain, sir,

Your obedient servant,

WILLIAM ROURKE.

Passage East, June, 1854.

With regard to Mr. Rourke's preliminary remarks, we have to say, that we know it is quite true that the interpretation put on the Bible by a member of the Church of Rome, is quite different from that put on it by any one else. And the reason is plain enough. A member of the Church of England reads the Bible with no other object than to learn what Scripture teaches, and to govern his belief by it. A member of the Church of Rome only gets leave to read the Bible on condition that he will find in it the doctrines of his Church; he opens the Scriptures, not to seek for truth, but to look out for arguments to defend the opinions which he has been taught that he must on no account question; and so it is no wonder if the interpretation he puts on texts be very different from what any one else would pronounce to be the plain meaning of them.

Mr. Rourke's first Scripture argument is taken from the prophecies addressed by Isaiah to the Jews; and it would, at first sight, appear, that if it proved the infallibility of any Church at all, it would prove the infallibility of the Jewish Church. If a Jew, however, were to endeavour to maintain, by the help of this text, that his Church was right in rejecting our Lord for their Messiah, Mr. Rourke, no doubt, would answer, that the text was *a prophecy*, which had not been fulfilled in the time of our Lord, seven hundred years after the prophecy was delivered. Well, we want to know, has this prophecy yet received its complete fulfilment. We know that the Church of Christ is to exist hereafter in a glorious and triumphant state, and that there are many prophecies which describe her as she shall be in that state. Mr. Rourke seems to forget this entirely; and applies to the Church, in her present state, every prophecy which he finds about her. Mr. Rourke (we have no doubt, without any designed unfairness) leaves out two verses in the middle of his quotation, which yet would greatly assist us in forming an opinion which state of the Church the prophet is speaking of:—"I will lay thy stones with fair colours, and lay thy foundations with sapphires. And I will make thy windows of agates, and thy gates of carbuncles, and all thy borders of precious stones. And all thy children shall be taught of God," &c. Now, let our readers open the 21st chapter of the book of Apocalypse, and see whether the time the prophet refers to is not that still future time, spoken of also by the writer of the Apocalypse.

No doubt, the prophecy receives, even now, a partial fulfilment; no doubt, still whatever spiritual knowledge the children of God receive, they are taught of God; but their full measure of light and purity is, doubtless, still future. The inapplicability of these prophecies of Isaiah to the present state of the Roman Catholic Church is still more apparent from other parts of the same prophecy, which are also omitted by Mr. Rourke, but which were brought forward by a former correspondent, who cited the same text from Isaiah.—Vol. I., p. 130. "INIQUITY shall be no more heard in thy land, waste and destruction in thy borders; and salvation shall occupy thy walls, and praise thy gates."—Is. lx., 18. Is Rome without *iniquity?* Have not many successive Popes, by the confession of her own historians, been monsters of iniquity?

Again—"The Lord shall be to thee an everlasting light, and *the days of thy mourning shall be ended.*"—Is. lx. 20.

Compare this with the letter of Pope Pius IX., dated 21st November, 1851:—"In the midst of the incessant and painful solicitudes with which *the calamity of the times overwhelms us* . . . it is for us no slight subject of sorrow, to behold what *a sad and lamentable spectacle is presented by our holy religion* and civil society *in these calamitous times.*"

Is not this sufficient to show that these prophecies of Isaiah have not found their complete fulfilment in the present times, but that they relate to that state of the New Jerusalem, spoken of in Apocalypse xxi., to which we have already referred, when "God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and death shall be no more, nor mourning, nor crying, nor sorrow shall be any more; for the former things are passed away."

Mr. Rourke next quotes a text, on which Protestants are accustomed to rely, as a very strong argument on their side—"Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you, let him be accursed."—Gal. i. 8. This proves, decisively, that the doctrine taught by *St. Paul* was infallibly true; but it certainly proves nothing for the infallibility of the Church of Rome. Accordingly, we accept, as infallible authority to govern our belief, the writings of St. Paul and the other Apostles and Evangelists; and when we find the Gospel taught by them differing very materially from that taught by the Church of Rome, this text is one, among others, why we reject her claims to our submission, and why we rather fear that she has brought herself under the curse denounced upon those who substitute another Gospel for that preached by the Apostle.

Next, after his arguments from Scripture, Mr. Rourke proceeds to prove, from common sense, the necessity and the duty of submission to authority. We are no foes to authority; we inculcate the duty of submitting to authority—children to that of their parents, subjects to rulers, pupils to schoolmasters, private Christians to their spiritual teachers, &c. But there is only one authority which must be submitted to implicitly, at all times and under every circumstance—the authority of God himself. All human authority, being exercised by men liable to error, may exceed its bounds, and may require to be occasionally resisted. If Mr. Rourke's argument were good, the Mahometan and the Hindoo might, with equal force, conclude, "that to be guided by authority is their indispensable duty; that being their duty, God must require it of them; and that doing what God required, they could not possibly go astray." And they would, on Mr. Rourke's principles, be fully justified in refusing to give a hearing to the Christian missionaries who should call on them to question the authority of the religious guides to whom they had from their childhood submitted themselves. We can see, then, that a man who should implicitly submit to authority, without taking due pains to assure himself that that authority is Divine, is not only not free from the danger of being misled, but is taking the very most likely means of running into error.

It follows, then, that Mr. Rourke is very much mistaken as to the greater certainty with which he imagines his method to be attended. Mr. Rourke is obliged to follow his own opinion and judgment as well as ourselves. He uses his private judgment, once for all, in selecting an authority to submit to, and then shuts his eyes, and follows blindly. Protestants submit to authority also; but they do so with their eyes open, constantly taking pains to assure themselves that the claims of their guide are well founded, and that his directions are reasonable and consistent. Which is most likely to be mistaken? How important is it that Mr. Rourke should not be mistaken in the one exercise of private judgment which he makes.

Faith, it is true, *in God* is certain and infallible; but faith in any human authority is not. We may be quite sure, that whatever God has revealed must be true; but as to what any human authority teaches, our certainty can never rise any higher than whatever certainty there may be that God has commissioned that authority. Mr. Rourke's certainty can, therefore, never rise any higher than whatever probability there may be for the truth of this one proposition to which his private judgment has led him—viz., that the Church of Rome is infallible.

We beg of him, then, to examine the truth of this proposition with all the care which its importance deserves. We borrow Mr. Rourke's own words, and apply them to himself.

May he not be mistaken in this opinion? Does it not happen to thousands to be mistaken in their opinion in questions far less difficult? Is it not the nature of men to be liable to error of judgment? What privilege can he plead to be exempt from the common lot of mankind? Is it that he seeks the truth with more candour and sincerity than others do? By persuading himself that he cannot go wrong in his choice of a Church, he claims for himself individually that infallibility which his Church denies to all but herself. Besides, he must remember, that this opinion of his—that the Church of Rome is infallible—is contrary to the conviction of all the wise and learned men who are outside the pale of that Church, and contrary to the opinion of Christendom for several ages, and to that of more than half of Christendom at the present day.

Of a number of travellers through a difficult country, half endeavoured to direct their steps by the aid of a trustworthy map; half submitted themselves to the conduct of the first guide who offered himself. And while these last bragged of the greater ease and certainty of their method, how were their brethren distressed to find that the path along which this guide confidently led them was plainly marked on the map as leading to precipices and other dangers. How they would try to persuade them that their certainty of being safe could never be higher than whatever certainty there was that their guide was a safe one, and that this probability could not be high, when he disregarded the directions of the map whose authority they all acknowledged.

It is with such feelings as these that we appeal to Mr. Rourke. We respect him as a sincere and candid inquirer after truth. He has occupied our pages, not with vulgar abuse, but with a fair attempt to prove his religion by arguments, and he has taken with good humour our remonstrances when we thought him occasionally too lengthy. It is, therefore, with pain that we see one false assumption at the bottom of his whole system. We do not feel more certain of any proposition in Euclid than we are of the fact that the Church of Rome not only *may* err, but *has* erred in several important points. We, therefore, are earnest in our request to Mr. Rourke to weigh well the grounds on which he submits himself to her. Can nothing better be said for her than the mere general assertion, that in human matters we are obliged (with due caution) to avail ourselves of the guidance of authority? or that God has promised that a time shall come when his Church shall be free from sin and error?

MUST THE DIVINELY-AUTHORIZED INTERPRETERS OF A REVELATION BE NECESSARILY INFALLIBLE?

SIR—I see that your correspondent, Mr. Rourke, in common with most of the Romish controversialists, takes it for granted that those whom God appoints to teach the meaning of the Bible must, of necessity, be secured from error. But it is strange that the case of the Jewish clergy does not occur to Mr. Rourke and others; and cause them to pause.

Had not the Jewish Church a revelation, even the Old Testament? Had not the Jews a clergy to teach them the meaning of Scripture; whose lips, Malachi says, should keep knowledge, whilst the law was to be sought at their mouth? Were the Jewish clergy, or were they not, infallible in exercising their office of interpreting Scripture? If they were infallible, what becomes of Christ's pretensions? If not infallible, what of the *a priori* argument that the Divinely-authorized interpreters of a revelation must necessarily be secured from possibility of error?

Of course Mr. Rourke may say, though without the shadow of proof, that the Jewish clergy had forfeited their previously enjoyed attribute of infallibility before they condemned our Lord. But how could they have justly forfeited it? Not certainly by false teaching, for that must *follow* and not *cause* the loss of infallibility. How, then, except by want of humility, or zeal in holding fast the truth, or by some other fault of temper, or living? But, having lost infallibility, were they, or were they not, still the priests of God's Church? That they were no longer the priests of God at our Saviour's time, will not, I am sure, be pretended. (See John xi., 51). If they retained their office, then have we an instance of a fallible clergy divinely authorized to expound revelation. And, further, if the Jewish

clergy might, through pride or immorality of life, deprive itself of infallibility, supposing them to have once possessed it; I see no reason, in the nature of things, why the Romish or any other branch of Christ's Church, might not, through unfaithfulness, forfeit any—no matter how great—gifts with which we may believe it to have been originally endowed.

But there is another answer, no doubt, ready—namely, that though the divinely-authorized expositors of the *Old* Testament were fallible, yet those of the *New* Testament cannot be so. But this gives up the question—a new position is here assumed; not that the authorized interpreters of *any* revelation must of necessity be infallible; but that, whereas God left the expositors of his message to man fallible, until Christ's coming, he can no longer do so with propriety. But to attempt to prove this by abstract reasoning, and without plain authority of Scripture, were absurd. We may well require God's own Word to convince us, that, what he once did, it would be derogatory to his attributes that he should do again.

Let Romanists, then, give us texts; and any which they may produce we will blind ourselves dispassionately to examine. But, if they have any fear of the guilt of blasphemy, let them beware how they represent as absurd that very arrangement which God did, confessedly, make for his Church before the time of Christ. He gave a revelation, and a clergy to explain it; he directed the laity to receive in general their clergy's instructions; and still he left the clergy exposed to error; and the people, if they would blindly follow them, he made liable to be led astray by their influence.

Such a mode of ordering things may, indeed, be condemned; but the condemnation rather befits the open infidel than any one who assumes to himself the Christian name.

Your obedient servant,
A KILDARE CHURCHMAN.

FLOWERS FOR JULY.

THE summer sun of July, of which we had but too little as yet, usually makes the most confirmed citizen pine for the open space and invigorating air of the country. Sometimes it drives him to seek the rippling stream and the sheltering wood, or tempts him to bend his footsteps towards the heather. What more delightful on a summer's day than to tread the wild HEATHER, with its gorgeous purple bell flowers around our feet? The heather belongs to the now aristocratic family of the Heaths or Ericas. Twenty-five years ago there were but four species of heath known in these kingdoms; no doubt pretty flowers, of dark purple, red, or rose colour, and most susceptible of improvement by cultivation. Since then, upwards of 300 varieties have been introduced, chiefly from the Cape of Good Hope, and form some of the most graceful and attractive ornaments of the greenhouse. Of our own native heaths, the common heather (*Erica vulgaris*) is the most familiar. The cross-leaved heath (*Erica tetralix*) is found growing on our boggy lands, and the fine-leaved heath (*Erica cinerea*) in the woods and thickets. Another variety has been found on the mountains of Connemara and Erris, which exactly corresponds with the Mediterranean heath. In Scotland, the heather is interwoven with many of the Highlander's dearest associations; it is often his couch and his covering. Everywhere the heath is esteemed the emblem of solitude; well may it be of that solitude to which many parts of our beloved country have been reduced by recent famine and pestilence. Emigration has added to this solitude; but it at least brings its consolation, that our exiled brethren are gone to a land of active industry and mental freedom, and are emancipated from the spiritual tyranny which sits, like a nightmare, on the faculties and free-will of too many of our countrymen at home. Alongside the heather, we are sure to meet the HAREBELL (*Campanula rotundifolia*), with its drooping flowers of azure and white. The extreme grace of this fair and fragile little flower, growing on moor and mountain, the delicacy of its tints, the lightness and elegance of its quivering form on its fairy-like stem, revelling in the freedom of its existence, have excited the imaginations of the poets, some even to persuade themselves that they hear its soft bells chiming,

> "Perchance to soothe the fairy queen,
> With faint, sweet tones in night serene,
> When glowworm lamps illume the scene
> And silvery daisies dot the green."

Others tell you that the harebells are in the habit of giving expression to conceits such as this—

> "No rock is too high, no vale is too low,
> For our fragile and tremulous forms to grow.
> Sometimes we crown
> The castle's darkest towers, and look
> Laughingly down
> Upon the pigmy men in the world below,
> Wearily wandering to and fro."

The corolla of the harebell is so similar to the common wild hyacinth that it is often confounded with it. In Scotland, it is the far-famed "blue-bell," the subject of many a song and glowing passage in Scottish minstrelsy. But the harebell is not more free and unconstrained in its movements than the Celtic Highlander himself, 300 years since, freed from the thraldom of a system which all experience has proved to be detrimental alike to the liberties and the moral energies of a people, as it is to their temporal and spiritual prosperity—for it is the social upas tree, under which nothing flourishes but the rank weeds of ignorance and poverty. Some time ago, we blushed to read in the page of history that Ireland, with treble the arable acres of Scotland, has, from some unhappy cause, not only not been able to contribute its own expenses to the nation, (while Scotland has yielded, for half a century, above five millions a year of clear surplus); but, that in the great famine of 1846, while Roman Catholic Ireland received eight millions sterling of alms, from the imperial treasury, Protestant Scotland—great part of which had suffered just as much—received nothing. The different condition of the Celt in Scotland from that of the Celt in Ireland is a wonderful fact, and if any doubt remained that it arises from the freedom from spiritual and ecclesiastical oppression which the former enjoys, it should be placed beyond controversy, by the prosperity of the Irish emigrant in America, when his hard taskmaster, the priest, is left behind.

But let us descend from the mountains and their congenial atmosphere of freedom to the river-side. Here we meet, in full flower, the charming White WATER-LILY. Among florists it bears the appropriate name of *Nymphæa alba*, or white nymph or naiad. It is a native of the British Isles and of most parts of Europe. In Ireland it is particularly abundant, and the tourist to Killarney, or Glendalough or Lough Dan, in Wicklow, or to the less frequented lakes of Connemara or Cavan, will be sure to meet specimens of this fair inhabitant of the waters. It is a sight truly refreshing to the eye on a sultry summer day, to see a pure white water-lily resting on the placid surface of a lake, or floating on the sluggish stream of a river. Its large, broad, oval leaves spread out like a fan, and so smooth and shining that the water runs over their oily surface, are the very picture of cool comfort; while the fair flower itself, of splendid white, faintly tinged with rose colour, seems to be the stately river-queen, presiding with native dignity over all around. The yellow water-lily (*Nymphæa lutea*), with its golden flowers, is of kindred with the white water-lily, and is also to be found growing in the lakes and rivers all over the country. The roots of the white water-lily form an excellent dye, and have been used for dying wool and yarn black, both in the Hebrides of Scotland and in Connemara.

But to proceed to the flower-garden, we have the PINK, just now in full perfection and bloom, and few flowers are more generally cultivated, or more esteemed than the pink, for its elegance of form, and rich, spicy fragrance. The various plants and flowers of the pink tribe go under the general name of *Dianthus*, or Jove's flower, given to them by Linnæus to express his admiration of this charming family. The popular appreciation of the pink is emphatically expressed every time we describe a thing supremely excellent, as the pink of perfection. So the particularly pleasing shade of light crimson colour, derives its distinctive name of pink from the prevailing hue of the favourite flower.

There are several species of the pink found wild in England, but in Ireland we believe but two. The pheasant eye-pink (*Dianthus plumarius*) is found in the County of Cork. The wild clove-pink—the parent of the carnation (*Dianthus caryophyllus*)—is also common in our land, and is known by its five plain petals, scolloped at the outer edge. Its chief attraction is its fragrance, like the clove, whence it derives its name. Its highly-prized offspring, the carnation, takes its name from the flesh-colour (*caro*) of some of its varieties. By cultivation its petals have become doubled, and assume all colours, but generally dark red, pure white, or striped, marbled, or piebald; yet it continually betrays its origin by a tendency to return to its ancient simplicity and singleness, unless carefully watched and cultured.

The *Indian Pink* (*Dianthus Chinensis*) is another well-known variety, derived from abroad. It is particularly rich and various in the combination of its colours. The Sweetwilliam (*Dianthus barbatus*) is another variety of clustered pink; called by the French, poet's pink, or nosegay of pinks. It grows wild in Germany and on the hills of Normandy.

It is a curious fact, that the pink appears to have been unknown to the ancients, as we may reasonably infer, not merely from the Greek and Latin poets being silent in its praise, and the naturalist, Pliny, never mentioning it, but from neither the Greek nor the Latin language having, in truth, any term to designate it. It surely could not have been known and unnoticed. The German poet, Göethe, in his "Captive Song," represents the prisoner pining for his favourite flower, the "forget-me-not," yet doing full justice to the pink.

> "The pink can no one justly slight,
> The gardener's favourite flower;
> He sets it now beneath the light,
> Now shields it from its power."

And we may fairly conclude, that the flower which Linnæus designated as worthy of being dedicated to the chief god of the heathen mythology would not have been passed unnoticed by Pliny had he been acquainted with it. In the sentimental language of flowers the pink is esteemed to be the emblem of love—its dedication is too often as senseless and unreal as if it were to Jove the imaginary god of the heathen. Selfish and imperfect, indeed, for the most part, is the love of man to his fellow; though the Scriptures teem with exhortations, such as—to abound in love—to be knit together in love—to walk in love as Christ loved us—to speak the truth in love—forbearing one another in love—serving one another in love, and continuing in brotherly love; and the spring and principle of all that is expected of us is given by St. John—"Beloved, let us love one another, *for* love is of God; and every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God. He that loveth not knoweth not God—for God is love."—1 Ep. John iv., 7 and 8. If our people were taught more of this from their altars, would we not be better friends and neighbours, and better Christians, too? Would we not tell each other the truth in love, and not retort in anger, and bitterness, and rioting, and bloodshedding? and if a man told us what he thought to be the truth, although we might think it all error, yet would we not forbear in love? If the loving Apostle St. John, who understood the nature and principle of brotherly love, perhaps, more intimately than any mere man that ever lived, were among us, he would say, "Let us love one another, for love is of God, and God *is* love;" and he would tell you again, what he has already done, both in his Epistle and Gospel, in what remarkable manner God manifested his love to us—not, indeed, as many of our readers would naturally suppose, from what they hear and read in their rosaries, by sending the Blessed Virgin Mary, or St. Joseph, or St. Peter, or St. Alphonso, into the world; no, none of these mercies—and, no doubt, great mercies in their way, as to the New Testament saints, at least, some of them are even hinted at; but the one grand, absorbing manifestation of God's love, which obscured all others—was—"In this was manifested the love (charity, in the Douay Bible) of God towards us, because God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him." (1 Ep. St. John, iv. 8; "For God so loved the world as to give his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him may not perish, but may have life everlasting."—St. John iii. 16, Douay Bible. This is the simple declaration of the Douay Bible itself; and our Roman Catholic readers should inquire why it is not kept more prominently under their view? Why the bright and cheering light of these comforting truths should be obscured under a cloud of modern inventions and fables which disparage the love of God—the gift of his only begotten Son—and virtually deny that "whosoever believeth in him, shall not perish, but shall have everlasting life;" for if this truth were really received, we should never hear more of Purgatory or penance, or intercession of saints or angels.

FARM OPERATIONS FOR JULY.

(*From the Irish Farmers' Gazette.*)

THE late rains, succeeding such a protracted drought, have stimulated the growth of weeds in no ordinary degree, and, in the majority of cases, the green crops also, which, with the general routine business of the farm—viz., haymaking and hoeing the green crops—will render the present month one of harassing and anxious care and attentive watchfulness to the farmer, to whom a well-considered and properly-organized system will be a safeguard, and carry him through with satisfaction to himself and those around him; but the want of it will bring vexation, disappointment, and loss.

Hay.—This being the most general month for cutting and saving meadow hay, much care and exertion are necessary in the various operations to secure a good and nutritious article for winter and spring provender; to do which, observe the precise period at which the greater portion of the most valuable grasses are in their prime and full of their most nutritious juices, so as to combine with the greatest possible weight the most nourishing qualities. If cut too early, it shrinks too much in drying, and the quality is not so valuable; on the other hand, if allowed to stand till the seeds become ripe the bulk may be increased; but the saccharine juices have become dissipated, and lost in maturing the seeds, and the culm is converted into woody fibre, containing very little or no nourishment. The proper period will be found by avoiding both extremes, and cut the grass, if the weather permits, when the greatest number of choicest grasses are in bloom.

Parsnips, Carrots, and Mangels, if not already singled out, should now have that operation performed without loss of time. The general treatment is similar to that already described for Swedes, except that the tap-rooted plants, in most cases, require singling by hand.

Transplanting Swedes and Mangels.—Blanks in the crops of Swedes or mangels may be filled up by transplanting. The portions of drills to be planted should be freshly turned over by the spade or fork, the plants carefully lifted, the outside leaves trimmed off, and the roots dipped in a rich puddle; they are then dibbled in, taking care not to double up the roots, and have the earth gently pressed about them. Warm, moist weather should be chosen, and if the weather comes on dry afterwards, they should be watered till they take root.

Potatoes in drills should have their final earthing given them, and all weeds eradicated.

Rape and Cabbages should be planted out after early potatoes or vetches, as fast as the land is cleared.

Odds and Ends.—Make good all requisite repairs about the homestead, barns, stables, hay and corn stadtles, &c. Cleanse the yards, sheds, ponds, water-courses, and ditches; paint all the outside woodwork, and farm implements not in use.

New and Recent Works

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

Booksellers to the Queen,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

ALFORD'S GREEK TESTAMENT, with a Critically Revised Text Marginal References, and Commentary. New Edition. Vol. I., much enlarged, 32s. Vol. II, 28s. (Vol III in preparation.)

HISTORY OF THE PROPAGATION OF CHRISTIANITY. By the Rev. William Browne, M.D. 3 Vols. 8vo. 36s.

KINGDOMS OF THE GENTILES, AND THE CHURCH OF THE HEAVENLY CALLING. Post 8vo. 5s.

MEMOIR OF THE REV. JOHN JAMES WEITBRECHT. By his Widow. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

SUNNY MEMORIES OF FOREIGN LANDS. By Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe. 2 vols. Post 8vo. 12s.

A MILITARY TOUR IN EUROPEAN TURKEY, THE CRIMEA, AND ON THE EASTERN SHORES OF THE BLACK SEA; including Rontes across the Balkan into Bulgaria, and excursions in the Turkish, Russian, and Persian provinces of the Caucasian Range. By Major General A. F. Macintosh. 2 vols. 21s.

THE RUSSO-TURKISH CAMPAIGN OF 1828-29; with a View of the present State of the Eastern Question. By Colonel Chesney. 12s.

TURKEY, RUSSIA, THE BLACK SEA, AND CIRCASSIA. By Captain Spencer. With Coloured Illustrations and a Map. 6s.

LIVES OF THE EMPEROR OF RUSSIA, NICHOLAS I.; AND THE SULTAN OF TURKEY, ABDUL MEDJID KHAN. By the Rev. Henry Christmas. 2s. 6d.

THE RUSSIAN SHORES OF THE BLACK SEA, IN THE AUTUMN of 1852, with a Voyage down the Volga, and a Tour through the Country of the Don Cossacks. By Lawrence Oliphant. 8vo. 14s.

ALISON'S HISTORY of EUROPE, from the fall of Napoleon, in 1815, to the Establishment of Military Government in France, in 1852; being a continuation of his former celebrated Work. Vols. I., II., and III. 8vo. 15s. each.

A HANDBOOK FOR TRAVELLERS IN TURKEY; describing Constantinople, European Turkey, Asia Minor, Armenia, and Mesopotamia, with Maps and Plans. 10s.

NARRATIVE OF A JOURNEY THROUGH SYRIA AND PALESTINE, IN 1851 AND 1852. By C. W. M. Van de Velde. 2 vols. 8vo. 30s.

THE HISTORY OF THE FRENCH PROTESTANT REFUGEES, from the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. By Charles Weiss. 8vo. 14s.

HOPE DEFERRED, NOT LOST; a Narrative of Missionary effort in Sonth America. With Journals of Captain Gardiner, &c. 5s.

ON THE PLURALITY OF WORLDS. An Essay. 8vo. 8s.

MORE WORLDS THAN ONE. The Creed of the Philosopher, and the Hope of the Christian. By Sir David Brewster. 6s.

LECTURES DELIVERED IN THE BETHESDA CHAPEL, DUBLIN, BY THE LATE REV. W. H. KRAUSE. Edited by the Rev. C. S. Stanford. Vol. I. 5s.

THE WARRANT OF FAITH; or a Handbook to the Canon and Inspiration of the Scriptures. By Rev. Robert Whytehead. 6s. 6d.

THE WORKS OF THE LATE REV. ALEXANDER CARSON, LL.D. Vol. III. Containing all his works on the Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. 5s.

EXAMINATION OF MR. MAURICE'S THEOLOGICAL ESSAYS. By Robert S. Candlish, D.D. Crown 8vo. 6s.

THE LAND OF SINIM; or, China and Chinese Missions. By the Rev. William Gillespie. 5s.

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY; with an Inquiry into the Causes of its Inefficiency: with a especial reference to the Ministry of the Establishment. By the Rev. Charles Bridges, A.M. Eighth Edition; corrected and enlarged. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

AN INQUIRY INTO THE ORGANIZATION AND GOVERNMENT OF THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH. By Rev. Albert Barnes. 2s.

CLAUDE, THE COLPORTEUR. By the Anthor of "Mary Powell." 7s. 6d.

ISRAEL IN EGYPT; or, the Books of Genesis and Exodus. Illustrated by Existing Monuments. Fcap. 8vo. 6s.

THE TWO NATURES OF A BELIEVER, as they are Revealed in Scripture, and Evidenced by Experience in the work of Regeneration and Sanctification. By a Layman. 3s.

VESTIGES OF THE DIVINE VENGEANCE IN THE DESTRUCTION OF SODOM AND GOMORRAH. By W. E. Tayler. 3s.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND ERASTIANISM. By J. R. Pretyman. 7s. 6d.

JESUS TEMPTED IN THE WILDERNESS. By Rev. Adolphe Monod. 2s. 6d.

SABBATH MORNING READINGS IN THE BOOK OF LEVITICUS. By the Rev. Dr. Cumming. 5s.

THE ECLIPSE OF FAITH; or, Visits to a Religions Sceptic. Fifth Edition. 5s.

THE CONVENT AND THE MANSE. By Hyla. 1s. 6d.

QUICKSANDS on FOREIGN SHORES. Edited by Mrs. Whately. 3s. 6d.

GRATITUDE: an Exposition of the Hundred and Third Psalm. By the Rev. John Stevenson. 8vo. 6s.

SYNONYMS of the NEW TESTAMENT. By Rev. Richard Chenevix Trench. 5s.

A SELECTION of ENGLISH SYNONYMS. Edited by Archbishop Whately. 3s.

ON THE STUDY of WORDS. By Rev. Richard C. Trench. 3s. 6d.

ON THE LESSONS in PROVERBS. By Rev. Rd. C. Trench. 3s.

THE BOOK AND ITS STORY: a Narrative for the Yonng, on occasion of the Jubilee of the British and Foreign Bible Society. By L. N. R. With an Introductory preface, by Rev. T. Phillips. Fcap. 4s.

THE DENS of LONDON: Notes and Narratives of a Six Years' Mission among them. By R. W. Vanderkiste. Cheap Edition. 1s. 6d.

HOME TRUTHS: being Miscellaneous Addresses and Tracts. By the Rev. J. C. Ryle. 3rd Series. 3s. 6d.

PLAIN SPEAKING. First series. Being forty short, Large-type Tracts. By the Rev. J. C. Ryle, B.A. In packet. 1s.

KATHERINE ASHTON. By the Author of "The Experience of Life." 2 Vols. 12s.

THE LAMPLIGHTER. With Illustrations. 3s. 6d. Cheaper Edition, 1s. 6d.

POOR PADDY'S CABIN; or, Slavery in Ireland. 1s. 6d. and 2s. 6d.

SHADOWS OF THE FUTURE; or, the Real Antichrist. The destinies of Rome, Constantinople, and Jernsalem. The World's Confusion, and the Coming Restorer. 6d.

WERTHEIM'S PACKET OF THIRTY TRACTS, assorted. Second series. 2s.

LIFE OF CARDINAL RICHELIEU. By J. Robson. With illustrations. 3s. 6d.

SCHAMYL AND THE CIRCASSIANS. By K. R. H. Mackenzie. 1s.

THE LADY'S COMPANION TO THE FLOWER GARDEN. By Mrs. Loudon. Sixth edition. 7s.

THE FRUIT, FLOWER, AND KITCHEN GARDEN. By the late Patrick Neill, LL.D. Fifth edition. 5s.

WANDERINGS AMONG THE WILD FLOWERS: How to see and how to gather them. By Spencer Johnson, M.D. With 173 engravings. 5s.

A POPULAR HISTORY of BRITISH FERNS, comprising all the Species. By Thomas Moore. Coloured Illustrations. 10s. 6d.

POPULAR FIELD BOTANY: A Familiar History of Plants. By Agnes Catlow. With 20 coloured plates. 10s. 6d.

A POPULAR HISTORY of BRITISH SEA-WEEDS, with Notices of some of the Fresh-water Algæ. By Rev. D. Landsborough. 10s. 6d.

THE SEA-WEED COLLECTORS' GUIDE: Containing plain instructions, for collecting and preserving. 2s. 6d.

HANDBOOK of ANGLING: teaching Fly-fishing, Trolling, Bottom-fishing, and Salmon-fishing. By Ephemera. 5s.

THE SEASIDE BOOK: being an Introdnction to the Natural History of the British Coasts. By W. H. Harvey, M.D. New Edition. 5s.

A BOOK for the SEASIDE. With numerous Engravings. 3s. 6d.

WAKEMAN'S HANDBOOK OF IRISH ANTIQUITIES. 5s.

BLACK'S GUIDE BOOKS for TOURISTS; with Road Maps and numerous Illustrations:—
I. England, 10s. 6d. II. Scotland, 8s. 6d. III. Ireland, 5s.

BLACK'S GUIDE TO DUBLIN AND THE WICKLOW MOUNTAINS. 1s. 6d.

BLACK'S GUIDE TO KILLARNEY AND THE SOUTH. 1s. 6d.

TWELVE VIEWS OF THE PICTURESQUE SCENERY IN IRELAND. In elegant enamelled cover. 1s.

JOHNSTON'S MAP OF THE SEAT OF WAR, in the Danubian Principalities. 1s.

JOHNSTON'S NEW MAP OF THE BLACK SEA, CAUCASUS, CRIMEA, ETC., with enlarged plans of Sevastopol and the Bosphorus. 1s.

JOHNSTON'S CHART OF THE NORTH SEA, and the BALTIC, with the Countries adjoining; and Enlarged Plans of Cronstadt and Revel. 1s.

8vo. boards, price 14s.

THE INSPIRATION OF HOLY SCRIPTURE, its Nature and Proof. Eight Discourses preached before the University of Dublin. By William Lee, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College.

Dublin: JAMES M'GLASHAN, 50, Upper Sackville-street.
London: RIVINGTONS, Waterloo-place.

Lately Published,

WILLET'S "SYNOPSIS PAPISMI." New Edition. Edited by the Rev. J. Cumming, D.D. Ten vols. 8vo. Price £3.

London: JAMES MILLER, 17, Berner's-street, Oxford-street, and all Booksellers.

Just published,

New Edition, Royal 4to., cloth, price 5s. 6d.,

THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN,

Vol. I, with complete Indexes.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY AND Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London: WERTHEIM AND MACKINTOSH, Paternoster-row.

Just Published, Fcap. 8vo., Price 2s. 6d.

I.

THE FIRST RESURRECTION: Being Comments on First Corinthians, Chapter xv. By the Rev. Robert Noble, A.M., Vicar of Athboy.

II.

Fcap. 8vo., cloth, price 1s. 6d.

THE PRINCIPLES OF ELOCUTION: Compiled from "The Elements of Rhetoric, by Archbishop Whately." With considerable additions and alterations.

III.

New Edition, Fcap. 8vo., cloth, Price 2s. 6d.

THE COLLECTS OF THE LITURGY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND,

Catechetically Explained, Compared with Scripture, and Briefly Commented upon, with the Date and Origin of each Collect annexed. For the use of Families and Sunday Schools.

By the Rev. Charles Miller, A.B.

With Recommendatory Preface by the Bishop of Meath.

IV.

Fcap. 8vo., Neat Cover, Price 1s.;
Cloth, 1s. 6d.; Cloth, Gilt Edges, 2s.

THE TALK OF THE ROAD: Showing how Irish people talk about Irish doings, when they get a quiet place at the back of a ditch, or under a hedge.

V.

Royal 32mo., Price One Halfpenny each.
Stories about the Mission Work in Ireland.

THE BRIGHT SIDE OF A DARK CLOUD.
BIDDY LACY.
FLOWERS TRANSPLANTED.
THE SHORES OF LOUGH CORRIB.
THE FIRST SCHOOLS IN CLIFDEN.

(The Series to be continned.)

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY AND Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London: WERTHEIM AND MACKINTOSH.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON, and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher, WILLIAM CURRY, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.
JULY, 1854.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Gloir do Dhia añ ṡna háṁduib, agus ṡíoḃċáin air an ṫalaṁ ḟeaġḋoil do na ḋáoiniḃ.

Luke II. 14.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. III.—No. 32. AUGUST, 1854. { Annual Subscription, 3s. 6d. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

PAGE.

The Benedictines of St. Maur—Mabillon 91
The Relics of St. Theodosia 92
Immutability of the Church of Rome—Tradition and Development 93
On the Succession of Irish Bishops 94
The Archbishop of Spalatro's reasons for resigning his archbishopric, A.D. 1616 94
Pasce Oves—Had St. Peter jurisdiction over the other Apostles? . 95
Talk of the Road—No. XXIV. 95
Pastoral of Dr. Cullen—Feast of the Assumption . . 96
CORRESPONDENCE:
On Infallibility—by Mr. Rourke 98
On the phrase Dominus Deus Noster Papa, by An Eoghirer . 99
On the Catholic Church—by a Roman Catholic . . . 100
On Infallibility—by W. R. 100
Flowers for August 100
Farming Operations for August 101

THE BENEDICTINES OF ST. MAUR.

In our unceasing exertions to provide our readers, month after month, with matter interesting as well as instructive, we have frequently contemplated diversifying our pages with a series of biographical sketches, such as might either illustrate the subjects we have in hand, or, at least, convey useful information to such of our readers as have not time or opportunity to acquire it elsewhere. We shall now attempt to carry our plan into effect, and think we cannot begin better than by noticing that remarkable confraternity, to whose great erudition and vast industry we are indebted for those valuable volumes, to which we have so often referred (forming, indeed, in themselves, no inconsiderable or uncostly library), the best editions which the world has ever seen of the earlier and later Fathers—Justin, Irenæus, Tertullian, Basil, Ambrose, Jerome, Cyril of Alexandria, Hilary, Chrysostom, Augustine, Origen, Athanasius, Gregory the Great, Cassiodorus, Gregory of Tours, Lanfranc, Anselm, and Bernard—we mean the Benedictine congregation of St. Maur, who, during the 17th century, successively produced those gigantic specimens of literary industry in the monastery of St. Germain des Prés, at Paris.

Of the hundred and five writers who divided among them this harvest of literary renown, *Mabillon* is the one who best deserves our notice, as he whom all the rest revered as their great example, and acknowledged, by acclamation, as their head; and in attempting to exhibit some slight sketch of that great seminary, in its days of splendour, in the reign of Louis Quatorze, we shall, perhaps, do well to confine our attention to this eminent writer, whose works have placed his name at the head of the competitors for the palm of erudition, in, perhaps, the most erudite nation of the world, at the period of her greatest eminence in learning.

Jean Mabillon was born at the village of St. Pierre Mont, in Champagne, on 23rd November, 1632. He was sent by a paternal uncle to the College at Rheims, founded by the celebrated Cardinal of Lorraine, for the education of clergymen; where, except while addressing their teachers, the pupils passed in profound silence every hour of the day, save that of noon. In 1653, he was received as a postulant at the Benedictine Monastery attached to the Cathedral Church of St. Remy, from whence, after he had taken the vows, he was sent to another monastery at Corbie, for the recovery of his health, which had seriously suffered during his novitiate, and he was afterwards transferred, by the commands of his superior, to the Royal Abbey of St. Denys. Never, perhaps, was there a more sincerely pious or obedient son of the Church, or one whose simple tastes, devout spirit, and affectionate nature would, under a more genial discipline, have produced a character more lovely, even had his diligence and critical sagacity, and extent of his knowledge been less wonderful. Even as it was, beneath the shade of what we cannot but consider many superstitions, and the burden of many errors, he soared immeasurably above the ordinary ascetics of the cloister, and obeyed, to the letter, the command of the founder of his order, by devoting every moment of his life to some useful and energetic occupation.

It was shortly previous to the birth of Mabillon that the congregation of St. Maur had taken possession of the monastery of St. Germain des Prés. At the time of his arrival at St. Denys, Dom Luc D'Achery, another Benedictine monk, was engaged in a great compilation, from the libraries of France, of the rare and valuable letters, poems, charters, and chronicles relating to ecclesiastical affairs, which had been deposited in them during a series of ages. These gleanings extended to thirteen great volumes, and were published under the name of *Spicilegium*. Such, however, were the bodily infirmities of the compiler, that, for forty-five years, he had never been able to leave the infirmary; and Mabillon, then in his 35th year, was withdrawn from his charge at St. Denys to the relief of this venerable scholar at St. Germains, where he passed the whole of his remaining life, with the exception of several tours, which he accomplished at a later period, through Flanders, Bargundy, Switzerland, Germany, and the whole of Italy, for the purpose of collecting and transcribing those valuable manuscripts, which were not then, as now, accumulated in the Royal Library at Paris, but dispersed in the conventual, episcopal, and other public archives through all the countries before mentioned.

The commencement of his fame was laid in a demeanour admirable for self-denial, humility, and loving kindness. To mitigate the sufferings of D'Achery, and to advance his honour, had become the devoted purpose of his affectionate assistant. Taking his seat at the feet of the old man, Mabillon humoured his weakness, stole away his lassitude, and became, at once, his servant, his secretary, and his friend. From the resources of his far deeper knowledge, guided by his much larger capacity, he enabled D'Achery to complete his Spicilegium—generously leaving him possession of the undivided honour of that contribution to the literary wealth of France.

Nor was this the only, or the greatest sacrifice, which he made to gratify the feelings of the aged antiquarian. The heads of the Benedictines had long meditated a complete history of their order. During forty successive years they had accumulated for the purpose a body of materials of such variety and magnitude as to extinguish the hopes, and baffle the exertions of all ordinary men. Having found, at length, in Mabillon, one "fitted to grapple with whole libraries," they committed to him the gigantic task, which he undertook in the spirit of obedience and love. In the printed circular he joined the name of D'Achery to his own, and kept alive the same friendly fiction by uniting their names in the title page of every volume of "the Acta Sanctorum Ordinis S. Benedicti," which appeared in D'Achery's lifetime.

The literary annals of France, though abounding in prodigies, record nothing more marvellous than the composition of that book by a single man; and, however absurd in our eyes is the Roman Catholic hagiology profusely contained in it, yet apart from the extravagancies of his monkish legends, and in despite of them all, Mabillon's book will live in perpetual honour and remembrance as the great and inexhaustible reservoir of knowledge, respecting the ecclesiastical, religious, and monastic history of the middle ages; and, therefore, though incidentally, respecting the secular condition and intellectual character of mankind during that period. In these nine folio volumes lie, in orderly method and chronological arrangement, vast accumulations of authentic facts, of curious documents, and of learned disquisitions—picturesque narratives without end, and inexhaustible disclosures both of the strength and weakness of the human heart. Mabillon was not a mere compiler, but was also a learned theologian, and a critic and scholar of the first order. When emancipated from the shackles of human authority, he knew how to take a wide survey of the affairs of men, and could sketch their progress, from age to age, with a free and powerful hand. To each volume, which he lived to complete, he attached a prefatory survey of the epoch to which it referred; which, if republished, in a detached form, would constitute such a review of the ecclesiastical history of that perplexing period, as no other writer has yet given to the world. It would, indeed, be based throughout on assumptions which all Protestants would contradict. But if, for the immediate purpose, those assumptions were conceded, the reader of such a work would find himself in possession of all the great controversies which agitated the Christian world during several centuries, and of the best solutions of which they are apparently susceptible.

In the reign of that most orthodox prince, Louis Quatorze, it was a hazardous thing either to give assent to any fact on which the Church had not set the seal of her infallibility, or to dissent from anything which her authority had sanctioned. Meekly bowing his head to "holy obedience," Mabillon was always ready to yield to the will of his superior and the rules of his convent; yet such was his innate candour and love of historical truth, that he ventured to hazard his safety by dissenting from much which the Church had sanctioned; and this heavy charge was preferred against him by some of his Benedictine brethren, before a general chapter of the order. Among the saints of whom the fraternity boasted, there were some whose relation to the order he had disputed; some whose claims to having lived and died in the odour of sanctity he had rejected; some whose very existence he had denied. His antagonists maintained that it was culpable thus to sacrifice the edification of the faithful to a fastidious regard for historical evidence, and injurious thus to abandon a part of the glories of their society, which, by mere silence, might have been maintained inviolate. To one of those who thus invoked the censure of their superiors on the audacity of Mabillon's critical inquiries, Dom Phillippe Bastide, he addressed a defence, in every line of which his meekness and his love of truth beautifully balance and sustain each other.

"I have ever been persuaded," says he, "that in claiming for their order honours not justly due to it, monastic men offend against the modesty of the Gospel as grievously as any person who arrogates to himself individually a merit to which he is not really entitled. To pretend that this is allowable because the praise is desired, not for the monk himself, but for his order, seems to me no better than a specious pretext for the disguise of vanity. Though disposed to many faults, I must declare that I have ever had an insuperable aversion to this; and that, therefore, I have been scrupulous in inquiring who are the saints really belonging to my own order. It is certain that some have been erroneously attributed to it, either from the almost universal desire of extolling, without bounds, the brotherhood of which we are members, or on account of some obscurity in the relations which have been already published. The most upright of our writers have made this acknowledgment; nor have the Fathers Yebes and Menard hesitated to reduce the number of our saints, by omitting those whom they thought inadmissible. I thought myself also entitled to make a reasonable use of this freedom, though with all the caution which could be reconciled with reverence for truth. I commit the defence of my work to the Divine Providence. It was not of my own will that I engaged on it. My brethren did me the honour to assign the task to me; and if they think it right, I shall cheerfully resign the completion of it to any one whose zeal may be at once more ardent and more enlightened than my own."

In the Benedictine conclave the cause of historical fidelity triumphed, though not without a long and painful discussion; and as a proof of the touching candour which Mabillon exhibited as a controversialist, we are told that he spontaneously published one of the many disputations against his book, to manifest his esteem and affection for the author of it.

We must here, also, record another noble instance of fairness towards an opponent which was practised towards Mabillon himself by another very learned man, Papebrock, the Bollandist, one of the most learned members of that learned body. Papebrock had published a book on the art of verifying the charters and other ancient public acts, deposited in the various archives of Europe. In 1681, Mabillon answered him in a treatise, which he designated *De Re Diplomatica*.

After laying down rules for distinguishing the false instrument from the true—rules derived from the form of the character, the colour of the ink, the nature of the penmanship, the style of orthography of the instrument, the dates, seals, and subscriptions, he proceeded to show, by more than two hundred examples, how his laws might be applied as a test, and how, by the application of that test, the manuscripts which Papebrock chiefly relied on might be shown to be valueless. Whatever may be thought of the interest or merits of this dispute (which, however, involves questions of the very highest practical importance) no one, we think, can read with indifference the answer which Papebrock gave to his formidable antagonist:—

"I assure you," he says, "that the only satisfaction which I retain in having written at all on this subject is, that it has induced you to write so consummate a work. I confess that I felt some pain when I first read it, at finding myself refuted in a manner so conclusive; but the utility and the beauty of your treatise have, at length, got the better of my weakness; and in the joy of contemplating the truth exhibited in a light so transparent, I called on my fellow student here to partake of my own admiration. You need have no difficulty, therefore, in stating publicly, whenever it may fall in your way, that I entirely adopt and concur in your opinions."

We confess that to us this noble act of homage to truth, and frank admission of error, is most touching, and worthy of all admiration. How different in spirit from that contentious and vainglorious love of personal victory, which has so often obscured the dignity of men of genius and learning? When will the world cease to worship at the shrine of mere intellect, and appreciate at its due worth that greatness of soul, which is ready to sacrifice every thing at the altar of truth alone?

Mabillon, among many other controversies of the times in which he lived, had the courage to engage his pen on the delicate subject of saintly relics, which has so often been made the subject of attack by Protestant writers, and somewhat disingenuously upheld by those of the Church of Rome. In the days of Mabillon the altars of the Church were everywhere enriched by the relics of saints and martyrs, of which the catacombs of Rome afforded an inexhaustible supply. It is true that to watch over this precious deposit, and to discriminate the spurious article from the true, was the peculiar office of a congregation at Rome, selected for that purpose from the Sacred College. But though the skill and the integrity of Cardinals might, by devout Roman Catholics, be thought remote from all suspicion, who could answer for the good faith of their subordinate agents? and what was the security that the worship appropriated by the Church to the bones of the blessed, might not be actually rendered to the skeletons of the ungodly?

When teaching the art of discriminating between the osseous remains of different mammalia, Cuvier never displayed a more edifying seriousness than was exhibited by Mabillon in laying down the laws which determine whether any given bone belonged of yore to a sinner or a saint. The miracle-working criterion, though apparently the best of all (and so largely and confidently relied on in earlier as well as later times), being rejected silently, and not without very good reason, Mabillon addressed a letter, "De Cultu Sanctorum ignotorum," to Theophilus Gallus, in which he discussed the sufficiency of three other tests, which have not unfrequently been relied on since, as confidently as if their fallaciousness had never been exposed.

First, he inquired, are we sure of the sanctity of a bone extracted from a sepulchre, on which an anagram of the name of Christ is sculptured in the midst of palms and laurels? The answer is discouraging: because it is a well-ascertained fact, that the body of one Flavia Jovina was found in this precise predicament; and, yet, she was a simple neophyte. Then, secondly, are we safe if a vase stained with blood be also found in the tomb; of course, nothing could be more secure, if only we could be quite certain that the blood of martyrs was buried with them in vases, and also that the stain was sanguineous, and was not produced by the perfumes which the ancients were accustomed to heap up in such vessels.* But, thirdly, what if the word "martyr" be engraven on the stone? In that case (provided the inscription be certainly genuine), all doubt might be at an end, were it not for a sophistical doctrine of *equivalents* which the relic dealers have propagated. Thus, for example, at the Abbey of St. Martin, at Pontoise, the devout had long been honouring the corpse of one Ursinus, in the tranquil belief that the words of his sepulchral inscription were *equivalent* to a declaration of martyrdom, whereas, on examination, they turned out to be really as follows:—"Here lies Ursinus, who died on the 1st of June, after living with his wife, Leontia, 20 years and 6 months, and in the world, 49 years 4 months and 3 days. Thus poor Ursinus's only recorded martyrdom was the endurance of Leontia's conjugal society for twenty years and upwards! which passed, however, among the devout at Pontoise as proof of St. Ursinus's martyrdom 1,000 years before. If the learned Benedictine had been as happy in the canons which he laid down for the guidance of the faithful, as he was in exposing the fallaciousness of those generally relied on, Protestants might, in aftertimes, have been rivals with their Roman Catholic brethren, in the purchase of those venerable antiquities. To assert, however, that any such question was debateable at all before the tribunal of human reason, was an act of liberalism, which even a Mabillon was required to expiate. Long and anxious were the debates in the Congregation of the Index, whether the book should not be condemned, and the temerity of the author rebuked; nor would that censure have been averted, but for the interference of the Pope in person, who prudently made himself sponsor for the willingness of the learned author to explain in a new edition, whatever might be thought objectionable in the first; and the worthy but submissive Benedictine having redeemed the pledge, the letter, "De Cultu Sanctorum ignotorum," was not only acquitted of reproach by the Sacred College, but even honoured with their emphatic approbation.

Mabillon gave a yet more decisive proof of his not being disposed to any extravagant scepticism; one which, perhaps, may even excite in most of our readers, a smile at his credulity. There was living in his days a M. Thiers, a man of singular talents and remarkable courage, who had accused the Benedictine Fathers of Vendome of an egregious impostnre, in exhibiting at their convent one of those *tears which fell from the eyes of Jesus* when he wept at the grave of Lazarus! An angel (such was the legend) had treasured it up, and given it to Mary, the sister of the deceased. It passed some centuries afterwards to the treasury of relics at Constantinople, and was bestowed by *some* Greek Emperor upon *some* German mercenaries in reward for *some* services to his crown; they placed it in the Abbey of Frisingen, whence it was conveyed by the Emperor, Henry III., who transferred it to his mother-in-law, Agnes of Anjou, the foundress of the monastery of Vendome, where she deposited it. Mabillon threw the shield of his boundless learning round this tradition; maintaining that the genuineness of the relic might, at least, be *reasonably presumed* from the admitted facts of the case; that it had a *prescriptive* claim to the honours it received; and that his brethren ought to be left in *peaceable enjoyment of the advantages they derived from the exhibition* in their Church, at Vendome, of the *Holy Tear of Bethany!*

Who can wonder that where legends like this were gravely upheld by the most learned writers, and the most enlightened generation of men whom Europe had ever seen, were invited to study and believe a mass of fables, of which the most audacious Grecian mythologist would have been ashamed, that half a century did not elapse before a race of philosophers arose who availed themselves of the materials which the Benedictine annals too copiously furnished them with for that overwhelming ridicule, by which they unsparingly strove to extinguish all religion, under the debris of its mediæval superstitions?

Passing, however, from fables too puerile for the nursery, to inquiries which have hitherto perplexed the senate, Mabillon undertook to explain the right principles of prison discipline in a work entitled "Réflexions Sur les Prisons des Ordres Religieux." He insisted that by a judicious attention and mixture of solitude, labour, silence, and devotion, it was practicable to render the gaol a school for the improvement of its unhappy inmates in social unity and in moral character. We have not space to follow him in the details of his benevolent speculation; but it is admitted on all hands, that the honour, which one of his biographers, M. de Malan, challenges for him, of being the very earliest of those who have applied themselves to this difficult subject in the spirit of philanthropy and wisdom, is strictly his due; and we cordially respond to the sentiment of Sir James Stephen (to whose able article in the "Edinburgh Review" we are largely indebted for what we have here presented to our readers), that to the enlightened reformer of prisons may he cheerfully forgiven his sacred osteology, and even his defence of the Holy Tear of Vendome. Though in bondage to the prejudices of his own age, he was able to break through the bonds which have shackled so many powerful minds in later and more enlightened times; and it gives us sincere pleasure, while protesting against the errors of Mabillon and his confraternity, to do homage to their candour and learning, and claim fellowship with the piety, the wisdom, and the love, which, in the midst even of all the errors of other Christian societies, attest the Divine original of all.

* Other archæologists are of opinion that what in such phials is called blood, was the deposit of the wine used in the communion.

ST. THEUDOSIA.

OUR readers have, probably, not forgotten the history which we gave in our number for May, of the fictitious life of St. Philomena, who never existed; we invite their attention now to the history of St. Theudosia. We take our account chiefly from an article, headed "TRANSLATION OF THE RELICS of St. THEUDOSIA," in the *Tablet* Newspaper, of October 22, 1853.

On that occasion were assembled, in the Church of Amiens, in France, THREE CARDINALS—to wit, Cardinal Wiseman, the Cardinal Archbishops of Rheims and Tours; SIX other archbishops, among whom we find Dr. M'Hale, and Dr. Cullen, and "the Archbishop of Babylon," a rather suspicious title certainly; but some of our readers may be led to suspect that they were all archbishops of "Babylon." There were, also, present NINETEEN bishops, besides mitred abbots, deans, &c., and between 1,200 and 1,300 ecclesiastics—many of whom had come great distances to be present.

For what was this reverend assembly held?

The cardinal archbishop took his seat, having on his right and left the Bishops of Poitiers and Amiens, the deputy of the clergy, and the deputy of the faithful, who had been sent to bring back from Paris to Amiens the precious relics of St. Theudosia, which they had previously had to bring from Genoa to Paris.

A speech was then made by the deputy of the clergy (the Dean of Picquigny), from which we extract the following:—"The body of St. Theudosia touches at this moment the soil which beheld her birth, and re-appears in the midst of us, after fifteen centuries, decorated with the aureole of the saints, and the palm of the martyrs. . . ." He goes on to say, that St. Theudosia is now to repose finally in the Cathedral of Amiens, and proceeds—"There St. Theudosia, restored to our veneration, will diffuse over the episcopal city, and over the whole country, her graces and favours; shall remove from us calamities and alarms; will obtain for us the preservation of the faith for which she shed her generous blood," &c.

Then spoke the deputy of the faithful (or the laity) of Amiens (the Count of Escalopier)—". . . If, like the look-out of a ship who discovers a luminous point on a far off land, I have been fortunate enough to signalize to you the existence of a treasure, it is to you my Lord (the Bishop of Amiens), it is to your solicitude, to the peculiar affection, so reasonable and so special, which you bear towards his Holiness Pope Pius IX., that we owe the possession of the precious body of St. Theudosia, and the triumph which awaits it," &c.

The Bishop of Amiens "replied in the most gracious manner to the honourable deputies—his lordship declared that that day in which the relics of St. Theudosia were brought back to their country, was the most glorious of his life. He addressed, in the name of the clergy, his thanks to the Count of Escalopier, who, having discovered the precious treasure of which we this day take possession, was in some sort the inspirer of the great religious manifestation which will take place in the festival of to-morrow."

The cardinal archbishop then spoke, and told the assembly how much he desired "to assist at that ceremony, in order to find there the occasion of solemnly renewing his immoveable attachment to the holy Catholic Church."

Then was read a document from the Lord Bishop of Porphyrium, who had charge of the relics of St. Theudosia from Rome, to deliver them at Genoa to the Bishop of Amiens, "in exchange for those of St. Viator" (of whom we hear no more on this occasion; but, doubtless, we shall have him again in his turn).

Then the marble tombstone of the saint "was also offered to the view of all." The inscription is not reported in the *Tablet;* but we have got it from another source, and will give it farther on.

From all this we collect the history of St. Theudosia. She was born at Amiens; she died a martyr at Rome, fifteen centuries ago; her tombstone and body was found at Rome the other day, by the Count of Escalopier; the Pope made a present of it to the Bishop of Amiens, as a reward for the bishop's great devotion to the Pope; the Pope forwarded the box to Genoa; a deputation had been sent to bring it first to Paris, and then to Amiens; and St. Theudosia was at last returned, "all resplendent with glory," to her native city; and cardinals, archbishops, bishops, and ecclesiastics were assembled from so many distant countries to receive her with honour.

All this was only the prelude to the splendid show of the next day. No words can do justice to the procession. The decorations of the houses, the triumphal arches, the obelisks, the green velvet with fringe of gold, "the magnificent domes of verdure, suspended in the air, with pendants of green velvet and white calico," "the magnificent triumphal arch in verdure," the "red dome, sprinkled with stars of gold, suspended from two very lofty masts of verdure," the cavalry and infantry, the statues, "the magnificent gilded chariot which bore the precious relics of St. Theudosia"—of which the account in the *Tablet* says, "we are obliged to relinquish the attempt to describe THE TRIUMPHAL CAR of St. Theudosia: here the pen is powerless—the painter only could give the image of it"—and then the cardinals, the archbishops, the bishops, the canons, all dressed in silks and ribbons, as fine as any lady for a ball—such is but a feeble attempt to describe this magnificent display.

"The next day the relics of St. Theudosia, surrounded as with a golden crown, on which the statues of the different saints of the diocese were conspicuous, was suspended in the air, above the high altar—this decoration offered the most beautiful spectacle one could see."

We had almost forgotten the sermon which was preached by Cardinal Wiseman, of which we have room but for one extract—"Yes, Theudosia, YOUR BONES, humiliated for Jesus Christ, *have this day trembled with joy*, and communicated to us their transports of gladness; and this joy, this festival, will have durable results; they lay for the future *the foundations of a* MORE SOLID AND FIRM PIETY. What Lucy is for Syracuse, Agatha for Catania, Genevieve for Paris, Agnes for Rome, Theudosia will be, is already, for Amiens. She will become the *object of a* DEVOTION, daily more tender;" and then he addresses Theudosia herself—"And, *if* up to the present time, unknown to themselves, you have, nevertheless, prayed for them, how much more for the future, being *invoked* by them with fervour and *confidence*, will you not redouble *your powerful* INTERCESSIONS unto the GOD of Martyrs?"

Thus we have endeavoured to give some faint idea of this grand display and ceremonial. And, now, we think, our readers will be ready to exclaim, before we conclude—"Who is this St. Theudosia who is to do such mighty things? Tell us something of her history! tell us her miracles while living! tell us of the superhuman virtues by which she merited to become an intercessor for us with God!"

Our answer to this must be very short; for there exist no materials for a longer answer. It is this—"In all the histories of the Church, in all its records, in all its annals up to this day, there is no mention made that there ever was any such person as St. Theudosia, of Amiens; there

is no trace existing in history of such a saint." This is the only answer we can give from the history of the Church! This striking fact is actually confessed by M. L'Abbe Gerbet, the Vicar-General of the Diocese of Amiens, in a tract which he has published on St. Theudosia. He says—"Nous n'avons aucun monument historique qui renferme quelques details sur Sainte Theudosie. Les anciens martyrologes, Romains et Gallicans n'ont pas recueilli son nom"—that is, "We have not any historical document which contains any details about Saint Theudosia. The ancient Roman and French martyrologies have not even mentioned her name!"

And what does it all rest upon—this splendid festival at Amiens, got up by Pope, cardinals, archbishops, bishops, and ecclesiastics? Why, upon this—The Count of Escalopier, a French nobleman of Amiens, in his travels at Rome, found a tombstone in the catacombs of Rome (an ancient burial-place), with this inscription:—

Aurelie Theudosie,
Benignissimæ et
Incomparabili feminæ,
Aurelius Optatus
Conjugi Innocentissimæ
Depos. Pr. Kal. Dec.
Nat. Ambiana
H. M. F.

TRANSLATION.

To Aurelia Theudosia,
A most benign
And incomparable woman,
Aurelius Optatus,
To his most innocent wife,
Buried 30th November,
By nation an Ambian,
To her who well deserves it,
He placed this monument.

Here you have, reader, the *whole* that is known on earth of Theudosia! here you have the credentials of the saint and martyr! of a new object of invocation! of a new intercessor between God and man!

This inscription is *the foundation*, THE ONLY FOUNDATION of the faith of those who have recourse to her intercession with God!

But for once we have made a mistake—we have forgotten *a fact*—in digging for the bones, *a little glass bottle* was dug up. Mark that, reader, for it is very important. What could that bottle have been for but to hold the blood of Theudosia? And why should her blood have been bottled, unless she was a martyr?

The Count of Escalopier (who, perhaps, came to Rome to look for something of the kind), submitted this tombstone and *glass bottle* to a Roman tribunal, called "the Congregation of Relics," whose duty it is to pronounce what relics are genuine. He submitted this evidence (and this alone, for there was no other evidence to submit); and on this evidence the tribunal pronounced that the bones he produced were the bones of Theudosia; that Theudosia was a saint and a martyr, and that she was a native of Amiens, in France!

The Pope himself confirmed this decision upon this evidence, and proceeded to make a decree that the name of Theudosia should now be added to the ritual of the Church of Amiens; that an office should be inserted there in her honour; and that henceforth masses should be celebrated in her honour in all the parishes in the diocese of Amiens, and an annual festival be celebrated in her memory!

Will our readers look over the inscription again, and imagine, if they can, the infallibility of the Pope who could pass such a decree upon such evidence!

But was this woman "born at Amiens?" So the Pope and congregation of relics translated *Nat. Ambiana*;* for Ambianum they said was the Latin name of Amiens. True, that was its name once; but too late to serve the turn; for its original name was Samanobria; and the Roman Emperor, Gratian, changed its name to Ambianis,† after the empire was become Christian, and the age of martyrdom had gone by. Will any of our readers now invoke St. Theudosia, or seek her intercession with God, on the faith of that inscription and the glass bottle? Will they believe in Pope, cardinals, archbishops (Irish ones, too), bishops, and ecclesiastics, teaching them to invoke dead women on such grounds?

Have we not proof here that the Church of Rome with all its infallibility, with all its machinery, is not fit to be trusted or followed in the question of the invocation of saints?

We hope to be able to show our readers more of this manufacture of saintly relics—of the manner in which joint-stock companies are got up, and people are invited to take shares in the buying and selling of relics as a good speculation, just as they would in a railway. And a very good investment for money it is for those who have no conscience. We hope to produce some evidence on this subject.

* It is almost inconceivable that the Congregation of Sacred Relics at Rome should be so grossly ignorant respecting Latin inscriptions as to take "nat." for a contraction of "nata," instead of for "natione," for which it always stands in such inscriptions. The inscription says nothing whatever about where Theudosia was born, but only states the nation from which she was sprung. How the poor people of Amiens have been gulled by infallibility? If infallibility be necessary in anything, it surely is necessary in directing us to true objects of worship.

† Sigibert, ad. A.D. 332.

IMMUTABILITY OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

TRADITION AND DEVELOPMENT.

ONE of the greatest difficulties that Protestants have to contend against in their controversies with Roman Catholics is, to ascertain what is, and what is not, the authoritative teaching of the Church of Rome. That there should be any doubt upon so fundamental a point, especially in the case of a Church which claims to be infallible, may be a novel and startling statement to those of our Roman Catholic readers who implicitly believe that the doctrines of their Church are fixed, unchanged, and unchangeable—the same now as in the first ages of Christianity, and destined to remain without a shade of variation to the end of time. Nor is it, indeed, at all surprising that they should believe this. They have heard it reiterated a thousand times that "Rome is immutable;" and they very naturally acquiesce in the truth of an assertion which, while it seems to invest their own Church with one of the sublimest of all attributes, implies, at the same time, that every other form of Christian profession, must be, from its very nature, novel and transitory. Our object in the present article is to show that this idea of the immutability of the teaching of the Church of Rome, is a mere illusion. And in proof of this position, we shall not enter upon a detailed examination of the various *particular* points on which she has changed, but we shall limit ourselves to the consideration of one great *general* question, which virtually includes all the rest—viz., Has the Church of Rome adhered invariably to the same opinion respecting the *Rule of Faith*?

Upon this fundamental point *we assert that the teaching of the modern Church of Rome is diametrically opposed to the clear and formal decisions of the Council of Trent.*

Tridentine Romanism declares the standard of faith to be fixed and invariable. Modern Romanism—as represented by the most eminent divines of that communion—maintains that there resides in the Church an unlimited and illimitable power of expanding it. Tridentine Romanism holds that the Church ever continues to believe what she first believed, neither more nor less. Modern Romanism insists that the existing Church, at each particular moment of her history (ἡ ἀεὶ ἐκκλησία), possesses an inherent power of ordaining *new* Articles of Faith. Tridentine Romanism declares that the Rule of Faith was, once for all, stereotyped, as it were, in the primitive ages. Modern Romanism denies this, and informs us that it has been set up in moveable types,* alterable from time to time, at the will of a living, infallible, authority. The Tridentine doctrine may be termed the theory of *Tradition*. The modern doctrine is known as the theory of *Development*.

Let us first consider the Tridentine doctrine upon this point. The invariable language of the Fathers of that Council is, that *all* the doctrines and *all* the practices which they decree to be true and obligatory, have *always* been the received doctrines of the Catholic Church in *every* age, without any the slightest varintion, from the days of Christ and his Apostles, who were the first authors of the said doctrines and practices, down to the time in which the holy and œcumenical Synod of Trent assembled. Thus, for instance, the well-known decree respecting the Rule of Faith, passed in the 4th session, runs as follows:—"The sacred and holy, œcumenical and general, Synod of Trent, lawfully assembled in the Holy Ghost . . . . seeing clearly that this [saving] truth and [moral] discipline are contained in the *written books* and the *unwritten traditions*, which, received by the Apostles from the *mouth of Christ himself*, or from the *Apostles themselves*, the Holy Ghost dictating, *have come down even unto us, transmitted*, as it were, *from hand to hand*, (the Synod) following the examples of the orthodox Fathers, receives and venerates, with an equal affection of piety and reverence, all the Books both of the Old and New Testament—seeing that one God is the author of both—as also the said Traditions, as well those appertaining to faith as to morals, as having been *dictated* either by *Christ's own word of mouth*, or *by the Holy Ghost, and preserved in the Catholic Church by a continuous succession*."† Here all saving truth and moral discipline are declared to have been delivered by the mouth of Christ himself or His inspired Apostles, and to have been handed down either in the Scriptures or by unbroken oral tradition. The same assertion is made in several other of the decrees—*e.g.*, speaking of the Sacrament of Penance, the Fathers say, "The universal Church has *always* (semper) understood, &c." (Sess. xiv., c. 5); and, speaking of matrimony, they declare, "that the holy Fathers, the Councils, and the *tradition of the universal Church, always* taught, &c." (Sess. xxiv). And in exact accordance with their statements, the famous Bossuet, writing against the theory of development, which had been recently propounded by Jurieu, a Calvinistic minister, thus expresses himself—"What I affirm to be true is, that *the faith never varies* in the Church: that it *reached* its *perfection at once*, and was *well known from the very first*."‡ In reference to Jurieu's assertion, that the mystery of the Trinity remained undeveloped down to the time of the Nicene Council, Bossuet designated such an opinion as a *horrible libel* on Christianity, worthy only of the lips of a Socinian.

* The illustration is Dr. Wordsworth's: See his Letters to M. Gondon, p. 32, 3rd edition.

† Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, translated by the Rev. J. Waterworth, pp. 11, 18.

‡ Bossuet, *Avertissements*, cited by Dr. Wordsworth, Letters to M. Gondon, p. 262.

"Can there," he proceeds to say, "be a greater error than to suppose that the faith of the Church only developed itself as heresies arose and according as she made *explicit* decisions respecting it? On the contrary, the Church never pronounced any judgments except in the way of propounding the *faith of the past*."* To the same effect Dr. Milner says, in his well-known work, "The End of Religious Controversy"—"It is a fundamental maxim never to admit any tenet but such as is believed by all the bishops, and was believed by their predecessors *up to the Apostles themselves*." And again, "It is proper to observe that this holy Church, as declaring her doctrine, does not profess to argue upon it in a controversial way, either from Scripture or tradition; *much less does she pretend to make new articles of faith*, or to *expound* the original articles in a *different sense* from that in which she has *always* held them. In short, her constant language is, *Nil innovetur, nil nisi quod traditum est*. Such and such is the sense of Scripture, such and such is the doctrine of her predecessors, the Pastors of the Church, *since the time of the Apostles*." Again, Dr. Wiseman says, "We believe that *no new doctrine* can be introduced into the Church, but that *every doctrine* which we hold *has existed* and been *taught in it*, ever *since the time of the Apostles*, having been handed down by them to their successors," &c.† "It must not be thought that Catholics conceive there is a certain mass of vague and floating opinions, which may, at the option of the Pope, or of a General Council, or of the whole Church, be turned into articles of faith."‡ "As we admit that *no new revelation of doctrines* can be made, so do we believe that the power of the Church consists in nothing more than defining that which was believed *from all times*, and in all her dominions."§ And, to quote no more authorities, De Maistre, in his celebrated work, "Du Pape," contends that "there is *nothing new* in the Church of Rome, and that she will *never believe anything which she has not believed always*."

Such is the *Tradition* theory, and such are a few of the many high authorities by which it is supported. One would hardly expect that statements so plain and explicit, solemnly propounded by the sacred and œcumenical Council of Trent, and re-echoed by many of the most renowned theologians of Rome, would be flatly contradicted not only by equally eminent divines belonging to the same communion, whose fundamental principle and perpetual boast is *unity of doctrine*, but even by an infallible Pope himself. And yet, strange as it may seem, the fact is so. Pope Leo X., in his famous Bull against Luther, entitled "Exsurge Domine," condemns, as heretical, the assertion "that it is not in the power of the Church or Pope to *constitute new articles of faith*."‖ Nor, was this a novel position. Before Leo's time, and about the middle of the fifteenth century, Cardinal Cusanus, an apostolic legate, and, as his biographer informs us, "by far the first of the theologians of his age," lays down the principle, that "the *Scriptures* are *accommodated to the times*, and are variously understood at different periods, so that at one time they are to be expounded in one way, according to the current practice of the Church, and that on the *change of her practice, its sense is changed also*."¶ That "the *practice* of the Church should at *one time interpret* Scripture in one way, and at another time in another way," he goes on to tell us is not surprising, because "the interpretation moves in a parallel line with the practice; and the practice which so moves is the spirit that gives life." To the same effect, exactly, the celebrated Salmeron declares that "God has not given all things to all men; that *every age* should rejoice in *its own truths*, which were *unknown to* preceding generations."** And lastly, even Bellarmine, the great champion of Tridentine Romanism, and, consequently, a zealous upholder of the Tridentine theory, yet finds himself compelled to admit that the "stability of *all dogmas* depends on the authority of the *existing Church*,"†† and that the Church of latter time has power not only to *explain and declare*, but also to *constitute* those things which belong to faith.‡‡ This admission Bellarmine was compelled to make by the incontrovertible evidence of historical facts. He could not deny, for example, that before the fourth Lateran Council (A.D. 1215) Transubstantiation was not an article of faith. He could not deny that the practice of administering the Eucharist in both kinds existed in the Latin as well as in the Greek Church, down to the age of Thomas Aquinas (middle of the thirteenth century). He could not deny that it is declared, in the Canon Law, that "many things were allowed before the Gospel became clear which are now forbidden by the Church"—*e.g.*, the marriage of the clergy.

We shall not stop to notice at length the remarkable application of this doctrine of a *gradual development* of the articles of faith which was made by the famous Jesuit Petavius, about the middle of the seventeenth century, and which called forth the great work of the English Protestant bishop Bull, "Defensio Fidei Nicenæ," for which he received, through Bossuet, the thanks of the Roman Catholic Clergy of France.§§ Suffice it to say, that

* Wordsworth, p. 264. † Wiseman, Moorfield Lectures, vol. i., p. 60. London, 1847. ‡ *Ibid.* p. 61. § *Ibid.* p. 85. ‖ Bullar. Roman. vol. v., p. 493. ¶ Cusan ad Bohem., cp. 2. ** Salmeron, de 3 Ref. in ep ad Rom. †† De Sacram. ii. 25. ‡‡ Bellarm. de Sum. Pontif. lib iv., c. 2–4.

§§ See, on this subject, Dr Newman's work, "Prophetical Office of the Church," p. 72, sq.

Petavius asserted that the bishops and Fathers of the Church, prior to the Nicene Council, were nearly all of the same sentiments as those for which Arius was condemned! and, consequently, that *the true faith* was *not fully* held in the Church *from the beginning*, but was only gradually arrived at and developed. The infidel historian, Gibbon, gladly seized on this admission of so renowned a writer as Petavius, and very naturally concluded that he was an Arian, and that the object of his elaborate work was to overthrow the Nicene faith; but, as Dr. Newman well points out, Petavius's real object was very different, and one much more in keeping with the principles of the order to which he belonged.

In our next number we shall proceed to give a sketch of the more recent history of this development theory. Meanwhile, we request our Roman Catholic readers to bear in mind that the Church which they regard as infallible and immutable is at variance with herself upon the most important question in theology—a question which underlies all others, and which, in fact, affects the very foundation of the Christian religion—the Rule of Faith. The Council of Trent, with a host of divines, asserts that it is fixed and unchangeable—the same from the beginning, now, and for ever. The modern Church of Rome, as represented by her choicest and most renowned champions, holds, on the other hand, that articles of faith are independent of antiquity, and may be called into existence at any time that the existing Church sees fit to do so.

ON THE SUCCESSION OF THE IRISH BISHOPS.

WE have in Ireland two rival Churches, each claiming our allegiance, as being the ancient Church of Ireland, by true and canonical succession.

In such a case, it concerns all Christians to know which claim is well founded; for, clearly, both cannot be right, and we ought to belong to that which has the valid title.

A valid and canonical succession of the bishops of a Church, has always been considered an important guide in tracing the succession of a Church.

Not as if the mere fact of a regular succession in a Church of its bishops is enough, by itself, to entitle that Church to the allegiance of Christians; for the first duty of any particular Church is, to preserve the doctrines of Christ, and the articles of the Christian faith, pure and entire. When any Church requires her members to deny the articles of the Christian faith, or to believe another Gospel, or to violate the commands and teaching of Christ, then it is the duty of all Christians to come out of that Church, and be separate from it, sooner than submit to such terms of communion. In such a case, even the most valid succession gives no title to the allegiance of Christ's people. This principle is acknowledged by all.

We have hitherto discussed, in various ways, which Church in Ireland does really hold and preserve all the articles of the Christian faith whole and unadulterated. Our readers are in a position to form some opinion upon that question; and we think it time to invite discussion on the question of fact, "which Church has really preserved an unbroken succession of bishops in the Irish bishopries?"

Our Roman Catholic readers will, no doubt, suppose that here, at least, the case is clear on their side; and they will, perhaps, wonder that we should bring this subject under discussion at all. But they should remember that we have always professed to search for truth, on whatever side it may be found; and we have no disposition to shrink from any discussion which may throw light on the truth. And this gives us a right to ask them to consider this question with the same candour and patience with which they receive our discussions on other subjects.

Our Roman Catholic readers have, no doubt, heard it *asserted* often enough, that the Roman Catholic Church has maintained an unbroken succession of bishops in all the Irish bishopries since the Reformation, and before it. But we ask them to consider, has any Roman Catholic bishop or priest ever produced to them a list of the bishops forming the succession in any one bishopric? We think it very likely that no one of our Roman Catholic readers has ever seen such a list of the succession of Roman Catholic bishops in any one bishopric in Ireland. If any of our readers can give such a list, we are ready to publish it. If no such list can be produced, the common *assertions*, that a succession of Roman Catholic bishops has been regularly kept up in Ireland, are worth nothing. In this, as in all other things, we want our readers to learn the difference between ASSERTIONS and PROOFS.

We will insert in our journal, from time to time, as we have room, lists of the bishops of the Irish Church, who have been consecrated in regular succession from those Irish bishops who, at the time of the Reformation, renounced certain errors then prevailing. And we call on all Roman Catholic bishops, and priests, and laymen, to come forward with lists of Roman Catholic bishops, in regular succession from those same bishops or their predecessors. This will enable all to judge for themselves by proofs, and not by assertions, "*who* have really preserved the succession of bishops."

The task will be easy on our side, for our lists have always been published to the world, whereas no Roman Catholic lists have ever been published; which in itself might well lead people to suspect where the succession is really to be found.

Our lists will be taken from Sir James Ware's learned work on the Irish bishops. But where will Roman Catholics look for their lists? The following passage from an Irish Roman Catholic historian, Philip O'Sullivan Bear, in his "Historia Catholica," does not seem to afford much hope of making out the Roman Catholic lists; where we must observe that this work was first published in 1621—84 years after the first renunciation of the Roman Supremacy, and 61 years after the complete Reformation under Queen Elizabeth: "a wholesome counsel IS BEGUN, that in all places of the realm there should be priests who may have the care of souls; which, that it may be more easily understood, it must be recollected, that there are four archbishopries in Ireland, and a great many bishopries, *and that* ALL *of them at this day* ARE POSSESSED *by the leaders of heresy*, and that, on account of that, *Catholic prelates* ARE NOT APPOINTED *to* the titles of them (that is, of those bishopries), EXCEPT ON RARE OCCASIONS; because, without the ecclesiastical revenues, such a crowd of bishops could not appear to be able to maintain their dignity and honour; wherefore, four archbishops, who are appointed by the Roman Pontiff, constitute vicars general in the suffragan bishopries (the apostolic authority acceding), either priests, or clerics, or men of the religious orders."* Here is certainly a serious gap in the succession of Roman Catholic Bishops in Ireland, and one which we believe was not stopped for some twenty years after that.

During that whole period, as O'Sullivan says, Roman Catholic bishops were *rarely appointed to the* TITLES *of those bishopries*.

This expression, "appointed to the *titles* of them," seems a strange one: it might seem more natural to speak of men being appointed *to the bishopries* than to *the titles* of the bishopries; yet O'Sullivan is strictly correct in so speaking, for several whom we find mentioned in his history as Roman Catholic bishops were not bishops at all, they were only persons *nominated* by the Pope *to be made* bishops, but NOT CONSECRATED, which alone can make a man really a bishop. This was the case with Eogan M'Eggan, whom we meet twice in O'Sullivan's History (pp. 78 and 244), and in each place he is called "*Episcopus Rosæ designatus*," which expression means that he was *named* for the Bishopric of Ross, but not *consecrated*, for the term *designatus* is *never* applied to a consecrated bishop.

We must say that this showed good taste, and a feeling of religious decency, in the Pope. For this M'Eggan was a priest who was sent over by the Pope as a political agent to conduct the war which the King of Spain was then waging in Ireland against the Queen of England: it helped the agent's proceeding, to have the *name* and *title* of a bishop, but the Pope had more decency than to *consecrate* him as a bishop on such grounds; and the discretion which the Pope exercised seems a wise one, when we come to read the account of M'Eggan's death in Stafford's Hibernia Pacata—"Owen M'Eggan, the Pope's apostolic vicar, so often before mentioned, to put fresh heart into his company, with his sword drawn in one hand, and his portius and beads in the other, with one hundred men led by himself, he came boldly up to the sword, and maintained a hot skirmish until he was slain with a shot."—Page 661.

Such an employment and death was certainly much more suitable to an "apostolic vicar of the Pope" than it would have been to a Christian bishop; and, therefore, it was an act of decency in the Pope to give this skirmishing priest only the *title of a bishopric*, and not the *consecration or office of a bishop*.

But while we give the Pope full credit for this feeling of decency about the episcopal office, we must remember that such "titular bishops" were not bishops in reality, since they were not consecrated, and, therefore, kept up no succession.

We must guard our readers from imagining, from what O'Sullivan has said, that a succession of Roman Catholic archbishops has been kept up in the four archbishops of Ireland; this was far from being the case. Thus, in the case of Dublin, for seventy-six years, from the year 1535 to 1611 (with the exception of the *four* years from 1555 to 1559) *we find no archbishop of Dublin in communion with the Pope of Rome*. There was, indeed, a Matthew de Oviedo, a Spaniard, *called* Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, in the year 1600, but he too was merely an agent in the Spanish war in Ireland, put forward with the title of a bishopric, but not consecrated, and, therefore, no bishop at all.

Whether Roman Catholics can show a clear succession in the Archbishopric of Armagh, the See of St. Patrick, we will put to the proof in our next number. We will give the succession of the Archbishops of Armagh down from Primate Cromer, who was Archbishop of Armagh in 1540, before the Reformation. We now call on all Roman Catholic archbishops in Ireland (especially Dr. Dixon), on all Roman Catholic bishops, priests and laymen, to send us a list of Roman Catholic archbishops in succession from Primate Cromer, with the dates of the vacancies and appointments, and the authorities in proof of each. If any such list should be sent to us, we will publish it side by side with our own list; if no such list should be sent to us, Roman Catholics may well suspect that it is as great a puzzle to make out a Roman Catholic succession in Armagh as in Dublin.

We have now put this question in a position in which it may be fairly examined and discussed; and we trust that our readers will look with interest for the results.

* "Ut autem in omnibus regni locis sint Sacerdotes, qui animarum curam gerant, salubre consilium est initum, quod ut facilius perficiatur, in memoriam revocandum est; in Ibernia Archiepiscopatus quatuor, et Episcopatus complures esse, omnesque hodie ab Hæreticis possideri; ob idque titulis eorum Catholicos præsules nonnisi raro creari, quod sine vectigalibus Ecclesiasticis tanta Episcoporum turba dignitatem et honorem tueri non posse videatur. Quamobrem Archiepiscopi quatuor, qui sunt a Romano Pontifice inaugurati in suffraganeis Episcopatibus vicarios generales constituunt authoritate apostolica accedente, sacerdotes, sive clericos, sive religiosos." (Historia Catholica, p. 297. Dublin, 1850. Edited by the Rev. Matthew Kelly, Professor of the College of Maynooth.)

THE ARCHBISHOP OF SPALATRO'S REASONS FOR RESIGNING HIS ARCHBISHOPRIC.

IN conducting controversy with Roman Catholics, Protestants are apt to overlook the great difficulties that stand in the way of a fair consideration of the arguments they may be able to adduce; themselves brought up in a Church which recognises the right and duty of all its members to weigh and consider the reasons of their belief, they forget that in the Roman Catholic Church, faith is measured by the unwavering assent, which its members are called upon to give to every dogma contained in its decrees; and that to question and discuss the grounds of belief, is prohibited as the first step to infidelity. To one thus educated and instructed, discussion and controversy is necessarily most abhorrent; and it will, we believe, be generally found, that where a change has taken place, the most difficult step in the way of the convert has been the taking into consideration at all the arguments of those who differed from them.

Indeed it is to this point also that the rulers of that Church have directed their most unwearied attention; and they never have hesitated to exercise their authority in restraining their flocks from reading or discussing the publications and arguments of those who oppose their pretensions. For this reason their Index Expurgatorius classes in the same category, the writings of a Milton with those of a Voltaire, and they silenced and imprisoned a Galileo, because his discovery of the true motions of the heavenly bodies was supposed to militate with the teachings of the infallible Church.

We have been led into these observations by the perusal of an old document, published in 1616 by Marcus Antonius de Dominis, at one time Archbishop of Spalatro, and Primate of Dalmatia and Croatia; but who lost those high offices by his seceding from the Church of Rome, and embracing the reformed doctrines. And though the subsequent career of this eminent man was not altogether consistent with his new profession, we give extracts from it to our readers, for the purpose of showing the great difficulties that stand in the way of inquiry, by even the most eminent and learned members of the Roman Catholic Church.

The document professes to state the reasons which led De Dominis to embrace the reformed doctrines; and, after stating the high dignities to which he had attained, and the prospects opened before him of reaching even higher dignities, it proceeds thus—

"For the most part, from my childhood, I was brought up among the Jesuits in holy study, according to the common doctrine of the schoolmen, and the received opinions of the Church of Rome; for which opinions I was for a long space most resolved to die, for I counted it execrable to admit the smallest doubt or ambiguity of mind or thought, much less of speeches; and being bound up in this common reverence of them, if at any time any thought had crept in against them, or my studies had suggested any doubt, I resolved to use violence against mine own reason (as the custom is in matters of faith) rather than I should admit the least doubt against those articles of faith, which I took for certain. I confess I did feel continually some sparks of the inward spirit, which, nevertheless, I resisted; yet, I could never freely acquiesce, neither free myself of a great suspicion, after I had made some progress in the studies of divinity, which suspicion was greatly augmented when I perceived they did most rigorously take heed that no book, written against our doctrine, should be held, or read, by any of us; that these books were altogether forbidden students and men of great learning, and well affected to the Catholic religion, I did ever judge (as reason will teach every man) was matter greatly to be suspected, especially as the Court of Rome suffered us not to use them, even after we had completed our course in the study of divinity and taken degrees therein; yea, and after our promotion to bishopries. This suspicion did yet more increase when I saw our masters and professors claim this authority to themselves, to be trusted in all they said; that those words and sentences which they did repeat were the words and sentences of their adversaries; and, in the meantime, the hearers were forbidden, under the pain of excommunication, to read the writings of those adversaries: in suppressing and destroying whereof, they make so great business that it is justly to be suspected something lurketh in them which our doctrine is not able to confute."

He then alludes to his promotion to a bishopric, and thus proceeds:—

"And because I did acknowledge the proper task of a bishop was to preach the Word, I set myself to read sermons and such books as are appointed for Lent, which did soon beget in me a loathing and detestation; for I saw in them, and that easily, a filthy abuse of Scripture, while it

is drawn to vain, unprofitable, impertinent, yea, and a pernicious sense. I saw examples and miracles propounded, either false and feigned, or, at least, ridiculous and not worthy of credit. I saw the people miserably deceived; and the inventions of avarice and ambition superstitiously forced upon them, under colour of articles of faith. These things I was astonished to consider; and, therefore, I resolved to leave those troubled streams, and to take myself to the fountains of the Fathers; in reading of whose works I began to delight, for sermons, and holy canons, and Church government.

"From this course, now and then, some beams of new light did shine into me, as yet unwilling and refusing; for, on the one part, I did observe the sayings of the Fathers in very many things, contrary to the common doctrine which I had learned in the schools, and I did perceive that they were either passed over in silence by my masters, or not faithfully quoted, or unfairly expounded. On the other part, I did see that the rule of Church government of our time was far different from the ancient practice, whereby my former suspicions were greatly augmented; and I perceived that we did not faithfully handle the doctrine and affairs of Christ and his Church; but stuffed our theology rather with the inventions of human speculations and philosophy than with the words of Holy Scripture, of which there is a great ignorance amongst us.

"Afterwards, the holy ancient canons, the orthodox councils, the discipline of the Fathers, and the ancient customs of the Church, were, often and again, turned over by me. Whereto shall I say more? I found abundantly in these all I sought, and a great deal more than I sought. There it was easy, with opened eyes, to see that the doctrine of these reformed Churches, which are bitterly reproved and impugned by our theologians, did in little or nothing at all differ from the true and ancient doctrine of the pure Church. I did also perceive that their doctrine, both at Rome and amongst us, is abhorred and repelled, rather than lawfully impugned; not that it is indeed heretical and false, but only because it is contrary to the corrupt sense and manners of the Court of Rome, and to her fleshly plots and inventions. I saw also, and perceived most clearly, that at Rome, without any lawful ground—yea, by extreme violence—innumerable new articles of faith were daily coined and forced upon us; and that in such things as not only appertain not to divine faith, but also contain in themselves manifest falsehoods; which articles that corrupt Court will not suffer to be discussed by any, but pursueth, even to the death, all those who dare whisper against them. It was formerly an article of faith that the Universal Church, dispersed through the whole world, is that Catholic Church of Christ, whereunto Christ himself doth promise his perpetual assistance. But now our Romanists have drawn this article of faith in lesser bounds; that the Catholic Church is now to be taken for none other than the Court of Rome. And it is propounded to be believed, that in it only, yea, and in the Pope alone, the whole spirit of Christ resideth; and whatsoever of old time had been said for the honour of the universal Church of Christ, are, to the great injury of the Church, wholly applied to Rome. These things, among many others, have grieved me exceedingly.

"What, then, should I do more in the midst of a wicked and forward nation? If I would have governed mine own Church according to the ancient discipline of the Catholic Church, and propound true and Catholic doctrine, I should, by that means, hasten upon mine head great stones, and horrible tempests from Rome.

"The Church, under the Bishop of Rome, is no more a Church, but a certain human commonwealth, all of it under the Pope's temporal monarchy. It is a vineyard only to make Noah drunk. It is a flock which the shepherds do shear and clip, even to the blood; yea, to excoriate and slay them. Albeit all these things did ever and earnestly persuade me to flee, yet, I do confess, I found the hand-maid, Hagar, with her child Ishmael, for a long time troublesome to me. I mean I heard my flesh rebelling against my spirit and reasoning after this manner—'Thou art come to great dignities and wealth, under the bishop of Rome, with hope also to attain further. These things thou dost possess; these are certain; but thou knowest not what shall befall thee in other places. Dost thou not know that immediately after thy departing at Rome, and then everywhere thou shalt be noted with the name of heretic?' These and more such speeches my fleshly Hagar did often whisper in my ear; but that divine spirit suffered me not any longer to make delay, but with an effectual voice called me to himself, as he did Abraham, saying—'Come out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, and come into the land which I will show unto thee.'

"Being, therefore, encouraged with this confidence, and moved with this holy calling, I have most cheerfully undertaken this my flight. I would, indeed, most gladly have retained mine own Church of Spalatro; but because that my Church, with many others, groaneth under the tyranny of the Pope, who hateth and abhorreth reformation, and by all his power, and the fears of his adherent princes, maketh impediment to it, and having power of life and death over them who urge reformation, suffereth none of them to live; therefore, I could not choose, but leave my Church, that I myself, having cast off these bonds, and set at liberty, might be the more ready to proclaim the truth, and, with greater safety, might deplore the desolation of the Holy Church, which she suffereth from the Court of Rome.

"This my departing from my country, or rather my going out, and flight from Babel, I will that it want all suspicion of schism; for I flee from errors, I flee from abuses, and that lest I be partaker of Babel's sins, and receive of her plagues: yet will I never sever myself from the love which I owe to the Holy Catholic Church, and to all and every one who communicate with her. Let the Word of God be a lantern to our feet, and let us follow the footsteps of our holy ancestors who have been excellent lights in the Church of Christ. Let us break asunder the darkness of error and falsehood by the light of the truth of the Gospel; and let us depart far from novelties which have quite extinguished the doctrines and discipline of the holy Church, that the Church of Christ on earth may be one coupled together with the glue of concord, whereunto let us all with one spirit and one mouth praise our God, and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ."

PASCE OVES.

SIR—I do not know whether the observations which I would wish to make in this letter may not be already familiar to your readers; but if not, and if you think them likely to be useful, I shall be glad to offer even this small contribution towards the good work in which you are engaged, and which you are conducting in a manner that must commend itself to every sincere lover of truth and peace.

Roman Catholic writers have not been slow in perceiving, that it is impossible to ground their doctrine of the universal supremacy of the Pope by Divine right, on the supremacy of St. Peter, unless they can prove, that Christ gave to St. Peter supreme jurisdiction over the other Apostles. They maintain that he did so; and one of the principal passages on which they rely is, the command given to St. Peter, in the twenty-first chapter of St. John—"Feed my lambs," "Feed my sheep;" "from which words" (I translate from Dr. Delahogue's Treatise on the Church) "the primacy of Peter over the rest of the Apostles, is manifestly collected, for to him is committed by Christ, the care not only of the *lambs*, but also of the *sheep*, or mothers of the flock—that is, of the pastors themselves—and, thence, of all Churches, and of all belonging to them."*

I quote Dr. Delahogue, not only because I have been under the impression that his work is used as a text-book in the education of the Roman Catholic priests in Ireland, but because he is very far from being an ultramontanist in his views of the supremacy. To show the value of this argument, it would be sufficient to observe, that even Roman Catholic writers have acknowledged, that St. Augustine and others of the Fathers have drawn no such conclusion from our Saviour's words. But it seems desirable to look a little more into the context.

St. John relates, that after our Saviour had given this charge to St. Peter, he pronounced a prophecy which was intended to intimate to St. Peter, that he should hereafter suffer martyrdom for his sake, and to signify by what sort of death he should glorify God. And having done this, he commanded the Apostle to follow him. While obeying this command, St. Peter turned about, and saw St. John following also; and on seeing him he said, "Lord, what shall this man do?" It is on this question, and the answer which our Saviour gave to it, that I wish to make a few observations. "Jesus saith unto him, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? Follow thou me;" which words made so great and so general an impression, that (as St. John himself observes) they gave rise to an opinion (of which it is not requisite to say more at present) that he was never to die.

Different motives have been assigned for the question of St. Peter. I cannot think it was a reprehensible curiosity which prompted him to ask—"What shall this man do?" Considering the affection which evidently subsisted between the two Apostles, nothing could be more natural than that Peter, thus forewarned of his own death, should wish to know whether—united by their Lord in life—in death also they should not be divided. Nor is it easy to perceive why our Saviour should answer as he did, if curiosity was the fault he wished to correct. If he had merely said—"What is that to thee? follow thou me," the answer would have been plainly intended to rebuke an improper inquisitiveness. But by saying "If I will that he tarry till I come"—so far from repressing curiosity, the words rather excited it; it being impossible not to feel desirous to understand their meaning. In point of fact, they set men on thinking and speculating at the time; and, as St. John informs us, gave rise to a current opinion among Christians. But let us take these words in connection with what immediately preceded them.

The Lord had, just before this, commanded St. Peter to feed his lambs and his sheep. According to Roman Catholic writers, this command invested him with supreme jurisdiction over all the other Apostles. According to their doctrine, the command was so peculiarly and especially a conveyance of power and pre-eminence to him, that the other Apostles were only part of his flock—the sheep whom he was to rule and govern. But if this were the meaning of the words, surely it was his place and his business to ascertain his Master's wishes respecting St. John? It was, I say, on the Roman Catholic theory of the supremacy of St. Peter, strictly within the limits of his office and duty, to say to his Master—"Lord, what shall this man do?" It was something to him—it was everything. For if he was constituted supreme pastor of the Church in the room of Christ, his following of Christ must consist, not merely in the imitation of his holiness and his patience, but in copying the example which the Lord had set him in the precise and especial duties of that dignity to which he was exalted. As supreme ruler of the Church, universal and vicegerent of Christ on earth, St. Peter could not follow Christ, unless he imitated the example of his government, as well as of his life and sufferings. He could not tread in his footsteps, unless he governed the other Apostles, in the same manner and on the same principles, as Christ had governed them and him during his abode on earth.

If it was something to *Christ*—if it was *his* office, while on earth, as the great shepherd of the sheep—to know what each of his Apostles should do, it was something to *St. Peter*. It was *his* office and his place to know what they should do in his Master's absence, and standing in his room. It was his duty to assign to them their works and places in the fold of Christ, as the Lord, in whose stead he acted, would have done if present. But to do this, he must, in every instance, seek for his Master's directions and the guidance of his Holy Spirit; and, therefore, the question, under all circumstances, on his lips, must have been precisely the one which he did ask—"Lord, what shall this man do?"

If St. Peter had supreme jurisdiction over the other Apostles, he was right in asking the question. It was the very embodiment of his whole office; for if (as I have said) his office consisted in assigning them, and all other pastors, their place and work, and in seeking the Divine guidance to enable him to do this with infallible certainty, this question—"Lord, what shall this man do?"—was the question of his whole existence.

If, then, St. Peter had any thought of this being his prerogative, in consequence of his having been commanded to feed the sheep, in what words could our Saviour have more distinctly corrected such a notion than by saying—"What is that to thee?" By such a reply he, as plainly and as strongly as words could do it, declared that St. Peter had no such charge, no such duty, no such authority in his Church; that the rest of the Apostles were not under his government and jurisdiction; that the direction of their life and ministry was absolutely retained by our Saviour in his own hands; so that the question—as far as authority and jurisdiction were concerned—did not concern St. Peter, any more than it did any other of the Apostles. The words are, in fact, totally irreconcilable with the notion of our Saviour having given supremacy to St. Peter over the universal Church. The proof, if there be any, must be drawn from some other source; and, even then, it would still be necessary for the advocates of the supremacy to show, how their interpretation of Matt. xvi. 18–19, and their inferences from other passages of the New Testament, can be made to harmonize with this answer of our Saviour—"What is that to thee? Follow thou me."

X. A.

TALK OF THE ROAD.—No. XXIV.

"WELL, Pat, isn't it the quare time since I saw you to have a talk, while I was above at the railway, with hard work and fair pay? And is there anything new at Kilcommon to talk of?"

"Deed, then, Jem," said Pat, "there's the new mission to talk of."

"Well, that's not new anyway," said Jem; "sure I saw that myself afore I went to the railroad."

"Well, it is new, Jem," said Pat; "sure its a Catholic mission that's in it."

"Is it the priests at a mission, Pat?" said Jem; "why, sure a station would be more in their way."

"Aye, is it," said Pat; "five or six priests there holding a mission of their own."

"Well, Mr. Burke and Mr. Owens is making a stir among the priests anyway," said Jem; "sure that's a new thing entirely; but what was it like at all?"

"Why, the greatest confessing and preaching that ever you seen; and the chapel-yard like a fair with the booths and shops."

"And what shops at all in the chapel-yard?" said Jem.

"Why, booths and stands, all covered with jimcracks and toys, fit to bring all the children at a fair to them," said Pat.

"And do you say its selling toys for the little children the missionaries were?" said Jem.

"Well, it wasn't just that," said Pat; "for it was toys for the *big* children they were selling."

"What sort at all?" said Jem.

* "Christus bis illi dixit; *Pasce agnos meos*, et tertiâ vice *Pasce oves meas*; quibus verbis primatus Petri supra cæteros apostolos manifeste colligitur, namque illi non *agnorum* tantum, sed et *ovium*, seu matrum gregis, cura a Christo committitur, id est pastorum ipsorum, prolisque omnium ecclesiarum et omnium ad illas pertinentium."—Delahogue Tractat. de Eccl. Univ., p. 334. Dublin, 1829. The proposition, which Dr. Delahogue is proving, is in these words—"S. Petrus a Christo primatum accepit supra alios apostolos vi cujus inter illos omnes, non honoris et dignitatis tantum, sed etiam autoritatis et jurisdictionis eminuit."—Ib., p. 330.

"Why, there was stands there, all glittering in the sun, covered all over with little bits of tin, at halfpence apiece, with gilding on them as bright as gingerbread," said Pat.

"And what were they at all?" said Jem.

"Miraculous medals, Jem," said Pat.

"And did they work miracles?" said Jem.

"Sorrow one, that I could hear of," said Pat.

"And did the people believe there was miracles on that stand, at a halfpenny apiece?" said Jem.

"Well, you see them that bought them had to get them blessed by the missionaries, before there would be any good in them," said Pat.

"And did the missionaries say they were miraculous medals, when they were blessed?" said Jem.

So then Pat pulled a printed paper out of his pocket, and showed it to Jem, with a cross at the top, and "Jesus, Mary, and Joseph," printed under the cross, and, under that again, in big letters, "RESOLUTIONS AT THE CLOSE OF THE MISSION," and then Jem read out of it, "PRAYER OF THE MIRACULOUS MEDAL—O Mary, conceived without sin, pray for us who have recourse to thee;" and then Pat took out of his pocket a little bit of gilt tin, as big as a sixpence, with the prayer, and the picture of the virgin stamped upon it; "And," said Pat, "here's the miraculous medal, Jem."

So Jem turned it about in his fingers, "And," said he, "do they think the people has got no sense at all? Sure its the height of impudence, it is, to call that miraculous."

"Well, I don't know, Jem," said Pat; "sure when grown childer can be got in plenty to buy the like of that for a miraculous medal, its a'most a miracle itself."

"Well, if bits of tin can beat the Bible in the long run, I'll call *that* a miracle, *when I see it*"—said Jem. "But *did* the people take to the medals, Pat?"

"Well, there was lots and lashings of them sold," said Pat, "but I don't think them that got them cared a deal for them; sure I was in Mr. Thomas's bread shop, when a boy come in, and said he had no money, and asked to buy a bit of bread with a miraculous medal, blest and all; and, indeed, Mr. Thomas gave him the bread, and took the medal, so one medal was worth something any way."*

"And what was the preaching like, Pat?" said Jem.

"Well, it wasn't like Father John's preaching at all," said Pat, "for they didn't abuse nor blackguard nobody, not even the Scripture-readers; but kept speaking to the people about their sins, and about death and judgment, and heaven and hell, quite solemn and serious, till you'd think that the people was just frightened out of their lives, and ready to look for salvation entirely; and you would see the people's hearts was stirred up in them entirely, for they never heard the like of that preaching in the chapel before; and, I'm thinking, if Father John doesn't mend his hand and try something more Christian-like, he won't go down with the people at all, after that."

"And, Pat, when the people was stirred up to look for salvation," said Jem, "did the missionaries shew them the way of salvation, or did they tell them of the blood of Christ at all?"

"Not one word about it at all, Jem," said Pat, "they just stirred up the people till you would think their minds couldn't be quiet at all about their sins, and then they just left them in the lurch, and didn't give them nothing to make their peace with God."

"And was there nothing about Jesus Christ, the Saviour of sinners, then?" said Jem.

"Nothing at all," said Pat; "there was plenty said then for the priests, but nothing at all for Christ, the Saviour of sinners! Sure, look at this paper I showed you," said Pat: "here's about death and judgment, and heaven and hell; and here's the Blessed Virgin six times over, and *the prayer of the miraculous medal*, and plenty of real good advice, and not one word about Jesus Christ, the Saviour, good or bad, first or last; and *that's the priest's mission*, Jem."

So Jem read the paper over, and he could not find one word about Christ, the Saviour of sinners, in it; and we print that paper (for a copy was sent to us) that our readers may try if they can find anything about Christ in it.

"Well," said Jem, "I think I see now what can come of it."

"And what's that, Jem?" said Pat.

"Well, it's my opinion," said Jem, "that them that's stirred up to think of their sins, and of heaven and hell, will *have* to look for a saviour and a way of salvation before they can get their minds quiet again—and it's clear they won't get that from priests—and who knows but they may be driv to the Bible for that."

"Well, Jem," said Pat, "I think you are right; sure enough, it's new work the priests are at in preaching that way, and more may come of it than they know of. If they stir the people to think in earnest about sin and their own souls, they'll maybe find they have riz what they cannot quell, for they haven't got what will satisfy them that are once in earnest about their own souls; and the Rev. Mr. Burke seemed to think that, too, for he kept writing mighty good letters to the people, showing them where they would find salvation and the way of peace with God, if they want to look for it now."

"But look here, Pat," said Jem, "see, here's a verse out of the Bible, stuck on to the end of the priest's paper; sure that's new anyway." So Jem read the verse—"Whosoever shall follow this rule, peace on them and mercy.—Galatians ch. vi., ver. 16."

"And what rule was that about," said Pat; "could it be about praying to the Blessed Virgin, and looking to her for salvation, the way it is in this paper?"

So Pat got his Douay Bible, and he read—"God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ; by whom the world is crucified to me and I to the world. For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor incircumcision, but a new creature. *And whosoever shall follow this rule, peace on them and mercy.*"—Galatians ch. vi., v. 14, 15, 16.

"Now, Pat," said Jem, "see what the rule in the Douay Bible is, *to glory in the cross of Jesus Christ, and nothing else*, and the promise of peace and mercy is to them that follow *that rule*. And now see if this paper isn't telling every one to pray to the Blessed Virgin and to look *to her* for salvation, without one word about Christ the Saviour of sinners; and then they clap on to this rule of their own making the very promise that the Bible makes to them that look to Christ only. Now, is'nt that nothing else but turning the word and promise of God himself into a lie?"

"Jem," said Pat, "there's nothing else to be got out of our priests. They haven't the Gospel, and so they won't let us have the Bible; and if we want the Gospel of Jesus Christ we must have the Bible for ourselves to teach us."

We print here the paper which the missionary priests printed and circulated about their mission, that our readers may see for themselves, whether what Pat and Jem said about it was fair and true.

* This did actually happen, in the shop of a Protestant.

✠

JESUS, MARY, AND JOSEPH.

RESOLUTIONS AT THE CLOSE OF THE MISSION.

1st. Every day, either at morning or night prayers, I shall repeat and consider these great truths: God SEES ME, and *beholds even the secrets of my heart. I must die, and it may be this very day. After death I must be judged, and woe to me if I be found guilty of mortal sin, not repented of. Then begins Eternity, which I must spend amidst the joys of Heaven or torments of Hell.*

2ndly. Every day I shall be exact in saying my morning and night prayers; I shall examine my conscience, I shall repeat the Angelus, say grace before and after meals, read a portion of a pious book (were it only for five or ten minutes), or recite a part of the Rosary of the Blessed Virgin.

3rdly. Every Sunday I shall assist devoutly at Mass, and, if possible, at a Sermon, and I shall read a *considerable portion* of a pious book; I shall also consider the faults of the past week, and resolve to avoid them this week. Moreover, I shall examine how I have kept these resolutions, and I shall repeat them anew.

4thly. Every month, at least, I shall approach the Holy Sacraments of *Penance* and the *Blessed Eucharist*. But if I should have the misfortune of falling into mortal sin, I shall overcome every inconvenience, in order to go to confession as *soon as possible*, knowing that *a person in mortal sin is liable at any moment, to everlasting damnation.*

5thly. I shall avoid most carefully *every person, every place, and every thing* that would bring me into sin, but above all, *such persons, such places, and such things*, as have already led me into sin.

6thly. I shall make every effort, with the grace of God, to overcome *that temptation* which I know by experience to be most dangerous to me.

7thly. Every night I shall repeat the following prayer, to obtain, through the intercession of the Blessed Virgin, the grace of persevering in these resolutions until death:—

PRAYER OF ST. BERNARD.

Remember, O most pious Virgin, that it was never heard of in any age that those who implored, and had recourse to thy powerful protection, were ever abandoned by thee. I, therefore, O Sacred Virgin, animated with the most lively confidence, cast myself at thy sacred feet, most earnestly and fervently beseeching thee to adopt me, though a wretched sinner, for thy perpetual child, to take care of my eternal salvation, and to watch over me at the hour of my death. O do not, mother of the Word Incarnate, despise my prayers, but graciously hear and obtain the grant of my petitions. Amen.

PRAYER OF THE MIRACULOUS MEDAL.

O MARY, conceived without sin, pray for us who have recourse to thee.

SPECIAL RECOMMENDATIONS.

To THE PARISHIONERS AT LARGE.—Exact attendance at the public service of religion in the Church, zeal for the becoming style and decoration of the Church, as also for the vestments and other requisites of the altar, respect for the Clergymen, and submission to their advice.

To THE HEADS OF FAMILIES.—Instruction, vigilance, correction, and above all, good example—prayer in common, proper choice of servants, attention to their religious duties.

To HUSBANDS AND WIVES.—Affection, mutual forbearance, union and peace—send your children to good schools.

To CHILDREN.—Love, respect, and obedience to parents—peace, and concord amongst themselves.

To MEN.—A horror of blaspheming, cursing, swearing, gambling, impure conversation, bad company, drunkenness, and public houses, a love of honesty, the pardon of injuries.

To WOMEN.—Meekness, patience, charity and attention to the duties of the house.

To YOUNG PEOPLE IN GENERAL.—To avoid dangerous occasions, wakes, dances, company-keeping, and bad books.

To YOUNG BOYS.—To avoid dangerous amusements, dread of everything contrary to modesty, to practice pious reading.

To YOUNG FEMALES.—Modesty, becomingness in dress, humility, particular devotion to the Blessed Virgin, the study and imitation of her virtues.

To ALL.—A spirit of piety, watchfulness, great distrust in ourselves, and unbounded confidence in God.

"Whosoever shall follow this rule, peace on them and mercy."—GAL. vi. 16.

Whether the prayer in the above paper was really written by St. Bernard, who lived in the 12th century, we do not know; perhaps some of our correspondents can tell us. But we do think it very strange that any prayer of St. Bernard should be put along with the prayer of the miraculous medal, "O Mary, CONCEIVED WITHOUT SIN, pray for us, who have recourse to thee," for this reason, that St. Bernard condemned the notion of Mary being *conceived without sin*, as a FALSE DOCTRINE. If our readers will look to another article in our present number, p. 97, they will find that St. Bernard affirms that this doctrine is "neither supported by reason nor backed by any tradition;" he says it was founded on "an alleged revelation which is destitute of adequate authority." He asks, "How can it be maintained that a conception which did not proceed from the Holy Ghost—not to say that it proceeded from sin—can be holy? or how could they conjure up a holy day on account of *a thing that is not holy in itself;*" and he says, that the Feast of the Immaculate Conception (which is now celebrated in the Church of Rome) "either *honours sin* or *authorizes a false holiness.*"

All this St. Bernard wrote; yet the Roman Catholic priests do not scruple to put St. Bernard's name side by side with a prayer, "O, Mary, conceived without sin!"

Thus the priests deal with the Fathers; thus they reverence the opinions and authority of the Fathers; but how could we expect them to deal more truly with the Fathers, than they do with Scripture itself?

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We beg to call the attention of our correspondents to the utility of adding their name and address to their communications.

Several papers are now in our possession which we cannot insert without alterations, which we do not feel at liberty to make without the previous concurrence of the writers.

We would request our correspondents, both Roman Catholics and Protestants, to limit the length of their communications, and not to discuss a variety of distinct topics in one letter.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st.

To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal, which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, AUGUST, 1854.

SINCE the publication of our last number, a Pastoral letter has been published, addressed to the [Roman] Catholic clergy and laity of the diocese of Dublin, on the Feast of the Assumption, signed PAUL CULLEN, Archbishop, &c., which sets forth some matters, to which we think it our duty, as lovers of truth, to call attention.

The document presents so striking an illustration of the tone and style in which it is now the fashion in the Roman Catholic Church to speak of, and address the Blessed Virgin Mary, that, had our space permitted, we should have been glad to have transcribed the whole of it for our readers. Its great length, however, obliges us to content ourselves with merely giving such extracts as appear the most striking, and worthy of remark; leaving it to such of our readers as may desire it, to consult the original letter, which they will find given in full in the *Tablet* of the 5th instant, and in most of the other Roman Catholic journals.

"The Church (says Dr. Cullen) invites us, at this season, to celebrate the Assumption of the Holy Virgin into Heaven. . . . This festival recalls to our recollection the last moments of the great mother of God upon earth, and puts before our eyes the sublime spectacle of her passage into heaven. She passes from the darkness of this world to the regions of eternal bliss . . . where she shall be for all ages—the health of the weak, *the refuge of poor sinners, the source of all spiritual graces and favours.* Her body, exempted from the lot of the other descendants of Adam, is not condemned to moulder into dust, but, united again with her pure soul, is translated into heaven, and placed at the right hand of the Eternal Son."

"Acquainted, as we are, with the *intensity* of your devotion to the Holy Mother of God, who is the *special*

patroness of this diocese and this city, we need scarcely exhort you to join in this Novena with fervour and zeal, and to celebrate, with the profoundest veneration and the warmest sentiments of piety, the greatest of her festivals. *All the honour that we can pay* to this great Virgin—to this most holy and exalted of all creatures—*is nothing when compared to what is due* to the sublimity of her dignity, the extent of her merits, and to the power of her patronage. . . . Choose, says St. Bernard, which you will most admire—the most beneficent condescension of the Son, or the sublime dignity of the Mother. On each side it is a subject of wonder and astonishment—that a God should obey a woman is a humility beyond example—and that a *woman* COMMAND a God is an unparalelled privilege."

. . . . "It is our sad lot to have been born in original sin, and to have inherited from our first parents the maledictions which they brought on themselves by transgressing God's commandments; whilst Mary, by a privilege granted to her alone among all the children of Adam, was *conceived free from every stain of sin*. Such is the received doctrine of *all* the Catholic world, and SUCH HAS IT ALWAYS BEEN. Let us humbly pray that the Holy Pontiff who now fills the chair of St. Peter will soon put the seal of infallibility upon it, by declaring to be a doctrine of the Church what is already, and HAS BEEN ALWAYS BELIEVED—thus satisfying the pious aspirations of the faithful Christians, who desire to add a *new* wreath of glory to the diadem of the celestial Queen, and to bring into stronger light the privileges of the most exalted of creatures."

There are several matters in the above extracts which, we confess, have startled us, not a little; and we earnestly beg the attention of our Roman Catholic readers to the calm consideration of them.

That Dr. Cullen should represent the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin to be now the received doctrine of *all* the *Catholic world*, while he, in the next sentence, admits that it has never yet been *declared* to be a doctrine of the *Church*, is in itself sufficiently strange to any one who has been in the habit of considering that it is the office of the Head of the Church to *lead*, and not to *follow*; to *teach*, and not *to be taught*, what doctrines ought to be believed by faithful Christians. And if Dr. CULLEN be right in asserting that "*all the honour we can pay* the Virgin Mary *is nothing when compared with what is her due*, and that the whole world of faithful Christians are agreed in breathing forth their pious aspirations to the holy Pontiff to add this *new* wreath of glory to the diadem of their celestial Queen, it does, certainly, appear to be somewhat singular that the present Pontiff, as well as all the Popes who have filled the Holy See before him, for the last six or seven hundred years, should have been so long blind to their duty, and so deaf to the prayers and pious aspirations of the *whole* Catholic world on the subject!

It is rather hard, we think, to believe that the Popes have been the only individuals among the faithful who were reluctant to add a new wreath of glory to the diadem of her whom Dr. CULLEN, in the *intensity* of his devotion, seems never to think he can eulogize sufficiently.

We cannot refrain from giving one other passage:—

"O my brethren, let us not neglect to avail ourselves of this great means of salvation. . . . . In our dangers and our difficulties let us invoke the *most* holy name of Mary. . . . . Let us put on the new man, and reform the tenor of our lives, in order that we may approach with confidence the *throne* of the Holy Virgin, and place ourselves under the shield of *her* protection. Let us prove that we are the children of the Queen of Angels, by our fervour in the service of God; the children of the Queen of Patriarchs, by our piety; the children of the Queen of Prophets and Apostles, by our zeal; the children of the Queen of Martyrs, by our courage and fortitude; the children of the Queen of Confessors, the children of the Queen of Virgins, the children of the Queen of Mercy," &c., &c.

"Oh! if we do so, the most Holy Virgin will not abandon us—like a pillar of light, she will go before us and direct our steps; she will defeat the attacks of our infernal enemies; she will strengthen us in our temptations, and obtain for us all the blessings and graces necessary in order to work out our eternal salvation."

Surely it would be passing strange if every Pope, who ever sat on the throne of St. Peter, was so hard-hearted as to refuse to add any new gem to the celestial crown of their grand patroness, unless some grave difficulty stood in the way of their doing so; and even if we knew no more of the matter, we confess that this reflection alone would have led us to suspect that Dr. Cullen's statements ought to be received with some little caution, and that, high as his position may be in the Roman Catholic world in Ireland, he is possibly not very accurately informed about the real state of the case, or the causes of the reluctance of the Holy See to satisfy the pious aspirations of the faithful Christians who desire to add this *new* wreath of glory to the diadem of their queen.

Fortunately, however, we happen to know what Dr. Cullen appears to be ignorant of, or to have forgotten; that, *if* it be true that it is *now* the received doctrine of all the Catholic world, that the Virgin was conceived free from every stain of original sin, and "that she never committed," as he adds, "the slightest fault, and never had to reproach herself with the smallest imperfections," it is as certainly false that such has *always* been the received doctrine of *all* the Catholic world. We should be sorry to suppose that any one in Dr. Cullen's position should be guilty of a wilful mistatement of such magnitude; but we beg his attention, and that of our readers, for a few moments, to the actual state of the case, as demonstrated by authorities, which even Dr. Cullen himself must admit to be irresistible.

We shall begin with St. Bernard—a witness who, singularly enough, Dr. Cullen has himself selected and quoted by name in this Pastoral, and whose notions of the dignity of the Virgin Mary must have been tolerably high, if he speaks of her, as stated by Dr. Cullen, as "*a woman commanding a God*"—which may, indeed, as he himself says, "well fill us with wonder and astonishment." We doubt if Bonaventura himself has ever uttered a stronger expression; and the passage seems a worthy companion to that which we cited from the works of that somewhat enthusiastic votary of the Blessed Virgin in our June number, p. 74.*

Now, how stands the actual historic fact. It may be briefly stated thus—So far is it from being true that this doctrine of the Immaculate Conception has always been the received doctrine of *all* the Catholic world, as asserted by Dr. Cullen, that it is no exaggeration to say that no controversy was ever waged between two great parties within the pale of the Roman Catholic Church with half the violence and bitterness that this disputed doctrine gave rise to. Until the year 1139, or 1140 (though, as an opinion, it may have been held by some individuals as early as the ninth century, and not earlier), it had no place in ecclesiastical ceremonies, or even in the arguments of the learned. About that date, however, A.D. 1139, the Canons of Lyons, in France, ventured to introduce it into the offices of their Church, and instituted a feast in the Church of Lyons in honour of the Immaculate Conception.

St. Bernard, who was then in the height of his fame, and is said by some to have possessed, in his retreat at Clairvaux, more authority in the Christian world than if seated on the throne of St. Peter, lost not a moment in publicly making known his sentiments at the innovation, and stoutly reprobated it with all the earnestness and eloquence of which he was capable. The letter which he addressed to the Church of Lyons on this occasion is contained in his works, vol. i., p. 389 (Paris, 1839), epistle 174, and is well worth Dr. Cullen's careful perusal. He will find there that St. Bernard says, "we can never wonder enough that some of you could have the boldness to introduce a feast which *the Church has not the least knowledge of*, which is neither supported by reason nor backed by any tradition. Are we more learned or more devout than the Fathers? It is dangerous presumption to attempt what their wisdom in such things omitted." He will there find that St. Bernard asserts that the alleged revelation on which some pretended that it was founded, was destitute of any adequate authority, and argues "How can it be maintained that a conception which did not proceed from the Holy Ghost, not to say that it proceeded from sin, could be holy? or how could a holy day be held on account of a thing *that is not holy in itself?* Willingly would the glorious Virgin be without that honour, by which either sin is honoured or a false sanctity introduced." And again, p. 389-391—"The royal Virgin has no need of a false honour. And what if others, on the same ground, should assert that feasts in honour of *each of her parents* are to be defended? And the very same thing some one might exact for her grandfathers and great grandfathers, and so it might be extended *ad infinitum*, and the number of holidays would be without end."† Well might the learned Du Pin observe on such passages—"Thus it may be observed that St. Bernard had *no very favourable* thoughts of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary!"

Great, however, as was the authority of St. Bernard, and though the powerful and widely-extended Dominican order, following their famous doctor St. Thomas Aquinas, for centuries combated the new doctrine most vehemently, as *contrary to Scripture and to the tradition of the Church*, and, therefore, contrary to the Catholic faith, the equally influential order of the Franciscans zealously adopted the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, and Pope Sixtus IV., himself a Franciscan, threw the whole weight of his authority into the same scale, and issued, in 1483, a Bull, in which he condemned those who *called the doctrine a heresy*, and the celebration of the festival a sin†—applying, however, an exactly similar condemnation towards the other party, who said it *was a heresy*, or sin, *to deny* the doctrine—a pretty cogent proof, we think, that, at that time at least, *all* the Catholic world were not agreed upon the point, as Dr. Cullen now would have the clergy and laity of our Irish metropolis believe. The truth is, the Bulls of Pope Sixtus IV. were as little minded by the Dominicans as the letter of St. Bernard was by the Franciscans, and the controversy raged as fiercely as ever. The annual recurrence of the Feast of the Conception continued for centuries to be the signal of renewed hostilities, and often gave birth to scenes of the most scandalous kind; and even when the doctrine of original sin came to be discussed at the Council of Trent, the debate ran so high between the Dominicans and Franciscans about the Immaculate Conception, that the Pope gave orders to the Papal legates to reconcile the contending parties,

* As Dr. Cullen does not give any reference to St. Bernard's works we cannot take upon us, at present, to say whether St. Bernard has really said anything so startling; but, for the present, it is not our purpose to dispute Dr. Cullen's quotation.

* "Unde miramur satis, quid visum fuerit hoc tempore quibusdam vestrum voluisse mutare colorem optimum, novam inducendo celebritatem, quam ritus Ecclesiæ nescit, non probat ratio, non commendat antiqua traditio? Numquid Patribus doctiores aut devotiores sumus? Periculose præsumimus, quidquid ipsorum in talibus prudentia præterivit."—Page 389.

"Sed præfertur scriptum superum, ut aiunt, revelationis. Ipse mihi facilè persuadeo scriptis talibus non moveri, quibus nec ratio suppeditare, nec certa invenitur favere auctoritas."—Page 391.

"Cum hæc ita se habeant, quonam jam erit festivæ rationi conceptionis? Quo pacto, inquam, aut sanctus asseritur conceptus, qui de Spiritu Sancto non est, ne dicam de peccato est? Aut festus habebitur, qui minime sanctus est? Libenter Gloriosa hoc honore carebit, quo vel peccatum honorari, vel falsa videtur induci sanctitas."

"Virgo regia non eget falso honore . . . . Quid si alius propter eandem causam, etiam utriquo parenti ejus festos honores asserit defendendos? Sed et avis et proavis idipsum posset pro simili causa quilibet flagitare, et sic tenderetur in infinitum et festorum non esset numerus."—Page 389—391.

† This decree may be found in the appendix of any of the authorized editions of the Council of Trent.

as far as possible, without giving a triumph to either. The directions were—"Not to meddle in this matter, which might cause a schism among Catholics; to endeavour to maintain peace between the opposing parties, and to seek some means of giving them equal satisfaction; above all, to observe strictly the brief of Pope Sixtus IV., which prohibited preachers from taxing the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception with heresy."* Accordingly, the Council of Trent left the great controversy still undecided; and satisfied itself with declaring, at the close of its decree concerning original sin (Sess. v., sec. 5), that it was not the intention of the Council to comprehend in that decree, the Blessed Virgin Mary, but merely that the constitutions of Pope Sixtus IV. should be observed; which we have given the outline of above;† and the great Roman Catholic controversialist, Bishop Milner, writing more than two centuries later, says—"The Church does not decide the controversy concerning the conception of the Blessed Virgin, and several other disputed points, because she sees nothing absolutely clear and certain concerning them, either in the written or unwritten word; and, therefore, leaves her children to form their own opinions concerning them."

This, we think, accounts satisfactorily for why so many Popes have declined to add this *new* wreath of glory to the celestial crown of the Queen of Heaven, and leaves no other difficulty unsolved, than the one which startled us so much in reading this magniloquent Pastoral of Dr. Cullen—namely, how it is possible for a divine to hold so distinguished a post in the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland, who is either so grossly ignorant of what every tyro in ecclesiastical history knows touching the progress of this much-vexed controversy, or so bold as to cite St. Bernard in almost the same sentence in which he (Dr. Cullen) proclaims as a doctrine which has *always* been *received* by *all* the Catholic world, the very doctrine which St. Bernard so earnestly *condemned*, and which for centuries rent the Catholic Church almost to its foundations! We should be glad to know, even at the present day, what the order of St. Dominic have to say upon the matter; and shall feel anxious to learn whether any of our respected Roman Catholic correspondents are disposed to vindicate Dr. Cullen's assertions, or whether they consider them mere rhetorical flourishes to amuse the vulgar, and increase the intensity of their devotion, by practising a pious fraud upon their understanding.

There is another matter set forth in Dr. Cullen's Pastoral which we propose to consider, but which will require a more full investigation than we have space to enter upon in our present number—viz., whether the alleged translation into heaven of the body of the Blessed Virgin, celebrated by the Church of Rome under the name of the Assumption, is a fact established on satisfactory historic evidence, like the translation of Enoch or Elijah, or the ascension of our Blessed Lord, for which we have the unerring testimony of the Holy Scriptures; or whether it is a mere fiction—as we seriously believe it to be—as destitute of real proof as the martyrdom of St. Philomena, St. Theudosia, or St. Ursinus.‡ It will give us much satisfaction if any of our friends will relieve us from the task, by sending us what they consider proof of the fact; and for the present shall merely say, that as far as our reading goes, we have found no trace, which can be relied on, of even any *tradition* upon the subject, before the time of John Damaseenus, a monk of Jerusalem, who flourished some time in the eighth century.

Should none of our Roman Catholic correspondents feel disposed to defend this great festival of their Church, by stating the grounds upon which the Church believes in the Assumption, we shall endeavour to throw what light we can upon the subject in our next number.

* F. Paul Sarpi Hist. Conc. Trid., lib ii., c. 68.

† "Declarat tamen hæc ipsa Sancta Synodus, non esse suæ intentionis, comprehendere in hoc decreto, ubi de peccato originali agitur, beatam et immaculatam Virginem Mariam, Dei genetricem, sed observandas esse constutiones fel. rec. Sixti Papæ IV. sub pœnis in eis constitutionibus contentis, quas innovat."—(Sess. v., s. 5., 17th June, 1546).

‡ As to the former of these worthies, we refer our readers to the May number of our journal (p. 56); and as to the two latter, they will find some notice in our present number (p. 92).

Correspondence.

ON INFALLIBILITY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—In the remarks on my letter, in the May number of your journal, I find the following sentence—viz., "This paragraph is pervaded by Mr. Rourke's old fallacy, that what is said in Scripture of the Church must necessarily be understood of the Church of Rome—a Church which actually did not exist at the time to which the passage in Acts ii. refers."

In answer to this "rhetorical flourish," I have only to say, that it will be proved in this letter, beyond the power of refutation, that the Church of Rome is the Church of Christ; and, by consequence, what is said in Acts ii. 47, and other parts of the most holy book of the Church, refers to her.

When we say that the Church of Rome is the only true Church, we neither mean the city nor the diocese of Rome; for that is but a part of the true Church; and any Catholic city or diocese in the world is as much a true Church as the city or diocese of Rome. No Catholic, therefore, ever was so weak as to mean this; but their true and only meaning is, that that body, or society of Christians (wherever dispersed, throughout the whole world), which is united in faith and communion with the Bishop of Rome, is alone the true Church of Christ upon earth; and we prove it thus:—

There is but one faith, and one Catholic Church. The first is expressly taught by St. Paul, saying—"One Lord, one faith, one baptism" (Eph. iv. 5); and we profess the other in the creed, so that, if there be more than one true faith, St. Paul is mistaken; and if there be more than one true Catholic Church, the creed deceives us. And since it is impious to say either the one or the other, it only remains to show, that the Church of Rome is this true Catholic Church, which I prove from this uncontested principle—viz., that there was a true Catholic Church upon earth before the Reformation. For if there was not, it will follow that this article of the creed—"I believe in the Holy Catholic Church" was false for many hundred years together, because the pretended Reformation only began in the year 1517.

Here, then, Mr. Editor, you must do one of these two things. You must either grant that the Church of Rome was this true Catholic Church before the Reformation, or mark out some other visible body or society of men in which the true Church of Christ subsisted before that time. If you grant the first, it is all we can desire; we gain our cause, and the dispute is at an end. For, if the Church of Rome was the true Catholic Church before the Reformation, she is so now, because her faith is the same now as it was then. Besides, it will follow that Protestants separated themselves, and continued separated from the true Catholic Church, which alone suffices to condemn them.

But, if you deny that the Church of Rome was the true Catholic Church before the Reformation, then you are bound to show us some other visible body or society of Christians, in which the true Church subsisted before that time; and to perform this effectually, you are bound to let us know in what part of the world this Church had her being, as, likewise, what particular countries, kings, and bishops were in her communion. And, lastly, you must specify to us the name and diocese of the bishop or bishops of this Church, by whom the first English Protestant bishop was ordained, and from whom the Church of England derives her mission. But this being a task impossible for you to perform, I do not see what other choice there is left you, but either to say that the creed was false for many hundred years before the Reformation, or own that the Church in communion with the See of Rome was the only true Catholic Church before that time. And if she was the only true Catholic Church when Protestants "reformed" her, she is so still, because she has not changed her faith since that time, as I have already observed.

The Nineteenth Article of your creed says:—"The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly ministered, according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that, of necessity, are requisite to the same."—Book of Common Prayer.

All this is very true, but altogether unsatisfactory. For if I should ask you, where this true Church, in which the pure Word of God is preached, is to be found?—the article does not answer this question. Yet here lies the knot of the difficulty; and if it be not clearly resolved, we may easily mistake a false Church for the true one; because all Christian Churches, though ever so opposite to one another, pretend to teach pure and sound doctrine, and to administer the sacraments according to Christ's ordinance. So that the article's account of the Church of Christ is as little to the purpose as if a stranger, inquiring for the best inn upon the road, should be told that the best inn is where there is the best accommodation; for, though this be very true, yet, unless some other marks be given—as the sign of the house, the name of the man that keeps it, and the like—a stranger will be as much at a loss to find it as if nothing were said to him. In like manner, though what the article says concerning the visible Church of Christ—the only true Church—be unquestionable, yet, in respect of the greatest part of mankind, it is of no manner of use to direct them how to distinguish this one true Church from the many false ones that lay claim to it, without certain external marks, whereby it may be clearly known in what particular body or society of men this Church may be found.

Now, listen to St. Augustine, and he will tell us the marks of the Church of Christ, by which all may know her. That holy doctor writes thus against the Manichees:—"Not to speak of that wisdom which you do not believe to be in the Catholic Church, there are many other things which most justly hold me in her communion.—1. The agreement of people and nations holds me. 2. Authority, begun with miracles, nourished with hope, increased with charity, confirmed by antiquity, holds me. 3. A succession of bishops, from the See of St. Peter—to whom Christ, after his resurrection, committed his flock—to the present episcopacy, holds me. 4. And, lastly, the very name of Catholic holds me, of which this Church alone has, not without reason, so kept the possession that, though all heretics desire to be called Catholics, yet, if a stranger asks them where Catholics meet, no heretic dare point out his own house or his own Church."—Con. Epist. Fund., c. 4.

These, sir, were the external marks by which St. Augustine distinguished the true Catholic Church from false ones, and which held him stedfast in her communion—viz., 1. The agreement of people and nations. 2. The evidence of miracles. 3. A continued succession of bishops, from St. Peter, the first Bishop of Rome, to him who then sat in the apostolic chair. And, 4. The name of Catholic, attributed to the true Church by the creed itself. Let us now see to what Church these marks can be appropriated.

The first—viz., the agreement of people and nations, may justly be called the distinctive mark of the Church in communion with the See of Rome. For, though all nations never were in her communion at one and the same time; yet there is scarce a nation in the known world but has been in her communion some time or other. All the "reformed" nations in Europe were in her communion for many hundred years; and so was the whole Greek Church until the middle of the ninth century. In St. Augustine's time, though there were yet many heathen nations, there was scarce a Christian nation under the sun but was in her communion. And, excepting Russia alone, which received its Christianity from the schismatical Greeks, it cannot be shown that any one people or nation, which, upon its conversion, was not immediately united in faith and communion with the See of Rome. Now, I presume, no reformed Church will pretend to anything like this. It is, therefore, evident to common sense, that the agreement of people and nations, which is St. Augustine's first external mark of the true Church, cannot, according to his meaning, be appropriated to any but the Church of Rome. And, even at this time, when so many Churches are cut off from her by heresy and schism, her communion alone is more extended than any one, I might say, than all, the reformed Churches together.

The second mark—viz., the evidence of miracles, belongs also in a peculiar a manner to the Church of Rome, that no Protestant communion ever had the confidence to lay claim to it. On the contrary, most Protestants have thought it their best way to despise and ridicule miracles, just as the fox in the fable pretended the grapes were sour, when he could not come at them.

But the third mark—viz., a perpetual succession of bishops and pastors, derived from the Apostles—never was denied to the Church of Rome, by any man of learning. Indeed, Protestant bishops lay no claim to any such succession but by the Church of Rome. Because, without the interposition of a long catalogue of Popish bishops to make up their ecclesiastical pedigree, there is a gap of near one thousand five hundred years between the Apostles and the first Protestant bishop that ever was in the world. However, even that will not render them any substantial service; for, supposing the validity of their ordination—which, yet, was never granted—unless they can also bring down their mission, in a lineal descent, from the Apostles, and can show that Protestants have, within their own communion, a continued succession of it from them (which is somewhat more than they ever pretended to), their Church will never be admitted into the apostolical family.

Catholicity, or the fourth mark of the true Church, will be treated of in my letter of next month. I hope all my letters will soon appear in the LAYMAN.

"O happy Church (says Tertullian), to which the Apostles poured out all doctrine with their blood! Where

Peter suffereth, like to our Lord's Passion—where Paul is crowned with John the Baptist's death."—De Præscript., nu. 14. The happy, the glorious Church of Rome, sir, is "walking in brightness," whilst the sects of the world are wandering in the valley of the shadow of death.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM ROURKE.

In the beginning of his letter Mr. Rourke expresses his opinion in words to which, with very little alteration, we can cordially assent. We believe that "when we seek for the true Church, we are not to look to the city nor the diocese of Rome exclusively [nor the Churches in communion with it]: all this is but a part of the true Church; and any Catholic city or diocese in the world is as much a true Church as the city or diocese of Rome; but we must seek the true Church in the whole body or society of Christians, wherever dispersed throughout the world." Our difference with Mr. Rourke is with regard to the limitation which he has thrown in, in which he makes unity in faith and communion with the Bishop of Rome an essential mark of the true Church. We require his proof of this; we want to know on what grounds he denies the share in the title of the true Church of Christ to the Church of England, and those other bodies who are not now in communion with Rome; and we want to know on what ground he applies to the Church of Rome exclusively those texts of Scripture which were spoken of the Church of Christ before the Church of Rome existed. We look in vain through his letter for any proof of this, to him, essential point of doctrine. He has certainly one great difficulty in his way, and that is the utter silence of Scripture, as to this very simple way of knowing the true Church. We have two letters written by St. Peter for the express purpose of enabling his converts to keep the truth after his death; if he knew of so simple a safeguard against error as to tell his disciples, whatever divisions might arise among Christians, to be sure always to hold fast by the See of Rome, can we suppose that he could possibly have forgotten to tell them of it? And what need of all the marks by which Mr. Rourke tells us St. Augustine distinguished the true Church from false ones, if he could have employed this very easy mark, that the true Church was that which was in communion with Rome?

Our readers will observe that Mr. Rourke asserts that no Church is a true Church which is not united in *faith* with the Church of Rome, and which is not united in *communion* with the Church of Rome. If they will look through his letter, they will see that he has not *attempted* to prove the last of these two things. He tells us he will prove that the Church of Rome is the Church of Christ, but he never tries to prove that the Church of England has not an equal, or even better right to the title. Whatever arguments he has brought forward apply solely to the point that the true Church must be united in *faith* with the Church of Rome. We shall then consider this point solely, omitting the other for which no proof is pretended.

Mr. Rourke's proof of the first point reduces itself to the text—"one Lord, one faith, one baptism," from which he infers that in the true Church there can be no difference in faith; and that, therefore, if the Church of Rome belong to the true Church, the Church of England cannot. But, of course, when Mr. Rourke asserts, and that rightly, that there is but one faith, he does not mean to say that there are no differences of opinion on religious matters between members of the true Church; if so, he would be puzzled to account for the violent disputes that have taken place in his own Church, such as those between the Dominicans and Franciscans for example. We suppose Mr. Rourke would answer that the points in dispute in such cases, however important, are not parts of the "one faith" which belongs to the Church, and that, therefore, a difference of opinion, in such matters, may exist without either of the parties ceasing to belong to the true Church. We approve of this defence; but Mr. Rourke will not find it easy to explain in practice how it is that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, for instance, should be declared by the Pope now to be part of the "one faith" necessary to salvation; and yet that three or four hundred years ago it should not have been so, and that differences of opinion in it could then have been tolerated.

We believe that the "one faith" is always the same. Those points of doctrine, the acknowledgment of which the ancient Church deemed essential to admission to her communion, we make necessary to ours; we retain the three creeds in which she embraced these essential articles of faith: she denied the name of Catholic to none who acknowledged them, neither do we arrogate the title of Catholic *exclusively* to ourselves, or to any one local body of Christians; we allow the possibility of salvation to all who hold this one faith which has been handed to us, however they may have endangered their condition by unauthorized additions to their system of doctrines. Let us see whether the Church of Rome has equally followed the example of the primitive Church. She does, indeed, retain the three ancient creeds; so far, well: we, therefore, admit the possibility of salvation in her communion, and allow her to be a part, though a corrupt one, of the Church of Christ. But she is not content with holding the one faith which the Apostles delivered to us. No sooner has one of her priests said Amen at the end of his repetition of the *old* Nicene Creed, than, as if he had not come to an end, he goes on with the clauses of the *new* creed which Pope Pius IV. introduced into her system of teaching. The Church of Rome, then, has *added* to the old faith a number of points of doctrine, and anathematized all those who will not assent to them. We agree in faith with the Church of Rome as she once was; we cannot, at the same time, agree with her as she is now. Which are we to do? Must we change with her? By her anathemas she renders it impossible for those to remain in communion with her, who wish to preserve the faith the same as it was held by the primitive Church; and she has, therefore, as far as in her lies, inflicted a grievous breach on the unity of the Church; as far as she retains the old doctrines she preserves her right to be counted in the Church of Christ; but in her schismatical anathemas she has grievously offended. All Mr. Rourke's arguments are founded on the hypothesis of the *infallibility* of the Church, and have force against none who do not admit this modern notion. Let it be once supposed possible that a part of the Church may fall into error, and the whole flank of Mr. Rourke's position is turned, and every argument in his letter falls to the ground.

Mr. Rourke asks us either to grant that the Church of Rome was the Church of Christ before the Reformation, or else to point out what other body was then the Catholic Church. Now, it would be a contradiction in terms to assert that the Church of Rome was, at any time, the Catholic Church. The Church of Rome must be, by the meaning of the word, local and particular; the Catholic Church must be universal without any limitation to place. But it would be just as absurd if, while we denied the claim of the Church of Rome, to be the universal Church, we were to set up a similar exclusive claim for any other body. Mr. Rourke's alternative is founded in a complete mistake as to the position we maintain; he might just as well say "either grant that Lord Aberdeen is the House of Lords, or else point out to us what other nobleman is the House of Lords." A man who should use such an argument as this would be said to be utterly ignorant of what is meant by a House of Lords, and we think that Mr. Rourke's argument shows just as complete a misapprehension as to the nature of the Catholic or Universal Church.

Mr. Rourke's argument, then, is not enough for his purpose. He is bound to show not only that the Church of Rome was a part of the Church, but that no Church, save those in communion with the Church of Rome, has a right to the title. There were, for example, before the Reformation a great body of Eastern Christians, whose Churches were founded by the Apostles themselves, and who could claim equal antiquity with the Church of Rome, and had just as good a title to be reckoned in the true Church as she. Mr. Rourke's argument, therefore, that the Church of Rome is the Church of Christ *exclusively*, wholly fails.

But we can retort it on himself. We call on him to grant or deny that the Church of England and Ireland was a part of the Church of Christ before the Reformation. If he admits that it was, we call on him to explain how or why she forfeited her right to that title. The body of clergy and bishops remained the same, and the text, of which Mr. Rourke is so fond, directing the laity to "obey them which had the rule over them," had as much force after the Reformation as before. The Church of Ireland could only have ceased to be a part of the true Church if, at the time of the Reformation, she gave up any part of the "one faith," which the Church of Christ has always professed. This is what he is bound to prove: he is bound to show that any of those articles of Pope Pius's creed are contained in Scripture, or that their belief was ever professed by the primitive Church as necessary to salvation. Until he can prove both these points, he cannot say that the Church of Ireland has been guilty of any heresy in withdrawing her acceptance from these modern inventions; and he is bound, if he will not be guilty of schism, to return to the communion of the ancient Church of this country.

Nor is the Church of Ireland to be forsaken, because, at the time of the Reformation, the Church of Rome withdrew her communion with her. It is for the Church of Rome to defend her schismatical conduct, in requiring, as conditions of communion, articles unknown to the ancient Church, and in introducing, after a wide gap, a new set of bishops into a country whose Sees were already occupied.

Mr. Rourke says, that if the Church of Rome were the Church of Christ before the Reformation, she is so still, because her faith is the same then as now. We deny this altogether. First, let it be remembered that, *at the time of the Reformation*, the Church of Rome changed her creed by adding twelve new articles to it. But even since then she has changed. A single question will decide the matter. Is the Immaculate Conception part of the faith of the Church now? If Mr. Rourke says it is not, the Pope will probably give him a flat contradiction before long. Well, then, was the Immaculate Conception part of the faith of the Church of Rome before the Reformation? If so, how was it that holy saints and learned doctors refused to hold it, and were, nevertheless, recognised as orthodox members of the Church?

With this question we take our leave of Mr. Rourke for the present, proposing to consider, in connection with his next letter, the four marks of the Church which he offers for our consideration.

OUR LORD GOD THE POPE.

DOMINUS DEUS NOSTER PAPA.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—In reply to your article on the Pope, in the last number of the LAYMAN, I send you a few observations, compressed into a short compass, according to your often-expressed wish; but I must observe, that it is hardly fair* to expect brevity in defence, when you reserve so wide a margin for attack. Objections are easily made, and occupy but little space, whereas the answers must be more diffuse, and accompanied by references, without which they are incomplete, and lead to no conclusion whatever.

It were idle to deny that these words, in their strict and literal meaning, are (what you have called them) startling, not to say blasphemous; that they were most injudicious all will allow. Strong as the case may appear, it is extremely old, for Constantine was of the fourth century. How very prudent and how convenient it is to raise bold of an expression, used hundreds of years ago, denied, according to your own showing, in the seventeenth century! Truly the French may say, "Qui dit trop ne dit rien."

The charge is so monstrous and so gross, that it merits the reply of O'Connell:—You either believe what you say, and are a fool; or do not believe it, and are a knave. Far be it from me to include you in either of these parties. I would fain hope that you fancied that the present generation might take these words without giving them a metaphorical acceptation.

Let us, however, examine the document, which runs thus:—"Satis ostenditur, a seculari potestate nec ligari prorsus nec solvi posse Pontificem, quem constat a pio Principe Constantino Deum appellatum, nec posse Deum ab hominibus judicari manifestum est."

The gloss or note is as follows:—

The most religious man, Constantine, in the holy synod which was assembled at Nice, seeing the complaint of several bishops brought before him, said, you cannot be judged by any man, for you have been called gods; and, therefore, you cannot be judged by men.—Canon, chap. 6.

Here Constantine, not content with giving this title to the Pope alone, gives it also to the bishops. We may well exclaim, "Qui dit trop."

But are there no precedents for this inflated and hyperbolical language of Constantine? In the seventh chapter of Exodus, we find the Lord said to Moses, "Behold I have appointed thee the god of Pharao, and Aaron thy brother shall be thy prophet."

The note in the Douay Bible—The God of Pharao—namely, to be his judge, and to exercise a divine honour, as God's instrument over him and his people. The note in Scott's Protestant Bible takes much the same ground. Moses was the favourite minister and great prophet of the Almighty; but it is elsewhere applied to persons in ordinary authority.—Exodus xxi. 6.

"His master shall bring him to the gods."—Exodus xxii. 8.

"The master of the house shall be brought to the gods."

In Psalm lxxxi. lxxxii. 6.—"I have said you are gods, and all of you the sons of the Most High."

"The rulers of Israel, as immediately appointed by Jehovah, to be his representatives, to judge according to his law, and to be types of his anointed, were especially honoured with this high title. Ye are gods, in which other magistrates share in proportion to their religious advantages."—Scott's Prot. Bible (note).

Having endeavoured to show that Constantine figuratively based his appellation on Scripture authority, may I ask what Pope or Popes ever sanctioned such a form of address? Were they ever publicly applied to in this manner? and by whom? In order to do justice to the Popes, it is not fair to take the titles they themselves assume—not the mistaken and exaggerated language which inhabitants of warmer regions may have sometimes used.

The title which was first taken by St. Damasus, then by St. Gregory, is "Servus servorum Dei," according to the inspiration of their Divine Master and model. "He that is greater among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is the leader, as he that serveth."—St. Luke xxii. 21.

The Pope daily styles himself, before heaven and earth, a sinner; he hearkens to the prayer made by his minister, that God would have mercy on him, and pardon his sins; he has recourse to that rite of humility and penance—auricular confession—just as the lowliest of his spiritual children. During the holy week he imitates the example of our Redeemer in washing the feet of twelve mendicants. To conclude, Pope Gregory VI. (Sic in MS.) was rebuked, by a Protestant lady, for permitting divine honour to be paid to him, whereas he was but a man. The Pope meekly answered, that he thanked her for the admonition, and that his position much required the safeguard of humility. I doubt not that his present Holiness would receive your homily in good part, were it to reach him.

* We can assure our correspondent, that we never wish to cut short real argument on either side of the questions discussed in our columns; and merely urge for the sake of our readers, as well as to increase their own chance of being read, that our correspondents, both Roman Catholic and Protestant, should make their communications as brief as may be consistent with doing justice to their arguments. Were we to put no restrictions on the length of letters inserted, our journal would soon become little more than a collection of letters, which probably would be read by nobody.—ED.

You have alluded to the ceremonies attending the inauguration of the Pope, in order to show that care is taken to keep up in reality the claim, which in words has been withdrawn. This custom or ceremony is thought objectionable by many Catholics.—*Vide* Eustace's Classical Tour.

I remain, sir,
Your obedient servant,
ENQUIRER.

August 6, 1854.

The writer of the above letter has mistaken the gloss in which the celebrated words in question are found; and, consequently, all that he says about Constantine is irrelevant to the subject. That the word "*Deus*," in the gloss upon the extravagant of John xxii., was not understood in the sense of the Hebrew term "Elohim" (God), as applied to Moses and the Judges of Israel, is evident from the fact that, had this been its intended sense, it would have been sufficient to have said so, instead of stealthily withdrawing the word altogether.

Our correspondent exclaims, "How very prudent, and how very convenient it is to seize hold of an expression, used hundreds of years ago, [and] denied, according to your own showing, in the seventeenth century!" We answer, that we deem it both prudent and convenient to point out to our Roman Catholic readers the means by which the dogma of Papal infallibility was established in the middle ages. We think it judicious and useful to direct attention to the scaffolding, so to speak, by which the edifice of the Divine supremacy of the Pope was erected, though the wise builders removed it as soon as the structure was complete. Nor is it unimportant to observe, as we have done, that in the case before us, the removal was one of the fruits of the Reformation. Were it not for the indignant remonstrance of the Reformers, jealous for the honour of God, the portentous words, "Our Lord God the Pope," would, doubtless, have remained to the present day on record, a reproach and a disgrace to Christianity.

As to the title "Servus Servorum Dei" (servant of the servants of God), which the Pope assumes, we should be very happy, and universal Christendom would have reason to rejoice, were the humility denoted by it a characteristic of the Papacy. But we cannot forget that it was borne by some of the haughtiest as well as the worst of men—by a Hildebrand, a Boniface VIII., and an Alexander VI.

We are truly glad that many Roman Catholics object to the ceremonies which accompany the inauguration of the Pope. Still they exist; and their existence is a proof, as we have said, that, in the *practice* of the Church of Rome, the principle embodied in the words "Our Lord God the Pope," is still affirmed, though the words themselves are, for prudential reasons, repudiated.

ON THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

DEAR SIR—In your leading article for this month, you go to prove your right to the term Catholic, and very generously concede it to other Churches; and you quote Athanasius, in your defence—"This is the Catholic faith, that we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in unity"—a portion of his creed against the Arians, showing the Catholic sense, and belief thereof, omitting essential articles of faith that Protestant and Catholic hold in common. The Greek and Protestant Churches, &c., would, in truth, be branches of the true Church, if they were only separated by distance, and not in belief. It does not require much argument to prove, that one only Church is Catholic; and all others, however numerous—and, God knows, they are almost numberless—have no right whatever to the title; if, as I remarked above, they all believed the one and same dogmas, ceremonies, internal and outward essentials of the true Church, they would, then, be one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church; but when they differ so widely from the parent Church, and wrangle so bitterly with each other, believing and teaching, at least, that their form, mode or conventicle, is just the thing to be saved by—the true, apostolic way—and all others, be what they may, are more or less astray from the one true path, that leads to heaven direct—comparing the Catholic Church to a tree and its branches, as a natural consequence, the branches must, and are all alike in appearance, in substance, and sap; its seedlings identical, its natural offspring essentially the same in all its propagating propensities; what more unnatural, than to see the olive tree bearing the prickly pear, the cocoa tree the rose of Sharon? "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church"—the apostolic sense is this, I believe it to be Holy, I believe it to be Universal; that it is the Church, fitted and appointed for all generations, for all ages, climes, and people; and that none other Church, be its pretensions what they may, is the Church of God; that communion with it is periling the salvation of whatever souls are subject to her teaching.

You claim not infallibility for your Church, therefore, you deny it to all Churches. You claim the title of Catholic for your Church, therefore, you concede it to all Churches, conventicles, and meetings, that prayer is their professed object. What have you gained by this? *Are the numberless Churches universal in time, place, and doctrine?* Were the Apostles to preach on earth again, would they recognise Catholicity in those religious denominations? Who will answer me Yes? You believe, as Catholics do, that bishops are of divine origin. The Scots Church believes them useless, an encumbrance, yea, unholy things. What think you of this? Are they Apostolic thus far? Are they Catholic for all this? And the numerous good citizens of the world, who preach the utter uselessness of baptism, are they Catholic in the true Apostolic sense? It would take more space than you could admit of to enumerate the particulars and inconsistencies of the numberless Churches that claim Catholicity for their mark; and each and all would deem themselves deeply insulted were you to question their right to said mark—*Catholic.*

I am, dear sir,
Yours respectfully,
A ROMAN CATHOLIC.

Carlow, July 23, 1854.

There are some Protestants who think that all Roman Catholics hold precisely the same set of religious opinions, and treat them accordingly; and many Roman Catholics return the compliment by imagining a set of opinions which they suppose all Protestants must hold.

Both parties are wrong; for Roman Catholics differ as widely (if not more widely), among themselves, about religious opinions, as Protestants do;* and few, or none, can be found among Protestants who really hold the opinions which Roman Catholics often attribute to all Protestants. Our correspondent falls into this mistake; he has in his own head a certain set of notions, which he considers "Protestant;" and then he feels quite sure that *we* must hold these notions, and that we must have written them too, although we defy him to find them in our paper.

What else can we say of a correspondent who writes to us thus:—"You claim the title of Catholic for your Church, therefore, you concede it to *all* Churches, *conventicles*, and *meetings*." . . . . "and the numerous good citizens of the world who preach the utter uselessness of baptism, are they Catholic?" We certainly have never said anything of the kind: and we have said before now that we regard baptism as the only entrance into Christ's visible Church on earth; and we certainly have never extended the term "Catholic" beyond the members of that Church.

We think it must be evident to any one who reads the article to which our correspondent refers, that we were then considering "Catholicity" only as it refers to *faith*. Churches which hold the Catholic creeds unchanged, as their articles of faith—those we consider Catholic in respect of faith; this was our assertion in that article, as well as in others; and to this judgment we adhere.

Where the question of Catholicity in *conduct and action* comes in, we do not scruple to declare our judgment, that those who cause divisions and separations in the body of Christ, are so far offenders against Catholic communion. But here we insist that facts are to be examined, and offences and divisions laid to the account of those who are truly and really guilty of them. And when this is done, we find that the Church of Rome is more guilty of offences against Catholic communion, than any other section of professing Christians in the world.

Take the case of the Lutherans, whom we mentioned in our article. The Lutherans never went out of the Church, or separated from it, by any act of their own. All they asked was to remain in communion with the whole Church—with the Church at Rome—with the Pope himself—on these terms—viz., holding the ancient Catholic creeds as the only true and complete summary of the Catholic faith; and doing nothing in the service or worship of the Church contrary to the word of God. Rome answered them by adding twelve new articles to the ancient creeds, and REFUSING TO HOLD COMMUNION with any who would not profess those *new* articles as part of the ANCIENT CATHOLIC FAITH. Was it not Rome that was really guilty of breaking Catholic communion? The Apostles not only directed that unity should be preserved, but they settled the terms of communion; and the ancient Church embodied and preserved those terms in the Catholic creeds. The Lutherans asked nothing, but that communion should be preserved on those apostolic terms. Rome altered the terms, and refused to communicate on the terms of the ancient Catholic creeds. And now, forsooth, on account of this, the Romanists only are Catholics, and the Lutherans are not Catholics!

It is no part of our business to prove that the Lutherans were right in everything. In the matter of the Lord's Supper, and in the matter of images, they did not sufficiently throw off all Romish errors. In some of the constitutions of an apostolic Church, they were defective; but that was not by their own choice, but by the conduct of the German bishops. And we believe that God will visit all offences on the guilty, and not on the innocent.

It is no part of our business to deny that some Protestant sects, who are Catholic in respect of their faith, have committed offences against Catholic unity; just as the Church of Rome has done, though, perhaps, seldom to the same extent. We do not justify such things. We do not wish our readers to be partakers of offences, by whomsoever committed. We show our readers a Church—the ancient Catholic Church of this country—a Church which makes no terms of communion but the ancient Catholic creeds—a Church which does not owe its existence to any act of separation—which has never committed any act of schism—and we say this is the Church to which Christians, in this country, ought to belong. Let our correspondent, if he can, bring forward a definite charge of schism against this United Church of England and Ireland, showing what specific acts of schism she has committed, and when and where those acts were committed—and we are ready to answer him. But, if he can say only that some *other* Protestant bodies have offended against Catholic unity, we answer that such a fact has nothing at all to do with the course which we recommend to the Irish people; and, therefore, it is foreign to the purpose of our journal to discuss it.

Our correspondent repeats the old argument, so often answered, "it does not require much argument to prove that one only Church is Catholic; and all others, however numerous, have no right whatever to the title."

Now, the word "Catholic" simply means "universal." Let us, therefore, put the word "universal" in place of "Catholic," in that sentence of his, and see what evident nonsense it becomes. "It does not require much argument to prove that one Church only can be *universal*, all others, however numerous, can have no right whatever to the title!"

In St. Paul's days, there was a Church of Rome, a Church of Corinth, a Church of Galatia, a Church of Jerusalem, &c., &c.; *which* ONE *was then universal?* Was not each one "universal" or "Catholic," as a part of the whole—none universal by itself alone? And how can it be otherwise now? No Church is now universal by itself alone. Each Church, so far as it holds the Catholic creeds, and adheres to the apostolic terms of communion, is "Catholic" or "universal," as being a part of the whole; and, in this sense, which is the true sense, Rome (which had added to the Catholic creeds, and refused to communicate with others on the terms settled by the Apostles) has, perhaps, the weakest title of all to the name of "Catholic."

* We beg our Roman Catholic readers to try and understand what we mean by "Protestant," we do *not* mean simply all who reject the peculiar doctrines of the Church of Rome; Mahometans believe that the religion of Rome is false and idolatrous, yet we do not count them Protestants, because they do not hold the fundamental doctrines of the Catholic faith; we say just the same of Socinians.

INFALLIBILITY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

MR. EDITOR—Will you kindly insert the following questions:—

1st—If the Church is infallible, how is it that St. Paul says, there should be an apostacy, a falling away from the true faith? such a thing, I imagine, could not occur if the Church had the promise of infallibility.

2nd—Why did St. Paul, in his epistle to the ancient Church of Rome, charge them not to be *high-minded but fear. For* if God spared not the *natural* branches take heed lest he also spare not *thee.* Now, I think St. Paul must have thought very little of infallibility when he said that.

3rd—In the Apocalypse we find our Lord reproving, exhorting, and comforting the Seven Churches of Asia, as each required; the Church of Laodicea, especially, he rebukes very sharply, he brings against it the charge of unfaithfulness; now, surely, that Church was a partaker of the promise of the Holy Spirit "*that He should guide it into all truth,*" as well as any other, and yet *it was not* infallible, it wanted life; and the Church of Sardis, also, "had a name that it liveth," and our Lord says it was dead. It is plain enough then, I think, that these two Churches were not infallible. With these instances, therefore, I think we may conclude, that *no Church* is infallible.

If there was *no danger*, why did St. Paul warn the Romans against "high-mindedness?"

If some of your Roman Catholic correspondents will kindly answer the above questions and satisfy me, they will greatly oblige

Your obedient servant,
W. R.

FLOWERS FOR AUGUST.

IF August be less prolific than the preceding month in its flowers, it is more abundant in its fruits; and the rich corn waving over the fields imparts a substantial beauty to the land, which many will regard more than the most glorious display of flowers. Along the roadsides we find in full flower the BRAMBLE (*Rubus suberectus*). Its two principal varieties are the Raspberry and the Blackberry. The raspberry (*Rubus idæus*)—so called from the rasp or roughness of its fruit—is found wild in the woods of Ireland. Its delicious fruit is too well known to need further notice. The Blackberry (*Rubus fruticosus*) displays its erect flowers and petals of delicate pale pink, on its long, flexible sprays in our hedges and thickets; its fruit, when ripe, is both wholesome and agreeable. Who has not gathered blackberries in the days of childhood, or even of mature age, and enjoyed the feast, which nature's bounty afforded without culture or care, with as much pleasure as the rarest fruits the garden or hothouse could give? The Bramble is the subject of the oldest apologue or fable extant, called Jothan's (or Joathan's) parable, and narrated in the Book of Judges, ix., v. 8 to 15.

Another humble, but sweet flower of the riverside and summer stream, to which we are much attached, is the MEADOW-SWEET (*Spiræa ulmaria*). Its flowers of yellowish-white or cream-colour, are to be gathered almost in the water itself, whence it peers out like a piece of lace-work embroidery, so soft that even the rude winds seem loth to disturb it, except to waft its sweet perfume over

the meadows. Its scent resembling that of new-mown hay, hawthorn, or heliotrope, is to our taste more fresh and fragrant than any. However, we would warn our readers to beware of its effects in a closed apartment, as it contains prussic acid in such large quantities as to be dangerous to life when emitted in sleeping rooms.

As we pass along to the flower garden we observe a most attractive flower, blooming in patches and clusters along the borders, the SCARLET VERBENA (*Verbena atrosanguinea*). The intensity of its bright colour is so dazzling to the eye, as to render it difficult to look upon it steadily. There are several varieties of the flowering verbena (or *Verbena hublesia*), scarlet, rose colour, white, pale lilac, and blue. Most of them, and the splendid scarlet verbena among the number, are natives of North America. The sweet-scented verbena is no relation of the flowering plants of the same name; it belongs to a different family altogether; its botanical name is *Aloisia citriodora* (so called from its lemon-scented foliage).

The flowering Verbena belongs to the well-known family of plants called vervain, renowned among the ancient Romans, and much praised by our ancestors for its medicinal virtues. It was supposed to possess many potent charms, and its roots used to be worn by superstitious old people round their necks as a preservative against the king's evil; while it was a grand ingredient in the love philters of foolish, sick-brained young folk. The common vervain (*Verbena officinalis*) flowers abundantly on the road-sides in many parts of Ireland.

The verbena, or vervain, is frequently confounded, even in books on floriculture, with a plant similar in name, but different in nature—namely, the VERONICA, or speedwell. The *veronica* has leaves of pale, shining green, and flowers of pale blue, or white with blue streaks, and sometimes of flesh colour. It has many varieties in Ireland, and is found growing abundantly in most parts of the country in grassy pastures, and in moist, shady situations. The common speedwell (*veronica officinalis*) is met with on dry, sandy banks, barren heaths and woods, and in mountain pastures; its leaves have been sometimes used medicinally as tea. Another variety of the speedwell, called brooklime (*Veronica beccabunga*), with bright blue flowers, is chiefly found in ditches and rivulets. The Germander speedwell (*Veronica chamædrys*) has numerous flowers of large, bright blue, with starry, white rays on the petals, resembling an eye (hence, popularly called bird's eye), and is sometimes mistaken for the forget-me-not. It is generally met with in woods and on hedge-banks. There is also the water speedwell, with bluish flowers inclining to purple. The popular name of this pretty little flower the speedwell is, perhaps, given it because growing on the hedge-banks by the way side, its cheerful, bright-eyed little countenance seems to bid the weary traveller good speed or speed well; and to one who can, in fancy, catch its passing salute, it may seem as if

> "Brighter than bright heaven is the speedwell blue
> Clustering the banks."

The speedwell was held in much veneration by our simple ancestors, and called the Holy herb; but its Latin name, *veronica*, we regret to say, reveals and perpetuates a sad tale of folly and credulity, which has left its memorial even upon this sweet, innocent, little country flower. The name (*veronica vera icon*) means a true image, and was acquired from some story about a portrait and representation of the face of our Saviour on a relic, said to be *lying* at St. Peters, Rome, in the shape of a handkerchief, which was alleged by some to have covered our Saviour's face in the sepulchre, and by others to have been used on his way to Mount Calvary, whereupon it was miraculously impressed with the likeness of the face of our Blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. It is impossible to speak of the gross absurdity of a miracle with so insignificant a result, and on so contemptible a subject as a pocket handkerchief, with that degree of respect and reverence with which we would desire to treat even the errors of so-called religion, and, therefore, we forbear from observations which might possibly give offence to even one of our readers. It is, alas, too much like the astounding stories of winking virgins, at Rimini, and holy coats at Treves—insults to the understanding of the faithful, which our Roman Catholic brethren in Ireland are saved from, by the broad and open daylight of public exposure which would await such practices if attempted here.

July and August are the chief months in the year for annual flowers, those sweet and transient visitants that need but little care to secure their reproduction. We scarcely know where to begin or how we shall end if we enter upon an enumeration of the annuals. However, we select a few—and first, the *nemophila insignis*—a very pretty little flower called, from its love of shady places, and highly ornamental as an edging to flower-beds or shrubberies. Although its introduction from California is so late as the year 1833, its pale blue flowers are now familiar to us all.

The *escholtzia* is another esteemed annual, with brilliant yellow and orange-coloured bell flowers on leaves of pale sea green. It is also a native of California and of North America, and very recently introduced among us. It has a very remarkable calyx which comes off like the extinguisher of a candle.

The CLARKIAS are also Californian annuals, of great beauty and variety, chiefly of rose-colour, white, and lilac. The *Calliopsis bicolor* is another handsome, yellow, border annual, derived from the State of Missouri, in America. The *Coreopsis tinctoria* is another very pretty annual, acquired from the Arkansas, in North America. The French marigold (*Tagetes patula*) is an old and familiar flower, derived from Mexico, in South America, though first, perhaps, known to us through France. It is called by the Italians, Death-flower (*fior de morto*), from a tradition that these flowers sprung up from the ground on which the blood of the unfortunate Mexicans had been spilled, who fell victims to the love of gold, and thirst of power, which induced the Spaniards to assail and destroy these unoffending people, under the pretext of converting them to the Roman Catholic religion. The beautiful convolvulus major (*Ipomæa purpurea*) with its transparent bells of various colours is also an American plant, as is the more useful Convolvulus jalapa, that yields the jalap of commerce. In our hedges we have a very graceful wild convolvulus, but wanting in the exquisite colouring and shades of the American variety. The convolvulus minor bears little resemblance to the other flowers of the same name, except that it is bell-shaped. Its flowers are much larger and generally of deep azure. The wax-like *phlox* is another contribution we have received from America. The Marvel of Peru (*Mirabilis jalapa*) was once a wonderful flower, and excited the astonishment of botanists some 200 years ago, from its great diversity and change of colours, varying from white to red, purple or yellow, and from the circumstance of its opening at night.

The *Fuschia*, with its crimson bells, is also of American origin, introduced here from Peru or Chili, within the last sixty years. Its name is derived from one Fuchs, a German botanist.

The common Heliotrope (*Heliotropum Peruvianum*) is also of American extraction. Who does not know its delicate lilac flowers of sweetest perfume? There are some varieties of the heliotrope in the Southern Europe, with paler flowers of white or faint purple, but none so rich in the sweet fragrance which makes the common heliotrope such a favourite. Its name (translated into turnsole) is acquired from its blossoms, always turning towards and following the sun.

The SUNFLOWER (*Helianthus annuus*) is also an American plant—a native of Peru and Mexico. When the Spaniards first invaded Peru the natives were worshippers of the sun, and their virgins who officiated in the temple of the sun, were crowned with wreaths of sunflowers. The Spaniards professing the Christian faith exterminated the unfortunate idolaters instead of teaching them the mild and gentle doctrines of the Gospel.

The DAHLIA is the great flower of August, and a signal instance of the astonishing success of culture and education. It grows wild on the plains of Mexico, but is not so bright or so beautiful in colour or form as the Dahlia of our island. It is in its native plains a single flower of purple with no varieties of colour, and now, from cultivation, the florist in these countries, is enabled to exhibit it in varieties ranging through every shade from dark purple, pink, scarlet, and crimson, to white. His art has hitherto failed to produce a blue Dahlia—the great desideratum among florists. The common purple Dahlia was that introduced from Mexico into Europe, by Baron Humboldt, the great naturalist; and has become a parent of 200 varieties, now in existence. In Mexico, the root of the Dahlia is boiled and eaten as the potato is here; but it is scarcely so palatable a root.

It thus appears how deeply we are indebted to America for our annual and perennial flowers, transplanted thence to adorn our gardens here. They form so many interesting links of association between us, that our exiled brethren, leaving the home of their fathers, may recognise, in the very flowers of their new home, old and familiar, and favourite acquaintances, and may indulge the hope, that as these little flowers have grown and flourished in their new beds in the British isles, so may our hardy and industrious emigrants take root and prosper in the free soil of the Western Continent. *Our* annuals contributed to America, in return for their pretty flowers, are the bone and sinew of our countrymen. Of these, upwards of two millions of Roman Catholics have been transplanted to America, within the last thirty years; and we are deeply interested in the inquiry how they have thriven in their new settlements, not alone in a temporal, but in a religious sense. As to temporal prosperity, the almost incredible amounts transmitted by the poor Irish emigrants to their families and relations at home, exceeding half a million sterling in the year, sufficiently demonstrate that our brethren on the other side of the Atlantic have materially bettered their temporal condition at least. But in connection with this (*we* will not say as the necessary accompaniment, but our readers will judge for themselves), we have it stated by an Irish Roman Catholic clergyman—the Rev. Mr. Mullen, of Clonmellon, in the County Westmeath, sent over by the Irish bishops expressly to America—that the Roman Catholic population of America, which, by the contributions of Irish and foreign emigration, and by the stated addition of births to the previous population from 1825 to 1852, should have been 3,970,000, stood at 1,980,000, being a loss to the (Roman) Catholic Church of two millions, in round numbers. There is no bribery or souperism to account for this loss of two millions of Roman Catholics in America, announced by the Roman Catholic priest; but it is sufficiently accounted for by the freedom of inquiry and fairness of discussion—by the absence of Graigue riots and semper crusades—by the impossibility of Skibbereen mobs, incited by priestly outrage—by the harmlessness of altar denunciations, like those lately poured forth from Castlebar, and five other places, on one respectable Roman Catholic gentleman, still a member of that Church, because he dared to insist upon the property of a deceased person being lawfully and rightly appropriated and disposed of. When the Roman Catholics of Ireland shall have acquired independence enough to think, and speak, and act as free men, and exercise the prerogative which God has given to them and commanded them to use—their plain, shrewd, common sense—we have no doubt they will be able to cast back upon the Scotch historian the taunt that, while sterile Scotland sustained herself during the terrible ordeal of the famine, fertile Ireland was beholden to the subscriptions of Protestant England, Saracen Turkey, and Hindoo India; and, instead of receiving half a million yearly, from proselytised Irishmen in America, will be enabled, out of the produce of their own independent industry, exercised on their native soil, to supply their own wants and to give a helping hand to their brethren in distress.

FARMING OPERATIONS FOR AUGUST.

(From the Irish Farmers' Gazette.)

From the cold, wet, and dull weather which has prevailed till within the last ten days, the ripening of the cereal crops has been, in most localities, considerably retarded, though they have advanced with great rapidity since warm weather set in, and much of the hay has been got up, which, though a short crop, in most instances gives a promise of good quality, and a luxuriant crop of after-grass.

Wheat, as a general rule, should be cut some days before it is dead ripe, which may vary from six to eight days, as the weather may be more or less of a ripening character, and which will require some attention and judgment to determine. When the grain, on being pressed between the fingers, ceases to give out milk, and has a tough, doughy consistence, it may be cut; but on no account should be allowed to get hard, as then much loss will be entailed by shedding the best and plumpest grains, and when sent to the mill it will yield a less per-centage of flour, and a larger one of bran. Avoid cutting in wet weather; make the sheaves small, and stook as soon as made; if the night promises to be fair, they need not be capped; but if inclined to be wet, capping will be indispensable. When the straw and grain are thoroughly cured and dry, no time should be lost in carrying and stacking, as it deteriorates the sample considerably—both grain and straw—to allow it to get wet and dry alternately.

Barley should be allowed to stand till fully ripe, which is indicated by the head turning down. It is of the greatest importance, in malting barley particularly, that the whole of the grain should be of one uniform degree of ripeness, so that it may all sprout together.

Oats, like wheat, should be cut before it is thoroughly ripe, otherwise much loss will be sustained from the best grain shedding; it fills and ripens well in the stook, and the grain holds firmer in the chaff than when allowed to become over-ripe.

Turnips, *Carrots*, *Parsnips*, *Mangels*, &c., will require much and vigilant attention this month, in hoeing, singling, cleaning, and, above all things, the spaces between should be often and thoroughly grubbed to a good depth. All such operations should be well and thoroughly performed before the crops are so far advanced as to shut out all further operations.

Potatoes.—We have only to reiterate the directions given last week in case the disease should attack the crop—namely, to cut away, or cut off the haulm when the leaves become spotted, and before the stems are affected. Tread the surface well, and cover well with fresh earth. Should it be convenient to strew the beds or drills, before covering, with lime or peat charcoal, so much the better. Then sow with turnips; the following kinds will answer—white globe, yellow bullock, Maltese, yellow stone, or orange jelly; or sow rape; or the latter may be transplanted.

Meadows, after being cut, should now be top-dressed with rich compost, liquid manure, or some of the hand manures.

Laying down Land with Clover and Grass Seeds.—This is the best month in the year for sowing the land to meadow or permanent grass. A little rape—say 4 lbs. to the Irish acre—may be sown with the clover and grass seeds, with great advantage. It serves to shelter the young grass and clover, till they are established, and the bite it gives sheep has a double advantage in the sustenance it affords; and the manuring and treading of the animals, by which the vigour of the young plants and their tillering is increased.

Rape may be sown till the middle of next month, in warm, early localities; but the earlier this crop is now got in the better. If on stubble, manure should be supplied liberally, the land should be finely harrowed, then rolled and sown, well harrowed in, and finished with the roller. In dry land sow broadcast, but in wet land, six or eight feet ridges, with deep furrows between, should be adopted.

The Dairy Stock will now require more than usual attention; frequent removals to fresh grass will be indispensable; and when those begin to fail, fresh vetches, early cabbages, or green food should be supplied, otherwise they will rapidly fall off in their milk, which cannot be brought up again during the winter.

New and Recent Works

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

Booksellers to the Queen,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

ALFORD'S GREEK TESTAMENT, with a Critically Revised Text, Marginal References, and Commentary. New Edition. Vol. I., much enlarged, 32s. Vol. II., 28s. (Vol III., in preparation)

HOOK'S CHURCH DICTIONARY. Seventh Edition. Revised and corrected. 16s.

EVENINGS WITH THE ROMANIST. By Rev. Hobart Seymour. 8s. 6d.

THE BIBLE HANDBOOK: an Introduction to the Study of Sacred Scripture. By Joseph Angus, D.D. 5s.

HELPS TO THE THOUGHTFUL READING OF THE FOUR GOSPELS. By Henry Stebbing, D.D. 8s.

THE PULPIT FOR 1854. Sermons by eminent living ministers. Vol. I., containing a hundred and three Sermons. 7s. 6d.

NARRATIVE OF A JOURNEY THROUGH SYRIA AND PALESTINE, IN 1851 AND 1852. By C. W. M. Van de Velde. 2 vols. 8vo. 30s.

THE HISTORY OF THE FRENCH PROTESTANT REFUGEES, from the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. By Charles Weiss. 8vo. 14s.

HOPE DEFERRED, NOT LOST; a Narrative of Missionary effort in South America. With Journals of Captain Gardiner, &c. 5s.

ON THE PLURALITY OF WORLDS. An Essay. 8vo. 8s.

MORE WORLDS THAN ONE. The Creed of the Philosopher, and the Hope of the Christian. By Sir David Brewster. 6s.

THE PILGRIM IN THE MISSIONS; or GOSPEL HUSBANDRY. By H. Smith, Esq. 4s. 6d.

OUR FATHER; or Jesus teaching to Pray. An Exposition of the Lord's Prayer. By Rev. Samuel Garrett. 2s. 6d.

HELPS AND HINTS FOR BIBLE READERS: Being practical comments on some of the most remarkable passages in the New Testament. By the Rev. Nicholas J. Moody. 3s. 6d.

SCRIPTURE AND THE PRAYER-BOOK IN HARMONY. England's Church and Handbook of Common Prayer, and Articles, the Scriptural antidote of Sacerdotalism and Schism. By Rev. A. R. Faussett. 3s. 6d.

MINISTERING CHILDREN; a Tale dedicated to Childhood. 5s.

ISRAEL IN EGYPT; or the Books of Genesis and Exodus, illustrated in existing monuments. 6s.

THE WARRANT OF FAITH; or a Handbook to the Canon and Inspiration of the Scriptures. By Rev. Robert Whytehead. 6s. 6d.

THE WORKS OF THE LATE REV. ALEXANDER CARSON, LL.D. Vol. III. Containing all his works on the Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. 5s.

EXAMINATION OF MR. MAURICE'S THEOLOGICAL ESSAYS. By Robert S. Candlish, D.D. Crown 8vo. 6s.

THE LAND OF SINIM; or, China and Chinese Missions. By the Rev. William Gillespie. 5s.

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY; with an Inquiry into the Causes of its Inefficiency: with an especial reference to the Ministry of the Establishment. By the Rev. Charles Bridges, A.M. Eighth Edition; corrected and enlarged. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

AN INQUIRY INTO THE ORGANIZATION AND GOVERNMENT OF THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH. By Rev. Albert Barnes. 2s.

CLAUDE, THE COLPORTEUR. By the Author of "Mary Powell." 7s. 6d.

VESTIGES OF DIVINE VENGEANCE IN THE DESTRUCTION OF SODOM AND GOMORRAH. By W. E. Tayler. 3s.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND ERASTIANISM. By J. R. Pretyman. 7s. 6d.

JESUS TEMPTED IN THE WILDERNESS. By Rev. Adolphe Monod. 2s. 6d.

SABBATH MORNING READINGS IN THE BOOK OF LEVITICUS. By the Rev. Dr. Cumming. 5s.

THE ECLIPSE OF FAITH; or, Visits to a Religious Sceptic. Fifth Edition. 5s.

GRATITUDE: an Exposition of the Hundred and Third Psalm. By the Rev. John Stevenson. 8vo. 6s.

SYNONYMS of the NEW TESTAMENT. By Rev. Richard Chenevix Trench. 5s.

A SELECTION of ENGLISH SYNONYMS. Edited by Archbishop Whately. 3s.

ON THE STUDY of WORDS. By Rev. Richard C. Trench. 3s. 6d.

ON THE LESSONS in PROVERBS. By Rev. Rd. C. Trench. 3s.

THE BOOK AND ITS STORY: a Narrative for the Young, on occasion of the Jubilee of the British and Foreign Bible Society. By L. N. R. With an Introductory preface, by Rev. T. Phillips. Fcap. 4s.

THE DENS of LONDON: Notes and Narratives of a Six Years' Mission among them. By R. W. Vanderkiste. Cheap Edition. 1s. 6d.

HOME TRUTHS: being Miscellaneous Addresses and Tracts. By the Rev. J. C. Ryle. 3rd Series. 3s. 6d.

PLAIN SPEAKING. First series. Being forty short, Large-type Tracts. By the Rev. J. C. Ryle, B.A. In packet. 1s.

KATHERINE ASHTON. By the Author of "The Experience of Life." 2 Vols. 12s.

THE LAMPLIGHTER. With Illustrations. 3s. 6d. Cheaper Edition, 1s. 6d.

POOR PADDY'S CABIN; or, Slavery in Ireland. 1s. 6d. and 2s. 6d.

SHADOWS OF THE FUTURE; or, the Real Antichrist. The destinies of Rome, Constantinople, and Jerusalem. The World's Confusion, and the Coming Restorer. 4d.

WERTHEIM'S PACKET OF THIRTY TRACTS, assorted. Second series. 2s.

THE ACQUITTANCE IN FULL. Tracts for Ireland. By Fidelis. 6d.

SCRIPTURE ITS OWN AND BEST INTERPRETER. By X. Y. 4d. by post 6d.

MANNA FOR THE PILGRIM; for each morning of the Month, from the writings of the Rev. W. H. Hewitson. 8d.

THE RUSSIAN SHORES OF THE BLACK SEA, IN THE AUTUMN of 1852, with a Voyage down the Volga, and a Tour through the Country of the Don Cossacks. By Lawrence Oliphant. 8vo. 14s.

ALISON'S HISTORY of EUROPE, from the fall of Napoleon, in 1815, to the Establishment of Military Government in France, in 1852; being a continuation of his former celebrated Work. Vols. I., II., and III. 8vo. 15s. each.

TURKEY, RUSSIA, THE BLACK SEA, AND CIRCASSIA. By Captain Spencer. With Coloured Illustrations and a Map. 6s.

MEMOIR OF THE REV. JOHN JAMES WEITBRECHT. By his Widow. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

SUNNY MEMORIES OF FOREIGN LANDS. By Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe. 2 vols. Post 8vo. 12s. Cheaper Editions, 2s., 1s. 6d., and 1s.

THE EXPERIENCE OF LIFE. By the author of Amy Herbert. 7s. 6d.

PASSAGES FROM THE DIARY OF A LATE PHYSICIAN. By Samuel Warren, Esq. Cheaper Edition. 5s. 6d.

TEN THOUSAND A YEAR. By Samuel Warren, Esq. 2 vols. Cheaper Edition. 9s.

HARD TIMES; for these times. By Charles Dickens. 5s.

MOWBRAY'S TREATISE ON DOMESTIC AND ORNAMENTAL POULTRY; a partial guide to the History, Breeding, Rearing, Feeding, Fattening, and General Management of Fowls and Pigeons. By L. A. Meall. With numerous Coloured Illustrations. 8s.

THE LADY'S COMPANION TO THE FLOWER GARDEN. By Mrs. Loudon. Sixth edition. 7s.

THE FRUIT, FLOWER, AND KITCHEN GARDEN. By the late Patrick Neill, LL.D. Fifth edition. 5s.

WANDERINGS AMONG THE WILD FLOWERS: How to see and how to gather them. By Spencer Johnson, M.D. With 173 engravings. 5s.

A POPULAR HISTORY of BRITISH FERNS, comprising all the Species. By Thomas Moore. Coloured Illustrations. 10s. 6d.

POPULAR FIELD BOTANY: A Familiar History of Plants. By Agnes Catlow. With 20 colonred plates. 10s. 6d.

A POPULAR HISTORY of BRITISH SEA-WEEDS, with Notices of some of the Fresh-water Algæ. By Rev. D. Landsborough. 10s. 6d.

THE SEA-WEED COLLECTORS' GUIDE: Containing plain instructions, for collecting and preserving. 2s. 6d.

HANDBOOK of ANGLING: teaching Fly-fishing, Trolling, Bottom-fishing, and Salmon-fishing. By Ephemera. 5s.

THE SEASIDE BOOK: being an Introduction to the Natural History of the British Coasts. By W. H. Harvey, M.D. New Edition. 5s.

A BOOK for the SEASIDE. With numerous Engravings. 3s. 6d.

WAKEMAN'S HANDBOOK OF IRISH ANTIQUITIES. 5s.

BLACK'S GUIDE BOOKS for TOURISTS; with Road Maps and numerous Illustrations:—
I. England, 10s. 6d. II. Scotland, 8s. 6d. III. Ireland, 5s. Wales, 5s.

BLACK'S GUIDE TO DUBLIN AND THE WICKLOW MOUNTAINS. 1s. 6d.

BLACK'S GUIDE TO KILLARNEY AND THE SOUTH. 1s. 6d.

BLACK'S GUIDE TO THE SHANNON AND WEST OF IRELAND. 1s. 6d.

DOYLE'S TOURS IN ULSTER; a handbook to the Antiquities and Scenery of the North of Ireland. With numerous Illustrations in tints, and Maps, &c. 8s. 6d.

CHART OF THE RAILWAY FROM DUBLIN TO BELFAST. 1s.

FRASER'S HANDBOOK FOR DUBLIN AND ITS ENVIRONS, with Maps, &c. 2s.

DUBLIN: WHAT'S TO BE SEEN, AND HOW TO SEE IT. By W. F. Wakeman. 1s.

TWELVE VIEWS OF THE PICTURESQUE SCENERY IN IRELAND. In elegant enamelled cover. 1s.

JOHNSTON'S MAP OF THE SEAT OF WAR, in the Danubian Principalities. 1s.

JOHNSTON'S NEW MAP OF THE BLACK SEA, CAUCASUS, CRIMEA, ETC., with enlarged plans of Sevastopol and the Bosphorus. 1s.

JOHNSTON'S CHART OF THE NORTH SEA, and the BALTIC, with the Countries adjoining; and Enlarged Plans of Cronstadt and Revel. 1s.

Lately Published,

WILLET'S "SYNOPSIS PAPISMI." New Edition. Edited by the Rev. J. Cumming, D.D. Ten vols. 8vo. Price £3.

London: JAMES MILLER, 17, Berner's-street, Oxford-street, and all Booksellers.

Just published,

New Edition, Royal 4to., cloth, price 5s. 6d.,

THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN,

Vol. I, with complete Indexes.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY AND CO., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London: WERTHEIM AND MACKINTOSH, Paternoster-row.

Fcap. 8vo., Neat Cover, Price 1s.;

Cloth, 1s. 6d.; Cloth, Gilt Edges, 2s.

THE TALK OF THE ROAD: Showing how Irish people talk about Irish doings, when they get a quiet place at the back of a ditch, or under a hedge.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY AND CO., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London: WERTHEIM AND MACKINTOSH.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON, and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher, WILLIAM CURRY, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

AUGUST, 1854.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Glóir do Dhia aṅ ṗna háṗuiḃ, agus ṗíoḋċáin air an ṫealaṁ deaġċoil do na ḋáoiniḃ.

Luke II. 14.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. III.—No. 33. SEPTEMBER, 1854. { Annual Subscription, 3s 6d. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

Immutability of the Church of Rome—Tradition and Development. No II. 103
Roman Catholic Literature—St. Rose of Lima—"The Young Christian's Library." 104
The Landlord's Letter 106
The Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary 108
The Catholic Church 139
CORRESPONDENCE:
On the Catholic Church—by Mr. Rourke 111
On the Relics of Saint Ursula—by Viator 113
The Safe Way 113
Flowers for September 112
Farming Operations for September 113

IMMUTABILITY OF THE CHURCH OF ROME—TRADITION AND DEVELOPMENT.

No. II.

In our last Number we made some remarks upon the two antagonistic theories which the Church of Rome maintains respecting the Rule of Faith, and which we designated respectively as the Tridentine or tradition theory, and the modern or Development theory. We proceed now to complete the brief sketch which our space allows us to give of this most important question.

In the progress of the controversy between the Reformed Churches and the Church of Rome, the advocates of the latter found themselves perpetually embarrassed by the rigid limits within which the definitions of the Council of Trent confined them; and the absolute necessity of some more enlarged basis of dogmatic teaching forced itself upon their attention. To meet this necessity, the celebrated Möhler, Professor of Theology in the Roman Catholic University at Munich, revived the doctrine of development, which Petavius's work, notwithstanding its real design, had, doubtless, brought into disrepute. The spirit of the age was favourable to its revival. Among the so-called philosophical writers, especially of the sceptical school, it became fashionable to talk of and speculate upon the notion of a gradual and progressive development of the human race. This theory was applied, amongst other things, to prove that Christianity itself was a mere natural development of the human mind; sufficiently well adapted, indeed, to the circumstances of the world when it first appeared, but now obsolete and unsuited to the present advanced stage of man's history. A theory so complimentary to human nature could scarce fail to be popular. And, accordingly, it appeared to Möhler that it might, when properly modified, be made to render good service to the cause of Rome. The result of his labours, which he executed with consummate skill, is contained in his celebrated work, entitled "Symbolism." The main idea of this elaborate defence of the Church of Rome is the following:—That the Christian revelation was *originally incomplete*—an *undeveloped germ*, confided to the fostering care of the Church—a *mere nucleus* of divine truth, which was to be acted on by the growing reason and increasing wants of men; and so to be gradually unfolded into distinct propositions and explicit dogmas of belief. Möhler tells us that "the theory of the conformity of the Church's doctrine to that of Scripture [the theory, in part, of Trent], is applicable only to the *substance*, and not to the *form*." "The original doctrine expanded itself, in proportion as the human mind evolved it, in a much altered form; it remained the original, and yet it *did not*." "The faith is *ever old and ever new*." This acute writer was fully aware of the difficulty of reconciling this theory with the Tridentine notion of a fixed and invariable tradition. This difficulty he endeavours to get over by obscure and vague assertions. He resolves tradition into development. With him the former is not a fixed and definite external reality, but the living word energizing in the hearts of the faithful. It loses its objective and historical character, and becomes invested with purely subjective attributes. In fact, as it has been well remarked by Dr. Wordsworth, "in Dr. Möhler's hands, tradition loses all its *traditive* character; and, instead of practising the strict fidelity of the historian, it luxuriates in all the exuberant imaginativeness of the poet."

Still the principle of development, as advocated by Möhler, was too valuable and necessary to be given up. Accordingly, it has been recognised, and applied to some extent, by one of the most learned and elaborate theological writers of the present day, Perrone, Professor of Theology in the Jesuit College at Rome. If Möhler was obscure and ambiguous upon the subject, Perrone is still more oracular. Whilst, on the one hand, he strives to uphold the tradition theory of the middle ages, he, on the other, is equally unwilling to forego the advantages to be derived from the more modern doctrine of development. Hence, as might be expected from the attempt to reconcile conflicting systems, he involves his Church in an inextricable web of inconsistencies. These we need not now stop to expose, and we shall content ourselves with the following extract from the edition of his "Prælect. Theolog.," published in 1842, to which subsequent events attach some degree of interest:—

"Since the objection, that the Church (of Rome) by her definition has added new articles to the creeds, has been incessantly urged against her by Protestants, among whom Newman holds a distinguished place—who, in his work on Romanism, upbraids the Catholics with substituting the confession of Pius IV. for the creeds which the Church of England receives—I rejoice to be able to stop the mouths of our adversaries with the profound theory of the illustrious Möhler."

The distinguished Anglican, of whom the Roman professor speaks in the passage just quoted, has since, as the world knows, joined his ranks, and signalized his conversion by the publication of a work which has far eclipsed, at least in notoriety, that of Möhler. Dr. Newman, with his wonted inexorable logic, has pushed the theory of development to its extremest consequences. In his remarkable volume, "An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine," he has taken up and elaborately worked out Möhler's idea of the original Christian doctrines, or rather germs of doctrine, being intended by the Divine Founder of Christianity to be subsequently evolved into a variety of new forms and aspects. He labours to prove that such a development was antecedently natural and necessary; and that, as Möhler also took care to notice, the process was conducted under infallible guidance. Dr. Newman saw well that the cause of Rome could not be maintained on the Tridentine ground of *Scripture and tradition*; he was also too acute not to perceive that it could as little be defended by a mixing up of the two opposite principles of tradition *and* development. Being forced to make an election between the two, he chose the latter, as seeming to offer the more satisfactory explanation of the difficulties of his adopted creed, and rejected the old-fashioned, though more orthodox, notion of apostolical tradition. It has been remarked* that the preface to this work of Dr. Newman's was dated only two days prior to his having been received into the communion of the Church of Rome, so that the book was, so to speak, his passport—his profession of faith. Amongst other strong statements, it contained the assertion that there was "no formal acknowledgment of the doctrine of the Trinity till the fourth century."—p. 167. This was the very assertion which, as we have already remarked, when broached, a century and a half before, by the Calvinist Jurieu, Bossuet had pronounced to be a "*a horrible libel on Christianity*," only possible from the lips of a Socinian." We mean nothing personally offensive to Dr. Newman. He knows, doubtless, how to explain his doctrine so as to escape the fearful censure pronounced by anticipation against it by the great Bishop of Meaux. He also, doubtless, knows how to solve a question in casuistry, which, to more ordinary minds, seems very difficult, if not impossible, to be resolved—viz., to reconcile the principle upon which his whole book is based with that clause in the oath administered to every priest at ordination, which says, "I will never interpret Scripture except according to the *unanimous consent of the Fathers*." The learned and ingenious author feels, we are sure, no difficulty in reconciling this, or any other seemingly hopeless discrepancy. Nothing is impossible to one who could become a convert to the religion of that very Church which, a few years before, he had described in the following portentous terms—"The Church of Rome is crafty, obstinate, wilful, malicious, cruel, unnatural, as madmen are; or, rather, she may be said to resemble a *demoniac*. She is her real self only in name, and till God vouchsafe to restore her, we must treat her as if she were the Evil One who governs her. And in saying this, I must not be supposed to deny that there is any real excellence in Romanism even as it is, or that any really excellent men are its adherents. Satan ever acts on a system."† And yet why should we feel surprised at the author of this famous book detecting, or, at least, acknowledging no inconsistency between its principles, and those of the Church of Rome? The lynx-eyed Inquisitors of the *Congregazione dell' Indice* themselves failed to discover anything objectionable in it. It has not found its way into the *Index Prohibitorius*, that jealous guardian of the orthodoxy of the Church. It would be just to the "Essay on Development" to say, merely, that it has escaped censure. It has been lauded to the skies by several of the most influential organs of Roman Catholic opinion both at home and abroad. Thus, for example, in an article in the "Dublin Review"—the authorship of which is usually assigned to no less a personage than Cardinal Wiseman—the Essay and the essayist are spoken of in the following terms:—"The reader must peruse this volume as the description of the process of reasoning by which the author's powerful and well-stored mind was brought to a *full accordance with Catholic truth*."† "Never did convert come to the Church with *mind, soul, and heart*, more *thoroughly made over to her cause*, with more *complete*, hearty, and filial obedience, than *this work shows him to have done*."‡ "The Catholic system is embraced (in it) with the fervour and simplicity of one trained from infancy in the faith."§ Nay, more, the same illustrious reviewer undertook, in the same periodical, to defend the "Essay" from the attacks made against it by the leading Roman Catholic Review in America, in which it had been denounced as *subversive of the Catholic faith*, and even *Christianity* itself.‖ "We have consulted," says the reviewer (Jan., 1847), "as high living authorities on the subject as there are in this country, and they all concur in saying that the Church can propose only what was revealed, and that *the revelation committed to the Church was perfect*." This, as we have seen, was the position maintained by Dr. Wiseman himself, in his Moorfield lectures, delivered in 1836. But some years' reflection, aided, doubtless, by the new lights evolved by "the powerful and well-stored mind" of Dr. Newman, so modified his opinion, that we read in the "Dublin Review" for December, 1847, the following remarkable passage—remarkable, that is to say, as contrasted with the passage, quoted in our last Number, from the "Lectures"—"The essential principle for which we [Roman Catholics] are contending, is no modern invention whatever, but as old as Catholic theology itself. The principle is, that the Church possesses the power, and has, from time to time, exercised it, of *raising into the rank of doctrines of faith* propositions *which*, previously to her definition, *were not such*." Here the tradition theory of the Council of Trent is plainly abandoned, and the development theory as plainly substituted for it.

But, it may be said, if the theory of development be so plainly opposed, as you assert, to the doctrine of Trent, why has it found so many advocates in recent times, and those too some of the most distinguished theologians of the Roman Church? We have already indicated the answer to this question, and we shall now state it more fully. When western Christendom was only just emerging from the night of the middle ages, during which the Scriptures had been hidden from the world, and the writings of the Church-Fathers buried in dusty MSS. in monkish libraries, it was easy for the Church of Rome to rest her system upon the asserted authority of Scripture and ancient Tradition. The documents upon which she based her claims were in her own hands, and were hardly accessible to any but such of the privileged class—the clergy—as were able to read them. But for some time previously to the Reformation, through the mighty agency of the press, the Scriptures became more generally diffused, and the works of the

* By Dr. Wordsworth, "Letters to M. Gondon," p. 10.

* Newman, "Prophetical Office of the Church," p. 103.
† "Dublin Review," December, 1845, p. 537.
‡ *Ibid.* p. 531.
§ *Ibid.* p. 534.
‖ We refer to "Brownson's Quarterly Review" (Boston), in which Dr. Newman's Essay has been assailed in a series of very able articles.

earlier Fathers more studied. The more sagacious apologists of Rome—Cardinal Cusanus for instance—perceived that new ground must be taken, and that Scripture and tradition would not suffice, without claiming for the Church an inherent right to constitute, from time to time, as occasion should arise, *new* doctrines of faith. The Council of Trent, afraid, probably, of sanctioning such a palpable departure from the mediæval system, which it was its great object and business to uphold, ignored the idea of anything like novelty in the Church teaching, and, accordingly, with more boldness than wisdom, stereotyped the good old principle of Scripture and Tradition, with, however, the all-important addition, that both were of equal and co-ordinate authority. The continued progress of Scriptural knowledge and patristic learning, which took place after the Reformation, soon proved that this position of the Tridentine Fathers was untenable, and that if the dogmas of Rome were to be defended at all, the aid of some new auxiliary must be called in. That auxiliary is the theory of development. Those who adopted it were not blind to the formidable objection which it would furnish Protestants with against the alleged immutability of the Church of Rome. But they had no alternative. Inconsistency in the parts of the Papal edifice was judged preferable to its total demolition.

What we have been saying leads us naturally to reflect upon the *variations* of the *invariable* Church, and that, too, on a question which, of all others, ought to admit of a definite and fixed answer—viz., What is the Rule of Faith? Is it all times unchanged and unchangeable, built upon the immutable basis of Scripture and unbroken apostolic tradition? Or does it depend on an ever-growing process of development, evolving new truths, or competent to evolve them in each succeeding age? On the one side, we have the infallible Council of Trent, with a countless array of the most renowned champions of Rome. On the other, we have an almost equal consensus of authorities, including, at least, one infallible successor of St. Peter (Leo X). Some few, as Möhler and Perrone, have undertaken the hopeless task of reconciling both theories. And some, again, as Cardinal Wiseman, have passed from one to the other, as circumstances rendered it expedient to do so. The magniloquent periods relative to the immutability of the doctrine of the [Roman] Catholic Church, which were so well adapted to the apprehensions and prejudices of a popular auditory, were laid aside when it became necessary to defend the opinions of a long-coveted and highly prized convert; albeit they are opinions which more scrupulous theologians of the same Church have pronounced to be subversive of the Catholic faith and even of Christianity itself.

This is the Church which boasts of unity of faith, and taunts Protestants with their divisions! There are, doubtless, divisions and variations enough amongst us, Protestants, upon *minor* points. That there should be such differences is part of the trial and discipline to which the visible Church is subjected in this lower world. But our differences do not touch upon the vital question of the Rule of Faith. Upon this, at least, we are all agreed. The *Bible alone*, the *Written Word* of God, is the immutable basis upon which the faith of Protestants is built. This foundation is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. The reflection of the mind of Him, with whom is no variableness neither shadow of turning, it continues from age to age, unchanged and unchangeable, the single fixed point amidst the ever-shifting things of time.

Let the Church of Rome then boast, if she will, of her perpetually-preserved apostolical traditions; or, if she prefers it, let her luxuriate in her ever-growing infallible developments. We envy her not. We are content to take our stand on the simple written Word of God. For we believe that this is the rock upon which the faith of the Church shall securely repose, until that blessed consummation shall arrive, when the kingdoms of the world shall become the kingdoms of the Lord and of His Christ.

ST. ROSE OF LIMA.

Our readers are probably aware that several Roman Catholic newspapers have, from time to time, expressed their dissatisfaction with our periodical, and have endeavoured to dissuade those with whom they have influence from reading it. It will, therefore, be considered very pardonable curiosity on our part, if we have desired to make ourselves acquainted with the literature which does obtain the commendation of the authorities referred to, and if we have tried to find out what is the kind of instruction which they consider adapted to the wants of the people. We have made known some of the results of our studies, in the articles which we have lately published on the life of St. Philomena, and on Father Faber's book, "All for Jesus;" and we intend, in the present article, to give an account of another number of "The Young Christian's Library," which has lately come under our notice. In our former articles we had occasion to remark on the recklessness with which, in these books, things not very probable in themselves were asserted positively, without a shadow of historical evidence; and we were forced to the conclusion, that one of the questions which the authors of these books cared least to be able to answer was, whether the things they wrote were *true*. We can conceive, however, that some persons may consider this a matter of subordinate importance. They may say, as some have said, "these lives are edifying and instructive; even if every thing related in them did not happen exactly as it is told, the histories afford useful examples for imitation; if they do not show what the life of a saint actually *has been*, they show, at least, what it *might* or *ought* to have been, and so they may give the readers help to become saints themselves." Well, we determined to read over one of these books solely from this point of view; not to trouble our heads about the evidence for the stories contained in it, but simply to see whether they were instructive and edifying, and whether the models proposed for our imitation were such as we should wish those for whom we had a regard, to follow. We have selected ST. ROSE OF LIMA, merely because her life was the last number of "The Young Christian's Library," published at the time of our procuring the volume; we believe, however, that she may be taken as a fair specimen of a saint, and that the stories told of her are not very different in kind from those told of the others whose names have been added within the last few hundred years to the Canon. We say within the last few hundred years, because the title of saint was obtained on much easier terms formerly, than now-a-days; every distinguished theological writer whose works are 600 years old, and free from the taint of heresy, is given this "handle to his name"; it is only in modern times that miracles, and voluntary torments, are required from a candidate for the title.

We abridge, from Mr. Duffy's volume, the following summary of the leading facts of St. Rose's life—as to the truth of which we shall not now raise any question. She was born on the 20th April, 1586, of respectable parents, at Lima, in Peru. Her first vocation to a religious life was felt when she was of the age of four years. "As she was playing one day with her little brother, he accidentally threw a quantity of mud on her hair; being neat and orderly in her attire, she was naturally vexed at this, and was on the point of going away in a sullen mood," when her brother appeased her with the excuse which would naturally occur to a child of his years, "my dear sister, do not be angry at this accident, for the curled ringlets of girls are hellish cords which enchain the hearts of men, and miserably drag them into everlasting flames." "Rose hearkened to these words as if they had been pronounced by a holy preacher of God, or as an oracle from heaven. She communed with herself, renounced this world [of which, at that time, she had such profound knowledge] for ever, and, finally, at the age of five years, by an irrevocable vow, consecrated her virginal purity to Almighty God, and solemnly promised to have no other spouse but him alone. We are taught in the fourth commandment that we should honour and obey our parents in all things lawful, and no saint has set us a brighter example of exact obedience to this law than St. Rose of Lima; but there are some things which we cannot do even to please our parents, and St. Rose has taught us the way to act in such perplexity, when it would seem clear that, while God commands one thing our parents command another."

This embarrassment soon arose with poor Rose, for her mother had eleven children to provide for, and would have been very glad if she could have married one of them off her hands; but Rose was determined to carry out the irrevocable vow which she had made, and not only to avoid marriage, but all which might lead to marriage. She was commanded, for instance, by her mother, to wear a band of flowers on her head. She obeyed; but in memory of the Redeemer's crown of thorns, "took the wreath, and fixed it on her head with a large pin, which pierced so deep into her flesh that it could not be drawn out without the aid of a surgeon, and even then with much difficulty. That she might not join in those vain assemblies and visits of which the world is so fond, she was in the habit of rubbing her eyes with pimento—a kind of burning Indian pepper—which rendered her eyes as red as fire, and so painful that she could not bear the light. To her mother, who remonstrated with her, she replied—'It would be much better for me, my dear mother, to be blind all the rest of my life than to be obliged to see the vanities and follies of the world.'"

Notwithstanding all this she remained so alarmingly beautiful that, "in order to extinguish the flames of passion which burned in the hearts of others, she used every artifice to disfigure herself. She made her face pale and livid with fasting; she washed her hands in hot lime to take the skin off them." Finally, she removed to a little village named Canta, and remained there four years without leaving the house. This last measure, however, was injudiciously adopted, and spoiled the effect of her other proceedings. Possibly it was more than female nature could bear, to witness the too great success of her efforts to disfigure herself; at all events, the son of one of the most distinguished ladies of Lima, who, we suppose, remembered her former beauty, but was prevented by her seclusion from observing the effects of the red pepper and hot lime, asked her in marriage. "The proposal was very agreeable to her mother, who, having eleven children, as before mentioned, to provide for, was happy at the prospect of an alliance so advantageous to her daughter. But Rose had given her virginity to God; and having a perfect abhorrence of the very thought of marriage, openly declared that she would never consent. Threats and caresses were alike vain. Blows and injuries were heaped upon her by her parents, but with no other effect than to make her more constant in her resolutions. She bore them all as her model, St. Catherine of Sienna, had done before her."

"In order to defeat the machinations of the enemies of her purity, she resolved to put on the habit of the third order of St. Dominic. This determination was confirmed by two miracles." We think it enough to give one of them, merely remarking that the other was an event equally supernatural.

"In the vast plains of Lima, amidst the countless butterflies that flit to and fro in the sunshine of that lovely climate, there is one prettily marked with black and white, the colours of the order of St. Dominic. One of these insects came and fluttered continually around her, and, as she was then looking about for indications of the will of God, she took this to be a second intimation from him that she should again follow the steps of St. Catherine, and become a religious of the third order of St. Dominic. She received the habit solemnly, at the age of twenty, on the 10th day of August, 1606."

Having brought our story to this point, we would, before going further, make a few remarks on one of the lessons taught to the little girls for whom their parents buy these "sweet little penny books" of Mr. Duffy's.

It seems to be one of the essential points in the life of a female saint that she should, while still a child, make a vow of perpetual celibacy. St. Philomena, it will be remembered, made such a vow at the age of ten; St. Rose, being, we suppose, twice as virtuous, made her's at the age of five. Promises so made are treated as irrevocably binding; and a child who altogether sets at nought, and defies the wishes of her parents in this matter, is described as choosing to obey God rather than man. What is here told of St. Rose and St. Philomena is repeated, with variations, in nearly all the lives of female saints that we remember; and in these religious romances the parents of the heroine fill the part which is assigned to the villain of secular romances. Those who have addicted themselves to the study of the old school of novels, know that it was the heroine's fate, after having in early life given her heart to a youth in every way worthy of it, to be invariably pursued by the machinations of a villain, from whose arts she is only finally delivered near the end of the third volume. In these religious romances it is the parents of the heroine who are intended to excite the reader's alarm (if anything can alarm a reader experienced enough to know how all such stories end); with "threats and caresses, blows and injuries" they seek to drive her from her purpose, but in vain; and her successful resistance is, at length, rewarded by reception into some distinguished nunnery.

We are inclined to believe, in charity, that the good priests who are the authors of these stories, not having any families of their own, are led into error through their ignorance as to the class of ideas of which the mind of a child of five years old is capable. We scarcely think that they would represent promises as binding made by a person ignorant of the meaning of what he was promising, or of the value of what he was giving away. If, for example, a man should prevail on a young child to promise to give him an estate to which the child was entitled when it should come of age, such an engagement would not be considered by any one as binding. Now, if our readers will try the experiment with the next child of five years old they meet, we think they will find them likely to possess a much more accurate idea, even as to what is meant by giving away an estate, than as to what is meant by "consecrating to God their virginal purity and making a vow of perpetual celibacy."

But see how the thing works in practice. A Roman Catholic little girl (if entitled to property in her own right so much the better) is asked how she would like to be a nun. Perhaps she goes to a nun's school; at all events she can form no other idea of a nun than a lady wearing a peculiar grand dress, living in a fine house, and thought holier and better than everybody else. She comes to the conclusion that to be a nun would be a very charming thing, and she forms her childish resolution accordingly. If her parents have treated her to Mr. Duffy's little books, she reads in them that such a resolution as she has taken is *irrevocable;* that it is an inspiration of the Holy Ghost, not to be repented of without sacrilege. If her parents disapprove of her plans she is taught that it will be the highest exercise of Christian virtue to set their wishes at defiance. We recommend any of our Roman Catholic friends, who would be sorry that their children took up these ideas, to look well to the kind of instruction they are providing for them.

We must not omit to remark how opposed to God's law are the lessons thus taught by Mr. Duffy to the "Young Christians" of Ireland. All human laws follow the dictates of common sense in this matter, and do not permit minors to enter into engagements against the consent of their parents. And so, in like manner, in the laws given by God to the Jewish nation, vows made to God, by an unmarried female, are treated as invalid if contrary to the consent of her parents.—See Numbers xxx. 5., R.C. Bible. "But if her father, immediately as soon as he heard it, gainsay it, both her vows and her oaths shall be void, neither shall she be bound to what she promised, because her father hath gainsaid it." Here we see that Moses would have decided St. Rose's perplexity in the case "where it would seem that God commanded one thing and the parents another," in precisely the opposite way from that in which St. Rose decided it. The Jews, however, are blamed by our Lord for adding to the laws which Moses gave them, traditions of man's devising; and it is singular that this very com-

mand of obedience to parents was the one which he censures them for tampering with. 'The Jewish Doctors of those days taught those who wished to be relieved from the necessity of obeying their father and mother to devote as a gift, to the service of God, whatever their parents required of them. "Well ye make void the commandment of God that ye may keep your own tradition. For Moses said, 'Honour thy father and thy mother; and he that shall curse father or mother dying let him die.' But you say, If a man shall say to his father or mother, Corban (which is a gift), whatsoever is from me shall profit thee; and, farther, ye suffer him not to do anything for his father or his mother; making void the Word of God by your tradition, which ye have given forth, and many such like things ye do."—Mark vii. 9-13, Douay Bible.

We think any candid mind must be struck by the resemblance between the traditions with which the Jewish teachers corrupted God's Word, and these traditions now taught in the Church of Rome; In both cases the plain command of God, "Honour thy father and mother," is set aside, under the pretext of offering God honour in some other way which he has not commanded; both have alike reason to apprehend the Saviour's rejection of such attempts to do him honour,—"In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."

We return now to the history of Rose, and proceed to give an account of the merits by which she obtained the title of saint. We are told that she was humble to a pre-eminent degree. "For she always chose for herself the vilest occupations of the house, and considered herself infinitely below a servant; she would frequently cast herself at the feet of a poor country girl, named Marianne, who worked in the house, and entreat her earnestly to beat her; to spit upon her; to trample her under her feet; and treat her as the most contemptible creature in the world. She thought herself a burden useless to the world and odious to nature; and, if any misfortune befel the family, she said it was her own sins that had drawn it down as a chastisement from heaven." As Rose obtained the honours of saintship, we are bound to believe that she was quite free from affectation in all this, and that she seriously expected Marianne to take her at her word.

"Her fasts and austerities were truly astonishing, and such as only the grace of God can enable the greatest of saints to impose upon themselves. At six years of age, she began to fast three times a week on bread and water. At fifteen, she made a vow never to eat meat, unless compelled by those who had authority over her, and whom she thought she could not disobey without sin. Her mother, seeing her face pale and emaciated with long fasting, used to blame her conduct, and even wished to persuade her that she committed a mortal sin, by denying to herself the necessary nourishment for the preservation of life. She obliged her to sit at table with the rest of the family, and fare as the others did. But St. Rose would beg the servant to offer her only a sort of dish made without salt, composed of a crust of coarse bread and a handful of very bitter herbs. She was accustomed to gather wild herbs in the forest and to cultivate them carefully in her own garden, that she might have the materials for self-denial ready at hand. Her fast, in general, was so strict and rigorous that in twenty-four hours she took nothing but a piece of bread and a little water. From the beginning of Lent she left off bread, contenting herself with a few orange pippins every day of the forty that are consecrated to penance; on Fridays she took only five. She was known to make a moderate-sized loaf and a pitcher of water last fifty days Another time she remained seven weeks without drinking a drop of water or any other liquor; and towards the end of her life she sometimes passed several successive days without eating or drinking. It was generally believed in Lima that she passed weeks without eating or drinking, and that when necessity compelled her to drink a little water to assuage the burning heat which consumed her, she would drink it warm, in order to mortify the pleasure which she would have enjoyed from drinking cold water."

"Nor was she content to emaciate her delicate body by fasting alone. She daily drew from her flesh streams of blood, with iron chains, and other instruments of penance. After she became a nun, she was not content with a common sort of discipline; she made one for herself, of two iron chains, with which she gave herself such frightful blows every night that her blood sprinkled the wall, and made a stream in the middle of the room. When her confessor, alarmed at the excess of her disciplines, had ordered her to discontinue to discipline herself with her iron chain, she made it into three rows, and wore it round her body; and, after passing the ends through the ring of a padlock, she threw the key into a corner, where it could not be found. This chain very soon worked its way through the skin, and eat the flesh so deeply, that it buried itself, and was no longer visible. . . . . Besides this chain, she wore a most severe hair shirt, mixed with the points of needles; and rubbed herself with nettles and thorns, making her body one entire wound and blister. Being still insatiable in her desire of pain, she determined yet more exactly to copy her Lord and Saviour, who had worn a crown of thorns for her's and our sake. When very young she made herself a crown of pewter, studded with little sharp-pointed nails, which she wore several years of her innocent life. In after years she constructed a circlet, of a plate of silver, three fingers broad, in which she fixed three rows of sharp points, in honour of the thirty-three years which the Son of God lived on earth. Cutting off her hair that the points might enter more freely, she wore this crown beneath her veil, in such a way, that the least agitation or motion of her body caused these iron thorns to tear her flesh, and pierce her head in ninety-nine places. Every Friday she tied this circlet more tightly, and made it come down upon her forehead, till it pierced the cartilage of her ears in many places."

"She made herself a bed, in the form of a chest, and filled it with rough stones, of different sizes. The bed still seeming too soft, she added three pieces of twisted and knotted wood, and filled up the space with three hundred pieces of broken tiles, placed so as to wound and tear the body. Upon this terrible cross she never placed herself without trembling and shuddering, while the blood seemed to freeze in her veins."

We think that the account we have given of her austerities will content most of our readers; and we shall, therefore, merely say, in conclusion, that by such a course of conduct she brought herself to the grave in the thirty-second year of her age; dying in such torments that she told her friends that she believed that when she died her bones would be found reduced to ashes, and the marrow dried up, from the effects of the burning heat which she endured.

But, now that we have finished, we have still to ask, what are the merits by which she deserved the especial title of saint? What useful thing did she do during her life? How did she promote the glory of God, and the good of her fellow-creatures? We can find no satisfactory answer to these questions in Mr. Duffy's book; and, as far as he has informed us, it may be strictly true that Rose was, what she confessed herself to be, "a burden, useless to the world," "a miserable sinner, who had given much trouble and uneasiness to the house in which she lived." All that Mr. Duffy records is, that she was very ingenious in tormenting herself; but it does not appear whether she did any good to any body else.

But our Roman Catholic friends will ask, does not the mere fact of the fortitude with which she bore her self-inflicted sufferings, suffice to give her a claim to rank among the heroines of Christendom? Must we not believe that she was one of those who went straight to heaven, without passing through purgatory; for what need of purgatorial torments can one have who bore so many torments in this life?

And yet all must acknowledge that the voluntary infliction of torments such as those of Rose, is not, *by itself*, a proof of supernatural grace. The feats of Rose in this way—her voluntary abstinences, and her voluntary tortures—are not only paralleled, but outdone, by the heathen devotees of India. We will not venture to say how long some of them have remained without nourishment; it is no uncommon thing to find others who, in performance of a vow, have kept their arm immoveably in one position, until they have become unable to move it again. At some of their feasts they will come in succession, till the head is too weary and the heart too sick to count them, to have hot spikes thrust through their tongues, their cheeks, their arms; and to have hooks passed through the fleshy part of the back, and be swung by them at the height of thirty or forty feet from the ground.

Now, if these Indians were asked the reason why they endured these tortures, they could give a more consistent explanation of their conduct than St. Rose and the others who have acted as she is said to have done. The Hindoos worship a Deity who is supposed to take pleasure in the sufferings of mankind, to the honour of whom their rites are well adapted. But how can such practices be acceptable to the God whom we worship, a God of mercy, and tenderness, and love? It is because of the false notions as to the character of God, which such stories as Mr. Duffy circulates, are calculated to instil, that we especially feel called on to draw attention to them. God is represented throughout merely as a Being of stern justice, not to say, of cruelty; only some few heroic Christians are described as admitted to approach Him directly; and *their* whole lives are, in consequence, a scene of torment and suffering; while the mass of Christians, at humbler distance, are recommended to have recourse to these saintly mediators, in hope to find from them the mercy they dare not expect from the Redeemer. These are representations which fill us with sorrow and indignation.

It is true that we all believe our God to be a God of justice, and we know that we have, by our sins, grievously offended against him; but what is kept in the back ground in these books of Mr. Duffy's is, that he is also a God of infinite love, who spared not his own Son, but freely gave him up for our sakes; and that the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from *all* sin. The justice of God is no longer the enemy of those who love him; it has been completely satisfied by Christ's all-sufficient atonement; nor is it required of his people to attempt the impossible task of making, by their own sufferings, expiation for their sins. We own that the sufferings of Christ are alluded to in the biographies we are reviewing; but they are spoken of rather as examples for the saints to follow than as an atonement, making expiatory sufferings on their own part unnecessary.

There was once on a time a father who, when his house was on fire, rescued his two daughters from the flames—a task which he did not accomplish without severe burns and great risk of life. Both girls were filled with gratitude to their father for his sufferings on their account. The one showed her gratitude by devoted attention to her father, by striving in every way to do his will and to anticipate his wishes; the other thought the best way to make her father a pleasant return for what he had suffered for her sake was by occasionally putting her own fingers into the candle, holding hot coals in her hands, pouring boiling water inside her clothes, and in other ways making herself miserable. Nor could her sister persuade her that it gave her father no pleasure to see her suffer; that the very reason he had endured so much was to save her from pain; and that though he had acted rightly in not shrinking from suffering where there was good cause, she would not be justified in inflicting on herself gratuitous and unmeaning torments.

If such a case occurred in common life, no one would be at a loss what judgment to pass on it; yet in religious matters the first kind of gratitude finds no favour with Roman Catholic teachers, who reserve all their admiration for the second, as divine and truly heroic.

We think there can be no doubt, that such conduct as that attributed to Rose of Lima is not only not meritorious, but positively sinful. All are agreed that suicide is a grievous sin; and no one has any greater right to inflict on themselves a lingering suicide, or to shorten their lives by self-inflicted torments. But all the guilt of such conduct is not to be laid at the door of the unhappy victim of it; much must be visited on the priests and confessors, and others who, by their approbation, urge it on. For, after all, the process by which a poor nun is led down the melancholy path which ends in canonization is so simple, that we only wonder there are not more candidates for the honour. When the doors of the convent are closed upon the poor girl, if the rules of her order do not admit of her being occupied in education or in attendance on the sick, she must seek for something to fill up the place which her worldly employments had held in her thoughts; she must look for some object for her existence. What is more natural than to endeavour to make some further advance in the road to superior sanctity, of which her very entrance into the convent was the first step? She strives to make her life conformed to that of those whom her Church sets before her as models. Rose adopted her system of tortures from a desire to imitate Catherine of Sienna. What wonder that others should desire to rival Rose? It appears from her life, that Rose, by her self-inflicted tortures, obtained the frequent visits of saints and angels, and heard Christ himself uttering the words—"Rose of my heart be thou my bride." How is the poor recluse to doubt the reality of scenes attested by her Church, or to question the lawfulness of self-murder, supported by the highest of her commended models? What limits are to be placed to the zeal of her who has been taught that she can best please God by tormenting a frail body, and that a self-inflicted death will endear her to her heavenly bridegroom?

Innumerable examples have proved that people will not unfrequently be found who, without any religious motive at all to animate them, will submit to the greatest pain and privation, in order to excite the wonder, or the respect, or admiration of those with whom they live. Within the last few years two or three instances have occurred, in our own country, of impostors who pretended that they lived without eating, and who, in order to carry out the appearance of abstinence, must have practised immense self-denial, with no apparent object but that of exciting wonder and admiration. With what far greater force must such motives act when they have the sanction of religion? How are the bleeding steps of the candidate saint supported by the honour and approbation of those who surround her! What praises she receives from her confessor! What an honour to the convent to which she belongs, if they have got a genuine saint to produce—one who fasts, and scourges, and disciplines herself after the most approved models! And so it is, that by the application of moral force alone, tortures, which would be thought too severe for an atrocious criminal, are inflicted on an unoffending girl, with no other fault than that of a weak and superstitious mind.

The conclusion, then, to which we wish to bring our readers is, that self-torture is not, *in itself*, a virtue. We believe that the good of mankind is the only legitimate ground for the voluntary endurance of pain; and we only approve of the exercise of such moderate privations as are employed as a discipline of mind and body, in order to acquire that habit of rational self-denial, without which extensive usefulness is impossible.

We have only, in conclusion, to mention one very important particular in which our idea of saints differs from that of the compilers of "The Young Christian's Library." We believe that it is the business of *all* Christians to be saints; that every one of us is bound to show his gratitude to the utmost of his abilities for the mercies the Saviour has bestowed on him, and that no one has a dispensation from practising whatever rules may most tend to our Lord's glory. In our opinion, Christian biography—the lives of people who have been distinguished for holiness and virtue—is profitable reading, only if those who study their biography strive to follow their good example, so as with them to be partakers of God's heavenly kingdom. But the view held by the Roman Catholics is, that saints are a class of people to be admired rather than imitated. We do not suppose a dozen Roman Catholic parents would purchase St. Rose's life, if they thought there was much danger of their daughters imitating her red pepper and hot

lime, her iron chains and broken tile mattresses. In Mr. Faber's book, which we have so often had before occasion to refer to, he modestly disclaims as absurd the notion that *he* should write a book for any one trying to be a *saint*. His aim he states to be, "affectionately to ask people to think, if they will not be saints, whether they will not love our dearest Lord as far as Calvary, without committing themselves to the crucifixion." But, after all, the real test of the goodness of doctrine is to see how it would work if *everybody* practised it. We can conceive no scene of greater happiness than the world would exhibit if everybody was a saint according to our notion of what is meant by the word; if everybody was full of love to God and to his neighbour; if selfishness were destroyed, sinful passions conquered, the promotion of God's glory the chief object in every one's thought—why, it would be no longer earth, it would be heaven. But suppose *every one* was a saint according to Mr. Duffy's model—suppose every one held the very thought of marriage in abhorrence—suppose every one endeavoured to improve on the way in which God Almighty had made him, and strove with hot lime, iron chains, dirt, and red pepper, to make his person as disagreeable to his neighbours as God, no doubt, would have made it if he had intended saints of Mr. Duffy's class to be general—suppose every one were to take as little food as nature would submit to, and that the noise of the iron discipline was continually resounding; that nothing was to be seen but pale faces, livid flesh, and bleeding shoulders—what a scene the world would present! it would be no longer earth, it would be—purgatory. Now, if any of our readers will but just look about him in the world, and see how God has made every natural object beautiful to the eye—how every sight, and scent, and sound of nature is full of pleasure, except where sin has depraved and polluted it—we are content to leave it to his decision to say which of these two kinds of saints is the kind with which the Author of Nature wished His world to be full.

THE LANDLORD'S LETTER.

I DON'T know whether any of those who now read the CATHOLIC LAYMAN ever heard of such a place as Ballintubber. Once on a time I wrote one or two accounts of some of the doings there, which were printed in this paper; but it is so long ago that you have had time to forget it; and, besides, I hear that a great many more read the CATHOLIC LAYMAN now than used to do then. Well, at any rate, I was reminded that I had not then time to tell any of the reasons the people of Ballintubber had for not liking Mr. Grip, the agent, so I may as well tell you now; and as what I am now going to tell you happened before any of the things I told of before, those that didn't read the old numbers of this paper will be the better able to understand my story.

If Mr. Grip didn't turn out well as an agent, it was no blame to those that appointed him, for the ageney had been in his family for about a hundred years; and there never was an honester man or one that managed better than his grandfather, old Anthony Grip. However, it was a great temptation to them, things being left so much in their power. The Sherwins lived altogether on the Continent, and the agent might do very much as he pleased. As long as old Anthony lived, things went on very well; but the son was a very different man from his father; and if he was bad, the grandson was worse. By degrees they introduced a good many new rules into the management of the estate; and the object of all these rules was the screwing money out of the tenantry, very little of which, I may tell you, went into the landlord's pocket. The way they managed was—first to make some little change in one of the old rules; they would generally choose the time when one of the tenants died to change the rule a little, and make some new exaction from the son; and if he objected, they bullied him, or they told him "it was always so"—It was one of the "regulations of the estate"—"they must know better than he;" and so when they got one rule well established, they tried another, and so on, until the tenantry were in such a bad condition that you would never know the place for the same it had been in old Anthony's time.

One thing, perhaps, which made the tenants submit to all this was the state of ignorance they were kept in; you could hardly blame the Sherwin family for this, for they had founded good schools on the estate, and left fine endowments for the master; but O'Reilly, the schoolmaster, was son-in-law to Mr. Grip, and played into his hands; It suited his laziness not to give his pupils more instruction than he could help; and, besides, perhaps he thought the less the people knew the more likely they would be to submit to those they knew to be wiser than themselves, and the less chance there would be of any complaints reaching the landlord's ears.

The first thing that made a great change in Ballintubber was, that some of the boys that found it hard to live there went over to America and throve very well there; you may be sure they were anxious to let their friends at home know of their good luck; and their poor fathers and mothers, at Ballintubber, wanted to send them news of home, from time to time, and it was then they found reason to be sorry for their want of education. Those that were best taught of them thought it a great thing if they could spell their way through one of the stories in the reading book, miscalling half the words; and when they grew up they generally forgot what they knew; and as for writing, not one of them was ever taught such a thing. The poor boys in America had to go about looking for some one to write their letters for them; and, when the letters came over, Mr. O'Reilly, who was postmaster, had to read them as well to the people, and to write their letters back again for them. If he had had an idle life before, I can tell you his place then was no easy one; however, if his ill-wishers are to be believed, he did not lose by his trouble. At least I was told of several remittances of money that were said to be sent over by the boys in America to their families, and I know that nothing was ever heard about them by the people in Ballintubber, who, to be sure, had to be contented with knowing as much of their letters as Mr. O'Reilly was pleased to tell them. I don't think they suspected anything, but, at any rate, they did not like this state of things; and Tim Callaghan, in particular, came to Mr. O'Reilly, and insisted that his son Pat should be taught to write: so did Michael Kelly, and several others of the people of the village. Mr. O'Reilly tried to laugh and talk them out of this foolish notion, and wanted to know why they wanted their children to be wiser than any of the people of Ballintubber for the last hundred years; and asked whether the education that had been good enough for themselves was not good enough for their children. However, the people were positive, and, at last, Mr. O'Reilly thought it best to give in; for he knew very well that writing was one of the things which, as schoolmaster, he was bound to teach. So there was a writing class in Ballintubber school; and Pat Callaghan, especially, took to the writing greatly, and could not only write a fair hand himself, but he could read writing-hand as well as some of them could read printed books. Now, Pat was a sharp lad, and it happened that one evening that he had been sent up to Mr. O'Reilly's to buy some trifle or other—for Mrs. O'Reilly had a little shop, and sold threads and tapes, and other little odds and ends—Pat noticed a paper on the chimney-piece behind the counter, and brought back word to his father that there was a letter directed to him at Mr. O'Reilly's. So, next morning, Tim Callaghan went up, and Pat with him, and asked Mr. O'Reilly for the letter for him.

"There's no letter for you," said Mr. O'Reilly.

"No letter!" said Tim, looking rather blank.

"No," said Mr. O'Reilly; "what letter should there be? there has been no American mail these three weeks."

"Why, sir," says young Pat, as sharp as you please, "there's the letter I mean on the chimney-piece."

"Oh, that letter," said Mr. O'Reilly; not stirring to give it him. "I thought, of course, you expected a letter from America; that letter is nothing but the letter from the landlord, Mr. Sherwin."

"A letter from the landlord," cried Tim; "well, if his honour has been pleased to write to me, sure that's the letter, of all others, I'd like to have."

"It's not to you, man, in particular," returned Mr. O'Reilly; "it's a circular to all the tenantry, containing some of the rules for the management of the estate, and directions for the cropping of your land."

"I'm delighted to hear it, sir," said Tim; "it will be of great use to us; will you hand it over to me if you please, sir."

"Use to you! What use would it be to you? Do you think, that ignorant people like you would understand it properly? Mr. Grip has got the circular, and understands it all, and you'll just take your directions from him, as usual, without troubling your own heads about it."

"But, sir," said Tim, "if Mr. Sherwin had intended the letter for Mr. Grip only, would not he have sent it straight to him? When he directed the letter to us, it looks like a poor compliment to the master if we wouldn't try and read it, and try and get as much good as we can by it. So, if you please, sir, I will take it home with me and try to understand it, and if I can't, why, if it does me no good it can do me no harm."

"No," said Mr. O'Reilly, "the mischief would just be that you'd be fancying you understood it, and going as you thought by it, when, in reality, you'd be going all wrong. So I have strict orders from Mr. Grip not to let any one have a copy of the letter except those that bring me written orders from him."

"But, sir," says Tim, "when the letter is directed to me, aren't you bound to give it to me?"

"Are you going to teach me my duty as postmaster?" says Mr. O'Reilly. "Do you think the government would have set me over the letters if I wasn't to have my discretion who to give letters to or not? What difference does it make to you whether you get it or not? Sure you're bound to take the meaning of it from me. You'd never know there was a letter at all here for you if I did not tell you or show it to you. Only for me you'd not know how to read a line of it. Many's the letter has come from America that you couldn't have made sense of at all, if I didn't expound it to you. So you may be as well be content to take it from me first as last. You can't help depending on me; and it's as good for you just to take the meaning of Mr. Sherwin's letter from the rules we give you, without troubling your own head about it."

"Then won't I get the letter, sir?" said Tim.

"Will you be off out of that, and not be crowding up the place all day?" cried Mr. O'Reilly, in a thundering voice; and Tim Callaghan moved off, not knowing exactly what to say, and yet not more than half satisfied.

When Tim came home he spoke to several of the tenants, and told them there was a letter for them from the landlord, that they could not get. However, when he explained to them the reason why, there was only Michael Kelly and one or two more that grumbled a little; the rest said, "why if we couldn't understand it what good would it be to us?" And Michael Kelly only said, "I wonder the master hadn't more sense than to go to the trouble of writing us a letter that we can't understand."

The more Tim thought of the matter the less he was pleased at not being allowed to see this letter; for there was another of the "regulations of the estate" of which I must tell you a little now, which he found very hard to make agree with this. It was one time that the tenantry had become dissatisfied with something or other, or had some favour to ask, I forget what, from the landlord, and having no one else to come to, they came to Mr. O'Reilly, to get him to write for them. He didn't make any difficulty about writing. Quite the contrary; he told them that it was the landlord's wish that they should send him a letter, once a week, giving him a report of the state of the farms, and telling him what they wanted him to do; that they should come up, once a week, to Mr. O'Reilly, and he would read over for them the letter he was going to send, and they should pay him so much a week for his trouble. Well, they all agreed to this; and the first week they went up, full of expectation, to hear what fine words Mr. O'Reilly would put their wishes in. But when he began to read, how they did stare at each other; one scratched his head; another would have interrupted him only for shame's sake; not a word could they understand from one end to the other. When Mr. O'Reilly had finished, he said, "There, boys; I defy any one to give you better value for your money than that letter; it shall go by this night's post, and all that are here present will be sure to find the good of it."

"Sir," says Tim Callaghan, "I have no doubt it's a very fine letter, but if I may make bold to say so, sorra word of it I could understand."

"How could you be expected to understand it, man," said Mr. O'Reilly; "sure its Latin."

"Latin!" said Tim; "why, then, wouldn't you tell his honour in plain English what it was we wanted."

"You ought to know," said Mr. O'Reilly, "that it's one of the regulations of the estate that no letter should ever be sent to the landlord except in Latin."

"Yerra, then," said Tim, "if that isn't the quare rule; and what's the reason of that, sir?"

"It ought to be reason enough for you," said Mr. O'Reilly, "that it is one of the regulations of the estate, and that's all need be said about it; however, I may tell you this—that Mr. Sherwin has tenants in France, too, and how would it look, if some of his tenants wrote to him in French and some of them in English; he likes uniformity you know. And if you were travelling in France, and if any of the tenants there asked you to join them in one of their petitions, how would you know what you were putting your name to, if the letter was in French?"

"Why, then, sir," says Tim, "if the Latin letters is no use till I come to travel in France, it's little good they are; and if the letter you read was in French itself, I'd understand as much of it as I do now; and, to my thinking, the best kind of uniformity would be, if every one was to write in the language they understood. However, sir, if it's one of the regulations of the estate there's nothing to be said again it. But, I suppose, sir, you won't want me to come up to hear the letter read every week. Sure I am willing to agree to it all without coming, since I'd be no wiser if I came."

"That won't do, at all, Tim," said Mr. O'Reilly; "it's only they that come and hear it read, and put their names to it, will get any benefit by it."

Well, I am afraid you'll think I am losing the thread of my story, by telling you all these regulations about the Latin letters; but, if I hadn't told you, I could not well have explained to you how it was that Tim was fairly gravelled now, when he could not get the landlord's letter. "Well," said he to himself, "that bates all, for quareness. Mr. O'Reilly won't give me the landlord's letter, becanse, he says, I couldn't understand it, and maybe he's right; but, if things I can't understand is bad for me, why does he make me go up every week to hear the Latin letters, that's written in a language that I'm told the devil himself can't understand. And, if the Latin I hear does me no harm, what harm could the landlord's letter do me, for it can't be harder than the Latin, supposing, even, there's not a plain word in the whole of it?"

It often happens that when one can't get a thing, that's the very reason one wishes for it, and so it was with Tim Callaghan; he came to be mighty curious about Mr. Sherwin's letter, and wondering what was in it, and how he could get it. And he remembered that Mr. O'Reilly said that he might give the letter to those that could bring him written orders from Mr. Grip. So the next time Tim was up paying his rent, he contrived to have some talk with Mr. Grip; and at last he brought the subject round to the letter, and to Mr. Grip not allowing it to be read by the tenantry. But, though Tim had spoken respectfully enough, as he thought, Mr. Grip fired up at once. "Who dare say such a thing," says he, "as that I would be against the tenantry knowing anything the landlord wished them to be told. There's nothing that I wish more

than that every tenant on the estate should be able to see the letter." This was joyful hearing for Tim. But Mr. Grip went on—"Of course," said he, "all I wish is, that the tenantry should know the landlord's wishes; and if any of them were so ignorant that they would take a meaning out of the letter quite the opposite of what Mr. Sherwin meant, then, it stands to reason, they'd be better without the letter than with it. So, all I require is, that people should bring me a certificate from the schoolmaster that they are educated men, and have sense enough to put no bad meaning on it, and then I give them an order to get it."

Says Tim—"I think I can get that same certificate easy enough, and I'll just step down for it."

"There's another thing I should mention," said Mr. Grip; "and that is, before I give you the order, you must sign an engagement that you'll never put any meaning on the letter except the meaning I bid you; and, in particular, that you'll never go about saying that any of the regulations of the estate, that I go by, are contrary to the words of the letter."

"Bless your honour," said Tim, "who'd ever suspect your honour of going against the words of the master's letter. Sure we all know you wouldn't make any regulations contrary to his authority; it's little occasion for me to sign such an engagement as that."

"I know better," said Mr. Grip. "I never yet let letters from the landlord get carelessly into the hands of any of the tenants, that they were not sure to say that they were contrary to some of my regulations. I had trouble enough, when you were a lad, with some scoundrels who had got hold of a letter from the landlord, and who had the impudence to say he condemned some of my rules; however, I soon settled their hash for them. I had them well punished, and bundled them out of the estate. And I am determined to take good care never to have such trouble again; so you either must sign the engagement, to put my meaning on the letter, and nothing else, or the letter you shan't have."

"Well," says Tim, "I have confidence in your honour, who to be sure is wiser than me; and I'd like to see the letter, so I'll sign the engagement."

"Then," said Mr. Grip, "you have only to bring me the schoolmaster's certificate, and I will give you an order to have the letter on payment of the postage."

"Postage," cried Tim; "and is there much postage to pay?"

"Only a pound," said Mr. Grip.

"A pound!" cried Tim; "why 'twould take me six months to save that much."

"You wouldn't have us treat the landlord with so much disrespect as to make his letters too common, or only to charge the same for them as for the scrawls your brother might send you from America."

"Sir," said Tim, "a pound is a great deal of money; and, after all, if I had the letter, since it only confirms the regulations you go by, I believe it will answer just as well to hear them from you."

"Just as well," said Mr. Grip; "now you speak like a man of sense. I read Mr. Sherwin's letter carefully enough; and as you have me to give you the meaning of it, you may just as well save your money. You will get on as well without it."

"Stay, sir," said Tim; "even though the letter contains nothing but your regulations, still, I think, I should like to have them all in black and white; for I often hear you tell us things are regulations, that I was never told of before; and as you say you never make a new rule, I would be glad to have the letter which gives, I suppose, a list of them all."

"And do you think," said Mr. Grip, "that all the regulations are in that letter? Why there's not the tenth part of them. My grandfather, Anthony, heard them all from Mr. Sherwin, that was then, and he taught them all to my father, and my father to me. It's only a few of the rules that are in the letter. But the great rule is to mind my bidding, and that's rule enough for you."

"I suppose that rule is in the letter, sir," said Tim.

"No, it isn't," said Mr. Grip, turning on him as if he would eat him up. "That's the principal of the things my father told me I was to impress upon you all. If the master forgot to put it in the letter, I suppose it was because he knew I would be sure not to let you forget it. But just take my advice, mind your potato field, and don't trouble your head about the letter, or you'll become a troublesome, rebellious fellow, like those I had to get rid of."

"Why, then, sir," said Tim, "I believe your advice is good; and I'll put the letter out of my head, for 'twould only cost me a mint of money, and I'd be no wiser after all."

After this conversation with Mr. Grip, Tim Callaghan gave up the idea of trying to see the landlord's letter, and things went on as usual, until Loughmanagh fair day, where he had to go over to sell a cow. He wasn't there very long before he sold her well, to Mr. Robinson, a stout farmer of Kilpatrick; he didn't stay very long after that; and on the way home, he overtook Mr. Robinson, and they walked together, for Tim's way lay through Kilpatrick. Another time, perhaps, he might have been shy of talking to Mr. Robinson, for there was bad blood between the Kilpatrick boys and the Ballintubber boys, and desperate faction fights there used to be between them, though now the police had put a stop to it; but this day Tim had Mr. Robinson's guineas chinking in his pocket, and he was not inclined to answer him surly when Mr. Robinson spoke friendly to him. So they walked on together, and by the time they got to Kilpatrick, they were such friends that Mr. Robinson asked him in to rest himself and eat a bit of dinner with him. And, after dinner, he took him round his place and showed him his way of farming; and Tim saw a great many things he never saw before, and was greatly delighted with it all—for he had no notion so much could be got out of the land. So, at last, he asked his new acquaintance, where it was that he had learned all these plans that were so new to himself. I wonder they should be new to you said Mr. Robinson; why I only go according to the directions Mr. Sherwin gave us in his circular.

"And is Mr. Sherwin your landlord, too?" said Tim Callaghan.

"Oh, yes; all this country belongs to him."

"But, how could it be that Mr. Grip would give *you* one explanation of the letter and *us* another—for he teaches us quite a different way?"

"I don't care how Mr. Grip explains it," said Mr. Robinson, "I go by the plain words of Mr. Sherwin's own letter."

"Then, have you got the letter?" cried Tim, all in surprise, "and how did you get Mr. Grip to allow you to have it?"

"I didn't ask his leave," said Mr. Robinson.

"And wern't you afraid of his turning you off the estate?"

"I have nothing to say to Mr. Grip," said Mr. Robinson; "he has no power over me."

"But," said Tim, quite overpowered with all the strange news he heard, "Mr. Grip told us, often and often, that Mr. Sherwin hadn't an acre of property anywhere, but he was agent over it."

"Don't believe a word of it," said Mr. Robinson; "we all lived in Ballintubber, when I was a lad, and were under Mr. Grip until my father got the landlord's letter and found out, from that, some of the tricks Mr. Grip was playing, and so he earned his ill-will, and Mr. Grip put him out of Ballintubber. And then my father wrote to Mr. Sherwin, so he gave him this farm we hold now, and we have nothing to say to Mr. Grip ever since."

"Ah," said Tim, "it's well your father was a learned man; but I dare not bring Mr. Grip's anger on me, for there's not a soul in Ballintubber could write to the master, but Mr. O'Reilly, and, to be sure, he wouldn't go again his father-in-law."

"And isn't there a soul in Ballintubber can write but one?" cried Mr. Robinson, whose turn it was now to be astonished.

"My own son, Pat, could write, if that was all," returned Tim; "but it's the Latin letters we're not up to."

"Oh, the Latin," cried Mr. Robinson, laughing, till he could hardly stand, "I had forgotten that. Well, Grip has certainly played you a great many tricks, but of all the barefaced humbugs I ever heard of, that's the most outrageous. Do you think that any gentleman, of common sense, would make a rule that he would'nt take letters except they were written in a language that the people that sent them didn't understand? No, it's no rule of Mr. Sherwin's; but do you know the reason of this rule?"

"Yes," said Tim; "I remember Mr. O'Reilly telling me some of the reasons for the rule; but, to tell the truth, I didn't think any of them good ones."

"I warrant he didn't tell you the true reason; and that is, there's nothing Grip is so much afraid of, as of the tenantry's going straight to the master without going through his hands; he knows, if they did, his rogueries would soon come to light; so that is why he puts every difficulty he can in the way of the tenantry making their wants known to Mr. Sherwin, or of his making his wishes known to them. And now, if you would like it, I will give you a copy of the master's letter to take home with you."

"There's nothing would delight me more," said Tim; "but is the letter you have got the same as the letter that was sent to me?"

"Exactly the same," said Mr. Robinson; "and if you want to be sure of it, just get Mr. Grip to read out some of the letter to you, and do you compare it with the letter I am giving you, and try if every line isn't the same. But do you know the reason the master's letter was kept from you so long?"

"Yes, sir, I do," said Tim; "it's because it's too difficult and hard for me to understand."

"You never made a worse hit than that," returned Mr. Robinson, laughing again; "it's *because it's too easy to understand*."

"And where could be the harm of that?" said Tim.

"No harm to you, perhaps; but great harm to Mr. Grip. It's very easy to understand the letter, but very hard to get a meaning out of it that will agree with his doings. No wonder, it must be a clever fellow that would get *his* meaning out of the letter. Just let me read you a little, and you shall judge for yourself."

So Mr. Robinson just read part of the letter in which Mr. Sherwin desired that his letter should be read out for them all—men, women, and children—and that they were to get it by heart, and teach it to their children, and talk about it when they were walking on the road, and in the evenings when they were going to bed, and in the mornings when they were getting up. "Well, Mr. Callaghan, how does this agree with Mr. Grip's not letting any of you have a copy of the letter?"

Then he read several other parts of the letter, which there's no use in my telling you, unless I had time to tell you of the strange rules Mr. Grip had made, that were quite contrary to the letter; another time I may tell you some of his tricks, if any of you care to read them. And some of the rules Mr. Grip laid most stress on were not mentioned in the letter at all; though any one could see they were a kind of thing that would not be left out if the landlord had wished them to be observed.

Tim could hardly sleep a wink that night, with thinking of all the new things he had learned that day; and, next day, he set to work reading over the letter; and before many days were past, he knew it so well, that he had it almost by heart. Somehow or other he was not in a hurry to go tell his discovery to Mr. Grip; but he could not help telling many of his neighbours how it could be proved that Grip kept many of their rights back from them, and how they weren't at all bound to pay many of the dues he exacted from them; and he began to alter his own plan of farming to agree with what was directed in the circular, and which he had seen work so well at Mr. Robinson's. So it could not be long kept a secret from Mr. Grip, and he sent up for Tim one morning, and asked him, "what new-fangled ways those were that he had the impudence to introduce into Ballintubber?"

Tim answered, "that he only did according to what was in the master's letter."

This made Mr. Grip furious. "What business have you, or the like of you, with his honour's letter; and where did you get a copy of it?"

Tim told him, from Mr. Robinson, of Kilpatrick.

"That's not the right letter you could have got from him," said Mr. Grip.

So, then, Tim did as Mr. Robinson had ordered him; and he offered to let Mr. Grip read out his letter, and compare the two, and see if they were not as like as two peas.

"Show your letter here," said Mr. Grip; so Tim did so very simply, thinking he was going to compare the two; but the agent just took the letter Tim handed him, and put it inside the bar of the grate, and held it tight with the poker, until it was burnt to ashes.

When Tim saw his treasure disappear in this way, he cried out at the disrespect of treating the master's letter in such a way.

"The master's letter, indeed," said Mr. Grip; "it's the devil's own letter for throwing the whole place into confusion. I wish I had this poker within reach of the fellow that gave it to you. And as for you, if I see any more of these new-fangled plans with you, or if I hear any more talk about letters from you, you don't remain another week upon the estate."

Now, Tim had plenty of courage; and besides, there were several of the tenantry in the office that he was sure would take his part, since, if he could put down any of Grip's rogueries, they would all be the better of it; so he told Grip stoutly that he had a right to the landlord's letter, and he would have it; and that as for his being put off the estate, that was more than Grip could do, if he did nothing wrong beyond asking for his own, and that the master had plenty of estates that Grip had nothing to say to.

To this Mr. Grip abused him like a pickpocket; and called him a liar; and swore, that Mr. Sherwin hadn't a foot of land but he was agent over it. If Tim had expected that the tenantry would take his part he was wofully disappointed. In the first place, they were all in great dread of Mr. Grip, who made out his power over them to be far greater than it really was; and besides, he took a very cunning advantage of the ill-will between them and the Kilpatrick boys. He turned on Tim, and said, ought not you to be ashamed, for a Ballintubber boy, to go and sell himself to the Kilpatrick faction? How much did Robinson pay you for introducing discontent into this estate?

Well, Tim could not deny that he had sold his cow to Mr. Robinson, and got his dinner from him; and then there was no end to the vile names Grip called him. He told every Ballintubber man to kick him, and every Ballintubber woman to spit upon the rascal, that sold himself to the Kilpatrick faction for a dinner. He finished by taking the horsewhip to Callaghan, who only escaped this, because the crowd hustled him out of the office.

"Boys, boys," he cried, "wont you listen to me. What would I sell myself to the Kilpatrick people for? or what good would it do them to buy me? Supposing I can get as fine crops out of my fields as Mr. Robinson, what would the Kilpatrick people be the better of it? And if we can get our rents lowered, and get rid of some of the agent's dues, who'll be the worse of it, except Mr. Grip? Isn't it foolish of you to take his part against me, when I often heard you complain of these same things between ourselves?

Tim's words were drowned in cries of "Hurroo for Ballintubber," "Down with the Kilpatrick vagaboad;" and the only answer he got was, the rap of a sod of turf on his right ear; and as he saw there was harder coming, he cried, "well, boys, if you haven't sense to know your friends, that's no reason why I should stay to be made a shilly cock of;" and with that he cut for his life, and glad enough he was when he found himself at home.

THE ASSUMPTION OF THE VIRGIN.

In our last number we undertook to give our readers some information about the Festival of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary, celebrated on every 15th August by the Church of Rome.

As some of our Protestant readers may be ignorant enough not to know what event or doctrine is meant to be commemorated by that festival, we must begin by informing them what it is that Roman Catholics mean by the "*Assumption.*"

They believe, as a matter of fact, that, after the Blessed Virgin died and was buried, which they say took place A.D. 47 or 48, her *body* was supernaturally removed from her coffin, and *taken up* into heaven; which miraculous removal is denominated, by the Church of Rome, her "Assumption."

The *death* and *burial* of the Blessed Virgin are not, therefore, the matters in dispute—the only controversy is, as to the truth or falsehood of the alleged *fact*, that after her death and burial her dead body was *taken up* to heaven, in the same miraculous manner that the living body of our Lord, after his resurrection from the dead, *ascended* into heaven.

Now, that such a miracle was just as possible and as easy for the Almighty to perform as the ascension of our Blessed Lord, or the translation of Enoch or Elijah, no Protestant doubts. The only question is, did God work this particular miracle, and what kind and amount of testimony have we that He did so.

We admit, fully, the possibility (we might even, perhaps, *a priori*, admit the probability) that God would distinguish so highly-favoured a vessel of mercy, by raising her to the beatified and glorified state before the ordinary period; but were we to allow our minds to speculate about *probabilities* in such matters, we should deem it more probable that the Blessed Virgin would not have died at all, but that she would have ascended visibly into heaven, or been visibly translated, as Jesus and Elijah. Descending, therefore, from the regions of imagination and *a priori* reasonings, to the humble sphere of historical facts, let us see what is the *evidence* that the dead body of the Blessed Virgin was taken up into heaven. *Who saw*, and *who recorded*, this miraculous event; and *where* did it take place?

Now, it is worthy of notice, we think, in the first place, that although the sacred historians bring down the record of events to a considerably later date (fifteen years, at least, after the death of the Holy Virgin), not one of them takes the slightest notice of this wonderful miracle. The Holy Scriptures are absolutely and profoundly silent about any such event having taken place; and have not a single word about either the time, the manner, or the place of Mary's death; or even as to whether she accompanied St. John in his travels or not. All that the Scriptures tell us is, that immediately after the crucifixion that disciple (St. John) took her to his own home.*

We must choose some other occasion for observing upon the affecting and edifying incident which St. John records as having occurred, relative to the Blessed Virgin, while the Lord Jesus was hanging on the cross; for the present, we shall only say, that if it had been our Lord's will that his beloved mother should be exalted into an object of religious adoration, and that all his followers should look to *her* as the channel through which the favours and blessings of heaven were to be conveyed to mankind, his words and conduct towards her, on that occasion, would, up to this hour, seem to be inexplicable; as would be also the words of the evangelist, St. John, *closing* his narrative, by the simple words—"And from that hour that disciple took her to his own home."

The silence of Scripture, however, may be, perhaps, made up for by the clearness and consistency of the uninspired testimony of other faithworthy writers; and the time, the place, the circumstances, may be recorded in such authentic histories, or supported by such early primitive traditions, that no fair and impartial inquirer can refuse credence to it. Let us see whether this be the case.

We had hoped that some of our Roman Catholic correspondents or readers would have saved us the trouble of searching for such evidence, by furnishing us with it themselves, or, at least, referring us to some writer of acknowledged orthodoxy and ability, in whose works it might be found. As, however, we have been disappointed in that, we think not unreasonable, hope, we must only do the best we can to elucidate the matter ourselves; though, in doing so, we feel very like a man attempting to grope his way in the dark, or to see through an impenetrable mist, which grows more dense and foggy the further he goes into it.

The first thing that strikes us is, that the very place where this astonishing event is said to have taken place, is a matter of dispute and uncertainty. Some maintaining that the Blessed Virgin breathed her last at Ephesus, while others affirm, that her departure from this world took place at Jerusalem. If, as the later writers affirm, the Virgin was buried in the Valley of Jehosaphat, in the Garden of Gethsemane, we think it rather singular that neither St. Jerome or St. Epiphanius, who are the two Fathers most likely to have heard of it, for the reasons we shall presently state, should have taken the least notice of it. M. Le Quien (Ordinis FF Prædicatorum), the Roman Catholic editor of the works of John Damascenus, observes on the silence of those two eminent writers on the subject, and says, that though St. Jerome passed a great part of his life at Bethlehem, and purports to enumerate in his "Epitaph on Paula," all the places in Palestine distinguished by any remarkable event, he has yet said nothing of this; and further says, that Epiphanius, though he lived long in Palestine, actually declares, that nothing was known as to the death or burial of the Blessed Virgin.* We cannot help agreeing with M. Le Quien, that *it is* passing strange that neither St. Epiphanius, who died A.D. 370, or St. Jerome, who died, A.D. 418, knew anything of the miraculous removal to heaven of the Blessed Virgin's body, if the Church then believed it! Was the feast of the Assumption celebrated on every 15th of August in their days?

The silence of Epiphanius and Jerome, however, may, perhaps, be amply made up for by the testimony of the rest of the Fathers; and it may be thought that they did not notice it, because it had been so frequently recorded by others.

What, however, will our readers think when we tell them, that not one of the writings of the primitive Fathers contain the slightest hint that they believed, or had even heard of such a tradition in their days.

Ignatius is silent; so is Justin Martyr. So are Irenæus, the two Clements, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Methodius, and Lactantius. So are Athanasius, Cyril, and Hilary, as well as Epiphanius and Jerome.

Will any Roman Catholic deny this to be the case? and is it possible that none of them ever heard the story? or had they so little zeal for the honour of the Virgin as not to record or even allude to it?

How ominous is such dark silence, how inexplicable, on any other hypothesis than the one we conceive to be the true one, either that the story had not then been invented; or, if it existed at all, that it was universally considered as a fabulous legend, unworthy of serious notice.

We believe that the modern doctrine of *development* has not yet been applied to the discovery of long-concealed historical *facts*; otherwise, perhaps, we ought to have said that there is another way of explaining the matter—viz., by supposing that the *fact* of the Assumption had not yet been *developed*, and that the silence of the Fathers may be attributable to their unhappily having lived too soon!

Let us grope on, however, and, perhaps, still we may be fortunate enough to arrive at some glimmering light on this mysteriously dark subject.

The earliest testimony we have ever seen referred to is a short supposed entry in a chronological work (long since lost), called the Chronicon of Eusebius, of which we shall have more to say another time, which is said to record (if such an entry can be considered a record) that *some* persons (whom he does not name, and the date even of whose writings he states nothing about), had written, not what they knew or had heard as a matter of fact, or received by tradition, but that a *revelation* had been made to them of a fact alleged to have taken place nearly 300 years before the time of that writer! The supposed entry is as follows:—"A.D. 48, Mary, the Virgin, the mother of Jesus, was taken up into heaven, as *some* write that it has been *revealed* to them."†

Now, suppose that this passage really came from the pen of Eusebius himself, is this the way he would have mentioned *a universally known and believed historical fact*, annually commemorated in the Christian Church on the 15th August, in the Festival of the Assumption, and in which he believed himself, as a doctrine of the Church?

So far, however, is this supposed entry, from deserving the name of Eusebius, that the above passage is now acknowledged to be a *palpable interpolation*, even in the alleged Latin translation, which is all that now exists of the Chronicon of Eusebius, which was written in Greek. There are seven manuscripts of this Latin translation in the Vatican library alone, not one of which contains anything of the kind, and Bishop Arnaldus Pontacus, the Roman Catholic editor of the Chronicon, printed at Bourdeaux, A.D. 1604, p. 566, tells us naively enough, that he was restrained from expunging it, only because nothing certain, as to the Assumption of the Virgin, could be substituted in its place!‡ Its spuriousness, however, is now no longer a question of dispute or doubt; for it is excluded from the Milan edition of 1818, by Angelus Mains and John Zohrab;§ and no trace of it is to be found in the Armenian version, published by the monks of the Armenian convent, near Venice, in 1818.

The next testimony is an anonymous work called the "Transitus," or Assumption of the Blessed Virgin, which appears (though we believe it is no longer extant) to have gained some currency in the fifth century. Who was its writer, or what statements it contained, we are unable to state; but it is a curious fact that, at the close of that century (A.D. 494) the council of Rome, with Pope Gelasius at its head, among the books not received, specifies as apocryphal, the book which is called the *Transitus*, or the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin.*

Well, we must admit that as yet we seem to be still getting deeper into the mist, and if the next authority be any better as helping to prove that in the course of the 5th century *part* of the Christian world were disposed to believe in this late-discovered miracle, we fear it will not much assist in establishing its existence as a generally believed historical fact, handed down by tradition from the earliest ages.

Whatsoever be its value, however, we shall, as impartial inquirers, give it to our readers, as we find it.

It is a letter said to have been written by Sophronius, the presbyter, about the beginning of the 5th century, entitled "Ad Paulam et Eustochium de Assumptione B. M. Virginis," and may be found in the 5th vol. of Jerome's works, p. 82 (Ed. Benedic. Paris, 1706). It was originally ascribed to St. Jerome, and is, therefore, included in that volume. We are not surprised that Baronius expresses much dissatisfaction with the writer; but, by assigning to the letter a still later date than the works of Sophronius, the Cardinal obviously only adds force to the argument for the comparatively recent origin of the story of the Assumption. That the letter is of *ancient* origin cannot be doubted, for our readers will readily believe that no Protestant forgeries were ever admitted among the works of St. Jerome, or could possibly, for a moment, have been mistaken for his. Whoever penned the letter, however, whether we look to the sensible and pious sentiments contained in it, or to its undisputed antiquity, we think the following extract cannot fail to be interesting; and we beg the earnest attention of such of our Roman Catholic readers to it as have been accustomed to treat the fact of the Assumption as if it stood upon the same undoubted testimony as the fact of the resurrection of our Blessed Lord himself.

"Many of our people," says the writer,† "doubt whether Mary was taken up together with her body, or went away, leaving the body. But how, or at what time, or by what persons, her holy body was taken hence, or whither removed, or whether it rose again *is not known*; although *some* will maintain that she is already revived, and is clothed with a blessed immortality with Christ in heavenly places, which very many have affirmed also of the blessed John the Evangelist, his servant, to whom, being a virgin, the Virgin was intrusted by Christ; because in his sepulchre, as it is reported, nothing is found but manna, which also is seen to flow forth. Nevertheless, which of these opinions should be thought the more true, we doubt; yet it is better to commit all to God, to whom nothing is impossible, than to wish to define rashly, by our own authority, any thing *which we do not approve of.* . . . . . Because nothing is impossible with God, we do not deny that something of the kind was done with regard to the Blessed Virgin Mary; although, for caution's sake, *salvâ fide*, preserving our faith, we ought rather, with pious desire, to think than inconsiderately to decide, what, without any danger may remain unknown."

We think no one can deem the writer of the above letter a reviler of the Blessed Virgin, or *unwilling* to yield to the uniform testimony of antiquity, if any such had existed in his time. It is obvious, however, that, in his time, whenever he wrote, the tradition regarding the Blessed Virgin's Assumption was *not generally* received in the Church, but that it was, at best, a point of grave doubt and discussion among the faithful, many of whom thought it an act of pious forbearance to abstain from pronouncing any decided opinion upon the subject.

What, then, is the first testimony in *favour* of the alleged fact, for hitherto we seem to have rather been dealing with evidence *against* it.

As we have already stated in our last number, the earliest author in whose works the tradition is found, so far, at least as we have been able to discover, is John Damascenus, a monk of Jerusalem, who flourished somewhat before the middle of the eighth century, and who, therefore, stood, in point of date, relatively to the period of the Virgin's death, pretty much as Dr. Cullen would now do, as to any ecclesiastical miracle which he might think proper to narrate now, as having occurred at Canterbury or elsewhere in the reign of William the Conqueror!

John Damascenus gives it, moreover, not on his own authority, but by way of extract, out of a work which he calls the Enthymiac History (not now extant), and about even the general character of which the learned are not agreed. Lambecius maintains that what Damascenus here quotes was not an ecclesiastical history, written by Enthymius, who is said to have died A.D., 472, but a biographical history of Enthymius himself, written by one Cyril, a monk, who died, A.D. 531. This opinion of Lambecius is combated by Cotelerius, and the discussion only adds to the denseness of the mist, which envelopes the whole from first to last. Whether Enthymius was the

* St. Epiphanius, towards the end of the fourth century, observes, that in the sacred Scriptures there was no mention made concerning the death of Mary—whether she was dead or not, buried or not buried; also, that the Scriptures were silent whether, when St. John went into Asia, she was the companion of his journey. "In quibus nullum de Mariæ obitu mentionem reperiet, mortua sit neene, sepulta an non sepulta fuerit. Ac cum Joannes interim in Asiam profectus sit nusquam tamen B. Virginem itineris comitem secum illum habuisse significat; sed de ea re penitus Scriptura conticuerit"—Epiphanius adv. Hæres. lib. iii, tom. ii., cap. xi., Oper., vol. i., p. 1013. Paris, 1622.

* Nam falsse ignotum Hieronymo qui magnam vitæ partem Bethlemi hand procul a Sancta civitate egit, ultam ejus sepulcrum indicat, præsertim vero in epitaphio S. Paulæ viduæ, in quo sacra Palæstinæ loca omnia accura è recensetur. Sanctum quoque *Epiphanium* genere Palæstinum, qui diu in Palæstina versatus est, norunt omnes palam declarasse, incompertum esse, B. Virgo mortua sit, necne. Quod viri quidam eruditi non ita quidem affirmaverunt eam Ephesi defunctam esse, ac sepultam in Ecclesia, quæ Idcireo in ejus honorem consecrata est, et de ejus nomine nuncupata in qua Synodus tertia generalis cele brata est, hoc Epiphanii verba falsi arguunt."—Joh. Damasceni, oper tom ii., p. 858. Paris ed., 1712.

† Latin Transl., Bourd. Ed., p. 158. "Maria Virgo Jesu Christi mater ad filium cœlum assumitur, ut quidem fuisse sibi revelatum scribant."

‡ Non extant in A.L.M. Septem Vatica, et meritu delenda, si vera est Epiphanii et Cedreni opinio, &c. Verum nil immutandum duximus, quod nil certi constet ex priscis auctoribus de tempore et modo obitus ipsius." Pontacus honestly enough did all he *dared* to do by printing the spurious passage in a different type to call attention to it.

§ See p. 374.

* Sacr. Concil., Labbe and Cossart, tom. iv., p. 1264. Paris, 1671.

† St. Jerome's works, Bened. ed., tom v., p. 83.

author or the subject of the work, however, signifies, perhaps, but little; the work is lost—an epitome only survives—but even that abridgment throws no light upon the subject, for no trace is to be found in the epitome of the passage which John of Damascus purports to quote from it; and we are, therefore, correct in stating, that the earliest extant author in whose works the tradition is found is Damascenus, in the middle of the eighth century.

The passage occurs in the 2nd of the three homilies on "the Sleep of the Virgin," "Dormitio* Virginis," a term generally used by the Greeks as equivalent to the Latin "Assumptio," and affords a striking example of the manner in which Christian orators used to indulge in addresses and appeals, not only to the spirits of departed men, but even to things which never had life. Here the speaker, in his sermon, addresses the tomb of Mary, as if it had ears to hear, and an understanding to comprehend; and then represents the tomb as having a tongue to answer, and as calling forth from the preacher and his congregation an address of admiration and reverence. Such apostrophes, we think, cannot be too steadily borne in mind, when arguments are sought to be drawn from similar salutations, by ancient Christian orators, to saints or angels, or the Blessed Virgin herself.

"Thou, O tomb, of all holy sepulchres most holy," says John of Damascus, in this homily, "(for I will address thee as a living being), where is the much-desired and much-beloved body of the Mother of God?"† The answer of the tomb begins thus, "Why seek ye her in a tomb, who has been taken up on high to the heavenly tabernacles?" In reply to this the preacher, first deliberating with his hearers what answer he should make, thus addresses the tomb.‡ "Thy grace, indeed, is never-failing and eternal, &c., &c." He then introduces the alleged passage—"Ye see, beloved fathers and brethren, what answer the all-glorious tomb makes to us, and in proof that those things are so, in the Enthymiac history, the 3rd book and 40th ch., it is thus written word for word." "It has been above said that the holy Pulcheria built many churches to Christ at Constantinople, of these, however, there is one which was built in Blachernæ, in the beginning of [the reign of] Marcion of divine memory. These, therefore—namely, Marcion and Pulcheria—when they had built a venerable temple to the greatly-to-be celebrated and most holy Mother of God and ever Virgin Mary, and had decked it with all ornaments, sought her most holy body, which had conceived God. And having sent for Juvenal, § Archbishop of Jerusalem, and the Bishops of Palestine, who were living in the royal city on account of the Synod then held at Chalcedon,‖ they say to them, 'We hear that there is at Jerusalem the first and famous Church of Mary Mother of God and ever Virgin, in the garden called Gethsemane, where her body, which bore the Life, was deposited in a coffin; we wish, therefore, her relics to be brought here for the protection of this royal city.' But Juvenal answered, 'In the holy and divinely-inspired Scripture, indeed, nothing is recorded of the departure of the holy Mary, Mother of God; but from an ancient and most true tradition, we have received that at the time of her glorious falling asleep, all the holy Apostles, who were going through the world for the salvation of the nations, *in a moment of time, borne aloft*, came together to Jerusalem, and when they were near her, they had a vision of angels, and divine melody of the highest powers was heard; and thus with divine, and more than heavenly glory, she delivered her holy soul into the hands of God, in an unspeakable manner. But that which had conceived God, being borne with angelic and apostolic psalmody, with funeral rites, was deposited in a coffin in Gethsemane. In this place the chorus and singing of the angels continued for three whole days. But, after three days, on the angelic music ceasing, since one of the Apostles had been absent, and came after the third day, and wished to adore the body that had conceived God, the Apostles who were present opened the coffin; but the body, pure and every way to be praised, they could not at all find. And when they found only those things in which it had been laid out and placed there, and were filled with an ineffable fragrance, proceeding from those things, they shut the coffin. Being astonished at the miraculous mystery, they could form no other thought but that He who, in His own person, had vouchsafed to be clothed with flesh, and to be made man of the most holy Virgin, and to be born in the flesh—God the Word and Lord of Glory—and who, after birth, had preserved her virginity immaculate, had seen it good, after she had departed from among the living, to honour her uncontaminated and unpolluted body by a translation before the common and universal resurrection."

And is this, indeed, the evidence on which this great fact is to be believed? A monk of Jerusalem, in the *eighth* century, cites a passage from a book which he calls the Enthymiac history, whose author is unknown, and which work now exists only in an epitome which is wholly silent on the matter, which passage records that Juvenal (an Archbishop it would seem of somewhat doubtful fame) informed the Emperor that a tradition had reached him concerning a miraculous event nearly 400 years before, that the body of Mary was taken out of her coffin without the knowledge of the Apostles who had deposited it there; which, reduced into general terms, amounts to this, that a man who lived 700 years after an alleged miraculous event *says*, that the writer of a book (since lost) *stated* that another man, whose character is doubtful, *told* another man that he had *heard* and believed that such a miracle did take place 400 years before! Whilst the primitive and inspired account (recording most minutely the journeys and proceedings of some of those very Apostles before and subsequent to the supposed event, and the letters of others), makes no mention at all of any transaction of the kind; and of all the intermediate historians and writers of every character, not one gives the slightest intimation that any rumour of it had ever reached them! And is this, indeed, the kind of evidence on which one of the most solemn religious festivals of the Church of Rome, "the crown and consummation of them all,"* is built? *A says* that *B wrote* that C *told* D that he C had *heard* and believed that a miracle occurred at Jerusalem 400 years before!!

What, we ask, would those eminent judges, Chief Justice Monahan, or Chief Baron Pigot, think of such evidence in the Courts of Exchequer or Common Pleas? or how would such eminent lawyers as Sergeant O'Brien, Mr. Fitzgerald, or Mr. O'Hagan, like to argue upon such evidence in the Court of Queen's Bench? and is it possible that any educated Roman Catholic can be satisfied with it, in a matter of such infinitely greater importance than any question likely to arise in any of our courts of justice?

Can, or will none of the eminent Roman Catholics we have ventured to name, or none other of our Roman Catholic friends and readers, have the manliness to go to Dr. Cullen and place this paper in his hands, and adjure him by that allegiance, that "*intensity of devotion*," which he has so earnestly expressed towards the Blessed Virgin, to come forward and publish whatever *better* evidence his Church can adduce in support of this stupendous miracle? This is no matter of mere political party, or polemical strife, nor a point to stand on punctilios or etiquette. Where souls are the stake, the game is a solemn one. The safety of immortal souls is in the balance; and will Dr. Cullen refuse or withhold any evidence within his power? The question is, whether we shall open the eyes of our Roman Catholic countrymen to things by which their salvation may be perilled, or will Dr. Cullen open the eyes of Protestants on a matter on which their eternal salvation may depend?

If Dr. Cullen or any of his clergy attend to this appeal, anything he or they may think fit to write will, we can assure them, meet with our most respectful attention; but if Dr. Cullen shrinks from this most sacred duty, we tell him plainly and solemnly, that his devotedness to his Celestial Queen, and much boasted zeal for her honour, will henceforth be set down by thinking men as little more than a zeal which explodes in high-sounding epithets, but really means nothing but this, that, as far as he is concerned, all the world may believe or not, just as it pleases them; but as to giving a *reason* for the faith that he professes, he will not condescend to do so to any one, even to save him from the deadly sin of heresy on the one hand, or the fatal abyss of infidelity on the other. We will not, however, anticipate. We shall see.

* Græcè Κοίμησις.

† Jam vero, O Sacrorum omnium sepulchrorum sacratissimum, (tecum enim tanquam animatum ea-se, mihi sermo erit) . . . . ubi sacratissimum illud atque amabilissimum corpus Dei genetricis? (Sepulchri responsio). Quid eum in sepulchro quæritis, quæ ad cœlestia tabernacula elata est? . . . . . "Quid porro nos vicissim ad sepulchrum dicemus? Tua quidem gratia perennis atque indeficiens est," &c.—Opera. Damasc., Vol. II., p. 878. Paris ed., 1712.

‡ P. 881.

§ Le Quien, the editor of the works of John Damascenus, insinuates the possibility of this Juvenal (whose character he makes no scruple to stigmatize) having invented the whole story, in order, for his own sinister purposes to deceive Marcion and Pulcheria. Just, he says, as Juvenal forged certain writings for the purpose of securing to himself the primacy of Jerusalem—a crime laid to the charge of Juvenal by Pope Leo the Great, in his letter to Maximus, Bishop of Antioch.—"Caterum Marcianum et Pulcheriam certiores factos esse a Juvenale Hierosolymitano de Delparæ Virginis Assumtione hentiquam austin infideli uti nec affirmare, hæc periude *conficta esse* ab eodem Juvenale, ac commentitia illa scripta, quæ ab eo producta falsæ ad obtinendum Palæstinæ principatum, Leo Magnus queritur in epistola ad Maximum Antiochenum." Id. p. 879. See also, Leo's works, vol. I., p. 1215, epist. cxix., where our readers will still find the charge referred to by Le Quien.

‖ If this story of Archbishop Juvenal, when attending the Council of Chalcedon, having told the Emperor this remarkable tradition be true, is it not somewhat strange that in the Acts of this Council there is not the faintest trace of any allusion to the supposed fact or alleged tradition, though the transactions of that council, in many of its most minute details, are recorded, and though its discussions brought the name and existence of the Virgin Mary continually, and with the most lively interest, before the minds of all who attended it?

* The Assumption of the Virgin Mary is the greatest of all the festivals which the Church celebrates in her honour."—Alban Butler, vol. viii. p. 178.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We thank "A Friend to the Layman" for his obliging letter and useful information.

We have again to apologize to several of our friends for postponing their valued communications. If our correspondents would recollect the limited space of our columns, when forwarding letters or articles, it would prevent much embarrassment and disappointment.

We beg to call the attention of our correspondents to the utility of adding their name and address to their communications.

To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal, which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, SEPTEMBER, 1851.

Our Roman Catholic correspondents have latterly applied themselves chiefly to the question of the Catholic Church—of whom does it consist, and to whom does the name rightly belong? but, we think, they have not taken a sufficiently comprehensive view of the subject; and we ask their candid consideration of the method we now propose.

The Church has been more universal in respect of time than of place. It is the Church of all ages, still more than the Church of all nations. Those who would form any right idea of the Catholic Church—what it is, and of whom it consists—must study it from its first beginning. None of our correspondents have yet thought of doing this; here lies the source of their errors; and to correct this is our present object.

The question our correspondents have raised is about Churches, rather than about individuals; to this question, therefore, we confine ourselves for the present.

What was the constitution of the Church as established by the Apostles? What was necessary *then* to entitle a Church, in any particular place, to call itself a portion of the Church universal—to claim to itself the title of Catholic? Those who have not considered this question, cannot be prepared to decide what is necessary *now*. Let us, therefore, take a survey of the Church as the Apostles left it.

We read in Scripture of a Church at Jerusalem, a Church at Antioch, a Church at Corinth, a Church at Ephesus, a Church at Philippi, the Church of the Smyrneans, the Church of the Laodiceans, the Churches of Asia (Rom. xvi. 19), &c., &c.

Will any one say of these (as some of our correspondents say now), "it is evident that one only can be Catholic, or universal; all others, however numerous, can have no claim to the title?" Does not every one see that all of them together, made up one Catholic or universal Church; and that each of them had, in this sense, as good a claim as any other to the title of Catholic?

In what did their unity consist?

All these Churches were bound to preserve, pure and unchanged, "the faith once delivered" to them. They were bound to preserve the ministry which the Apostles had established in them. And each Church was bound to preserve communion and Christian fellowship and love, on the terms settled by the Apostles, with all the others. As each Christian was bound to communicate with the Church in that place in which he lived, so the Church, in each place, was bound to communicate with the Churches in all other places. Corinth could not intrude into Rome, to set up a second Church or society of Christians there; nor Rome into Corinth. Wherever a Christian went, he found *one* Church in that place; and he found himself a member of that Church. In this consisted the unity of one Catholic Church. But we nowhere find in Scripture that any one of these Churches was bound to be *subject* to any other of them. If there be such a place in Scripture, let our Roman Catholic correspondents produce it.

Christ prayed for the unity of his Church (John, ch. xvii., v. 21-23), and his Apostles commanded it (Rom. xvi. 17), so it was worthy to be put in the Catholic creed, "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church." About holding that article of the creed, there is no difference between

Roman Catholics and us; it is in our creed as well as in theirs: we believe it as well as they.

Where, then, lies the difference between us? Take up the creed of Pope Pius IV. and you will see. That creed contains a SECOND article about the Catholic Church; one which never was found in any ancient Catholic creed: "I acknowledge the Holy Catholic and Apostolic *Roman Church* as *the mother and mistress of all Churches*." And that creed goes on to say, "this is the true Catholic faith, without which no one can be saved." To this we say—that *that* article is a plain, downright falsehood; and that it cannot be necessary to salvation to believe a lie.

THIS is the question about which Roman Catholics and we do differ: "Is the *Roman* Church *the mother and mistress* of all other Churches?" If this be the Catholic faith, then all Churches that refuse to acknowledge her as *mother and mistress* have thereby ceased to be Catholic, and have forfeited all right to the name; but if this be false, then no Church ceases to be Catholic by refusing to believe it.

We trust we have stated this question fairly. We invite Roman Catholics to join with us now in producing and examining the proofs.

Was the Roman Church the mother and mistress of all other Churches in the times of the Apostles? Was the Roman Church the *mother* of the Church of Jerusalem, the Church of Antioch, and of many other Churches which flourished before there was a Roman Church at all? Is there any proof in Scripture that the Roman Church was their *mistress* in the days of the Apostles? If there be, let it be now produced, that we may discuss it.

Did all other Churches acknowledge the Roman Church as their mother and mistress in the second, third, fourth, and fifth centuries? If they did, let the proofs be produced; if they did not, let it be acknowledged that this was then no part of the Catholic faith.

If there be any instances in those centuries of other Churches submitting to Rome as their "mother and mistress," let Roman Catholics now at last produce those instances. We can find no such instances, and, therefore, cannot produce them. But we do find strong and plain instances to the contrary, and those we will produce.

When first, after the Apostles' times, a great question arose in the Church (about the time of keeping Easter), the venerable Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, and disciple of St. John, went to confer about it with Anicetus, Bishop of Rome. The following account of what passed between them is given by Eusebius, who took it from an epistle written by Irenæus, a disciple of Polycarp:—

"And the blessed Polycarp having come to Rome, in the the time of Anicetus; and having some small difference between each other, about some other things, immediately they were reconciled, not disputing much with one another on this head (the dispute about Easter). For neither could Anicetus persuade Polycarp not to observe those things which he had always observed along with John, the disciple of our Lord, and the other Apostles with whom he had lived; neither did Polycarp persuade Anicetus to keep those things; he saying that he ought to hold the custom of those who were elders before him. And these things being thus, they communicated with each other, and in the church Anicetus yielded to Polycarp the office of celebrating the Eucharist, as it were out of reverence; and they departed from each other in peace—those who observed, and those who did not, having the peace of the whole Church."*

Does not this prove that there was *then* no such notion in the Catholic Church as that all other Churches must follow Rome, and be subject to her? If such a rule had then existed, would not Polycarp have set the example of obedience? But he thought it his duty to say, that what he had learned from the Apostles was different from what was practised in the Church of Rome. But both parties continued Catholic by preserving communion with each other: they were still one Catholic Church.

Roman Catholics will, perhaps, tell us, that the question was one of little consequence. Let them wait a little.

What we have related above took place, probably, soon after the year 100. For about seventy years from that time, both parties continued to follow their own customs, without any dissension or division arising between them on that account; and then Victor, Bishop of Rome, held a council about it at Rome; and so did the French bishops, at Lyons; and the Bishops of Palestine, and of Pontus, and of several other places: and all these separate councils decided that the custom which the Asiatic Churches had followed, from St. John and St. Polycarp, ought to be given up. On this, Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, and all the bishops of Asia, wrote to Victor, to say that they were only following the custom which St. John, and Polycarp, and others had established and handed down in Asia, and that they would not give it up. We tell the rest of the story in the words of Eusebius:—

"Upon this, Victor, Bishop of Rome, attempted at once to cut off from the common unity, as heterodox, the dioceses of all Asia, together with the neighbouring Churches; and he proscribed them by letters, pronouncing all the brethren there wholly excommunicated. But these things did not please all the bishops; they, therefore, exhorted him, in turn, to study the things that concern peace and unity, and love towards his neighbour. Their words are in existence, very cuttingly reproving Victor."*

And then, as a specimen of those letters, Eusebius gives the letter of Irenæus, which holds up the conduct of Anicetus to Polycarp, as we have related above.

Here it is clear, that even those Churches which preferred the custom of Rome to that of Asia, did not dream that it was necessary that Asia should follow Rome; but did all unite in condemning the Bishop of Rome for breaking off communion with the Churches of Asia; and did never suppose that the Churches of Asia had ceased to be a part of the Catholic Church, merely because the Bishop of Rome had presumed to pass his sentence of excommunication upon them.

There is no greater name among the Fathers than St. CYPRIAN, and he shall be our next instance.

About the year 256, Novatian having established a new sect, and some who had been baptized in that sect having been converted to the Church, a question arose whether it were necessary or right to baptize such persons over again on their admission to the church.

St. Cyprian thought all such persons must, in every case, be baptized over again.

Stephen, the Pope or Bishop of Rome, was of an opposite opinion; and his opinion is thus given by Cyprian, from Stephen's own letter:—"If, then, any shall come to you from any heresy whatsoever, let there be no innovations beyond what has been handed down, that hands be laid on such to repentance." *

The force of this is thus explained by St. Cyprian—"He has *forbidden* one coming *from any heresy whatever* to be baptized in the Church."

Of this decision of Pope Stephen, Cyprian says, "He endeavours to uphold the cause of heretics against Christians, and against the Church of God." And St. Cyprian says further, "If this be commanded in the Gospels, or in the Epistles, or Acts of the Apostles, then let this divine and holy tradition be observed." And, again, "But if in times past it was nowhere at all commanded *or written*, that hands only should be laid on a heretic to repentance, and so communion be granted to him. . . . What obstinacy is that, or what presumption, to prefer human tradition to divine ordinances, and not to perceive that God is displeased and angered, as often as human tradition relaxes and sets aside the Divine command." In which it is clear that St. Cyprian had no notion that the Church of Africa must submit to the Church of Rome. St. Cyprian clearly thought, that in any such question we must go back to the written Scriptures for a decision, without paying any regard to the tradition of the Pope of Rome.

That Stephen did, upon this, proceed to excommunicate the Churches both of Asia and Africa, is plain, from a letter from St. Firmilian, a famous Bishop of Asia, to St. Cyprian; which letter also makes it plain how little they cared for such excommunication.

"What can be more lowly and meek than to have disagreed with so many bishops throughout the whole world, breaking peace with them severally, in various modes of discord, now with the Eastern Churches, now with yourselves, who are in the south? . . . This is to have kept the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace, *to cut himself off from the unity of charity*, and in all things to make *himself an alien to the brethren*, and with the fury of contumacious discord to rebel against the sacrament and the faith. . . . And yet Stephen is not ashamed to give support to such (heretics) against the Church, and for the upholding of heretics to divide the brotherhood; nor, further, *to call Cyprian* FALSE CHRIST, and FALSE APOSTLE, and DECEITFUL WORKER. *He, conscious that all these marks are* IN HIMSELF, has been beforehand, and *falsely objected to another* WHAT HIMSELF DESERVED!"

It was thus that the Pope's excommunications, by which he made divisions in the Church, were *then* regarded by CATHOLICS. And yet no one, either then or since, has ever ventured to deny that Cyprian and Firmilian were Catholics, or to say that the Churches of Africa and Asia, thus rejected out of the communion of Rome, were not still parts of the universal Church, and entitled to the name of Catholic.†

St. Augustine is our next instance. If Rome be the mother and mistress of all Churches, to which all other Churches are bound to submit, then Rome has a right to revise and correct whatever decisions any other Church may make.

This is the foundation of the right of appeals to Rome.

About the year 416 Pope Zozimus claimed this right over the Churches of Africa; yet he durst not venture to put it on this ground. So he sent them a Canon of the General Council of Nice, giving him this power over all Churches.

---

* Και τοῦ μακαριου Πολυκαρπου επιδημησαντος τῃ Ρωμῃ επι Ανικητου, και περι αλλων τινων μικρα σχοντες προς αλληλους, ενθυς ειρηνευσαν. περι τουτου τοῦ κεφαλαιου μη φιλεριζησαντες προς ἑαυτους. ουτε γαρ ὁ Ανικητος τον Πολυκαρπον πεισαι ἐδυνατο μη τηρεῖν ἁ τε μετ' Ιωαννου τοῦ μαθητοῦ τοῦ κυριου ἡμων και τῶν λοιπῶν Αποςολῶν οἷς συνδιετριψεν, αει τετηρηκοτα. ουτε μεν ὁ Πολυκαρπος τον Ανικητον επεισε τηρεῖν, λεγοντα την συνηθειαν τῶν προ αυτοῦ Πρεσβυτερῶν οφειλειν κατεχειν. και τουτων ὀντως ἐχοντων ἐκοινωνησαν ἑαυτοῖς, και εν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ παριχωρησεν ὁ Ανικητος την Ευχαριςιαν τῶ Πολυκαρπῳ κατ' ευτροπην δηλονοτι, και μετ ειρηνης απ' αλληλων απηλλαγησαν, πασης της εκκλησιας ειρηνην ἐχοντων και των τηρουντων, και των μη τηρουντων.—Eusebius, Eccl. Hist., book v., c. 24.

* επι τουτοις ὁ μεν της Ῥωμαιων προεςως Βικτωρ, αθροως της Ασιας πασης ἁμα ταις ὁμοροις ἐκκλησιαις τας παροικιας αποτεμνειν ὡς ἑτεροδοξουσας, της κοινῆς ἑνωσεως πειρᾶται. και ςηλιτευει γε δια γραμματων, ακοινωνητους αρδην παντας τους ἐκεῖσε ανακηρυττων αδελφους. αλλ' ου πᾶσι γε τοῖς επισκοποις ταῦτ' ηρεσκετο. αντιπαρακελευονται δητα αυτῳ, τα τῆς ειρηνης και τῆς προς τους πλησιον ἑνωσεως και αγαπης φρονειν. φερυνται δε και αι τουτων φωναι, πληκτικωτερον καθαπτομενων τοῦ Βικτορος.—Euseb., Eccl. Hist., book v., c. 24, p. 192.

* Ep. 74. Ed. Oxford, 1844.

† It is hardly to our purpose to enter into the merits of that question; but it may interest our readers to know that, in the next ages, St. Augustine clearly proved, that both Pope Stephen and St. Cyprian were wrong, in going into opposite extremes; and that a middle course should be taken, admitting the baptism of those sects which baptized in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost, and rejecting the baptism of such as did not use that form. This course was approved, and adopted by the whole Church ever since. The Council of Trent pronounced an anathema on any one who should maintain the doctrine of St. Cyprian.—Sess. vii. de Baptismo, Can. iv. Yet the Roman Catholic priests follow St. Cyprian's practice now by rebaptizing Protestants.

The Churches of Africa replied that they would obey all the Canons of Nice; but that there was not any such Canon among them as that which he sent! The dispute waxed hot with his two successors, Boniface I. and Celestine; Augustine and the African bishops sent to Constantinople and Alexandria for certified copies of the Canons of Nice, and from both places they got proof that there was no such Canon among the Canons of Nice, as that which the Pope said was among them. Accordingly, St. Augustine and TWO HUNDRED AND TWENTY bishops of Africa wrote to Pope Celestine that the Council of Nice had passed no such Canon as he said; but "had clearly committed both the clergy of the lower order, and also the bishops themselves to their own metropolitans; and had most prudently and justly provided that all affairs of whatever kind should be finally determined in their own localities, in which they arose;" and they say, "is there any one who could suppose that our God would inspire justice in examination into *any one person whatsoever* (meaning the Pope especially), and yet refuse it to a multitude of prelates collected in council."* They, therefore, flatly refused to submit to the Pope's authority, or to let him alter their decisions. They did more—they passed a decree that any clergyman of Africa, who should presume to appeal from the judgment of the Church of Africa to any place beyond the sea† should not be allowed the communion of the Church within Africa. This decree was repeated more than once: we find it in the African code;‡ in a collection of African canons;§ in the second Council of Milevis, in Africa;‖ and we find it also in the Canon law, Decret. Gratian. 11, quest. iii., c. 34; and, again, 2, quest. vi., ch. 35, in which last place Gratian adds a note of his own, "unless, perhaps, they should have appealed to the Roman See;" but this exception was added by Gratian 700 years after the Canon was made; and only seems to show his Notion, then, of what the Canon *ought to have been, but, was not.*

If Rome was "mother and mistress" *then*, this was a flagrant violation of her authority. Any Church that should pass such a Canon *now*, would immediately be condemned at Rome, as cut off from the Catholic Church. Well, then, was the Church of Africa cut off *then*? It is a curious and an interesting question, which we must try to answer. We have an epistle of Pope Boniface II., said to have been written about the year 530, as follows:—

"For Aurelius, formerly bishop of the aforesaid Church of Africa,¶ with his colleagues,** at the instigation of the devil, began, in the times of our predecessors, Boniface (I.) and Celestine, to set himself up against the Roman Church; but Eulalius, now seeing himself cut off from the communion of the Roman Church by the sins of Aurelius, humbly recollected himself, and seeking the peace and communion of the Roman Church, by subscribing together with his colleagues, condemned by apostolic authority all writings which were made against the privileges of the Roman Church, under whatever pretence."††

From this letter it would appear that Aurelius and Augustine, and the other African bishops, with the whole African Church, had been cut off from the Church of Rome, under Pope Celestine—that is, about the year 420; and that the African Church had continued so cut off until the year 530, when Boniface II. was Pope, and Eulalius Primate of Africa—that is, for *one hundred and ten years*—and yet we never find that any one has ventured to say that St. Augustine, and Aurelius, and the African bishops, during that time, were not Catholics!

But Cardinal Baronius, and Cardinal Bellarmine, and Archbishop Binius all say that this letter of Pope Boniface II. is forged; and Binius affirms that Augustine and the African Church were never separated for a single day from the Church of Rome. Now, we are quite ready to admit that that letter of Pope Boniface II., like so many other letters of the Popes of Rome, was a forgery. But, what follows then? No one says that the letter of St. Augustine and the African bishops to Pope Celestine was a forgery. Well, then, it appears confessed, that in those ages a Church might resolve finally to settle all its own affairs within itself, and for that purpose might disown, resist, and defy the authority of the Roman Church, without being thereby separated from the communion of the Catholic or universal Church.

We commend these facts to the consideration of Roman Catholics. Let them discuss and settle with us, *first*, what was the constitution of the Catholic Church in early ages; and then we will go on and discuss with them, which, the Roman Church, or the Church of England and Ireland, has violated that constitution in later times.

Let them remember that the question turns upon this, whether the Roman Church be "mother and mistress of all Churches." If that be true, their creed is right, and we must submit; if that be false, *we* are not bound to believe a lie.

We ask them to tell us "how old is that doctrine?" *We* find in the second General Council, which they themselves acknowledge to be a general council, that Jerusalem is the mother of all other Churches.* Will Roman Catholics now tell us where *they* find that the Roman Church is "the mother and mistress of all Churches?" Let them produce the oldest document in which they find that stated. Bring it forth. Why not? Let all men behold the origin of this doctrine, and see whether it can be traced to anything but the FORGED *decretal epistles* of the Popes!

If it cannot, will Roman Catholics then call on us to believe that to be a part of THE CATHOLIC FAITH, or *necessary to salvation*, which they cannot show to have any other origin than forgery and falsehood?

---

* Labbe and Coss. vol. ii. p. 1675. Ed. Paris, 1672.

† N.B.—The Pope, with whom their dispute was, lay just across the sea from Africa.

‡ Ad transmarina autem qui putaverit appellandum, a nullo intra Africam in communionem suscipiatur. Codex canonum Afric. Can. 125, Labbe and Coss., vol. ii., p. 1,129. Ed., Paris, A.D. 1672.

§ P. 1,667, Can. 92.

‖ P. 1,542, Can. 22.

¶ This Aurelius was Bishop of Carthage and Primate of Africa, at the time when the letter of the African bishops, above mentioned, was written to Pope Celestine.

** St. Augustine was one of these colleagues, "instigated by the devil."

††"Aurelius enim præfatæ Carthaginensis ecclesiæ olim episcopus, cum collegis suis (instigante diabolo) superbire temporibus prædecessorum nostrorum Bonifacii et Celestini contra Romanam ecclesiam cœpit; sed videns se modo peccatis Aurelii Eulalius e Romanæ ecclesiæ communione segregatum, humilians recognovit se, pacem et communionem Romanæ ecclesiæ petens, subscribendo una cum collegis suis, damnavit apostolica auctoritate omnes scriptoras quæ adversus Romanæ ecclesiæ privilegia facta quoquo ingenio fuerunt."—Bon. Pap. II., Ep. I., L. and Coss., vol. iv., p. 1,681, Paris, 1672.

* "Ecclesiæ Hierosolymitanæ, quæ est aliarum omnium mater." Letter of the second General Council (Constantinople) to the Bishop of Rome and the other bishops assembled there.—L. and Coss., vol. ii., p. 965.

Correspondence.

ON THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Catholicity, which is the fourth mark of the true Church, insisted upon by St. Augustine, and is professed in the creed as an essential part of her character, belongs to the Church in communion with the Bishop of Rome, by so unquestionable a title that no heretics (as St. Augustine observes) ever had the confidence to dispute it with her in his time. Nor could any of the present reformed Churches ever get the possession of it, though some of them have endeavoured with their utmost power. For truth and good sense have always prevailed, in spite of all their efforts. Go to what country you please, where there is a mixture of Roman Catholics and Protestants, we are as well known by the name of Catholics as a spade is known by the name of spade. And if a stranger asks a Protestant where the Catholic Church is, he will never direct him to his own Church, but to some Popish chapel. *Now*, if Papists be truly Catholics, I am sure of two things—1st, that the Church, in communion with the See of Rome, is the Church of Christ, upon earth; and, 2nd, that she is the only true Church upon earth; or else the creed, which describes the true Church of Christ to be one and Catholic, is false. But why cannot the reformed Churches pretend to be Catholics, as well as the Church of Rome?

The answer is plain, because there is a two-fold universality belonging to the Church of Christ—viz., universality of time, and universality of place; and, therefore, no Church can assume to herself the title of Catholic, unless she can show, that the faith she professes, is universal, both as to time and place, which no reformed Church can do.

Here, then, let us consider whether (for example) the faith of the Church of England, as it differs from Popery, can be called universal, either as to time or place. The Church's universality, in respect of place, must, certainly, be understood in a limited sense, or it will follow that Christ never had a Catholic Church upon earth: because there never yet was a time, wherein her communion was so universally received by the whole world, but that great numbers of heretics, and many heathen nations, were out of it. Yet, in Scripture language, she is styled the Church of all nations. Thus, St. Paul says:—"The truth of the Gospel, which is come unto you, as it is in all the world."—Col. i. 5, 6. And so he applies to the Apostles that of the psalmist—"yea, verily, their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world"—Rom. x. 18. The Church of Christ is, therefore, called Catholic or universal—1st., because she has been at all times, since the Apostles, the Church of many nations; 2dly, because she is the great body of Christians, from which all went forth; and, 3dly, because she either has been, or will be in every nation before the end of the world; that so all nations may be blessed in the seed of Abraham, according to God's promise.—Gen. xxii. 17, 18.

This is the true meaning of the Church's universality, in respect of place. But her universality in respect of time is without limitation—that is, it suffices not that she be the Church of many ages, but it imports that she is the Church of all ages, since the time of the Apostles, and derived originally from them, both as to her faith and communion. Whence it follows, that Catholics, truly so called, are the standing body of Christians, throughout all ages, from which all societies of heretics and schismatics have been cut off, as so many branches from the body of a tree, which continues standing and growing, whatever branches are lopped from it.

Now, let us see whether the reformed Church of England can make good her universality, either of time or place. Is she in the communion of that great body of Christians, from which all heretics and schismatics went forth, ever since the time of the Apostles? Alas! she herself broke off from it a little before the middle of the sixteenth century. Can she be styled the Church of all nations?

She who, three hundred years ago, was not the Church of any one nation in the world! Has her faith, contained in the thirty-nine articles, been preached in France, Spain, Italy, Greece, &c., &c., or any other nation under the sun, but what belongs to the crown of Great Britain? No man is so weak as to say it has. It is, then, a plain case she has no universality of place, even in the limited sense in which I have explained it.

Again, as to what we call universality of time (which, as I have remarked, comprehends all ages, from the Apostles down to us), she may as well pretend to have received the system of her whole faith and religion, by a continued succession of pastors, from Noah as from the Apostles. For how is it possible she could receive it from the Apostles, when Popery was in possession of the whole kingdom, for nine hundred years before the Reformation? And the book of Homilies declares, that all Christendom was drowned in Popery during all that space of time. Where, then, was that faith of the reformed Church of England in all those ages? By what external body, or society of men was it possessed? Finally, where was her succession of Protestant bishops for so many hundred years before the Protestant religion had a being? Was she a Christian Church, and yet in part of Christendom? For I am sure in Christendom she could not be, because all Christendom was overrun with Popery, even our enemies being judges. The plain truth, then, of the matter is, that she had no being at all before the sixteenth century; and she wants about one thousand five hundred years of universality of time. So that in effect Protestants may as well style themselves antediluvians as call themselves Catholics.

From what has been said it follows very plainly, that the Church in communion with the See of Rome is the Church of Christ, the only true Church. For the Catholic Church cannot but be the true Church; and if she be the true Church, there can be no other true one.—See Ephes. iv. 4, 5.

> "Thus one, thus pure, behold her largely spread,
> Like the fair ocean, from her mother-bed;
> From east to west, triumphantly she rides,
> All shores are watered by her wealthy tides.
>
> "As one yielded, so from errors free;
> As one to faith, so one in sanctity;
> Thus, she, and none but she, the humbling rage
> Of heresies opposed, from age to age."

St. Cyprian says, "there is one God, and one Christ, and one Church, and one chair, by our Lord's voice founded upon

Peter. Another altar to be set up, or a priesthood to be made, besides one altar and one priesthood is impossible. Whosoever gathereth elsewhere scattereth. It is adulterous, it is impious, it is sacrilegious, whatsoever is instituted by man's fury to the breach of God's divine disposition. Get ye far from the contagion of such men, and fly from their speeches as a cancer and a pestilence, &c."—Lib. de unit. Eccles. nu. 5. Whereby we learn that this unity of the Church, commended so much unto us, consists in the mutual fellowship of all bishops with the See of St. Peter.

Yours, &c.,

WILLIAM ROURKE.

We come now to consider the four notes of the Church which Mr. Rourke adopts from St. Augustine. We might remark that St. Augustine only uses them as *presumptions*, acknowledging that any argument founded on them would be overthrown if there were plain Scriptural evidence on the other side;* but we think it of far more importance to hasten on to the discussion—are these good marks of the Church or not?—than to spend time in disputing as to St. Augustine's opinion on the matter. No one would be more shocked than the good saint himself if any were to maintain that every argument, thrown out by him in the heat of controversy, was to be accepted as valid and not to be contradicted. None knew better than St. Augustine how to distinguish between the unhesitating reverence with which the dictates of inspiration are to be submitted to, and the wise discrimination with which we are to receive the teaching of the best of fallible men. "We ought not," says he, "to esteem the statements of any persons, however Catholic and of whatever repute, as the canonical Scriptures; so that it may not be lawful for us, without infringing on the honour due to these men, to blame or reject this or that in their writings if perchance we shall have found that they have been of a different opinion from what truth requires—truth, as understood by divine aid, either by others or by ourselves. Such is my feeling when reading the writings of others, and *such I wish to be the views of others when considering the meaning of mine.*"† We need, then, no other authority for passing on at once to discuss each of Mr. Rourke's four notes on their own merits, to examine as to each of them, is it a good mark of the Church, and does the Church of Rome possess it.

His first mark is "the agreement of people and nations." Now, we beg to refer Mr. Rourke to an article in our last volume, p. 40, "Are numbers a test of truth?" in which we have considered whether this is a good mark or not. We shall only repeat thus much of what we there said—"The religion which God gave the Jews was certainly true; yet, the professors of it were always a very small minority of the inhabitants of the earth. No nation, in short, agreed with them. For many hundreds of years the Christians were a minority in every nation of the world into which Christianity had spread. Christianity grew and converted so many nations, by despising, denying, and refuting this argument of numbers as a test of religious truth." We then ended our article by saying, that "we distrusted this argument from numbers because we know it cannot stand in the judgment hereafter; and no argument can be worth anything *now* which cannot prevail *then*. Suppose any poor mortal should then presume to say to the Great Judge, 'I always tried to be of the religion of the majority,' will not Christ say to him, 'I gave you this warning from the beginning, and if you had searched the Scripture you would have found it—*Enter ye in at the narrow gate, for wide is the gate and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there are who go in thereat. How narrow is the gate and strait is the way that leadeth to life, and few there are that find it.*—Matthew vii., 13, 14.—Douay Bible.

But, if the consent of nations be a good argument it will certainly never benefit the cause of the Church of Rome. We were amused at the desperate ingenuity with which Mr. Rourke attempted to bring this argument to bear. He leaves heathen nations and Russia out of count altogether, and then he counts as consenting with the Church of Rome every nation which had at any time been in communion with her, even though their consent with her may not have existed since the ninth century; or, in other words, though they may have dissented from her a greater number of centuries than they have agreed with her.

Put special pleading out of the case, and is it not a plain matter of fact that there is not a general agreement of nations with the Church of Rome: some of the largest and most powerful, and some of the most intelligent nations of Christendom dissent from her communion. We need only mention England, America, Australia, Prussia, Sweden, Denmark, Russia, Saxony, part of Switzerland, &c., &c. If, then, the agreement of nations be a note of the true Church, we need not discuss whether the Church of Rome *ever* had this note, for, certainly, she has lost it now.

Mr. Rourke's second note is "the evidence of miracles." He is prudently very brief on this head. His difficulty plainly is, that while his Church claims, in general terms, the possession of miraculous powers, she is too wise to pledge herself absolutely to the truth of any particular miraculous stories; and the very same tales are devoutly believed in by one set of Roman Catholics, laughed at by another set, equally orthodox, while a third set—the least respectable of all—repeat them without believing them, and say, that if these particular miracles did not take place, no doubt others did. We believe that Mr. Rourke is a little too intelligent to receive the stories of winking pictures, &c., which Roman Catholic newspapers circulate for the amusement of the vulgar, and we can, therefore, easily understand why he talks of the "evidence of miracles" in general terms, but carefully abstains from going into particulars.

His third head is the "succession of bishops." If this be a good note of the Church, the Church of Rome in those kingdoms certainly cannot lay claim to it. We have treated of this subject in a separate article in our last number; we shall therefore merely say here, that at the time of the Reformation, the majority of the Irish bishops retained their sees and handed them down in regular order to their legitimate successors—the present bishops of the Church of England and Ireland—whereas, if you were to ask one of the Roman Catholic bishops to show you *his* list of his predecessors you would, in all probability, find a great gap of a hundred years or so in the middle, a considerable time having elapsed in most of the Irish sees before any foreigner attempted to dispute possession with the lawful successors of the old Irish bishops. And in England the very names of the sees claimed by the Roman Catholic bishops remind us that they are new things founded within the last half-dozen years, and that those bishops cannot even pretend to be the successors of the early occupants of the sees of Canterbury and York and the other *ancient* sees of England.

Mr. Rourke's last note is the name, "Catholic." He says, "if a stranger ask a Protestant where the Catholic Church is, he will never direct him to his own Church but to some Popish chapel." We have always thought that as good an answer as this argument deserves is to retort it on himself—"if a stranger ask a Roman Catholic in this country where 'the Church' is, he will never direct him to a Popish chapel, but to the nearest Church of England place of worship." Is it not plain, then, by their own acknowledgement, that the Roman Catholics do not belong to the true Church of Ireland." The argument is just as good on the one side as on the other. But, in point of fact, what is really worth attending to is not what names things are *in the habit* of being called, but what they *have a right to be* called. The whole foundation of Mr. Rourke's argument arises out of a general unwillingness among Protestants to quarrel about words or names, and an anxiety not to give offence to their neighbours. If we give the name of "Papists" to those who acknowledge the Pope as the head of their Church, they cry out—we do not know why—that we wound their feelings, and mean to insult them; and if we call those Romanists who pride themselves on their union to Rome, ten to one but they call this name insulting also. Well, then, if any Protestants, either from thoughtlessness or from kindness and good nature, give them the name of Catholics, they turn round and say—"There, now, you recognise that we are the Catholics, it is plain that you are the heretics!" Is not this a poor return to Protestants for their unwillingness to offend them? Is it not a manly and generous mode of arguing?

Whatever be the force of Mr. Rourke's argument, it has none against us. He could never have taken up our periodical without seeing that we bore on our front the title of Catholic, in which the Church to which we belong has always claimed her share. We have never pushed our good nature so far as to allow our opponents to use the name as a distinctive title for themselves. They must see that it is not we who are insulting them by refusing them the exclusive use of this title, but they who are insulting us by denying us our share in it. When we have had occasion to speak of them, we generally have chosen Roman Catholics as the least offensive name consistent with truth. And this name serves well enough to distinguish the *Irish* Catholics, whose bishops are the successors of St. Patrick and his fellow-labourers, from the *Roman* Catholics, whose bishops were introduced into this country by the bishops of Rome a couple of hundred years ago.

It now only remains to say something as to the two-fold universality of time and place which he says the Church must possess. The Church's universality in point of place must, he says, be understood in a limited sense. Certainly, if the Church of Rome be exclusively the Church, it must be understood in a very limited sense indeed. That Church is barely holding its ground in the old countries of the world, while in the vast emigration that is going on she is left immeasureably behind, and the new countries of the world are filling fast with a population which refuses to submit to her. Test by this mark, and then say which is the right notion of the Catholic Church—Mr. Rourke's notion, which limits the name to less than the half of Christendom, or ours, which embraces every Church in the world which retains the old faith embodied in the creeds which the ancient Church handed down to us.

As to universality in point of time, one would think Mr. Rourke had never looked into the Thirty-nine Articles, and that he imagined that the Church of England taught some new religion invented three hundred years ago. Why, he believes many of the Thirty-nine Articles himself without knowing it. Every one of the doctrines contained in the creeds of the Church of England (such as the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Redemption of the world by our Saviour, the gift of the Holy Ghost) is universal in point of time. There is no dispute about it; the Church of Rome confesses it as well as ourselves. The dispute is as to the new articles of Pope Pius's creed. We call for proofs that these are universal in point of time. Let any one show that the ancient Church worshipped images, had communion in one kind, prayed to the saints, and so forth. Thus we have tried the Church of Rome by Mr. Rourke's own tests, and found her wanting. We reject her because her creed is not universal in point of time, and her communion is not universal in point of place.

RELICS OF SAINTS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Your strictures on the inscriptions found on the tombs of the apocryphal saints, Philomena, Theodosia, and Ursinus, remind me of another inscription, that of St. Ursula and her eleven thousand virgins, whose remains are to be seen to this day preserved in glass-cases all round one of the Churches at Cologne, and which may be new to some of your readers. The inscription appears to have been somewhat obliterated by age, as antiquarians were divided in opinion about it. Some say that it was "St. Ursula, et XI.M.V.—*i.e.*, et 11 *Martyres* Virgines," (eleven virgin martyrs), which, through ignorance, or wilful deceit, has been converted into undecim *millia* virgines—11,000 virgins. Other antiquarians say, that the inscription meant "SS. Ursula et Undecimilla martyres virgines," and that Undecimilla, which was the proper name of a virgin martyr, was mistaken, by some ignorant copyist, for an abbreviation of undecim millia, 11,000. What a slight foundation serves for a pious legend in the Church of Rome! which, in the course of a few centuries, takes a tangible and visible form, as in this case, where cart-loads of bones, removed, no doubt, from some neighbouring church-yard, are enshrined in glass-cases round a Church, in the 16th century, as the bones of *eleven thousand virgins!!*

The legend told of them is, I believe, as follows:—That an English chief, after conquering and taking possession of Lower Brittany, returned to his native land in search of wives for his army and himself. He married Ursula, an English Princess, and took eleven thousand maidens as brides for his companions in arms. Ursula whilst journeying with this bridal train to join her husband was driven by a storm into the mouth of the Rhine, and arrived, somewhat oddly, at Cologne. They were there beset by a party of Huns, who murdered them all. Their bodies were discovered at Cologne in the 16th century; and the remains of SS. Ursula, which were at first mixed with those of her companions, were pointed out by *a miracle* for the special veneration of the faithful. Cologne is not without a rival, however, in claiming the bones of St. Ursula, for it is said that she has a whole body also at St. Jean d'Angely, besides three separate limbs and various fragments at Mans, Tours, and Bergerat. Several of her virgins also are said to have relics in various parts of Europe, and are distinguished by their proper names, as St. Ottilla, St. Fleurina, &c.

As you seem to like short letters, perhaps you may wish to encourage them by inserting this.

Your obedient servant,

VIATOR.

We feel obliged to "Viator" for his letter, which is nothing the worse for being short. We have, ourselves, seen the glass-cases of bones in the Church of St. Ursula, at Cologne, which were disgusting and dismal enough, though we were unable to discover any one who believed in them. We suppose, however, there must be still some such persons, or probably the collection would be removed to some more decent cemetery. We confess we dislike converting a Church into a charnel-house, even were it certain that all the bones belonged to unfortunate young ladies going to be married, and butchered in barbarous times by the Huns. What must have been the darkness of the sixteenth century when such wholesale disinterments could be recognized and approved of by any Church? Cart-loads of bones, taken at random from a grave-yard, and enshrined in glass-cases for the worship of the faithful. Surely the Reformation did not begin too soon!

FLOWERS FOR SEPTEMBER.

THE flowers are gradually passing away; the sober tints of autumn succeed the gay and sprightly hues of spring and summer; brown leaves rustle where brilliant flowers lately blossomed, and though some few remain as bright as ever, yet, one by one, they are going, marking, with solemn emphasis, the sure and steady advance of winter. Such is the course of human life, passing from the joyous spring-time of youth, into the short summer season of manhood, and, then, rapidly falling into "the sear and yellow leaf" that withers, drops, and is swept away by the blast of winter. The decline of summer, and the shortening of the days—of our own few days—should be watched with a feeling of something more than melancholy, were it not that there is a germ of immortal life wrapt up in our

* See our leading article for July, 1851, vol. ii., p. 79, where our readers will find that, in his great controversy with the Donatists, St. Augustine gave up the argument from the use of the name Catholic, and decided the question, which is the Catholic Church, wholly by Scripture proofs.

† Neque enim quorumlibet disputationes, quamvis Catholicorum et laudatorum hominum, velut Scripturas canonicas habere debemus, ut nobis non liceat salva honorificentia, quæ illis debetur hominibus, aliquid in eorum scriptis improbare atque respuere si forte invenerimus quod aliter senserint quam veritas habet, divino adjutorio vel ab aliis intellecta vel a nobis. Talis ego sum in scriptis alienum, tales volo esse intellectores meorum.—Ad. Fortun, ep. 148, c. iv., tom ii., p. 502.

frail bodies, and which, we believe, ere long, will be developed into a nobler spirit when *He* shall come for whom we look, even the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, "who shall change our vile bodies that they may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself."—Philippians iii., v. 20-21. The assured hope of a joyful resurrection, throws a light over the evening of life, as the prospect of another spring-time, reconciles us to the fading glories of nature. Would that we could all say with Job, "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth, and, though, after my skin, worms destroy this body, yet, in my flesh, shall I see God."—Job xix., v. 25, 26, 27. If so, we may regard the departure of summer and the approach of winter, the advance of time, and the increase of years and infirmities, and the prospect of death itself, without alarm and without regret.

But, though the garden is bereft of its chief beauties, the general landscape is, perhaps, more beautiful and enchanting than ever. The clear and cloudless sky of September, and the calm serenity that its peaceful blue betokens, are in keeping with "the universal tinge of sober gold," and combine to form a scene of rich splendour, mellowed and softened into repose. There is much, also, to compensate in the fresh foliage of the evergreens, and the after-grass of the meadows. In the corn fields, we meet a very showy flower with large, deep, yellow petals, and leaves clasping their stem—the CORN MARIGOLD, or yellow ox eye (*Chrysanthemum segetum*). It is larger and taller than the garden Marigold, and like a large daisy. The French call it "La Marguerite jaune," or yellow daisy. In Southern Europe, our own garden Marigolds are wild flowers, and are found growing in the corn-fields, as our Corn Marigold grows here. There is another of this family of vagrants—the many-eyed Marigold—which the farmer catches trespassing among his corn, in its gay, yellow dress. The Marigolds all belong to the chrysanthemum tribe, of which these wild ones form our only native specimens. Our garden chrysanthemums are natives of China. Their botanical name, chrysanthemum, signifies, in the Greek, gold-flower; so our native specimens were called by Chaucer, and the early English poets, gold flowers; and, in England, they are still called goules, or goulans. In Denmark, the farmers found this gay but too prolific intruder so injurious to agriculture, that a law was passed for its extirpation, and a penalty imposed upon the sluggard husbandman who endangered the safety of his neighbours' fields by harbouring the proscribed flower.

Among the flowers of the preceding month which still remain, is the brilliant SCARLET LYCHNIS (*Lychnis Chalcedonica*). Its name is derived from a Greek word denoting a lamp, because the bright colour of its flowers was thought to be brilliant as a flame, or because the down of the plant was used to make wicks for the lamps, of olden times. It was introduced among us from Russia, which is said to have acquired it from the East, in the time of the Crusades. Somewhat resembling the Lychnis in colour is the SCARLET LOBELIA (*Lobelia syphilitica*), a magnificent herbaceous plant, derived from Mexico. Among the the American Indians, it has the repute of possessing valuable medicinal qualities. Another favourite flower that still remains in blossom is the SWEET SCABIOUS (*Scabiosa atropurpurea*), a native of the East Indies. The name is borrowed from the roughness (*scaber*) of the tribe of plants to which it belongs. Its deep colour, and the sweet, musky odour of its star-studded flowers have made it a favourite.

Few, indeed, are the flowers that open to the sun of September; yet there is one of singular beauty, the GENTIANELLA, with its brilliant, bell-shaped blossoms, which open now for the second time during the year. They appeared in the spring as the harbinger of summer, and now come in the autumn to sing its requiem.

"Thou comest late and comest alone,
When woods are bare and birds are flown,
And frosts and shortening days portend
The aged year is near his end.

"Then doth thy sweet and quiet eye
Look through its fringes to the sky—
Blue, blue, as if that sky let fall
A flower from its cerulean wall.

"I would, that thus when I shall see
The hour of death draw near to me,
Hope, blossoming within my heart,
May look to heaven as I depart."

This is very prettily written by the American poet, Bryant; but it wants the assured tone of Simeon, whose earnest prayer, having found Christ, was—"Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace according to thy Word, *because* mine eyes *have seen thy salvation*, which thou has prepared before the face of all people—a light to lighten the Gentiles and the glory of thy people Israel."—Luke ii., v. 29, 33. St. Paul describes his feelings on the subject as "having a desire to depart, and *to be with Christ*, which is far better."—Phil. i., v. 23. This is the hope which should blossom within the heart of the departing Christian—"to be with Christ"—wherever that may be; and if he has found Christ, and experienced him in his soul as his salvation, there need be no uncertainty about the matter, but an earnest and immediate readiness, if not a desire, to depart, and to be with him, unless, as in the case of St. Paul, he knows that God has a work for him to do upon earth, which it is his duty and privilege to perform.

The Gentianella is a mountaineer, and inhabits the loftiest heights of the Swiss Alps, and the Pyrenees, and the less elevated summits of the Welsh mountains; it, consequently, requires a very pure air in which to grow, as we have found to our sorrow and disappointment. It is too fastidious to put forth a single blossom in the confined air of a town garden; even where it does condescend to flower, the bright blue of its native mountains is never attained in less elevated aspects.

The common Gentianella (*Gentiana acaulis*) is called by a rather paradoxical name, the large dwarf-flowered Gentian. It is scarcely an inch in height, and consists of little else than its petals, which, in size, are out of all proportion to its diminutive leaves and branches.

There is a taller Yellow Gentian (*Gentiana lutea*) which bears a handsome flower and a bitter root. The Gentian root is well known in medicine, and was so from an early antiquity. The name of Gentius, a King of Illyria, is preserved to memory by this brilliant little flower, as the monarch who, according to Pliny, discovered its tonic virtues.

There is another sweet flower of September, the WHITE JESSAMINE (*Jasminum officinale*); its name is derived from two Greek words, signifying the odour of a violet. In the daytime it may be passed unheeded, but if we go abroad in the twilight, it is sure to attract our notice by its rich perfume; and its profusion of white flowers, peering through the green foliage, are like so many scattered stars on the firmament.

The plant that wakes while others sleep—
Timid Jasmine buds that keep
Their odours to themselves all day,
But, when the sunlight dies away,
Let their delicious secret out.

The White Jessamine is a native of the East Indies; and, though now so commonly known, when first introduced into Europe, by a certain Grand Duke of Tuscany, it was kept in a garden at Pisa, under a guard of soldiers, so that no cutting of it might be stolen. But, notwithstanding the jealous vigilance of the churlish prince, who would confine the beneficent gifts of God within the narrow enclosure of his own selfish pleasure, it has escaped, and got free, and spread its fragrance over Europe to gladden the heart of many an humble cottager. So it was recently with another Grand Duke of Tuscany, who would confine a still more precious gift of God to mankind, the Bible, within the narrow limits of his will and pleasure, and place under a guard of soldiers, and in irons, the humble family of the Madini's, for venturing to read it. We have reason to hope that in spite of his tyrannical restrictions, the Word of God will find its way into many a Tuscan cottage, spreading the odour of its sanctity around, and comforting and consoling many an humble Christian with its Divine and holy precepts.

THE SAFE WAY.

Kneel down; thou hast a lonely hour,
And thou to seek thy God art free:
The name of Jesus still has power,
Ask, and the Lord shall answer thee.—Jno. xiv. 14.

Canst thou not say, "If I am right,
Lord, keep me in Rome's strictest way;
If I am wrong, oh, give me light
To show me where I go astray."—Ps. xxv. 4, 5.

"If I am right, then bid me still
On bended knee the Host adore;
If I am wrong, incline my will
To worship creature-gods no more."—Is. xliv. 9, 10.

"If I am right, bid me entreat
Ten thousand saints my cause to aid;
If I am wrong, at Jesus' feet
Let all my prayers be only laid."—1 Tim. ii. 5.

"If I am right, then bid me win,
Through penal fires, a heavenly throne;
If I am wrong, oh, cleanse my sin
In Christ's redeeming blood alone."—1 John i. 7.

"If I am right, still bid me brave,
Safe in 'the Church,' hell's fiercest shock;
If I am wrong, look down and save,
And lead to Christ, the only rock."—1 Cor. iii. 11.

"If I am right, my will control
With faith to hear the priest forgive;
If I am wrong, absolve my soul,
And in the living bid me live."—Is. xliii. 25.

Wilt thou not pray in earnest thus,
One deep, free prayer, that light be given;
With God, and not with man, discuss
If thou art on the way to heaven.—Amos v. 4, 5,

There is one book would point the way—
Wilt thou not trust its heavenly light?
Open it now—kneel down and pray,
And God direct thee to the right.—Eph. i. 17, 18.

FARM OPERATIONS FOR SEPTEMBER.

(*From the Irish Farmers' Gazette.*)

THE last fortnight has come in most opportunely, and been one continued burst of the finest harvest weather that could be desired, so that harvesting operations have gone on most briskly during the past ten days in the neighbourhood of Dublin, and men's wages have risen pretty high, both in consequence of the large breadths coming in for the sickle, and the scarcity of hands. Nevertheless, it will be to the farmers' interest to stretch his purse strings a little on the occasion, and get his harvest cut and cured in such favourable weather, and which, we trust, they will take advantage of, as the nights will henceforth be growing long, chill, and damp. Let the corn, therefore, be bound as fast as cut, and stooked *before* the dew falls, taking care to have them set up in the most exposed and airy situations, away from hedge rows and trees. Hooding will not be necessary, unless on the approach of rain; as by leaving them uncapped the sooner the corn will be fit to carry and stack, which should be effected as soon as the grain and straw is sufficiently dry, and, when stacked, no time should be lost in securely thatching; the stacks should be made with a long shank and short head, and well-ventilated by carrying up one or more chimneys according to size, which should discharge into horizontal flues placed to open out under the eavings.

Summer Fallows, where the system is practised, should get its final harrowing about the middle of the month, then ploughed up to receive the seed, and be sown, providing sufficient rain has fallen to give the land that proper degree of consistency necessary to the successful cultivation of wheat; but, if the land is too dry and friable, it will be necessary to wait for rain; on cold, backward soils, this is also a good season for sowing wheat.

Winter Vetches should be sown this month in considerable breadth; the land should have a liberal dressing of manure, which should be well ploughed in—the earlier the better. If the land is dry, it may be ploughed flat, get a turn of the harrows and sown at the rate of four bushels of winter vetches and one bushel of rye, per Irish acre, and well harrowed in with a light harrow; but, if the land is not likely to be perfectly dry, it will be safer to plough into eight-feet ridges, lightly harrow, sow the seed, harrow well and cover with the shovel from the furrows.

Rape sown in June last should now be transplanted; if the land is poor a liberal dressing of manure will be well repaid in the greater luxuriance of the crop. In early, warm soils, and a favourable climate, this crop may still be sown; but in cold, backward soils the better plan will be to transplant.

Italian Ray-grass and Clover should be sown early in the month, in well-prepared, rich, stubble land, or after early potatoes. It may be sown in the proportions of two bushels of the ray-grass to 12 lbs. of clover, or four bushels of ray-grass to four or five lbs. of clover, per Irish acre, just as it may be desirable to have the ray-grass or clover form the greatest bulk of soiling; rye may also be now sown alone as a soiling crop.

Clover and Grass Seeds intended for meadow or pasture may still be sown; let the land have a light ploughing or scarifying, well pulverized and cleaned before sowing.

Grass Lands may now be advantageously top-dressed with rich composts. If the land is much infested with moss, it should be well scarified with the harrows to extract the moss, which should then be raked off, and harrowed before top-dressing; it should be well bush-harrowed, to distribute the manure, and then well rolled. A good opportunity will now be afforded to introduce such of the superior grass seeds as the pasture may be deficient in.

Clover Leas intended for wheat should be ploughed up forthwith. The clover should be eaten or mown close before ploughing—the latter is the better plan. A dressing of twenty to forty barrels of lime may be given and harrowed in with the seed. After many years' experience, we would strongly recommend sowing the winter wheat in eight or ten feet ridges, and shovelling the furrows, particularly in clover lea.

Cabbages, if sown early in July, will be ready for transplanting by the middle of the month. The land for this crop should be well manured and deeply tilled.

Hemp.—When the leaves begin to decay and the seeds turn brown, the main crop of hemp will be fit for pulling; it is then tied in small bundles, and stooked till dry; the seeds then thrashed out, and the bundles steeped like flax; raised when sufficiently steeped, spread out, and dew-retted till the fibres readily separate from the woody matter.

Ewes should now be selected from the general stock for breeding, and put them on good, sound, pasture, that they may be in good condition when put with the tups next month.

Lambs should also be kept on good pastures, lest they fall off in condition, which cannot be restored during the winter. Young animals should be kept in a gradually increasing condition.

Ploughing should be energetically proceeded with after the corn is cut. When subsoiling is necessary this is the best month to do it in; where there is not a proper subsoil plough or grubber, a strong, common plough, stripped of its mould, following in the track of the other, answers the purpose admirably, and will do the work very effectively.

New and Recent Works

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

Booksellers to the Queen,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

ALFORD'S GREEK TESTAMENT, with a Critically Revised Text, Marginal References, and Commentary. New Edition. Vol. I., much enlarged, 32s. Vol. II., 28s. (Vol III., in preparation.)

HOOK'S CHURCH DICTIONARY. Seventh Edition. Revised and corrected. 16s.

NARRATIVE OF A JOURNEY THROUGH SYRIA AND PALESTINE, IN 1851 AND 1852. By C. W. M. Van de Velde. 2 vols. 8vo. 30s.

JOURNAL OF A DEPUTATION sent to the East by the Committee of the Malta Protestant College, in 1849, containing an account of the present state of the Oriental Nations, including the Religion, Learning, Education, Customs, and Occupations, &c. 2 vols. 8vo. 12s.

THE HISTORY OF THE FRENCH PROTESTANT REFUGEES, from the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. By Charles Weiss. 8vo. 14s.

HISTORY OF THE PROTESTANT CHURCH IN HUNGARY, from the period of the Reformation to the present time. With introduction by Dr. Merle D'Aubigne. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

THE LAND OF SINIM; or, China and Chinese Missions. By the Rev. William Gillespie. 5s.

AN EXPOSITION OF THE FIRST SEVENTEEN CHAPTERS OF THE GOSPEL OF ST. MATTHEW. By the Very Rev. Daniel Bagot. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

THE BIBLE HANDBOOK: an Introduction to the Study of Sacred Scripture. By Joseph Angus, D.D. 5s.

HELPS TO THE THOUGHTFUL READING OF THE FOUR GOSPELS. By Henry Stebbing, D.D. 8s.

THE PULPIT FOR 1854. Sermons by eminent living ministers. Vol. I., containing a hundred and three Sermons. 7s. 6d.

EVENINGS WITH THE ROMANISTS. By Rev. Hobart Seymour. 8s. 6d.

A HANDBOOK TO THE ROMISH CONTROVERSY, being a Refutation in detail of the Creed of Pope Pius IV., on the grounds of Scripture and reason. With an appendix and notes. By the Rev. C. S. Stanford. New Edition, greatly enlarged. 1s. 3d.

TREGELLES on the Printed Text of the Greek New Testament, with remarks on its Revision upon Critical Principles, together with the Collation of the Critical Text of Griesbach, Scholz, Lachmann, and Tischendorf, with that in common use. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

THE POETRY OF CHRISTIAN ART. Translated from the French of A. F. Rio. 8vo. 9s.

MEMOIR OF THE REV. JOHN JAMES WEITBRECHT. By his Widow. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

ON THE PLURALITY OF WORLDS. An Essay. By Professor Whewell. Fcap. 8vo. 6s.

A DIALOGUE ON THE PLURALITY OF WORLDS. Being a Supplement to the foregoing. 1s.

MORE WORLDS THAN ONE. The Creed of the Philosopher, and the Hope of the Christian. By Sir David Brewster. New Edition. 6s.

SISTER AGNES; or the Captive Nun; a picture of Conventual Life. By a Clergyman's Widow. 5s.

THE CONVENT AND THE MANSE. 1s. 6d.

MINISTERING CHILDREN: a Tale dedicated to Childhood. 5s.

ISRAEL IN EGYPT; or the Books of Genesis and Exodus, illustrated in existing monuments. 6s.

VESTIGES OF DIVINE VENGEANCE IN THE DESTRUCTION OF SODOM AND GOMORRAH. By W. E. Tayler. 3s.

HOME TRUTHS: being Miscellaneous Addresses and Tracts. By the Rev. J. C. Ryle. 3rd Series. 3s. 6d.

PLAIN SPEAKING. First series. Being forty short, Large-type Tracts. By the Rev. J. C. Ryle, B.A. In packet. 1s.

PLAIN SPEAKING. By the Rev. J. C. Ryle. Cloth. 1s. 9d.

SCRIPTURE ITS OWN AND BEST INTERPRETER. By X. Y. 4d. by post 6d.

MANNA FOR THE PILGRIM; for each morning of the Month, from the writings of the Rev. W. H. Hewitson. 8d.

THE OIL OF JOY FOR THE AFFLICTED AND THE BEREAVED. From the Writings of the Rev. W. H. Hewitson. 1s.

THE TWO NATURES OF A BELIEVER, AS THEY ARE REVEALED IN SCRIPTURE, AND EVIDENCED BY EXPERIENCE IN THE WORK OF REGENERATION AND SANCTIFICATION. By a Layman. 2s. 6d.

THE BOOK AND ITS STORY: a Narrative for the Young, on occasion of the Jubilee of the British and Foreign Bible Society. By L. N. R. With an Introductory preface, by Rev. T. Phillips. Fcap. 4s.

THE NEW REFORMATION IN IRELAND; or Striking Facts and Anecdotes, illustrating the Extent and Reality of the Movement. By the Rev. Llewellyn Wynne Jones. 1s. 6d.

SYNONYMS of the NEW TESTAMENT: being the substance of a Course of Lectures addressed to the Theological Students, King's College, London. By R. C. Trench, B.D. Second Edition. 5s.

CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL ESSAYS CONTRIBUTED TO THE EDINBURGH REVIEW. By Thomas Babington Macaulay. 2 vols. Post 8vo. cloth. Cheaper Edition. 8s.

THE RUSSIAN SHORES OF THE BLACK SEA, IN THE AUTUMN of 1852, with a Voyage down the Volga, and a Tour through the Country of the Don Cossacks. By Lawrence Oliphant. 8vo. 14s.

TURKEY, ANCIENT AND MODERN: a History of the Ottoman Empire, from the period of its Establishment to the Present Time. By the Rev. R. W. Fraser. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

THE BALTIC, THE BLACK SEA, AND THE CRIMEA; comprising Travels through Russia, with a Voyage down the Volga, to Astrachan, and a Tour through Crim Tartary. By Charles Henry Scott. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

TURKEY, RUSSIA, THE BLACK SEA, AND CIRCASSIA. By Captain Spencer. With Coloured Illustrations and a Map. 6s.

THE FALL OF THE CRIMEA. By Captain Spencer. 5s.

THE CITY OF THE SULTAN, and Domestic Manners of the Turks. By Miss Pardoe. New Edition. 12mo. 1s. 6d. Cloth. 2s.

ALISON'S HISTORY of EUROPE, from the fall of Napoleon, in 1815, to the Establishment of Military Government in France, in 1852; being a continuation of his former celebrated Work. Vols. I., II., and III. 8vo. 15s. each.

ALISON'S HISTORY OF EUROPE; People's Edition. vols. I.—VII. 4s. each.

HUNGARIAN SKETCHES IN PEACE AND WAR. By Moritz Jokai. 3s. 6d.

THE PILGRIM IN THE MISSIONS; or GOSPEL HUSBANDRY. By H. Smith, Esq. 4s. 6d.

OUR FATHER; or Jesus teaching to Pray. An Exposition of the Lord's Prayer. By Rev. Samuel Garrett. 2s. 6d.

HELPS AND HINTS FOR BIBLE READERS: Being practical comments on some of the most remarkable passages in the New Testament. By the Rev. Nicholas J. Moody. 3s. 6d.

SCRIPTURE AND THE PRAYER-BOOK IN HARMONY. England's Church and Handbook of Common Prayer, and Articles, the Scriptural antidote of Sacerdotalism and Schism. By Rev. A. R. Faussett. 3s. 6d.

THE WARRANT OF FAITH; or a Handbook to the Canon and Inspiration of the Scriptures. By Rev. Robert Whytehead. 6s. 6d.

FORREST SCENES IN NORWAY AND SWEDEN: being Extracts from the Journal of a Fisherman. By the Rev. Henry Newland. 12mo. 3s. 6d.

PRESCOTT'S HISTORY OF THE REIGN OF FERDINAND AND ISABELLA. Crown 8vo. 5s.

THE HAND OF GOD IN WAR. By the Rev. W. K. Tweedie, D.D. 6d.

THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES. By Rev. Dr. Cumming. 3s. 6d.

HARD TIMES. For these times. By Charles Dickens. 5s.

KATHERINE ASHTON. By the Author of "The Experience of Life." 2 Vols. 12s.

SUNNY MEMORIES OF FOREIGN LANDS. By Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe. Post 8vo. 5s. Cheaper Editions, 2s. 6d., 2s., 1s. 6d., and 1s.

THE DENS of LONDON: Notes and Narratives of a Six Years' Mission among them. By R. W. Vanderkiste. Cheap Edition. 1s. 6d.

POOR PADDY'S CABIN; or, Slavery in Ireland. 1s. 6d. and 2s. 6d.

IMPORTANT QUESTIONS AFFECTING THE EXISTENCE OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH IN ENGLAND: or, Answer to a Letter published by Cardinal Wiseman in the Parisian *Univers*, against some articles of the "Ami de la Religion," recommending to British Roman Catholics Moderation, Loyalty, Patriotism, and Respect for Public Opinion. By a Roman Catholic. 1s. By Post, 1s. 6d.

MOWBRAY'S TREATISE ON DOMESTIC AND ORNAMENTAL POULTRY; a practical guide to the History, Breeding, Rearing, Feeding, Fattening, and General Management of Fowls and Pigeons. By L. A. Meall. With numerous Coloured Illustrations. 8s.

THE LADY'S COMPANION TO THE FLOWER GARDEN. By Mrs. Loudon. Sixth edition. 7s.

THE FRUIT, FLOWER, AND KITCHEN GARDEN. By the late Patrick Neill, LL.D. Fifth edition. 5s.

WANDERINGS AMONG THE WILD FLOWERS: How to see and how to gather them. By Spencer Johnson, M.D. With 173 engravings. 5s.

A POPULAR HISTORY of BRITISH FERNS, comprising all the Species. By Thomas Moore. Coloured Illustrations. 10s. 6d.

POPULAR FIELD BOTANY: A Familiar History of Plants. By Agnes Catlow. With 20 coloured plates. 10s. 6d.

A POPULAR HISTORY of BRITISH SEA-WEEDS, with Notices of some of the Fresh-water Algæ. By Rev. D. Landsborough. 10s. 6d.

THE SEA-WEED COLLECTORS' GUIDE: Containing plain instructions, for collecting and preserving. 2s. 6d.

HANDBOOK of ANGLING: teaching Fly-fishing, Trolling, Bottom-fishing, and Salmon-fishing. By Ephemera. 5s.

THE SEASIDE BOOK: being an Introduction to the Natural History of the British Coasts. By W. H. Harvey, M.D. New Edition. 5s.

A BOOK for the SEASIDE. With numerous Engravings. 3s.

WAKEMAN'S HANDBOOK OF IRISH ANTIQUITIES. 5s.

Just published, price 1s. 6d.,

TRUE STORY; or, THE DIVIDED RING.

A Poem. By E. C.,

Author of "Irrelagh," "Little Ones of Innisfail," &c.

London: J. NISBET AND CO. Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY AND CO. Cork: TRACT DEPOSITORY. Bristol; JOHN WRIGHT.

Just published,

New Edition, Royal 4to., cloth, price 5s. 6d.,

THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN,

Vol. I, with complete Indexes.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY AND CO., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London: WERTHEIM AND MACKINTOSH, Paternoster-row.

Fcap. 8vo., Neat Cover, Price 1s.;
Cloth, 1s. 6d.; Cloth, Gilt Edges, 2s.

THE TALK OF THE ROAD: Showing how Irish people talk about Irish doings, when they get a quiet place at the back of a ditch, or under a hedge.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY AND CO., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London: WERTHEIM AND MACKINTOSH.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON, and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher, WILLIAM CURRY, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

SEPTEMBER, 1854.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Gloir do Dhia an fna hárduib, agus fsodcáin air an dtalamh deaghtoil do na daoinib.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. III.—No. 34. OCTOBER, 1854. { Annual Subscription, 3s. 6d. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

	Page
A Wise Old Man	115
The Invocation of Saints, No. III.	115
The History of the Popes, No. I.—Pope Stephen VI. and Pope Formosus's Fingers	116
The Succession of St. Patrick—Archbishops of Armagh	117
The Talk of the Road—No. XXV.	118
Autobiography of a Roman Catholic Priest	118
Results of Controversy—Conversion of a Roman Catholic Priest	119
The Apparition of La Salette—The Bishop of Grenoble and his Clergy	120
CORRESPONDENCE:	
Recent Controversy at Boulogne, between Rev. Dr. Moeran, and two Roman Catholic Laymen	122
Is the Roman Church the Mother and Mistress of all Churches?	124
Is the Protestant Bible a Corrupt Translation?—by Mr. Collette	124
On the Catholic Church—by Mr. Rourke	124
Flowers for October	125

A WISE OLD MAN.

We have been much struck with the force of the following story, which we find in the leading article of the *Tablet*, of Saturday, October 7:—

"Bacon tells a story of a man who had become famous among his friends for skill in reconciling differences. His son tried his hand at the same difficult task; but having failed on several occasions, he begged his father to tell him the secret of his own great success. The father told him that his secret was a very simple one; *he never interfered at the beginning of the dispute;* but he waited until the dispute *had lasted a long while*, until both parties were weary of the controversy; and, though too proud to make advances themselves, were not the less very willing to see an impartial mediator step in and aid them to do, at last, what was the common interest, and the common wish of both disputants."

Nothing is wanting to this story but the name of "the wise old man." Would our readers like to know who he is? No doubt they would. It would make the *Tablet* itself doubly sensible of the old man's wisdom. Now, we happen to know who that old man was; for he is a great acquaintance of ours, and we know him well. The Pope himself is that "wise old man;" and St. Bernard, "the last of the Fathers," was the foolish son!

Now, listen to this. SEVEN HUNDRED YEARS ago a dispute arose, for the *first time*, whether the blessed Virgin was conceived immaculate; St. Bernard, like a goose, *interfered at the beginning of the dispute;* of course, he failed, and all Roman Catholics will shortly be bound to believe that he was little better than a heretic, for he denied the immaculate conception; and his foolish haste to try and preserve the peace and ancient faith of the Church, only resulted in a desperate strife, of some centuries duration, between the Franciscans and Dominicans. Not so, "the wise old man;" he "waited a long while."*

At the Council of Trent, after FOUR HUNDRED YEARS of fighting, the Franciscans worked hard to get the Pope and council to settle the question. But the old man was too wise, for the parties were fighting still! The Holy Council, under the old man's direction, expressly said they would not settle it (session v.); and the present Pope, in his letter of February 3, 1849, has said—"This honour *has not yet been decreed* to the most holy Virgin by the Church, and the APOSTOLIC SEE." So, for THREE HUNDRED YEARS more, the old man has waited still!

But now, when the Dominicans seem to have abandoned the former doctrines and conduct of their order—now, when no Roman Catholic is heard to raise his voice on behalf of St. Bernard—now, when the dispute seems to have worn itself out, and the battle is ended—the wise old man has been for FIVE whole years (since February, 1849) cautiously feeling his way, to step in and settle the question—which he now promises to do on the 8th of December next.

* Our readers may find the history in the 1st and 2nd numbers of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, January and February, 1852, vol. I.

Never did a wise old man wait so long, watching till a dispute should be over, that he might then step in and settle it! And that is just the way we know that this is the very old man that is pointed at in the story in the *Tablet*.

No wonder, then, that the *Tablet*, as in duty bound, should admire the wisdom of its "wise old man." But, for us, it savours a little too much of that worldly wisdom, sometimes called cunning, to be suitable to the "Vicar of CHRIST" (who taught the world in another method), or "to the judge of controversies." But "the children of this world are, in their generation, wiser than the children of light."—Luke xvi. 8. And St. Bernard, with many of the errors of his age, was a "child of light" indeed, compared to "the wise old man."

THE INVOCATION OF SAINTS.—No. III.

We undertook in our first article on this subject to give our readers some account of the manner in which the corrupt practice of saint-worship was gradually introduced into the Church, thinking that no error is fully refuted, until some explanation is given how men ever came to adopt and practice it. And here we shall not indulge in any theory or speculation of our own, but prefer what has been already written by eminent writers; and we consider ourselves fortunate in being able to refer to the writings of a very eminent Roman Catholic author of our own day, M. Beugnot, who has, singularly enough, largely developed the subject in his "Histoire de la Destruction du Paganisme en Occident"—a work which is considered one of the masterpieces of modern French literature, and was crowned as such by one of the most learned bodies of Europe, the "Academie des Inscriptions et des Belles Lettres," of Paris. We propose to avail ourselves, in our present article, of the result of his learned labours, merely premising that hero or dæmon worship was a favourite part of all Pagan systems of religion, and that the invasion of Italy by the Pagan Goths and Vandals appears to have been nearly cotemporaneous with the rise and growth of saint-worship in the Church of Rome.

"The fundamental idea of Christianity," says M. Beugnot, "was a new powerful idea, and independent of all those by which it had been preceded. However, the men by whom the Christian system was extended and developed, having been formed in the school of Paganism, could not resist the desire of connecting it with the former systems. It was, indeed, making a large concession to the spirit of ancient times; but they believed that they could correct its inconveniences by maintaining in all its purity the form of Christian worship, and rejecting with disdain the usages and ceremonies of polytheism. When Christianity became the dominant religion, its doctors perceived that they would be compelled to give way equally in respect to the external form of worship, and that they would not be sufficiently strong to constrain the multitude of pagans, who were embracing Christianity with a kind of enthusiasm as unreasoning as it was of little duration, to forget a system of acts, ceremonies, and festivals, which had such an immense power over their ideas and manners. The Church admitted, therefore, into her discipline, many usages evidently pagan. She undoubtedly has endeavoured to purify them, but she never could obliterate the impression of their original stamp.

"This new spirit of Christianity—this eclectism, which extended even to material things—has, in modern times, given rise to passionate discussions; those borrowings from the old religion were condemned, as having been suggested to the Christians of the fourth and fifth centuries by the remnants of that old love of idolatry which was lurking at the bottom of their hearts. It was easy for the modern reformers to condemn, by an unjust blame, the leaders of the Church; they should, however, have acknowledged, that the principal interest of Christianity was to wrest from error the greatest number of its partisans, and that it was impossible to attain this object without providing for the obstinate adherents of the false gods an easy passage from the temple to the Church. If we consider that, *notwithstanding all these concessions*, the ruin of paganism was accomplished only by degrees and imperceptibly—that, during more than two centuries, it was necessary to combat, over the whole of Europe, an error which, although continually overthrown, was incessantly rising again—we shall understand that the conciliatory spirit of the leaders of the Church was true wisdom.

"St. John Chrysostom says that the devil having perceived that he could gain nothing with the Christians by pushing them in a direct way into idolatry, adopted for the purpose an indirect one. If the devil—that is to say, the pagan spirit—was changing its plan of attack, the Church was also obliged to modify her system of defence, and not to affect an inflexibility which would have kept from her a great number of people, whose irresolute conscience was fluctuating between falsehood and truth.

"Already, at the beginning of the fifth century, some haughty spirits—Christians who were making a display of the dignity of their virtues, and who were raising an outcry against the profanation of holy things—began to preach a pretended reform; they were recalling the Christians to the apostolic doctrine; they demanded what they were calling a true Christianity. Vigilantius, a Spanish priest, sustained on this subject an animated contest with St. Jerome. He opposed the worship of the saints, and the custom of placing candles on their sepulchres; he condemned, as a source of scandal, the vigils in the basilicas of the martyrs, and many other usages, which were, it is true, derived from the ancient worship. We may judge by the warmth with which St. Jerome refuted the doctrines of this heresiarch, of the importance which he attached to those usages. He foresaw that the mission of the Christian doctrine would be to adapt itself to the manners of all times, and to oppose them only when they would tend towards depravity. Far from desiring to deprive the Romans of certain ceremonial practices which were dear to them, and whose influence had nothing dangerous to the Christian dogmas, he openly took their part, and his conduct was approved by the whole Church.

"If St. Jerome and St. Augustine had shared the opinions of Vigilantius, would they have had the necessary power successfully to oppose the introduction of pagan usages into the ceremonies of the Christian Church? I do not believe they would. After the fall of Rome, whole populations passed under the standards of Christianity, but they did it with their baggage of senseless beliefs and superstitious practices. The Church could not repulse this crowd of self-styled Christians, and still less summon them immediately to abandon all their ancient errors; she, therefore, made concessions which were not entirely voluntary. They may be considered as calculations full of wisdom on the part of the leaders of the Church, as well as the consequence of that kind of irruption which was made at the beginning of the fifth century into the Christian society by populations who, notwithstanding their abjuration, were Pagans in their manners, their tastes, their prejudices, and their ignorance.

"The Romans had derived from their religion an excessive love of public festivals. They were unable to conceive a worship without the pompous apparel of ceremonies. They considered the long processions, the harmonious chants, the splendour of dresses, the light of tapers, the perfume of frankincense, as the essential part of religion. Christianity, far from opposing a disposition which required only to be directed with more wisdom (?), adopted a part of the ceremonial system of the ancient worship. It changed the object of its ceremonies, it cleansed them from their old impurities, but it preserved the days upon which many of them were celebrated; and the multitude found thus in the new religion, as much as in the old one, the means of satisfying its dominant passion.*

"The neophytes felt for the pagan temples an involuntary respect. They could not pass at once from veneration to a contempt for the monuments of their ancestor's piety. Christianity understood the power of this feeling; it consented, therefore, to establish the solemnities of its worship in the edifices which it had long disdained. Its care not to offend pagan habits was such, that it often respected even the pagan names of these edifices. There are at Rome even now several Churches which had formerly been pagan temples, and thirty-nine of them have been built on the foundation of such temples. Four

* On comparing the Christian calendar with the Pagan, it is impossible not to be struck by the great concordance between the two. The Saturnalia and several other festivals were celebrated on the calends of January; Christmas was fixed at the same epoch the Lupercalia—a pretended feast of purification—took place on the calends of February; the Christian purification (Candlemas) was celebrated on the 2nd of February; the festival of Augustus—celebrated on the calends of August—was replaced by that of St. Peter, to whom is established on the first of that month.

Churches at Rome have pagan names—viz., S Maria Sopra Minerva, S Maria Aventina, St. Lorenzo in Matuta, and St. Stefano del Cacco.

"There is, moreover, a peculiar cause to which the rapid decline of the pagan doctrines in the west must be ascribed. On the 21st June, 431, two hundred bishops at the Council of Ephesus declared that the Virgin Mary should be honoured as the mother of God. The worship of Mary the mother of God, seems to have been the means which Providence has employed for completing Christianity. The nations were as if dazzled by the image of this Divine mother, who united in her person the two most tender feelings of nature—the pudicity of the virgin, and the love of the mother. They accepted this new worship with an enthusiasm sometimes too great, because with many Christians it became the whole Christianity. The pagans did not even try to defend their altars against the progress of the worship of the mother of God; they opened to Mary the temples which they kept closed to Jesus Christ,* and confessed their defeat. It is true that they often mixed with the worship of Mary those pagan ideas, those vain practices, those ridiculous superstitions, from which they seemed unable to detach themselves; but the Church rejoiced, nevertheless, at their entering into her pale, because she knew that it would be easy to her (?) to purge of its alloy, with the help of time, a worship whose essence was purity itself. Thus, some prudent concessions, temporarily made to the pagan manners, and the worship of Mary, were two elements of force which the Church employed in order to conquer the resistance of the last pagans—a resistance which was feeble enough in Italy, but violent beyond the Alps."

We beg our readers to recollect that the whole of the above long extract is taken from an eminent Roman Catholic writer, and did space permit there is much more of M. Beugnot's work which we might extract with benefit, as proving, in an unanswerable manner, the extent to which pagan rites and ideas were admitted into the Roman Catholic Church by way of *compromise* between Christianity and paganism; but we shall merely observe, that however natural it is to believe that such a line of policy may have contributed to the rapidity of the extension of the external dominion of Christianity, it as naturally accounts for the introduction into her pale of errors and superstitions, which (as we must ever think the propagation of Divine truth by the Church of Christ to be a matter of *principle* not *policy*), we cannot but think, it was her mission to eradicate and destroy, instead of delivering over mankind, as far as lay in her power, to their baneful influence.

With such admissions on the part of an able writer, not at all imbued with Protestant notions or arguments, we think it will not be very difficult to understand or imagine how the saints of the Roman Church, to whom the defence of particular countries was assigned, took the place of the *Dii Tutelares* of the pagan world; how those to whom the safety of certain cities were committed, took the place of their *Dii Præsides;* or such saints as temples and churches were built and altars erected to, of their *Dii Patroni;* in short, how the practice of saint and martyr worship was gradually, during the fourth and fifth centuries, substituted for the hero, or dæmon worship of pagan Rome.

We have still, however, to show the way in which sincere Christians were themselves gradually led into superstitious practices, which, in the primitive ages, they were ignorant of; and to trace *some*, at least, of the steps by which this kind of worship grew up to the height which it ultimately arrived at in the Church of Rome.

That during the first ages of Christianity, when persecution raged against it, and martyrdom was no infrequent testimony to the earnestness and devotedness of its professors, the primitive Christians should have held these martyrs and confessors in the greatest honour, on account of the great service they had done to the cause of Christ, was both natural and commendable. In fact, they were in the habit of frequenting their tombs, and rehearsing there the good works they had done in their lifetime, and their faith, patience, and constancy in death. There they blessed God for the grace that was given to them, and proposed their virtues for imitation, and had their own piety and zeal inflamed by the remembrance of them. This was the honour which the primitive Christians deservedly showed to their victorious martyrs—they loved their memories, commemorated their virtues, and blessed God for their example; but they did not invocate them; *that*, as we showed in our former paper, they reserved as the religious worship which was due to God only.

Towards the middle and latter end, however, of the fourth century, the state of the Church had greatly changed. The Emperor, Constantine the Great, had been converted to Christianity, and the Church had rest and ease, and prosperity began to dawn upon it. Riches and honour at length began to attend the profession, for which so many had suffered martyrdom; and those who were wont to frequent the tombs of the martyrs, that at the sight of the place their affections might be raised, their devotions enlivened, and their faith and charity receive warmth and heat from their burning and shining examples, now that they no longer anticipated a similar fate themselves, soon began to honour the saints more by lofty praises and high sounding commendations, than by endeavouring to become saints themselves by imitating their virtues; and, as is not unusual in religious matters, that they might make up in the one way what they wanted in the other, the language of their panegyrics, and laudatory orations, by degrees broke out into superstitious conceits, and lavish and extravagant expressions, which ended at last in actual invocation or religious worship.

Gregory of Nazianzum, who died about the close of the fourth century, A.D. 396, is referred to by Father Paul (the well-known Roman Catholic commentator on the proceedings of the Council of Trent) as one of those, who, "by addressing the saints in public harangues, laid the foundation of the modern practice of praying to them; though such addresses," he justly adds "ought to be regarded as figures of rhetoric, rather than invocations." Gregory's works, no doubt, contain many panegyrics delivered on the anniversaries, or at the tombs of celebrated Christians, in which, at the close of his collaudation of their virtues, he apostrophizes the martyr, apologizes for his own defects, begging him to accept his exertions, however unworthy of the merits he had been celebrating, and to look favourably on the company who were assembled in his honour. That such apostrophes, however, do not prove that Gregory actually believed that the dead heard or understood his addresses, is plain; for, we find him, by a similar figure of rhetoric, apostrophizing things which never had ears to hear, or a mind to understand. Such as the following*—"Such are thy narrations and wonders, O Egypt," &c.;† and the same thing will appear, perhaps, still more clearly, when we find him addressing dead men and women in the language of uncertainty and doubt (not as to the happiness of true Christians in another world, but as to their *power to hear* the addresses made to them by any here below). Thus, in his funeral oration upon his own sister Gorgona, he says (Paris Ed., p. 189), "Mayest thou enjoy all these, of which on earth thou receivest a few droppings, from thy genuine disposition towards them. But IF *thou canst take any interest in our affairs, and this boon be granted by God to pious souls, that they have any perception of such things*, receive our address, instead of many, and in preference to many, funeral obsequies, which address we presented to Cæsarius before thee, and now to thee after him.‡ Better, we know, and far more to be prized, are the things which thou hast now, than what are here seen; the choir of angels, the vision of the Trinity most high, the more pure and perfect illumination of the glory no longer withdrawing itself from a mind in bondage and dissipated by the passions, but certainly contemplated and held by the whole mind, and shining upon our souls with the whole light of the Godhead, and all these thou mayest enjoy," &c. And, again, in his First Invective against Julian (Id., p. 50), after calling upon all on earth to hear him, the same Gregory adds, "Hear, O Heaven, and give ear O earth . . . and Hear, O thou soul of the great Constantius, *if thou hast any perception of these things*, and all ye souls of the kings before him who loved Christ."§ Who could fairly conclude from such passages that Gregory of Nazianzum believed, or intended seriously to teach, that it was proper or justifiable to invoke the saints with religious worship, or to inculcate the belief that they were able to hear or answer our prayers? It is obvious that the language of *doubt* is not that which St. Gregory would have spoken, had the Church then held it as a matter of *faith*, that the saints can hear us, and ought to be worshipped.

We might greatly extend quotations illustrative of this subject, but our space forbids us to go further for the present. We think, however, we have already said enough to show our readers in what manner saint-worship was first introduced, and some of the steps, at least, by which, in the fourth and fifth centuries, the minds of Christians became gradually reconciled to practices at variance with the purer worship of the first three centuries.

---

*"Amongst a multitude of proofs," says Beugnot, "I shall choose only one, in order to show with what facility the worship of Mary swept away, in its progress, the remnants of paganism which were still covering Europe:—Notwithstanding the preaching of St. Hilarion, Sicily had remained faithful to the ancient worship.—After the Council of Ephesus, we see eight of the finest pagan temples of that island becoming, in a very short time, churches dedicated to the Virgin. These temples were—(1.) Of Minerva, at Syracuse; (2.) of Venus and Saturn, at Messina; (3.) of Venus Erigone, on the Mount Eryx—believed to have been built by Æneas; (4.) of Phalaris, at Agrigent; (5.) of Vulcan, near Mount Etna; (6.) the Pantheon, at Catania; (7.) of Ceres, in the same town; (8.) the Sepulchre of Stesichorus."—*Aprile Cronologia Universale di Sicilia.*

* By similar apostrophies insensate things are often addressed in the Holy Scriptures—"Hear, O ye mountains." "Praise the Lord, ye dragons and all deeps"—and numberless other passages in the poetical books of Scripture.

† Our readers will probably recollect a striking instance of this in our last number, where John Damascenus apostrophizes the tomb of the Virgin, as if it had been a living being.—p. 109.

‡ Εἰ δέ τις σοὶ καὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἐστι λόγος, καὶ τοῦτο ταῖς ὑσιαις ψυχαῖς ἐκ Θεόν γέρας, τῶν τοιούτων ἐπαισθάνεσθαι, δέχου καὶ τὸν ἡμετέρον λόγον, ἀντὶ πολλων καὶ πρὸ πολλῶν ἐνταφίων, ὃν Καισαρίῳ μεν πρὸ σου, καὶ σοὶ μετ' ἐκεῖνον ἀποδεδώκαμεν.—Greg. Naz. Græc. Lat. Oratio xi. p. 189. Paris, 1630.

§ Ἀκουε καὶ ἡ του μεγάλου Κωνσταντίνου ψυχή, εἴ τις ἄισθησις, ὅσαι τε πρὸ αὐτοῦ βασιλέων φιλόχριστοι, τοῦ δὲ καὶ πάντων μάλιστα, ὅσῳ τῇ χρίστου κληρονομίᾳ συναυξηθείς.—Id. p. 50.

HISTORY OF THE POPES.—No. I.

POPE STEPHEN VI., AND POPE FORMOSUS'S FINGERS.

THE office claimed by the Popes is the highest that has been imagined among men. To be the vicar of Christ, and the successor of Peter, the prince of the Apostles—to decide all questions that can arise in the Church by the authority of Peter, who speaks in the person of the Pope—these are their claims. Thus, when the Irish Roman Catholic bishops were disputing about the national schools, the Pope pronounced his decision, and the Synod of Thurles proclaimed it thus—"Peter has spoken in the person of Pius; the judge has spoken; the controversy is ended." And when Pope Pius shall have decided, for the first time, on the 8th of December next, that the Blessed Virgin Mary was conceived without sin, the Roman Catholic bishops will equally exclaim, that it is St. Peter who has spoken in the person of Pius.

It is not supposed that Popes have acquired these powers in modern times: no; it is affirmed that the Church has *never* been without a lawful representative of Peter, speaking by his apostolical authority.

Those who are convinced that this claim is well founded, may well believe that the history of the Popes is worthy of the most attentive study. What a pity that Roman Catholics should be so little acquainted with the lives and actions of the Popes in ages past! May they not, with great reason, expect, that in the history of this divine institution, from age to age, there will be found lessons of justice, wisdom, and truth, superior to any that can be learned in the history of any other institution that ever has existed in the world?

We shall endeavour, from time to time, to open up this mine of hidden wisdom, by giving some of the most striking facts from the lives and history of the Popes. Writing, as we do, for Roman Catholics, we shall, of course, not quote what any Protestant author has written about Popes; we shall confine ourselves entirely to the lives of the Popes, as we find them in the collection of the councils made by the learned Jesuits, Labbe and Cossart, and in the annals of Cardinal Baronius, and other authors of the very highest credit in the Church of Rome.

We take as our first instance, the life of Pope Stephen, VI.,* who succeeded Formosus about 896, as we find it in Labbe and Cossart (vol. ix., p. 474, Ed. Par. 1671), who profess to have taken it chiefly from Cardinal Baronius.

"Stephen VI. succeeded Formosus. For Boniface, who invaded the apostolical See, and held it for fifteen days, is not to be reckoned among the Popes. . . . . And although each of them obtained the See by force, fear, and tyranny (that is, both Boniface and Stephen VI.), and, therefore, one who was equally an intruder thrust out an intruder, yet Stephen is reckoned in the number and list of the Popes *by common consent;* because, for the sake of averting the danger of schism, the *entire clergy* approved of him, although he was *a most infamous man*, and *the whole Catholic Church*† *acknowledged him as vicar of Christ and successor of St. Peter.*"

The account gives some instances as to how he was acknowledged, and then proceeds—"He commenced his pontificate with that sacrilege in which he cast into the Tiber the body of Formosus, dug up out of its grave, clothed with the sacerdotal garments, and mutilated of three of its fingers; and ordered that all who had been ordained by him should be consecrated and ordained over again."‡

The life in Labbe and Cossart goes on to express surprise that Onuphrius, in his notes on Platina, should reject this account as fabulous, since it is proved by ancient documents, and is related by Luitprand,§ in the eighth chapter of the first book of his history; which account the life proceeds to give as follows—". . . . . who being appointed, like an impious man and ignorant of the holy doctrines, he ordered that Formosus should be dragged out of his tomb, and placed on the pontifical seat, clothed in the sacerdotal vestments; to whom also he says 'when you were Bishop of Ostia, why did you usurp the universal Roman See, in the spirit of ambition?' These things being done, he ordered him to be cast into the Tiber, stript of the sacred vestments, *and three of his fingers being cut off;*

---

* Some call this Pontiff Stephen the *Sixth*, others call him Stephen the *Seventh*: attention to this is necessary, to prevent confusion. The difficulty arises in this way—Roman Catholics do not know whether the Stephen who was first appointed in the year 752 was a Pope or not. It will be seen in this paper that Roman Catholics have no certain way of knowing who were really Popes and who were not. Labbe and Cossart get over this difficulty cleverly: in the list in vol. xvi., p. 132, they count thus—Stephen II., Stephen III., then *another* Stephen III., and then Stephen IV. Thus they call this man Stephen VI., as the ancients did, and still they contrive to get in *all* the Stephens—more clever than satisfactory, certainly—in a list of the Popes.

† Stephanus Sextus successit Formoso. Bonifacius enim qui invadens sedem apostolicam, tenuit eam diebus quindecim, non est numerandus inter pontifices. . . . . Et quamquam uterque per vim, metum, et tyrannidem, sedem adepti fuerint, adeoque intrusus pariter intrusum expulerit; tamen Stephanus in numero et serie pontificum communi sententie numeratur, quia ad periculum schismatis avertendum, illum quamquam homo scelestissimus esset universus clerus approbavit, totaque ecclesia Catholica pro Christi Vicario et successore Petri agnovit.—Labbe and Cossa., vol ix., p. 474. Ed. Paris, 1671.

‡ Pontificatum auspicatus est a sacrilegio illo, quo corpus Formosi exhumatum, sacerdotalibus indumentis indutum, tribusque digitis mutilatum in Tyberim projecit, omnesque ab eodem ordinatos iterato consecrari et ordinari præcepit.

§ This Luitprand was Bishop of Cremona, in Italy. He wrote his history about thirty years after the death of Pope Stephen. He was well acquainted with the facts of those times, and bears the character of a learned and accurate historian.

and he ordained over again, as deposed from their orders, all whom he (Formosus) had ordained."*

That all this really was done by Pope Stephen VI. to the dead body of his predecessor, Pope Formosus, is past all reasonable doubt; for it is not only related by Luitprand who wrote so soon after Stephen's time, but we have another account written by Auxilius, who was himself ordained a priest by Pope Formosus,† who relates exactly the same story, except that he says that Pope Stephen only cut off *two* fingers of the right hand; In all which, he says, Pope Stephen acted like a wild beast, unmindful of humanity; and he observes that the Lord did *not* say, whatever you shall bind *under* the earth or *under the river*, shall be bound in heaven!—Book ii. ch. 30.

The object of cutting off the dead Pope's fingers is not very clear to us. Why did not the live Pope cut off the dead Pope's head?‡ Why not the toe which all the world had been kissing? Why did he not, at least, cut off *all* his fingers while he was about it? Was it from moderation? or was there any special reason for it? Some say that these three fingers were used in benediction and ordination; in which case, cutting them off would, of course, disable the dead Pope from ordaining any more; but could scarcely be supposed to affect what he had done while living. But, then, it seems strange that Auxilius, who was himself ordained by Formosus, should speak of only *two* fingers. If but *one* had been cut, we might have thought it was done to get off "the fisherman's ring;" and, indeed, the Roman Council under Pope John IX., which condemned the acts of Stephen, expressly says that plunder was the object of the whole proceeding.§

We must return to the account in Labbe and Cossart, who proceed thus with Luitprand's story—"Of how great authority and how religious Pope Formosus was, we can gather from this, since, when he was afterwards found by fishermen and carried to the Church of the blessed Prince of the Apostles, *certain images of the saints*, with veneration, *saluted him*, placed in his coffin; for this I have very often heard from most religious men of the city of Rome."‖

We should have thought that this miracle would have settled the question, whether the ordinations performed by Pope Formosus were to be considered null, and to be repeated; but we shall see presently that the question continued to rage for seventeen years after, and that different Popes decided it in opposite ways. But to return again to the life of Pope Stephen VI.; it goes on to say—"Pope Stephen added crime to crime, when in a synod which he collected, he approved the nefarious, impious, and detestable act. For the stones themselves, execrating such a monstrosity, then cried out with their own voice by knocking against each other, that they would more willingly suffer spontaneous ruin, than that the Roman Church should remain depressed by so great a scandal. It happened, then, that the sacred Basilica of the Lateran, the principal seat of the Pope, fell prostrate from the altar to the door, an evil angel striking it, because the walls were by no means able to stand, when the first rock of the hinge was shaken by the earthquake of so great a crime."¶

The life in Labbe and Cossart goes on to say, that "the heretics of our time (the Protestants) on account of that impious act, wickedly rise up against the promises of Christ made to Peter and the Church, and boasting too much of victory, triumph too soon."** We give now the defence of these most learned men against the triumph of the Protestants, and let us see if it be satisfactory: "For all things, which Stephen said or did against Formosus, *he did as a man struck with madness*, fulfilling what his raging fury suggested. But he defined nothing against faith or good morals by pontifical authority lawfully obtained. For the bishops and presbyters who were summoned to a synod about this matter, being *not unlike to Stephen*, persecuted Formosus with like hatred, and, therefore, pronounced for that sentence *which they knew would be agreeable to a man struck with madness*. From whence we acknowledge, indeed, a violent tyranny in fact in this matter; but we confidently deny that an error in faith was defined or approved by Stephen *lawfully obtaining* pontificial authority; although it would in no way prejudice the apostolic See, if we should grant that an usurper, not lawfully elected, but *an intrusive false Pope* had erred in affirming articles of faith."††

The force of the defence lies in this—first, that Stephen VI. was a madman, and not lawfully Pope; and, secondly, that he defined nothing against faith or good morals.

As to the first, it is a common and an easy device, when a Pope is convicted of infamous crimes, or sacrilege, or error in faith, to say, "Oh, that man was no lawful Pope; he got the Popedom by tyranny or bribery, or even by worse means, and, of course, the powers of a true and lawful Pope are not to be expected in him." We shall have many instances to show, in which Roman Catholics are driven to set up this defence and excuse for the doings of their Popes.

But is not this the great argument in support of the claims of the Popes—"that it is impossible to believe that God would have left his Church without a visible head, a living and speaking judge, in the place of Christ, whom all might safely follow in the confidence of faith?" And is it not still harder to believe that God should profess and undertake to give his Church such a head and judge, and yet leave the Church liable to be deceived by a false head—to be imposed on by a madman, who was no lawful Pope, and led by him into wholesale sacrilege about the so-called sacrament of orders? If the Church cannot distinguish between a true and a false head, where is her security in having a visible head?

Now, this very account of Pope Stephen in Labbe and Cossart, which sets up this defence, that Stephen was no lawful Pope, does also say (as we have shown above) that "the whole clergy approved of him, and *the whole Catholic Church* acknowledged him as the Vicar of Christ and the successor of Peter;" and the account concludes by saying, "*after he had held the apostolic See six years*, being strangled in prison, he closed his life by an infamous death, God being the avenger."† Was not this a great security to the Catholic Church, to be for six years looking up to a sacrilegious madman, who actually filled the place of the Pope, but who was no lawful Pope—mistaking him for the Vicar of Christ and true head of the Church?

This is what Roman Catholics tell us themselves. And then they ask us how we can dare to suppose that God would leave his Church without a visible head, a living and speaking judge in the place of Christ?

And to this we reply, that if God had undertaken to provide such a head, He would not have let it become a delusion and a snare, such as we have it proved by Roman Catholic authority that this Pope Stephen was.

But how do Labbe and Cossart know that this Stephen was not a lawful Pope? The whole Catholic Church thought that he was—nay, Pope John IX., who succeeded soon after, and whom all Roman Catholics acknowledge as a lawful Pope, thought so too; for he held a council at Rome in the year 904, to reverse the proceedings of Pope Stephen and his council against Formosus; and that council of Pope John commences thus—"We wholly repeal the council celebrated in the time of Pope Stephen VI., of PIOUS MEMORY—to wit, OUR PREDECESSOR—in which the venerable body of the venerable Pope Formosus was dragged through the land from its violated sepulchre, ..."‡

Clearly, then, the Church at that time, even when it had a Pope whom Roman Catholics now think was a lawful head, did not find out its mistake about Pope Stephen; for the lawful successor, even when repealing Pope Stephen's acts, acknowledged him as a lawful Pope.

To say he was not a lawful Pope is a mere afterthought to get out of a difficulty, and one which Roman Catholics of the present day are not agreed about; for Bishop Milner, in his End of Controversy (Letter xxviii., century ix.), thus gives the list of the Popes—" . . . John VIII., Marinus, Adrian III., Stephen VI., Formosus, Stephen VII.,§ Romanus, Theodore II., John IX., Benedict IV., Leo V., Christopher, and Sergius III."

The SECOND point in the defence of Labbe and Cossart against "the heretics," is that Pope Stephen VI. defined nothing contrary to faith or good morals. It is confessed by Labbe and Cossart themselves, that Pope Stephen VI. did commit sacrilege in decreeing that persons who had been lawfully ordained should be ordained over again; and, we ask, is not sacrilege, *at least*, contrary to good morals? But was not *this* sacrilege *also* contrary to the Roman faith as now held? This is certainly a hard thing to urge against Roman Catholics; because their religion, being formed, *from time to time*, by additions and inventions of men, is not the same in one age which it becomes in another; and it is hard to expect Popes of the 9th century to decide according to what their religion was to be in the 19th. But while Roman Catholics continue to assert that their religion has been the same in all ages, we must continue to show them the falsehood of this assertion.

It is confessed that Pope Stephen did decree that all who had been ordained by his predecessor, Pope Formosus, should be ordained over again. The Council of Trent declared that three of the sacraments of the Roman Church, Baptism, Confirmation, and Orders, cannot be repeated.* It has ever since been held that it is sacrilege, and contrary to the true Roman faith about the sacraments, to ordain over again those who have once been ordained. But all now acknowledge that those whom Formosus ordained were really ordained; yet Pope Stephen and his council decreed that they should be ordained over again, contrary to the Roman doctrine, as now held about the sacraments. And Auxilius, who was ordained by Formosus, tells us (Book ii. c. 9) that "a great multitude of bishops, priests, and deacons" were so ordained over again. Pope Stephen VI. did, therefore, err in the Roman faith concerning the sacrament of orders; and he led "the whole Catholic Church," who followed him "as the vicar of Christ," into wholesale sacrilege about "the sacrament of orders;" and it was, indeed, *a question of faith*, that the live Pope and the dead Pope were then cutting off each other's fingers about. And yet we feel that it is rather hard to urge this against Pope Stephen VI., when we consider what has been said about this very case by Father Morinus, the most learned authority of the Church of Rome in the matter of ordination—"*It had not yet* passed into a thing settled, and AN AXIOM OF THE CATHOLIC FAITH, that whatever ordination performed according to the rites of the Church, and by a bishop ordained according to those rites, was valid, and in no case to be repeated."† So this poor madman, Pope Stephen VI., only erred in not knowing what "the axioms of the Catholic faith" might turn out to be 600 years after! If he was a Pope, he was, at least, no prophet! It is hard to blame him; but we commend this to the consideration of those modern Roman Catholics who still think that "the axioms of the Catholic faith," have been *the same* in the Church of Rome *in all ages*. Clearly it was not so about "*the sacrament of orders*."

One word now about the history of this question about the ordinations of Pope Formosus.

About the year 896, Pope Stephen VI., and his council at Rome, ordered all those ordained by Formosus, to be ordained over again.

In the year 904, Pope John IX., and his council at Rome, repealed all that Pope Stephen and his council had decreed. Benedict IV., Leo V., and Christophorus kept this decree unchanged. ‡

About the year 906, Pope Sergius III. renewed the decree that the ordinations of Pope Formosus were to be repeated.—Labbe and Coss., vol. ix., p. 517.

How long this decree of Pope Sergius III. held good we cannot tell. The following Popes seem too deeply sunk in wickedness to trouble their heads about ordinations. But Morinus says, "this controversy afflicted the Church about seventeen years."—Part iii., cap. 3., p. 69. And *that*, although Luitprand says, that at the very beginning of the controversy the *images* of the saints interfered to try and settle it, by bowing down to Pope Formosus in his coffin!

We commend it to Roman Catholics to consider, "where was the head of the Church, and the living and speaking judge in place of Christ, during the pontificate of Pope Stephen VI.?" Even if this were a solitary instance, it is yet enough to disprove the notion that God *must* always have given such a head to the Church. But we warn them it is *not* a solitary instance.

We purpose proceeding with the history of the Popes in our next number, and we fear the result will still further horrify those who still try to believe that the Papacy was instituted by God, and that the Pope is the inheritor of the promises made to the Church.

THE SUCCESSION OF ST. PATRICK.

IN our number for last August, we published an article "ON THE SUCCESSION OF THE IRISH BISHOPS." At the end of that article we said, "whether Roman Catholics can show a clear succession in the Archbishopric of Armagh, the See of St. Patrick, we will put to the proof in our next number. We will give the succession of the archbishops of Armagh down from Primate Cromer, who was Archbishop of Armagh in 1550, before the Reformation. We now call on all Roman Catholic archbishops in Ireland

---

* Quo constituto, ut impius, doctrinarumque sanctorum inscius, Formosum e sepulcro extrahi, atque in sede pontificatus sacerdotalibus vestimentis indutum collocari præcepit, cui et ait; "Cum Portuensis esses episcopus, cur ambitionis spiritu Romanam universalem sedem usurpasti?" His expletis, sacratis exutum vestimentis, digitisque tribus abscissis, in Tyberim jactari præcepit, cunctosque quos ipse ordinaverat, gradu proprio depositos, iterum ordinavit.

† The two books of Auxilius in defence of the ordinations of Pope Formosus are printed in Morinus de Sacr. Ordin., part ii., p. 285. Antwerp, 1695. Few works of that age are written with so much learning and good sense as these of Auxilius.

‡ If Platina, who was keeper of the Vatican Library, under Pope Sixtus IV, is to be believed, Pope Sergius III. who a second time annulled the acts of Pope Formosus, had his body also a second time exhumed, and actually did cut off his *head*, and threw his body again into the Tiber!!—See Platina De Vitis Pontificum, p. 116, Ed. optima, 1529.

§ Sub fœdere conspirationis ad capiendum Theutrum, corpus illius trahentes, &c.—Labbe and Coss., vol. ix., p. 505. Can. 9. Ed. Paris, 1671.

‖ Quantæ autem auctoritatis, quantæque religionis Papa Formosus fuerit, hinc colligere possumus, quoniam dum a piscatoribus postmodum esset inventus, atque ad beati apostolorum principis ecclesiam deportatus, sanctorum imaginibus hunc in loculo positum venerabiliter salutarunt. Hoc namque a religiosissimis Romanæ urbis viris persæpe audiri.

¶ Addidit culpam culpæ Stephanus Papa, quando collecta synodo, nefarium, impium, et detestandum factum approbavit. Ipsi enim lapides tale portentum execrati, sua tunc voce mutua collisione clamarunt, spontaneam libentius pati ruinam, quam ut Romana ecclesia tanto scandalo depressa maneret. Accidit tunc ut sacrosanctæ Basilica Lateranensis, primaria pontificis sedes, impulsore angelo malo, ab altari usque ad portas prostrata corrueret, quia nequaquam stare poterant parietes, dum prima cardinis petra tanti facinoris terræ motu concussa fuisset.

** Hæretici nostri temporis . . . . contra promissiones Christi Petro et ecclesiæ factas, propter illud factum impium male insurgunt et præmatura nimis de victoria gloriantes triumphum agunt.

* Omnia enim quæ Stephanus contra Formosum dixit vel egit, homo furore percitus egit, impiens id quod exæstuans rabies suasit. Pontificia vero auctoritate legitime usurpata nihil contra fidem vel bonos mores definivit. Nam qui hac de causa ad synodum convocati sunt; episcopi et presbyteri Stephano non dissimiles, simili odio Formosum prosequebantur, adeoque in eandem sententiam pronunciarunt, quam humani furore percitu gratam fore præsciebant. Unde hac in re violentiam quidem tyrannidem in facto agnoscimus, errorem autem in fide per Stephanum pontificiam auctoritatem legitime usurpatam definitum vel approbatum falsae constanter pernegamus; quamquam nihil sedi apostolicæ præjudicaretur, si dicamus invasorem non legitime electum, sed intrusum pseudopontificem in articulis fidei asseverudie aberrasse.

† Postquam sedem apostolicam sex annis tenuisset, in eodem carcere strangulatus, Deo vindice, exitu infami vitam clausit.

‡ Synodum tempore pia recordationis sexti Stephani papæ, decessoris videlicet nostri celebratam, in quam venerabile corpus Formosi venerandi papæ, de sepultura violata per terram tractum est, . . . penitus abdicamus.—Labbe and Coss., vol. ix., p. 502.

§ This is the same Stephen, called Stephen VI. by Labbe and Cossart, as observed in a foregoing note; another proof, as we there remarked, that the Roman Church has no certain means of saying of any particular Pope, whether he be a true head of the Church or not.

* Session vii., canon 9.

† Nondum enim in rem judicatam transierat, et in *fide Catholica axioma*, quamlibet ordinationem secundum ecclesiæ ritum ab episcopo secundum eosdem ritum ordinato, celebratam, validam esse, et nullo casu iterandam.—Morinus de Sacris ordinationibus, part ii., p. 292. Antwerp, 1695.

‡ Platina says that Pope Romanus, also, abrogated the acts of Stephen; and Pope Theodore II. restored the acts of Formosus.—Ut Supra, p. 114.

(especially Dr. Dixon), on all Roman Catholic bishops, priests, and laymen, to send us a list of Roman Catholic archbishops in succession from Primate Cromer, with the dates of the vacancies and appointments, and the proofs of each. If any such list should be sent to us, we will publish it, side by side, with our own list; if no such list should be sent to us, Roman Catholics may well suspect that it is as great a puzzle to make out a Roman Catholic succession in Armagh, as in Dublin. We have now put this question in a position in which it may be fairly examined and discussed; and we trust our readers will look with interest for the results."

We now appeal to our Roman Catholic readers, whether that proposal was not a fair one on our part—whether it would not have been the most satisfactory way to have the two successions placed side by side, that they might be examined and compared together?

We greatly regret that it is not in our power now to place the two successions side by side; but the fact is, that no Roman Catholic has ventured to send us a list of the succession of their archbishops in the chair of St. Patrick; and *that*, although we have waited a *second* month for it.

We are not *surprised*—for it is our conviction that no Roman Catholic *can* give us such a list as would stand examination. But we think such a fact must be either humiliating or instructive to Roman Catholics, who have been so long accustomed to hear their priests and bishops boasting of their succession from St. Patrick. We wish this fact to be instructive to them, and not humiliating; for no man is really humbled by *learning* an important fact, but the contrary. We, therefore, call again on all candid Roman Catholics to inquire of their priests, whether a list of their archbishops of Armagh *can* be given, showing their succession from St. Patrick, or from Primate Cromer, who was Archbishop of Armagh before the Reformation.

In the meantime, all we can do is to give what *we* believe to be the true succession of Archbishops of Armagh, from Primate Cromer, which we take from Sir James Ware's learned work on the Irish bishops.* It will then be for Roman Catholics, if they can, to give us what *they* consider the true succession.

Names.	When each succeeded.	When each died, or otherwise vacated.
George Cromer	A.D. 1522 . .	Died, 1543.
George Dowdall	1543 . . .	Abandoned the see, October, 1551.
Hugh Goodacre	Feb., 1553 . .	Died, May, 1553.
George Dowdall	Restored Mar. 1554 . . .	Died, August, 1558
Adam Loftus	March, 1563 .	Translated to Dublin, August, 1567.
Thomas Lancaster . . .	June, 1568 .	Died, 1584.
John Long	July, 1584 .	Died, 1589.
John Garvey	May, 1589 .	Died, March, 1595.
Henry Usher	August, 1595	Died, April, 1613.
Christopher Hampton . .	May, 1613 .	Died, January, 1625.
James Usher	March, 1625 .	March, 1656.
John Bramhall	January, 1661	June, 1663.
James Margetson . . .	August, 1663	August, 1678.
Michael Boyle	January, 1679	December, 1702.
Narcissus Marsh	Feb., 1703 .	November, 1713.
Thomas Lyndsay	May, 1714. .	July, 1724.
Hugh Boulter	1724 . . .	Died, Sept., 1742.
John Hoadly	1742. . . .	Died, July, 1746.
George Stone	1747. . . .	Died, Dec., 1764.
Richard Robinson . . .	1765. . . .	Died, October, 1794.
William Newcome . . .	1795. . . .	Died January, 1800.
William Stuart	1800. . . .	Died, 1822.
Lord John G. Beresford. .	1822. . . .	

Now, if Roman Catholics can do for themselves what we have done here, let them do so; and we will be ready to publish their list, and to compare the two successions; but if they cannot venture to do it, will they attempt hereafter to boast of their succession from St. Patrick?

We shall proceed to give the succession in the See of Dublin next.

* We give the dates according to the new style.

TALK OF THE ROAD.—No. XXV.

"PAT, I have got something new to talk about," said Jem, pulling a roll of paper out of his pocket.

"Let us see it, Jem," said Pat. So Jem unrolled the paper, and showed a beautiful picture, with fine, bright colours in it.

So said Pat, "what is it at all, Jem?"

"Don't you see for yourself Pat?" said Jem.

"Why, then, if it isn't the souls in Purgatory!" said Pat.

"'Deed and it isn't then; you're out for this time," said Jem; "so look again, Pat."

So Pat looked again; "and what else can you make of it at all?" said Pat.

"The *bodies* in purgatory," said Jem.

"Well, sure enough, it is," said Pat; "sure enough them's bodies; them can't be souls anyway. But isn't it mostly *souls* that goes to Purgatory?" said Pat, a little puzzled.

"Well, I never heard tell of any but souls going there, if so be they go there at all," said Jem; "but you see yourself it's bodies that is in it."

"Sure enough it is, Jem," said Pat; "and my! but they're the purty creatures, them women, just like real ladies! I wonder what they done at all to bring them there? Would they be bad women, now?" said Pat.

"Well, you know Pat," said Jem, "that couldn't be; for doesn't the catechism say that them that dies in mortal sin goes to hell for all eternity, and not to Purgatory?"

"Aye," said Pat; "but doesn't the catechism say, too, that them that gets their mortal sin, and the guilt of it, forgiven in this world, has still to go to Purgatory, for a time, to get the stains washed out of them before they can go to heaven, where nothing defiled can enter? and might'nt it be that way they got there?"

"Well, maybe so," said Jem, "if so be that them that's forgiven goes there at all. But when Jesus Christ said to the woman that was a sinner, *thy sins are forgiven thee;* and when he allowed her to wash his feet with her tears, and wipe them with the hair of her head, and, more than all, when he finished with her by saying, *thy faith hath saved thee*, GO IN PEACE, did he just mean to bid her go to Purgatory? or was that the meaning she took out of it?"*

"Well, Jem," said Pat, "I'm thinking if Jesus Christ had just took and shown her that picture, she would'nt have *gone in peace* anyway."

"I'm thinking so, too," said Jem; "and that when the Blessed Lord said them blessed words to the woman that was a sinner, he didn't mean the picture at all; and it's hard to think that them that's forgiven by him will ever come to the like of what's in that picture."

"Well, if they was ever so bad," said Pat, "sure it would be only commonly decent, with their purty, white skins, and the beautiful hair flowing down on their backs, to put a bit of a shift on them itself when their pictures was going to be took in Purgatory."

"Man alive," said Jem, "what good would that be? sure look at the long flames just curling up all round them, and would'nt the shift be burned off them afore you could look round?"

"Well, I don't know for that," said Pat; "sure there isn't so much as the sign of a scorch on their beautiful skins; and why couldn't the shift stand it as well? Don't you mind in the Book of Daniel, when the wicked king put the three men in the fire, because they would not worship the golden image, the fire couldn't hurt their clothes no more than themselves."†

"Well, sure enough," said Jem, "the picture looks a deal more like people that the fire couldn't hurt at all, than like people it could hurt; and that being the way, they might as well have their clothes on, and I'm thinking it might be better too in the picture; for you know yourself, Pat, there's many a young boy that cares little for Purgatory, that would buy that picture just for the bad thoughts that could be took out of it."

"Well, there's some in the picture dressed fine enough, anyway," said Pat; "who would they be now?"

"Sure them's the angels taking the souls out of Purgatory," said Jem; "don't you see the wings on them."

"Well, that's the elegant dress on that angel," said Pat; "that's the beautiful green bedgown, and the purtiest red petticoat ever I seen. Sure the finest lass at a fair would be proud to be an angel, to wear such a bedgown and petticoat!"

"'Deed and she might," said Jem; "but sure a girl that wore the like of that would, at least, have the shoes on her arm going to a fair or a market."

"But what's this, at all, at the top," said Pat, "with all the bright light about it? Well, it's the cross and a lamb on it. Won't that be Jesus, now?"

"That's what it's meant for," said Jem; "the lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world;‡ and don't you see the blood running from its throat, and the angels catching the blood in golden cups, and pouring it out on the people in Purgatory."

"And is it the blood of Christ and not the fire, after all, that cleanses them that's in Purgatory?" said Pat; "and is it only *waiting* in the fire they are till they get the blood of Christ? didn't I think that sins were forgiven in this life by the blood of Christ, and that them that was forgiven had to go to Purgatory to get their stains bleached out of their souls by the fire itself? but if it's the blood of Christ that cleanses too, what is the fire for at all?"

"Well, it's just for to punish them," said Jem.

"Don't tell me of *punishment* for them that's *forgiven*," said Pat, "that's not reason, and it's not Gospel. Either the fire is to cleanse out the stains of the soul, after the sins is forgiven, or it's for nothing at all; and *which* does the cleansing, is it the blood of Christ, or is it the fire?"

"Well, Pat," said Jem, "the Bible tells us of forgiveness of sins, through the blood of Christ; and it tells us just the same of the *cleansing* too. Sure does'nt it say—'How much more shall the blood of Christ, who by the Holy Ghost offered himself unspotted unto God, CLEANSE our conscience from dead works, to serve the living God.'§ And if the blood of Christ does *all*, what is the fire for?"

"Well, Jem," said Pat, "here is the differ of the Bible and the picture. *Both* allows that the blood of Christ does it; but, by the Bible, the blood of Christ does it *now;* and, by the picture, the blood of Christ won't cleanse us till we get to Purgatory."

"Well, I think that's it," said Jem. "Sure we have the Bible and the picture to choose between."

"Well, thank God for having the choice anyway," said Pat, "which I wonder would the priests like us to follow?"

"Well, Pat," said Jem, "I got this picture in a shop that had plenty more, just nigh hand to the great Carmelite Church, in York-row, in Dublin. Sure the priests like to see it set up in the windows; if they don't like it, why don't they stop it? Sure it isn't Protestants sells that! And why don't they say a word against it? Why don't they warn the people against it, the way they do against reading the Bible? Sure the priests like the picture well, and why would'nt they give it to us for our religion. I'm thinking there is a deal of things in our religion would be better took off it, if any priest would only set about it."

"Well, Jem," said Pat, "I thought that last week, when I seen Peter M'Kenna buying a horse in Kilcommon fair; and the horse had a big bush of a tail on him, and Peter got him cheap, for he run him down for falling away entirely in the hind quarters; and when Peter got him into a yard, he just backed him up to the wrong end of a cart, and whipped the big tail off him, and then he stood a one-side, and says Peter—'Now, is'nt that a great addition to him entirely.' And thinks I to myself, would'nt it be a great addition to our religion if it was well docked too."

"Well, never mind the horse, Pat," said Jem. "But sure enough there's a deal to come off our religion, and the more the Bible gets out, the sooner it will be done."

And the more we hear of the talk of plain people, like Pat and Jem, the more hope we have that the Bible will get out indeed.

* St. Luke, vii. 37, to the end.

† This history is in the fourth chapter of the Book of Daniel. N.B.—Observe, from verse 23 to verse 90 of this chapter, in the Douay Bible, is not in Hebrew Bible—Daniel wrote in Hebrew: neither is it in the Protestant Bible; but the account of the men being saved in the fire is in both Biblea.

‡ Gospel of St. John, i. 29.

§ Hebrews, ix. 14 (Douay Bible).

THE LIFE OF A PRIEST.

To those who are themselves seeking for truth, or desirous of studying the human mind under circumstances, and, perhaps, struggles similar to their own, a truthful narrative of the mental workings of one who has made serious sacrifices to what he is convinced is the cause of truth, may, perhaps, not be without instruction, or, at least, interest. It will be seen, at any rate, in what follows, that the writer has not been actuated by any momentary impulse, or propelled by any ecclesiastical censures, in taking the course he has finally adopted; but has been led to his present views by slow degrees, and, after long deliberation and a diligent study of that Holy Book which all Christians equally acknowledge to be the Word of the Living God.

Guided by such feelings and principles, allow me to introduce myself to your notice, and to that of the educated and thinking persons who read the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, as a priest who passed his classes, with some distinction, in the College of Maynooth, where I remained during the period of six years—the three first of which were spent in exercises on metaphysics, ethics, and mathematics, under the guidance of French refugees (Sorbonnists), whose literary merit I was then unable to appreciate, but who, now that my judgment is matured by years, I have no hesitation in saying, were men of unquestionable talent and varied information. The other three years were misspent in the quibbling casuistry of moral theology.

During all that time the students were not instructed in the Scriptures, except during one hour on Sunday, by the dean, who was an indifferent scholar, and who explained them according to the view of that Church of which he was a paid official, invariably enforcing his arguments by reference to decrees and councils, rather than to the internal evidence of undoubted inspiration.

After my course of education was completed, I was ordained in due course, and obliged, in one hour after, to take up the Breviary, a book replete with the most palpable falsehoods that were ever dictated by the pen of untruth. It will be sufficient for my justification in leaving off reading this book (although taught that I was bound to read it, under pain of mortal sin), to point out one or two of those fables. One day, during the infancy of Peter of Alcantara, and whilst a baby, under a Spanish veranda, a swarm of bees came into the cradle where the baby was placed, got into his armpit, and brought out honey therein! Another of these fables is—The Bishop of Cracow, in Poland, purchased a plot of land from one of the public functionaries, to build a church on. In some time after, the bishop was called upon for payment, to which application he replied, that the money was already paid, and required but three days to substantiate his point. The holy bishop repaired to the cemetery, where his man of business had been buried upwards of three years, took off his mantle, spread it on the tomb, and called upon his old friend to come up, and, in an instant, he came forth, walked to the magistrate's office, deposed, on oath, that the money was paid, went back, and slept in the Lord! I am induced to add another, although at the risk of trespassing on the pages of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN. A friar wanted to cross the Nile, but could not procure a boat. A crocodile, seeing the holy man's distress, backed in to the bank and carried him over in safety! Such are the fables that are to be found in that book, which is put

into the hands of all young priests the moment they are ordained, and after they promise, on bended knees, that they will not preach or teach anything contrary to truth, and not contained in the volume of inspiration. How preposterous is it in the Church of Rome, after imposing such obligations, to put such incredible fables into the hands of her ministers! What morality can be expected from the members of a Church which forces such indigestible food down the throats of her priesthood, and requires them to believe, or, at least, to profess, things so self-evidently incredible and absurd?

After having finished my academical course of study, and left the college, I considered it would add not a little to the future dignity of my character to travel. Accordingly, I set off for Paris, and, as my family was much more respectable and opulent than those from whom the students were usually selected, I had ample means given me for my journey. After my arrival in that city, I had time enough to consider how weak it would be to continue to read a book which I could not disguise from myself was nothing but a mass of turgid homilies, unintelligible hymns, and incredible falsehoods. I then came to the resolution of adding one volume more to the small family library of the hotel I was staying in, in the Rue de St. Honoré—Fontaine's and Florian's fables. I placed my book of fables with them, without possessing the style or morality of either.

After having thus disposed of my Breviary, I bought a copy of the New Testament, out of which I read a chapter every day, and feared no divine displeasure in consequence of the change. In the dark ages, when those miraculous powers existed in the minds of cloistered monks, rather than in the persons to whom the suspension of the natural law was attributed, those legendary tales were fabricated, without evidence or facts, justifiable alone on the Jesuit principle, "that the end justifies the means, and that all pious frauds are allowable to promote the glory of God."

As I had learned the French language grammatically in the college, I had not much difficulty in speaking it fluently after a stay of six months in that city, where I had repeated opportunities of witnessing the gorgeous display of natural and artificial garlands of flowers, with clouds of incense that obscured the churches, notwithstanding the brilliant light of the wax candles so uselessly wasted in the sunshine of a Paris meridian. Young as I was, it struck me very forcibly that these spectacles, these theatrical performances, were calculated more to affect the senses than to inspire a spirit of piety or improve the heart, and that all true devotion was lost in the representation; it appeared also to me to be a device of the Church of Rome to engage the senses, in order to prevent the mind from investigating the subject of most cardinal importance in this pompous display. During my stay in Paris, I visited the public libraries, and the various public buildings with which that great city abounds. The Royal Institutes, the Hotel Dieu, built by Madame Neckar, the Hotel des Invalides, and the Palace of the Tuileries, commenced by that wicked woman, Catherine de Medicis, who, actuated by the same infernal principle, "the end justifies the means," caused the death of so many thousands of French Protestants in the streets of Paris, on the Feast of St. Bartholomew, in 1572.

The gallery of the Louvre, and the royal gardens, designed by Andrew Lenostre, were the next objects to captivate my attention, and I must to say, that for conception of design and grandeur of effect, nothing in England, not even the Paxton Gardens at Chatsworth, could, in my opinion, be compared to them.

During my stay of six months in Paris, I had frequent opportunities of speaking to the priests on various subjects. But, whenever I spoke on the religion of Rome, they invariably shrugged up their shoulders, and, with a forbidding grimace, said that the Church was infallible, that the Church ordered everything as it then stood, and that nothing remained for them but *to obey*. On one occasion, I said to one of them, named Huluttè, as you are at this side of the Alps, and have nothing to fear from the tribunal of the Inquisition, would you not test all things, according to the advice of St. Paul? I would, said he, but my bread depends upon my present belief, and I will not forfeit it for any other. However, as you are a British subject, and I have nothing to fear from you, I shall be happy to discuss the subject of infallibility with you this evening in the sacristy of the church to which I belong. I accordingly went, and began by saying, that from the days of St. Augustine, every Roman bishop had reversed, not only the decisions of his predecessors, but his own; and that these reversals had exercised a decided influence, not only on the Church itself, but on the purity of her doctrine. I showed him that Pelagius, Theodoretus, Arius, Athanasius, Origen, Paul of Samosata, and many others, had been condemned and acquitted by general councils, with the approbation of the Popes.

Is it not also a matter of history, that those very books that were once to be found in the "Index Expurgatorius," became afterwards school-books in the colleges of Rome; and as this is an age of proof, I shall point out some of them to your notice.

The history of Natalis Alexander, the writings of Galileo, the sentences of Petrus Lombardus, Archbishop of Paris, even the books of Bellarmine are among those I have mentioned. Here you see *a change of purpose* totally incompatible with the Pope's infallibility, even in matters of fact. Besides, this doctrine of infallibility of the Popes was not known in the early ages of the Church; as Bossuet says, that the Popes' infallibility was first propounded in the Council of Florence, in the 15th century, by Cajetan, celebrated in ecclesiastical story. To all this he fully agreed, but said, what is to become of me, if I change my creed? I should have to go to one of the poor institutions of the city!

This objection was, of course, an unanswerable one. That it was not, however, calculated to convince an inquiring mind, you will readily believe. That it shuts the door, however, against all inquiry to many, there can be no doubt, in Ireland as well as in France. Alas! when will religious liberty be more than a mere name?

Before I left the College of Maynooth, I was greatly prejudiced against the French nation, in consequence not only of the frightful massacre of the French Protestants, already alluded to, but also on account of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and the infamous conduct of the Duke of Alva, to say nothing of the more recent horrors of the French Revolution.

Tours and Cambray were, however, names of almost daily familiarity; and I was irresistibly impelled to visit both those places. A magnetic influence draws our feet to spots upon which our imagination has long fed; it is an instinct of our nature; and, perhaps, the chief charm of travel, and the simplest dictate of the heart, is to wish to visit those places that have been sanctified by miracles, or adorned by learning. I, therefore, set off for Tours, the Canterbury of France.

After spending a few days at Orleans I descended, in a passage boat, down the Loire, which serpentined around a smiling and fertile landscape, and whose banks were decorated with the yellow blossom of the broom, which formerly gave title to the House of Plantagenet, and now rendered the scenery "unprofitably gay."

During the voyage of a summer's day, my mind was occupied with thoughts of Tours, formerly the ecclesiastical capital of France, in the fourth century, and the depository of the miracle-working remains of St. Martin, during the fifth and sixth centuries. This miraculous power gave an impulse to the munificence of France, and Tours became the centre from which radiated churches, monasteries, and religious houses. I must confess I was greatly disappointed when I found that two dilapidated towers were the only remains of the Cathedral of St. Martin, of which the king of France was once the abbot; and found the Church of St. Julian profaned by the impious ribaldry of a French postilion. The healing powers of the saint have been withdrawn by God, he even permitted the shrine to be plundered, the body itself to be taken away, and dishonored. Can it be that the saints are like the heroes of antiquity, that have passed away; and that a book is a more lasting monument than a saintly life; or than a body endowed with miraculous powers? Are the plough and the mattock, the loom and the distaff, of more paramount importance to mankind than the crucifix and the missal? I felt on this occasion that disappointment which a person who expects too much always feels. Yet, I must say, with Dr. Johnson, that I do not envy the man his feelings whose piety or patriotism are not excited by visiting the ruins of Iona or the plains of Marathon; and that it would give me pain to be numbered as one of those cold calculators who visit, with indifference and without emotion, such places of intense interest, as the hallowed remains of the Cathedral of Tours, Galileo's cell, the ancient battle-field, or the ruined abbey.

On my return from Tours, nothing of any moment occurred; nor did I see anything worth mentioning, except the sullen and gloomy scowl of the frowning Blois, as we swept along its rugged base. The scenery of France is generally tame and monotonous, without any of those bold features which so particularly distinguish Northern Europe. You do not find those mountain ranges in France that reign elsewhere with such composed majesty from age to age, and arrest the traveller's attention as he journies along; but a vast ocean of tillage everywhere appears, with beautiful slopes dressed with vines, and whole districts covered with the mulberry tree, which feeds myriads of silkworms which enrich, in perspective, the populous city of Lyons.

Having taken leave of Tours, I set out for Cambray, in Picardy, a place that has been associated with everything that could adorn literature or add dignity to virtue. I may be pardoned when I avow that my feelings overcame my reason, when the tottering remains of the episcopal palace that witnessed the learned labours of the illustrious Fenelon were pointed out to my notice, as also the spot where the streets met at right angles, and where that illustrious man was compelled to burn, with his own hands, the best of his works, by order of the then Pope, the veriest of despotic tyrants. Cambray has been distinguished by two events of a very different character; the first is, that it was in this city was formed the famous league against the republic of Venice by Julius II.; the second, that it was from Cambray that the classic elegance of Fenelon's compositions was poured forth upon Europe.

The age that was signalized by the reign of Louis XIV., which in itself involved the history of Europe, was not less remarkable for having given birth to the inimitable author of Telemachus.

I was not long in Cambray when I became acquainted with a Dutch priest whose name was Rondat, who showed me the public institutions of the city; and, in return, I made myself as useful as I could, particularly on Sunday morning, when he was engaged in the confessional; I blessed the holy water for him. As I was always most anxious to come at the foundation of things, I examined very closely, not only the derivation of words, but also the practices of the early ages. I searched for the origin of holy water in the New Testament, in the works of the early Fathers, and, lastly, in the heathen authors. After having searched in vain for holy water in the Holy Scriptures, I examined the works of the Holy Fathers without finding any trace of it; but I found it in the works of the heathen writers. The lustrations of the ancient pagans was effected by sulphur, fire, or water; and as water was the most common element, it was it that was most commonly used. Ovid speaks of the *Aqua Lustralis* in his Metamorphoses, and so does Virgil in his Georgics. The arena where the gladiators fought was purified with water in ancient Rome. That the holy water of the Roman Church was borrowed from the lustral water of the pagans is evident, as the brush used by the priests is called *asperges*, the very name it bore amongst the pagans.

Frequent lustrations are also practised by the Turks in their mosques before prayers, and the Church of Rome, as well as that of Mahomet, borrowed this lustral practice from the ancient pagans. The exorcism used in making holy water is a curious *pot-pourri* of the practice of the middle ages, and I take leave to point out how it is effected. The priest, with lighted candles, and ritual in hand, forms the sign of the cross three several times over the salt and water, in the name of the true God, the *living God*, and the *holy God*, to banish all demons, all unclean and malignant spirits, from those elements of salt and water; he then mixes the salt and water together, and uses this mixture (out of which he supposes himself to have banished all evil and malignant spirits), in one moment after, to banish all fairies, demons, and evil spirits, that may be lurking in houses, in homesteads, in dairies, and elsewhere. What a burlesque on the common sense of mankind, to make salt and water first the medium of possessing demons and evil spirits, and then the medium of banishing them!

In the present age, when the human mind has elevated the arts and sciences to a higher standard than they were ever before known to reach, how degrading it must be to thousands of priests to be employed, simultaneously, on the Sabbath morning, banishing unclean and malignant spirits from the pure water and salt, that were produced from the barrel of a pump or the bottom of a salt-pan. And can any one doubt, that hundreds of them feel the degradation, though they are obliged to submit to it?

Besides, how profane it is to employ the name of God six times in this unholy exorcism, contrary to the third commandment—"Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain." Moreover, if there are unhallowed spirits in springs and salt-pans, why does not Archbishop Cullen extend the ecclesiastical privilege of exorcism to all the salt and water necessary for the domestic purposes of life?

As nothing can be more subversive of true piety than superstition, I earnestly entreat my countrymen not to depend on holy water for their future salvation, as it is not to be found in the Scripture, or in the writings of the primitive Church, but was introduced into the Church of Rome in the beginning of the ninth century, as appears from Martini's History of the Rites of the Church; but to depend on the last petition of the Lord's Prayer, to deliver us from evil. As external pomp and ritual observances are foreign to the spirit of the Christian religion, let us place no dependence upon them for our future happiness; but let us rely upon the lustral sacrifice of the cross, and upon the pure water of eternal life—the Scriptures—and let us no longer slake our thirst in the impure water that flows from the *Cistern of the Hills*.

(To be continued.)

LATE CONVERSION OF A PRIEST OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

During the season of 1851, the Abbé Miel, then an officiating priest of the Roman Church, published in London two small works, entitled "The Pope and the Holy Scriptures," and "The Pope and the Primitive Church." In these the writer proposed to prove, "by precise Scriptural evidence," as also "from the writings of the primitive Christians," that the supremacy of Peter, and of his so-called successors the Popes of Rome, and of the Roman Church, was universally acknowledged.

The pamphlets contain a precise digest of all the texts from Scripture, and the principal extracts from the proceedings of councils and writings attributed to the Fathers of the early Christian Church, usually quoted by Romanists on the subjects to which the titles refer. They were expressly written for circulation among Protestants.

Mr. C. H. Collette, a lay member of the Church of

England, entered into a controversial correspondence with the Abbé Miel, on the subjects treated of, which has led to the conversion of the latter; and the once sincere and zealous Roman priest is now a sincere and zealous evangelical Christian.

The subjoined letter has since been received by Mr. Collette from the Abbé.

To C. H. Collette, Esq., 57, Lincoln's Inn Fields.

MONSIEUR — Comme vous avez été le premier instrument dont Dieu s'est servi pour me dessiller les yeux, je veux vous faire part, à vous le premier, de l'heureux changement que la divine grâce a opéré dans mes idées et dans mon cœur.

Et d'abord, je vous l'avouerai sans détour, Monsieur, il m'en a coûté de reconnaître, d'après vos indications si positives, non pas que je m'étais trompé, mais que nos théologiens les plus considérés nous trompent, ou plutôt se trompent eux-mêmes. Forcé pourtant de me rendre à l'évidence sur la fausseté d'un des principaux textes cités dans ma brochure, je crus pouvoir me retrancher sur les autres qui étaient nombreux et me paraissaient concluants. Hélas! vous l'avez trop bien montré, Monsieur, ils ne méritaient guère plus de confiance que le premier. Je me rejetai alors sur l'histoire. Je voulus trouver dans les documents historiques de la première période Chrétienne, des faits décisifs en faveur de la primauté de l'évêque de Rome, c'est-à-dire, de la Papauté. J'ai produit avec confiance les plus importants de ceux sur lesquels les docteurs Catholiques Romains appuyent leur système. Mais bientôt un examen plus attentif et plus impartial, provoqué par vos attaques, m'a prouvé qu'ils étaient insignifiants ou douteux; et pour quelques-uns qui semblent favorables, j'en ai découvert d'innombrables qui sont manifestement contraires à la thèse que j'avais entrepris de défendre. Et ainsi, Monsieur, si vos articles contre mes brochures pèchent dans la forme, qui pourrait être quelquefois plus digne, et souvent plus adoucie; du moins, vous avez gain de cause pour le fond, et c'est l'essentiel. La question débattue entre nous est trop sérieuse, j'ai apporté trop de bonne foi dans cette controverse, pour songer à me défendre par des arguties.

Le travail critique et historique auquel vos articles m'ont conduit, Monsieur, a été suivi d'un autre non moins important. Quand j'ai vu que la doctrine Romaine ne pouvait tenir en face de l'histoire, je me suis démandé si du moins elle n'avait pas dans l'évangile des fondements solides. Laissez-moi vous le dire, Monsieur, ce fut un grand jour dans la vie de mon âme que celui, où après de longues luttes intérieures qu'un vrai Catholique Romain peut seul comprendre, je me décidai à lire l'évangile avec un esprit sincère, mais indépendant. Cent fois précédemment j'avais fait cette lecture, mais dans un simple but d'édification, et bien déterminé à ne jamais voir dans le texte sacré que le sens qu'y attache l'église Romaine. Cette fois je résolus donc de ne m'en rapporter qu'au jugement de ma raison aidée de la prière. Or, à peine eus-je parcouru quelques-unes des saintes pages dans ces dispositions nouvelles que je fus stupéfait de découvrir dans le livre divin une doctrine que je n'y avais jamais remarquée précédemment, et qui dans les points fondamentaux me semble la négation et quelquefois la condamnation expresse des doctrines de Rome. Les limites de cette lettre ne me permettent pas d'entrer aujourd'hui dans quelque détail, mais je crois pouvoir défier qui que ce soit de lire l'évangile comme j'ai fait, c'est-à-dire, exempt de préjugés, et avec droiture de cœur, sans arriver au résultat que, par la grâce de Dieu, j'ai moi-même obtenu. Du reste, je me dispose à publier prochainement à ce sujet un petit travail, qui sera comme l'historique de mes études, de mes observations, et de mes recherches; il servira, peut-être, à guider quelques âmes dans la voie qui conduit à la vérité; en tout cas, ce sera un témoignage de la sincérité, et, (s'il m'est permis de le dire,) de la sagesse avec lesquelles j'ai procédé.

J'aurais pu m'en tenir, Monsieur, à cette double étude sur l'évangile et sur les premiers âges Chrétiens; j'avais droit dès-lors, je pense, de tirer mes conclusions contre le système Romain. Cependant, pour que nul ne pût me reprocher plus tard de m'être prononcé dans une matière aussi grave d'une manière inconsidérée, j'ai voulu tenter une dernière épreuve. J'ai fait tout exprès le voyage de Rome, afin de juger le système en question, sur place, pour ainsi dire, et dans son application immédiate. Oh! c'est là, Monsieur, c'est à Rome que les faits parlent, et, certes, un bien éloquent langage. Oh, non! je ne m'explique plus comment, à part même toute étude préalable, un homme au cœur droit, à l'esprit sincèrement ami de la vérité, peut rester ferme dans sa foi de Catholique Romain, s'il lui a été donné d'observer Rome avec un œil impartial. Presque partout la superstition a la place de la religion; ce trafic odieux des choses de la piété; ces honteuses spéculations sur la foi des simples; l'homme substitué à son Dieu recevant jusque dans le temple les hommages qui ne sont dus qu'au Seigneur lui-même, le luxe pour le moins étrange (au milieu d'une population de mendiants,) de ces cardinaux et de ces pontifes, qui n'hésitent pas à se donner comme les seuls légitimes successeurs des pêcheurs de la Galilée, et comme les premiers ministres de celui qui n'avait pas où reposer sa tête; l'ignorance et la dégradation morale et matérielle de ce pauvre peuple, gouverné par eux, élevé sous leur directe influence, et dans le cœur du quel on a peine à trouver encore la trace d'un sentiment honnête et généreux. . . . . Monsieur, je n'ai séjourné que quatre semaines à Rome, et c'a été bien avisé à moi de ne pas y rester d'avantage; mais dès les premiers moments que j'ai passés dans la ville appellée sainte, il m'a semblé que retentissait sans cesse à mon oreille cette voix mystérieuse qui fut entendue dans le temple de Jérusalem peu de temps avant sa ruine, "Sortons d'ici! Sortons d'ici!"

Et en effet, Monsieur, de ce moment je me juge obligé de renoncer à tout ministère dans l'église Romaine. Il ne m'est pas permis de servir plus long temps une institution qui se donne comme divine, quand une étude consciencieuse m'oblige à ne voir en elle que l'œuvre des hommes, je dirai même, le chef-d'œuvre de l'orgueil humain.

Toutefois, Monsieur, je ne considère pas comme accomplis tous mes devoirs envers la vérité et envers la société Chrétienne. Je vais continuer avec tout le zèle dont je suis capable mes méditations et mes recherces. Joignez-vous à moi pour prier le ciel de les bénir; et puisse venir un jour où il me soit donné de rendre quelques-uns de mes frères participants de la lumière et de la grâce que Dieu dans sa bonté m'aura départies.

Je serais heureux, Monsieur, qu'après nous être traités jadis en adversaires, nous pussions avoir désormais des relations d'emis. En tout cas, agréez, je vous prie, l'assurance des sentiments de haute estime avec lesquels je suis, votre très humble et tout dévoué serviteur,

MIEL.

Londres, 27 Janvier, 1854.

SIR—As you were the first instrument employed by God to remove the scales from my eyes, it is my wish that you may be the first person to whom I communicate the happy change which divine grace has effected in my views and in my heart.

In the first place, I will avow, without circumlocution, how deeply it has grieved me to discover, as you so accurately pointed out, not that I had deceived myself, but that our most esteemed theologians deceive us, or rather deceive themselves. Nevertheless, compelled to yield to evidence respecting the untruthfulness of one of the principal citations in my pamphlet, I thought that I was able to fall back upon the others, which were numerous, and, in my opinion, conclusive. Alas! Sir, you have too successfully shown to me that these deserved no more confidence than the first. I then fell back upon history. I thought I could find in the historical documents of the first Christian period decisive proof of the primacy of the Bishop of Rome—*i.e.*, of the Papal supremacy. I brought forward, with confidence, the most important of the facts upon which Roman Catholic doctors base their system. But ere long a more attentive and unbiassed examination of those facts, to which I was incited by your attacks, proved to me that they were either of no weight or of doubtful authenticity; and for a few which seem to favour the Roman Catholic pretensions, I discovered innumerable instances in manifest contradiction to the thesis which I had undertaken to defend. And I thus found that if your observations upon my pamphlets were faulty in style—if they seemed, on some occasions, wanting in suitable dignity, and often wanting in softness—at least, you had the right and truth of controversy at the foundation, which is the essential point. The question at issue between us is too serious, and I brought to the controversy too much good faith to suffer me to make use of any subterfuges.

The critical and historical researches to which your observations led me was followed by another of no less importance. When I saw that the Roman doctrine could not stand before the face of history, I asked myself whether it had not, at any rate, a firm foundation in the Gospel. And let me tell you, Sir, it was a great day in my existence on which, after long internal struggles, which a real Roman Catholic alone can understand, I, at last, resolved to read the Gospel in a sincere but unbiassed spirit. I had read it hundreds of times before, but simply with a view to edification, and with a full and fixed determination never to see in the sacred text any other sense than that adopted by the Roman Church. But on this occasion, I, at last, resolved to take the opinion of my reason alone, assisted by prayer. Scarcely had I perused a page or two in this new disposition of mind when I was stupified at finding in the Divine Book a doctrine which I had never before observed in it, and which is, in fundamental points the negation and sometimes the express condemnation of the teaching of Rome. The limits of this letter do not permit me to enter, on the present occasion, into any detail; but I defy any one to read the Gospel as I have—I mean free from prejudice, and in uprightness of heart, without arriving at the result, which, thanks be to God, I have myself attained. I hope to be able shortly to publish on this subject a few remarks which will be, as it were, a historical review of my studies, my observations, and my researches; it will, perhaps, serve to guide some souls in the way which leads to the truth; at all events, it will be a testimony of the sincerity, and (if I may so say) of the caution with which I have proceeded.

I should have been justified in contenting myself with this double investigation of the Gospel, and of the early ages of Christianity. I had a right from that moment to draw my conclusions against the system of Rome. However, in order that no one might, on any subsequent occasion, have it in their power to reproach me with having declared myself in a matter of such gravity without the fullest consideration, I wished to make a last trial. I undertook for this sole purpose, a journey to Rome, in order to see the system in question on the spot and in its direct application to men and things around it. Oh! it is there—it is at Rome itself that facts speak, and, assuredly, in eloquent language. I cannot explain to myself how, without reference to any previous studies, any man, with an upright heart, with a mind sincerely attached to truth, can continue firm in the Roman Catholic faith after he has once seen and observed Rome with an impartial eye. Almost everywhere is to be found superstition occupying the place of religion, everywhere an odious traffic in objects of devotion; everywhere shameful speculations based upon the credulity of the simple-minded; man, substituted for God, receiving, even in God's house, the homage due to the Lord alone; amidst a population of mendicants, the strange luxury of cardinals and pontiffs, who give themselves out as the sole, legitimate successors of the fishermen of Galilee, and as the first among the servants of Him who had not where to lay his head: the ignorance and degradation, moral and physical, of their poor people, though governed by them, and brought up under their direct influence, and in whose hearts is scarcely any longer to be discovered the trace of a noble or generous feeling . . . Sir, I remained but four weeks at Rome, and I think I did well to stay no longer; but from the first moment of my sojourn in the so-called Holy City, I seemed ever to hear resounding in my ear that mysterious voice which was heard in the Temple of Jerusalem, shortly previous to its destruction, "Let us flee hence! Let us flee hence!"

I have, in fact, gone out of her; and, you may consider me for this moment to renounce for ever all ministry in the Church of Rome. It is not lawful for me any longer to serve an institution which claims to be divine, when a deeper study and research compel me to see in her but the work of man—I will even say, the greatest work of the pride of man.

I do not, however, consider that I have fulfilled all my duties towards truth and the Christian world. I shall continue to carry on with all the zeal of which I am capable my meditations and my researches. Join, I beg of you, your prayers with mine for the blessing of heaven upon these studies and meditations, and that the day may come when it shall be given me to bring some of my brethren to participate in the light of grace which God shall have shown me.

I should be happy, Sir, if, after having formerly known each other as adversaries, we may henceforward have intercourse as friends. But, in any event, I beg you will accept the sentiments of deep esteem with which I am your very humble and obedient servant,

MIEL.

London, 27th January, 1854.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We have received Mr. Edmond Power's letter, the great length of which, obliges us to postpone it till our next.

We have again to apologize to several of our friends for postponing their valued communications. If our correspondents would recollect the limited space of our columns, when forwarding letters or articles, it would prevent much embarrassment and disappointment.

We beg to call the attention of our correspondents to the utility of adding their name and address to their communications.

To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal, which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, OCTOBER, 1854.

IN our number for April, 1853, we gave our readers a short account of the alleged apparition of the Blessed Virgin on the 19th September, 1846, to two peasant children named Peter Maximin Giraud, and Frances Melanie Mathieu, aged respectively eleven and fourteen years, on a mountain, near Grenoble, called La Salette, the authenticity of which formed the subject of a sharp controversy between M. Philibert de Bruillard, Bishop of Grenoble, and his metropolitan, Cardinal de Bonald, Archbishop of Lyons, which terminated in a letter of the latter to his clergy cautioning them against false miracles, from which the following is an extract:—

"In times of perplexity, pious, but imprudent persons are found, who wish to have it thought that God interferes in a visible manner in human affairs. An effect produced by a natural cause, which is to them a mystery, is by them transformed into a prodigy; and without waiting to examine into it, or consult men of knowledge, they allow themselves to be deceived by false appearances, and declare miracles to be true which are very questionable. *Some pecuniary speculations* which intrude themselves into everything, seize upon this imaginary fact, and, at the expense of the credulous, turn it into profit. *Men greedy of gain* soon dress out the history of these false miracles, and *accompany them by false indulgences.* What, then, is their grand object, but *to procure dishonest gains*, by *trafficking in objects of superstition.* We, therefore, forbid the publication of any miracle from the pulpit without previous permission, *should its authenticity be attested even by another bishop.*"

We have not recurred to the subject for the last eighteen months, believing that but few of our intelligent Roman Catholic readers were in danger of being deceived or influenced by so glaring an imposture; and knowing that the prevailing feelings, with regard to the matter, were those of regret and shame, that the cause of religion should be compromised by such palpable frauds upon the credulity of mankind.

The asserted miracle has, however, been of late so perseveringly pressed by the ultramon-

tane journals, such as *L'Univers*, the *Catholic Standard*, and the *Tablet*,* that we think it would be culpable in us any longer to delay placing before the public the real state of the matter as it now stands, involving, as it clearly does, much more than could have originally been anticipated from such a beginning.

Our attention has been, moreover, particularly called to the subject by some recent publications which show, that the matter still occupies an amount of attention and credit which we could scarcely have anticipated after Cardinal De Bonald's letter.

A little volume, published by Messrs. Richardson, of London and Derby, entitled, "The Holy Mountain of La Salette," by a pilgrim of the year 1854,† among other things discloses the facts, not only that the Bishop of Grenoble published a formal charge ("mandement") in its favour, dated 19th September, 1851, but that the Pope is believed to have been induced to take part with the bishop, by authorising the establishment of a sanctuary at La Salette, to which he has conceded a variety of spiritual favours.

To prevent misconception we transcribe, from this book, page 79, the following passages *verbatim* :—

"I. By a Rescript of 24th August, 1852, the Sovereign Pontiff declared the High Altar of the Sanctuary of La Salette, a privileged Altar in perpetuity.

"II. By a Rescript of 26th August, 1852, he grants permission to say a Votive Mass of the Blessed Virgin, to all priests who come to La Salette, on any day of the year except on the great Festivals and the privileged Ferias.

"III. By a Brief of 26th August, 1852, the Sovereign Pontiff grants to the members of the Confraternity of La Salette—

"1st. A plenary indulgence on the day of entering the Confraternity.

"2nd. A plenary indulgence at the hour of death.

"3rd. A plenary indulgence once a year, the day of the principal festival of the Confraternity.

"4th. An indulgence of seven years and seven quarantines, four times a year, on four determined days.

"5th. Sixty days of indulgence for every work of piety or of charity accomplished by them.

"IV. By a Brief of 3rd September, 1852, His Holiness grants a plenary indulgence once a year to every one who shall visit the church of La Salette.

"V. Another Brief of the same date grants—

"1st. A plenary indulgence to the faithful who follow the exercises of the missions or of the retreats, preached by the missioners of La Salette, provided they have assisted at three, at least, of the discourses.

"2nd. Two hundred days each time they assist at one of the discourses.

"VI. A Brief of 7th September, 1852, grants for ten of the missioners of La Salette, the power of indulgencing crosses, medals, and beads.

"VII. A Brief of the same date, gives the Missioners of La Salette the power of giving the Scapular to the faithful.

"VIII. A Brief of the same day erects the Confraternity of La Salette into an Arch-confraternity, under the name of our Lady of *Reconciliation* of La Salette.

"IX. In fine, by an Indult of 2nd December, His Holiness Pius IX. grants, at the request of the Bishop of Grenoble, the permission to solemnize each year, on the 19th of September, the anniversary of the Apparition (VEL IPSO APPARITIONIS DIE), or on the following Sunday, in all the churches of the Diocese, by a solemn Mass, and by singing the Vespers of the Blessed Virgin. In the same Indult His Holiness authorizes the clergy, if they prefer it, to celebrate the memory of the Apparition (MEMORIAM HUJUS APPARITIONIS RECOLERE), by adopting the entire office, and celebrating the Mass of the *Patronage of the Blessed Virgin*, under solemn rite, as a *Double of the Second Class*."

If the Holy See has not *formally* pronounced upon the *fact* of La Salette in the above briefs, we cannot but think that it has given, at least, to this new devotion (taking for granted that the above statements are true), an amount of countenance and encouragement which it would be scarcely proper for an infallible judge to give to an *Apocryphal* miracle, or even to one of the truth of which he had not satisfied himself in the most conclusive manner.

The work, accordingly, has gone on rapidly; and we read in the *Tablet* of 6th May, 1854, that 42,000 francs have already been received for building a fine church of black marble, on the mountain, now nearly completed; in addition to which they are also erecting two hospitals, one for men under an order of La Salette monks; the other for women, managed by La Salette nuns; and not even contented with confining these orders to the kingdom of France, we find that the Roman Catholic Bishop of Birmingham has thought it right to establish what we suppose may be considered a kind of chapel of ease to La Salette, in the good town of *Stratford-on-Avon*, by the following decree, published in the *Tablet* of 10th September, 1853 :—

"IN THE CHAPEL OF NOTRE DAME DE LA SALETTE, AT STRATFORD-ON-AVON.

"William Bernard, by the grace of God, and the favour of the apostolic see, Bishop of Birmingham, to all by whom these presents shall be heard or read, health and benediction in the Lord.

"Having taken into our consideration the petition addressed to us by the Rev. Alfred J. Dayman, missionary priest at Stratford-on-Avon, praying us that we would canonically erect in the chapel of Notre Dame de la Salette, of the said mission, a pious association of prayers and good works, under the title of 'Our Lady of Reconciliation of La Salette.'

"Having diligently considered the devout ends contemplated by this association, and the tenour of the brief of our Holy Father Pius IX., of date September 7, 1852, whereby the Sovereign Pontiff erects into an arch-confraternity the pious association of 'Our Lady of Reconciliation of La Salette,' established in the sanctuary of that name, in the diocese of Grenoble, in France;

"Having, moreover, in view the design of honouring more and more the ever-blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God, and of manifesting our confidence in the efficacy of invoking her intercession under the title of 'Our Lady of Reconciliation of La Salette,' and of opening to the faithful of our diocese a new means of obtaining the grace and blessings of Almighty God, especially in the conversion of sinners to repentance, of such as are sealed in error to the truth, in the reparation of all blasphemies against God, against his saints, and against holy things, of the neglect of his holy laws, and the laws of the Church, especially the sanctification of the Sunday, and of all the crimes, sacrileges, and abandonment of the duties of religion, which brings the scourges of God upon his people;

"And with the full assurance that this pious association will contribute, through the mercy of God and the intercession of the ever-blessed and immaculate Mary our Mother, to the divine glory and the salvation of souls;

"We hereby, and through these presents, erect, in the aforesaid Chapel of Notre Dame de la Salette, at Stratford-on-Avon, the Association of our Lady of Reconciliation of La Salette, and we depute the Rev. Alfred Joken Dayman, missionary priest of that chapel, to establish this pious confraternity, and to direct the same in conformity with the statutes hereunto annexed.

"And we authorize the said director of this confraternity to obtain its aggregation with the arch-confraternity of La Salette, with the view of obtaining for the association those favours and indulgences which either have been or may be granted to it by the Holy See, and a participation in the prayers and good works of the association.

"Given at Birmingham, under our hand or seal, and the signature of our secretary, the 17th day of August, 1853.

"✠ W. BERNARD, Bishop of Birmingham.

"By command of my Lord Bishop,

"E. ESTCOURT, Secretary."

The alleged miracles wrought by our Lady of La Salette, are, as the writer in the *Tablet* of 6th May last, observes, "most stupendous and almost inconceivable." Two are given in some detail, as samples, which we transcribe verbatim, though some of our readers may, perhaps, censure us for giving circulation to such self-evident fabrications :—

"One was of a nun who was raised from death to life! Her history is this:—Long afflicted with internal cancer, she was also covered all over with large boils of twelve months' standing. In consequence she was bedridden, and so weakened that her recovery was wholly despaired of. Convulsive fits and paralysis followed. The Last Sacraments were administered, and prayers for the agonizing said. Before dying she made two requests of her mother—one was to have a Mass said for her the morning of her death; the other to place in her hand, after her being laid out, a small image of Our Lady of La Salette, which she had devotion to, and that it might be buried with her. These were her last words. She grew worse, and died that night. Her mother sent word to the parish church to have the Mass said, and sat up with others to wake the corpse. In the course of the night she recollected her promise, and taking the image out of a press in the same room, she had no sooner laid it on her daughter's bosom than, to the astonishment of all present, the corpse gave a deep sigh, and was heard to articulate, 'O Divine Mere, si je dois vivre, c'est pour vous servir toute ma vie sur votre sainte montagne!' Great was the terror of all present at this, but greater still did it become when the corpse gave signs of life by turning on one side. Sleep for three hours followed; and she, *who had been dead, awoke in perfect health*!—she who could not move herself in bed sat up, asked for her clothes, walked to church, and heard the very Mass which was to have been said for the repose of her own soul!!"

The other occurred also to a *nun* in the neighbourhood :—

"The mistress of the work awoke in the middle of the night, hearing, as she thought with good reason, some robbers in the workroom, where some very rich vestments then were. Imagining that the robbers would fly if disturbed, she advanced and opened the door, but they, two in number, rushed upon her and gave her several severe wounds. She fell, calling on Our Blessed Lady of La Salette for protection, and promising, if she obtained it, to make a pilgrimage to the holy mountain. The robbers escaped; she was found to have received no less than twenty-six wounds, *many* of which were by the surgeons *pronounced mortal*. But three days afterwards she was miraculously cured, *no mark whatever remaining on her*. The bishop gave her permission to perform the pilgrimage, which she went through, accompanied by the whole community."

We might add to these a whole chapter of similar miracles, from the work of the Pilgrim of 1854, already referred to, but our space forbids; and if those we have given do not *convince* the minds of "the faithful," we suppose the whole catalogue would fail likewise.

That they *have* all failed to carry conviction to the minds of those *who have had the greatest facilities for judging of the whole matter* by their proximity to the spot, may be best proved by the following widely-circulated prospectus of a work lately published at Grenoble, *exclusively for the priesthood*, by a considerable body of the clergy of that diocese, with the object of laying before the Pope a memorial showing the dangers attending the (Roman) Catholic Church from the adoption of such false miracles. The work is entitled: "La Salette devant le Pape, ou Rationalism et Héresie découlant du Fait de 'La Salette,' suivie du Mémoire au Pape. Par plusieurs Membres du Clergé diocésan de Grenoble" :—

"PROSPECTUS.

"The event of 'La Salette' has had immense notoriety; for in every part of Europe the clergy have accepted it and proclaimed it as a religious *fact*, having, to a certain degree, made it enter into the religious belief of the Catholic populations.

"The diocese of Grenoble, and some of the neighbouring dioceses, have alone resisted the movement which elsewhere was received with feelings of confidence, but which was rejected at Grenoble, Lyons, Gap, &c.; *because there, on the very scene of the event*, they were aware of all the machinations of this work, which was essentially human, and they foresaw that the foundations of religion would be shaken in this age of rationalism by this rash enterprise.

* The *Tablet* of 3rd September, 1853, says—"The appearance of La Salette is a great supernatural event, which has happened in an unbelieving age, to confound the infidel and the blasphemer." And a letter to the editor, dated Mountain of La Salette, 16th September, 1851, inserted in the *Tablet*, of 20th September last, commences thus—"Dear Sir—When the editor of the *Univers*, was lately asked if he believed in the apparition of La Salette, he answered, '*Tout L'Univers Croit!*' That the editor of the *Tablet* believes it all the world knows; and I beg to assure him that the missioners of La Salette feel truly grateful for the good that has been done by his advocacy of the truth of the apparition."

The *Tablet* of 12th August, 1854, reviewing the work, published by Richardson, says—"We suppose this work will long remain the most important repository of information on the *stupendous event* of which it treats."

† The *Catholic Standard* of 26th August, 1854, in reviewing this, has the following passage—"Even in those days of coldness and unbelief, we are not without *visible* proofs of the Blessed Virgin's continued interest in our behalf, and of her power with God. Not only is she not repulsed by our tepidity—for the very *reason* that faith has waxed cold does she *appear amongst us*, endeavouring by fresh miracles of grace to excite us to fervour in the service of God. Rimini, La Salette, and other localities, have, in our own days, witnessed a renewal of the wonders of more faithful ages; and persons brought into the Church, or into a state of grace, not merely by the devout use of the medals and scapulars of Mary, but by her *visible* interposition in their behalf."

"The honour of the Catholic religion—the danger which it incurs from 'La Salette'—have determined the most intelligent and conscientious amongst the clergy of the diocese on breaking silence, under the protection of the 'disciplinary canons,' and on submitting the affair of 'La Salette' to the Pope, in a memorial which is a model of propriety and moderation, and which points out the unfortunate means by which it was endeavoured to exalt an event, exclusively human, to the dignity of a miracle.

"One of the clergy has (in a work characterized by great powers of reasoning, close logical conclusions, and deep veneration for the first principles of Catholicism, as well as by a religious spirit which drew forth the sympathy and approval of the prelates to whom it was submitted) shown the power of authority, in opposition to that of rationalism, and proves in the most decisive manner by facts, quotations, and the discussions which it has given rise to:

"1. That the recital of the lady to the two shepherds (the groundwork of the miracle) has been falsified in its essential points, and with the most aggravating circumstances.

"2. That none of the rules prescribed by the Council of Trent (Sess. 25) have been attended to.

"3. That the miracles cited are apocryphal.

"4. That the 'doctrinal mandement' of the 19th September, 1851, is based entirely upon error.

"5. That in order to force the acceptance of this 'mandement' on the diocese, persecution and bribery were by turns resorted to.

"6. That Rome has not acknowledged the apparition

"7. That the conduct and recent predictions of the two shepherds—predictions which were impious, heretical, anarchical, enslaving, and which were *too well known* at Grenoble and in the diocese—far from having produced faith in La Salette, cause it to be repudiated.

"8. That the apparition is reduced to the promenade, on the mountain of 'La Salette,' of a fanatical nun, who has been pointed out by name, and defied to prove an alibi.

"9. That henceforward 'La Salette' involves a *capital* heresy, and introduces rationalism into the Church by the sanction of authority.

"These solemn assertions will cease to surprise when the third chapter of the work has been read, and when one is forced to veil the face on seeing it proved that in 1842, 1843, 1844, and 1845, in the very same diocese, divers miracles had been attempted, and that amongst others the adoration had been commanded, and a church had been erected in honour of some *blood*, whose acceptance as the precious blood of our Lord Jesus Christ had been insisted on. The priest should live by truth; his lips are the depositories of learning; and if he be so fortunate as to awaken faith, and to extend it, he should not compromise its purity by the inconsiderate adoption of a false miracle.

"A *false* miracle throws doubt and contempt on *true* miracles; and in our days, with the spirit of rationalism that exists, it does more—it creates doubts and contempt as to the doctrines as well as the acts of the Church; and it is with the sole end of averting this danger, and enlightening ecclesiastics at a distance, that the clergy after God's own heart have had the courage to unite in a volume, of nearly 400 large pages 8vo., this memorial to the Pope, and a commentary, which is as rich in quotations and in facts, as conclusive in its proofs. It is addressed to their ecclesiastical brethren in France and in foreign countries. This work is a production exclusively ecclesiastic. It will be the *Vade Mecum* of the priest who desires truth as God would have it—who seeks for light to direct safely the belief of the flock intrusted to his care, that he may not lead them thoughtlessly into a path merely human, which, ere long, his conscience might make it a duty to attack, so that he might not be the means of supplying a new and too dangerous weapon to the enemies of religion. This work is to be had, by ecclesiastics only, at the *Libraire Nouvelle, rue Bayard* 13, *à Grenoble*, (*Isère*) price 4f., and 5f. 20c. by post. This may be sent either by twenty-six postage stamps, post paid, or by Post-office order.

"An order for 12 copies, at least, will be forwarded by diligence, and the price will then be reduced to 4f. 50c.

"To be had at the same library, 'La Salette fallavaux (*fallax vallis*), ou la Vallée de Mensonge.' Par M. Donnadieu. 2 vols., in 16mo. Price 2f. 50c.; and by post, 3f. 50c. All letters to be paid.

"LENOIR, P.P.

"It is requested that this prospectus may be communicated."

The extensive circulation of the above work throughout France, has given a severe blow to the credit of what we must consider the greatest imposture of the 19th century. The Bishop of Grenoble, however, is too deeply implicated in the matter to give up without a struggle; and we are, therefore, not surprised to find in the *Univers*, of the 7th inst., a long mandement of the said bishop, bearing date 30th September, 1854, not only condemning the book entitled, "La Salette devant le Pape," Grenoble, imprimerie Redon, 1854, without one syllable of disproof of its contents, but prohibiting the faithful of his diocese from reading the book, keeping, or circulating it, *under pain of excommunication*, or, if ecclesiastics, of *suspension ipso facto*; and further prohibiting, under like penalties, every one from reading, keeping, or circulating even the *prospectus* of the work, as also the two volumes entitled "*La Salette Fallavaux*," par Donnadieu, mentioned in the same prospectus!

Thus, at present, stands this important controversy, begun it will be recollected by the indignant remonstrance of a Cardinal Archbishop, *denouncing* those "whose object was to procure dishonest gains by trafficking in objects of superstition," and ending, for the present, by a decree of *excommunication* against all who have the courage to read the masterly exposè by M. Lenoir and his colleagues, of this daring and gigantic fraud upon the credulity of the 19th century, which, judging from Salette and the Immaculate Conception agitation, appears to require strong stimulants to keep its faith in an active state.

How the thing will end it is hard to say. It is publicly asserted at Grenoble that the police have been, for some time, on the track of the fanatic who played the part of the Virgin on the occasion; but we confess we much doubt whether anything serious will be brought before the public by that machinery. It is far more probable that all the weight of the government action will be thrown into the scale of the imposture. Louis Napoleon is, we fear, too deeply implicated with the parti-pretre to run the risk of covering them with shame and confusion by inconvenient disclosures; and it is much more likely that the wretched creature will be quietly removed to some place where there will be an end of her testimony; and so "our Lady of Salette" will be as firmly maintained on her pedestal as any other saint in the Roman calendar.

We shall probably return to this subject shortly, and examine it a little more particularly, merely adding, for the present, that we understand that the Abbè Rousselot, who has written three works on the subject, has made a good round sum by propagating the grounds of *his* belief, while M. Lenoir and his colleagues are prohibited from circulating the grounds of *their* belief, under the penalties of suspension and excommunication.*

* M. Ronsselot, we are informed, drives also a thriving trade by selling to the pilgrims the miraculous water from the fountain near which the virgin appeared (said to be a sovereign cure for sore eyes), though he has been sadly grieved, they say, of late, by a reverend brother, the Vicar of Corps (a village 4 or 5 miles distant from Salette, upon the road through which the pilgrims pass to the scene of the miracle), who has laid in a large store of the water in bottle, to gratify the impatience of the pilgrims to possess the magic liquid, who buy largely of him without going to the fountain head, to say nothing of the winter season, when Salette is not accessible owing to the snow, when the Vicar has all the trade to himself, of course, to the great loss and dissatisfaction of M. Rousselot, the original vendor. This is really hard on poor M. Rousselot, who has worked very hard for his privilege, not only by writing up the whole thing himself, but actually going in person to Rome, and bringing back with him the special indulgence, which authorized the pilgrimage; and but for which not one bottle of the water would ever have been sold at all! We do not exactly know whether M. Rousselot has any interest in the profits of the substantial inn which has been established on the spot for the comfort of the pilgrims; but we are informed, by a correspondent from Grenoble, that it is perfectly clear that it is the landlord of this inn who, in his double character of landlord and exporter of holy water, has profited most largely by the transaction. Of the magnitude of his gains, we may judge from a letter, published in the *Tablet* of 26th September, 1854, in which the writer states, that a vast number of pilgrims were then there from every part of France, as well as from Italy and Spain. The number of people assembled was not less than *six thousand!*

Correspondence.

RECENT CONTROVERSY AT BOULOGNE.

A PAMPHLET having been recently published at Boulogne, entitled "A Resumé of a Controversy between a Protestant Doctor of Divinity and two Catholic Laymen," printed by Berger, Brothers, 51, Grand Rue, Boulogne, which we are informed contains a very unfair and garbled statement of the arguments of the reverend gentleman, who maintained the Protestant side, and was published without his concurrence or any previous communication with him, we consider it a duty to open our pages to a correct version of what passed on the occasion, authenticated by a letter from that gentleman, signed by himself; merely adding that, in the spirit of candour and fair play, which we are always anxious to maintain, we shall be happy to publish any reply or further argument which may be furnished to us by the Roman Catholic gentlemen in question, provided they comply with the general rules on which our periodical is conducted. We rejoice to find, from the closing passage in the "Resumé," that our offer is likely to be accepted, as it states that "the following distinct offer [printed in capital letters] was made on the [Roman] Catholic side—viz., TO GIVE UP TWO HOURS A DAY FOR A WHOLE YEAR, IF NECESSARY, TO THE DISCUSSION OF ANY POINTS PROPOSED BY THE DOCTOR OR ANY OF HIS COLLEAGUES, IN WHATEVER NUMBER OR OF WHATEVER DIGNITY."

We regret that it is out of our power, from the crowded state of our pages, to insert the whole in our present number.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Allow me to request your insertion of the following account of a discussion which took place recently at Boulogne, between two Roman Catholic gentlemen and myself; the substantial accuracy of which I can vouch for. The circumstances under which the discussion took place were briefly as follows:—

A young lady, who had become a Roman Catholic, had expressed her intention of entering a nunnery. Before taking this step she consented, at the wish of an anxious friend, to hear what might be urged against her adopted faith, provided the Protestant advocate would be prepared to meet those who were ready, on her part, to defend it. An earnest request having been made to me that I would undertake the matter, I agreed to do so, and went to Boulogne for the purpose. Before the discussion began I was distinctly informed that the young lady had not the slightest doubt upon any article of the Roman Catholic religion, and that the discussion was merely to satisfy her friends, and to be private. A report of the arguments used, entitled "Resumè of a Controversy between a Protestant Doctor of Divinity and two Roman Catholic Gentlemen," has since been printed at Boulogne by these gentlemen without any communication having been previously made to me, for authentication of its truth or accuracy; and I regret to add that the following statement, which is as nearly as possible what passed, is, in almost every essential particular, different from that given in the "Resumè." Whether those gentlemen were justified in printing, without my concurrence having been even asked, any report of our discussion, I leave them to consider; but as they have done so behind my back, and without even the authentication of their own names, I consider myself bound to publish a true account, authenticated by my signature.

I have the honour to be, sir, yours very truly,

EDWARD B. MOERAN, D.D.

Kingstown, Oct. 1, 1854.

Dr. Moeran—My time here is limited. Hence, and as infallibility is not only the great boast of your Church, but also the doctrine, which, if admitted, brings with it the admission of all tenets having its sanction, I propose it as the subject for discussion, and as no proof of it can go beyond the Scriptures, I am ready to commence with your main passage—"Thou art Peter," &c.

Mr. Gretton—There are other passages; and infallibility can be proved in three ways: by reason, tradition, and Scripture.

Dr. M.—What is the argument from reason?

Mr. G.—If a revelation has been given to a Church, there must be some infallible method of ascertaining its meaning and teaching it. If, in fact, a Church be possessed of a revelation, it *must*, in order to be a Church at all, and discharge the functions of a Church, be also possessed of infallibility.

Dr. M.—Was the Jewish Church a true Church?

Mr. G.—Yes.

Dr. M.—Was it infallible?

Mr. G.—Not in the same sense as the Catholic Church. The infallibility of the latter was more complete and extended.

Dr. M.—I do not understand your answer. What do you mean by "same sense." Infallibility cannot consist of degrees.

Mr. Langdon—The Jewish Church has nothing to do with the matter; there is no resemblance whatever between it and the Catholic.

Dr. M.—However different they may have been in other

respects, they are quite similar in the *only* circumstance essential to my argument—namely, each was a Church. Mr. Gretton's argument from reason is this—a Church possessed of a revelation cannot properly be a Church at all, unless it have infallibility. My reply is—the Jewish Church *was* possessed of a revelation, and *was not* infallible. Yet it was not only a Church but the only existing Church. It was the true Church of God, though its priests spoke falsely, and its rulers rejected the Lord Jesus, and crucified Him. If Mr. Gretton's argument from reason be good, its necessary consequence is to *unchurch* that Church so loved, and acknowledged of God. Now, as such a result cannot be admitted, being contrary to fact, the argument which necessitates it, must be false.

No further answer was then given. On the next morning, Mr. Gretton referred to the subject, and said, he was now prepared to maintain that the Jewish Church was infallible, though not in the same perfect way as the Catholic. God had given to it a revelation. He also sent prophets—infallible teachers—in quick succession; thus He preserved Divine truth in the Jewish Church.

Dr. M.—The answer now attempted is a clear sophism. For the question between us is *not* whether the *announcers* of Divine truth be infallible, but whether, after a revelation has once been fully given, it is essential to the existence of the Church possessing it, that *this Church* either itself be, or have, some *visible* infallible *interpreter*. You are confounding two things totally distinct—the *inspiration* of the prophets as *announcers* of a Divine truth, with the (presumed) necessity of *infallibility* of a Church as *interpreting* it.

No further reply was attempted. Thus the argument for infallibility from reason ceased.

I now proceed with the arguments from Scripture, which are wholly omitted in the "Resumè."

The passage, "Thou art Peter," &c., first came under consideration.

Dr. M.—I desire to know, distinctly, what is the inference you propose to make from this text? Does it, to your view, establish the infallibility of Peter, and of his (presumed) successors, or their jurisdiction over the whole Church, or their infallibility and jurisdiction?

Mr. G.—Both.

Dr. M.—My reason for asking is this—there is, among the members of the Roman Catholic Church, notorious discordance in their views of infallibility. Some will have the Pope to be personally infallible; others, a general council; and a third party contend that the union of both is necessary. The fact of so great indeterminateness of opinion, where it is all-important that unanimity, if existing, should appear, proves, I conceive, very decisively, a clear insufficiency of the passages of Scripture to establish this doctrine at all. To save time, then, let me know, at the outset, what meaning you attach to the passage, and keep to that meaning. If the words, "Thou art Peter," &c., contain only a promise of jurisdiction, then you cannot use it *at all*, when called on to prove infallibility. If they also contain the promise of infallibility, then you must be consistent, and limit this prerogative, as the passage refers to an individual, or (to allow, for a moment, your requirement) to individuals—*i.e.*, to the Roman Pontiffs, unless you can show a reason why it should be extended to a body—*i.e.*, the Church. Now, then, is not any prerogative, herein contained, personal?

Mr. G.—I am an ultramontane in the most extended sense. I hold this passage to convey infallibility to St. Peter, and to his successors, the Popes.

Dr. M.—You hold, then, that the Popes are personally infallible, by virtue of their office, as successors of St. Peter?

Mr. G.—I do.

Mr. L.—Oh! Mr. Gretton does not mean to say that. What he means is—

Dr. M.—But Mr. Gretton did, very explicitly, say so. It is an opinion common to the school to which he belongs, though vehemently opposed by a great portion of his Church. I shall, however, ask the question again.

The same question was then asked, and answered in the same way.

Dr. M.—Now, Mr. L., is this your opinion, or is it the doctrine of your Church? I add the latter question, as I shall be much surprised if you produce any judgment whatever of your Church on a matter of such moment.

Mr. L.—Mr. Gretton and I are quite agreed. We both believe the Pontiff cannot err. Every Catholic child is taught to say, daily, a prayer for the Pope. Now, if "the effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much," my instinct (!) tells me that God, in answer to so much prayer, will pour down upon the Holy Father such an amount of grace as to keep him from all error in doctrine, and render him, in fact, infallible.

Dr. M.—You are but trying to hide—and I must strongly press upon our hearers this attempt to do so*—the manifest difference of opinion which exists between you. Mr. G., an ultramontane, holds the personal infallibility of the Pontiff, deducing it from the passage, "Thou art Peter," &c.; while you, Mr. Langdon—holding, in common with the great body of your Church, not the infallibility of an individual but of the Church itself—dare not accept the interpretation which your friend gives to this passage, since that explanation will exclude you from applying it at all to the Church. Now, you cannot afford to do this; your case will not stand without trying to jumble together what is clearly personal with what applies to the Church of Christ at large. It will not, however, do to let your hearers perceive the great difference among those who make their boast of unity. *That*, at all hazards, must be avoided. Accordingly, when pressed, you say you do believe, with Mr. Gretton, in the infallibility of the Pontiff; but the reason you give is, your *instinct* tells you that God, in answer to prayer, will, in point of fact, render him infallible. I will add here, that the difficulty which this passage, "Thou art Peter," &c., occasions to the Roman Catholic Church is no light one. It is impossible, without it, to give any colour whatever to their claim of infallibility; but when it is taken into the proof—as any prerogatives presumed to be contained therein are personal—the legitimate result is to restrict them to individuals—that is, granting your own inference to the Roman Pontiffs. The infallibility of the Church of Rome cannot, therefore, be proved by it, and it is certain it cannot be proved without it. Hence, the explanation of this notorious and striking fact—the Church of Rome has never yet declared, and I do not believe ever will declare, *where* infallibility is to be found. She has left it an open question. The members of her communion are free, in the absence of any official declaration, to oscillate among these conflicting doubts—whether the Pope be infallible, or the Church, or the union of both. The infallible Church has never yet determined where her infallibility can be found.

Mr. G.—She has, in her general councils, which declare that they are assembled "by the authority of the holy Roman See and in the Holy Ghost."

Dr. M.—This is no answer to the question; which is *not* whether infallibility has been *claimed* indiscriminately by Pontiffs, or by Councils, which the Church of Rome either receives or rejects. I am not speaking of a claim made by Council against Pope, by Pope against Council, or by one Council, with a Pope at its head, against a rival Council, headed by its Pontiff. I am asking for a simple decision determining who among these litigants has "the right of possession." I want a single authoritative declaration from the Church of Rome *localizing* infallibility, determining where it is situated. It is historically true that Councils have asserted their superiority over a Pope, and that Pontiffs have recriminated theirs on Councils. Or, to put the objection in another way, Roman Catholics profess to take every doctrine from the teaching of an infallible tribunal; but one of their doctrines is—I am, at least, so told by almost every Roman Catholic whom I ask—that the criterion of infallibility is the confirmation of a Council by a Pontiff. Now, what I want to know is, where a Council, confirmed by a Pontiff (their own criterion of infallibility), ever asserted this doctrine—namely, that such was the criterion of infallibility.* If you cannot produce this, you are convicted of doing that which you affect to condemn in Protestants—receiving doctrines on the conviction of your own judgment properly exercised—convicted of a contradiction, and furnishing an argument, because being an instance, against the need of infallibility as a ground of belief.

Mr. G.—I say again that infallibility has been always claimed and allowed; it is the foundation on which all the acts of the Church proceed; no general council has ever sat without assuming it as a claim allowed. You may as well ask me to prove a man has a head, or that he has reason. A man, acting as a man, proves himself possessed of reason. So with general councils; they always act on the claim to infallibility, and thus prove it.

Dr. M.—No one doubts that a man has a head, and that it is situate between his shoulders; but as to infallibility, Roman Catholics themselves doubt about its locality, and all other persons deny its existence. You both assert that the criterion of infallibility is either a general council or the Pontiff speaking *ex cathedrâ*. Others of your communion require the union of both these to secure it. The councils of Basil, Constance, Pisa, and Lateran bear witness to these disputes.

Mr. G.—But the Church has subsequently decided between them; her list of councils determines which was right.*

Dr. M.—But the existence of the disputes proves it had not been settled that the Pontiff, speaking *ex cathedrâ*, or a general council, did constitute the criterion of infallibility. There appears to have been no consent as to the locality of infallibility. You are, I think, chargeable justly in this matter with holding a doctrine without having that only security for its truth which you profess to admit. Nor is this the only instance. You do the same with respect to "the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary." As yet your Church has not formally pronounced upon it. It is well known to have been, for a considerable time after its introduction, the occasion of *one* of the fierce disputes between your two great orders of Dominicans and Franciscans. You believe that doctrine implicitly now. No subsequent authentication can add anything to your belief either of its truth or importance. Here then again, Roman Catholics, who so boast of infallibility as the guarantee for truth, are found to believe as firmly *without it* as with it. You save Protestants the trouble of confuting you, for you confute yourselves. My former argument was intended to show the *indeterminateness* of infallibility. This instance shows—you furnish the evidence—the *inutility* of it. While the entire absence in early church history of a single instance where the claim was made and allowed proves the *novelty* of the doctrine.

No additional argument having been adduced on this part of the subject, the passage—"Thou art Peter," &c., then came under discussion.

Dr. M.—You have already said, Mr. Gretton, that this passage confers infallibility upon St. Peter, and those whom you consider as his successors. Upon what principle of interpretation did you make this assertion? It must have been either upon the authority of your Church, or upon the universal consent of the Fathers, or upon your own judgment. The first of these you cannot use, since this would be to *assume* infallibility *in order to prove it*. The second you cannot allege, since it does not exist. The Fathers have been, not only not unanimous in their interpretation of the text, but not one of them, so far as I have ever heard, ascribes to it the sense which you do. None interpret it as conferring infallibility either upon Pontiff or Church. Are you not, then, driven to admit, what you cannot avoid, the Protestant principle—the use of *private judgment directed by the proper means of regulating its exercise*. It seems to me that, at the very outset of your attempt to prove infallibility from Scripture, you are stopped by the following difficulty:—Unless you be infallibly certain that you are right in the interpretation of this, or any other text adduced in proof of this doctrine, you cannot be infallibly certain of the conclusion. But you cannot be infallibly certain that you are correct in the interpretation, since for that you must rely on human judgment, which you always assert cannot be trusted; therefore, you cannot be infallibly certain of the conclusion—that is, your *proof* of infallibility is fallible, and, therefore, the doctrine itself unproved.

Again, the Council of Trent binds you never to interpret Scripture contrary to the unanimous consent of the Fathers, or to the sense which the Church always held. Yet there is no unanimous consent of the Fathers on this text, nor any unvarying sense of the Church.

Mr. G.—Protestants always make a foolish blunder about "the consent of the Fathers." The Council of Trent does not mean to say that every Catholic, before he interprets a passage of Scripture, is bound to examine the folio volumes of the Fathers, amounting to some hundreds. But simply that no Catholic is permitted to interpret Scripture, on points of faith, *contrary to* the universal consent of the Fathers, or the sense which the Church has always put upon it. Any other meaning is quite absurd.

Dr. M.—I am quite aware of the explanation you give to the words. But there is a convenient ambiguity in them which conveys the claim, that you really *do always*

---

* Rather than give any description, or express any opinion on this attempt, I shall use an extract from a letter addressed to Mr. Langdon by one who witnessed it. The letter itself is an indignant protest against the unfaithfulness of the "Resumè":—

"In this 'true statement of the whole controversy' (words used by Mr. Gretton when describing the 'Resumè,' which he and Mr. Langdon drew up, in a correspondence with the gentlemen whose letter I now quote), I have looked in vain for Mr Gretton's admission that, being of the ultramontane school, he believed in the personal infallibility of the Pope, while you distinctly, for yourself, repudiated the notion. A curious example, as it struck me at the time, of that agreement of 'all Catholics' in Catholic doctrine, of which you so often boasted. You have glossed over this point at page 71 you felt the inconvenience of your awkward position, and attempted, *clumsily*, to shade off the difference by stating that 'a prayer was offered daily by every member of the Church of Rome for the Pope, and that such an amount of grace was asked for, and concentrated upon that one point—namely, the Popedom—that it was impossible to conceive he could err.' So much for Catholic unity.

"I do not perceive that Mr. Gretton has established the correctness of his ultramontane opinion *in print*, as he did *orally*, by the graphic portrait he gave us of Popes Liberius, Marcellinus, and Alexander VI., whom he described as 'awful,' 'dreadful,' and 'vile characters,' 'whose horrible conduct was equivalent to denying Christ.' *So infallibly fallible* were those men that, according to Mr. Gretton, they ought to have been hung, drawn, and quartered!!! So much, also, for the daily prayer and its effects to which you referred."

These statements with respect to the characters of these popes—matters, of course, of known history—were drawn out in attempting an answer to the following difficulty—What *accredited* test has an ultramontane Roman Catholic for distinguishing when the Pope speaks infallibly—what is the authorised (not private opinion) rule for deciding when the Pope speaks officially or unofficially? The distinction between the office and the individual who bears it is intelligible and just. But these Roman Catholics who hold the personal infallibility and admit, as they must, the monstrous crimes of some among their pontiffs, are sometimes not a little perplexed to give an account of "the sayings," as well as "the doings" of their Vicars of Christ. The gentleman from whose letter I have quoted has, at least, raised a fatal objection to Mr. Langdon—unless, indeed, the custom of praying for the Pope be as novel as the argument here founded on it; for if prayer call down so great an amount of grace as to preserve the Pontiff from doctrinal, why not also from practical errors? I notice this because a similar answer avails in a different and important part of the controversy. It is well known that one of the great arguments of Roman Catholic controversialists for the infallibility of the Pope or of the Church (which of the two they have not yet decided) is from the words, "Lo, I am with you always even unto the end of the world." A good answer to this is—If the presence of Christ be, as you assert, the guarantee for infallibility, why not likewise for impeccability? Why do you assume that the presence of the Lord secures only soundness of doctrine, and not purity of life: the heart is as important as the head. It is evident that the Roman Catholic who makes the distinction *in this passage*, is bound to account for it. The flagitious lives of some among the Popes is a complete answer, at least, to any Roman Catholic who uses this passage to prove the infallibility of the Pontiff.

* I had selected this criterion as being that almost invariably given. The same question is, however, equally applicable to any of the three criteria unsettled up to this day. The simple fact that *there* such do really exist, shows us the difficulty of settling the doctrine, the impossibility of proving it. It is some disparagement to infallibility that after all, its advocates have recourse to the wiser rule—"in the multitude of counsellors there is safety."

* Where is such a list, authorised by the Church of Rome, to be found? We showed, in our October number for 1853, vol. II., p. 116, that no such list exists. Ed.

interpret Scripture *according* to such consent. And Roman Catholics are continually told, and led to believe, that the Fathers are really unanimous upon the passages adduced in proof of the *peculiar* doctrine of the Church of Rome; whereas the very reverse is a known historic fact. Thus, the celebrated Abbé Launoy proves, by extracts from the Fathers, that they held no less than four different interpretations of the passage, "Thou art Peter," &c.

Mr. G.—The Church has always interpreted the passage, as making St. Peter head of the Apostles, and giving him the power of the keys—jurisdiction over the whole Church of Christ—to him and to his successors.

(To be continued.)

IS THE ROMAN CHURCH THE MOTHER AND MISTRESS OF ALL CHURCHES?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I have read with pleasure your leading article, on the "Catholic Church," in your last number; because, I think, you have put the question on its real point: for, I think, the dispute must turn on that article of the Roman creed, that "the Roman Church is the mother and mistress of all Churches:" is that true or false? that is the question.

My reason for writing, is this. I remarked that your Roman Catholic correspondents wrote very clearly about the Catholic Church: they *would* write about *that*, and about nothing else. Now, I hope, they won't drop it, just when you bring it to the real point. Is the Church of Rome "the mother and mistress of all Churches?" Surely they won't drop the question, just when it comes to that!

Dear sir, if you have got a letter from any of them about *that*, then don't mind putting in this letter; but if you have got no letter from any of them, then just put in this note to remind them that we are all waiting, now that the thing has got to a point,

Yours, dear sir,

ONE THAT WANTS TO BE A TRUE CATHOLIC.

Oct. 10, 1854.

IS THE PROTESTANT BIBLE A CORRUPT AND MUTILATED TRANSLATION OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES?*

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I very much regret to find that you have brought to a close your interesting articles on the above important subject. You have omitted to notice passages, equally interesting and important, bearing on the controversy between Protestants and Roman Catholics, with those already noticed by you. Permit me to bring before your readers, three other texts, which are differently rendered in the two translations; on each of which, important doctrines or ecclesiastical usages are founded, and which Protestants are accused of perverting for sinister and unholy purposes. An omission, on your part to notice these, might be construed, by some of your lay Roman Catholic readers, into a tacit admission of the correctness of the present Roman Catholic version.

I refer to the three texts from John ii. 4, Ephes. v. 32, and 1 Cor. xi. 27.

1. John ii. 4.—The words, Τι εμοι και σοι, γύναι, are rendered, in the Roman Catholic translation, "Woman, what is that to me and to thee?"—in the Protestant version, "Woman, what have I to do with thee?" It has been argued that Protestants have wandered from a literal translation of the words, to adopt another which would convey an idea that our Lord desired to rebuke his mother for her untimely interference, whereas, if properly rendered, "it plainly shows that his mother knew of the miracle that he was to perform, and that it was at her request he wrought it."†

I may be permitted to observe that it is not a *modern* Protestant notion, that the words of our Lord were uttered in reproof. *Saint* Irenæus (A.D. 180) said, in reference to his mother's interference, that "the Lord repelled her untimely hurrying, said," &c.‡ *Saint* Chrysostom (A.D. 405) speaks of her "foolish arrogance."‖ And *Saint* Augustine (A.D. 430), in his comment on our Lord's address to Mary, said, "His Mother required him to perform a miracle, but he, as it were, does not acknowledge his human origin (or others translate the words, *viscera humana non agnoscit*, does not recognise parental authority), when about to effect a Divine work; as though He said, 'To that part of me which works the miracle thou didst not give birth.' 'Thou didst not give birth to my divinity,' &c. Therefore, because she was not the mother of his divinity, that the miracle was about to be performed, He answered, 'What have I to do with thee?'"§ And to the like effect *Saint* Cyril of Alexandria (A.D. 400),¶ and others; and *Saint* Epiphanius expressly informs us that our Lord made use of the word "woman" on this occasion, "Lest any one should think that the holy (Blessed) Virgin was a being of superior excellence."**

But all this is beside the real question. Does the Protestant version give an incorrect or erroneous translation of the words of our Saviour? Fortunately, in the present instance, we need not enter into a learned discussion of Greek *idioms*. How have Roman Catholics themselves interpreted these very words in other places? The very same words occur *eight* times in the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament, and *six* times in the original text of the New Testament, which the Latin Vulgate, in every instance, renders by the same form of expression, "Quid mihi et tibi." In every single instance, save the one in question (John ii. 4), the Roman Catholic version now in use, has "What have I to do with thee" (or you).†

Now, sir, I think, one may fairly leave this text as rendered in our Protestant version, until objectors are prepared to show that in these fourteen different places they have themselves given an incorrect translation of the words in question.

The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Philadelphia, Dr. Kenrick, is constrained to admit the correctness of our version, and has actually adopted it in his recent translation of the New Testament!

II. Ephesians v. 32. We know that Roman Catholics teach that "marriage" is one of the Seven Sacraments instituted by Christ. That marriage is declared in the Bible to be a sacrament, we are referred to this text, which they render, "This is a great sacrament." The original word is μυστηριον—literally, *mystery*—and is so rendered in the Protestant Authorized Version.

We dispose of this point as we did the last. The same original Greek is used five other times in this same epistle—nay, further, it occurs twenty-two different times in the New Testament.‡ In twenty-one instances the present Roman Catholic version renders the word in question as we do, "*mystery*;" while, in the twenty-second instance, and in this particular place, for very obvious reasons, the same word is rendered "*sacrament*."

When Roman Catholics are prepared to show that in these twenty-one different places they have themselves given an incorrect translation, it will be time enough to consider the twenty-second.

What saith a cardinal of this Church? Cardinal Cajetan confesses, in his remarks on this very text—"This is a great mystery; but the learned reader cannot infer from thence that marriage is a *sacrament*; for he (Paul) said not it is a sacrament, but a mystery."‖

And here again Dr. Kenrick has adopted the same translation as given in our Authorized Version, in his late edition, above referred to, candidly admitting, in a note, that he preferred the literal reading.§

III. 1 Cor. xi. 27. The Roman Church denies the cup to the laity. The first official decree, on this subject, was issued by the Council of Constance, A.D. 1414, at the 13th session. While admitting that Christ instituted the sacrament under both kinds it declared "that it should be received by laymen under the kind of bread only, is to be held for a law which may not be refused.¶ In all Protestant Churches the wine, as well as the bread, is given to the laity. We act on Scriptural authority. But we are charged with the guilt of corrupting a text in Scripture to support our system. The text, 1 Cor. xi. 27, is rendered, in the present Roman Catholic version—"Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this bread *or* drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily." The note observes—"Here erroneous translators corrupted the text by putting *and drink* (contrary to the original ἢ πινῃ) instead of *or drink*." In the "Grounds of Christian Doctrine," Dublin, 1838, p. 31, we read, "the Protestant translators have evidently corrupted the text by putting in '*and drink*,' instead of '*or drink*,' as it is in the original." Mr. Waterworth declares our rendering to be "a horrid mistranslation" or "no translation at all."**

Griesbach has ἢ πίνῃ, which we translate *and* drink; *modern* Roman Catholics, *or drink*. As establishing or confirming a matter of doctrine or custom, it is of little consequence which translation we adopt in this text, for in both versions, in the verse immediately before and immediately after, we have the words *and drink*. But the question is, are we Protestants guilty of corrupting the text, 1 Cor. xi. 27, by substituting *and* for *or*?

1. The Lexicographers, Schleusner and Robert Constantine (a Roman Catholic) say that ἢ ἠ is sometimes used for *και*, *and*.

2. The Alexandrine and some other Greek manuscripts have *και* not ἢ; and the Syriac, Coptic Æthiopic and three Arabic versions rendered this text as we do now.

3. But these last may be declared heretical versions, and of no authority, then we assert that very many of the authorized Roman Catholic editions have *and* and not *or*, a great many of the oldest *vulgate* editions included. I have myself examined the Paris edition of the Vulgate, edited by the Benedictine monks, A.D. 1565, and another published in 1573, declared to be "accurate recognita et emendata," &c., and another of 1543, also the Paris edition, "Apud Rob. Stephanum," 1527, and the Basil edition of John Forben de Hamelburg, 1495, all these I can testify have *et* (and) and not *aut* (or).

The following passage is from Blair's letters, on the "Revival of Popery"*:—

"1st. I find it stated, in page 492, vol. iii., of 'Curæ Philologicæ et Criticæ Wolfi,' 4to., Basil, 1741, that more than thirty of the earliest printed editions of the Vulgate translations, between the years 1462 and 1569, have *et biberit* (*and* shall drink), agreeing with our own version. 2nd. That the Missals, both printed and manuscript copies, likewise read *et biberit*. 3rd. I have myself examined such printed editions of the Vulgate Latin as came in my way, and have found *above fifty* of them to contain the same rendering of the text. 4th. I have consulted several manuscripts of the Vulgate, some at the British Museum, others in the libraries of private individuals, in which I found *et biberit*, &c., not *vel* or *aut biberit*. 5th. Some of the very oldest translations into German, French, &c., made from the Vulgate, by Roman Catholics themselves, agree on the disputed passage with ours. 6th. Not merely do the printed versions agree, but likewise different manuscripts which I examined, and particularly those in French, which are founded on the versions of Guiart des Moulias, or on the History of Peter Comester, so highly esteemed by the schoolmen, &c., before printing was discovered. Among the Latin Vulgate editions alluded to, are some of peculiar value—for instance, the very first Bible ever printed by *Faust and Guttenburg*, called the Mazarine Bible, about A.D. 1450, or soon after, but without date; the Bible executed, with a date, by the next printers, at Metz, 1462; the celebrated copy in the Polyglott of Cardinal Ximenes, with the authority of Pope Leo X.; the early Bible of Eggerstein, about 1468; also that with notes of Nicholas de Lyra; Peter Comester's Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles, written in the middle of the twelfth century; the Bible of the Louvain Doctors; that of the Paris Divines; the grand Polyglott of Antwerp; the Bible of the Salamanca University; and a multitude of others, highly important, which it would be tedious to particularize."

And, lastly, I may add that the same reading as ours is to be found in the edition published by Pope Sixtus V., or, rather, he adopted the old Vulgate, and he denounced his anathema against the man who should alter it "*in the smallest particular*;" notwithstanding this denunciation, Pope Clement VIII. subsequently published another edition, altered in *very many particulars*, and among them the one in question.

I do trust that you will permit this subject to be followed up, as it is universally admitted to be of the greatest consequence. A ready answer is at once afforded by this means to the virulent attacks made by Roman Catholics against our excellent version.

I remain, sir, your obedient servant,

C. H. COLLETTE.

ON THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN

SIR—As the month is very far advanced, I shall send you only a short letter, that you may be enabled to insert it in your next number.

You praised me in a late number of the LAYMAN very highly, because I abstained from vulgar abuse, or scurrility and slander, in this discussion with you. Indeed, Mr. Editor, I believe that if I had had recourse to such ignoble weapons, I would have injured the cause which I impotently and unlearnedly espouse. My religion, I say it emphatically, requires no such arms of defence. For my part, I declare sincerely, if I found any Catholic writer arming himself with abuse and slander, instead of sober reasoning, against Protestants, it would startle me extremely, and be apt to make me stagger in my faith, especially if I observed that the generality of our divines followed that method.

The reason hereof is plain, because everybody that has but a grain of common sense knows that misrepresentation and abuse are not only the foulest stains upon the credit and reputation of any cause, but even betray a consciousness in the author that the cause he maintains has not a solid foundation of its own to stand upon. For if he thought that it could stand firm upon its own bottom, he would never hazard the reputation of it by employing the most unchristian means to support it. Hence it is, that truth being able to maintain itself by fair and solid reasoning, not only disdains the ordinary little artifices of fallacy and misrepresentation, but utterly abhors to receive any assistance from the vile hands of falsehood and slander. Whereas lies can only be maintained by lies; and there is no surer mark of a bad cause than when, instead of standing a fair trial of argument and reason, it has recourse to such unwarrantable methods for its defence as no man will

---

* If our respected correspondent will refer to the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. i., page 117, and vol. ii., page 34, he will find that we have already noticed some of the subjects treated of in this letter; they are, however, well worth calling attention to again, and we, therefore, gladly insert this letter.

† Note to Roman Cath. translation.

‡ Lib. iii., c. 18, pp. 206-2. Edit. Benedict.

‖ Απόνοια, vol. vii., page 467. Paris, fol. edit., 1718, and see vol. viii., p. 125.

§ Augustine, vol. iii., part ii., pages 354, 355, 357, &c. Edit. Paris, 1700.

¶ Vol. iv., p. 135, p. 1064. Paris Edit., 1638.

* Epiph., pages 1056-1064. Paris edit., 1622.

† The texts are—Judges xi. 12; 2 Samuel (2 Kings) xvi. 10, and xix. 22; Ezra (Esdras) iv. 3; Joel iii. 4; Joshua xxii. 24; 1 Kings (iii.) 17, 18; 2 Kings (iv.) 3, 13; Matt. viii. 29; Luke viii. 28, and iv. 34; Mark v. 7, and i. 24. See CATH. LAY., vol. i. No. 10, p. 117.

‡ Mark iv. 11; Rom. ii. 25, xvi. 26; 1 Cor. ii. 7, xv. 51; Eph. i. 9, iii. 3, iii. 4, iii. 9, v. 32, vi. 19; Col. i. 26, i. 27, iv. 3; Col. ii. 2; 2 Thess. ii. 7; 1 Tim. iii. 9, 16; Rev. i. 20, x. 7, xvii., 5 & 7.

‖ Non habes ex hoc loco, prudens lector, à Paulo conjunctum esse sacramentum. Non enim dicit, sacramentum, sed mysterium hoc magnum est, et veri &c."—Cuj. apud. Chamier. de Sacram. lib. iv., cap. iii., tom. iv., p. 149 (p. 140. Paris ed., 1532).

§ See CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. ii., No. 16, p. 43.

¶ Labbe and Coss., Conc. Trin., xii., col. 100. Paris, 1672.

** Venn's Letters to Waterworth, Hereford, 1845, p. 106.

* London, 1819; appendix, pages 250-252.

take if he be persuaded that he has the truth on his side. In a word, a good cause stands in no need of dishonourable ways to maintain itself, but a bad cause cannot subsist without them.

With this preface I will resume the subject of Infallibility by asking, is there such a passage as this in the Holy Book—"Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it?" You will say that there is. Well, now, I will tell you that that text incontestably proves the infallibility of the Church. For these words evidently contain a promise made by Christ to His Church. What does he promise? To build this Church upon a rock. Could Christ, in His wisdom, have promised to build a Church upon a rock, if He foresaw her future fall by heresy or error; or, did He not intend by these words that she should be so firmly established as never to be overturned? Unless this were the case, who could "liken Him to the wise man who built his house upon a rock, and the rains descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew and beat upon the house, and it fell not, for it was founded upon a rock?"—Matt. vii., 24, 25. But if a shadow of doubt remained on the subject, it is immediately removed by the concluding words of the promise, "and the gates of hell shall not prevail against her." Now, faith is essential to the constitution of a Church, and faith is destroyed by heresy. Hence, if the Church has fallen, or can fall into heresy, she ceases to be a Church—she was not built upon a rock, the gates of hell have prevailed, and do prevail against her. Moreover, either Christ foresaw that the gates of hell would not prevail against his Church, or he did not. It is now I am only going to begin to argue with you. If He did not, we will be compelled to deny His prescience, and to say that He promised what He knew nothing of. If He did foresee it, as His prescience is infallible, so the event must infallibly correspond with the prediction—and it is infallibly true that the gates of hell never did prevail, and never will prevail, against the Church. In a word, to conclude this almost superfluous argumentation on so very plain a text—*according to Jesus Christ, the fountain of truth, the gates of hell will never prevail against His Church. But if she fall into any error in faith, the gates of hell would prevail against her. Therefore, she cannot fall into any error against faith, and, consequently, is infallible in all articles of faith.*

The infallible Church of Christ, sir, stands upon her glorious apostolical eminence—frustra circumlatrantibus hæreticis. Thigum thu shin.

"But, gracious God! how well dost thou provide
For erring judgments, an unerring guide.
Thy throne is darkness in the abyss of light,
A blaze of glory that forbids the sight.
Oh, teach me to believe Thee, thus conceal'd,
And search no farther than Thyself reveal'd;
But her alone, for my director take,
Whom Thou hast promised never to forsake."

I remain, Sir,
Your humble and obedient servant,
WILLIAM ROURKE.

P.S.—You will be so kind as to insert, in your next number, the letter which I sent you some months ago.*—W. R.

It tends very much to bring a discussion to a point, when people will consider one argument at a time, and not pass on to a second till the first is disposed of. Mr. Rourke, in his present letter, presents us with a single argument, stated in logical form, which, in order to fix the reader's attention on it, we have taken the liberty of putting in italics. Now we grant the first of his two propositions, but we deny the second; and call on him for proof of it. We admit that Christ has promised that the gates of hell shall not prevail against His Church; and we believe that He will keep this promise; but we deny that these words imply that the Church shall be infallible in every point of doctrine. The words convey a promise of perpetuity, and of ultimate victory over all her enemies; but nothing more. If a prophet had foretold the issue of the war in which we are at present engaged, in similar words, "The power of England is founded on a rock, and Russia shall not prevail against it;" no one would have a right to infer, from such a promise, that none of our soldiers should be slain, or that we must be successful in every skirmish; but he would only know that the end of the whole war would be in our favour. And it is just so with the Church. The gates of hell—the powers of darkness—make war upon it; by open persecutions, by clandestine frauds, by corruption of her morals, and by corruption of her faith. And sometimes these assaults appear, for a time, to be successful. Her enemies have, at times, by the violence of their persecutions, almost put down the public profession of her creed; vice and immorality have, at times, overspread themselves over her to such an extent that the See which claims to be her chief one, has become the seat of the most abandoned debauchery; heresy and false teaching have, at times, gained possession of some of her fairest provinces. But Christ's promise gives us confidence in the hour of her darkest suffering. We know that the victory must, in the end, be hers. If there is persecution, it cannot reach her; she will outlive her persecutors. If there is vice, or if there is false doctrine, God will, in due time, raise up instruments to bring about a reformation. But certainly the most artful device the devil ever invented to prevent a reformation, is to use Christ's own promise in order to persuade men that a reformation could never be needed;—to teach that we ought to lead the life and hold the doctrines that Pope Alexander VI. professed, on the ground that if we were to grant that his life or doctrines were reprehensible, it would follow that the gates of hell in his time prevailed against the Church.

We firmly believe that this most subtle device of the powers of darkness will, in the end, be as ineffectual as their other arts; and that Christ will not permit the figment of his Church's infallibility to be always used as a means of preventing her reformation.

* We do not know what letter Mr. R. alludes to. We have printed in full eight letters from Mr. Rourke, and are not aware that we ever received any other.—ED.

FLOWERS FOR OCTOBER.

THE flowers are almost gone, and the trees stripped of their gay summer attire, or, at best, clothed in sad and sober brown; the proudest ornaments of the garden hang their heads, mutely conscious how the unceasing wheel of time is revolving, and hourly steals their beauty! The fading flower, the fallen leaf, and the departing swallow—all tell us that the summer is over. Even the feathered tribes seem concerned in the fall of the year—

"'Mid russet-shaded leaves
The robin sits and grieves
Your hastening death, sweet flowers;
Sings your requiem all the day,
And mourns because ye pass away."

But more emphatically still does the swallow, which came to us in the spring time, and now prepares for his departure to more temperate regions, announce the coming winter. It takes knowledge of the dealings of God with the earth, which he has fore-ordained and written in the book of nature, and it makes timely preparation before the storms come to impede its flight, and the frosts fall to stiffen its pinions. It is so far wiser in its generation than the children of men, who—knowing that there is appointed to all men a time to die, and after that the judgment—postpone their preparations till disease and infirmity have paralyzed their bodies and benumbed the faculties of their minds.

But late though the season is, we have still

The Foxglove's purple bell,
On bank and upland plain;
The scarlet pimpernel,
And daisy on the dell,
That kindly blooms again
When all her sisters of the spring
On earth's cold lap are withering.

THE FOXGLOVE (*Digitalis purpurea*) is, perhaps, the most beautiful and stately of all our indigenous wild flowers. Everybody who has traversed the road sides in autumn must have noticed a simple flower growing to the height of three or four feet, with an erect stem, and large lanceolate leaves, rearing aloft a pyramid of freckled bell flowers of rich deep purple. Its drooping pendants are spotted within, like to "*fairies' petticoats.*" They are found abundantly on dry hills and rocky situations; and we have gathered them recently in the highest districts of Wicklow. The name of the flower, Digitalis, is probably derived from its resemblance to the finger of a glove. Its leaves, when dried and reduced to powder, produce the powerful drug of that name.

As the season advances the autumnal CROCUS opens; we welcomed the spring Crocus in the month of February, and its autumnal follower is not the less welcome now. The autumnal Crocus (*Crocus Sativus*) yields the saffron of commerce, a drug formerly in great estimation, and still of considerable use. It grows wild, and in great profusion, on the Alps of Tyrol and Savoy, and is so abundant in many parts of England and Ireland, that it is commonly considered to be a native. But there is little doubt that it was introduced into England in the reign of Edward III., and first planted in Essex, at a place still called Saffron Walden. It grows most abundantly in the fields of Cambridgeshire, Herefordshire, Suffolk, and Essex; but it is grown for profit only in a few places in Essex, near its original seat. Our supplies of saffron are derived principally from France and Spain. The parts used for the saffron are the stigmata, and part of the pistil, which are picked out from the flowers in September, and pressed into cakes.

Kindred with the autumnal Crocus is the MEADOW SAFFRON (*Colchicum autumnale*), another field flower of October, with purple blossoms very similar in colour to the Crocus. A common observer would not distinguish the two flowers, but a naturalist would at once see they are essentially different in species. The colchicum has six stamens and three pistils, while the Crocus has but three stamens and one pistil—a distinction which enables the herbalist to avoid the Meadow Saffron which is poisonous, and seek the Crocus which is harmless and valuable. The Colchicum, however, is valuable as a medicine in skilful hands; and its roots, seeds, and blossoms are collected in large quantities. Its bells, of amethyst colour at this time, cover many fields and meadows in England and in Ireland, along the banks of the Shannon, below Limerick, like an embroidered carpet. The Colchicum has one singular circumstance attending its growth and development, that while its flowers appear in the autumn, its leaves and fruits do not appear till the following spring. Towards the end of October its flowers die away, and no one looking at the faded and withered plant would imagine that it would ever appear again; but its seeds are buried in the bulb. And while the winter snows are around and above them they are preserved in safety; and when the sunshine and showers of the spring re-appear, the seeds come forth and ripen. This is a very beautiful emblem of the resurrection of the just (or justified in Christ Jesus). The earthly tabernacle withers and is dissolved and buried in the earth; but the seed of immortal life is preserved, and will come forth to ripen when the Sun of Righteousness shall appear.

There are some varieties of the Colchicum of various colours, and many of them double, cultivated in our flower gardens, derived mostly from the isles of Greece. They all, like the wild Colchicum, await the following spring to produce their leaves and fruits. None of them, however, have any value in commerce. The name of the flower Colchicum is not without some interest to the classical reader and to every reader at present. It recalls the ancient Colchis on the shores of the Euxine, or Black Sea, to which was directed the earliest maritime expedition on record—that of the Argonauts. It is in the same locality and within a very short distance of the same spot to which has been directed the greatest maritime expedition perhaps ever undertaken—that of England and France against the Crimea and its celebrated fortress of Sebastopol. It is singular that the same locality, almost the same spot, should, at an interval of 2,000 years, be destined to be the scene of two similar exploits. The Colchicum derives its name from the abundance of its flowers at Colchis, now called Mingrelia.

Lingering still among us is the MIGNIONETTE (*Reseda odorata*)—

"The fragrant weed,
The Frenchman's darling."

Its name with us signifies "little darling," mignionne; but, though the name is borrowed from the French, it is strange that the Mignionette is not known by any such name in France, but as "la resede d'Egypte." The Spaniards designate it by an endearing name, of similar import to ours, Minioneta. It grows wild in the sandy plains of Barbary; but is generally believed to be a native of Egypt. Its introduction into our gardens is comparatively recent, not yet a hundred years since. The plant was well known to the ancients, and was called *Reseda* from its soothing and calming properties, in allaying the irritation of wounds. Pliny gives an account of a form of incantation employed when it was used as a charm. The Mignionette may, with care, be made to blow almost throughout the year. Its flowers themselves are small and not very attractive; and but for its exquisite fragrance, so far surpassing the promise of its appearance, the plant would be, perhaps, wholly unnoticed. It has been, on this account, considered a fitting emblem of the superiority of mental qualifications over personal beauty and gracefulness.

In Ireland we have two species of wild Mignionette. The Reseda luteola is found in our hedges in the autumn. It has pale yellow flowers; it is also called Dyers' rocket, being used sometimes in dying woollen stuffs yellow. The other is Reseda lutea, or Base's rocket, of a deeper yellow colour.

The crowning glory of October, and our most national shrub, is the STRAWBERRY-TREE (*Arbutus unedo*). The Arbutus is not only an ornament to every shrubbery, but, as everybody knows, it forms the special ornament of Killarney about this time of the year. Its greenish-white flowers hang like waxen bells among the thick and luxuriant foliage of evergreens, and its deep crimson berries, or fruit, soon take their place. It was said to have been introduced from Spain by the monks of Muckruss Abbey, but this is scarcely probable; and it is stated by Mackay to be a shrub certainly indigenous to Ireland, from whence it has been transplanted into the gardens and shrubberies of the sister country. This is extremely probable as it has been known to have been in Ireland for many centuries, and it attains a height and luxuriance in the woods of Muckruss and on the shores of the lakes of Killarney, and at Glengariff, which it does nowhere else, as if the noble shrub felt itself at home among the Irish lakes and mountains. Its very name is Celtic, "ar boise," or, austere bush, from the nature of the berries, or fruit. Unedo (*una edo*), is said to import that those who taste one of them will be content without trying a second. If this be the meaning of the word it appears to us a libel, as they are not so very nauseous; and the blackbirds and thrushes of Killarney would give their verdict in support of our opinion.

The Strawberry-tree is, for some reason or other, made the emblem of perfect goodness, but it is hard to say where we shall look on earth for anything which it may fairly represent. Our Saviour has said—"There is none good but one, that is God."—Matt. xix. 17. Of him only can it be said, "The goodness of the Lord endureth continually; the earth is full of the goodness of the Lord." The Apostles, in their preaching and teaching only attempted to present "Every man perfect in Christ Jesus" (Col. i. 28); by preaching and teaching salvation by faith in the finished work of Christ, Christ in you the hope of glory, and not by preaching or teaching the works of the law, "Because by the works of the law no flesh shall be justified before Him."—Rom. iii. 20, R. C. version. "For the law brought nothing to perfection."—Hebrews vii. 19.

RE-ISSUES OF IMPORTANT PUBLICATIONS.

I.

THE PICTORIAL HISTORY OF ENGLAND,

IN TEN VOLS., SUPER ROYAL 8VO.,

CARRIED DOWN TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE RUSSIAN WAR.

THE Pictorial History of England will be re-issued in its original form and with all its original illustrations, forming Eight volumes, and terminating with the year 1815. To this series will be added a New Edition of the History of the Peace, extended to March, 1854, and including a complete Chronological Index. The entire work will be completed in Ten volumes, Super Royal 8vo., printed on fine paper, to be published in Weekly Numbers at 6d., and Monthly Parts at 2s. There will be about Sixty Parts, the first of which will appear on the 4th November.

II.

THE PENNY CYCLOPEDIA,

REVISED, WITH THE LATEST CORRECTIONS AND ADDITIONS.

ILLUSTRATED WITH SEVERAL THOUSAND WOOD ENGRAVINGS.

THIS work, comprising upwards of 14,200 pages, exclusive of a Supplementary Volume, will be printed on imperial 8vo., in fine paper, and constitute one of the most valuable works of reference of the day. It will be brought out in Weekly Numbers, price 6d., and Monthly Parts, price 2s.; to commence on the 2nd December. It will be issued also in Volumes and Half Volumes; the whole expense not to exceed £8 16s.

III.

THE PICTORIAL BIBLE;

WITH NUMEROUS NOTES BY DR. KITTO.

SPLENDIDLY ILLUSTRATED WITH STEEL ENGRAVINGS, MAPS, ETC.

THE new edition of this beautiful work will be more elegantly printed than any of the preceding editions, and Notes will now be added, regarding the recent Assyrian discoveries of Mr. Layard, and the interesting results illustrative of Scripture, which will render the work much more valuable than before. It will be printed in Super Royal 8vo., and issued in Weekly Numbers, price 6d., and Monthly Parts, price 2s.; to commence on 4th November; the whole to be completed in 86 numbers, or 22 parts.

WILLIAM CURRY AND CO.

ARE RECEIVING SUBSCRIBERS' NAMES FOR EACH OF THE ABOVE BOOKS,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

NEW WORKS

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET.

HORNE'S INTRODUCTION TO THE CRITICAL STUDY AND KNOWLEDGE OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES. New Edition. Edited by the Rev. J. Hartwell Horne; the Rev. Samuel Davidson, D.D.; and S. P. Tregelles, L.L.D. 4 vols., 8vo. (In the Press.)

THE DOMESTIC COMMENTARY ON THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS. By the Rev. Robert Shittler. 2 vols., Imp. 8vo., £2; or in 4 vols., £2 2s.

THE LIFE AND EPISLES OF ST. PAUL. By the Rev. W. Conybeare; and the Rev. J. S. Howson. 2 vols., 4to., with maps, and numerous Steel Engravings. £2 8s.

ALFORD'S GREEK TESTAMENT, with a Critically Revised Text, Marginal References, and Commentary. New Edition. Vol. I., much enlarged, 32s. Vol. II., 28s.

TREGELLES on the Printed Text of the Greek New Testament, with remarks on its Revision upon Critical Principles, together with the Collation of the Critical Text of Griesbach, Scholz, Lachmann, and Tischendorf, with that in common use. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

THE MESSIAH, AS PREDICTED IN THE PENTATEUCH AND PSALMS; being an Historic-critical Exposition of the Jewish Oracles. By J. R. Wolf. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

ON RELIGIOUS RESTORATION IN ENGLAND: A Series of Sermons, preached in Westminster Abbey, at the Boyle Lecture. By Canon Wordsworth. 8s.

ON INQUIRY INTO THE PRINCIPLES OF CHURCH AUTHORITY; or, Reasons for recalling my Subscription to the Royal Supremacy. By the Rev. R. J. Wilberforce. 8vo. 5s.

THE APOCALYPSE FULFILLED; or, an Answer to "Apocalyptic Sketches," by Dr. Cumming. By the Rev. P. S. Desprez. Fcap. 8vo. 8s. 6d.

CHRISTIANITY VIEWED IN SOME OF ITS LEADING ASPECTS. By the Rev. A. L. R. Foote. Fcap. 8vo. 3s.

HISTORY OF FRENCH LITERATURE IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY. By the late Alexander Vinet, D.D. 8vo. 8s. 6d.

THE MOSAIC RECORD, IN HARMONY WITH THE GEOLOGICAL. Fcap. 8vo. 3s.

THEOLOGIA GERMANICA; translated from the German. By Susanna Winkworth. With a Preface by the Rev. Chas. Kingsley. 5s.

ON THE PLURALITY OF WORLDS. An Essay. With a Dialogue on the same subject. By Professor Whewell. Third Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 6s.

MORE WORLDS THAN ONE. The Creed of the Philosopher, and the Hope of the Christian. By Sir David Brewster. New Edition. 6s.

JOURNAL OF A DEPUTATION sent to the East by the Committee of the Malta Protestant College, in 1849, containing an account of the present state of the Oriental Nations, including the Religion, Learning, Education, Customs, and Occupations, &c. 2 vols. 8vo. 12s.

THE JORDAN AND THE RHINE; or, the East and the West. Being the Result of Five Years' Residence in Syria; and Five Years' Residence in Germany. By the Rev. William Graham. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF THE LATE REV. WILLIAM JAY, OF BATH. With Selections from his Correspondence. Edited by the Rev. J. A. James, and Dr. Redford. 8vo. 12s.

MEMOIR OF THE REV. JOHN JAMES WEITBRECHT. By his Widow. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

THE PILGRIM IN THE MISSIONS; or, GOSPEL HUSBANDRY. By H. Smith, Esq. 4s. 6d.

OUR FATHER; or, Jesus teaching to Pray. An Exposition of the Lord's Prayer. By Rev. Samuel Garrett. 2s. 6d.

BRANDE'S DICTIONARY OF SCIENCE, LITERATURE, AND ART. New Edition. With a supplement, and numerous Engravings. 8vo. 60s.

SILURIA: The History of the oldest known Rocks, containing organic remains. With a brief sketch of the distribution of Gold over the earth. By Sir Roderick Murchison. With Coloured map, 38 Plates, and 200 Woodcuts. 8vo. 30s.

INCIDENTS OF TRAVEL IN CENTRAL AMERICA, CHIAPAS, AND YUCATAN. By J. L. Stephens. With numerous Engravings. 8vo. 12s.

THE BALTIC, THE BLACK SEA, AND THE CRIMEA; comprising Travels through Russia, with a Voyage down the Volga, to Astrachan, and a Tour through Crim Tartary. By Charles Henry Scott. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL ESSAYS CONTRIBUTED TO THE EDINBURGH REVIEW. By the Right Hon. Thomas Babington Macaulay. Cloth. 2 vols. Post 8vo. Cheaper Edition. 8s.

TURKEY, RUSSIA, THE BLACK SEA, AND CIRCASSIA. By Captain Spencer. With Coloured Illustrations and a Map. 6s.

HISTORY OF RUSSIA FROM THE FOUNDATION OF THE EMPIRE BY ROURICK, TO THE CLOSE OF THE HUNGARIAN WAR. By Alphonse Rabbe, and Jonathan Duncan. 2 vols. Illustrated. 5s.

ATHENS AND THE PELEPONNESE. With Sketches of Northern Greece. From the German of Hermann Hettner. Crown 12mo. 2s. 6d.

WHAT, WHERE, AND WHO IS ANTICHRIST? By the Rev. H. H. BEAMISH. Fcap. 8vo. 3s.

NATIONAL RESTORATION AND CONVERSION OF THE TWELVE TRIBES OF ISRAEL. By Walter Chamberlain. 8vo. 14s.

EVENINGS WITH THE ROMANISTS. By Rev. Hobart Seymour. Dedicated to Lord Viscount Palmerston, M.P. Crown 8vo. 8s. 6d.

HOME TRUTHS: being Miscellaneous Addresses and Tracts. By the Rev. J. C. Ryle. 3rd Series. 3s. 6d.

PLAIN SPEAKING. First series. Being forty short Large-type Tracts. By the Rev. J. C. Ryle, B.A. In packet. 1s.

PLAIN SPEAKING. By the Rev. J. C. Ryle. Cloth. 1s. 9d.

THE BISHOP, PASTOR, AND PREACHER. By the Rev. J. C. Ryle. Fcap. 8vo. 2s.

MEMORIAL OF THE LIFE OF MRS. OPIE. By Cecilia Lucy, Brightwell. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Just Published,

THE TWO FARMERS OF BALLINTUBBER,
THE INFALLIBLE DOCTOR,
THE LANDLORD'S LETTER,
AND
THE FAIR OF LOUGHMANAGH.

Reprinted from the CATHOLIC LAYMAN. Price 1d. each; or, 7s. 6d. per 100, for gratuitous distribution.

Second Edition.

Royal Quarto. Cloth.

THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN, Vol. I. Also, Vol. II., with complete Indices. Price 5s. 6d. each.

THE TALK OF THE ROAD, Nos. 1 to 16. Reprinted from the CATHOLIC LAYMAN. Price 1s.

Just Published, 8vo., Price 2d.; by Post, 6d.

THE SANITARY,

AND

TOWNS IMPROVEMENT JOURNAL. NO. I.

(Published Monthly.)

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY AND CO., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Price Six Shillings,

THE

CHURCH OF ENGLAND QUARTERLY REVIEW,

FOR

THE UNITED CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND IRELAND.

OCTOBER.

CONTENTS:

I. Freedom of Inquiry. II. The Last Historical Problem. III. Phases of Unbelief. IV. Ecclesiastical Courts. V. Wonders of the Deep. VI. The Second Advent of Christ. VII. Quarterly Journal of Facts and Figures, &c., &c.

London: S. Low and Co. Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY AND CO., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

In the Press, and shortly will be Published,

A CHARGE,

DELIVERED BY

THE LORD BISHOP OF MEATH,

At his Primary Visitation of the Diocese of Meath,

Held on Wednesday, Sept. 20, 1854.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

TO BE SOLD, and immediate possession given, that part of LEMONFIELD called

THE MODEL FARM,

Near Oughterard, Co. Galway,

Containing 39 acres (of which 15½ are reclaimable bog), held by lease for a term of 91 years, at a rent of £12 10s. per annum.

It has been for some years under cultivation by an English gentleman, who has laid out upwards of £700 in buildings and improvements. There is a handsome, well-built Cottage, designed by a London architect, on the farm, with good offices.

There is also attached a yearly holding of 14½ acres of Prime Glebe Land, at £13 11s. 6d. per annum, which the Purchaser can have.

The live and dead stock, and the crops, will be handed over to the purchaser.

The Fee of "The Model Farm" will be sold in November next, in one lot, in the Incumbered Estates' Court.

For further particulars apply to R. W. TOWNSEND, Esq., 2, Henrietta-street, Dublin; or to J. L., 70, Fleet-street, London.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher, WILLIAM CURRY, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

OCTOBER, 1854.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Glóir do Dhia añ ṡna háṫaiḃ, agus ṡíoḋċáin air an ṫalaṁ deaġċoil do na ḋáoiniḃ.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. III.—No. 35. NOVEMBER, 1854. { Annual Subscription, 2s. 6d. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

	Page
The Nuns of Port Royal	127
The History of the Popes, No. II.—The Popes of the Tenth Century	128
Origin of the Doctrine of the Immaculate Conception	130
Autobiography of a Roman Catholic Priest—No. II.	131
The Sure Title; or, Father Flynn and Phil Ryan	132
The Success of our Paper—The Roman Catholic Priesthood	133
Recent Controversy at Boulogne, between Rev. Dr. Moeran and two Roman Catholic Laymen—continued	133
CORRESPONDENCE:	
Is the Church of England and Ireland Schismatical?	135
On Purgatory—by Mr. E. Power	135
Flowers for November	137

THE NUNS OF PORT ROYAL.

Such of our readers as were not surprised at our article on the Benedictines of St. Maur, in a recent number, in which we so freely admitted the learning and virtues of Mabillon and his colleagues, will probably thank us for giving them a little further respite from the shock of controversy by a sketch of the remarkable sisterhood whose name stands at the head of this article. We trust the time is coming when it will no longer create surprise, that men engaged in bearing testimony against religious errors, should, at the same time, be ready to admit the virtues with which those errors are not unfrequently associated, and when it will be more generally admitted than it is, that true Christianity does not consist in a mere vivid perception of the faults, and an obtuse blindness to the merits of those who differ from us. We, at least, shall never be afraid to do homage to virtue wherever we find it, or to indulge a hope that there is a Catholic Church wide enough to comprehend within its limits all who, however widely separated in other respects, are earnestly and habitually striving, according to the measure of knowledge placed within their reach, to be truly conformed to the will of their Heavenly Father, and to have the love of the Lord Jesus Christ vividly engraven on their hearts. Whoever has himself caught any resemblance, however faint and imperfect, of that divine and benignant original, will, we think, at the same time, have learnt to recognise as brethren all in whom he can discern the same resemblance.

The same able writer to whom we acknowledged our obligations when treating of the Benedictines, Sir James Stephen, has given the following picturesque description of the spot in which the heroines of our present sketch—for such they undoubtedly are—enjoyed the friendship of a Pascal, a De Saci, and a Tillemont. "He whose journey lies from Versailles to Chevreuse, will soon find himself at the brow of a steep cliff or hollow intersecting the monotonous plain, across which he has been passing. The brook which winds through the verdant meadows beneath him, stagnates into a large pool, reflecting the mutilated Gothic arch, the water-mill, and the dovecot, which rise from its banks; with the farm-house, the decayed towers, the forest trees, and innumerable shrubs and creepers which clothe the slopes of the valley.

"France has many a lovelier prospect, though this is not without its beauty; and many a field of more heart-stirring interest, though this, too, has been ennobled by heroic daring; but through the length and breadth of that land of chivalry and song, the traveller will, in vain, seek a spot so sacred to genius, to piety, and virtue. That arch is all which remains of the once-crowded monastery of Port Royal. In those woods Racine first learned the language—the universal language of poetry; under the roof of that humble farm-house, Pascal, Arnauld, Nicole, De Saci, and Tillemont, meditated those works which, as long as civilization and Christianity survive, will retain their hold on the gratitude and reverence of mankind."

It was in this interesting spot, in the sixteenth century, that Jaqueline Marie Angelique, granddaughter to M. Marion, the advocate-general of Henry IV., presided as abbess of the Cistertian Monastery, founded four centuries before by Matthieu de Marli, on the eve of his departure to the conquest of the holy sepulchre.* Endowed with a superior understanding, address, courage, fortitude, and self-reliance, the Mère Angelique would, nevertheless, perhaps, have enjoyed much less remarkable influence over the minds of all with whom she came in contact, but that born in the reign and educated near the court of a Bourbon, the lighter and more gentle elements of her nature found exercise even under the paralyzing influence of an ascetic life. Had she not been immured by superstition within a cloister, but placed within the genial atmosphere of the domestic circle, the affections which she poured out on every human being who claimed her pity, would have burned with as pure and intense a flame as ever was depicted in poetry or romance. During the wars of the League, religion, by becoming a watchword, had almost ceased to be a reality; and few things, at the time Angelique became the Abbess of Port Royal, were less thought of by the French ladies of the Cistertian order, than the rules of their austere founder. Civil war, the apology for every crime, had debased the national character; and the general profligacy of manners had not been excluded from the precincts of the cloister.

To reform these scandals at Port Royal, and the neighbouring Abbey of Maubisson (in which Angelique also laboured for five years to bring back its inmates to the exact observance of their sacred vows), this remarkable woman devoted herself with an energy and a wisdom which have seldom been surpassed; and Port Royal was once more a sanctuary, whence the sacrifices of devotion rose with an unextinguished flame to heaven, thence, as it was piously believed, to draw down an unbroken stream of blessings upon earth. The nuns employed themselves in educating the children of the rich and the poor, in almsgiving and other works of mercy. Nor did her benevolent labours end there. Aided by her sister, Agnes the Abbess of St. Cyr, Angelique established a similar reform in a large proportion of the other Cistertian nunneries of France. A moral plague was stayed by their love, their prudence, and self-devotion; and excesses, which even the sensual and the worldly condemned, were banished from the sanctuaries of religion. In some, the change might, indeed, only be from shameless riot to hypocritical conformity; but though we are among those who think that even the most exalted virtues of the cloister hold but a subordinate and equivocal place in the scale of Christian graces, and some of the means of reformation introduced by Angelique de St. Arnauld were certainly but little calculated to attract our admiration, yet cannot we withhold the meed of our approbation for the pious labours of love of this self-denying and energetic woman; or think they were unaccepted by Him, in lowly imitation of whom she went about doing good. That she was not free from the "volantary humility" which attached extravagant importance to austerities, and loathsome self-mortifications, we cannot deny;† but that her heart seems to have been mainly directed to the Saviour, no one can reasonably doubt. In a book of devotion, entitled "The Secret Chaplet of the Holy Sacrament," composed or adopted by her for private use, she, indeed, gave expression to sentiments savouring so much of undivided affection to the Saviour, as not to escape the censure of the Church; for it was dragged to light and condemned at Rome. There is reason to believe that under the direction of St. Cyran, her religious sentiments and those of her whole community, became much more enlightened; and the exalted piety and humble faith she manifested on her death-bed, when in the midst of exquisite sufferings, and in the absence of the last rites of her religion, which her persecutors denied her, she expired in the full assurance of salvation through the merits of the only Redeemer, form one of the most interesting episodes in the martyrology of the Church.

To return, however, to our subject. The trials of Port Royal were not all of this sort. The wars of the Fronde succeeded; in the tedious history of which we have no intention of involving our readers. Most of the nuns fled for refuge to Paris, where they had another establishment, Port Royal de Paris. But to one inmate of Port Royal des Champs, the terrors of even civil war brought no disquietude. Angelique remained there, the guardian of the place. Hundreds of ruined peasants were daily fed by her bounty. "We are all occupied in contriving soups and pottage for the poor (we quote from one of her letters to a friend at the time). This is, indeed, an awful time. Our gentlemen, as they were taking their rounds yesterday, found two poor persons starved to death, and met with a young woman on the very point of killing her child, because she had no food for it. All is pillaged around; corn-fields are trampled over by the cavalry in presence of their starving owners; despair has seized all whose confidence is not in God; nobody will any longer plough or dig; there are no horses, indeed, left for the farmers; nor if there were, is any person certain of reaping what he sows; all is stolen. Perhaps I shall not be able to send you a letter to-morrow, for all our horses and asses are dead with hunger. Oh, how little do princes know the detailed horrors of war! All the provender of the beasts we have been obliged to divide between ourselves and the starving poor. We have concealed as many of the peasants and of their cattle as we could in our monasteries, to save them from being murdered, and and losing all their substance. Our dormitory and the chapter-house are full of horses; we are almost stifled by being pent up with these beasts, but we could not resist the piercing lamentations of the starving and the heart-broken poor. In the cellar we have concealed forty cows. Our court-yards and out-houses are stuffed full of fowls, turkeys, ducks, geese, and asses. The church is piled up to the ceiling with corn, oats, beans, and peas, and with caldrons, kettles, and other things belonging to the cottagers. Our laundry is filled by the aged, the blind, the maimed, the halt, and infants. The infirmary is full of sick and wounded. We have torn up all our rags and linen clothing to dress their sores; we have no more, and are now at our wits' end. We dare not go into the fields for any more, as they are full of marauding parties. We hear that the Abbey of St. Cyran has been burned and pillaged. Our own is threatened with an attack every day. The cold weather alone preserves us from pestilence. We are so closely crowded that deaths happen continually. God, however, is with us, and we are at peace." The inward peace, however, which Angelique was enabled to maintain during the horrors of civil war, was soon to be exposed to a still more arduous trial. But to explain this we must introduce to our readers some other personages, who played a considerable part in one of the most remarkable episodes to be found in the pages of ecclesiastical history.

Hauranne de Verger, Abbot de St. Cyran, and Cornelius Jansen, successively Professor of Divinity at Louvain, and Bishop of Ypres, were two of the most memorable names in the ecclesiastical annals of that age. They had passed six years of social study together in their youth, at Bayonne—and to their joint labours are to be traced that system of religious belief and practice, which still goes by the name of Jansenism in France. Jansen's life was one of unremitting labour. He read ten times over every word of the works of St. Augustine (ten volumes folio!); thirty times he studied all those passages of them which related to what is termed the Pelagian controversy. We are not going to inflict on our readers even an outline of that metaphysical contest. Our object is not to maintain or to refute the doctrines which he deduced from the writings of the Bishop of Hippo, to illustrate which he elaborately collated passages from all the Fathers of the Church. We are going merely to deal historically with matters of fact—and it is as such that we state that after an uninterrupted study of twenty years was finished the "Augustinus Cornelii Jansenii," and on the day which witnessed the completion of it, the 6th of May, 1638, the Bishop of Ypres, died of the plague which was then desolating Flanders.

Within two years after, the "Augustinus" appeared in print, and publicly received the approbation of above forty learned doctors, and was rapturously welcomed by the friends of the author. As its title imports, it was little more than a digest of the writings of St. Augustine, and though purporting to set forth nothing but what was to be

* Some say it was founded in 1204 by Eudes de Sully, Bishop of Paris.

† The substitution of coarse serge or haircloth for linen, or the occasional dropping of melted wax on the bare arms—in which mortifying exercises the abbess showed an example to the rest of the sisterhood—are scarcely as extraordinary as that a female brought up in the vicinity of a luxurious court should have chosen as her dormitory the filthiest cell in the convent, infested by vermin and everything the most loathsome.

found in the writings of that greatest of the Fathers, it at once gave the signal for a contest which, for nearly seventy years, agitated the Sorbonne (the College of Divinity in the University of Paris), and the divines of France, in a manner almost unparalleled in the annals of the Gallican Church. Though professedly written to revive the doctrine of Augustine, the "Augustinus" was felt by the society of the Jesuits as in reality an attack upon them under the name of Pelagians. To conscious delinquency the language of implied censure is often more galling than formal impeachment. And the whole efforts of the society were summoned to defeat its influence. On the other hand, St. Cyran, who had aided largely in the composition of this memorable treatise, exerted himself with great effect in building up a society for the maintenance and propagation of the principles it established; and a college of learned men, bound by no monastic vows, and living according to no positive rule, Benedictine, Dominican, or Franciscan, were gradually assembled at Port Royal. Schools for the instruction of youth in every branch of literature and science were kept by Launcelot, Nicole, Fontaine, and De Saci. Some laboured at translations of the Fathers, and other works of piety. Arnauld plied his ceaseless toils in logic, geometry, metaphysics, and theological debate. Le Maitre, and other eminent lawyers, addressed themselves to the work of arbitrating in all the dissensions of the village. From year to year, till death or persecution removed them from the valley of Port Royal, the members of this singular association, though held together by no vows, or governed by no common superior, adhered to their design, and lived together in unbroken harmony; all following their respective callings; silent, grave, abstracted, self-afflicted by fastings, watchings, and humiliations—a body of penitents on their painful progress through a world which they had resolved at once to serve and to avoid. That the immortal Pascal and De Saci (the illustrious author of the best French translation of the Holy Scriptures), were among the number, must for ever shed an undying lustre upon this singular association, even among those the most unfriendly to some of the austerities they practised. They were not, however, long left in peace.

That St. Cyran was a patron of the fraternity, and that Antoine Arnauld, who had so often contended against the casuistry, the theology, and the morals of the Jesuits, was one of its members, was sufficient to draw down upon the whole body the direst enmity of that formidable society. One Brisacier, a Jesuit, led the assault; followed by Father Meguier, who accused the Abbot of St. Cyran and Arnauld of a conspiracy against the religion of Christ, in terms so extravagant that the accusation overstepped the bounds of human credulity and refuted itself. The mode of attack was subsequently changed by Nicolas Cornet, a Jesuit and syndic of the faculty, who was the author of the far-famed "Five Propositions" which he said were *deduced* from the "Augustinus" of the Bishop of Ypres, by Arnauld, and other doctors of the Gallican Church, and by them inculcated on their disciples. That these five dogmas, lying in the dim regions of psychological divinity, on the mystery of Divine grace, were actually to be found within the "Augustinus" of Jansenius, was not the original charge. The propositions were worded by Cornet with the most artful ambiguity. The phrases were so contrived, as to be capable of two or even three different constructions.* The propositions, thus carefully worded and maliciously constructed, were condemned, first by the Sorbonne, and then by Pope Innocent X. (in a Bull, dated 31st May, 1653), as heretical; and to the authority of the Holy See, Arnauld and his friends, as earnest and submissive sons of the Church, implicitly bowed. The Pope had only as yet pronounced on a matter of *faith*; and those who had been brought up to admit his infallibility in such matters could not resist the decision, without abandoning the Church to which they were sincerely attached. The Jansenists unanimously signed the paper; each, at the same time, adding to his signature a denial, that the propositions were in the book of Jansenius. The alleged heresies being thus disposed of, one might have supposed the controversy was happily at an end; but, there still remained the question in point of fact. Admitting even that the obnoxious propositions were heretical, were they, in point of *fact*, really to be found in the "Augustinus" or not? Arnauld ventured to declare that he had studied the book from end to end, and could not find them in it. That there they were, nevertheless, the Jesuits as strongly asserted. To have quoted, by chapter and page, the alleged passages, after the manner, which, in the present day, we deem the only one likely to lead to infallible results, would, however, have spoiled the most promising quarrel which had arisen since the close of the Council of Trent. Still-born must then have perished the ever-memorable distinction of the *droit* and the *fait*, the difference between infallibility in matters of *faith*, and matters of *fact* (which has since often perplexed and exasperated the combatants within the pale of the Church of Rome)—the *droit* being, in this instance, the justice of the papal censure of the five propositions, which all Catholics admitted; the *fait* being the existence, in the "Augustinus," of the propositions so censured, which all Jansenists denied. The vulgar mode of trial by quotation being discarded or refused, nothing remained but trial by authority; and the Pope, instigated by the Jesuits, promulgated a Bull which decreed that the five propositions *were* in the book; and a conclave of Parisian doctors, selected by Annat, the king's confessor, a Jesuit in religion, and Mazarin, the king's minister, a Jesuit in politics, required that all the ecclesiastics and all the religious communities of France should subscribe their assent to the order which had thus fastened the offensive opinions on the poor Bishop of Ypres. At the bidding of the king, a synod of the clergy of France drew up an anti-Jansenist test or formulary, to be taken by all ecclesiastics and all religious communities, male and female, fortified, of course, by effective penalties. They were all required to subscribe their names to a declaration, that the five propositions, in their heretical sense, were to be found in the *Augustinus*; nor was there any exception in favour of those who had never seen the book (which, by the way, is a most ponderous folio of 900 pages), or of those who could not read Latin. This was no ineffectual menace. Blow after blow fell on those who refused, and even on those who were expected to refuse, thus to condemn the long deceased Bishop of Ypres. Port Royal was foremost among such obdurate recusants, and the exquisite wit and matchless satire of Pascal's Provincial Letters has secured an immortal interest to the otherwise contemptible dispute, which has covered with ridicule no inconsiderable part of the Christian world at that period. Even the fame of Pascal, however, did not avail. The schools of Port Royal, male and female, were dispersed. The recluses were banished from the valley. St. Cyran, the leader and ornament of the party, languished, for five years, in the dungeon of Vincennes, and only survived his release by a few months, and the great Arnauld, who had once refused a cardinal's hat, died in 1684, in exile, without one servant to attend him.* The admission of novices and postulants was interdicted to the abbess; and Angelique was now sinking under the pressure of infirmity and old age. In vain she addressed to the Queen Mother a letter, justly celebrated as a model of epistolary eloquence, detailing the wrongs of her sisterhood, and the cause of their persecution. Day after day, these helpless women were torn from the arms of their dying mother. M. Perifixè, the Archbishop of Paris, imprisoned twenty-six of them. He then repaired in pontifical state to the Port Royal monastery, and again tendered the anti-Jansenist test. Angelique was gone (she died on 6th August, 1661, at the age of 70); but her spirit and her constancy survived. The simple-hearted nuns thought it would be a mere falsehood to attest the existence of "five propositions" in a book which they had never seen and could not read; and truth, they knew, was the command of God, let Pope, cardinal, or archbishop say what they would to the contrary. Perifixè interdicted their admission to the holy sacrament. "Well, my lord," they replied, "there is in heaven a judge who reads the heart, and to him we commend our cause." The prelate's reply was almost too shocking to be repeated—"When we get to heaven it will be time enough to consider that, and see how things go there."

For ten months the nuns showed no change of purpose, and remained in prison. He then ordered them to return to Port Royal des Champs, there to be excluded from the sacraments of the Church, and die without her benediction. The invincible opposition of the Port Royalists to the test had, however, awakened a more extended resistance. Men had begun to deny the right of assemblies of the clergy, or of the king himself to impose such subscriptions. Louis, however, could not retract, and desired the Pope himself, first to draw up a formula, which should declare his own infallible knowledge of matters of fact, and then to require the universal acceptance of it. Pope Alexander VII. gladly complied, and fulminated a Bull on the 16th November, 1656. Subscription to the test, or formulary, as it was called, was now exacted by Papal authority, with the addition, that the subscribers should call on the Deity himself to attest their sincerity. It was conceived in the following terms:—"I condemn, from my inmost soul, and by word of mouth, the doctrine of the five propositions, which are contained in the work of Cornelius Jansenius. A doctrine which is not that of St. Augustine, whose sentiments Jansenius has misinterpreted." Such was the celebrated formulary dictated by the realm, and extorted by the intrigues of the Jesuits. The Jansenists, to a man, refused their signature, and persecution burst forth from every quarter. The great body of the clergy of France submitted; but still the resistance of the nuns of Port Royal was unsubdued. Four years of persecution—of mean, unmanly, worrying persecution—followed. From the poor remnant of earthly comforts which those aged women had retained, the mean-spirited king and his bigotted archbishop daily stole whatever could be so pilfered. From their means of preparing for the world where the wicked cease from troubling, every deduction was made which sacerdotal tyranny could enforce. But no tyranny could induce them to attest a lie. One after another went down, with no priestly absolution, to graves which no priest would bless; strong, even amidst the weakness and mental agonies of nature, in the assurance that the path to heaven could not be found in disobedience to the immutable laws which heaven itself had established. At last a Papal Bull was obtained for the total suppression of the monastery; and in October, 1709, it was carried into effect by an armed force, under the Marquis D'Argenson.

In a grey autumnal morning a long file of armed horsemen was seen to issue from the woods which overhung the monastery. Seated in the abbatial throne, D'Argenson, in the name of Louis, summoned the nuns to his presence. Their papers, title-deeds, and property were then seized, and proclamation of a royal decree made for their immediate exile. Each pursued her solitary journey to the prison destined for her. Of these venerable women some had passed their eightieth year, and the youngest was far advanced in life. Labouring under paralysis and other infirmities of old age, several of them died under the distress and fatigues of their journey. Last in the number appeared at the gates of the abbey the Prioress Louise de St. Anastasie Mesnail de Courtiaux. To each she had given her parting benediction. She shed no tears, nor for a moment betrayed the dignity of her office or the constancy of her mind. "Be faithful to the end," were the last words she addressed to the last companion of her sorrows; and nobly did she fulfil her own counsels. She was conducted to a convent, where she endured all the rigours of a jail. Deprived of all the religious comforts which it is in the power of man to minister, she enjoyed a solace and found a strength which it was not in the power of man to take away. In common with the greater part of her fellow-sufferers, she died without any priestly absolution, and was consigned to an unhallowed grave. They died the martyrs of sincerity; strong in the faith that a lie must ever be hateful in the sight of God, though infallible Popes should exact it, or an infallible Church, as represented by cardinals and confessors, should persuade it.

The monastery and the adjacent church were overthrown from their foundations. Workmen, prepared by hard drinking for their task, broke open the graves, in which the nuns and recluses of former times had been interred. It is some slight satisfaction to know that some families besought permission to remove the bodies of their relations, and that the bodies of the Arnauld family, of De Tillemont, Racine, Le Maitre, and De Saci, were among the number removed, and who got decent burial elsewhere. No trace was allowed to remain of the fortress of Jansenism to offend the eyes of the Jesuits, or to perpetuate the memory of the illustrious dead, with whom they had so long contended. The mutilated Gothic arch, the water-mill, and the dovecot, rising from the banks of the pool, with the decayed towers and the farm-house, on the slopes of the valley, are all that now attest that it was once the crowded abode of the wise, the learned, and the good. In that spot, however, may still be seen the winding brook, the verdant hills, and the quiet meadows, nature's indestructible monuments to the devout men and holy women who nurtured there affections which made them holy in their lives, and hopes, which rendered them triumphant in death. Nor, in her long roll of martyrs, has history to record the names of any who suffered with greater constancy, or in a nobler cause; for their conflict was with the very Church which they most profoundly revered, and their cause was that of devotedness to sincerity, and abhorrence of falsehood.

* Those who are curious to understand the matter more fully may consult, with profit, the able historical introduction of Dr. Thomas M'Crie, prefixed to his translation of "Pascal's Provincial Letters," of which the second edition was published by Johnston, Prince's-street, Edinburgh, in 1848.

* Even at the risk of interrupting our main object, we cannot help recording a memorable saying of this indomitable man. Though driven from France and hunted from place to place, he continued to fight to the last. On one occasion, wishing his friend, Nicole, to assist him in a new work, the latter observed, "We are now old; is it not time to rest?" "Rest," exclaimed Arnauld, "have we not all eternity to rest in?"

HISTORY OF THE POPES.—No. II.

THE POPES OF THE TENTH CENTURY.

We gave in our last number the history of the madman, Pope Stephen VI., and his predecessor, Pope Formosus. We promised then to proceed with other instances taken from the history of the Popes.

We are unwilling to be suspected of picking instances here and there, however forcible those instances might be. We, therefore, adopt a course above all suspicion; we take up the history exactly where we dropt it—at the death of Pope Stephen VI.; we begin again with his successor, and we propose to continue the history of the Popes for ONE HUNDRED YEARS, giving each Pope in regular succession; and we take the history from no Protestant author, but from the learned Jesuits, Labbe and Cossart, in their great work, the "Concilia Generalia;" and we ask Roman Catholics to consider, when they have read it, whether this be the fulfilment of the promises which God has made to his Church?

We must first settle the list of the Popes before we can give their history. We take that list from the greatest modern authority, Bishop Milner, in his "End of Controversy."

Bishop Milner thus gives the reasons for tracing the *succession* of the Popes:—

"If a prince is desirous of showing his title to a throne, or a nobleman or gentleman his claim to an estate, he fails not to exhibit his genealogical table, and *to trace* his pedigree *up* to some personage whose right to it was unquestionable. I shall adopt the same precise method on the present occasion, by sending your society a slight sketch of our apostolical tree; by which they will see, at a glance, an abridgment of the succession of our chief bishops in

the Apostolical See of Rome, from St. Peter up to our present edifying Pontiff, Leo XII."

In this "precise method," we must observe, that if there come in a dozen or two dozen of persons in the *succession*, who are acknowledged to have no lawful rights at all, the nobleman or gentleman will have a poor chance of establishing his claim. But let us come to Bishop Milner's "succession."

In the list, in letter xxviii., after Pope Stephen, he gives Pope Romanus, who closes the ninth century, and he then goes on with the tenth century. "The several Popes during this century were"—

Theodore II.	Stephen IX.
John IX.	Martin II.
Benedict IV.	Agapetus II.
Leo V.	John XII.
Christopher	Benedict V.
Sergius III.	John XIII.
Anastasius	Benedict VI.
Lando	Domnus II.
John X.	Benedict VII.
Leo VI.	John XIV.
Stephen VIII.	John XV.
John XI.	Gregory V.
Leo VII.	

We think it a great matter to have the list from a modern authority who is above all exception; and we now proceed to give the history of the Popes in Bishop Milner's list, as we find it in the work of these most learned Jesuits.

POPE ROMANUS.

We begin with Pope Romanus, with whom Bishop Milner closes the ninth century. Here is his history from Labbe and Cossart:—

"Romanus, a Galesian by nation, the son of Constantine, *was made Pope* in the year of our Lord 900. He sat four months and twenty days. He openly condemned the acts of Stephen made against Formosus, and he crowned as emperor, Ludovic, the son of Boso, after the flight of Berengarius."* And this is all. Not much (our readers will say) for the life of a Pope; but still, surely, a most legitimate Pope.

Well, now, just look to the list of Popes given by the same Jesuits, Labbe and Cossart, in vol. xvi., p. 132, and there we find this same Romanus not given in the list or reckoned in the number of the Popes, but inserted thus, in a note, in italics:—"Romanus Gallesinus per vim intrusus"—Romanus, a Gallesian, intruded by force. The Pope before him is number 114 in this list, and the Pope after him 115; yet Bishop Milner reckons him in the succession by which the title is proved.

POPE THEODORE II.

The whole of his history is as follows:—"Theodore, the second of his name, a Roman by nation, the son of Photius, was appointed in the room of Pope Romanus, in the year of our Lord 901, in the time of Ludovic IV., emperor of the west. He sat *only twenty days*. But on what day he died none of the ancients has disclosed. The opinion of the moderns, derived from conjecture, varies."† In other words, for all we can tell, he was turned out, and another took his place while he was living—a thing that very often happened in that age.

POPE JOHN IX.

His history is chiefly political. Berengarius, Duke of Friuli, took the emperor prisoner, deprived him of his empire, and put out his eyes. Coming to Rome with an army, he demanded the imperial crown from the Pope, which the Pope gave him. After the death of the emperor, the Pope recalled Lambert, whom Formosus had made emperor, and declared the coronation of Berengarius void. "And when very many of the Romans favoured Berengarius, and adhered to him against Lambert, Pope John, not thinking himself safe if he should stay at Rome, went to Ravenna, and there, in a synod, declared void the acts of Stephen against Formosus; and in these most turbulent times, like another Jeremiah sent from God, he pulled up, scattered, and destroyed all those things which had been badly planted, and most wickedly built up by his predecessor, Stephen. He sat three years and fifteen days, and died in the year of our Lord 905."‡

His condemnation of Stephen seems somewhat political; and it seems it was not the first time that a Pope has fled from Rome, when the present Pope did so in 1848, because it was not safe to stay. But it does seem strange that a "successor of Peter," and a "vicar of Christ," should become "another Jeremiah sent from God,"§ *by destroying all* that a previous "successor of Peter, and vicar of Christ" had done! But such is the history of the Papacy, as related by the Jesuits themselves.

POPE BENEDICT IV.

We shall give this Pope's life literally, and in full. "Benedict IV., a Roman by nation, after the interval of one day, was appointed in the room of John IX., in the year of Christ 905, in the time of Lambert the emperor. Most munificent to the poor, the widows, and the orphans, he shone like a brilliant star among the Popes of these times. In the third year of his pontificate, which is the year of Christ 907, he departed this life, and was buried near St. Peter, by the entrance, by which the way leads to St. Gregory, where also his sepulchre was adorned with an epitaph, which Baronius has, copied from Manlius, in the aforesaid place."*

The Jesuits, as in duty bound, praise where they can; and we, who are not selecting instances, but transcribing history fairly, willingly record their praise.

POPE LEO V.

"Leo V., an Ardeatine by nation, was appointed in the room of Pope Benedict IV., in the year of our Lord 907, in the time of the Emperor Lambert. And when he had governed the Church forty days, being driven from the pontificate, he was thrust into prison by Christopher—an invader of the Apostolic See—in the same year, without doubt, in which he had obtained the Pontifical See."† This is the whole of his history.

POPE CHRISTOPHER.

"Christopher, an invader of the Apostolic See, was ejected from the pontificate by the invader, Sergius, in the same way in which he himself had removed from his See his own predecessor, Leo V., lawfully elected. For when he (Christopher) had held the Pontifical See seven months, being violently ejected from the See by Sergius, and loaded with chains, and cast into prison, being compelled by force, he undertook the life and habit of a monk."‡ This is the whole history of Pope Christopher.

Thus a lawful Pope, Leo. V., was thrust out, and an usurper seized the See, while the lawful Pope was living; and yet that usurper is counted in the succession by which Bishop Milner proves the title of the present Pope! But let us go on, for the succession still gets better—or worse, as you may call it.

POPE SERGIUS III.

"Relying on the most powerful arms of Adelbert, Marquis of Tuscany, that cursed Sergius, a man the slave of all vices, and the most wicked of all men"—these are the words of the Jesuits, Labbe and Cossart, "who, together with Stephen VI., had raged above measure against Pope Formosus, invaded the See of Christopher, and, therefore, by all, is counted not a legitimate Pontiff, but an invader of the Apostolic See." . . . . "Through ambition of the Apostolic See, he betook himself to the Franks, says Sigebertus, and by their assistance, seizing the invader, Christopher, and thrusting him into prison, having privately entered Rome, he invaded the Papacy, and drove the Romans, by threats and terrors, to count all the ordinations of Formosus void; that he also ordained over again all who were ordained by Formosus, and superinduced new ordinations of them, Auxilius testifies."§

But if this man is counted *by all* to be "NO LAWFUL POPE, but an invader," how comes it that Bishop Milner reckons him in the *succession* by which the title of the present Pope is proved? Is it no flaw in the succession to have those in it who were not lawful Popes?

That this re-ordination of persons already ordained was sacrilege according to the Church of Rome, we have already shown in our account of Pope Stephen in our last number.

But is there no explanation of all this? Of course there is; the Jesuits, Labbe and Cossart, were able to explain it, and we give their explanation. "But, lest any faint-hearted person should take scandal at this deed, let him remember that these things were perpetrated by invaders and intruders, usurping the name of Pope, and unlawfully invading the Apostolic throne, and who, by the censure of the Church, were to be called not so much *Apostles* as APOSTATES; but those who were lawfully created Roman Pontiffs, such as John IX., vehemently execrated those things. Whence it is not wonderful that Sergius, with Stephen, the most potent invader of the Apostolic See, should have attempted and usurped things which cannot be granted by the sacred laws. The invader of others is A RONNER; and who would expect from him all things just and lawful?"‖

These men were no Popes, it seems. They were APOSTATES, not Apostles; yet, Bishop Milner's succession, by which he says the title of modern Popes *must be proved, could not be made out without them!* The present Pope traces up his succession through APOSTATES. Mind that. But "who would expect honest dealing from a robber?" A very fair question, we think; and one which any plain man can answer. But what a defence is this of the papal claims? *Can* the Church of God be imposed on by one who enters into office as its head, BY ROBBERY? *Is this* the fulfilment of the promises which God has made to his Church? Does not our Saviour say that his sheep will not follow a robber, but fly from him?—John x. 1, *b*, 8. Douay Bible. And was the Church not imposed on? Let us hear what follows:—"And although, what *is* wonderful, Sergius was such a one, and to cursed sacrilege he added most foul unchastity; and by Marozia, the daughter of that famous harlot Theodora, (of whom we very often speak farther on, from Luitprand in the second book, thirteenth chapter), he begot a son, John *by name*; yet, ALL THE FAITHFUL, especially the northern people at a distance from Rome, followed the Roman Church with such honour and reverence, that whoever they heard was sitting in it, a Pope only by name, wonderful to be said, without any discussion of how he got in, him they worshipped as Peter!"* And they go on to prove it by several instances! And what conclusion is to be drawn from all this? Hear the conclusion which is drawn by Labbe and Cossart, the Jesuits! "Whence there is no one who does not understand with how great providence the good God rules and governs the universal Church, which, when it is inflamed at the pleasure of harlots, and all evils and scandals increase, and it is to be feared that it will be torn asunder with a great schism, he yet so defends the same from all heresy and schism, that all the faithful of the nations everywhere rather persevere, conjoined in the same bond of faith and league of obedience, and firmly adhere to it."†

The Jesuits think it a wonderful providence that the world did not then turn Protestant—but that the Church continued obedient to the Papacy, when a false Pope, a robber, a sacrilegious debauchee, the most vicious of mankind, had usurped the place of the head of the Church, and vicar of Christ! That the Church should bow down to a robber, and acknowledge him as her head, was a miracle of God's providence, that the Church of Rome only could produce!

But, O God of truth and holiness, is this the performance of thy promise to the Church? Or can any interpretation of thy promises be correct, which rejoices in such a fulfilment as this?

POPE ANASTASIUS III.

This Pope sat two years, and as many months. The only fact that arrests our notice in his brief history is this: "he decorated the Church of Ticina with many, and those, too, magnificent, ornaments; conceding to its bishop the use of the canopy, and to be drawn by a white horse, to have the cross carried before him on a journey, and to sit on the left of the Pope in Councils."‡

And if he never did worse, knowing Popes as we now do, we will not complain of him for having never done better: let him rest in peace.

POPE LANDO.

"Lando, a Sabine by nation, the son of Transo, succeeded to Pope Anastasius, in the year of Christ 912, in the time of Constantine, Emperor of the East. This Pope, at the pressing entreaty of that most powerful, most noble, and most impudent harlot, Theodora, who had prostituted one of her two daughters, Marozia, to Pope Sergius, and the other, Theodora, to Adelbert, Marquis of Tuscany, and by this means had obtained the dominion of the city (Rome), created John, whom she was most fondly in love with, Bishop of Bononia, from being Presbyter of Ravenna; and when Peter, Archbishop of Ravenna, was dead, translated the same to be Archbishop of that same Church of Ravenna. And a little after he had done so foul an act," says Luitprand, Book 2, ch. 13, "he departed this life."§

---

* Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., col. 482; Ed. Paris, 1671. As our extracts are so long, we give the Latin only where the matter makes it important or desirable to do so.

† Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., Col. 482.

‡ . . . . relat alter Jeremias a Deo missus, evolsit, dissipavit, et destruxit ea omnia, quæ a predecessore Stephano male plantata atque pessime ædificata fuerant.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., col. 483

§ This expression refers to Jeremiah, i. 10.

* Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., col. 510.

† Pulsus a Pontificatu, detrusus est in carcerem per Christophorum, sedis apostolicæ invasorem, anno eodem haud dubie quo pontificatum adeptus fuit.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., col. 515.

‡ Christophorus invasor sedis apostolicæ, pari modo ab invasore Sergio pontificatu dejicitur, quo ille prædecessorem suum Leonem quintum legitime electum sede sua amoverat. Nam cum septem menses sedem pontificiam tenuisset, dejectus est a sede violenter per Sergium, strictisque vinculis, et in carcerem trusus, per vim inductus vitam et habitum monasticum suscepit.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., col. 516.

§ Sergius ille nefandus Adelberti Tusciæ marchionis armis potentissimis fretus, homo vitiorum omnium servus, omnisque facinorosissimus, qui una cum Stephano Seato in Formosum papam supra modum sævierat, sedem Christophori invasit, adeoque ab omnibus non legitimus Pontifex, sed invasor sedis apostolicæ est habitus. . . . . Ambitione sedis apostolicæ ad Francos se contulit, ait Sigebertus, et eorum auxilio Christophorum invasorem capiens, et in carcerem trudens, latenter Romam ingressus, papatum invasit, et Romanos minis ac terroribus perpulit, ut omnes ordinationes Formosi irritas haberent. Eumdem etiam ordinatos a Formoso Papa exordinasse, novasque earumdem ordinationes superinduxisse, testatur Auxilius.—Labbe and Coss., vol. ix., col. 511.

‖ Ne quis vero pusillanimis ex hoc facto scandalum accipiat, meminerit patrata esse hæc ab invasoribus et intrusis, pontificis nomen usurpantibus, et illegitime thronum apostolicum invadentibus, quique censura ecclesiæ non tam apostolici, quam apostatici erant nominandi: qui autem legitime creati sunt Romani Pontifices, ut Johannes IX., ista vehementer sunt execrati. Unde non est mirandum, quod Sergius cum Stephano sedis apostolicæ invasore potentissimo, ea quæ sacris legibus inconcessa sunt, tentaverit et usurpaverit. Alienorum invasor, grassator est: at quis ab isto justa legitimæque omnia requirat.—Labbe and Coss., vol ix., col. 517.

* Et licet, quod mirandum est, Sergius talis fuerat, et ad sacrilegium nefandum turpissimam impudicitiam addiderit, et ex Marozia, nec non illius filium Scorti Theodoræ, de qua ea Luitprando libro secundo cap. decimotertio infra scripsi, filium Johannem nomine prænominavit; tamen eo honoris et reverentiæ fidèles omnes, præsertim longe positi Boreales populi, prosequebantur Romanam Ecclesiam, ut quemcumque in ea sedentem audirent nomine tenus Pontificem, eumdem, mirum dictu, nulla habita discussione ejus ingressus, ut Petrum colerent.—Labbe and Coss., vol. x., col. 517.

† Unde nemo non intelligit, quanta providentia ecclesiam universam Deus optimus regat et gubernet, quo cum mercurium arbitrio infamaretur, omnia mala et scandala incrubuerunt, magnaque schismata scindenda meterentur, eumdem ob hæresi et schismate omni ita defenderit, ut pene omnes ubique gentium fideles eidem fidei vinculo et obedientiæ fœdere junctî perstarent, fraternique adhærerent.—Labbe and Cossart, vol ix., col. 514. This Pope held the See three years.

‡ Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., col. 547.

§ Lando, patria Sabinus, Trani filius, successit Anastasio Pontifici, anno Christi nongentesimo duodecimo, tempore Constantini octavi Imperatoris Orientalis. Hic ad imperitantem potentissimi, nobilissimi, et impudentissimi Scorti Theodoræ, quæ duarum filiarum, alteram Marotiam Sergio Papæ, Theodoram vero ejusdem Adelberto Marchioni Tusciæ prostituerat, et per hoc monarchiam urbis tenebat, Joannem, quem illa turpissime deperibat, ex Ravennate Presbytero Episcopum Bononiensem creavit, defunctoque Petro Ravennate Archiepiscopo, eumdem in ejusdem Ecclesiæ Ravennatis Archiepiscopum transtulit. Et paulo postquam rem tam fœdam perpetravit, inquit Luitprandus libro 2, cap. 13, ex hac vita migravit.—Labbe and Coss., vol ix., col. 548.

There you have the whole history which the Jesuits have to give of Pope Lando! We might comment upon this, but why should we, when we look at what is to follow!

POPE JOHN X.

"John, of whom we have spoken above, in the life of Lando, from being Archbishop of Ravenna was made Pope, *or rather* FALSE POPE, in the year of our Lord 912, in the time of Constantine, Emperor of the East. The most impudent harlot, Theodora, being vehemently inflamed with the beauty of his appearance, procured him to be appointed in the room of Pope Lando, whom Lando himself had ordained Archbishop of Ravenna from being Bishop of Bononia. Theodora did that, says Luitprand, lest, in consequence of the distance of two hundred miles, by which Ravenna is separated from Rome, she should only very rarely enjoy the concubinage of her lover. Thus an unchaste man, bearing rule by the power of the prostitute of Rome, was made false Pope, and a wicked invader of the See; which, that you may believe that it could have happened, remember reader, that Theodora (as Luitprand testifies) had two daughters—the one Marozia by name, whom she prostituted to the false Pope Sergius; the other Theodora, who, in adultery with Adelbert, Marquis of Tuscany, conceived Alberic, who, at this time, had usurped the principality of the city of Rome, and ruled over it almost alone; besides (remember) that Marozia, after the death of Sergius, had married Wido, Prince of Tuscany, the legitimate son of Adelbert, whose power was so great that he appeared to be called a king rather than a marquis."*

Well, this *is* a reason for having such Popes. These women, in their fornications, and in their marriages, surpassed the common wickedness of mankind. This woman, Theodora, married the son of him by whom her own sister had a son in adultery. And these women, by the political influence which they gained by prostitution and adultery, *made the Popes!* No wonder that the Popes were the most infamous of mankind!

So the Jesuits go on—"By these waves the ship of Peter was tossed. But Christ sleeping in it, suffered it to be covered and overwhelmed by those storms; but not to be wholly sunk. For being freed from infinite heresies, he rendered it so safe against the most heavy scandals, that FOR THE VERY CAUSE for which the heretical innovators (the Protestants), like impious men, blaspheme the Church, *for that very cause* the sons of the same Church, in gratitude to God, praise and bless God."†

But if any of *our* readers *do* bless God for such Popes, elected by such means, we confess we know not what to say to them.

But was this infamous wretch a false Pope or a true one? Bishop Milner considers him essential to the succession; and let us hear the Jesuits, Labbe and Cossart—"From the things transacted under this Pope it is gathered as very probable, that he who had entered as an invader, a thief, and a robber, began to be reckoned as a legitimate Roman Pontiff, by the consent of the clergy accruing to him, when his own troops being joined with Alberic, the son of Adelbert, Marquis of Tuscany, he came to battle with the same against the Saracens. For, after the Saracens were conquered, various embassies are read of, sent to him from different parts of the world for imploring palls‡ and other things,"§ of which several instances follow. One of them is worth notice—a boy under fifteen years of age was made Archbishop of Rhemes; which (the Jesuits say) Pope John not only did not condemn, but he confirmed the election, which led to a common practice, in after ages, of appointing boys to such offices! And of this the Jesuits very fairly say—"truly a work worthy of such a Pope, whom an infamous woman, by her infamous work, had intruded into the throne of Peter.‖

The history of Pope John X. thus concludes—"And when after all these things, Pope John *had held the See* SIXTEEN YEARS, Wido, Marquis of Tuscany, at the persuasion of Marozia, his wife, who formerly had been prostitute to Pope Sergius, threw into prison him (Pope John) removed from his See, on account of Peter the brother of the Pope, whom they (Wido and Marozia) persecuted with the greatest hatred; and not long after, this invader and unjust possessor of the Apostolic See, died in that same prison, or was most wickedly suffocated by a pillow placed on his mouth, and met with an end worthy of his crimes. So that he who had violently seized the Holy See by means of the unchaste mother, Theodora, being hurled from it and cast into prison by the just judgment of God, was deprived of it, and of his life together, by the equally unchaste daughter."*

And this man, John X., was VICAR OF CHRIST, and HEAD OF THE CHURCH, for SIXTEEN YEARS! Or, if *he* was *not*, WHO WAS? The Jesuits call him a FALSE POPE, and yet say that he came to be taken for a true one! But Bishop Milner reckons him in that SUCCESSION of Popes, through which the claim of the present Pope must be proved!

The reader is now, perhaps, as much disgusted with the history of Popes as we are. Gladly would we turn from such a subject; but while so many think that the Popes are the inheritors of the promises which Christ has made to his Church, we must needs try and disgust them with that false notion, that they may learn to look for the performance of the promises of Christ to those who have been his true Church in every age—all those who have taught and sought salvation by the name of Christ, and have departed from iniquity. We shall, therefore, continue the history of the Popes of the tenth century in our next number. In the meantime, let our readers consider what Bishop Milner (a Roman Catholic bishop, in England, in the nineteenth century), says of the tenth century:—"This age is generally considered *the least enlightened by piety* and literature of the whole number. Its greatest disgrace, however, arose from the *misconduct* of several of the above-mentioned Pontiffs, owing to the prevalence of *civil factions* at Rome, which obstructed the freedom of canonical election; yet in this list of names there are ten or twelve which do honour to the Papal calendar; and even those who disgraced it by their lives, performed their public duty in preserving THE FAITH and unity of the Church IRREPROACHABLY."

Thus it seems Bishop Milner thought such infamous men were quite capable of being, and *actually were very good Popes*, and very efficient VICARS OF CHRIST. But, in our opinion, a Christian bishop who, for the sake of bolstering up his cause, can give no harsher name than "misconduct" to such horrible iniquities, does misconduct himself very grossly.

ORIGIN OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION.

In the approaching month of December, the city of Rome will be the scene of a grave and imposing spectacle. On the 8th of that month, as we learn from various sources, a large number of Roman Catholic bishops and dignitaries, gathered together from all parts of the world, will assemble under the presidency of Pope Pius IX; and it is confidently expected that the result of their deliberations will be, to decide the question of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, which has long been a source of bitter controversy in the Church of Rome, and to make it an article of faith, for all present and future members of that Church.

We have already, on more than one occasion, brought this subject under the notice of our readers,† but we think that it may be useful, at the present crisis, to make a few remarks on the *origin* of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. In a question which the head of the Roman Catholic Church deems of such pressing importance that he has called to his aid all his best and wisest councillors, to help him to come to a decision, we are sincerely anxious, for our part, that every intelligent member of that Church should be able to form an opinion how far the Pope's decision (whatever it may be) is in conformity with the *ancient* doctrine of the Christian Church or not.

On the Feast of the Assumption in the present year, a pastoral letter was addressed by the most Rev. Dr. Cullen to the Roman Catholic clergy and laity of Dublin, in which the following passage occurs:—"It is our sad lot to have been born in original sin, and to have inherited from our first parents the maledictions which they brought on themselves by transgressing God's commandments; whilst Mary, by a privilege granted to her alone among all the children of Adam, was *conceived free from every stain of sin*. Such is the received doctrine of all the Catholic world, and SUCH IT HAS EVER BEEN." It becomes, then, an interesting subject of enquiry, to ascertain the real facts of the case, with regard to the doctrine in question. If, as Dr. Cullen so positively asserts, the Christian Church has *always* believed in the Immaculate Conception, it is plain that we ought to find some traces of this doctrine, either in Holy Scripture, or in the works of the ancient Fathers. Dr. Cullen, perhaps through inadvertence, forgot to add any *proofs* of his assertion; we will endeavour to supply the deficiency, so far as it may be in our power.

When a sect of heretics called the Collyridians, who lived in the fourth century, began to worship the Virgin Mary as a goddess, and to offer up to her little cakes in sacrifice upon her festival, their superstitious practices were at once condemned by Epiphanius Bishop of Salamis; and one of the chief arguments which he employed against these corrupters of primitive truth was as follows: "What Scripture hath told us any thing concerning this?"* In like manner, when a sincere and pious Christian desires to satisfy his mind respecting the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, the first question to which he would naturally desire an answer is this, "what Scripture hath told us anything concerning this doctrine?"

Let us suppose our enquirer to turn for information to Cardinal Bellarmine, the great storehouse of dogmatic theology, and what is the result of his enquiry? *Not one single text of Scripture* can be adduced in support of the doctrine in question. Nay, more, the learned Cardinal seems almost inclined to be cross and peevish, as if the request for Scriptural authority, or even Church authority, on this point, was quite unreasonable. "People must not expect," saith he, "that we can bring forward an express text of Scripture in this matter, or any certain definition of the Church."† But why must we not expect a plain text of Scripture on this point? The Apostles, it is evident, either believed the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, or they did not. If they did believe it, why may we not look for some declaration of their belief, in those holy Scriptures which contain the record of the doctrines they taught? If they did not believe it, what becomes of Dr. Cullen's assertion, that the Church has *always* held this doctrine?

But we are not left to mere conjecture on this subject, and it was not without good grounds that Bellarmine felt a strong dislike to appeal to Scripture, upon the question of the Immaculate Conception. The Bible has repeatedly described the corruption of the whole human race in such plain and general terms that it is inconceivable, if the Virgin Mary had been really free from sin, that her case would not have been specially excepted by some one or other of the inspired writers. But of such an exception no trace whatever is to be found in the whole of the New Testament. What emphatic language, for example, does St. Paul make use of in his Epistle to the Church of Rome of his day, as if he almost foresaw the rise of grievous errors upon this very point—"*All* have sinned, and do need the glory of God."—Rom. iii. 23. "As by one man sin entered into this world and, by sin, death, and so death passed upon all men, in whom *all have sinned*."—Rom. v. 12. "The Scripture hath concluded *all under sin*."—Galat. iii. 22. And, if the meaning of these texts be not sufficiently clear, let us listen to the direct and special application which St. Augustine makes of them to the Virgin Mary. "*Mary, sprung from Adam, died, because of sin;* Adam died because of sin; and the flesh of our Lord, derived from Mary, died to take away sin."‡ Death, we are told in Scripture, is the penalty of sin; and if we believe, as St. Augustine teaches, and as the Christian Church always held, that the Virgin Mary was subject to death, it is plain that, in some shape or other, she must have sinned; and, therefore, her nature could not have been wholly pure.

We cannot place the Scriptural evidence on the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception in a clearer light than by quoting the words of Melchior Canus, a distinguished canonist of the Church of Rome—"The dogma which holds that the Blessed Virgin was free from original sin is nowhere delivered in the Scriptures, according to their proper sense: nay, the general law which is delivered in them embraces all who were descended from Adam, without any exception. Nor can it be said that this doctrine has descended in the Church by apostolic tradition; for traditions of this kind cannot have come to us through any other persons than by the ancient bishops, and the holy authors who succeeded the apostles. *But it is evident that these ancient writers did not receive this doctrine from their predecessors.*§

---

* Johannes, de quo supra in Landone, ex archiepiscopo Ravennate factus est Pontifex, vel potius pseudo-papa, Anno Domini nongentesimo duodecimo, tempore Constantini imperatoris orientalis. Theodora meretrix impudentissima in hujus speciei decorem vehementer exardens, Landoni Pontifici subrogari procuravit eumdem, quem ipse Lando ex Bononiensi episcopo Archiepiscopum Ravennatem ordinaverat. Fecerat illud Theodora, inquit Luitprandus, ne amasii ducentorum milliarium interpositione, quibus Ravenna sequestratur a Roma, rarissime concubitu potiretur. Ita impudicus homo meretricis viribus Romæ pollens, factus est pseudo-papa et nefarius sedis invasor. Quod ut fieri potuisse credas, memineris lector, Theodoram, ut testator Luitprandus, duas habuisse filias, unam Maroziam nomine, quam Sergio pseudo-pontifici prostituit; alteram Theodoram quam per adulterium ex Adelberto Tusciæ marchione suscepit Albericum, qui hoc tempore urbis Romæ principatum usurpabat, eique fere solus dominabatur; præterea Maroziam post obitum Sergii nupsisse Widoni filio Adelberti legitimo Tusciæ principi, cujus tanta erat potentia, ut rex potius quam marchio videretur appellandus.—Labbe and Cossart, vol ix., col. 569.

† His fluctibus agitabatur navicula Petri. Verum Christus in ea dormiens patiebatur illam istis procellis operiri et immersi; sed non plane absorberi. Nam liberatam ab infinitis hæresibus contra gravissima scandala reddidit adeo tutam, ut qua de causa hæretici novatores ecclesiam, velut impii, blasphemant, eamdem ob causam filii ejusdem ecclesiæ Deo grati Deum laudent, et benedicant.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., col. 569.

‡ The seeking for palls from a Pope was the strongest recognition which archbishops could give, that they acknowledged that Pope as legitimate, and that they were subject to him as Pope.

§ Ex rebus sub hoc pontifici gestis, verisimile esse colligitur, quod qui invasor, fur, et latro ingressus erat, accedente cleri consensu, legitimus Romanus Pontifex haberi cœperit, quando copiis suis cum Alberico filio Adelberti marchionis Tusciæ conjunctis, cum eodem contra Saracenos in prælium venit. Nam post Saracenos debellatos, diversæ legationes ex diversis orbis partibus pro pallis aliisve rebus implorandis ad eum missæ leguntur.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., col. 570.

‖ Opus sane tali Pontifice dignum, quem infamis fœmina infami opere in solium Petri tetruserat (p. 570).

* Cumque post hæc omnia Joannes papa annos sedecem sedem tenuisset, Wido Tusciæ Marchio, suasu Marozæ conjugis, quæ quondam Sergii papæ prostituta fuerat, eumdem propter Petram papæ germanum, quem summa invidia prosequebantur, acie unitum in carcerem conjecit; atque in eodem non multo post defunctus, vel cervicali ori ejus imposito pessime suffocatus finem accepit invasor atque injustus detentor sedis apostolicæ; ut qui per impudicam matrem Theodoram, sacrosanctam sedem violenter arripuit, per filiam æque impudicam, justa Dei vindicta, ejectus, et in carcerem conjectus, ea simul cum vita caruerit.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., col. 571.

† *Vide* CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. i., p. 19 (February, 1852); vol. iii., p. 97 (August, 1854).

* ποία δὲ τις γραφὴ διηγήσατο περὶ τούτου—Epiphan., adv. Hæreses, lib. iii., Hær. 79, p. 1062. Colon., 1682.

† Neque vero expectandum est, ut expressum Dei verbum adferamus, aut certam aliquam Ecclesiæ definitionem.—Bellarm. de Amissa. Grat. et Stat. Pecc., lib. iv., cap. xv., tom. iv. p. 103. Colon., 1615.

‡ Maria ex Adam mortua propter peccatum; Adam mortuus propter peccatum; et caro Domini ex Maria mortua est propter delenda peccata.—S. August. Op. Enarr., in Psalm xxxiv., Serm. ii., tom. iv., col. 240. Par., 1691.

§ Beatam Virginem a peccato originali fuisse penitus liberam e libris sacris juxta germanum literæ sensum nusquam habetur. Quinimo lex generalis in eis traditur, quæ universos filios Adam, carnali scilicet propagatione creatos, sine ulla exceptione complectitur. Nec verò dici potest, per traditionem apostolorum id in ecclesiam descendisse; cum hujusmodi traditiones non per alios, quam per episcopos illos antiquos et sanctos auctores apostolis succedentes, ad nos usque pervenerint. At constat, priscos illos Scriptores non id a majoribus accepisse.—Melchior Canus, De Locis Theol, lib. vii., cap. iii., vol. i., p. 377. Matriti, 1732.

Hitherto, then, we have not seen much reason to rest satisfied with Archbishop Cullen's positive assertion, that the Church has *always* believed the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. Perhaps, however, when we come down a few centuries later, to the times of the early Fathers, we shall find some evidence that *they* held this doctrine, which is now deemed so vitally important that it is about to be erected into an article of faith. And, accordingly, when we examine their writings, we do find several clear statements of their views on this head; but, unfortunately, *one and all held the very opposite opinion* to that which Dr. Cullen advocates, and which he states to have been *always* held and believed by the Church!

We do not ask our readers to take this fact merely upon our word; we shall adduce evidence of its truth, from the statements of many eminent Roman Catholic divines. Cardinal Cajetan, for example, reckons up fifteen Fathers, whom he calls "Irrefragable," who believed that the Virgin was conceived in sin; and the Jesuit writer, Salmeron, reporting the judgment of some Romanist writers on the same side, says, "Some of them reckon up *two hundred Fathers*" who agree with them; "others—for example, Bandellus—reckon up *three hundred*."*

It is needless, however, to quote any further authorities, for the testimony of Melchior Canus, which we are about to cite, is so clear and explicit that it ought to set the matter at rest. We may observe, in passing, that this learned writer was himself inclined to believe in the Immaculate Conception, as a pious and probable opinion; but he was far too honest and too upright to misrepresent the views of the early Fathers, even for the sake of supporting his own conclusion by the weight of their venerable names. His words are as follows: "*All the saints, who have made mention of this question, assert with one voice* that the Blessed Virgin was *conceived in sin*."† He then gives references to the works of S. Ambrose, S. Augustine, S. Chrysostom, S. Bernard, and a host of other writers, in proof of his statement. It would be easy for us to cite these authorities at length; but the quotation we have given above from S. Augustine may be taken as a sufficient specimen. And, finally, Melchior Canus winds up his catalogue with the emphatic declaration, that—"nullus sanctorum contravenerit"—not one of the Fathers contravenes the statement, that the Virgin was conceived in original sin.

After the foregoing citations, we think we may fairly ask our readers, what weight ought, in reason, to be attached to Dr. Paul Cullen's deliberate assertion that the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin has *always been the received doctrine of the Catholic world?*" If a lawyer in a court of justice were to state to the jury that he had several witnesses to prove a certain fact, and if these witnesses, one and all, proved the very opposite, would not the jury have reason to question either his ability or his good faith? For we must remember that the point on which we are now at issue with Dr. Cullen, is not as to the truth or falsehood of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception itself, but solely as to a matter of fact—namely, did the ancient Church believe this doctrine, or did it not? The belief of the early Church can only be learned from the writings of the Fathers and other authors of the time; and if these, as Melchior Canus states, assert *with one voice* that the Immaculate Conception was not then believed by the Church, on what ground does Dr. Cullen assert that it was, and has *always* been believed?

We can easily conceive a Roman Catholic writer to speak thus:—"I do not care for ancient authorities; I do not mind what two, or three, or ten, or a hundred Fathers or Doctors have said; I am only anxious to adopt that opinion which will best secure and defend the honour of Mary."‡ Such a line of conduct might not, indeed, be very consistent in a member of the Church of Rome, which has always prided herself on the immutability of her doctrines; but it would at least be plain and intelligible. To assert, however, as Dr. Cullen has done, that the Church has *always* believed a doctrine which it can be proved, on the most unimpeachable testimony, that she did *not* believe, is a mode of argument little likely, we should imagine, to bring conviction to any impartial and unprejudiced mind.

Perhaps, however, some of our readers may ask—If the ancient Church did not believe the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, at what time was it invented? To this question, we fear that we can give no certain reply. It may, perhaps, have been held by some few individuals about the ninth or tenth centuries, but it did not come prominently into notice until the time of S. Bernard, about the middle of the twelfth century. That eminent writer, as we formerly stated, set himself vigorously to oppose this innovation in the faith; and he denounced both the festival of the Immaculate Conception and the doctrine itself to be "false, new, vain, and superstitious."* But, nevertheless, this newly-invented doctrine, unknown to the best and purest times of the Church, gradually crept in; until at length, about fourteen centuries after the Christian era, the feast of the Conception was formally enrolled among the sacred festivals of the Church of Rome.† If, therefore, *novelty* be a proof of error in religion, as Roman Catholic writers are so fond of asserting, we know not how those who believe the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception can defend themselves from the charge.

We have met with one allusion to this doctrine, indeed, as early as the seventh century; but it may amuse some of our readers to be told that this allusion occurs, not in the work of any orthodox Father, but in the Koran of Mahomet. In the third chapter of that work, the writer, in giving an account of the birth of the Virgin Mary, speaks of "driving Satan away with stones," in which words, according to the Jesuit Maracci, the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin is hinted at.‡ One of the Mahometan commentators on this passage of the Koran writes, that according to a tradition of Mahomet's, every person that comes into this world is touched at his birth by the devil, and, therefore, cries out, Mary and her Son only excepted. The citation is given at length, in the original Arabic, in Maracci's notes on the Koran; and it is with reference to this curious theory, that Gibbon observes—"The Latin Church has not disdained to borrow from the Koran the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin."§ If this statement of the historian be well founded (and Gibbon's learning is rarely at fault), it would furnish a remarkable illustration of the progress of human error. Strange, indeed, would it be, if the doctrine, which, in the course of a few weeks, a venerable conclave of Christian bishops, with the Pope at their head, are about to stamp with the seal of infallibility, should have had its first rise, more than a thousand years ago, in the wayward fancy of an Arabian impostor!

But it is time for us to draw our remarks to a close. The question of the Immaculate Conception has proved a source of bitter contention and animosity, within the bosom of the Church of Rome, for a space of more than three centuries. Successive Popes were frequently supplicated to put an end to those disgraceful quarrels between the rival sects of the Dominicans and Franciscans, which we described at length in a former number, and to terminate the struggle by an infallible decree. One of the last of these attempts was made in the year 1617. At that time Philip III., King of Spain, sent an embassy to Pope Paul V., with this special object in view. The Pope made answer,‖ that he acknowledged the great probability of the opinion of those who defended the Immaculate Conception; but he said, that the adversaries of that opinion still maintained, that if the question came to a formal definition of faith, *the sentence must needs go on their side*, because of the authority of the Scriptures, the Doctors, and St. Thomas Aquinas. The Immaculate Conception, therefore, was still allowed to remain "a pious opinion."

At last, after the lapse of more than two centuries, the formal definition is about to be pronounced. Will Pius IX. be governed by the authority of "the Scriptures, the Doctors, and St. Thomas Aquinas," or will he throw them all aside, and set up *a new article of faith* in the Church, which was unknown to the Fathers and Apostles? A few short weeks will decide. Meanwhile, we would earnestly commend to the attention of our Roman Catholic readers the solemn warning and encouragement which was given to the Jews of old, by the mouth of one of God's ancient prophets—"Thus saith the Lord: Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the *old paths*, which is the good way, and walk ye in it; and you shall find refreshment for your souls."—Jer. vi. 16.

THE LIFE OF A PRIEST.

(Continued from page 119.)

After leaving France, I next visited the principal cities of the Low Countries, that gave birth to Emperors and Crusaders, and exercised a decided influence not only on the religious and political, but also the commercial state of Europe for several centuries. It would be unsuitable to my purpose in writing this sketch, to attempt to describe the noble churches, the rich galleries of paintings, and the high state of agriculture and manufacturing industry, which I witnessed with admiration in the Netherlands. I cannot, however, refrain from making a few remarks on the agriculture of these countries, in which subject many of the readers of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN take a lively interest.

I have never seen, in any part of England or Ireland, such a universal school of industry, or a better or more skilful cultivation of the soil than in these countries. Their stock is excellent, and more beautiful and luxuriant crops of corn are nowhere to be seen. The farmers appear to adopt very generally the three-crop shift, and for cleanliness and absence of weeds, I have seldom seen any tillage equal to that of Belgium. Their cattle are seldom to be seen in the fields during the summer's heat, at the mercy of their indefatigable tormentor, the gad-fly; but tied up, under shelter, during the heat of the day, and fed with clover, which greatly augments that indispensable ally of the farmer—manure. The manure-heaps are, indeed, often larger there at the end of autumn than ours generally are in the beginning of April. Nothing can surpass their neatness. No thriftless or slovenly practices are to be seen in either Flanders or Holland. All their stock-yards are clean and trim, and their manure-heaps are never exposed either to the sun's evaporation in summer, or to the chilling rains of winter, and no farm is wanting in that essential requisite, the cistern or tank for liquid-manure. It was too late in the season for me to see Flora decorated in her vernal dress, and I cannot, therefore, say anything that might be acceptable to the admirers of flowers, beyond this, that I purchased in a seed-shop, in Bruges, a few bulbs of the double ranunculus, anemone, tulip, narcissus, and lily, which, it will be seen hereafter, were not without influence upon my future life and happiness, in a way I little anticipated at that time.

At Ghent I became acquainted with a priest named Vandergelt, who was the only man of his class who, at that period, ever spoke freely to me of the necessity of a reformation in the Church of Rome. He condemned the use of the Latin language in the Liturgy, the celibacy of the clergy, abstinence, and jubilees; and reprobated, above all, the withholding the Word of God from those for whom it was originally intended. He even went further, and said that the Pope's infallibility was a doctrine got up by the Jesuits to uphold the dogmas of the Church, and to support their own favourite principle—"Let her be what she is, or let her not be at all." If all priests were at liberty to speak their private sentiments freely, who can tell how many now in communion with Rome might, at this moment, wish for her reformation as sincerely as Vandergelt did.

There was, however, one religious institution in the Netherlands, which I cannot help mentioning with respect. In nearly all the large towns are to be seen numbers of Béguines or nuns, with small baskets in their hands, containing medicine, and refreshments for the sick and indigent. They do all this, and even dress wounds of the most repulsive character, by profession; and, they add, that they would do more for the glory of God. I am, however, very much mistaken if they would not fulfil the ends of their creation, to more effect, by bringing up a family in the love and fear of God, and thereby add fresh stars to the kingdom of Heaven. They are, generally, young ladies of high birth and education, who devote themselves to those works of mercy.

As I was speaking one day to the above-mentioned Vandergelt, in Ghent, one of those fair Béguines came up and spoke to him in the French language, most earnestly and pathetically. It was in favour of a fresh instance of distress, that came under her observation, in one of the public hospitals of the city, and to the funds of which she contributed largely. The priest assured her the case should be immediately attended to, whereupon she took leave and went on with her labour of love. He told me she was the daughter of a rich merchant in Brussels, who bestowed her fortune on the public institutions of the country, and devoted her whole time to relieving the poverty and sufferings of her fellow-creatures. She had a superior figure, great dignity of demeanour, and charming elegance of manners; she had also a melancholy cast of countenance, which induced me to think that something else led to this melancholy expression, besides the footsteps of care. Perhaps, however, this air of melancholy gained her more of public sympathy and feeling, than if the picture was possessed of the highest degree of colouring. When the priest said he would at once attend to her application, I shall not easily forget the smile of religious fervour that evidently sprang from the heart, at the feeling, that immediate relief was to be imparted to the object of her solicitude. I was taken so much by the warmth and energy of her appeal, and the consequence of it, that had I met her on the plains of Indostan, I would have reverenced her with more true devotion, than would a Hindoo a venerable Brahmin. Shall the names of Vanderveist (or Nightingale) be forgotten, when those of Alexander and Celestine still continue to hold a place in the annals of Europe?

From Ghent I started in one of those heavy coaches that drag their unwieldy lengths along to Bruges, where I arrived in the month of September, 1834. All the cities of the low countries are very commercial and fortified, and are connected with more historic, warlike, and commercial associations than any other cities in central Europe.

I must not, however, intrude on your space by mere historical reminiscences, suffice it to say, that after a tour of a year and a half, the only truly happy period of my life, I sailed from Ostend, and arrived in Cork, after a very tempestuous and dangerous passage; and after visiting that land of enchantment, our own incomparable Killarney, I proceeded at once to call on the titular bishop, of whose diocese I was an alumnus, who lived on the way between Cork and the residence of my family, and was one of

---

* Quidam illorum computant ducentos Patres; alii, ut Bandellus, trecentos. Cajetanus quindecim, et illos quidem, ut ait, *irrefragabiles*. —Salmeron, Comm in N. T., Rom. 5. disp. 51, in princip. Colon. 1602.

† Sancti namque omnes, qui in ejus rei mentionem incidere, uno ore asseverarunt, Beatam Virginem in peccato originali conceptam esse.—Melch. Canus, ut supra, vol. 1, p. 389.

‡ This view of the question was actually advanced, in substance, by the Jesuit writer, J. Baptista Poza—*vide* his Elucidar., lib. 13, tr. 16, p. 1056.

* Nulla ei ratione placebit contra ecclesiæ ritum præsumpta novitas, mater temeritatis, soror superstitionis, filia levitatis.—S. Bernard, Ep. 174, tom. 1, col. 294. Paris, 1839.

† Tandem vero Ecclesia Romana ante 200 annos celebritatem hanc generaliter amplexa est; unde quodammodo videtur Conceptionem Virginis canonizasse.—Suarez, tom 2, in 3, Thom. qu. 27, art. 2, disp. 3, sect. 5, p. 91. Mogunt. 1604.

‡ Hinc opinantur aliqui, inani Immunitatem ab originali peccato Beatissimæ Virginis.—Maracci in Alcoran., tom. ii, p. 112. Patavii, 1698.

§ Gibbon's Decline and Fall, cap. 50.

‖ Vide Legatio Philippi III. ad Paul V., per Luc. Waddingum. p. 234. Lovain, 1624.

the old aristocratic Roman Catholics of that part of the country, who prided himself not a little on being descended from one of those Danish Princes who invaded Ireland at an early period of her history. He received me more courteously than cordially; and after some conversation, said there was a parish vacant by the death of a very worthy priest who died of fever in the discharge of his duty, and ordered me to it on the Sunday following. As obedience is the primary law in a bishop's code, which they exercise with uncontrolled jurisdiction, there was little use in saying that I would be happy to spend some time with my family, so I made a virtue of necessity, and after a week's delay with my parents, I set off to my mountain parish on Sunday morning, accompanied by a boy who had a horse and car, containing a bed and bed-clothes, a flitch of bacon, a pound of tea, and a stone of sugar, with some bread given me by my mother. With this slender store of provision I journied along to commence the world; yet small as it was, it was quite sufficient, as the parish revenue, after the first week, was amply sufficient to render me independent of any extraneous aid. With this stock of provision and furniture, I commenced housekeeping in my highland home, a cabin not sufficiently respectable for the poorest cottier, nor even for the horse I rode. However, I had no alternative, it was in it the last priest lived, and most probably the only vacant one then to be found. It consisted of one room, with an earthen floor, without any overhead ceiling, and a kitchen with a fixed settlebed for the servant. Whatever furniture my predecessor had was removed by his friends, except an old crazy table, not worth the carriage, and a poor attenuated vestal who acted as his housekeeper, and who waited to see if his successor would take her, as she said, to earn an honest penny. She talked so often, and so well of the last priest, that she gained me over to her interest, and I never had less reason to regret my choice.

As the boy who drove the horse knew where the last priest lived, I pushed forward to the chapel, which was covered with straw, with a forge and a small toddy house, as its only appurtenance. Before I left home, I understood there was no respectable Roman Catholic in the parish, and I found them all frieze-coated persons of the same class, and almost uniform in their dress. They appeared to have a good deal of intelligence in their expression of countenance, without any marks of craft or duplicity, and with every manifestation of unsophisticated honesty, which subsequent experience proved to be really their character.

The priest's clerk, who is most commonly a sort of hereditary heirloom, was very assiduous, and made his responses as audibly, and with as much self-sufficiency, as if he understood the Latin language as well as Tacitus. After the service was over he accompanied me to my "mountain home," where the old vestal had our dinner prepared, which she placed upon the old kitchen table, that was bolstered up by the clerk with some bogwood, which was left as useless by the friends of the late priest. This old crazy table answered also as a bedstead for some time, until I could procure one from the county town. This poor man took care of my horse, and went to market on Saturday, as we had neither a butcher or baker in the neighbourhood, and in a little time, he learned to plant his early Yorks and Savoys with as much precision as any vegetable gardener at Fulham. After the experience of ten years, I found this man to have but two faults, one in common with all the priests' clerks from Brandon Head to Donegal, that is, that he knew not one word of the responses he made at Mass; the other, in common with some of the priests themselves, that he sometimes took a little too much of the "mountain dew," which was to be found in abundance in those mountain ranges. The only circumstance that gave me pain was the want of society, as man without it generally degenerates into a misanthrope. A mutual communication of ideas, and sometimes a collision of sentiment, generates a desire to come at the foundation of truth. Yet, with my poor uneducated parishioners there could be no companionship.

That I should wish to avoid a life of seclusion, and possess a relish for a little society was very natural. Disguise it as Romanists may, man was created for society; even in his uneducated and natural state he is gregarious, but when educated, he must either find, or form for himself, a social state. Not one of the numerous monastic institutions that peopled the eastern deserts, or the monasteries of the Levant, or of the interminable number of religious houses to be met with on the Continent, or in England, before the Reformation, fulfilled the ends of their creation, nor have they given to the world that good example which it expected from them. More Popes than one were obliged to issue an inquisitorial inquiry into the scandalous and disreputable conduct of those monastic institutions, particularly when the abbeys were in proximate contignity. Besides, I may be pardoned for the want of that peculiar taste, which placed Stylites upon a pillar, and condemned the monks of La Trappe to perpetual silence.

Possibly, too, I may be forgiven for feeling somewhat painfully the contrast between the mountain cabin, which I very appositely denominated *Misery Lodge*, with its odour of bogwood and turpentine, compared to the room I occupied in the Rue de St. Honore, near the Boulevard de Madeleine. Yet, there was no alternative; and as I was taught that obedience was better than sacrifice, nothing remained but to bear my fate with implicit submission. This was, however, but a small part of my trials. The priest, however reluctant, *must* think as the bishop thinks; and, moreover, bear with patient endurance the irrational and unmeaning ceremonies and ritual observances of a mechanical religion as subservient acquirements. It may be worthy of remark, that those priests who are the sons of small farmers or artisans, are much more submissive to the will of their superiors, than those of the more opulent who are better educated, and whose minds are generally more independent, and more indifferent to the ritual observances of the Church of Rome.

In the country where I was located, there was but one resident Protestant gentleman to whom most of the parish belonged; he was always high on the grand panel of the county, drove four horses to his carriage, was a high-church-and-state-man, and upon bowing intimacy only, with the former priests. His lady, however, was a person of the most amiable manners, a florist, and kind to the poor. As I had no garden, I forwarded the Dutch bulbs to her, with directions in French, how to prepare compost, and to protect them, when in bloom, from the heat of the sun, which I had received from the seedsman in Bruges. How the Maynooth priest came by the Dutch flower roots was to her quite enigmatical.

To a thinking man, it must appear of no rare occurrence, what great effects are produced, either good or bad, by causes seemingly trivial. How true to life is that observation of Pascal, that in every state and condition of life, "C'est une roue de cuivre qui fait mouvoir une aiguille d'or." How little I thought that those few flower roots which I purchased in Holland, would be the means of procuring for me the friendship of the veriest of aristocratic proprietors, and a family who hated a priest as much as Byron did a monk. Before I proceed further, however, I must mention a circumstance worth the reader's attention as showing how antagonistic the teaching of the priesthood is with their practice. The first Shrovetide after my induction, I married all those that presented themselves upon the "voluntary principle," and without any previous bargain. All the priests complained to the bishop that they would be inevitably ruined if I persevered upon this plan. The consequence was that the bishop sent down a priest the next Shrovetide that made as close bargains as he would in the ordinary transactions of life; and to whom I was obliged to give a per centage. Now, if the bishops and priests believe matrimony to be a *sacrament*, what becomes of the teaching of St. Peter, when he says to Simon (Acts, chap. 8, v. 20) "thy money perish with thee, because thou hast taught that the gifts of God can be purchased with money." If they disbelieve them to be sacraments, to the crime of simony they add that of hypocrisy which is condemned in the most forcible language that could be uttered by St Paul. I might, perhaps, add, that to those sins they added, in my case, that of usury; for I was obliged, under pain of disobedience, to give this priest 20 per cent. out of the money which he so unfeelingly wrenched from the pockets of my reluctant parishioners.

The spring following I received a note from the lady of the manor, to come and see the flowers in blow, and to spend the day; I accordingly went "nothing loth," and spent a happy evening with a family well educated, and of highly polished manners. The gentleman of the house was a Protestant "of the right sort," and would not allow the word "expediency" into the vocabulary of his religion or politics. To the ease of a gentlewoman, the lady superadded the most refined manners, and the young ladies were not only familiar with the round of female accomplishments, and spoke French grammatically, but were able to converse critically upon most subjects, and particularly on one in which I felt much interest, the decay of ecclesiastical architecture in Ireland since the Reformation. At this period the country was greatly disturbed by the agitation of the tithe question; and the proprietor considered it very prudent to build a military barrack near his residence, as he lived about ten miles from the county town where the military were stationed. He accordingly built one, and a detachment was ordered out for his and the public protection; so that the want of society which I dreaded so much, was obviated by the box of flower-roots, and the barrack which O'Connell's giant agitation caused to be erected. If the Sunday evening dinner was not improved by the zest of the classical literature of the different officers quartered in the new barracks, yet the frank manners of a soldier combined with the polish of a travelled gentleman, contributed exceedingly to our Sunday happiness, and I need scarcely add, made his society particularly welcome to the young ladies as well as their seniors. As the life of a priest is so monotonous, that the history of one week is almost an epitome of his entire life when once placed in a parish, it will be sufficient to say, that ten years thus passed off in the happiest manner, enlivened by the society of this Protestant family, and the different officers that were quartered in the barracks.

One circumstance connected with this family made a serious impression on my mind, which I cannot omit making mention of, as it is one deserving of warm commendation, and which ought to be practised in every family in the kingdom—I mean family prayers, that the blessing of God may descend upon them. We read in the gospel of St. Matthew, 15th chapter and 20th verse: "That where two or three are gathered in His name, He is in the midst of them;" and the 11th chapter and 9th verse of St. Luke tells us: "And I say unto you, ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened to you." Would that every family, in accordance with this precept, had at least on Sunday evenings united prayer, and with one voice and sincerity of heart, asked "those things that are requisite and necessary as well for the body as the soul." I am not ashamed to confess, that though in the commencement of my acquaintance with this family, I only joined in these family prayers, I subsequently was permitted to read them myself, and experienced no remorse in doing so. How little Roman Catholics usually know of that beautiful liturgy which the Church of England has compiled for the use of her people.

In a little time after this a dark and heavy cloud was seen to loom on the horizon of my hopes, which no exertion of mine could dissipate or sunshine illume. The unexpected death of the proprietor cast a general gloom on the surrounding country, and the sorrow of the family and of the tenantry was loud and pathetic on this mournful occasion. The stock and effects were sold by public auction. The lady of the house, with her daughters, went to reside at Bath, and both her sons, who were in the army, were in the East Indies. Family incumbrances required the property to be put under the control of the Chancellor. The agent, who was well acquainted with the condition of the tenantry, was removed, and another appointed, who was perfectly unacquainted either with them or the nature of the different soils, and consequently of their value; and many of the unhappy tenantry were, within the short space of two years, reduced to seek a shelter in the workhouse from this unfeeling tyrant. It was thus the cup of happiness was at once dashed from my lips, and the seat of hospitality and cheerfulness plunged into the gloom of the desert. It is generally observed that one misfortune seldom comes unattended by her twin sister. All the military detachments in Ireland were called into head-quarters, and replaced by the constabulary, so that, in the space of a few months, I lost not only the society of a highly-respectable family, but also that of Captain S., as fine a fellow as ever cast five yards of mohair into a river—a modern Raleigh, the Ivanhoe of chivalry; and I was once more plunged into that solitude which I so much dreaded at the commencement of my missionary labours:—

> "Thus hope unmoors her little boat,
> And boldly tempts the main,
> Winning the daring height she sought,
> To fall to earth again."

But God, who does every thing for the best, was all this time working invisibly for my future happiness, as will be seen hereafter.

(To be continued.)

THE SURE TITLE; OR, FATHER FLYNN AND PHIL RYAN.

Father Flynn had been lecturing us on the greatness and power of the Church, and commanding us to leave the care of our souls entirely to the clergy, and to be satisfied that what they told us, and nothing else, was right. There was a bold fellow present, one Phil Ryan, a decent farmer, with some small holdings, in a place near us. When they were dismissed, all but myself, and two or three more, that were in the priest's confidence, Phil came back, and making his best bow, said:—

"Plase your riverence, I just forgot how I want to lodge a complaint against Mike Connor; he is contrary, and scrupulous, and suspicious."

"Well, be short, man; it's little I'm likely to do in settling your differences; but I always held Mike to be a decenter fellow than yourself," says Father Flynn.

"Well, then," says Phil, "to make short of it, your riverence, I want Mike to rint of me a snug cabin, and a matter of two acres of good land, on a lease."

"Well?"

"Mike is unreasonable, your riverence, all out; he wants to see my title, to be sure it's good, and to examine all about the little property; which I take very unkind at his hand, seeing he has my word for it all."

"Why, man alive!" says the priest, who had a liking to Mike, "what's got into your head, now? Do you suppose any but a natural would take your bare word in a matter where himself, his interest, and his comfort, are all concerned? Go give him the satisfaction he wants, and don't be setting yourself up in the place of justice, lease, and all."

But Phil did not move. "Plase your riverence," said he, "I have the head landlord's authority to say, that he executed the lease, putting me in possession of these premises, to let as I like; and why should any man stand doubting me for want of proofs?"

"Get along, sir," said Father Flynn, to him again. "Produce your lease, show him the title, satisfy the honest man's mind, that his own will be good, or else he's a fool if he has anything to say to you or your holdings; it's what every tenant has a right to," says he again to us; "and ye know that, boys, very well.

But what a change came over Phil! He stood as bold as a lion, and as brisk-looking as a kid; and never moving his eyes from the priest's face, that grew all scarlet and blue, as he spoke, he said:—"Why, then, your riverence, will you please to show me *your* title to grant me an *entrance into the kingdom of heaven*; and satisfy me that if I take it at your hands, I am safe in possession, let who may object to it?"

The priest was like one mad. He made as if he would close in upon him and chastise him; but Phil was a powerful fellow, and not to be trifled with. He stood on his guard firmly, but not disrespectfully, and so went on—

"It's but a cabin, sir, and a patch of ground; and the longest possession a man can have of it is but a few years. And in case he don't get it, there's scores of places just as good to the fore; or, if he's turned out, he needn't want a shelter to go to. But the place that we're depending on your riverence to engage for us when we leave this world ——"

Here the priest interrupted him with a worse word than I would like to write down; and turning to us, he said—

"Hoys, will you see your priest insulted by a swaddling apostate, that sold himself to the devil and the Bible-men for a few coin? My curse on ye if ye don't stop his blasphemous mouth, and drive him out!"

"They needn't," says Phil, looking coolly at us; "I'm not going to trouble your riverence any further, as I've incensed you into my meaning about the everlasting habitation. I meant you no disrespect, sir; but a poor man's soul is precious; and I must have better warrant than the bare word of any living man before I hazard it for ever."—*American Paper.*

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

The great length of Mr. Power's letter has obliged us to postpone Mr. Rourke's till our next. Our reasons for not publishing the communication headed "Talk of the Wall," have been already stated in our May number.

We have again to apologize to several of our friends for postponing their valued communications. If our correspondents would recollect the limited space of our columns, when forwarding letters or articles, it would prevent much embarrassment and disappointment.

We beg to call the attention of our correspondents to the utility of adding their name and address to their communications.

To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal, which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, NOVEMBER, 1854.

We have been so little in the habit of boasting of what we have done in the field of controversy, that it is very probable many of our most constant readers are actually ignorant, even at the present time (though our periodical has now been in existence nearly three years), to what extent its columns have been circulated, and read throughout the British dominions. The official returns made by the Revenue department, and recently published, of the number of stamps issued to the several newspapers in this city, have, however, made public the *enormity* of our proceedings; and we were somewhat amused a short time since by a story told us by a warm friend, of a worthy man, sincerely anxious for the success of Protestant missions in this country, but apparently wholly ignorant of the existence or nature of our paper, who confessed to him that he had been greatly discouraged by seeing, from the public returns, the increased circulation of a "Popish" paper, called the Catholic Layman, which, within the preceding twelve months, had actually risen to an annual issue of 120,000 copies! As it is useless to deny that our misdemeanours really amount to that formidable number, we must only hope that our numerous readers will rejoice to find that they have so many to sympathize with them, and that they will cordially aid our efforts to make our circulation still greater, so as to bring it within the reach of all who are able and willing to use the reason which God has graciously bestowed on them, in "proving all things, and holding fast that which is good." Nor can we help feeling gratified by the numerous encouraging letters which reach us from various quarters, expressive of cordial approbation of the tone and spirit of our paper. We also think it right to acknowledge the flattering allusion to our labours, made by an ably-conducted contemporary, the *Irish Church Journal*, in a recent number, couched in terms of praise, which, though they may exceed our merits, certainly but justly describe what we would earnestly *desire* to become, if in our power. We trust none of our readers will attribute our citing it to mere vanity or a spirit of boasting, which we hope we have never indulged in, but rather to a sincere desire to encourage our readers, by showing them that their partiality for our columns is participated in by others well qualified to judge of the object we have in view, and our mode of attempting to effect it.

"Let that admirable periodical, the Catholic Layman," says our respected contemporary, "which has already done so much good, in the most solid, but least obtrusive form, be generously supported, and the sphere of its operations extended on all sides. It reaches the minds that lead others. It exercises an influence not only on the middle classes, the shopkeepers, and more intelligent farmers—but upon the priests themselves. It is a missionary whose advent provokes no riots, and brings about no breach of the peace—a missionary who can be present with the same talent, learning, good taste, and wisdom, at the same time in every house in Ireland—a missionary who runs no risk of broken bones himself, and whom every man may listen to without compromising his position in society, or drawing upon himself the universal notice of his neighbours."

Should the above passage meet the eye of the worthy friend of Irish Protestant Missions, above referred to, we hope it will go far to reconcile him to the idea which so grievously alarmed him when he discovered that the circulation of the Catholic Layman, within the last twelve months, amounted to 120,000 copies. Our appeals he will find are all to the reason, and never to the passions of our readers, either Roman Catholic or Protestant; and, therefore, afford, we hope, some prospect of ultimately leading men to the truth. We have good reason, also, to believe, that the *Irish Church Journal* is not far wrong in the allusion made in the passage cited to the Roman Catholic priesthood, and that no inconsiderable number of the priests in this country are among our regular readers. It would be too much to suppose that the majority of them are friendly to our exertions, or that they do not still look upon our pages with a somewhat jaundiced eye, as calculated to exercise an injurious effect upon their own interests. Some, however, we sincerely believe, are capable of taking a higher and more noble-minded view of the matter, and would willingly (or even, like the worthy Dutch priest described in another column, gladly) see a reformation in the Church of which they are members, did they not fear that a disclosure of their wishes might subject them to the wrath of their ecclesiastical superiors, and tend to their personal ruin. We confess it ever gives us pain to think that even the transition from the most fatal error to the most glorious truth should injure, even in a temporal point of view, the welfare of any one, whether priest or layman; and we would gladly see the same happy result again, which has, in some instances, we believe, already occurred even in this country, of the priest and his flock *simultaneously* repudiating the errors of a Church which has long arrogantly claimed to be "the mother and mistress of all Churches," without being able to give any rational proof to satisfy an unprejudiced inquiring mind, that she really deserves that title. It is cheering, however, to learn, as we read in a letter from Monsieur Ernest Vent, pastor at Brussels, dated 5th October, 1854, published in the same periodical above referred to, that Roman Catholic priests, who have the courage, like the Abbe Miel (whose interesting letter we printed in our last number), to follow their conscientious convictions, by renouncing the Church of Rome, are not always, even in that eminently Romish country, Belgium, pecuniary sufferers by their change.

"Until 1839," writes Monsieur Vent, "there were in Brussels only two Anglican Churches, and the French and German Church, which latter consists of about 3,000 Protestants. In that year, pastor Von Maerdyck, formerly a Roman Catholic priest, opened a Flemish Church. At first, there were but thirty or forty hearers. Last year, the Flemish congregation numbered more than fifteen hundred, of whom more than twelve hundred were converts. This congregation has become so settled, and is progressing so regularly, that the government could not help allotting a salary to its pastor, three months ago. Thus, this Church is now publicly acknowledged, and forms but one with the French and German one. M. Von Maerdyck has, during the whole year, two religious lectures in two different parts of the city, for adult Romanists—these lectures are attended by from sixty to seventy persons."

We are not altogether without hope that we may yet live to see the day when similar results may not be uncommon in our own beloved country. Be that as it may, however, we are determined to do our part, under the Divine blessing, and leave the result to God. Will not our readers assist us in this devout wish, by circulating our pages, if they approve of them, by every means in their power?

RECENT CONTROVERSY AT BOULOGNE.

(Continued from page 124.)

Dr. M.—It is not the fact that the Church has always interpreted the passage, "Thou art Peter," &c., in the manner you state. We have distinct proof of this in the reason assigned for giving the Bishop of Rome a primacy of place—namely, the rank of his metropolitan city;* that, and not the passage "thou art Peter," &c., was the foundation of the precedence of place allowed to him. But I must ask you to remember your own assertion, that these words conferred both infallibility and jurisdiction over the whole Church, upon St. Peter, and the Roman Pontiffs. Produce, therefore, if you please the decree of the early Church giving *that* passage.

Mr. G.—The great Council of Nice, held in the year 325, declared that the Church of Rome always had the primacy and jurisdiction over the whole Church.

Dr. M.—No such decree was made. The Roman legate, at the subsequent Synod of Sardica, referred to a canon of the Council of Nice, and, when quoting it, *interpolated* the words you mention. Reference was made to the genuine canons, when this addition was convicted, and rejected. Again, I must ask you what even this has to do with infallibility? Why do you not produce a decree of the Church, if any such really exist, on this head? If the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff or Church, was recognised is it not strange that we do not find it either urged or submitted to, which, if true, it assuredly would be, as the effectual means of checking or ending the multitudinous disputes which distracted the early Church. Not only is this not the case, but we have decisive testimony to the reverse. This infallible interposition was not only not exerted, but decisions of the Roman Bishop were even disbelieved. Take, for instance, the memorable Donatist schism, when the Emperor commanded the Roman Pontiff (with whom he associated other bishops) to examine the matter. The Donatist bishops refused submission to this Pontiff's decision when adverse to them, alleging, as a reason for so doing, that the judgment of a few western bishops—the Pope being one of them—should not be weighed against that of so many Numidian ones. Now, is it credible, that such a plea as this could have been made—and it appears, moreover, to have been allowed—if the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff or Church had been then a recognised doctrine? With respect to the *jurisdiction* of the Roman Pontiff, I just wish to ascertain what you understand by it; has the Pope supreme power in temporal as well as in spiritual matters?

Mr. G.—In both; he has a direct and supreme authority in spiritual things; but, since you cannot separate these from temporal, he has, indirectly, jurisdiction over the latter also.

Dr. M.—I ask the question because, whatever claim you make, it is *that* and not something else which you must prove. *Is there* any doctrine of your Church on the subject, or is it not true that here, as in other most important matters, there is a variety of opinion? Thus, on the one side, Pope Innocent III. claims express temporal jurisdiction over kings—God, said he made two great lights, the greater to rule the day, &c., these are, said he, the papal and the regal; the former superior to the latter.

Mr. G.—I never heard that illustration before; it is beautiful, and quite expresses the truth.

Dr. M.—Well, let us see, here are Cardinal Wiseman's words directly contradicting the Pope—"There is nothing taught in the Catholic Church on the subject; it is no principle of her belief whatsoever, that the Pope does possess, or can possess, any temporal power, and that if we speak of those kingdoms which are not in anywise connected with his temporal government, it

* For this reason, the Bishop of Rome must long since be disentitled even to this primacy of place.

is the belief of all Catholics that the Pope has not the slightest jurisdiction or right to interfere upon earth" —"Lectures on the Church," p. 170

Mr. Langdon.—I shall proceed to show the doctrine from the Scripture. Walking one day in Galilee with His disciples he halted and said to them:—

"Whom do men say that I am? And the disciples answered: Some say that thou art John the Baptist, and others Elias, and others Jeremias, or one of the prophets. He then said to them: But whom do you say that I am? Simon Peter, answering, said: Thou art Christ the Son of the living God. And Jesus, answering, said to him: Blessed art thou Simon Bar-Jona, because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee but my Father who is in heaven. And I say unto thee: Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth it shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth it shall be loosed also in heaven.* And at the last supper, suddenly turning towards Peter, He said to him: Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat: but I have prayed for THEE that THY FAITH FAIL NOT: and thou being once converted, CONFIRM THY BRETHREN." † After His resurrection, Jesus one day said to Peter: Simon, son of John, lovest thou me more than these? Peter answered: Yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee. Jesus said to him: feed my lambs. He said to him again: Simon, son of John, lovest thou me? He answered: Yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee. Jesus said to him: feed my lambs. He said to him the third time: Simon son of John, lovest thou me? Peter was grieved because Jesus said to him the third time, lovest thou me? And he answered, Lord thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love thee. And Jesus said to him: Feed my sheep.‡

"In virtue of these words addressed to him by Christ, Peter exercised his apostolic prerogative on the following among other occasions.

"In the Cenacle—Acts, chap. 1st, v. 15 and following.

"On the day of Pentecost—Acts, chap. 2nd, v. 14 and preceding and following verses.

"The first miracle wrought by him—Acts. chap. 3rd, v. 6, 12 and following.

"Addresses the princes, ancients and scribes in answer to the question, by what power they taught. &c.—Acts, chap. 4th, v. 8th and following.

"Judges Ananias and Sapphira, and executes judgment upon them—Acts, chap. 5th. v., 3rd, and following.

"Visits the Churches—Acts, chap. 9th, v. 32 and following,

"Cornelius sent to him by the Spirit of God—Acts, chap. 10th, v. 5th and 6th.

"First invites the nations to the Faith—Acts, chap. 11th, v. 34th and following.

"And, to sum up all, he is always put forward most prominently in the Scriptures much oftener than, and in a manner quite different from, any other apostle."§

Dr. M.—Now, Mr. Langdon, remember what you have undertaken to prove by these passages—jurisdiction over the whole Church of Christ, in the sense of power to be submitted to, given to St. Peter and to his successors. You have read, it is true, a number of passages, now interpret them, and prove their meaning to convey that doctrine which you want us to believe. But here you are again met by the insurmountable difficulty which meets you everywhere, when you attempt any argument from the Scriptures. What is the principle of interpretation which you employ? Are you going to use your own judgment for the explanation? Then, why do you so peremptorily prohibit a like use of it for Protestants? Whatever objections you make against it must (try to evade the fact as you will) recoil in full force on yourselves. It is *impossible* for either Roman Catholics or Protestants to avoid exercising their own judgments upon the Scriptures—you must do it, and cannot help it. Are you about to use the infallibility of the Church as the warrant for your interpretation? This you cannot here do; you cannot assume what you are called on to prove. Are you going to assert the unanimous consent of the fathers? Then give me the proof that it did really assign to the passages you address that meaning, and none other, which you now assign to them; produce explicit declarations to this effect. The question is one of simple fact, to be established by an appeal to history.

Mr. L.—*I am not arguing for heretics!* but for a Catholic lady who has eyes in her soul,‖ and can understand truth. No one but a Catholic can perceive Catholic doctrine.

Mr. G.—A Catholic writer reckons up the number of times wherein mention is made of St. Peter, more than of any other Apostle; the proportion is very great indeed.

Dr. M.—Suppose we grant it all, the fact is unavailing, unless he or you prove, in addition, that each occasion of mention establishes the *present* doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church. If you use the fact you speak of as an argument, you are clearly bound to show the reason of mention in all these cases to be the distinct declaration of your modern doctrine. It is easy enough, I think, to show, that while some of them establish the reverse, not one of them proves your case. Here is your perpetual device and sophism; you assert one thing, and prove something utterly different, which you hope may be mistaken for it. Why do you not keep to the point at issue? Prove what you assert, and prove nothing else. Can anything be more weak than Mr. Langdon's attempt? It is simply to read a number of passages, wherein Peter is mentioned, and then assert, without any proof, that they establish a jurisdiction of power to have been committed to that Apostle and to the Roman Pontiffs. That Peter had a primacy of place is not even made out by them; that he had a primacy of power over the whole Church is, I think, refuted by the best possible testimony—the history of the transactions of the Church—while he was yet alive and exercising all the functions of his office.

Take, for instance, one of the cases, mentioned by Mr. Langdon—Peter's visit to Cornelius—Upon his return, he was *called to account* for acting as he had done—"Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised, and did eat with them." Is this a mode of address likely to be used by those who admitted his jurisdiction as an acknowledged fact? Does his reply make a claim or even a reference to such authority? No such thing; his defence is, he remembered the words of the Lord foretelling this reception of the gentiles unto the Church, and then adds, "what was I that I could withstand God." So far, then, as this passage adduced by Mr. Langdon bears on the question, it gives a double evidence—that of Peter and his accusers—*against* the doctrine he desires to establish by it. That the Apostle should, in this summary way, be called on to defend his act, is inconsistent with the idea that the Church admitted him to have supreme jurisdiction, while the manner in which he makes that defence, proves he had no idea of it himself.

With respect to another of the passages just quoted—"I will give to thee," &c.—did it *convey* this supreme jurisdiction and infallibility to St. Peter?

Mr. L.—Certainly.

Dr. M.—Bellarmine has found a considerable difficulty where you see none. If infallibility be *conveyed* here to St. Peter, how does it occur that shortly after he denied the Lord? He was not, surely, infallible then, and, therefore not before the act of denial. Now, though Roman Catholics very commonly press this whole passage as the great proof of this Apostle's infallibility, yet it is clear, that Cardinal Bellarmine felt it would not do to say this without some qualification. He felt the difficulty I have mentioned; and asserts, accordingly, that the words, "Thou art Peter," &c., did not *convey* infallibility, but only *promised* it, the *conveyance* being through a subsequent address—"Feed my sheep," &c.

Short of express passages, absolutely condemning and rejecting the alleged prerogatives of Peter (which cannot be found, simply because the claim itself was an usurpation introduced in times long subsequent), we have as strong evidence as it seems probable to have that no such thing existed; circumstances, of which we have the account, occurred, which must have drawn it out, had it been true; statements are made absolutely inconsistent with it. Let us take the case of St. Paul, the same who declares that he did not build on another man's foundation. He must, beyond all doubt, have *usurped* Peter's asserted prerogatives (if such existed) when he asserts that on him, not on Peter, was "the care of all the Churches." He does more, since he limits expressly this Apostle's superintendence in Church matters; for he terms him, by way of distinction from himself and restriction, "the minister of the circumcision," while he claims for himself the *wider* province over the gentile Church. He speaks, moreover, of such distinction and limitation as a thing admitted and acknowledged in the Church, "when they"—*i.e.*, the heads of the Church at Jerusalem—"saw that the Gospel of the uncircumcision was committed to me, as the Gospel of the circumcision *was* unto Peter," &c. Here is a division of superintendence distinctly asserted and allowed: the limitation of the *smaller* portion to Peter; the reservation of far the larger part of the gentile Church (under which, be it well remembered, the Church of Rome itself was included) to Paul. How can this be reconciled with the alleged claim of (made *for*, not *by*) Peter to *undivided* jurisdiction over the *whole* Church. Is it not absolutely inconsistent with it? And in strict accordance with his own extent of jurisdiction, St. Paul addresses his epistle to the Church at Rome, expressly asserting as his reason for doing so, the fact, that the whole gentile Church was his province. "I am debtor," he says—that is, I am bound by the duty consequent upon this province to preach—to the gentiles. So—because the Church of Rome was a gentile Church—I am ready to preach the Gospel to *you that are at Rome also.*" Here the *principle* which refutes your doctrine is clearly laid down. But there is also an especial instance *personal* to these Apostles which again contradicts it.

St. Paul says—"When Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face," &c.

Mr. G.—We consider that to be a great proof of St. Peter's humility, he submitted to rebuke from an inferior. The fact also that St. Paul mentions him so especially proves his peculiar dignity.

Dr. M.—You will, I think, find it difficult to adapt what you say to the recorded facts of the case. I am afraid the whole transaction will press as severely against the infallibility of Peter as it does against his supreme jurisdiction. The charge which Paul makes against him is expressly this—that, by his conduct, he was giving encouragement to the false doctrine which the Judaising teachers disseminated in the Galatian Church. This doctrine was one which Paul incessantly opposed as contradictory to the truth of the Gospel. St. Peter, by his example, gave strength and countenance to the great error, that observance of the Mosaic law by gentile converts was essential for their salvation. This Paul everywhere opposed; and he opposed Peter for sanctioning it. It was no "mere act of imprudence" which he condemned, it was a grievous error. St. Peter's humility had a deeper foundation than the frivolous one you assign. It was from the consciousness of having strengthened a grievous error to the great detriment of truth. And the peculiar mention of him, which you say proves his peculiar dignity, is declared to arise from the simple fact, that he "had come to Antioch."

It is certainly very strange if Peter be, as you assert, the only infallible Apostle, that he alone should be mentioned, after the day of Pentecost, as the only fallible one. Does it not seem as if distinct provision was here made against the modern *allocation to him* of any such prerogative? Before the day of Pentecost he denied Christ, though it had been said of him, "Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven."* After the day of Pentecost, he alone of the Apostles is found on the side of error. How does actual special fallibility accord with presumed especial infallibility? Again we are informed (Acts viii. 14), "When the Apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the Word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John."

Mr. G.—There is no force in that. The prelates of the Church may, on some important matter, meet and request the Pontiff to go and settle it in person. His supremacy would not be affected by this.

Dr. M.—I am very sure if they did, which is unlikely, they would not record the act in these words, "*they sent*" the Pope. The expression would surely have been more deferential. I use the passage, however, simply as an *indication* that the doctrine of Peter's primacy of power was then unknown, as I use, for the same purpose, these other statements which appear to repel the supposition that Peter was believed to be elevated, as you would have him to be. "James, Cephas—*i.e.*, Peter—and John who seemed to be pillars." If Peter was known to be supreme in jurisdiction, would he be spoken of along with others as *seeming* to be a pillar; or, if the Corinthian Church knew of such doctrine, would they have literally gone against it, as they did when one of them was "of Paul," another "of Apollos," another "of Cephas." No such doctrine, it is plain, was heard of at Corinth.

There remains another proof to which I beg to direct your attention, for it appears to me very decisive, Acts xx. 26, &c.† Here you will observe St. Paul is warning the elders of the Ephesian Church, that certain errors would creep in—that, of their own selves, "men would arise speaking perverse things," and "seeking to draw away disciples." Now, is it possible to conceive that St. Paul, if he knew the doctrine of Peter's infallibility or of the Church's—which, if either existed, he must have known—would, upon the very occasion where it is most essential he should assert it as a decisive preventive of those very evils which it was most essential to prevent, not only omit all mention of it, but state instead and *enforce other* preventives. For he says—"*Therefore* watch, and remember," &c. He points out evils which he apprehended as certain; those evils were erroneous doctrine and schism. Infallibility, and jurisdiction of power in a particular person or Church, if acknowledged, would have stopped both, by extinguishing the right to think at all. How is it possible to account for St. Paul's omitting to mention them, under circumstances which were exactly those requiring their mention, unless the true explanation of his silence was, that he knew nothing of them.

The following extract is taken from the Resumé as the answer given by Mr. Gretton to this argument:—

"That nothing of so negative a nature could be adduced as proof. That great existing facts are often passed by in silence by contemporary writers *as too well known to require mention.* That in extracting doctrines from the Bible, it was always necessary to compare one part with another. That if the Doctor's line of argument held good hardly any doctrines could be proved by the Bible. That in the '*whole counsel of God*,' preached by St. Paul, no doubt entered the necessity of submission to *one* visible head of *one* visible body, as the only means of preserving unity, and this the experience of nineteen centuries had victoriously proved, for it is a well-known and

---

* St. Matthew, xvi. 13.

† St. Luke, xxii. 34, 32.

‡ St. John, xxiv. 15 and following.

§ The passages in small type are taken verbatim from the Resumé.

‖ Coupling this with Mr. Langdon's previous statement about "instinct," it appears that this gentleman came much nearer to heresy than became his determined orthodoxy. Condemning the exercise of judgement, however well regulated and directed, he yet approves of "instinct" as an argument, and gives "eyes of the soul" to Catholics Thus he is in hazardous proximity to the old extravagancies of Methodism, to Quakerism, and to some of the ancient Gnostic modes of defending their deadly errors. So true is it that "extremes meet."

* Whenever and in whatever particular case the Holy Spirit was the teacher there, of course, was truth taught and uttered. The force of the argument is to show that infallibility was not attached (according to the Roman Catholic doctrine) as a permanent gift to the person of Peter, and, therefore, not to his imaginary successors.

† For this argument I am indebted to a sermon, preached by his Grace the Archbishop of Dublin, on this passage, from the Acts. It is so decisive, that I see no possibility of answering it, except in one way, and that is, by supposing the *doctrine of development* to have extended to St. Paul. It would not in the least surprise me to hear this asserted yet; for, as there has been introduced "a development of doctrine," so the doctrine of development may itself be developed. The principle applied to itself will produce it. An intelligent Roman Catholic controversialist, Dr. P. Murray, of Maynooth, after some time, undertook an elaborate answer to his Grace's sermon—(see CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. I., p. 101). The inference from this reply appears inevitably to be this—that the argument cannot be refuted, except by the fatal admission, that infallibility is not at all necessary for the perpetuation of Divine truth.

avowed fact that out of the Catholic Church there is no visible unity."—Resumé, page 14.

Dr. M.—The silence of Scripture respecting any doctrine is a decisive argument against its truth. Contemporary historians would scarcely omit, if *writing for posterity*, facts of prime importance, as being too well known to be mentioned. But your parallel *assumes* the fact which is wholly denied—namely, that infallibility and primacy were known *at all*. There is very decisive evidence afforded by Mr. Newman's doctrine of *development*, that all early history is against you; for it is a plain declaration on his part, that the doctrines of the Church of Rome, as *they now exist*, cannot be found in the records of the early Church. Their germs only are, on this theory, to be found either in the Bible or in such records. These were subsequently to be expanded or *developed*. This settles your assertion that the facts were *too well known to be mentioned;* for it *admits* that the *present* doctrines of your Church were not known at all. Moreover, would not that historian be judged unfaithful, who, when writing for future ages, should omit most important facts which they could not know except through history. Acting thus, although the circumstance which he was describing called expressly for mention of such facts, still more would he be to be reprehended were he, though aware of their importance to futurity, not only to suppress but apparently to supplant them by other statements very difficult to be reconciled with them.

Nothing can be safer than your rule—"In extracting doctrines from the Bible it was *always necessary* to compare one part with another." It is precisely because such comparison of passages, as well as the separate examination of each, negatives your *peculiar* doctrines that we, Protestants, reject them.

You say, "that in the whole counsel of God, preached by St. Paul, *no doubt entered the necessity of* submission to *one* visible head &c. This is, of course, a mere assertion, plainly without a shadow of proof. Nay, more, it is not only irreconcilable with the *systematic* silence of Paul in *all* his epistles, but against the clear witness of those several instances where he makes express mention of Peter. He wrote fourteen epistles. He treated of discipline, and delivered doctrine. He is, in every case, silent on the infallibility and supreme jurisdiction of the Church or Peter, though the circumstances which he mentions were just the fitting occasions to enforce these doctrines, *if they were true*.

The beloved Apostle, St. John, is another witness against you. He lived until the end of the first century, presiding over the seven Asiatic Churches. During his lifetime there were several succeeding Roman bishops. If your imagined prerogatives of St. Peter were transmitted to imagined successors in the See of Rome, it would follow that the inspired Apostle, John, must have been inferior in spiritual privileges, and subordinate in authority to successive bishops of Rome.

Mr. G.—So he was.*

Dr. M.—Now, you directly contradict the Scriptures, which declare, "God hath set some in the Church. *First* Apostles (1 Cor. xii. 28), secondarily, &c." Here it is very clear from the context, that "first" includes foremost in dignity. This could not be if, as you say, St. John, though an Apostle, was subordinate to the bishops of Rome, who were successively his contemporaries, and who were not Apostles.

(To be continued.)

* I am pretty sure it was Mr. Gretton who gave this answer, which is in strict harmony with, or rather a necessary consequence of the inheritance of St. Peter's asserted privileges; and is, therefore because of its absurdity, a refutation of them. Mr. Langdon, on another occasion, replied to me—"We have one (the Bishop of Rome) *just as good as St. Paul!*"

Correspondence.

IS THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND IRELAND SCHISMATICAL?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Carlow, October 29, 1851.

Sir—I take the liberty of resuming a correspondence that I had with you last August, on the title "Catholic." In answer to your strictures on my last letter, you say, that "the Irish Protestant Church does not owe its existence to any act of separation, which has never committed any act of schism;" and you say this is the Church to which Christians of this country ought to belong.

If I am to understand, by the foregoing, that the present Protestant Church of Ireland is identical with the Church of Ireland four hundred years ago, I am wonderfully deceived. In the first place, what is a separation, but simply a change of belief from one set of opinions to that of another, and I call this a separation, more or less, according to the nature of opinions changed; to use a military phrase, you have circumscribed our field of action, therefore the fight will be more decisive.

In Bede's Eccl. Hist., bib. 1st., you will find that Celestine, Pope of Rome, sent Palladius to convert the Irish, and afterwards St. Patrick.—See, also, St. Prosper, Chron. St. Columbanus calls the Pope his master, the steersman, the mystic pilot.

The ancient monasteries, and the remains of other holy buildings, with their crumbling altars, holy water fonts, stone crosses, the chalices of ancient times yet in the land, and the remains of other church plate with monkish devices thereon, fairly indicate, beyond a shadow of doubt, that they belong to another and different religion to the one now occupying the land, having the title "Irish Protestant Church, or Church of England and Ireland." St. Bridget and her abbeys, her religious houses, and virgins of her pious order—where are her followers to be seen in the Protestant Church of England and Ireland? Where? Oh, yes, I could multiply testimony on testimony of the non-existence of this new and alien Church, from this fertile land of Catholic antiquity; and oh, I could trace the changes of religion, aye, painfully too, and as true as it is painful. When Patrick became our island saint, it was with crozier in hand, with a halo round his path, and a blessing marked his footsteps, and he onward came, the apostle of peace, an image of his Heavenly Master, and he evangelized the land. Thenceforward Ireland became like Rome in Paul's days; their faith and piety, and learning, were spoken of throughout the world.

We can learn from ancient historians and their cotemporaries that Ireland, from Patrick to the British rule, kept up a faithful and submissive chain of correspondence with the Pontiff at Rome. In my next letter, please God, if you will, I shall enter more largely and in detail, peering my way, by strict, undeniable, historical information, that will leave a reasonable impression on the minds of your readers that I have not begun this correspondence empty-handed as regards "proof positive" of the justness of my cause.

I am, dear sir, yours respectfully,

A Roman Catholic.

Our correspondent appears to us to confound the obvious distinction between "opinions" and "actions." We admit, that at the Reformation, the Church of Ireland changed many erroneous opinions; we deny that it committed any act of separation or schism. Our correspondent thinks that he disproves this statement by saying, that, at the time of the Reformation, the Irish Church did alter some of its opinions. But this is no contradiction to what we said; as far as it goes, it exactly agrees with what we said. If our correspondent wants to contradict what we said, he must show what act of separation or of schism the Irish Church committed at the time of the Reformation. This he does not attempt to do; and we are justified in supposing that he does not attempt to point to any act of the kind, simply because he can find no act of the kind to point to. We feel sure that if our correspondent could point out any act of separation or schism committed by the Church of Ireland, on any particular day, or in any particular place, he would not fail to do so. Until he can point out such an act, it is useless for him to affirm that such acts have been committed.

All he attempts to do is to affirm that, *in his opinion*, every change of opinion is an act of separation. With the history of the Church before us, we think such an opinion quite untenable. We recommend our correspondent to change that opinion at once; and in doing so, he will find, by his own personal experience, that changing an opinion does not necessarily involve any act of separation. Surely he can change this untenable opinion without separating from any body. If other people separate from him because he changes it, the act of separation will be committed by them, and not by him. This was precisely the case of the Irish Church at the Reformation. She changed some erroneous opinions; and for that the Bishop of Rome separated from her, and persuaded as many as he could to do the same; but she committed no act of separation. If she did, let our correspondent point out the when, and where, and how.

In the third century, St. Cyprian and the African Church held a totally opposite opinion to Pope Stephen and the Church of Rome, in a matter which the Council of Trent treats as a question of faith—viz., the rebaptizing of heretics. Does our correspondent mean to say that St. Cyprian and the African Church at that time committed any act of separation from the communion of the Church of Rome? All history is against such a notion.

Under the guidance of St. Augustine, the African Church altered that erroneous opinion, and adopted another, opposed to St. Cyprian, and equally opposed to Pope Stephen. The whole Church has since adopted the opinion of St. Augustine. Does our correspondent mean to say that the Church of Africa, by correcting that error, did separate from herself or from any other? If he think so, let him say it. But if he feel, as he must, that such an assertion would be false and absurd, with what truth or reason can he say that every change of opinion or belief must needs be an act of separation?

We will give him one instance more. Respecting the Immaculate Conception, Bishop Milner says—"The Church does not decide the controversy concerning the conception of the Blessed Virgin, and several other disputed points, because she sees nothing absolutely clear and certain concerning them, either in the written or the unwritten Word."—End of Controversy, letter xii. The present Pope, Pius IX., has confirmed this in his letter of February 2, 1849, in which he distinctly admits, that "this honour has not yet been decreed to the most Holy Virgin by the Church and the Apostolic See."* It is clear, therefore, that, up to the present time, the Church of Rome has been of opinion that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, whether true or false, is not an article of the Christian faith which all men are bound to believe. But the Church of Rome is now going *to change this opinion*. On the 8th day of December next, the Church of Rome will decide that this doctrine *is* an article of the Christian faith, which all are bound to believe. Now, when the Church of Rome shall have thus changed her opinion about no less a question than whether a certain doctrine be an article of the Christian faith or no, will our correspondent then be ready to say that the Church of Rome of December will have separated from the Church of Rome of November? We think the Church of Rome will have changed its opinion for the worse, and will have still further corrupted the Catholic faith; but we do not see that any act of separation will be thereby committed, or will necessarily follow; although we are quite clear that if any members of the Church of Rome should thereupon separate from her, on the ground that she had corrupted the faith, they would be quite justified in doing so.

We hope our correspondent now understands the difference between altering an opinion and committing an act of separation. Actions may follow from opinions; but it does not therefore follow that opinions are actions. An act of separation may follow from a change of opinion, or it may not. To say that a Church has changed some opinions, can never be a proof that that Church has committed an act of separation, *until* that act of separation can be pointed out. Let our correspondent, therefore, show us *when, and where, and how*, the Irish Church derived its existence from an act of separation or schism, or ever committed such an act?

Our correspondent says, at the end of his letter—"That Ireland, from Patrick to the British rule, kept up a faithful and submissive chain of correspondence with the Pontiff at Rome." Now, it is our opinion that if our correspondent was at all acquainted with ancient Irish Church history, he would never have ventured on so rash an opinion as this. However, as he promises to write to us again upon this subject, we will keep our observations upon that point till we hear from him again. And we hope he will not fail to perform that promise.

* For this letter, see the Catholic Layman, vol. i., No. 1, January, 1852.

ON PURGATORY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Sir—If it be allowed to notice some of your leading arguments against the doctrine of Purgatory, I shall, in the first instance, respectfully direct attention to Catholic Layman, vol. i., p. 81, where, with respect to "W. C. Search," quoting Tertullian, you say—"We are surprised he should venture to do so." Again—"Now, the fact is, that both the passages which 'W. C. S.' quotes from Tertullian, are both taken from books written after he became a Montanist and a heretic!" Then, you ask—"Is it not strange that men who call themselves Catholics should turn away from what Tertullian believed while he was yet a Catholic, and preach to us only the *deadly heresies* he fell into after he had left the Catholic Church?" Again, you pointedly ask—"Why do they (Catholics) not quote to us Mahomet and the Koran?" Your opinion, thus dogmatically expressed, decides the character of these two books of Tertullian; they are thus declared by your *fiat*, to contain only the heretical and impious doctrines of Montanus; yet, immediately after, you tell us—"the first passage (*De Corona Militis*, p. 200) speaks only of offering for the dead:" thence, we are to conclude from your own arguments, that offering for the dead is a part of the heresy of Montanus. With respect to the passage I have referred to, I perceive that you and Mr. Collette are in the antipodes of opinion; but, in your charge on Purgatory, perfectly unanimous. In Catholic Layman, vol. iii., p. 86, Mr. Collette says—"Tertullian speaks of a custom then existing in the Church among some Christians." In page 87, he admits, that in this book, which you stigmatize as heretical, and no better authority than the Koran, and in the identical chapter from which "W. C. S." quotes, Tertullian has enumerated certain usages of the Church (not the impious heresies of Montanus), and among them oblations for the dead, on the anniversary days of their heavenly birth." This passage he further vindicates, and thus establishes its genuine character beyond exception, by collateral and corroborating passages from St. Cyprian's epistles; and, in doing so, he has evolved no mystery, enunciated no new principles, but only given us what is the teaching of the Catholic Church now, as well as in the days of St. Augustine; that prayers and sacrifice offered for the Apostles, martyrs, &c., and for all those whose lives are very good, acts out of thanksgiving; yet, from this principle, Mr. Collette undertakes to disprove the doctrine of Purgatory! And, in order to make this conclusion available to the end he proposes, he tells those for whose edification he writes, by an egregious mistake, no doubt, that, "according to the modern Roman doctrine, all the faithful—all those who die in the faith of Christ—go to Purgatory, before they can be in a fit condition to appear before God!" But the poor gentleman has been reckoning without his host. I wish he had informed us where and how and from whom he has learned this novel feature of modern Roman theology. In Catholic Layman, December, 1852, page 141, col. i., I observe you fell into a like mistake; you say, "whenever Roman

Catholics read any prayers for the dead, or any commemoration of the dead, they always take for granted, that it must be for getting the souls of the dead ont of Purgatory." Now, I ask you, and let me have a fair reply—Where do yon find that Catholics hold such a belief? Again, in same page, you say—"Well, then, when we read of any sacrifice or commemorntion for a dead person, in the early Church, what right has nny Roman Catholic to say, that this is proof that that person was in Purgatory, and that sacrifice or commemoration could nnt be for any other purpose than getting the soul ont of Purgatory?" I answer, he has no right at all to say so; his religion teaches him that such sacrifice, &c., could be, have been, and still continue to be offered for another purpose. You continue—"If the Church of Rome now thinks, that there are any other reasons for offering her sacrifice and making her commemorations now, for souls that are not in Purgatory, much more might the early Church offer her very different sacrifice, &c., for souls that she never believed to be in Purgatory." That the sacrifice offered by the carly Church of Rome differed from that offered by the modern Church of Rome, remains to be yet proved; in this respect, the Church of England does not agree with either of them; she offers *no sacrifice at all*, either for the living or the dead. This she proves for me thus—"We must, then, takeheed, lest, of the *memory, it be made a sacrifice;* lest, of a communion, it be made a private eating; lest, of two parts, we have but one; lest, *applying it for the dead*, we lose the fruit that be alive."—*Homily of the worthy receiving of the Sacrament*, 2nd book Homilies, page 375. Next you say—"How absurd, then, for any Roman Catholic now to say, that sacrifice and commemoration for the dead cannot be for any other purpose besides getting the soul out of Purgatory!" Yon love to harp upon this string; your starting note is still the same; but I fancy I will spoil the tune, by referring yon to CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. ii., p. 83, col. 1, where "J. B." quotes from the "*Sincere Christian Instructed*," &c., thus—"*Question:* For whom is the Mass offered? *Answer:* For those in heaven, in *thanksgivings* to God for all their happiness, for the Church on earth, &c., and for the souls in Purgntory." In order to evnde the force of this plain statement, yon have no course left, save the old *mistake;* and the whole force of your argument is, that "we rely on this gross absurdity," which you cannot deny to be "contradicted even by our own practice."

To contradict every word of your mistaken arguments, I will have recourse to no more mighty authority than yourself; I mean your severo animadversions on the Catholic Church for her faithful record of a number of holy personages, in every age, since the Apostles, whose heroic sanctity and supernatural virtues shone forth with a heavenly effulgence that cannot be disputed. In illustrntion, I will select St. Bernard, of the twelfth century, and I will ask you, did Catholics ever contradict their practice by praying for him, as if he should pass through Purgatory on his way to heaven? The same I repeat with respect to the holy St. Francis Xaverius, the Apostle of the Indies? You decry the Church of Rome for thus paying a just tribute to the exalted virtues of numbers of her children, and thus you establish the fact, that the Church of Rome believes nnd teaches, that many of her members go to heaven without passing through Purgatory. And to pray for a saint, with the notion that he was in need of the suffrages of the Church, can be no more repugnant to Catholic doctrine, than it would be to offer sacrifice and prayers for the damned; and St. Augustine says, that even in this case, "though they afford no relief to the dead, they are an advantage to the living."—*Enchiridion* cap. cx., t. vi., p. 238. The Church of England, you say (CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. iii., p. 71), "honours the undoubted saints of the primitive Church;" you might add, she honours King Charles I. in the same way, and even with the highest honour—that of a martyr. What is allowed in the Church of England in this respect, cannot be refused to the Church of Rome. Luther grants, in *Apol. Resp., ad. Arg. p.* 99, that St. Anthony, St. Bernard, St. Dominick, and St. Francis, though all members of the Church of Rome, are to be numbered among the saints; deny, if you can, that they have not as good a title to this distinction as many of those in your calendar.

The second passage (Monogam, cap x., page 155) cited by "W. C. S." may, I consider, be fairly assumed to be genuine, and to enunciate, as well as the first, a practice of the Catholic Church; and this assumption is fully warranted by a corroborating passage from St. Cyprian, Epist. xlvi., page 114. The widow is not said here to offer a thanksgiving that her husband "is now placed, liberated in the presence of God, to hold fast without delay a heavenly kingdom;" but she prays, supplicates, and offers sacrifice, to seek a favour for him; the idea of which is to be conceived from the general term *refrigerium*, to which, in the passage of Cyprian, the term *dormitio* affords an exact parallel. That the prayers and sacrifice offered in the early Church, for the Apostles, martyrs, &c., were purely commemorative and acts of thanksgiving, and materially different, as to their object, from those offered for the ordinary dead, is fully evinced by St. Cyril in his explanation of the Liturgy. He says—"When that spiritual sacrifice, that unbloody worship is finished, we supplicate God, over this victim of propitiation, for the common peace of the Church, &c., &c. We all beseech thee, and we offer this sacrifice to thee, that we may commemorate all those who have died before us; in the first place, the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and martyrs, that God, *through their prayers and intercessions, may receive our supplications.*" Thus, he inculcates the *invocation* and *intercession* of saints, with as much perspicuity as that dogma hath been defined by the Council of Trent, Sess. xxv.; as an integral portion of Catholic doctrine, set forth in the liturgical offices of the Church—through this medium they offered up their supplications, even for the other dead. For, the saint continues, "then we pray for our deceased holy fathers and bishops, and, lastly, for all our departed, believing that the souls receive great advantage, for whom supplication is offered up in the celebration of the holy and tremendous sacrifice."—Myst. v., page 328. The *refrigerium* of Tertullian, *the dormitio* of Cyprian, and the μεγιστην Ονησιν of Cyril are, evidently, as many different modes of expressing this "*advantage;*" and, hence, they are strictly explicable in one particular sense only; and, as they all express the object supplicated for the dead in the sacrifice of the altar, the language of the Liturgy must determine their precise meaning. In the Liturgy of St. James, tom. ii., Bib. Patr., Paris, 1624, p. 11., the priest, in offering the sacrifice, entreats God to receive it εις αναπαυσιν των προκεκοιμημενων ψυχων. That αναπαυσιν means rest, relief, &c., from pain, torment, &c., is beyond contradiction—Apoc. xiv. 11. *Approved version.* "And they have *no rest* day or night," &c.,—και ουκ εχουσιν αναπαυσιν ημερας και νυκτος, &c.—Greek Testament. That it means the rest enjoyed in heaven by the blessed, in contradistinction to all pain, trouble, persecution, &c., is proved from v. 13—ινα αναπαυσωνται εκ των κοπων αυτων—"that they may rest from their labours," &c. Thus, in the 2nd and 3rd centuries we see the Church offering sacrifices for the relief of the dead, for their repose, rest, &c.; this doctrine explained by St, Cyril, in the 4th century, nnd confirmed, not alone by the Liturgy of St. James, but by all the ancient Liturgies. Moreover, in addition to prayers and sacrifice for the dead, we see, that as early as the year 350, the Church supplicates God through the intercession of the saints, with many other practices as papistical as anything in the present day; and how the Fathers and doctors of the Church, at whatever period these novel doctrines were introduced, could conspire to cajole the Christian world out of their Church, in which, according to the doctors of the Church of England, they had no sacrifice, no intercession of saints, no prayers, &c., for the relief and repose of the dead; and how such a change was effected, so secretly that no one could detect it, and, yet strange, without their knowing it, all became arrant Papists; nnd, at what time this revolution took place, with the names of the innovators, and the principal details of the event, I beg you will inform me. St. Cyril says, with regard to prayers for the Patriarchs, &c.—ινα μνημονευωμεν—that we may celebrate their memory; but of the other dead he says, supplication is offered for them—η δεησις αναφερεται. The same distlnction is observed in all the Liturgies. This distinction you have endeavoured throughout, to confound. The restoring of *pro natalitiis* (De Corona Militis, p. 209) is of the utmost importance, as by the use of it we can discern, even in the Church of the second century, a recognition of the distinction I have just noticed: a distinction between the oblations and sacrifices to celebrate the memory of the martyrs who "have arrived at the presence of the Lord, the Lord himself rejoicing," and those offered by the widow to supplicate relief for her husband's soul—a distinction confirmed by the testimony of the most emlnent Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries. St. Epiphanius says—"We pray for the just and sinners in quite a different manner, &c., that for the latter we may obtain mercy" (ελεους θεου δεομενοι).—*Hær.* lxxv., t. l, p. 911; and in the same manner the other Fathers.

Are we, then, to conclude, I ask you, that all the Fathers, in this respect, taught only the impious and deadly heresies of Montanus; and that Aerius, who maintained that the prayers, alms, &c., of the living did no good for the dead; "and that we must not pray or sacrifice for them; that the solemn fasts appointed by the Church should not be kept, and that every one was to fast as he pleased; that he might not seem to be under the law" (St. Augustin, *Lib. de Hær.* liii., &c.); are we, I ask you, to believe that Aerius was the only living portion of Christ's Church to be found then in the world? for, the more than incipient doctrines of Popery had, as I have already shown, taken deep root throughout Christendom. The noxious sacrifice of the Mass differs nothing from the sacrifice of the early Church as explained by St. Cyril, in the paragraph immediately preceding my first citation from him; he says—"We invoke the most benign God to send down the Holy Spirit on the things offered, to *make the bread* the *body* of Christ, and *the wine the blood* of Christ—ινα ποιηση τον μεν αρτον σωμα Χριστου, τονδε οινον αιμα Χριστου. All the ancient Liturgies invariably agree with St. Cyril; having the words ποιη, αποφηνη, αναδειξαι, ποιησον, ποιηση, &c., all of which express precisely the action, to make, to render, &c., the bread the body, &c.; whilst the prayer of consecration in the Ritual of the Church of England make the bread and wine to be totally different things from the body and blood of Christ. The oblations made in the early Church appear to be very different from *doles* to the poor; St. Irenæus, the disciple of Polycarp, who was himself the disciple of St. John the Evangelist, says—"Christ giving instructions to his disciples, to offer their first fruits to God, &c., he took bread into his hands, and, giving thanks, said, 'this is my body.' Likewise he declared the cup to be his blood, and taught the new *oblation* of the New Testament." And, again—"therefore, the *oblation* of the Church, which the Lord taught to be offered in the whole world, was deemed a pure sacrifice before God."—Adv. Hær. Lib. ix.. cap. xviii., p. 251. He generally uses the word *oblatio* for the sacrifice of the altar, but never in the sense of a *dole* to the poor; hence, it is plain, that the *oblationes pro defunctis* of Tertullian and the early Fathers must be understood of the sacrifice of the altar, offered for the living and the dead.

Your arguments, as already remarked, as far as I have considered them, are formed on a wrong principle, and are, therefore, utterly inconclusive; and Mr. Collette's are, on the same account, equally so. All your other statements, including your citations from St. Augustine, shall in due course be fairly and candidly disposed of; when it will be made to appear that all these, as well as those noticed, are equally fallacious.

Although I have far exceeded my proper limits, I cannot omit noticing another mistake of yours, in CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. iii., p. 71, col 1, where you quote a passage, from Council of Trent, Sess, xxv., *de Invocatione Sanctorum*, so thoroughly eviscerated, and in such a mutilated and spurious shape, that the original could not be recognised; and instead of explaining Catholic doctrine, goes to establish as deadly a heresy as ever could be inspired by the father of lies—a heresy from which Origen defended the Church against the attacks of Celsus. You make us pray directly to the saints, as by them alone to obtain favour from God. This, though not connected with the other portion of my letter, I thought essentially necessary to observe.

You will kindly accept my endeavours to elucidate the truth as an apology for this long essay.

I am, Sir, yours, &c.,

EDMOND POWER.

Sept. 30, 1854.

We are afraid it will not prove very satisfactory, to such of our readers as are seeking for truth, to have their time and our space occupied by a discussion which they can scarcely understand or appreciate, without taking the trouble of reading again, a long past discussion of two years ago; nnd we feel some apology is due for asking them to do so. We must beg them, however, to remember that it is Mr. Power who has dragged them into it, and not we; and we cannot help observing, that that gentleman, with whom we had so many earnest discussions upon the doctrine of Purgatory, must be rather hard pressed for arguments, in support of his opinions, when, after six months' consideration and ransacking our pages, from vol. i., p. 81, to vol. iii., p. 86, he has been able to take hold of nothing more worthy of criticism than a supposed discrepancy between our views and that of our respected correspondent, Mr. Collette. So far from that criticism affecting our "leading arguments" against the doctrine of Purgatory, we are satisfied, if Mr. Power will only consider a little more carefully the nature of the arguments which we have used nbout the proof of Purgatory, he will himself see that he is, in fact, proving the truth and force of our own observations; and we are truly glad to have our arguments supported by so intelligent a writer. To make this more clear, we must take leave to repeat the passage to which we allude in his letter.

After citing correctly a passage from our columns, in page 141, vol. i., in the following words—"Well, then, when we read of any sacrifice or commemoration for a dead person in the early Church, what right has any Roman Catholic to say, that this is proof that that person was in Purgatory, and that such sacrifice or commemoration could not be for any other purpose than getting the soul out of Purgatory," Mr. Power goes on to say, "*I answer, he has no right at all to say so.* His religion teaches him that such sacrifice, &c., could be, have been, and still continue to be, offered for *another purpose.*" Now, what is this but exactly what we have so often said, that prayers or sacrifices for the dead do not prove Purgatory, even by way of implication, because they "could be, nnd actually are offered for another purpose?" We are quite satisfied with this answer, and only hope that Mr. Power will have the candour not to attempt hereafter to withdraw the admission how far he really agrees with us.

With respect to Tertullian our correspondent hardly treats us candidly. It is true we did say, in vol. i., p. 81, "Is it not strange that men, who call themselves Catholics, should turn away from what Tertullian believed while he was yet a Catholic, nnd preach to us only the deadly heresies he fell into after he had left the Catholic Church." But Mr. Power takes no notice of the *fact* which led us to say this; yet it was a remarkable fact. The great champion of Rome, Cardinal Bellarmine, produced a passage from Tertullian as a clear proof of Purgatory; that passage *is* clear for Purgatory; but in that very place Tertullian says that he learned *that* from Montanus (a

wretched fanatic who believed himself to be the Holy Ghost!). Might we not well express our horror at a Cardinal of Rome seeking to impose upon Christians a doctrine of Tertullian's, which Tertullian himself says he had learned from Montanus? We now ask Mr. Power, "*is it not strange?*"

We have nowhere said that *everything* contained in the books written by Tertullian after he became a Montanist was taken from Montanus, nor do we think Mr. Collette has ever said so, though we shall not presume to interfere as far as Mr. Collette's letter is concerned, that gentleman being well able to defend himself; but when we see that Tertullian does expressly say that he learned the doctrine of Purgatory from Montanus (see vol. i., p. 67, col. 3, at the foot), then we do object to *any* proof of Purgatory brought from the writings of Tertullian after he became a Montanist; and we think it not creditable in professing Christians to quote such a proof. At the same time we think it quite open to ourselves, or to Mr. Collette, to show that *many* of the passages which are produced from Tertullian to prove Purgatory do not prove it at all. *One* passage, we admit, does speak of Purgatory, but that one professes to be the teaching of Montanus.

We have nowhere asserted that the Church of Rome has defined that prayers for the dead, or sacrifice offered for the dead, can only be for the sake of getting souls out of Purgatory; but we have complained, over and over again, that almost every Roman Catholic controversialist that we meet with, both in their own books, and also in our own pages, does argue, not only as if the Church of Rome *had* defined this, but as if it were a thing so clear that even Protestants must admit it. Is not this the common way that all Roman Catholics argue about Purgatory? They produce a passage which speaks simply of "prayer for the dead," or "sacrifice for the dead," and they expect us to take *that* as proof of Purgatory! To that we have always answered that these prayers might have been for a very different object besides getting the souls out of Purgatory; and, therefore, that such prayers were no proof of Purgatory, unless it could be shown that the prayer was intended to refer to Purgatory—a thing that never can be shown, because not one of the ancient forms of prayer for the dead ever makes any mention of Purgatory. Hitherto we have found that Roman Catholics were very slow to admit the fairness of this answer of ours; they seem always inclined to stick to the one notion, "*there* is a prayer for the dead, and that *must* mean Purgatory;" whicli, of course, can be no argument at all, unless it be supposed that prayer for the dead *can be for no other purpose* except to get the soul out of Purgatory. And it is this which makes us so much delighted now to see that our argument has at last succeeded, and that its force is now admitted by so intelligent a writer as Mr. Power. We beg leave to thank Mr. Power again for his clear admission; and we hope all our correspondents in future will remember it.

Mr. Power makes the same admission, also, about "sacrifice for the dead:" and we thank him for that too. Sacrifice for the dead is no proof of Purgatory, unless it can be shown that the sacrifice was offered for that purpose to get a soul out of Purgatory. Now, will Mr. Power produce to us any passage, from any ancient form of offering for the dead, *which professes to make the offering for that purpose?* We ask him can he, or can he not, produce such a passage? Until he, or some one else can produce such a passage, we are justified on his authority in saying, that "offering for the dead" is no proof for Purgatory.

Whether the ancient notion of the Christian sacrifice, or offering, be the same as that now held in the Church of Rome, is too large a question to go into now; we will treat that separately again. But if the modern Roman notion be the true one—namely, that it is "a propitiatory sacrifice for sin"—then for what purpose *can* it be offered, except to free the soul from the punishment of sin? Will Mr. Power undertake to answer this?

Whether St. Anthony and St. Francis, &c., were saints or not, is a question which we are not much disposed to judge of. We leave that to God. Considering how many lying stories we have read about them, and how stoutly the claims of some to saintship were denied by great numbers of Roman Catholics, the question becomes quite too perplexing for us.

But Mr. Power says, "to pray for a saint with the notion that he was in need of the suffrages of the Church, can be no more repugnant to the Catholic doctrine, than it would be to offer sacrifice and prayer for the damned." Can this argument be serious? Can "prayer for the damned" be "the prayer of faith?" and, if not, what is it? Might we not as well pray for the devil; as poor "Uncle Toby," in the exercise of a charity, more sentimental than believing, was almost tempted to? And *can* it be any justification of the practices of Rome that they are *not worse* than this? Yet how natural, in those who quote Origen in proof of Purgatory!

But Mr. Power quotes St. Augustine, to prove, that if praying for the damned can do no good to the dead, it may to the living! Aye, and if St. Augustine lived now, he might say that in earnest; for sure it is by that they get their living!

The passage which Mr. Power quotes from St. Cyril (Myst. v.) does *not* speak of *the invocation* of saints, as Mr. Power says—that passage makes no allusion at all to Invocation; and the *intercession* it speaks of is very different from what the Church of Rome means; there is a great difference between "intercession" *with* invocation, and without it. Many Protestants believe it to be very probable that God's people, who are at rest, do, in their prayers, remember His people who are still contending with the world; we have no means of knowing, with certainty, whether this be so or not; some things seem to make it likely; we find no fault with those who think it likely. But it is a very different matter when we are told *that we must pray to them*, in order that they may intercede for us; and this is exactly what St. Cyril does *not* say in this passage; he says not one word of invocation of saints.

We have no objection to the prayer of St. Cyril's liturgy, "that he may make the bread the body of Christ;" we no more object to these words than we do to the words of Christ himself, "this is my body;" the question is, in what sense did St. Cyril understand these words? There are two ways of understanding them; some think the bread is made the sign and sacrament of the body of Christ, and that in that sense it is called his body; others think that it is turned into his body. Both parties agree in applying to the bread the words, "this is my body;" but it is clear that they must differ as to the sense in which those words are applied. Now, what did Cyril think of this? Did he think that the bread was the actual body of Christ itself; or *the sign* of that body? Whichever way he thought about this, it is clear he must have understood the words, "this is my body," in a corresponding sense. Now, in this very sermon, which Mr. Power quotes, St. Cyril says—"When we taste, we are bidden to taste not bread and wine, but THE SIGN* of the body and blood of Christ." This is a way of speaking that no Roman Catholic ever uses; because they feel that speaking in this way is, in fact, giving up the doctrine of transubstantiation; yet, this was the way that St. Cyril thought fit to speak; and it is, therefore, clear that he must have understood the words in his liturgy, "to make this bread the body of Christ," in that very sense in which Protestants understand the words of Christ; for, *after* this prayer has been offered, he still calls the bread, "the *sign* of the body."

Mr. Power is very much mistaken, indeed, in supposing that Aerius was the only person in the early Church who questioned the efficacy of prayer for the dead; and we do think that Mr. Power should not have made such an assertion after reading that sermon of St. Cyril, which he quotes; for, in the very next sentence to that which Mr. Power has quoted, St Cyril does say, "I know that many do say, what is a soul profited which departs from this world either with sins or without sins, if it be commemorated in the prayer." St. Cyril does not say that these persons have departed from the faith; nor does he answer them from the doctrine of the Church; he merely tries to answer them by arguments drawn from the conduct of earthly kings; and the way the word *commemorate* is used in this passage, applied alike to those who depart with sin, or without sin, goes far to destroy the distinction which Mr. Power endeavours to draw as to the use of that word.

We trust that for the future it will be remembered, that neither prayer nor sacrifice for the dead afford any proof for Purgatory, unless it can be directly shown that the prayer or sacrifice was actually intended to get a soul out of Purgatory. Only let this be attended to, and we shall have few such passages brought forward as proofs of Purgatory.

We think we have some reason to complain of the terms in which Mr. Power speaks of our quoting the Council of Trent in "such a mutilated and spurious shape, that the original could not be recognised." We can assure him we had no intention to misrepresent either the Roman Catholic doctrines, or the Council of Trent. We cited, of course, merely as much as was necessary to elucidate our purpose, and gave those words only which applied to the particular subject of which we were treating.

If Mr. Power is disposed to write an "essay," in reply to our articles on the invocation of saints, we shall be very happy to hear from him, and to defend every proposition we have put forward on the subject; but we anticipate that Mr. Power will find it just as hard to reconcile the decree of the Council of Trent with the writings of his favourite author, Origen, as we have done.

* Αντιτυπον σωματος.

FLOWERS FOR NOVEMBER.

YES; even in dreary, dark November, we are not without our flowers; and though many are dead and gone, others still appear in that wonderful and regular succession which a kind and merciful Creator has ordained. A November sky, however gloomy, cannot deter the LAUREL (*Cerasus lauro*) from opening its bright-looking flowers, as cheerfully as if they were to meet the clear sunshine of June; and, with its kindred shrub the Portugal Laurel, it will continue flowering till the spring has introduced her train of gay attendants. The common Laurel is a native of the south of Europe, and its leaves are poisonous. The Laurel of the poets, and with which the victorious generals of Rome were rewarded, is not our common Laurel, but the sweet bay tree (*Lauro nobilis*), an evergreen worthy of its high distinction from the elegance of its form and the aromatic fragrance of its leaves. The Laurel has always been the emblem of glory. The crown of Laurel wreathed the conqueror's brow. St. Peter tells us that when the Prince of Pastors shall appear, those pastors who feed the flock of God, taking care of it, and being made *patterns for the flock*, shall receive a never-fading crown of glory. Of what materials shall that crown be composed which is for those pastors, who are patterns to their flocks of cursing on the Sabbath-day from the altar, denouncing to death and destruction their neighbours and fellow-countrymen? Can such be the pastors spoken of by St. Peter?—1st Epistle v. 2-4.

The LAURISTINUS is another shrub of great beauty that cheers us now with its wintry blossoms of purplish red, tinged with white. When fully expanded, its flowers are almost entirely white, and in the midst of its evergreen leaves their clusters form an agreeable contrast; dark blue berries succeed the flowers. The Lauristinus is a native of southern Europe, and found on the hills and plains of northern Africa. It was introduced among us about the year 1596. Its ancient name was Tinus, and its leaves being evergreen, and like the laurel it was called Lauristinus. Its botanical name is *Viburnum tinus*.

The SNOWBERRY (*Symphoria racemosa*) is another elegant bushy shrub, which favours our November with its small white or rose-coloured flowers. It is a native of both North and South America, but has long since become a favourite ornament in the foreground of our shrubberies. It is not an evergreen, but rather a delicate deciduous shrub. It bears two crops of flowers and an abundance of snowy berries or fruit. The PYRACANTHUS (*Crataegus*) —or fiery thorn—is another beautiful shrub, bearing a rich profusion of scarlet berries, like those of the mountain ash in their winter splendour. They remain throughout the severest part of the season, and only fall when spring provides a fresh relief.

The MICHAELMAS DAISY (*Aster Tradescanti*), with its large purple flowers and yellow disk, a native of the fields of Virginia, generally lingers in our gardens to the end of this month, and then departs. There is another herbaceous plant of the same name, but a native of our own isles (ASTER TRIPOLIUM, or SEA STARWORT), a blue daisy, with lilac flowers. It was supposed to change its colours three times in the day—to have been white in the morning, purple at noon, and crimson in the afternoon—whence the Greeks gave it its name of TRIPOLIUM. But we cannot find any evidence of those changes in our sober climate.

If we wish to add a more sprightly flower to our winter nosegay, we have at hand the last representative of the ROSE, the monthly or Chinese rose (*Rosa Indica*), whose delicate and odoriferous flowers never looked more pure or engaging than they do now, emblematic of beauty, always new. We may add to our wreath the flowers of the EVERLASTING, a most interesting family of plants, consisting of many members—

> "That look as infants do, who smile when dead,"

all remarkable for the property of retaining their beauty for years after they are pulled, if gathered in dry weather. One of these is the CUDWEED, of which there are nine or ten varieties in Ireland. Their botanical name is *Gnaphalium*, from the soft down with which their leaves are clothed. The common Cudweed (*Gnaphalium Germanicum*) is found on sandy heaths, its stem and foliage covered by a soft woolly down. The yellow species, called, by the Parisians, "Immortelle," and met with at every step in that most romantic resting-place for the dead, the Cemetery of Pere la Chaise, is the Gnaphalium Orientale, a native of Africa and Asia, growing wild on the slopes of Lebanon and Carmel. There is something very touching in the display of sentiment evinced by that gay, and perhaps giddy people, when you see the graves, which have evidently closed upon their tenants several years since, freshly decked with wreaths of the Everlasting, their blossoms dyed of a deeper yellow, and interwingled with others of a jet black, and carefully renewed year by year—fitting emblems of never-ceasing remembrance.

There is another plant which passes by the name of Everlasting, the Xeranthemum, or *dry* flower, which also retains its brightness and colour for many months after it is gathered. The purple, white, and yellow Xeranthemums are popular annuals among us now, and are natives of southern Europe.

Another annual flower, also entitled to the name of Everlasting is the IMMORTAL AMARANTH (*Gomphrena globosa*). Its name indicates its immunity from decay. Milton represents the angels as crowned with it:—

> "Their crowns inwove with amaranth and gold—
> Immortal amaranth; a flower which once
> In paradise, fast by the tree of life
> Began to bloom."

The French call it "Violette Immortelle;" and it appears to have been dedicated, by the early Greeks, to the same funereal purpose to which the Parisians apply the Gnaphalium. Homer introduces the wreath of Amaranth as used at the burial of Achilles. He was a hero and demi-god; and, perhaps, thought worthy of immortality—not the lot of meaner men. The heathen notion of immortality was a narrow one, an indistinct glimmer of truth, till "the illumination (or appearing) of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath destroyed death, and hath brought to light life and incorruption (immortality), by the Gospel."—1 Timothy i. 10.

RE-ISSUES OF IMPORTANT PUBLICATIONS.

I.

THE PICTORIAL HISTORY OF ENGLAND,

IN TEN VOLS., SUPER ROYAL 8VO.,

CARRIED DOWN TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE RUSSIAN WAR.

THE Pictorial History of England will be re-issued in its original form and with all its original illustrations, forming Eight volumes, and terminating with the year 1815. To this series will be added a New Edition of the History of the Peace, extended to March, 1854, and including a complete Chronological Index. The entire work will be completed in Ten volumes, Super Royal 8vo., printed on fine paper, to be published in Weekly Numbers at 6d., or in Monthly Parts at 2s. The first of which was published on the 4th November.

II.

THE PICTORIAL BIBLE,

WITH NUMEROUS NOTES BY DR. KITTO.

SPLENDIDLY ILLUSTRATED WITH STEEL ENGRAVINGS, MAPS, ETC.

THE new edition of this beautiful work will be more elegantly printed than any of the preceding editions, and Notes will now be added, regarding the recent Assyrian discoveries of Mr. Layard, and the interesting results illustrative of Scripture, which will render the work even more valuable than before. It will be printed in Super Royal 8vo., and issued in Weekly Numbers, price 6d., and Monthly Parts, price 2s. The whole to be completed in 86 numbers, or 22 parts.

Intending Subscribers are requested to send in their names to

WILLIAM CURRY AND CO.,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN,

Where specimens of the works can be seen.

NEW WORKS

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET.

PHILOSOPHY AT THE FOOT OF THE CROSS. By Jas. Augustus St. John. Fcap. 8vo. 5s.

MORNINGS WITH JESUS; a Series of Devotional Readings. By the late Rev. William Jay, of Bath. Fcap. 8vo. 5s. 6d.

A MODEL FOR MEN OF BUSINESS; or, Lectures on the Character of Nehemiah. By the Rev. Hugh Stowell. 8vo. 7s.

THE LAITY, CONVOCATION, AND THE EUCHARISTIC QUESTION. A Charge delivered at Chichester, October, 1854. By Archdeacon Garbett. 2s. 6d.

AN INQUIRY INTO THE PRINCIPLES OF CHURCH AUTHORITY; or, Reasons for recalling my Subscription to the Royal Supremacy. By the Rev. R. J. Wilberforce. 8vo. 5s.

EVENINGS WITH THE ROMANISTS. By Rev. Hobart Seymour. Dedicated to Lord Viscount Palmerston, M.P. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 8s. 6d.

DANIEL'S GREAT PERIOD OF TWO THOUSAND THREE HUNDRED DAYS. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF THE REV. WM. JAY; with Reminiscences of some distinguished Contemporaries, Selections from his Correspondence, &c. By George Redford, D.D., and J. A. James, D.D. 8vo. Second Edition. 12s.

DIARY IN TURKISH AND GREEK WATERS. By the Earl of Carlisle. Post 8vo. 10s. 6d.

THINGS AS THEY ARE IN AMERICA. By Wm. Chambers. Post 8vo. 6s.

NOTES AND REFLECTIONS ON THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS. By Arthur Pridham. Post 8vo. 5s. 6d.

MEMOIR OF THE LIFE AND WRITINGS OF JAMES MONTGOMERY; including Selections from his Correspondence and Conversations. By John Holland and James Everett. 2 vols. Post 8vo. [Nearly ready.]

A TREATISE ON THE BIBLICAL CRITICISM OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS. By the Rev. Samuel Davidson, D.D. 2 vols. 8vo. 18s.

THE TABLE-TALK OF JOHN SELDEN. With Notes by David Irving, LL.D. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

SHORT PRAYERS ON EVERY CHAPTER OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. 12mo. 3s.

THE DAILY LIFE; or, Divine Precepts and Prescriptions for Christian Living. By Rev. John Cumming, D.D. Fcap. 8vo. 6s.

THE EARNEST STUDENT; being Memorials of the Life of John Macintosh. By the Rev. Norman MacLeod. Post 8vo. 6s.

THE JEWS; a brief Sketch of their Present State and Future Expectations. By Ridley H. Herschell. 12mo. 1s. 6d.

THE MORNING LAND; a Family and Jewish History. By the Author of "Leila Ada." 5s.

EDWARD IRVING; an Ecclesiastical and Literary Biography. By Washington Wilks. Fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

PETER PARLEY'S ANNUAL FOR THE YEAR 1855. Illustrated, 5s.

MY NOVEL. By Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton, M.P. 2 vols. New Edition. 8s.

HEART'S-EASE. By the Author of "The Heir of Redcliff." 2 vols. 12s.

FOLLOW JESUS. By Newman Hall, Author of "Come to Jesus," 3d.; cloth, 1s.

ON THE PLURALITY OF WORLDS. An Essay. With a Dialogue on the same subject. Third Edition Fcap. 8vo. 6s.

MORE WORLDS THAN ONE. The Creed of the Philosopher, and the Hope of the Christian. By Sir David Brewster. New Edition. 6s.

THE FOOTPRINTS OF THE NEW CREATION; or, the Narrow Way of Life; Jesus himself being our Companion, the Holy Ghost our Comforter and Guide. 1s. 6.

CHRISTIANITY VIEWED IN SOME OF ITS LEADING ASPECTS. By the Rev. A. L. R. Foote. Fcap. 8vo. 3s.

THE BISHOP, PASTOR, AND PREACHER. By the Rev. J. C. Ryle. Fcap. 8vo. 2s.

New Tract by the Rev. J. C. Ryle, "WHAT TIME IS IT?" Being Thoughts on Romans xiii. 12. 2s. per dozen.

WYLD'S MAP OF THE SIEGE OPERATIONS BEFORE SEVASTOPOL; showing the positions of the Armies, Fortifications, Batteries, range of fire, &c. 2s. 6d. In case, 4s.

WYLD'S MAP OF THE CRIMEA, with plan of Sevastopol and its Fortifications. 3s. In a case, 4s. 6d.

A BIRD'S EYE VIEW OF THE CRIMEA, from Old Fort to Balaklava; exhibiting the physical features of the country and the Encampment of the Allied Forces on the heights above Sevastopol. 3s. 6d. Coloured, 6s.

PLAN OF SEVASTOPOL; with its Harbours, Fortifications, Batteries, &c., on a large scale. With numerous marginal references. 1s. Coloured, 2s.

POCKET-BOOKS, ALMANACS, ETC., FOR 1855,

IN GREAT VARIETY.

Sold by

WILLIAM CURRY AND CO.,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

The Christian Remembrancer, with Daily Texts. In tuck, 2s. 6d.

The Scripture Pocket-book, with Daily Texts. In tuck, 2s.

Suttaby's, Marshall's, Poole's, Fulcher's, Pawsey's, &c.; all the varieties, 1s. 6d., 2s., 2s. 6d., and 3s. 6d.

The Christian Almanac, 6d. Gilt edges, 8d.

Tract Society Pocket-book Almanac, 1d.
Do. Do. Do. Interleaved, and Gilt edges, 2d.

Tract Society Sheet Almanac, 1d.

Tilt's Miniature Almanac. Cloth gilt, 6d.; roan tuck, 1s.

Tilt's Pocket Almanac. Cloth gilt, 9d.; roan tuck, 1s. 6d.

Tilt's Sunday Calendar. Card size, 1d.

The Victoria Golden Almanac. Printed on blue paper, 6d.

The Illustrated London Almanac, 1s.

Just Published, 18mo., *in a Coloured Wrapper*,

POPULAR STORIES,

CONTAINING:

THE TWO FARMERS OF BALLINTUBBER,

THE INFALLIBLE DOCTOR,

THE LANDLORD'S LETTER.

Reprinted from the CATHOLIC LAYMAN. Price 3d., or £1 1s. per hundred, for gratuitous distribution.

Each of the above stories may be had separately, price 1d., or 7s. 6d. per hundred, for gratuitous distribution. Also,

THE FAIR OF LOUGHMANAGH,

PRICE ONE PENNY.

THE TALK OF THE ROAD,

Nos. I to 16.

Reprinted from the CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

PRICE ONE SHILLING.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

SECOND EDITION, ROYAL QUARTO CLOTH,

THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN,

VOLS. I. AND II.,

With complete Indices.

PRICE 5s. 6d. EACH.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

BAGSTER'S BIBLES, ETC.

COMPREHENSIVE, MINIATURE QUARTO, FAC-SIMILE, AND POLYGLOT BIBLES, ETC.

A large and varied assortment of the above kept continually in stock, by

WILLIAM CURRY AND CO.,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET,

in every style of Binding, and with the richest Mountings.

Also, a choice assortment of

BAGSTER'S PRAYERS AND CHURCH SERVICES,

Now published for the first time, and which may be had of various sizes, and in most elegant bindings.

NEW ILLUSTRATED WORKS

FOR THE

APPROACHING SEASON.

THE KEEPSAKE for 1855. With beautifully finished Engravings. By Mr. T. A. Heath. Elegantly bound. 21s.

THE BOOK OF BEAUTY; or, Court Album for 1855. A Series of Portraits of the Young Female Nobility. 21s. Coloured Plates, £2 2s.

LONGFELLOW'S GOLDEN LEGEND. With fifty Engravings, by Birket Foster and Jane E. Hay. Crown 8vo. 12s. Morocco, 21s.

THE RHINE; its Picturesque Scenery and Historical Associations. With Twenty Steel Engravings from drawings by Birket Foster. Super royal 8vo. 21s.

JERUSALEM REVISITED. By the late W. H. Bartlett. With numerous Steel and Wood Engravings. Super royal 8vo. 16s.

MARMION; a Tale of Flodden Field. By Sir Walter Scott. Exquisitely Illustrated by Birket Foster and John Gilbert. 18s.

MILTON'S L'ALLEGRO AND IL PENSEROSO. With Thirty Illustrations by Birket Foster. 8vo. 21s.

THE TASK. By William Cowper. Beautifully illustrated by Birket Foster. Small 4to.

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET.

CHRISTMAS PRESENTS, PREMIUMS,

SUNDAY SCHOOL REWARDS, AND JUVENILE WORKS.

WILLIAM CURRY and Co., will have a large assortment of new and interesting Works during the forthcoming season, from which selections may be made for Christmas and New Year Gifts, Premiums for Sunday Schools, and a great variety of illustrated and other juvenile works for young people.

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

In the Press, and shortly will be Published,

A CHARGE,

DELIVERED BY

THE LORD BISHOP OF MEATH,

At his Primary Visitation of the Diocese of Meath, Held in September, 1854.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher, WILLIAM CURRY, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin. NOVEMBER, 1854.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Glóir do Dhia aṅ ṛna háṅduiḃ, agus ṡíoḋċáin air an dtalaṁ deaġċoil do na dáoiniḃ.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED THE MIDDLE OF EVERY MONTH, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. III.—No. 36. DECEMBER, 1854. { Annual Subscription, 2s. 6d. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

	Page
The Priest's Power of Forgiving Sins—No. I.	139
On the Celibacy of the Clergy	140
Christian Ministers not Sacrificing Priests	141
Pious Frauds—No. II.—Relics	142
The Roman Breviary—No. I.	144
Autobiography of a Roman Catholic Priest—No. III.	145
The Talk of the Road—No. XXVI.	146
The Old Irish Clergy—No. IV.	148 & 149
The New Article of Faith	147
The Patriotic Fund—A Litany for the time of War	150
Recent Controversy at Boulogne, between Rev. Dr. Moeran and two Roman Catholic Laymen—continued	150
CORRESPONDENCE:	
Are the Priesthood Sincere? by the Abbé Miel	151
Reply to Mr. Power, by Mr. Collette	151
On the Infallible Church, by Mr. Rourke	152
On Purgatory, by In Earnest	152
Flowers for December	153
Farming Operations for December	153

THE PRIEST'S POWER IN FORGIVING OF SINS.

No. I.

Of all the anxieties which must press upon the mind of a Roman Catholic priest who is earnest in the execution of his office, none can be heavier than those which relate to the forgiving of sins.

To sit in judgment on a fellow sinner—to decide whether his sins shall be forgiven or retained—to exercise "this discretionary power,"* is surely the most solemn responsibility which can rest upon a mortal man. Which is most awful, *to retain*, or *to remit* sin? To send away a guilty wretch, refusing him that sacrament of penance, "to which belongs in so special a manner the efficacy of remitting actual guilt, that without its intervention we cannot obtain or even hope for pardon" (Catechism p. 261)—to refuse him *this*, and send him away in a state in which death must be eternal damnation—what an awful responsibility! how it must oppress the mind of a priest who thinks himself bound to do it!

On the other hand, to pronounce the awful words, "I absolve thee," and to send away the sinner under the conviction that he has no longer to seek forgiveness from God; how fearful, if there be any room to doubt whether that man's sins are forgiven by God.

This is the position of the priest, "who sits in the tribunal of penance as his legitimate judge . . . the priest *represents the character, and* DISCHARGES THE FUNCTIONS of Jesus Christ"—Catechism, 260. A task awful in itself; but how distracting to him who has to perform it without that knowledge of the hearts of men, which enabled Christ to perform it unerringly! Christ could say, *O generation of vipers*; Christ could say, *thy sins are forgiven thee*; because he saw *the hearts* of men. But priests confess that they have *not* this knowledge; and, then, to have to discharge *the functions of Jesus Christ*, without that knowledge which enabled Christ to discharge it; to have to give or to refuse salvation, on his own frail and human judgment; what task like this, for its perplexities and anxieties, was ever imposed upon man?

We have often thought that there must be many Roman Catholic priests, sincere and earnest in their profession, deeply feeling many responsibilities, but this the most intolerable of them all.

With all the care that can be used, how is it possible that an erring man, with nothing but mere human judgment to guide him, should pass his life in thus judging of the hearts of others, and yet avoid the involuntary, but still fatal error, "to kill souls which should not die, and to save souls alive, which should not live?"—Ezekiel xiii. 19, Douay Bible.

And if the priest resolve to deliver his own soul, by explaining the real state of the case to the people, how great his difficulty!

There are three different views of the form of absolution.

The first, which teaches that all that man can do, is to DECLARE what he finds reason to believe that God has already done.

The second, that the words spoken do actually and always accomplish the thing expressed.

The third, that the words spoken do actually accomplish the thing, only on certain conditions; and, therefore, only in some cases, and not in others.

Those priests who have not a serious and solemn sense of responsibility about their office, will, perhaps, choose between these three without much difficulty.

It will seem to them out of the question to let the people believe that the priest can only *declare* a forgiveness already given by God; because the people would hardly consider this worth paying for: and they will think the third explanation little less dangerous; because if the people once come to think that there is *no certainty* of sins being forgiven, when the priest has said "I absolve thee," the people will hardly continue to believe that there is any efficacy in the words. Such priests will at least not be unwilling that the people should believe that the words spoken do always and necessarily produce the effect. And there is too much reason to fear that many of the people do hold this belief, because their priests are at least content to let them hold it.

But these are not the men of whom we are writing now. There must be some priests who have a fearful sense of responsibility towards God and man, in the execution of this office; and *to them* it must be a source of great embarrassment and perplexity, which of those three explanations they are to give to the people.

Some few, perhaps, may have already felt that there is some reason to suspect that the first explanation is the true one; that Christ alone can really perform *his own functions*; that God alone can really forgive sin; and that all that man can do, is to declare a forgiveness already given, where he has reason to believe that God has given it.

But this is so contrary to the doctrine of the Church of Rome, that it can only be a new source of perplexity and distraction to any priest who even suspects that it may be true; for, "unlike the authority given to the priests of the old law, *to declare* the leper cleansed from his leprosy, the power with which the priests of the new law are invested, *is not simply to declare that sins are forgiven; but as the ministers of God, really to absolve from sin.*"—Catechism, p. 259.

Such priests as we speak of now, can never think of adopting the second explanation; because they know that, however common among the people, it is yet given up as incapable of being defended, by most writers in the Roman Catholic Church, distinguished either for piety or learning. Such priests must ever feel that they are in danger of being guilty of other men's souls, if they suffer them to think that the words spoken do necessarily produce pardon of sin.

But if any such priest should adopt the third explanation, and apply himself earnestly to teach, that absolution can have no effect but where the hearts of men are prepared as God requires; and that, therefore, the effect of absolution can be known with certainty to God only, who alone knows the hearts of men; he would probably find, not only great trouble from without, but great perplexity in his own mind within.

Many priests around him would probably think him a troublesome fellow, who was stirring questions that ought not to be raised among the people; a pestilent fellow, and a ringleader of sedition, he might be called; and it would be thought very inexpedient to disturb people's minds and set them thinking, in a time when any inquiry is found dangerous.

But this is not our subject. We are writing of the sincere and earnest men, who would face troubles from without, but are distracted with perplexities within; and *for them* this third explanation is full of difficulty.

They will, of course, find that "contrition" is the first and greatest "condition," in order that the words "I absolve thee," may really have the effect of forgiving sin, as if spoken by Christ himself.

They may, perhaps, without much difficulty, see their way to this, that under the Gospel *perfect contrition* does of itself procure forgiveness of sin direct from God himself, without waiting for the priest to say—"I absolve thee;" and that, therefore, in *this* case, the words, "I absolve thee," when spoken by the priest, are only *a declaration* of forgiveness already obtained from God. This much they might easily see their way to; because the Catechism of the Council of Trent expressly says—"*As soon as* we have conceived this contrition in our hearts, our sins *are forgiven* . . . . of this we have a figure in the ten lepers, who, when sent by our Lord to the priests, were cured of their leprosy *before they had reached them*;" to give us to understand that such is the efficacy of true contrition, of which we have spoken above, that *through it* we obtain FROM GOD, the *immediate pardon* of our sins."—Catechism, p. 270. This much, then, they may easily see.

But, then, this is a case that seldom arises; and, therefore, the catechism goes on to say—"This is a degree of contrition which few reach; and hence, through perfect contrition alone, very few, indeed, could hope to obtain the pardon of their sins. It, therefore, became necessary that the Almighty, in His mercy, should afford a *less precarious and less difficult* means of reconciliation and of salvation; and this He has done, in His admirable wisdom, by giving to His Church the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven."—Catechism, p. 271. So "the Church" lets in whom God would keep out.

Here, it appears to us, is where the great responsibility and perplexity of a priest must arise. He has not merely to judge whether a man *be* "contrite" *or not*, but he has to judge of the *precise degree* of contrition at which he will adjudge to damnation, or admit to salvation.

For, "if the sinner have recourse to the tribunal of penance, with a sincere sorrow for his sins, and a firm resolution of avoiding them in future, although he bring not with him that contrition which may be sufficient of itself to obtain the pardon of sin, *his* sins are forgiven, *by the minister of religion*, through the power of the keys."—Catechism, p. 271. In *this* case (the most general case) there is *no* forgiveness, without actual absolution; and the priests are "judges in the causes on which this discretionary power is to be exercised."—Catechism, p. 273.

Here, indeed, is a fearful weight of responsibility for earnest-minded men.

But the question we are about now is, how far in this case the priest is at liberty to proclaim the third view of absolution—viz., that the words, "I absolve thee," produce their effect of forgiving sin, only where the necessary amount of contrition is present.

Can the priest tell, *as Christ can*, the precise amount of contrition which exists in any man's breast? We think it is admitted that the priest can only form a human and an erring judgment upon this. Therefore, on the supposition that the third view of absolution is the true one, the case stands thus—*if* the amount of contrition be sufficient, the man is forgiven by God; but if the amount be not sufficient, the man is not forgiven by God. And as the priest cannot

---

* Catechism of the Council of Trent, translated into English, by the Rev. J. Donovan, Professor, &c., Royal College, Maynooth. Dublin, 1829. P. 273.

To save space, whenever the word "Catechism," with a number after it, occurs in this paper, it refers to the pages of the above translation.

* This story is to be found in Luke xvii. 14. In a passage above quoted from the Catechism of Trent, a contrast is drawn between the power of the Jewish priests in only *declaring* lepers cleansed, and the power of priests of the new law in "*really absolving from sin.*" If this were so, was it not strange that our Saviour should *declare* these lepers *himself*, and then send them to the priests to be *declared* clean, *as a figure of the pardon of sin?*

The reader may, at first sight, think this difficulty is solved by the fact of these ten lepers being an example of *true* (or perfect) contrition. If it were so, that would be an answer; because this Catechism of the Council of Trent confesses that, where contrition is perfect, pardon comes immediately from God, and absolution only *declares* it. But the difficulty is that "the ten lepers" was not a case of true or perfect contrition. We read in the account that only one came back to give thanks—"and Jesus, answering, said, *Were not ten made clean, and where are the nine? There is no one found to return and give glory to God, but this stranger.*" Was there perfect contrition in the nine? Is contrition perfect which does not lead to thanksgiving for pardon received? If not, then "the figure" expresses one case of perfect contrition, and *nine cases of imperfect contrition*; yet Jesus treated all alike, and sent all alike to be only *declared* clean by the priest; and the Catechism of the Council of Trent holds this up as a pattern of the forgiveness of sins by the priests of the Gospel. And still that Catechism tells us that while those who have *perfect* contrition get their forgiveness from Christ, and are only *declared* forgiven by the priest, those who have *imperfect* contrition are sent by Christ to the priest, to get their actual forgiveness *from him*. Is not this very strange? Does it not perplex us? Will any serious, earnest priest try and explain it to us?

see into the man's heart, he cannot tell him, with certainty, whether his sins are really forgiven by God or not.

But *may* the priest tell the man that his forgiveness is dependant on the amount of contrition in his own breast, and, therefore, known with certainty to God only; and known to man himself only so far as he knows and can judge of the sincerity of his own repentance?

No; the priest may *not* tell him this. "The faithful are to be informed, in the first place, *why* the Redeemer was pleased to give it (penance) a place among the sacraments. His object was, no doubt, to remove, in a great measure, *all uncertainty* as to the pardon of sin pronounced by our Lord. . . . Pronouncing upon *his own* actions, *every* man has reason to question the accuracy of his own judgment; and hence, on the sincerity of interior penance, the mind *must* be held in anxious suspense. To calm this our solicitude, the Redeemer instituted the Sacrament of Penance, in which we cherish a *well-founded* hope that our sins are forgiven us *by the absolution of the priest;* and the faith which we justly have in the efficacy of the sacraments has much influence in tranquillizing the troubled conscience, and giving peace to the soul."—p. 256. So that the man's assurance of pardon is *not* to rest on his own judgment of the "*sincerity* of interior penance," but upon *the absolution of the priest*, as having been expressly instituted to free the man from uncertainty about his own sincerity.

And this is made plainer still by the words that follow—"The voice of the priest, who is legitimately constituted a minister for the remission of sins, is to be heard *as that of Christ himself*, who said to the lame man, 'Son, be of good cheer, thy sins are forgiven thee.'"—p. 256.

We can understand, and deeply feel for, the overwhelming anxieties of a sincere and earnest priest, who has longed to tell the people that they were not to rest upon his words, "I absolve thee," even after the most careful exercise of his fallible judgment; but that they must judge of God's forgiveness by the sincerity of their own contrition. We can understand, and deeply feel for, his perplexity, when he comes to find that he is expected to tell them that his words are meant to secure them against any doubt of their own sincerity; and that they are to hear his words *as if they heard Christ himself* saying to them "thy sins are forgiven thee."

The difference is, that Christ could see into the hearts of those he spoke to, and the priest cannot.

It is this that must overwhelm the heart of a conscientious and earnest priest with a sense of responsibility too great for man to bear.

How can he "discharge the functions of Jesus Christ," without having the knowledge required for it?

If Christ had called any man to "discharge his own functions," would he not also have given him the requisite knowledge wherewith to do it?

Gladly would we aid any sincere and earnest man to see his way in such perplexity.

We must consider the means of knowledge which God has given us. Our faculties are very limited; when we strive to see every little detail at one view, we lose sight of the whole, and get into an inextricable maze, as the able writers of the Trent Catechism did. We must be content *to begin* by seeing LEADING TRUTHS and LEADING ERRORS. When we see so much, we can go on to examine the details. This is the way of knowledge among men.

There is a matter in this question, which is EITHER a *leading truth*, or a *leading error*. It is *the very form* of "the Sacrament of Penance." Let us examine this well.

"Every sacrament consists of two things—'matter,' which is called the element, and 'form,' which is commonly called the Word. . . . . In the sacraments of the New Law, *the form* is *so definite*, that *any*—even a casual *deviation from it*—renders the sacrament *null*. . . . These, then, are the parts which belong to the nature and substance of the sacraments, and of which every sacrament is *necessarily* composed."—Catechism, pp. 145 and 146.

"The words that compose THE FORM (of the Sacrament of Penance) are—'I ABSOLVE THEE.'"—Catechism, p. 259.

Let it be observed, then, that *any* deviation from this form, *renders the sacrament null.*

And so Thomas Aquinas says—"In sacramental absolution it would *not* be sufficient to say—Almighty God have mercy on thee, or, God grant unto thee absolution and forgiveness; because, by these words the priest does not signify that absolution is done, but only entreats that it may be done."*

And Cardinal Bellarmine says, that absolution given with such a condition as this—"If thou dost believe and repent as though oughtest to do," would not be valid.

And the Council of Trent itself says—"The holy synod also teaches that THE FORM of the sacrament of penance, in which its force *is especially contained*, is placed in those words of the minister—"I ABSOLVE THEE."† So, without those words, there can be *no sacrament*, no pardon, no salvation, for the vast majority of men whose contrition is *imperfect*.

Yet, no fact in the history of the Church is more certain than this, that those words, "I absolve thee," were never contained in any form of absolution used in the Church, for more than a THOUSAND YEARS.*

During all that time, the forms of absolution used in the Church were always in that form which the Church of Rome now pronounces to be ineffectual for the pardoning of sin. "Almighty God have compassion on thee, and put away all thy sins," was the ancient form of absolution in the Church of Rome itself.†

So here is A LEADING ERROR at the foundation, and the whole system of the Church of Rome about absolution breaks down altogether.

Those who would get free from the perplexities in which the Council of Trent and the catechism involve priests, in the matter of forgiving men's sins, must seek *elsewhere* for something that can stand examination, and satisfy the conscience of an earnest man.

It is at least something to learn *why* and *in what*, we have laboured in vain. Let any such priest as we are writing of, only try and imagine himself living in the Church of Rome 800 years ago, and using the form of absolution *she* then used; and let him consider what opinions he would *then* have entertained, and what instruction he would have given to the people about absolution; or let him suppose himself at liberty now to use only the ancient forms, and let him consider how easily he could then satisfy his own mind and conscience, about the way he would explain it to the people.

In this way alone, can he understand the cause of his perplexities, and the way to escape from them.

To aid those who may wish to investigate this further, we shall, in a future number, show what were the views of the Fathers about absolution, while the ancient form of absolution was in use.

CELIBACY OF THE CLERGY.

VARIOUS attempts at reform have, from time to time, been made within the bosom of the Church of Rome, both before and subsequent to the great movement of the sixteenth century, which restored religious freedom to a large part of Europe, and which is commonly known by the name of the Reformation. These attempts, it is true, have, for the most part, failed to bring about any important change, either in the doctrine or discipline of the Roman Catholic Church; but the consideration of them is important, especially at the present time, inasmuch as they prove that a deep-rooted feeling of dissatisfaction with many parts of the system of the Church of Rome has always more or less existed within that Church, and has rarely failed to manifest itself, whenever external circumstances permitted its members to declare their real sentiments openly and without reserve.

One of the most remarkable circumstances which has characterized these movements of the popular mind is this, that the *same points* of the Romish system have almost always been selected, as those in which reform was most imperatively demanded. From the contests of the Calixtines and the Taborites of the fifteenth century, down to the religious movements in Germany, in our own time, the instinct of sober, thinking men has always fixed upon some few crying grievances in the system of the Church of Rome, which were felt to press most heavily, and which were seen to be plainly repugnant to the Word of God. If a patient always complains to his physician that he feels pains in the same part of his body, it is an evident sign that some evil is lurking there, for which a remedy is needed; and the same maxim is no less applicable to the disorders of the religious system.

Among the grievances just adverted to, there is one, against which the most urgent remonstrances have at various times been addressed to the Court of Rome—namely, the compulsory celibacy of the clergy. We are anxious to invite the attention of our readers to this subject for two reasons. In the first place, we believe that the social evils resulting from this rule, both to clergy and laity, can scarcely be overrated; and we have reason to think, moreover, that not a few of the Roman Catholic clergy themselves would be glad to be set free from a restriction, which, as we hope presently to prove, is condemned alike by Scripture, reason, and experience.

We can hardly adduce better proof of the sentiments of many of the clergy on this important question, than is afforded by a remarkable Encyclical Letter, addressed by the late Pope, Gregory XVI., to the bishops of Poland in the year 1831. At the outset of this letter, the Pope alludes to certain unquiet spirits who had been for many years troubling the Holy See with unreasonable requests—requests, which though always refused, were, with unconquerable pertinacity, continually renewed; and that the repeal of the law of clerical celibacy was one of these "unreasonable requests," is evident from the passage which follows—

"We desire, venerable brethren, to excite your constancy on behalf of religion, against a most disgraceful *conspiracy with regard to clerical celibacy*, which *you know is spreading more widely every day*, and which is promoted not only by pernicious philosophers of our time, but even *by certain persons of the ecclesiastical order*, who, forgetful of their character and office, and hurried away by the blandishments of pleasure, have even dared, in some places, to address public and repeated requests to their princes for the overthrow of this holy rule of discipline."*

We consider that the facts here stated, which were so reluctantly alluded to by Pope Gregory XVI., are deserving of the serious attention of all who are anxious for the welfare of the Roman Catholic Church. It must have been a deep consciousness of the evils which the law of constrained celibacy was inflicting on the Church, that induced a large number of Roman Catholic ecclesiastics to appeal to their temporal princes against the known wishes of their spiritual head. Gregory XVI. stated, as we have seen, that the feeling against clerical celibacy was entertained both by clergy and laity, and was "spreading more widely every day." We do not believe that the movement for reform in this matter, to which the Pope alludes, ever extended to this country; but we see no reason why the Roman Catholic clergy of Ireland should feel less deeply, or be less vitally interested in this question, than their brethren on the Continent. In approaching this subject we have no wish or intention whatever to discuss it in an unfriendly or hostile spirit. Our only object is to set before our readers some of the serious objections to which the law of clerical celibacy is liable. For the present we shall confine our remarks to the case of the clergy.

Let us suppose, then, some young priest, who has just been ordained, to be confined to the retirement of a country parish, in a village where he has only the society of his clerk and his servant. His parishioners, being, for the most part, plain country folk, devoid of literary tastes and acquirements, are unable to afford him any comfort in his solitude. His duties, save on the Sunday, consist chiefly in the performance of a few routine services, which habit soon renders monotonous. Study, perhaps, has few charms for him; for during his education at Maynooth his reading was, for the most part, confined to dry treatises on dogmatic theology. The young man, previous to his ordination, had anticipated a pleasant existence in the ecclesiastical state; but he very soon begins to experience a foretaste of the irksome feeling of privation and constraint which compulsory celibacy almost inevitably occasions. Should he be placed within the reach of female society, he is obliged to regard it with suspicion and distrust. However carefully he may guard all approaches to his heart, yet nature cannot be thwarted with impunity; unless he be singularly cold and apathetic, his breast will probably be the scene of many a weary struggle, because his vow obliges him to fight incessantly against feelings which are constituent parts of man's nature, and can never be wholly eradicated. All the diversified attractions which others find in mixed social intercourse are so many new snares and temptations in his path. And, as if to crown the difficulties of his position, he is obliged, by the nature of his ministry, to be constantly brought into contact with young persons of the other sex, whose hearts are laid open before him, and whose most secret thoughts he is forced to inquire into. Surely, it is most unreasonable to expect that human nature can bear this trial without a struggle of the most painful kind.

Nor is this all. If there was a prospect, however remote, that this state of things would ever come to an end, perhaps our young priest might be enabled to bear it with composure. If he could look forward to a time when he would be set free from this yoke of bondage—when the loneliness of his solitary dwelling would be lit up by the smile of kind, familiar faces, knit to himself by the dearest ties of earthly relationship—then, perchance, he might be enabled with more ease to school his wayward heart into submission. Hope and fancy might then combine to diffuse a bright glow of anticipated happiness over some future stage of his existence, some rays of which would cheer and enliven the period of his early probation. But, alas! the future has no such prospect in store for him. His celibacy is to last for life. The stern law of his Church even forbids him the companionship of any female relative of his own; and thus, if he looks forward at all into futurity, he sees himself lonely and desolate, with faculties impaired and strength decayed, dependant upon strangers for the simplest acts of kindness that he needs. As he gradually drops into the grave, there is no one to cheer or console him; no voice of kindly sympathy to greet his ear. Can we wonder, then, if gloom, moroseness, and austerity should too often take possession of the minds of those who through life have been exposed to such an ordeal as this?

And now, what reason is alleged for the maintenance of a system, the features of which we have thus faintly at-

---

* In sacramentali absolutione non sufficeret dicere, misereatur tui omnipotens Deus; vel, absolutionem et remissionem tribuat tibi Deus; quia per hæc verba sacerdos absolutionem non significat fieri, sed petit ut fiat.—Thom. part. iii., quæst. 84, art. 3, ad. 1.

† Docet preterea sancta Synodus, sacramenti Pœnitentiæ formam, in qua præcipue ipsius vis sita est, in illis ministri verbis positam esse; ego te absolvo, &c.—Council of Trent, session 14. c. 3.

* We might, perhaps, safely say 1,200 years; but we wish to be under, rather than over.

† Absolutio criminum. Misereatur tui omnipotens Deus, et dimittat tibi omnia peccata tua, &c.—Confitentium ceremoniæ antiqu. Edit. Colon., ann. 1530.

* Hic autem vestram volumus excitatam pro religione constantiam adversus fœdissimam in clericalem cœlibatum conjurationem, quam unatis effervescere in dies latius, conniventibus eum perditissimis nostri ævi philosophis nonnullis etiam ex ipso ecclesiastico ordine, qui personæ obliti munerisque sui, ac blanditiis abrepti voluptatum, eo licentiæ proruperunt, ut publicas etiam atque iteratas aliquibus in locis ausi sint adhibere principibus postulationes ad disciplinam illam sanctissimam infringendam.—Vide "Quarterly Review," vol. 75, p. 163 (June, 1844), where further extracts from this encyclical letter will be found.

tempted to delineate? If any young priest, as he paces his solitary chamber, should ask himself, "Why am I and others subjected to this cruel and unnatural constraint?" what answer can he give to the inquiry? Weighed down, as too many of them are, by a yoke which presses heavily upon every hour of their existence, it can surely be no just matter of surprise that this law of compulsory celibacy should suggest to them to inquire into the *right* which the rulers of their Church had to impose it.

If a Roman Catholic priest opens the first page of the Bible, what declaration does he find inscribed on it? "It is not good for man to be alone."—Gen. ii. 18. These words were spoken by God, who had created man, and who knew what was in man. Marriage was the remedy which the Almighty himself appointed; and if human nature required this remedy before the fall, while man's feelings and affections were yet pure and unsullied, how much more necessary to his happiness is this remedy now, when sin has introduced so many elements of disturbance into his system!

It is said, indeed, by Bellarmine and others, who have attempted to defend the law of clerical celibacy, that the married state is inconsistent with the sanctity of the clerical character. "Matrimony," saith he, "prevents the priest from performing the duty of sacrificing, because the utmost purity and sanctity is required in it."* Such an argument comes with a very ill grace from a divine of the Church of Rome, which holds that marriage is a sacrament, and that, like the other sacraments, it "confers grace."† How can the same ordinance confer divine grace, and destroy personal holiness? The two things are manifestly inconsistent.

But we need not argue the question upon this ground. A glance at the history of the Old and New Testaments is sufficient to prove that the married state is perfectly consistent with the proper discharge of the holiest and most solemn duties. The 21st chapter of the Book of Leviticus, which specially enjoined the Jewish priests that "they should be holy, because the Lord their God was holy," in *the very same passage* lays down numerous rules regarding the marriage of priests. The High Priest himself, whose duty it was to offer sacrifice on the great day of atonement, in the Holy of Holies, in the immediate presence of God, was distinctly *commanded* to be married.—Lev. xxi. 13. So weak is Bellarmine's assertion that the duty of offering sacrifice could not fitly be performed by a married priest, if we should even grant that it is any part of the duty of a Christian minister to offer sacrifice—an assumption which we have in another column proved to be untenable.

When we come to the New Testament, however, the evidence for the lawfulness of clerical marriage becomes abundantly convincing. If, as many Romanist writers are fond of asserting, it be really a profanation that the Eucharist should be consecrated by married men, how comes it to pass that St. Paul speaks of this so-called profanation without the slightest trace of censure or disapproval? "A bishop," saith he, "must be blameless, the husband of one wife, having his children in subjection with all gravity."—1 Tim. iii. 2, 4. And, again, he thus writes to Titus—"For this cause I left thee in Crete, that thou shouldst ordain priests in every city, if any be blameless, the husband of one wife."—Tit. i. 5, 6. If our Lord were again to come upon earth and to act as the Church of Rome does, He would, doubtless, choose unmarried men for his Apostles. Yet, whom did He choose? If we believe the early Fathers, the great majority of the Apostles were married men. "All the Apostles," writes St. Ambrose, "with the exception of St. John and St. Paul, were married."‡

As early as the time of Clemens Alexandrinus, certain heretics began to condemn marriage; and Clemens, as Eusebius tells us, "reckons up the Apostles that were married, to refute those who disapproved of it. *Will they*," *said he*, "*condemn the Apostles themselves?* For St. Peter and St. Philip begat children."§

Scripture alludes to St. Peter's marriage on two occasions; once, where it speaks of his wife's mother (Mark i. 30); and, again, St. Paul, at a later period, refers to St. Peter's wife in one of his epistles.—1 Cor. ix. 5. Did our space permit, we should wish to quote the account given by Eusebius, of the touching interview between St. Peter and his wife, before the latter was led away to martyrdom. We think that the Church of Rome has hardly done justice to the domestic partner of him whom they claim as their own immediate founder. That Church has obviously no liking for Peter's wife. Rome has granted the honours of canonization to all the holy persons named or alluded to in the New Testament, and even to some who are not named there—for example, the father and mother of the Virgin Mary; but she has taken special care *not* to grant this honour to the wife of St. Peter although St. Paul represents her as accompanying the Apostle in his painful and perilous journeys. So successful has the Church of Rome been in saying nothing about this lady, that a great many Romanists never heard her mentioned all their lives; and, perhaps, it may be new to many of our readers, to be told that St. Peter ever had a wife at all.

To return, however, to the arguments which are alleged on behalf of clerical celibacy. We are saved the trouble of citing any further texts from Scripture, because Bellarmine is fairly obliged to surrender this part of the question. "*There is no precept for celibacy*," saith he, "*in the whole of Scripture.*"* This is an important admission; but we may go a good deal further than this. The prohibition of sacerdotal marriage is unknown to the oldest monuments of the Church. No vestige of the prohibition is to be found in the long lapse of three hundred years after the apostolic age. We will quote but a single testimony from Clemens Alexandrinus:—"God," saith he, "allows *every man, whether priest, deacon, or layman*, to be the husband of one wife."† An attempt was made, indeed, in the Council of Nice, to impose the yoke of celibacy upon the clergy, but the council rejected the proposal. Surely, the Roman Catholic clergy of Ireland may ask with reason, why they are subjected to a restriction not only opposed to Scripture (which places "forbidding to marry" among the "doctrines of devils."—1 Tim. iv. 1, 3) but unknown to the best and purest ages of the Church.

It would be tedious to go through the various steps by which this law of clerical celibacy—the child, not of religion and Christianity, but of superstition and worldly policy—was at length imposed upon the clergy of the Western Church. For many centuries, indeed, no attempt was made to enforce a prohibition which had always been found to be productive of the most serious evils, both to religion and morals. In the Canon Law, a long list is given of Popes who were either sons of Popes or also of other bishops. "Many persons," saith Gratian, "are found to have governed the Apostolic See, who were born of priests."‡ Osius, Boniface, Felix, Agapitus, Theodorus, Silverius (who was son of Pope Silverius), Deusdedit, Felix III., and various other Popes, were all in this condition. We have given conclusive evidence, moreover, in former numbers of this journal, that the ancient bishops of the *Irish* Church were married, and that the law of clerical celibacy was a late innovation, unknown to the early Church history of our own Island.

At length, in the middle of the eleventh century, A.D., 1074, Pope Gregory VII., after a fierce struggle, succeeded in imposing this heavy yoke upon the clergy of the Church of Rome. We have no space to detail the fearful amount of misery and disorder which the enforcement of this arbitrary law, by an old man, then tottering on the verge of the grave, occasioned throughout Europe. Perhaps there is no single enactment of ancient or modern times which has proved so fatally effective in destroying the happiness of countless thousands who have since come under its influence. We have no wish to judge Gregory VII. hardly. Perhaps he thought he was acting for the benefit of the Church in severing her ministers from all worldly ties, and binding them more closely to their spiritual head. There can be no question that it is to this, more than to any other law of the Church of Rome, that we are to attribute the enormous temporal power which that Church has since possessed; but we can confidently affirm, that all who feel a due regard for the interests of morality, and are familiar with the gloomy annals of ecclesiastical biography, will have reason to feel that this temporal power has been too dearly purchased.

In 1561, Charles IX., King of France, addressed a petition to Pope Pius IV., praying for the repeal of the law of clerical celibacy. The petition was referred to the Council of Trent, which was then sitting; and the historian of the council informs us of the purport of the speech then delivered by Cardinal di Carpi, which induced the Tridentine Fathers to reject the petition. "It is plain," said he, "that married priests will turn their affections and love to their wives and children, and they would thus be drawn away from their dependance on the Pope. *In a little while the authority of the Holy See would then be limited to the city of Rome.*"§ Those of our readers who are inclined to feel surprise that the Court of Rome has always adhered with such pertinacity to the law of clerical celibacy, will find, in this short extract, the key to the policy which she has so long and so steadily pursued.

Writing, as we have done, with an anxious desire to convince the judgments of our readers, we have hitherto touched but lightly on the physical sufferings of some of the unhappy victims of compulsory celibacy. Jerome, who was one of its votaries, drew a vivid picture of the misery he endured. He describes himself as acting with scorpions in a frightful solitude, parched with the rays of the sun, clothed in sackcloth, pale with fasting, quenching his thirst from the cold spring, while his blood boiled with restless emotion.* St. Francis frequently threw himself, in winter, into a pit full of icy water.† Godric, an English hermit, clothed himself in haircloth, and, during the wintry frost and snow, he immersed himself in the stream of the Wear, up to the neck, and spent the whole night singing psalms.‡ Ulric, another English saint, fasted till the skin was the only covering of his bones, and nightly descended into a vessel filled with freezing water, in which he continued during the hours of darkness.§ Benedict, the father of the Benedictine Order, was obliged, according to the Breviary, to roll his naked body in nettles and thorns, till the lacerated carcass, through pain, had lost all sense of pleasure.‖ Such are a few specimens of the austerities men have inflicted on themselves, in the vain and mistaken effort to be wiser than God. Whether we consider, then, the wide-spread immorality of the many, or the self-inflicted misery of the few, it was not without good reason that Pope Pius II. gave utterance to the well-known sentiment which his historian Platina has recorded, that "though there was good reason for taking away the right of marriage from priests, yet *there was far better reason for restoring it to them again.*"¶

And why should not the attempt to restore this right to the clergy be made? Bellarmine and all the great authorities allow that the Pope can dispense with vows of celibacy. Popes have done this before repeatedly for individuals, why not for an entire nation? The object to be gained is certainly worth an effort. Why should not Pope Pius IX. give effect to the recorded sentiments of Pius II.? Sure we are that the repeal of the law of clerical celibacy would be hailed by the clergy with more heartfelt satisfaction, and be productive of more real benefit to the Church, than the new dogmatic decree on the Immaculate Conception.

CHRISTIAN MINISTERS NOT SACRIFICING PRIESTS.

THERE is an obvious connection between the idea of the Lord's Supper, regarded as a proper sacrifice, and that of the Christian ministry considered as a sacrificing priesthood. One of these notions implies and involves the other. Which of the two was first in order of historical development is an interesting subject of inquiry, into which, however, we cannot now enter. Suffice it to say, that the weight of probability is on the side of the priority of the notion of a Christian priesthood, which then necessarily gave birth to the correlative notion of a proper sacrifice in the Eucharist. The Council of Trent, indeed, decided that both one and the other—the sacrifice and the priesthood—were instituted by our Lord himself; the appointment of the priesthood being subsequent to, and a consequence of the institution of the sacrifice. The following are the words of the decree*—"Sacrifice and priesthood are, by the ordinance of God, in such wise conjoined, as that both have existed in every law. Whereas, therefore, in the New Testament, the Catholic Church has received, from the institution of Christ, the holy visible sacrifice of the Eucharist, it must needs also be confessed, that there is in that Church, a new, visible, and external priesthood, into which the old has been translated. And the sacred Scriptures show, and the tradition of the Catholic Church has always taught, that this priesthood was instituted by the same Lord, our Saviour; and that to the Apostles, and their successors in the priesthood, was the power delivered of consecrating, offering, and administering His body and blood, as also of forgiving and retaining sins."

In proof that our Lord constituted his Apostles and their successors proper sacrificing priests, the Council here refers us to the testimony of Scripture, and to the tradition of the Catholic Church. We propose to consider the validity of both these alleged proofs, and we shall begin with the testimony of Holy Scripture.

How little support Scripture lends to the dogma of a human priesthood under the Christian dispensation, was implicitly acknowledged at the Council of Trent itself, by a learned Portuguese theologian,†† who counselled the Fathers to abandon the attempt to prove from Scripture that the Eucharist was a sacrifice, and to content themselves with resting the weight of their proof upon the testimony of tradition. He even went so far as to discuss, one by one, the passages of Scripture which were

---

* Jam vero matrimonium impedit imprimis, ut ait Hieronymus, munus sacrificandi, quia summa quædam puritas atque sanctitas in eo requiritur.—Bellarm., lib. i., de Cler. c. 19, Tom. i., p. 116. Colon. 1616.

† Si quis dixerit, per ipsa nova legis sacramenta ex opere operato non conferri gratiam, anathema sit.—Decret. Conc. Trid. Sess. vii., Can. 8.

‡ Omnes apostoli, excepto Johanne et Paulo uxores habuerunt.—S. Ambros. opera, col. 1961. Par 1549.

§ Ὁ μέντοι Κλημης διὰ τοὺς ἀθετοῦντας γάμον, τοὺς τῶν Ἀποστόλων ἐξετασθέντας ἐν συζυγίαις καταλέγει, φάσκων, ἢ καὶ τοὺς Ἀποστόλους ἀποδοκιμάσουσι; Πέτρος μὲν γαρ καὶ Φίλιππος ἐπαιδοποιήσαντο.—Euseb., Hist. iii., 30, p. 124, Cantab., 1720.

* In tota Scriptura nullum tale extat præceptum.—Bellarm. de Cler. lib. i., c. 18, Tom. i., p. 113 Colon. 1615.

† Τον της μιας γυναικος ανδρα πανυ αποδεχεται, καν πρεσβυτερος ᾖ, καν Διακονος, καν λαικος.—Clem Alex., Strom., tom. i., p. 552. Oxon., 1715.

‡ Cæteros etiam alii inveniuntur, qui de sacerdotibus nati apostolicæ sedi præmerunt.—Corp. Jur. Can. Tom. i., Decret. pars i., Dist. lvi. Paris, 1605.

§ Si l'on permettoit aux prêtres de se marier, l'interet de leurs familles, de leurs femmes et de leurs enfans les rendroit de la dependance du Pape. En peu de temps, l'autorité du Saint Siege se borneroit à la ville de Rome.—Paolo Sarpi. Hist. Conc. Trid., Tom. ii., p. 314 Amsterdam, 1731.

* Sola Philistæa inundatio bellicosa Hieron. Oper. Tom. iv., col. 180. Paris, 1704.

† Morері, Tom. iv., p. 179.

‡ Ut carnis incentiva vel-rent, cilicio carnem desuetæ equitare. Hieron. vola et sive rigentes, undas frumen ingressus. Sæpe ita tum et usque ad collum submersus, orationi et psalmis cum lacrymis profundebat.—M. Paris, p. 131. Zuicch. 1644.

§ M. Paris, ut supra, p. 67.

‖ Nudum se in urticis ac vepres immittere volvendo, dum voluptatis pungens dolore penitus experimentum.—Brev. Rom., 21 Mar. 11.

¶ Sacerdotibus magna ratione publicus usus sæpibus, magni restituendi videbant.—Platina, in Vita Pii II., p. 382. Colon. 1574.

** Sess. xxiii., cap. 1. Waterworth's Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, pp. 170-2.

†† His name, according to Sarpi (ii., 314), was George d'Attalde; according to Pallavicino, François Foscari.

alleged, and showed that there was not one from which a clear proof of the sacrificial character of this sacrament could be drawn. It is hardly to be wondered at, then, if the Protestant cannot find in the Bible satisfactory proof of the institution of a Christian priesthood; but, on the contrary, feels convinced that such an idea is utterly irreconcilable with the letter, as well as with the spirit, of Bible Christianity. In order to exhibit more fully to our Roman Catholic readers the grounds upon which this conviction is based, we beg their attention to the following considerations.

The idea of a mediator between God and man arises naturally from the intuitive consciousness which man feels that he is by nature in a state of enmity with God. This feeling prompts him to shrink from an immediate approach to the divine presence, and to seek for indirect channels of communication. Hence, every form of Paganism, whether ancient or modern, had or has its priests—that is to say, certain persons—usually a peculiar *caste*—supposed to be divinely authorized to mediate between the offended Deity and his worshippers, and to whom were delegated those acts of religious homage which the worshippers deemed themselves unworthy to perform in their own persons.

In the Jewish economy, a positive divine sanction was given to what natural feeling had spontaneously prompted, and a human priesthood was divinely appointed to mediate between God and his people. The reason of this appointment is to be found in the fact that, under the Jewish dispensation, sin—that hateful thing which separated fallen man from his Creator—though it was susceptible of pardon through prospective faith in the promised Redeemer, was not actually taken away; and, therefore, "the way into the holiest"—the immediate presence of God—was not yet made manifest to all believers. God and man were not yet brought into perfect union in the person of the incarnate Son; and, consequently, man's redemption, and his direct access to God through Christ, were as yet not matters of experience, but of faith. All, therefore, that could be vouchsafed to the believer, under the Jewish law, was a typical or symbolical representation of future blessings. Hence, the law necessarily made use of the machinery of a human priesthood and animal sacrifices; the felt insufficiency and imperfection of which were calculated to lead the reflecting Jew to infer their typical and transitory character.

Now, Christianity does not abolish the idea of priesthood. It fulfills, on the contrary, what Paganism had unconsciously predicted, and realizes the divinely-appointed types and shadows of the Old Testament dispensation. The entire of the Jewish ceremonial law was typical, prefiguring the character and offices of the future Saviour. The sacrifices of the law all pointed to the one great sacrifice to be offered up upon the cross; the Levitical priesthood was typical of the heavenly priesthood of Christ. It was to Him, as the one true and perfect Priest and Mediator between God and man, that all the types and prophecies bore reference. Through Him all believers now have direct and immediate access to God. We neither need nor have any other priest, any other advocate with the Father, but him.

Such is the plain testimony of Holy Scripture upon this momentous subject; of all Scripture generally, but particularly of that portion of it, the special purpose of which is to exhibit the relation which the priesthood of Aaron bore to that of Christ. The Epistle to the Hebrews furnishes an inspired commentary on the Levitical law; and from it we learn, not only that a human priesthood does not exist under the Gospel, but the reason why it does not—namely, because Christ himself, in his office of Priest, is a real, abiding, sole, perfect, and all-sufficient Mediator between God and man. The following are a few of the passages bearing on the subject:—"By so much is Jesus made a surety of a better testament. And the others [the Levitical High Priests], indeed, were made many priests, because by reason of death they were not suffered to continue; but this [our great High Priest], for that He continueth for ever, hath an everlasting priesthood, whereby he is able also to save for ever them that come to God by Him, always living to make intercession for us. For it was fitting that we should have such a High Priest—holy, innocent, undefiled, separated from sinners, and made higher than the heaveus: who needeth not daily (as the other priests) to offer sacrifices, first for his own sins, and then for the people's: for this he did once, in offering himself. For the law maketh men priests who have infirmity; but the word of the oath [God's oath, recorded in Ps. cix. 4. (Douay)], which was since the law, (maketh) the Son, who is perfected for evermore."—Heb. vii. 22-28. "For Jesus is not entered into the holies made with hands, the patterns of the true, but into heaven itself, that he may appear now in the presence of God for us. Nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the High Priest entereth into the holies every year with the blood of others: For then he ought to have suffered often from the beginning of the world; but now once at the end of ages, he hath appeared for the destruction of sin, by the sacrifice of himself. And as it is appointed unto men once to die, and after this the judgment: so also Christ was offered once to exhaust the sins of many; the second time he shall appear without sin, to them that expect him unto salvation."—Heb. ix. 24-28. "And every (Jewish) priest, indeed, standeth daily ministering, and often offering the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins: but this man (Christ) offering one sacrifice for sins, for ever sitteth on the right hand of God. For by one oblation he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified. . . . . Now, where there is a remission of these [sins and iniquities] there is no more an oblation for sin."—Heb. x. 11-18.

Now, we put it to any Roman Catholic of ordinary candour and plain common sense, whether the above extracts, considered simply in themselves and without reference to controversy, or the dogmas of conflicting creeds, do not convey the following truths—Firstly, That the priesthood of Christ is unique, and uncommunicable, inasmuch as it, and it alone, is perfect, perpetual, and all sufficient. Secondly, That the oblation or sacrifice which He offered was offered once for all, and can never more be repeated. Thirdly, That He now sitteth at the right hand of God, and shall remain there perpetually making intercession for his people, until his second coming at the end of the world. Fourthly, That a human earthly priesthood is, in its very nature, preliminary and typical; and, as such, was superseded and abolished, when that to which it was preparatory and of which it was typical was revealed. Indeed, so far is Scripture from countenancing the idea of a proper Christian priesthood upon earth, that, on the contrary, we find a distinct assertion in the passage above quoted (Heb. ix. 24) compared with ix. 7-14, to the effect that even Christ's priestly office was not complete till he had ascended into the heavens, and there presented, in the true Holy of Holies, his own blood before the mercy seat of the Most High. And, in the 8th chap. of the same Epistle it is stated, with equal distinctness, that Christ's priestly functions could not be fully exercised on earth, and for this reason, that the earthly priesthood of the Levitical Law was typical, not of another visible and earthly, though more exalted, priesthood, but of a priesthood, the scene of whose operations should be heaven itself. "If, then, He were on earth, He would not be a priest; seeing, that there would be others, to offer gifts according to the Law, who serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things."—Heb. viii. 4-5. We again ask, would any unbiassed man, calmly and carefully reading over the above and kindred passages of this Epistle, ever dream of inferring from them that the Levitical priests were typical of another order of earthly priests? would he think that, when the inspired Apostle positively declares, there is but "one sacrifice for sins" (x. 12); and that "by one oblation Christ hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified" (x. 14); and that "there is no more an oblation for sin" (x. 18); would any plain and candid man, we ask, think that Scripture was fairly dealt with by saying—True, there is but one *bloody* sacrifice and oblation for sin—that offered upon Calvary—and, but one priest who could offer this sacrifice—Jesus Christ; but, *un*bloody sacrifices and oblations may and must be offered upon earth, to the end of time, and there may and must be an order of sacrificing priests to offer them? And, yet, this is the interpretation which the theology of Rome is obliged to put upon the plain words of inspiration.

And when we turn to other parts of the New Testament, we find that the writers are in perfect harmony with the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews upon this vital subject. We find them all, without exception, abstaining, when speaking of the Christian ministry, from the use of terms belonging to the Jewish sacrificial system. Christian ministers are described in Scripture by a variety of terms—pastors, rulers, teachers, ministers, evangelists; but not once is the name *Hiereus—i.e.*, sacrificing priest—applied to them; not once are they spoken of as, in their ministerial capacity, offering sacrifice. It is not that the New Testament writers wholly abstain from the use of these terms—priests and sacrifices—in reference to the religion of the Gospel: far from it; they frequently mention and allude to them, but they invariably apply them either to Christ himself, or to the *whole* body of Christian believers. Jesus Christ is styled "Priest," a "High Priest," a "Sacrifice," an "Oblation." *All* Christians are declared by St. Peter to be a "holy priesthood" (1 Pet. ii., 5), a "kingly priesthood."—ib. v. 9. St. John (Rev. i. 6) says, that Jesus Christ "hath made us [*all* Christians] a kingdom, and priests to God and his Father." The same statement is repeated (Rev. v. 10) in reference to those who were redeemed out of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation. Again, *all* Christians are spoken of as offering sacrifices to God—their own bodies (Rom. xii. 1); the spiritual sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving (Heb. xiii. 15); the sacrifice of benificence to the poor (Heb. xiii. 16). The same remarkable change in the established meaning of the Old Testament terms, when applied to the Gospel dispensation, is observable in the case of the word temple. The Jewish Temple has no material counterpart in Christianity. Nowhere in the New Testament do we meet with any such use of the word. But we do frequently find believers themselves spoken of as temples consecrated to the Divine service. Thus—"Know you not that your members are the temple of the Holy Ghost, who is in you" (1 Cor. vi. 19); "Be ye also as living stones, built up a spiritual house" (1. Pet. ii. 5); "Ye are fellow-citizens with the saints, and the domestics of God, built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone; in whom all the building, being framed together, groweth up into an holy temple in the Lord, in whom you also are built together into an habitation of God in the spirit."—Eph. ii. 19-22. Now, when we remember that the New Testament writers, from whom the above quotations have been made, were men who previously lived under a system in which a material temple, sacrificing priests, and sacrifices were essential elements, and all whose *natural* associations and tendencies would, accordingly, have led them to reproduce the same ideas under the new dispensation, it certainly does seem wonderful that they not only abstained from so doing, but distinctly and studiously excluded all mention of the words *in the sense* in which they had been *hitherto* employed. Nothing, perhaps, furnishes stronger evidence of the Divine origin of our religion than this very fact, that the writers of the New Testament, in direct opposition to all their natural tendencies, purposely and pointedly exclude from it the notions of a material temple, sacrificing priests, and material sacrifices.

That all mention of a material temple is excluded from the Gospel system is a fact of so much importance, that we must dwell a moment upon it. The Temple at Jerusalem was the great centre of the religious ritual and ecclesiastical polity of the nation, and the visible bond of union among all the synagogues of Jews throughout the world. The exclusion from the New Testament of anything corresponding to the material temple, proves that Christianity was not designed to have a visible centre of unity, to which all the individual Churches of the world should be joined by a visible external union. The bond of connection between the various Churches of Christ was to be of a higher, because a spiritual kind—namely, their common relation to the one invisible temple, "the mystical body of Christ, or blessed company of all faithful people," and to its one invisible High Priest and Head, who is at the right hand of God, and ever liveth to make intercession for his people.

That the idea of a sacrificing priesthood is utterly foreign to the Gospel system appears, also, from the following consideration:—We have three epistles of St. Paul, addressed to Christian ministers (Timothy and Titus), in which the duties of their office are laid down at considerable length; but we search in vain for any instructions as to the mode of offering up the body and blood of Christ. In fact, the whole New Testament does not furnish the slightest trace of a Eucharistic ritual, or a prescribed form for the consecration of the elements. Omissions of this kind, especially in epistles which were obviously designed as a manual for the pastor, are utterly unaccountable, on the assumption of the Christian ministry's being a proper priesthood. For, a visible priesthood and sacrifice being supposed, they constitute so important and central an element in the religious system of which they are a part, that they must stand out in marked prominence beyond every other institution of worship. It was so under the Jewish law; it is so now in the Church of Rome. In that Church the Sacrifice of the Mass constitutes the central point of divine worship; and, compared with it, every other act of religious service—prayer, reading, preaching—sinks into insignificance. If St. Paul had regarded Timothy and Titus as priests, we might, therefore, reasonably expect that he would have given minute directions respecting the discharge of their sacerdotal functions of sacrifice and intercession; at least, we can hardly think it possible that he would wholly omit all allusion to them, as he does.

And so, throughout the entire New Testament, the ministerial gifts which are spoken of have no connection with sacerdotal functions. They all point to the services of the synagogue and not those of the temple. Thus we find St. Paul dwelling on the "ministry of the Word" or teaching, and on aptitude for governing, as the principal qualifications of the Christian minister: and these were precisely the duties which devolved on the elders of the synagogue. But under a sacerdotal system, the teacher necessarily occupies, as compared with the priest, a subordinate place. Thus, under the Jewish law, teaching was no part of the proper priestly functions, as we may conclude from the fact that no directions upon that head are found in the portions of the Pentateuch, which treat of the duties of the priests. Indeed, we know that the Scribes, whose peculiar office it was to expound the law, belonged indiscriminately to *all* the tribes, and not exclusively to the tribe of Levi. To offer sacrifice and to intercede, were the proper functions of the priest; to teach, to admonish, to govern, to administer discipline, were the duties of the presbyter or elder. No reader of the New Testament need be told to which of these offices that of the Christian minister, as described by St. Paul, bears the greatest resemblance.

Such are a few of the arguments against the sacerdotal character of the Christian ministry, derived from the very genius of the Gospel, as a spiritual system, and from the invariable tenor of the whole New Testament. We cannot now enter into a discussion of the particular texts on which it has been attempted to base the doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass, neither can we examine the alleged support which that doctrine receives from early Church writers. To these branches of the subject we will hereafter address ourselves. For the present we have preferred to confine ourselves to the plain statements of Holy Scripture, and to equally plain inferences from them.

PIOUS FRAUDS, NO. II.—RELICS.

THE waywardness of the human mind has so often led men astray, when left free to guide and govern itself, that we cannot deny there is much plausibility in the theory of those who would confide the management of the masses to

those few who are supposed to be more enlightened and learned than the rest. Thus it is, that implicit submission to authority has become, in the creed of many, a test of both virtue and faith; and it cannot be denied that if we could always secure leaders, either civil or ecclesiastical, who were exempt from the ordinary vices of human nature—pride, cupidity, and selfishness—mankind would do well to submit to their authority with the most unreserved and implicit obedience. Alas! however, for poor human nature; experience and history too plainly prove, that there is no post so likely to be unworthily filled as that of irresponsible power, and that if the people but consent to close their eyes, and walk blindfold, as their leaders would have them, without putting any check, or using any precaution, against the abuse of power, their ease soon becomes that of those blind leaders of the blind, both of whom fall into the ditch.

There is no vice to which irresponsible rulers, however, seem more prone than that of cupidity. The thirst after wealth appears to be inherent in all classes; and when men once attain the power of ruling others, whether by physical force, or mental influence, they seem irresistibly to use that power to the ends of personal or family aggrandizement. The feudal barons were little more than aristocratical robbers. The ecclesiastics of the middle ages, little better than a huge conspiracy against the property and privileges of the laity around them, under the guise of encouraging them in the practices of piety and devotion. To no other origin can we trace the complicated and enormous frauds which disgraced the Church for many centuries, and which, in modern times, we believe, many would gladly renounce, if it were possible to do so, without admitting the *fallibility* of the system, out of which they originated, and perilling that piety which is supposed to have been supported by them.

Among the frauds, miscalled pious, which have been practised on a large scale by Roman Catholic ecclesiastics, with the connivance of their Church, to excite the devotion of the people, or replenish their own coffers, one of the most prominent and palpable (to those who dare open their eyes and examine into such things) is, the wholesale manufacture of *spurious* relics.

We believe that few well-informed Roman Catholics of the present day, would deny that the greatest part of the relics displayed throughout Europe are mere fabrications, impudently put forward by impostors, to deceive the pious, but credulous multitude, who are thought to require such visible and tangible objects to stimulate and keep alive their devotion; forgetting that veneration for such material objects naturally leads the mind away from spiritual religion into superstition; and too often, among the unenlightened and ignorant classes, becomes the parent of actual idolatry.

Our present object, however, is not to consider whether genuine relics are just objects of public or private veneration, or whether they do tend to lead mankind into superstition or idolatry; but to expose, as briefly as we can, the *frauds* which have been practised, on a large scale, by pawning off *false* relics as genuine ones; and the unholy traffic, which has been carried on for centuries in such spurious wares, to the great profit of those authorized by the Roman Catholic Church to deal in such things.

One of the simplest and most satisfactory modes of coming at the truth in this matter, would be to visit the principal churches of Europe, and keep a brief register of the various objects of veneration preserved therein, and calculate how many *duplicates* of the same pretended objects are publicly exhibited in various places, by ecclesiastics of position and credit. But as it is not possible for every one to travel extensively enough, even in these days of rapid locomotion, to make such observations for himself, it may assist such inquiries, and induce some to reflect more seriously on the credit due to the character and faithworthiness of their ecclesiastical superiors, to give a few cases of *duplicate* relics, of which it is manifest that *one* or *other* must be false and supposititious.

Such cases are very numerous, and it has sometimes happened that these duplicate relics were found in such an awkward proximity, that it became necessary to suppress or conceal one of them, to avoid the natural surprise and ridicule which would arise from such a discovery, even in an age when few could be found bold enough to speak out and expose such deceptions.

Thus the canons of Treves and the canons of Liege each had a head of St. Lambert; and as it was somewhat hard to believe that St. Lambert had *two* real heads, and those towns were scarcely sixty miles apart from one another, the canons of Treves compounded, for a sum of money, with those of Liege, not to show publicly the head in their possession, lest it might throw discredit on the genuineness of their own *rival relic*.*

Sometimes, also, long and expensive law-suits have been carried on between rival Churches, who could not or would not condescend amicably to compound matters by buying off their opponents in the discreet fashion of the canons of Liege; but, in the great majority of instances, the *duplicates* were at such a distance from one another, that either, neither of the claimants were aware of their rivals, or both could afford to disregard the trifling chance of discovery, and still smaller chance of exposure, possibly thinking more of present gain and credit to themselves than of possible consequences to the credit and character of their Church in after ages, when the curious and inquisitive traveller might begin to run "to and fro" over the world, and with prying eyes look more closely and steadily into such matters.

One of the law-suits we have alluded to was that between the Church attached to the convent of Selle, at Poitiers, in France, and the Church dedicated to St. Hilarion, in the same place, as to which of them possessed the real body of St. Hilarion; and whether the suit is now going on, or whether it is still suspended, as it was for almost an indefinite period (during which time the faithful worshipped *two* bodies of the same saint, at Poitiers) we are really unable accurately to inform our readers.

Another instance is, the long and severe contest between Arles and Vienne, in France, as to which of them possessed the true body of St. Anthony, which, we believe, has never yet been determined, but left in all its original confusion—to say nothing of a third body shown at Novgorod, in Russia, which, of course, in the present day, we shall readily believe not to be the true one.*

Another remarkable law-suit was that between the Abbey of St. Denis, in France, and Ratisbon, in Germany, as to which of them possessed the true body of St. Denis, the great evangelist of France; and, strange to say, we believe, that this suit was decided against the Abbey of St. Denis, in favour of Ratisbon, without, however, diminishing the credit of the one at St. Denis by a single worshipper.

While on the subject of duplicates, we may as well add that two bodies of St. Honoratus are to be seen, one at Arles, the other in the Island of Lerins, near Antibes. St. Giles, also, has a body at Toulouse, and a second in a town bearing his name in Languedoc.

We have, however, to go a step or two further than cases of mere duplicates. Poets tell us a legend about a King of Spain who had *three* heads, which, is, perhaps, about as credible as that Lazarus, whose body our Lord raised from the dead, should have *three* bodies, one of which is at Marseilles, another at Autun, and the third at Avalon. Another protracted law-suit took place between the two last-named towns concerning the validity of their respective claims to the possession of the real body of this saint; but, after an immense expense, both parties may be said to have gained their suit, for neither forfeited its title to ownership.

This, however, is nothing to the far-famed St. Sebastian, whose remains were said to have the wonderful power of curing the plague. He is fortunate enough to have *four* bodies; one in the Church of St. Lawrence, at Rome; a second, at Soissons; the third, at Piligny, near Nantes; and the fourth, at his birth-place, near Narbonne. In addition to which, it may be scarcely worth noticing, that he has a head at St. Peter's, at Rome, and another in the Dominican Church, at Toulouse; that the Franciscan monks at Angers claim to have his brains; and that the Churches of St. Sternin at Toulouse, Case Dieu in Auvergne, Montbrisson, and that of the Dominicans at Angers, each possess one of his arms, to say nothing of smaller fragments of his body, which may be seen in many other churches.

We are almost ashamed to proceed with this sad catalogue of fraud and credulity; and can assure our readers that we do not continue it in any spirit of undue sarcasm, or triumph over any class of our fellow-countrymen, but with a sincere desire to open the eyes of some who have never seen these things in their true light, and lead them to reflect on the sad consequences of trusting too implicitly to their ecclesiastical superiors, and turning from the direct worship of the living and true God, to seek after the perishing remains of fellow-mortals like themselves. Well would it have been for the Christian world, if they had followed the examples of the first Christians, who left the bodies of the saints in their graves, obeying the universal sentence, that "all flesh is dust, and to dust it must return," instead of attempting their resurrection before the appointed time by disinterring them in pomp and state, in order to glorify and worship them. Had the practice of primitive Christianity been followed, Europe would never have been the dupe of hawkers who pawned off, as relics of saints, the commonest rubbish, as the well-known cases at Geneva prove, where what was long kept in a shrine, and kissed, and worshipped, as an arm of St. Anthony, turned out, when examined, to be the bone of a stag; and where what was long preserved on the high altar, and considered the undoubted brain of St. Peter, proved, when subjected to a close inspection, to be a piece of pumice-stone.

We shall not attempt to recapitulate all the relics alleged to be connected with our blessed Lord himself, most of which, if genuine, would, we should think, be more legitimate objects of horror than veneration—such as the instruments of his excruciating sufferings, the cross, the nails, the spear, and the crown of thorns. Suffice it to say, that it has been calculated, and, we believe, justly, that if all the wood exhibited, in various places, as pieces of the true cross, were collected together, they would form a whole ship's cargo; and that the *three* nails have multiplied into, at least, twenty-seven, to be found at Rome, Siena, Venice, Cologne, Treves, Paris, St. Denis, Bergues, Tenaille, Draguignan, and a dozen other places, each of which alleges that it has certain proofs to establish the genuineness of its relic. In a similar manner the spear has multiplied into four; one of which is at Rome; a second, at Paris; a third, in the Abbey of Tenaille in the Saintonge; and a fourth, at Salve, near Bourdeaux.

What must have been the amount of ecclesiastical fraud and cupidity involved in the exhibition of so many fraudulent objects of veneration in the various churches we have mentioned; but if all the things, of a similar kind, contained in two or three thousand bishoprics, twenty or thirty thousand abbeys, more than forty thousand convents, and an almost infinite number of parish churches and chapels, were collected into one mass, and could be arranged in one catalogue, we doubt whether a single intelligent worshipper would be left in connection with such a system. All men would see clearly how much they had been deceived and blinded, and what darkness and folly had overspread the earth.

Let us begin with the pretended relics of our Blessed Lord himself, about whose blood there have been, and still are, such fierce disputations. Many have erroneously maintained that He had no blood, except of a miraculous kind; and as a proof, we suppose, of the error, the natural blood is exhibited in more than a hundred places! They show at Rochelle a few drops of it, which, they say, was collected by Nicodemus in his glove. In some places they have phials full of it, as for instance at Mantua and elsewhere; in other places they have cups filled with it, as in the Church of St. Eustache at Rome; to say nothing of the blood mixed with the water as it flowed out of his side when pierced on the cross, which is preserved in the Church of St. John Lateran at Rome.

Is it possible to believe that the blood of Jesus Christ was found, after the lapse of several hundred years, distributed over half the world, without the slightest notice of such an astonishing fact having been recorded either by the Holy Scriptures or one of the Fathers of the ancient Church? And, if it be not possible, what becomes of the veracity and credit of those ecclesiastical leaders who have been deliberately and unblushingly continuing such frauds for so many centuries?

We next come to the things which are said to have touched our Lord's body. In the Church of Madonna Maggiore at Rome, they show the manger in which he was placed at his birth; in St. Paul's Church are preserved the swaddling clothes, and in another his cradle, and the shirt his mother made for him; at the Church of St. James, in the same city, is shown the altar on which he was placed at his presentation in the Temple, though it will be recollected that both the Temple and the whole of Jerusalem was destroyed about fifty years after the death of our Lord, to say nothing of Rome, which was itself several times taken, pillaged, and almost destroyed after the date at which, if at all, such things could have been deposited there.

After them come the relics belonging to the period between the childhood and death of our Lord—such as the water-pots in which he changed water into wine at the marriage feast of Cana in Galilee. St. John tells us in his Gospel (chap. ii. 6), that they were six in number; but the six have been multiplied into at least three times that number, and are now to be seen, among other places, at Pisa, Ravenna, Cluny, Antwerp, Salvaterra, St. Nicolo of the Lido, at Venice, at Moscow, Boulogne, Tongres, Cologne, Beauvais, Port Royal near Paris, and Orleans. It is almost needless to say that they are made of very dissimilar materials and of very different measures, though there can be but little doubt that the real originals were of uniform size and make, being as St. John records, "water-pots of stone, set there after the manner of the purifying of the Jews, containing two or three firkins a piece."

At Orleans they go somewhat further, for they have even the wine which was obtained by that miracle; and once a year the priests there give to those *who bring offerings* a small spoonful, saying, that they shall taste the very wine made by our Lord at the marriage feast, the quantity whereof never decreases, the cup being always refilled!

The cup in which Christ gave the sacrament to the Apostles is shown at Notre Dame de L'Isle, near Lyons; there is another in a convent of Augustines in the Albigeois; and, if we can credit the historian Sigebert, there is a third, made of emerald! devoutly preserved in the town of Genoa.

The towel with which our Lord wiped the feet of the

* The good canons of Treves do not seem to have heard of the ingenious mode of explaining such apparent discrepancies said to have been hit upon in Hungary, if we may credit an anecdote related by Miss Pardoe in her "City of the Magyar." A museum of curiosities was kept in the chateau of Prince Grassalkovich, which was usually shown to strangers by the parish priest of that place. This worthy man was once conducting a traveller over the collection and showed him, amongst other curiosities, two skulls, of large and small size, saying of the first, "This is the skull of the celebrated rebel, Ragotzi," and of the second, "and that is the skull of the same Ragotzi *when he was a boy!*" Perhaps both heads of St. Lambert were equally genuine with those of Ragotzi, if the good canons could get at the real truth of it.

* The legend concerning St. Anthony's arrival at Novgorod is curious. It is said that this saint, while at Rome, was commanded by an angel, in a dream, to go and convert the inhabitants of Novgorod. In obedience to the angelic injunction, St. Anthony embarked on a *millstone*, and floated on this extraordinary craft down the Tiber, passed over the Mediterranean, Atlantic, and Baltic seas, and arrived safely at the river Wolchow, upon which Novgorod is situated, having accomplished the whole voyage in four days—a marvellous speed, putting to shame the wonders of modern steam navigation. It adds but little to the wonder that the date assigned to the voyage is a few centuries after St. Anthony's death!!!

Apostles is shown at Rome, at the Lateran; a second is at Aix-la-Chapelle, and a third at St. Corneille de Compiègne. Two at least of these must be a gross imposture; and whether the third be a bit more faithworthy may well require proof somewhat more satisfactory than those usually produced in defence of such exhibitions.

Here we must pause for the present, and merely ask our readers, in sober earnestness, whether, if these things be so, such a mass of imposture can be accounted for, consistently with the belief that the Church which sanctions and permits such things is the best, and most faithworthy, and safe guide into all truth?

BREVIARIUM ROMANUM.

No Christian Church can employ a more effectnal instrument to fashion and mould the minds of her members, than the form of prayer and worship which she sanctions for daily use. The Church of Rome has not neglected this powerful means of fashioning the modes of thinking of her people; and the Brevlary, or clerical Prayer Book of the Roman Catholic Church is an unerring test of the standard to which she wishes to reduce the minds and hearts of her clergy, from the highest dignitary to the most obscure priest.

For the sake of those who are not familiar with the Service Books of the Church of Rome, we may premise that by the "Breviary" is meant the volume or volumes containing an abridgment of the divine offices appointed for the several canonical hours of each day during the course of the year. The first conception of thus abbreviating the long services nsual in the earlier ages of the Church, has been traced to Pope Gregory VII., who flourished in the second half of the 11th century. This Pope, we are told,* being overwhelmed by the multiplicity of important affairs in which he was engaged, found it necessary to curtail the long services or courses which had hitherto been customary; and, accordingly, drew up such a "Breviary" or abridgment, for his own chapel at Rome. This example was followed by the Franciscan and Dominican Orders, and by the bishops of various dioceses; so that, within no long interval of time, almost every diocese and monastery had its own Breviary, compiled and arranged according to the particular inclinations and judgments of those who drew them up. The eminent Roman Catholic ritualist, Zaccaria, enumerates more than one hundred and fifty different Breviaries which were in use in the West prior to the Reformation.†

The particular Breviary, however, which we propose to consider is not that of any obscure diocese or monastery, but that sanctioned and approved, at the present day, at Rome itself. And the value which the Church of Rome sets upon the Breviary may be known from the strictness with which she demands the perusal of it. Whoever enjoys any ecclesiastical revenue; all persons, of both sexes, who have professed in any of the regular orders; all subdeacons and priests, are bound to repeat, either in public or private, the whole service of the day, out of the Breviary. The omission, indeed, of any one of the eight portions of which that service consists, is declared to be a mortal sin—*i.e.*, a sin that, unrepented of, would be sufficient to exclude from salvation. We have reason, also, to believe, that in some places, at least, the person guilty of such an omission loses all legal right to whatever portion of his clerical emoluments is due for the day or days in which he neglected that duty; and cannot be absolved till he has given the forfeited sums to the poor, or redeemed them by a donation to some other religions object. With such sentences and penalties, it may well be believed, that no part of the priestly duty is performed with more scrupulous exactness; and, as we are assured, the task can scarcely be performed, even with the most rapid enunciation, in less than about one hour and a half daily, it follows that if a Roman Catholic clergyman is unable, from press of other duties, as is not unfrequently the case, to devote more than that portion of his time daily to reading, his Church, virtually, places him under a practical necessity of deriving nearly his whole knowledge from the Breviary.

Valuable, indeed, should be the contents of snch a privileged volnme, if we trust the authority which thus paramountly enforces its perusal; and in it we may fairly look for the true extent of the pious belief to which she would train that portion of her flock, and the true stamp of those virtues which she boasts of as her models of Christian perfection.

We have now before us the "BREVIARIUM ROMANUM," published in Dublin, by Richard Coyne, printer and bookseller to the Royal College of Maynooth, in 1845, with the license and approbation, under his hand and seal, of the late Most Rev. Dr. Murray, dated 6th July, 1845; and which purports, in its title-page, to be published by the order of Pope Pius V., according to a decree of the Sacred Council of Trent, and afterwards sanctioned by the authority of Popes Clement VIII. and Urban VIII. We intend, in our next number, to give a little more of the history of this remarkable book. Our present business is rather with the nature of its contents; and, as it would be impossible to give an adequate idea of them in one number, we propose to continue the subject until our readers are fully acquainted with them; and shall at present only present them with a few brief extracts, without much regard to classification or even order, giving, however, as usual, the exact references to volume and page, as we have been accustomed to do in our columns.

It may facilitate our readers in finding the passages, to state that the work is in four vols. or parts, corresponding to the four seasons of the year—pars Verna, pars Æstiva, pars Autumnalis, pars Hiemalis—which we shall specify with the pages from which our extracts are taken.

On 26th May, the Feast of ST. PHILIP NERI, Confessor (pars Verna, p. 554-5), the 4th, 5th, and 6th lessons contain the history of that saint; and all faithful priests are encouraged to cultivate the love of God, by believing what is therein narrated; first praying solemnly that God would mercifully grant that they might *profit by the example* of his virtues (we give the prayer itself in the note).*

After narrating that St. Philip was born at Florence, and had betaken himself to Rome, where he instituted the congregation of the Oratory, the 5th lesson proceeds thus:—

"Wounded by the love of God he continually languished; and with such ardent love did his heart beat, that, when it could no longer be contained within its boundaries, the Lord miraculously enlarged his bosom, by breaking and raising up two of his ribs! Moreover, when performing the sacred offices, or fervently praying, he was sometimes seen lifted up into the air, and shining on all sides with a wonderful light!"†

That he was rescued from a pitfall by an angel (as the narrative goes on to state), and was favoured frequently with apparitions of heavenly spirits, and even of the Blessed Virgin herself, or that he saw several souls surrounded by splendour ascending into heaven, or that, having restored many sick and dying people to health, he actually recalled one dead man to life, will probably seem but commonplace and everyday occurences in comparison with the previous story, about the love of God having broken his ribs; or (what is related with equal gravity) that, in consequence of having preserved the most spotless purity, he arrived at so refined a sense of smell, that he could even distinguish those who preserved their chastity by their odour! and, of course, detect others "*ex fœtore*." We give the original Latin verbatim in the note.‡

On 19th October, the Feast of PETER of ALCANTARA (Pars Autumnalis, p. 402-3), the lessons are equally edifying:—

"The love of God and his neighbour diffused in his heart, after some time excited in it such a burning flame, that he was obliged to break out from the confinement of his cell into the open fields, to moderate, by the coldness of the air, the burning heat engendered in it!§ He was frequently seen suspended in the air, and shining with a wonderful effulgence! He passed over rapid rivers without wetting his feet! A staff fixed by him in the ground immediately grew up into a flourishing fig tree! While he was making a journey by night, in a heavy fall of snow, he took refuge in a ruined house without a roof, but for him the snow remained suspended in the air, and acted as a roof, that he might not be smothered by it!"‖

The manner of his passing the rivers is not particularly stated, but we may assume it was in the orthodox fashion of other saints, of whom we read in the same volumes. For instance, we find that (2nd April, Pars. Verna, p. 466) *St. Francis de Paulo* crossed the Strait of Sicily *on his own cloak*, taking another monk as a passenger!¶ So also *St. Raymond de Pennafort* (23rd January, Pars. Hiemalis, p. 476), who, being about to return from the island of Majorca to Barcelona, spread his cloak upon the sea, and performed the voyage of a hundred and sixty miles in six hours, finishing by entering his monastery through the closed doors!** So, also, *St. Hyacinth, the Pole*, ferried over, in like manner, on his cloak, a number of his companions across the flooded Vistula.—(16th August, Pars. Æstiva, p. 572).††

St. ANDREW AVELLINI (10th November, Pars. Autumnalls, p. 450) seems to have been an equally useful travelling companion in his own way; for, returning home one tempestuous night, after confessing a sick man, when the rain and wind had extinguished their torch, not only neither he nor his companions were the least wet, but the whole company had the advantage of seeing their way in a pitch dark night by the radiance of the saint's person.*

ST. STANISLAUS, of Cracow, seems also to have possessed this *light-emitting* quality. After performing the remarkable miracle referred to in our October number, p. 118, of raising up a man who had been dead *three years*, as a witness, to prove that he had purchased certain lands, poor St. Stanislaus was barbarously murdered by the king, who was his enemy, and seems to have been too hardened to profit by this great miracle; and his body was quartered, and scattered about the fields. The wild beasts would have made a repast of the holy relics, but for the watchfulness of some eagles, who never allowed any of them to touch them, until the Canons of Cracow, led by the light thrown out by the scattered limbs, collected them the ensuing night! The most wondrous part of the tale remains, however, to be told, for the different parts of the body, when properly adjusted together, suddenly united as closely as kindred drops, and not a mark was left of the effects of the knife!† What a pity it was that poor Stanislaus derived no benefit from all those marvellous interpositions; for though his body was so wonderfully put together again, he seems to have been past resuscitation himself, though, to make up for it, *after his death he did many miracles*, no doubt equally faithworthy as those so particularly narrated,—(7th May, Pars. Æstiva, p. 321-2)

This recalls to our mind the miraculous joining together of the links of the chain of St. Peter, recorded in the Breviary lessons for the feast of *St. Peter ad Vincula*.—(1st August, Pars. Æstiva, p. 503.)

Eudocia, the wife of Theodosius the younger, being on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, received as a present the chain with which St. Peter was said to have been bound in prison, when he was liberated by the angel. This chain, *set in jewels*, was forwarded by the pious empress to her daughter, then at Rome. The young princess, rejoiced with the gift, showed the chain to the Pope, who repaid the compliment by exhibiting another chain, which the holy Apostle had borne under Nero; but no sooner had the Pope brought the two chains into contact, than lo! it came to pass, that the links at the end of the two chains miraculously became joined together, and had all the appearance of a single chain wrought by the same artificer!‡

The Pope, no doubt, at once claimed the whole, which is still to be seen as one of the standing miracles at Rome, and is occasionally held out as one of the inducements to the faithful to visit the holy city.

A somewhat similar miraculous conversion of property is recorded of another pontiff, Pope St. John.—(27 May, pars. Verna, p. 558.)

His Holiness being on a journey, near Corinth, and in want of a quiet and comfortable horse, borrowed one which the wife of a certain nobleman used to ride. The animal carried the Pope with the greatest docility, and when the journey was over, was honorably returned to its master. So wicked had the horse become, however, that he always afterwards threw his mistress, "as if," says the Breviary, "*feeling indignant* at having to carry a woman, since the Vicar of Christ was on his back!" It is needless to add, that the horse was subsequently presented to his Holiness as unfit to be ridden by a less dignified personage.§

Such are a few of the edifying and instructive "lessons" which every Roman Catholic priest is bound to read daily under pain of mortal sin, and taught to pray that he may emulate. Might we not venture to ask, if our readers can believe, that any intelligent or educated priest in the nineteenth century, can sincerely give credit to such old wives' fables? and if they do not believe them, *how long* will they submit to the humiliating indignity of reciting with their lips what they disbelieve in their hearts?

Will it be, until their intelligent and educated flocks gain courage enough (as the day is coming when they will) to ask them plainly whether they believe such things to be truths or falsehoods?

---

* Dictionnaire de Liturgie, par L'Abbe Migne, col. 163.
† Zaccaria Biblioth. Ritual. I., pp. 121-134.

* "Deus, qui beatum Philippum confessorem tuum Sanctorum tuorum gloria sublimasti: concede propitius, ut cujus solemnitate lætamur, ejus virtutum proficiamus exemplo—Per Dominum."

† "Charitate Dei vulneratus languebat jugiter: tantoque cor ejus æstuabat ardore, ut, cum intra fines suos contineri non posset, illius sinum, confractis atque elatis duabus costulis, mirabiliter Dominus ampliaverit. Sacrum vero facicus, aut ferventius orans, in aera quandoque sublatus, mira undique luce fulgere visus fuit."

‡ "Virginitatem perpetuo illibatam servavit: idque assecutus est, ut ea, qui puritatem colerent ex odore; qui verò secus, ex fœture dignosceret."

§ "Charitas Dei et proximi in ejus corde diffusa tantum quandoque excitabat incendium, ut e cellæ augustiis in apertum campum prosiliret, aerisque refrigerio conceptum ardorem temperare cogeretur."

‖ "In aera frequenter sublatus, miro fulgore corruscare visus est. Rapidos fluvios sicco pede trajecit. Baculus, ab ipso terræ defixus mox in viridem ficulneam excrevit. Cum noctu iter ageret, densa nive cadente, dirutam domum sine tecto ingressus est, cique nix in aere pendula pro tecto fuit, ne illius copia suffocaretur."

¶ "A nautis rejectus, Siciliæ fretum alrato super fluctibus pallio cum socio transmisit."

** "Multa patravit miracula, inter quæ illud clarissimum, quod ex insula Baleari Majori Barcinonem reversurus, strato super aquas pallio, centum sexaginta milliaria sex horis confecerit, et suum cœnobium jamtis clausis fuerit ingressus."

†† "Inter quæ (miracula) illud insigne, quod Vandalum fluvium propo Visegradum aquis redundantem, nullo navigio usus trajecit, Sociis quoque expanso super undas pallio traductis."

* "Cum enim intempesta nocte ab ædita ægri confessione domum rediret, ac pluviæ venturumque vis prælucentem facem extinxisset, non solum ipse cum sociis inter effusissimos imbres nihil madefactus est; verum etiam inusitato splendore, e suo corpore mirabiliter emicante, sociis inter densissimas tenebras iter monstravit."

† "Postremo impius rex sacerdotem Dei, hostiam immaculatam ad altare offerentem, sua manu obtruncat: corpus membratim concisum, et per agros projectum, aquilæ a feris mirabiliter defendunt. Mox Canonici Cracovienses aparsa membra nocturni de cœlo splendoris indicio colligunt, et suis locis apte disponunt; quæ subito ita inter se copulata sunt, ut nulla vulnerum vestigia extarent. Multis præterea miraculis servi sui sanctitatem Deus declaravit post ejus mortem."

‡ "Cum igitur Pontifex Romanam catenam cum ea, quæ Hierosolymis allata fuerat, contulisset; factum est, ut illæ inter se sic connecterentur, ut non duæ, sed una catena ab eodem artifice confecta esse videretur. Quo miraculo," &c.

§ "Nam cum ei nobilis vir ad Corinthum equum, quo ejus uxor mansueto utebatur, itineris causa commodasset, factum est, ut domino postea remissus equus ita ferox evaderet, ut fremitu, et totius corporis agitatione, semper deinceps dominam expulerit; tanquam indignaretur uniquam recipere, ex quo sedisset in eo Jesu Christi Vicarius. Quamobem illi equum Pontifici donaverunt."

THE LIFE OF A PRIEST.

(Continued from page 132)

Before I proceed further, I must say a word upon a a subject which no words can ever give an adequate idea of to those who had not the misfortune to be themselves witnesses of it—I mean the famine caused by the mysterious potato blight of 1847. At least one-half of my parishioners fell victims to it, either in their own cabins or in those abbatoirs or slaughter-houses of human beings, the temporary workhouses, from which they were carted out into the churchyards, to make room for others who were to succeed them. At no period of Ireland's history had the ministers of religion more arduous and melancholy duties to discharge, with less means to alleviate the distress, of which they were the hourly witnesses. The priests were living next door to pauperism, and the clergy of the Established Church, most of whom had families to support, were impoverished by a double poor-rate unjustly charged upon their rent-charge, and scarcely better able to relieve them. I shall not stop to criticise the abortive though, doubtless, well-meant efforts of the government, to give useless employment through the Board of Works, in making skeleton roads and destroying good ones, nor to lament that the large views of that eminent man, Lord George Bentinck, to construct railroads at the public expense, were not adopted instead. In spite of every effort, practical or speculative, many poor families died off day after day, and after full one-half of them had passed into an untimely grave, I felt it my duty to advise the others to depart to the New World, whilst a remnant of property remained in their hands; and according to the accounts since received, the greater part of them now form an independent and respectable colony on the banks of the Missouri. I at the same time resigned my living into the hands of the bishop, and betook myself to reading as the only resource now left to me. The results to which this reading led me I shall now endeavour briefly to communicate, not indeed in the order in which my own mind arrived at them, which it would be difficult for me now to retrace or analyse, nor in that fullness in which they were by degrees brought out in my mind, into a clearer light, which would occupy much greater space than would be reasonable to expect at your hands, but I hope with sufficient distinctness to lead, and, perhaps, assist others to examine and reflect for themselves whether they are following truth or error in adhering to the system taught by the Church of Rome.

It was a gloomy and tempestuous evening that I took down from the bookcase a volume of Johnson's works; and, in the course of the night, met the following observation—"that, at fifty, a person should be in earnest about his religion." As I was myself approaching this age, the observation struck me with the greater force, and I awoke at once to a dreadful perception of my own danger in having thought so little of my personal state; and I determined upon a decided and impartial examination of my state of mind and, among other things, of the truth of the doctrines of the Church to which I belonged. I at once placed the catechism and the Maynooth class-book on one hand, and the Bible on the other—the great charter of man's salvation—and, having invoked the Spirit of Truth to enlighten my understanding and to dispel prejudice, I set to work according to the advice of St. Paul, 2nd of the Corinthians, chapter the 13th, and 5th verse—"Examine yourselves, whether you be in the faith. Prove your own selves." As I was resolved to examine every point *seriatim* and impartially, I began at the beginning, by inquiring if, as the catechism teaches, "the Church of Rome was the first Church, the matron and mistress of all other Churches," and whether the Church of Rome was founded by St. Peter.

On consulting the New Testament, which I exchanged in Paris for that veritable book called the Breviary, I found that the Churches of Corinth, of Thessalonica, of Ephesus, of Antioch, of Phillipi, together with the Churches of Galatia, were in existence, and had bishops and deacons, before there was a Church in Rome; and, consequently, the Church of Rome was *not* the first Church, the matron and the mistress of all other Churches.

Besides, is it not more in accordance with the nature of things that the first Churches should radiate round the theatre of the crucifixion than that an Apostle should start "*tout a coup*" to establish a Church in the most heathen city in Europe. Moreover, the Apostles took advantage of the miracles performed by Christ, before and after his death, to establish the first Churches in the adjacent provinces whilst the recollection of these miracles was still fresh in their memories.

St. Peter, so far from having founded the Church of Rome, probably never saw the Eternal City. St. Paul in his epistle to the Colossians, which was written from Rome (chap. iv.), mentions the names of his fellow-labourers in the vineyard of the Lord—Tychicus, Onesimus, Aristarchus, and Justus—and if St. Peter was then at Rome, surely he would not have omitted making mention of his name. St. Paul also says that no person stood by him at his first defence, which could not be if St. Peter was in Rome.

We read in the first chapter of St. Paul to the Galatians, eighteenth verse, that St. Paul abode in Jerusalem with Peter for fifteen days, and that he again met him, in the same place, after an interval of fourteen years. St. Paul salutes many persons in Rome, but does not mention St. Peter. There is, besides, one other position which must appear evident to the most sceptic, and superior to all argumentative opposition to establish that St. Peter was not at Rome. It is that the Emperor Claudius banished all Jews from Rome, and, consequently, St. Peter, if there, must have been amongst the number; but it is evident he was not, as St. Peter would sooner make mention of his name than of Aquila, whom he came to see from Athens to Corinth.

Moreover, St. Peter was an Apostle, and could not remain stationary in any one place, as Christ said to his Apostles (St. Mark xvi. 15)—"And he said unto them, Go ye into the whole world, and preach the Gospel to every creature."

But, for the sake of argument, let me suppose that St. St. Peter established the Church of Rome. What security, in point of doctrine, would that confer on the Church of Rome? I say none; as it is admitted by Protestants, as well as by Romanists, that the Church of Antioch was founded by St. Peter, yet that the Church of Antioch fell, not merely in matters of discipline, but into errors of the most vital importance in point of doctrine. From what has been said, and proved by the infallible authority of the Word of God, I found that the Church of Rome was not the first Church, the matron and mistress of all other Churches; and although the proofs that the Scripture affords to establish that St. Peter was not the founder of the Roman Church are negative, still these proofs are equivalent to positive proofs, when the contrary is not supported by positive and direct evidence.

The next question I had to inquire into was, what was the creed the first Churches professed? I found the Apostolic creed to be the first and only creed of the primitive Catholic Church for 300 years after the death of our Redeemer. In the year 325, I found that the Council of Nice augmented the Apostle's creed, and made it more explanatory, and, of course, more easy of comprehension, by its interpretation. The acts of this council were confirmed by the Council of Constantinople, held in the year 351. The Council of Ephesus, held in 431, approved and confirmed the decrees of Nice and Constantinople; and, to crown all, I find that the Council of Chalcedon had sanctioned the proceedings of Nice, Constantinople, and Ephesus, in the year 451. *L'ecriture et les symboles sont les temoignages des premiers chretiens et de l'Eglise qu'ils forment.* The nearer we approach the times of the Apostles and their successors, the purer must the doctrine be; just as the nearer we come to the head of a fountain the more limpid the water. Notwithstanding the anathema pronounced by the Council of Ephesus against those who shall dare to alter, add, or take from this creed, yet we find Pope Pius IV. adding twelve new articles to the ancient creed, in the year 1564, and six commandments, which are explained more frequently by the priests, and considered of even more importance, than the commandments of God.

Every question which involves the momentous interest of man's salvation should be investigated with all the energy of the heart and soul; but, at the same time, with that calm and deliberate attention which a subject of such importance eminently deserves. The Mass is a grave subject, and of paramount and everlasting practical Importance to the salvation of man, according to the doctrine of the Church of Rome, and deserves, therefore, to be inquired into with grave consideration. Let us, then, follow the advice of the Prophet Isaiah, c. 1, v. 18—"Come now and let us reason together." The doctrine of the Church of Rome is—that in the Mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead, and that the sacrifice of the Mass is the same as the sacrifice of the Last Supper; and that in the Eucharist there are truly, really, and substantially the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, which conversion is called Transubstantiation—Trent, Session 13.

There are here three important questions to be examined. The first is, Is the Mass a propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead? The second is, Was the Lord's Supper a sacrifice? And the third is, Are the bread and wine converted, by the sacerdotal action, into the body and blood of Christ? Let us examine each of these questions *seriatim*, and with that cool and deliberate attention which they deserve, as they are of cardinal importance to man's salvation, according to the doctrine of Trent. As these questions are bare allegations of the Council of Trent, unsupported by a single scintilla of proof, the burthen of proving them rests on the Church which asserts them, and not on its opponents to disprove them. But I will here state some reasons, taken from Scripture, which afford proof that the Mass is not a propitiatory sacrifice. We read in Leviticus, c. xvii., v. 11, "For it is blood that makes atonement for the soul." This doctrine of the Old Scripture is confirmed by that of St. Paul (Hebrews, ix. 22), "And without shedding of blood there is no remission of sin." We find also, in the same epistle, c. vii., v. 27, "Who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifices, for this he did *once*." Again, we read in the same epistle, c. 10, v. 12, "But this man, after he offered *one* sacrifice for sin, for ever sat down on the right hand of God." Therefore, as our Saviour offered but *one* sacrifice, that was the sacrifice of Calvary, it follows that there is no propitiatory sacrifice in the Mass, nor the smallest necessity for it, as the atonement of the cross was all-sufficient, and the most august that was ever offered to an offended deity. Besides, the Apostle speaks in this entire chapter in the singular number, which he would not have done if the future Mass was to be propitiatory, and ancillary to the sacrifice of the cross.

The next question is, Was there a sacrifice at the Last Supper? I answer, most certainly not. The above proofs are equally applicable to the Lord's Supper, and prove that it was not a sacrifice. Moreover, there was no sacrificial act performed, there was no altar, no victim offered, no blood spilled. Christ was simply at table, surrounded by his disciples, to whom he gave bread and wine, as a lasting memorial of his love for them, and, therefore, there was no propitiatory sacrifice at the Last Supper.

The third question to be examined is, Are the elements of bread and wine changed by the sacerdotal agency into the body and blood of Christ? To which I answer, hear the proofs from Holy Writ, and judge for yourself. We read in the xxii. chap., 19th and 20th verses of St. Luke—"And he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying—This is my body which is given for you. This do in remembrance of me. Likewise, also, the cup, after supper, saying—This cup is the New Testament in my blood which is shed for you." The Church of Rome, on the authority of the bishops of Trent, maintains that the word "*is*," in the 19th verse, should be taken literally, and that Christ actually converted the bread and wine into his own body and blood, and gave them to his Apostles.

In innumerable passages of the Old and New Scripture, the monosyllable "*is*" is taken to mean "represents." In the 17th chap. and 10th verse of Genesis, where God was speaking of the circumcision, says—"This *is* my covenant." It must appear evident to every person that the circumcision was not transubstantiated into the covenant, but that it must be taken in a figurative sense, and only as a memorial of the covenant. In the 12th chap. of Exodus we read, when God was speaking of the lamb that was sacrificed in memory of the passing over the houses of the Israelites and smiting the first-born amongst the Egyptians—"It is the Lord's passover." Here also the word "*is*" must be taken as represent, as the lamb could not be transubstantiated into the passover. I could multiply proofs from the Old Scripture where that monosyllable "*is*" must be taken to mean represent. But as proofs from the New Scripture seem to have more weight with most people, let us come to it, and see if it is so in that also. In the 13th chap. of St. Matthew, v. 37, our Saviour says—"He that soweth the good seed *is* the Son of Man." In verse 38 of the same chapter, he says—"The field *is* the world." And in the 39th verse, same chapter—"The harvest *is* the end of the world." And St. Paul, speaking of the Church, says—"It *is* the body of Christ." Now, as the monosyllable, *is*, must be taken figuratively to have any meaning in all those passages, it follows, as analogous, that "*is*" must be taken in a figurative sense, and to mean represent, in the 22nd chap. 19th verse of St. Luke, where we read—"This is my body." Besides, was it not thus the institution of the Lord's Supper was taken in the early ages, when the religion of Christ was inculcated in its sublime simplicity, and before the doctrine of Transubstantiation was propounded by Paschasius-Radbert—an abbot of the ninth century.

There is another argument taken from the nature of things which places this question beyond the reach of argument and scepticism, and is, I believe, *de la premiere main*, to which I take leave to call the reader's attention. The properties of all created things are either contingent or essential; the contingent properties—such as colour, shape, or particular configuration—cannot subsist by themselves without a subject of adhesion; but the essential and vital properties are necessarily constituent, and without which no subject can subsist; whereas the contingent properties do not of necessity appertain to any object. Thus, a circle must be equidistant from its centre, as rotundity is the essential property of a circle; but that circle may be large or small, as these are accidental properties. A man cannot exist without lungs, blood-vessels, muscle, and tendons; but he can be black or white, short or tall, as these are only contingent properties. The essential properties of things are truths existing from eternity, and are founded in the nature of things, and are immutable and intransitive. That it is in the power of man to change the accidental properties of things cannot be denied; but no known agency can either commute or annihilate the essential and constituent attributes of things. There was no antecedent time, nor will there be a future time, when it *was* or *will* be true that things could exist without their essential and distinctive properties. Buffon, in his theory of the earth, when speaking upon this subject, says (page 364, vol. ii.)—"Aucun agent connu ne sera jamais capable de faire sortir les propriétés du circle de combinaisons propres a leur nature." I am not here to be understood as limiting the power of him who does all things well, as God could annihilate all things with their essential and accidental properties; but, as soon as anything is created, it must of necessity possess its vital and essential attributes, because it is founded in the nature of things.

Bread and wine must have their essential and elemen-

tary properties in common with all created things, and must retain their immutable and intransitive character, independent of any external agency. Besides this metaphysical argument, we find the same substantial identity after the sacerdotal action as before. We have a metaphysical certainty arising from the nature of things, that no subject can exist without its peculiar and distinctive properties. The evidence of our senses establishes the same identity after the ministerial agency; and, to crown all, the omniscience of God confirms both, as He knew that the nature of created things could not be altered; and, consequently, he must have spoken figuratively. What weight can the Council of Trent have when placed in juxta-position with the above proofs? Yet, in her 13th session, she pronounces an entire conversion of the elementary properties of bread and wine.

Perhaps it will be objected to me that He who created the heavens and the earth—the fixed stars with their concomitant planets, all things visible and invisible, who changed the rod of Moses into a serpent, who changed Lot's wife into a pillar of salt, who changed the river of Egypt into blood, and the water into wine at the marriage feast of Cana—could change the elementary properties of bread and wine into his own body and blood, by a miraculous interposition. To this I answer, that a miracle is a suspension of the natural law to promote a moral advantage. All these miraculous changes were intuitively, and by immediate perception, *apparent to the senses of every person present*, and reason bowed in affirmation to their decision. But, in the case of Transubstantiation, there must be not only a suspension of the natural law but an entire subversion of the fundamental principles of physics—an entire prostration of the senses, with marks of no confidence stamped upon their creation. But in order to have a parallel case with Transubstantiation, the wine, at the wedding feast, should still have retained, after its conversion, the colour and taste of water, together with all its pure and elementary properties, instead of satisfying, as it did, the combined energies of the senses of all who witnessed it, that a real change had taken place, from actual water into actual wine, with all the qualities of taste, colour, and smell naturally incident to it.

From these proofs, taken from the sacred Scripture, it must appear evident that there was but *one* propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of mankind, and that was the sacrifice of Calvary. That there was no sacrifice at the last supper appears from the same proofs, and that no change has, or could be effected by the sacerdotal action, so as to transubstantiate a particle of dough into the God of the universe.

How melancholy, then, is the reflection, that so many, who profess the religion of Rome, run on from the cradle to the tomb without inquiring if they are following the religion of Christ and him crucified, or without ever opening the Bible—the great charter of man's salvation, which, in every page, points out the way to eternal life. How true to life was that remark of Addison, which says—"If you tell the same story to a man for several years consecutively he will believe it to be true in the end." This observation is confirmed by the conduct of the followers of Rome, who hear their priests say, every week, that the mass is a continuation of the sacrifice of the cross, and that the bread and wine are changed into the body and blood of Christ, without ever inquiring into the truth of this doctrine, which is entirely refuted by the teaching of the New Scripture.

If we compare the worship of Roman Catholics of the present day, though to them the light of revelation has been made known, even with the simple, yet sublime, homage of the uneducated Indians of Peru, what a melancholy contrast! They worshipped the sun—the parent of life and vegetation, of time and seasons, of all things visible, yet unapproachable. What more solid foundation to build *natural* religion upon? A perpetual fire burned on the altar of the Indians. What a beautiful representation of their divinity! This sun worship seems to have been widely spread, and was known to the Phœnicians, Chaldeans, Babylonians, and even to the Irish people in their natural state. A fractional remnant of this untaught religion may even still be seen in this island, when fires are lit when the sun is at its highest altitude at the summer solstice. Possibly this adoration of the Indian was only secondary, but at any rate it was the sublime poetry—the dignified and refined religion—of nature's uneducated children. Place this pure, sublime, and ætherial homage of uneducated Pagans in contrast with that of modern Roman Catholics, and how great is the difference? The former adored the parent of life, the latter a particle of dough. As rational and accountable beings, I shudder for the consequences. Idolatry though unconscious is still idolatry. If Transubstantiation be an error, as I have demonstrated it to be, what must be the guilt of those in the sight of God, who, *in spite of both their reason and their senses*, persist in practising a mimic and idolatrous adoration.

(To be Continued.)

TALK OF THE ROAD.—No. XXVI.

"Them's hard times, Jem," said Pat.

"That's true anyway, Pat," said Jem; "it's not easy keeping the meal to the children these times. But sure we have a right to be thankful it's no worse."

"Well, Jem," said Pat, "I heard Mr. Nulty talking of that, and he allowed that if the crops was short this year, it's the famine we would have back again; so we have a right to be thankful sure enough."

"And it's the poor thing, too, that the Rooshians with their fighting, should stint the childer of the meal," said Jem; "I wonder will it soon be over."

"Well, I heard Mr. Nulty allow it wouldn't," said Pat; "and he allowed there would be mighty heavy taxes on the farmers and the gentlemen to pay for it; so you see all gets their pinch by it as well as we."

"Well, it's not bad times yet with the farmers," said Jem; "they're pretty snug for a while anyway. But I suppose they will get their turn of the pinch too."

"Well, most all comes in for it by turns," said Pat; "but there's some getting the pinch sore enough these years back, that there isn't much said of."

"And who would that be?" said Jem.

"Why it's the priests, Jem," said Pat; "sure it's they got the pinch in earnest in the famine times, and hasn't come round yet like the farmers."

"Well," said Jem, "I don't think times is hard on Father John, and sure there's Father Peter, the curate, and Father Brady of the next parish, and enough more of them, that keeps their hunters as fine as ever."

"Well, there's some of them not much the worse," said Pat; "but even Father John hasn't near what he had; and there's a deal of the priests that got it sore in the famine times, and that isn't much better yet; you see, Jem, where the farms is good, and the farmers strong, the priest gets his share now as well as ever; but where the priests were depending to the little man, it went to the bad with them entirely. Sure the poor people can't pay them now the way they used; and there isn't the marrying and the christening there used to be; and there's a deal of places where the poor people itself isn't in it; and what can the priest do there? and where there's large Protestant grazing farms, and the poor people's houses down, sure the priest may go starve."

"Well, it's the poor thing, sure enough," said Jem, "for them that was bred to be clargy, and had such a rule in the country, to come to that. Sure they can't do without it no more nor ourselves, and they're not used to it; and it doesn't come natural to clargy, the way it does to the like of us. Sure I would be sorry for Father John himself, if he was at a dis-short; but it makes again them greatly when some of them keeps their hunters, and goes a skevying across the country after the hounds; 'deed I thought many a time it would be no worse for them if they would take after the Prosestant clergy in that. But what becomes of them at all where they gets nothing?"

"Well, I heard a deal about that, when I was down at the fairs in Connaught," said Pat. "I was talking to the men that driv up the cattle from the out-of-the-way places, and they allowed there wasn't half the priests in it there used to be; and them that was there had little enough to live on; and maybe it's getting less was the little."

"And where are the priests that's not in it?" said Jem.

"Why, there's some in America, and some in Australia," said Pat.

"Well, sure if they follow the people, won't they do as well as ever?" said Jem.

"They won't, Jem," said Pat; "by all accounts the people isn't the same in America as they is here. Don't you mind Father Mullen's letter that we read in the newspaper* that made it out that two millions of the Irish had turned in America. Sure it isn't them the priests can live by. You see, Jem, America is a kind of place where every man does what he likes."

"Well, I wonder why people doesn't do what they like in Ireland, as well as in America," said Jem; "but, sure enough, they don't; what's the reason at all?"

"Well, I had a talk about that, with a man that drove up the sheep that Mr. Nulty bought at Ballinasloe," said Pat; "he was a mighty cute sensible man; and we fell into talk, and I asked him that very same; and says he, 'do you mind them sheep,' says he; 'now, while you keep them together on the road, where the one goes, they'll all go,' says he, 'and you'll just have no trouble at all; but, if you wonst let them get one in one field, and another in another field, why, then, every sheep goes after its own nose, and no two goes the same way; and its the more they'll scatter,' says he, 'and the harder on you to gather them; and that's the way with men, too,' says he; 'keep them together, and they'll go the one way; but, once they scatter, then every man goes the way he likes, and no man thinks no more about what every body does; so you mind the sheep and keep them all together,' says he."

"And will the Irish people go the one way for ever in Ireland, without minding the way they would like to go?" said Jem.

"Why, man alive," said Pat, "don't you see yourself, if a bully of a sheep just makes a bolt at the hedge, all the rest goes bolt after him too; and sure it's in the field they will be in spite of you. Sure it's in the field they would all like to be; and, when the bully goes, won't they be after him?"

"Aye," said Jem, "I see that surely; but where will we get the right sort of bully in Ireland? Sure it's sheep we are, but there isn't the bullies in it."

So Pat looked Jem right hard in the face, as if he was going to be the bully to make the bolt himself—only he wasn't. So said Pat, looking as hard as he could, "Jem, it's a right bully of a priest I would like to see, of the right sort; and wouldn't *he* have the following?"

"And what would you have him to do, at all? said Jem.

So Pat looked harder at Jem than ever; and he said, with a fire that seemed to be dancing in his eye, "Jem, as I'm a living man, there's a something afore us in Ireland; and a PRIEST, with THE BIBLE in his hand, is what Ireland wants."

"And would you have him to turn, and have the bishop on his back?" said Jem.

"I don't want him to turn neither backward nor forward," said Pat, "but to hold up the Douay Bible in his hand, and to call on the Irish people; that's the man that Ireland's waiting for, and that's the man for the following; and it isn't the bishop on his back he need think about, for it's Ireland he will have at his back."

"And would he be a Protestant all out, Pat?" said Jem.

"Well, that isn't so easy seen, Jem," said Pat. "You see, if a man quits the Mass, and goes to Church, he changes his name plain enough; but, if a priest only stands up in the chapel, and holds up a Douay Bible in his hand, and says, 'Boys, it's the Word of God that is able to save our souls,' it isn't so easy seen if that makes them all Protestants. Anyway, it's not as plain as a man walking, by himself alone, out of the chapel into the church."

"Aye, but where would that stop, Pat?" said Jem.

"It wouldn't stop short of the Word of God, Jem," said Pat; "and why should it; and who could say again it. Who *could* stop it, at all? Neither crook nor crozier, if that bolt was made by the right bully. Wouldn't all Ireland turn round to the priest with the Bible in his hand?"

"And will the like of that ever be, Pat?" said Jem.

"Jem," said Pat, "there has been trouble from God in Ireland. His hand done it. There was trouble on the people, and trouble on the priest. And it's not for nothing. The hearts of the people is stirred, like what they never was before; and there seems to be something that the hearts of the people wants; and it can't be nothing but the Word that comes from God. There's a something afore us; and it's THE MAN we're waiting on."

Time will tell if Pat has rightly comprehended the feeling of poor men like himself. And, perhaps, "the man," when he comes, may look back to the words of Pat.

* We gave extracts from this letter in our number for September, 1852, vol. i., p. 103.

THE OLD IRISH CLERGY.

No. IV.

WE have been obliged by press of other matter, so long to postpone the following paper, that it may be necessary to remind our readers, that we have already shown in former numbers,* that so far from the celibacy of the clergy having always prevailed in Ireland, for many centuries of our history, ecclesiastical benefices descended in this Island of Saints from one member of a family to another (often from father to son or grandson), much in the same way, as did secular landed property, according to the old Irish law or custom, known by the name of *Tanistry*.

We showed, that from A.D. 753 to A.D. 1134, the same custom prevailed through 12 generations at Clonmacnoise, that it also prevailed for a period of 300 years in the churches of Lusk, Monasterboice, Iona, Derry, Kildare, Armagh, and many others.

We concluded our last paper, by noticing the strange contrast between the accounts given of the death of Murtogh, A.D. 1134, by the Irish Annalists, the Four Masters, and St. Bernard, in his life of Malachy.

According to the former, "Murtogh, successor of St. Patrick, died penitent—yea, triumphant." According to the latter, "Murtogh—no bishop but a tyrant, an ecclesiastical adulterer, went from this world to be damned; yet still, to live in an heir, provided for the purpose of adding to his deeds of damnation!"

The quiet remark of the very learned Father Colgan, on this curious difference between St. Bernard and the Irish Annalists, is to the following effect:—"St. Bernard," says he, (speaking of Primate Niall,) "is more severe on this individual than are our native Annals;" which Dr. O'Donovan quotes in his "Annals of the Four Masters" (A.D. 1139, p. 1062, note *b.*) as "a very appropriate remark." We do not however, think it so. It would not appear to us at all an appropriate remark to say, "Dr. MacHale is more severe on the Achill Scripture-readers than the Protestant clergy are." It would rather seem a stupid remark, and likely to have come from some one who did not understand the matter, or know how to represent it fairly; because the Protestant clergy are not at all severe on the readers, but countenance and favour them. So neither are the Irish Annalists anywhere, or in anyway, severe on Primate Niall or his family, any more than on their opponent Maelmogue and his helpers. On the contrary, they speak of them as they do of all the good and pious men whom they notice generally, and mention their deaths as those of any

* See CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. ii. pp. 51, 87; vol iii., pp. 33, 45,

other ordinary ecclesiastical persons, whether the earlier successors of St. Patrick, or any other of the ancient worthies of the Irish Church.

Father Colgan, on the other hand (although, perhaps, not having looked into the facts brought forward in these papers in their full connection, and in the accurate way in which we have endeavoured to present them to the reader), appears to have been sorely perplexed and distressed at the evidence furnished in the "Annals," of the fact that the old Irish clergy, including those of the highest rank and eminence among them—culdees, bishops, abbots, &c.—were commonly married men, and in so far nothing different from those reforming bishops and clergymen (Geo. Browne, of Dublin, &c.), who, in the time of Queen Mary and Cardinal Pole, were branded as adulterers, and put out of their Sees, for having married wives, according to the permission of the Lord by his holy Apostles. Father Colgan, therefore, labours with much ado to confuse what is in itself so plain and intelligible; seeking, if possible, to dissipate the force of the evidence in question. In order to enable the reader to see what so learned a person, of such views, is able to make of the case, it will be best to let Colgan speak for himself; and we shall, accordingly, for this purpose, set forth here his statement of the matter, though rather a long one, in full, as follows:—

"As to what he (*i.e.*, St. Bernard) says concerning the hereditary usurpation of that See (*i.e.*, Armagh) for some fifteen generations, provided it be rightly understood, I regard it as being either wholly true, or very near the truth, and can show this to be the case. For by a *generation*, he doth not (as some erroneously understand it,) mean the age of one man, nor even the space of twenty years, much less a full century (seeing that Christianity itself was not so old as that in Bernard's day), but either the succession of one bishop to another of the same family (for, as I shall demonstrate presently, we find fifteen such generations or successions of bishops of one family, actually on record); or, at least, by a *generation* he understands the age at which the period of generating begins, which is, in men, that of fourteen years—as is to be inferred from his own adding immediately after, '*who had now for about 200 years kept possession of the sanctuary of God.*' Therefore, by *some fifteen generations* he means only *about 200 years*. And that such a sort of hereditary succession did continue for so many years, or more, is to me evident from two reasons—

"*First*, Because the aspect of the Irish Church, which, from the year of Christ 440, to about the year 840, had been in a most flourishing condition, and, for so long, second to no other in Europe, began gradually to alter for the worse, for the course of some 200 years then following, during which, in engagements, fightings, and conflicts—not of annual, but almost monthly, and, at times, of daily occurrence—was spent the period of that unceasing warfare between the Irish and the ferocious, and then dominant, race of the Normans—*i.e.*, the Norwegians and the Danes, and other adjacent clans—who, not content with their own vast extent of territory, conquered and subjugated England, Scotland, and the rest of the British Isles, and some of the maritime districts of Gaul, burning and destroying with pagan fury the dwellings of clergy and laity, their churches and cities, and occupying for themselves certain ports and maritime towns. These tedious disasters having reached their close, and the Normans having been beaten and slaughtered in the battle of Clontarf in the year 1013, another trouble succeeded, which was no less ruinous to the whole country and its Church's discipline and religion. The princes of the realm, engaging in quarrels relative to the chief supremacy, which occasioned constant battling from the year 1013 to 1105, and subsequently, Church discipline and religious influences received so severe a shock as well nigh annihilated them; until, at length, in that year, 1105, St. Celsus having been created Archbishop of Armagh, did his utmost for the restoring of piety from her exile, and discipline from the neglect into which she had fallen. It is not, therefore, to be wondered at, if, in such disastrous times, some powerful family, especially the one which had bestowed various lands on the erection and endowment of the See of Armagh, made an effort to have prelates of their own tribe appointed to that See, and in this way to possess, as if by hereditary right, the sanctuary of God.

"The *second* argument which I promised above, not only establishes the credibility of that hereditary succession of prelates in the same family, but even seems to demonstrate the fact of its having really existed. For (as it appears from what has been already said in this Chronological Catalogue), from the year 925 (in which, on the death of St. Maelbride, son of Tornan, Joseph succeeded as Bishop of Armagh,) to the year 1129, (in which St. Celsus, the last of them, died,) fifteen bishops of the same family are found to have succeeded one another for the space of about 200 years, as is clearly evident from the following catalogue of them, according to the order of their succession, and the years in which, respectively, they died:—

"Maelpatrick, son of Maeltila, died the same year (925), having sat for nine months.
"Casey, son of Alcheus, died A.D. 946.
"Murray deposed, and Dudalehe, son of Kellach, substituted in his stead, an. 965.
"Murechan occupies the See, an. 993.
"Maelmury, son of Scanlan, died 994.
"Maelmury, son of Hoey, 1020.
"Awley, 1049.
"Dudalehe, son of Maelmury, 1064.
"Cumuscach, 1075.
"Melisa, son of Awley, 1091.
"Donald, son of Awley, 1105
"S. Celsus, son of Hugh, son of Melisa, died an. 1129.

"Now, from these entries we deduce that fifteen bishops of the same family did, for the space of about 200 years, retain possession, as by hereditary right, of the See of Armagh, as S. Bernard states. For from that powerful family was descended S. Celsus himself, who, happily degenerating from the unprincipled custom of his kindred, alienated the sanctuary of God from his own family to S. Malachy; for he was grandson to Melisa, Prelate of Armagh (by his son Hugh), of whom above, as is inferred from the remarks already made at A.D. 1105. It appears further, from the same entries, taken in connection with what else has been said above in this catalogue, that the statement is either true, or nearly true, which is contained in the words of S. Bernard afore-cited—viz., that *there were eight before Celsus (i.e.*, styled Prelates of Armagh) *who were married men, and without orders, but, however, men of education.* For of these eight married and unordained persons were Murechan, father of Murray, Prior of Armagh, of whom above, at A.D. 986; Maelmurry, son of Hoey, father of Dudalehe, another bishop of Armagh, of whom above, at A.D. 1064; Dudalehe himself, father to Hugh, Archdeacon [*rather* vice-erenach] of Armagh, of whom above, at A.D. 1108; Awley, father to Melisa and Donald, Prelates of Armagh, of whom [we have spoken] at A.D. 1091, 1105; Melisa, father to Flannagan, of whom at A.D. 1114; Donald, father of that pseudo-bishop [Murtogh, or] Maurice, who, supported by the secular power, thrust himself into the place of Celsus, according to what we shall state presently. The other three appear to have been, Murray, 965; Dudalehe II., son of Kellach, who was substituted in Murray's place; and Cumuscach, who died in the year 1075.

"Hence, then, arose *all that relaxation of Church discipline, powerlessness of censures, and annihilation of religion*, above complained of by S. Bernard. Yet were there, in the time of these pseudo-bishops, others legitimately ordained, who, acting as their suffragans, did perform episcopal offices in the diocese of Armagh—as Casey, son of Murchadan, who died A.D. 966; Arvey, son of Cosgry, 1006; Maelmury, son of Hoey, A.D. 1020; Maeltila, 1032; Hugh Ua Forrey, 1056; and Kencorach, who died A.D. 1106.

"But you will say *first*, that some of the aforesaid persons enumerated by us among the married prelates, are described as having closed a laudable career by distinguished penitence; as Dudalehe the 2nd, who died June 2, A.D. 998; Dudalehe the 3rd, September 1, 1064, Melisa, December 20, 1091; Donald, son of Awley, who died August 2, A.D. 1105; and that they ought not, therefore, to be reckoned among the pseudo-bishops, or married men. I *answer*, that this inference doth not hold; for even Murtogh (who, after having seen S. Malachy elected before himself, according to the will of S. Celsus, and by the votes of the clergy and laity, still thrust himself, by the aid of the secular power, into the same See) is described afterwards as having ended his days in laudable penitence. And why should not Christian men, observing the sins and errors of their past life, have recourse to laudable penance at its close?

"You will say, *secondly*, that Prelate Awley administered the sacrament of Extreme Unction to Malachy, King of Ireland, when dying, in the year 1022; and that he, therefore, should not be enumerated among the married men.

"I *answer*, that we nowhere read of Awley's having administered the sacrament of Extreme Unction to King Malachy; but only that King Malachy was anointed in his hands. But that Awley begat two sons—viz., Melisa and Donald, who were afterwards numbered among the prelates of Armagh, is a matter evident enough from what is aforesaid. We must rather, therefore, class him with the married and unordained prelates, of whom S. Bernard speaks, than suppose him, contrary to the dignity of his position, and all right views of his order, to have begotten children by adultery and sacrilege. And seeing that, even in the present day, when ecclesiastical discipline is more strictly enforced than it has been for many ages past, we may observe in Germany, and various other countries of Europe, many persons numbered among the bishops, archbishops, and even cardinals, who have never been admitted to the sacred orders corresponding to such office, who can wonder, that in those ages of turbulence, amid so many tempests of wars, many should come to be numbered among the archbishops of the Church, who had received no sacred orders?"—Colgan's *Trias Thaumaturga; Septima Appendix ad Acta S. Patricii, p.* 301, *col.* 2, *seq.*

Such is the extraordinary account of the matter given by this most learned Roman Catholic writer. It is one, however, which will not stand examining very closely, as we shall easily prove to the reader.

(For continuation see page 149.)

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We have again to apologize to several of our friends for postponing their valued communications. If our correspondents would recollect the limited space of our columns, when forwarding letters or articles, it would prevent much embarrassment and disappointment.

We beg to call the attention of our correspondents to the utility of adding their name and address to their communications.

To diminish the chances of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Rochetlle-st.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal, which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, DECEMBER, 1854.

SINCE our last number appeared, an event has taken place which is full of import to the Christian world. Although we have not yet received actual intelligence of it, we may assume that on Friday, the 8th of December, the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception has been decided as an article of faith in the Roman Catholic Church.

Perhaps no fact of greater importance to Christendom has taken place in our day; for it brings to a point, and it brings under our own view, the great question which so long has distracted the Christian world.

The great question has been, whether the Church of Rome has preserved unchanged the faith which Christ and his Apostles delivered to the world.

If the Church of Rome has preserved that faith unchanged, then all who differ from her must be wrong; but if the Church of Rome has *changed* that faith, then to "contend for the faith *once* delivered to the saints" is the duty of all who will follow the blessed Apostles as they followed Christ.

This great question has been argued in reference to many particulars, in respect of which it is said that the Church of Rome has *formerly* altered her faith; but these alterations are said to have taken place many centuries ago; and it is, perhaps, not easy for plain people to judge about past events with the same certainty with which they judge of the events which happen in their own day, and within their own knowledge. But now the question, whether the Church of Rome has preserved the Apostles' faith unchanged since the Apostles' days, must be argued upon a fact which is actually taking place while we write these pages.

The Council of Trent professed to deliver nothing concerning matters of faith but what had been handed down unchanged from the time of the Apostles. Speaking of the purity of the Gospel, that Council says, "seeing that this truth is contained in written books and unwritten traditions, which, being received by the Apostles from the mouth of Christ himself, or delivered by the Apostles as with their own hands, at the dictation of the Holy Spirit, have come down even to us. . . . . Moreover, these traditions, whether pertaining to faith or morals, it (the Council) receives with equal affection of piety and reverence, and venerates, as being dictated by word of mouth, either by Christ or the Holy Spirit, and *preserved* in the Catholic Church *by continual succession*."*

And when they come to declare their doctrine

* "Perspicuous hanc veritatem et disciplinam contineri in libris scriptis, et sine scripto traditionibus, quæ ipsius Christi ore ab Apostolis acceptæ, aut ab ipsis Apostolis, Spiritu Sancto dictante, quasi per manus traditæ, ad nos usque pervenerunt. . . . . Necnon traditiones ipsas, cum ad fidem, tum ad mores pertinentes, tanquam vel ore tenus a Christo, vel a Spiritu Sancto dictatas, et continua successione in Ecclesiâ Catholicâ conservatas, pari pietatis affectu ac reverentia suscipit et veneratur."—*Sess.* quarta.

on particular points, they profess to do it on the principles above laid down. Thus, they teach their doctrine of justification as being that "which Jesus Christ, the Sun of Righteousness, the author and *finisher* of our faith, taught, which the Apostles delivered, and the Catholic Church, at the suggestion of the Holy Spirit, always retained."* And so in all their doctrines they profess to teach nothing else but what Christ himself taught, the Apostles delivered, and the Church always held.

It is true that Protestants deny that *all* their doctrines were so delivered. For instance, they say it is hard to see how the words "I absolve thee," could have been instituted by Christ himself as the form of a sacrament, when no trace is found of those words in the Church for a thousand years, as shown in another column of our paper. But still this fact remains, that the Council of Trent *professed* to teach nothing but what had been taught and delivered by Christ and his Apostles, and always held in the Church. This is a great fact, which should be carefully attended to now. This principle of taking the whole faith from the actual teaching of Jesus Christ and his Apostles, handed down either by writing or by tradition, has the supposed infallible sanction of a Pope and a general council.

But now this principle itself is about to be given up.

It is not merely that a new article is to be added to the faith of the Church of Rome, but the principle itself is to be abandoned, that Christ is the author and the FINISHER of the faith; that everything ought to be drawn from what He taught and the Apostles delivered. We shall call attention to both these points as we proceed.

That the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, although believed as an *opinion* by many Roman Catholics, has never yet been held as a *matter of faith* by the Church of Rome, is very easily proved; for it is, in fact, confessed.

St. Bernard, in the 12th century, declared that the doctrine was then newly invented, without any tradition to support it, but founded on a false revelation.

In the year 1483, Pope Sixtus IV. forbid any one to call those heretics who *denied* the Immaculate Conception; and for this reason—"Because it has not yet been decided by the Roman Church and the Apostolic See."

The Dominicans, one of the orders of the Church of Rome, *always* denied this doctrine.

The Council of Trent expressly declared that they did *not* decide on this doctrine; and they expressly renewed the above decree of Pope Sixtus IV.

The Roman Catholic Bishop Milner, in England, declared, not forty years ago, "The Church does *not* decide the controversy concerning the conception of the Blessed Virgin."†

And the present Pope declared, about five years ago, "This honour *has not yet* been decreed to the most Holy Virgin by the Church and the Apostolic See."

We have given these authorities fully in vol. 1, p. 20, and again in vol. 3, pp. 96, 97, and none of our correspondents has ever ventured to deny or question any of them.

Thus, we may fairly take it as confessed, that this doctrine is new; never before established by the Church of Rome.

It is true that many Roman Catholics have believed in the Immaculate Conception; but, then, they held it as an opinion of their own, not as the doctrine of their Church. They were equally at liberty to deny it, if they thought fit. So Doctor Milner says expressly, "The Church leaves her children to form their own opinions concerning it." This makes the difference between the opinions of individuals, and the doctrine of a Church.

But *now*, this doctrine is to be made an *article of faith* in the Church of Rome.

As the doctrines authorized by Rome stood a week ago, a man who denied this doctrine, and denounced it as false and unholy, as St. Bernard did, might die and go to heaven, where, we hope, St. Bernard is; but if that man does not now immediately change his opinion, he must certainly be damned, for denying an article of the Roman faith.

So the Roman faith is changing, or has changed, within the last week, under our very eyes.

But it is not merely the change in the faith of the Church of Rome, that makes this decision so important. It has changed THE PRINCIPLE which lies at the root of all faith.

Hitherto, as we have seen from the Council of Trent, the Church of Rome professed to hold no doctrine but what Christ taught to his Apostles, and the Apostles delivered to the Church. Pope Pius IX. and his assembled bishops, by adopting as an article of Catholic faith what is confessed not to have been taught by Christ, or delivered by his Apostles, have now virtually renounced this principle.

We say this *is* confessed. It is explicitly confessed by Bishop Milner, when he says "the Church *sees nothing* absolutely clear and certain concerning it, *either in the written or unwritten word*, and, therefore, leaves her children to form their own opinions concerning it."

It was confessed by Pope Sixtus IV., when he said, "it has not yet been decided by the Roman Church and the Apostolic See." It was virtually confessed by the present Pope, when he said, "this honour has not yet been decreed to the Most Holy Virgin by the Church and the Apostolic See."

If the Church of Rome *now* believes that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception *was* taught by Christ, and delivered by the Apostles to the Church, how can she defend HERSELF for allowing her members full liberty to disbelieve it for 1850 years?

It must, therefore, be confessed that this doctrine was not taught by Christ, nor delivered by his Apostles.

Whoever now adopts this doctrine as an article of the faith, does thereby abandon and reject the principle that faith must be limited to the teaching of Christ.

We know that some have done so already. Dr. Newman, the much-boasted convert, has actually published a book, in which he openly avows that some of the present doctrines of the Church of Rome were not taught by Christ and his Apostles, and cannot be proved either by Scripture or tradition; and that no such proof is required for doctrines sanctioned by infallible authority.

Until now this principle has not been adopted by the Church of Rome; but now, as we have shown, this principle is both adopted and acted on by the Pope and his assembled bishops.

This is the most fearful step ever yet taken by the Church of Rome.

It is one which calls on every member, and every priest, of that Church, to consider his position.

We know that there are many priests who were shocked at Mr. Newman's startling doctrine, and at the reception which he, and his doctrines, met with in high quarters.

An able Roman Catholic Review in America (Brownson's) exposed and condemned that book, and had great support in doing so.

What are those priests to do now, when the principle of that book is adopted and acted on in matters of faith?

We trust that there are many priests who have hitherto sincerely believed that they were teaching nothing but what Christ taught, and his Apostles delivered. What are those priests to do now, when they see a new article of faith concocted before their eyes, which it is impossible to believe was taught by Christ and his Apostles?

If they will have a good conscience towards God, they must adhere to what they believe that Christ and his Apostles taught.

Solemnly, earnestly, affectionately, we call on the Roman Catholic priests of Ireland to consider this question.

Did Christ teach the Immaculate Conception to the Apostles?

Did the Apostles deliver it to the Churches?

Can it be shown that this doctrine was ever heard of in the Church for a thousand years?

If Christ taught, and the Apostles delivered it, how came it to be so long unknown? How came it that it was never yet established in the Church of Rome?

If *not* so taught, can any one *now* make it a part of "the faith once delivered to the saints?"

If these questions need a discussion, our pages are open for it; if this doctrine can be shown to come from the teaching of Christ, then, in the name of God, let all our readers be convinced of it; but if this cannot even be attempted, then, in the name of God, let the priests look every man to his own soul, and stand up for "the faith once delivered to the saints," without addition or subtraction.

We have ever desired to deal with candour and kindness towards the Roman Catholic priests. Where we have had to censure, we have confined it to those whose acts deserved it. Where we have seen conduct deserving of respect, we have accorded it freely. We have now no object in view but to awaken them to the solemn importance of their position at this time.

There are among them men of ability and learning, we trust, men of sincerity, too, who have not disgraced their position by exciting the passions, or imposing on the ignorance of the people. We call on these men to consider the principle of the Council of Trent—that nothing can be of faith but what Christ taught, and his Apostles delivered. We call on them to consider the vast importance and the deep responsibility of their own position, now that they are driven by their Church, either to abandon or to stand up for that principle.

No greater or more solemn question has ever been forced on the consideration of priests; and those whose hearts may be stirred to meet it with a zeal for God, and for the faith which Christ delivered, will earn for themselves no ordinary position in the Church of God.

Have the priests of Ireland *always* hitherto maintained that the Church *can teach*, and *has taught*, nothing but what Christ taught, and the Apostles delivered? and are there no champions among them now to take their stand upon this sure foundation, ere it pass from under their feet for ever?

Let them awake, and arise. The trial may be great and the struggle fierce, both without and within; but no more certain call to everlasting victory was ever proclaimed in the Church of God.

Let them come forth, and fight the good fight of faith in this; and let them trust that God will make their way plain in other things.

Nor is there wanting much prospect of encouragement and support.

The doctrines advocated in this paper, and the means by which those doctrines are advocated, may well lead priests to hope that they have

* "Quam Sol justitiæ Christus Jesus, fidei nostræ auctor et consummator, docuit, Apostoli tradiderunt, et Catholica Ecclesia, Spiritu Sancto suggerente, perpetuo retinuit."—Proem. *Sess. sexta.*

† Milner's End of Controversy, part i., letter 12. All the quotations from Bishop Milner, in this article, are taken from the same place.

something sounder and more ancient to look to, than what they have been accustomed to suppose that Protestantism is; and though all means, both human and ecclesiastical, would, no doubt, be resorted to against such a priest, yet, surely, the priests must be well aware that any man of character and ability who should now take this course, would probably find his people nearly as ready for it as himself, and both able and willing to support him.

Are there no mighty men in Israel, to stand forth before the world and the Church!

We beg to state that, with a view to facilitate fair discussion, we shall be happy to forward the Catholic Layman henceforward, *without charge*, to any Roman Catholic clergyman who will be good enough to intimate either to the editor or publisher, 9, Upper Sackville-street, his desire to receive it in future, direct through the post. We also beg to express a hope that our regular subscribers will be good enough to forward their subscriptions for the ensuing year (together with any arrears due) on or before the 1st of January next. We need scarcely remind them, though 3s. 6d. is a small sum, that when a large number of such sums is in arrear, it imposes a serious difficulty in the way of the conductors. The sums paid for stamp duty during the past year alone, amounts to nearly £400.

THE OLD IRISH CLERGY.

(Continued from page 147.)

1. Colgan represents the system of hereditary succession as *an abuse which crept into* some Churches in Ireland, (at least into Armagh); and this long after the first planting of Christianity in the country; that it commenced, in fact, subsequently to the year 840, and after the face of religion in the country had been miserably darkened by Danish barbarism. Whereas we have seen that it was a prevalent custom among the Irish Christians, elsewhere, as well as in Armagh, from a much earlier age; as illustrated in several examples given in the last paper, and as having, according to ancient Irish tradition (as we saw at the outset, and subsequently,) the sanction of S. Patrick himself, and of the other eminent luminaries of early Christianity in this island.

2. Colgan pretends that King Malachy the great was not anointed in his dying hour by "Awley, successor of Patrick" (as the Irish Annals call him), but by some deputy bishop or priest whose name is not given, nor his presence in any way alluded to in the "Annals." And when the "Annals" say, (as already quoted, in No. III.) that he was anointed in [*or.* at] the hands of Awley, Colgan would seem to have us understand, that Awley only *held him*, for some other person to anoint; but Dr. O'Donovan, whose object was only to translate the passage correctly, without having any crooked argumentative purpose to serve, renders it thus—"*after being anointed by the hands" of Awley*; the original *Annalist's* intention having been, obviously, to tell who actually performed the rite, and to mention by name such of the more dignified *clergy* as were present at King Malachy's death-bed, and saying masses, with psalms and hymns, for his repose in that hour.

3. Colgan's mode of representing the testimony of the Irish Annalists concerning the family so long possessed of the See of Armagh is most unreasonable. Those Annalists, in recording the events which appeared worthy of note in the history of their native Church, were utterly unconscious, as far as we can see, of any wrong done to that Church by the family in question. The custom complained of was certainly liable to abuses; but it was not, after all, attended with worse evils, nor was it any worse founded in right, equity, or Holy Scripture, than the system which succeeded it, of papal and regal squabbling, against local influences not less worthy of support, for the control of episcopal appointments. The Irish Annalists nowhere say a word against the family which opposed St. Malachy; though Bernard, in the spirit of a partisan of the Church of Rome (whose influence and authority were concerned in the struggle), was led to use such very strong language on the subject. Colgan, looking into the "Annals" for some expression to harmonize with those ideas of Bernard's, could find none more to his purpose than the statement, that some of those whom he calls pseudo-bishops (*i.e.*, nominal bishops, no real bishops), *died penitent*; and he seems to think this penitence may refer to their usurpation of the primacy. But that expression is used of men of piety and worth, according to the opinion of the Annalists, and does not by any means imply conversion from a life of grievous impiety, in its ordinary use. Thus, Malachy the great, above named, who, whatever his sins, was no usurper, is said by them to have died after "intense penance." (A.D. 1022.) And so at A.D. 1147, we find "Murray O'Flanagan, a choice priest, died after intense penance;" and at 1149, "Bishop O'Gormly, a noble, devout senior, died, after suffering [*or* 'penance,' according to O'Donovan], and after intense penitence." But on a point so absurdly plain to any fair and unprejudiced mind, it were foolish to multiply illustrations.

4. As the old Irish Annalists, whose records are embodied in the compilation of the Four Masters, nowhere allude to, or seem conscious of, any ecclesiastical defect connected with the married prelates of Armagh, which could interfere with their ministrations about holy things, but rather represent them as saying masses, anointing men for death, &c., as clerical persons; so neither have they the slightest allusion to any of those suffragans, or deputies, with which some learned men, in late ages, have kindly supplied them. We meet, indeed, in the "Annals" with instances of *vice-abbots* and *vice-erenachs*; but those *vice-primates, vice-bishops of Armagh*, or *deputy successors of Patrick*, of whom Colgan speaks, are persons altogether unnoticed by them in that capacity. Colgan is, indeed, lamentably inaccurate on this point. For, whereas he includes Primate Awley among the unordained married men, who required of necessity to have deputies to perform their duties; and Maelmury, son of Hoey, among the deputies, or suffragans, who performed such clerical functions in their stead; the *Annalists*, on the contrary, testify that Awley held the very office which this Maelmury had previously held, and actually succeeded him in it.—See the extract at A.D. 1020, in our last paper. But Colgan seems to have confusedly interchanged in the above place the name of this Maelmury, son of Hoey, who was actually primate, with that of Maelmury, son of Scanlan, who was only Bishop of Armagh, (see at A.D. 994, No. III.), though he had a little previously enumerated both among the fifteen usurping primates.

The truth of the matter would seem to be simply this, that in the ages preceding the time of Kellach and Malachy, the offices of *Primate*, or *Successor of St. Patrick*, and of *Bishop of Armagh*, were, generally speaking, altogether distinct; differing much in their natures, as well as held by distinct individuals, although they might occasionally be found united in one person. And it was only in the time, and also in the person, of St. Malachy, that an attempt was first made to unite and consolidate the two offices permanently, with a view to assimilate the Church discipline of Ireland to that of other branches of the Church, and securing for the *Archbishop of Armagh, as such*, whatever of dignity, prestige, wealth, or influence, had previously been enjoyed by the *Successors of St. Patrick, as such*—in other words, by the *abbots of Armagh*. These remarks will, perhaps, be more fully understood from an inspection of *all* the obits of such persons (*i.e.*, either abbots or bishops of Armagh), which occur in the "Annals" during the sixth and seventh centuries, which are as follows:—

A.D. 512, Duagh, of Drum-Dearv, *Bishop* of Armagh, breathed forth his spirit.

A.D. 525, Ailill, *Bishop* of Armagh, who was of the Hy-Breasail [race], died.

A.D. 535, Oilill, *Bishop* of Armagh, also of the Hy-Breasail [race], died.

A.D. 550, David ——, *Bishop* of Armagh —, died.

A.D. 577, Felimy Finn, *Abbot* of Armagh, died.

A.D. 587, S. Caorlan, *Bishop* of Armagh, died.

A.D. 597, Hoey, son of Dermot, *Bishop and Abbot* of Armagh, died.

A.D. 609, Seanach, *Abbot* of Armagh (from Clonygreek), died.

A.D. 622, Mac Laisre, *Bishop and Abbot* of Armagh, died.

A.D. 660, S. Tomian, son of Ronan, *Bishop* of Armagh, died.

A.D. 686, S. Segenius, of Aghaclive, *Bishop* of Armagh, died.

Some learned writers have supposed that the Annalists had a confused way of writing "*Bishop of Armagh*," or "*Abbot of Armagh*," where, if they had learned to express themselves accurately, they should have said, "*Archbishop of Armagh*," adding, perhaps, "*Primate of all Ireland*," or other like titles of dignity, accommodated to more modern ears. But the student, who carefully examines the original "Annals," will see little in them to countenance any such notion; and will rather conclude that when a "*Bishop of Armagh*" is named, it means simply the person exercising episcopal functions in the establishment at Armagh, the function of ordination especially; and, in like manner, that the "*successor of Patrick*," or "Abbot of Armagh," implies simply the ruler of the religious establishment there, its head, to whose authority even the bishop, when a distinct person, was subject; although the abbot was, at times, as is evident from the above entries, bishop also. When he was not, he still, no doubt, ruled, but left ordination to the bishop. As for what St. Bernard says of Primate Awley and the other seven, whom he calls *unordained* persons, the statement must be received with some hesitation and qualification, considering the quarter whence it comes; and it can, in all probability, signify no more, at the utmost, than that the parties concerned were *not elected and ordained with canonical regularity*, according to the usages of the Church of Rome—any ordination independent of which Bernard would probably ignore.

5. But that those married prelates of Armagh were possessed of such orders as were considered, by the Irish people, sufficient to constitute them clergymen at least, if not even bishops, is most certain; not only from the general way of mentioning them in the "Annals," where their occupying of the primacy, collecting of visitation rents, &c., are mentioned, without the least hint of there being anything sacrilegious in such appropriation of ecclesiastical property, but also from other circumstances which we may there find noticed concerning them; as, for instance, Awley's having anointed King Malachy, which Colgan so lamely endeavours to disprove. And, again, Murchan, whom he sets down as the first of these eight married and unordained persons, is introduced at A.D. 972, of the "Annals," as inaugurating, or consecrating to his kingly office, Hugh, son of Donnell, Lord of Oileach—*i.e.*, the prince of one of the most famous provincial royalties in Ireland. This act it were very absurd to suppose performed by a mere unordained layman, who was, in that character, at most, but an inferior prince to the one who received his blessing. Maelmurry, son of Hoey, another of these married prelates, is called by the Annalists (A.D. 1020), "the *head of the clergy* of all the north-west of Europe, and flood of dignity of the western world;" whereas, according to Colgan, he must either have been no clergyman at all, and, in that case, guilty of sacrilege, or else, if a clergyman, then both sacrilegious and adulterous, in his marrying and begetting children in holy orders. Awley, the next of those prelates (*ib.*), was appointed by the suffrages of the laity *and clergy*, and acknowledged as primate through all Ireland, even in the most southern parts, being received and honoured with visitation dues, &c., in Munster (A.D. 1021); which was not very likely to have happened if he was a mere layman in the estimation of the Irish people. Again, Dudalehe, son of Kellach, whom Colgan mentions in the last place but one, as likely to have been one of the married and unordained men, was so highly esteemed as primate, both in Ireland and beyond its limits, that, a vacancy occurring in the office of Successor of Columkille (or chief ruler of his monasteries in Iona, Derry, and elsewhere generally), he was, by the common choice of the Irish and Scots, elected to fill the situation; so that, if Dudalehe was unordained, then, contrary to all that has ever been suggested on the subject, not only the electors to the See of Armagh, but also the religious congregations following the rule of Columkille in Scotland and Ireland, must voluntarily have selected a mere layman for their head; which it is not very likely that any person acquainted with the history of those times will regard as a probable hypothesis.

The short and the long of it is, that Father Colgan has made a very sad mess of this whole matter; nor could he, approaching it with his invincible prepossessions and prejudices, have done any better. Nor will any person do better at it, who approaches a subject of the kind with a determination to squeeze it into some particular shape, suitable to his own preconceived notions, though sanctioned by the traditions of centuries; and who is not rather prepared to listen to what an original authority says for itself, and receive, as its testimony, whatever it seems naturally intended to convey to the reader. It was a neglect of this that led Colgan to that sensible remark, that St. Bernard is *more severe* on Primate Niall, and others of our old clergy, who married wives, and begat sons and daughters, than are our native "Annals." The *degree* in which the two sorts of authorities differ, is certainly worthy of our attention. According to the one, those married ecclesiastics were guilty of sacrilege and adultery, perpetrators of deeds of damnation, and cunning enough to add to their crimes even after death; tyrants, not clergymen; profaners of the sanctuary of God. So speak St. Bernard and Colgan, and other upholders of the supremacy of Rome. According to the other view, Conn-na-mbocht, Head of the Culdees of Clonmacnoise, and an anchorite, although himself a married man, and the descendant, in direct lineal succession, through ten generations, of abbots and bishops, erenachs and anchorites (covering a space of three hundred years), was, after all, "the glory and dignity" of the religious establishment in which he flourished. So speak our native "Annals."

If any member of the Church of Rome, in this country, be disposed for a moment to think that, perhaps, the Irish Church was actually in so bad a state as to deserve the severe censures of St. Bernard, that, in fact, so eminent a person would not have given utterance to them without cause, it may suffice to remind him, that such was not, certainly, the general opinion of Christendom concerning the Irish Church, in those early ages preceding the coming of the English, throughout which, we have shown this system of marrying, among the abbots, bishops, and other clerical persons in Ireland, and hereditary succession to ecclesiastical offices and benefices, to have prevailed; the Irish Church having been famous, throughout Europe, for its men of eminence, for learning and piety, schools and missions, in the same ages. And, even in the later age, when St. Bernard flourished, she little needed, according to the opinion of Dr. Lanigan and other authors of like sentiments, any foreign interference to revive her discipline or piety; her own sons having not only sufficient informa-

tion, ability, and zeal, for engaging in the task; but having actually engaged in it with no little energy, and having set, of themselves, about introducing such reforms as to them appeared to be needed, before any foreigners came to assist in the work—as did, subsequently, under a Papal sanction, the King of England and his helpers in the subjugation of Ireland.

But, whatever ecclesiastical reforms the Irish themselves, or the Danes, or English, or bishops of Rome, may have introduced or attempted in this country, subsequently to the Anglo-Norman invasion, sufficiently certain it is that the abolition of marriage among the clergy was not, at all events, a feat of their accomplishment. But, as its use was allowed among the said clergy, from the days of St. Patrick to the date of the Invasion,* so was it also continued in the ages which come after, from the Invasion to the Reformation; as we hope satisfactorily to prove to the reader of our next paper.

R. K.

THE WAR.

As many of our readers, like ourselves, may have a deep personal interest in friends and loved ones engaged in the present war, we think it may be acceptable to them to be provided with a form of prayer for those on whom their affections are so engaged.

We ask our readers to consider, if every family in Ireland were daily to join in offering up such prayer to God, might we not hope for an answer to our prayers, from Him who heareth prayer?

In ancient times, such prayers were always "Litanies"—that is, the prayers were so drawn up, that all might join and take their part in them. It is a cold thing for *one* to pray, and all the rest *to listen*. Who would not wish *to pray themselves*, for those they love, in their hour of danger? Our Litany is intended for this purpose. It is intended that the one who leads the prayer, should read with reverence what is written in the usual print, and that all the rest should join in answering what is written in the *italic* or sloping print. Thus *all* join in praying. This was the method of the ancient Litanies.

While we are on this subject, we invite our readers to give their contributions to "the Patriotic fund," which is now being raised for the relief and support of the widows and orphans of the soldiers and sailors who fall in this war. Who would not contribute to such a fund? Who would not wish to give comfort to the soldier's heart, as he lies bleeding on the battle field or mangled in the military hospital? and what comfort *can* we give them, like the assurance that those they have loved best on earth, in whom their dying wishes centre—their widows and their orphans—shall have their inheritance in the gratitude of their country? *This* is the object of the Patriotic Fund. The soldiers *hear of it*. How many a soldier as he stands steadfast before the hail of bullets, or rides to death as the light cavalry so lately did, will think upon that "Patriotic Fund"! What Irishman would not contribute to it?

We deeply regret that some, to check the flow of national sympathy, have circulated the unfounded calumny, that this fund is to be used for proselytizing purposes. If there be any ground for such a charge, *let a memorial be presented to the Queen*; or, *let a motion be made in Parliament* now assembled. If grounds can be shown, none are more ready than we to join. The Samaritan did not stop to say to the Jew, "If you will worship at Gerizim, I will heal your wounds;" *that* was not our Saviour's story, when he said "Go, and do thou likewise." Any such abuse of the "Patriotic Fund" would be a foul iniquity; for that which is *morally wrong* can never be *religiously right*. Nothing could be more wicked than such an abuse of such a fund, except the conduct of those who seek to stop the generous current of a nation's sympathy, and then shrink from coming forward, in the light of day, to prove their dark insinuations. If, then, as we venture to predict, no such memorial will be presented to the Queen—no such motion made in Parliament, that inquiry should be immediately instituted, and exposure made—let our readers believe that the calumny is unfounded, and let them come forward, like Irishmen, to show their generous sympathy with the gallant defenders of their country.

Wherever there are not local associations to receive such contributions, we are ready to receive post-office orders, payable to our publisher, William Curry; or postage stamps enclosed to him, and to acknowledge the receipt in our pages.

And we ask the prayers of our countrymen for the soldiers, the sick, the wounded, and the mourners in this war.

A LITANY TO BE USED IN TIME OF WAR.

Almighty and Merciful God, the aid of all that need, the helper of all that flee to thee for succour, we beseech thee, in this time of war, for our country and for the Queen whom thou hast set over us, for her councillors and officers, for her soldiers and sailors, and for all who are in trouble or sorrow through the war,

We beseech Thee to hear us good Lord.

That Thou will be her defender and keeper, giving her victory over all her enemies,

We beseech Thee to hear us Good Lord.

That thou will grant her councillors wisdom, and endue her officers with courage and humanity,

We beseech thee to hear us, Good Lord.

That Thou wilt bless the arms of our country, to the restoration of peace, justice, and equity, in the world,

We beseech Thee to hear us, Good Lord.

That Thou wilt be merciful to our soldiers and sailors (especially we pray thee for . . . . .*), that thou wilt succour and comfort them in all their distresses, and preserve them in the day of battle, and make them merciful in the hour of victory; and so teach them to number their days, that they may apply their hearts unto wisdom.

We beseech Thee to hear us, good Lord.

That Thou wilt look down from heaven upon the sick and the wounded (especially . . . .*); behold, visit, and relieve them, and restore them to health, if it be thy gracious will,

We beseech Thee to hear us, good Lord.

That Thou wilt sanctify their sufferings, that they may lead the rest of their lives in Thy fear and to Thy glory; or else fit and prepare them for their departure hence, in the faith and fear of Thy Holy name, and lift up the light of thy countenance upon them, and give them peace, through the merits and mediation of Jesus Christ our Lord,

We beseech Thee to hear us, good Lord.

That Thou wilt be gracious to those whose souls are in trouble for sin, that they may have hope through Christ; that Thou wilt not break the bruised reed, nor quench the smoking flax,† nor shut up Thy tender mercies in displeasure,‡ but make them to hear of joy and gladness, that the bones which Thou hast broken may rejoice,

We beseech Thee to hear us, good Lord.

That Thy blessing may be upon all who have gone forth to minister to their spiritual or temporal comfort,

We beseech Thee to hear us, good Lord.

That Thou wilt have compassion upon all who are in affliction or sorrow for the danger or the loss of their dear ones; that Thou wilt heal the broken-hearted, and comfort all that mourn,§

We beseech Thee to hear us, good Lord.

That when Thy judgments are in the earth, the inhabitants of the world may learn righteousness,‖

We beseech Thee to hear us, good Lord.

That Thou wilt accomplish the time when nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more,¶

We beseech Thee to hear us, good Lord.

That Thou wilt accomplish the number of thine elect, and hasten thy kingdom; that we, with all those that are departed in the true faith of thy Holy name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in thy eternal and everlasting glory, through Jesus Christ, our Lord,

We beseech Thee to hear us, good Lord.

Our Father, which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name; Thy kingdom come; Thy will be done on earth, As it is in heaven; Give us this day our daily bread; And forgive us our trespasses, As we forgive them that trespass against us; And lead us not into temptation, But deliver us from evil; For thine is the kingdom, And the power, And the glory, For ever and ever. Amen.

Almighty God, who hast given us grace at this time with one accord to make our prayers and supplications unto Thee; and dost promise that when two or three are gathered together in Thy name, thou wilt grant their requests; fulfil now, O Lord, the desires and petitions of thy servants, as may be most expedient for them; granting us in this world knowledge of thy truth, and in the world to come life everlasting. Amen.

The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, be with us all evermore. Amen.—2nd Cor. xiii. 14.

* Additional evidence on this point will, it is believed, be furnished, when the important collection of the Brehon Laws, now in course of preparation for publication, shall have issued from the press.

RECENT CONTROVERSY AT BOULOGNE.

(Continued from page 135.)

The following arguments, are given in the Resumè as those urged by Mr. Gretton in support of the authority of the Roman See, p. 9:—

"Before the end of the 1st century under St. Clement, the 4th Pope, a schism, or, as St. Clement himself described it, 'a foul and unholy sedition,' having broke out in the Church of Corinth, an appeal was made to the Church of Rome for its interference and advice. The Epistle which the Holy Father addressed to the Corinthians is to be found in the Epistolæ Patrum de Prey, Basle, 1742."

"On the authority of Father Lacordaire, whose works (from whence they are quoted) have received the sanction of the Catholic Church, the following were offered:—

"At the end of the 2nd century, the Churches of Asia persisted in celebrating Easter on the fourteenth day of the moon, like the Jews, whilst the Christians of the west on the Sunday which follows that day; the Pope, St. Victor I., excommunicated them."

"In the 3rd century, St. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, with a council of sixty bishops of Africa decided that the children of heretics should be rebaptised; the Pope, St. Stephen I., opposed it and menaced them with excommunication, and St. Cyprian, great man as he was, was obliged to bend."

"St. Denis, Patriarch of Alexandria, the first of the patriarchates of the east, issued certain doubtful propositions on the Trinity; many bishops, being alarmed, addressed the Sovereign Pontiff, and St. Denis was obliged to write an apologetic letter to the Pope."

"St. Irenæus, a writer so near the Apostolic times as to have had for his instructor in Christianity, St. Polycarp, a disciple of St. John the Evangelist, says—"

"We can enumerate those bishops who were appointed by the Apostles and their successors down to ourselves, none of whom taught or even knew the wild opinions of these men (heretics). However, as it would be tedious to enumerate the whole list of successions, I shall confine myself to that of Rome, *the greatest and most ancient and illustrious Church*, founded by the glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul; receiving from them her doctrine which was announced to all men, and *which, through the succession of her bishops, is come down to us.* Thus we confound *all those who, through evil designs, or vainglory, or perverseness, teach what they ought not; for to this Church, on account of its superior headship (potentiorem principalitatem), every other must have recourse—that is, the faithful of all countries, in which Church is preserved the doctrine delivered by the Apostles.*"—Adv. Hæres, Lib. 3.

"St. Cyprian—Primacy was given to *Peter* to show that there is but one Church and one Chair. Does he who abandons the Chair of Peter, upon *which the Church is founded*, flatter himself that he is in the Church?"—De Unit. Ecc.

"St. Cyprian—Moreover, after all this, having had a pseudo bishop set up for themselves by heretics, they dare to sail and to carry letters from schismatic and profane men to the Chair of St. Peter, and *to the principal Church*, whence the unity of the priesthood took its rise; nor do they consider that the Romans are those (whose faith was praised in the preaching of the Apostle) to whom faithlessness cannot have access."—Ep. 55, ad. Cornel.

"St. Cyprian also calls the Roman Church the *Root and Matrix of the Catholic Church.*"—Cyp. Op., Ep. 65, Perisse Freres. Paris.

"St. Optatus, Bishop of Milevis, in Numidia, in the fourth century—You cannot deny that St. Peter, the *chief of the Apostles*, established an Episcopal Chair at Rome. This Chair was one, *that all might preserve unity, by the union which they had with it, so that whoever set up a Chair against it, should be a schismatic and an offender.*"—De. Schism. Donat. Paris and Mayence.

"St. Jerome—I am following no other than Christ, united to the communion of your *Holiness*—that is, to the Chair of Peter. I know that the Church is founded on that Rock. Whoever eateth the Lamb out of that house, is a profane man. Whoever is not in the ark shall perish by the flood."—Ep. 15, ad. Damas.

Dr. M.—It certainly is very striking that you so systematically avoid the Scriptures, and the real questions at issue. The reason why you are thus anxious to escape from the former is plain enough—they give no support to your doctrines. For this cause. Those doctrines were never derived from the Bible, but grew gradually into existence, and in assumption. In order to *support* them, recourse was had, in after years, to God's Word. Certain passages, from which they were not at all derived, were tortured into proof. Hence, the true reason of the extreme weakness of the Scripture proof which you attempt to give of your peculiar tenets. That such has been your mode of procedure is evident from this circumstances. You dare not attempt the only proof which can, upon your own principles, fairly establish your case by Scriptural testimony. If the passages from the Bible which your Church now adduces, had really been the source from whence her doctrines were derived, it will be easy for you to establish this, by showing that early Christian writers did take those passages, and did explicitly assign to them that meaning which your Church, since the Council of Trent, has ascribed. But this you will not attempt. You cannot produce a single instance where it was done. Hence, it is clear such passages were not the originals from whence your peculiar doctrines were deduced. The Scripture was an afterthought. The doctrines, as you now hold them, grew gradually in assumption from century to century, and their growth can be easily accounted for. It was, of course, necessary to make some defence of them from revelation. But as your Church could not find in it, as might be expected, any good defence, she was constrained to take the best she could get, and make up for lack of evidence by asserting her infallibility, for the truth of her modern interpretations. She has *put* a sense which she did not *find* in them on such passages, and, by authority, *created* a new meaning. If this account of the present Scriptural argument be untrue, you can at once refute it, by taking *seriatim* the passages of Scripture

* Here any may be mentioned in whom the persons assembled are especially interested.
† Matt. xii. 20. ‡ Ps. lxxvii. 9. § Isaiah lxi. 1-2.
‖ Isaiah xxvi. 9. ¶ Isaish ii. 4.

which you maintain to be the basis of your claims, and then show, from those early writings which we possess, that their authors did really, by their own words, give to them that interpretation which you now give. This you will not attempt to do.

In point of fact, what I am now requiring is the only proof, by your own principles, open to you. For, you do not permit men to exercise their own judgment upon those passages of Scripture which contain articles of faith. Infallibility you cannot assume when called on to prove it. Take, then, now, the questions at issue in our present discussion, the infallibility of, either Church or Pontiff—which it be, or whether it be of both, you have nowhere yet decided—take your present doctrine of the Pontiff's supreme jurisdiction of power over the whole Church of Christ. How will you proceed in the Scriptural proof? What is your rule for the interpretations of the passages you adduce? It must be one of three things. The natural judgment of men duly exercising the same reason which they use in all matters of practical importance; or it must be infallibility interpreting them; or the universal authority of the Fathers testifying, by their united sanction, to the truth of your present interpretation.

But the first of these methods you prohibit; the second you cannot *assume* when called on to prove it. You have, therefore, nothing left but to test the truth of your doctrines by the only criterion which remains, and which you assert to exist—the according and universal consent of the Fathers.

Here again your pretensions have driven you into a fatal difficulty. If your Church did not assert that there really was such an according witness from the earliest times—if she did not allege that there really was a flowing stream of consentient testimony to the truth of her doctrines—it is manifest she would have no proof at all left her. Such testimony she does assert; and she has succeeded in imposing upon her members the reception of an assertion instead of the truth of a fact. She has so jumbled together infallibility with assertion, that her members do not distinguish. They take her infallibility not only as a guarantee for interpretations of Scripture, but likewise as proof for the truth of historic allegations. They do not limit the claim to the proof of doctrines from the Bible, but believe, moreover, that she is as infallible when asserting a fact, as when deriving a doctrine; as a witness or as an interpreter.

My present position is this—your pretensions have forced you to make a claim which is fatal to you. Equally fatal would it have been had you not made it. Prohibiting the exercise of private judgment upon passages of Scripture containing articles of faith debarred from assuming infallibility when called on to prove it, you had no option, because no other proof of your pretensions, but the dogmatic averment that there really did exist one united voice of all antiquity deposing to the truth of your doctrines. Nothing less than this could prove your case. It would not do simply to say that *some* Fathers held your views; for if there was any difference of opinion among them, this would be to let in what you, with so much worldly wisdom, so well prohibit—private judgment. Hence, you were constrained, by your position, and because of your pretensions, to hazard the daring assertion, that there really did exist—that full proof can be produced of its existence—the consentient authority of the Fathers deposing, with full unanimity, to the existence of your modern doctrines in the Church of Christ from the earliest period. This you do assert; this you do teach; and this I shall now put you to prove in the two questions which we are at present discussing; and here I say your pretensions will fall by their own weight.

(To be continued.)

Correspondence.

ARE THE PRIESTHOOD SINCERE?

[We have great pleasure in presenting to our readers a translation of the following letter from the Abbé Miel, which we think valuable, not only as coming from the pen of one intimately acquainted with the state of the priesthood in France, of which he was so lately a distinguished member, but as evincing the same spirit of Christian moderation which rendered his former letter, published in our September number, so touchingly interesting.]

(TRANSLATION.)

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I have every day occasion to observe that many evangelical Christians are persuaded that the greater part of the Roman Catholic priesthood are wanting in sincerity, and do not themselves believe in what they are commissioned to teach to others. That it may be so, more or less, in Protestant countries, is possible, though I am not aware of it. But as concerning the countries where the Roman system is dominant, and especially as concerning France, of which the clergy everywhere enjoy particular and deserved consideration, I know, and owe it to truth, as well as to justice, to say, that the clergy in general do not feel the least doubt with regard to the doctrines which they preach in the name of Rome. How that comes to pass, and what is the nature of that sincerity, it will not be difficult nor, perhaps, needless to explain, and such is the object of this letter.

If there be any one point of its organisation in which the Church of Rome shows herself particularly skilful, it is beyond contradiction in the education of her clergy. You cannot imagine how marvellously everything is combined in order to fix firmly in the intellect and affections of candidates for orders what is called faith—faith, be it remarked, not in our Saviour, nor in Scripture, but faith in the Church herself. What precautions are taken to prevent a doubt from reaching the understanding, or to repel it victoriously if ever it should present itself there! The principles inculcated in young candidates for holy orders, the lessons given to them, the books placed in their hands, every thing concurs and tends to the same object. And these operations are certain of success, because they are directed against simple, unsuspicious souls, who, as it were, lend themselves of their own accord, without resistance, to the impressions. The seminaries are recruited, in fact, from the country districts. The pupils are, for the most part, children of the lower orders, who have attracted attention by their happy disposition, by their assiduity in attending religious ceremonies, and by the docility they display to the lessons of the priests. When they quit their families to enter the first or lower seminaries they certainly have but little knowledge of religion. This, however, they know perfectly well (for they have been taught it from their infancy), that in order to be Christians they must believe firmly, and under pain of damnation, everything which is believed and taught by the Roman Church. And as they have been equally taught that the Church means the parish priest and every priest approved by the bishop, they have an unbounded reliance in the word of the priest. The priest is in their eyes a man altogether beyond and above the rest of mankind, he exercises over them all the ascendancy not only of learning and virtue, of which they form to themselves a very high opinion, but of a celestial mission of a divine nature. They listen to him as the oracle of God, not admitting the possibility of deceiving them, or of his deceiving himself. His lessons are the more impressive from being given with all the force of simple affirmations—"That is so;" "That is not so." So far is this carried, that they have not even an idea of a religious discussion or controversy. Even in the world, in which they are received before their admission to the college, and where they again appear from time to time during the vacations, no discussion is ever heard upon these subjects. By common agreement, in all Roman Catholic countries, the study of religion is considered the business exclusively of the priest, the believer has only to gather at the foot of the pulpit the fruits of that study. The few exceptions which might be produced against this rule would only serve to establish its truth.

Nevertheless, when the understanding of the pupil of the seminary is a little more developed—when he commences to make use of his own judgment in the domain of natural science—it sometimes happens that reason endeavours to vindicate her right to be heard in matters of religion also, and seeks to qualify the doctrine presented to her as alone containing eternal truth. But the confessor is ever at hand to guard his spiritual son against this dangerous snare. Reason is silenced as being merely the voice of pride; or else is deluded by the promise of having her suggestions examined at another stage, during the term of study at the upper seminary.

At last arrives the solemn epoch, in which the theological education is completed—an epoch the most critical of all. If the edifice of belief does not crumble then, it is usually fixed for ever. Every history which is not in every point in perfect harmony with the doctrine of Rome is strictly forbidden. Even Bailllie's *Treatise on Theology*, which has for a number of years been almost exclusively used in our seminaries in France, has just been placed in the index of forbidden works, on the ground that it does not profess *Ultramontanism* with sufficient openness. This is the doctrine which must, at any sacrifice, prevail. Whether knowingly or not, the teachers do not hesitate, with this object in view, to mis-state facts and to misquote texts, as I shall soon have occasion to demonstrate. And yet, upon the slightest reflection, how flimsy are the foundations upon which is reared so colossal a structure!—how weak the arguments!—how inconclusive the evidence!

Well then, would you believe it, the circumstance which ought to shake the faith of the neophyte is precisely that which in most cases serves to fix it. Taking this proposition as a starting point, which they deem exempt even from the possibility of attack—viz., that whatever is taught in the name of Rome is infallibly true, the argument proceeds thus:—"Reason is inadequate to demonstrate such or such a truth: faith, therefore, is a matter of necessity." And, closing their eyes, they precipitate themselves into the bosom of a faith justly called blind.

It is an analogous reasoning to what I have often heard repeated by sincere Roman Catholics after visiting the eternal city. Deeply affected by the scandals of every description pervading the city of the Pontiffs, they deduced from these very scandals a *proof* of the divine nature of the Church of Rome, and of the permanent protection afforded to it by the Holy Ghost, alleging it to be manifest that that Church could not, without such protection, exist for an hour in the midst of such corruptions.

Nor is this all, although it would be something, no doubt, to have thus brought the young student in theology to admit as a necessity this belief in the Church. But, after having thoroughly impressed the idea in his mind that a simple doubt kills faith—after having exhibited in the most hideous colours all who have ever shaken off the yoke of Rome—then they extol beyond all measure the excellence of an humble submission to the authority of the priest—or what they term "*foi de charbonnier*" [faith of a charcoal burner—*i.e.*, of an uncultivated, ignorant person]. Such a submission is incessantly placed before the pupil as the basis of all virtue, as the source of every grace, and of every light; and the result is that the neophyte, terrified and cajoled in turns, throws himself unhesitatingly into the extremest opinions opposite to that from which he has been warned. Not only does the shadow of a doubt terrify him—he flies from it as he would from the serpent of impurity. For this is another rule incessantly impressed upon him, that temptations against faith are to be placed in the same category as temptations against chastity; that the only security against such is in flight. Nay, he even goes beyond this—he at last comes to love faith for itself, and for the love of faith to despise, I had almost said to hate, reason. He persuades himself that there is supreme merit in believing without proof; he does not desire to examine, or to be convinced by any examination which he may make—he would rather preserve all the merits of an unreasoning assent.

I have read in the life of St. Louis [Louis IX. of France], that when some of his courtiers came to announce a miracle which he might have an opportunity of witnessing, by which our Lord showed himself visibly in the consecrated host, under the form of a child, the pious monarch replied—"Let those who doubt concerning the real presence in the holy sacrament go and see this miracle: for myself, I believe in that Presence as firmly as if I saw it bodily with my eyes." I do not hesitate to assert, that the majority of our young ecclesiastics, on leaving the seminary, would be disposed to hold similar language under similar circumstances. Such is the state of belief to which it is possible at length to arrive by *willing* that one should believe; by continually repeating to one's self "I believe."

I hope, sir, that your readers can now understand the two things which I proposed to myself to show in this letter—viz., how it happens that (at least in France) a Roman Priest may be sincere in his teaching, and in what sense it is true that he is a man of faith.

I am, with respect,
Your very humble servant,
C. MIEL.

PURGATORY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Permit me to make a few remarks on that point of Mr. Edmond Power's letter, in your last (No. 35, p. 135), which refers to myself.

The object of my previous letter (No. 31, p. 86) was to expose misquotations made by two of your Roman Catholic correspondents in their endeavour to prove "that the doctrine of Purgatory was taught by the early Fathers." As Mr. Power has not attempted a justification on this head, I presume that he admits the accuracy of my references. He, however, calls in question one of my statements. He writes—

"Mr. Collette undertakes to disprove Purgatory! and in order to make this conclusion available to the end he proposes, he tells those for whose edification he writes, by an egregious mistake, no doubt, that, 'according to the modern Roman doctrine, all the faithful—all those who die in the faith of Christ—go to Purgatory, before they can be in a fit condition to appear before God.'" Mr. Power then desires to know whence I learned this novel feature. He does not, however, deny such to be the teaching of his Church. He will admit that his Church makes a broad distinction between those who die in *mortal* and those in *venial* sins. Those who die in mortal sin go "to hell for all eternity" (Dr. Doyle's Abridgment of Christian Doctrine), and those who die in *venial* sins, we are told, "go to Purgatory till they have made full satisfaction for them, and then to heaven." Then we read in the Catechism of the Council of Trent—"Besides this (namely, hell), there is a *purgatorial fire*, where the SOULS OF THE PIOUS are, for a certain time, expiated by suffering, by which an entrance may be gained to the eternal abodes, into which nothing unclean can enter."*

Pope Gregory I. (if, indeed, the work attributed to him by Romanists be genuine) stated, that the fire of Purgatory was for those only who had committed "peccata minuta atque levissima."†

Now, I believe Mr. Power will admit that those who die in *venial* sin, and the "pious," such as stated in the Cate-

* Cat. Conc. Trid., pars i., cap. iv., Quæst. iii., p. 80. Lips. 1801.
† Gregor. Magn. Dialog., Lib. iv., c. 39.

chism, are the *faithful*, and such as die in the *faith of Christ*. All these must go to Purgatory before they go to heaven.

That *all*, and the best of us, have sinned, and do sin, cannot for a moment be denied. Let the following texts of Scripture be carefully examined on this head:—1 Kings viii. 46; Job xv. 14; xxv. 4; Ps. cxxx. 3; Pr. xx. 9; xxiv. 16; Eccl. vii. 20; 1 John i. 8.

The Blessed Virgin Mary herself is charged with errors and failings, even of want of faith, by many of the early Fathers, among whom we find Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, Basil, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Cyril of Alexandria.

Is Mr. Power prepared to assert that any one Christian dies without some taint of sin upon him, or wholly perfect? Now, Dr. Wiseman in his 11th Lecture, p. 57, vol. ii., London, 1851, writes—

"Moreover, we are assured in the New Law that 'nothing defiled shall enter' into the heavenly Jerusalem. Suppose, then, a Christian dies, *who had committed some slight transgression* [Is there any Christian who has not?], he cannot enter heaven in this state, and yet we cannot suppose that he is to be condemned for ever. What alternative, then, are we to admit? Why, that there is some place in which the soul will be purged of the sin, and qualified to enter into the glory of God. Will you say that God forgives all sin at the moment of death? Where is the warrant for that assertion? This is an *important point of doctrine;* and if you maintain that God at once forgives sins, on any occasion, you must allege strong authority for it. If you find nothing of such a doctrine in his revelation, but if, on the contrary, you are told—first, that no defilement can enter the kingdom of heaven; and, secondly, that some sins are forgiven in the next world, you must admit some means of purgation whereby the sinner, who has not incurred eternal punishment, is qualified for the enjoyment of God's glory."

Again, in explanation of the text from Rev. xxi. 27, we read in Keenan's "Controversial Catechism" (London, 1854), cap. xxi, sec. 2, p. 148—"There must be some place for the purification of souls after death; because the Scripture assures us, that even *the just man* falls seven times; and can any one in his senses suppose that many will not die without expiating these faults? With these they cannot enter heaven, which receiveth nothing defiled; they cannot be sent hell, for they are, according to Scripture, JUST; therefore, there must be a third place, where these failings of even the just man will be expiated."

Thus, then, it is very evident, that all Christians who do not die in mortal sins do go to Purgatory; they, nevertheless, are the *pious* who die in the *faith of Christ*.

I am quite aware that some Romanists assert that martyrs go direct to heaven and their sins are at once forgiven; but this is only a private opinion, and not a *doctrine* of the Church of Rome.

For instance, Keenan's Catechism (reference as above) in explaining away the text, "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord, for they shall rest from their labour," asserts that it "only alludes to martyrs and such as die free from all sin and debt of temporal punishment; and such, of course, required no purification." But this is not only an unsupported and unwarrantable interpretation of the text, to get over an obvious difficulty, but it assumes that any mortal can be declared to die "free from *all* sin;" free from (as Pope Gregory has it) of the lightest and most trivial sin for whom Purgatory is said to be reserved!

I think you, sir, at least, will agree with me, that I have made no "egregious blunder."

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

C. H. COLLETTE.

London, Nov. 18, 1854.

ON THE INFALLIBLE CHURCH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I will begin this letter by saying, it is true that if the infallibility of the Church were to depend on the natural weakness and fallibility of the members who compose her, the unbeliever might have some specious pretence for refusing to submit to her authority. But the eternal wisdom of the Father, who "reacheth from end to end strongly, and disposeth all things sweetly," took especial care to provide His chaste spouse on earth with an infallible guide, to preserve the integrity of that faith which He had purified in His blood.

Now, it would be unreasonable and preposterous that the Church, in the law of nature, or the Mosaic law, should be endowed with greater privileges than the Church in the law of grace; yet we find, from the beginning of the world to the promulgation of the new law, that all true believers had, ordinarily, no other grounds for their infallible faith than the infallibility of the Church, or body of faithful then existing, in proposing the traditions which she or they had received. And it would be repugnant to the wisdom of Christ, and He would have acted contrary to all other legislators, if He had left a law, mysterious from its own nature, and subject to a thousand different interpretations, from the various interests, prejudices, and passions of those for whom it was intended, without having constituted an infallible judge to expound its meaning. What more simple than the obedience required from Catholics to the dictates of a Church with which Christ has promised to abide for ever? There is no one so humble, so ignorant, or unlettered, but may safely follow this rule, which, with a Divine and admirable impartiality, renders the attainment of saving faith equally easy to all.

Common sense tells us, sir, that the Church which our Lord founded on earth, ought to possess the power of teaching by authority; and it is sufficiently clear that this is the only method whereby—

First—The ignorant, the dull of apprehension, and those who have not leisure to examine the Scriptures—that is to say, the greater part of mankind—can be at all instructed; whereby—

Secondly—The learned themselves can be so instructed as to remove all fluctuation and doubt from their minds; whereby—

Thirdly—Both learned and ignorant are furnished with the same motives of belief, and the same foundation for their faith; whereby—

Fourthly—All heresies, schisms, and dissensions about religion, are prevented; whereby—

Fifthly—The spirit of peace, of meekness, of humility, of diffidence in ourselves, of submission and obedience—that is to say, the characteristic virtues of a disciple of Christ—are inculcated, and are formed in us; whereby, that pride and presumption of the human heart, which, as St. Paul says, "raiseth itself up against the knowledge of God," is beaten down and subdued, and every understanding is made captive to the obedience of faith; whereby we are guarded against the wildness of imagination, the illusions of self-love, the spirit of party, the bias of education, the influence of prejudice, and so many sources of error and vice; whereby, in short, that holy, that rational, that amiable religion, which Christ brought down from heaven as a blessing to mankind, can be taught, can be enforced, and can be constantly maintained.

Now, as the method of instructing by authority is that which answers all these heavenly purposes, and leads man to virtue and happiness, in a manner conformable to his nature; and as the contrary method, whereby people are desired to shake off authority and judge for themselves, naturally leads to so great evils, and is so ill suited to the state and condition of mankind, it follows, undeniably, I repeat, that the Church of Christ has, and ought to have, power to exercise it. Indeed, Mr. Editor, in matters of faith and religion, we must be as humble and obedient to the Catholic Church as young children to their parents. "Amen, I say to you, whosoever shall not receive the Kingdom of God as a child, shall not enter into it."—St. Luke.

I remain, Sir,

Your very obedient servant,

WILLIAM ROURKE.

Passage.

Mr. Rourke observes that "from the beginning of the world to the promulgation of the new law, all true believers had, ordinarily, no other grounds for their infallible faith than the infallibility of the Church or body of faithful then existing." In saying this, he must surely have forgotten the state of the Jewish Church in the time of our Blessed Lord. We ask him, where was *then* the infallibility of the Church, at a time when of all others she most needed to be rightly instructed on the question of our Lord's claim to be the promised Messiah? Were not the chief priests and scribes our Lord's bitterest enemies? Did they not threaten to put out of the synagogue every Jew that believed on Him, and did they not finally condemn Him to death? Surely, if Mr. Rourke reflects on this for a moment, he cannot but see that the case of the Jewish Church is fatal to his favourite theory of infallibility. We have stated more than once that the Jews, as a visible existing Church, had far clearer evidences of divine guidance and instruction than any that the Church of Rome can point out. Yet we know that on the most important of all questions, the heads of the Jewish Church proved false and treacherous guides: and, if our Lord's hearers had not exercised their private judgment—if they had not "searched the Scriptures" which testified of Him, not one of them would have ever attained to a saving knowledge of the Gospel. What Pope of the Church of Rome could ever truly say that he prophesied, and spoke under the influence of the Holy Ghost? Yet we are told in Scripture that Caiaphas, who was high priest in the time of our Lord, did this, in virtue of the office that he held.—John xi. 51. And, nevertheless, he was the most active conspirator against the life of our blessed Lord. Arguing *a priori*, we might say, "what more simple than the obedience required" from a Jew "to the dictates of a Church with which God promised to abide? There is no one so humble, so ignorant or unlettered, but may safely follow this rule." Yet it is plain that if the Jews in our Lord's time had followed this *safe* and *simple* rule, they would most certainly have perilled Their eternal salvation; and from hence we conclude that the promises which God has left to his Church, never can dispense with the duty incumbent on each member of the Church, to satisfy himself of the truth and reasonableness of the doctrines which she teaches.

We fully admit that the Church possesses the power of teaching by authority; all that we deny is, that this authority is an *infallible* authority. The example which Mr. Rourke adduces at the close of his letter sufficiently illustrates this distinction. Every parent has an authority over his child, to which the child is bound to submit; yet the parent is not infallible. He may command his child to do what is wrong, and if the child's moral faculties are sufficiently instructed to know this, it is clearly his duty to disobey his earthly parent, and to "obey God rather than man." It may, doubtless, seem to us, that mankind would have been placed in a more safe and secure position, as regards their spiritual welfare, if they were not exposed to the perils arising from error and unbelief, if no heresies existed in the Church, to draw the unwary from the truth—if, in short, the path to virtue and happiness was as plain and easy as Mr. Rourke would fain represent it. But the simple answer to all this is, that God has not willed it so. He has seen fit to place us in a position where we must exercise habits, not of blind, unquestioning submission to authority, but of sober, rational inquiry. These precautions are necessary, to secure our temporal welfare; and they are almost equally necessary for our spiritual well-being. In short, to use the words of the Apostle, it is our duty to "prove all things, and hold fast that which is good."—1 Thess. v. 21.

ON PURGATORY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I have been brought up a Catholic, but have lived several years in a Protestant family, and amongst them the second coming of our Blessed Saviour and the end of the world are often talked of as being very near.

Now, without troubling myself as to whether or not they are right in the opinion some of them hold on this matter, I do confess that I am troubled in my mind about one point connected with the end of the world, and the more I think of it the more it puzzles me. I would ask the question myself from a priest, but I was once told when I made an inquiry about another subject, "that such questions were only a tempting of God to take away my faith." The answer quieted me at that time, but I do not say and do not think it would satisfy me now.

The family I live in takes the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, and, as you must know, there have been many papers in it about Purgatory from both Catholic and Protestant, still there is one question about it that (as far as I have seen in these papers) has never been publicly asked, and, what is more, I have never read a word about it in any Catholic prayer-book I have now, or ever have had. It is not mentioned in any way in either the Daily Companion, the Garden of the Soul, the Key of Paradise, the Manna of the Soul, the Missal, or the Office for the Dead, or the notes to the Douay Bible. I can find no reference to it in either the double or single Douay Catechism, or any English or Irish one; still I do not mean to say that it has never been alluded to or explained, but only that I have never been able to find any mention of it.

Sir, I have not much expectation that you can tell me anything satisfactory on the subject; but I do hope that some one or other of the Catholic gentlemen who have written you such long and learned letters may assist you in doing away with my difficulty—I may say not mine only, but that of many others with whom I have talked about it. What I want to know is this—supposing the Protestant notion to be true, that the end of the world is really near at hand—say next week, or next month, or next year—what will become of me if I should die in venial sins so shortly before the Day of Judgment that I should not have time to atone for them by the pains of purgatory, or should not be released by the masses or the private prayers of my relations and friends, or be taken out of Purgatory by the Blessed Virgin on account of the scapular, or any other of the means the Church has appointed for the release or relief of the souls in purgatory—I ask again, what is to become of me?

Ought I to be received in Heaven with some of my sins unsatisfied for, or must I be sent to Hell for sins that I have been taught do not deserve eternal punishment?

I know that you, sir, can get rid of my question at once by saying that you do not believe in purgatory, and that there is no use in your arguing about it. But I would gladly impress on you that to Catholics purgatory is a very terrible reality, which no unbelief on your part can destroy.

We have the testimony of many fathers of the Church to the fact of there being a purgatory; and that angelic doctor, St. Thomas, says—"That the pains of it exceed the pains which Jesus Christ suffered in his holy passion, which, notwithstanding, were the most bitter that ever any creature endured in this life; over and above which they are not torments for an hour or a day, as those of this world, but they may, and do, last twenty, thirty, or a hundred years."

My mother has been dead more than fifty years, and prayers are still said for her on her anniversary. Her life was not half the length that mine has been, and I cannot think she committed more sins than I have done; yet the priests evidently show, by taking money for celebrating mass for her, that they think she still requires to be prayed for. What then, I ask for the third time, is to become of me if I should die within a short time of the Day of Judgment?

Sir, you say you are sincerely anxious that people should know what they ought to believe and trust to. Will you add your request to my supplication, that some of your

Catholic correspondents will give me, through your paper, a clear and plain answer as to what we are to believe on this important subject. For, without giving in to the Protestant supposition that the end of the world is so very near at hand, as that those now alive may live to see it, still the Day of Judgment must come sometime, and there can be no reasonable objection that we should know now how we may expect to stand then.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

In Earnest.

We gladly insert the above letter, and shall be glad if any of our Roman Catholic correspondents will give a clear and plain answer to it. Fifty years in such a place as Purgatory is represented to be, is, indeed, a very terrible idea to those who believe it to be a reality. The question is all the more important—is it a reality or a fiction? We believe it to be a fiction; first, because it is never once mentioned in the Holy Scriptures, where Heaven and Hell are spoken of in places innumerable; secondly, because it is inconsistent with those passages in Scripture, in which the blood of Jesus is stated to *cleanse from all sin*, and which, therefore, renders needless any other mode of purification; thirdly, because no tradition of it is traceable to the times of our Lord and his Apostles; fourthly, because, in the fifth century, St. Patrick, in his works, never once alludes to it, and even negatives its existence in his treatise on "The Three Habitations"—Earth, Heaven, and Hell; fifthly, because Gregory the Great treats it as a *new discovery* in his time—viz., the sixth century; sixthly, because we have clearly traced its origin to Paganism and heresy, and not to the Fathers of the Primitive Church. We earnestly invite our respected correspondent to an investigation of these reasons for believing that Purgatory, though truly terrible to those who believe in it, is not a reality, but a mere delusion, which we are satisfied has done more to render mankind miserable and vicious, than any other popular error which has ever prevailed in the world.

FLOWERS FOR DECEMBER.

Almost the very last representative of the glorious flower family is the "golden-anthered, ever-fair Chrysanthemum." It appears in the middle of November, and continues flowering till the close of December. A favourite flower it would have been in June, but in the midst of winter, smiling as it lifts its cheerful eye to heaven, through storm and rain, it is tenfold welcome—

"Like'an old friend's pleasant face,
Though all the earth is void of grace,
And the very birds are dumb,
Cheerful, gay, Chrysanthemum."

So bright is its countenance, and so pleasant its smell, that it seems almost unnatural to the season; and we might fancy some rose tree to have slept the summer months, and awakened now to find all its gay cotemporaries departed.

"But though thy wintry doom may seem severe,
Uncheered by songs of birds or kindred flower,
I do believe thou dost not blossom here
But by the will of that Almighty power
Who makes thy fragile bloom an instrument
To teach the proud and murmuring content."

And most aptly fitted to teach this lesson of content is the flower that shows itself so cheerful and bright, in the midst of gloom and storm. It is the philosopher of its race, and the appropriate emblem of contentment under adversity.

The term Chrysanthemum, or gold-flower, is a generic name, given by botanists to several plants bearing star-shaped flowers. The ox-eyed daisy is the *C. leucanthemum*; the corn marigold is the *C. segetum*—both natives of Ireland. The Chrysanthemum that flowers just now is the Chinese Chrysanthemum (*C. Sinense*). The old-fashioned red kind was introduced into England in 1795; but it is far surpassed in beauty by the varieties more recently cultivated, and brought to such great perfection. Though a native of the warm climates of China and Japan, the Chrysanthemums have become acclimated and hardy among us, and grow as freely in the open air as in the greenhouse.

The Passion Flower is another of those visitants of the closing year that seem to irradiate the winter day. It is a member of a numerous family of twining plants, chiefly found in a wild state in America, and in parts of central Europe. In the American forests, the Passion Flower climbs the loftiest trees, and clothes them richly in festoons of bright green leaves and gay-coloured flowers. It is there chiefly valued for its fruit, which never ripens with us; though a very interesting object in the early months of spring. The common Passion Flower (*Passiflora cærulea*) is a native of Brazil. Everybody has heard how it derives its name from a fancied resemblance between the instruments of our Lord's crucifixion and the several parts of the flower, which were supposed to indicate the accompaniments of our Redeemer's death and sufferings. In the five anthers were supposed to be represented the five wounds of the body; in the triple style, the three nails by which he was fixed to the cross; in the centre pillar, which elevates the germen, the pillar to which he was bound; in the rays of the nectary, the bright halo which encompassed him, or the crown of thorns with which he was crowned; and so on. There is much of poetical fancy and natural sentiment in all this; and did these things end here, we could have no possible objection to such symbols, but would entertain a lively interest in the innocent emblems of sacred things, which have a place in the reverential recollection and gratitude of every Christian.

No man can pass with indifference the spot where a faithful martyr has perished; nor look unmoved on the fragments of the stake to which his body was bound; and every man of feeling—not to say of pious gratitude—would be disposed to regard with affectionate interest every emblem of our Lord's crucifixion, and especially the cross itself. And our Roman Catholic friends are mistaken if they suppose that any right-minded Protestant regards with aversion or indifference those outward signs which they (the intelligent portion of them) profess merely to reverence and respect, and not to adore or to worship. Why, then, do we not set up the cross and the images of saints and martyrs in our churches and thoroughfares? Are we stoics in religion, and callous to all those recollections and associations connected with Christian history and Christian hope? Far from it; but our reasons are—first, that these reverences, and these settings up of outward signs and symbols, are not commanded or encouraged where we might expect to find them recommended if they were safe and salutary incentives to devotion; but are, on the contrary, expressly forbidden by Him who is wiser than we are, and who understands human nature, its frailties, and its tendency to idol worship, better than we do. And, secondly, because our own experience, and the observation of every honest and intelligent man in the kingdom, tells that these emblems have become the source, not merely of harmless enthusiasm or amiable weakness, but of the most downright and stupid idolatry. We do not wish or mean to impute this to any peculiar perversity of Romanism, but to the natural tendency of our common nature. The natural impulse of the human heart is to make a superstitious use of those sacred emblems and memorials, and thereby to give a misdirection to the religious sentiment, from God and Jesus Christ to canvas, wood, and stone; and it is vain to escape the tremendous responsibility of sanctioning such reverences under metaphysical distinctions of Latria, and Dulia, and Hyperdulia. The Church of Rome itself did not discover these degrees of reverence until the Reformation coerced the Council of Trent, in self-defence, to invent and to promulgate distinctions which—if not without a difference—it is preposterous to imagine that any ignorant peasant can either comprehend or observe. It is a serious question, then, for any conscientious and enlightened Roman Catholic priest (of whom we are satisfied there are many in Ireland) to consider—Do you, in your heart and conscience, believe it possible to hold up any material object—whether it be a golden calf, or a golden image, or a cross—to a mixed congregation of educated and uneducated worshippers, for adoration—as is done, for instance, in Rome, on every Good Friday—and expect that God's law shall not be broken—"Thou shalt not make to thyself a graven image, nor the likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or in the earth beneath; thou shalt not adore them nor serve them."—Exod. xx. 5.

When the Spaniards who invaded Peru first beheld the Passion Flower growing on every lofty tree, they regarded it as a token that the American Indians should become their converts. History tells us a humiliating tale of their mode of preaching the Gospel of Christ, and how much the most sacred emblems and objects may be desecrated and abused. The Passion Flower has, for reasons too obvious, become the emblem of religious superstition. Would that the cross of Christ was the rallying point of intelligent Christianity, based exclusively on the meritorious sufferings and bloodshedding of Christ, and that men would look more to the substance and reality of that atonement, and be less concerned about the outward emblems of perishable wood and stone.

There is another flower whose pale beauty is displayed amid the desolation and storm of December—the Christmas Rose (*Helleborus Niger*)—as beautiful as any that the summer produces. Like flakes of snow or large white roses, its flowers contrast vividly with the dark evergreen of its leaves. It is an Alpine plant, but long since common in our gardens. The Helleborus Orientalis was the black Hellebore of the ancients, which they believed to possess virtue in the cure of insanity. Anticyra, a city of Greece, was famous for its Hellebore, and the proverb, "Naviget Anticyram," was equivalent to send the lunatic to Anticyra. It enjoys a happier association with us, being the emblem of Christian faith.

Christmas, too, is associated with the Mistletoe, the Holly, and the Ivy. The Mistletoe (*Viscum album*) is a simple, modest plant that cheers the woods at Christmas time. The Druids used it in their sacrificial offerings, and gathered it with superstitious rites, supposing it to possess the virtue of curing certain diseases. The early Christians appear to have borrowed its use from the Druids, as they did the Maytlower on May-day, and employed it as an emblem of joy and gladness at Christmas time. The Holly plant (*Ilex aquifolium*), with its fearless, hardy leaves, bristling like a hedgehog, was, from an early time, used in decorating churches at Christmas, whence it was called Holy Tree, now corrupted into Holly Tree.

The Ivy is, perhaps, the latest flowering plant of the year; and on a warm winter's day the poor bees may be seen hovering round its sickly-green blossoms. Its berries do not ripen till April. The common Ivy (*Hedera helix*) displays its clusters of green blossoms in almost every part of the world, and is everywhere linked with the warmest associations, whether it climbs the lofty heart of the forest oak, or mantles the decaying ruin of departed greatness. Among the ancients the Ivy was associated with the festive board, and revelry and mirth, which seems so strange and foreign to its natural haunts and habits.

"Oh, how could they crown with thee,
In ancient days, the god of wine;
And bid thee at the banquet be
Companion of the vine?
Ivy, thy home is where each sound
Of revelry hath long been o'er,
Where song and story once went round
But now are known no more."

There is indigenous to Ireland a very remarkable variety of the Ivy (the *Hedera helix vegeta*, or Irish or Giant Ivy), prized and cultivated on account of the large size of its foliage and its very rapid growth. The common Ivy attains a great age, and ultimately becomes so thick and strong as to be capable of supporting itself. It is, perhaps, the only climber that is not destructive to the tree that bears it, or that can be reared alongside of a dwelling-house without rendering it damp. How often do we see the trunk of a blighted oak, that had flourished in its pride and glory for ages, at length yielding to the irresistible influence of time, till it sinks into slow decay, and is left leafless and sapless, indebted to its once weak and lowly companion, the Ivy, for its bloom and freshness.

"Round which a luxuriant Ivy had crown,
And clothed it with verdure no longer its own."

But have we learned the lesson it is calculated to teach, and to prize the companion that will cling closest and longest to us?

"Then, in thy youth, beseech of Him
Who giveth and upbraideth not,
That his light in thy heart become not dim,
And his love be not forgot.
And thy God in the darkest of days shall be,
Greatness, and beauty, and strength to thee."

Reader, we must now bid farewell to the flowers. We have been permitted for an entire twelvemonth to walk the garden of nature, and to cull out some of its choicest ornaments, from the Snowdrop of January to the Chrysanthemum of December. We have seen that every month has its flowers, many of which are able to admonish, to instruct, and to cheer us. Our Blessed Lord called upon the lilies of the field to teach an unbelieving people the lesson of faith; and in much humility, and with a desire not to indulge in mere sentimentality or scientific disquisition, we have ventured to present the flowers of the year, as they succeeded each other, in such associations as they seemed to suggest, and, we trust, without offence to one of our numerous and kind readers.

FARMING OPERATIONS FOR DECEMBER.

(From the *Irish Farmers' Gazette.*)

Wheat may still be sown, but should be got in, if possible, before Christmas. Lea land may be sown as fast as the land can be ploughed up; but in the case of old broken land, if too wet, the sowing must be postponed till it becomes sufficiently dry.

Russian or Winter Beans, Peas, and Winter Vetches may still be sown. For details see former operations.

Lifting and Storing Roots—Advantage of dry weather should be taken henceforth in lifting and storing the several root crops before severe frosts come on. The site chosen for their storing should be cool and dry, and the best aspect is that facing the north; when facing the south or east, early sprouting is encouraged; whereas, if stored at the northern sides of walls, plantations, or hedges, their sprouting is prevented as long as it is possible to do so; when lifted, topped and tailed, the roots are carted off, and built in longitudinal heaps—mangels and turnips about six feet wide at the base, and tapering to a point to the same height. If brush-wood can be conveniently obtained, and laid in in layers, as the roots are being piled up, it will prevent them from tumbling down. Parsnips and carrots should be made up into narrower and lower heaps—say four feet wide and four feet high; they will also be much benefited if packed in sand or moderately dry turf mould. After the roots are packed, the heaps should be thatched, to keep out rain and frost.

Early Potatoes.—In dry weather early sorts of potatoes may still be planted. At this season the lazy-bed system for planting them will be much preferable to the drill. A liberal coat of fresh stable-dung will be requisite, and six inches of cover will preserve the tubers from frost.

Ploughing should be continued in favourable weather, so that all stubble land, and lea for oats, may be completed before the new year.

Draining and Subsoiling should be proceeded with vigorously where needful. After securing a good outfall, begin with the lowest fields, so that each field may fall into its proper places as the works are proceeded with.

Water Meadows.—Obstructions from dead leaves, deposition of silt, &c., should be looked after, and removed from the supply ducts as discovered, so that the water may flow evenly without loss by overflowing. If severe frost comes on, the water must be kept running; but in fine, open weather it should be changed from one quarter to another, as the former becomes saturated, which may be known by a scum rising to the surface, and again returned when the water has sufficiently drained off.

NEW AND ILLUSTRATED WORKS,

SUITABLE FOR CHRISTMAS PRESENTS,

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

BOOKSELLERS TO THE QUEEN,

And to His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

THE COURT ALBUM for 1855. A Series of Portraits of the Young Female Aristocracy. Elegantly bound, 21s.

THE KEEPSAKE for 1855. Edited by Miss Power. With beautifully-finished Engravings, on steel, by Mr. F. A. Heath. Handsomely bound, 21s.

LONGFELLOW'S GOLDEN LEGEND. Exquisitely illustrated, from drawings by Birket Foster and Jane E. Hay. Elegantly bound in blue and gold, 12s.

LONGFELLOW'S POETICAL WORKS. On tinted paper. Illustrated with upwards of 100 Engravings on wood, from designs by Jane E. Benham, Birket Foster, &c. Handsomely bound, 21s.

MILTON'S L'ALLEGRO and IL PENSEROSO, with upwards of 30 Illustrations, drawn by Birket Foster, with the text printed in red. In a rich ornamental binding. Imperial 8vo. 21s.

SCOTT'S MARMION. Illustrated with 80 Engravings, from designs by Birket Foster and John Gilbert. Elegantly bound, 18s.; Morocco extra, or Antique, 25s.

GOLDSMITH'S DESERTED VILLAGE. Illustrated with 34 Engravings, from drawings by members of the Etching Club. Handsomely bound, 7s. 6d.; Morocco, 15s.

THE VICAR OF WAKEFIELD. Illustrated with 40 Engravings, from drawings by George Thomas and T. Macquoid. Handsomely bound in cloth, gilt, 10s. 6d.; Morocco, 21s.

LONGFELLOW'S VOICES OF THE NIGHT. Illustrated with 64 Engravings on wood, from designs by Birket Foster. Elegantly bound, 15s.

COWPER'S TASK; with upwards of 50 Engravings on wood, from drawings by Birket Foster. Handsomely bound, 18s.

BARTLETT'S JERUSALEM REVISITED. Illustrated with numerous steel and wood Engravings. Handsomely bound, 12s.

TUPPER'S PROVERBIAL PHILOSOPHY; with upwards of 100 Illustrations on wood. 4to. Handsomely bound in extra cloth, £1 11s. 6d.; Morocco, £3.

THE BUTTERFLIES OF GREAT BRITAIN, with their Transformations. Delineated and described by J. O. Westwood. With 20 beautifully-coloured Plates. Imp. 8vo, 12s.; Morocco, 21s.

LADY LOUISA TENNISON'S CASTILE AND ANDALUSIA. Imperial 8vo. With 50 Illustrations. Handsomely bound, 21s.

CAMPBELL'S POETICAL WORKS; with 20 exquisitely-engraved Vignettes on steel, from designs by Turner. Handsomely bound in Morocco, extra gilt, 31s. 6d.

FEATHERED FAVOURITES. Twelve Coloured Pictures of British Birds, from drawings by Joseph Wolfe. Handsomely bound, 18s.

BAGSTER'S BIBLES,

COMPREHENSIVE, MINIATURE QUARTO, FACSIMILE, AND POLYGLOT BIBLES,

A large and varied assortment of the above, kept continually in stock,

In every style of Binding, and with the Richest Mountings,

ALSO, A CHOICE ASSORTMENT OF

BAGSTER'S PRAYERS AND CHURCH SERVICES,

Now published for the first time, and which may be had of various sizes, and in most elegant bindings.

WILLIAM CURRY AND CO.,
9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET
DUBLIN.

LAMARTINE'S MEMOIRS OF CELEBRATED CHARACTERS, to which is now added a LIFE OF MILTON. 2 vols. 12s.

OUR ANTIPODES; or, Residence and Rambles in the Australian Colonies. By Colonel Mundy. 15s.

THE FIFTEEN DECISIVE BATTLES OF THE WORLD. By Professor Creasy. 15s.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF THE REV. WM. JAY; with Reminiscences of some distinguished Contemporaries, Selections from his Correspondence, &c. By George Redford, D.D., and J. A. James, D.D. 8vo. Second Edition. 12s.

DIARY IN TURKISH AND GREEK WATERS. By the Earl of Carlisle. Post 8vo. 10s. 6d.

MEMOIR OF THE LIFE AND WRITINGS OF JAMES MONTGOMERY; including Selections from his Correspondence and Conversations. By John Holland and James Everett. 2 vols. Post 8vo.

THE DAILY LIFE; or, Divine Precepts and Prescriptions for Christian Living. By Rev. John Cumming, D.D. Fcap. 8vo. 6s.

CONNYBEARE AND HOUSTON'S LIFE AND EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL. With beautiful Steel Engravings and Maps. 2 vols. 4to. £2 8s.

LAYARD'S DISCOVERIES IN THE RUINS OF NINEVEH AND BABYLON; being the result of his Second Expedition. With 400 Illustrations. 21s.

THE PICTORIAL SUNDAY BOOK. By the late Dr. Kitto. With many hundred Illustrations. Imperial 4to. Cloth, gilt. 21s.

MEMOIRS OF THOMAS CHALMERS, D.D. By the Rev. William Hanna, L.L.D. 2 vols. Calf, extra. 20s.

MACAULAY'S CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL ESSAYS. 3 vols. Calf extra. 30s.

THE WORKS OF THE REV. SIDNEY SMITH. 3 vols. Calf, extra. 33s.

THE WORKS OF THE RIGHT HON. SIR JAMES MACINTOSH. 3 vols. Calf, extra. 30s.

MEMOIR OF THE REV. EDWARD BICKERSTETH. By the Rev. T. R. Birks. 2 vols. Calf, extra. 18s. 6d.

SUNDAY AFTERNOON; or, Questions, Pictures, and Poems upon the Old Testament Scriptures. By G. B. With Seventy-two Steel Illustrations. 8s. 6d.

THE LANDS OF THE MESSIAH, MAHOMET, AND THE POPE, as visited in 1851. By Rev. Dr. Aiton. 5s.

THE LEISURE HOUR FOR 1854. With numerous Engravings. 6s.

THE SUNDAY AT HOME FOR 1854. With numerous Engravings. 4s. 6d.

THE TRICOLOUR ON THE ATLAS; or, Algeria and the French Conquest. By Francis Pulszkey, Esq. With tinted Illustrations. 6s.

PRESCOT'S HISTORY OF THE REIGN OF FERDINAND AND ISABELLA. Post 8vo. 5s.

PRESCOTT'S HISTORY OF THE CONQUEST OF MEXICO. Post 8vo. 5s.

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY

HAVE

SUTTABY'S, MARSHALL'S, and POOLE'S POCKET BOOKS for 1855.

THE SCRIPTURE POCKETBOOOK for 1855. 2s.

THE CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER for 1855. 2s. 6d.

SMITH'S CITY and COUNTRY ALMANACS.

TILT'S POCKET and MINIATURE ALMANACS.

BROWNE'S IRISH ALMANACS and DIARIES.

TRACT SOCIETY'S PENNY ALMANAC; Pocketbook ditto, 2d.

9, Upper Sackville-street.

CHRISTMAS PRESENTS, PREMIUMS,

SUNDAY SCHOOL REWARDS, AND JUVENILE WORKS.

WILLIAM CURRY and Co. will have a large assortment of new and interesting Works during the season, from which selections may be made for Christmas and New Year Gifts, Premiums for Sunday Schools, and a great variety of illustrated and other juvenile works for young people.

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

In a few days will be ready,
BOUND IN CLOTH,
WITH A COPIOUS INDEX,

THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN,

VOLUME III.

PRICE 5s. 6d.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

SECOND EDITION, ROYAL QUARTO CLOTH,

THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN,

VOLS. I. AND II.,

With complete Indices.

PRICE 5s. 6d. EACH.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Just Published, 18mo., in a Coloured Wrapper,

POPULAR STORIES,

CONTAINING:

THE TWO FARMERS OF BALLINTUBBER,
THE INFALLIBLE DOCTOR,
THE LANDLORD'S LETTER.

Reprinted from the CATHOLIC LAYMAN. Price 3d., or £1 1s. per hundred, for gratuitous distribution.

Each of the above stories may be had separately, price 1d., or 7s. 6d. per hundred, for gratuitous distribution. Also,

THE FAIR OF LOUGHMANAGH,
PRICE ONE PENNY.

THE TALK OF THE ROAD,
Nos. 1 to 16.

Reprinted from the CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

PRICE ONE SHILLING.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

PETER PARLEY'S ANNUAL FOR 1855. A Book for Young People. With numerous illustrations. 5s.

THE FOREST EXILES; or, the Perils of a Peruvian Family amid the Wilds of the Amazon. By Captain Mayne Reid. With 12 Illustrations. 7s.

THE BOY-HUNTERS; or, Adventures in Search of a Wild Buffalo. By Captain Mayne Reid. 7s.

THE DESERT HOME; or, Adventures of a Lost Family in the Wilderness. By Captain Mayne Reid. 7s.

THE YOUNG VOYAGEURS; or, Adventures in the Fur Countries of the Far North. By Captain Mayne Reid. 7s.

THE NOTE-BOOK OF A YOUNG ADVENTURER IN THE WILDS OF AUSTRALIA. By William Howitt. 4s. 6d.

THE ICE-KING AND THE SWEET SOUTH WIND. A Tale for Children, showing the influence of Good and Bad Temper. With 8 Illustrations. 3s. 6d. Coloured, 5s.

THE BOYHOOD OF GREAT MEN. Intended as an example for Youth. By J. G. Edgar. 3s. 6d.

FOOTPRINTS OF FAMOUS MEN. Biography for Boys. By J. G. Edgar. 3s. 6d.

HISTORY FOR BOYS; or, Annals of the Nations of Modern Europe. By J. G. Edgar. 5s.

THE STORY OF THE PEASANT-BOY PHILOSOPHER, founded on the early life of Ferguson, the Shepherd-Boy Astronomer. By Henry Mayhew. With numerous Engravings, 6s.

THE LITTLE BOYS' OWN BOOK. A selection from "The Boys' Own Book" of Games and Sports suited to Little Boys. 3s. 6d.

THE DISCONTENTED CHILDREN, and how they were Cured. By Mary and Elizabeth Kirby. With Illustrations. 2s. 6d. Coloured, 3s. 6d.

PLAYING AT SETTLERS; or, The Faggot House. By Mrs. R. Lee. With Illustrations. 2s. 6d. Coloured, 3s. 6d.

PETER, THE WHALER; his early Life and Adventures in the Artic Regions. By W. H. G. Kingstown. With Illustrations. 5s.

THE AFRICAN WANDERERS; or, the Adventures of Carlos and Antonio among the Western Tribes. By Mrs. R. Lee. 5s.

HOPE CAMPBELL; or, Know Thyself. By Cousin Kate. 4s. 6d.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher, WILLIAM CURRY, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.
DECEMBER, 1854.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN,

VOL. IV.

JANUARY TO DECEMBER,

1855.

DUBLIN:
PUBLISHED BY WILLIAM CURRY AND CO.,
9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET.

LONDON: WERTHEIM AND MACKINTOSH,
24, PATERNOSTER-ROW.

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

VOL. IV.

JANUARY TO DECEMBER.

1850.

INDEX TO VOLUME IV.

Page

Abraham's bosom—what according to the Council of Trent.. 143
what according to Dr. Milner .. ..
Absolution, is it valid if the confessor underestimate the guilt of his penitent? 63
Adultery, habitual, does not make a pope less infallible .. 4
Advocate and the ape 30
America, Romanism in 31
Angels on horseback 123
Antinomianism, Roman Catholic 28
Apocrypha, its claims discussed 68, 80
testimony of canonized saints against it 81
Arrigoni Giulio, his pious labours 94
Attention, is it necessary in prayer? 5, 38
Augustine, his canon of Scripture 80
his distinction between the deference due to Scripture and to uninspired writings 56

Babylon, what does it mean in Scripture 114
Bible, why the priests are against it 99, 105
would they burn it if their doctrines agreed with it? 67, 142
how poor Irishmen get it 106
reasons for reading it 139
reasons for not reading it 128
how the heathen persecutors burned the Bibles of old, and how the early Christians suffered martyrdom rather than permit it 67
English translation of, testimony of enemies, to its excellence 70, 141
" " differences between it and the Douay 69
Bible burning in the time of Henry VIII. 67
" " letter from "In Earnest" on 130
" " trial of Father Feicherine for 139, 141
" " the Very Rev. Dr. M'Evoy, on the right way to do it 140
" " thoughts upon 141
Body, resurrection of the 123
Bonaventure, Psalter of 1
its genuineness discussed 52
Bones *versus* Bibles 127
Boniface VIII., his bull, "Unam Sanctam" 30
Boulogne, account of controversy at 9, 20, 32, 45
Breviary, specimens of its tales 13
history of attempts to reform it 39
Brucioli's bible put into the index 22

Cajetan, Cardinal, his opinion about the apocrypha .. 81
Cahill, Dr., and controversy 58
"Canonical Books," ambiguity of the phrase 68
Carthage, Council of, its list of canonical books 69
Carthy, Dan, his letters 89, 92, 95, 106, 119, 143
Catacombs at Rome, account of 73
Celibacy of Clergy, not the practice of the old Irish Church .. 41
Changes may have taken place in the Church's doctrine, even though we cannot fix the exact date of the change .. 18
Christ Church Cathedral, account of imposture attempted there .. 75
Church, Scripture description of it, and what Societies answer to it 105
Clergy, old Irish 41
Clericaunes and Fairies, proof that they exist in Ireland .. 143
Coarbs, explanation of the name 42
Coat, story of an old one 18
Columbanus's letters on Holy Wells 79
Communion in one kind opposed to Christ's institution .. 56
Confessing our religious opinions, duty of 114
Confession to a priest; it appears from the Roman Catholic Catechisms, that the Priests *did* command it, and Jesus Christ didn't 43
earliest example of 58
the abuse of it leads to sin. 63
Confession: what is the best kind of 43
Confiteor the, puts the Saints on a level with God 58
Controversy, the spirit in which it ought to be carried on .. 43
reasons why the priests will not engage in it 70, 95, 131
Convert, history of a 87
Cornelius blessed, prayed to, though not canonized 121
was in communion with an anti-pope 122
Creed, its clauses considered 118
the old and the 126
Councils, Roman Catholics cannot give a list of general ones .. 21
decrees of ancient, not followed by Roman Church .. 86
was the fourth Lateran general? 21
Crimea, mass in the 23
how to save life there 83
Cullen, Archbishop, his pastoral on the Immaculate Conception 136
spurious writings of Fathers appealed to by him .. 137
Cyprian St., did not acknowlege Roman supremacy 30
Cyril, St. of Jerusalem, on prayers for the dead 71
some of his other statements considered 82
his creed drawn exclusively from Scripture 94
of Alexandria does not prove the Immaculate Conception 136
Curtis and Kelly, Drs., testimony to the excellence of the Protestant Bible 141

Decalogue, when first mutilated 47
Decapitation, does not impede locomotion 111
Devout sheep and ass 142
Dispensations by the Pope, the terms on which they are given .. 44
Dixon, Archbishop, his hunt for his predecessors thigh bone .. 121
Doyle, Dr., his testimony to the excellence of the English authorized version of the Bible 140
Douay Bible, history of editions of 75
on what authority its text and its notes rest 75
difficulty of getting it 105
double dealing of the priests with regard to it .. 59
differences between it and the authorized version considered 69

Duffy, how he cooks St. Liguori for the Irish market 28, 40
are his publications approved of by Roman Catholic authorities 107

Ephrem, St., spurious writings under his name cited by Dr. Cullen 137
Epiphanius, St., spurious oration of his cited by Dr. Cullen .. 134
Equivocation, Roman Catholic doctrine of 77, 102
hatefulness of it described by Dr. Murray, of Maynooth .. 102
Eternity of future punishment, practically denied by Roman Catholics 136

Faber on the blessed sacrament 134
Faith and practice, their relative importance 81
Fathers, how far they are safe guides 82
how their writings have been falsified 83
Ferretti, Signor, his letter about the Archbishop of Lucca .. 75
Florence, religious persecution in 67
Francis, St., his preaching 142

Gallican rights still insisted on 9
Ghost, neither a soul nor a body 47
Good works, for what purpose required of us by God .. 42
Gregory the Great, the discoverer of purgatory 98
recognized the difference between Apocrypha and books of Scripture 81
Guide, what is the safest in religious matters 85

Hands cut off sometimes grow again 110
do not interfere with locomotion 110
Heretics to be exterminated, by the rules of the Roman Catholic Church 22
Holy fire 83
Holy wells 79, 111, 121

Immaculate Conception discussed 7, 19, 26, 136
the question left unsettled at Trent 11
earliest authority which the present Pope produces for the doctrine 19
feast of the conception does not imply the doctrine .. 12
Scripture proofs offered for the doctrine 80
Infallible judge, in Church of Rome never decides till the dispute is over 8
if there was one, there would be an infallible way of finding him out 16
in what does the advantage of one consist 23
Infallibility of the Church, cannot be proved by unanimous consent of Fathers 10
nor by Scripture 45
the attempt leads to an argument in a circle 47
letter from L. Corranman, about 10
letters from Mr. Rourke, about 21, 46
letter from "In Earnest" about 85
Innocent XI., his condemnation of the Jesuits' doctrines, and how they evaded it 78
Intolerance of Church of Rome 67
shows a want of faith in Christ's promises to his Church .. 115
Invocation of Saints, in what respects asserted to differ from the worship of God 61
Italy, character of the priests there 97
religious liberty in 67

Januarius, annual miracle of 93
Jesuits, moral teaching of 81
Jerusalem, shrines of 91

Kenrick Father, endeavours to maintain that the Jewish priests (who condemned our Lord) were infallible 86
Keorick Archbishop, his praise of the Protestant Bible .. 140

La Boarde, Abbe on the Immaculate Conception 26
his proceedings at Rome on the occasion of the publication of the doctrine 54, 63
Laity, their right to a voice in controversies of faith recognized by Papal authority 9
Lamerliere, Mdlle., how she personated the blessed Virgin at La Salette 65
Leary's letters, on blessed Virgin and the Crimea .. 83, 131
Legends of the Blessed Virgin Mary 94
Liberty, Civil and Religious, what it means? 98
Literal meanings of our Lord's Words not always the true one.. 126
Liguori St., his Glories of Mary 28,40,92
his teaching formally adopted by the Church of Rome 84, 92
his Moral Theology 81, 62, 77, 88, 100
Lions, Remarkable for Piety 13
Liturgy of Church of England, offer of Pope Pius IV. to ratify it 40
Loaves and Fishes, what they signify? 25
Loretto, Holy House of 49
Lucca Archbishop of, his Circular about Cholera 42
his Character 95
Lying, a Venial Sin, in the Romish Church 86

Macaulay's Account of Jesuit Moral Teaching 81
Mansion, the Ancient 126
Manufacture of the Facts of Christianity carried on at Rome .. 8
Marshall, a Roman Catholic Priest, proves Purgatory to be a Pagan Doctrine 8
Mary, Blessed Virgin, Specimens of the Worship of her Sanctioned at Rome 192
Blessed Virgin, passages of the Fathers that speak of her, discussed 127
her Worship Commanded by the Pope 90
alleged differences between her Worship and that of God 61
how this distinction is observed in practice 51
is she under the Pope's orders? 91
made Patroness of Meath without her consent being asked 91

Page

Mary, scandalous Imputations on her Character by St. Liguori 40
legends respecting her 94
Mass, why cannot it be said in every place? 22
Matrimony, Roman Catholic Doctrine of.. 24
does it confer grace? 26
Mediator, Jesus Christ, the mediator between God and man according to the Scriptures 2
the Virgin Mary according to the Church of Rome .. 2
Miel, Abbe, on the Romish System 30
Milner, his dishonest defence of Latin Prayers 24
his controversy with Father Charles O'Conner 79
his difference with the Council of Trent 141
Miracles true and false, ... 71, 88, 118
Newman's Theory of 118
ancient miracles 93
Moran Dr., his controversy at Boulogne .. 9, 20, 34, 45
Moral Theology of Church of Rome 84, 100
Murray, Pat. of Westmeath, letters from .. 47, 121
Murray, of Maynooth, on Equivocation 102

Newman, Father, on Ecclesiastical Miracles 118
Nicholas I. recognises the right of Laity to be present at councils where faith is discussed 8
was the first who took into his own hands "the indignation of Almighty God and the Apostles" 20

Ordeal appealed to by the opponents of Savonarola .. 134

Pagan Origin of the Doctrine of Purgatory proved by a Roman Catholic priest 6
Pascal's explanation of the fact that opposite schools of morality are tolerated in the Jesuit Society 81
his explanation of mental reservation 79
of the privileges of bankrupts 100
Patrick's Purgatory 90, 126
Patrick, St., never mentions the Virgin Mary in his writings .. 134
Pious swallows 142
lions 13
sparrows 91
sheep and ass 142
Pius II., Pope, *versus* Æneas Sylvius 45
Pius IV., Pope, and General Councils 86
Pius IX., Pope, on Immaculate Conception 19
Poor, very unequally dealt with by the Church of Rome 44, 143
Popes, account of Succession of 102
difficulty of finding out the right one 103
admitted by Roman Catholics not to be necessary to the existence of the Church 16
bad character of those immediately before the Reformation 133
the list of Popes cooked 85
instances of heretical Popes 37
two theories as to the Spiritual power of the 46
can he make a new article of faith.. 37
temporal power of, opinion of Baronius and Bellarmine as to 31
power of deposing Princes claimed by 87
of tenth century, their wicked lives 3, 14
Power, Mr. E., letters from, ... 34, 70
Prayers in an unknown tongue 37, 131
testimony of a Roman Catholic Ritualist as to disadvantage of 40
need prayers be attended to by those who make them .. 5, 38
Priest, Life of a 4, 17, 37, 86
Priests ought to nominate members for Parliament according to the *Tablet* 103
office to the Roman Catholic 141
have they a right to prevent people reading the Bible .. 139
why they will not enter into controversy .. 70, 95, 131
Christian ministers not sacrificing priests 11
Processions, religious 123
Protestants, why they circulate the Douay Bible 143
Prophecies of Scripture, their accurate fulfilment 104
Proxy religion, is it possible? 42
Purgatory, earliest vision of 94
the doctrine had a Pagan origin 3
belief in it, does not appear in the Catacombs .. 73
visited on Saturdays by the Virgin Mary .. 61, 125
is Christ with his people there? 107, 113
history of 90, 125
Protestant Purgatory 114, 125, 143
the priests had a pecuniary interest in inculcating the belief in it.. 125
means of obtaining release from it 125
pernicious consequences of the doctrine 126
hard on the poor 143

Queen of Heaven, how she exercises her Sovereignty .. 24
her predecessors in the title 61

Rambler, The, its defence for the Rosary. 6
its testimony that English Roman Catholics dislike the Glories of Mary 40
its theory about religious controversy and its practice .. 43
Reformation, necessity of it proved by the corrupt state of the Church in the 15th century 133
Relics, Spurious, in the Church of Rome 14
at St. Oviedo, catalogue of 120
how the Roman Examiner of them is paid 121
Rome, modern worship in 1, 37
Maunday Thursday, at 59
Campagna di 104
Church of, what proof she offers for her claims .. 30
Roman Catholic literature 2
moral theology 82, 77, 84, 100
Rosary of the Virgin, how to be used 5
contains five times as many prayers to the Virgin as to God 5
living Rosary, letter about 47

	Page
Rourke, Mr., letters from	21, 46
SACRAMENTS, when first counted seven	25
Savonarola, his life and character	133
Scapular, its virtues	30
Scriptures, the authority invariably appealed to by our Lord ..	85
the only rule of faith owned by the fathers ..	56
why the Church of Rome discourages reading of	99
Servants, may they deny their masters?	78
Sin, is the cloister a retreat from it	13
has passed on all without exception ..	27
Soul, what is the price of one	82
whose business is it to look after it ..	82
Spain, state of religion in	115
Sparrow, story of the pious	94
Speech of the Right Hon. W. Keogh on Bible burning	140
Succession, its value as an argument	107
of the popes	15, 102
of the archbishops of Dublin	112
Supremacy of Rome, what kind granted by ancient councils ..	86
opinions of fathers as to	33
TABLET, the, on dispensations from the Pope	44
on the right way of appointing members of parliament ..	103
Talk of the road 17, 42, 79, 91, 103, 114,	126
letter about	57
"This is my body," what is the most natural interpretation of the words	59
Toleration at Rome	112
in Spain	115
in England	66
Tradition, ambiguity of the word	94
Translations of the Missal, forbidden by a Pope	38
Transubstantiation, its evidences and its consequences examined	90
contradictions involved in it, stated by a Roman Catholic writer	124
not in the New Testament	125
Trent, council of, differences of opinion amongst its fathers, on the subject of the canonical books	
Truthfulness represented by Roman Catholic writers as a curious English national peculiarity	89
UNITY rules for	117
that effected by intolerance not real unity	116
falsely laid claim to by the Church of Rome ..	134
how she attempts to maintain it	139
VENIAL sins harder to be got rid of than mortal sins ..	119
Lying a venial sin	86
WENEFREDE'S well	109
Wiseman's defence of Liguori examined	62
his practice of equivocation	88
case of Boyle v. Wiseman	100
Wylies travels in Italy	103

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Gloir do Dhia an fna hárduib, agus fiodcáin air an dtalaim deagtoil do na daoinib.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED THE MIDDLE OF EVERY MONTH, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. IV.—No. 37. JANUARY, 1855. { **Annual Subscription, 2s. 6d. Payable in Advance.**

CONTENTS.

	Page
Modern Worship in Rome—the Virgin Mary	1
Roman Catholic Literature—Rev. William Marshall on Purgatory	2
History of the Popes of the Tenth Century—No. III.	3
The Use of Forms of Prayer—The Rosary of the Blessed Virgin Mary	5
Autobiography of a Roman Catholic Priest—No. IV.	6
The Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary and the *Tablet* Newspaper	7
Recent Controversy at Bonlogne, between Rev. Dr. Moeran and two Roman Catholic Laymen—continued	9
CORRESPONDENCE:	
On the Infallible Church—by a L. Corran Man	10
On the Immaculate Conception—by a Catholic	11
Christian Ministers not Sacrificing Priests	11

MODERN WORSHIP IN ROME—THE VIRGIN MARY.

It is the policy of the Roman Catholic Church to disguise some, at least, of her practices from those even of her communion, whom they might revolt; and only to disclose them to those, whose minds are fully prepared for their reception. Hence, we sometimes find her educated laity not only ignorant of, but ready to deny (perhaps indignantly) the imputation of such practices to their Church. We have no desire to call into question the sincerity of this denial, or to blame the feeling with which it is sometimes, and not unnaturally, accompanied. But, we think, we have a right to remind such persons, that their denial can only exonerate themselves, but not their Church. That Church must be judged of on these points, not by the private and unauthorized assertions of individuals, but by the conduct of her public functionaries. And where can the proceedings of these latter be more accurately ascertained, than in Rome itself? There the Sovereign Pontiff is supreme in matters civil as well as ecclesiastical. There, not a book can be published, not a theatre opened, not a manufacture commenced, not a railroad constructed, not a steamer launched, without his permission. The religious observances, then, which are there not merely permitted but promoted, may, without mistake, be regarded as essentially hers, and as such ought to be exposed—not more to confirm those who disown her, than to undeceive her too confiding followers elsewhere.

On this account, we have in former numbers described some of the superstitious observances publicly solemnized in Rome.* And we would now call attention to the character of the private worship, sanctioned and daily offered there to the Virgin Mary.

For this purpose, we shall make use of two manuals of devotion published, under *authority*, in Rome itself.

One of these is entitled, "A daily tribute of affectionate prayers and praises, &c., to the most Holy Mary, Immaculate Mother of God, the Mother of Mercy, and Refuge of Sinners, &c., extracted from the works of the seraphic Doctor St. Bonaventura,"† &c.

The other is styled, "Daily Prayers to the Mother of God, to obtain a happy death; taken from the Psalter of Saint Bonaventura. New translation. Rome, 1834."‡ The language of this translation is more select than that of the former, and the Latin of the saint is given throughout on the opposite page. These circumstances show that it is intended for a higher class of readers. It also is arranged according to the days of the week, so as to be used throughout the year.

Both these little books are published under the highest sanctions that the Roman Church supplies—1st, that of the "Master of the Holy Apostolical Palace," who is at once a leading member of the Inquisition, and of the Congregation of the Index; 2nd, that of the "Vicegerent of the Cardinal Vicar," who, in these matters, is the Pope's representative. These "Imprimaturs" united, may, therefore, be regarded as equivalent to that of the Pope himself.*

Some eminent Roman Catholic authors have disapproved of the Psalter of Bonaventura, and have endeavoured to exonerate him of its authorship, and their Church of its adoption; but the Church of Rome has, at his canonization, fully sanctioned it.†

We may also observe, that the publications themselves supply two *practical* proofs, that the Pope's decision in this controversy is in favour of the Psalter.

From these manuals we shall, in the present and following numbers, give a few extracts; which will satisfy the candid reader, that the private homage offered to the Virgin in Rome, and offered, as we have proved, with the approbation of the Pope and his two great councils (the Congregations of the Index, and the Inquisition), is of the *same character* as that offered to God himself.

Our first extracts shall be from the latter of the above books, because in it the Latin of Bonaventura is given opposite to the Italian translation; and we have thus two means of ascertaining the true mind of the Pope, who equally sanctions both.

We shall commence with the Saint's Parody of the "Te Deum;" in which he appropriates to the Virgin, the honour, and praise, and worship, which the Church, in that sublime canticle, had for so many years offered up to God alone.

PARODY OF THE TE DEUM LAUDAMUS.

CANTICLE.

We praise Thee, O Mother of God, we acknowledge Thee, Mary, Virgin.

All the Earth doth *worship* Thee, spouse of the Eternal Father.

To Thee Angels and Archangels; to Thee Thrones and Principalities humbly bow down.

To Thee all the Powers, and the Supernal Virtues of Heaven, and all the Dominations yield obedience.‡

All the Choirs of Cherubin and Seraphin rejoicing wait upon Thee.

To Thee all angelic beings with ceaseless voice of praise do cry,

Holy, Holy, Holy Mary, Mother of God; both Virgin and Mother.

Heaven and Earth are full of the glorious Majesty of the fruit of thy womb.

The glorious company of the Apostles praise Thee, the Mother of their Creator.

The holy assembly of Martyrs celebrate Thee, the Mother of Christ.

The glorious army of Confessors proclaim thee, the temple of the Sacred Trinity.

The lovely band of holy virgins exulting, eulogize Thee; the model of humility and virgin purity.

CANTICO.

A Te, Madre di Dio, innalziamo le nostre lodi: Te Maria Vergine predichiamo.

Te sposa dell' Eterno Padre *venera* tutta la terra.

A Te gli Angeli tutti e gli Arcangeli: a Te i troni e i Principati umili si inchinano (humiliter serviant).

A Te le Podestà tutte e le Virtù superne dei cieli (*coeli coelorum*) e tutte le Dominazioni prestano ubbidienza.

A Te i cori tutti, a Te i Cherubini e i Serafini assistono intorno esultanti.

A Te le angeliche creature tutte con incessante voce di lode cantano (incessabili voce proclamant).

Santa, Santa, Santa Maria Genitrice di Dio (*Dei Genitrix*), Vergine insieme e Madre.

Pieni sono i cieli e la terra della Maestà gloriosa del frutto del tuo grembo.

Te il glorioso coro degli Apostoli Te Madre del loro Creatore (*Creatoris Matrem*) celebrano.

Te il poro ceto dei Martiri beati Te Genitrice di Cristo concelebra.

Te il glorioso esercito dei Confessori templo della Trinità (Trinitatis templum) sacrosanta ti appella.

Te l' amabil coro delle sante Vergini festanti, esempio di umilità ti encomia, e di virginale candore.

All the Court of Heaven honours Thee as Queen.

The Church throughout all the world sings hymns to Thee, and invokes Thee;

Mother of the Divine Majesty.

Thee adorable, holy, loving, and pious, who hast truly brought forth the King of Heaven.

Thou art the Mistress of the Angels; Thou art the Gate of Paradise.

Thou art the ladder to the kingdom and glory of Heaven.

Thou art the nuptial bed, the Ark of mercy and grace.

Thou art the source and channel of mercy: Thou the spouse and Mother of the King of the Everlasting Ages.

Thou art the temple and sacred abode of the Holy Spirit, and the noble resting-place* of the most Holy Trinity.

Thou art the *Mediatrix between God and men*, the lover of us mortals, and the light of Heaven.

Thou art strength to the struggling, the advocate of the sinner: Thou the compassionate refuge of the miserable.

Thou art the dispenser of celestial gifts, the exterminator of demons and of the proud.

Thou art the Mistress of the world, the Queen of Heaven, and next to God our only hope.

Thou art safety to him that invokes thee, a harbour to the shipwrecked, the solace of the wretched, and the refuge of the perishing.

Thou art the Mother of all the Blessed, and next to God, their fulness of joy, the joy of all the dwellers in Heaven.

Thou advancest the righteous and recoverest them that are out of the way; Thou, the long promised to the Patriarchs.

Thou, the light of truth to the Prophets, the eulogized of the Apostles, and also their wisdom: Thou the instructress of the Evangelists.

Thou are strength to the Martyrs, an example to the Confessors, the boast, glory, and rejoicing of the chaste.

When Thou wouldst deliver man from the exile of death, thou didst welcome into thy womb the beloved Son of God.

When Thou hadst subdued our ancient enemy Thou didst re-open the Kingdom of Heaven to all believers.

Thou, together with thy Son, are seated at the right hand of the Father.

O Virgin Mary, pray for us to him of whom we believe, that he shall yet be our judge.

We, therefore, pray Thee that thou wouldst come to the help of thy servants who have been redeemed with the precious blood of thy dear Son.

Te la corte celestiale tutta onora come Regina.

A Te per tutto l' universo la Chiesa inneggia, e ti invoca.

Madre della divina Maestà. (*Matrem divinae Majestatis.*)

Te venerenda, te vera puerpera del Re del cielo, santa, amorosa e pia.

Tu se' la Signora degli Angeli: Tu se' la porta del Paradiso.

Tu scala al regno ed alla gloria del cielo.

Tu talamo, tu arca di pietà e di grazia.

Tu se' *sorgente* e vena di misericordia: Tu Sposa e Madre del Re de' secoli eterni.

Tu tempio e sacrario dello Spirito Santo, e della Trinità santissima nobile trichinio.*

Tu *mediatrice fra gli uomini e Dio*, amorevole a noi mortali, e luce di cielo.

Tu fortezza ai combattenti, avvocata ai peccatori: Tu ai miseri pietoso rifugio.

Tu dispensiera dei celesti doni, sterminatrice dei demoni e dei superbi.

Tu Signora del mondo, Regina del Cielo, e dopo Dio nostra unica speranza (*post Deum sola spes nostra*).

Tu salute a chi ti invoca, porto ai naufraganti, sollievo ai miseri, e ai pericolanti rifugio.

Tu Madre di tutti i Beati, e dopo Dio lor gaudio pieno (*gaudium plenum post Deum*), gioja di tutti i cittadini del cielo.

Tu promotrice dei giusti, soccoritrice dei traviati. Tu promessa già ai Patriarchi.

Tu luce di verità ai Profeti, Tu preconizzata dagli Apostoli, e sapienza di quelli (*doctrix Apostolorum*); tu ammaestratrice degli Evangelisti (*magistra Evangelistarum*).

Tu fortezza ai Martiri, esempio ai Confessori, vanto, gloria e giubbilo delle vergini.

Tu per liberare l' uomo dall' esilio di morte accogliesti nel tuo grembo il Figliuolo di Dio.

Per Te' debellato l' avversario nostro antico, fu reaperto ai Fedeli il regno dei cieli (*Per te expugnato hoste antiquo, coeli aperta fidelibus regna credentum*).

Tu col Figliuolo tuo siedi alla destra del Padre (*Tu cum Filio tuo sedes ad dexteram Patris*).

A Lui Tu supplica per noi, O Vergine Maria, il quale crediamo, che ci abbia un giorno a giudicare.

Te dunque noi preghiamo, perchè tu voglia venire in soccorso ai servi tuoi: a noi redenti col prezioso sangue del tuo Figliuolo.

---

* See "Modern Worship in Rome," Nos. 26, 30, 31.

† "Tributo Quotidiano di Affettuose Preghiere e Lodi per ciascun giorno della Settimana, Alla Immacolata Madre di Dio, Madre di misericordia, e Rifogio de' Peccatori, &c. . . . Tratte dalle opere del Serap. D. S. Bonaventura," &c. This production was evidently intended for the humbler classes, being written in a familiar style, and sold for little more than one penny (3 Baj). And in 1849, it had already reached the eleventh edition.

‡ "Preci Quotidiane alla Madre di Dio, per impetrare una Buona Morte. Tratte dal Salterio di S. Bonaventura. Nuova traduzione. Roma, 1834."

* Both publications were purchased in Rome by a friend, who has placed them at our disposal; and they may be seen by any of our correspondents at the office of our publisher.

† This point has been fully discussed and decided in a treatise, by Robert King, A.B., entitled—"The Psalter of the Blessed Virgin Mary," &c. Dublin: Grant and Bolton. 1840.

‡ The "powers," "virtues," and "dominations," according to Romish doctors, are three of the angelic orders of Paradise.

* "Tetina beatissima *Trichinii* nobile *Trichinum*." The saint seems here to have indulged in a holy play on words. The Italian is not open to this grave objection, as "Trichino" is generally taken to mean, not a couch, but a supping or dining room. We have felt it, however, more reverential to translate it as in the text.

O Pious Virgin Mary, oh, cause that we, together with thy saints, be rewarded with eternal glory.

Let thy people, O Lady, be saved by thee, that we may be made partakers of the inheritance of thy dear Son.

Be thou our guide, be thou our support and defence throughout eternity.

Day by day, O Mary, our Lady, we reverence thee. And we desire with mind and voice to sing thy praises for ever and ever.

Deign, sweetest Mary, now and ever to preserve us from sin.

Have mercy upon us, O Pious (Virgin), have mercy upon us. Be merciful to thy children, because in Thee, O Virgin Mary, have we placed all our trust.

In Thee, sweetest Mary, all we do hope: defend us throughout Eternity.

To Thee be praise, to Thee dominion, to Thee power and glory, without end. Amen.

O pia Vergine Maria, deh! fa che insieme coi Santi tuoi siamo della eterna gloria rimunerati. (*Æterna fac, pia Virgo Maria, cum Sanctis tuis nos gloria munerari.*)

Salvo sia per te, O Signora, il popolo tuo (*Salvum fac populum tuum, Domina*), sì che siamo fatti partecipi della eredità del tuo Figliuolo.

Sii nostra guida, Sii sostegno e difesa nostra in eterno. (*Et rege nos, et custodi nos in æternum.*)

In ciascun giorno, O Maria Signora nostra, ti salutiamo. E bramiamo cantare le lodi tue colla mente e colla voce in sempiterno.

Degnati, dolcissima Maria, ora e sempre conservarci illesi da peccato. (*Dignare, dulcis Maria, nunc et semper nos sine delicto conservare.*)

Abbi, O Pia, di noi misericordia: abbi misericordia di noi. Fa misericordia ai figliuoli tuoi: ché in Te, O Vergine Maria, abbiamo riposta tutta la fiducia nostra.

In te, dolcissima Maria, noi tutti speriamo: difendici in eterno.

A Te le lodi, a Te l'impero, a Te virtù e gloria pei secoli dei secoli. Così sia.

(*Te decet laus, te decet imperium, tibi virtus et gloria in sæcula sæculorum. Amen.*)

We might safely leave the above extraordinary production without comment to the consideration of the candid reasoner. The Scripture-reading Protestant cannot fail to be grieved, as well as shocked, at finding any body of professing Christians offering to a mere mortal the homage that is due to the Triune God alone. Even the pious Roman Catholic must feel, that in the above overflowing effusion of adoration and praise, something more is conveyed, and intended, than what he has been accustomed to call Hyperdulia. And if he would compare it, clause by clause, with the Scriptures of truth, he would, we are convinced, abandon its defence. This process, however, we can only suggest to him as a private and personal duty. We cannot at present do more than point out a few obvious instances, the consideration of which, may, perhaps, induce him, to complete the inquiry himself. Take for example the second verse of the above. Bonaventura's Latin is—

"Te æterni Patris Sponsam, *Omnis terra veneratur.*"

The Latin of the "TE DEUM" itself is—

"Te æternum Patrem, *Omnis terra veneratur.*"

Thus the very same words *omnis terra veneratur* are used in the "*Te Deum*" and in its parody; and, therefore, the very same worship that in the one is ascribed to God, is in the other ascribed to Mary.

Further, the English of this verse of the "TE DEUM," according to the translation sanctioned by Cardinal Wiseman and his twelve suffragan bishops* is—"Eternal Father, *by all earth adored.*"†

Now, "adore," is the word used in the Douay Bible (Ex. xx. 5.) to express the worship which is there *forbidden* to be offered to any being but God; and which the Roman Catholic Doctors call "Latria." Hence, the Cardinal's authorized translation proves, that these words of the "*Te Deum*," express the highest worship that can be rendered to Deity. And the above canticle (both in the Latin and Italian) shows, that the appropriation of this worship to the Virgin is sanctioned by the Pope. If, therefore, the will of his Holiness could be made binding through all the earth, we should see "all men honour the" Mother, "even as they honour the Father"—that is, the Virgin would, in point of worship, be placed completely on a level with the Father and the Son; for our Lord hath declared, that the Father "hath" given all judgment to the Son, that all men may honour the "Son, even as they honour the Father."—Douay Bible, John v. 22, 23.

In verse 22 of the above canticle, we find the Virgin addressed as the mediatrix between God and man ("Tu Mediatrix Dei et Hominum"). But the testimony of the Apostle is, "There is *one* God, and *one Mediator* of God and man, the man Christ Jesus."—Douay Bible, I Tim. ii. 5.

Immediately after, she is represented as the *dispenser of celestial gifts*. These, however, by the inspired writers, are ascribed to the Holy Ghost. "The fruit of the Spirit is charity, joy, peace, patience, benignity, goodness, longanimity, mildness, faith, modesty, continence, chastity."—Douay Bible, Gal. v. 22, 23.

Further on, she is described as the "light of truth to the Prophets, the glory and instructress of the Apostles," and the Mistress of the Evangelists. ("Præconium et doctrix Apostolorum, magistra Evangelistarum.") But Peter has assured us, that "prophecy came not by the will of man at any time, but that holy men of God spake, inspired by the Holy Ghost."—Douay Bible, 2. Pet. i. 21. And as to the Apostles and Evangelists, our Lord left not them to the teaching of a woman; but plainly declared to them, "The Paraclete, the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he will teach you all things, and bring all things to your mind, whatsoever I shall have said to you."—Douay Bible, John. xiv. 26. "But when He, the Spirit of Truth, is come, he will teach you all truth. For he shall not speak of himself: but what things soever he shall hear, he shall speak: and the things that are to come he shall show you."—Ibid. xvi. 13.

The effect of all the preceding glorifications of the Virgin is, to set her up as a threefold usurper—a usurper of the worship which is due to God only, of the Mediatorial Office which is essential to Christ, and of the celestial graces, divine teaching, and prophetic inspiration, which proceed from the Holy Ghost. And thus the Pope and his advisers are chargeable with the guilt of sanctioning in Rome a daily devotion, which sins against each person of the Sacred Trinity.

The ignorant and misguided devotee who has thus been instructed to ascribe worship, and mediatorship, and sanctifying grace to the Virgin, is easily led to look to the same being, as all-powerful to protect, to pardon, and to save.

Hence, he is next taught thus to address her—"Make us to be rewarded with thy saints in glory everlasting." "Save thy people, that they may be partakers of the inheritance of thy dear Son." "Be thou our guide, and support, and defence throughout eternity." "Deign both now and ever to preserve us free from sin." "Have mercy upon us, have mercy upon us." "Take pity on thy children, since we have placed all our trust in thee." "All of us hope in thee; defend us throughout eternity." "To thee be praise, and dominion, and power, and glory, world without end!!!"

Could more be ascribed to the Lord of all? could more be sought from Christ himself?

Will the enlightened Roman Catholic of Great Britain join in this worship? and, if not, can he be safe in adhering to a Church, whose ruler, one from whose decision there is no appeal, has already sanctioned it, and who will, if in his power, render it universal?

ROMAN CATHOLIC LITERATURE.

WE have already had occasion to point out, that Roman Catholic writers may be divided into two classes, who present the doctrines of their religion in two very different forms. The one class, who intend their writings to come into the hands of Protestants, take care to soften down all those doctrines which Protestants regard as objectionable. They are careful to distinguish between the authoritative teaching of their Church and the opinions of private divines; they do not like to commit themselves to the defence of more than is asserted in express words by the Council of Trent; and they include, in the class of *optional* opinions, many of the doctrines which are most firmly believed by Roman Catholics. The other class of writers, who intend their works to circulate among Roman Catholics, make no such distinctions; and, without any reserve or hesitation, teach as certainly true those doctrines to which Protestants are told their Church is not committed. But when we want to know what the Roman Catholic religion really is, it is to the latter class of writers we ought to look rather than the former. We must remember (what their controversial writers often tell us) that the truth of their doctrines does not depend on their being formally declared by the Church, but on their having been always believed. There was a time before councils had explicitly declared any of their doctrines; but still they hold that these doctrines were no less true, and had been no less generally received before. When, then, we want to know what the Roman Catholic religion really is, what we ought to inquire is, what are the doctrines, which are generally believed by Roman Catholics, which are publicly taught by the priests, and which are contained in works circulated with the approval of Roman Catholic authorities? Such doctrines, if not yet declared to be articles of faith, which men are bound to believe on peril of their salvation, are liable to become so at any moment, whenever the Church shall be pleased to declare her belief in them.

We have, accordingly, already devoted a few articles to the consideration of the literature which is circulated, with approbation, among Roman Catholics, and hope, with God's blessing, from time to time, to give our readers some further information on the same subject; from which they will be able to judge what a mass of doctrine has been developed *since* the time of the Council of Trent, and is ready to be elevated into the rank of articles of faith, by the next general council that may be assembled. But we have had opportunity to observe, that even the controversial writings of Roman Catholics may be divided into the same two classes. Besides those, which are expected to come into the hands of Protestants, in which some caution is used in the selection of arguments, and some degree of fairness and honesty in the quotations employed, there is another class of works, intended merely for the use of Roman Catholics, in order to make their minds comfortable in the belief of the doctrines of their Church; and in these a very different method is pursued. We shall, in this article, give our readers a specimen of one of these books, but we must first tell how our attention happened to be directed to it.

Those who possess our first volume will notice there the names of two or three Roman Catholic correspondents, who have not continued to give us the benefit of their communications; and we may recall to their memories the occasion on which one of these, who signed himself, "Warner Christian Search," discontinued his letters to us. In the course of his correspondence with us, "Warner Christian Search" quoted Bishop Jeremy Taylor as expressing himself in favour of the opinions which he advocated. But we found it easy to point out that in the passage in question, Bishop Jeremy Taylor was not expressing his own opinions at all, and that the words, "says the Romanist," which would have made this clear, had been cut out of the quotation. From the calm and temperate tone of the letters of "Warner Christian Search" to us, we felt assured that he had been imposed upon by others, and had not been guilty of the dishonesty of himself garbling the citation from Jeremy Taylor; but we called on him in justice to his own character, to tell from what book he had taken his quotation, otherwise he should bear the blame himself. "Warner Christian Search" replied, that he had not taken the quotation in question from Bishop Taylor's own writings, but from a controversial work on Purgatory, by a Roman Catholic writer. As he still did not give the *name* of the work from which the quotation was derived, we again called on him, as he valued his character for honesty and truth, to give up his authority, otherwise, though he was not guilty of fraud himself, he could not be exculpated from the charge of screening from exposure, the writer who had been guilty of imposture.

We have never had any reply since from "W.C. Search;" and we confess that we noted his silence with regret. He seemed to be a person disposed to conduct controversy in a candid and Christian spirit; discussion with whom might have been expected to be profitable, had he not unfortunately trusted to a treacherous guide, whom, even after proof of his unfair dealing, he had not moral courage to disavow.

We had never happened to fall in with the "controversial book on Purgatory," to which "Warner Christian Search" referred, until our attention was lately again drawn to the subject by an English correspondent. He tells us that, having recently met some of the numbers of our paper, he had been induced to order the back volumes, and had thus become acquainted with our controversy with "W. C. Search." He turned over our pages in vain to find where "W. C. Search" had answered our appeal for the name of his authority, when it happened that he was enabled himself to detect the guilty party. A Roman Catholic friend put into his hands a most "convincing and unanswerable" defence of Purgatory, which turned out to be the very book from which "W. C. Search" had drawn his quotation. The title of it is "The Doctrine of Purgatory, Patriarchal, Perpetual, and Universal—Scriptural, Patristical, Protestantal, and Rational. By the Rev. Wm. Marshall. Third Edition, 1853. London: J. Brown. Dublin: J. Duffy." That this book has some circulation among Roman Catholics, sufficiently appears from its having reached a third edition; and that it is not intended for the eyes of Protestants (or, at least, of educated Protestants), appears from the reluctance of "W. C. Search" to disclose the name of it, although Roman Catholics evidently ought to be glad to make known to the many Protestant readers of this paper, any really valid defence of their religion.

But, certainly, on looking over the book, we saw good reasons why "W. C. Search" should not have been very forward to produce it. Mr. Marshall evidently knew very well that very good reasons are not wanted in order to convince people who are convinced already, and that he was addressing those who would not inquire very severely into the accuracy of his quotations, or the fairness of his arguments. Accordingly, he acts like one whose business it was to supply plenty of arguments to persons not likely to be too particular as to the quality of them, provided the number were complete. With marvellous dexterity he manufactures witnesses for Purgatory, out of the most refractory materials—Luther and Calvin, Archbishop Ussher and Bishop Bull, Bishop Andrewes, Bingham, the *Saturday Magazine*, and the [unonymous] Cambridge Professor of Divinity, are *marshalled* with Bishop Taylor (whose evidence we are told, is a host in itself), in defence of the doctrine of Purgatory. We have already pointed out (see vol. i., pp. 107, 125) how poor Jeremy Taylor came to be pressed into the service. There is a well-known chapter in the "Liberty of Prophesying," in which Bishop Taylor argues against the persecution of Roman Catholics, by pointing out that they were not *wilfully* in error, but were deceived by certain plausible arguments; and, we have shown, that Mr. Marshall is not the first Roman Catholic writer who has made a dishonest use of this chapter, by quoting, as Taylor's own sentiments, the language which he there puts into the mouth of Roman Catholics. Our readers will guess that the other Protestant writers whom we have mentioned, are not, in reality, more favourable than Jeremy

* "The Missal for the use of the Laity," &c., "with the approbation of the Cardinal Archbishop, and all the Bishops of England." London: Dolman, 1853. Part III., p. 135.

† The cardinal's translation is supported by Facciolati—"Venerer to adore, revere, honour, worship, respect, venerate, &c." The quotations also show that this word is constantly adopted by Cicero to express the worship due to the gods.

Taylor to the cause, into the service of which Mr. Marshall has so violently enlisted them.

Mr. Marshall devotes another chapter to the patristical testimony for Purgatory. Our readers will judge of the fairness with which his list is made out, when we tell them the first name on his list of uninspired witnesses. It is a great father, Mr. Marshall tells us, who flourished, A.D. 51, the disciple and convert of St. Paul—who do you suppose?—Dionysius the Areopagite!! The quotation, to be sure, is not much to the purpose; but just fancy any one at the present day, with the slightest pretensions to learning, seriously quoting, as the work of a Father of the first century, such an exploded forgery as the works of Dionysius the Areopagite. We can scarcely conceive it possible that Mr. Marshall was not aware of the character of the work he was citing; and we fear his conduct, in this respect, is only of a piece with his ingenious quotation from Jeremy Taylor.

It will be supposed that a writer either so ignorant or so dishonest as this, does not deserve any serious refutation, nor should we have devoted an article to him but for the very curious line of argument which he pursues in his first chapter, and which we think deserves to be made known to our readers. We should add, too, that it is not Mr. Marshall's own invention, but taken by him from popular French writers; and it is, therefore, not uninteresting to learn the views as to the character of their religion maintained by Roman Catholic writers in so influential a country as France, and which are thought worthy of being translated for the benefit of Roman Catholics of this country, and have been received by them with such favour as to pass to three editions.

In order to explain these views, we must begin by reminding our readers that many Protestant writers (see, for example, Middleton's letter from Rome) have been struck by the resemblance of some of the rites and practices of Romanism, to the old superstitions of heathenism. They have pointed out how Christians came to be placed under the temptation to pervert the simplicity of their religion, in order to accommodate it to the prejudices of their heathen friends, so as to enable those, for example, who were addicted to the use of images or to the worship of deified mortals, to combine these practices with the profession of Christianity. Protestant writers have pointed out the great similarity between the controversy which they have to conduct with Roman Catholics, and that which the early apologists for Christianity had to conduct with the heathen. The defenders of Paganism asserted that they did not pay direct worship to images, though they used them in their religious services—that they worshipped one supreme God, although they invoked the assistance of other inferior beings. The advocates of Christianity, on the other hand, rejected these apologies as insufficient, and condemned the use of images as absolutely unlawful. It would lengthen this article too much were we to attempt to enumerate the various points of resemblance that have been traced between modern Romanism and ancient Paganism. This is a subject, on which, until of late years, Roman Catholic writers have not been very fond of touching. In our times, however, they have found courage to grapple with it. We quoted in our number for October last, the defence of the Roman Catholic system, given by the French writer, M. Beugnot. He distinctly admits the fact, that great changes were made in the Christian religion in the fourth and fifth centuries, but defends them as part of a wise and necessary policy, employed in order to gain over the heathens into the Church; he endeavours to show, that the system which has grown into Romanism, originated in a compromise between Christianity and Paganism, essential, in his opinion, to the success of the former religion. We shall not now stop to inquire what is to be thought of those who represent the Founder of our religion as so ignorant of human nature as to leave it to the worldly policy of his followers, some hundreds of years after his departure from the world, to supply those deficiencies in his scheme, without which his doctrines could never have obtained universal diffusion. It is the less necessary to expose M. Beugnot's errors, as he has been far outdone by the French writers, whom Mr. Marshall has followed in the work before us. While other Roman Catholics have endeavoured to conceal, or to deny the resemblance between Romanism and Paganism—while M. Beugnot endeavours to account and apologize for it—Mr. Marshall triumphantly calls attention to the many points of similarity between the religion of the Roman Catholics and that of the Egyptians, the Greeks, the Chinese, the Tartars, the North American Indians, &c., and concludes, that these people were all evidently better Christians than Protestants.

It does not, at first sight, appear obvious why the similarity of Roman Catholic notions to those of the heathens, should be an argument in their favour. The following sentence, which contains Mr. Marshall's notions on the subject, will hardly be thought satisfactory by any one who is not convinced beforehand that the Roman Catholic doctrines are true:—

"Whether the Pagans received this doctrine by patriarchal tradition and from Noah's own lips, before the dispersion, which is most likely, or whether they learned it in after days, from the Jews, through the medium of their philosophers, or whether, in fine, it was a law engraved upon their hearts by God's own finger, is immaterial as to the subject under discussion."—p. 9.

We have already given the reader to understand, that the particular doctrine which Mr. Marshall endeavours to prove to be handed down from Noah, is that of Purgatory; but he does not confine his labours to this point, and endeavours, in passing, to clear his friends, the heathens, from the charge of polytheism, which has been rashly brought against them.

"The Pagans in giving the generic name of all spirits, did not, however, give *equal honour* to all. 'We say, once for all,' observes a celebrated writer,* 'to those of our readers who have not studied antiquity, that the ancients, not even excepting the Jewish people, gave the generic name of Gods to all the celestial and infernal spirits, and even to men whom they canonized. It is still very common in Asia, Africa, and America; but, notwithstanding this, they at all times know well how to distinguish amongst the celestial gods, the God supreme, uncreated and Creator. They, like the Catholics, adored one God; like them they honoured the angels, like them they paid a secondary respect to the saints, and that has always been the case; *so that, on these points, they were more Christian than the Protestant sectaries.*' [!!!] 'There is a marked analogy,' adds another writer,† 'between the gods of the Pagans and our angels; between their deified heroes and our saints. No one can deny the existence of the celestial spirits that God employs in the government of the world; it is, in like manner, certain that the angels are not of a nature so different from man, that the latter should not associate with them after death, when he merits it by his virtue. Such has always been the belief of mankind.' Celsus, as quoted by Origin [*sic*] speaks precisely in the same manner (lib. 7, v. 68). Therefore, the Pagans, though calling all the heavenly and infernal spirits, as well as their heroes and geniuses, gods, were not polytheists."—Marshall, p. 5.

We have to thank Mr. Marshall for the pains he has taken to establish a point we have often dwelt on (see, for example, volume ii., page 21)—namely, the similarity between the pleas now offered by the Roman Catholics in defence of their system, and those which the heathens put forward of old. If Roman Catholics are in the right, it is certainly quite true that the Pagans were much better Christians than Protestant sectaries, and it might be added, than the Christian writers of the first three centuries. But if the defenders of Christianity in early times were right in rejecting those pleas which the heathen put forward in defence of their image-worship and their polytheism, are Protestants wrong in refusing to admit them now?

We come now to notice some of Mr. Marshall's testimonies on the subject of Purgatory. We quote first his remarks, which are rather curious, on the fact that the heathens, some of them, believed in the transmigration of souls, as a sort of preparatory purification of souls—

"It is not surprising that such a popular error as the transmigration of souls should have made its way into a *mere matter of opinion*. I say a mere matter of opinion; for it never has been yet defined, even in the true Church, where Purgatory is, or in what its pains consist, &c., &c. So that we are at liberty, as much as the Pagans, to entertain our own views upon those subjects, without infringing upon an *article of faith*. All the Church requires of us to believe concerning Purgatory is, 'that there is such a place, and that the souls therein detained are relieved by our prayers and good works, but more especially by the holy sacrifice of the Mass.' Now, these *essential points* are found in the doctrines of the Pagans, notwithstanding the diversity of their opinions as to the manner, time, and place of the punishment; and if fault is to be found with them for their discrepancy on this head, Protestants should be the last in the world to reproach them with it."—Marshall, page 4.

We dare say that many of our Roman Catholic readers will be surprised to learn that their Church allows them so much latitude of opinion on the subject of Purgatory—that even if they hold the transmigration of souls they would retain all that is *essential* in their Church's doctrine. But we feel that if Mr. Marshall had been half as charitable to the Protestants as he is to the Pagans, he might have discovered that they, too, hold all that is essential in the doctrine of Purgatory. We, too, are willing to admit "that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls detained there are helped by the prayers of the faithful." The time and place of Purgatory are confessedly non-essential matters, and the only difference is, that we place our Purgatory in this world, and maintain that the only time when souls are purified must be on this side of the grave.

We must, in conclusion, give a few specimens of the manner in which Mr. Marshall collects the testimonies of all nations to "the essential parts" of the doctrine of Purgatory. We need not repeat what he says as to the Egyptians, Chaldeans, Babylonians, and others, who are said to have believed in the transmigration of souls. We pass on to the testimony of the Romans. We have already quoted (vol. ii., p. 58) the account given by Virgil of *his* Purgatory, thinking, in the simplicity of our hearts, that it was some presumption against the truth of the doctrine, that a statement, made by a heathen, of the doctrines of the heathen religion—of the religion of false gods—should serve so exactly to express the doctrine of the Church of Rome now. Mr. Marshall, however, takes a very different view of the case, and quotes Virgil with great relish, concluding thus (p. 14)—"The Romans believed in three distinct places for souls after this life; they practised piety, and offered prayers and sacrifices for those whose sins were expiable. They could not do more had they been orthodox Christians." He tells us, also (p. 12)—"The people of the Thibetans was founded by Magog, the grandson of Noah, by Japhet, and inherited the sacred traditions of the patriarchs, through which they not only believed and practised all that was *enacted* with regard to Purgatory, but even celebrated *All Soul's Day*, and perfectly coincided with our Saviour's idea of heaven, 'there are many mansions in my Father's house,' and of hell, where each shall suffer according to the number of his crimes."

We give next Mr. Marshall's account of "the savages" (p. 16)—"It can be asserted that nothing is better observed among the savages in general, than respect for the dead. The women burn offerings on the tombs, and consign to the flames all the substance of the deceased. [What savage waste—why not give them to the priests?] They believe that they can appease the souls with the effusion of blood. The inhabitants near the river Palmas celebrate the anniversaries of their dead, and the relatives of the deceased accompany the ceremonies of these anniversaries with many incisions on the body, from which blood abundantly flows. The savages, therefore—yes, the *wild*, naked, and ignorant red savages of North America—are more *orthodox* upon this and many other *essential* points of Christian faith than many of the sanctimonious and Bible-reading Protestants of this enlightened country."

From the North Americans Mr. Marshall passes to the Turks. He says (page 17)—"The veneration that the Mussulmen entertain for Mahomet, does not prevent their being more Christian than a multitude of other Protestants. They have preserved many dogmas, institutions, and practices which were rejected by Protestants. Besides the belief in a Purgatory, we shall mention the devotion to guardian angels, the intercession of saints, the veneration for their tombs and for their relics, pilgrimages, profound respect for the writings of the holy doctors, the monastic orders, the lent, &c., &c."

It would be tedious were we to go through the other nations which Mr. Marshall has adduced as witnesses for Purgatory; enough has been said to show in what respectable company he claims to hold the doctrine. We add, in conclusion, the peroration with which Mr. Marshall concludes this branch of his subject. Any of our readers who are familiar with the style of French eloquence, will recognise, with patriotic gratitude, that the nonsense we have been copying is not of home manufacture.

"Enough, Jews! enough, Gentiles! Natives of the earth, 'tis enough! The immense unanimity of your testimonies, in diffusing itself all over the wide world, has submersed all incertitude, elevated itself above the highest exigencies of logic—the unique, the perpetual, the universal existence of this dogma is established now and for ever. People of the tombs—venerable manes of those nations that have slept for ages—return in peace to the cities of the dead, to the realms of the departed; the dogma which ye have so much honoured and cherished is fully satisfied with this last homage that ye have given to it, and the mementoes of which shall long be present in the grateful memories of the living."

HISTORY OF THE POPES—No. III.

THE TENTH CENTURY CONTINUED.

In resuming the history of the Popes of the tenth century (the last part of which appeared in our number for November) we ask our readers to remember—*first of all*, that we are not selecting instances here and there, but giving the history of all the Popes of that century in their order; *secondly*, that we are not giving the history from any Protestant writers, but from the famous and learned Jesuits, Labbe and Cossart, in their great work on the Councils, in which they have given the history of the Popes also; *thirdly*, that wherever the Jesuits find it in their power to praise a Pope, we give that praise in full. So our readers may safely take the history, as the most favourable that can be given of the Popes.*

POPE LEO VI.

"Leo, the son of Christopher the chief secretary, the sixth of this name, was made Pope about the end of the year of Christ 928, in the time of Constantine the Emperor. In the following year, being cast into prison, he died, after six months and fifteen days."† But *how* he died, or for whose wickedness he was imprisoned—his own, or his successor's—the Jesuits do not tell. A Pope being cast into prison was, in that age, too common a thing (as our readers must have learned from our November number) to excite much attention.

POPE STEPHEN VII.

This is the same called Stephen VIII. in Bishop Milner's list, which we gave in our November number; but

---

* La Religion Comparée, par M. De La Mare, n. iii., p. 119, c. 8, vol. i.

† L'Abbé Foucher Memoires de l'Academie des Inscriptions, tom. xxiv., p. 23.

* To save space, we give the Latin only where we think it necessary for the purpose of having an object in transcribing. The edition of Labbe and Cossart used by us, is that printed at Paris, A.D. 1671.

† Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., col. 957.

the Jesuits count him Stephen VII. Strange that Roman Catholics cannot agree about who were Popes, and who were not! "Stephen, a Roman by nation, the son of Theudemund, the *seventh* of this name, was appointed in the room of Leo VI., in the year of our Lord 929, in the time of Constantine and Romanus, Emperors of the East; who, when he had sat two years, one month, and fifteen days, departed this life."* And that is all they have to say of him. But let us have patience; the life of his successor will be more full.

POPE JOHN XI.

"John, the son of his father, the false Pope Sergius, by the strumpet Marozia, was intruded into the place of Stephen by the power of Wido, Marquis of Tuscany, and of his mother, Marozia, in the year of Christ 931, in the time of Constantine and Romanus, Emperors of the East—at which time he could not yet have been capable by age of so great a dignity, even though no other impediment stood in the way.† Artaldus, a most holy man, who, from being a monk, was elected Archbishop of Rheims after the boy of fifteen years of age was cast out, would never have sought the pall from a MONSTER *of this kind*, had he not thought so highly of *the name* of Roman Pope, that he thought that name was to be honored even in a man unworthily and unlawfully appointed, and had persuaded himself that the Apostolic See was to be judged by none but by God."‡

We trust that our readers will observe, that such reverence for the name of Pope, and such a doctrine that "the Apostolic See" cannot be judged by man, is a poor security for the Church, when it leads archbishops, "most holy men," to bow down before such a monster, acknowledging him as head of the Church, and Vicar of Christ. But to proceed with the history of Pope John XI.—"Alberic, *his brother*, together with *his mother*, Marozia, kept this Pope enthralled in prison to the day of his death. Marozia offered the dominion of the city to Hugo, brother of her deceased husband King Wido, if he would promise that he would make a confederacy by marrying her. Hugo accepted the condition, and, having entered the citadel of St. Angelo by stealth, after incest committed with the widow of his brother, he despised the Romans; he knocked down his stepson Alberic, whilst, by the command of his mother, Marozia, he poured water on her hands, as if he poured out too much of it. Which injury that he (Alberic) might avenge, he stirred up the Romans to revolt; and after the citadel was stormed, as Luitprand says, he put to flight his incestuous father-in-law, Hugo; but he ordered his mother, Marozia, with his brother, the fallen Pope John, to be detained in prison, in which the violent invader, violently cast down, died, after he had not so much ruled as foully defiled the Apostolic See for five years and some months."§

A family quarrel worthy of such a family! But what an account of how a Pope was appointed, and how he died! Yet this "monster," as the Jesuits call him, is counted by Bishop Milner as a lawful Pope, as a Vicar of Christ, who performed his duty as such IRREPROACHABLY, and as a step in the apostolic succession, by which the title of the present Pope must be proved!

POPE LEO VII.

This Pope sat three years and six months. The Jesuits tell us nothing of him, except that he got Odo, Abbot of Clugni, to settle the above-mentioned family quarrel and boxing-match between Hugo and Alberic.

But they relate a fact which happened in his pontificate, and added not a little, they say, to the troubles of the Church. Manasses, Bishop of Arles, seized upon the dioceses of Verona, Trent, Mantua, and Milan, in addition to his own; and Manasses said he was only following the example of St. Peter, who was Bishop of Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria at the same time! But if St. Peter must answer for all that has been done in his name, he will have a heavy account.‖

POPE STEPHEN VIII.

This Pope is called Stephen IX. by Bishop Milner. We cannot expect much in the history of this Pope, on account of an ugly accident which happened to him. Labbe and Cossart say "he was elected by the Romans, the votes of the cardinals having been set aside.* His accident is thus related—"This Pope was deformed in the face by many sacrilegious blows, by the tyrants, whose hatred he had excited against himself on account of his election."† It is commonly thought that his nose and ears were cut off. The effect of these injuries on him is thus related—"And although these brands, inflicted for righteousness' sake, by the ministers of Satan, were not a disgrace, but an ornament, yet, from this cause, he abstained as much as possible from the public assemblies of men."‡ Nothing is harder to bear than personal shame; and the Pope *could not* think the loss of his nose an ornament. Father Paul says he never after appeared in public.§ So he shut himself up for three years and four months, and then died, leaving no further materials for history.

POPE MARINUS II.

Marinus was made Pope in the year 943. The Jesuits say, that twenty-three years before, when Udalric was coming to Rome, this Marinus foretold to him the death of his predecessor, Adelbero, and that Udalric should be his successor. The character and conduct of Marinus is thus described—"He applied himself wholly to composing the Church, by the reformation of the clergy as well as of the monks, and by the restoration of churches and the care of the poor; by his letters he accomplished that peace should be established between Christian princes contending with each other."‖

Such a Pope was, indeed, wanted; and a heavy task he had to perform. But he only sat three years and six months. "In his time," the Jesuits say, "the image of Christ, the Redeemer, miraculously impressed, and sent to King Abgarus, was removed to Constantinople, when Edessa was besieged by the Romans, in the year 946." This "miraculous image" was one of the many lying stories which the Church of Rome has helped to impose upon the world. Perhaps no Roman Catholic would now be found who would undertake to say that this miracle really happened; yet it is related as a true miracle by these most learned Jesuits, and the story did its work for the Church of Rome in its day. Well, at least, when one lying story is proved false, the Church of Rome can always get up another—witness the winking picture of Rimini, and the apparition of La Salette.

POPE AGAPETUS II.

No facts are related of him, but that he decided a contested election to the Archbishopric of Rheims; gave a pall to Bruno, Archbishop of Cologne; and confirmed the privileges of the Church of Hamburg, on occasion of the conversion of the Danes. His history thus concludes—"when he had well discharged his pastoral office, during nine years, seven months, and ten days, he departed this life."¶

POPE JOHN XII.

John, the son of that Alberic who ruled over the city (of Rome), invaded the Apostolic See, in the year of our Lord 955, in the time of the Emperor Constantine VIII.; and although the lawful age, and ALL OTHER THINGS *which are required in a lawful Pope*, were wanting in him, yet (the consent of the whole clergy afterwards accruing to him) it seemed that he was rather to be tolerated, than that the Church should be divided by any schism, which otherwise would have arisen; and since the universal Catholic Church knew that it was a less evil to bear a head, however monstrous, than that one body should be cut in two and deformed with two heads, she venerated him as a true and lawful Pope throughout the whole world."**

This is so important in relation to that doctrine of the Church of Rome, which teaches that the Pope is the head of the Church, and that it is necessary to salvation to be subject to this head, that we shall keep it to be considered in a separate article; so we proceed now with the history of John XII.

"He truly is the first Pope that is met with who changed his name, which, on account of his tyranny, changed but not forsaken, he wished to be called John, instead of Octavianus. His father, Alberic, called his son Octavianus with a view to the temporal dominion of the city: but he, on the contrary, having obtained the pontificate and the spiritual dominion of the whole world, wished to be called by this name of John."*

This name, JOHN, signifies "the grace or mercy of God." But the Popes of this name have been the most graceless of all—as if God would thus show the falsehood of the pretences of Popes. In this century alone, so far as we have gone, in the space of 40 years—Pope John X. was appointed solely through his infamous connection with a vile woman; Pope John XI. was the son of another Pope, by a strumpet, and was chosen Pope for that very reason; and, now, a Pope, who was "wanting in everything required in a lawful Pope," must call himself John XII.! And in this Pope we find the origin of the custom, since become universal, of Popes changing their names at their appointment. Another mark of the succession of modern Popes being derived through these monsters of iniquity. The Jesuits go on to relate the wars in which Pope John XII. engaged; the oath of allegiance which he took to the Emperor; how he broke his oath, and fled to avoid punishment; how the Romans swore never again to appoint any one Pope without the Emperor's consent; how the Emperor held a synod, in which John was degraded from the Papacy, and Leo VIII. appointed a "false Pope;" and how Pope John, on the departure of the Emperor, returned and deposed Leo VIII. as an adulterer and invader of the See. But the death of Pope John must be related in their own words—"Concerning the unhappy end of Pope John, the author, who is said to be Luitprand,† writes these things—'On a certain night, as he was delighting himself with the wife of a certain man, he was so struck by the devil on the head, that within the space of eight days he died of that wound,' not because, as he says, being justly condemned, he was unjustly received (into the Papacy), but because being admonished by God so often, and with so great troubles, *he did not abstain* FROM HIS ACCUSTOMED SINS."‡

One would suppose that a Pope would be justified from the charge of habitual adultery, and of being killed in the act of adultery, if it were possible; but the Jesuits do not undertake to deny the story, nor do they think it of any consequence to do so; they say expressly that they "*do not dispute* the truth of this story, in as much as these things bring no damage to the Catholic faith, concerning which we confess, with unanimous consent, that Peter, and the successors of Peter, after the promise of Christ received, could fail in morals indeed, but not in faith!"§

When our readers shall hear that distinction put forward again by Roman Catholic writers, we trust they will remember what great necessity the Roman Church had to invent that distinction. For be it remembered that this Pope John XII. is in Bishop Milner's list of the succession, through which the title of the present Pope must be proved; and it was, of course, necessary to maintain, that a Pope, "in whom all things were wanting that are required in a lawful Pope," who lived in "habitual adultery," might yet perform "his public duties," *as Vicar of Christ*, IRREPROACHABLY!

How did our Blessed Saviour prove that the Jews were the children of the devil? we find it in the 8th chapter of St. John's Gospel—"whosever committeth sin is the servant of sin" (verse 34); "ye do the deeds of your father" (verse 41); ye are of your father, the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do."—verse 44. We think Roman Catholics cannot deny that a man who professes to live in holy virginity, and yet lives and dies in habitual adultery, does the lusts of the devil, and is a child of the devil; yet, according to the doctrine we are now considering—viz., "that a Pope may err in morals, but not in faith"—such a child of the devil may "perform his public duty, in preserving the faith and unity of the Church irreproachably;" as Bishop Milner says, all these monsters of iniquity in the 10th century actually did!—End of Controversy, letter 28, cent. x.

But if no degree of moral iniquity, or profligacy, or depravity can hinder a man from performing the office of Pope irreproachably, so long as he cannot err in faith, why might not the evil one himself prove an irreproachable head for the Church of Rome? St. James says—"the devils BELIEVE and tremble." The devil knows, with the greatest certainty of conviction, that Christ is the son of the living God; that Christ was born of a virgin, and was made man; that He died for our sins, and rose again; and that He will come to judge the world. The devil believes with the highest degree of conviction, and he trembles! Could Pope John XII. do more?

We ask our readers to consider what objection there

---

* Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., col. 590.

† The birth of this John is mentioned in the life of Sergius III., given in our November number. If this John was born, as it would appear, after Sergius was made Pope, he could not have been more than 23 years of age when made Pope himself. Father Paul Sarpi says he was but 20.—Treatise on Eccl. Benefices, ch. 19.

‡ Johannes Patre Sergio pseudo-pontifice ex scorto Marozia prognatus, Widonis Tusciæ Marchionis et Maroziæ Matris potentia in locum Stephani intruditur, anno Christi 931, tempore Constantini et Romani imperatorum orientalium, quo ipse nondum per ætatem tantæ dignitatis capax esse potuisset etiamsi nullum aliud impedimentum obstitisset. Artaldus ex monacho Rhemensis Archiepiscopus electus, vir sanctissimus, post puerum illum quinquennalem ejectum, ab ejusmodi monstro pallium nequaquam petisset, nisi tanti Ipse fecisset Romani Pontificis nomen, ut etiam in homine immerito et illegitime collocato illud honorandum esse putasset, sedemque apostolicam a nemine, prætorquam a Deo, dijudicandam esse sibi persuasisset.—Labbe and Coss., vol. ix., 590.

§ Hunc pontificem Albericus frater una cum matre Marozia custodiæ mancipatum usque ad diem obitus detinuit. Marozia Hugoni Regis Widonis defuncti mariti germano urbis dominium obtulit, si ille suo se conjugio confœderandum promitteret. Acceptavit conditionem Hugo, et clanculo arcem sancti Angeli ingressus, post incestum cum relicta fratris uxore commissum. Romanos despexit. Albericum privignum suum, dum juxta matris Maroziæ aquam manibus ejus infunderet, quasi immoderata effudisset, in faciem cecidit. Quam ut ille injuriam ulciscceretur, Romanos ad defectionem commovit, postque arcem impugnatam, ut ait Luitprandus, Hugonem Vitricum suum incestuosum fugavit; Matrem vero Maroziam, una cum fratre Joanne pseudo-papa mandavit detineri sub custodia, in qua violentus invasor violenter dejectus obiit, postquam sedem apostolicam quinque annis et aliquot mensibus non tam rexisset, quam turpiter polluisset.—Labbe and Coss., vol. ix., 591.

‖ Labbe and Coss., vol. ix., 593.

* Posthabito Cardinalium suffragio, electus est a Romanis.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., col. 599.

† Hic a tyrannis, quorum odium propter sui electionem in se concitavit, crebris ictibus sacrilegis facie deformatus fuit.—Same reference.

‡ Et quanquam hæc stigmata propter Justitiam a Satanæ ministris inflicta, non dedecori, sed ornamento essent; tamen ipse a publico hominum congressu hac de causa ut plurimum abstinuit.—Labbe and Coss., vol. ix., 593.

§ Treatise on Eccl. Benefices, ch. 19.

‖ Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., col. 608.

¶ Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., col. 618.

** Joannes Alberici illius qui urbi dominabatur filius, apostolicam sedem invasit, anno Domini 955, tempore Constantini VIII. Imperatoris. Et quanquam hujc legitima ætas aliaque omnia deessent quæ in legitimo pontifice requiruntur; tamen accedente postea consensu totius cleri visum est, hunc potius easa tolerandum, quam ecclesiam schismate aliquo, quod aliquin exortum fuisset, dividendam. Cumque universæ ecclesiæ Catholica sciret minus malum esse, caput quantumlibet monstrosum proferre, quam unum corpus in duo secari, et duobus capitibus informari, eandem toto orba terrarum tanquam verum et legitimum pontificem venerata fuit.—Labbe and Coss., vol. ix., 640.

* Hic revera primus est inventus, qui sibi nomen mutavit, quique ex Octaviano, pro mutata non exuta tyrannide, voluit Ioannes nominari. Ob temporale urbis dominium, Albericus pater filium suum Octavianum nominaverat; ille e contra pontificatum et spirituale dominium totius orbis consecutus, spirituali nomine hoc Ioannis appellari voluit.—Labbe and Coss., vol. ix., 640.

† This refers to a history of the Popes which passes under the name of Luitprand, but which was not written by him.

‡ De infausto Ioannis papæ exitu, autor qui asseritor Luitprandus hæc scribit; quadam nocte extra Romam dum se cum cujusdam viri uxore oblectaret, in temporibus adeo a diabolo est percussus, ut infra dicrum octo spatium eodem sit vulnere mortuus. Non quia, ut illa ait, juste damnatus, injuste receptus fuerit; sed quia tot tantisque vexationibus a Deo admonitus, a peccatis consuetis non abstinuit.—Labbe and Coss., vol. ix., 641.

§ Veritatem eorum non controverto, utpote quod nullum dispendium afferant fidei Catholicæ, de qua unanimi consensu profitemur, Petrum Petriqua successores post acceptam Christi promissionem, in moribus quidem, non autem in fide deficere posse.—Labbe and Coss., vol. ix., 641.

could be to it, if the maxim that "the Pope may err in morals but not in faith," be sufficient to show that John X., John XI., and John XII., and many more such Popes, were duly qualified to perform the office of Vicar of Christ irreproachably.

We shall conclude the history of the Popes of the tenth century in our next number.

THE USE OF FORMS OF PRAYER.

We have, in another article, given our readers one specimen of a Roman Catholic controversialist; but as it is our principle always to deal with the *best* arguments, and the most formidable opponents we can find arrayed against us, we consider it right to introduce them, also, to a higher class of Roman Catholic writers. We are, indeed, ready to acknowledge the marked increase that has taken place of late years in the ability of their controversial publications. Much of this improvement, no doubt, is owing to the accession which their ranks have gained in some recent converts from Protestantism; men (our Maynooth friends will forgive us for saying) of a higher education than has usually adorned the Romish priesthood, and who besides, as deserters, possess the advantage of knowing the exact points against which to direct their fire; or, to speak without any metaphor, of knowing the difficulties most likely to be felt by Protestants, and the arguments most likely to tell with them.

We have before us now a little bundle of controversial tracts, in which we think we do not mistake in saying we observe traces of Protestant education. We select for review that on the "Rosary of the Blessed Virgin Mary," partly because we have no doubt its statements as to Roman Catholic opinions and practices will convey real information to many Protestant readers on points of which they were ignorant; partly because its line of argument has been reproduced—whether by the same or a different writer—in a late (the November) number of the "Rambler."

We take from the "Rambler"—which is the most concise—the following statement of the difficulty which the writer professes to encounter:—

"In the Rosary, we must first remind our Protestant readers, the 'Hail Mary' is repeated one hundred and fifty times; the 'Our Father,' ten times; and the 'Glory be to the Father,' ten times. Frequently only one-third of the whole is said at once; but the proportion of the three prayers remains the same. This is, at least, the case with that which is commonly called '*the* Rosary,' or 'The Rosary of the Blessed Virgin,' for there are others constructed on different plans. This Rosary is, also, the most universally in use of all Catholic popular devotions. It is said repeatedly by every Catholic, from the Pope downwards. Indeed, on an average, it is scarcely too much to state that one-third of the whole is said almost daily by every devout Catholic above the age of childhood.

"Now, all that non-Catholics know of this devotion is, that for every *Pater Noster* and *Gloria Patri* we say ten *Ave Marias*. Is not the deduction inevitable that we think ten (or, rather, five) times as much of the Blessed Virgin as of Almighty God? Or, to be extremely charitable, that we pray five times as often to Mary as to our God and Saviour? So, at least, the world has decided against us.

"But what is the fact? The fact is, that this is *not* the Rosary which we say, and that no such Rosary exists at all, or was ever heard of in the Catholic Church. The doctrine of the Rosary consists in meditations *with the understanding and the heart* on the chief events of the life and passion of Jesus Christ, and the great blessings of the Gospel, while, *with the lips*, we recite all these Hail Marys, Lord's Prayers, and Doxologies."

As we think it possible some of our Protestant readers may be so stupid as not to perceive, on the first reading, the exact point of this defence, we hope to make the matter more clear to them by laying before them the explanation of the use of forms of prayer, which we have learned from Roman Catholic writers. Our readers are aware that differences of opinion prevail among different denominations of Protestants on the question whether extemporc prayer is preferable to the use of forms in public worship. They know, also, that the Church of Rome not only agrees with the Church of England in the use of public forms of prayer, but that she carries the use of forms in private devotions to a much greater extent than is common among the members of the reformed Churches. The following extract (from the tract on the Rosary), however, will prove that members of the Church of Rome are not insensible to the force of some objections that may be urged against the use of forms:—

"The defect of this method of devotion is, that in saying words composed by others, we must ask exactly for what they express, and sometimes they will not quite express our own feelings. Sometimes, perhaps, we are ashamed to utter words of absorbing self-abasement, when we are conscious that our own sense of contrition is less deep; or it may be the words before us are all full of joyful love, and we would only be lying at the foot of the cross, crushed and humbled under the intolerable sense of sin. Then, again, our wants are so various, one could not find prayers to meet them all. Sometimes they are very distinct, growing out of the cares of to-day—the little things which belong to our own life, but which may seem unimportant to other people—difficulties and temptations which may not occur to other minds, but are very grave and real to us. Sometimes, again, they are not so clear and definite. There are feelings which others cannot understand, and which, perhaps, we do not well understand ourselves. Nothing it may be, but a weariness, and the sense of a great need. It is not that we have this or that to ask for in particular, but we feel weak, and fretful, and unhappy; we desire only to kneel down in God's presence and let him see all our hearts, and then the best-chosen phrases of other men seem stiff and empty. We do not seek for words; or, if any are needed, let them be such as will mould themselves to the fashion of our own unutterable thoughts.

"Surely all must know what I mean, that there is often a consciousness of sin impossible to confess, and a sense of prayer impossible to put into any set form of words. We may try to use our own, chosen at the moment; if so, how difficult it is to select those that are right and good! Sometimes we say the same thing over and over again; sometimes, try as hard as we may, what we say does not express our meaning—it vexes us that our words should be so vague and indistinct, and we puzzle ourselves to find better; and so, in thinking for right expressions, we lose time, and our thoughts get distracted."

Here, then, are some objections, forcibly stated, to the use of forms of prayer—at least in private devotion. How are they to be got over? How are the confessed advantages of forms to be reconciled with the elasticity of extemporaneous prayer? The secret consists in knowing how to use forms in the right manner. We have already given our readers the key to the enigma, and, therefore, without further mystery, announce to them, that *the proper way of employing forms of prayer is to use the forms with the lips while the thoughts are occupied with something else.*

Some of our Protestant readers will think this strange, and will, perhaps, find it hard to believe that such advice has been given by Roman Catholics; but if they will reflect for a moment, they will remember, that in the Roman Catholic Church the public service is conducted in Latin—a language not understood by the people—that it is absolutely impossible for them to follow, with their thoughts, the words of the service, and that all that can be expected of them is, that they should occupy their minds, during the time of worship, with some kind of holy and prayerful thoughts, by no means, however, necessarily corresponding to the words uttered by the officiating minister. Nor is this confined to persons ignorant of Latin. A Protestant clergyman, a few years ago, paid a visit to Rome, directing his particular attention to the religious ceremonial, and has published an account of what most struck him. One of the points he noticed, which appeared to him most remarkable was, that the non-officiating clergymen, at the different churches, were almost invariably engaged, during the time of divine worship, with their private books of devotion, that no two of them were occupied in the same study, and that scarcely any one dreamed of following the service actually being performed. Mr. Seymour merely records faithfully what he saw, without giving any theory to account for it, as we are now in a position to do. Our readers, then, must learn, that there are three kinds of attention which may be given to prayer. The first kind is, when you follow the words of the prayer, and attend to their meaning. This is the lowest kind of attention, and almost any one is capable of it. The second kind is, when your heart is filled with the spirit of prayer, without particular attention to the words employed. The third kind is, when you attend to the words, and have the spirit of prayer too. This last kind of attention is, undoubtedly, the best, but is of such a kind that only a few exalted souls are capable of it.

We take the above statement of doctrine from Father Baker's work, "Sancta Sophia," quoted as a standard authority by Mr. Faber, in his book, "All for Jesus," from which we have already made several quotations. We think it better to give our readers Father Baker's own statement of his doctrine—"Now, whereas, in all manner of prayer, there is necessarily required an attention of the mind, without which it is not prayer, we must know that there are several kinds and degrees of attention, all of them good, but yet one more perfect and profitable than another; for—1st, there is an attention, or express reflection on the words and sense of the sentence pronounced by the tongue, or revolved in the mind. Now, this attention being, in the vocal prayer, necessarily to vary and change, according as sentences in the Psalms, &c., do succeed one another, cannot so powerfully and efficaciously fix the mind or affections on God, because they are presently to be recalled to new considerations or succeeding affections. This is the lowest and most imperfect degree of attention, of which all souls are, in some measure, capable; and the more imperfect they are, the less difficulty there is in yielding it; for souls that have good and established affections to God, can hardly quit a good affection by which they are united to God, and which they find gustful and profitable for them, to exchange it for a new one succeeding in the office; and, if they should, it would be to their prejudice.

"The second degree is that of souls indifferently well practised in internal prayer, who, coming to the reciting of the office, and either bringing with them, or by occasion of such reciting, raising in themselves an efficacious affection to God, do desire, without variation, to continue it with as profound a recollectedness as they may, not at all heeding whether it be suitable to the sense of the present passage which they pronounce. This is an attention to God, though not to the words, and is far more beneficial than the former; and, therefore, to oblige any souls to quit such an attention for the former, would be both prejudicial and unreasonable; for, since all vocal prayers, in Scripture and otherwise, were ordained only to this end, to supply and furnish the soul that needs with good matter of affection, by which it may be united to God, a soul that hath already attained to that end, which is union, as long as it lasts ought not to be separated therefrom, and be obliged to seek a new means, till the virtue of the former be spent.

"A third, and most sublime degree of attention to the divine office is, that whereby vocal prayers do become mental—that is, whereby souls, most profoundly, and with a perfect simplicity, united to God, can yet, without any prejudice to such union, attend, also, to the sense and spirit of each passage that they pronounce—yea, thereby find their affection, adhesion, and union increased, and more simplified. This attention comes not till a soul be arrived at perfect contemplation, by means of which the spirit is so habitually united to God, and, besides, the imagination so subdued to the spirit, that it cannot rest upon anything that will distract it. Happy are those souls—of which, God knows, the number is very small—that have attained to this third degree; the which must be ascended to by a careful practice of the two former in order, especially of the second degree."

Those of our readers who have mastered the theory of attention here laid down, are now in a position to understand the great advantages of the Rosary, and the wise simplicity of what they may have deemed its vain repetitions. If your thoughts are not to be particularly occupied with the meaning of what you are saying, what possible advantage can there be in giving utterance to long and varied forms of prayer? Is it not far more simple to take some short form—such as the *Pater Noster* or the *Ave Maria*—and repeat it over fifty or a hundred times, or as often as may be necessary, filling your thoughts the while with meditations as holy and as profitable as you are able?

But some of our Protestant friends may here object, and cry out, to what purpose is the use of any words at all. "We have no doubt," says the "Rambler," "that to those who are not Catholics this appears a most extraordinary and preposterous device. They will ask, what can be the possible use of saying one thing, and meaning another? and, in all probability, will flatly deny that we ever do what we pretend, reiterating their conviction that the whole thing is a nonsensical piece of gabbling and muttering—at once unscriptural and irrational. Now, we do not deny, that were a person who is not a Catholic to attempt to say the Rosary in the way we have described, he would be completely baffled in his efforts. When a man has little or none of that inward power by which we realize the objects of our faith, and when he has never been habituated to the peculiar ways of Catholic devotion, he would find the Rosary the most unspiritual and the most tiresome of prayers."

The "Rambler" proceeds to explain the utility of an apparatus or device by which bodily or outward motions may be made subservient to the operations of the mind. We have all heard of children who could not repeat the verses they had learned by heart, unless they were constantly buttoning and unbuttoning their sleeve buttons; of orators who, if not allowed a string to fiddle with, were sure to lose the thread of their discourse; of sailors who cannot go to sleep unless the wind is blowing, while landsmen will be awake all night because there is a gust every quarter of an hour.

"Just such is the use of the 'Hail Marys' and other prayers of the Rosary. From childhood a Catholic is accustomed to associate the great mysteries of faith with the low, monotonous murmur from his own lips and those of others of those forms of prayer, and with the mechanical movement of the hands in passing the beads along with the fingers. Even when the custom is not begun in childhood, a short practice confers the necessary unconscious mechanical facility of both lip and finger; and those who, as Protestants, regarded the whole thing as incomprehensible, or laborious, or childish trifling, acquiesce, with delight and gratitude, in the unerring wisdom of the Church that has sanctioned so admirable and so simple a means for drawing the thoughts away from the glare and gloom of this life and its agitations."

"The string of beads he holds in his hand is simply to assist his memory, and prevent him from losing his place and getting confused in the repetition of the same words so many times. His great object is to keep his mind constantly fixed upon the subject before him; therefore, he is very glad of anything that prevents distraction, and tells him the proper number of prayers has been said without his having to count them, and think whether there is not one more yet to say, which would in a moment take his thoughts off from the presence of God. The touch of the beads, without disturbing him, reminds him of the proper time to change the form of prayer, and when he is to pass from one point of meditation to another. In all this it is the object of the Church to assign some fixed limits to our meditations, though she allows us ample freedom within them. We need discipline in prayer quite as much as in everything else."

It must be confessed, that supposing there is a "proper number" of prayers which it is necessary to say, that the invention of beads for the purpose of counting them with facility is one the advantages of which cannot be denied.

To complete, however, the defence of the Rosary against the charge of vain repetition, it is necessary to add, that the words employed may receive a new colouring each time—thus, each time that the words "Mary pray for us" are uttered, we may mentally subjoin that we may receive so and so, according to the blessings of which we may at the time feel our need. So that the Rosary, as actually performed, resembles one of those elaborate pieces of music in which the composer, having for his theme some simple strain, ornaments and enriches it with a hundred different variations.

We have thus laid before our readers the best defence that has been given of a practice which Protestants are in the habit of thinking not only absurd but unscriptural. For, certainly, the Church of Rome is right in forbidding her subjects to use their private judgment in the interpretation of the Bible, since she is so unlucky as to be perpetually in, at least apparent, opposition to the Bible, understood as a plain man would interpret it. When, for instance, our Lord directs his followers—"When ye pray, use not vain repetitions, as the heathen do, for they think they shall be heard for their much speaking"—it does, at first sight, appear that she could not well have gone in more direct opposition to our Lord's commands than by recommending a method of devotion which consists in saying the same words, over and over again, one hundred and fifty times. Even the wiser heathen condemned such repetitions as these. Do you think (says the old heathen in Terence, for example), that the gods are as stupid as yourself, and that they cannot understand a thing unless they are told it a hundred times.*

But let us examine the defence that is offered us. It is the same as the apology that the old lady made for the silence of her parrot—"Poor creature, if he does not speak, he thinks the more." As far as the *words* of the Rosary are concerned, it is acknowledged, that they could not be cleared from the charge of vain repetitions. But, then, it is said, you are not to judge of us by the words; there is enough of variety and of devotion in our thoughts. Let us endeavour, then, without prejudice, to consider the advantages of this kind of mental reservation in our address to God—this method of thinking one thing and saying another.

We by no means deny that some persons of cultivated minds may be able, during the repetition of the Rosary, to carry on in their thoughts such a series of prayers and meditations as the writers we are reviewing describe. But these are just the persons who could, without difficulty (and we should think with far greater profit to themselves), carry on their private devotions in words of their own. But the question is, whether this is the ordinary way in which the Rosary is employed—whether every old woman we see telling her beads does occupy her mind meanwhile in a series of meditations on the principal events of the Gospel history, or whether she rests satisfied that she has offered sufficiently acceptable service to God in the mere repetition of the prayers. In spite of the "Rambler's" insinuations that Roman Catholics have different faculties and powers from Protestants, we shall take the liberty to believe that human nature is pretty much the same in the Church of Rome and our own; and that we are tolerably well able to form a guess as to the degree of devotion which is likely to accompany the use of the Rosary. But we are not left to our own conjecture. The author of the tract we are reviewing tells us "that it is by no means an easy thing to say the Rosary well," and, "that any one who *can* do so has little more to learn in the science of devotion." This precisely agrees with our own opinion; and, as the "Rambler" tells us, that the Rosary is said daily by millions of Catholics, we may guess in what manner it is said by all, except those few "who have little to learn in the science of devotion."

And now the question arises, what are we to think of the nature of the service performed by those who say the Rosary, but do not say it "well;" who gabble over the prayers, but who do not accompany them with the meditations which are so eloquently described in the tract before us. In the silence of the "Rambler" we must appeal to the authority of the standard Roman Catholic divines, and we shall find that, according to their principles, any person who repeats the words of these prayers, intending thereby to perform an act of divine worship, does, without further condition, perform all that is essential to prayer, and all that is necessary to entitle him to the benefits of it. The account which we are about to give of the attention necessary to prayer, is taken from Cardinal Tolet,† and agrees with that laid down by St. Thomas, and by his commentator, Suarez. And if any of our Protestant readers are so prejudiced as to imagine that Roman Catholic doctors teach that attention is not necessary in prayer, let them learn their mistake. There are three kinds of attention, and one of these is absolutely necessary, and that is—attention to the right pronunciation of the words. If any one repeating prayers does not attend so far as to pronounce the right words, or if he hurries so as to pronounce them ill, or if, in reciting with others, a priest gets on so fast as to repeat one verse of a psalm before those with whom he is reciting have finished the verse preceding—or if any one, in repeating the Rosary, is so inattentive as to skip some of the words, or to say a Gloria when he ought to say an Ave, we do not undertake his defence; no casuist warrants us in saying that by such careless service he can acquire any merit for himself or for others.

The second kind of attention is to understand the meaning of the words, and all are agreed that this is not necessary. "If this were required," says Tolet, "there would be very few, indeed, who could comply with this requirement. All that is necessary is to know that what is repeated is intended for divine praise and worship, and to repeat it with that intention."

The third kind of attention is, to remember during our repeating that we are in the presence of God, and are addressing him. "This kind of attention is of great use," says Tolet, "but is not necessary."

There is another distinction, too, of great importance—that between actual and virtual attention; since it is by no means necessary that we should actually attend to our prayers, provided we pay virtual attention. Virtual attention is when we commence with the intention of being attentive, and though our thoughts wander afterwards, yet we do not let them designedly wander; for instance, if any one, in repeating a Rosary, or if the priest, in reciting his "hours," should write a letter at the same time, or engage in any other work requiring attention, then this would not be considered "virtual attention," since the distraction is deliberate and designed; but if there be no such settled purpose of inattention, no fault is to be found, however little attention he may actually pay. A priest, however, may repeat his "hours" and hear Mass at the same time (thus killing two birds with one stone), since the command to hear Mass does not include any command to attend to the words. Suarez, too, lays it down that, though attention is necessary, yet that the very smallest degree of attention is sufficient in order to constitute real prayer. The tendency, in short, of all this teaching is to represent prayers as producing their effect like charms, *ex opere operato*—"just," says St. Antoninus, "as a precious stone is of as much value in the hands of an unskilful man as of a jeweller." We think, then, we are safe in drawing, from the general principles here laid down, the conclusion, that a person repeating the Rosary without any meditation, but merely with the general notion that he is performing a duty and offering God worship, does all that is necessary to acquire merit by his service. And now we are in a position to see how very unfair is the defence of the Rosary offered by the "Rambler" and his fellow labourer. When Protestants object to the Rosary as consisting of a set of vain repetitions, they are told that they are not to look to the words—that these are meant only as means to excite certain profitable meditations; but, on looking further, we find that these meditations, however useful they may be regarded, are not *essential*, and that the mere saying of the words without understanding them is enough to satisfy the requirements of Roman Catholic divines. Now, any one can see the failure of a defence which turns on an unessential point, which ascribes to a class attributes in reality belonging only to a few individuals of it.

We have heard nothing urged in defence of the Rosary which might not, with equal justice, be urged in behalf of the praying mills of Thibet. There the worshipper is taught to write his prayer on a piece of paper, put it in a mill, and turn it round and round the proper number of times. What is to prevent the Thibetian grinding his mill with, at least, a virtual attention that he is offering some kind of divine worship; and may he not say, perhaps, that he has learned to associate with this mechanical operation, all manner of holy and religious thoughts?

We have, in conclusion, to offer a few remarks upon another point touched on by the "Rambler"—namely, the disproportion between the number of prayers offered to the Virgin and to the Most High—there being ten Aves for one Pater and one Gloria. We shall show that the apologist gains nothing by transferring the question from the words to the thoughts; and that in the subjects selected for meditation there is just as much pre-eminence given to the Virgin as in the words of the prayers. These subjects include, in fact, every incident in the life of the Virgin (some of them, indeed, not found in Scripture at all); and though our Lord is mentioned, it seems to be only because Scripture is obstinately silent as to any part of the history of the Virgin apart from her Son. We give briefly the heads of the subjects, and allow the reader to form his own judgment on them—

"*The Fifteen Mysteries of the Holy Rosary.*

"The Five Joyful Mysteries.

"1. The Annunication of the Blessed Virgin.

"2. The Visitation of the Blessed Virgin to her cousin Elizabeth.

"3. The birth of our Blessed Lord, at midnight, in the stable at Bethlehem.

"4. The presentation of our Blessed Lord in the Temple by his Virgin Mother.

"5. The finding Jesus among the doctors in the Temple by the Blessed Virgin."

It is easy to see that, in every one of these meditations, the Virgin is made the central figure.

"The Five Sorrowful Mysteries.

"1. The agony of our Lord in the garden.

"2. The scourging of our Lord by the soldiers, who gave Him over 5,000 stripes.

"3. The crowning of our Lord with thorns.

"4. The carrying of the cross, in which our Lord bears, with most amazing patience, the cross which is laid on him for his greater torment and ignominy, meeting His blessed Mother on the way.

"5. The crucifixion of our Lord in the presence of His afflicted mother."

It is to be acknowledged that the Virgin is not mentioned in three of these mysteries.

"The Five Glorious Mysteries.

"1. The Resurrection of our Lord.

"2. His Ascension in the sight of His Blessed Mother and the Apostles.

"3. The descent of the Holy Ghost on the Apostles as they continued in prayer and supplication with the Blessed Virgin.

"4. The Assumption of the Blessed Virgin.

"5. The coronation of the Blessed Virgin; in which, amid the great jubilee and exultation of the whole Court of Heaven, and to the particular glory of all the saints, she is crowned by her Son with the brightest diadem of glory."

With reference to the first of these glorious mysteries, it is to be borne in mind that Roman Catholic writers, although without any Scripture authority, represent the first appearance of our Lord after His resurrection as being made to the Virgin. It will be seen, then, that in every one of this last set of meditations, too, the Virgin is the figure on which the imagination of the repeater of the Rosary is most likely to dwell.

THE LIFE OF A PRIEST.

(Continued from vol. iii., p. 146.)

In the middle ages the Church of Rome, having no other Church to contend with, gave her own interpretation to the Old and New Scriptures, and to obey the Church was then of primary obligation on the peer as well as on the peasant; nor was it contemplated that a reformation would take place in the Church; and, consequently, it was thought that Transubstantiation, the Mass, Purgatory, and all her other antiscriptural doctrines, would be safe from detection behind the impenetrable darkness of ecclesiastical authority.

To aggrandize the Church and increase her revenue has been, at all times, the policy of Rome, to which nothing could contribute more than the Mass, Purgatory, and Indulgences.

It was Gregory the Great who decorated the Mass with deacons, sub-deacons, acolytes, with incense and lights, in order to affect the senses, like any theatrical performance. For the altar above the throne has always been the ardent desire of Rome; and by conferring on the priesthood the superhuman power of creating God and forgiving sins, the Pope was, at the same time, placing himself above the monarchs of the earth; for he who assumed all the power of heaven and of earth could not be less in his own estimation than that of universal monarch. To be the Pontifex Maximus only of the suburban sees would have been nothing—he must also be the head of all the churches that were to be established in both hemispheres.

The next question to which I turned my serious attention was that of Purgatory—a doctrine so much relied on by the Church of Rome—and which I could not find either in the sacred volume or in the records of the early Church; and the conclusion was irresistible that it was introduced into that Church from interested motives, in order to make the Mass of more value, and to increase its demand by its application to souls in that place of punishment. The Mass was introduced as an effective abstergent for the sins of the living and the dead, contrary to the doctrine of the Apostle, who says, "that the blood of Christ his Son cleanseth from all sin." The Church of Rome adduces as a proof of Purgatory the First Epistle of St. Peter iii. 19, 20—"By which also he went and preached unto the spirits *in prison*." This prison, it is said, could not be either hell or heaven; therefore, there must be a middle place. But this argument is easily answered by looking at the rest of the passage—

"He preached unto the spirits in prison which sometime were disobedient [incredulous, Douay Bible], when once the long-suffering of God *waited in the days of Noah*." The spirits who were disobedient, or incredulous, in the days of Noah were so wicked, that, we are told in the Book of Genesis, ch. vi., "it repented God that he had made man on the earth." "The wickedness of men was great on the earth, and the thought of their heart was bent upon evil at all times." Now, Purgatory is defined by the Church of Rome as a place where *venial* sins are purged by fire; whereas those spirits who were disobedient in the days of Noah were clearly guilty of mortal sins.

Again, the Church of Rome insists that there are some sins that are forgiven in the next world, according to the doctrine of St. Matthew xii. 32, where he says, "that sin against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven, either in this world or in the world to

* One Jam desine uxor gratulando deos obtundere, nisi illos tuo ex ingenio judicas, ut nil credas intelligere nisi idem dictum est centies.

† Instruct Sacerd., lib. ii., c. 13. n. 5, 6.

come." This doctrine, it is said, necessarily implies that there are some sins that can be forgiven in the next world; and, consequently, there must be a middle place, called Purgatory. But what a slight and uncertain ground for such an inference! The more obvious meaning of this text would be, to any man of ordinary understanding, that the sin in question was so enormous, that it could not escape punishment either in this life or in the world to come.

Now, if the doctrine of the purification of souls was true, would the Apostles pass it over in silence? or would the early Church omit such salutary doctrine in her primitive teaching?

No argument can prove more effectually the great advantages which the Church of Rome derived from the doctrine of Purgatory than that all the ecclesiastical lands which Henry VIII. confiscated at the Reformation were formerly given by profligate and ferocious barons, and other eminent sinners, to the Church of Rome for the relief of their souls—"*pro remedio animarum suarum.*" This historical fact is supported by Hume and Gibbon, and is too well established to be capable of contradiction.

The doctrine of purgation by fire is taken from the works of Virgil and Plato; "Month's Mind" and "Anniversaries" are taken from the heathen religion of ancient Greece, as may be seen by the "Travels of Anacharsis." Without this doctrine of purgation there would not be an adequate staple for the lucrative merchandise of Masses and Indulgences.

The next step I had to examine in the ecclesiastical ladder of the Church of Rome was Confession, and to see upon what foundation it was established. I found in the Maynooth Class Book, in the 21st canon of the Council of Lateran, under the Pontificate of Innocent III., in the year 1215—"Let every one, both man and woman, truly make confession of all their sins, at least once a year, to their own priest." The Council of Trent, in the 5th chapter of the 14th session, says, "that the universal Church has always understood that a confession of sins was ordained by Christ." The decrees of both these councils are founded upon that observation, which Christ addressed to St. Peter—"to thee I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven, whose sins you forgive they are forgiven, and whose sins you bind they are bound." In the old law the Jews could not be persuaded that their priests could forgive sin; nor did the priests themselves pretend to have such divine power. This is manifest, from what David says in the 32nd psalm—"Oh, I acknowledge my sins *unto thee*, and mine iniquity have I not hid;" and, again—"I said I will confess my transgressions *unto the Lord*, and *thou* forgavest the iniquity of my sins." Daniel says—"To the Lord our God belong mercies and *forgiveness*, though we have rebelled against him."—Daniel ix. 9. In this doctrine of the Old Scripture there is no mention of auricular confession or sacerdotal absolution. Let us now descend to the New Scripture, and inquire what authority can we find there for confession to a *priest*, or for the validity of his personal absolution. It will be said that when Christ gave the keys of the kingdom of heaven to Peter, and the power of forgiving sins, that confession to him and to his successors was necessarily implied. In ancient times, keys were the emblems of authority; and "the key of the house of David," says God, "will I lay upon his shoulders." Thus did God invest his son with the keys, which were emblematic of his authority. The house of David represents the Church of Christ; and when Christ says, "I am he who hath the key of David," he proclaims *himself* to be the sole spiritual ruler of his kingdom, to whom it was given by his Father. It is quite clear when Christ gave the keys to Peter, and to the other Apostles, that he gave them a commission to preach and teach the Gospel to all nations, and, in connection with it, the power of loosing and binding. All those who forsook heathenism and were baptized, had their sins forgiven them; but all those who disbelieved the Gospel truths, and adhered to the old leaven of Paganism, had their sins retained; and all this irrespective of auricular confession or priestly absolution.

SS. Peter, Paul, and John are good authorities on this subject. Peter told his countrymen, the Jews, that God raised up Christ to be a prince and a Saviour, to give repentance to Israel, and *remission of sins*. He says again to Simon Magus—"Repent and *pray God*, if, perhaps, the thought of thy heart be *forgiven thee*.—Acts viii. 22. Peter did not say, *come and confess your sins to* ME, I AM THE VICAR OF CHRIST, *to whom he gave the keys of the kingdom of heaven*, and I WILL PARDON you. St. Paul says—"Through this man, Christ, is preached unto you the forgiveness of sin."—Acts xiii. 38. St. John says—"If we confess our sins, HE is faithful and just to forgive us our sins."—1 John i. 9. In all these passages it will be seen that forgiveness of sin is not connected with the ceremonial act or absolution of the priest, but depends exclusively upon the faith and repentance of the person. The Apostles heard no confessions, had no scruple-boxes, imposed no penances, but exhorted sinners to *fly to God for forgiveness*, which he was willing to afford "*without money and without price.*" Beside these proofs, have we not Christ himself forgiving sin *without confession*, in the case of the man who was sick of the palsy. "Son, thy sins are forgiven thee."—Mark ii. 5.

If further proof is wanted to show that auricular confession is not warranted by Scripture, read the pathetic history of the weeping penitent of Bethany.

Moreover, Cardinal Cajetan, who was so famous in controversy at the time of the Reformation, said that auricular confession could not be proved directly, but only inferentially, or by way of implication from the Scripture.

Now, can that be properly said to be of divine institution, and necessary to salvation, which depends only on an inference, and is proved only by an *inuendo*? When our Lord issues his commands, they are ordinarily plain and express. "Go ye and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."—Matt. xxviii. 19. "Except a man be born of water and of the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."—John iii. 5. Would he not, also, have said somewhere—"Except a man confess his sins to the priest, he shall in nowise enter the kingdom of heaven," if he had intended to convey that as a divine command?

The early and greatest Fathers of the Church seem to have read Scripture, and never to have thought of the duty of confessing to a priest. ST. AUGUSTINE says—"To what purpose do I confess my sins to men who cannot heal my wounds? To a set of men inquisitive in inquiring into the lives of others, but indolent in amending their own! And how shall they (who know nothing of my heart but by my own confession) know whether I say true or no? For no one knows what is in man but the spirit of man that is in him."*

ST. CHRYSOSTOM speaks lightly of confessions to men, and urges continual confession to God only. "It is not necessary," says he, "that thou shouldest confess in the presence of witnesses; let the inquiry of thy offences be made in thy thoughts; let God only see thee confessing. . . . . I do not say to thee, bring thyself on the stage, nor accuse thyself to others; but I command thee to obey the prophet, saying, reveal thy ways unto the Lord, confess them before God, praying, if not with the tongue, at least with thy memory, and so hope to obtain mercy. Thou art ashamed to say that thou hast sinned—confess thy faults, then, daily in thy prayers. Nor do I say confess them to thy fellow-servant, who may reproach thee therewith—confess them to God who healeth them."†

Is it possible to read these passages, and believe that either St. Augustine, or St. Chrysostom, conceived that secret or auricular confession of every sin to a priest was an indispensable condition of salvation? An open declaration of sin, and further, atonement was, no doubt, urged and required when the crimes of notorious offenders had given open scandal. "Open confession is good for the soul," is an observation of daily familiarity all over Europe at the present day, and dates its origin from the infancy of Christianity. In the Eastern Churches an open acknowledgment of sin was made by the Catechumens after their conversion from Paganism, and before they were baptized; and when they were sufficiently instructed in the principles of their newly-adopted religion, a declaratory absolution was pronounced by the priest before they received the Lord's Supper—"*May the Lord God forgive you your sins*"—indicating thereby that God alone could forgive sins. It was in the same manner the Jews believed, when they accused Christ of blasphemy for having told the man sick of palsy, "thy sins are forgiven thee."

An officer, called the *Public* Penitentiary, for some time existed, at least in the Eastern Church, until it was abolished by Nectarius, Bishop of Constantinople, in the latter end of the fourth century, on the occasion of the confession of a noble matron, admitting her guilt with a deacon of the Church there, which, coming to the ears of the people, created such a popular commotion, on account of the dishonour and scandal that it reflected on the whole Church, that Bishop Nectarius, to extinguish the flame, and prevent like occasions in future, abolished the office of penitentiary altogether; "by which means," says the ecclesiastical historian, Sozomen, "every man is left to the conduct of his own conscience, and permitted to partake of the holy mystery at his own peril."

In the Western Church, it was that despotic tyrant, Innocent III., who trampled on the necks of kings, and absolved their subjects from allegiance—who subverted the natural law by the ultramontane doctrine of Transubstantiation—who introduced a pharisaical hypocrisy, in the southern states of Europe, by that infernal machine the Inquisition—it was he who enslaved the human mind by the introduction of auricular confession, with all its disgusting disclosures and loathsome revelations; and the same year, 1215, that beheld the human mind reduced to the most abject slavery, on the banks of the classic Tiber, by a tyrant Pope, witnessed, also, the freedom of every British subject, by the powerful influence of the Barons at Runnymede, on the banks of the Thames.

(To be continued.)

* S. Augus. Confess., lib. x., c. 3., tom. i., p. 171. Paris, 1679.
† Hom. de pœnit. et confess., tom. iii., p. 901.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We have again to apologize to several of our friends for postponing their valued communications. Letters from Mr. E. Power and Mr. Rourke are in type, and will be inserted in our next.

We beg to call the attention of our correspondents to the utility of adding their name and address to their communications.

To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Rutland st.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with the copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to members of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal, which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, JANUARY, 1855.

THE promulgation of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin is the great event of the 19th century. The joy which it appears to have inspired in that large class who are led more by their feelings than reasoning and evidence, and the consternation which it has created among those who, though sincerely attached to the Church of Rome, have loved it chiefly because they believed it to be an unchangeable Church, which never innovates or decides without reason, are equally remarkable and startling to those who look on as impartial spectators of a proclamation so novel in modern times.

It is not merely giving a new honour to the Virgin Mary, it is authoritatively announcing a new fact, and a fact too, which, if true, gives a new character and aspect to the Christian religion. It is, in truth, little less than the promulgation of a new religion—a religion of which the mortal being, thus raised above the pale of humanity, is to be the goddess. It is adding a cardinal fact to those which have been handed down to us as the truths of the Gospel history; and that not upon the authority of tradition—for the belief in it can, in no way, be traced to ancient times; not upon the authority of Scripture—for the New Testament is wholly silent as to any of the circumstances of the birth of the Mother of our Lord; but solely upon the authority of the Pope, and those bishops whom he assembled in the Vatican, in December, 1854, to join him in taking advantage of an apparent agreement among his adherents, to make himself remarkable by doing what none of his predecessors, for the last 700 years at least, has been able to accomplish.

What is the reason of this present agreement? Has any new light broken in—any new evidence—any new revelation burst upon the world? or is the only reason for the present agreement, that it has become more agreeable to the feelings of the worshippers of the Virgin to believe her free from the taint of original sin, and immaculate from the first moment of her conception in the womb of her mother?

We may, perhaps, assume, that neither Pope Pius, nor Archbishop Cullen, nor Cardinal Wiseman, pretend to any particular personal knowledge upon the subject upon which they undertake to pronounce. They are not, like the Apostles, witnesses of facts which they themselves have seen or known, or even which they have heard from credible witnesses. They declare upon the state of a matter which happened nearly nineteen hundred years ago—a matter for which no contemporary narrative vouches—nay, which plainly was not believed in at the time of the alleged occurrence. They can refer to no written testimony, either in the New Testament, or any other book. They cannot say that the story has been handed down, in the Church, from generation to generation. But what is done is this—a certain number of ecclesiastics, assembled at Rome, in the year 1854, without any evidence whatever—upon their own speculation, and nothing more—choose to affirm, that a particular miracle happened some years before the Christian era; and, having so affirmed

it—because they think if it did not take place it ought to have taken place—they demand that, upon pain of damnation, all Christian people shall believe that it actually did take place.

Now, is this anything more or less than the assumption of a power to manufacture the facts of Christianity? It is the only word by which we can express the process by which this new fact is concocted. We could perfectly understand the assertion that some new evidence had been discovered which established a fact hitherto unknown, even after the lapse of nineteen hundred years—nay, we could understand men to say that a more careful collection of existing evidences had led them to the belief in any particular state of things; but it is quite another thing to say that that which was not a fact yesterday is a fact to-day, because some bishops in Rome think that it ought to be so. The founder of the Mormonites was, at least, rational and consistent; his story was, that he found certain histories, long lost to mankind, and recorded certain facts hitherto unknown. If the Mormonite invented the facts, he thought it necessary, also, to manufacture the evidence. The conclave at Rome has a shorter and readier way—that of manufacturing the facts without any evidence at all.

Into the discussion of all the consequences that naturally follow from the belief in this new dogma, it is not our purpose now to enter. Those who accept it will hold a religion to which Christianity will scarcely be the most appropriate title. That religion will be much more the religion of Mary than the religion of Christ. If men really believe in this miraculous birth of the Virgin, she was, long before the angel visited her to announce the coming birth of the Saviour, a being above humanity. Had she never been the mother of the Saviour, she was divine; she was, in fact, the author of Christianity—the first divine being that was born in human nature.

The idolatry that must directly follow from such a belief is alarming indeed. We cannot think that intelligent Roman Catholics will be ready to revolutionize their faith at the bidding of the conclave assembled at Rome. There is, however, in the promulgation of this fiction, an humbling lesson to the arrogance which is wont to boast, that in keeping to the See of Rome as the centre of unity, they escaped, at least, all danger of the novelties by which Protestants are sometimes distracted. The faith of Roman Catholics, we are often triumphantly told, was rested on the unalterable foundation of ancient tradition. "Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus." This was the safe test of "Catholic" belief, according to the dreams of the Puseys, the Newmans, and the Wilberforces. Behold the realization of your dream in the monstrous novelty of "the Immaculate Conception." Mokanna, raising his veil, did not more horrify and surprise his victim than this novelty must those who went to the Church of Rome to listen to the certain voice of *ancient* teaching, and found the conclave of modern bishops issuing forth the new doctrine of "the Immaculate Conception."

We cannot pause to point out how apt an illustration this supplies of the mode in which many other doctrines, equally novel, may have been thrust upon the Church. We know, beyond all question, that this very doctrine of the Immaculate Conception has not been, up to this time, generally received. Now, we presume, it is an indisputable article of faith. Why? not because it has been received by all Christians from ancient times; but because a conclave of bishops, selected by the Pope, have chosen to impose it upon the Church. Five centuries hence, if contemporary evidence should perish, who could tell the origin of the belief, then, no doubt, both ancient and universal. Just in the same way were foisted upon Christianity all those peculiar tenets which distinguish Roman Catholics, to the receipt of which by their Church, Roman Catholics now point, as evidence that the belief in them is ancient and universal.

Unquestionably, it never again can be urged that the reception of a doctrine by the Roman Catholic Church is any evidence that it has come down from ancient times. We now know of a certainty that there is a mint at the Vatican where new coins of doctrine can be constantly struck off; and even if they affect the impress of antiquity upon the die, or the date of ancient times upon the legend, they no longer conceal the truth that the coins they issue may be of modern manufacture, as much as that of the medal of Australian gold, which has been struck in honour of the event—"*Deiparæ Virgini sine labe conceptæ*"—to commemorate the new fact which Pope Pius has added to the narrative of the New Testament.

IT is with deep interest that we watch for indications of the feelings and opinions of Roman Catholics concerning this late decree of the Pope, establishing the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception as an article of the Roman faith.

Our readers are, perhaps, equally anxious to know what view is taken of it by those who profess to express the opinions of Roman Catholics, and how they get over the difficulties which, as we showed in our last number, do arise from that decree.

Our attention has been engaged by two leading articles in the *Tablet*, of December 23, which throw much light on this subject. Whether we consider the assertions, the confessions, or the contradictions contained in them, those two articles appear to us most instructive.

The previous number of the *Tablet* (Dec. 16), in its leading article, had said, in reference to this decree of the Pope—"The Immaculate Conception is NOW a solemn article of Catholic faith;" where the word "*now*" evidently admits that it had *not* been so the week before.

The first leading article of December 23, thus proceeds:—

"In all its circumstances, whether we look without the Church or within it, we should say that the time for giving the authoritative decision on this great question, has been most happily chosen. . . . . Looking to the dogma in question, the circumstances of the time are not less happy."

And here are the facts which make the choice of the time so happy—

"For twelve centuries the fact of Mary's Immaculate Conception remained unquestioned."

St. Bernard, in his 174th epistle, explains how it happened not to be questioned; when writing to the Church of Lyons, on the feast of the Immaculate Conception, *then lately invented*, he says—"We can never enough wonder that some of you could have the boldness to introduce a feast which the Church *has not the least knowledge of*, which is neither supported by reason, *nor backed by any tradition*." Of course, men do *not* question that of which they have never heard.

The writer in the *Tablet* proceeds—

"*Then* a controversy arose; and *the Church permitted controversy*; for she is the mother and the nurse of rational intellectual freedom. . . . . Ours was *the earnest controversy* of men deeply interested for the faith that establishes the transmission of original sin on the one side; and, on the other, for the honour and privileges of her who, in the minds of both parties, ranked as the most highly-gifted of God's creatures. And so the Church, seeing only a burning zeal for faith on all sides, *graciously stood by and listened*. Toward her faithful children, as long as charity presides over disputation, she has always put in practice this noble system of enlightened tolerance and fond forbearance."

The principle here laid down has our entire concurrence. We are delighted to have the testimony of the *Tablet*, that the Church encourages controversy when carried on in an earnest and charitable manner. We trust that the readers of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN will approve of this as much as we do.

But we greatly doubt whether the controversy on the Immaculate Conception was really carried on in so charitable a spirit. And even if it were, we are puzzled to see how it could be the duty of an infallible judge to "stand by and listen," because those disputing were willing to be taught. The *Tablet* itself says, that it was an article of the Catholic faith that was in dispute. Some said that article was true; others confidently affirmed that it was false. St Bernard, "the last of the Fathers," maintained that it "eithers honours sin, or authorizes a false holiness." Pope Sixtus IV., in his decree, dated 1483, says that—

"Some preachers of various orders, as we hear, in their sermons to the people, publicly, through various states and countries, have not blushed hitherto to affirm, and do not cease daily to preach, that all those who hold or maintain that the glorious and immaculate Mother of God was conceived without stain of original sin, do sin mortally, or are heretics. That those who celebrate the office of her Immaculate Conception, or who listen to the sermons of those who affirm that she was conceived without stain of this kind, do sin grievously. From which preaching, heavy scandals have arisen in the minds of the faithful, and greater scandals are, with reason, feared to arise from day to day."

This is the testimony of a Pope, in a solemn decree. We ask our readers seriously to consider, *was* this a case in which a divinely-appointed and infallible judge of faith, should "graciously stand by and listen!" What! one party in the Catholic Church contends for "a solemn article of the Catholic faith," and another party in that same Church denies that article, and cries out that those who hold it are heretics, and that it is a mortal sin to listen to them! Truly, the controversy appears to us more earnest than charitable. Yet this was the case in which that so-called infallible judge of controversies, himself bitterly lamenting these "heavy scandals," and fearing still greater, "graciously stood by and listened" for SEVEN HUNDRED YEARS!

Who is not ready to exclaim, "away with such an infallible judge. Let him do his business if he can. If he cannot, let him cease to mock the world by telling them that he has power and authority from God to settle all controversies of faith as they arise."

But let us return to the article in the *Tablet*—

"But, unlike what happens among heretics, whose gloomy destiny it is to be always seeking, and never finding, the *friendly* controversy between domestics of the Catholic household are sure to come ONE DAY to the desired end."

Well, SEVEN HUNDRED YEARS is a long day to wait! In that time TWENTY GENERATIONS of men lived and died! Was not their destiny as gloomy as the heretics? and more bitter, too—mocked as they were by the pretensions of an infallible judge of controversy, who, "when debates arise among Catholics concerning points of faith, . . . *fails not* to examine them by the received rule of faith, and to pronounce an authoritative sentence upon them. The dispute is thus quashed, and peace is restored."—Milner's End of Controversy, Letter xi.

But let us hear the circumstances under which the controversy was decided—

"It was, therefore, at a moment of complete internal freedom and repose, *when dispute was long dead, and disputation silent*. . . . . when already the myriad children of Christ were clinging, and had long been clinging, with fond embrace, to the sweet and beautiful doctrine of Mary's sinlessness, it was at such a moment . . . . that a Pope, the last and best of a long galaxy of Pontiffs, who, from the time of Sixtus IV., had been shedding down their lights on the path of this sacred tenet, chose to gratify the long-cherished wishes of the children of the Church, by the issue of a solemn, judicial, and definitive sentence, proclaiming that Mary had never contracted the stain of original sin—that this truth has been revealed by God to man, and is, therefore, from henceforth and for ever, an article of Catholic belief, which no one can HEREAFTER deny

impugn, or doubt, without losing his faith and becoming a heretic."

Mark that word, "hereafter." They might have denied it before, as St. Bernard did, *without* being heretics. And why, if it was indeed "revealed by God to man?" Mark that, Roman Catholics! It is no heresy to deny what God has revealed to man; but to deny what the Pope says, that is rank heresy!

But see how happily the time was chosen! "When dissent was long dead, and disputation silent!"

Do our readers remember a story in the first page of our number for October? "The wise old man;" who told the secret of his success in settling disputes—"never to interfere till the battle was over." We took that story from the *Tablet*. We said that the Pope must be the old man intended; and, lo! the *Tablet* now declares that the wisdom of the Pope consists in choosing his time thus happily, when "dissent was dead, and disputation silent!"

Roman Catholics are fond of proving the necessity of the Pope's judicial powers, by the necessity of judges in courts of law. But if such a judge should say to all parties who brought a case into court, "go and settle it among yourselves; when you have no longer any dispute between you, that will be the time to come to me, and I will then settle it in a trice;" would not all men cry out that such a judge was the greatest humbug the world had ever seen?

But hear now the conclusion which the writer in the *Tablet* draws from all this—

"Whenever necessity arises for a downright unmistakeable pronouncement, be sure the Church—the living, speaking, acting, judging authority of the Church—*will make itself heard.*"

Our readers are plain men, and have plain common sense. We ask them, *when* does the *necessity* arise for a "downright unmistakeable pronouncement?" Is it *necessary* when parties *are disputing*, or when they have *ceased* to dispute?

But we come now to the second article in the *Tablet*, of December 23, which immediately follows the one we have been considering; and we confess it does surprise us, as, perhaps, it will our readers too.

Observe, that "dissent is long dead, and disputation silent."

What is the subject of the article which follows?

Why, simply, this fact, that it is at this moment under discussion by the government in France, whether the Pope's decree in favour of the Immaculate Conception will be allowed to be published at all in France!

Now, the greatest canonists are agreed, that no one is bound by the Pope's Bull or decree until it has been published in his own country. And it has been sworn before committees of parliament, by the most eminent of the Irish Roman Catholic bishops, that no decree of the Pope is of any force in any country, until it has been published in that country. So this dispute about publishing the Pope's Bull in France involves the question whether the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception is to be a binding article of faith in France or not—whether the Roman Catholic faith is to be the same in France as in other countries! But let this article in the *Tablet* tell its own story—

"Now, while all Christians throughout the world are exulting with joy at this great event, long desired, which has taken place in Rome, *there are men* in Paris, the natural and ancient enemy of the eternal city (Rome), *who throw themselves into a fever of rage*, and, under pretence of *guarding their liberties and defending their rights*, are prepared to renew the ancient contentions of the university and parliament of Paris, to stir up the embers of an extinct sedition, and *to scandalize the faithful throughout the world.*"

This does seem rather strange if "dissent be dead, and disputation silent." But let us hear further—

"A Papal Bull is by this time in France, in the hands of the Apostolic Nuncio, but the publication of which, we are told, cannot be made before it is discussed *in the council of state*. Certain Gallican lawyers are still to be consulted, it seems, before the French nation may safely believe, with divine faith, that our Blessed Lady was conceived without sin. The general belief of the faithful, the concurrence of bishops and priests, and the infallible decree of the Sovereign Pontiff are, as yet, all worthless, until these wise men shall have given the final stamp of their approbation. . . . One of these dishonest additions to the concordat, requires all decrees and letters emanating from the Holy See, to be submitted to the council of state for examination, and, we suppose, approval, before they can bind the consciences of of Frenchmen. This is the state doctrine. . . . . The Gallican spirit is essentially seditious." . . .

Let our readers mark that this is the law of the greatest Roman Catholic country in Europe about the decrees and Bulls of the Pope, by which he undertakes to make new articles of faith. Those Bulls cannot even be published in France until the council of state has examined and sanctioned them. And this law is now put in force about the Pope's infallible decree on the Immaculate Conception, by a Roman Catholic government founded on universal suffrage! No wonder that the *Tablet* should be very angry at seeing an infallible decree so dealt with.

We shall have more to say, as this question proceeds, about this "Gallican spirit," which the *Tablet* considers so seditious. It is, in fact, a very ancient denial, by the French Church, of the infallibility and almost the supremacy of the Pope. It was thought that this had died out in France; yet we see that now, when it was thought that "dissent was dead," and that all was safe for infallibility to show itself, this great attempt of the Pope has brought the old Gallican spirit to life again.

And we must say, that the Pope's attempt was well calculated to produce such an effect; for it is the first instance, in the history of the Church of Rome itself, in which the Pope has ever attempted to settle articles of faith, without the concurrence and consent of the princes of Christendom. The ancient general councils were called by the Roman emperors. The emperors presided and spoke in them. The great officers of state, and the Roman senate, were present, and took part in them, and directed the proceedings.

In the ninth century, no less a Pope than Nicholas I. himself, wrote thus to the Emperor Michael—"Where have you read that the emperors, your predecessors, were present in councils, *except it were in those in which the faith was treated of, which is an universal and common concern of all, pertaining, not only to the clergy, but to the laity, and to all Christians.*"*

The learned work of Cardinal Jacobatius, "De Concilio," written not very long before the Council of Trent, speaking of the presence of emperors and kings in a general council, says—"But they need not of necessity be present, *except when the faith is treated of.*"†

At the Council of Trent itself, the emperor sent his ambassadors, with a commission to act in his name, and to vote in all the deliberations of the council; and it appears, by the published lists of those who were present at the Council of Trent, that the princes of Europe were represented in that council by sixteen ambassadors, ten of whom were laymen.

And now, for the first time in the history of the Church of Rome itself, the Pope has attempted to establish an article of faith, in an assembly of bishops only, excluding the princes of Europe. To this novel attempt at excluding the laity altogether from what even Pope Nicholas I. admitted to concern them as much as priests, the Emperor of the French has most appropriately replied, by appealing to the old Gallican spirit of "sedition," as the *Tablet* calls it, and requiring that the Bull shall be submitted to the council of state; a measure which, as CATHOLIC LAYMEN, we heartily approve.

There are already other indications of open resistance to the Pope's decree. A leading newspaper, published in Rome, reports that the heads of the Franciscan order publicly returned thanks to the Pope for establishing the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, which their order always supported. We were anxious to see if the Dominican monks, who always denied that doctrine, had done the same; but we found no mention of them. We have since heard, that the Dominican monks at Florence, in Italy, have spoken openly against the Pope's late decree, and refuse to submit to it. It would be strange, indeed, if the Dominican monks, one of the most famous orders in the Church of Rome, should now acknowledge that their order have always been supporting heresy, and denying an article of the Catholic faith. Yet they must now acknowledge this, or reject the Pope's decree. We shall wait to see further what the monks of St. Dominic will do.

In the meantime, enough has been confessed by the *Tablet* to show that the question cannot yet be considered at an end. There is still time to speak. Let our readers remember what the *Tablet* says in the article first quoted. "The Church permitted controversy; for she is the mother of rational, intellectual freedom." Only let "charity preside over disputation," and even yet the Church of Rome may "graciously stand by and listen."

* Ubinam legistis imperatores antecessores vestros in synodalibus, conventibus interfuisse? Nisi forsitan in quibus de fide tractatum est, quæ universalis est, quæ omnium communis est, quæ non solum ad clericos, verum etiam ad laicos, et ad omnes omnino pertinet Christianos.—Ep. viii, Labbe & Coss., vol. viii., 310.

† Imo non debent de necessitate interesse; nisi quando tractarotur de fide—De Concilio. Liber I., De personis secularibus.

‡ Locum et vices nostras in *omnibus* sessionibus, consultationibus, deliberationibus, tractationibus et actibus obtinere et gerere, omnium *suffragium, votum*, et decretum nomine nostro dare. . . . Labbe & Coss., vol. xiv., 1138. Paris, 1671.

RECENT CONTROVERSY AT BOULOGNE.

(Continued from vol. iii., page 151)

Do not shrink from the simple issue to which the matter is now brought. I am proposing to try your claim by the test your Church has supplied. She has based the validity of all her peculiar doctrines upon a statement which cannot be proved for any one of them—upon the assertion, that her doctrines, as now held, have been the doctrines of the primitive Church. This is a simple matter of fact, to be determined by an appeal to history.

Here your difficulties thicken and overwhelm you. How is it, if the unanimous consent of the Fathers be the notorious fact you have asserted it to be—but which you have asserted, not because your Church proves it to be a fact, but because such assertion was the only expedient left her—that none of your writers can produce the only legitimate establishment of its truth? Why can you not at once come forward with that proof, which is just what your case requires, and which must silence us, so far as history goes? You allege that your infallibility was ever believed. You base it on certain passages of the Bible. Now, the Fathers wrote—many of them—especially on those passages. Let us select your leading one—"Thou art Peter," &c. Bring forward extracts from their writings to show that they did interpret those words as conveying infallibility and jurisdiction over the whole Church to Peter and the Roman Pontiffs. Show that they expressly said this. How is it your writers never do this? Your whole case rests on their ability to do so; yet, instead of it, passages are produced which speak of the grandeur of the See of Rome—which speak of a certain primacy allowed (the reason being in some cases specifically given, it is because of the political greatness of the city of Rome) to the Roman Pontiff; of the need of maintaining union with the Church of Rome. (Who would have denied it of her more than of the Eastern Church, as long as they continued pure Churches?) But you never produce a single honest extract, plainly stating that these writers held your modern doctrines, or derived them from the passages of Scripture which you now adduce in support of them.

Here, again, you are involved in a difficulty, from which there is no escape for you. When you are challenged, and put to the proof of your peculiar doctrines from antiquity, what is it you do? You give us certain passages which assuredly do not *assert* your doctrines—which do not even *seem* to contain them. Now, you cannot say these doctrines are not specifically enunciated, because they were not denied. For if you say this, you destroy your alleged proof from antiquity. And, in the

second place, not only were there, in the heresies and schisms which distracted the early Church, just the proper and necessary occasions for asserting the authority of the Pontiff and infallibility—either of him or of the Roman Church—but there is distinct evidence that his decisions were rejected, and his encroachments disallowed. The extracts which you adduce from the Fathers are of that character, that—to take a very safe position, yet quite sufficient for my purpose—do not *plainly* or satisfactorily, for any reasonable man, prove your doctrines. Hence, you *interpret* these extracts. You say the Fathers *meant* so and so. You catch at every ambiguous word; you strain any sentence of doubtful import; you give, instead of dogmatic averments of these writers, instead of explicit decisions of councils, your own reasons or assertions that they must have meant what you want to make them mean. Instead of their own declarations, which you cannot produce, you offer arguments, and mostly very weak ones, to prove they *must* have intended what, at least, they have never said; you give *interpretations of their interpretations*, and, after all your clamour against the right and dangers of private judgment, base your whole case, in the last resort, upon it—upon your interpretations of the Fathers' interpretations—and, therefore, by your own account of human judgment, upon a double fallibility.

[The reader will perceive that this argument is an extension of one used in the early part of the discussion against the Roman Catholic use of Scripture. That was shown either to involve a *petitio principii*, or to be an inference of private judgment. The same is here applied to the argument from the Fathers. The sophism is the same, only it is better hid by being put farther off. It appears so important to show it clearly, that I shall take leave to state it as explicitly as I can. It is plain that the whole body of the peculiar doctrines of the Church of Rome rests on the admission of her infallibility. If this be fairly proved, they are proved; if not, they fall. Accordingly, when Scriptural proof of this cardinal doctrine is attempted, her advocates are stopped by being reminded they cannot assume the doctrine when proving it. The difficulty is so clear that the Church of Rome rests the proof upon the assertion that there is an unanimous consent of the Fathers on this subject. Thus the burden of proof for the *doctrine* is transferred to the proof of this *fact*, and the whole case rests upon it. The next step is, therefore, to produce the passages from the Fathers which establish such unanimous consent. They are adduced; but they do not contain any clear, or, indeed, any statements at all of any such doctrine. We have no instances where they speak thus—The Church interprets, or I interpret, these words, "Thou art Peter" (or any other passage), as declaring the Bishop or Church of Rome to be infallible. Hence, the burden of proof is again shifted to the ascertainment of what the Fathers *meant*. Upon this there is all imaginable litigation. The Protestant side having the clear victory so far, that their opponents have never yet produced passages which convey anything like an explicit statement of this doctrine of infallibility, not only not from *all* the Fathers, but not even from *one* of them. Thus the proof of the doctrine comes to this issue—"What did the Fathers *mean*." But here, of course, the infallibility of the Church, as an interpreter of such meaning, cannot be alleged or allowed. Thus the decision comes to the issue of *private judgment*, and must come to it.

I do not see how it is possible to deny the fairness of this argument, or to refute it. The sophism, however, works in this way. It *seems* fair enough for Roman Catholics to exercise their judgment upon the writings of men, though they prohibit it upon the revelation of God. It looks as if there was no contradiction in doing so. But it is concealed, all the while, that the proof from Scripture, in reality, comes to the proof from the Fathers, and that it cannot be infallibly certain the doctrine itself is true, unless the proof for it be so likewise But this proof, resting ultimately upon the sense to be attached to the meaning of the Fathers, is subject to all the dangers which the Roman Church ascribes to human judgment by which alone such patristic proof is made out. Thus the proof of infallibility is completely shattered. The Church of Rome commits suicide by prohibiting private judgment on passages of the Scriptures which contain articles of faith. She slays her own pretensions in order to escape death to them from the hands of her opponents.

I can best elucidate the sophism which I have been endeavouring to expose, by the use of an admirable illustration—"Nothing is stronger than its weakest part." The strength of a chain depends on its weakest link. The number of strong links do not add to the strength of the chain, but they increase the difficulty of detecting the faulty one.—See Elements of Logic, by the Archbishop of Dublin.]

As to the consent of the Fathers, which you allege as united in witnessing to the antiquity of your doctrines—your recent convert, Dr. Newman, disposes of this, and surrenders it as *impossible of proof*. His theory is, that the present doctrines of the Church of Rome did not exist in primitive times, as they now exist. Their *germs* only can be traced. These were *developed* in after ages, and expanded into your modern tenets. How do you answer this? It is manifest destruction to your argument from antiquity.

You say, as your Church avers, that there does exist an unanimous consent of the Fathers, interpreting, as you now interpret, those passages of Scripture upon which you profess to ground your peculiar doctrines. Let us test the fact. I shall take one of the most eminent among them. I select St. Augustine, not only for positive disproof of the truth of such assertion, but because he is, also, a witness against your prohibition of private judgment.

Augustine wrote upon the passage "Thou art Peter," &c. He not only interprets the rock to mean Christ, but gives an admirable reason for thinking so. "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid—Christ Jesus." It is true, indeed, that he also says, I have elsewhere interpreted the rock to mean Peter, but more frequently to be Christ. But which of these two interpretations be the best, *let the reader choose.*

Now, if, as you say, the Church always interpreted the rock to be St. Peter, how could Augustine have been ignorant of the fact, or as, an orthodox writer, venture to oppose her. It is clear, from his manner of treating the passage, that he was quite unconscious of any such authoritative, or according counter-interpretation. This, if it existed, he could not but know. Hence, he is evidence, not merely that there was no unanimous consent (for he is one exception), but that there was no ecclesiastical or dogmatical interpretation at all. Moreover, how do you answer his concluding words—"let the reader judge?" Can you find in them your doctrine which prohibits men from exercising their judgment upon passages which contain articles of faith?

[The following is the reply given in the "Resumè" to this argument:—"The Doctor quoted a passage from St. Augustine on the interpretation of the words, 'Thou art Peter,' from which it would appear that the Father held *two* opinions about this text—viz., that the rock was *Peter* or Christ; but supposing even this to be the case, can the doubt of St. Augustine on the meaning of *one* among the *many* texts proving the supremacy of St. Peter, outweigh his own testimony in other parts of his writings, and those of all the early Fathers in favour of this supremacy?"

Here it is conceded that so far as St. Augustine's testimony goes, the doctrine of Pontifical infallibility and jurisdiction was not *settled* as being derived from the main passage on which they are now based, while no answer is given to the inference from his concluding words, against the existence of any interpretative authority precluding the exercise of human judgment.]

Dr. M.—You have made certain extracts from early writers, and made some assertions thereon. Some of these last are notoriously unfounded. Of these extracts, none, so far as I know them, prove your doctrines.

Thus you say, that upon the occasion of a schism in the Corinthian Church, an appeal was made to Clement of Rome for interference and advice. Suppose the fact to be so; what does it prove? "Interference and advice" are not infallibility and supremacy. The Corinthians acted wisely in asking such advice, and would have acted more wisely in following it. If the faith of the Church of Rome was as pure now as it was then, similar appeals would, in all likelihood, be made. Nothing was more natural than the appeal of the Corinthian to the Roman Church; for St. Paul (not St. Peter) was the bond of connection between them. He was *a* founder of one, and *the* founder of the other Church. This Epistle is written in the name of the Church—*i.e.*, the people of Rome, to that of Corinth. It is, as Irenæus describes it, a very pathetical letter. It exhorts the unruly to obedience towards their own pastors, but never once enforces their allegiance to himself as Bishop of Rome; nor is there anything in the whole letter, bearing on the present discussion, which does not tell against you.

(To be continued.)

Correspondence.

ON THE INFALLIBLE CHURCH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Having been favoured with a copy of your December LAYMAN, I cannot avoid briefly alluding to your remarks on the "Infallible Church." Being exceedingly sensible of the almost worse than inutility of controversy in swaying the judgments of those to whom it is addressed, and of the angry and unpleasant feelings which it invariably excites between the most temperate of contenders, it is with the utmost reluctance that I approach anything which could possibly be regarded as such; some of your arguments, however, seem so easily refuted by those of a contrary character that spontaneously suggest themselves, that I cannot refrain from repeating them. The desire which you seem to feel for the promotion of fair discussion will, I am sure, prove a sufficient guarantee for their insertion.

From the following considerations and texts, it will be evident that Christ instituted in his Church an exterior coercive authority, by which controverted points and subjects pertaining to religion are decided by an infallible judgment:—Cor. i. 11—"There are contentions among you." Cor. i. 13—"Is Christ divided?" Cor. i. 17—"For Christ sent me, &c., &c." Cor. i. 9—"God is faithful, &c., &c. Who does not but tremble and wonder at the express words of the Apostle of nations in teaching the Corinthians the necessity of unity; and, at the same time, he assures us that, necessarily to fulfil the ordinance of God, there exist schisms and heresies to prove and confirm the faith of Christ's followers; but, at the same time, God does not permit his faithful to be tempted more than their belief permits them to withstand such temptations. Then it follows, that Christ has taken precautions sufficient to deter the faithful from falling into heresy or being led astray from the way of salvation by false preachers. The nature of such precaution will be our immediate inquiry.

That there should exist an infallible judge to decide controverted religious questions, the wisdom of God necessarily requires; for Christ, instituting his Church, compares it to a kingdom. Now, how can we conceive the establishment of a kingdom, or any other political society, if we do not suppose, existing therein, a judge, invested with sufficient authority to decide controverted matters, with power, coercive and supreme. Again, Matt. xviii. 17—"He who does not hear the Church let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican." From this solitary text of Scripture it is lawful to conclude, that Christ appointed in his Church a judge to decide disputes in matters pertaining to religion and the salvation of mankind.

I am, yours truly,
A REAL L. CORRAN MAN.

We gladly insert the letter of our correspondent, and trust that controversy conducted in such a calm and temperate spirit as his communication exhibits, and as we hope to preserve in our reply, is not likely to excite any angry or unpleasant feelings.

His first argument, so far as we understand it, is as follows:—The Apostle condemns schisms and heresies—therefore, "Christ must have taken precautions sufficient to deter the faithful from falling into heresies;" the only sufficient precaution is the gift of infallibility to the Church—therefore, the Church must possess this gift of infallibility. In reply to this, we beg to ask our correspondent, what persons he means by "the faithful" in the above argument? If he means those who do not fall into heresies, no precautions are necessary; for it would be a contradiction in terms that the faithful should abandon the faith. But if he means Christians generally, it is quite certain (whatever we might have thought beforehand) that Christ has *not* thought fit to take such precautions as will prevent them from falling into heresy. The texts which our correspondent has cited, prove that heresies and schisms existed even in the Apostles' days; and they have continued to exist even in our own time. However strange this may appear to us, it is not more so than the fearful prevalence of sin in God's world. In both cases the fault is wholly man's and not God's. God does *deter* men from heresy by the warnings of his Apostles, and by giving them the Scriptures, in which he has clearly made known all things necessary to their salvation; but he has not seen fit to institute an "exterior coercive authority" to exclude heresies.

Our correspondent's next argument is drawn from the analogy of a kingdom or political society, in which it is necessary that there should be a judge invested with sufficient authority to decide controverted matters. We reply—In a kingdom is it not also absolutely necessary that not only there should be judges appointed, but that it should be known and unquestioned who they are?

Thus all the judges of our land are known men—known to be judges—and no person can doubt or question that these are the men; but if it were a doubtful point *who* were these judges, and if they had no commission to show, and no certain warrant for their authority, would not such judges rather multiply controversies than end them? So, likewise, if our Saviour, the King of the Church, had intended that all controversies of religion should be finally determined by some visible judge, who can doubt but that he would have expressed himself in plain terms about the matter? He would have said plainly, "I have appointed the Bishop of Rome to decide all controversies."

We wonder how any one can believe that our Saviour designed the Bishop of Rome to this office, and yet that he would not say so, nor cause it to be written by any of the Apostles or Evangelists, so much as once, but left it to be drawn out of uncertain principles by consequences still more uncertain.

As for the third argument, derived from the text, "Hear the Church," our correspondent is probably not aware that the meaning of this text has already been frequently discussed in this paper.*

The context clearly shows that our Lord is speaking, not of controversies of faith, but of matters of private dispute between Christians, which they were directed to bring, not before heathen tribunals, but before the local church to which they belonged; and any person who refused to submit to its arbitration would no longer be treated as a member of that body. We will merely cite the entire passage, which speaks for itself—"Moreover, if thy brother trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone; if he shall hear thee, then thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church; but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican."

* Vide CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. I., p. 68; vol. II., p. 122.

THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—In a letter, which within this month has been taking the round of the Protestant papers, from the pen of the well-known Protestant writer, Dr. Croly, I find the following passage:—

"The Popish hierarchy having been summoned by the Pope from various countries of Europe and, amongst others, from our own, and the meeting having commenced its sittings in Rome, on the 22nd of last month, I must make some remarks on the subject. The declared purpose is the promulgation of the doctrine, that the mother of our Lord was born exempt from original sin, as the doctrine of the Christian world. That other purposes are concealed under this summons, we can scarcely have a doubt; for the doctrine, under the name of the 'Immaculate Conception,' was established by the formulary of the Council of Trent three centuries ago, in these words—'The blessed Mary, Mother of God, is exempt from all sin, actual and original.'—Session 6."

Now, sir, I would be glad to know how does that statement, from so high a Protestant authority, comport with your oft-repeated assertion, that the doctrine has been heretofore an open question in the Catholic Church, never decided or settled by Pope or council—and the more especially with the statement in your last number, that "the Council of Trent expressly declared, that they did *not* decide on this doctrine?" An answer in your next, to this humble inquiry, will much oblige your most humble servant,

St. Stephens's Day, 1854. A CATHOLIC.

We think it not likely that Dr. Croly should have made such a statement, and we decline to search "the round of the papers" for it, for this reason—we have made it our rule never to produce the assertions of Protestants as proofs of the doctrines of the Church of Rome; we charge nothing on the Church of Rome but what we find in her own standard authorities, or in the writings of her Popes, cardinals, bishops, &c. We feel sure that Roman Catholics approve of our never bringing Protestant writers as evidence of what is believed in the Church of Rome. What the Council of Trent did must be decided by the records of that Council, and not by what Dr. Croly or any other Protestant may have said.

In the *sixth* session of the Council of Trent, there is nothing at all on the subject of the conception of the Blessed Virgin, nor of original sin in respect of her; but in the *fifth* session, which declares all men born under original sin, we do find this—"This holy synod, however, declares that it is not its intention to comprehend in this decree, where original sin is treated of, the Blessed and Immaculate Virgin Mary, Mother of God; but that the constitutions of Pope Sixtus IV., of blessed memory, which it renews, are to be observed, under the penalties contained in those constitutions."* And this is all that the Council of Trent has said upon the subject.

That Dr. Croly should represent this as a decree that "the Blessed Mary, Mother of God, is exempt from all sin, actual and original," is certainly most unlikely, although, if he did, it would be nothing to us.

But since the *Tablet* newspaper has actually endeavoured to put this construction on that decree, we ought, perhaps, to show the absurdity of such an attempt.

In the leading article in the *Tablet*, of December 23 (the same article we have quoted in another paper), we find this passage—"After propounding its definition, affirming against the heretics the dogma of the universal transmission of original sin, the Council took care to add, *with great delicacy and tenderness for her own children;* but in such a way as to leave no doubt about *its own sentiments and the strong bias of its mind*, 'that it is not its intention to comprehend in its decree the *immaculate* Virgin Mary, Mother of God,' &c. Our Catholic readers will, no doubt, be struck, as we have been, with the evidence of this concordance of the Church with herself." Now, this *confesses* that the Council of Trent, out of *delicacy and tenderness* to those who denied the immaculate conception, carefully refrained from saying that it was true; but it also tries to insinuate that the terms of the decree prove that the Council really believed the doctrine, though they shrunk from saying so, because so many denied it. And the *Tablet* prints the word in italics, thus, "*Immaculate* Virgin," as if that word applied to her, implies her immaculate *conception*. We notice this, because it is, perhaps, the course intended to be adopted in this controversy. Such writers will, perhaps, produce passages in which the Virgin is called "Immaculate," and try and impose that as proof that those who called her so, must have believed in the immaculate conception; but truth compels us to say, that such a use of the words is a deliberate deception. In fact, the term "immaculate *Virgin*," only implies that she always continued a virgin; and is so used by Pope Sixtus IV., in his decree of 1476—"Et immaculata Virgo nihilominus post partum remanerot." And very many who applied the word Immaculate to her in a larger sense, intended thereby only that she was preserved from actual sin, and not at all from original sin.

Thus the Dominican monks, who held that the doctrine of the Immaculate conception was downright heresy, still called the Virgin "Immaculate," because they conceived that she had been kept from *actual* sin. So the word Immaculate, applied to the Virgin, does not at all prove that they who called the Virgin so, did believe in the Immaculate *conception*, unless the *Tablet* is prepared to say that the order of St. Dominick held the Immaculate conception—which even the *Tablet* will not attempt to say.

And with respect to that decree of the Council of Trent, it is to be remembered, that Cardinal Pacheco and other cardinals and bishops in the Council of Trent wanted to introduce words to the effect, that it might be "piously believed that the Virgin was conceived without sin;" and the Council positively refused to let those words be put into the decree—Du Pin, Eccl. Hist., Vol. iii., p. 426. Dublin, 1724. Did that show the strong bias of the Council *in favour* of the doctrine of the Immaculate conception?

And the Council did actually in that very decree renew and confirm the constitutions of Pope Sixtus IV., which actually condemned to excommunication, from which the Pope alone could absolve, "those who should dare to assert that persons who held the contrary doctrine—viz., that the glorious Virgin Mary was conceived in original sin—do incur the crime of heresy or mortal sin; since it is not yet decided by the Roman Church and the Apostolic See."* If the Council had really meant to imply that the immaculate conception was an article of the Catholic faith, would they have renewed this sentence of excommunication upon those who should venture to say that it was heresy to deny it?

The plain and evident meaning of the decree of the Council of Trent was this—that in deciding that all mankind were born under original sin, they would not undertake to decide whether the Blessed Virgin was or was not. And until now, Roman Catholics themselves admitted this; for which we appeal to no less a controversialist than Bishop Milner—"The Church *does not* decide the controversy concerning the conception of the Blessed Virgin, and several other disputed points, because she sees nothing absolutely clear and certain concerning them, either in the written or unwritten word; and, therefore, leaves her children to form their own opinions concerning them."—End of Controversy, Letter 12.

* Declarat tamen hæc ipsa sancta synodus, non esse suæ intentionis comprehendere in hoc decreto, ubi de peccato originali agitur, Beatam et Immaculatam Virginem Mariam, Dei Genitricem; sed observandas esse constitutiones felicis recordationis Sixti Papæ IV., sub pœnis in eis constitutionibus contentis, quas renovat.—Sess. v., sect. 5.

* Simili pœnæ ac censuræ subjicientes eos, qui aliud fuerint asserere, contrariam opinionem tenendo, videlicet gloriosam Virginem Mariam, cum originali peccato fuisse conceptam, hæresis crimen, vel peccatum incurrere mortale; cum nondum ad a Romana Pontifex et apostolica sede decisum.—Bull of Pope Sixtus IV., A.D. 1483.

CHRISTIAN MINISTERS NOT SACRIFICING PRIESTS.

WE have received a letter, signed "Imus," in reference to the article in our last number, of which the above is the title. As we do not think the writer's objections proceed from a real difference of opinion with us, but from a misapprehension of our meaning, in the crowded state of our columns we hope he will be satisfied if, instead of inserting his letter, we add to our article such explanations as it would seem to require. Its object was to prove that the Christian minister is not a SACRIFICING priest, as were the Pagan *ispeus* or *Sacerdos* and the Jewish *Cohen*, and as the Romish priest claims to be. It was never said or meant that the English language and the English Church do not attach a definite meaning to the term priest; nor was such an absurdity ever thought of, as that the formularies of the Church of England do not clearly recognise a distinction between the ecclesiastical orders of priest and deacon, and assign corresponding offices to each in her ritual. The very title of the article in question expressly limited the sense in which it treated of a priest—viz., a "*sacrificing* priest." In this sense we repeat most emphatically our assertion, that the New Testament knows nothing of the word as applied to Christian ministers—nay, more, that such a sense of the word is utterly irreconcilable with the whole spirit and genius of the Christian religion. Our objection was not to the use of the English word "priest," which has in its etymology and original no connection whatsoever with the *iepeus* of the Greeks, or the *sacerdos* of the Latins, but is the true representative of the Greek πρεσβυτερος, Latin *presbyter*, from which word it is contracted—the intermediate step being supplied by the Saxon *preostre*, which, of itself, is sufficient to show that the Romish and Romanising sense of the term is not its genuine sense.

We beg, also, to repeat, that the "*proper* functions" of the Jewish cohen (or priest) *as such*, were to offer sacrifice and to intercede for the people; and that the business of teaching, admonishing, governing, and administering discipline, was not *peculiar* to him in his *sacerdotal* character, but was shared by the Levites and the Elders of the congregation—even by those who did not belong to the sacred tribe. The very passages referred to in our correspondent's letter prove this position most completely. Thus, from 2 Chron. xvii. 7-9, sect. 21, 22, xxxv 3; Ezra vii. 10, 11; Neh. viii 9, viii. 7. It appears that it was not in their character of *sacrificing* priests that the priests taught the people, because the Levites are associated with them in that office; whilst from the first of the passages just quoted it further appears that even civilians (princes) might be commissioned to take part in the same work. Again, with respect to Deut. xxxi. 9-12, our correspondent has omitted to notice the important word "*thou*"—v. 11. The following extract from the note of Bishop Patrick (who has never been charged with low views respecting the Christian priesthood) will explain our meaning:—"This order being directed, not to all Israel, but to a particular person, plainly imports that the supreme governor, whosoever he was, had the charge laid upon him to take care these laws should be read at the solemn time, that all the people might hear them; and, therefore, I think, *the Jews rightly say that their kings*, when they had them, were bound not only to look after this matter, but to *read the law themselves to as many as could hear them*—appointing the priests and Levites to read it in as many other assemblies of the people as were necessary for the fulfilling of the precept." Indeed the best commentary upon the passage is furnished by the sacred history itself, from which we learn that Joshua "read all the words of the law, before all the congregation of Israel"—Joshua viii. 34, 35; and that King Josiah "read in the ears of all the men of Judah, and all the inhabitants of Jerusalem, all the words of the book of the covenant"—2 Kings xxiii. 2. The matter is equally clear in the case of another passage insisted on by "Imus."—Deut. xvii. 8-13. On this passage Bishop Patrick observes—"the Jews all agree that the supreme court, or sanhedrin, here spoken of, did not consist only of priests and Levites, but *of any persons of the other tribes*, who were fit to be promoted to the dignity. Nay, they say *if there was not one priest or Levite in the court, it was a lawful judicature*; for the high priest himself, no more than any one else, had a place here, merely for his birth, unless his learning in the Law was answerable."

It is needless to go through the other passages adduced by "Imus"—*e.g.* Lev. x. 8-11—in which the Jewish priests are spoken of as teaching, &c. The same remark applies to them all—viz., that while the priests were, of course, competent to discharge these duties, and were commanded to do so, still it was not *quoad priests* that this was enjoined on them, seeing that others, not invested with the sacerdotal office, might and did discharge them, and were commanded by God to do so. So much for our assertion, at which "Imus" has taken offence, that "under a *sacerdotal* system, the *teacher* necessarily occupies, as compared with the priest, a *subordinate* place; and that under the Jewish Law, teaching was no part of the *proper* priestly functions, as we may conclude from the fact that no [specific] directions on that head are found in the portions of the Pentateuch which treat of the peculiar duties of the priests [*as such*]." Again, as to the objection urged against our assertion that "the peculiar business of the Scribes was to expound the law, and that these Scribes belonged indiscriminately to all the tribes, and not exclusively to that of Levi," we are sure that if "Imus" carefully reads over the New Testament, to say nothing of the works of Lightfoot, Vitringa, and others who have treated of the Jewish ecclesiastical polity in the Gospel age, he will no longer call in question so incontrovertible a statement; and we are also sure, that as soon as he makes himself fully acquainted with the respective positions occupied by the Temple and the Synagogue in the time of our Lord, he will cease to doubt the perfect correctness of the assertion, that "to offer sacrifice and intercede were the *proper* functions of the priest (the minister of the Temple); to teach, to admonish, to govern, to administer discipline, were the special and characteristic duties of the presbyters or elders (the ministers of the Synagogue)."

In conclusion, we beg once more to remind our correspondent that he has mistaken the sense in which we used the word priest. We did not use it, as he seems to think, in its ordinary modern sense of "one who officiates in sacred offices." In this sense, we cordially agree with him, the Christian minister is a priest. We used the term in the sense of a *sacrificing* priest, and our whole argument was based upon this definition. The difference is enormous, and on it depends essentially much of the controversy between Romanists and Protestants. Neither do we maintain—very far, indeed, are we from it—that the office of teaching, admonishing, correcting, &c., is not a proper part of the Christian minister's functions. The very opposite follows from our argument, and was one of its intended consequences. We denied, and we still deny, that the Christian minister is the successor of the Jewish priest, regarded in his proper character as a *sacrificer*. We never denied, nor do we now, that the Christian minister may be regarded as the successor of the Jewish priest when divested of his sacrificial and purely legal functions, and viewed merely as "one who officiates in sacred things," as the authorised minister in the Church of the true God. But, under this limitation we hold, and do still hold, that the Christian minister corresponds more nearly to the Presbyter of the Jewish Synagogue than to the priest of the Jewish Temple.

I.

Just Published, Cloth Extra, price 12s. 6d.,

LADIES OF THE REFORMATION.

MEMOIRS OF DISTINGUISHED FEMALE CHARACTERS belonging to the Period of the Reformation in the Sixteenth Century. By the Rev. JAMES ANDERSON. Above One Hundred Illustrations by J. Godwin, J. W. Archer, &c.

II.

Cloth, 7s. 6d.; Calf Extra, Antique, 14s.,

LADIES OF THE COVENANT.

MEMOIRS OF DISTINGUISHED SCOTTISH FEMALE CHARACTERS, embracing the period of the Covenant and Persecution. By the Rev. JAMES ANDERSON. Numerous Engravings.

BLACKIE AND SONS, GLASGOW, EDINBURGH, AND LONDON. JAMES M'GLASHAN, 50, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

NEW WORKS

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

MEMOIR OF THE LIFE AND WRITINGS OF JAMES MONTGOMERY; including Selections from his Correspondence and Conversations. By John Holland and James Everett. 2 vols. Post 8vo. 21s.

THIRTY YEARS OF FOREIGN POLICY: a History of the Secretaryships of the Earl of Aberdeen and Viscount Palmerston. 8vo. 12s.

LIFE OF NICHOLAS I., EMPEROR OF RUSSIA; with a short account of Russia and the Russians. By F. Mayne. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

A MONTH IN THE CAMP BEFORE SEBASTOPOL. By a Non-combatant. 5s.

THE CHINESE EMPIRE; forming a Sequel to the Work, entitled "Recollections of a Journey through Tartary and Thibet." By the Abbe Hue. 2 vols. 8vo. 24s.

ODESSA AND ITS INHABITANTS. By an English Prisoner in Russia. 2s. 6d.

HUNGARY, PAST AND PRESENT; embracing its History from the Magyar Conquest to the present time. By Emeric Szabad. 7s. 6d.

ESSAYS SELECTED FROM CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE "EDINBURGH REVIEW." By Henry Rogers. 3 vols. 21s.

DOD'S PEERAGE, BARONETAGE AND KNIGHTAGE OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND, for 1855. 10s. 6d.

THE PLURALITY OF WORLDS. The Positive Argument from Scripture; with Answers to some late Objections from Analogy. 3s. 6d.

MORE WORLDS THAN ONE: THE CREED OF THE PHILOSOPHER, AND THE HOPE OF THE CHRISTIAN. By Sir David Brewster. 6s.

OF THE PLURALITY OF WORLDS. An Essay. With a Dialogue on the Subject. 6s.

THE CHEMISTRY OF COMMON LIFE. By Professor T. F. W. Johnson. 2 vols. 11s. 6d.

A HANDBOOK FOR YOUNG PAINTERS. By C. A. Leslie. With Illustrations. 10s. 6d.

HORSES AND HOUNDS. A Practical Treatise on their Management. By "Scrutator." 5s.

THE RURAL ECONOMY OF ENGLAND, SCOTLAND, AND IRELAND. By Leonce de Lavergne. 8vo. 12s.

COWPER'S TASK; with upwards of 50 Engravings on wood, from drawings by Birket Foster. Handsomely bound, 18s.

BARTLETT'S JERUSALEM REVISITED. Illustrated with numerous steel and wood Engravings. Handsomely bound, 12s.

LONGFELLOW'S GOLDEN LEGEND. Exquisitely illustrated, from drawings by Birket Foster and Jane E. Hay. Elegantly bound in blue and gold, 12s.

CONNYBEARE AND HOUSTON'S LIFE AND EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL. With beautiful Steel Engravings and Maps. 2 vols. 4to. £2 8s.

CHRIST, AS MADE KNOWN TO THE ANCIENT CHURCH: an Exposition of the Revelation of Divine Grace, as unfolded in the Old Testament Scriptures. By the late Robert Gordon, D.D. 4 vols. 8vo. £2 2s.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF THE REV. WM. JAY; with Reminiscences of some distinguished Contemporaries, Selections from his Correspondence, &c. By George Redford, D.D., and J. A. James, D.D. 8vo. Second Edition. 12s.

THE LEISURE HOUR FOR 1854. With numerous Engravings. 6s.

THE SUNDAY AT HOME FOR 1854. With numerous Engravings. 4s. 6d.

THE ENGLISHWOMAN IN RUSSIA; or, the Russians at Home. Described by a lady 10 years resident there. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

LIFE IN THE MISSION, THE CAMP, and ZENANA; or, Six Years in India. By Mrs. Colin Mackenzie. 2 vols. 8vo. 21s.

LAMARTINE'S MEMOIRS OF CELEBRATED CHARACTERS, to which is now added a LIFE OF MILTON. 2 vols. 12s.

DIARY IN TURKISH AND GREEK WATERS. By the Earl of Carlisle. 10s. 6d.

THE EARNEST STUDENT; being memorials of John Macintosh. By the Rev. Norman Macleod. 6s.

HEART'S EASE; or, the Brother's Wife. By the author of "The Heir of Redclyffe." 2 vols. 12s.

THE GREAT HIGHWAY; a story of the World's Struggles. By S. W. Fullom. 5s.

THE CHURCHMAN'S PENNY MAGAZINE FOR 1854. 1s. 6d.

THE SIEGE OF MAGDEBURG; a Tale of 1631. By Gustave Nieritz. 1s.

TALES OF YOUTHFUL GENIUS—MUSICIANS. 1s.

WHO'S WHO IN 1855. 2s. 6d.

ERIN'S HOPE; the Irish Church Missions' Juvenile Magazine for 1855. 10d.

LECTURE ON MODERN CIVILIZATION, DELIVERED AT EXETER HALL. By Archbishop Whately. 4d.

HOPE CAMPBELL; or, Know Thyself. By Cousin Kate. 4s. 6d.

THE ICE-KING AND THE SWEET SOUTH WIND. A Tale for Children, showing the influence of Good and Bad Temper. With 8 Illustrations. 3s. 6d Coloured, 5s.

THE FOREST EXILES; or, the Perils of a Peruvian Family amid the Wilds of the Amazon. By Captain Mayne Reid. With 12 Illustrations. 7s.

THE STORY OF THE PEASANT-BOY PHILOSOPHER, founded on the early life of Ferguson, the Shepherd-Boy Astronomer. By Henry Mayhew. With numerous Engravings, 6s.

THE LITTLE BOYS' OWN BOOK. A selection from "The Boys' Own Book" of Games and Sports suited to Little Boys. 3s. 6d.

A TREATISE ON BIBLICAL CRITICISM; exhibiting a systematic view of that Science. By Samuel Davidson, D.D. 8vo. 18s.

HISTORY OF THE FRENCH PROTESTANT REFUGEES, from the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes to the present time. By Charles Weiss. 8vo. 14s.

THOM'S IRISH ALMANAC AND OFFICIAL DIRECTORY FOR 1855. 12s. 6d.

THOM'S IRISH ALMANAC AND COUNTRY DIRECTORY, 1855. 6s. 6d.

MACAULAY'S CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL ESSAYS. 2 vols. 8s.

LADIES OF THE REFORMATION; Memoirs of distinguished Female Characters belonging to the period of the Reformation—England, Ireland Scotland, and the Netherlands. By Rev. James Anderson. 12s. 6d.

MARVELS OF SCIENCE. By S. W. Fullom. Cheaper Ed. 6s.

THE DRUSES OF THE LEBANON, comprising a visit to the Druse villages in the Lebanon, and the Anti-Libanus. With a description of the Country, Character, and Domestic habits of those extraordinary people. By George Washington Chasseand. 3vo. 14s.

THE FACE OF THE CRIMEA. By Captain Spencer. 5s.

KATHERINE ASHTON. By the author of "the Experience of Life." 2 vols. 12s.

KATE HARVEY; or the Brother's Legacy. 2s. 6d.

LECTURES ON THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES. By a Clergyman of the Church of England. 3s.

"CHRIST IS ALL;" the Gospel of the Old Testament—Genesis. By the Vencrable Henry Law, Archdeacon of Wells. 3s.

Bagster's Bibles.

COMPREHENSIVE, MINIATURE QUARTO, FACSIMILE, AND POLYGLOT BIBLES,

A large and varied assortment of the above kept continually in stock,

In every style of Binding, and with the Richest Mountings.

ALSO, A CHOICE ASSORTMENT OF

BAGSTER'S PRAYERS AND CHURCH SERVICES,

Now published for the first time, and which may be had of various sizes, and in most elegant bindings from

WILLIAM CURRY AND CO.,
9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET,
DUBLIN.

New Tracts by the Rev. J. C. Ryle.

WHAT IS WANTED? Being Thoughts and Suggestions on some of the Chief Wants of the Church of England in the present day. 4d.

HAVE YOU PEACE? A Treatise for 1855. 2s. per dozen.

ARE YOU READY? A Treatise for a New Year. 6d. per dozen.

PLAIN SPEAKING. *Second Series.* Being 40 Short Large-type Tracts in a packet. 1s.

*** All Mr. RYLE'S other Tracts constantly kept in Stock.

London: WERTHIME and MACINTOSH. Dublin: WM. CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

In the Press, and shortly will be Published,

A DIGEST OF THE EVIDENCE

ON THE

System of National Education in Ireland,

Taken before a Committee of the House of Lords in last Session of Parliament, with Notes.

By the Rev. WILLIAM LEPOER TRENCH, D.D., Honorary Secretary to the Church Education Society.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Just Published, price 1s.; Cloth, 1s. 6d.,

THE TALK OF THE ROAD: Showing how Irish people talk about Irish doings, when they get a quiet place, at the back of a ditch, or under a hedge.

"A most interesting little volume, from the pen of one who seems to be well acquainted with the Irish character, and the doings of the priests in our sister island. We felt highly entertained by its perusal, and can cordially recommend it to our readers. That it will prove serviceable to the cause of truth, we doubt not. Missionaries to the Irish Roman Catholics will find in it a valuable assistant."—*Edinburgh Witness.*

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London: WERTHEIM and MACKINTOSH.

Just Published, Royal 4to., Cloth, price 5s. 6d.,

THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN,
VOLUME III.,

WITH A COPIOUS INDEX,

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London: WERTHEIM and MACINTOSH.

SECOND EDITION, ROYAL QUARTO CLOTH,
PRICE 5s. 6d. EACH.

THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN,

VOLS. I. AND II.,

With complete Indices.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London: WERTHEIM and MACINTOSH, Paternoster Row.

Just Published, 18mo., *in a Coloured Wrapper,*
PRICE 3d.,

or, 21s. per hundred for gratuitous circulation,

POPULAR STORIES,

CONTAINING:

THE TWO FARMERS OF BALLINTUBBER,
THE INFALLIBLE DOCTOR,
THE LANDLORD'S LETTER.

Also, price 1d.,

THE FAIR OF LOUGHMANAGH.

Each of the above stories may be had separately, price 1d., or 7s. 6d. per hundred, for gratuitous distribution.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher WILLIAM CURRY, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

[JANUARY, 1855.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Θlóiṙ ꝺo Ꝺhia añ ṙna háṙꝺuiḃ, agur ṙíoꝺḋáin aiṙ an ꝺtalaṁ ꝺeaḃ ꝺóil ꝺo na ꝺáoiniḃ.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED THE MIDDLE OF EVERY MONTH, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. IV.—No. 38. FEBRUARY, 1855. { Annual Subscription, 3s. 6d. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Is the Cloister a retreat from Sin?	13
The Roman Breviary—No. II.	13
History of the Popes of the Tenth Century—No. IV.—concluded	14
Pious Frauds, No. III.—Relics, No. II.	16
Autobiography of a Roman Catholic Priest—No. V.	17
The Talk of the Road—No. XXVII.	17
Pope Pius IX. on the Immaculate Conception	18
Recent Controversy at Bologne, between Rev. Dr. Meeran and two Roman Catholic Laymen—continued	20
CORRESPONDENCE;	
On the Infallible Church—by Mr. Rourke	20
On the Fourth Council of Lateran, and Persecution of Heretics—by a Protestant	21
On Bruciolí's Bible—by Mr. Hearn	21
What does St. Peter say about the Popes?	22
In what does the advantage of having an Infallible Guide consist?	22
On the Mass in the Crimea—by Poor Paddy	22
Farming Operations for February	23

IS THE CLOISTER A RETREAT FROM SIN?

THE other day, as we sauntered along a quiet, country road, in the pursuit of health, we were struck with an odd expression from an elderly, decent-looking woman to another, who seemed to be listening to a narrative of provocation, so exceedingly aggravated, that she said, "It was enough to make a nun or an angel commit sin!" As we passed along, and thought over the expression, we remembered that there certainly were angels who did lose their first estate, and did commit sin; but we very much doubt if the good old woman, who put the case to her listening friend, ever harboured a thought that a priest or a nun could have committed sin. The angels did not commit sin until they had fallen from their first estate; all mankind, including priests, popes, and nuns, have, in Adam, already fallen from their first estate of innocency, and have been born in sin; yet, from an extensive intercourse with our Roman Catholic brethren, in the humbler ranks of life, we know that it is a prevalent notion among them, that a priest or a nun (unless reprobate and cast away) cannot, and does not commit sin.

Now, we have not the slightest intention to impugn the lives and conduct of those whom our Roman Catholic friends are disposed to revere. Far from it. We are ready to give the utmost credit that can be claimed to the sincerity and good motives of those who desire to devote themselves to a holy and religious life, and to fly from the world and its seductions and temptations, and seek spiritual rest and peace in the retreat of their cells and cloisters. But though we concede the utmost sincerity and purity of motives and life to the devotees, we venture to question the idea that is so deeply rooted in the Roman Catholic mind, that sin can be shut out by stone walls—that Satan and his powers of darkness can be escaped or eluded by flying to the retreat of a convent or a monastery. The grosser acts of sin, the vices of fashion and frivolity, may no longer be open to the recluse, and so far there is a certain degree of immunity secured; but what avails this in the sight of a pure and holy God, who estimates sin not according to the measure of man, and reckons its magnitude not by its danger to society—who holds the impure imagination of the heart to be adultery, the vengeful thought of the mind to be murder—who denounces the proud and haughty spirit with the most fearful condemnation. If you place a man on the loftiest summit of the Alps, far away from everything of human kind, can you thereby free his mind from devouring thoughts of ambition, jealousy, impatience, or discontent? If you shut him up in the deepest abyss of the earth, can you take him beyond the reach of the wildest imaginations, and the most wicked thoughts? May not his mind be like a wilderness through which every unclean beast of the forest may roam at large? How vain and foolish then the idea of our young Roman Catholic friends, who fly from the world without, and its snares and temptations, its deceitfulness and sin, not knowing that they are abandoning themselves more entirely to a still worse and more depraved world within, to a heart that is by nature "deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked?" We, of course, admit the potency of the dangers with which the associations of the world are fraught, and confess, that the experience of its insincerity has quenched many a generous aspiration and stunted many a noble impulse of youth, and that its evil example has led many into vice and degradation, yet, with all its temptations, it seems to us that he who mingles in the daily throng has far ampler scope for the exercise of the humanizing and ennobling charities of life, and is quite as likely to be usefully employed, whether as regards himself or others, as the pale recluse who, absorbed in complacent reveries on his self-dedication, says mentally to all beside, "Stand off, for I am holier than thou."

Again we say, we do not impeach the sincerity or purity of the lives of those who devote themselves to a monastic or conventual life; but we boldly assert, that it is one of the greatest delusions that ever possessed the mind of a young person to suppose, that a life of seclusion, or of the most rigorous observance of discipline or formularies, can so preoccupy the mind as to debar all entrance to sin—or that the great enemy of souls cannot as effectually practice his wiles and temptations upon the frail child of Adam in the solitude of a cell as in the giddiest maze of fashion or folly. Depend upon it, we are safest when in the way of God's own ordinance, when we are in the path of duty, fulfilling in humble dependance upon divine strength, the allotted duties of our station and calling; and we may rest assured, that as the devil is not less active or powerful in the most solitary retirement of the cloister, so neither is the protecting arm of God less strong in the busiest scenes of life.

We have something further to say on this subject in another column.

BREVIARIUM ROMANUM—NO. II.

IN our last December number we gave several specimens of the instructive "lessons" which every Roman Catholic priest is bound to read daily, under pain of mortal sin, in the Breviary or Clerical Prayer Book of his Church; and, notwithstanding the immense circulation of our paper through every part of the kingdom, we have not received a single complaint that we misrepresented or mistranslated a single passage, nor a single protest against the question we asked our readers—viz., whether they believed that any intelligent or educated priest, in the nineteenth century, can sincerely give credit to such old wives' fables?

We shall proceed with our extracts, as before, without much regard to classification or order, but giving, as usual, the original Latin, with the exact reference to the volume and page where each story is to be found. The first which occurs to us is the story of Paul the Hermit, whose feast is held on the 15th of January, and which will be found in the Breviarium Romanum, published by R. Coyne, printer and bookseller to the Royal College of Maynooth. —(Pars Hiemalis, p. 450-1, 4th, 5th, and 6th lessons.)

Paul the Hermit, we are there told, retired to a cave in the desert parts of the Thebais, on account of the persecution of Decius and Valerius, where he lived to the age of 113. Being near his death, Anthony, another Egyptian anchorite, paid him a visit by a supernatural command from heaven. They at once saluted one another by their proper names, though previously strangers to each other, and began to talk about spiritual matters, when a raven, who had been in the habit of bringing Paul half a loaf of bread daily, brought a whole loaf for him and his visitor! After the raven had departed, "Ah," said Paul, "the Lord has sent us our dinner. It is now sixty years since I have received daily half a loaf; to-day my allowance has been doubled." They then proceeded to eat their dinner at the fountain, and spent the night in divine praises. In the morning, Paul admonishing Anthony about his death which was then approaching, exhorted him to bring him a cloak which he had got from St. Athanasius, and which he wished to have as his winding-sheet. Anthony was coming back with the cloak, when he saw the soul of Paul ascending into heaven, surrounded by the holy company of the prophets, and apostles, and choirs of angels. In the cave he found the corpse of Paul, with crossed knees, erected head, and hands stretched out on high, which he wrapped in the cloak as desired. He was, however, at a loss how to dig a grave, being himself an old man of ninety, and having no spade or other instrument to do it with. When, lo! *two lions* ran swiftly from the interior of the desert to the body of the blessed old man, and gave Anthony to understand, very intelligibly, as well, at least, as they could, that they greatly deplored Paul, and then set to work with their claws, and, striving to outdo one another, eagerly dug a hole in the earth, big enough conveniently to contain the body, and then departed! When they were gone, Anthony buried the body in the grave prepared by these singular grave-diggers, and formed a tomb over it after the manner of Christians. He then took possession of Paul's coat, which was made of palm-leaves, in the manner of basket-work, and wore it regularly as long as he lived as a holiday-dress on Easter and Whitsunday.*

We may here briefly refer a few other specimens of *pious lions*, recorded in the same book; and, we doubt not, there are others, if we had time to search further.

St. Venantius (18 May. Pars Verna, p. 544) was ordered to be cast to the *lions*, but they, forgetting their natural ferocity, cast themselves at his feet!†

St. Prisca also, after suffering many other cruelties, was brought into the amphitheatre, and cast to a *lion*; but he, forgetting his savage nature, humbly cast himself at her feet!‡ —(Pars Hiemalis, p. 461.) This and other miracles were, however, said to say, wrought in vain; for poor Prisca's persecutors, after unsuccessfully trying to starve, burn, and tear her to pieces with iron nails, at last succeeded by bethinking themselves of the more summary process of cutting off her head!

A still more striking instance, however, is to be found (under date, 10th June, Pars Æstiva, p. 361), where SS. Primus and Felicianus having been cast into the theatre, and two lions let loose on them, the noble animals, not only prostrated themselves at their knees, but fawned upon them with their heads and tails. The poor saints, however, were, as usual, despatched with the axe.§

A very similar story is told (same vol., p. 375, 15th June) of SS. Vitus, Modestus, and Crescentia, who were also cast to a lion, who prostrated himself, and licked their feet.‖

In the same volume (30th July. Pars Æstiva, p. 496) we have a slight variation in the spectacle, in the case of SS. Abdon and Sennen, who having been cast to the *bears* and *lions*, for spitting on the images, in the time of the Emperor Decius, the wild beasts were afraid to touch them, whereupon the never-failing sword was successfully resorted to, in spite of the miracle.¶

When on the subject of wild beasts, we ought, however, not to omit mentioning the case of the celebrated *St. Januarius* and his companions (19 Sept. Pars Autumnalis, p. 343), who, after having escaped, unhurt, from a burning furnace, and various other trials, were also thrown to the wild beasts in the amphitheatre, who (as before), forgetful of their natural ferocity, prostrated themselves at the feet of Januarius,** which, however, did them but little good, for the prodigy having been attributed to magical incantation, they, like St. Prisca and the rest, were despatched with the sword.

---

* Cumque ad ejus cellam pervenisset, invenit genibus complexibus erecta cervice, extensisque in altum manibus corpus exanime; quod pallio obvolvens, hymnosque et psalmos ex Christiana traditione decantans, cum sarcofago, quo terram foderet, non haberet, duos leones ex interiore eremo rapido cursu ad beati corpus ferentes; ut facile intelligeretur eos, quo modo potuerint, planctum edere; qui certatim terram pedibus effodientes, foveam, quæ hominem commode caperet, effecerunt. Qui cum obtemperat, Antonius sanctum corpus in eum locum intulit; et injecta humo, tumulum ex Christiano more composuit. Tunicam vero Pauli, quam in sporta modum ex palmæ folia ille sibi contexerat, secum asportans, eo vestitu diebus solemnibus Paschæ et Pentecostes, quoad vixit, usus est. We give the Latin, of course, only in the passages where otherwise we might be suspected of exaggeration or distorting the original.

† "Quod cum præsidi nuntiatum esset, extemplo Venantium leonibus objici jussit; qui, naturali feritate oblita, ad ejus se pedes abjecerunt."

‡ "Post triduum in amphitheatrum producta, leoni objicitur; qui, cum feritatis oblitus, humiliter se ad ejus pedes abjecit."

§ "Mox utrumque perduci imperat in theatrum, in eosque immitti duos leones, qui prostrati ad eorum genua, capite et cauda ipsis blandiebantur."

‖ "Leoni objiciuntur, qui protensum se eorum pedes lambebat."

¶ "Qui cum in urbe ad simulacra attracti essent, ea detestati conspuerunt. Quamobrem ursis ac leonibus objecti sunt, quos furore non audebant attingere."

** In ardentem fornacem conjectus ita flamma cessit, ut ne vestimentum aut capillum quidem flamma violaverit. . . . Postero die omnes in amphitheatro feris objecti sunt, quæ naturalis oblita feritatis, ad Januarii pedes se prostrarunt

The story then goes on to tell the exploded fable of St. Januarius's blood, which, kept in a glass phial, in a coagulated state, liquifies and bubbles up, just as if it were recently shed, as often as it is placed in sight of the martyr's head!*

This favourite standing miracle is annually enacted at Naples, before thousands of admiring spectators; but it has been well asked—would it not be more charitable to allow one of our chemists to view the blood, and observe its change, not surrounded by priests, candles, and the smoke of frankincense, and thus convert us all at one stroke?

The Rev. Blanco White, once Chaplain to the King of Spain, and Rector of the College of St. Mary at Seville, tells us, in his "Practical Evidence against Catholicism," p. 171, that he had often performed High Mass, before the shrine of St. Ferdinand, in the Royal Chapel at Seville; but though a member of the Chapter to whose charge the Spanish kings have entrusted their holy ancestor, he never could obtain a distinct view of the body, which the Church of Rome declares to be incorrupt.†

"On certain days," says he, "the front of a massive silver sarcophagus is removed, when a gold and glass chest is seen, containing something like a man covered with splendid robes; but the multitude of candles on the altar, and the want of light from behind, prevent a distinct view of the objects within. Once, when the multitude was thronging the chapel, a lady of high rank, who had applied to me for a closer view than was allowed to the crowd, was furnished with a stool to stand upon a level with the body. To gratify, at once, her and my own curiosity, I took a candle from the altar, and endeavoured to counteract the reflection of the glass, by throwing the light obliquely. One of our inferior clergy, the sacristan, whose duty it was to stand near the saint in his surplice, seeing what I was about, snatched the candle from my hand, with a rudeness which nothing but his half-roguish, half-holy zeal could have prompted. He pretended to be alarmed for the pane of glass; but I more than suspect that he knew the incorruptibility of the saint could not bear inspection. The head, which I distinctly saw, was a mere skull, with something like painted parchment holding up the lower jaw. A similar covering seems to have been laid on the right foot, which projects out of the royal robes. When the greatest miracle of Christianity, the resurrection of Christ, was performed for the conversion of men to the Gospel, the Saviour himself offered the marks of his wounds to the close inspection of a doubting disciple. The Church of Rome follows a different plan in the use of the multiplied miracles of which she boasts. She has no compassion for men who will credit only their sight and touch."

But to return to our extracts from the Breviary—When alluding to Paul the Hermit's raven, we ought not to forget *St Ægidius*'s wild doe, who, when he had retired into the wilderness, used to come to him every day, at stated hours, to give him milk, on which he lived for a long time with the roots of herbs‡ (2 Sept. Pars Autumnalis, p. 281), though we, perhaps, might account for a deer becoming tame and coming to be milked rather more easily, than we could explain how a raven could bake bread, and know when a whole loaf was necessary, and when half a loaf would do!

St. Raymond Nonnatus (31 Aug. Pars Autumnalis, p. 280) was also indebted to the kind offices of a blind mule, which, when after his death a contention arose about where he should be buried, decided the matter by spontaneously carrying the body, shut up in its coffin, to the Chapel of St. Nicholas, that he might be buried in that place where he had first learned the rudiments of a more holy life.§

A few pages farther on in same volume (Pars Autum., p. 286) we have another specimen of posthumous honours in the case of St. Lawrence Justin, who used, among other modes of mortifying his body, to sleep on bare tiles, and even when sick and dying ordered his domestics to place him on his usual bed, in reward for which, his body, after it had been more than two months buried, was found whole and uncorrupt, *fragrant with a sweet odour, and with a ruddy countenance!* On which account, with other novel miracles wrought by him after his death, Pope Alexander VIII. added him to the number of the saints.‖

St. Lawrence's bed of tiles is, however, far outdone by that of *St. Rose of Lima*, whose life we reviewed in our third vol., p. 104, but who figures also in the Breviary (30 Aug. Pars Autum., p. 277). Her bed was made of knotted trunks of trees, of which she filled up the interstices with broken tiles.* According to her life, in Mr. Duffy's volume, it was a still more dreadful instrument of torture. "She made herself a bed, in the form of a chest, and filled it with rough stones of different sizes. This bed, still seeming too soft, she added three pieces of twisted and knotted wood, and filled up the space with three hundred pieces of broken tiles, placed so as to wound and tear the body. Upon this terrible cross she never placed herself without trembling and shuddering, while her blood seemed to freeze in her veins." For the other almost, if not altogether, incredible austerities of St. Rose, we must refer our readers to Mr. Duffy's volume, in what he calls "The Young Christian's Library," or to the CATHOLIC LAYMAN already referred to, vol. iii., p. 105, adding this single sad reflection, which we believe to be actually the truth. Roman Catholic nunneries rob society of many of the most amiable and virtuous female minds—those who, in the practice of social duties, if brought up in the more genial atmosphere of home, would be a blessing to their relations and friends, and patterns of virtue to the community—to make their lives, at best, a perpetual succession of torture and useless, if not of actually suicidal, practices. The quiet and soberminded are made the slaves of outward ceremonies; the ardent and sensitive are doomed, like St. Rose, to fanaticism and madness. Is not such the natural result of the Church holding up such models for daily imitation? The power of persecuting others on a grand scale is given to very few, but every individual might be made his own tormentor, if he would only adopt the practices which the Church of Rome represents as the means of arriving at Christian perfection.

We must postpone further extracts from the Breviary till another number.

HISTORY OF THE POPES.—NO. IV.

THE TENTH CENTURY CONCLUDED.

WE now proceed to complete the history of the Popes of the tenth century, from the Jesuits, Labbe and Cossart.

POPE LEO VIII.

This Pope, of whom we have found mention in the life of Pope John XII., given in our last number, is *not* reckoned in the list of Popes, either by Labbe and Cossart or by Bishop Milner. But here we meet with a curious fact—the Leo who was Pope in 936 is called in both lists Leo VII., and the Leo who was Pope in 1049 is called Leo IX; and *neither list* has any Leo VIII. at all! The reason is, because this Leo VIII. was counted in the list by all the older writers; and all the historians called the next Pope of that name Leo IX. It was impossible in later times to alter the title of this Leo IX. without confounding all history; so all that could be done to get over the difficulty of having two Popes at one and the same time, was to have no Leo VIII. at all! But Leo VIII. will turn up again for all that, for such a Pope there was, and a stirring fellow, too.

POPE BENEDICT V.

The Jesuits say—"Benedict, from being a deacon of the Church of Rome, was elected by the unanimous consent of the clergy and people of Rome, in place of the deceased Pope John XII., in the year of our Lord 964, in the time of the emperors, Otho and Nicephorus. Which thing being done, since the Roman chiefs had done it contrary to their faith given and confirmed by an oath, "the Emperor Otho," says Luitprand, "went to Rome with a multitude of his faithful followers, collected from all sides, and surrounded it on all sides with a strict siege, lest any way out should lie open. But the citizens, greatly animated by the exhortation of Pope Benedict, for a long time sustained the siege, until, stricken with hunger, they were compelled to surrender the city. After the city was taken, Benedict being banished to Humburg, the false Pope Leo, the eighth of that name, was raised to the See, a false synod was called, and empty constitutions were made.†

The Jesuits proceed—"Benedict died in exile in the year of our Lord 965, adorned with the title and honour of martyrdom, equally with Popes Pontianus and Martinus, who, on account of their glorious confession of Christ, for his name's sake suffered banishment and other injuries and insults."‡ We, however, greatly doubt whether Benedict V. had any valid claim to the honour of a martyr; for we have in Labbe and Cossart the proceedings of the above-mentioned synod held by Leo VIII., and it appears there that Benedict V., when brought before that synod, begged hard for mercy; and "shouted out that he himself was the invader of the holy Roman See!" And he handed up his Pall and Papal staff to Leo VIII. as true Pope!§ And by thus acknowledging himself a false Pope, he obtained banishment instead of the death which he feared. Great allowance, no doubt, is to be made for such weakness in an unsuccessful aspirant to the Papacy in that age. But the Jesuits have a strange idea of the spirit of a martyr, when they put forward this man as an instance of the spirit of martyrdom in Roman Popes! When St. Paul was persecuted for being an Apostle he did not beg for mercy, and "shout out" that he was a false Apostle, in order to obtain it! So the attempt to show one martyr-Pope in the tenth century is a sad failure.

The Jesuits thus conclude his history—"Some writers omit him altogether, as being unjustly intruded; others place him *before* Leo, the schismatic and false Pope; but they are deceived in maintaining either of these opinions. For, from those things which I have said above, it manifestly appears that Leo was never anything else but a false Pope, and an antipope, unworthy to be counted in their number, decorated with the name of Pope."*

But it is truly wonderful how impossible it appears to be for Roman Catholics to agree even about those things which they say themselves are manifest and evident. For if we turn to the Canon Law, the Decretum of Gratian, dist. 63, c. 23, there we find the decrees of Pope Leo VIII. in his synod, inserted as the law of the Church of Rome!

POPE JOHN XIII.

"John, Bishop of Narnia, after the death of the false Pope Leo (whether Benedict V. was alive or dead is uncertain), was made Pope in the year of our Lord 965, in the time of the Emperors Otho and Nicephorus Phocas."† Now, it seems to us rather important to know whether Benedict V. was then alive or dead; for if he were a lawful Pope, and living at the time when John XIII. was appointed, it is hard to see how Roman Catholics can consider John XIII. a lawful Pope. But on that we can get no satisfaction, so we go on—"Who, in the beginning of his Pontificate, attacked the chief men of the Romans perhaps more sharply than he should have done; by their advice, being seized by the prefect of the city, he was banished to Campania." In this banishment he seems to have acted with more spirit certainly than his predecessor, Benedict V.; but it was not exactly the spirit of a martyr either; for, having got the emperor on his side, he got him to punish the prefect thus—"He took care that the prefect of the city, while living, should be stripped naked, placed on an ass, and being crowned with a bladder, be led about in derision, beaten with rods, and, at length, cast into prison; he commanded that the corpse of the dead prefect, by whom Pope John had been ejected from the city, dragged from its sepulchre, should be rent asunder, and scattered in diverse places."‡ A very complete revenge, certainly; and another illustration of the name of John—"The mercy of God"—as borne by the Popes. But if the present Emperor Napoleon had ordered the same thing to be done to all by whom the present Pope, Pius IX., was driven from Rome in 1848, what a procession there would have been!

The rest of the history of Pope John XIII. consists of a list of those nations who were converted about that time; and it was well if the Popes of that age did not make their converts as much the children of hell as themselves. It is also recorded at the end of this Pope's life, that "he expelled a devil, by the chain of St. Peter, placed round the neck of the possessed."§ But we think if any man could have expelled the devil out of the hearts of so many of the Popes of that age, that man would have been a greater miracle-worker than any Pope that ever lived. What a pity the Popes did not begin at home!

POPE DONUS II.

"Donus, who by others is called Domnus, and Domnins, a Roman by nation, was made Pope (the second of this name) in the year 972; who died when he had sat only three months."‖ We can hrdly expect a longer account of one who only held the Papacy three months; but it does look very suspicious that so many Popes died so soon after their appointment, in that age. It looks as if others were very anxious to succeed them.

POPE BENEDICT VI.

This Pope, as far as we can judge from his life, seems to have been more sinned against than sinning; and some light is thrown, too, on the short lives of Popes. "Benedict being taken and thrust into prison by Boniface Franco, a Roman, the son of Fernitius, A CARDINAL DEACON, a most wicked man, was strangled in the same

---

* Præclarum illud quoque quod ejus Sanguis, qui in ampulla vitrea concretus asservatur, cum in conspectu capitis ejusdem martyris ponitur, admirandum in modum colliquefieri et ebullire, perinde atque recens effusus, ad hæc usque tempora cernitur.

† "Jacet ejus corpus incorruptum adhuc post quatuor sæcula in templo maximo Hispalensi, honorificentissimo incluem sepulchro."—Breviarium Romanum in festo Sancti Ferdinandi.

‡ "Ægidius Athenensis . . . . accessit in eremum, ubi diutius herbarum radicibus, et cervæ lacte, quæ statis ad eum horis veniebat, admirabili sanctitate vixit."

§ "Mortui corpus, cum circa locum sepulturæ contentio orta esset, arcæ inclusum, et mulæ cæcæ impositum, ad sacellum Sancti Nicolai Dei nutu delatum fuit, ut ibi tumularetur, ubi prima jecerat sanctioris vitæ fundamenta."

‖ "Sacrum cadaver per duos ultra menses inhumatum, suavi fragrans odore et rubescente facie, integrum, atque incorruptum, ac nova post mortem patrata miracula, quibus permotus Alexander octavus Pontifex maximus eum sanctorum numero adscripsit."

* "Lectulum sibi e truncis nodosis composuit, horumque vastus commissuras fragminibus testarum implevit."

† Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 658.

‡ Benedictus obiit in exilio, anno Domini 965, titulo ac honore martyrii condecoratus instar Pontiani et Martini Pontificum, qui ob gloriosam Christi confessionem pro nomine ejus exilium aliasque injurias ac contumelias sustinuerunt.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 658.

§ . . . . ad Domini Leonis papæ pedes, ipsiusque imperatoris, idem Benedictus concite procidens, se peccasse, seque sanctæ Romanæ sedis invasorem esse acclamavit. Post hæc pallium sibi abstulit, quod simul cum pontificali ferula, quam manu gestabat, domino papæ Leoni reddidit, quam ferulam idem papa fregit, et fractam populo ostendit.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 659.

* Hunc Scriptorum alii velut injuste intrusum omittunt; alii Leoni schismatico et antipapæ eumdem antepoount; sed utramlibet harum sententiam tuentes falluntur. Nam ex iis quæ supra dixi, manifeste constat, Leonem nunquam nisi pseudopontificem et antipapam fuisse, indignum qui nomine pontificio condecoratus in numerum eorumdem referatur.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 658.

† Ioannes Narniensis episcopus, post obitum Leonis pontificis pseudopapæ (vivente an defuncto Benedicto quinto incertum) factus est Pontifex, A.D. 965, temporibus Ottonis et Nicephore Phocæ imperatorum.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 662.

‡ Præfectum urbis viventem curavit denudari, impositumque asino et urre redimitum, ad indibrium circumduci, virgisque cædi, ac demum carceribus mancipari; cadaver defuncti præfecti, a quo Joannes papa urbe ejectus erat, e sepulcro extractum in diversa loca distrahi ac dissipari præcepit.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 662.

§ Per catenam sancti Petri arreptiti collo circumdatam, dæmonem expulit.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 663.

‖ Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 710.

prison, in the year of Christ 974, when he had sat one year, three months, and some days."*

POPE BONIFACE VII.

There is no Boniface VII. in the lists of either Labbe and Cossart or Bishop Milner; and, more curious still, there is no Boniface VI. either! Both lists give Boniface V. in the year 617, and Boniface VIII. at the year 1294, without any Boniface between—a curious instance how the list of the Popes has to be "cooked" to make it square with modern ideas of what the list of the Popes *ought to be*. But in the life of Benedict VI., above mentioned, we find the following:—"The sacrilegious murderer, Boniface,† *who is met with elsewhere called the seventh of that name*, violently invaded the Apostolic See, vacant by the sacrilegious slaughter of a most excellent Pontiff, *and held it* one year and one month. I, following more ancient writers, have judged that this man is not to be reckoned among true and lawful Popes, because having basely entered into the Apostolic See, he more basely deserted it. For, when after many other crimes and flagitious actions, this nefarious man had plundered the Vatican Church of all its ornaments, Benedict, relying on the wealth and aid of the Alberici, of whose family he was, so far disquieted him, that he was compelled to fly to Constantinople, abandoning Rome. When and upon what occasion he returned to Rome I will tell below, in the life of John XIV."‡ So we must wait for the rest of his history; but, in the meantime, let it be remembered, that more than 300 years after (in 1294), when another Pope, named Boniface, arose, all the world called him Boniface VIII., showing that they all acknowledged that there had been a Pope Boniface VII.; and all the Jesuits now can do is to try to leave A BLANK in place of Boniface VII.

POPE BENEDICT VII.

This was the Benedict who put Boniface to flight, as above related; so the Papacy was fairly his by right of conquest.

The Jesuit here states, that he and Cardinal Baronius, between them, had "expunged" Pope Boniface VII. from between the two Benedicts.§ It was natural to boast of such a fact; but the boast confesses that Leo VII. had been commonly reckoned in the list for 600 years! No more is told us of Pope Benedict VII., but that he kindly received Sergius Damascenus, who had been driven out of his bishopric by the Saracens. When no more than this can be told of a pontificate of nine years duration, we may, at least, hope that the Church found Pope Log more tolerable than Pope Stork.

POPE JOHN XIV.

This Pope succeeded Benedict VII., in 984. When Pope Boniface VII. heard this, and that the Emperor Otho was also dead "he returned to Rome to invade the See a second time; he seized upon the chair of St. Peter; and he not only thrust out John, whom he found sitting in it, but with great tyranny he thrust him, bound with chains, into the castle of St. Angelo, which was held by a faction of his friends; and the violent and sacrilegious robber compelled him, shut up there for four months, at length to perish with hunger;"‖ and he publicly exhibited his dead body to the people. The history goes on—"This invader of the See, this cruel slayer of two Popes, this cursed parricide, and truculent robber, the antipope Boniface, oh, horrible! through tyranny occupied the chair of Peter!"¶ However, he died after he had held it for four months, in addition to the thirteen months which he had held it before, and the Church and the world were rid of another "monster Pope." But so used were the people of that age to see "monsters" in the chair of St. Peter, that for 600 years he seems to have retained his place in the list, until the Jesuits and Baronius "expunged" him! But why he should not have remained in the list as well as Sergius III., Pope Lando, Pope John X., John XI., John XII., and others, it is not easy to see; was he really so much worse than they? That he was commonly counted in the list till comparatively late times, the Jesuits themselves confess, when they say at the end of his life—"These things, Baronius, at the year 984, &c., has taken from ancient Vatican documents. *Let the more recent chronographers see* what a robber and tyrant *they reckon in the number of* MOST EXCELLENT PONTIFFS (oh! oh!), who should rather be reckoned among the most notorious robbers, and the most powerful traitors to their country, the Syllas and the Catilines."**

POPE JOHN XV.

This Pope was appointed in the year 985. Through fear of what his predecessor had suffered, he retired into Tuscany. The Romans, through fear of what they had suffered from the emperors, invited him back. Nothing appears in his life to throw light on his character for good or evil. This Pope sat nine years.†

POPE GREGORY V.

"Gregory V. was made Pope in the year 996, before Otho (the emperor) had come to Rome. John, a Calabrian by nation, Bishop of Placentia (whom they call John XVI., and badly placed in the number of the Popes), was set up in the apostolic throne against him in schism, by the exertions and aid of Crescentius."‡

So here is another Pope expunged who was once in the list. But let us see what became of this Pope who, like so many others, was "one too many." "But when Otho, the emperor, had come to Italy to avenge the injury offered to the Pope by Crescentius, and had conquered Rome, he ordered for the invader of the Apostolic See, that his sacrilegious hands should be amputated, his ears cut off, and his eyes plucked out! And when the Romans had been freed from the tyranny of Crescentius (on whom Otho inflicted capital punishment by beheading) AFTER *that amputation of his members*, they placed him on an ass, and compelled him, HOLDING IN HIS HANDS the tail of another ass going before him as leader, to sing this through the public street of the whole city—'Such punishment let him suffer, who endeavours to drive the Roman Pope from his See.'"§

We give this history as we find it; though, we confess, it puzzles us to understand how a man, *after* both his hands have been amputated, could be compelled to hold the tail of an ass in his hands! But those who can believe that the Popes of that age were "Vicars of Christ," may, perhaps, be able to believe this too.

POPE SYLVESTER II.

"This was he who, after he had obtained the friendship of Hugo, King of France, procured Arnulphus, Bishop of Rheims, to be driven from his See, and himself to be put in his place, by the decree of the false synod of Rheims; and who, when at length ejected from it by Leo, the Legate of the Apostolic See, and the decree of the Council of Rheims, fled to the Emperor Otho." A very suitable beginning for one who rose to be Pope in those days. However, from the fact that he was afterwards Archbishop of Ravenna, the Jesuits *suppose* that he must have done penance "for all the calumnies which he put upon the Roman See by fraud, deceit, and lies."‖ This Pope is reported to have been a great philosopher and astrologer; and he must have been a clever artist, too, from the way that he got to be Pope. "He was raised to the Pontificate by the assistance and patronage of Otho, the third emperor of that name, although Aimonus writes that he was asked for by the people, who, without doubt, did so out of flattery to the emperor. I believe that the emperor favoured him, as well because he was a German as because, as Ditmar says, having lived a long time at Magdeburg, he made there a most admirable *clock*, and thus, by means of an instrument composed with skilful art, had drawn all into love and favour to himself."¶

It is true that a story was got up by Cardinal Benno, and long currently believed, "that Sylvester was raised to the height of the Apostolic See by magical incantations, and by selling his soul to the devil for a price."** But in thus concluding our history of the POPES OF THE TENTH CENTURY with Sylvester II., appointed in the year 999, we are content to take the account of the Jesuits, and look on him as a man who (however he might have misbehaved himself as an archbishop) was still *good for something, since he got the Papacy by making* A CLOCK!

Let us now give a brief summary of "the Popes of the tenth century," as exhibited in our numbers for November, January, and the present month—

Romanus, intruded by force.
Theodore II., sat only twenty days.
John IX., another Jeremiah, by destroying what his predecessor did.
Benedict IV., *highly praised*.
Leo V., cast into prison by an usurper.
Christopher, an usurper.
Sergius III., "the most wicked of all men;" "a robber;" "an apostate."
Anastasius III., no materials.
Lando, kept a harlot, who made her lovers archbishops.
John X., his harlot made him Pope.
Leo VI., six months, cast into prison and died there.
Stephen VII., no materials.
John XI., his father a Pope; his mother a harlot; himself "a monster."
Leo VII., no materials.
Stephen VIII., nose and ears cut off.
Marinus II., *highly praised*.
Agapetus II., *also praised*.
John XII., killed in adultery.
Leo VIII., cut out, and a blank left.
Benedict V., "abouted out" that he was a false Pope.
John XIII., got the prefect of the city tortured to death.
Donus II., only three months.
Benedict VI., strangled by a cardinal.
Boniface VII., a murderer, cut out and a blank left.
Benedict VII., Pope by right of conquest.
John XIV., four months, starved in prison by Boniface VII.
John XV., no materials.
Gregory V., no materials, except the use JOHN XVI. made of his hands after they were cut off.
Sylvester II., made Pope for making a clock.

So we find thirty in all (including John XVI.), who held the Papacy in the tenth century, and were reckoned as Popes afterwards, with more or less general consent. And if, some centuries afterwards, two were cut out, and their titles left blanks to this day, and one clean disappeared, and some others pronounced false Popes, *but still left in the list*, all these clumsy corrections in later times do not prove that the Papacy was a sure and certain guide to those who believed in those Popes while living. It rather proves that the Papacy was a delusion and a snare to those who died believing in false Popes: and if delusive to them how can it be certain to us? Information as to who is the true Pope, and the Vicar of Christ, comes too late when men are dead.

Of the thirty who actually held the Papacy in that century, we find nine or ten pronounced by the Jesuits themselves to have been monsters, adulterers, whoremongers, murderers, apostates, or whatever other crime can be thought of.

Of all the thirty, the Jesuits themselves can praise but THREE, a fact more remarkable, because they pass by so many without praise or blame. If the Jesuits could have found any ground to praise some more of the Popes of that age, would they not have done it, when praise was so cheap, and Popes to be praised so few?

We are not the first who have considered these histories, and drawn the natural conclusions from them. Roman Catholics have done so before now; and their judgment is entitled to weight. We take the following from the learned and pious Father Paul Sarpi, himself a Roman Catholic:—

"From this time (883) until the year 963, during the space of 80 years, wherein Italy laboured under the extremest confusion, as well in the civil government as ecclesiastical, *especially in the Papacy*, we must not expect to find any traces or form of good government in the Church, *but a mere chaos of impieties*, and a general preparative and forerunner of the miserable revolutions and disorders which followed. Popes were then excommunicated by their successors, and their acts ceased and annulled; not excepting the very administration of the sacraments. Six Popes were driven out and dethroned by those who aspired to their places. Two Popes put to death, and Pope Stephen VIII. wounded in the face with so much deformity, that he never after appeared in public. Theodora, a famous courtezan, by the interest and faction she then had in Rome, got her professed lover chosen Pope, who was called John X.; and John XI. was chosen Pope at the age of twenty years, the bastard of another Pope, dead eighteen years before; and, in short, such a series of wild disorders, gave occasion to historians to say, that those times produced *not Popes but monsters!* Cardinal Baronius, being under some difficulty how to treat their corruptions, saith—'That in those days the Church indeed was, for the most part, without a Pope, but not without a head; its spiritual head, Christ, being in heaven, who never abandons it.' In effect, it is certain that Christ hath never yet forsook his Church, neither can his divine promise which he hath made us, fail—that he will be with it even to the end of the world; and on this occasion it is the duty of every Christian to believe, with Baronius, that the same calamities which happened in the world at that time, have happened also at another; and that as the assistance of Christ alone preserved the Church in those times, so hath he afforded that shield of defence to his Church, and

---

* Benedictus a Bonifacio Francone Romano Ferutii filio, Cardinali diacono, viro scelestissimo, captus et in carcerem detrusus, strangulatus est ab eodem, anno Christi 974, cum sedisset annum unum, menses tres, et dies aliquot.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 710.

† This is the cardinal, above mentioned, who murdered Pope Benedict VI.

‡ Sedem apostolicam sacrilega cæde optimi Pontificis vacantem sacrilegus homicida Bonifacius, qui septimus ejus nominis reperitur alibi nuncupatus, violenter invasit, eamque annum unum et mensem tenuit. Hunc ego antiquiores scriptores imitatus, inter veros et legitimos pontifices numerandum non esse judicavi, quod sedem apostolicam turpiter ingressus, turpius deseruerit. Nam cum post multa alia scelera et flagitia homo nefarius Vaticanam basilicam omnibus ornamentis sua expollasset, Benedictus Albericorum, de quorum familia erat, ope et auxilio fretus, eum usque adeo exagitavit, ut Roma relicta Constantinopolim abire cogeretur. Quando et qua occasione Romam redierit, dicam infra in vita Joannis XIV.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 710.

§ Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 715.

‖ Sedem iterum invasurus, Romam rediit, Cathedram Petri involavit, et quem in ea sedentem invenierat Joannem, inde non tantum exturbavit, verum etiam vinculis alligatum in sancti Angeli munitionem, quæ a suorum factione detinebatur, magna cum tyrannide intrusit, detentumque ibidem mensibus quatuor, violentus et sacrilegus prædo tandem fame perire coegit.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 739.

¶ Iniquus invasor sedis, duorumque Pontificum crudelissimus interfector, parricida nefandus et truculentus prædo Bonifacius antipapa, Petri Cathedram, proh nefas, per tyrannidem occupavit.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 739.

* Hæc ex antiquis Vaticanis Codicibus Baronius, anno 984, &c. Videant recentiores chronographi, quantum prædonem et tyrannum in numerum optimorum pontificum referant, qui potius inter famosissimos latrones, et potentissimos patriæ proditores, Syllas et Catilinas, annumerandus erat.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 740.

† Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 730.

‡ Crescentii studio et opera contra eum in schismate elevatus est in thronum apostolicum Joannes (quem xvi. nominant, et in numerum pontificum male referunt) natione Calaber, Placentinus episcopus.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 751.

§ Sed cum Otto imperator ad vindicandam injuriam pontifici per Crescentium illatam in Italiam venisset, Romam expugnasset, invasori sedis apostolicæ manus sacrilegas amputari, aures abscindi, atque oculos evelli præcepit. Cumque a tyrannide Crescentii (de quo Otto obtruncatione capitis extremum supplicium sumpserat) Romani liberiores facti essent, post illam membrorum amputationem asello imposuerunt, tenentemque alterius asini præcantis tanquam rectora caudam in manibus, compulerunt ut per publicam totius urbis viam hæc caneret; Tale supplicium patitur qui Romanum papam de sua sede pellere nititur.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 751.

‖ De calumniis sedi apostolicæ per fraudem, dolum, et mendacium objectis.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 775.

¶ Ad pontificatum evectus est studio et patrocinio Ottonis III. ejus nominis imperatoris, quamquam Aimoinus scribat eum a populo, imperatori sine dubio adulante, postulatum fuisse. Credo favisse eidem imperatorem, tum quod Germanus esset, tum etiam quod cum eo diu conversatus, ut ait Ditmarus, in Magdeburg admirabile horologium fecisset, atque ita, per instrumentum dædalice inventionis compositum, totum in sui amorem et favorem pertraxisset.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 775.

** Benno . . . primus architectus fuit istius fabulæ, qua vulgo jactatur Silvestrum magicis incantationibus ad apostolicæ sedis culmen provectum esse, pacta pro mercede diabolo anima.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 773.

will continne it to her in all the like events and accidents of this world. So that a Pope *was not necessary* to the existence of the Church, even though there should NEVER MORE HAVE BEEN A POPE."*

These are the words of a Roman Catholic who had deeply studied the history of his own Church. No true Protestant will object to his confidence in the promises of God to his Church. If Roman Catholics would study the history of their Church with the same accuracy, and think of it with the same candour, the whole Church of Christ might even now be reunited again.

The moral of the whole history is this—the promises of God to his Church are the same in all ages; whatever promises the Popes have *now*, the same promises belonged to the Popes of the tenth century. If the performance of God's promises to the Church in the tenth century was not through the Popes, neither is it through the Popes now. The Popes of the nineteenth century may be better in some things, and may be worse in others, than the Popes of the tenth century; but if there are no more promises to the Popes in one age than to the Popes in another, then we must try the Popes in each age by their conformity to "the faith once delivered to the saints." We must try to do it while we live ourselves, and not leave it to be found out by others, some centuries hence, whether the Popes, whom all the world acknowledged while they were living, were false Popes or not. It will not do to discover the validity of their claims, or the truth of their teaching, in purgatory or in hell.

If we close our history with the century we undertook, it is not for want of materials to proceed with. Benedict VIII., who died in 1024, is said, by Labbe and Cossart,† to have appeared to his successor to beg to be got out of Purgatory. But, for our parts, we think, if there be such a place, a Pope of that age who got admission there might be thought a lucky fellow.

Benedict IX. was appointed in the year 1033, being then eleven years of age! and although, even at that age, an example of unchastity, "the universal Catholic world, which is wonderful, worshipped him as the successor of Peter, and recognised him as the Pope of Rome!"‡ This Pope devoted his whole life to his lusts, and at last resigned the Papacy, that he might have nothing but his lusts to think of! But he held it for eleven years, and during that time there were at one period three Popes together—Benedict IX., Sylvester III., and John the Dean of Rome. On which the Jesuits say—"Thus a three-headed beast, rising from the gates of hell, most miserably infested the most holy chair of Peter!"§

It is with disgust and shame that we have soiled our pages with such histories as these; but while Roman Catholics make the claims they do for the Papacy—while they affirm, that except through the Papacy, the promises of God cannot be fulfilled to his Church—we must point to the HISTORY OF THE PAPACY, and ask "IS THAT THE FULFILMENT?" And as often henceforth as the claims of the Papacy are discussed in our pages, that history will be pointed to, and that question asked.

* Treatise on Eccl. Benefices, ch. 19. Jenkins, fourth edition. Dublin, 1737.

† Vol. ix., 810.

‡ Tamen universus orbis Catholicus, quod mirandum est, eumdem successorem Petri coloit, et pro Romano pontifice aguovit.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 936.

§ Atqua ita triceps bestia ab inferorum portis emergens sanctissimam Petri Cathedram miserrime infestavit.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 937.

PIOUS FRAUDS—NO. III.

RELICS—NO. II.

IN our last December number we gave our readers an account of some of the spurious relics which the cupidity of the ecclesiastics of the middle ages palmed upon the superstition and ignorance of those who were credulous enough to abandon the use of their reason and the evidence of their senses out of deference to authority, and many of which, though long since exposed, continue to deceive multitudes of people throughout every Roman Catholic country in Christendom.

The last article we mentioned was the miraculously multiplied towel with which our blessed Lord wiped the feet of the apostles, one of which is shown at the Lateran, in Rome; a second, at Aix-la-Chapelle, in Prussia; and a third, at St. Corneille de Compiègne, in France.

This brings us naturally to treat of the linen cloths (called in Latin by Roman Catholic writers, *sudaria*, which we may, perhaps, with Webster and others, translate "sudaries") in which we read in the Gospel narratives that our Lord's dead body was wrapped when laid in the tomb by Joseph of Arimathea.

It may be proper here to recal to the memory of our readers what the Holy Scriptures have recorded about them. The Gospel narrative is simply as follows:—

St. Matt. xxvii. 57—"And when it was evening there came a certain rich man of Arimathea, named Joseph, who also himself was a disciple of Jesus. He went to Pilate and asked the body of Jesus. Then Pilate commanded that the body should be delivered. And Joseph taking the body wrapt it in a clean linen cloth, and laid it in his own new monument, which he had hewed out in a rock. And he rolled in a great stone to the door of the monument, and went his way."

St. Luke xxiii. 50 gives a similar account of the transtion.

St. John xix. 40 says—"They (Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus) took therefore the body of Jesus, and bound it in linen clothes with the spices, *as the manner of the Jews* is to bury. Now, there was in the place where he was crucified a garden, and in the garden a new sepulchre, where no man yet had been laid. There, therefore, because of the parasceve ("preparation day"—*Authorized Version*") of the Jews, they laid Jesus, because the sepulchre was nigh at hand. And on the first day of the week Mary Magdalene cometh early, when it was yet dark, unto the sepulchre; and she saw the stone taken away from the sepulchre. She ran, therefore, and cometh to Simon Peter and to the other disciple whom Jesus loved, and saith to them, they have taken away the Lord out of the sepulchre, and we know not where they have laid him. Peter, therefore, went out and that other disciple, and they came to the sepulchre. And they ran both together, and that other disciple did outrun Peter, and came first to the sepulchre. And when he had stooped down, he saw the linen clothes lying; but yet he went not in. Then cometh Simon Peter following him, and went into the sepulchre, and saw the linen clothes lying, and *the napkin that had been about his head*, not lying with the linen clothes, but apart, wrapt up into one place. Then that other disciple also went in, who came first to the sepulchre, and he saw and believed. For as yet they knew not the Scripture, that he must rise again from the dead. The disciples, therefore, departed again to their home."

We read nothing here of the likeness of our Lord's body being miraculously impressed on its wrapping sheet—though, if it was true, it would have been a most remarkable and marvellous event, worthy of being recorded; and, indeed, much more important to mention than the mere fact that certain women followed Jesus to the place of crucifixion without meeting with any miracle, or that when the disciples visited his tomb they found the linen clothes lying, and the napkin which wrapped his head lying in a place by itself—matters one would conceive of very trivial importance to be recorded, if anything connected with such a solemn event were not interesting to his believing followers. Can any one doubt, too, if they who went to seek the Lord's body had really found such a full length likeness of it as is now exhibited in the places we shall presently mention, that either the disciples or the faithful women would have at once removed them, and proclaimed and showed to their companions and friends so remarkable a corroboration of their story? and if they did not remove them at once, is it probable that they would afterwards have returned to the sepulchre, where they knew he was not, when they had positive proof that he was actually risen from the dead, and had no longer any object in going there? Be this, however, as it may, it is the boast of a number of modern towns—for instance, Turin, Carcassone, Nice, Aix-la-Chapelle, Treves, Besançon, and six or seven other places—that each of them possesses the whole original linen cloth or sheet mentioned in the Holy Scriptures, to say nothing of a variety of fragments of it to be seen elsewhere; and thousands of persons, for centuries, have undertaken, and possibly still undertake, long pilgrimages, at much expense and fatigue, in order to see these sheets or *sudaries*, of which, if we were to grant that any one of them was the *real* sheet in which Christ's body was wrapped 1800 years ago, it is manifest that *all the rest* must be wicked impostures to deceive the public for the sake of gain. That none of them, however, is really what is pretended is plain from the following considerations, if, indeed, any negative proof were required, where no affirmative proof exists to counterbalance the antecedent improbability of the whole story. Whenever the "holy sudary" is exhibited they show a large sheet with the full-length likeness of a human body on it. The most celebrated of them—the *holy sudarium* of Turin—is a long linen sheet, upon which is painted, in a reddish colour, a double likeness of a human body—*i.e.*, as seen from before and behind, quite naked, with the exception of a broad scarf encircling the loins. Now, we have seen that St. John's Gospel says that Christ's body was "bound in linen clothes, as the manner of the Jews is to bury"—and what was that custom? This may be known by their present custom, and their books which describe the ancient ceremony of interment among them, which was to wrap the body in a sheet to the shoulders, and to cover the head with a separate cloth. This is precisely as the evangelist, St. John, described it, saying "then cometh Simon Peter, and went into the sepulchre, and saw the linen clothes lying, and the napkin that had been about his head, not lying with the linen clothes, but apart, wrapt up into one place."* Can any proof be more convincing that these "*holy sudaries*" are not the genuine linen clothes which wrapped the Saviour's *body*, or the *napkin* which was about his head, but a clumsy fabrication by men who were, perhaps, as ignorant of Jewish customs and of the Scripture narrative, as they were of the rival relics of the same kind in other places.

The history of the sudary of Turin is curious, as it shows that the efforts of enlightened and pious prelates, even in the Church of Rome, to prevent idolatrous practices invading their churches, proved unavailing against that general tendency to worship visible objects, so strongly implanted in corrupt human nature, that, even in this enlightened age, we are continually witnessing such manifestations of its revival as may be compared only to that of the dark period of the middle ages.* It is pretended that this relic was saved by a Christian at the taking of Jerusalem by Titus; that it was brought back to Palestine in 640, from whence it was transferred to Europe by the Crusaders. It was taken by a French knight, named Geoffroi de Charny, who presented it to the collegiate church of a place called Liré, situate about three leagues from Troyes, in Champagne; the donor declaring that this holy sheet was taken by him from the infidels (why the infidels should have thought it worth preserving does not appear), and that *it* had delivered him in a miraculous manner from a prison dungeon into which he had been cast by the English. The canons of the church at Liré (which place, by the way, belonged to the knightly narrator of the miracle, and who, consequently, had a personal interest in drawing pilgrims thereto) seeing at once the great profits to be derived from such a relic, lost no time in exhibiting it, and the church forthwith was crowded with devotees. The Bishop of Troyes, Henri de Poitiers, however (not being, we suppose, personally interested, and finding no proofs of the authenticity of the pretended relic), *prohibited* it to be shown as an object of worship, and it remained unheeded for twenty-four years. After the death, however, of Bishop Henri, the sons of Geoffroi de Charny, about the year 1388, obtained permission from the papal legate to restore this relic of their father's to the Church of Liré, and the canons exposed it in front of the pulpit, surrounding it with lighted tapers. The Bishop of Troyes (Peter D'Arcy), however, was as incredulous as his predecessor, Henri de Poitiers, and, in spite of the legate, he prohibited the exhibition under pain of excommunication. Geoffroi's sons afterwards obtained from the king, Charles VI., an authorization to worship the *holy sudarium* in the said Church of Liré. The bishop was, however, as persevering as they were, and himself repaired to court, and represented to the king that the worship of the pretended sheet of Jesus Christ was nothing less than downright idolatry, and argued so effectually, that Charles revoked the permission by an edict, dated August 21, 1389. Geoffroi de Charny's sons had, however, too deep an interest in the matter even to let it drop there, and they appealed to Pope Clement VII., who was residing at Avignon; and he granted permission for the *holy sudarium* to be exhibited. The Bishop of Troyes then sent a memorial to the Pope, explaining the importance attached to this so-called holy relic, and so far prevailed, that though Clement did not prohibit the sudarium from being shown, he forbade it to be exhibited as the *real* sudary of Jesus Christ. The canons of Liré, being thus checkmated, put aside their sudary, which they were only permitted to show on the terms of not asserting it to be *genuine*; but it, not long after, re-appeared in other places, and, after being shown about in various churches and convents, it seems to have remained in Chamberry, about 1482, where nobody dared to impugn its reality. From that time its fame increased, and Francis I., King of France, went a pilgrimage, on foot, the whole way from Lyons to Chambery, in order to worship this linen cloth. In 1578, St. Carlo Borromeo, having announced his intention of going from Milan, on foot, to Chambery, to adore the holy sudary, the Duke of Savoy, wishing to spare this high-born saint the trouble of so long a pilgrimage, had the relic brought to Turin, where it has since remained, and where the alleged miracles performed by it, and the solemn worship paid to it, may be considered as a proof that its authenticity is no longer doubted.

We should be glad to know whether Pope Clement was right when *he prohibited* its being worshipped as the *real* sudary, or whether St. Carlo Borromeo was an idolator when *he* worshipped it as genuine?

Akin to these holy sudaries, is the smaller sudary, or handkerchief of Veronica, which is shown in the Church of St. Peter at Rome, with the face of Jesus Christ miraculously imprinted on it. It is recorded that a kerchief with the likeness of our Lord's face upon it, and covered with blood and sweat, was kept in a church at Rome in the 11th century. It is noted in a brief of Pope Sergius IV., dated 1011. We do not know what tales respecting this relic were related at that time; but it appears that copies of it, called *Veronicas* (a corruption of "vera icon," "the true image") were sold; and, no doubt, this appellation gave rise to the *legend of Sancta Veronica*, who wiped the face of our Lord with her kerchief as he was going to Calvary. The evangelists, we need scarcely remark, when naming the women who followed our Lord to the place of crucifixion, make not the least mention of this Veronica being among them—though, if true, it was so marvellous and remarkable an event, that the face of Jesus Christ should have been miraculously imprinted on a handkerchief with which a woman named Veronica wiped away the blood and sweat from it, that it was much more worthy of being recorded by the evangelists than many other things which they have minutely recorded connected with the occasion.

There are many versions of this legend (with other

* St. John xx. 6, 7.

* Let those who think this an exaggeration remember the pilgrimage to the Holy Coat of Treves, and the recent translation of the bones of St. Theudosia at Amiens, described in our last August number—CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. iii., p. 92; or the life of St. Philomena, same volume, p. 56.

legends of the same date), some stating that it was this woman whom Jesus cured of the bloody issue; whilst others maintain that she was no less a woman than Berenice, niece to King Herod. It is also said that after the dispersion of the Apostles, St. Veronica went in company with Mary Magdalene, Martha, and Lazarus, to Marseilles, where she wrought many miracles with her kerchief. The Emperor Tiberius (the legend proceeds) heard of these miracles, and, having fallen ill, summoned Veronica to Rome, where *she cured him in an instant*, and was rewarded with great honours and rich presents, though, ungratefully enough, he lived and died a pagan. The remainder of her life is said to have been spent at Rome, in company with St. Peter and St. Paul, and she bequeathed the miraculous handkerchief to Pope St. Clement. Notwithstanding all this, and though she is said to have suffered martyrdom in France, and, we believe, is acknowledged as a saint and allotted a place in the calendar, this legend has never yet, we believe, received the official approbation of the Roman Catholic Church, and may, therefore, we presume, be disbelieved without pain of mortal sin. Perhaps, however, as Pope Pius IX., has lately stated, for the first time, another miracle, as old as Christianity itself, in his recent Bull, he may also, ere long, put the seal of his approbation on the legend of St. Veronica's handkerchief also.

We have not yet done with this instructive subject, and, shall probably give our readers a few additional specimens of spurious relics in an early number.

THE LIFE OF A PRIEST.

(Continued from page 7.)

In the prosecution of any favourite object, what perseverering industry is employed by man in the examination of all its bearings upon the destiny of his future life; and what energy he exercises, in examining all its collateral consequences? But, alas, what little exertion is employed in examining the doctrine of man's salvation, the most important subject that could engage the mind of man. The salvation of our souls is their deliverance from the guilt of sin, and the verdict of God is, that all have sinned —"There is none righteous, no, not one." But is there no hope for the guilty, no pardon for the condemned? Yes, there is: To the Lord our God, belong mercies and forgiveness, though we have rebelled against him.—Dan. ix. 9. When the guilty repent sincerely, a full and free pardon of their sins is imparted to them. God says, "I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and iniquities will I remember no more."—Heb. viii. 12. The moment the sinner repents, he is free from the condemnation of punishment. David says (Psalms xxxii. 1, 2), "Blessed is the man to whom the Lord imputes no sin. And, again, blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered." A full and entire remission of all their sins is granted them, through the all-sufficient merits of Christ's atonement, and the black catalogue of their crimes, which have been written down in the book of God's remembrance, by the *recording angel*, shall, by one penitential tear, be blotted out for ever.

A great portion of my time and attention has been hitherto devoted to the examination of the doctrine of salvation, as it is taught in the catechisms and in the Maynooth Class-book; and I found, in those books, no proofs taken from the Scripture, from the Fathers, or from the records of the early Churches, in support of the doctrine of salvation, as it is inculcated in the Church of Rome. But I found salvation more difficult to be attained in that Church than in the reformed Catholic Church, for the following reasons:—There were twelve new articles added to the original belief by Pius IV., six commandments, and five sacraments, by the Council of Trent—making altogether 23 new articles to be believed, more than are to be found in the belief of the early Churches, and not found at present in the Church of England; and to increase the difficulty, the members of the Church of Rome must believe them to be of divine institution, without proof and contrary to evidence, or an anathema will be hurled against them from the castle of St. Angelo: and it is thus the Church of Rome puts an extinguisher upon free inquiry, contrary to the doctrine of St. Paul, "*prove* all things."

As indulgences are hinged upon confession, I shall take them in order, and examine upon what authority they are founded. Pius IV. says—"I, also, affirm, that the power of indulgences was left by Christ to the Church, and that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people." The Council of Trent says (Sess. 25)—"Since the power of granting indulgences has been bestowed by Christ to his Church, and she has exercised this power from the earliest antiquity, the holy Council teaches and enjoins, that the use of indulgences is, in the highest degree, salutary to Christian people; and it condemns with anathema those who assert, that they are useless, or deny that the power of granting them is in the Church." Here are the "ipsissima verba" of the Pope, and the decree of the Fathers of Trent, without any Scriptural authority, or definition of indulgences. But the catechism says, "that an indulgence is a release from the *temporal* punishment due to those sins that have been forgiven us by penance and confession, by means of the superabundant merits of Christ *and his saints*, which are applied to our souls, by the special favour of the Church." From this doctrine I can conclude, that the merits of Christ alone are not sufficient without the addition of the merits of the saints; which must be considered as nothing less than awful impiety; and that our Blessed Lord did not speak the truth, when he said to his disciples, that they could have no merit of themselves—"When ye have done all things commanded, say, we are unprofitable servants" (Luke xvii. 10); which borders very closely on blasphemy. The Church of Rome holds, that the punishment incurred by sin is both temporal and eternal. That the eternal punishment is removed by the absolution of the priest, but that the temporal punishment must be paid in this life by penance, or in the next by the flames of Purgatory.

There is a well-known axiom in all schools, "qui potest majus, potest et minus eodem sub respectu." According to this principle, the priest who can absolve from the eternal guilt, can *a fortiori* absolve from the temporal punishment. The difference between the Church of Rome and Scripture doctrine is very perceptible in this instance. An Apostle tells you that if you confess your sins to God, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from ALL unrighteousness.—John i. 1, 9.

When God pardons a sinner, it is not by half measures, but he pardons him fully as well as freely, and eternally, by his own gracious agency, without money and without price; without sacerdotal interference, or Papal indulgences. Of this you have a striking instance in the case of the man who was sick of the palsy; and also in the instance of the weeping penitent of Bethany. My reading does not enable me to go, nor do I believe can any one, farther back than the first crusade, to establish the origin of indulgences. At that time of fanatical enthusiasm, the prison-doors of all Europe were thrown open to all prisoners, however enormous their crimes, and an indulgence was granted to all those who would join the standard of the cross, and a plenary indulgence was to be applied to the souls of all those who fell by the hand of the Saracen, or who plunged their consecrated swords into the heart of an infidel. The next place I find indulgences issued from the treasury of the Vatican, was at the commencement of the pontificate of Leo X., to finish the magnificent Church of St. Peter in Rome. For this ostensible purpose, indulgences were sold, and the traffic was carried to a shameful excess in the beginning of the sixteenth century, till this coin became so base by its too frequent currency, that it led to the Reformation, the happiest event that could happen to promote the civil, political, and religious liberty of Europe. The jubilee or plenary indulgence is of pagan origin, and was introduced into the Church of Rome by Martin V., in order to fill his exhausted treasury, and to facilitate his entry into Rome, after the great schism of the west. The word jubilee signifies a time of rejoicing. In the Old Testament it occurred every fiftieth year after the completion of the seven Sabbatical years, during each of which all labour ceased for man and beast; and even the land itself was allowed a seasonable repose. But we do not find the word jubilee in the New Scripture. It is a well-authenticated historical fact, that the Popes, after being forced to leave the Eternal City in consequence of their tyranny and political oppressions, resided at Avignon in France, during the period of 75 years; and that Otho Colonna was the first Pope who was induced to return to the City of the Hills, by Petrarch, to dry up the tears of the disconsolate widow who was mourning, in sackcloth and ashes, the absence of the spiritual father of the people. The deserted city, during her melancholy widowhood, has been pathetically, yet beautifully described by the elegant muse of Petrarch, at the revival of literature, in the commencement of the 15th century. Otho Colonna was the son of a Roman citizen of great ancestral claims upon the gratitude of the Roman people; when a period of great scarcity occurred, and the people were dying by hundreds of hunger, this benevolent Roman threw open his purse and his granaries, and saved the remnant of an expiring people. In gratitude, the people raised a column to his memory; and, in subsequent times, the family name was changed to Colonna. After the deposition of the Popes of Avignon, Martin V. was elected, and took every precaution to insure himself a favourable reception in his native city. Amongst the ancient customs of the Romans was, that of celebrating secular games on the first day of January of every century, in honour of the age of the Eternal City. The new Pope was well acquainted with the Carmen Seculare, which he read in his more youthful days, in the Odes of Horace, and was sung by a choir of youths dressed in the most gorgeous attire, amidst the shouts of an admiring people, who rolled along in one unbroken wave, from the steps of the Pantheon to the majestic dome of the Capitol. After which a donative was given to the people. Pope Martin deferred his entry into the city of Rome, until the first day of January, after his elevation to that See, and had, in the meantime, hymns of jubilee composed, to be sung on the occasion, by youths beautifully dressed, in imitation of the custom of heathen Rome. On the first of January he made his public entry into the city of the Cæsars, surrounded with all that was not only respectable, but magnificent, and preceded by a multitude of people who joined the youths in singing jubilate to Martin V., the representative of Colonna, the saviour of the Roman people. After the procession—a civic ovation—the Roman people were ordered to make an offering at the shrine of the apostles, and a plenary indulgence was pronounced by Martin V. from the balcony of the Vatican. By means of this happy device, the Papal treasury was once more filled to overflowing, and the Pope was in a position to give a donation to the inhabitants of the city in imitation of the Roman emperors. Thus, the citizens of Rome, and all those who thronged into the city, were enabled to return to their respective homes, with erect heads and light hearts, after being relieved from an oppressive weight of sin by this timely yet imaginary indulgence.

The sale of indulgences, under the pontificate of Leo X., by Tetzel, a low, unprincipled man, who was selected by the Archbishop of Magdeburg, together with the great immorality of the clergy of the 16th century, were the proximate causes that led to the Reformation. From that period the human mind was emancipated from all the superstitious ignorance of the barbarous ages, and recovered its natural elasticity, while it shook off that oppressive weight which debased its powers and cramped its energies.

As it is with the *doctrine* of the Church of Rome I have to do, the immorality of the clergy before and at the time of the Reformation is foreign to my purpose, and I shall abstain from any inquiry into that disagreeable subject, and leave that task to others who may feel it their duty to expose it.

In proportion as we ascend to the days of the apostles the nearer we approach the noble simplicity of the Christian religion, like the radii of a circle that converge to its centre. The great advantage to be derived from falling back upon primary principles, is to be learned from Montesquieu's Spirit of Laws, in which he says, that as soon as he found out first principles, the laws by which nations are governed became very easy to him. Let us go back in imitation of that great man to the primary principles that are to be found in the Holy Scriptures, and we cannot fail in detecting the errors that have by degrees crept into the Church since the period of the apostolic age.

The next question I had to examine in the category was, "Is the Latin language which is used in the Roman Liturgy in accordance with Gospel principles?" I answer, certainly not; as we read in the Acts ii. 4, "And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the spirit gave them utterance. And they were all amazed, and marvelled, saying one to another, 'Behold, are not all these that speak Galileans. And how hear we, *every man in his own tongue*, wherein we were born, the wonderful works of God?'" The apostles received on this occasion from the Holy Spirit the power of speaking different languages, in order that *their preaching might be understood in every part of the world*—In Mesopotamia and Judea, Cappadocia, Pontus, and Asia. Yet the Church of Rome continues to have her prayers read in a dead language, which is not understood by the people. St. Paul devotes an entire chapter—the fourteenth of the first Corinthians—to this subject, to show the necessity of speaking in a language which the people can understand—"If I pray in an unknown tongue my understanding is unfruitful." The clergymen of the reformed Churches pray with their faces to their respective flocks, and, at the same time, in their vernacular language; whereas the priests pray with their backs to the people, and in a language which they do not understand—no, not even the clerk who makes the responses. In this instance the Church of Rome acts in direct opposition to her own decree, as the fourth Council of Lateran established it as a rule that the service should be in the vulgar tongue of every nation; and we find it so in every nation independent of Rome.

(To be continued.)

TALK OF THE ROAD.—No. XXVII.

PAT and Jem did not get together for a good while to have a talk; but at last they fell in on the road, and were walking together; but Pat did little at the talking, but kept looking mighty hard at his old coat, first at one sleeve and then at the other, and then on the big patches on the breast of it.

And, indeed, poor Pat's coat was very bad. It was once made all of blue frieze, and then it must have looked very smart; but, when times got hard, Pat had to get a piece on the coat betimes, because he never had the price of a new one; so there were black patches, and gray patches, and patches the colour of mud; and there were the legs of two old stockings, sewed over the arms, from the wrists to the elbows, to keep the patches together; and all the patches looked as if the best wife in the country could not keep them together much longer.

So Pat kept looking mighty hard at his coat, and talking little.

"What's the matter with the coat at all?" said Jem.

"Well, I'm studying the old coat," said Pat.

"Is it how to get a new one, you mean?" said Jem.

"Time enough to study that when the meal gets cheaper," said Pat; "it's this *old* coat I'm studying."

"Well, and what do you make out of the old one?" said Jem.

"Well, I had a discussion on it last night," said Pat, "and I didn't think there was as much to be got out of an old coat."

"And what's to be got out of it?" said Jem; "tell me that, Pat."

"Well," said Pat, "I was in last night at old Ned Flanagan's, and there was a deal of people in it, and there was Tim Reilly, the priest's schoolmaster; and they were all talking about the old religion and the new religion; and Tim Reilly was holding out that the Church of Rome had the old religion; and others was asking wasn't there things changed in it, and then how could it be the old religion? and at first Tim Reilly wouldn't give in that that there was anything changed; but there was old Ned Flanagan, that gets a newspaper, called the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, and he had a deal of learning out of it; and, indeed, he promised me the reading when he had done it. So, says he to Tim, 'Is the Immaculate Conception an article of the Catholic faith?' says he. 'It is,' said Tim; 'didn't you hear the priest read the Pope's decree in the chapel.' 'And how could St. Bernard be a saint when he denied it?' said Ned. 'It wasn't an article of the faith then,' said Tim, 'for the Pope hadn't settled it.' 'Well,' says I, 'sure that's a new piece put on it anyway; and how can it be the old religion after that?'

"Well, with that he turns round to me, for he's a mighty cute little fellow that would bother anybody, and says he, 'how long have you the old coat?' says he. 'It's turning the talk, you are,' says I. 'It's not,' says he; 'it's coming to it I am: how long have you the old coat?' says he again. Well, they all allowed me to answer him: so, says I, 'it's eight years any way, and may be a bit more. 'And mighty well mended it is,' says he, 'for the time. Now, do you mean to tell me,' says he, 'that you bought that coat eight years ago?' says he. 'Deed and I do,' says I. 'That very coat?' says he. 'This very coat,' says I. So he put's his hand on my shoulder, and says he, 'was this patch on when you got it?' says he. 'No,' says I. 'Nor none of the patches?' says he. 'Not one of them,' says I. 'And it's the same coat for all that,' says he.

"Well, I seen then what he was at; and when I came to think of it, it wasn't easy to think it *was* the same coat, when there was hardly a bit of the first coat left in it. 'Well, I think it's hardly the same, after all,' says I. 'Well, boys,' says he, 'did you ever hear the like of that? didn't he say this minute it was the very coat?'

"Well, they were all down on me then; and I tried to make the best hand I could of it; 'for sure,' says I, 'it isn't like it, for it was a blue coat when I got it, and I leave it to yourselves, boys, if you can find one bit of the blue cloth in it now.' Well, with that, the boys all began discussing if it was the same coat or not; and some allowed that as long as I took it off at night, and put it on in the morning, it was surely the same coat; and more of them allowed it was the cloth made the coat; and when the same cloth wasn't in it, how could it be the the same coat. Well, when they were all done talking, says Tim to me—'Is it the same coat,' says he, 'or is it not?' 'Well, I think it's not,' says I. 'And *when* did it turn into another coat?' says he; 'was it when the first patch was put on it?' says he. 'No,' says I, 'it wasn't, sure enough.' 'And was it the second patch, or the third patch, or the fourth patch, or what patch,' says he, 'that turned it into another coat?' says he. Well, with that they all began again, and now they were all for allowing that it *was* the same coat. Well, Ned Flanagan's byre is down, and so he had the cow in the corner. So I turns to Ned, and says I, 'that's a pretty little calf,' says I. 'It's no calf,' says Ned, 'it's a cow giving milk, with a calf of her own.' 'Don't be joking,' says I, 'it's a calf.' 'It's joking you are,' says he. 'Was it ever a calf?' says I. 'It was.' says he. 'What day did it turn into a cow?' says I; 'was it a Sunday or a week-day? Here's a learned man,' says I, pointing to Tim, 'that will prove to you, that it's a calf still, if you can't tell the day it changed.' Well, with that they all allowed the day couldn't be told, and still the calf had turned into a cow.

"'And, says I, 'isn't it the same with the corn that grows—*who* can tell the day the ear is formed? and isn't it the way with spring and summer? and with child and man? and isn't it the way with day and night? and where's the good,' says I, 'of the priest telling us our religion must be the same now that it was at first, just because no one can tell what day it changed from one religion to another; and wouldn't just the same argument prove,' says I, 'that night was day, or day night? But who would be the fool to believe it against his own eyesight,' says I, 'and where's the good of argument that's as fit to prove that black is white, as to prove anything else?' says I.

"Well, with that they all fell to talking, and they allowed that things does change, in a way that no one can tell *when* they changed, and that there is no use denying it.

"Well, I was considering with myself that when a thing is said sharp and clever about one thing being like another, people, maybe, is apt to take it up mighty quick, and think it very learned, without stopping to consider how far one thing is like another; so, thinks I to myself, *would* the religion of Jesus Christ be like an old coat at all?

"So I turns to Tim Reilly, and, says I, 'after all there's a differ between the coat getting old, and the calf turning into the cow, and I give in to you entirely that it's the very same coat I bought eight years ago.'

"'To be sure there's a differ,' says he, 'between a thing getting old, and one thing turning into another, and that's what I was going to say when you would be done talking,' says he; so, then, he went on to talk a deal about the old coat being the same, with all its patches; and just the same way, he allowed, when the Pope made new decrees and new articles of faith, his religion was still the same religion, and the old religion, for all that.

"So I waited till he was done; and then says I, 'And do you mean to tell me,' says I, 'that the religion of Jesus Christ is made up of patches and mendings, like an old coat? You're right so far, any way,' says I, 'that your religion is old enough, like the old coat,' says I; 'it's as old as being patched and mended, and threadbare and darned, and in rags and holes, and tossed and turned, can make it; but you'll never get the holes out of an old coat by turning it,' says I; 'and isn't it enough for me to have my old coat made of rags and patches without having my religion made of them too,' says I; 'and isn't that the way with all them that tries to patch up a religion of their own merits instead of the merits of Christ; for doesn't the the Bible say that "all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags?"* And *why* do I get patches on the old coat?' says I. 'Isn't it because it is wearing out and going to the bad? And can that be the way with the religion that God made? Doesn't the Bible say that the heavens and earth will wear out like an old coat, but that God keeps still the self-same ever more?† And won't his religion keep the same? "for the Word of the Lord endureth for ever";‡ so I leave you the old coat for your religion,' says I; 'but it won't fit the religion of Christ; for there never was a coat,' says I, 'but *the one*, that could be fitting for the religion of Christ.'

"Well, with that they all began tearing at me to tell what coat that was; and I made them guess for it, and of all the guesses ever you heard they were the quarest; one allowed it was what the priest says mass in; another said it was what the nuns wear on their heads; another said it was the red strip that some of the priests wear over their shoulder; one old woman said it be to be the scapular; another said it was the blue cloak that's on the picture of the Virgin Mary in the chapel; and another allowed that it be to be something that was on the Pope: but they could make no hand of it, till old Ned Flanagan, that reads his Bible, says, 'Why, then, wasn't it the coat of Christ himself, that was "without seam, woven from the top throughout."'§ 'That's the hit,' says I; 'would there be seams and patches in the religion of Christ, any more than on his coat?' So with that, for it was getting late, says I to Tim Reilly, 'I'll just take myself off with my old coat,' says I; 'and may you get the religion without seams or patches, afore I get a new coat.' So they all bid me the good night kindly, and maybe they will think of the coat."

"Well Pat," said Jem, "you done it well: and deed I didn't know there was much good to be got in an old coat, and when times mend, and you get a new one, I hope it will serve you as well."

We hope so, too, and we hope the state of poor Pat's coat will remind some rich people how much the poor want some warm clothing in this cold weather, when the most a poor man's wages can do, is to get a little meal at a dear price, and maybe little enough of that. May God stir up the hearts of us all to remember how "the religion without seam," teaches us to feed the hungry and to clothe the naked.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We have again to apologize to several of our friends for postponing their communications. Letters from Mr. E. Power and others are in type, and omitted from want of room.

We beg to call the attention of our correspondents to the utility of adding their name and address to their communications.

To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal, which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

THE Publishers respectfully request their Subscribers to remember, that their subscriptions are payable in *advance*. When the friends of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN are informed, that at this moment above 1,000 sums of 3s. 6d. each are due to the publisher, it is hoped that those in arrear will be good enough to remit or pay the amount due, without the necessity of special applications. Where the annual sum is so small, it is impossible to make applications in the usual manner, without incurring a serious expense in proportion to the sum due. Mr. Curry will, therefore, feel greatly obliged by remittances.

* Isaiah lxiv. 6, and compare Romans x. 3.

† Thou in the beginning, O Lord, didst found the earth: and the works of thy hands are the heavens.

They shall perish, but Thou shalt continue: and they shall all grow old as a garment.

And as a vesture shalt Thou change them: and they shall be changed: but Thou art the self-same, and Thy years shall not fail.—Hebrews i. 10, 11, 12, and Psalm ci. 26, 27, 28, Douay Bible; Psalm cii. 25, 26, 27 in the Protestant Bible.

‡ 1 Peter i. 25, Douay Bible.

§ Gospel of St. John, xix. 23.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, FEBRUARY, 1855.

WE have now before us the Letter Apostolic of the Pope on the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. This decree was pronounced on the 8th of December, and is published in the *Univers* of the 20th January, and in the *Tablet* of January 27. The decree is, of course, in Latin; but the *Tablet* also gives a translation, which we shall make use of in preference to any of our own.

Such a document, of course, demands our consideration, and we desire to call the attention of our readers to it.

The first sentence that requires our notice is one near the end of the first clause or paragraph of the decree, in which our Lord is spoken of as "by nature one and the same common son of God the Father, and of the Virgin."*

This savours very strongly of the ancient Eutychian† heresy, which admitted only *one nature* in Christ. We hold, with the Catholic Church of all ages, that He who was born of Mary was truly God. We hold, also, that He was truly man. We hold with the Catholic creed of St. Athanasius, that he was "God, of the substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds; and man, of the substance of his mother, born in the world." We hold that these two natures remained distinct and unmixed in Him. "Perfect God, and perfect man." That He was "equal to the Father, as touching his Godhead; and inferior to the Father, as touching his Manhood." And yet that he was "one Christ," "not by confusion of substance, but by unity of person." All this our readers may see in the Athanasian Creed.

As respects his divine nature, he is the Son of God. As respects his human nature, he is the Son of Mary. And, *by the unity of His person*, he is the common son of both. To say that He is the *common son* of both by nature, whereas he is, in fact, the son of each in respect of *separate* natures, is the heresy of the Eutychians.

How the Pope fell into this error is plain enough. *His* object is to magnify Mary. If Mary was the mother of Jesus only by reason of his human nature, the Pope's object fails. But if Jesus was the common Son of God and of Mary, in respect of the *same nature*, then is she raised to the throne of God.

We ask our readers to consider how the new doctrine has led the Pope himself to confound the two natures of Christ, which the Catholic Church has always kept so distinct in her creed.

The Pope goes on to affirm, with the confidence that becomes a Pope, that the Church "HAS NEVER CEASED to lay down, to cherish, and to illustrate continually, by numerous proofs," the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception.

But, unfortunately for his assertion, the Pope tries to support it by proofs; and here is the earliest proof which he is able to produce—"For this doctrine . . . . the Church herself has most clearly pointed out, when she did not hesitate to propose the Conception of the same Virgin for the public devotion and veneration of the faithful. By which illustrious act she pointed out the Conception of the Virgin as singular, wonderful, and very far removed from the origins of the rest of mankind; and to be venerated as entirely holy, since the Church celebrates festival days only of the saints." So the earliest act of his Church, which the Pope can point to

* "Ut naturaliter esset unus idemque communis Dei Patris, et Virginis filius."

† The followers of Eutyches denied that the two natures of God and man remained distinct and separate in Christ. The Fourth General Council of Chalchedon was called to condemn this error, and pronounced that both natures remained in Christ, each perfect and distinct from the other.

as laying down the Immaculate Conception, is the institution of the feast and office of the Conception of the Blessed Virgin.

Now, when was this feast instituted? St. Bernard, "the last of the Fathers," will tell us. Writing, in the TWELFTH century, to the clergy of Lyons, who had then begun to introduce such a feast, he says—"We can never enough wonder that *some* of you could have the boldness to introduce a feast which the Church has not the least knowledge of, which neither is supported by reason, nor backed by any tradition."* This is conclusive proof that the Church of Rome had no such feast in the twelfth century. The Church of Rome adopted it in the thirteenth century *at the earliest*; and this is the most ancient act of the Church of Rome which the Pope can *find to support his confident* assertion, that the Church of Rome "has never ceased to lay down" this doctrine! Never ceased! But when did she begin? Why the Pope's own proof makes it plain that she BEGAN then to lay it down in the thirteenth century, at the earliest.

The Pope proceeds to confess a fact, which will probably prejudice many Christians against the doctrine he tries to support—"And, therefore, the very words in which the sacred Scriptures speak of uncreated Wisdom, and represent His eternal origin, she (the Church of Rome) has been accustomed to use, not only in the offices of the Church, but also in the holy Liturgy, and TO TRANSFER to the origin of that Virgin." That "uncreated Wisdom" is Christ, who is "the wisdom of God;" and what the Scripture says of His origin, the Church of Rome TRANSFERS to the origin of Mary! But *why* has the Church to do so? Is it not because the Scriptures does *not* attribute an immaculate origin to the Virgin? So the Church has to borrow from Christ, to lend to Mary; and when did the Church begin to do this? Was it before the thirteenth century?

The Pope then goes on to lay down a very important principle respecting the prayers which are appointed to be read in the Church of Rome. Whatever is prayed for in those offices, becomes thereby an article of faith! Thus, speaking of the Litany of Loretto, and other such prayers to the Virgin, he says—"Thus the rule of faith would be established by the rule of supplication itself." We must not forget this, when we have to speak of the Litany of Loretto in future.

Having thus spoken of the public acts of the Church, which the Pope cannot trace farther back than the thirteenth century at the farthest, he goes on to speak of the public acts of former Popes in favour of the Immaculate Conception.

And here the "object" of this devotion, as defined by the Popes, does seem to us strange. "Our predecessors, the Roman Pontiffs, increasing with all their care the devotion of the Conception, studied most especially to declare and inculcate its OBJECT and doctrine: for they taught clearly and openly that the festival was celebrated for the Conception of the Virgin; and they proscribed as false and most foreign to the intention of the Church, the opinion of those who considered and affirmed that it was not the conception itself, but the sanctification, *to which devotion* was paid by the Church. . . . . Our predecessors themselves thought it their duty to protect and defend, with all zeal, both the Feast of the Conception of the most Blessed Virgin, and *the Conception from the first instant* AS THE TRUE OBJECT OF DEVOTION." We ask, now, DO Roman Catholics *really* pay THEIR DEVOTION *to that act*, by which the Virgin Mary was conceived in the womb of her mother!! What else is the meaning of saying that "the Conception" is "the true object of devotion?"

Well may we say now, with Saint Bernard—"How can it be maintained that a conception which proceeds not from the Holy Ghost, but rather from sin, can be holy?"

But when did POPES first begin to set up the Conception as the "true object of devotion?"

The present decree gives the names of the Popes who did so, and we have only to ascertain their dates.

The first whom the present Pope can mention as having done so is Pope Sixtus IV., and the next Pope, Alexander VII. Pope Sixtus IV. obtained the Papacy in 1471, and Pope Alexander VII. in 1655! and these are *the earliest Popes* who can be shown to have set up the Conception as an object of devotion.

The Pope in his decree does *mention* Sixtus IV., but wisely refrains from *quoting* him. This was prudently done, as becomes an infallible Pope. For the object was to get men to believe that a Pope sanctioning a service for the feast of the Conception was, in fact, a decision of the Church of Rome in favour of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception; and to have *quoted* Sixtus IV. would have spoiled this idea entirely. For that very decree* of Pope Sixtus IV. which speaks of the service for the Conception—"When the Holy Roman Church publicly and solemnly celebrates the feast of the Conception of the undefiled and ever Virgin Mary, and has ordained a special and proper office for it,† that very decree does also prohibit any one from *condemning* those who *deny* the Immaculate Conception, on this very ground, "because the question has not yet been decided by the Roman Church and the Apostolic See."‡ So the very Pope who instituted the office of the Immaculate Conception, did proclaim that the question was *not* settled by that office; and yet the present Pope, in his decree, appeals to that office as a decision on the question by the Pope who authorized that office!

Of course, the Pope can do no better, in his decree, when he has no better proofs to produce. But it was wisely done only *to refer* to Pope Sixtus IV., and NOT *to quote* his decree!

The first of his predecessors whom the present Pope ventures *to quote* on the subject in his decree, is Pope Alexander VII. Pope Pius IX. does not in his decree tell us in what age Alexander lived.§ So the readers of the decree, in English, may imagine, if they like, that Pope Alexander lived "long, long ago." But, on turning to the list of the Popes in Labbe and Cossart, we find that Alexander VII. succeeded to the Papacy in 1655, just *two* hundred years ago. And this is the first Pope who can be *quoted* in support of the assertion, that the Church of Rome "has never ceased to lay down" the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception!

The passage quoted in the decree from Pope Alexander VII. is, indeed, most worthy of attention, for it throws light on an important subject—viz., the precise period at which the Church of Rome began to celebrate, *by authority*, the festival of the Immaculate Conception. This is Pope Alexander's evidence—"Considering that the Holy Roman Church solemnly celebrates the festival of the Conception of the Immaculate and ever Blessed Virgin, and has appointed for this a special and proper office, according to the pious, devout, and laudable institution WHICH EMANATED from our predecessor, Sixtus IV. . . . . ." So the "Office of the Conception" is *an institution* of Pope Sixtus IV. It *emanated* from him. Now, Pope Sixtus IV. succeeded to the Papacy in the year 1471. So it was not until the *fifteenth century* that the prayers on which the present Pope now lays such stress in his decree were *authorized* at all by a Pope in the Church of Rome.

We have spoken above as if that office might have commenced in the *thirteenth century*. We did so in compliance with a common opinion, founded, we believe, on an expression in the 36th Session of the Council of Basil.* But that Council is condemned and rejected by the Church of Rome. And here, in the present Pope's decree, we have the first genuine authority for the institution of the office of the Conception, near the end of the fifteenth century.

Pope Alexander VII. goes on to say, that the reverence shown to this "piety, devotion, and festival," has "never changed in the Roman Church *since the institution of the worship itself.*" *Now* we know what Pope Pius meant when he said, in the beginning of his decree, that the Church "*has never ceased* to lay down" this doctrine. He means, *never since* 1471!

Pope Alexander VII. then goes *on* to denounce anathemas against those "who try TO RECALL INTO DISPUTE the same belief, festival, or worship." So *it had been in dispute.* This comes in very awkwardly in a decree which affirms that this belief had been *always* laid down, *always* held in the Church.

It was a hard case for poor Pope Pius IX. to find none of his predecessors that he could venture *to quote* in favour of the Immaculate Conception, until the year 1661!—only 193 years ago! —and then to have to quote what damages his case so much!

But what is wanting in *proof* in this decree, is well made up, for those who will swallow it, in confident and blustering assertions.

The decree then goes on to claim the Council of Trent as establishing the Immaculate Conception. We exposed this in our last number, p. 11, col 1, and we refer to it now; only observing here, that the very sentence of the Council of Trent which the Pope refers to, expressly confirms the decree of Pope Sixtus IV., which declares that the question "*has not yet been decided* by the Roman Church and the Apostolic See," "which constitution (says the Council of Trent) WE RENEW;"† and the Pope now appeals to the very sentence in which they say this, as their *decision in favour of* the Immaculate Conception!!

We have now examined all the *authorities and proofs* which are contained in the Pope's decree. The remainder of it is nothing but assertions.

He says, it is proved, by "illustrious monuments of a venerable antiquity," that this doctrine "always existed in the Church." But not one such document does he mention; and we venture to say, that no Roman Catholic will ever tell us the title of one of these documents, for the best of all reasons, that none such exist.

He says, it is the "clear, unanimous opinion" of the Fathers. But not one Father does he name; and it is enough for us to name St Bernard in reply.

He speaks of the religious orders, without making any limitation or exception; and it is enough for us to name the Dominicans, though Pope Sixtus IV. would help us to many more.

He speaks of "the most eminent doctors of divinity;" and it is enough for us to name St. Thomas Aquinas and Cardinal Cajetan, out of a host that we could name.‡

He names no Father; but he says the Fathers beheld the Immaculate Conception "in the ark of Noah," in "Jacob's ladder," "in the Burning Bush," and many other like things: and if these things are, indeed, Scripture proofs of the Immaculate Conception, why did not the Church of

* 174th Epistle, tom. i., col. 393. Paris, 1839.

* Ex Lib. III., Extravagantium Communium Tit. de reliquiis et veneratione Sanctorum. c. 2.

† Cum Sancta Romana Ecclesia de Intemeratæ semperque Virginis Mariæ Conceptione publice festum solemniter celebret, ut speciale ac proprium super hoc officium ordinaverit.

‡ Cum nondum sit a Romana Ecclesia et Apostolica Sede decisum.

§ There is, however, appended to the original Latin copy a note which gives the date—Alexander VII., Const. Sollicitudo omnium Ecclesiarum, VIII. Decembris, 1661."

* Labbe and Cossart, vol. xii., 633. Ed. Paris. 1671.

† Session V. De Peccato Originali, at the end.

‡ See CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. iii., p. 131.

Rome put Noah's ark and Jacob's ladder into her prayers to the Immaculate Conception, instead of TRANSFERRING to the Conception of Mary what the Holy Spirit spake of the origin of the "Wisdom uncreated," the everlasting Son of God?

And, after all, the Pope goes on to say—"Wherefore, *from the ancient times*, the princes of the Church, ecclesiastics, and even emperors and kings themselves, have earnestly entreated of this apostolic see that the Immaculate Conception of the most holy mother of God should be defined *as a dogma of Catholic faith*;" and again—"We resolved that we should *no longer delay* to *sanction* and *define*, by our supreme authority, the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin." And, in the name of goodness, if, as the Pope says, it was "revealed by God," and always held and believed in the Church, how comes it that it never till now was "a dogma of Catholic faith?"

One word more to show the practical object of this Papal decree. The Pope thus issues his command—"Let all the children of the Catholic Church, most dear to us, hear these our words; and, with a more ardent zeal of piety, religion, and love, *proceed* TO WORSHIP, invoke, AND PRAY to the most blessed Virgin Mary, mother of God, conceived without original sin."*

It has been usual, when Protestants have said that the Church of Rome teaches men "to worship" and "pray to" the Virgin, to hear this indignantly denied. But *now* it is absolutely COMMANDED, by what professes to be the infallible authority of the Church of Rome.

Let those look to it who have hitherto denied that their Church teaches this idolatry; and let them hear the warning voice that comes from heaven—"Go out from her, my people, that you be not partakers of her sins."—Apocalypse xviii. 4, Douay Bible.

The Pope concludes his decree with a threat, which becomes the less terrible the more it is considered. "Let no man interfere with this our declaration, pronunciation, and definition, or oppose and contradict it with presumptuous rashness. If any should presume to assail it, let him know that he will incur *the indignation of the* omnipotent God, and of his blessed Apostles Peter and Paul." As if the Pope had in his hand the indignation of Almighty God and the apostles to bestow it upon whom he would!

How would Popes John X., John XI., John XII., Pope Lando, and many others, have bestowed that indignation? Not surely upon adulterers or robbers.†

We trust that God Almighty still keeps his indignation in his own power, to be exercised on those alone "who love not the Gospel, and obey not the Lord Jesus Christ."

But where did Popes get this power, or from whom did they learn these mighty threats? That shall be told. Pope Nicholns I., the man who imposed the forged decretal epistles of the Popes upon the Church, in the ninth century, that was the man who *first* took into his own hands "the indignation of Almighty God and the chief of the Apostles."‡ And if our readers will look back to our number for February, 1854, p. 16, col. 3, under the heading, "Popes' Power of Condemning to Hell," they will find Pope Nicholas's authority for assuming a power until that time unknown in the Church. And from that time forward Popes have enforced their decrees by such threats as Pope Pius now uses—on the authority of forgery alone!

We commend it to our readers to consider whether this present decree of the Pope is to be received as the decision of an infallible authority instituted by God in His Church—whether the act by which the Virgin Mary was conceived in the womb of her mother is to be henceforward "the true object of devotion" to the Catholic Church—whether the Virgin herself is to be "worshipped" and "prayed to" by Catholics.

* The Latin is, "Colere, invocare, exorare beatissimam Dei genetricem, &c." The translation is the *Tablet's*, not ours.

† See our article in this number, p. 15.

‡ Ep. xxx. ad Carolum Calvum Regem.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. viii., 410. Ed. Paris, 1671.

RECENT CONTROVERSY AT BOULOGNE.

(Continued from page 10.)

You cite the case of the Asiatic Churches as celebrating Easter contrary to the Roman custom, and say that Victor, Bishop of Rome, excommunicated them. This proves him to have been, as he was then held to be, a hot, imperious, and meddling man. But why did you not assert the only thing pertinent to your case—namely, that these Churches of Asia recognised his authority and yielded? Simply, because instead of submitting, they *disclaimed* it, and continued to observe their own day of celebrating Easter, notwithstanding his attempted interference.

This case will show how carelessly assertions are made in support of Roman Catholic claims. It is perfectly notorious that the Eastern Churches refused to adopt the custom of the west, and followed their own mode of Paschal observance for more than a century and a quarter after Victor's unauthorized interference. The Council of Nice decided the time of celebration. On this Pontiff's attempt he was admonished by several bishops, amongst the rest by Irenæus. Eusebius states that Victor's attempt was displeasing to many who spoke strongly to him. Irenæus uses very decided language. He says, the Apostles commanded not to judge others in matters of meat or drink, and, very pertinently to the point, ἐν μερει ἑορτῆς (in the matter of a festival). The fragment of this letter which is preserved, as well as the history of this whole controversy, is decisive testimony against the authority of the Roman See. It is perfectly certain that the attempt of the Pontiff to interfere with the liberties of the Asiatic Churches was, in this, as in other cases, summarily disallowed. The eastern mode of celebrating Easter was persevered in until the Council of Nice, notwithstanding Victor's disapproval.*

You next adduce the instance of Cyprian, and assert that when a council of sixty-six African bishops decided that the children of heretics should be rebaptized, the Roman Pontiff Stephen threatened them with excommunication, and that Cyprian, "great man as he was," was obliged to bend.

Now, the facts of the case are *directly the reverse*. The African bishops, with Cyprian at their head, were so far from bending before Stephen, that they re-affirmed, in most emphatic terms, their former decision, *notwithstanding his condemnation of it*. Two Carthaginian Councils had already pronounced a doctrine differing from that of Rome. The second of these, by a synodical letter, informed the Pontiff of its decision. Stephen haughtily disapproved. Strong letters passed between him and Cyprian. The Roman bishop broke off all communication with these opposing Africans. But so far were they from being intimidated thereat, and yielding, that in a third Council of Carthage (256) they repeated their former judgment. Peace ensued on Stephen's death. But the Africans *maintained their own doctrine;* and, so far down as the fourth century, the opinion of the Greek Fathers was in accordance with that of those Carthaginian Councils.†

[Repetition of assertion naturally tends to secure its acceptance. The Church of Rome makes powerful use of the fact to the furtherance (and to the discredit) of its cause. The amount to which historic truth has been perverted by its advocates is most lamentable and wicked. A good cause rejects such defences, but the exigencies of inveterate error force it to expedients which are its refutation and its shame. We speak of those who, knowing the fraud, or having reason to suspect it, persevere in using or in countenancing it. The present instance is one to the point. Father Lacordaire (whose works, according to my opponents, have received the sanction of the Catholic Church), with others, asserts that Cyprian yielded in this matter to Pope Stephen. The simple account of the transaction, the continuance of the Eastern view until long after Stephen, sufficiently refute the statement. Nothing can be clearer than that the jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff was not for a moment admitted—nay, that it was peremptorily rejected. And, as to his infallibility, let Cyprian testify to his view of it. He says—"In tantum Stephani fratris nostri obstinatio dura prorupit, ut etiam de Marcionis baptismo, item Valentini, et Apelletis, et cæterorum blasphemantium in Deum patrem contendat filios deo nasci." Here the African Father speaks of the "unbending obstinacy" of the Pontiff; charges him with holding those to be regenerate who speak evil (blasphemy) against God the Father; he describes the same Pontiff as having written rashly, and without forethought, things haughty, irrelevant, and contradictory. And when Stephen urges Roman tradition, the steadfast African rejects it in terms, which (notwithstanding Cyprian's hierarchical notions) are especially adverse to the Romish cause. His words are—"How great is that obstinacy, how great that presumption, which prefers human tradition to divine injunction, and perceives not that God is indignant as often as human tradition sets at nought and neglects the divine commands. Custom which has crept in among *some unawares* (a home thrust) ought not to hinder truth from prevailing and triumphing; for (the aphorism is well worth recording) custom without truth is only error inveterate." He then finely adds—"It is no more beneath the dignity of a Roman bishop than of any other man to suffer himself to be corrected when he is in the wrong; for the bishop ought not only to teach but to learn; for he becomes even the better teacher, who is daily adding to his knowledge and making progress by the correction of his errors."

Such is the witness of Cyprian to pontifical infallibility and jurisdiction over the whole Church of Christ. But in order to show how utterly untrue it is to affirm of Cyprian and the African Church that they yielded to Stephen (whom they so resolutely and successfully opposed) in this matter of baptism, we shall mention some contemporary events.

Firmilian, Bishop of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, upon learning the opposition made to the Roman Pontiff by Cyprian and the African Church, wrote, assuring them of the full approbation of the Churches of his province. Dionysius, of Alexandria, likewise condemned the conduct of the Pontiff. The letter of the former, extant in 26 Cod., is so strikingly adverse to Romish pretensions, that it was purposely omitted in the Ed. of Cyp., Rom. ap. Paul Manutinm, 1563.

Firmilian speaks of Stephen's "boldness and insolence," of his "open and manifest folly," of the strifes and dissensions which he had caused in the Churches. And, then, in reference to his attempted excommunication of the African Church, apostrophising the Pope, uses the following language:—"Thou hast cut off thyself. Be not deceived. He is truly the schismatic who has made himself an apostate from the communion of ecclesiastical unity." Pretty strong terms these in which to speak of the Pope, and fully sufficient to show how entirely unknown in those days had been the modern claims of Papal infallibility and jurisdiction.

In order to leave no doubt that the assertion of Cyprian's deference to the Roman Pontiff in this matter is wholly at variance with truth, let us take the testimony of the celebrated Roman Catholic historian, Dupin. Having given the same account of the controversy between Stephen and Cyprian which I have given, and spoken strongly of the unchristian conduct of the Pontiff, he says—"*It is certain that St. Cyprian never altered his opinion;* that the Greek Churches were, for a long time after him, divided upon this question; that the Council of Arles first decided it in the west, &c."]

The next argument from Cyprian is founded upon the words—"Primacy was given to Peter to show that there is but one Church, and one Chair—does he who abandons the Chair of Peter, *upon which the Church is founded*, flatter himself that he is in the Church?"

Whatever meaning we may give to these words, *supposing them to be genuine*, it is certain you cannot deduce from them that Cyprian believed in the infallibility or supremacy of the Roman Pontiff, because he had, as we have seen, in conjunction with the Council of Carthage, determinedly and successfully opposed him. Cyprian held high views of the Church order and unity. He supposed bishops to be successors of the Apostles. Of the last he says—"They were all, *in common with Peter*, possessed of like power and authority." His words here are express. Bishops, their successors, were, in like manner, all equal. "Christ," he says, "to mark the *unity* of his Church, mentions one among these equals by name, Peter." It was to mark or *indicate* unity, but not to *localize* it at Rome, that, in Cyprian's view, Christ made mention of one—*i.e.*, Peter. Unity did not consist in the subordination of all Churches to one visible head, resident at Rome, but in the communion of each Church with all the others. He was as truly a schismatic who separated from the See of Carthage as he who broke communion with Rome. Cyprian's idea of unity was what Firmilian expressed when, in writing to him, he describes—in reference to Pope Stephen—the true schismatic to be the one who, by breaking the general union among Churches, separated himself from "the communion of *ecclesiastical* (not pontifical) unity."

[So far as this passage is concerned, we need not dwell upon it further than to notice it as another instance of the imposition practised on the too confiding members of the Church of Rome. The former statement contradicted history, and was untrue in point of fact. This statement is a fraud, for it is an interpolation on the works of Cyprian. The genuine passage is as follows (I mark, by brackets, the Romish interpolations):—"Et quamvis apostolis omnibus post resurrectionem suam parem potestatem tribuat, et dicat, 'Sicut misit me pater,' &c., tamen ut unitatem manifestaret [unam cathedram constituit et] unitatis ejusdem originem ab uno incipientem sua auctoritate dis-

* The Paschal controversy contains ample evidence against the usurpations of the Romish See, and is a most unfortunate case for its advocates to adduce. They bring it forward solely because it shows some cases of interference on the part of the Pontiff; but they suppress the fact, that such interference was rejected. It is well-known matter of history that the ancient British and Irish Churches, observing their own mode of celebrating Easter, *refused* conformance to the Roman method, and persevered in their opposition, and proved their independence, notwithstanding the attempts of the See of Rome upon their liberties. Baronius confesses that the early Irish Church was treated by the Church of Rome as schismatical up to the sixth century.

† And (as it is highly pertinent to observe) an intermediate opinion, which afterwards became the prevailing one, arose in the Western Church itself.

posuit. Hoc erant utique et cæteri apostoli, quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio præditi et honoris et potestatis; sed exordium ab unitate proficiscitur [et primatus Petro datur ut una Christi ecclesia et cathedra una monstratur. Et pastores sunt omnes, et grex unus ostenditur, qui ab apostolis omnibus unanimi consensione pascatur] ut ecclesia Christi una monstratur. Hanc ecclesiæ unitatem qui non tenet, tenere se fidum credit? Qui ecclesiæ renititur et resistit [qui cathedram Petri, super quem fundata est ecclesia deserit], in ecclesia se esse confidit."

It will hence appear that the passage quoted by my opponents *consists of interpolations*. Gieseler asserts they are not to be found in the oldest MSS. Now, these *insertions* are the parts on which the Romish claim is based, so far as this passage is concerned. The genuine words show Cyprian's view "of unity" to be as I have represented it. To these sad expedients is the Church of Rome driven in support of her claims. They are the sure but distressing evidences of their conscious untenableness.]

The 3rd passage which you have quoted from Cyprian, ends with the words—"to whom faithlessness cannot have access." The inference which you made hence is this—that, according to the testimony of this writer, the Church of Rome was infallible.

[This is, perhaps, a suitable place for observing, that I had, during this discussion, repeatedly asked for, but could not obtain, references to the extracts and editions of the writers quoted by my opponents. I subsequently both wrote and sent to obtain them, but to no purpose. The reason was, perhaps, this, that the quotations were, I believe, almost wholly made second hand. With respect to the present passage, I had at first understood Mr. Gretton to quote it in reference to Pope Stephen; and, knowing what Cyprian's view of this prelate's conduct was, I requested him to read on, believing that something important was suppressed. I had no books of reference with me during this discussion, and could only rely on my memory. But, having previously noticed an attempt of Cardinal Wiseman's, in his Lectures on the Church, to mislead the public with regard to the opinions of Cyprian, by affirming a doctrine to be his, which he certainly did not hold, and which neither he nor his times had even heard of, I quoted a passage from Cyprian's letter, directly asserting that Pope Stephen was deceived, and, therefore, not infallible. It turned out, however, that Mr. Gretton had quoted from a letter of Cyprian's to Pope Cornelius. The passage is, so far as I know, quite genuine; but the inference made from it completely contradicts Cyprian's own explicit assertion. He never held the Roman See to be preserved by divine Providence from the possibility of being deceived, because he expressly asserts the reverse, in the case of Pope Stephen; and as for his jurisdiction, Cyprian and the North African Church resisted it without hesitation.

Now, with respect to the epistle to Cornelius, if any one will take the trouble of looking at it, he will see that Cyprian as little held the infallibility and jurisdiction of this Pontiff as of the other. The letter is, in part, an *expostulation* with Cornelius for receiving as ambassador of the Carthaginian Bishop, Fortunatus, a person (Felicissimus) who had been excommunicated. He exhorts the Pope to be firm, and not to fear the threats of wicked men; he very clearly intimates that the Pontiff had no right to interfere in the matter. "The cause had been already decided, and judgment already passed where the crime had been committed. The opinions of bishops should not be different. Christ says, let your discourse be yea, yea." The Roman Pontiff was not to alter the judgment already passed by another Church. Hence, it is very certain that Cyprian held not the infallibility, or admitted the supreme jurisdiction of Pope Cornelius. The passage, "to whom perfidy cannot have access," plainly means this—that the Church, whose faith was praised by Paul, should be so mindful of its high character, as, by its foresight and wisdom, to preclude the hope of evil men to deceive by perfidy. That Cyprian did not mean to say more, or, that in point of fact, the Roman See was so secured, is plain; for he expressly says, that perfidy *did* get access, and *did* prevail.]

The last argument you allege from Cyprian is, that "he calls the Church of Rome the root and matrix of the Catholic Church." In any literal sense this is plainly untrue, since other apostolic Churches were founded, so far as we know, before the Church of Rome. The term on which you base your argument was commonly applied to apostolic Churches. And the second Council of Constantinople justly styles the Church of Jerusalem as "the mother of all the Churches in the World."

(To be continued.)

Correspondence.

ON THE INFALLIBLE CHURCH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I am able to adduce many more passages from the Holy and Divine Book in support of the infallibility of the Church, but, as you are so fond of brevity, I will only give a few of them in this letter.

On the eve of our Lord's passion, in order to wean His afflicted Apostles from the sensible delights of His presence, of which they were, in a short time, to be deprived, He places before their view the speedy arrival of another Comforter, and the glorious prerogatives of that pillar of truth, of which they were to be the first supporters. "I will ask the Father," said He, "and he will give you another Comforter, that He may abide with you for ever, the Spirit of Truth, whom the world cannot receive."—John xiv. 16, and a portion of verse 17. He then subjoins (v. 26) the nature and end of this divine mission—"The Comforter, the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he will teach you all things, and bring all things to your mind, whatsoever I shall have said to you." In the continuation of His address (xvi. 13) the same promise is repeated—"But when He, the Spirit of Truth, is come, he will teach you all truth."

It is almost trifling with common sense to set about reasoning on these evident testimonies. Christ promises the descent of a Comforter; the promise was fulfilled on Whit-Sunday. He further promises that this Divine Spirit of Truth should abide with them for ever, should teach them all things, and lead them into all truth. Who shall dare to doubt but that this second part of the promise has also been fulfilled in every age since the days of the Apostles? What was the end or nature for which the promise was delivered? To guide the Apostles and their successors for ever into all truth. For has not the Church, in every age, required the perpetual assistance of the Director of Truth, as well as in the Apostolic times? And if it were necessary for them who had imbibed the true faith from the mouth, and in the school of Jesus himself, how much more so must it not be for the faithful in every succeeding age? Therefore, it is clear that the unlimited and unconditional promise of Christ could never become void, whilst the only cause for which it was made still existed in all its force; and hence He has promised that the Spirit of Truth should for ever remain with the Church, conducting her into all truth. That this was His meaning will be further proved from the next Scriptural argument in support of her infallibility, which you shall have next month.

I remain, sir, your humble servant,

WILLIAM ROURKE.

Before any argument can be founded, for the infallibility of the present Church, on the passage from St. John quoted by Mr. Rourke, it is necessary to prove that it is addressed, not to the Apostles merely, but to the Church of every age. Now, let us look at the context. We find our Lord saying—"These things I have spoken unto you, *being present with you.*"—xiv. 25. "The Comforter shall teach you all things, and *bring all things to your remembrance*, whatsoever I have told you."—xiv. 26. "I go away, and come again to you."—xiv. 29. "I have told you before it came to pass."—xiv. 28. "You have been with me from the beginning."—xv. 27. "These things I have told you, that when the time shall come you may remember that I told you of them. And these things I said not unto you at the beginning, because I was with you."—xvi. 4. "I have many things to say unto you, but you cannot bear them now."—xvi. 12. Is it not evident from all these passages that our Lord was addressing the Apostles themselves, and, in order to comfort them for his approaching departure, promising them the assistance of a Paraclete, whose stay with them should not be temporary, like the sojourn of our Lord on earth, but who should abide with them always? Through the whole passage there is not a syllable said about the successors of the Apostles. If our Lord had meant them, would he not have said so, and, at the same time, told us who they were?

The passage cited by Mr. Rourke, when not cut away from the context, affords an argument *against* the claims of the Church of Rome. Let Mr. Rourke open the passage in his Bible, and he will read as follows:—"If ye love me, keep my commandments, and I will ask my Father, and he shall give ye another Paraclete, that he may abide with you for ever, even the Spirit of Truth, whom the world cannot receive." When the passage is read thus entire, it shows clearly that Roman Catholics can have no certainty of the decisions of their Church. They cannot conclude, in virtue of this promise, that the Pope is infallible when he declares the doctrines of their Church, unless they can be certain that he fulfils the condition of the promise—namely, to love God, and keep his commandments. Now, Mr. Rourke will not deny that many occupants of the Roman See were men of the world—worldly, wicked, carnal, diabolical men—men who, it is expressly stated here, "*cannot receive the spirit of truth.*" From this very text, then, we conclude that the Church of Rome can have no certainty of the truth of the decrees of such Popes, or of the decisions of councils which have been confirmed by them, and, therefore, the infallibility of the Church which guides herself by such decrees, falls to the ground.

FOURTH COUNCIL OF LATERAN, AND PERSECUTION OF HERETICS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—In the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, for February, 1853, you stated that the Lateran Council decreed that temporal princes should be compelled by the Pope to exterminate heretics from their dominions. I would feel deeply indebted if you would kindly answer such objections to the above as you may have heard stated, such as the denial of Dr. Doyle that it was a decree of a general council (see examination before House of Lords, April 21, 1825), and the assertion, or rather insinuation, of Milner ("End of Controversy," page 124), that it was only directed against persons who, on account of their crimes, deserved such treatment.

There are several friends of mine who would, I imagine, be led to doubt the infallibility of the Roman Catholic Church if doctrines so contrary to those which Christianity teaches were clearly shown to have been decided upon by an Œcumenical Council.

I would also wish to direct your attention to the statements made by Dr. Dixon, relating to the Apocrypha; they appear to me to be exceedingly absurd; and I consider it would be well if you would devote some of the space in your journal to answering them, as they are put forward by a person of such a high station in the Roman Catholic Church.

Trusting that you will persevere in the good work in which you are engaged,

I remain, Sir,
Yours, sincerely,
A PROTESTANT.

3rd February, 1855.

We thank our correspondent for calling our attention to a very important subject, on which we will endeavour to satisfy him.

We admit that Roman Catholics are excusable, in some cases, for being puzzled to know what are, and what are not, general councils.

Roman Catholics are bound, indeed, by the creed of Pope Pius IV., to believe, as matters of faith, and necessary to salvation, all that the general councils have defined; but their Church has not given them any authorised list of general councils, nor any means of knowing how many general councils there are. On this subject we refer to an article in our number for October, 1853, vol. ii., p. 116.

At the same time, there are *some* councils which the Church of Rome *has* declared to be general councils, which no one may venture to deny. The Council of Trent is an instance of this, and so is the Fourth Council of Lateran, which decreed the extermination of heretics. And it has often struck us with astonishment to see the coolness with which some Roman controversialists will deny those very authorities which, by the creed of Pope Pius IV., they are bound to believe, whenever the arguments of Protestants become so strong as to make them ashamed of confessing those authorities before the world.

We will now proceed to show what claims the Fourth Council of Lateran has to be acknowledged as a general council of the Church of Rome; and if any should then say they are not bound to receive its decrees, we ask them to consider what greater obligation they have to believe in the infallibility of the Pope's late decree on the Immaculate Conception.

The Fourth Council of Lateran was summoned by a circular letter of Pope Innocent III. In Labbe and Cossart, vol. xi., 123, we have a copy of the letter sent to the archbishop and bishops of the Province of Vienna. In that letter the Pope says—"Because these things concern the common state of all the faithful, *we consoke* A GENERAL COUNCIL according to the ancient custom of the holy Fathers."* The letter goes on to state the purposes for which this general council is called—"For extirpating vices and planting virtues, correcting excesses and reforming manners, for *rooting out heresies* and confirming the faith," &c., &c.† And, for full preparation, *two years* notice is given, because "a universal council could not conveniently be gathered quicker."‡ And the Pope thus speaks of the source whence this council originates—"Believing that this salutary proposal descends from Him by whom every best and every perfect gift is given;"§ referring to the Epistle of St. James, ch. i., v. 17.

Then follows a list of those to whom copies of this letter were sent, by which, it appears, that SEVENTY-SIX copies of this letter were sent out, each one directed to the archbishop and bishops of a province.‖

Then follows a letter to the Greek Emperor, calling on him to send special ambassadors to the council (col. 126), and a list of twelve other kings of Europe to whom similar letters were sent. Then follow letters to the patriarchs of Alexandria and Jerusalem, also summoning them to a "general council" (col. 128, 130).

So this was clearly a summons for a general council of the Church of Rome.

And the attendance was answerable to the summons. No less than four hundred and twelve bishops, besides eight hundred abbots and priors attended. And Pope Innocent himself presided at the council.

Now, we ask any Roman Catholic to tell us what was wanting here to constitute a general council of the Church of Rome.

Can any one show us a list of general councils in any Roman Catholic author, in which this Fourth Lateran

* Ut quia hæc universorum fidelium communem statum respiciunt, generale concilium juxta priscum sanctorum patrum consuetudinem convocamus.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. xi., 124.

† Ad extirpanda vitia, et plantanda virtutes, corrigendos excessus, et reformandos mores, eliminandas hæreses, ad roborandum fidem, &c.—Vol. xi., 124.

‡ Quia vero ante biennium, universale non possent concilium commode congregari.

§ Credentes igitur hoc salutare propositum ab Illo descendere, a quo est omne datum optimum, et omne donum perfectum.

‖ This whole list is given in Labbe and Cossart, vol. xi., 133, 136.

Council is not reckoned as one? Laurentius Sarius, a very learned man in Roman councils, says—"No one of sound mind can doubt that this Lateran Synod which follows was distinguished among the chief, and truly œcumenical. As being one in which the affairs of religion were treated of with the greatest concord of the Greek and Latin Church, at which were present the patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem, and SEVENTY archbishops, as well Latin as Greek, four hundred and twelve bishops, more than eight hundred abbots and priors—all the prelates, together, TWELVE HUNDRED AND FIFTEEN, or more."* And the canon law itself pronounces this a general council, as we shall see presently.

If this were not a general Roman council, what was?

Now let us see what this council did. They passed 70 canons. The first is—"de fide Catholica"—a confession of faith. The second is the condemnation of the doctrine of the Abbot Joachim. The third, about heretics, &c., &c. *All passed by the same authority.*

Now, let any Protestant only say, in our pages, that the doctrine of Transubstantiation was never decreed by any general council of the Roman Church before the Council of Trent, and then we should have a host of correspondents exclaiming against such ignorance, and pointing to the first canon of this very Council of Lateran, as the solemn decision of a general council in favour of Transubstantiation. We should admit that Roman Catholics are correct in giving such an answer. But when we then quote the 3rd canon of this very same council, as containing the decision of a Roman general council about heretics, what right have Roman Catholics, then, to turn round on us and say, that it is *not* a decree of a general council?

We can, however, prove, against them, that it is. We prove it from their own canon law. The Roman canonists of the present century lay it down that, whatever is in the decretals of Pope Gregory IX., is the law of the Church of Rome.†

Now, we turn to those decretals—Lib. v., Tit. vii., c. 13—and there we find this 3rd canon of the fourth Council of Lateran, and we find this heading to it—

"IDEM—viz., Innocent III.—IN CONCILIO GENERALI."

Thus the canon law itself declares this very canon to have been passed by a Pope *in a general council.*

Our readers will now like to see some extracts from this canon—"We excommunicate and anathematize EVERY HERESY which exalts itself against this holy, orthodox, and Catholic faith which we have expounded above; condemning *all heretics*, by whatever names they may be censured. . . . . Let the secular powers be admonished, and induced, and, if necessary, *let them be compelled by ecclesiastical censures*, whatever offices they fill, that as they desire to be reputed and counted faithful, they publicly *take an oath* for the defence *of the faith;* that in sincerity, to the utmost of their strength, *they will apply themselves to exterminate all heretics denounced by the Church.* . . . But if the temporal lord, having been required and warned *by the Church*, shall have neglected to purge his land from this heretical foulness, let him be bound with the chain of *excommunication*, by the metropolitan and the other comprovincial bishops; and if he shall have despised to make satisfaction within a year, let this be signified to *the supreme Pontiff*, that he (the Pope) may pronounce the vassals (or subjects) thenceforward *absolved from their allegiance*, and may expose his land to be seized *by the Catholics*, who shall possess it without any contradiction, *the heretics being exterminated*, and shall preserve it *in purity of faith.*"‡

There is not one word in the whole canon about civil crimes. It is directed against "every heresy," and "all heretics." It is for "purity of faith," not for civil welfare. It is THE CHURCH *compelling* the civil power, *by ecclesiastical censures*, to persecute heretics.

Now let us see what Bishop Milner has to say in answer to this.

First, he speaks of the authority by which this decree was passed. "It must first be observed," he says, "*who*, were present at this council, and *by whose authority* these decrees of a temporal nature were passed. There were then present, besides the Pope and the bishops, either in person or by their ambassadors, the Greek and the Latin Emperors, the Kings of England, France, Hungary, the Sicilies, Arragon, Cyprus, and Jerusalem; and the representatives of a vast many other principalities and states; so that, in fact, this council was a congress of Christendom, temporal as well as spiritual."—End of Controversy, letter 49.

Who, on reading this, does not think that this Council of Lateran was quite different in its constitution from the general councils of the Church of Rome—that it was, in fact, more of the nature of a Congress of the princes of Europe to settle the temporal affairs of Europe; and that for infallible decrees of the Church we must rather look to the purely spiritual councils of the Church?

Bishop Milner, it is true, does not *say* all this; but it was obviously what people would think on reading what he said, and that was just what the crafty bishop wished. The bishop knew as well as we do, that there *never* was a general council of the Church of Rome to which the princes of Europe were not summoned precisely as they were to this Council of Lateran. He knew that all the princes of Europe (Roman Catholic) were represented in the Council of Trent itself, precisely as they were in this Council of Lateran. But then he hoped that his readers would *not* know all this, and so wrote in a way that would lead them to think that this Lateran Council was an assembly of a quite different nature from the general councils, which are supposed to speak the sense of the Church. It is an instance of the disingenuous artifice by which this writer is always ready to take advantage of the ignorance of his readers. But such artifices are never used by clever men, except when they are conscious that their cause is bad, and that truth is against them.

And did Bishop Milner really suppose that in the Church of Rome *ecclesiastical censures* emanate from the princes and not from the bishops?

Second, Bishop Milner says—"The decree of the council regarded only the prevailing heretics of that time." But we have given the very words of the decree above—"Every heresy," "all heretics, by whatever names they may be censured," "all heretics denounced by the Church."

Is there one word here to confine the canon to heretics guilty of crimes? Does it not expressly speak of "ALL heretics?" Is there one word to confine it to the heretics of that time? If that were its meaning, why did Pope Gregory IX., twenty years after, embody it into a code of laws intended for all future ages—a code still held at Rome as being the law of the Church?

The fact is clear. A general council of the Church of Rome, with a Pope at its head, has made a decree in a point of morals, which all Roman Catholics now see was wrong; but they think it still necessary to maintain that a general council, with a Pope at its head, cannot go wrong, either in faith or morals. And so they are driven to every shift and evasion to try and get rid of this decree, against the plainest evidence of its authority and meaning. Let them not be content with such wretched shifts where God's truth and the salvation of their own souls are the things to be sought for. Let them confess that a Pope and a general council have erred against morals in this decree, and then they will be in a position to inquire, like honest men, whether a Pope and a general council have ever erred in a question of faith.

If our correspondent will tell us what work of Dr. Dixon's he refers to, we will attend to it.

ON BRUCIOLI'S BIBLE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Permit me to notice, for the benefit of your inquiring Roman Catholic readers, a letter, signed William Murphy, in the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, of Jan., 1854, p. 11, wherein the Bible translated by A. Brucioli is offered as evidence that "in every Catholic (Roman) country the circulation of the Scriptures is encouraged." You, sir, have had frequent occasion to complain that Roman Catholics too much rely on second-hand evidence, and on arguments long since refuted; but, perhaps, the enlistment of A. Brucioli's Bible as creditable to the Church of Rome, affords the most notable example. Cardinal Wiseman, twenty years ago, referred to the same Bible, with similar purpose, in his Moorfield lectures, which called forth the *admirable* "*letters*" to Dr. Wiseman," by the late Vicar of Blackburn, Dr. Whittaker, wherein he says—"In the account you give of Brucioli's Bible there is not one particle of truth, with the exception of the date of the editio princeps. I am convinced that you never saw the book, and must have taken your account of this distinguished individual on very bad second-hand authority."—p. 175. Dr. Whittaker in proof states that Antonio Brucioli was compelled to fly from Florence, and, with some risk, saved his life, having fallen under the suspicion of heresy. That (according to Dr. M'Crie, in his "Hist. of the Suppression of the Reformation in Italy," pp. 55, 56) Brucioli's Bible was ranked among prohibited books of the first class in the index of the Council of Trent. The Spanish index, then, before Dr. Whittaker, also holds it in the same class. That Brucioli's Bible was published "con privilegio de lo inclito Senata Veneto," and without any Roman authority whatever. Lastly, that the pictorial illustrations heading the 13th and 17th chapters of the Apocalypse, exhibit respectively a ferocious "beast" and the well-known impure female, described in the text as "madre de la fornicatione," each wearing the triple crown! the papal tiara!

I have myself seen Antonio Brucioli's Bible in Dr. Whittaker's library, and specially examined those boldly executed and instructive wood-cuts. Should Mr. William Murphy and his informant, the Editor of the *Weekly Telegraph*, only view the same, an indulgence which the Dublin libraries could no doubt afford, they will gladly withdraw their statement that "there was another (Italian version) by A. Buccioli (*sic*) in 1523 (1532), and that is promoted by all means within the command of the Church, of Popes, of cardinals, &c., &c."

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,
EDWARD M. HEARN.

Hurst-green Parsonage,
January 27, 1855.

WHAT DOES ST. PETER SAY ABOUT THE POPES?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I have read with great interest the correspondence of Mr. Rourke in the columns of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, and am happy to congratulate the members of the Roman and Protestant Churches on the auspicious circumstance of the truth being argumentatively contended for by the laity of both communities.

Priestcraft is but the working of ambition in the breasts and minds of unregenerate clergymen, who, excluded from its pursuits in the secular affairs of life, aim at the most fearful despotism that can be exercised over their fellow men, by means of that dark influence which is brought to bear upon spiritual hopes and fears in time and for eternity, and this craft succeeds only in proportion to the people's ignorance of the word of God, and their acceptance of other standards for their faith and practice; the true minister of the Gopel (Mark ix. 33 to 40. Hebrews viii. 1 to 6) does not seek to be a lord over God's heritage; he knows that he has authority in the Church only as it is committed to him, according to the revelations contained in Holy Scripture, and he makes no claim upon belief or submission of the judgment, for which he cannot appeal to the law and to the testimony of his God.

This world is the field in which wheat and tares are growing together till the harvest shall come, and wherever there is a priesthood or a ministry, there lurks in the hearts of the *unconverted* members of either body that proud spirit that would reign over men upon the earth and attain the glory of its kingdoms. The common safeguard against the most cruel of all tyrannies, lies in our capability of judging the pretensions that are put forth, and examining every ground of authority upon which they are asserted; looking no further than to secondary causes, we can see that it was the exercise of this right of judgment in a limited degree, that led to the comparative independence of the Gallican portion of the Church of Rome, and to the differences that have existed, not only between Jansenists and Jesuits, but between other more nearly accordant brotherhoods in the Papal system; it is the exercise of this right, ever under strictly-imposed limitations, that marks the distinction between the ultramontane and the more reasonable part of the subjects of the Roman see, and keeps alive whatever semblance of spiritual liberty they are either of them permitted to enjoy; it is the exercise of this right which, so far as it is properly carried out in every Church, operates as a check upon the ambition which is in man's fallen nature, whether that nature be clothed in priestly vestments or a layman's garb.

Now, sir, the Church of Rome makes high claims for its priesthood, and asserts that from them, and them only, the laity are to receive the dogmatic teaching of religion. Will Mr. Rourke kindly undertake to prove, for the benefit of every inquiring mind, from the inspired Epistles of St. Peter as his text, and the rest of Scripture for his corroborations—first, that the claims of the Pope and priesthood are right and true; and, secondly, that the dogmas which are exclusively Papal or Roman are in accordance with the sacred writings of the Apostle from whom the hierarchy of his Church claims descent? I ask this favour in all courtesy, and think that if he will accede to my request, he may, under God's blessing, either convince others of what is the truth, or elicit such arguments from you as may lead many to the knowledge of it as it is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

A.

THE ADVANTAGE OF HAVING AN INFALLIBLE GUIDE: IN WHAT DOES IT CONSIST?

SIR—There is nothing the importance of which the Church of Rome dwells more upon than divine faith—by divine faith she means, not what we call a practical living, or sanctifying faith, but a faith which is unwavering, because built upon the testimony of a witness known to be infallible; all else she calls human faith, reasonings, and guesses, and she utterly despises it. Now, there are two questions, to decide which, she maintains the necessity of such an infallible authority. First, is the Bible the Word of God? And, secondly, what is the meaning of its written message? She would enforce upon men this dogma, that their faith, as to these two points, must be built on infallible authority; or else, it is no true faith, nor of any value at all. I will take these two questions separately.

---

* Labbe & Cossart, vol. xi., p. 238.

† Quidquid igitur in iis comprehenditur, legem facit. Devoti, Jus Canonicum. Vol. i., 379. Romæ, 1837.

‡ Excommunicamus et anathematizamus, omnem hæresim extollentem se adversus hanc sanctam, orthodoxam, Catholicam fidem, quam superius exposuimus, condemnantes universos hæreticos, quibuscumque nominibus censeantur. . . . . Moneantur autem, et inducantur, et, si necesse fuerit, per censuram ecclesiasticam compellantur sæculares potestates, quibuscumque fungantur officiis, ut sicut reputari copiunt et haberi fideles, ita pro defensione fidei præstent publice juramentum, quod de terris sæ jurisdictioni subjectis universos hæreticos ab ecclesia denotatos bona fide pro viribus exterminare studebunt. . . . . Si vero Dominus temporalis requisitus et monitus ab ecclesia, terram suam purgare neglexerit ab hac hæretica fœditate, per metropolitanum et cæteros comprovinciales episcopos excommunicationis vinculo innodetur. Et si satisfacere contempserit infra annum, significetur hoc summo Pontifici; ut ex tunc ipse vassallos ab ejus fidelitate denunciet absolutos, et terram exponat Catholicis occupandam, qui eam, exterminatis hæreticis, sine ulla contradictione possideant, et in fidei puritate conservent . . . . . —Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 148.

• J. Hatchard and Son, London.

We, Protestants, she says, believe the Bible to be the Word of God merely on the authority of human reasonings. She herself, she says, on the contrary, places faith in it, because she accounts as infallible the testimony on which it rests. But who tells a Romanist that the Bible is the Word of God? His own branch of the Church, supposed by him to be infallible. A Romanist, then, boasts that he is *as sure* that the Bible is inspired, as he is that the witness to that fact is infallible. His argument is fair here. His certainty as to the authority of the Bible, may *equal* his certainty as to the infallibility of the Church which places it in his hands; but, receiving the Bible merely on the word of his Church, it is impossible that his confidence as to the inspiration of the Bible should be *stronger* than his assurance of the infallibility of the witness from whose hands and on whose sole credit he accepts it. We may well ask, then, what foundation a Romanist has for believing his Church to be infallible? If the Bible is to be received only on the testimony of one known to be infallible, this witness's infallibility must be received on the authority of some one else, previously ascertained to be infallible. If a Romanist were to believe his Church infallible on mere human reasonings and deductions, then his faith in the Bible, received on that Church's authority, would as much rest on human reasonings, as our own. On what grounds does a Romanist regard his Church as the one true Church? On what grounds does he believe that one Church is infallible? Will each individual Romanist pretend to a direct revelation from God announcing this fact to himself? No, doubtless! If not, will he pretend that the infallible one who maintains to him the infallibility of the Church is his confessor or parish priest, speaking officially and by the Church's authority? If so, the chain of evidence runs thus: every priest being so far infallible, supports the infallibility of the Church; and the infallible Church maintains the inspiration of Holy Scripture. But on what authority does an individual Romanist believe that each Romish priest is infallible? Nay, on what ground does he build his assurance, that any man calling himself a Romish priest, is really one at all? Does he receive these things on human testimony? If so, then on *that*, in the first place, rests his belief in the inerrancy of his priest; and the priest's word, in the second place, supports the Church's infallibility; and the Church's word, in the third place, upholds the inspiration of the book called the Bible. So that, in the end, the whole belief of a Romanist depends as much on human evidence, as our own does. If any link in a chain be too weak to support a weight, it is of very little consequence whether that infirm link be the one next to the weight, as in our case, or with a few interposed between, as in that of a Romanist. But Romanists, not seeing this, will wish, perhaps, to move the weak link a little further off still. Another infallible is called in, to speak to the infallibility of the man's spiritual instructor. Then we have Father B to prove the infallibility of Father A. But, then, who shall go security for Father B? Father C. must do this; and so on *ad infinitum*; or else the individual must believe his priest infallible solely on an immediate inspiration conveyed by God to himself personally. In that case, he is to credit it, not on human testimony, but because he has a conviction, that cannot deceive him, that God has revealed that fact to him. But, on the same authority, a Mormonite, or Irvingite, or follower of Joanna Southcote, may just as reasonably place faith in one of those unfounded systems. It will not satisfy Rome that God, having introduced Christianity into the world, established its claims by miraculous proofs; a superhumanly endowed witness must place the New Testament in each man's hand. Unless an infallible witness is thus brought into *immediate* contact with each man's mind, the Romish theory is incomplete. It is *there, next to the man himself*, that infallibility is required. Further off, a series of infallible authorities, each depending upon the other, are of no more use than the infallible Bible itself. Such an assurance as Rome demands can be had only by God sending an inspired messenger to speak to each of us, and, in that case, there would be little need either of the Inspired Volume or of the infallible Church to vouch for its authenticity. The meaning of the writings, when once their inspiration is acknowledged, is, of course, a different question—but of that hereafter.

Bishop Stillingfleet thus quotes and answers the Romish argument which I have been considering. The Papist argues—"As long as the infallibility of a revelation stands *remote* from me, for want of an undoubted application, made by an infallible proponent, it can no more transfuse certainty into faith, than fire, at a great distance, warmth" Stillingfleet replies—"If men cannot be infallible in believing the Apostles, unless there be other infallible proponents in every age, to assure them that the Apostles were inspired, why must not the infallibility of these present proponents be likewise so attested, as well as (that) of the Apostles; and what undoubted application can be made of the Church's infallibility, unless there be some other infallible proponent still to transfuse certainty into my belief of that by virtue of which I must believe all other matters of faith, which is the Church's infallibility. So that the last proponent must either be believed for himself, without any further evidence, and then the shorter way would be to believe the first so; or else there will be an endless infallibility; or, at last all must be resolved into the enthusiasm of every particular person."—Stillingfleet's answer, &c., p.p. 78, 83.

I have now considered the first purpose on account of which the Church of Rome asserts the necessity, and, *therefore, the existence*, of an infallible living authority. I have, I trust, shown that, for the end proposed, such an arrangement would be altogether worthless; I am next to consider the other use of an infallible, speaking, authority—namely, as an expounder of the meaning of Scripture: this, with your permission, I will reserve for a future occasion.

Your obedient servant,

A KILDARE CHURCHMAN.

MASS IN THE CRIMEA.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—We, in St. Giles, in London, sometimes get a look at your paper, and as I think you will give a straightforward answer to a plain question, I take the liberty of asking your honour about something we have heard lately from the Crimea, which mightily puzzles us all, and perplexes me out and out. We have always been taught to tell Protestants that the Mass is in the Protestant Bible, and that the last book in the Old Testament, Malachi I believe it is, says, that "From the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles; and *in every place* incense shall be offered unto my name and a pure offering."

Now, I see by the "Life of a Priest," in your last number (page 6), that "it was Gregory the Great who decorated the Mass with *incense* and light," &c.; and we are told that Gregory the Great was the man that sent Augustine into England, and that was about the year 600. And, your honour, was it 600 years before *incense* was offered in any place? I suppose the priest that says so is a good judge, and wouldn't say so if it wasn't so. But what puzzles me entirely is, that it is to be offered *in every place*, and yet one of the Roman Catholic chaplains at the war tells us the contrary, in a letter which your honour will see in the *Tablet* of January 6, 1855, page 5. There one of our own priests says, "Last Sunday I read the service in the open field—to offer the Holy Sacrifice *there* is *impossible*. In a day or two I hope I shall be able to get a tent of sufficient height for an altar, so as to offer Mass in my tent."

Now, what in the world is the meaning of all this? I am sure I can never again quote that text against Protestants anyhow. Sure, Mr. Editor, wouldn't they turn round on me and say, that one of our own priests admits that the Mass *cannot* be offered *in every place?* and what am I to say then? Sure two or three days at the least he can't get a tent at all—he only *hopes* to get one; and only think, Mr. Editor, of all the poor soldiers that must die in that time, and yet there is no Mass for them, because it can't be "offered in *every* place." But more than that, we hear that the clothes, food, and *tents* sent out from England have been delayed or lost, and, perhaps, this reverend gentleman's tent was among them; or if he got it, it was a chance whether it would be *the proper height*; and if it was *too low* for an altar, Mr. Editor, what was to be done then? The people in England, I'm sure, don't know *what height* an altar should be, nor, indeed, do I myself; but that's, perhaps, my own fault; and I hardly think they would, in the hurry and bustle, think of making the tent exactly to the liking of his reverence.

As I know you publish letters asking information, perhaps you will print this for me, and ask *what height* an altar should be? and why it is impossible to have the Mass in the open air? Certainly I have heard of great storms out there, and 'tis true they might blow out the candles, if the altar was exposed; but if the Mass is to save souls, couldn't they do without the lights in the day time, and thus save the candles too—and, by the same token, we hear they are wanting badly out there during the cold and dark nights.

Mr. Editor, if any body can give me the desired information, I'm sure you can. It's too bad to hear that Protestants can preach and pray in the open field, and, indeed, *in every place*, and that *we* can't. Excuse the inquisitive letter of

POOR PADDY.

St. Giles, London.

We readily insert Poor Paddy's letter, and hope some of our Roman Catholic correspondents will enable us to give an answer to it; which, of course, would be much more satisfactory, than any reply proceeding from ourselves. Our opinions on such matters are already well known. True religion is an affair of the heart, and neither consists in Masses or candles, tents or altars. Let those who think otherwise answer our correspondent, and we will readily insert it.

FARMING OPERATIONS FOR FEBRUARY.

(From the Irish Farmers' Gazette.)

WHEAT should be sown, with as little delay as possible, after the weather clears up, and the land becomes dry enough; the best varieties to sow will be the white ones, of which the red-chaffed white and the white-chaffed white are the most generally esteemed; if possible the sowing should be concluded within the month; but the true spring or April wheat (*Triticum æstivum*) may be sown as late as the middle of April.

Beans should be got in, as early as possible, this month. They require deep and clean cultivation, and a liberal supply of manure; good crops are obtained by broadcast sowing, and harrowing them in—this mode requires a clean tilth; but if the land be foul, drilling them in at 24 to 28 feet apart, will be the best mode; the most approved varieties are the tick, Heligoland, and Russian. A heavy, clay soil, but dry, is best suited for beans, and they make the best preparation for wheat, while the lighter and more calcareous ones are best suited for peas.

Peas should also be sown some time during the month; select the finer and lighter soils for their cultivation, which should be thoroughly clean, and moderately manured, taking the condition of the land into consideration, as too much would run the crop to too much straw; they may be sown either broadcast, or in drills 19 inches apart. If one-fourth beans are mixed with the peas they will serve to support and keep the latter off the ground; after thrashing they may be easily separated from the peas by a suitable riddle, though, if required for home consumption, it is not needful to do so, as both may be ground together for meal.

Spring Vetches should be sown early in the month, of a suitable breadth, to succeed the winter-sown, and be followed by successional sowings during the season, as will be directed in subsequent operations; the land will require a liberal dressing of manure; a little oats and rapeseed should be mixed with the vetches, which will improve the quality, and increase the bulk of the fodder.

Potatoes—Planting should be proceeded with when the weather is mild and open; since the appearance of the blight, planting potatoes have, with good results, preceded the sowing of oats and barley. Care should be taken not to plant in wet weather, or while the land is wet; in damp, backward soils, planting in beds is to be preferred; in light, dry soils they may be planted in the usual way in drills; but when an early crop is desirable the beds will, in most localities, be found the better mode, so as to obtain that object.

Rye and Bere may still be sown either for a soiling or seed crop.

Oats.—In favourable weather, and dry, early situations, oats may be sown this month, but in the majority of cases it will be better deferred till next month, particularly the white varieties; the black Tartary being hardy, may be sown by the middle of this month.

Parsnips may be sown any time during the month, providing the land be thoroughly pulverised, rich, and deep, and the weather mild and dry. Sow in drills 20 inches apart. Though parsnips may be sown with great advantage this month, we would only recommend sowing a small breadth—next month will be best for the general crop; heavy, deep soils, tolerably dry, are the best for parsnips, and they make an excellent preparatory crop for wheat; but light, sandy loams are best for carrots, though the latter, when rich and deep, produce excellent parsnips.

Grass Land, intended for meadowing, should be no longer trespassed upon, but shut up at once; if to be top-dressed with compost, no further delay should take place; when dry enough, the top-dressing should be bush-harrowed, all large stones and brushwood gathered and raked off, ant hills cut and scattered, and then well rolled.

Watered Meadows require particular attention during the month; see that the water be given in full and sufficient quantity, and that it flows evenly, regulating the outlets so that the discharge may be equal to the supply, allowing no stagnation on any part. When the land in one quarter is sufficiently saturated, which is indicated by a scum rising to the surface, turn the water off to irrigate another quarter, and when the first is sufficiently dry, lay on the water again; but in severe frosts, the water must not be turned off till the frost is gone; water should not be turned over land during frost.

Fatting Stock will now be approaching maturity, when sales should be effected, so as to economise provender for the stores which have the most pinching time of the year before them.

Ewes in Lamb will now require much care, turnips should not be given too profusely, and they should have free access to good hay, with oil-cake and rock-salt in their troughs; but sudden changes in their food should be avoided.

Fatting Sheep, and stores of all ages, should have a regular increase of artificial food, such as rape, turnips, mangels, oil-cake, &c., with salt. Those in sheds should be regularly littered, and have their feet examined and pared.

Fatting Calves and Lambs require great care and attention, with abundance of cow's milk, dry, warm lodging, and clean beds; salt and chalk should be laid in their troughs to lick at pleasure.

Fatting Pigs should have plenty of cooked turnips, mangels, or other roots, mixed liberally with pea, bean, or barley meal; clean out their troughs when done feeding, and give the refuse to the stores. All pigs should have free access to pure water.

Farm Horses.—As the days advance in length, and the hours of work increase, the teams will require full and liberal rations, and particularly an increase in the quantity of corn.

SELECTION OF

NEW WORKS

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

SKETCHES, LEGAL AND POLITICAL, by the late Right Honourable Richard Lalor Sheil. With notes by M. W. Savage. 2 vols. 21s.

THIRTY YEARS OF FOREIGN POLICY: a History of the Secretaryships of the Earl of Aberdeen and Viscount Palmerston. 8vo. 12s.

LIFE OF NICHOLAS I., EMPEROR OF RUSSIA; with a short account of Russia and the Russians. By F. Mayne. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

A MONTH IN THE CAMP BEFORE SEBASTOPOL. By a Non-combatant. 5s.

LITERARY PAPERS, by the late Professor Edward Forbes, F.R.S. Selected from his writings in the *Literary Gazette*. 6s.

CONNYBEARE AND HOUSTON'S LIFE AND EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL. With beautiful Steel Engravings and Maps. 2 vols. 4to. £2 8s.

CHRIST, AS MADE KNOWN TO THE ANCIENT CHURCH: an Exposition of the Revelation of Divine Grace, as unfolded in the Old Testament Scriptures. By the late Robert Gordon, D.D. 4 vols. 8vo. £2 2s.

"CHRIST IS ALL;" the Gospel of the Old Testament —Genesis. By the Venerable Henry Law, Archdeacon of Wells. 3s.

A TREATISE ON BIBLICAL CRITICISM; exhibiting a systematic view of that Science. By Samuel Davidson, D.D. 8vo. 18s.

HISTORY OF THE FRENCH PROTESTANT REFUGEES, from the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes to the present time. By Charles Weiss. 8vo. 14s.

LIFE IN THE MISSION, THE CAMP, and ZENANA; or, Six Years in India. By Mrs. Colin Mackenzie. 2 vols. 8vo. 21s.

MEMOIR OF THE LIFE AND WRITINGS OF JAMES MONTGOMERY; including Selections from his Correspondence and Conversations. By John Holland and James Everett. 2 vols. Post 8vo. 21s.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF THE REV. WM. JAY; with Reminiscences of some distinguished Contemporaries, Selections from his Correspondence, &c. By George Redford, D.D., and J. A. James, D.D. 8vo. Second Edition. 12s.

LADIES OF THE REFORMATION; Memoirs of distinguished Female Characters belonging to the period of the Reformation—England, Scotland, and the Netherlands. By Rev. James Anderson. 12s. 6d.

THE PLURALITY OF WORLDS. The Positive Argument from Scripture; with Answers to some late Objections from Analogy. 3s. 6d.

MORE WORLDS THAN ONE: THE CREED OF THE PHILOSOPHER, AND THE HOPE OF THE CHRISTIAN. By Sir David Brewster. 6s.

OF THE PLURALITY OF WORLDS. An Essay. With a Dialogue on the Subject. 6s.

BURKE'S PEERAGE AND BARONETAGE OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND, Corrected to the present time. Royal 8vo. 38s.

BURKE'S LANDED GENTRY OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND, Containing the names of upwards of 100,000 persons, corrected to the present time. Royal 8vo. 42s. [Very shortly.]

DOD'S PEERAGE, BARONETAGE, AND KNIGHTAGE OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND, for 1855. 10s. 6d.

FOSTER'S POCKET PEERAGE OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND, Containing also the Baronetage. 6s.

WHO'S WHO, in 1855. A Pocket Peerage, &c., &c. 2s 6d.

THE ENGLISH CLERGY LIST for 1855. Containing also a List of the Clergy in Ireland, Scotland, and the Colonies, &c. 9s.

THE PULPIT FOR 1854. Sermons by eminent living Ministers. Vol. II. Containing 104 Sermons. 7s. 6d.

THE DUBLIN UNIVERSITY CALENDAR FOR 1855. 5s.

THOM'S IRISH ALMANAC AND OFFICIAL DIRECTORY FOR 1855. 12s. 6d.

THOM'S IRISH ALMANAC AND COUNTRY DIRECTORY, 1855. 6s. 6d.

THE ENGLISHWOMAN IN RUSSIA; or, the Russians at Home. Described by a lady 10 years resident there. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

ESSAYS SELECTED FROM CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE "EDINBURGH REVIEW." By Henry Rogers. 3 vols. 21s.

MACAULAY'S CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL ESSAYS. 2 vols. 8s.

THE FOOTSTEPS OF ST. PAUL. By the Author of "The Faithful Promiser." 5s.

THE MIND OF JESUS. By the Author of "Morning and Night Watches." 8d.; cloth, 1s.

THE GLORY OF THE HOLY GHOST. By Rev. Peter M'Laren. 3s. 6d.

CHRISTIAN RETIREMENT; OR, SPIRITUAL EXERCISES OF THE HEART. By T. S. Reade, Esq. New Edition. 6s.

IMPRESSIONS OF CHINA AND THE PRESENT REVOLUTION. By Captain Fishbourne. 6s.

LADY WAKE'S SIMPLE COMMENTARY ON THE NEW TESTAMENT. 2 vols. 12s.

BICKERSTITH'S CONDENSED NOTES ON SCRIPTURE; being the Substance of Sermons, selected from his MS. Notes, and revised by his Son. 10s. 6d.

EVENINGS WITH THE ROMANISTS; with an Introductory Chapter on the Moral Results of the Romish System. By Rev. Hobart Seymour. 8s. 6d.

THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH OF ROME: A Correspondence between the Right Rev. Bishop Brown, of Chepstow, and the Rev. Joseph Baylee, M.A., St. Aidan's College, Birkenhead. 2s.

THE JUDGMENT OF GOD UPON THE NATIONS.—Pius IX., the Last of the Popes. 1s. 6d.

THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION OF OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST: A Sermon preached on the Feast of the Nativity, 1854, with some Notes on the New Dogma of the Church of Rome. By Rev. W. P. Walsh. 1s.

THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY, Historically reviewed. By the Rev. Robert Magnire, Islington. 1d.

THE NEW ROMISH DOGMA OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION; or, Trial of the Church of Rome before a Jury of Irish Roman Catholics. By the Rev. Edward Maguire. 6d.

ISRAEL IN THE WORLD; or, the Mission of the Hebrews to the great Military Monarchies. By W. H. Johnstone, M.A. 3s. 6d.

A WORD IN SEASON; or, Comforting Thoughts to the Relatives of the Fallen Brave. By Rev. Dr. Cumming. 1s.

THE ROVING BEE; or, a Peep into many Hives. Edited by Mrs. Whately. 3s. 6d.

DETACHED THOUGHTS AND APOPHTHEGMS, extracted, by permission, from some of the writings of Archbishop Whately. 3s.

SCIENTIFIC CERTAINTIES OF PLANETARY LIFE; or, Neptune's Light as great as ours. By T. C. Simon. 6s.

THE MORNING LAND; a Family and Jewish History. By the Author of "Leila Ada." 5s.

LEGENDS OF MOUNT LEINSTER.—THREE MONTHS IN KILDARE-PLACE.—BANTRY AND DUFFREY TRADITIONS.—THE LIBRARY IN PATRICK-STREET. By Harry Whitney Philomath. 2s.

FERN LEAVES FROM FANNY'S PORTFOLIO. First and Second Series. Complete in one volume. 2s.

PHILIP O'FLAHERTY, THE YOUNG SOLDIER. Containing interesting particulars of the War in the Crimea. 6d.

Just Published, price 3d., by post 5d.,

Here and Hereafter:

A SERMON TO CHILDREN,

PREACHED IN

TRINITY CHURCH,

ON THURSDAY, JANUARY 11, 1855.

BY THE

REV. JOHN GREGG, A.B,

MINISTER OF TRINITY CHURCH.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London: WERTHEIM and MACKINTOSH.

Just Published,

A Controversial Correspondence

BETWEEN

THE REV. P. MACLACHLAN (ROMAN CATHOLIC PRIEST),

AND

R. W. KENNARD, ESQ.

Part I. 1s. Part II. 2s.

London: WERTHEIM and MACINTOSH. Dublin: WM. CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

New Tracts by the Rev. J. C. Ryle.

WHAT IS WANTED? Being Thoughts and Suggestions on some of the Chief Wants of the Church of England in the present day. 4d.

HAVE YOU PEACE? A Tract for 1855. 2s. per dozen.

ARE YOU READY? A Tract for a New Year. 6d. per dozen.

PLAIN SPEAKING. *Second Series.* Being 40 Short Large-type Tracts in a packet. 1s.

*** All Mr. RYLE'S other Tracts constantly kept in Stock.

London: WERTHEIM and MACINTOSH. Dublin: WM. CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Just Published, in 2 vols., 8vo, with Maps and Plates, price 12s.,

Journal of a Deputation,

SENT TO THE EAST

BY THE

COMMITTEE OF THE MALTA PROTESTANT COLLEGE IN 1849.

Containing an Account of the Present State of the Oriental Nations, including their Religion, Learning, Education, Customs, and Occupations, &c.

BY A LAY MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE.

London: J. NISBET and Co., 21, Berner's-street. Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

In the Press, and shortly will be Published,

A Digest of the Evidence,

TAKEN BEFORE THE

SELECT COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS,

Appointed to Inquire into the Working of the National System of Education in Ireland.

By the Rev. WILLIAM LEPOER TRENCH, D.D., Rector of Killereran, Diocese of Tuam, and one of the Honorary Secretaries of the Church Education Society for Ireland.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Military Books.

THE QUEEN'S REGULATIONS AND ORDERS FOR THE ARMY. 9s.

ADDENDA TO QUEEN'S REGULATIONS. 6s.

THE MUTINY ACT AND ARTICLES OF WAR. 4s.

INFANTRY SWORD EXERCISE. 2s.

THE INFANTRY MANUAL. 2s.

MITCHELL'S SYSTEM OF LIGHT DRILL. 4s.

COLONEL JEBB'S MANUAL FOR THE MILITIA. 2s.

MARTIN'S GUIDE TO THE MILITARY EXAMINATION. 4s. 6d.

Sold by WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

Just Published, Royal 4to, Cloth, price 5s. 6d.,

THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN,

VOLUME III.,

WITH A COPIOUS INDEX.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London: WERTHEIM and MACINTOSH.

Just Published, 18mo., in a Coloured Wrapper,

PRICE 3d.,

or, 21s. per hundred for gratuitous circulation,

POPULAR STORIES,

CONTAINING:

THE TWO FARMERS OF BALLINTUBBER.
THE INFALLIBLE DOCTOR.
THE LANDLORD'S LETTER.

Also, price 1d.,

THE FAIR OF LOUGHMANAGH,

Each of the above stories may be had separately, price 1d., or 7s. 6d. per hundred, for gratuitous distribution.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Just Published, price 1s.; Cloth, 1s. 6d.,

THE TALK OF THE ROAD: Showing how Irish people talk about Irish doings, when they get a quiet place, at the back of a ditch, or under a hedge.

"A most interesting little volume, from the pen of one who seems to be well acquainted with the Irish character, and the doings of the priests in our sister island. We felt highly entertained by its perusal, and can cordially recommend it to our readers. That it will prove serviceable to the cause of truth, we doubt not. Missionaries to the Irish Roman Catholics will find in it a valuable assistant."—*Edinburgh Witness.*

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London: WERTHEIM and MACKINTOSH.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher, WILLIAM CURRY, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

FEBRUARY, 1855.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Θlóιp do Dhia añ pna háροuiδ, agur píoδcáin aip an δealaiṁ δeaġčoil do na δáoiniδ.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED THE MIDDLE OF EVERY MONTH, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. IV.—No. 39. MARCH, 1855. { Annual Subscription, 3s. 6d. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Matrimony	25
The Abbe Laborde on the Immaculate Conception	26
Autobiography of a Roman Catholic Priest—No. VI.	27
Roman Catholic Antinomianism—St. Alphonso Liguori	28
Thoughts on the Romish system, by the ex-Abbe Miel	30
Romanism in America	31
Recent Controversy at Boulogne, between Rev. Dr. Moeran and two Roman Catholic Laymen—continued	32
Correspondence:	
On Purgatory—by Mr. E. Power	34
On Infallibility in the Church of Rome—by In Earnest	35
Farming Operations for March	36

MATRIMONY.

Some time since we happened to be present at a wedding which was celebrated under rather peculiar circumstances, in the fine old parish Church of St. Roch, at Paris. Most of our readers who know any thing of the gay and lively character of the French, will be apt to imagine that a Parisian wedding must present a scene of no ordinary joy and festivity. They will picture to themselves the Church decorated with flowers; the aisles thronged with a numerous assemblage of friends and neighbours; a gaily-dressed bridal-party standing before the altar—in short, fancy and imagination will lead them to group together every circumstance calculated to excite and enhance the social feelings of mirth and enjoyment.

The scene which we actually witnessed was the very reverse of all this. The walls of the church were hung in black; a coffin, covered with its funeral pall, stood on a bier in the centre of the aisle, surrounded by a crowd of mourners; the solemn words were uttered, which consigned the corpse to its kindred clay; and the last notes of the touching requiem for the dead were still re-echoing along the vaulted roof, when the bride and bridegroom, accompanied by one or two friends, glided out of a side door, and advanced with noiseless step to the altar, where an aged priest was waiting to bestow upon them the nuptial benediction.

The circumstance which caused this strange and ominous juxta-position of the two most opposite solemnities of the Church, is easily explained. A very wealthy old lady had recently died in the neighbourhood, who, during her lifetime, had been remarkable for her numerous acts of charity to the poor; and the clergy of the parish wished to mark their sense of her liberality and beneficence by giving to her remains the honour of a public funeral. If the wedding party, as is most probable, were ignorant of this arrangement, they must have been startled at the gloomy aspect which the church presented on their arrival. In Ireland we fear that a marriage, celebrated under such melancholy auspices, would give rise to the most gloomy forebodings respecting the future happiness of the wedded pair. Perhaps the lively character of the French enables them to shake off such impressions with greater ease than we can. Minds that are susceptible of deep emotion are often more readily influenced by superstitious feelings.

The wedding above alluded to was the first solemnity of the kind that we had ever witnessed in a Roman Catholic Church; and we were incidentally led by it to study, at some length, the sentiments of the chief divines of that Church on the Romish doctrine regarding matrimony—a subject on which we beg now to offer a few brief remarks. Some of the articles which have appeared, from time to time, in our pages, must, we fear, have proved rather dry and uninteresting, especially to the fairer portion of our readers. Discussions on controverted theological questions, however really important their subject-matter may be, cannot always be made as amusing as a newspaper; and the hard names of old Greek and Latin writers, such as Vincentius Lirinensis, or Gregory Thaumaturgus, will not run off female lips as smoothly as the words of an Italian song. But marriage, fortunately, is a topic in which all ladies are generally supposed to take a lively interest, present or prospective; and we may hope, therefore, for some portion of their attention, while we endeavour to state the doctrine of the Church of Rome, on a ceremony which forms such an important epoch in the life of almost every individual.

It is needless for us, we suppose, to remind the great majority of our readers that, while the Church of England holds that there are only *two* sacraments—Baptism and the Lord's Supper—the Church of Rome believes that there are *seven*, of which Marriage is one. Perhaps, however, it may be new to many persons to learn, that this doctrine of seven sacraments is of comparatively recent origin, and that it cannot be traced farther back than the middle of the twelfth century. This fact is acknowledged by Cassander, one of the most eminent ritualists of the Romish Church. "Until the days of Peter Lombard," saith he, "you shall scarce find any author who set down any certain and definite number of sacraments."* Peter Lombard, we may observe, lived about A.D. 1150; so that it is proved, on the clearest evidence, that the modern doctrine of the Church of Rome on the number of sacraments was not known for more than a thousand years after Christ. We need not be surprised, therefore, to find Cardinal Bellarmine losing his temper a little, and getting testy and cross, when he was pressed to prove, out of the Fathers, the exact necessity of this number seven. "Our opponents," he exclaims, "have no business to ask us to point out to them, either in Scripture or the Fathers, the exact number of seven sacraments; for Scripture and the Fathers did not write catechisms!"† They certainly did not; and if Bellarmine, or any other cardinal or Pope, thought fit to publish to the world his or their private opinion, that there were seven, or seven hundred sacraments, we would not quarrel with them upon a mere speculative question, nor would we trouble them for reasons on one side or the other; but the matter becomes very different when the belief of this particular number is made a necessary condition of salvation. In this case, with all deference to the learned cardinal, the demand for *proof* seems not only reasonable, but a point of positive obligation.

The Council of Trent (as we have had occasion, more than once, to remind our readers) published the following canon in its seventh session:—"If any man shall say that all the sacraments of the new law were not instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ, *or that they are more or fewer than seven, let him be accursed.*"‡ One would think, that before the venerable fathers of the Council had arrived at this conclusion, respecting the exact number of the sacraments, they must have had before them evidence the most clear and unmistakeable for the doctrine which they have expressed in such strong and seemingly uncharitable language. We turned, therefore, with a good deal of curiosity, to the history of the Council, in order to learn the precise nature of the arguments which the learned fathers found so clear and convincing; and we must frankly confess that, if we were not satisfied with the result of our researches, we were, at least, considerably amused. But we must adduce one or two specimens, in order that our readers may judge for themselves.

The first place is due to the eminent divine, Tyraboscus, who, at that time, filled the dignified office of Patriarch of Venice. On Quadragesima Sunday, 1563, he delivered a sermon before the Council, part of which runs as follows:—"The world," saith he, "was created in seven days." This was certainly beginning at the beginning; although what relation exists between the number of the sacraments and that of the days of the creation it is not very easy to see. We always believed, moreover, that the world was created in *six* days, and not *seven*; Tyraboscus, however, seems to have thought this difference immaterial. But he then proceeds with a fresh argument—"The people in the wilderness were fed by five loaves and two fishes. Now, five and two make seven. The Apostle Philip said, two hundred penny-worth of bread was not sufficient for them. The meaning of this is, that the mysteries of the Old and New Testaments were not sufficient for enlightening the people. But how shall the Council find bread for satisfying the people? By establishing seven sacraments!"* If any of our readers find this argument conclusive, they must be much subtler logicians than we can pretend to be. We were always aware that the Church of Rome, in all ages, took pretty good care of the loaves and fishes; but we certainly never could have guessed that such a deep mystery as the number of the seven sacraments, lay hid in the Evangelist's simple account of our Lord's miracle, until it was drawn forth to light by the sagacity of the profound Tyraboscus.

We have not space to dwell at any length upon the other reasons (if they can be called such) alleged in the Council of Trent, on behalf of the particular number seven, which was then declared by the Church of Rome to be the proper infallible number of the sacraments. Scripture and tradition, as we have seen, were disregarded altogether; and instead of arguments drawn from these sources, we find a puerile enumeration of the various properties and qualities of the number seven. The fathers of the Council, we are informed by the historian,† dwelt, with tiresome prolixity, on the seven cardinal virtues, the seven deadly sins, the seven plagues of Egypt, the seven planets, the seven candlesticks of the Apocalypse. It was not thought fit, however, to insert any of these fine reasons in the decree of the Council; and as there were no others for holding to the number seven, no reasons were inserted at all. When the Roman Catholics of our day tell us that there are seven sacraments, they do so with so much confidence that one could hardly think it possible that this number was unknown for twelve centuries, and that it was finally fixed and determined in the manner we have described. They themselves, for the most part, suspect this less than any one. They have not the most distant idea that the doctrine of seven sacraments has not been recognised and taught in their Church since its foundation; and it is with the most perfect good faith that they ask, how any man can be bold enough to attack that venerated number? And yet, we trust, we have now shown what little reason the Council of Trent could allege for its sweeping and uncharitable anathemas.

In this long digression, however, we have almost lost sight of the question of marriage with which we started, and to which we must now return. Perhaps some of our more inquisitive readers may ask, how matrimony ever came to be included in the list of sacraments? We believe that the true reason is as follows:—In the dark ages, somewhere about the eleventh or twelfth century, a few writers, arguing on the fanciful analogies, of which a specimen has been given above, came to the conclusion, that the Church *ought to have* seven sacraments; and, having done so, they began to look about them, in order to find what these seven sacraments should be.‡ Now, St. Paul, when speaking of the primary institution of marriage in his Epistle to the Ephesians, had used the words, "This is a great mystery;"§ which were thus translated by the Latin Vulgate, Hoc est sacramentum magnum—"this is a great sacrament." Here, then, the Roman Catholic divines found one of their seven sacraments ready made to their hand; and it was no wonder that, at a time when the clergy knew but little Latin and less Greek, the argument derived from this passage of the Vulgate should have been deemed conclusive. "St. Paul," saith the Jesuit writer, Mumford, "applieth here the very name of sacrament to matrimony, which name is not once in all the Scripture applied to any of the other sacraments."

---

* Non temere quenquam reperies ante Petrum Lombardum qui certum aliquem ac definitum numerum sacramentorum statuerat.—*Cassander, Consult*, art. 13, p. 961. Paris, 1616.

† Non debere adversarios petere a nobis ut ostendamus in Scripturis aut Patribus nomen septenarii numeri sacramentorum; Scriptura enim, et Patres non scripserunt catechismum.—*Bellarm., lib. 2, de effectu Sacram., cap. 24*, Tom. iii., p. 53. Colon., 1615.

‡ Si quis dixerit, sacramenta novæ legis non fuisse omnia a Jesu Christo, Domino nostro, instituta, aut esse plura vel pauciora quam septem, anathema sit.—*Decret. Conc. Trid., Sess.* vii., Can. 1.

* Dominica quadragesimæ, anno 1563, Tyraboscus Venetiarum Patriarcha, orationem habuit in Concilio Tridentino. Mundi creationi (inquit) dies septimus die imperitus est; saturando populo quinque panes et duo pisces, quæ septem efficiunt, sufficerunt. Quod D. Philippo dictum est, Centenarium denariorum panem non sufficere, hunc habet sensum, Veteris nempe et novi Testamenti mysteria populo illuminando non satis esse. At quomodo septenarium panem saturando populo invenies? Septem nempe constituendo sacramenta!—*Gandilat. Exam., Conc. Trid., lib. 4, Sess. 22, Num. 26.*

† *Vide* Sarpi, Hist. Conc. Trid., lib. ii., cap. 58, vol. i., p. 356. London, 1736.

‡ See the curious and amusing argument which is developed with much seeming plausibility in the catechism of the Council of Trent. It has the modesty, however, to advance this argument, not as demonstrative, but as merely probable (probabili quadam ratione).—Vide Catech. Conc. Trid., Pars. ii., cap. i., quæst. 13.

§ τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν—Ephes. v. 32.

So far, then, the right of matrimony to be considered a good and proper sacrament would seem to be plausibly made out. But there are two sides to every question, and many Roman Catholic theologians were either too acute, or too honest, not to perceive and acknowledge the difficulties with which the doctrine of the sacramental character of matrimony was embarrassed. Let us briefly advert to one or two of these difficulties.

The Council of Trent, as we have already seen, had laid down, as the first quality which a sacrament ought to possess, that it must have been *instituted by Christ*. In this point we and they are cordially agreed; for the Church of England, in her catechism, makes the very same asssertion. But when did Christ institute the sacrament of marriage? We search in vain for an answer. Let us hear the well-known Roman Catholic writer, Dens, on this subject. "The Council of Trent," saith he, "has defined that the sacrament of marriage was instituted by Christ; but *when* this was done *is by no means clear*. Some say that it was instituted when Christ was present at the marriage at Cana of Galilee, which he honoured with his presence, and is said to have blessed.—John ii. According to others, it was instituted when Christ, bringing back matrimony to its primeval unity, and rejecting the bill of divorce, said, 'What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder.'—Matt. xix. But others refer its institution to the time of the forty days between the resurrection and ascension, during which Christ often taught his apostles concerning the kingdom of God, or his Church. *Others say the time is uncertain.*"* Thus the institution of marriage, as a sacrament, cannot be discovered by the ablest Romish divines. The Council of Trent is unable to find, in Scripture, the place where Christ established it. The Roman catechism adroitly evades this point, and leaves the matter in the same uncertainty as it found it. May we not well ask, what is the good of a central infallible authority if it will not give positive information on such points? Is this a specimen of the boasted harmony and unity of opinion prevalent in the Church of Rome, touching an important sacrament?

But it is said we have no need to settle this point, because St. Paul, in the above quoted passage from the Epistle to the Ephesians, distinctly calls marriage a sacrament. The reply, however, is obvious. The "mystery" spoken of by the apostle, lies not in marriage, but in the union of Christ with his people. "This is a great mystery; but I speak concerning Christ and the Church." The Latin word *sacramentum* is, indeed, used by the Vulgate to translate the Greek word *μυστήριον*; but this word, in Scripture usage, never refers to any rite or ceremony whatsoever, but is generally used to denote the hidden meaning of some type, allegory, dream, vision, or figurative description. Thus we read in the Vulgate of "the sacrament of God's will" (Eph. i. 9); "the sacrament of godliness" (1 Tim. iii. 16); "the sacrament of a dream" (Dan. ii. 18, 30, 47); "the sacrament of the seven stars" (Rev. i. 20); "the sacrament of the woman" (Rev. xvii. 7). Are we to hold all these to be sacraments, in the modern sense of the word, because the Vulgate translators have thought fit to use the word *sacramentum* in each of them? This principle of interpretation would quickly lead us to into strange absurdities.†

As yet, however, we are only on the threshold of our difficulties, with regard to the sacrament of marriage. The Catechism of the Council of Trent tells us that the proper idea of a sacrament is, that it is "an *efficacious* channel of divine grace."‡ But what grace does matrimony effectually confer? This is a question on which we feel sure that all our readers, married or unmarried, will be anxious to know the truth. The charge has often been brought against us by political economists of the school of Malthus, that the Irish young people were always in too great a hurry to get married. We will not now discuss the prudential view of the question; but, certainly, if the doctrine of the Church of Rome be true, that marriage is a sacrament, and that all the sacraments are efficacious channels of divine grace, we think the argument for early marriages would be very strong indeed.

The Council of Trent, which seemed to take a malicious pleasure in letting fly an anathema against all who differed in opinion from itself, pronounces every person to be accursed who denies that grace is conferred by the sacraments always and upon all persons, as far as God is concerned.§ Hence, if matrimony be really a sacrament, it must efficaciously confer grace always and upon all persons who do not place an obstacle in the way. But are the Romish doctors agreed upon the nature of the efficacious grace which matrimony confers? Alas! we are bound, in all honesty, to declare that there are the bitterest contentions among them upon this very question.

One of the most provoking embarrassments of theological controversy is, to have to deal with antagonists who *profess* to be united in opinion, and then to find, on closer examination, that scarce any two are of the same mind. An ancient Greek author has left us an account of an amusing scene which once took place in a theatre. Some ingenious artist had trained a number of monkeys to stand together in line, and to go through various military manœuvres with much order and regularity. This novel exhibition attracted crowded audiences, and everything went on very harmoniously, until at length, on one occasion, some mischievous wag threw a handful of nuts on the stage. Instantly the spell was broken, and all the monkeys began forthwith to fight and scramble together; to the dismay and disappointment of their owner.

It is far from our intention to cast any disrespect upon the learned divines of the Church of Rome; but we really feel that the anecdote just cited gives no very unfair representation of the want of harmony which too often prevails among them. In *words* they profess to belong to a Church whose great boast is unity of faith; but when some particular fact or doctrine is thrown amongst them for discussion, where is this unity to be found?

Let us begin with Peter Lombard, the great Master of the Sentences. He distinctly denied that grace was conferred by matrimony.* Again, the same opinion is often stated, with equal clearness, by the schoolmen. The author of the Gloss upon Gratian, in the canon law, affirms it several times. "Marriage," saith he, "is *not* one of those sacraments which confer the consolation of divine grace."† And, again, "in this sacrament, the grace of the Holy Spirit is *not* conferred, as it is in the others." The Roman correctors could not bear this; they say, in the margin, "Immo confert"—yea, matrimony doth confer grace; but, instead of proving the point, they refer back again to the decree of the Council of Trent, before cited. That is as much as to say, the thing is true because it is true.

Again, Durandus, one of the most learned of the Romish divines, not only asserts the same opinion as Peter Lombard, but gives his proof. "Matrimony," saith he, "does not confer the *first* grace, which is that of justification; nor does it *increase* grace; for if it did, the married person would have more grace than the unmarried; and, therefore, there would be no virtue in celibacy. Hence, if matrimony neither confers the first grace, nor increases grace, it can confer no grace at all."‡ Durandus adds an amusing argument on the same side, which he says is supplied by the lawyers—"A treaty of marriage," say they, "is good in law, if one of the conditions be that a certain sum of money shall be paid down—*e.g.*, for the lady's fortune; but this would be altogether unlawful, if matrimony conferred grace; because the essence of the crime of simony consists in this, that it is an attempt to purchase the grace of God for money!"§

What conclusion are we to come to, therefore, on this knotty question? We are anathematized by the Council of Trent if we venture to deny that divine grace is effectually bestowed in and by the sacrament of matrimony; but if, according to Durandus and the Master of the Sentences, matrimony neither confers the first grace, nor increases grace, we may well ask what grace does it confer? And, moreover, if every marriage, where the lady has any fortune, involves a simoniacal contract, in what a melancholy condition does this doctrine of the lawyers place the great majority of married people in the world!

But it is needless to press the argument farther. A clear proof that the Church of Rome does not believe her own doctrine (as Durandus very plainly hints), is afforded by the law which she has laid down regarding the celibacy of the clergy. Can anything be more absurd than to assert, that matrimony effectually confers grace, and yet to debar a large body of men and women from all access to the source from which this grace is supposed to flow? What should we think of a man who told his friend that a good dinner would add to his bodily strength, and yet that he would be stronger if he ate no dinner at all?

This, however, is not the only absurdity into which the Church of Rome has fallen relative to this supposed sacrament. She asserts that the *intention of the minister* is necessary to the validity of the sacraments; and, therefore, if this intention be *wanting* in the sacrament of matrimony (which can never be certainly known), the two parties are not really married at all!

We must defer the consideration of this branch of the subject, however, to some future opportunity.

THE ABBE LABORDE ON THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION.

IN our last number we examined at some length the statements and assertions of the Letter Apostolic of Pope Pius IX. on the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. The subject is of such immense importance, and so intimately bound up with the faith and worship of the whole Roman Catholic Church in the present day, that we make no apology for again returning to it. Every day brings to light some fresh fact tending to show how dangerous and impolitic was the step which the Pope has just taken of propounding a *new* article of faith. We learn from an Italian newspaper (the *Cattolico*, of Genoa) that four priests of Pavia—MM. Teuca, Parona, Grigiani, and another, whose name is not given—have recently been suspended by their bishop for declaring that the Pope had no authority to impose this new doctrine on the Church without the consent of a General Council. . . . . .

We doubt not but that many more priests, in Italy and elsewhere, are of the same opinion as the four confessors of Pavia.

Those of our readers who have read the Pope's Letter Apostolic, will find, that among the reasons he assigns for his late decree, two are put prominently forward. The first is, that the Roman Catholic bishops and people unanimously called upon him to declare the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. "Communi veluti voto a Nobis expostularunt" are the Pope's own words—"They demanded it as if with common consent." The second reason is, that "it was proved, by illustrious monuments of a venerable antiquity, that this doctrine always existed in the Church, and that it was the *clear, unanimous opinion* of the Fathers."

Now, the document which we publish below will, if we mistake not, demonstrate the weakness and insufficiency of the Pope's attempted justification of his conduct. The letter, of which we now give a translation, was addressed to Pius IX., in August last, by an eminent French priest, the ABBE LABORDE; and in it he remonstrates, in a most affectionate manner, with the Pope, on the danger of the step he was about to take; and he proves conclusively that the new doctrine was utterly unsupported by Scripture, and that it was contrary to the well-known sentiments of the Fathers, from the earliest times.

We attach considerable importance to this letter, which appears to us to deserve the attention of our readers, both from the position of the writer and the learning and ability which he displays. No one can read the letter without observing that the ABBE LABORDE is still warmly attached to the Papal system; and, therefore, the views which he expresses will, probably, have the more weight with many Roman Catholics, as they are the sentiments, not of an adversary, but of a friend.

We rejoice to find that there are still divines within the bosom of the Church of Rome who see the false and unscriptural nature of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, and who have the courage to speak their opinions openly and without reserve. The Abbe Laborde states, in the last paragraph of his letter, that "many priests and faithful of both sexes" concur with him in the same sentiments. These are not very encouraging facts for the Pope and his advisers, who have joined in imposing this "new dogma of faith" on the Roman Catholic Church.

We will only add, that we have carefully verified the references to ancient authorities which are cited by the Abbe Laborde; and we have occasionally given the originals in full, which do not appear in the letter as published in the *Glaneur Savoyard*.

MOST HOLY FATHER—Our Lord Jesus Christ, when he was about to leave this world, commanded his apostles that "they should go and teach all nations, baptizing them, and teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever he had commanded them."—Matt. xxviii. 19. In order to put them in a condition to discharge this mission perfectly and unconquerably, he added the promise, that the Holy Spirit should assist them, that "this spirit of truth should dwell in them, should guide them into all truth, should teach them all things, and bring all things to their remembrance, whatsoever he had said unto them."—St. John xvi. 13, xiv. 26.

Jesus Christ fulfilled his promise. And when the blessed apostles had been filled with the Holy Ghost (Acts ii. 4) they preached everywhere, on the house-top, that which they had heard in the ear (Matt. x. 27); the Lord working with them, and confirming his words with signs following.—Mark xvi. 20.

We have, then, for the authors of our faith the apostles of the Lord, who did not select that which they should introduce into it, according to their own fancy, but who transmitted, faithfully, to the nations that which they had received from Christ.* Now, this summary of the doctrine

---

* *Dens Theol., Tom.* vii., *de Matrim.* No. 26.

† It may, with some of our Roman Catholic readers, strengthen our argument to state that, in the recent and improved translation of the New Testament, by F. P. Kenrick, Roman Catholic Bishop of Philadelphia, published at New York in 1841, that learned and candid writer, instead of following the Douay version, translates the passage—"This *mystery* is great," adding the following in a note, p. 395—"The Greek term, *μυστηριον*, is used of *mysteries*, properly so called, and of sacraments, as divine instruments of grace." The Latin term; *sacramentum*, admits of still greater latitude. I have preferred the literal reading of the Greek, lest I should seem to seek support for the sacramental character of marriage in an ambiguous word. The mysterious nature of conjugal union is declared by the apostle, in consequence of its typical relation to the union of Christ with the Church. From its first institution it was so referred, although this was not then declared, nor was grace attached to it. "He calls it a great mystery," says St. Chrysostom, "because blessed Moses, or rather God, intimated something great and wonderful."

‡ Sacramentum res est sensibus subjecta, quæ ex Dei institutione sanctitatis et justitiæ tum significandæ tum *efficiendæ* vim habet.—*Pars* ii., *cap.* i., *quæst.* viii.

§ *Decret. Conc. Trid., Sess.* vii., *Can.* 7.

* De matrimonio Petrus Lombardus negavit in eo gratiam conferri. —*Cassander Consult., ut supra*, p. 951.

† *Vide Caus.* 1, q. 1, c. 101, and 32, q. 2, c. 13.—In hoc sacramento non confertur gratia spiritus sancti, sicut in aliis.—Corp. Jur. Can. vol. i., col. 1,607. Lugd. 1671.

‡ Ipse vero Durandus hoc argumento utitur; matrimonium non confert primam gratiam, quæ est ipsa justificatio a peccatis; neque secundam gratiam, sive gratiæ incrementum; nullam igitur gratiam confert. . . . . Quod gratiam secundum non confert, probat, quia majoris gratiæ esset matrimonium quam continentia, si continens per matrimonium in gratia divina augeretur.—*Bellarm.* de Matrim. Sacram., lib. i., cap. v., tom. iii., p. 506. Colon., 1615.

§ Jureconsulti probant, sacramentum matrimonii non conferre gratiam, quia licite fit pactum de matrimonio contrahendo si certa summa pecuniæ numeretur; quod illicitum videretur, si matrimonium gratiam conferret; est enim simoniæ crimen, gratiam Dei pecuniis emere velle.—*Bellarm. ut supra.*

* Apostolos Domini habemus auctores, qui nec ipsi quicquam ex sua arbitrio quod inducerent elegerunt; sed acceptam a Christo disciplinam fideliter nationibus adsignaverunt.—Tertull. de Præscrip., cap. vi., p. 22. Mogunt, 1602.

of Jesus Christ, which was communicated by the apostles to all the churches as they were founded, to be kept by them, and to be transmitted successively from hand to hand, to distant times—even to the end of the world—this is the Catholic faith, this is that deposit of our faith, of which the apostle writes to Timothy—"O, Timothy, keep the deposit which has been committed to thee, avoiding profane novelties of speech, and oppositions of science, falsely so called, which some professing, have erred from the faith."—1 Tim. vi. 20, 21.

This deposit, then, of the faith has been transmitted by the apostles of Jesus Christ to all Timothies—that is to say, to all Christians who fear God, to be in such wise kept, that they should add nothing to it, that they should take away nothing from it, that they should change nothing in it, that they should mingle no strange doctrine with it, and that they should not tolerate any addition, diminution, change, or admixture by others. Further, they have ordered us, if perchance any persons should teach any other doctrine than that which has been transmitted from the beginning, to say to such persons, anathema!—"Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you, let him be anathema. As we said before, so say I now again, if any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be anathema."—Gal. i. 8, 9. It was on this account that a great man, or rather, all the fathers of the Church, and successors of the apostles, speaking by the mouth of one of themselves, have laid down this law—"To teach, therefore, anything to Catholic Christians, besides that which they have received, never is lawful, never has been lawful, never will be lawful; and to anathematize those who do teach anything besides that which has been once for all received, was always a duty, is always a duty, and always will be a duty." After this (adds the same writer) can there be any person either so bold as to wish to proclaim a new doctrine to the Church or so rash as to receive any other doctrine than that which he has already received from the Church? The Apostle Paul, that chosen vessel, that teacher of nations, that trumpet of the apostles, that herald of the whole earth, that witness of what passed in heaven, he, speaking by means of his epistle, directs his speech to all the faithful, at all times, and in all places; he, I say, once, yea twice, exclaims—"If any one preach to you a *new doctrine*, let him be anathema!"*

This being the case, most Holy Father, who will not wonder that a *new dogma* is announced to Catholic Christians; that a *new dogma* is at this moment forged at Rome? Is there not a widely-spread report that your Holiness threatens the world with a decree, by which we are commanded to believe that the conception of the Blessed Virgin was immaculate? But, Holy Father, this is precisely that thing which the apostle called "a profane novelty of words and contradiction of science, falsely so called;" this is precisely to preach to us another gospel than that which has been preached to us by St. Paul—the teacher of nations, the trumpet of the apostles, the herald of the whole earth.

For, in truth, that apostle, who was a witness of what passed in heaven, never preached to us that the Blessed Virgin was free from original sin. He made not one single exception, and, therefore, he included the Blessed Virgin as well as all others, when he said—"For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly; for scarcely for a righteous man would one die, yet, perchance, for a good man some would even dare to die."—Rom. v. 6, 7. She was not, therefore, just, she was not, therefore, holy and spotless—the Blessed Virgin for whom Christ died. "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, for that *all* have sinned."—Rom. v. 12. ALL, therefore, also the Blessed Virgin. "The love of Christ constraineth us, because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead; and that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again."—2 Cor. v. 14, 15. The use made of this text by St. Augustine will be seen below.

The ancient Fathers of the Church, successors of the chair of the apostles, legitimate interpreters of Scripture, themselves, in their own time, the witnesses, guardians, and oracles of the traditions and faith of the Church, have taught us that our Lord Jesus Christ *alone* was without original sin, because he alone was conceived without the union of man and woman; but that Mary, his Holy Mother, was "sinful flesh"—that is to say, conceived in sin, like all others. What saith Origen? "*No one*, therefore, can ever avoid the snare of sinful concupiscence; for all have sinned, as it is written—'By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin.' And again, 'Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one.'—Job xiv. 4. Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ is, therefore, the *only* one who has not sinned; but the Father hath made him to be sin for us, in order that, being in the likeness of sinful flesh, and sprung from sin, he might condemn sin. He, therefore, came into those snares, but he was the *only* one who could not be entangled in them."†

So, also, St. Augustine writes:—*Christ alone* was born without sin, who was conceived by a Virgin, not in the desire of the flesh, but in the obedience of the spirit. She only could prepare the medicine for our disease, who produced an offspring without the wound of sin."‡

Here is the privilege of the son; here is the privilege of the mother. The son *alone* was conceived without sin. The mother *alone* conceived a son exempt from sin.

"He alone who was made man without ceasing to be God, never had any sin, and never took the body of sin, although born from a mother of sinful flesh."†

And, again—"Therefore, all are dead, and Christ died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him who died for them, and rose again."—2 Cor. v. 14, 15. All, therefore, *without one single exception*, are dead in sins, either original or voluntary, whether by ignorance, or by knowing, and not doing that which was righteous. He alone who liveth—that is, the only person who never committed any sin whatsoever—died for all the rest, who were dead, in order that they who live by the remission of their sins, should no longer live unto themselves, but unto him who died for our sins, and who rose again for our justification."‡

All the other Fathers unanimously teach the same doctrine.

This, then, Most Holy Father, is the faith which we have received from the beginning. As yet, to-day, 1854 years after the preaching of the apostles, it is not an article of faith that the Blessed Virgin was born free from sin. If, therefore, this becomes an article of faith to-morrow, it will plainly be a *new article*.

Together with the present letter, we send to your Holiness a volume, entitled "The Belief in the Immaculate Conception can never become an Article of Faith;" in which we have demonstrated at length the points which we now briefly assert. We have there pointed out the exact period up to which it was yet unheard of in the Church, that the Blessed Virgin was without original sin. The doctor who first openly professed this opinion is there named; and from the progress of this opinion it is historically proved, that this doctrine is a new invention in the Church. We beseech you, Holy Father, seriously to meditate on the value of these arguments. Your Holiness ought to be aware of the sad consequences that must necessarily follow from an attempt to force a new dogma of faith on Christendom. "We have no curiosity, beyond Jesus Christ; we need no inquiries beyond the Gospel. When we believe, we have no desire to increase our belief; for the first point of our belief is this, that there is nothing beyond (the Gospel) which we are bound to believe."§

We cannot disobey the precepts of the apostles. We are bound to oppose the introduction of new articles of faith.

Most willingly we believe and confess, Holy Father, that the Bishop of the first See has the primacy in the Church. We are ready to maintain, and to assert energetically, that Peter, to whom the flock of Jesus Christ was entrusted, was the chief in the band of the apostles; that he had the chief authority in religious matters, as being that person to whose care all were entrusted. We assert that the Bishop of Rome is the legitimate successor of St. Peter; and we believe that the authority of the former is no less great than that of the latter. We cannot, however, forget that, from time to time, cases may arise in which it is necessary that "Paul should withstand Peter to the face, because he is to be blamed, and because he walketh not uprightly, according to the truth of the Gospel."—Gal. ii. 11, 14. You, most Holy Father, are Peter; and we—that is, the body of Christian people—are Paul. If, then, you imitate Peter, and "walk not uprightly according to the truth of the Gospel," it must be our part to imitate Paul, and "resist you to the face." But can there be a plainer proof of "not walking uprightly according to the truth of the Gospel," than the attempt to make new articles of faith?

We, indeed, in company with all those who hold no other head than Jesus Christ, are united in communion with your Holiness, as with the chair of Peter. We know that the Church is built on this rock, and we believe every person to be profane who eats the Lamb out of this house (Hier. ad Dam. Pap.); but we cannot forget the boldness of the reply which our own St. Hilary, of Poictiers, once addressed to a certain sacrilegious bishop of the See of Rome—"Know, Liberius, that I say anathema to thee and to thy companions. I say anathema to thee for the second and the third time, thou prevaricating Liberius!"*

Listen, Holy Father, to the genuine and lawful decrees of the sixth General Council against a *Bishop of Rome in former days*—"We have thought fit to *put out* of the Holy Catholic Church of God, and, at the same time, to *anathematize* Honorius, formerly Bishop of Rome, because we have found in the writings which he addressed to Sergius, that he agreed in his sentiments, and conformed to his impious dogmas."†

Listen, Holy Father, to the genuine and lawful decrees of the seventh General Council against the same Pope—"We profess the two wills and operations according to the two natures in Christ Jesus, as the sixth Council, held in Constantinople, formerly did, with applause, when it drove out Sergius, *Honorius*, Cyrus, Pyrrhus, Macarius, and all those who are enemies of true religion, and think as they do."‡

Listen again, most Holy Father, to the genuine letter of another Bishop of the chief See, who, in like manner, pronounced an anathema upon that unworthy Bishop of Rome (Honorius), and confirmed the anathema of the sixth General Council. The letter of Leo II. is as follows:—

"We anathematize the inventors of new errors—that is to say, Theodorus, Bishop of Faran; Cyrus, Bishop of Alexandria; Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paulus, Peter, successors rather than bishops of the Church of Constantinople; and, besides these, Honorius, who, instead of enlightening this apostolic chair by the doctrines of apostolic tradition, has endeavoured, by guilty treachery, to corrupt and ruin the holy faith."§

It is not in our power to be ignorant of these, or many other similar facts which have taken place from the times of the apostles to our own days, but which it would be too long to enumerate. Woe to these perfidious shepherds who, instead of "strengthening their brethren in the faith" (Luke xxii. 32), as it is their duty to do, attempt to ruin the faith itself! Woe to those shepherds, "ravening wolves in sheep's clothing" (Matt. vii. 15), who, after having received from Christ that holy commandment, "Feed my lambs, feed my sheep" (John xxi. 15, 18), have torn with their teeth and claws both the lambs and the sheep.

May God preserve you, beloved Father, from entering into their ways. May the Lord "enlighten the eyes of your mind" (Ephes. i. 17, 18), that you may see the wiles of the serpent, prepared, by the mouth of flatterers, against your own soul and against the peace of the Church! We know it, we know it. Flattery does not cease to allure you. It tells you that you will render your name glorious in the sight of men; that you will confirm the domination of the Bishop of Rome over the universal Church, if, by a decree of faith, binding on all Christians—laity, clergy, priests, and bishops—you are able to define a question which none of your predecessors nor any council has dared thus to define. These are the wiles of the serpent; for if your Holiness should order the belief of the new dogma that you meditate, you will gather for yourself, not glory, but ignominy; and for the Bishop of Rome, not domination, but derision. It will be a new proof, in addition to so many other proofs from history, that the Bishop of Rome is, like all other men, a weak man, prone to sin, subject to error; and that it may happen to him to be a prevaricator in his holy office, to be deceived himself, and to endeavour to deceive others!

Listen, then, rather to us, beloved Father—us, who seek the true glory of your Holiness, not by flattery, but by the love of truth, of charity, and of peace.

May God long preserve you in good health, and keep you holy, through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Most Holy Father,

For myself, and for many priests, and faithful persons of both sexes,

THE ABBÉ LABORDE, of Lectoure.

August 10, 1854.

THE LIFE OF A PRIEST.

(Continued from page 17.)

The celibacy of the priesthood was introduced into the Church so late as the year 1139, and is contrary to the natural law, to the Old and New Scripture, to the well-being of society, to the example of St. Peter, and to the express exhortation of St. Paul to Timothy, relative to the qualifications of bishops and deacons—"A bishop,

---

* Annunciare ergo aliquid Christianis Catholicis, præter id quod acceperunt, nunquam licuit, nunquam licet, nunquam licebit, et anathemare eos qui annuncient aliquid, præterquam quod semel acceptum est, nunquam non oportuit, nusquam non oportet, nunquam non oportebit. . . . . *Si quis novum dogma annunciaverit*, anathematizetur.—Vinc. Lirin. Common, cap. xiv., p 516. Moguut, 1602.

† Nullus ergo alius fuit, qui recta ista superare potuerit. Omnes enim peccaverunt, sicut scriptum est. Et rursus, ut Scriptura dicit, non est justus super terram, qui fecerit bonum, et non peccaverit. Et iterum, Nemo mundus a sorde. *Solus* ergo est Dominus et Salvator noster Jesus Christus qui peccatum non fecit, sed peccatum cum Pater fecit pro nobis, ut in similitudine carnis peccati, de peccato damnaret peccatum. Venit ergo ad illa retia, sed involvi in eis solus ipse non potuit.—Origen. in Cant, Hom. iii., p. 36, 37, Tom. iii. Paris, 1740.

* Solus sine peccato natus est, quem sine virili comp'exu, non concupiscentia carnis, sed obedientia mentis virgo concepit. Sola nostro vulneri medicinam parere potuit, quæ non ex peccati vulnere germen prolis emisit.—St. August. de pecc. meritis, lib. i., c xxix., No. 57, col. 32, vol. x. Paris, 1690.

† Solus ergo ille etiam homo factus mundus Deus, peccatum nullum habuit unquam, nec sumpsit carnem peccati, quamvis de materna carne peccati.—St. August. de peccat. meritis, Lib. ii., cap. xx v., No. 38, ut supra. This is the reading of the Benedictine editors; the old editions read—"De natura carnis peccati."

‡ Omnes itaque mortui sunt in peccatis, *nemine prorsus excepto*, sive originalibus, sive etiam voluntate additis vel ignorando, vel sciendo, nec faciendo quod justum est. Et pro omnibus mortuis vivus mortuus est unus, id est, nullum habens omnino peccatum; ut qui per remissionem peccatorum vivant, jam non sibi vivant, sed ei qui pro omnibus mortuus est propter peccata nostra, et resurrexit propter justificationem nostram.—St. August. de Civit. Dei, lib. xx., c. vi., sec. 1, tom. vii., col. 573. Paris, 1690.

§ Nobis curiositate opus non est post Christum Jesum, nec inquisitione post Evangelium. Cum credimus, nihil desideramus ultra credere. Hoc enim prius credimus, non esse quod ultra credere debeamus.—Tertull. de Præscript, c. viii., p. 80. Moguut., 1602.

* St. Hilar. Hist. Fragm., Lib. vii. 6, No. 6, col. 1287. Paris, 1693.

† Cone. Gen. Labbe, tom. vi., p. 913.

‡ Cone. Gen. Labbe, tom. vii., p. 558.

§ Epist. Leonis II., ad Hisp. Conc. Sexti, apud Labbe, vi., 1117.

then, must be blameless, the husband of one wife, given to hospitality, apt to teach."—Chap. iii. v. 2. "Likewise must the deacons be grave, not double-tongued, not given to much wine, not greedy of filthy lucre."—Chap. iii., v. 8. Any law that has been framed contrary to the above authorities I cannot hesitate to pronounce an infernal one, whether it proceeds from the Vatican of Rome, or from the Cathedral of Canterbury. We find in Genesis the following precept—"Increase and multiply, and fill the land." The influence of this command is omnipotent, and is felt by all living things—by man and beast, by the insects of the air, as well as by the fishes of the sea. How do, then, thousands of men escape the all-powerful influence of this primary law under the warm sun of Spain or France? The answer is very obvious—they cannot; as it is equally powerful on the banks of the Seine as on those of the sunny Tagus. If his Satanic Majesty could summon together an assembly of the most atrocious sinners in his wide dominion, to form an ordinance by which he could people his infernal empire with the souls of the damned, they could not frame a more effectual one than that which establishes the celibacy of the priesthood. I am fully justified in making this strong observation from my own personal observation and experience, as well as from the extent of my reading. Paul IV. was obliged to issue a Bull to the Inquisition in the sixteenth century to inquire into the immorality of the priests of Spain. The Bull commences in these words—"Whereas, certain ecclesiastics in the kingdom of Spain, in the cities and dioceses, having the care of souls, have broken out into such heinous acts of iniquity as to abuse the sacrament of penance, in the very act of hearing confessions, by enticing and provoking females to lewd actions at the very time they are making their confessions." The inquisition commenced to discover the sacerdotal delinquents; but the abuse was so general the scandal would be in proportion, and it was agreed to consign the prosecution to the Greek Kalends. I would not cite this instance of Papal interference to prevent this fearful iniquity, if it was confined to a few individuals who would only form the exceptions; but as the entire kingdom of Spain is included in the Pope's Bull, it forms an insuperable argument why that penal statute should be obliterated from the records of mankind. Now, if the priests of Spain were so profligate, what charter of exemption can those of Portugal, Italy, England, and Ireland claim from this the worst of all penal ordinances?

Were not the prophets and patriarchs married, and several of the apostles, with some of the evangelists? Is it not more criminal to see ecclesiastics living in the most abandoned debauchery than to see them enter into the holy state of matrimony?—matrimony which, the Apostle Paul says, is honourable in *all* men."

I could point out the names of some of the most eminent bishops who were married, and the ages they lived in up to the time of the apostles, but as this historical fact will not be denied, I will only mention that "Bishop Spiridion was Father of St. Basil, and father-in-law to Gregory Nazianzen, and that the See of Ephesus was in the family of Polycrates during the period of seven hundred years. But what will devout Roman Catholics say when they are told that some of the Popes themselves are the sons of bishops. Felix III., Adrian II., Agapetus I., and Agapetus II.: nor was the sanctity of St. Patrick retarded by being the son of a deacon, and the grandson of a priest. If it should, however, irritate Roman Catholics to tell them such a simple fact, that the bishops and priests of their Church were married, will it please them more if I tell them, that in the very year that the Pope was framing the Bull to prevent the marriage of the clergy, he was himself laying the foundation of one of the most illustrious houses in Italy, with the help of the Countess Matilda, who had a beautiful chateau on one of those picturesque slopes that look down upon the classic shores of Etruria. Will anyone believe that the pure air of the Apennine and the desire Hildebrand had of assisting the countess at her devotions, were the only motives that induced his Holiness to visit these lovely solitudes? How prophetic were the words of St. Paul, and how applicable to the Church of Rome, is the language of the apostle where he says, "that in the latter days some shall depart from the faith, forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God had created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth."—Tim. iv. 3.

The infallibility of the Church is the next question which I proposed to discuss—a doctrine which was first propounded by the Jesuits for their own private ends, and to flatter the vanity of the Popes, and was afterwards sanctioned by the second Council of Nice in the year 786. If the Church of Rome was infallible, the infallibility must be found in the aggregate of the individuals forming that Church, or in her general councils, or in the Popes. But it is not found in either; every individual is fallible, and the aggregate of fallible individuals must be fallible. It could not exist in her general councils, as it is admitted even by Roman Catholics that the Council of Rimini was an Œcumenical council, and erred, having deliberately signed the Arian heresy; and to which Pope Liberius himself annexed his name. Nor can it be found in the Popes. Was Leo X., an atheist, infallible? Was Alexander VI., an incestuous Pontiff, infallible? Or, may I ask, was John XXII. infallible, the most profligate of mankind? Although the Council of Trent has cautiously abstained from publishing any decree on this subject, yet the Pope, bishops, and priests still cling with unshaken tenacity to infallibility as the culminating point upon which all the dogmas of their Church depend. The promises made by our Lord in the following texts of Scripture, are the foundation upon which they build their doctrine of infallibility:—"The gates of hell shall not prevail against it."—Matt. xvi. 18. "Lo I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."—Matt. xxviii. 20. There are two things that can be obviously deduced from these texts of Scripture—the first is, the existence of the Church to the end of time; and the second is, that God will never withdraw his protecting hand from his Church. Nothing can be more clear that the Church of Christ is to last to the end of time, than that she is increasing since the death of Christ under the protection of heaven, and by the labours of the missionaries all over the world. It is no less certain that God has exercised a vigilant care over his Church since her foundation, as she never disappeared, even in the most abandoned times. It is quite true that errors have crept into the Church in the middle ages, both from the avarice and ambition of the Popes, and from the gross ignorance of the times, yet she never disappeared. She always retained the Holy Scriptures, believed the fundamental doctrine of the Gospel dispensation, and was the treasury of God's Holy Word, although some base coin was issued, from time to time, from the mint of the Vatican. The time arrived when the Reformation became absolutely necessary, when there was no morality, no discipline, no literature, no reverence for divine things, and religion was almost extinct. Did not all this justify the reformers in commencing the great and arduous task of reforming a Church then immersed in vice and abominable wickedness, when Leo X., an infidel, was Pope and Vicar of Christ.

The great Burke said, that all corporate bodies stand in need of reformation from time to time, and that they who undertook this arduous task deserved the best thanks of the commonwealth.

The reformers, instead of receiving every possible praise for their intrepid conduct in stemming the torrent of vice and immorality that then threatened to deluge the world, there is no epithet, however vituperative, in the English language, that is not, even now, poured out against the memory of those men of learning and morals, and which, I regret to add, is the besetting sin of modern Roman Catholics. If the Church was infallible, in the Roman Catholic sense of the expression, she could not err, and, up to the present day, she would want no reformation, as she would be "without spot or wrinkle." To prove that the Church was overwhelmed with every vice to which human nature is subject, and required a dyke of powerful strength to resist the flood of unsound doctrine and scandalous conduct which threatened to deluge a trembling world, hear what Catholic authorities, of great eminence, say upon this subject.

The Cardinal of Cambray says—"Although there are great evils which we see, yet unless the Church be speedily reformed, we shall, in a short time, see unspeakably greater."

Nicholas de Clemangis writes as follows—"That wicked persons did so much abound, in all professions of men, that scarce one in a thousand was to be found who lived answerably to his profession."

The Cardinal of Lorraine, at the Council of Trent said—"That all the calamities which had befallen France were to be attributed to the general corruption of manners that prevailed in that country."

Cardinal Julian tells Eugene IV.—"That the people were above measure incensed against the ecclesiastical state by the dissolute lives of the clergy, for which it is greatly to be feared, unless they mend their manners, lest the laymen, after the example of the Hussites, fall foul upon the whole clergy."

The Suffragan Bishop of Saltzburg speaks of the clergy in the following words, at the commencement of the Reformation—"The modern and unhappy clergy neglect the love of God and of their neighbour; they are addicted to infamous practices, and neglect the salvation of the souls of God's people."

I could quote authorities without end to show the *necessity* of a reformation in the Church at the time it happened; but the above are quite sufficient for the purpose. Roman Catholics assert, contrary to fact, that it was no reformation, but the creation of a new religion; whereas, the reformers only fell back upon primary principles, and expunged all unsound, extraneous, and antiscriptural doctrine, which was introduced into the Church during the dark ages. This universal depravity of morals, and the heathen doctrine then taught in the Church, prove its fallibility, and the impurity of the water that flowed from the Cistern of the Hills.

(To be continued.)

ROMAN CATHOLIC ANTINOMIANISM.

It has often been a subject of complaint in countries ruled over by monarchs with absolute power, that those who did the king faithful service have been neglected, and their interest sacrificed to that of the flatterers who thronged his court. Many a soldier who has grown gray in fighting his sovereign's battles, without reward, has murmured at seeing gay courtiers put over his head, whose only merit was, that they had humoured the weakness or ministered to the pleasures of their prince; and often, too, have complaints been excited at the easy pardon which the cruelty or oppression of courtiers has received, provided they have taken care to make themselves personally agreeable to their master. "More than one well-disposed ruler," says a distinguished writer, "has given up whole provinces to rapine and oppression, merely from a wish to see none but happy faces round his own board, and in his own walks. No man is fit to govern great societies who hesitates about disobliging the few who have access to him, for the sake of the many whom he will never see." Some authors have been so ungallant as to say, that the weakness which we are here describing is one to which female sovereigns have been particularly liable. A few flattering compliments, with some profession of personal attachment, have, in their case, often been considered as atonement for serious crimes, and have outweighed the solid services of less showy competitors.

One of the most odious features in the idolatry of the heathen is, that they have not only framed for themselves gods in the likeness of men, but that they have taken some of the vilest and worst of men as the models of their divinities. While they rightly judged that the relation of a king to his subjects was one which, in some degree, was a representation of the relation of God to his creatures, they have degraded the majesty of heaven by comparing it to some of those weak and worthless earthly monarchs, whose faults we have attempted to describe. It was a common error in the heathen systems to imagine that their gods could be bribed by a few prayers or a few sacrifices to overlook the vices of their worshippers and that they would not make any severe examination into the conduct of those who were careful to give them due praise and honour.

In the true religion, on the other hand, all possibility of an error of this kind has been carefully guarded against. No wicked man is allowed for a moment to think that, unless he forsake his sins, his prayers or his devotions can gain him any favour from God. "Why call ye me Lord, Lord," says our Saviour to those who offered him this homage of the lips, "and do not the things which I say."—Luke vi. 46. David expresses the conviction of every Christian when he tells us—"If I regard iniquity in my heart, the Lord will not hear me."—Psalm lxvi. 18. So far is it from being the case that one continuing in wickedness can, by prayers offered in such a state of mind, mitigate the displeasure of God, that, doubtless, the hypocrisy of such worship only makes him more hateful to a God of purity; and we are expressly told that the sacrifice of the wicked is *abomination* in the sight of God.—Prov. xv. 8.

It may be imagined that doctrine like this would not be very acceptable to men who were unwilling to forsake their sins, and yet who longed for some reason to hope that continuance in sin would not be attended with ultimate danger; who wished to find some expedient for keeping up some claim on the favour of God, even when they were transgressing his commands, so that they might be able to reckon on obtaining from him, at the last hour, the grace of repentance and pardon. And if *God* would not be mocked with the prayers of impenitent sinners—if *He* declared their sacrifice abomination—could no one else be found more indulgent, or who would undertake the patronage of sinners on easier terms? These are the cravings of men's corrupt hearts, which we are ashamed to say that priests of our religion have been found to satisfy; and *that* at the expense of the honour of one whom all Christians ought to be ready to hold in reverence. There is one whose earthly life we may lawfully believe to have been graced with such holiness as a child of fallen Adam may attain unto, and yet who is represented as the patron and the protector of wilful sinners. Protestants have been often accused of hating the Blessed Virgin Mary, and of being jealous of her honour; but we know of no representations so degrading to her character as those given by some of those Roman Catholic divines who have professed the greatest devotion to her. While zealous for her material dignity—while claiming for her the title of Queen of Heaven—they represent her as exercising her sovereignty in a manner which would disgrace the weakest and vainest of earthly queens. They represent her as intensely jealous of personal compliments; angry if they are withheld; but ready to give anything, and forgive anything, to those who make a profession of personal attachment to her. We know not how any Roman Catholic, zealous for the real honour of the Virgin, can read, without disgust, such books as St. Liguori's "Glories of Mary," and others of the same character, which, while intended to do honour to the Mother of our Lord, would, if they were true, be highly degrading to her character. We give a few specimens, principally from the "Glories of Mary," of the stories to which we refer; and we ask our readers to say, whether an earthly queen, who should allow herself to be so influenced by a few compliments, would be considered fit to govern a great country.

We are obliged by the pressure of other matter to omit several of the stories which we had marked for quotation, and which were intended to illustrate the great value which the Blessed Virgin is represented as setting on the honours paid to her; and how completely (if we are to believe Roman Catholic writers) her character must have changed since she was on earth, where we never hear of her being greedy of praise and adoration. Thus

we cannot afford space to quote Mr. Faber's story, how she appeared to "our own St. Thomas of Canterbury," to thank him for the "Hail Marys" he was in the habit of repeating, and to request him to add a few more to his daily list. Nor, again, how when "the Blessed Joseph Herman, the Premonstratensian," being employed to act as sentinel, to guard a church from robbers, had omitted some of his usual "Hail Marys," the Virgin appeared to him, not as usual, in youth and beauty, but old and wrinkled; and how, when he asked the reason, she explained to him how much hurt she felt at his neglect of her, and how she begged him another time to say his full number of "Hail Marys," and leave the guardianship of the church to her. These and some other stories of the same kind we must leave out, and hasten on to those which have more immediate reference to the subject of our preceding remarks. What should we think of an earthly sovereign who, when asked to execute judgment on a notorious offender, should answer, that the criminal was in the habit of frequently paying compliments to her, and that she made it a rule never to execute justice on a friend of hers. Well, let our readers peruse the following story, which we take from the "Glories of Mary" (vol. i., p. 360. Dublin, J. Duffy, 1851), and let them say whether they think those who invented, or who repeat such a tale, have added to the honour of "the Queen of Heaven":—

"In Domans, in France, there was a married man who, though his wife was living, kept up a criminal intimacy with another woman. The wife, being unable to bear such maltreatment, continually besought the Lord to punish the crimes of her husband. She went one day before an altar of the Blessed Virgin, in a certain church, to implore just vengeance against the woman who lived with him. The other woman went every day before the same image to recite a 'Hail Mary.' The Divine Mother appeared one night, in a dream, to the person who had been maltreated by her husband; the woman instantly began to exclaim, as usual—'Justice, O Mother of God, justice.' The Blessed Virgin replied—'Do you ask justice from me? Go and find some one else to execute justice. For my part, I will not do it. Know that the sinner against whom you demand justice, recites a salutation every day in my honour; and I will endeavour to save from the vengeance due to their sins those who recite that salutation.'"

Thus our readers will see that, though the prayers of the wicked may be abomination to God, it is not so with the Virgin; and the wickedness of her votaries does not prevent her from being flattered by their attention, and duly rewarding their devotion. St. Liguori tells us distinctly, and endeavours to prove by citations from grave authors, as well as by historical examples, that "*a client of Mary, who honours her faithfully, and recommends himself to her*, CANNOT BE LOST."—p. 313. The edition of the "Glories of Mary" from which we quote, is what may be called a controversial edition, and is furnished with notes to defend Liguori from the objections of Protestants, and, when the saint's *words* appear objectionable, to tell us what he *meant*—or, at least, what he ought to have meant. In the present instance there is a note to explain that the saint only means to speak of those clients of Mary who sincerely wish to repent of their past sins, and to lead a holy life. Now, we assert, and shall presently prove by abundance of examples, that this is a most unfair distortion of the saint's meaning, and that all his stories show that he wished to teach that all who honour the Virgin—sinners or saints, penitent or impenitent—should receive from her a certainty of salvation as their reward. But, to avoid being misunderstood, we must explain that we do not believe St. Liguori teaches that the Virgin brings any to heaven without their repenting beforehand. No sinner, however, is so unreasonable as to expect to get to heaven without first performing some ceremony of this kind. But what makes them uncomfortable in their sins is, the fear that, if they continue in them, death may overtake them without their ever having repented. This is a point which Protestant preachers often urge on their hearers—that every hour they continue in sin strengthens its power over them, and increases the unlikelihood of their repentance, while the uncertainty of life makes their continuance in unrepented sin fearfully dangerous. Now, from all uneasiness of this kind, St. Liguori delivers his disciples. The tendency of his instructions is as follows:—"Repent and forsake your sins by all means; this is what I recommend as the best and safest course. What, you find this too great an effort? Well, then, at least, do not forget to say, every day, a 'Hail Mary,' and, no doubt, the good Mother will procure for you, at some time or other, the grace of contrition."

Schoolboys, sometimes, when the master is away, are afraid to play their mad pranks, lest the unexpected appearance of their teacher should bring punishment on them; but, sometimes, by leaving one of their number outside, to give them timely notice of the master's coming, they are able to carry on their mischievous tricks in comfort and security. Just such a service as this does St Liguori represent the Blessed Virgin as affording to sinners who honour her, allowing them to continue comfortably in their sins for a sufficient space of time, but taking care to warn them before it is too late, and by obtaining repentance for them, to secure them from all unpleasant consequences.

We shall now enable our readers to judge whether we are justified in bringing this charge against Liguori. The first story which we shall quote is the "Example" which St. Liguori appends to the chapter in which he asserts that it is morally impossible that a servant of Mary can be lost. And we must say that we feel much indebted to the saint for his habit of affixing examples to all his chapters; for nothing tends to make a writer's meaning so clear as when he illustrates, by particular examples, the sense in which he uses his general propositions—

"In the year 1601, there were, in the City of Flanders, two young students, who, instead of attending to the acquisition of learning, sought only the indulgence of the appetite, and the gratification of their unchaste passions. One night they went to a house of ill-fame; after some time, one of them, called Richard, returned home, the other remained. After having reached his house, Richard, while undressing, in order to go to bed, remembered that he had not said the 'Hail Mary' which he was accustomed to recite every day in honour of the Virgin. Being oppressed with sleep, he felt a great repugnance to say them; however, he did violence to himself, and recited the usual 'Hail Marys,' *without devotion, and half asleep*. He went to bed, and, during his first sleep, he heard a loud knock at the door, and instantly saw before him his companion, presenting a deformed and hideous appearance. 'Who are you?' said Richard. 'Do you not know me?' replied the other. 'How,' rejoined Richard, 'have you undergone such a change? you look like a demon.' 'Ah, unhappy me,' exclaimed the other, 'I am damned. In leaving that infamous house, a devil came and strangled me. My body lies in the middle of the street, and my soul is in hell. Know that the same chastisement also awaited you, but the Blessed Virgin, on account of the little devotion of reciting the "Hail Marys" has saved you from it. Happy if you know how to avail yourself of this warning, which the Mother of God sends you through me!' After these words he opened his cloak, and showed Richard the flames and serpents by which he was tormented, and then disappeared. Richard, shedding a torrent of tears, fell prostrate on the ground to thank Mary, his deliverer; and while he was reflecting on a change of life he heard the bell of the Franciscans calling them to matins. He then said—'Here God calls me to do penance.' He went instantly to the convent, and entreated the fathers to receive him. Being aware of the wicked life he had led, they at first refused; but he related, with tears, all that had happened; two of the fathers went into the street and found the strangled body of his companion, which was as black as a cinder; they then received him into the convent. Richard began to lead an exemplary life; he afterwards went to the Indies to preach the faith; he thence passed into Japan, and, in the end, had the happiness of being burned alive, and of dying a martyr for Jesus Christ."—Glories of Mary, vol. i., p. 322.

Here, then, our readers can see whether this client of Mary sincerely intended to repent of his past sins, and to lead a holy life. There were, in fact, two men, equally guilty, equally impenitent; but the one, because he repeated his Ave Maria, "without devotion and half asleep," was rescued from the doom that overtook the other, obtained the grace of contrition, and eventually the crown of martyrdom. We give another story, taken from Father Muzzarelli's "Mouth of Mary," which will serve to show how little the Blessed Virgin requires of her clients, and how mere mechanical devotion to her is represented as sufficient to procure the grace of contrition and to obtain forgiveness—

"A blood-stained man, full of enormous crimes, was earnestly entreated by his wife to fast on Saturday in honour of Mary, and to recite an Ave Maria to her when he fell in with an image of her, since he was not disposed to bring himself down to penance. He did so, *perhaps more to please his wife than anything else*; nevertheless, from this devotion his felicity took its beginning. One day, in a journey, he entered into a church to refresh himself from the heat; he saw an image of Mary, and, *without much devotion*, he said an Ave Maria. As he drew back he perceived the infant Jesus, who was in the arms of his most holy mother, was wounded all over and bathed in blood; he shuddered at such a sight, and, turning to the Virgin, he said—'Who has ill-treated your son this day?' 'You,' replied she, 'with your sins, have wounded the Son of God and my son.' At these words this man began to weep exceedingly, and prayed the Virgin, with many sobs, to obtain his pardon. But the holy Infant showed no wish to hear his mother's prayers. Then the Virgin redoubled her entreaty,* and said—'but what can be denied to Mary?' She received the grace, and said to him, kiss the wounds of my Son. He did so, and seemed to see that upon this act the infant's wounds were healed by his contrition. This done, he left the church, and the world also, since, by common consent, he and his wife retired to take a religious life."†

Here is another tale with the same moral. We have to apologize to our Protestant subscribers for citing so many; but one or two examples would give the reader no idea of the urgency with which the same doctrine is enforced—viz., that the most abandoned sinners may be certain of ultimate salvation if they will only not neglect to make Mary their friend.

"A young man who had lost his father, was sent by his mother to be the page of a certain prince. But before they parted, his mother, who had a great devotion for the Holy Virgin, made her Son promise that he would repeat every day the *Angelic Salutation*, and with it this short supplication—'*Blessed Virgin, assist me at the hour of my death!*' The young man was no sooner arrived at the court than he plunged into every kind of vice; and his bad conduct lost him entirely the favour of his master, who, at last, dismissed him from his service. In despair, and without any means of subsistence, he became a *highwayman*; but, even whilst he was robbing and murdering on the king's highway, he remained faithful to the *practice of piety*, which his mother had enjoined him. At length his crimes met with their reward; he fell into the hands of justice, and was condemned to death. He was thrown into prison, there to remain till he should be summoned to undergo the penalty of the law. On the evening *before* the day that was fixed for his execution, his disgrace, his approaching death, and the grief of his poor mother, presented themselves so vividly to his mind, that he was buried in sad thoughts, and his tears flowed abundantly; when, all at once, he beheld before him a young man, who, addressing him, offered to deliver him from prison and death, if he would bind himself to obey him. The prisoner gave the promise, when the young man disclosed to him that he was the devil, and commanded him, in the first place, to renounce Jesus Christ and the sacraments, *to which the prisoner consented*. 'That is not enough,' added the evil spirit, 'you must also deny the Holy Virgin, and renounce her protection.' '*That I will never do*,' replied the criminal; and, addressing the Mother of God, he repeated the prayer which he was in the habit of making to her—'Blessed Virgin, succour me in the hour of death.' These words put the devil to flight; but the poor young man remained inconsolable for having denied his Saviour; in his affliction, he had recourse to Mary, and prayed to her with such fervour that she obtained for him a sincere contrition for his sins, under the influence of which he confessed with a deep feeling of penitence. On the next day, as the officers were leading him to the place of execution, he had to pass by an image of the Mother of God; he saluted it, and said—'Blessed Virgin, succour me in the hour of death.' The Image, in the sight of all who were present, inclined its head, and returned the salutation. Penetrated by this mark of favour, he asked permission to kiss the feet of the image. The soldiers who were conducting him, did not at all like this; but, as the people murmured, they did not venture to refuse his request. The young man stooped down, and the Image, extending its arms, took him by the hand, and held him so tight, that it was impossible to get him away again. At this miracle but one cry was heard—'pardon!-pardon!' and the pardon was granted. He returned to his country, and ever after led an exemplary life, retaining the most tender gratitude to Mary who had saved him from two deaths, a temporal and an eternal one."†

The stories we have given sufficiently show the readiness of the Virgin Mary to obtain the forgiveness of God for the most abandoned sinners, who have put themselves under her protection; but man is sometimes less merciful than God, and will not so easily forget the past history of those who have led a life of crime. But even this has been provided for. We have been obliged, by want of space, to erase the story of Sister Beatrix from our extracts; but our readers will find, at p. 284 of "The Glories of Mary," how this nun, being urged by criminal passion, left her nunnery, but, on departing, placed her dress and the keys which she held as porteress, beneath a picture of the Virgin, asking Mary to take her place, and fill it more worthily than she had done; and how, after living a life of prostitution for fifteen years, she happened to hear that Sister Beatrix had a high character for holiness, and had been promoted to be mistress of the novices: and how, on inquiry, she found that the Virgin had taken her at her word, had assumed her form during the whole time that she lived in vice; so that she was able to resume her office with the best of characters, and no one was the wiser, until Sister Beatrix, on her death-bed, thought fit to reveal the truth for the glory of Mary.

There are other stories which show the dangerous consequences of omitting an Ave Maria. We pass over the story of Esquilio, whom the Virgin herself ordered to be led to the fire, rejecting the intercessions of the saints on his behalf, on the grounds that *he had been exceedingly wicked, and that he had never said so much as an Ave Maria*, though the good mother did eventually allow herself to be prevailed on to relent. But the following story, to the same effect, is, perhaps, better worthy of extract:—

"In Venice there was a celebrated advocate who became rich by fraud and bad practices. Almost the only good

* St. Liguori tells us here that the Virgin (the image, we suppose) placed the infant in the niche and prostrated herself before it.

† This story is also to be found in the "Glories of Mary," vol. i., p. 297.

† The version here given we had copied some time since from a translation made from a French edition of the "Glories of Mary." On comparing it with Mr. Duffy's translation (vol. i., p. 372) we find that the latter makes no mention of the young man having been ready to deny Jesus, though he refused to deny Mary. There is another very similar story at p. 443, where a young man is represented as having refused to deny Mary, and no mention is made by Mr Duffy of his having renounced our Lord: and yet afterwards when the Virgin intercedes for him, Jesus at first replies—"This ungrateful manner has renounced my service." We are led, therefore, to believe that Mr. Duffy has designedly departed from the text of Liguori; and we are heartily glad to see that there is any of St. Liguori that is thought too strong for Ireland. We only wish there was more of it omitted. Mr. Duffy and his friends were ashamed of. If any of our friends could furnish us with a French or Italian edition of "The Glories of Mary," we should feel obliged.—(ED.)

action which he performed was to say certain prayers every day to the holy Virgin; and through the mercy of Mary this miserable devotion was the means of saving him from eternal death! Behold how! He had the good fortune of contracting a friendship with Father Matthew de Basso. He pressed this father so much to dine with him on a certain day, that the father, at length, consented; as soon as the father entered the house, the advocate said to him—'Father, I will show you a thing which you never have seen. I have a wonderful ape that does the work of a servant—he washes the glasses, lays the table, and opens the door for me.' 'Perhaps,' replied the father, 'it is not an ape, but something else; let me see it.' The ape is called repeatedly, but does not appear; at length, he is found concealed under a bed, but refuses to come out. 'Let us,' said the religious, 'go and see him.' As soon as he arrived at the place along with the advocate, he said—'Infernal beast, come forward; on the part of God I command you to tell me what you are.' Behold, the ape answered that he was the devil, that he was waiting till the advocate would omit, on some day, his accustomed prayer to the Mother of God; he added, that he had permission from God to strangle him on that day, and to carry him off to hell. At these words the poor advocate fell on his knees, and asked assistance from the servant of God, who encouraged him, and commanded the devil to depart from the house without doing him any harm. 'I only give you permission,' said the religious, 'to make a hole in one of the walls of the house as a sign of your departure.' After these words a loud noise was heard, and in the wall an aperture instantly appeared, which God wished to remain for a long period, though it had been closed several times with lime and stone."—Vol. i., p. 310.

We think we have now proved sufficiently that in order to the efficacy of this devotion to Mary, no repentance is required. This "practice of piety" may be followed by a highwayman or a harlot, by people in the constant exercise of the grossest sin, and yet, while it is persevered in, the devil has no power to hurt, and eventually the grace of contrition is bestowed. If we accept these stories as true, is not St. Liguori's assertion fully proved, that it is morally impossible that a servant of Mary's can be damned? Who would not be willing to take advantage of a means of salvation that does not require one to make, immediately, a painful effort to part with cherished sins, but only to spare a few minutes each day to say a "Hail, Mary." But, alas, the hardness of heart of some people is astonishing. There are some who grudge even this small trouble, and for whom St. Liguori and his coadjutors have been obliged to provide a still easier method of salvation. Without even requiring us to spend some minutes every day in prayer to the Virgin, they teach that it will be sufficient to find a couple of minutes some time or other in our lives, to put on the scapular of Mary in sorrow, and then we may bid defiance to the devil and all his works. Witness the story (vol. ii., p. 245), which we have not space to give entire, of the young man in Perugia, who sold his soul to the devil, by a writing under his hand, signed with his blood, and yet, notwithstanding, the poor devil was cheated; for when he came to obtain fulfilment of his bargain, he found that the young man had on his neck the scapular of Mary in sorrow, and the devil was neither able to persuade the young man to take it off, neither could he carry him to hell with it on; so he had to retire in confusion. And the following story is nearly as conclusive (vol. ii., p. 141):—

"A priest, hearing confession in a certain church, saw standing before him a young man, who appeared to wish and, at the same time, not to wish to go to confession. Looking at him several times, the father, at length, asked him if he wanted to go to confession. He answered in the affirmative; and finding that the confession would be a long one, the confessor brought him to a solitary apartment. The penitent began by saying that he was a foreigner and a nobleman, and that he did not know how God could pardon him after the life he had led. Besides innumerable sins of impurity and homicide, he said that he had entirely despaired of salvation, that he had begun to commit sins, not so much for the indulgence of his passions, as through contempt and hatred of God. He said, that, among other things, he always carried about him a crucifix, which he had maltreated through contempt. He said, that on that morning he made a sacrilegious communion; and for what purpose? In order to have an opportunity of afterwards trampling on the consecrated host. After having received the sacred host he wished to execute his wicked purpose, but was prevented through fear of the persons who were present. He then consigned to the confessor the consecrated particle which he had wrapped up in a paper. He stated, that in passing by the church he felt a strong impulse to enter; being unable to resist it, he went in, was instantly stung with remorse of conscience, and felt a certain confused and irresolute will to go to confession. Hence, he placed himself before the confessional; while he was standing there his confusion and diffidence were so great that he wished to leave the church, but it seemed to him that some one had kept him by force, until the father asked him if he wanted to go to confession. 'I now,' said he, 'see myself here; I find myself at confession, and I know not how.' The father then asked him if he had practised any devotion during this time, *meaning devotion towards most holy Mary, for such miraculous conversions only come through the powerful hand of Mary.* 'No, father,' replied the young man; 'I have practised no devotion; I regarded myself as already damned.' 'Reflect a little,' added the father, 'and endeavour to remember whether you were not in the habit of performing any act of devotion.' 'No, father,' he replied, 'I have practised none.' But putting his hand on his breast, he perceived that he wore the scapular of Mary in sorrow. 'Ah, sir,' said the confessor, 'do you not see that the Blessed Virgin has obtained this grace for you. Know,' added the father, 'that this is the church of the Virgin.'"

And thus the whole mystery was explained; and the foreign nobleman went away full of gratitude to Mary, and resolved on leading a new life.

We mentioned above that there are two reasons which, to Protestant minds, make the continuance in sin appear very unsafe; one is the power of sin in hardening the heart, so as to make repentance the more unlikely the longer the sinner has persisted in vice; the other reason is, the uncertainty of life, and the danger of our being hurried away from this world without having power to carry our good resolutions into effect. Now, we have seen that the first of these dangers does not exist for those who are persuaded of the truth of St. Liguori's tales. No lengthened continuance of sinful habits throws any impediment in the way of contrition and pardon, if the form, at least, of devotion to the Virgin has been kept up. It remains for us to show how the second of these dangers is also obviated; but our article has run to a considerable length already; and we cannot now afford the room necessary for the additional citations which must be made from St. Liguori, for the reflections which the quotations we have made suggest, and for the consideration of the apologies which have been put forward in defence of the saint. We must, therefore, stop here for the present, but hope to pursue the subject in the next number. And when we have given another article to St. Liguori's devotional writings, we shall then be able to proceed to another topic, on which more than one of our subscribers have expressed a wish for information—namely, the moral theology of the same saint.

THE ROMISH SYSTEM.

[THE following thoughts have been communicated to us by the ex-Abbé Miel, formerly a distinguished Roman Catholic priest in France, and are, we think, highly interesting, as throwing light on the process of mind by which he was led to abandon the Church in which he was brought up. We would have wished to have presented it to our readers also in the original French, being conscious that it loses much of its real force and eloquence in our translation; but we are unable to do so from want of room.—ED.]

It is not merely the monopoly of truth which the Romish Church arrogates to herself, but also that of virtue. Her adherents never admit that any one can sincerely and conscientiously think differently from themselves in religious matters; and to hold back or refuse submission to the authority of Rome is generally, in their eyes, only a sign of pride or perversity. This prejudice, injurious as it is to those against whom it is directed, is also most fatal to those who are its slaves. To seek to dissipate what I believe to be a fatal doctrine, and to show, with God's help, whether it be the partisans of the Romish system or its adversaries, who have reason and conscience for their guide, is the end I have in view in writing the following lines. And, first, let us consider the unheard-of fact, one which has not its parallel in the annals of mankind, and which, therefore, singularly provokes to reflection, that an institution exists among us, of which each member taken singly is only a sinful man like other men, but which institution, nevertheless, gives itself out to be divine, and arrogates to itself the highest attributes of divinity. Addressing itself to every human being who comes into the world, it demands from him homage, fidelity, obedience, love; it says to him, "Come to me, I am the way, out of which you will infallibly go astray. No one comes to the Son, and, consequently, to the Father, except by me. I am the truth, certain, immutable as God himself; out of me there is only uncertainty, darkness, and lies. I am life; I open and shut the springs of it at my will; he who drinks of my waters will live eternally; he who deprives himself of them can only perish. My empire resembles no other; it is the absolute empire of souls. I reign over the intelligence to which I give laws, and impose impassible barriers. I reign over the heart; its most secret movements ought to be revealed to me. I reign over the conscience; I have the power to bind or to absolve it; and this power does not end with the life that now is, it passes the tomb, and extends to another world!" What language is this? Who ever held such before? Yet these are only *some* of the pretensions of Rome!

Now, in considering these pretensions, we will suppose a wise man, a man sincerely anxious about his eternal destiny! a man to whom salvation is the greatest of all affairs! What should this man do? Should he accept such assertions immediately, without hesitation, without examining them? Such conduct would be the most culpable temerity on his part! If they related to matters of little moment it might pass; one could understand a determination being lightly taken. But the question placed before him is a capital question; it is a question of life or death; error would be fatal—would be damnation. Never was it more indispensable to proceed with caution and with prudence, and not to decide, except with perfect confidence; therefore, the man, who is a sincere friend to truth and duty, will consider himself as rigorously obliged to weigh carefully, to examine strictly, to reflect maturely on these pretensions, before he surrenders himself to them, as his guide through time and eternity.

Well! let him set to work, and he will scarcely have reflected a moment before what appeared only strange, will now appear suspicious. What! will he say to himself, *men* who give themselves out as having rights over the *soul*—the soul which is the peculiar province of God! Men who call themselves infallible, when experience has shown, everywhere and always, that human beings are subject to illusion and error, when the Holy Spirit has revealed to us that it is so without exception—"Omnis homo mendax." Men who claim for themselves the special attributes of God! who wish to make themselves equal to the Most High! Was it not a crime of this kind that created hell, and which has flooded the earth with a deluge of evils? Was it not for wishing to become like God that Adam was driven out of the Garden of Eden, and that Lucifer was cast out of Heaven? How much reason have I to fear that men of like passions with myself should act in this matter under the influence of the same spirit of pride, which seduced even the angels of God, and man in a state of innocence. How ought I to be on my guard, and how foolish and criminal should I be to yield up all power over my own soul into the hands of these men, unless they can really *prove* to me, and that in the most irresistible way, their divine authority! Let them give proofs, therefore, and manifest testimony, which shall exclude all doubt, and prevent any hesitation; without this my adherence to your system cannot be conscientious. These proofs, too, and this testimony, must be of a nature not only to satisfy a fully developed intelligence, but open to the comprehension of mankind in general, and of unlearned minds, otherwise your religion is, at once, convicted of not being the religion of Christ; for it was the poor and the humble, in the first place, that he came to evangelize. Now, does Rome produce such proofs and such testimony? can she furnish them? I do not say a great number of proofs, or even several, but *even one—one* which can legitimately command the submission of both wise and simple! No, there is not one—Rome produces no proof. She does not even seek to furnish one, but by a new pretension, stranger still than the rest, and truly worthy to crown the others, in assertions so prodigious, and of such importance, Rome expects to be believed on her word!

A man once appeared in the midst of time who did not fear to make this prodigious affirmation—"I am God." This man was JESUS CHRIST, the only Son of the Father, and equal to him in all things. Certainly, if ever any one had a right to be believed on his own assertion, it was the Incarnate Word. So far, also, was this divine assertion, when he made it, from appearing suspicious, that, coming from him, one would be predisposed to admit it. It was enough to contemplate once that august countenance to feel convinced that Jesus was more than man; it was enough to hear one word from his mouth to be able to say, "Never man spake like this man." Well, did the Son of God avail himself of these favourable dispositions to invoke in favour of his divinity, only his own testimony? Let us listen to him and learn!—"*If I bear witness of myself my witness is nothing*"—that is to say, you ought not to submit to it; but it is my Father who bears witness of me—it is the Scriptures and my works, also, bear witness to me. And, in truth, the Father was heard proclaiming several times from Heaven, "This is my well-beloved Son." Tested by the Scriptures, he showeth himself in all things to be the end of the law—the realization of its figures, as well as the object of its predictions; and his miraculous works attested his divinity in a still more satisfying manner. All infirmities and diseases fled before his face as before the master of health. The dead were raised to life at his voice, as at the voice of the author of life. The sea bowed beneath his feet, as if under the feet of its sovereign. All nature was moved at his approach, as at the approach of its King; and even the devils obey his voice, and are constrained to confess to his supreme power. This was the way in which Jesus Christ *proved* and confirmed *his assertions*, and such is the value which He sets upon human reason, the greatest of the gifts which we have received from the liberality of the Creator. Such are the proofs which the incarnate word condescended and thought it right to present to us, before *He* demanded our adoration, in order that it might be paid him with full faith and love.

And yet, you, poor mortals—as miserable as the rest of mortals—pretend to impose your authority on my soul, without informing me first, if you have any legitimate title to such power. Vainly does the voice of all ages cry out to you that *none is permitted to pronounce in their own case.* Vainly does eternal truth consecrate the principle, and herself set us the example of it. There exists in the world a society of men who, despising the voice of ages, exalting themselves above the Son of God, repeat loudly and continually, "*We bear witness of ourselves and our witness is true. We judge in our own case and every soul ought to submit to our decisions. Woe to those who refuse!* Mahomet appealed for the truth of his doctrine to the sword. We appeal for the truth of ours to hell! Mahomet said, 'believe or I kill thee.' Sometimes

we say the same, but, generally, do better, and say, 'I believe or be damned!'"

What audacity!

But there is more than audacity in this; there is, also, profound cunning. Rome knows it well. There is nothing more likely to make an impression and lead men than such an assertion, uttered in a form so menacing and absolute. And those who are astonished that the adherents of the Romish system should be so numerous, prove they understand very little of the mystery of human nature.

But question these million subjects of Rome; ask them to give a reason for their belief, and I affirm, that out of a hundred you will find ninty-nine who can only answer, "I believe what the Church tells me, *because she says so.*" And they boast of such credulity, and represent it to us as the perfection of faith, humility, and virtue. Such faith is condemned by common sense; such humility is reproved by conscience; such virtue, it is to be feared, will be treated as a crime by Him who will judge every one of us at the last day.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

The great length of Mr. Power's letter has obliged us to postpone one from Mr. W. Rourke till our next. Several other valuable communications, already in type, are also postponed from want of room.

We beg to call the attention of our correspondents to the utility of adding their name and address to their communications.

To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal, which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The publishers respectfully request their subscribers to remember that their subscriptions are payable in *advance*. It is hoped that those who are in arrear will be good enough to remit or pay the amount due, without the necessity of special applications. Where the annual sum is so small as 3s. 6d. per annum, it is impossible to make application in the usual manner without incurring a serious expense in proportion to the sum due. Mr. Curry will, therefore, feel greatly obliged by remittances, and begs to return his grateful thanks to those who were good enough to remit the amount of their subscriptions since the publication of the last number.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, MARCH, 1855.

ROMANISM IN AMERICA.

The subject of the temporal power of the Pope has lately begun to occupy a considerable share of public attention amongst our brethren in the United States. The *Tablet* newspaper of the 3rd inst., contained a speech delivered on this question by the Hon. J. R. Chandler, in the House of Representatives, on the 11th of January in the present year, which the editor truly describes as "a very able and important speech." As the subject is one of much practical interest, we propose to discuss a few of the arguments and statements which are brought forward by Mr. Chandler. Before doing so, however, we think it well to say a few words on the remarkable change in public opinion which has taken place in America within the last few years, with regard to the position and influence of the Roman Catholic Church in that country. The causes by which this change has been brought about are so singular and instructive, that a brief sketch of them may prove interesting to many of our readers.

During the first half of the present century—that is, up to about the year 1850—the prospects of the Church of Rome in the United States were peculiarly encouraging. There was no established church in that country from which she had any need to fear either rivalry or opposition. In the midst of various religious parties the Roman Catholic Church was almost the only body which possessed the advantages of compact organization and united action. Its numbers were yearly augmented by a steady and continuous stream of immigrants from other countries, especially Germany and Ireland. Even where the people were nominally Protestant, the Roman Catholic priests often met with a favourable reception. In the thinly-peopled districts of the Western States, the settlers in which were often obliged to locate themselves in the depths of untrodden forests, the arrival of *any* religious teacher was hailed with satisfaction. The Church of Rome, with provident forethought, availed herself of the opportunity thus offered. She planted her priests and missionaries in considerable numbers along the great valley of the Mississippi, which she plainly saw was destined in time to rise into immense importance, and to become, perhaps, the most powerful and influential portion of the great Confederacy of the West.

All these causes, combined with others which it would be needless to specify, daily augmented the influence of the Roman Catholic Church and priesthood in America. Their aid was eagerly sought after by politicians of all parties, who hoped, by their means, to rise to distinction. In a country where almost every place is given away by universal suffrage, it is no wonder that unscrupulous men, who desired to gain "the most sweet voices" of the multitude, should naturally have recourse to the Romish priests, who were supposed, rightly or wrongly, to have the votes and consciences of a large part of the electoral body in their keeping. No means of flattery or conciliation were left untried to win their favour and support. A Roman Catholic archbishop was asked to preach before Congress, although the overwhelming majority of that body were Protestants; and, in the state of New York, a judge laid down from the bench the rule, that a priest was not to be interrogated about the secrets of the confessional (a principle then quite new to American law), with the hope, as was generally supposed, of thereby gaining the vote of the Roman Catholic party at the next election for the governorship of that state.

At length the ambition of the Romanist party in America took a higher and a wider flight. The love of power and influence is deeply implanted in the heart of man; and the priests of the Church of Rome, cut off by the stern policy of their Church from all family ties, have generally devoted their untiring energies to projects of worldly aggrandisement. The Roman Catholic party, which had hitherto been content to turn the balance in some local contest, now sought to exercise a controlling influence in the presidential election itself. The nomination of Franklin Pierce, the existing President of the United States, is generally supposed to have been carried by their instrumentality; and the effect of it certainly was, to introduce a large number of Roman Catholics into the public offices which were in the gift of the President.

At last, however, the reaction came. The native Americans took alarm when they saw many of the chief offices of the state conferred upon persons of foreign birth, and members of a Church which owed allegiance to a foreign spiritual head. Suddenly it began to be whispered that a secret confederacy had been formed, under the singular title of the Know-Nothing party, the members of which had bound themselves by an oath never to vote for any Roman Catholic. With magical rapidity this new association diffused itself through the length and breadth of the United States, and by the latest accounts it was reputed to include two millions of adult members. History scarcely records an instance of an organization formed with such rapidity, and on such a gigantic scale.

The principal argument by which, so far as we can learn, the Know-Nothing party justify their proceedings is one which has often been urged in our country, both in Parliament and elsewhere—namely, that as a Roman Catholic is bound to obey the Pope, he can never give an undivided allegiance to the constitutional authorities of his native land. The speech of Mr. Chandler, to which we have already adverted, is an elaborate attempt to show that this argument does not rest on sufficient historical grounds. We now proceed to consider a few of his assertions in detail, and we begin by giving the general statement of the question in his own words:—

"The charge, then, against the Roman Catholics of this country is, that their views of the supremacy of the Pope render them unsafe citizens, because it renders them liable to be withdrawn from their allegiance to their own civil government by the decrees or ordinances of their spiritual superior."

Let us now see how Mr. Chandler proposes to meet this charge:—

"Mr. Chairman, I deny that the Bishop of Rome has, or that he claims for himself the right to interfere with the political relations of any other country than that of which he is himself the sovereign. I mean, that I deny to the Bishop of Rome the right resulting from his divine office to interfere in the relations between subjects and their sovereigns. I recognise all the rights of the venerable head of the Church to the *spiritual* deference of its children."

Now, with all respect to Mr. Chandler, we consider that Cardinals Bellarmine and Baronius are better authorities than he is on the power and privileges claimed by the See of Rome; and it is a remarkable fact that both Cardinals stigmatize as *heretical* the opinion advocated by the American orator. We quote, as usual, their express words:

"*They are branded for heretics* who take from the Church of Rome and the See of Saint Peter one of the two swords, and allow only the spiritual."*

So far Cardinal Baronius. Let us now hear Bellarmine:—

"The next opinion, or rather *heresy*, teaches that the Pope, as Pope, has by divine right no temporal power, and that he has no right to command temporal princes, much less any power of depriving them of their kingdoms."†

We commend the following passages, from the the same author, to Mr. Chandler's attentive consideration:—

"The third and intermediate opinion, and that which is *generally received* by Catholic theologians, is this—That the Pope, as Pope, has not *directly* and immediately any temporal, but only a spiritual power; that, nevertheless, by reason of this spiritual power, he has a certain authority, and *that supreme*, in *temporals*." "That the power of the Pontiff, properly, chiefly, and in itself, is spiritual; but that by it he can dispose of the temporal things of all Christians, when such a measure is necessary to the end of his spiritual power; to which the ends of all temporal powers are subordinate." "He has no power merely temporal; and yet, in order to a spiritual good, he *has the supreme power of disposing of temporal things*." "The spiritual power does not interfere in the temporal concerns; but suffers all things to proceed so long as they do not oppose the spiritual end, or be not necessary to obtain it. But if *anything* of this sort occurs, *the spiritual can and ought to coerce the temporal, by any way or means which may appear necessary.*"‡

It is a remarkable circumstance, that the opinions of Bellarmine on the extent of the Papal power, extravagant as they may appear to us, failed to satify Pope Sixtus V. He thought, we are told, that Bellarmine had done a great prejudice to the dignity of the See of Rome, by insisting that the power of the Pope over the tem-

* Haeresis errore notanter omnes qui ab ecclesia Romana et cathedra Petri a duobus gladium alterum auferunt, nec non spiritualem concedunt.—Baronius, anno 1053, § 14.

† Altera non tam sententia quam haeresis docet, primo, pontificem ut pontificem ex jure divino nullam habere temporalem potestatem, nec posse ullo modo imperare principibus secularibus, nedum eos regnis et principatu privare.—Bellarm. de Rom. Pontif. lib. v. § 1. Tom. I, p. 344. Colon. 1613.

‡ Tertia sententia media, et Catholicorum communis, pontificem ut pontificem non habere directe et immediate ullam temporalem potestatem, sed solum spiritualem; tamen, ratione spiritualis, habere saltem indirecte potestatem quandam, eamque summam, in temporalibus, &c.—Bellarm. de Rom. Pontif. lib. v., cap. 1, 5, 6, p. 344, et seq. ut supra.

poralities of kings was not *direct*, but only *indirect*; upon which account Bellarmine's treatise "*de Romano Pontifice*," was placed among the prohibited books.* If Sixtus V. thought the opinions of Bellarmine did not *go far enough*, what would he have thought of Mr. Chandler?

We must proceed, however, to the consideration of his next statement:—

"Dr. Kenrick, Archbishop of Baltimore, one of the most learned of the Roman Catholic Church, asserts positively, that the temporal power, of which we speak, was never claimed by the Church, and he challenges the production of a single decree or definition in which the power was propounded as an article of faith."

We fear that Mr. Chandler must have relied on the ignorance of his auditory, when he made this assertion. We will merely quote, in reply, a short extract from the famous Extravagant of Pope Boniface VIII., entitled "Unam Sanctam," which is inserted in the Canon Law:—

"It is necessary that one sword should be under another, and that the temporal authority should be subject to the spiritual power. And thus the prophecy of Jeremiah is fulfilled in the Church and the ecclesiastical power, 'Behold, I have set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms, to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, to build, and to plant!' Therefore, if the earthly power go astray, it must be judged by the spiritual power; but if the spiritual power go astray, it must be judged by God alone. Moreover, we declare, say, define, and pronounce it to be *altogether necessary to salvation* that every human creature should be subject to the Roman Pontiff."†

It is almost a waste of words to comment on a statement so plain and unambiguous as this. Boniface VIII. distinctly asserts that it is *necessary to salvation* for every human being to be *subject* to the Pope; and what the limits of this subjection are, is evident from the preceding clauses, where he claims a rightful authority over every temporal power, without any limitation or qualification whatever. The Pope founds his claim, moreover, on a passage of Scripture, which speaks of "pulling down, destroying, and overturning *nations and kingdoms*." Words have no meaning if the claim of the Pope to temporal power is not here propounded as an article of faith.

The definition of the Papal power, laid down by Boniface VIII., has the advantage (of a greater than which no Papal decree is capable) of being expressly confirmed by one of the general councils of the Roman Church. "We," says Pope Leo X., in his Bull, read and passed in the fifth Lateran Council, "do renew and approve that holy constitution, with approbation of the present holy council."‡ Accordingly, Melchior Canus writes: "The Lateran Council did renew and approve the Extravagant of Boniface."§ And Baronius referring to it, says, that "all do assent to it, so that none dissenteth who does not by discord fall from the Church."‖

The multiplied instances recorded in history, in which the Popes *actually exerted* the power of deposing princes, and releasing subjects from their allegiance, leave us in no doubt whatever regarding the real nature and extent of the authority which Boniface VIII., as we have seen, claimed as an article of faith. It was impossible for Mr. Chandler to avoid this glaring difficulty; and we were curious to see how he would dispose of it. His own statement is as follows:—

"But I shall, of course, be asked whence the boldness of the assertion against Roman Catholics, and whence the readiness to believe the charges, if they are altogether unfounded? Has not the Pope exercised the power of deposing monarchs, and thus of releasing subjects from their allegiance?"

Now for Mr. Chandler's reply, which has, at least, the merit of originality. We give it in his own words:—

"The Christian princes *conferred* upon the Pope a power which previously he had not attempted to exercise; never, indeed, claimed to possess. The temporal power was conceded—was conferred by the Emperor and Christian princes—not to aggrandize the Bishop of Rome, but to enable him to decide betwixt them in their various disputes."

With all deference to Mr. Chandler, we must protest against this gross perversion of the plain facts of history. "The temporal power (of deposing princes) was *conferred* by the Emperor and Christian princes upon the Pope!" We ask, when was this done? History is entirely silent. "The Pope never claimed to possess the temporal power!" Again we refer to the Extravagant of Boniface VIII. Positive assertions, such as those of Mr. Chandler, are of little avail, except with persons who are ready to believe without any proof or argument at all.

Where was the "consent of the Emperor and Christian princes" when Hildebrand deposed the Emperor Henry IV.? Or, if we want an example nearer our own times, let us read the preamble of the Bull of Excommunication which Pope Pius V. pronounced against Queen Elizabeth. It was as follows:—

"He that reigneth on high, to whom is given all power in heaven and in earth, committed one Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church (out of which there is no salvation) to one only upon earth—namely, St. Peter, the prince of the apostles, and to Peter's successor, the Bishop of Rome, to be governed in fulness of power. Him alone he made prince over all people and all kingdoms, to pluck up, consume, scatter, destroy, plant, and build up.

"We do, out of the fulness of our apostolic power, declare the aforesaid Elizabeth, being a heretic, and a favourer of heretics, and her adherents, to have incurred the sentence of anathema, and to be cut off from the unity of the body of Christ. And, moreover, we do declare her to be DEPRIVED *of her pretended title to the* KINGDOM *aforesaid, and* of ALL DOMINION, *dignity, and privilege whatsoever.*"*

Here we see that the Pope claims to derive his power to depose a queen, not from any supposed consent of Christian princes, but *directly from God himself.* He relies, like Boniface VIII., on the passage from the Prophet Jeremiah, and he declares that his acts proceed "out of the *fulness of our apostolic power.*" This Bull of Pius V. effectually disposes of Mr. Chandler's ingenious theory, that the Pope, poor man, had the burden of this weighty responsibility thrust on him by the Emperor and others, for their own convenience and advantage. Mr. Chandler must, certainly, bring forward much more cogent and subtle arguments, if he hopes effectually to subdue the deep-rooted hostility which his countrymen have conceived against the encroachments of a foreign power.

In fact, the dilemma to which a sincere and honest Roman Catholic is reduced is this—"I believe the Pope to be infallible. Pope Boniface VIII. and others have repeatedly claimed, as of apostolic and divine right, the power to depose princes, and they have repeatedly exercised this power. Either, therefore, I must believe that Pope Pius IX. *now* possesses this power, or I must believe that Popes have erred; and, consequently, that they are not infallible." We see no answer to this argument.

Moreover, Roman Catholics universally acknowledge that the Pope's commands in spiritual matters are to be obeyed. But who is to decide what are spiritual and what are temporal things? If Bellarmine's comparison be true, that the spiritual power is like the soul, and the temporal power like the body, it is plain that the influence of the latter is reduced to very narrow limits indeed.* If the mind decides upon going one way, and the body another, it is easy to foretell in what direction the *man* will go.

The spiritual power in the hands of the Church of Rome pretends to rest upon a divine appointment, which is subject to no accident, and can undergo no change nor diminution. It works by the most powerful considerations upon the consciences and affections of men; it calls upon its subjects to obey upon pain of damnation; it promises heaven and threatens hell; which upon some men have an infinite sway—upon all men a considerable influence. The State can only grant temporal rewards, or inflict temporal punishments; but the priest can evoke the hopes and fears connected with a never-ending eternity. He has continual opportunities of conversing with men; he can insinuate and suggest the obligation to obedience with the greatest advantage—in secresy, in the tenderest seasons, in the moments of greatest weakness, in the trying hour of dissolution. Can we wonder, therefore, if mankind, in all ages, have looked with distrust and aversion upon the inordinate powers which the Church of Rome claims to exercise over the minds and consciences of free-born, intelligent men?

RECENT CONTROVERSY AT BOULOGNE.

(Continued from page 21.)

Dr. M.—Your next testimony is Irenæus, and your argument is, that as he says "to this Church, on account of its superior headship, all others must have recourse," therefore, the Church or Bishop of Rome must be infallible, and have supreme jurisdiction over all other Churches. The words of Irenæus, and the purpose for which he used them, not only do not bear out your inference, but, moreover, directly oppose it. Irenæus was, in the work from which you quote, writing against heretics. One argument which he uses against them is—the consent of Catholic and Apostolic Churches. All these, he says, agree in doctrine. But since it would be irksome to enumerate all, he selects one as the type of such consent—the Church of Rome. The reason for this selection was quite clear. That Church was the only Western Church of known apostolic origin. It was founded, as Irenæus declares, by Peter and Paul, and not, as your writers (contending for the pontifical inheritance of Peter's presumed privileges) say, by Peter alone. It was the Church whose faith, spoken of by the Apostle Paul, continued in its purity while Irenæus wrote, as notorious as it was pure. It was the greatest city of the world. Hence this writer selects it, and he plainly could select no other Western Church, as the type of catholic consent, and proof of catholic doctrine among the Churches of the West. Now if, as you assert, Irenæus held the infallibility and jurisdiction of the Roman Church, is it possible that he would have passed by such a means of proving his case against heretics? His argument must have been this—the Church of Rome is infallible; your doctrine opposes hers, therefore, you are clearly convicted of error; or, she has supreme jurisdiction; you resist her, therefore, you are an enemy to the truth. Manifestly, if this writer held the doctrine which you *make* him to have held, he must, unless he had neither reason nor memory, have urged it in that case where it was just the fact which, *if it existed*, must have decided the dispute. Not only does Irenæus not do this, but he does use an argument inconsistent with the supposition that he was acquainted with the doctrine you ascribe to him. Why does he give, as his reason for specializing one Church—the Roman—"that it would be irksome to enumerate all?" Why does he not say, as he must have said, if he held, as you assert, your modern doctrine—"It is allowed, and not to be denied, that the Church of Rome has an authority which can never err, and must never be resisted; submit to her," &c. His argument is not so. It is this—all Catholic and Apostolic Churches agree in doctrine; hence it is, as it

---

* Doctrinâ Bellarmini auctoritatem illam minui, quam Christus Dominus vicario suo in terris dedit ad ecclesiæ dignitatem firmitatemque, idque fieri in opinione ipsius circa Dominium temporarium, quod Pontifici competit item in res temporarias.—*Vide* Bayle, vol. iii., p. 170. Note R. London, 1735.

† Oportet autem gladium esse sub gladio, et temporalem auctoritatem spiritnali subjici potestati. Sic de ecclesia et ecclesiastica potestate verificatur vaticinium Hieremiæ, Ecce, constitui te super gentes et regna, et cetera, quæ sequntur. Ergo si deviat terrena potestas, judicabitur a potestate spirituali. Sed si deviat spiritualis; a solo Deo. Porro subesse Romano Pontifici omni humanæ creaturæ declaramus, dicimus, definimus, et pronunciamus omnino esse de necessitate salutis.—Corp. Jur. Can. De Major. et obed. Tom. ii., p. 394. Paris, 1687.

‡ Constitutionem ipsam, sacro præsenti concilio approbante, innovamus et approbamus.—Conc. Gen. Labbe. Tom. xiv. Conc. Later. v., sess. xi.

§ Quam Extravagantem renovavit et approbavit Concilium Lateranense sub Leone. X.—Melch. Can. Loc. Theol. lib. vi., cap. iv., p. 316. Colon. 1605.

‖ Hæc Bonifacius, cui assentiuntur omnes, ut nullus discrepet, nisi qui diasidio ab ecclesia excidit.—Baron. anno 1053, sect. xiv., tom. xi. Romæ. 1606.

* Regnans in excelsis, &c.—Magn. Bullar. Rom. Tom. ii., p. 324. Luxemb. 1727.

* Est igitur alia similitudo longè aptior in nobis ipsis. Ut enim se habent in homine spiritus et caro, ita se habent in ecclesia duæ illæ potestates.—Bellarm. de Rom. Pont., lib. v., cap. vi., p. 349. Tom. i. Col. 1615.

would be impossible to enumerate them all, sufficient to select that one whose faith is as notorious as it is true. All agree with this Church, for there is a catholic consent of doctrine, and Rome is the type of this consent; therefore, you, heretics, oppose the truth in differing from her. Nay, more, the argument used by Irenæus enables us to determine what *he did not mean*—and this is all I want in order to refute your inference—by the words "superior headship." Whatever he meant by them, it is certain he did not mean to include, under the circumstances which justified that title, either infallibility or supreme jurisdiction, because, if he had, he never would have destroyed the strong argument which he might have founded, and must have founded upon them, *if they existed*, by giving, as a reason for selecting the Church of Rome, not this infallibility, not this jurisdiction over the whole Church, but the irksomeness of enumerating all Churches. The common accordancy of doctrine among all Churches is the fact upon which he bases his refutation of heretics. The fact upon which, if it existed, he must have based it, would, of necessity be the infallibility of the Roman Church. Particular qualifications, conveyed by the expression "superior headship,"* contain his reasons for selecting the Church of Rome as being, among Western Churches, the best, and the admitted exponent of that faith. But among those qualifications indicated by that phrase, it is impossible Irenæus can be understood to have included (what was, indeed, utterly unheard of in his age) either the infallibility or jurisdiction of that Church, because his argument then must have been—Rome is infallible, yield to her; and not what it is—since it is irksome to enumerate all Churches, I select Rome! You seem quite to have forgotten that Irenæus does, on another occasion, let us into his views upon the matter of pontifical jurisdiction. You forget his letter to Pope Victor, in which, though agreeing with him upon the matter in debate, he severely rebukes his unchristian arrogance in attempting to force his opinion on the Eastern bishops.

A clear witness to the meaning of Irenæus, and against the Church of Rome, is Tertullian, who uses exactly the same argument, and on the same occasion, with the Bishop of Lyons. He refutes heretics from the consent of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, which consists of the several Churches in union with each other. He takes the leading Church of each country as the type of such consent. Irenæus was a western bishop, and, therefore, selects Rome. The African's argument is wider, but just the same in principle. The Apostolic Churches echo the voice, and represent the dignity of their founders. "Is Achaia near you? You have Corinth. If you be not far from Macedonia, you have Philippi, you have Thessalonica. If you go into Asia, you have Ephesus; *but if you be proximate to Italy, you have Rome.*"

Can anything be more clear than this argument? All churches agree in doctrine. It is tedious to enumerate them separately. Take, then, those founded by Apostles as types of others—Corinth, Philippi, Thessalonica, Ephesus, Rome. You can appeal, as you are nearer, to any of these; the faith of all is one; it came from their apostolic founders. Why does Tertullian mention Rome simply, as he mentions other apostolic Churches? Why does he not say—"Appeal to Rome—she is infallible—she has supreme jurisdiction—she has the right to decide, and to require implicit obedience?" Why does he use a weak argument?—for his, though intrinsically good, must be relatively weak, if he possessed a better, and one which, if true, he could not have overlooked? Why does he use the same argument as Irenæus?—the common consent of all churches, and not the infallibility and jurisdiction of one? Simply because he could not use what neither he, nor any one of his time had ever heard of. The doctrines were innovations of a subsequent period.]

Your next authority is from the fourth century. Optatus, of Milevis, who says—"You cannot deny that St. Peter, the chief of the apostles, established an episcopal chair at Rome. This chair was one that all might preserve unity by the union which they had with it; so that whosoever sets up a chair against it, should be a schismatic and an offender."

I think it may safely be said, even of the strongest passages which you bring, that they fall utterly short of establishing what you are required to prove. How is it that you can never, and do never, bring forward an extract from any accredited early writer which plainly states your doctrines. Take Optatus, though he is but a sorry witness. He wrote against the Donatists, whom he shows to be schismatics. Is it not striking, that he, too, should be silent upon the infallibility and the jurisdiction of the Roman Church? How can you account for the systematic silence of all the early writers on these doctrines, when writing upon the very subjects which must have *necessitated* their mention, if they were really allowed? Heretics and schismatics were just the offenders to be answered and condemned by them. Yet, in no one instance can you produce the proof that they were so refuted. It is wonderful that you, who so continuously assert that *all* the Fathers held your doctrines, cannot adduce a single clear statement from any *one* among them to justify the assertion. You always *make* inferences, but never give plain, unmistakeable quotations. You invent interpretations, instead of translating passages. You *create* a sense, but do not discover it, which sense no one, who had not a purpose to serve, could ever find in the extracts you bring. Why does not Optatus say at once, if he believed—and *he must so have believed* if your inference from his words be correct—"The Church of Rome is infallible; the Bishop of Rome has supreme authority over the whole Church of Christ." He does not say these things; and why? Because as, if he believed them, he must have said them, so his silence, with that of all other writers, proves that he did not believe what neither he nor they had ever heard of. His argument is this—"You, Donatists, claim to be the true Church. How can this be? There is union in the true Church. This you have broken therefore, you cannot be it. He particularizes Rome as evidence of such union. But what does he state to be the bond of union between it and other Churches? Was it infallibility? Was it a co-acted submission to an irresistible jurisdiction? No such thing. He speaks of "Damasus (Bishop of Rome), now our colleague, by whose means all the Churches of the world are united with us, *keeping correspondence by circular letters.*" A very just idea of union. There was communion among other Christian Churches and that of Rome, through the Pontiff, by circular letters. Whoever broke such union was a schismatic. The Donatists set up their own bishops (and, as we know, made but little count of the Roman Pontiff), and, in so doing, proved themselves to be schismatics.

[Whatever *opinion* Optatus had, it cannot be worth much. The man who, among other strange sayings, founded a proof that Peter was head of the Apostles, upon the name Cephas, which, in his view, was derived from the *Greek* word κεφαλη (head), cannot be one whose judgment is entitled to much respect. Such good cause is there for distinguishing between the opinions of some among the Fathers, and their depositions to facts.

In Optatus, as earlier in Cyprian, may be discovered the germ of the error of which the Papacy, in after-years, became the full development. That great error, which lays undue stress upon the objective or visible aspect of union; first, to the disparagement and depression, then to the extinction of union, through communion of doctrine, heart, correspondence, &c. This evil culminated in the Papacy. Augustine stands out as the strong opponent of this sad declension from Christian purity. Not directly, as the evil was not then apparent; but indirectly, from his Christian view of the Christian Church. He deals, by anticipation, heavy blows against modern papacy. Take, for instance, his explanation of the reason why Simon was called *Peter*. Romanist writers, of course, now say it was by way of anticipation, referred to the Church subsequently to be founded upon him as "the rock;" but, according to this eminent man, because Peter was himself founded on Christ, "the rock"—and so, in other instances.]

Your last witness is Jerome, who thus writes—"I am following no other than Christ, *united to the communion of your Holiness—that is, to the Chair of Peter; I know that the Church is founded upon that rock; whoever eateth the Lamb out of that house is a profane man;* whoever is not in the ark shall perish by the flood."

Now, take this passage as it stands. What does it prove? Infallibility, or supreme jurisdiction over the whole Church? Nothing of the sort. It proves simply, in Jerome's view, strongly attached as he was to Rome, the indispensability of union with the Church of Rome, as then constituted, as then undefiled by its subsequent perversions and corruptions of that faith once held by this Church in its purity. Many early writers held very decided opinions on the necessity of union among all Christian Churches, which their contests with schism increased. Rome naturally stood out among western Churches as the symbol and centre of such union. But what you never attempt to prove is just what you are called on to prove, and that is, that these writers agree in asserting that the reason why the Church of Rome becomes thus specialised is, because she alone was infallible, or because her Pontiff alone had a supremacy of power over all other Churches. Other reasons are given, but these, which are what you undertook to show, never.

You take certain extracts, and *force* the meaning which you want upon them. Nothing can be more easy than to show, by extracts from the same writers, that they did *not* hold the opinions you ascribe to them.

In point of fact, it would be quite easy, by producing other extracts from the same writers, to neutralise completely any passages you produce, even allowing your own interpretation of them. If these writers meant anything like what you assert they did, because of the passages you produce, they must be men so unstable in judgment, and so uncertain in expression, as wholly to destroy their value as testimony; because in other passages, they make it very clear that they held no such views. But if these doctrines were of the notoriety and universality you claim for them, they would have been stated without ambiguity or exception.

You assert your peculiar doctrines to have been held by all writers. Nothing less than universal consent will, because you have asserted such, prove your case. Hence you leave us an easy task, to overthrow the claims by producing an opposing witness. Any one of credit will suffice, since you assert an universal consent in your favour, to upset your case.

I take, for instance, St. Ambrose, what are his words? "Peter exercised a primacy of confession, not of honour; a primacy of faith, not of order." You assert the direct reverse of this in your modern doctrine of pontifical supremacy.

Mr. Gretton subsequently replied. I prefer giving his answer in the words of the account published by my opponents. "On referring to the passage from St. Ambrose, quoted by the Dr., his real words were found to be, that, on being interrogated by Christ, Peter *exercised* (egit) *a primacy of confession and of faith, not of honour and order*, which he HAD NOT YET RECEIVED."

Dr. M.—From what edition of Ambrose are you quoting? The last words are an interpolation.

[The reader will perceive that St. Ambrose makes completely against the Roman Catholic claim, if the last words be *not genuine*. Now, in order to show how the writings of Ambrose have been dealt with, I shall first adduce the testimony of the Roman Catholic historian, Dupin. I shall then give the genuine passage as given by the celebrated Roman Catholic authorities, the Benedictine editors of the writings of the Fathers.

First, with respect to the liberties taken with Ambrose, Dupin thus speaks—"The works of St. Ambrose, above all the other Fathers, have been most corrupted in the ordinary editions. The *Roman* edition, from which those that followed after were made, instead of restoring the text of this Father, hath rendered it more faulty in many places, by the liberty which the supervisors of that edition took, of making alterations in it of their own authority. In this edition the works were in great confusion, without order and without distinction of what was genuine, and what was superstitious, &c."—Eccl. His. vi., art. St. Ambrose. Now—in order to show that the words—"which he had not yet received," upon which the Roman Catholic claim rests, and without which it is expressly denied by Ambrose, are one of "the corruptions," we have only to consult the Benedictine edition, where they *are omitted* as being spurious. The passage is as follows—"(Petrus) ubi audivit: vos autem quid me dicitis? Statim loci non immemor sui primatum egit: primatum confessionis utique non honoris, primatum fidei non culminis."—De Incarn., cap. iv.

Thus it appears that the words, "which he had not *yet* received," have been fraudulently added to the statement of Ambrose, which, *without these words*, directly oppose the Roman Catholic claims of primacy for Peter.]

Again, it is so notorious that the title or power of universal bishop was not allowed to the Roman Pontiff, that the first person who assumed it was a Bishop of Constantinople, not of Rome. The Roman Pontiff, Gregory, wrote to the Emperor, urging upon him to suppress this assumption, and declaring it, among other objections, to savour of the spirit of Antichrist.

Mr. Gretton gave the following answer. I quote from the "Resume":—"In the context of the letter, St. Gregory explains his meaning by these very words addressed to John, 'having despised thy brethren thou desirest to be the sole bishop in existence,' and in *this sense* he adds that such a title would be blasphemy, as it would subvert the whole divine right of episcopacy."

Dr. M.—Gregory objects against the assumption of the title, because it did convey such arrogant pretension, as to subvert the right of episcopacy. The claim, he says, did that. But it was not, as you say, that he only objected against the assumption of the title by a Bishop of Constantinople, for he adds, no Bishop of Rome had ever taken it, and ought not to do so. The title of universal bishop had been offered to Pope Leo, and he refused it, "lest by giving something peculiar to one bishop only, they should take away the rights which belong to all bishops."

(To be continued.)

* In order to show still more fully the weakness of the Roman Catholic argument, founded on the expression, "superior headship," it must be remembered that we do not know what Irenæus really said. The original is not extant. We have only what the Roman Catholic historian, Dupin, terms "a very barbarous version" of the work, from whence the passage under consideration has been taken. Until we know the original, the argument of our adversaries, such as it is, rests on the fidelity with which the words, "propter potentiorem principalitatem," of "a very barbarous version" represent the original; which may have been either ικανωτέραν πρωτιάν, or αρχαιοτητα, instead of πρωτιαν; neither expression would prove the Roman Catholic claim. But, whatever may have been the original, we have, as it fairly appears, the reasons given by Irenæus which induced him to apply the words "potentiorem principalitatem" to this Church. For he speaks of it as "maximæ et antiquissimæ et omnibus cognitæ, a gloriosissimis duobus apostolis, Petro et Paulo, Romæ fundatæ." Moreover, when it said, "to this Church every other must have recourse—that is, the faithful in all countries"—it is to be observed on this translation. The word *must* is the translation of "necesse," which is not the translation of the Greek δει—this would have required oportet. The original, if the Latin be correct, was, therefore, αναγκη. Hence, Irenæus did not mean to say there was a moral obligation on all other churches to conformity with Rome. He clearly means to state the circumstance which warranted him in making this Church the type of consent among churches. "With this Church, on account of its more important pre-eminence (the reasons for such pre-eminence having been assigned, without mention either of infallibility or jurisdiction), all believers must agree, of course." Still more strongly against Roman infallibility are the concluding words, wroogly translated thus—"in which Church is preserved the doctrine delivered by the Apostles," but truly, "has been preserved by believers from all places" (therefore, not by an infallible judge): or, perhaps, as Gieseler more truly, because of what follows, renders it, "has been always preserved *in correspondence* with believers in all places." Thus we see how far Irenæus is from supporting the modern claims of the Roman Church.

Correspondence.

ON PURGATORY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—1. I again assert that prayers and sacrifice are offered for the dead by the Catholic Church for another purpose, besides that of getting the soul out of Purgatory; but I deny that this *admission* contradicts, even by implication, the doctrine of Purgatory. 2. I, moreover, respectfully submit, that the word *commemorate*, as used in any passage by St. Cyril, with respect to prayers for the dead, instead of destroying, establishes, beyond dispute, the distinction between prayers for the saints, and those for the other dead. St. Cyril's words, which I shall transcribe where necessary, will test the accuracy of this assertion. He says—*Δεομεθα σου παντες ημεις, και ταυτην προσφερομεν σοι την θυσιαν, ινα μνημονευωμεν και των προκεκοιμημενων, πρωτον Πατριαρχων, Προφητων, Αποστολων, Μαρτυρων, οπως ο Θεος ευχαις αυτων και πρεσβειαις προσδεξηται ημων την δεησιν.* "We all beseech Thee, and we offer this sacrifice to Thee, that, in the first place, we may *commemorate* the patriarchs, the prophets, Apostles, and martyrs, who are dead, that God, through *their prayers* and *intercessions*, may receive our *supplications*." St. Cyril continues—*ειτα και υπερ των προκεκοιμημενων αγιων Πατερων και Επισκοπων, και παντων απλως των εν ημιν προκεκοιμημενων, μεγιστην ονησιν πιστευοντες εσεσθαι ταις ψυχαις υπερ ων η δεησις αναφερεται, της αγιας και φρικοδεστατης προκειμενης θυσιας.* "Next we beseech Thee, and we offer this sacrifice to Thee, for our deceased holy Fathers and bishops, and, in fine, for all our departed, believing that the souls receive great advantage, for whom supplication is offered up in the celebration of the holy and tremendous sacrifice." The idea of *commemoration*, suggested by the first passage, is perfectly limited and independent of that in the second passage. In the former, the word *μνημονευωμεν*, is applied exclusively to the patriarchs, &c., for the purpose of invoking God through their prayers and intercession; in fact, the natural structure of the discourse prohibits the application of it to the dead alluded to in the second passage; for these the commemoration is, *Δεομεθα σου παντες ημεις και ταυτην προσφερομεν σοι την θυσιαν υπερ των προκεκοιμημενων*, &c., &c., to the end of the second passage given above; and thus far, the distinction is self-evident and incontrovertible.

3. The holy Father next tells his *neophytes* he will explain for them, by an example, the advantage which arises to those for whom supplication is offered, *υπερ ων η δεησις αναφερεται*; "for many say, what benefit is it to a soul departed this life, either with sins or without them, to be commemorated in this sacrifice? But tell me, I say, if a king had driven into banishment some persons who had offended him, and their friends supplicating, should present a crown of great value, might not the king, by that means, grant a pardon to the guilty persons?" He continues to explain for them, that, "after the same manner that they supplicate the king to seek pardon for their friends, so do we offer our supplications to God for those that are dead, *if they be sinners*; we do not propose a crown, but we offer Christ slain, for our sins, propitinting, both for them *(the dead)* and for us, Him who is so beneficent." *κατα αυτον τροπον και ημεις υπερ των κεκοιμημενων αυτω τας δεησεις προσφεροντες, καν αμαρτωλοι ωσιν, ου στεφανον πλεκομεν, αλλα Χριστον εσφαγιασμενον υπερ των ημετερων αμαρτηματων προσφερομεν, εξιλασουμενοι υπερ αυτων και ημων τον φιλανθρωπον.*—*Catech. Mystag.* v., page 38. This last passage affords very important and decisive evidence of the practice of prayers and sacrifice, at that time offered by the Church, for the relief of the dead, to obtain pardons for them, &c.

"If they (the dead) be sinners," or "though they be sinners," applied antithetically with respect to the patriarchs, &c., &c., "we offer supplications for them"—*τας δεησεις προσφεροντες*; "we offer Christ slain"—*Χριστον εσφαγιασμενον* (thus, he names the sacrifice of the altar), to propitiate God for them, to make atonement, to obtain pardon, alike for the dead and the living, as members of the same body; thus confirming the distinction already noticed, and vindicating the practice of praying for the relief of the dead from the objections of those who questioned its efficacy, and who, contrary to what you assert, are ranked among *heretics*. For *Aerius*, on this account, is set down for a heretic by *St. Augustine*, *Lib. de Hær* liii., &c., where he says of him—"he taught private opinions of his own, saying, 'that we must not pray or offer sacrifice for the dead;'" and, in the same manner, he is numbered in the list of heretics by *St. Epiphanius*, Hær. lxxv., &c.

4. Thus, in the fourth century, we find the Church virtually inculcating, "that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls there detained are relieved by the prayers of the faithful, but, chiefly, by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar."—*Conc. Trid., Sess.* xxv., *de Purgatorio*. I showed in my last letter, that this doctrine is supported by the authority of all the ancient liturgies; and 5. I quoted a passage from the Liturgy of St. James, as *old a form of offering for the dead* as any to be found in the world, in which it is positively stated, that the sacrifice was offered to supplicate repose, relief, rest, from *pain, torment*, &c., "*for the souls of the departed*." I proved that this was the doctrine of the Church in the 2nd and 3rd centuries; and, hence, we find the essential doctrine of Purgatory supported by a respectable antiquity, and claiming the title of immemorial prescription; and, at a much later period, we find a strict corroboration of this doctrine in the first Liturgy of the Church of England, declared by an act of parliament to have been framed by *inspiration of the Holy Ghost*: here we have a prayer for the departed, that "God *would grant them mercy and everlasting peace.*"—*Collier's Ecc. Hist.*, vol. ii., *page* 257. 6. Your cavils with respect to the opinion of St. Augustine are an odd sort of argument; let him defend himself. He says—"when we offer the sacrifice of the altar, or give alms for all the faithful departed, they are *acts of thanksgiving* for the truly good—they are *propitiations* for those not very bad—and though they are no helps to those that are very bad, they are some consolation to the living." Cum ergo sacrificia, sive altaris, sive quarumcunque eleemosynarum pro baptizatis defunctis omnibus offeruntur; pro valde bonis gratiarum actiones sunt; pro non valde malis, propitiationes sunt; pro valde malis, etsi nulla sunt adjumenta mortuorum, qualescunque vivarum consolationes sunt.—*Enchirid, cap.* cx., page 238. Now, I challenge you, if you can, to repeat your question—"might we not as well pray for the devil?" I stated nothing but what is consonant to the opinion expressed in the above passage, and I maintain, it is an ample justification of the practices of Rome that they are not worse than this.

7. You say—"we find no fault with those who think it likely" that the saints in heaven pray for us; but you add—"it is a very different matter when we are told *that we must pray to them*," &c.; "and this is exactly what St. Cyril does not say in this passage;" and allow me to remark, for your information, that this, too, is exactly what the Catholic Church *does not say* or teach. Christianity obliges us no more to desire the prayers of the saints, than it obliged St. Paul to desire the prayers of the Christians.—*Rom.* xv. 30, 31; Eph. vi. 19; Heb. xiii. 18., &c.

And I now call upon you to show, upon the authority of any orthodox standard of Catholic doctrines, or of any approved exposition of Catholic principles, a positive law of the Catholic Church, by which it is expressly stated "*that we must pray to them.*" This, as a journalist, you owe to the public, whom you may have misled, by asserting that we (Catholics) *must pray to the saints*; you owe it to me as an individual engaged in the defence of Catholic truth. And, if you cannot refer to any authentic source, as I am confident you cannot, you cannot refuse us to decline the honour of subscribing to a creed, such as you think proper to frame for us. Let our real principles be fairly admitted, not these fictitious forms of *credenda*, these caricatures of Catholic belief, and I feel confident you will be quite unable to refute them.

8. The *Council of Trent* will afford you no assistance, except in the emboweled and decapitated form that you cited it in CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. iii., p. 71, col. 1. You complain of the terms in which I treat your citation; you say—"you had no intention to misrepresent Roman Catholic doctrines," &c.; and "we cited, of course, merely as much as was necessary to elucidate our purpose." Now, I ask you, was not the subject discussed by you, "*The Invocation of Saints?*" and the garbled quotation was necessary to elucidate your purpose! Hence, it plainly follows, that though there was "*no intention* to misrepresent Roman Catholic doctrines or the *Council of Trent*," the very elucidation has degenerated into a flagrant misrepresentation. I do not consider I have used a word disrespectfully. The cause of truth requires plain, open dealing—no suppression of facts, no distortion of evidence. We are assured that the Church in the third and fourth centuries, believed that the saints in heaven prayed for their brethren on earth. 9. On the evidence of St. Cyril we learn, that the Church offered to God, through the saints, their supplications, both for the living and the dead; they held them to be *mediators* of prayers and intercessions; the liturgies and the Fathers afford joint evidence in this case.

10. This holy patriarch also says—"we offer Christ sacrificed to make atonement to God, to propitiate him, to beg mercy," &c., as expressed by the word *εξιλεουμενοι*, for the dead, if they be sinners;" *καν αμαρτωλοι ωσιν*, or, "even if they be sinners;" this sacrifice he, a little before, called *η θυτια εκεινη τον ιλασμον*—the very victim of atonement. You cite the words—"when we taste, we are bidden to taste not bread and wine, but the SIGN of the body and blood of Christ;" and you say—"this is a way of speaking, that no Roman Catholic ever uses," &c.; but in this, I venture to tell you, you are mistaken. The Catholic believes that the outward sacramental appearances of bread and wine, which still remain after consecration, are not only a sign and a memorial of Christ, but also of the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist. We are bidden to taste *not bread and wine*, but the *antitypes*, &c.; hence, it plainly follows, that the antitypes, or sacramental elements, were not believed to be bread and wine; but that "in the *type* of bread the body is given to thee, and in the *type* of wine the blood is given"—*εν τυπῳ αρτου διδοται σοι το σωμα, και εν τυπῳ οινου, διδοται σοι το αιμα*; and, that what appears to be bread, is not bread, though it be taken by the taste to be bread, but it is the body of Christ; and that which appears to be wine, is not wine, though the taste judges so, but it is the blood of Christ"—*ο φαινομενος αρτος, ουκ αρτος εστιν, ει και τη γευσει αισθητος, αλλα σωμα Χριστου, και ο φαινομενος οινος, ουκ οινος εστιν, ει και η γευσις τουτο βουλεται, αλλα αιμα Χριστου.*—St. Cyril. Catech., Mystagog. iv., cap. 320–2.

From these passages of St. Cyril it follows, that though he uses the word *antitype*, to express the sacrament of Christ's body and blood, neither he nor the Church in his time, understood it in your *figurative sense*. They believed and taught, that though to the senses bread and wine appeared in the sacrament, they were *not bread and wine*, but the *body and blood* of Christ; this they teach without any, the slightest ambiguity.

Their sacrifice was identically the same as the sacrifice offered by the Catholic Church of this present day; and we have seen that it was offered *then*, as well as *now*, to free souls from the punishments of sin, to render God merciful to them, to make atonement for them, to appease Him, and expiate their offences. And unless you can show that the Church offered sacrifice for this purpose, for the saints who were already in the possession of the beatific vision, or that the plain, but nervous words of St. Cyril cannot now be allowed to represent the same significant ideas, which in the natural and philosophical mechanism of the language they were first used to express, I must still hold that prayers and sacrifice for the relief of the dead, the invocation of saints, setting aside misrepresentation, the real presence in the Eucharist, are three Popish principles coeval with Christianity.

I remain, Sir, yours much obliged,

EDMOND POWER.

To save repetition, we have prefixed numbers to those passages of Mr. Power's letter which require an answer.

No. 1. Mr. Power continues to assert (what we ourselves have always asserted), that prayers for the dead may be offered for another purpose besides that of getting the soul out of Purgatory. So far we are agreed, to the confusion of all those Roman Catholic controversialists who, whenever they find *any* prayer for the dead, immediately ask us to believe that it *must* be for the purpose of getting the soul out of Purgatory. Again we say, that prayer for the dead does not prove Purgatory, unless it can be shown that the prayer was offered for the purpose of getting a soul out of Purgatory.

But did the early Church ever pray for the dead, for the purpose of getting a soul out of Purgatory? Mr. Power, will you produce us a prayer expressly for that purpose? You have all the ancient liturgies to search through; produce from them only one prayer, that a soul may be delivered from out of Purgatory—and we will submit. Why will you not produce the prayer, and end this discussion? Can there be any better reason for not producing it—than that no such prayer is to be found?

No. 2. The whole of this paragraph is intended to prove that the word "commemorate" is applied *only* to "patriarchs, prophets, Apostles, and martyrs," while, for all others who are prayed for, the word "supplicate" only is used.

Now, if Mr. Power had taken the trouble to turn to any one of the ancient liturgies, he would have seen that this distinction, on which he relies so much, has no shadow of foundation; for in all those liturgies the word "commemorate" is expressly applied to all others who are prayed for, as well as to patriarchs, prophets, &c. Let him only look at the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom, in Goar's "Rituale Græcorum," and he will find this—*Ενταυθα ζωντων και τεθνεωτων ὧν εθελει ὁ ιερευς μνημονευειν ονομασι*—"here the Priest *commemorates* by name the living and the dead whom he wishes." It is quite useless to bring evidence to prove that *this* was *not* in the ancient liturgies, when we see it in the liturgies themselves; and, indeed, it is only by an evident misconstruction of the words of St. Cyril, that Mr. Power makes St. Cyril appear to contradict this. In the Oxford translation, made from the Benedictine and Oxford texts, Mr. Power will see that the first words which he has quoted, "we all beseech thee, and we offer this sacrifice to thee," belong to a *previous* sentence, relating to prayers for the *living*. Then he commences about prayers for *the dead*, at the words, "these we *commemorate*," &c.; and that word, "commemorate," must run through that whole sentence. So St. Cyril does *not* contradict the liturgy at all. And, in this sentence, respecting prayer for the dead, there is not one word said of "sacrifice for the dead;" but only that prayer was offered for the dead, at the time that that sacrifice was offered. And this disposes of a great deal of Mr. Power's letter.

No. 3. It is quite clear from the liturgies themselves, that commemorations and prayers were intended to be made only for those "who had gone to rest in hope of the resurrection of eternal life" (qui in spe resurrectionis æternæ vitæ obdormierunt); for these words follow on to the words which allow the commemoration to be made. How, then, are we to account for the fact of St. Cyril being driven to justify prayers for those who died in their sins—*ἁμαρτωλοι*? There is only one possible

account of it; this corrupt practice had grown up of praying for such; and St. Cyril had the weakness to try and defend it by a very poor argument of his own, instead of openly saying that the Church and the liturgy gave no sanction to such a practice. So it is now. If we charge the Church of Rome with teaching that the Mass will save those who die in mortal sin, we should be met with assertions that the Council of Trent does not sanction such a practice. But if a priest is offered money to say Masses for one who notoriously died in mortal sin, he is well enough satisfied that it should be thought that the Mass is of use.

But St. Cyril admits that "many" thought *these* prayers were useless; and he does not say they were heretics, or contradicted *the Church* by so saying. He only offered a very poor argument of his own, and one, too, which many Roman Catholics say is contrary to the present doctrine of the Church of Rome herself.

No. 4. Is it not wonderful that these old Fathers *never* SPEAK of Purgatory in those places in which Roman Catholics think that they *must* MEAN it? Oh, they speak of it *virtually!* That means that they never NAME it once! Strange that they should write so much of it, as Roman Catholics think they do, and yet never once mention it. We affirm that St. Cyril, who never names it, does *not* speak even "virtually" of it, unless Purgatory be for *ἁμαρτωλοί*, which means hardened sinners.

No. 5. In the passage of Mr. Power's letter which we have numbered 5, he says—"I quoted a passage from the Liturgy of St. James, in which it is positively stated, that the sacrifice was offered to supplicate repose, relief, rest, from *pain, torment*, &c., for the souls of the departed." We can only meet this assertion by an explicit contradiction. Mr. Power marks the words, "*pain, torment*," in italics, as containing the force of the passage which he quoted. Now, the passage which he quoted from the "Liturgy of St. James," do *not* contain the words, "pain, torment," at all. The words which he quoted were these, *ὑπὲς ἀναπαυσιν των προκεκοιμημενων ψυχων*"—that is, "for the rest of the souls of those who have died before us." There is not one word in the quotation about *pain* or *torment*. It is true, Mr. Power affirms in the place referred to, "that *ἀναπαυσιν* means rest, relief, &c., from *pain, torment*, &c., is beyond contradiction.—Apoc. xiv. 11." But the words, "pain, torment," are Mr. Power's *own* words, and he has no right in his present letter to give those words of his own, as positively stated in the Liturgy of St. James. The argument by which Mr. Power, in that former letter (Nov., 1854), tries to prove that the word *αναπαυαν* (which simply means "rest") does mean "rest from pain and torment"—such as purgatory—does really prove exactly the reverse. In his present letter he refers to Apoc. xiv. 11, and they have *no rest* day or night—"*και ουκ εχουαιν αναπαυαιν ἡμερας και νυκτος.*" Any one who looks to the verse will see that this is said of those who are in *hell*, not in purgatory; for, "the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever." And the only contrast to this which is spoken of, is in the 13th verse—"Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord *from henceforth*; yea, saith the spirit, that they may rest from their labours; (*ινα αναπαυσωνται εκ των κοπων αὐτων*): so the only rest spoken of is from "labours," and not from "pain or torment"; and those who have "no rest," are in *hell*, and those who have "rest," are in heaven, from the time of their death; and there is not one word in the passage about *rest* to prove the *pain* or *torment* of purgatory.

We ask Mr. Power to look at the prayer in the "Apostolical Constitutions" (Book viii., c. 41), which, although not really "apostolical," is, at least, as old, and probably older than the prayers in the Liturgy of St. James. That prayer is for those only "who have rested in Christ;" and the prayer is, "that God would place them in the bosom of Abraham—where pain, and sorrow, and mourning have fled away"—using, in the latter part of the sentence, the very words of the Greek version of Isaiah xxxv. 10. If any one can find Purgatory in that verse, he may find it in this prayer. And the 43rd chapter says—"But we say these things of the pious, for though you should bestow all your worldly goods for them, you cannot assist the wicked at all; for he who was an enemy to God while alive, without doubt he is so when dead."—Labbe and Coss., vol. i. 504, 505. This seems to us much sounder, as it probably is much older, doctrine, than St. Cyril's on the same point.

No. 6. We think our answer to the use which Mr. Power made of St. Augustine was a fair one. Mr. Power brought him forward as justifying prayers for the damned—for those whose salvation is past hope. We said then, and we say now again, why not for the devil, too, if for the damned? Will Mr. Power now say that it is lawful to pray for the damned? He will not. Why, then, did he bring forward St. Augustine to prove it? We say again it is a poor defence for the Church of Rome to say her practices are "not worse" than this.

No. 7. Mr. Power calls upon us to show "a positive law of the Catholic Church by which it is expressly stated" that we must pray to saints. We never said there was such a law. He himself quotes our words thus—"we are told that we must pray to them." Many Roman Catholics accuse Protestants of irreligion and impiety, for not praying to them. That is enough to justify our words. The Church of Rome inserts such prayers in her authorized services; that looks very like saying we must use them; especially as the late "infallible" decree of the Pope says, that the prayers of the Church are a rule of faith. But we admit there is no *law* of the Church of Rome to oblige us to pray to them. We thank Mr. Power for the hint. Roman Catholics, attend! There is nothing in God's Word to justify you in praying to saints, *and your Church does not require you to pray to them!* Mark that!

But when Mr. Power goes on to imply that prayers to saints stand in the same position as St. Paul's request for the prayers of Christians, we must dissent from him. We have the examples of an inspired Apostle to warrant us in asking the prayers of our fellow-Christians. We have *not* the example of any Apostle for praying to saints. *Therefore*, says Mr. Power, we are *no more* bound to pray to saints, than to ask the prayers of our fellow-Christians; and, we think, "not quite so much."

No. 8. With respect to the quotation from the Council of Trent, we have already stated that we quoted, for brevity's sake, only what seemed to us to bear upon the precise point we were speaking of. But, as all persons do not see the precise point of a quotation in the same light, we frankly confess it is better to quote more fully, and we shall be careful to do so in future.

No. 9. Mr. Power says—"On the evidence of St. Cyril we learn, that the Church offered to God, *through the saints*, their supplications." If this mean that they *asked the saints* to present their supplications to God, we expressly deny that St. Cyril said any such thing. He supposes that the saints do pray for us; and, therefore, he says we *commemorate* them, hoping that God will hear their prayers for us. Not one word of our praying to them.

No. 10. Mr. Power ventures to tell us we are mistaken in saying, that no Roman Catholic now speaks of the consecrated bread and wine as St. Cyril did, as "signs of the body and blood of Christ;" but will he venture to *prove* that we are mistaken? If so, let him produce some quotations from Roman Catholics, in which they call the consecrated bread and wine "signs." And let him explain to us, *how a thing can be the sign of itself.*

We trust we have said enough to show that there is much in Mr. Power's letter which, as a lover of truth, he ought to reconsider.

ON INFALLIBILITY IN THE CHURCH OF ROME.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I beg you to accept my thanks for having inserted in your paper my inquiry about Purgatory, and for the reply you have given to it. A candid disbeliever of the doctrine could not say less, and I am sure you will not blame me for still hoping, for sake of those who believe in it, that an answer may yet be given by some of their own teachers.

I wish I could think that the difficulty of adhering to the doctrines of the Church of Rome were lessened, instead of being aggravated, as they are, by the introduction of so startling a lesson as she now calls on her children to learn and to believe.

To question the divine authority of any doctrine the Church proposes, is the last thought of those who are born and educated in her bosom; but there is a class amongst her disciples who look for a little more deference to the Word of God, than her new article of faith discloses. To this class the writings of the Fathers are unattainable, even as books of reference, but they are not, consequently, destitute of reason and understanding, and cannot adopt many items of faith which they find prevailing amongst those who are left exclusively to the teachers of the Church, such, for instance, as was lately declared by a most pious and faithful Catholic woman to be her real and solemn belief—namely, that the Blessed Virgin "*never was born*," that she was spued out of the mouth of God.

I cannot believe that any Catholic priest ever taught this to any one, but I must confess, that what the Church now teaches, and requires to be believed, is open to as much objection as this portion of the poor woman's creed, and that it gives rise to very serious doubts as to whether she has not outstepped her authority, and forfeited her claim to infallibility.

In asserting her infallibility, she certainly violates a principle on which she acts in other matters. In the Douay Catechism, from which I was instructed in my childhood and youth, it is asserted, that no amount of venial sins can make or constitute a mortal sin. May we not fairly ask how many fallibilities can make an infallibility, and whether any number of fallible men can compose an infallible council, and decree an infallible doctrine?

I know that the Church adopts exclusively as hers the promise of our Blessed Saviour, that the Holy Ghost should abide with His Church for ever, and teach her all truth to the end of the world; and this maxim of the Church has induced me to examine my Bible (a Douay Bible, first published by the English College, at Rheims, anno 1582, corrected according to the Clementine edition of the Scriptures), to see if I could find any indication of what our Saviour considered to be the infallible truth, to the teaching of which he annexed this gracious promise, and I find the verse to stand thus—(John xiv., 26, Douay version) "But the Paraclete, the Holy Spirit, whom my Father will send in my name, he will teach you all things, and will bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I shall have said to you;" in the fifteenth chapter, still speaking of the Holy Spirit, he says, "He shall give testimony of me;" and in the sixteenth chapter are these words, "He shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you." Here is not one word about hearing any testimony to, or teaching anything of, the Blessed Virgin.

Will you, sir, deem me unreasonable and unobserving of an answer, when I ask from any Catholic, whether priest or layman, that may have studied the Scriptures, whether the words of our Saviour, "whatsoever I shall have said unto you," include the "all things" that the Holy Ghost should "teach, and put us in remembrance of;" because, if so, no Catholic need consider himself bound to believe the newly-proclaimed doctrine as essential to salvation. Such a doctrine of the Blessed Virgin is not spoken of, or alluded to by either our Saviour himself, or by those to whom the Holy Ghost was afterwards given at Pentecost (Acts ii. 4, Douay version); and who after that spoke as He, the "Holy Ghost, gave them to speak;" and I cannot help thinking that infallibility is only promised to those who speak only whatsoever things Jesus has spoken, and whatsoever things the "Holy Ghost gave to the Apostles to speak;" and that the Church of Rome cannot be infallible, unless when she teaches what Christ and his inspired Apostles taught; and that any church may be, and is, fallible in teaching "doctrines and commandments of men."—Matt. xv. 9.

Oh, sir, no one reared in Protestantism can estimate the misery a Catholic feels when he first begins to doubt the evidence on which he has believed all that he thinks sacred and true, and it is very cruel not to answer this inquiry explicitly and fully.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

IN EARNEST.

FARMING OPERATIONS FOR MARCH.

[*From the Irish Farmers' Gazette.*]

SPRING WHEAT.

FROM the late very severe frost and snow-storm which continued during last month, the sowing of spring wheat was totally out of question. The snow having now disappeared, every exertion should be made in getting in this valuable crop, as soon as the land has been sufficiently dried to bear the plough and horses; but, in many instances, the spade and shovel must be substituted for the plough and horses, or the grain cannot be sown in proper time; when men can be had, their employment will amply repay the farmer for the extra cost, as the land must remain, in numberless instances, too wet and poachy to be able to get in the crop in time by horses.

Winter Wheats.—As soon as the land is sufficiently dry to bear it, it should be well harrowed, to break the hardened crust, destroy the annual weeds, which have so luxuriated under the comfortable cover of the snow as to render the whole surface perfectly green to the eye in many instances, to mould the young wheat plants, and promote their sending out additional coronal roots; after which the application of the roller will be of great service. The young wheat in drills should also be hand or horse hoed; but these works should only be performed when the land is sufficiently dry, otherwise more harm than good will be done, and it had better be put off till next month.

Potatoes planted before the storm should now be closely examined, and where found injured, the loss repaired by dibbling in fresh sets. Accounts which have come to hand report much damage amongst the early planted potatoes; but we would advise a very close examination to be instituted, as though the flesh of the set may present a blackened appearance, many of the eyes will be found still good, and a crop may be expected; but constant (at least weekly) examinations should be made, so as to ascertain the amount of damage in time to dibble in fresh sets where needful.

Potatoes should now be planted with as little delay as the state of the land will permit. In damp, low soils, beds or ridges are to be preferred; in dry soils, drills will be the most expeditious and economical mode; a liberal dressing of manure will be requisite to insure an early and abundant crop.

Spring Vetches mixed with a little oats should now be sown in breadth to suit requirements in July; successional sowings to be made once a fortnight or three weeks, till June or July next.

Barley may be sown from the middle to the end of the month; as this grain germinates very rapidly, the soil should be finely pulverised for its reception. When sown after green crops, to be laid down with clover and grass seeds, the best mode will be to drill or rib in the barley at 18 inches apart, which affords plenty of light and air for the perfect growth of the small seeds.

---

* CATHOLIC LAYMAN, November, 1854, p. 136, col. 2.

SELECTION OF

NEW WORKS

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

THE PICTORIAL BIBLE; Illustrated with Steel Engravings, and many hundred woodcuts, representing Landscape Scenes, and subjects of Natural History, &c. With original notes, by John Kitto, D.D. A new edition, with additional notes, based on the Discoveries of Recent Travellers. Vol. I. Super Royal 8vo. 12s. (To be completed in 4 vols.)

THE CHRISTIAN CYCLOPEDIA; or, Repository of Biblical and Theological Literature. By the Rev. James Gardner, M.D. Royal 8vo. 15s.

CONNYBEARE AND HOUSTON'S LIFE AND EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL. With beautiful Steel Engravings and Maps. 2 vols. 4to. £2 8s.

CHRIST, AS MADE KNOWN TO THE ANCIENT CHURCH: an Exposition of the Revelation of Divine Grace, as unfolded in the Old Testament Scriptures. By the late Robert Gordon, D.D. 4 vols. 8vo. £2 2s.

A TREATISE ON BIBLICAL CRITICISM; exhibiting a systematic view of that Science. By Samuel Davidson, D.D. 8vo. 18s.

BICKERSTITH'S CONDENSED NOTES ON SCRIPTURE; being the Substance of Sermons, selected from his MS. Notes, and revised by his Son. 10s. 6d.

THE PULPIT FOR 1854. Sermons by eminent living Ministers. Vol. II. Containing 104 Sermons. 7s. 6d.

THE GOLDEN LECTURES; Thirty-six Sermons delivered at St. Margaret's Church, Lothbury, 1854. By the Rev. Henry Melvill. 6s.

"CHRIST IS ALL;" the Gospel of the Old Testament —Genesis. By the Venerable Henry Law, Archdeacon of Wells. 3s.

THE GLORY OF THE HOLY GHOST. By Rev. Peter M'Laren. 3s. 6d.

THE FOOTSTEPS OF ST. PAUL. By the Author of "The Faithful Promiser." 5s.

THE MIND OF JESUS. By the Author of "Morning and Night Watches." 8d.; cloth, 1s.

MEMOIR OF THE LIFE AND WRITINGS OF JAMES MONTGOMERY; including Selections from his Correspondence and Conversations. By John Holland and James Everett. 2 vols. Post 8vo. 21s.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF THE REV. WM. JAY; with Reminiscences of some distinguished Contemporaries, Selections from his Correspondence, &c. By George Redford, D.D., and J. A. James, D.D. 8vo. Second Edition. 12s.

SKETCHES, LEGAL AND POLITICAL, by the late Right Honourable Richard Lalor Sheil. With notes by M. W. Savage. 2 vols. 21s.

LIFE OF NICHOLAS I., EMPEROR OF RUSSIA; with a short account of Russia and the Russians. By F. Mayne. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

THE ENGLISHWOMAN IN RUSSIA; or, the Russians at Home. Described by a lady 10 years resident there. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

A HISTORY OF THE WAR; forming a complete narrative of the origin and progress of the War. Compiled from Public documents, and other authentic sources. With a Map of the Crimea. 2s.

A MONTH IN THE CAMP BEFORE SEBASTOPOL. By a Non-combatant. 5s.

OUR HEROES IN THE CRIMEA; being Historical Sketches of our Military Officers from the General Commanding-in-Chief to the Subaltern. By George Ryan. 1s.

PHILIP O'FLAHERTY, THE YOUNG SOLDIER. Containing interesting particulars of the War in the Crimea. 6d.

BURKE'S PEERAGE AND BARONETAGE OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND, Corrected to the present time. Royal 8vo. 38s.

OF THE PLURALITY OF WORLDS. An Essay. With a Dialogue on the Subject. 6s.

MORE WORLDS THAN ONE: THE CREED OF THE PHILOSOPHER, AND THE HOPE OF THE CHRISTIAN. By Sir David Brewster. 6s.

THE PLURALITY OF WORLDS. The Positive Argument from Scripture; with Answers to some late Objections from Analogy. 2s. 6d.

SCIENTIFIC CERTAINTIES OF PLANETARY LIFE; or, Neptune's Light as great as ours. By T. C. Simon. 6s.

THE ROVING BEE; or, a Peep into many Hives. Edited by Mrs. Whately. 3s. 6d.

DETACHED THOUGHTS AND APOPHTHEGMS, extracted, by permission, from some of the writings of Archbishop Whately. 3s.

ESSAYS SELECTED FROM CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE "EDINBURGH REVIEW." By Henry Rogers. 3 vols. 21s.

MACAULAY'S CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL ESSAYS. 2 vols. 8s.

OXFORD ESSAYS, Contributed by Members of the University. 7s. 6d.

THE CHEMISTRY OF COMMON LIFE. By James T. W. Johnson. 2 vols. 11s. 6d.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF FRANCIS ARAGO. Translated from the French. 1s.

OUR FRIENDS IN HEAVEN; or the Mutual Recognition of the Redeemed in Glory Demonstrated. By Rev. J. M. Killen, M.A. 4s.

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF BEDELL. A Lecture delivered in Belfast, by the Rev. W. M'Ilwaine. 6d.

A SERMON FOR THE TIMES. Preached at Evington, on the day of general fast and humiliation, April 26, 1854. By Rev. William Pownall, D.C.L. 6d.

EVENINGS WITH THE ROMANISTS; with an Introductory Chapter on the Moral Results of the Romish System. By Rev. Hobart Seymour. 8s. 6d.

THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH OF ROME: A Correspondence between the Right Rev. Bishop Brown, of Chepstow, and the Rev. Joseph Baylee, M.A., St. Aidan's College, Birkenhead. 2s.

THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION OF OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST: A Sermon preached on the Feast of the Nativity, 1854, with some Notes on the New Dogma of the Church of Rome. By Rev. W. P. Walsh. 1s.

THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY, Historically reviewed. By the Rev. Robert Maguire, Islington. 1d.

THE NEW ROMISH DOGMA OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION; or, Trial of the Church of Rome before a Jury of Irish Roman Catholics. By the Rev. Edward Maguire. 6d.

THE JUDGMENT OF GOD UPON THE NATIONS.—Pius IX., the Last of the Popes. 1s. 6d.

CONSTANTINOPLE IN CONNECTION WITH THE PRESENT WAR. By the Rev. S. Farman. 6d.

A TRACT FOR SOLDIERS. By the Author of the "Faithful Promiser." 1½d.; or 10s. 6d per 100.

THE SOLDIER AND SAILOR ON FOREIGN SERVICE. By the Rev. Ashton Oxendon. 1d.; or, 1s. 4d. for 25.

Just Published, price 3d., by post 5d.,

Here and Hereafter:

A SERMON TO CHILDREN,

PREACHED IN

TRINITY CHURCH,

ON THURSDAY, JANUARY 11, 1855.

BY THE

REV. JOHN GREGG, A.B.,

MINISTER OF TRINITY CHURCH.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London: WERTHEIM and MACKINTOSH.

In the Press, and shortly will be Published,

A Digest of the Evidence,

TAKEN BEFORE THE

SELECT COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS,

Appointed to Inquire into the Working of the National System of Education in Ireland.

By the Rev. WILLIAM LEPOER TRENCH, D.D., Rector of Killereran, Diocese of Tuam, and one of the Honorary Secretaries of the Church Education Society for Ireland.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Just Published, Demy, 8vo., Price 3s. 6d.,

THE

BRITISH AND FOREIGN

EVANGELICAL REVIEW,

March, 1855.

CONTENTS.

I. Idea of the Church.
II. The Conversion of Northern Europe.
III. The Plenrality of Worlds.
IV. Modern English Theism.
V. Ferrier's Institutes of Metaphysic.
VI. The Future of the Jewish Nation.
VII. Maurice on Sacrifice.
VIII. Critical Notices.

"This is decidedly one of the best Quarterlies of the day—rich and sound in its theology, besides displaying great ability in the general walks of literature. The selections made from Foreign sources are usually very judicious, and it is really delightful to find such variety from widely-separated quarters of the world, brought into immediate juxtaposition in this Journal and presented to the public in so convenient a form."

Edinburgh: JOHNSTONE AND HUNTER. Dublin: WM. CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Just Published, in 2 vols., 8vo, with Maps and Plates, price 12s.,

Journal of a Deputation,

SENT TO THE EAST

BY THE

COMMITTEE OF THE MALTA PROTESTANT COLLEGE IN 1849.

Containing an Account of the Present State of the Oriental Nations, including their Religion, Learning, Education, Customs, and Occupations, &c.

BY A LAY MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE.

"There is much more contained here than might at first sight appear under the fixed local object of a college. They comprise wide discussions, historical, geographical, social, and political. Mohammedanism is admirably illustrated, while the ecclesiastical and political history of Egypt, from the introduction of Christianity to later times, is ably and copiously detailed. The Work deserves a place in every library, both public and private."—*British Banner.*

"These Volumes contain a large amount of deeply-interesting information, respecting places and people intimately associated with the Records of the Word of God."—*Evangelical Christendom.*

London: J. NISBET and Co., 21, Berner's-street. Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Just Published,

A Controversial Correspondence

BETWEEN

THE REV. P. MACLACHLAN (ROMAN CATHOLIC PRIEST),

AND

R. W. KENNARD, ESQ.

Part I., 1s. Part II., 2s. Part III., 2s. 6d.

"We have read nothing so fresh on the subject for a long time, with the exception of Sir George Sinclair's Letters, alongside of which Mr. Kennard's ought to be placed. When a well-educated and extensively-read layman discusses a question of this kind, the directness of his arguments tell powerfully on the community. We hope this pamphlet will have an extensive circulation."—*Edinburgh Witness.*

"This is a remarkable publication. Mr. Maclachlan is sufficiently skilled in the Romish arts of controversy; but in logical dexterity, and even in theological learning, the Roman Catholic Priest is evidently no match for the Protestant layman."—*Dr. Irving, Edinburgh.*

"We have not, for a long time, seen a publication that has given us greater satisfaction than Mr. Kennard's 'Controversial Correspondence.'"—*Morning Advertiser.*

"I sincerely admire its learning, its reasoning, and its spirit of Christianity; and I know of no production fitter to produce a more ample assurance in the mind of any man open to rational conviction."—*Dr. Croly.*

"We have in the pamphlet before us an instance in which a Protestant Layman, a gentleman well known and highly respected in the City of London, has replied to a Roman Catholic Priest, and certainly beaten him in fair and honest argument."—*Bell's Weekly Messenger.*

London: WERTHEIM and MACINTOSH. Dublin: WM. CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Just Published, Royal 4to, Cloth, price 5s. 6d.,

THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN,

VOLUME III.,

WITH A COPIOUS INDEX.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London: WERTHEIM and MACINTOSH.

Just Published, 18mo., in a Coloured Wrapper,

PRICE 3d.,

or, 21s. per hundred for gratuitous circulation,

POPULAR STORIES,

CONTAINING:

THE TWO FARMERS OF BALLINTUBBER,
THE INFALLIBLE DOCTOR,
THE LANDLORD'S LETTER.

Also, price 1d.,

THE FAIR OF LOUGHMANAGH,

Each of the above stories may be had separately, price 1d., or 7s. 6d. per hundred, for gratuitous distribution.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Just Published, price 1s.; Cloth, 1s. 6d.,

THE TALK OF THE ROAD: Showing how Irish people talk about Irish doings, when they get a quiet place, at the back of a ditch, or under a hedge.

"A most interesting little volume, from the pen of one who seems to be well acquainted with the Irish character, and the doings of the priests in our sister island. We felt highly entertained by its perusal, and can cordially recommend it to our readers. That it will prove serviceable to the cause of truth, we doubt not. Missionaries to the Irish Roman Catholics will find in it a valuable assistant."—*Edinburgh Witness.*

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London: WERTHEIM and MACKINTOSH.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher WILLIAM CURRY, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.
MARCH, 1855.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Gloir do Dhia añ gna háṁuiḃ, agus síoḋċáin air an ṫalaṁ ḋeaġ-ṫoil do na ḋáoiniḃ.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED THE MIDDLE OF EVERY MONTH, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. IV.—No. 40. APRIL, 1855. { Annual Subscription, 5s. 6d. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Modern Worship in Rome—No. IV.—Prayers in an Unknown Tongue	37
The Breviary and the English Prayer Book	39
Roman Catholic Antinomianism—No. II.	40
The Old Irish Clergy—No. V.	41
Is it possible to be Good by Proxy?	42
Talk of the Road—No. XXVIII.	42
The True Principle of Religious Controversy—*The Rambler*	43
Dispensations by the Pope—*The Tablet*	44
Spiritual Power of the Pope	44
Recent Controversy at Boulogne, between Rev. Dr. Moeran and two Roman Catholic Laymen—concluded	45
CORRESPONDENCE.	
On Infallibility—by Mr. Rourke	46
The Living Rosary—by W. M.	47
What is a Ghost?—by Pat Murray, of Westmeath	47
Notes and Queries	47
Farming Operations for April	47

MODERN WORSHIP IN ROME.—No. IV.

PRAYERS IN AN UNKNOWN TONGUE.

THE war, which is now unhappily raging in the East, is supposed by some sanguine persons likely to promote the conversion of the Mahometans and other Eastern nations, by bringing them more directly into contact with those who profess the pure faith of the Gospel of Christ. We trust that this benevolent hope will not be altogether disappointed; but we are bound to confess, that some of the peculiar usages of the Church of Rome appear to us to interpose the greatest obstacle to such a desirable event. This assertion may appear strange to many of our readers; but we will endeavour briefly to state our reasons for it.

Let us suppose an intelligent Turk to meet, in Constantinople or elsewhere, with a Roman Catholic missionary clergyman, and to be told by him that Christianity was the only true, rational religion in the world, and that Rome was the place where this religion was professed and practised in its greatest purity. As Italian is very generally spoken throughout the East, it would be no very difficult matter for our friend the Turk to travel to Rome, in order to judge for himself whether the Christian religion be, in truth, such a reasonable religion as he had been told it was. He finds himself at St. Peter's, suppose on last Easter Sunday, on which day the Pope always proceeds in state to that Cathedral. The first thing that meets the eye of the Turk, is a countless number of statues and pictures, before which the assembled multitudes are kneeling, in an attitude of fervent devotion. The Mahometans, as is well known, have such a horror of idolatry, that they will not tolerate even a painting of the human form, lest it should lead, however remotely, to the commission of that sin; and it is needless to say what feelings of aversion would be excited in the mind of the Turk, by the image-worship which the Church of Rome not only tolerates, but openly defends.* He sees persons of all ranks and ages prostrating themselves before some inanimate piece of wood or marble, and offering up their prayers towards it. He knows nothing of the ingenious subtleties invented by the Romish doctors, to distinguish between the image and the object represented by it. He has never heard about *latria*, *dulia*, or *hyperdulia*; he only sees the practice of a mode of worship which he feels to be derogatory to the dignity and majesty of the one true God; and he asks himself, in amazement—Is this the pure and reasonable religion in which I am told I must believe, if I desire to attain eternal salvation?

We need not stop to describe the increased amazement of the Mahometan inquirer, when he hears the names of countless saints and angels mixed up in the prayers uttered by the crowd around him. His reason tells him that God alone is the proper object of religious worship, and he finds it hard to conceive how that can be a pure religion, in which the Almighty is robbed of the honour which rightfully belongs to Him alone. At last, however, the priest mounts the steps of the high altar, and the service is about to begin. A low murmur reaches the ears of the Turk; but he can scarcely distinguish the words of what is spoken. He sees the crowd kneeling and crossing themselves; and he is anxious to be informed respecting the meaning of the prayers which they are offering up to God. He addresses one of the congregation near him—"Good sir, you seem to be mightily concerned and affected with what yonder man in the gay garment is reading; for my part, although I know Italian pretty well, I do not understand one word that he says; but I suppose you can inform me?" And what reply does he receive? "No, truly, friend, the language which the priest speaks is quite unknown to us; we understand the prayers no more than you do." "Then, why," he would naturally ask, "do you raise your eyes, and lift up your hands, and beat your breasts, as if you did understand them?" "Why, as for that, we can give no other reason, but that we believe they are very devout words, in a language spoken by our ancestors about eighteen hundred years ago; and it is an old fashion among us thus to behave ourselves whilst they are reading." "But, what!" he would ask, "have you not met together to join with the priest in offering up your prayers in common to God?" "No, truly," the Italian would reply, "we need not mind the meaning of the prayers at all; the priest prays for us as well as for himself; if we attend to the *sound of the words*, our divines tell us that it is quite sufficient; and we need not trouble ourselves to understand their meaning, or, indeed, to have our thoughts fixed on God at all!" Now, what will the Turk think of these *enlightened* people, or of the religion which they profess? We need not go far to look for an answer; the case, just such as we have described it, has been long since disposed of, in a very few words, by St. Paul, when he wrote his first epistle to the Church at Corinth—"If, therefore, the Church be come together in one place, and all speak with tongues, and there come in those that are unlearned or unbelievers, *will they not say that ye are mad?*"—1 Cor. xiv. 23. If, instead of "all speak with tongues," we insert "the priests speak in an unknown tongue," have we not, in these words of the apostle, an exact description of such a scene as we have ventured to describe?

Indeed, among all the strange practices of the Church of Rome, the use of an unknown tongue in her public prayers has always seemed to us one of the strangest and most indefensible. It is, as we shall presently see, expressly contrary to Scripture; it is contrary to the unanimous opinion of the Fathers; it is opposed to the practice of antiquity; and it is contrary to reason and common sense.

For what is prayer? It is, surely, not the mere posture of the body. A man may kneel till he wears out the stones; he may put himself into every variety of attitude; he may throw himself on the earth, and lie in the dust; like the idolatrous king of Israel, he may put on sackcloth and ashes; or, like the monks of old, he may kneel till his knees become horny, and yet never pray at all.

It is not the mere expression of the mouth, or the utterance of a form of words with the lips. A man may repeat a hundred times in the day that beautiful and affecting prayer which our blessed Lord has taught us, and which we call the Lord's Prayer; but if the affection of the soul do not accompany the words uttered, it is no real prayer. Let us hear our Lord's own words, in which he condemned the worship of the Jewish Church—"This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoureth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me. But *in vain do they worship me*."—Matt xv. 8, 9.

Prayer, therefore, is the outpouring of the *heart* to God. It is a holy intercourse with the Father of our spirits; it is a sacred bond whereby the soul is united to that great Being, who alone can supply all our wants, and who is the author of all the blessings we enjoy. Man is sinful, weak, and unstable in himself; but prayer gives him the great and inestimable privilege of coming to God, as to a merciful Father, to make known to Him all his wants and infirmities, with the confident assurance, that if he asks in faith, his prayer will be heard. "*All things*," said our blessed Lord, "whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive." Christians are commanded and invited to pray publicly in the Church, as well as privately in their closets; and our Lord Jesus Christ has been pleased to promise a special blessing to those who meet together, to offer up their prayers in common. "Where two or three," saith he, "are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them."—Matt. xviii. 20.

But how can a man express the devotional acts of the mind in a form of words which he does not understand? How can he pray in faith, when he knows not what he is to pray for? How can he confess his sins with sorrow and remorse of soul, when he confesses he knows not what? How can he desire or hope for the particular blessings which the prayers of the Church contain, when he knows not what they are? How can he cordially praise or give thanks, when he knows not either what it is that he praises, or whether the prayer that the priest is reading be a confession, a petition, or a thanksgiving? In short, how is it possible for him to accompany with his heart a prayer which he does not understand? If attention to the *sound* of the words be all that is required, a parrot may be as attentive as a Christian. It scarcely needs the grave authority of St. Augustine to expose such an absurdity. "We ought," saith that learned Father, "to understand the *meaning* of our prayers, that we may sing with man's reason, not with mere voice, as birds do. For parrots, and ravens, and magpies, and such like birds are often taught by men to sound that which they do not understand."†

We have said that the use of an unknown tongue in prayer is expressly contrary to Scripture; and in proof of this, we need only cite one short passage from St. Paul's Epistles. In the 14th chapter of 1st Corinthians, the Apostle, throughout the whole chapter, purposely argues against preaching and praying in an unknown tongue; for in those days the miraculous gift of tongues being very common in the Church, many of those persons who were inspired with it were too apt to overvalue themselves upon it; and it became a practice among them to preach and pray, and sing psalms in a language which their hearers did not understand. This evil practice of theirs is distinctly condemned by the apostle, upon the ground that it did not tend to the instruction and edification of the Church, but rather the reverse. "Except," saith he, "ye utter by the tongue words easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken? for ye shall speak into the air."—v. 9. "When thou shalt bless with the spirit [or with thy unknown tongue], how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned say *Amen* at thy giving of thanks, *seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest*. For thou verily givest thanks well, but the other is not edified. I thank my God, I speak with tongues more than ye all. Yet in the Church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others also, *than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue*."—v. 16, 17, 18, 19.

We confidently ask our readers, whether the use of an unknown tongue, in the public services of the Church, is not condemned in this passage as plainly and unmistakeably as words can express? And what answer, it may be said, do the divines of the Church of Rome make to these arguments of the inspired apostle, in which, as it were by anticipation, he denounces the use of a Latin liturgy among persons who do not understand it? "Oh," say Bellarmine and others, "St. Paul only condemns *preaching* in an unknown tongue, but says nothing about *praying*. Now, our sermons are intended for the instruction of the people, and they are always preached in the vernacular language of the country; therefore, the censure of the apostle does not apply to us."‡

This reply, however, is manifestly insufficient. Let us open the Romish Missal. It contains not only prayers, but also sundry portions of Scripture and pious lessons, all of which, as well as the prayers, are read to the people in an unknown tongue. Now, either these Scriptures and lessons are read for no end at all, or they are read for the same end as preaching, which is to instruct the people; and, therefore, the reason which St. Paul urges for preaching in a known tongue—viz., the edification of the people—would equally oblige the Church of Rome, if she wished to be consistent, to read the Scriptures and lessons in the Missal in a known tongue.

---

* *Vide* CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. i., pp. 122, 123; vol. iii., p. 56.

† Quid hoc sit intelligere debemus, ut humana ratione, non quasi avium voce cantemus. Nam et merula, et psittacus et corvus et pica et hujusmodi volucres sæpe ab hominibus discuntur sonare quod nesciunt.—S. August., op. tom. iv., col. 81.1 in Psalm xviii. Enarr. II., i. Par., 1679.

‡ Respondeo, in primis certum esse, in magna parte hujus capitis non agi de lectione Scripturarum, nec officiis divinis, sed de exhortationibus spiritualibus. . . . Exhortationes ab omnibus debent intelligi.—Bellarm. De Verbo. Dei. lib. ii., cap. xvi., tom. i., p. 43. Colon., 1615.

But, secondly, Bellarmine's assumption that St. Paul only condemns *preaching* in an unknown tongue is unfounded. The apostle manifestly includes praying as well as preaching, for he speaks, as we have seen, of the people saying *Amen* at the end of the prayers; and, further, he applies the very same argument to the two cases. The reason why he forbad the Corinthian teachers to preach in an unknown tongue was, that it was a hindrance to the edification of the people; and *this very reason* he urges likewise against their praying in an unknown tongue. "For thou, verily, givest thanks well," saith he—*i.e.*, thou mayest be very devout in thy own heart and affections, whilst thou art praising God in an unknown tongue—"but the other"—that is, he that doth not understand the tongue thou speakest—"is not edified."—1 Cor. xiv. 17. And so his words are interpreted by the ancient Fathers. "When the words of the prayer are unknown to those that are present," saith St. Basil, "the mind of him that prays is unfruitful, because it profits none; but when those who are present do understand the prayer, so that it is capable of profiting them, then he who prays hath the fruit—viz., the bettering of those that are profited by him."*

The case, therefore, stands thus:—If a Christian should ask, whether preaching in an unknown tongue be allowable in the Church? No, replies Bellarmine. And why? Because St. Paul condemns it as being useless and unedifying to those who hear it. Is praying in an unknown tongue allowable? Yes, very allowable, says Bellarmine. But does not St. Paul urge the same reason against this as he does against preaching in an unknown tongue? Yes, he does. And why is not the reason as good in the latter case as in the former? We seek in vain for a reply.

St. Paul had left the Christian Church this standing rule, that, in our religious assemblies, "all things should be done to edifying."—1 Cor. xiv. 26. But the Church of Rome steps in, and says, that the greater part of what is done in the Church—viz., the stated and ordinary prayers—must *not* be done to edifying; for they must be said in a language which the people do not understand. And Bellarmine, ever ready to defend all the parts of the Romish system which appear most contrary to common sense, boldly asserts, that "the instruction and consolation of the people is *not* the principal end of divine worship!"† And, as if this were not enough, he broadly lays down this general proposition:—"In order that the prayers should profit the people, *there is no need that they should understand them!!*"‡

We may well be startled at such strange assertions. Are not the people, we would ask, bound to pray to God, and worship Him, just as truly as the priest? If they do not understand the prayers offered up in the Church, why should they frequent the public worship wherein they have nothing to do? There is, clearly, no reason for the people meeting together to hear Mass, if the praying is to be done by the priest alone. If, therefore, the people are at all obliged to pray, and praise, and give thanks in the public worship—which, one would think, no Christian should deny—it is impossible for them to perform this duty with any decency or order, except in conjunction with the priest in the public prayers, or liturgy; and this they can never do, unless they understand the language of it.

Nay, the Church of Rome herself must be forced to own, that the people are obliged to join in her public prayers with the priest, or else she must confess herself guilty of the greatest absurdity; for, in the Missal, the priest is ordered to commence a great part of the prayers with the word "*Oremus*"—*i.e.*, "*Let us pray.*" Now, whom doth the priest mean by *us*? It is plain that he cannot mean himself only, for then he must split himself up into two men; but (as it is not imaginable that he should mean anything so extravagant in such a serious matter) he must clearly intend by *us*, himself and the people. Now, why should he call upon the people to pray, if they are not obliged to pray with him?

In the office for the fourth Sunday after Easter, as given in the Missal, there is a very beautiful prayer, the translation of which runs thus—"O God, who makest thy faithful people to be of one mind and of one will, grant unto us to love the thing that thou commandest, and to desire that which thou dost promise; that so, amidst the changes of this world, our hearts may there be fixed, where true joys are to be found, through Jesus Christ our Lord, Amen." The collect is to be found, nearly in these words, in the service of the Church of England for that day. Now, if this prayer were to be spoken in English a few Sundays hence, throughout the various chapels in Ireland, we doubt not that thousands of our Roman Catholic countrymen would cordially join in offering it up to God. Does not the Church of Rome, then, use this prayer in her service? She does; but how? The priest is directed to say—"*Deus, qui fidelium mentes unius efficis voluntatis,*" &c. If one of the congregation should ask—"Pray, Father A., what language is that?" "Why, it is Latin." "Is it so? why, it might as well be Turkish, or Chinese; for we cannot understand a word of it." "Understand!" (the priest would reply, following his master, Bellarmine) "what is that to the purpose? I tell you, you must pray it, whether you understand it or no." Might not the congregation reasonably reply, that it was a very hard case for them to be required to join in a prayer, of the meaning of which they had no knowledge, and which, for aught they knew, might be an imprecation of mischief, instead of a supplication for mercy.

But was it *always* the case, that the public service of the Church was carried on in a language unknown to the people? Certainly not. This fact is acknowledged by the best Roman Catholic divines. Thus, Thomas Aquinas and Nicolas de Lyra say—"The common service in the primitive Church was in the common vulgar tongue."* And why, we may well ask, did the Church of Rome ever depart from an usage so accordant with reason and common sense? We searched the history of the Council of Trent for an answer to this question, but in vain. It would be hard, indeed, to find anywhere a greater example of inconsistency than the decree of the Council on this very point. It begins by telling us that—"the Mass contains very plentiful matter of instruction for all faithful people." Surely, if such were their opinion, one would expect to find the Council making careful provision, that all this valuable instruction should be communicated to the people in their own mother tongue. But what follows? "Nevertheless, it did not seem expedient to the fathers, that it should be celebrated everywhere in the vulgar tongue!†"

Was there ever so absurd a conclusion drawn from such a reasonable proposition? And then they wind up with their usual uncharitable anathema—"If any man shall say, that the Mass ought only to be celebrated in the vulgar tongue, *let him be accursed.*"‡

In fact, the decree of the Council of Trent, when put into plain words, really means as follows:—"Good people, you must know, that in this mass-book of ours there is contained such excellent matter for edification, that, if you could come at it, it would do you a world of good, and make you much wiser and better Christians than you are. Nevertheless, for reasons best known to ourselves, we think it expedient to lock it up from you in an unknown tongue; and, therefore, pray satisfy your hunger with the belief, that here is great store of spiritual food for you, though you never be permitted to taste of it; but if you wish to feed and nourish your hungry souls with the *sound of words*, without any knowledge of the sense of them, then we freely grant you this boon with all our hearts; much good may it do you!" Should not all Roman Catholic people be most extremely obliged to these tender-hearted Fathers, that talk to their children of bread, but give them a stone?

But it is time that we should notice another defence which has been attempted to be set up for the use of an unknown tongue in the public prayers of the Church. Bellarmine, as we have seen, was forced to adopt the startling proposition, that the people *need not understand the prayers*. In this he was quite true to the principles of his Church; for, in point of fact, it is the only ground on which a Latin liturgy can be consistently defended. But the proposition, thus nakedly stated, appears, at the first blush, so plainly contrary to common sense, that it would be apt to repel, rather than persuade, enlightened sensible men; and, therefore, Bishop Milner, writing for English readers, with his usual adroitness endeavours to put the matter in a more favourable light. "The use of the Latin tongue," saith he, "in the public liturgy of the Church, ... is no detriment to the faithful, as they have *translations* of the liturgy and other books in their hands, by means of which, or of their own devotion, they can join with the priest in every part of the solemn worship."§

Milner's defence, even if well-founded, would prove a very inadequate justification of the practice of the Romish Church, in continuing the use of a Latin liturgy. If, as he seems to admit, the people *ought to understand* the prayers, why does she not at once adopt the vernacular language of each country, in the public prayers of the Church, instead of leaving the people to grope their way through the means of a translation, which could be of no manner of use to the poor, who could not afford to purchase one, or to the ignorant, who could not read the book, even if they possessed it?

But we have a graver charge to bring against Milner than the adoption of an inconclusive argument. While he speaks of translations of the Romish liturgy, as if they were in every body's hands, he suppresses the important fact, that the *use of these translations has been authoritatively condemned* by an infallible decree of the Pope himself. This was a matter of which a learned divine like Bishop Milner could hardly have been ignorant; and if he was aware of it, it is another proof of the intentional dishonesty of that writer, of which, as our readers are aware, we have been already obliged to give so many instances. The circumstances which drew forth this Papal condemnation are so curious, that we think it well to mention them.

In the year 1660, an eminent French writer, named Voisin, who, as a good Roman Catholic, had probably read the statement of the Council of Trent—"that the Mass contains very plentiful instruction for all faithful people"—and, as a pious and benevolent man, wished to benefit his fellow-countrymen, determined to translate the Missal into the French tongue, for their use. Pope Alexander VII. then occupied the Papal chair; and one would naturally expect, that he would have bestowed praise and commendation upon a writer who took such pains to diffuse among his countrymen the knowledge of that book which the Council of Trent had pronounced to be so useful and instructive. Far different, however, was the reception which Voisin's translation met with at Rome. The Pope was filled with rage and indignation at this profanation of the sacred mysteries of the Church; and he forthwith gave vent to his anger in the following Bull, which, as a curiosity, we translate for the information of our readers:—

"With great sorrow of heart it has come to our ears, that, in the kingdom of France, certain *sons of perdition* (quidam perditionis filii), anxious to destroy souls by their novelties, and despising ecclesiastical sanctions, have arrived at such a *pitch of madness* (ad eam nuper vesaniam pervenerint) that they have dared to translate into the vulgar French tongue, the Roman Missal, which was written in the Latin language, and used for so many ages in the Church, and have dared, moreover, to print and circulate it, for the use of persons of every rank and sex, thereby endeavouring to throw down and trample upon the majesty of the holy ritual, expressed in the Latin tongue, and by their rash attempt, seeking to expose the dignity of the sacred mysteries to the gaze of the vulgar.

"We, then, to whom the care of the Lord's vineyard has been entrusted, in order that we may root up, as far as in us lies, the thorns with which it is overgrown, do declare our abhorrence and detestation of that thirst for novelty which deforms the beauty of the Church, and is the fruitful parent of disobedience, rashness, sedition, schism, and many other evils.

"Therefore, of our certain knowledge, mere motion and mature deliberation, we perpetually condemn, denounce, and forbid the aforesaid Missal, translated by some person into the French tongue, *or one hereafter to be written and published in any manner whatsoever* (vel in posterum alias quomodolibet conscribendum et evulgandum); and we *for ever* forbid *under the penalty of excommunication*, the *printing*, *reading*, *or possession of such a book*, to all faithful persons of both sexes, of whatever rank, order, condition, or dignity they may be, even though special and individual mention be made of them.

"Given at Rome, at Sta. Maria Maggiore, under the Fisherman's ring, January 12, 1661."*

And, now, what do our readers think of Bishop Milner, and his excuse that the practice of Latin prayers may be palliated by the use of a translation? Alexander VII. had no fault to find with the accuracy of Voisin's book, and he raised no objection to it on that head. No! It was the mere fact of making a translation of the Missal that the Pope condemned. This was an acknowledgment, that the people were called upon to use their reason, and that it was their duty to endeavour to *understand* the services of the Church; and the Pope seems to have thought that such a terrible crime as this could not be denounced in sufficiently severe terms. Poor Voisin himself was called "*a son of perdition*;" he was *mad*, *schismatical*, *seditious*. And why? Because he dared "to expose the sacred mysteries to the gaze of the vulgar!" The printers and purchasers of his work were threatened with *excommunication*, and the same penalty was denounced *against all similar attempts in future!* And, yet, notwithstanding all this, Bishop Milner has the assurance to tell Roman Catholics that they may lawfully use translations of the Latin liturgy! Has the Pope ceased to be infallible? or, has the threat of excommunication lost its power?

We shall add but one fact more, to show the practical consequences of the teaching of the Church of Rome upon the all-important subject of prayer.

Towards the end of the sixteenth century, Cardinal Tolctus, a learned Jesuit, published a work for the instruction of the Romish clergy. In speaking of the manner in which they should repeat their prayers, he says that attention is of three kinds†—First, attention to the *words* of the prayer; secondly, to its *meaning*; thirdly, that the thoughts should be fixed in God. The first of these—namely, attention to the words—*is necessary*, but only at the beginning of the prayer. The second, namely, attention to the *meaning* of the prayer—is *not* necessary, and for a very curious reason; "because," saith he, "if, in singing the Psalms, it were necessary to understand the sense, there would be *very few* who could accomplish it!" This, be it remembered, is the rule given for the clergy; and if *they* are not called on to understand the meaning of the prayers they use, much less, we may suppose, need the laity trouble themselves on this score. The third act of attention—namely, to have the thoughts fixed on God—is *not necessary!*

---

* "Οταν μὲν γὰρ ἀγνωστα ᾖ τοῖς παροῦσι τὰ ῥήματα τῆς προσευχῆς, ἄκαρπός ἐστιν ὁ νοῦς τοῦ προσευχομένου, μηδενὸς ὠφελουμένου. ὅταν δὲ οἱ παρόντες νοῶσι τὴν προσευχὴν ὠφελεῖν δυναμένην τοὺς ἀκούοντας, τότε ὁ προσευχόμενος καρπὸν ἔχει τὴν τῶν ὠφελουμένων βελτίωσιν.—S. Basil., Reg. Brev. 278, tom. ii., p. 733. Paris, 1839.

† Finis præcipuus divinorum officiorum *non* est populi instructio, vel consolatio.—Bellarm., ut supra, tom. i., p. 51. Colon., 1615.

‡ Oratio ecclesiæ non fit populo, sed Deo pro populo. Itaque *non est opus* ut populus intelligat, ut ei prosit.—Bellarm. ut supra, p. 50.

* In primitiva ecclesia benedictiones et cetera communia fiebant in vulgari.—Bibl. cum Gloss. Ord et Expos., N. de Lyra., Ad. 1, Cor. xiv., pars. vi., fol. 55. 2. Basil, 1502.

Quare non dantur benedictiones in vulgari? Dicendum est quod hoc fortè fuit in ecclesia primitiva.—Thom. Aquin., op., in 1 Cor. XIV.; lect. iii., tom. xvi., fol. 84. Venet., 1595.

† Etsi missa magnam contineat populi fidelis eruditionem, non tamen expedire visum est patribus, ut vulgari passim lingua celebraretur.—Decret. Conc. Trid., sess. xxii., cap. viii.

‡ Si quis dixerit, lingua tantum vulgari missam celebrari debere, anathema sit.—Conc. Trid., sess. xxii., can. ix.

§ Milner's "End of Controversy," pp. 448, 449. London, 1842.

* Cherubini, Magn., Bull. Rom. tom. v., p. 333. Lugdun, 1673.

† Recitare oportet cum advertentia et attentione, quæ multiplex est. Prima circa verba; altera, ut intelligatur sensus verborum; tertia, ut attendatur finis orandi, nempe, ut qui recitet consideret ea Deo præsentem, et cum Deo verba facere. Prima attentio, seu advertentia, est necessaria. . . . Secunda attentio *non* est necessaria; nam si ad Psalmos canendos juxta præceptum, oportet sensum intelligere, *paucissimi essent* qui illud implerent. . . . . Tertia etiam attentio *non* est necessaria.—Card. Toletus de Instruct., Sacerd. lib. ii., cap. xiii., p. 359. Rothomag, 1641.

This, then, is the melancholy consequence of using prayers in an unknown tongue. By the constant repetition of forms which they do not, or cannot understand, priests and people alike are, at length, taught to believe that the mere utterance of certain words is all that is required of them. They are told, by one of their own divines, that they need not remember they are in the presence of God; and the proper end and object of prayer—namely, the communion of our souls with our heavenly Father, and the making known our wants to Him, is utterly lost sight of and forgotten. Thus, the very life of devotion is destroyed; and nothing is left, save a dry, cold, inanimate formalism, which resembles the lifeless skeleton, rather than the living and breathing form of vital Christianity. Is this the religion which the Church of Rome offers to us, which is to be our guide in life, our comfort in affliction, our support in the hour of death?

THE BREVIARY AND THE ENGLISH PRAYER BOOK.

Our object in this article is—first, to notice some of the attempts which have been made, from time to time, by Roman Catholics themselves, to correct the gross errors and superstitions by which they have been compelled to admit the Breviary is disfigured; and, secondly, to call attention to the remarkable fact, that the very reforms which they have vainly attempted or desired to effect, have been realized and carried out in the Liturgy of the Reformed Church of these kingdoms.

I.—First, then, as to the attempts at reforming the Breviary made by members of the Church of Rome itself. As might be expected from the age in which these Breviaries were compiled, they were not merely an abridgment of the ancient Church offices, but abounded in corrupt and superstitious matter, novel in its origin, and utterly opposed to the purity and simplicity of the primitive worship. The following description of the Service Books of that period is taken verbatim from a work of high repute, by a zealous ultramontane writer—the Abbe Gueranger:—* "These copies," he says, "were not only corrupted by the ignorance and carelessness of their authors, but were filled with a multitude of gross and even superstitious additions. These additions consisted chiefly of apocryphal stories, unknown to the preceding ages, and sometimes even rejected by them; and which were introduced into the lessons, hymns, and anthems. Barbarous formularies (formules) were inserted with the view of gratifying a gross-minded populace; votive masses took the place of the ordinary masses, and were performed with superstitious rites; benedictions were pronounced, unknown to all antiquity. In a word, in place of being the living rule, the instruction, and the supreme law of a Christian people, the Liturgy was degraded to the office of ministering to the popular passions; and fictions, which were quite in their place in the middle-age mysteries, often invaded the books of the altar and the choir. To understand the full extent of these abuses it is only necessary to remember the *sang froid* with which the clergy gave up the Cathedrals to the strange farces of the Feast of the Ass, and of the Feast of Fools."† The author concludes this sad description with the remark—"In submitting to such degradation, during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the Liturgy only shared the same fate as the Church itself."‡

The first attempt at reforming the notorious corruptions of the Church ritual was made by Pope Leo X., about the time when the Reformation began. It is admitted that this Pontiff was not actuated by any regard for the Divine honour in this matter, but merely by the desire of getting rid of the barbarous Latinity and offensive grossness which revolted his fastidious taste and classical refinement. A reform, originating in such motives, came, as might be expected, to nothing. Still the evil was universally and deeply felt; especially as the Reformers failed not to direct their assaults against the undeniable corruption of public worship which existed in the Church of Rome. Accordingly, Pope Clement VII., duly impressed with the momentous nature of the subject, entrusted the task of revising and reforming the Roman Breviary to one of the most learned and pious members of the sacred college—Cardinal Quignon, General of the Franciscan Order. He completed his task in the year 1535, shortly after Clement's death, and dedicated his reformed Breviary to the new Pope, Paul III. The title of the work sufficiently indicates the main feature by which it was distinguished from the former Breviaries—"The Roman Breviary Compiled and arranged, *chiefly from Sacred Scripture* and approved Histories of the Saints."§ A brief of Pope Paul was prefixed to the book, permitting the use of it, under certain conditions, to the secular clergy, and releasing them from the use of any other Breviary whatsoever. The first edition was speedily exhausted, and a second appeared the next year, 1536. In the preface to this second edition the author informs us, that whilst the great majority of grave and learned men approved of his work, and saw nothing in it to be changed, there were some who, though they approved of it on the whole, yet thought it was incomplete in some points; and that, in deference to their opinion, he had made some alterations, still adhering to the same idea and plan. He also speaks of a third class to whom his work was not equally pleasing, because, having grown old under a different regime, they were of opinion that no change whatever should be made by the clergy in the established mode of praying." Amongst the objectors of this class were found the Doctors of the Sorbonne at Paris. Notwithstanding this partial opposition, the reformed Breviary became all but universally popular with the clergy, and a vast number of editions were published at Rome, at Venice, at Antwerp, and even at Paris, under the very eyes of the Sorbonne Doctors, who had vainly attempted to bring it into disrepute. The fact of its frequent republication at Rome proves that it still enjoyed the countenance of Paul III., and of his immediate successor in the the Papacy, Julius III.

But, unfortunately, a change soon came over this promising state of things. Cardinal Caraffa mounted the Papal throne in 1555, under the title of Paul IV. One of his first acts was to withdraw the permission which Paul III. had given, and Paul's successor had continued—the permission, that is, to use the Breviary of Quignon. Two reasons may be assigned for this retrograde policy. First, a feeling of personal jealousy against the author. For at the time that Pope Clement had commissioned Quignon to review the Breviary, he gave a similar charge to Cardinal Caraffa. The work of the former was preferred; and it is very natural, though not very creditable to the head or heart of the latter, that as soon as he obtained the power, he lost no time in prohibiting the further circulation of the work of his rival. The other reason above alluded to may be found in the fact—to which we shall advert more particularly below—that the Church of England had not long before put forth her Book of Common Prayer; in one of the Prefaces† to which the compilers stated the principles on which they had proceeded in drawing it up, and which principles were to some extent identical with those by which Cardinal Quignon had (in the Preface to the second edition of his Breviary above noticed) declared himself to have been guided. Nay, more, the compilers of the English Prayer Book had, in this Preface, actually appropriated, as best expressing their own views, some of the statements put forward by Quignon in his Preface. These reasons sufficiently explain why Pope Paul IV. discountenanced the Breviary of Quignon. The call for some reformation in the offices of the Church was, however, too urgent to be disregarded. He accordingly set himself to perfecting the work which, as we have seen he himself had already begun, and which was not approved by Clement VII. His death, however, which took place in 1559, put a stop to his undertaking before it was complete. The question of liturgical reform, pressing as it was, was laid aside for a time. The Fathers of Trent, occupied with other weighty matters, were either unable or unwilling to enter upon so momentous a matter. But the necessities of the case became too urgent to admit of any further postponement. The Court of France, especially, directed the Cardinal of Lorraine to impress upon the Council the necessity of reforming the divine offices, and purifying them from the corruptions and superstitions, "which, under the pretext of piety, serve only to deceive the people." It was also expressly demanded that public prayers should be allowed to be said in the vernacular tongue, in order to be understood by the people‡ Upon this, Pope Pius IV. sent the Council the unpublished work of his predecessor, Paul IV., to serve as a basis upon which to proceed; but after much delay, and the appointing of a commission to execute the task, nothing was eventually done. The Council, in its last session, contented itself with referring the question respecting Missals and Breviaries to the Pope. Pius IV. died soon after this, leaving the work still undone to his successor, Pius V. This Pontiff, assisted by a number of divines§ whose sympathies were all on the side of inveterate usage, and opposed to the reforming tendencies which had partially developed themselves under Clement and his immediate successors, published, at last, in 1568, the long-looked for edition of the Roman Breviary. In the Bull prefixed to it, Quignon's Breviary was abrogated, together with all other Breviaries which could not show a prescription of two hundred years.‖ By this prudent reservation the Papal See avoided any collision with the cherished usages of the Churches which had never conformed to the Roman ritual. Thus, for example, Milan was left in undisturbed possession of the Ambrosian office, and Toledo of the Mosarabic.

Not many years, however, elapsed when it was found necessary, from the numerous discrepancies which arose in the successive editions of Pius's Breviary, to undertake a new revision. This was done by Pope Clement VIII., in 1602.¶ This Breviary again was superseded by another revision under Urban VIII., in 1631, which is the Breviary still in general use in the Church of Rome,* and the one from which we have given so many extracts to our readers in former numbers.

When once the Council of Trent had stamped with its authority the traditional usages of the Church, it became, of course, a necessity to uphold the old-established Breviaries, with all their corruptions and superstitions, and to repudiate such changes as those which Cardinal Quignon had introduced. The effect, accordingly, of the successive revisions just noticed, was not to reform any of the abuses which had grown up during the dark ages, but to stereotype them, and introduce new superstitions. Fabulous legends and spurious writings were still allowed to disfigure the pages of a work professing to guide the devotions of the faithful, and promote the honour of the God of truth. Such a proceeding as this could not and did not satisfy those who were truly in earnest about the momentous subject of divine worship. Accordingly, in the year 1680, the Archbishop of Paris, Francois de Harlay, published a Breviary founded on the grand principle of Cardinal Quignon—namely, that of excluding human compositions from the responds, anthems, &c., and replacing them by texts of Holy Scripture. And upon the model of this Paris Breviary are constructed the other Breviaries since in use throughout France.†

From this retrospect it appears that the worship of the Western Church had been, in the lapse of ages, gradually becoming overlaid with abuses and superstitions of various kinds. That, at last, the evil became so intolerable as to induce the Roman Pontiff to attempt to correct it, by reforming the offices of the Breviary. That, in accordance with his desire, and at his special request, a reformed Breviary was drawn up, which was sanctioned by him and his immediate successors, and met with almost universal reception in the Western Church during a period of several years. That, at length, the spirit of determined hostility to every measure which could possibly be construed into an approval of the detested Reformation, unfortunately led to the abandonment of the course initiated by Clement VII., and caused a retracing of the steps which, under his auspices, had been so wisely, and ably, and piously taken by Cardinal Quignon. That, under the retrograde influence thus called into action, the Breviary became again disfigured with absurd fictions and superstitious ceremonies, which, however well suited to the ignorance and credulity of the middle ages, are utterly out of place in an age calling itself enlightened. That, accordingly, the Gallican Church refused to accept the Roman Breviary, thus restored to its mediæval state, and effected for itself a reform akin to that originated by Quignon, and approved by the Papal See for many years.

II.—The second purpose which we proposed to ourselves in this article was, to show that the reform of the divine offices, commenced by Cardinal Quignon, and partially effected by him, has been fully realized and carried out by the compilers of the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England. In order to show this, we cannot do better than place, in parallel columns, a few extracts from the preface to Quignon's Breviary, of 1536, and the preface to the English Prayer Book, of 1549, entitled "Concerning the Service of the Church;" from which comparison it will at once appear that the compilers of the English Liturgy so fully concurred in the sentiments of the Roman Cardinal respecting the great principle upon which the offices of divine worship ought to be based—namely, a close adherence to Holy Scripture—that they hesitated not to adopt, in some cases, his very words:—

BREVIARIUM QUIGNONII, PRÆFATIO.	PREFACE TO THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.
Factum est, nescio quo pacto, precantium negligentia, ut paulatim a sanctissimis illis veterum patrum institutis discederetur. Nam libri Scripturæ Sacræ qui statis suæ temporibus legendi erant more majorum vindemiæ incepti omittuntur. . . . Illud ante omnia visum nobis est in consuetudinem revocare, ut Scriptura Sacra maxime omnium toto anno, et omnes Psalmi singulis septimanis perlegerentur. Utrumque enim veteribus patribus summa ratione placuisse videbamus, qui plerosque libros utriusque testamenti per anni tempora legendos disponerant in Breviario, et per dies sin Psalmos distribuerant, ut singulis septimanis totum psalterium legeretur. Sed (ut supra diximus) precantium negligentia factum erat ut minima pars Scripturæ legeretur, et psalmorum plerique omissis, pauci singulis fere diebus repeterentur. . . . . Tum historiæ sanctorum, quondam tam crebræ et tam sine delectu scriptæ habentur (in also Breviario) ut nec authoritatem habere videantur nec gravitatem.	This many years this godly and decent order of the ancient Fathers hath been so altered, broken, and neglected, that commonly when any Book of the Bible was begun, after three or four chapters were read out, all the rest were unread. They (the ancient Fathers) so ordered the matter that the whole Bible (or the greatest part thereof) should be read over once every year. . . . And, furthermore, notwithstanding that the ancient Fathers have divided the Psalms into seven portions, now, of late, a few of them have been daily said, and the rest utterly omitted. (The continual reading of Holy Scripture) hath been neglected by planting in uncertain stories and legends.

* Gueranger, Institutions Liturgiques, vol. i., pp. 359, 360. Paris, 1840.

† These abuses relate to the Missal as well as to the Breviary. Even the most solemn rite of the Church did not, by the confession of this writer, escape profanation.

‡ In connection with this subject, the following remarks of the same writer are deserving of attention:—"We have not yet enumerated all the abuses which, in those ages, introduced themselves into divine worship. Religious architecture prostituted itself even in the extent of presenting ignoble caricatures of sacred things in the very sanctuary itself. Indecent images of clerks and monks decked the niches; the confusion, the bizarreness, the caprice of ornamentation, opened the way to the admission of pagan forms, producing an incongruous mixture of mythological subjects, of the most carnal kind, with the mystical emblems of divine worship—l. c., pp. 362-3.

§ Breviarium Romanum ex Sacris potissimum Scriptura et probatis sanctorum historiis collectum et concinnatum.

* Zaccaria, p. 130.

† Dictionnaire de Liturgie, col. 165.

* Zaccaria, i., 110.

† This Preface is entitled "Concerning the Service of the Church."

‡ Fleury Continuat., tom. xxxiii., pp. 14, 16. Pallavicino. Lib. 19. cap. i. n. 8.

‖ Zaccaria., p. 116. § Zaccaria, p. 115. ¶ Zaccaria, p. 119.

Accedit tam perplexus ordo, tamque difficilis precandi ratio, ut interdum paulo minor opera in requirendo ponatur, quam cum invenieris, in legendo.

Quod ipsi animadvertentes, rationem ineundam putavimus ut Veteris Testamenti magna et utilissima pars, et totum Novum, præter partem Apocalypsis, in anno, et singulis septimanis Psalmi omnes perlegerentur. . . . Curavimus ut ordine longè simpliciore et expeditiore magna pars laboris minueretur. Versiculos, Responsoria, et Capitula omittere idcirco visum est. . . . quoniam locum relinqui voluimus continenti lectioni Scripturæ Sacræ.

Moreover, the number and hardness of the rules called the Pie, and the manifold changings of the service, was the cause that to turn the Book only was so hard and intricate a matter that many times there was more business to find out what should be read than to read it when found out.

These inconveniences, therefore, considered, here is set forth such an order whereby the same may be redressed. And, for a readiness in this matter, here is drawn out a calendar for that purpose, which is plain and easy to be understood; wherein, so much as may be, the reading of Holy Scripture is so set forth that all things shall be done in order, without breaking one piece from the other. For this cause be cut off anthems, responds, invitatories, and such like things as did break the continual course of the reading of the Scripture.

So far, then, as the restoring of Scripture to its due place in the offices of Divine Worship, the reformed Church of England in her Prayer Book adopted, and carried into effect, the principles which Cardinal Quignon propounded, and which were sanctioned by more than one Pope; but which, unhappily, did not long find favour in the Church of Rome. But the compilers of the English Liturgy, did not, and we glory in saying so, confine themselves to the reform so ably commenced by Quignon. They went farther than he did or could presume to venture. They substituted the vernacular language for the Latin, on the plain ground that "St. Paul would have such language spoken to the people in the Church as they might understand, and have profit by hearing the same;" whereas, in the unreformed Church of England they had "heard with their ears only, and their heart, spirit, and mind were not edified thereby."* The legendary fictions which had so long disgraced the Service Books of the Western Church were wholly removed; together with all invocations and worshipping of saints and angels, which, as we have elsewhere shown in this Journal, are utterly at variance with the purity and simplicity of the primitive Christian worship, and were gradually introduced into the Church, partly by its contact with paganism, and partly by the spontaneous development of the very form of superstition which St. Paul so emphatically condemns in his Epistle to the Colossians.—ii. 18.

As a commentary upon the wisdom displayed by the Church of England in substituting the vernacular tongue for the Latin in her public offices, we cannot forbear quoting the following striking words of one of the most eminent Roman Catholic ritualists of the present day:—†

"The Breviary, let it contain ever so much of what is beautiful, tranquillizing, and edifying, has become for the people an antiquity, and has ceased to be intelligible to them. The necessity of public devotions is still acknowledged by the faithful; but they require nourishment for their head and heart, and, accordingly, they attend more willingly to the rehearsal of a Rosary than to our Psalmody. Is this to remain so always? We hope not. We maintain that it would be to the great interest of the Church, if the Breviary were *again* to be adapted to the devotion of the people. Who can seriously doubt that the present, frequently bungled, recitation in cathedrals and monasteries is *far inferior to a morning and evening prayer in a language understood by the people?* How edifying would it be if daily in our cathedrals and town churches, where the attendance of a considerable number of the laity might reasonable be hoped for, and on Sundays and holidays, at least, in our country churches, morning and evening hymns were sung by the mouth of the laity as well as by the clergy; if intelligible *Biblical* lessons were read; and if the service concluded with a prayer adapted to the solemnities of the day? Happy times which shall see such a ritual *again* established! Is not the fulfilment of the wish, in the case of nuns, who, knowing nothing of Latin, must yet sing in Latin, a crying necessity, and one which demands immediate attention? May God awaken men to undertake this great work! Undoubtedly, reform is necessary! Nay, we assert, that those very ecclesiastics, who are not only scrupulously obedient to the command of the Church, but endure this command as a sweet yoke, remembering that without it we should, as a general rule, pray but little or not at all, are exactly the persons who most fully share in our wishes for reform."

In conclusion, we beg to recal a very important fact to the minds of such of our Roman Catholic readers as may be disposed to acquiesce in the justice of our remarks as to the English Prayer Book realizing the reforms which so many of the best and wisest members of their Church have sighed for and attempted in vain. The fact to which we refer, is this—that, in the year 1560, Pope Pius IV. proposed, through his Nuncio, Parpalia, to Queen Elizabeth, to *ratify the English Liturgy*, as well as to allow communion in both kinds, upon condition of her acknowledging his supremacy.* This was a clear admission, on the part of the Pontiff, that he saw nothing absolutely objectionable in the English Ritual; and an admission, too, the more valuable as coming from one who, from the part he took in reference to Quignon's Breviary, must have been in a peculiar degree prejudiced against the Prayer Book of the Church of England.

* Preface Concerning the Service of the Church.
† F. X. Schmid, Kultus der Christkathol. Kirche, ii., 95.

* Camden's History of Elizabeth, p. 47. Camden derived his information from the Queen's Secretary, Cecil.

ROMAN CATHOLIC ANTINOMIANISM—No. II.

WHEN we want to distinguish between true and false doctrine there is no better test than that given by our Lord himself—"By their fruits ye shall know them." Find out which is the doctrine which puts most discouragement on sin and leads most naturally to holiness of life, and that is the doctrine which is likely to have come from the pure and holy Saviour. We endeavoured in our last number to apply this test to the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church, and we gave very full quotations from the writings of one of her canonized saints, from one of the most popular books of devotion in her communion—St. Liguori's "Glories of Mary." We think we gave full proofs of the immoral tendency of that work. If there is any person who has his heart bent upon sin, who feels that sin is exceedingly pleasant, but also exceedingly dangerous, then, the "Glories of Mary" is just the book for him. It will show him how he may live all his life in sin, and yet, through Mary's help, get to heaven at last. All he has to do is to cultivate devotion to her; he may renounce Christ, or renounce the sacraments; but if he holds fast to her she will procure him in time the grace of repentance. The sinner, however, who had only read those of St. Liguori's stories which we copied in our last number, might still be haunted by an uneasy scruple. He might be sure that his veneration of her would be certain to cause in him a change of heart; but might not this change come too late? Life is uncertain, and what would become of him should he happen to be cut off in his sins before the Virgin had made him repent of them? We purpose, in this article, to show how satisfactorily this scruple is removed by St. Liguori. Before, however, we proceed to this subject, we have something to say as to the merits of Mr. Duffy's translation which we have been using. We were led in the last number to express our suspicions that Mr. Duffy had been dealing unfaithfully by the saint, and had suppressed some very important incidents in his stories. We have been since enabled, through the kindness of a friend who has furnished us with a French edition of the "Glories of Mary," to ascertain the justice of our suspicions. The story, to which we appended a note in the last number, agrees perfectly with the French edition, and differs from Mr. Duffy's; and, in further proof of the same unfair course of proceedings, we give another story (Duffy, vol. i., p. 242; Paris, 1832, vol. i., p. 187), marking in italics the parts omitted by Mr. Duffy—

"Bellnacensis and Cesarius relate, that a young nobleman having, by his vices, reduced himself from affluence to such a degree of poverty that he was obliged to beg, left his own country, in order to live with less shame in a distant land, where he was unknown. On his journey, he met a person who had been formerly a servant to his father. This person, seeing him afflicted on account of the poverty into which he had fallen, told him to be cheerful, and promised to conduct him to a liberal prince who would supply all his wants. This man was an impious sorcerer. Behold, he took the poor young man with him through a wood which stood near a marsh, and began to speak to a person who was invisible. The young man asked to whom he was speaking. He answered, 'to the devil.' Seeing the young man terrified he endeavoured to animate his courage; and, continuing his conversation with the devil, he said—'This young man is reduced to extreme necessity; he wishes to be restored to his former condition.' The fiend answered—'*If he will obey me* I will make him richer than he was before, *but he must commence by denying God.*' *The young man had, at first, a horror of it, but afterwards, being excited by the detestable magician, he yielded, and denied God.* '*That is not enough,*' *replied the demon*, 'he must *also* deny Mary, *our irreconcilable enemy.* How many souls has she snatched from our hands, to bring them to God, and to save them?' 'Oh, no,' replied the young man, 'I cannot deny my mother, she is my only hope [after God]. I am content to beg during my whole life, rather than deny her.' He then departed from the place. On his return, the young man, full of repentance, passing a church dedicated to the Virgin, entered, and, kneeling before her image, began to weep and implore the most holy Virgin to obtain for him the pardon of his sins. Behold, Mary instantly prays to her son for the unhappy man. At first, Jesus answered—'My mother, this ungrateful sinner has renounced my service.' Seeing that his mother continued to pray for him, Jesus, at length, said—'O mother, I have never refused thee anything. Since thou askest pardon for this sinner, I forgive him.' The person who had purchased all the property of this spendthrift young man had secretly observed from a corner of the church all that had happened. Struck with the compassion of Mary towards this sinner, he gave him his only daughter in marriage, and made him heir of all his fortune. Thus the young man recovered, through the intervention of Mary, both the grace of God and his temporal possessions."

Now, our readers will see what a piece of deliberate falsification Mr. Duffy's translator has been guilty of. He had, no doubt, often heard Protestants say, that the necessary result of the worship paid by Roman Catholics to the Blessed Virgin, was to lead them to honour and love her *more than God;* and now when he finds in St. Liguori so striking an illustration of the truth of this accusation, he not only "burkes" the offensive part of the story, but when the sinner calls Mary his only hope, "his only hope *after God*," interpolates Mr. Duffy.

We say no more on this part of the subject, as our business now is not with the *idolatry* of this book of Liguori's, but with its morality. We are not now complaining that he pays too much honour to the Virgin, but that he does not really honour her at all. We are sure that the stories he tells of her would, if they were true, be very little to her credit; and we are sure that Roman Catholics who do really reverence her, without having, at the same time, lost their perceptions of right and wrong, must be pained at hearing the worship of the Virgin put forward as a substitute for all morality and all the rest of religion.

We return now to the point we have undertaken to prove from Liguori—namely, that there is very little danger of the worshipper of the Virgin being overtaken by death before he has accomplished his repentance. Perhaps our readers may have formed exaggerated ideas as to the time necessary for repentance; if so, we hasten to undeceive them.

"In the life of Sister Catherine of St. Augustine it is related, that in the neighbourhood of the monastery of this servant of God, there was a woman called Mary, who, from youth to old age, continued obstinate in sin. Her crimes were so great that the inhabitants expelled her from among them, and confined her in a cave outside the town; there she died, abandoned by all and without the last sacraments, and, therefore, was buried like a brute beast in an open field. Sister Catherine, who was accustomed to pray with great fervour for all who had passed to the other life, having heard of the frightful death of this poor old woman, never thought of praying for her, believing, as every one else did, that she was damned. But, behold, after four years, a soul in purgatory appeared to Sister Catherine, and said—'Sister Catherine, how miserable is my lot! You recommend to God the souls of all who die, and for my soul alone you have had no compassion.' 'And who are you?' replied the servant of God. 'I am that poor Mary who died in the cave.' 'What,' said Sister Catherine, 'are you saved?' 'Yes,' said the soul, 'I am saved through the clemency of the Virgin Mary.' 'And how?' asked Sister Catherine. 'When I saw that I was at the point of death, so full of sins, and abandoned by all, I turned to the Mother of God, and said to her—"O lady, thou art the refuge of the abandoned; behold, at this moment I am abandoned by all; thou [after Jesus]* art my only hope; thou art able to assist me; have pity on me." The holy Virgin obtained for me the grace to make an act of contrition; I died, and am saved. Mary, my queen, has also obtained for me the favour that my punishment should be abridged, and that by suffering intense pains for a short time, I should satisfy for the punishment due to me for many years; I now only require a few Masses to be said for me, in order to be delivered from purgatory. I entreat you to procure for me the celebration of these Masses, and I promise to pray ever after to God and to Mary for you.' Sister Catherine got the Masses offered; and, behold, in a few days after, the soul appeared to her again, more resplendent than the sun, and said to her—'I thank you, Catherine; behold, I go to sing the mercies of my God, and to pray for you.'"

We could produce many other instances of equally rapid conversions, but only refer in passing to (vol. ii., p. 204) the case of a nobleman "deserving of contempt for the depravity of his morals, who, by express compact, became the slave of the devil, and served him uninterruptedly for sixty years, without ever approaching the sacraments," and who, in his mortal illness, twice repelled the confessor who exhorted him to repentance; and yet for whom the Virgin obtained a good death, because, "though he had led such a wicked life, he had always preserved devotion to her Dolours."

But suppose the worst came to the worst—suppose the devil was too quick for the Blessed Virgin, and that he had actually succeeded in procuring the death of his victims in mortal sin before she had obtained their repentance—does it follow that her resources are exhausted? It will appear from the following that, under *no* contingency, can a servant of Mary perish:—

"It is the opinion of many theologians, and particularly of St. Thomas, that for many persons who died in mortal sin, the divine mother has obtained from God a suspension of their sentence, and the grace to return to life, in order to do penance. Many examples of this are related by grave authors. Among others, Flodoard, who lived about the ninth century, relates in his chronicles (Ap. Crasset, tom. i., q. 12) that a certain deacon, called Adelman, who was believed to be dead, returned to life when they were going to bury him, and said, that he saw the place in hell which had been prepared for him, but that, through the prayers of the

* Mr. Duffy is at his tricks again. All through the book he makes the same correction—St Liguori himself not being accustomed to make any such reservation.

Blessed Virgin, his life was restored, that he might do penance for his sins. Surius also relates (lib. I., cap. 35) that a Roman citizen, called Andrew, had died in sin, and that Mary had obtained for him the grace to return to life, that he might be able to repent and obtain pardon. Pelbart relates (Stellar. Cor. B. V. 1, 12, p. 2, a. 1) that, in his own time, when the Emperor Sigismond along with his army were crossing the Alps, a voice was heard from a skeleton asking for confession, and saying, that the mother of God, to whom he was devoted while a soldier, had obtained for him the grace to live in these bones until he would make confession of his sins; after confession he died.

"Father Eusebius Nierembergh relates, that in a city of Arragon there was a young lady, called Alexandra, who, being of noble birth and extraordinary beauty, was greatly beloved by two young men. Through jealousy, they one day began to quarrel, and killed each other. Their relations went in a rage and took away the life of poor Alexandra, because she had been the occasion of the death of the young men; they cut off her head and threw it into a well. In a few days after, St. Dominick passed by, and, being inspired by God, went to the well and said—"*Alexandra come forth.*" Behold, the head of the deceased came forth, placed itself on the edge of the well, and entreated St. Dominick to hear the confession of Alexandra. The saint heard her confession, and gave her communion in the presence of an immense multitude of persons who had come to see the wonder that had been wrought. St. Dominick commanded her to state the reason why she had received so great a favour. Alexandra said, that when her head was cut off, she was in mortal sin, but that in return for the pious practice of reciting the rosary, most Holy Mary preserved her life. The dead remained alive for two days on the well in the presence of all, and then the soul of Alexandra went to purgatory. In fifteen days her soul appeared to St. Dominick, beautiful and brilliant as a star, and said to him, that the recitation of the rosary in their behalf, was one of the principal sources of relief to the souls in purgatory; and that as soon as they go to heaven they pray for all who recite for them this powerful prayer. After these words, St. Dominick saw the fortunate soul ascending in triumph to the kingdom of the saints."

After reciting the stories, of which we have given some samples, St. Liguori adds a caution, that these examples "should not encourage any rash sinner who wishes to live in sin, with the hope of being saved from hell by Mary, even though he should die in sin. For as it would be great folly in a Christian to throw himself into a deep well with the hope of being preserved from death by Mary, because she may have preserved another in similar circumstances, so it would be still greater folly to run the risk of dying in sin with the presumption that the Holy Virgin will save him from hell."

Such is the antidote with which the saint hopes to counteract the effects of all his other teaching. He must have had very little knowledge of human nature if he expected it to have much effect. He might as well supply a man with large draughts of spirituous liquors and then blandly advise him not to be intoxicated, as tell him such tales of the Virgin's reluctance to allow one of her clients to be lost, and then warn him not to be presumptuous. The saint's illustration about a deep well is not a very apposite one, because a deep well is a place that one is under no temptation to jump into; but suppose it was a place that there was some pleasure or profit to be got by venturing into, would not every instance recorded of people who had made the venture and come back safe, give strong encouragement to those who were inclined to run the risk themselves. Suppose that a young man were desirous of going over to California or Australia to try his fortune at the diggings, and suppose that his mother, alarmed at the dangers and the hardships of the expedition, had employed St. Liguori to counsel her son against the venture, how should we think the saint fulfilled his commission, if he spent the whole time of the conference in relating stories of persons who had tried the experiment and returned safe with full purses, and then dropped a few words at the close, "My son, the risk is very great, I should not advise you to venture." Just as much effect will St. Liguori's words of caution have in counteracting the tendency of all the rest of his teaching. He forgets that people do not generally commit sin for the mere sake of sinning. They do so in order to gratify some of their desires or appetites, even when that gratification is forbidden. And if they find that the risk of yielding to the temptation is much less than they had expected, that many others had yielded in a much more fatal way, and had escaped without any injury, why, then, is it likely that they will deny themselves present pleasure through fear of a very remote danger?

One of St. Liguori's readers may say, I am quite aware that the stories recorded in this book are extreme cases, and things that do not happen every day; but, then, I do not intend to ask the Virgin to do as much for me as she did for those abandoned sinners. I do not want to keep a crucifix to trample on daily (vol. ii., p. 142); nor have I any intention of getting consecrated hosts to outrage (vol. ii., p. 142); nor do I ask her to take my place among my friends while I spend fifteen years in a house of ill fame (vol. i., p. 284); nor do I mean to sell myself to the devil and sign the compact with my blood (vol. ii., p. 256); nor to absent myself sixty years from confession (vol. ii., p. 201); nor to do any of the horrible things which the sinners, St. Liguori tells of, perpetrated: I only mean to be a sinner in a small and quiet way, and to indulge in some cherished vices that I own the Gospel requires me to forsake, but which I find it hard to part with. Let me, therefore, take my own way for the present; it is no great hardship to say a few Hail Marys every day; and, no doubt, the Virgin will sometime or other enable me to repent of my sins. I will take care to ask her not to allow me to *die* in mortal sin, and, no doubt, she will take care I shall not. "There was, for instance, a sinner (vol. I., p. 305) who had not been at confession for fifty-three years, and who had practised no other devotion than that of saluting every image of Mary which he passed, and of asking her to obtain for him the grace not to die in mortal sin. And one day, when engaged in a duel, he broke his sword, and seeing himself at the mercy of his adversary, turning to Mary he said to her—'Ah, I shall now be killed, and damned; mother of sinners assist me.' After which words he found himself transported, without knowing how, to a place of security." Surely it is not likely that I shall die so suddenly, but that I shall have as much time as this to enlist her good offices in my behalf; and, therefore, I do not expect ever to require to give her the trouble of raising me to life, as she has done for others a great deal worse than ever I intend to be, in order to give them time for repentance.

We think we need say no more to illustrate the immoral tendency of St. Liguori's teaching; and we have now only to ask our Roman Catholic readers what they think of it. We know that there are many Roman Catholics in England who dislike the devotional writings of St. Alphonsus Liguori, and see with regret the attempts that are being made to give them increased currency in this country. An article in the *Rambler* (November, 1854), from which we have already quoted, gives an account of this, to which we are not disposed to yield much credence. It says—"We entirely accept St. Alphonsus as a fair type of the prevalent and living spirit of Catholic devotion towards the Blessed Virgin. We adopt his language; we venerate his example; we circulate his writings; we deny that they are disliked by the rich or the educated, or the laity as such." But it goes on to explain that in the choice of devotional, as well as of other books, personal tastes and predilections come into play; and that there are some "who have no fancy for the "*Glories of Mary*," and who find it rather a dull book."

A dull book! Does any of our readers believe that the book from which we have given extracts is disapproved of because of its dulness. What? the book which contains the history of "the advocate and the ape," of "the pious highwayman," of "Beatrix the porteress," and many others more extraordinary which we have not given. This a dull book! Why we might as well call Baron Munchausen's travels a dull book. If the stories St. Liguori tells are true, his work is one of the most interesting ever penned, and deserves to be deeply meditated on. And if these stories are false, his book deserves to be rejected, not because it is dull, but because it is full of lying doctrines, supported by lying stories; because it teaches its readers to offer to a creature the honour due to the Supreme God; and because it likewise degrades the character of the creature whom it deifies, by representing her as so greedy of praise and honour as to be indifferent to the sins of those who pay honour to her.

These are the reasons why *we* dislike the "Glories of Mary;" and, if we mistake not, these, and not its "dulness," are the reasons why it is disliked by some of our Roman Catholic brethren in England.

THE OLD IRISH CLERGY.—No. V.

All that we have said relative to the marriage of our old clergy in this island, and their mode of hereditary succession to ecclesiastical offices and benefices, receives a strong corroboration from the testimony of Pope Innocent III., who wrote, as we are told, many letters to his legate in Ireland (A.D. 1201), named Johannes Salernitanus, "instructing him, among other things, to put an end to that abusive custom, whereby sons and grandsons were appointed to succeed their fathers and grandfathers in ecclesiastical benefices."—Ciaconius de Vitis Pontif. col. 624. Romæ. 1630.

St. Paul was so strongly of opinion that the circumstance of a clergyman having married, and brought up his children well, or his being engaged in so rearing them up, was a valuable sort of experience to prepare him for the office of a bishop, that he even asks, in connection with the subject, this question—"*If a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the Church of God?*" as if it were next to impossible for an unmarried man to be fully qualified for that important office. How strange, then, that in the ecclesiastical system with which Father Colgan was identified, the only steps whereby a clergyman could become possessed of such a qualification were those of the crimes of "adultery and sacrilege!"

This learned author would seem to insinuate for true what is so commonly believed among the more ignorant members of the Church of Rome, as to the marrying of the clergy being a mere Protestant innovation, introduced by careless, worldly-minded men, with all the other heresies of the Reformation. We have shown, however, thus far, that it was, on the contrary, a common custom of the ancient Irish clergy from the very first; pointing, among other distinguished instances, in illustration of the fact, to the case (300 years before the Reformation), of an Abbot of Louth being father to a primate of Armagh, who *one again* himself father to another abbot of Louth, &c., &c. (see No. I. of this series), and this on testimony of Irish records which no Irishman will venture to object to as unworthy of trust. We shall now proceed to show *proof*, that in the period of Anglo Roman rule in Ireland—*i.e.*, from A.D. 1172 to A.D. 1552—the same custom of clerical marriages continued to prevail, whatever opposition to it, or efforts to suppress it, may have proceeded from the authorities of the Roman Court.

The Church of Killala, in Mayo, seems to have been, in the 13th century, in the possession of a family named O'Mulfover; concerning some individual members of which, we have in the "Annals" these entries:—

A.D. 1224. Mellus, *son to the Bishop O'Mulfover*, parson of Hy-Fiachrach and Hy-Amhey, and the making of a bishop, for his wisdom, was killed by the son of Donogh O'Dowd.

A.D. 1231. Aengus O'Mulfover, *Bishop of Hy-Fiachrach* [Killala], died.

A.D. 1235. Isaac O'Mulfover, *Erenach* of Killala, died.

A.D. 1267. Hugh O'Murray, *Chief of Lagan* [Barony of Tyrawley], was killed at Killala by O'Mulfover, *Coarb* [or principal ecclesiastic] of the Church, on a Sunday, after hearing Mass.

Proceeding onwards through the "Annals," we meet in them, from time to time, with the following notices:—

A.D. 1281. Cormac, *son of O'Donnell the Lector* [or "Divinity Professor." *Colgan*], fell in battle at Desiercreat.

A.D. 1317. Conor O'Conor, *son to the Coarb* of St. Coman, was slain. . . . Gillaroe, *son to the Erenach* MacTiernan, was slain at Kilmore.

A.D. 1325. Nicholas, *son to the Coarb* of St. Mudoc [*i.e.*, to the Abbot of Drumlane, County Cavan], died.

A.D. 1330. Petrus, *son of the Coarb* of St. Mudoc, killed by the English of Kells.

A.D. 1358. Melaghlin, *son to Bishop O'Dowd* [of Killala], slain in battle.

A.D. 1367. Aengus, *son of Dean Magauran*, died.

A.D. 1373. *Parson Mac Feorais son* was slain by Turlogh Roe O'Conor.

A.D. 1377. Mac Moriasy, the great dean [of Achonry] died, at Rome. . . . Donnell, son to Farrel, *son of the monk* O'Gallagher, died.

A.D. 1406. Owen, *son of the Abbot* O'Connor [defeated, with others, by Turlogh O'Conor].

A.D. 1443. The Abbot of Muirgeas, *son to the Abbot* MacDonnagh, killed *per dolum* by his own kinsman [from the "*Annals of Duald Firbis*" in O'D's *note*].

A.D. 1444. Richard, *son of the great dean* . . . Bishop of Ardagh, died. . . . William, *son of the Dean* O'Flanagan, Prior of Roscommon, died.

[*Dudley Firbis's Annals* add, at this year, the death of "John, *son to the Abbot* of David." Under it they record, also, a battle fought in the Barony of Garryeastle, King's County, between two rival factions of the local sept of that county, the MacCoghlan's; one of those branches being headed by their bishop: and the bishop with his men were defeated; and, further, the bishop with his two brothers, Brian and Magnus, the *two sons of the Archdeacon* Mageoghlan, . . . and James, *the bishop's son*, Archdeacon of Clonmacnoise, &c., . . . were all killed," &c., &c.]

A.D. 1450. The Archbishop of Connaught—*i.e.*, *son to Parson* Burke—died.

A.D. 1464. Redmond, *son of the Prior*, son of Loughlin O'Farrel, died of the plague. . . . Donogh, *son of the Prior* O'Farrel [beaten by Mageoghlan].

A.D. 1467. James, *son to the Bishop* Richard, *son to the Great Deane* fitzDaniel fitzJohn Gallda O'Fergagyl, Abbot of Lethraith [Abbeylara], a friar, young, learned, benign, hospitall, nobleman, died in the flowere of youth and beginning of his happiness [from *D. Firbis's Annals*, in O'Donovan's *note*].

A.D. 1470. The *son of Bishop O'Gallagher* was slain [in battle at Ballyconnell, barony of Tullyhaw, County Cavan].

A.D. 1474. Dermot, *son of Bishop O'Brien* [was hanged for murder].

A.D. 1484. Niall, *son of the Coarb* MacMahon, died on his way from Rome.

A.D. 1486. Philip, *son of the Coarb* MacMahon, a canon chorister at Clogher, Coarb of Clones, Parson of Dartry, &c., died. . . . John, *son of the Prior* MacRannall, died.

[In the same year, "Art, son of MacDonnell of Clankelly. . . . was slain at Clones in a quarrel which he had with the clergy on little Christmas—*i.e.*, with James, the son of Philip, *son of the Coarb Mac* Mahon," &c.—*Annals of Ulster.*]

A.D. 1490. Gilchreest, *son of the Lector*, a young priest, of Clonlish, died.

A.D. 1492. Magrath—*i.e.*, Dermot, son of Marcus, &c.—Coarb of the Church of St. Daveog, died [and at A.D. 1496 we have mention made of "Rory Magrath, son of Dermot, son of Marcus," as Coarb of the same Church lands].

A.D. 1497. William, *son of Bishop O'Gallagher*, [fell in battle, near Rathmelton].

A.D. 1498. A great mournful news throughout all Ireland this year, viz., the following: MacManus Maguire died this year, *i.e.*, Cathal Oge, the son of Cathal, &c. . . . He was a Canon Chorister of Armagh, and in the bishopric of Clogher, and Dean of Lough Erne, and Parson of Innis Cacin in Lough Erne, and the representative of a bishop for fifteen years before his death. He was a precious stone, a bright gem, a luminous star, a treasury of wisdom, a fruitful branch of the Canon, and a fountain of charity, meekness, and mildness, *a dove in purity of heart, and a turtle in chastity, &c., &c.*

This curious obit of the distinguished Cathal Maguire, compiler of the *Annals of Ulster*, is from the pen of his continuator in that work, Roger Cassidy, as translated in the Dublin copy of the *Annals of Ulster;* and we have introduced it here, because the eminent and famous individual concerned, who is in it so highly lauded, was himself one of those married clergymen, of whom we now write. Dr. O'Donovan, indeed, seems to indulge in a strange sort of doubtfulness on the subject, his note concerning it running thus—"Cathal Oge, compiler of the Annals of Ulster. He had several legitimate sons, though *apparently* in Holy Orders." Why, "*apparently?*" after the aggregation of clerical titles bestowed on him in the Annals. Surely, if *ever* there were a clergyman in Ireland, "at all at all," in full orders, Cathal Maguire was so, beyond all doubt.

And yet, after all, parson, dean, bishop's vicar, canon chorister, and what not, although having several children, he was able, wonderful man, to leave among his countrymen a memory likening him to a *dove in purity of heart, and a turtle in chastity;* no Father Colgan, alas, being at hand, to explain to the poor ignoramuses "the sacrilegious adulterer" that he was in reality. Let us return, however, to the thread of our subject, and the testimony of the "Annals."

Same year (A.D. 1498). Cormac, the son of Owen, *son of the Bishop* MacCoghlan, Official of Clonmacnoise, and a learned ecclesiastic, *in Christo quievit* [*Annals of Ulster. Dublin*].

A.D. 1499. Sile, *daughter of Bishop Maguire, i.e.*, of Ros, the bishop, died this year, [*from the same*].

A.D. 1501. John, the son of [bishop] Rossa, son of Thomas Oge Maguire . . . Parson of Aghalurcher, &c., . . . died.

A.D. 1502. The daughter of Rory Caech Maguire, died in this year, *i.e.*, Meave, who was wife to Teige MacGaillghille [now Lilly], and *who had brought forth children to the young abbot.* [*Annals of Ulster.* It does not appear whether Teige Lilly was the "young abbot's" name, or whether he married the widow of one so named.]

A.D. 1504. Andrew Magrath, *son of the Coarb* of Termon Daveog [*i.e.*, the clergyman of Termonmagrath], died.

A.D. 1511. Hugh, son of Felim, son of Marcus, slain by James, son of John, *son of Bishop* Maguire.

A.D. 1513, The sons of Brian, *son of Bishop O'Gallagher* [pursued after plunderers of Donegal, and recovered what they were stealing].

A.D. 1514. Pierce, *son of the great Abbot* Maguire, died.

A.D. 1515. James, son of Thomas Roe, *son of the Abbot Maguire*, was slain.

A.D. 1518. Hugh, *son of* [*bishop*] *Rossa*, son of Thomas Oge Maguire, . . . Parson of Aghalurcher died . . .

The son of MacManus (Redmond, *son of Cathal Oge MacManus*), a charitable and humane man, died. [See A.D. 1498 sup.].

A.D. 1521. The Prior of Devenish, died; *i.e.*, Redmond, *son of the Parson* of Inismacsaint [in Lough Erne], a clerical, kind, charitable, humane man.

A.D. 1527. MacManus Maguire (Thomas Oge, son of Cathal Oge, &c.), died. [This was the son of the compiler of the *Annals of Ulster*, whose death is recorded above under the year 1498. *O'Donovan.*]

A.D. 1530, Celia, daughter of O'Fallon, and wife of Carbry, *son of the Prior*, a beautiful and humane lady, died.

Hugh O'Flanagan, *son of the Parson* of Inismacsaint, died. . . .

A.D. 1531. James O'Flanagan, *son of the Parson* of Inis [macsaint], a man of great name and renown in his country, died.

A.D. 1540. The sons of William, *son of Bishop* O'Gallagher, namely, William Oge and Hugh Gruama, were slain by the sons of O'Boyle.

A.D. 1541. James Oge, *son of the Prior* Mac Coghlan, was treacherously beheaded by Kedagh O'Melaghlin.

A.D. 1566. Rose, *daughter of* Cuconnaught Maguire, *the Coarb*, died.

The word *Coarb* in the earlier times of Irish Church history, before the coming of the English, undoubtedly meant the principal ecclesiastic of the Church with which he was connected, the successor and representative of the original founder, and, as such, possessed of the lands belonging to the establishment, as well as all other honours and emoluments conceded by common usage to persons holding such an office. But when the country came under the power of England and Rome, every exertion was made to transfer the power and emoluments of the *Coarbs* to diocesan dignitaries, and thus to provide for the endowment of cathedral corporations with both income and ecclesiastical honours, at the expense of the old Irish Church dignitaries, who had been alike independent of England and Rome. The old Irish abbeys were discouraged and fell to decay, and new and splendid Anglo-Norman ones, in close connection with Rome, arose to fill their places. The Coarbs, however, tenaciously held to their hereditary possessions, and the result of the struggle between their national influence and that of Rome would seem to have been, in many cases, that while the power and jurisdiction, the ecclesiastical rank and office, passed over to the Roman functionaries, endowed from one source or another, in the course of time, the lands continued to be held on by hereditary Coarbs and Erenachs, retaining still these names, though no longer necessarily ordained to the priesthood or episcopate, as their predecessors, the early abbots, had been, but in many cases admitted only to the *prima tonsura* or lowest degree of holy orders. The Coarbs above mentioned in the Annals were probably, for the most part, of the regular sort, ordained men, as their predecessors had been.

But in whatever degree this may, or may not, have been the case, the entries above afford a very sufficient evidence as to what was the practice concerning the enforcement of clerical celibacy in Ireland in those days. A very large amount of additional evidence on the subject might, if there were need, be deduced from our ancient Registers, those of the 15th century in particular, in which occur numerous *dispensations to men born of priests*, to be admitted, that defect notwithstanding, to holy orders, and ecclesiastical benefices; the Pope granting to such a one, that, although *de presbytero genitus et soluta* ["*born of a priest and an unmarried woman;*" as her marriage to such a person, against the canons, would, of course, be null and void], he may, for his personal worth, be promoted to so and so. But the evidence already adduced in these papers on the subject, is in itself sufficiently conclusive on the point concerned, and we shall content ourselves with having made such a passing allusion to the other for the present.

R. K.

IS IT POSSIBLE TO BE GOOD BY PROXY?

WE have to request our readers' attention to a few thoughts on a question which lies at the bottom of many of the points of difference between Protestants and Roman Catholics. Everyone knows how the Church of Rome encourages the people to rely on the merit of good works done by others—how she teaches that the saints have performed what are called "works of supererogation"—that is to say, works more than their own salvation requires, and which they can, therefore, afford to have reckoned for the benefit of others—how she teaches them to believe that if they become members of certain confraternities they will be entitled to share in the merit of the good works done by the rest of the society; and how Roman Catholics are ready to pay priests to perform certain religious exercises for them, or to pay persons to go on pilgrimages and undergo penances on their behalf. The case, in fact, is supposed to be similar to that of a man who owes a sum of money to his neighbour. If some friend is so kind as to pay a debt for you, and in your name, the creditor is as well satisfied as if you had paid it yourself out of your own purse, because all he cares for is to obtain his money for his own benefit.

But we ask our readers to reflect for a moment and say whether this illustration represents correctly the relation in which we stand to God. Every one will acknowledge that our Divine Master has no need of the services of his creatures, and that, therefore, the good works which he requires of us are *not* for his benefit, but for our own—for our own moral improvement. "Can a man be profitable unto God as he that is wise may be profitable unto himself? Is it any pleasure to the Almighty that thou art righteous? or is it gain to him that thou makest thy way perfect?"—Job xxii.

Now, just see what an important bearing this fact—that it is not for the Almighty's sake, but for our own, that we are required to worship and obey him—has upon the question whether such services can be performed by proxy?

Suppose that a man were to offer a map to a publisher for sale, it is no matter to the purchaser whether the man drew the map himself or got some friend to draw it for him; provided the map is honestly the seller's property, and is well executed, that is all the buyer cares for. But, on the other hand, suppose that a schoolmaster sets a boy to draw a map, by way of practice, in order that he may learn to be a good draftsman, then if the boy should get a school-fellow to do it for him, and should show it up as his own, he would be reproved and punished; for the task was set him not for the sake of the map (which the schoolmaster could have drawn better for himself), but as an exercise for the improvement of the learner.

Now, it cannot be doubted that it is the latter case which answers to ours in reference to our divine master; and that since "no man can be profitable unto God," and since He cannot stand in need of our services, it must be solely for our own moral improvement that the works which he requires of us are demanded. In arguing, then, with those who rely on the merits of the saints, we have no occasion to enter on the question whether the penances and austerities recorded in lives of the saints are real good works or not; nor, again, whether it is possible for any man to perform more good works than God requires of him, or to live so free from sin, as not to need, at least, all his merits for his own justification. Important as these questions are, they are superseded by the consideration we have been urging, that since good works are required of us for our own improvement, not for God's benefit, it must be impossible that another person should perform our duty in our stead, or that his good works, real or supposed, should be considered as done by ourselves.

TALK OF THE ROAD.—No. XXVIII.

"WELL, Pat," said Jem, when they met last, "is there anything new to talk of?"

"I don't know about its being new, Jem," said Pat: "maybe it's not old enough; but it's an old thing with me, anyway."

"And what is it," said Jem.

"It's confession, Jem," said Pat.

"And were you at confession, Pat?" said Jem.

"No, Jem," said Pat, "I wasn't. It's long enough since I was there."

"And was it reading the Bible put you off it, Pat?" said Jem.

"No, Jem, it wasn't that put me off it," said Pat: "sure, I quit confession, like a deal of the boys, long afore ever I took to reading; so, it wasn't that."

"Well, there's a deal of the boys surely that doesn't read the Bible, nor go to confession either, said Jem;" "more maybe than does go, a great deal. And I'm thinking they're getting more and more; and what's the reason, if it's not the reading that does it?"

"Well, the times done a deal of it, Jem," said Pat. "Sure, it was the famine put me off it; for I hadn't the dust to pay. Not but what the priest would hear my confession if I hadn't the money; but, then, you know, Jem, they don't like not to see the money; and people doesn't like to go without the money: and that put me off it first."

"Well, but Pat," said Jem, "the times got better, and sure you might get the shilling then?"

"Aye, I could," said Pat; "but, then, how would I remember all the sins I committed in five years maybe? And if I couldn't mind them, how would I confess them? And, then, where was the use of going? So, one way or another, I quit confession long afore I took to the reading."

"'Deed, Pat," said Jem, "there's a deal, I believe, quit it just in the same way. But, are you going to take to it again now?"

"Not till I find it in the Bible, Jem," said Pat.

"And what set you talking about it, then?" said Jem.

"The wife, Biddy, set me talking about it," said Pat. "Sure, she was at confession, and she wouldn't quit talking about it, wanting to get me to go, too."

"And what did you say to her?" said Jem.

"'Won't I confess my sins to God,' says I; 'and won't He be faithful and just to forgive me my sins,'* says I.

"'And what good will that do you,' says she, 'if you don't get absolution from the priest?'

"'And do you mean,' says I, 'that if God forgives me, the priest can send me to hell?' says I.

"'But how will you know it,' says she, 'if the priest doesn't say it?'

"'Well,' says I, 'I suppose that's the good of confession and absolution, just to make it more sure when we hear the priest say it.'

"'To be sure it is,' says she; 'sure, then, we're sure we are forgiven, when we hear it said; and how would we know it without?'

"'And mustn't we make a good confession, Biddy, dear?' says I.

"'To be sure we must,' says she; 'it's no good without that.'

"'Then, the priest saying the absolution over me,' says I, 'is just no security at all to me, only as far as I can be sure that I made a good confession?' says I.

"'Well,' says she, 'sure, it's the easiest thing in life to make a good confession to the priest; sure, if you do what pleases him, he won't be hard on you at all.'

"'Well, Biddy,' says I, 'it be to be a good confession, or it's no absolution after all; and if the priest lets me off a good confession, sure he is only letting me off the absolution.'

"'It's the easiest thing in life,' says she, 'to make a good confession to the priest.'

"'And isn't it just as easy,' says I, 'to make the same confession to God? But, Biddy, dear,' says I, 'what have you to confess to the priest?'

"'All my mortal sins,' says she.

"'Since when?' says I.

"'Since I went to confession afore,' says she.

* 1st Epistle of St John i. 9.

"'How long is that?' says I.

"'This time twelvemonth,' says she.

"'And did you mind all your deadly sins since that?' says I.

"'Why wouldn't I?' says she; 'sure they're not that many.'

"'And how long did it take you?' says I.

"'Not the turn of my hand,' says she; 'for his reverence was in a hurry, and a deal of people waiting.'

"'Maybe some was forgot in the hurry?' says I. 'Tell me, Biddy, dear,' says I, 'isn't anger one of the seven deadly sins?'

"'It is,' says she.

"'And did you tell him every time you were angry at me and the childer, for the last year?' says I.

"'How would I?' says she, 'when the childer angers me every turn of the day, and it's forgot as soon as over,' says she.

"'And was that confessing all your mortal sins for the year, Biddy?' says I.

"'And what can I do?' says she. 'Sure, I can't go to confession every day in the year,' says she.

"'Deed can you, Biddy,' says I.

"'Is it nonsense you're talking?' says she; 'where would I get time, or where would I get priests enough, or where would I get all the shillings?" says she. 'Sure, it would take a man's wages,' says she.

"'I'll show you the way, Biddy, dear,' says I. 'If we take to confessing our sins to God, sure, it's every night we will do that, Biddy; and we can tell them to Him while they're on our minds, and ask His pardon, and ask Him, too, to help us the next day; and won't that keep us watching ourselves? But when we leave it for once a-year to the priest, why, the sins are all forgot, and then they're not confessed at all, and then there's no absolution, nor nothing to keep us watching every day. That's the reason,' says I, 'that I would rather confess my sins to God, because it makes a better confession,' says I.

"'And didn't Jesus Christ command us to confess our sins to the priest,' says she; 'and how will it be if we don't?'

"'Can you say the Ten Commandments of God, Biddy?' says I.

"To be sure I can,' says she; 'aren't they in our catechism?'

"'Is confession among them?' says I.

"'No, then, it's not,' says she.

"'And what commandments is it in?' says I.

"'It's in the commandments of the Church,' says she; 'sure enough, that's the way it is in the catechism.'

"'Well, Biddy,' says I, 'isn't it all nonsense for them to be telling us that Jesus Christ commanded it himself, when their own catechisms allow that it is only a commandment of the Church? Sure, if He commanded it, wouldn't it be in the commandments of God?'

"'And who commanded it on us, then,' says she, 'if Jesus Christ did not?'

"'The priests *did*, and Jesus Christ *didn't*,' says I. 'Sure, that's just the meaning of it's being in the commandments of the Church, and not in the commandments of God.'

"'Well,' says she, 'anyway, I'd never be easy in my mind, if I didn't go to confession once a-year.'

"'Well, Biddy, dear,' says I, 'sure, I'll never say again your going, as long as it is in your mind to go. But, sure, Biddy, dear,' says I, 'it wouldn't do any harm, anyway, to confess your sins to God, too.' So she allowed it wouldn't. 'And now, Biddy, dear,' says I, 'wouldn't we just lay it down for ourselves to go, both of us, on our knees to God every night, and confess our sins for that day, and ask His pardon, and ask Him to help us against them for the next day; and, when Easter comes round again, you can go to the priest, if you like; and then you'll be the better judge, Biddy,' says I, 'whether confessing to the priest once a-year, or confessing to God every night, makes the best confession,' says I. Well, so Biddy agreed to do that same, and we've both done it every night since. And, now, you would wonder to see how Biddy tries not to be angered at the children. And, 'deed, Jem, since I put Biddy on that, it's making myself mighty careful, too, about things I thought little of before. And, maybe, when Easter comes round, Biddy will think that confessing to God makes the best confession."

"Well, 'deed, Pat," said Jem, "I think it's a good way you took, and the best way of all to learn what's best. Sure, it's a deal better than if you tried to stop Biddy going to the priest. And, 'deed, when a person tries that way, they'll find that it's not so easy to make a good confession to the priest once a-year. And, sure, if confession isn't done in reality, there's no good in absolution; and how can a man know, at the end of a year, if he made a good confession at all? and he getting, maybe, three minutes, more or less, to make it?"

"Well, I think that's the great harm of it, Jem," said Pat; "the people goes to the priest once a-year, and maybe not that often, and just says a few words to him in a hurry, and then thinks it's done, and all right; and then never thinks more of it till next year; and it's just the greatest stopper at all to people confessing their sins in real earnest. Sure, if a man goes to confess them to God every night, while he minds them himself and knows that God saw them, it will make him sore and sorry to have to tell the same sins every night, and make him pray the more for pardon and help, and make him strive more, too. But, when he goes once a-year to the priest, and gets clear of all in the turn of his hand, won't he just go on the same for the next year, and trust to get clean as easy. It's just like paying by Peter Burrowes,* so it is; and, sure, that never made a man honest or industrious."

"Well, 'deed, Pat," said Jem, "I thought that once myself, when I got to the sea near Drogheda, after I had the sickness, and I met Peter Reilly, the blacksmith, that is working in a great factory in Drogheda now; and he's the hardest working boy at all, and the dirtiest boy at all; for his face is as black as a sweep with the coal-dust, and his clothes that dirty with the coals and the grease they use in the factory, that you wouldn't like to touch them with the end of a stick. And Peter had just come out of the sea, washed for once in his life, and had just got the clothes on him when I came up. 'And isn't it the pity,' says I, 'to see you in the dirty clothes again, after the washing you got.' 'Well, then,' says he, 'I'm as easy in the clothes now, as if I had been confessing to the priest; sure, washing is like confessing,' says he; 'it lasts the year, anyway.'"

"Aye, that's too like what the people thinks that confesses to the priest, and then thinks themselves all right to go on again just the way they did before," said Pat; "but I'm trusting Biddy will think different afore Easter next."

And we trust that many of the Irish people may think different yet about confession of sins.

* A saying in part of Ireland, for getting clear of a man's debts in the Insolvent Court, of which Mr. Burrowes was a Judge.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We are requested by Mr. Curry to put our friends again in mind that their subscriptions are payable in advance. We have already explained the difficulty of making special applications.

We have again to apologize to several of our contributors for postponing their communications.

To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal, which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, APRIL, 1855.

In a former number we gave our readers copious extracts from an article in the *Rambler*, a Roman Catholic journal and review, published monthly in London, strongly and justly commenting on the Rev. Dr. Cahill, and his "violent and contumelious" mode of conducting controversy, and judiciously observing, that "controversial discussion, to be useful, requires a sound head, a cool judgment, a disciplined temper, a prudent tongue, a contempt for clap-trap, and a desire to convince opponents, rather than to elicit the applause of indiscriminating admirers." Our attention has again been attracted by an article in the *Rambler*, contained in the number for the present month, headed "The True Principle of Religious Controversy," which contains many sentiments in which we heartily concur, and which, if generally acted on by controversialists, would not fail, we think, to promote the progress of truth and Christian charity in the world—

"Nothing can be worse," says the writer, "than to treat a sincere man, in invincible ignorance, as if he were a hypocrite, or a wilful unbeliever. 'Man is made to be led, and not to be driven.' If you do not treat an opponent as sincere and well principled, whatever you may think of him, your cleverest arguments may be thrown to the winds without further thought. The notion against which we are protesting arises from confounding two totally distinct things—the destruction of error, and the building up of truth. Prove a man the most stupid fool in the universe, or the blackest scoundrel that ever disgraced his species, and what have you done? Shown that he deserves contempt and punishment, and nothing more. You have not even begun to make him a wise man or a good Christian. The only method of reforming a criminal is to discover what good yet remains undestroyed in him; to work patiently upon that *foundation*; and so, leading him from one step to another, to raise him in the end to the stature of an upright and worthy man."

"We can do no harm by treating a man as better than he is, provided only we never lead him to overlook the nature of his errors, and the enormity of the guilt of those who trifle with known truths. However little he may deserve our lenient judgment, at least he will be considerated. He will not experience the most irritating of feelings—the sense that he is wronged; that he is not fairly met; that his motives are misinterpreted, and his difficulties not made allowance for. He will be tempted to take refuge in that most true, but often perverted maxim, that God is *more merciful than man*; or turn away from us as hard-hearted, rigorous judges, when he has been looking for considerateness, gentleness, and patient love."

"It need hardly be added, that the principle of controversy here advocated is totally dissimilar from that which seeks to make Catholicism look like Protestantism in Protestant eyes. This latter system we think as fatal to the conversion of non-Catholics as the most bitter denunciation of every individual opponent as 'a heretic,' or the most caustic disparagement of every apparently good work of Protestants. In fact, the charitable treatment of Protestants, is really part of the very system which condemns the modification of Catholic doctrine or practice out of deference to their passion or prejudice. In both cases, *we place our confidence in the ultimate power of truth and sincerity.*"

"It is obvious, however, that the principle of controversy here defended, does not apply in certain cases which too often come before us. It sometimes happens that the only weapons which we can employ are those of unsparing exposure and bitter satire. We have our foes, in whom not a trace of anything good appears, to which we may appeal in the hope of leading them on from good to better, for their own benefit, as well as our own protection. There are those who, in their present condition of mind, must be treated as adversaries, and nothing more. They are to be shown up, not for their own sake, but for the sake of others who stand by and watch the result."

"Still our controversies will always be more successful for a careful discrimination between a possible friend and an inveterate foe. And the surest way to convert a possible friend into an inveterate foe is, to treat him as if we regarded him, if not as a knave, yet certainly as a fool."

There is so much in the foregoing extracts completely in unison with our own sentiments, that we had well nigh hoped that we had, at last, found an opponent with whom we could have argued out all the points in controversy between the two Churches with perfect good temper, and some hope of a triumph to truth, on whichever side it is to be found. We regret, however, to add, that there are other passages in the same article scarcely, in our opinion, reconcilable with the charitable treatment of Protestants, the *prudence*, rather than the *Christian duty*, of which the writer has so strongly advocated. It is true that he says—

"We have no wish to show that all Protestants are worthless, hateful to God, and under his sentence of wrath. It is no part of our argument that every man who holds heretical opinions is himself a heretic."

Yet, in other passages he describes his Protestant opponent as—

"An opponent so vast, so pretending, so boastful, so *laughably* inconsistent, so *illogical*, so *presumptuous*, so *lamentably ill informed*, and so *shameless*, that it is hard to resist the inclination to give him his deserts."

And, again—

"The glaring inconsistencies, the illogical assumptions, the *violations of history*, the *puzzled confusion of their minds*, are studiously kept out of sight."

Surely the man who wrote these descriptions of his Protestant antagonists must have held them to be both knaves and fools—to use his own language, "deserving contempt and punishment, and nothing more;" or, at least, have forgotten his own judicious observations above referred to—"that controversy should be conducted with a cool judgment, a prudent tongue, a *contempt for clap-trap*, and a desire to convince opponents, rather than to elicit the applause of indiscriminating admirers."

We think we might safely challenge our readers to produce from our pages—from our first number (in January, 1852) to the present time—so sweeping a condemnation, or a sentence so severely uncharitable towards our Roman Catholic opponents as those we have last quoted, in an article, too, expressly written to point

out the folly of attempting to "overthrow English Protestantism by abusing Protestants."

Does the writer in the *Rambler* think it will conciliate Protestants, or tend to prejudice them in favour of what he calls "Catholic truth," to denounce the Thirty-nine Articles as "*vile*"—to speak of the "chaotic world of Protestantism"—of "Protestantism as essentially a religion of negations," in which it is *difficult to find two people who do not disagree in their creed*"—of "that singular thing, English Protestantism . . . raising new churches, and paying additional clergy by hundreds and thousands, yet *winking at burial-club poisonings, wife-beatings, and child-murders*, and extolling the English people as the most moral on the face of the earth"?

Were we to have *conciliated* our Roman Catholic readers by similar vituperation, instead of calm argument and affectionate remonstrance, we rather think we should have long since been consigned to the oblivion we should have merited, and all our fine professions about candour and fair play would have been justly set down as mere snares to entrap the weak or unwary, instead of being considered, as we trust they are (even by our opponents), as the honest expressions of an earnest desire to follow truth wherever it leads, and of a sincere confidence that "the ultimate power of truth and sincerity" must, at last, prevail.

While, however, we protest against such harsh and uncharitable sentiments as unworthy of an article on "The True Principle of Religious Controversy," and utterly inconsistent with the sound views so ably urged in the paragraphs first cited, we are glad to be able to add some further extracts, couched in a more candid spirit. Speaking of English Protestants, the writer says, in another passage—

"They make sacrifices for religion—some of them great sacrifices. . . . . They have wonderfully improved in general morals during the last half century; and that, not under the pressure or from the example of Catholicism (of which they know nothing), but from some influence residing among themselves."

Well, this we think is some set-off against the grievous charge of *winking at burial-club poisonings, wife-beatings, and child-murders*;" and, probably, our readers will agree with us, is somewhat inconsistent with it. But if the *Rambler* expects to influence the minds of English or Irish Protestants by really doing what he professes, "placing his confidence in the ultimate power of truth and sincerity," we would recommend him to act up to his own wise principles, as we have endeavoured (we hope not wholly unsuccessfully) to do, and sincerely and steadily try to *lead* the minds of those who now sincerely differ with their Roman Catholic brethren (men whom the *Rambler* acknowledges cannot be *driven*) by fair reasoning, learned and logical argument, and truthful historical statements, based on adequate authority, into that glorious unity, which has been so eloquently described by the great Burke, as being not "unity of belief in the bond of ignorance, nor unity of profession in the bond of hypocrisy, but unity of the spirit in the bond of peace." In the words of the *Rambler* itself, we think there is, indeed, "an indescribable power, a victorious efficacy, in the very look, the voice, the gestures, and still more in the words of those rare persons in whom Christian *love* not only lives, but is absolutely dominant, which is unapproached by all the achievements of logic, and all the captivating beauty of human discourse. The reason we believe to be this—that the saint appeals to that which is good in a man, and treats him as being better, perhaps, than he is; while we, for the most part, attack that which is evil in him, and treat him as worse than he is, or, at the best, with the barest measure of rigid justice."

We shall forward our present number to the the Editor of the *Rambler*, in the hope that the good spirit in which the main part of the article we have referred to is written, will induce the conductors of that journal to try whether there are to be found in our pages any of the "illogical assumptions, the violations of history, or the puzzled confusion," which they would have their readers to believe are the characteristics of all writers who are opposed to them. Our pages have dealt with so large a number of topics as to afford ample ground for detecting and exposing such faults, if they exist; and not pretending to the supernatural powers of infallibility, we are not vain enough to suppose that we may not at times have fallen into involuntary error. One thing we are sure of, however, that we would not willingly either *remain in error* ourselves, or lead others into it, and shall, therefore, be truly glad to have any errors into which we may have fallen pointed out if they exist; and, with that view, we shall be happy if the Editor of the *Rambler* will permit us, not in a boastful or pretending, but a sincere spirit of Christian friendship, to present him with the whole of our periodical, Nos. 1 to 40 inclusive, if he likes to break a friendly lance with us in controversy. carried on in the Christian spirit we both profess to admire and approve of. We can assure the Editor that we have no party object in view, but are sincerely anxious to promote the cause of truth and virtue, and that we ever look upon those who differ with us, as *friends* and not as enemies, when they are trying to convert us to the opinions which they conscientiously believe to be true; and should the *Rambler* succeed in exposing inconsistencies, or illogical assumptions, in what we have presented to the world, he will, at least, not find us "*shameless*," but, on the contrary, *sensitively alive to character*, and anxious to repair any wrong we may have done, as all honest men ought to be, when venturing to write on subjects of such vast importance to the happiness and safety of the whole human race, as the boundaries between religious truth and error.

DISPENSATIONS BY THE POPE.

Our attention has been called to this subject by the leading article in the *Tablet* newspaper of March 24. A proposal has been made in Parliament to allow a widower to marry the sister of his deceased wife. It is not the object of our paper to discuss such questions; but if we were bound to give a decided opinion, we should fully agree with the *Tablet* in condemning this proposal, and, perhaps, on stronger grounds. For, if God has made man and wife to be "one flesh" (Gen. iii. 24; and Matthew xix. 5; and Mark x. 8.), then we do not see how it can be lawful for a man to marry his wife's sister, any more than his own sister. We hope the proposed change will be rejected in Parliament; and even if it should be adopted, we hope the Irish people will never act on it. So far, therefore, we are quite agreed with the *Tablet* about it. And we are sorry to find that all Roman Catholics do not agree with the *Tablet* on this subject; for Mr. Bowyer, an English Roman Catholic lawyer, who is member for Dundalk, did actually support this proposal in Parliament: on which the *Tablet* observes, "English lawyers have never been famous for their respect for the Holy See."

But our present question is with the power of the Pope to grant dispeosations to people to do what is wrong.

The law now restrains men from marrying their wives' sisters. Some people try to get up an outcry against that law. The *Tablet* condemns that outcry, and says, "it is a scandalous reflection on the discipline of the Church, which has ever maintained, with zealous vigilance, these unpleasant restrictions on human extravagance."

But, if this be so, how are we to understand what the *Tablet* says further—"We know well that these marriages are now unlawful, and that *nothing can make them innocent but the permission of the Pope?*" Now, if these marriages are guilty and sinful in themselves, can the Pope give men leave to incur guilt and sin? and does his permission make it innocent to commit sin?

But the *Tablet* goes on to say—"The dispensation is most difficult to obtain, *excepting only where sin is in question.*" Now, what does this mean? Does it mean that the Pope gives leave to commit sin, only where people *will* sin, whether they get leave or not? That seems to be the meaning; for the *Tablet*, in speaking of the evidence which Cardinal Wiseman gave, concerning these dispensations, says—"His Eminence was speaking of one class of dispeosations, *which come from the penitentiary*, and which were made, in a sense, *necessary by the sins of the petitioners*. . . . . Nothing was further from his thoughts, or more removed from his practice, than the issue of dispensations, by which persons *of blameless life and conversation* could marry the sisters of their departed wives." So it seems that to get a dispensation, a man must first commit sin, and then "the penitentiary" gives him a dispensation to continue in his sin; and that makes his sin innocent!

But, if this be so, why does not the Pope allow all his subjects to continue in sin, and make them innocent, just by giving them a license or dispensation? Should he not give fair play to all? Should not the rich and poor be on the same level in respect of sin, and of the Pope's care to free them from sin?

But the *Tablet* says this is not so. The *Tablet* says—"If the law were changed to-morrow, no English Catholic *under the degree of a peer, could reasonably presume* that his case could be *listened to*; and it passes our comprehension how any Christian can say that this is *a poor man's question.*"

In that case it passes our comprehension, too, how "dispensation" can be a "poor man's question." But it is quite within our comprehension, why dispensation is *not* a poor man's question. A dispensation from the Pope costs a large sum of money. So a poor man cannot get a dispensation to continue in sin with innocence, and a rich man can. The poor man, unless he gives up his sin, *must* go to the devil; but the rich man need only go to the Pope and be safe in his sin.

We leave it to our readers to consider, whether sin be no sin when the Pope gives license to live in sin? And, if this be so, whether the poor man should not have license to live in sin, as well as the rich man?

SPIRITUAL POWER OF THE POPE.

In our last number we showed what differences exist in the Church of Rome about the *temporal* power of the Pope. Many of the greatest authorities of the Church of Rome have maintained that the temporal power of kings and princes is subject to the Pope, who has authority from God to command, and even to deprive them of their kingdoms. Many Popes have claimed and exercised this power; and none have since disclaimed it; but it still stands in the canon law, as part of the law of the Church of Rome, that it is "altogether necessary to salvation that every human creature should be subject to the Roman Pontiff."

On the other hand, Roman Catholic princes, as is natural, do generally resist and deny this doctrine; and we believe that most of the Roman Catholic laity at present do reject and deny it.

This involves serious questions. Either these Popes have falsely claimed to have a power from God, which God never gave them; or else a vast number of Roman Catholics have been, and now are, resisting a power which God has given to the Popes.

It is not our intention to pursue this point of the Pope's temporal supremacy any further at present; but if any of our Roman Catholic correspondents are disposed to discuss it, we are ready to supply them with materials in plenty.

But our present object is to ask, whether Roman Catholics are better agreed among themselves about the *spiritual* supremacy of the Pope.

Here, at least, we might expect to find Roman Catholics agreed; and yet it is far otherwise. For many ages past the Roman Catholic Church has contained in it two parties who hold opposite views about the Pope's spiritual supremacy; and these two parties continue to differ about it at this day.

One party thinks that the Pope is only the chief servant of the Church, and subject to the Church.

The other party thinks the Pope is lord and master of the Church, and that the Church is subject to him.

But it is better that we should give these two opposite views of the spiritual supremacy, from the writings of most eminent Roman Catholic divines, and not from our own. We, therefore, give the best and clearest statements we can find of the two different opinions.

We take the first statement from the learned Æneas Sylvius.

NO. I. ÆNEAS SYLVIUS.

"It is the opinion of all those who are dead, if that ought to be called an *opinion*, which is fortified with sufficient authorities, that the Pope of Rome is subject to the universal Church; neither dare those who are living deny it. But they venture on this, to make a doubt among some, whether that should also be believed concerning a general council. For there are some, whether desirous of distinction, or that by flattery they expect rewards, who have begun to preach certain strange and *altogether new* doctrines, and are not afraid to exempt the Pope from the jurisdiction of the holy council; for ambition has blinded them, from whom not only this modern schism, but all schisms to this day, are found to have arisen. . . . . They who are half ashamed to beg, do chiefly support this heresy of to-day, of whom one cries out, that the actions of those subject to him are to be judged by the Pope, but that the Roman Pontiff is reserved to the judgment of God alone. Another says, that no one shall judge the first See, because that neither by the emperor, nor by all

the clergy, nor by kings, nor by the people, can it be judged. . . . . These wretched men do not consider that the words they so earnestly preach are either the words of Popes extending their borders, or the words of those who flattered them; and because such words are easily answered,* they run immediately to the Gospel, and interpret the words of Christ, not as the sense of the holy spirit requires, but by their own fancy. They chiefly rely on this, that it was said to Peter—'thou shalt be called Cephas,' by which they make him head of the Church; 'I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven;' and 'whatever thou shalt bind on earth;' and 'I have prayed for thee, Peter, that thy faith fail not;' and 'feed my sheep;' and 'cast thy net into the deep;' and 'fear not, from henceforth thou shalt catch men;' and that Christ commanded Peter alone, as prince of the apostles, to give tribute for himself and for him; and that Peter drew the net to land full of great fishes; and that Peter alone drew his sword in defence of the Church; all which things these men, in an astonishing manner, set up on high, the expositions of the holy doctors being altogether disregarded."†

And Æneas Sylvius goes on to say—"Seeing the Pope is Vicar of *the Church*, no one doubts that a master may, at his pleasure, turn off his vicars; nor is there any doubt that the Pope is more truly called the Vicar of *the Church*, than the Vicar of Christ;"‡ and elsewhere, "whatever some men say, I cannot agree with those who call the Pope the Head of the Church, unless, perhaps, a ministerial head;§ for we read that Christ is Head of the Church, not the Pope."¶

We take this passage as a fair statement of the views of a very large party, including even whole nations and churches in the Church of Rome.

For Æneas Sylvius wrote this in defence of the Council of Basil.

That Council of Basil, in its second session, about the year 1432, had renewed a decree formerly made in the General Council of Constance, in these terms—

"This Synod, lawfully called in the Holy Spirit, and constituting a general Council, and representing the Church militant, has power immediately from Christ, to which every one, of whatever state or dignity, even though it should be the Papacy itself, is bound to obey in those things which relate to faith, or to the extirpation of the aforesaid schism, or to the general reformation of the Church of God, in its head and in its members."¶

And in their 32nd session the Council pronounced this decree, which makes the Council without the Pope supreme, and binds the Pope to obey it, to be "a verity of the Catholic faith."**

This decision of the Council of Basil has been, of course, condemned as heretical at Rome; and the decree of the Council of Constance, which the Council of Basil only confirmed, has always been reprobated at Rome, although the Church of Rome expressly acknowledged the General Council of Constance as a general council, and infallible!

But the French Church has always acknowledged what was thus decided at Constance and Basil to be true and right. This is the main point of what is called the "Gallican liberties." And though the Gallican doctrine for the last few years has seemed to be forgotten in France, yet it is now rapidly reviving; and the Archbishop of Paris is known to be in favour of it. And this is what the *Tablet* meant (Dec. 23, p. 809), when it exclaimed in a rage against "the new sprung veneration for Bossuet;" for Bossuet was a famous French bishop who ably supported the Gallican liberties.

So the defence which Æneas Sylvius wrote at the time for the decree of the Council of Basil, may well be taken as expressing the sentiments of a large party in the Church of Rome, which exists to this day.

But we come now to the other view of the spiritual supremacy of the Pope, which is, perhaps, the one generally advocated in Ireland at this day, though it was far from being so general fifty years ago. In this case, too, we give the statement from a great authority, Pope Pius II.

NO. II.—POPE PIUS II.

"As cranes follow one; as among bees, one is queen; so in the Church militant, which is like the Church triumphant, one is the ruler and judge of all; from whom, as *from* THE HEAD, all power and authority is derived to the subject members, which power flows immediately to him from Christ the Lord our God. Nor truly has Christ chiefly imparted supreme authority to any other as the leader of his army, except to his own vicar, who first was Peter, to whom we have known that the care of the Lord's flock was committed. Nor do the evangelists make mention of two or more Peters, nor did the Lord institute two or more, who should hold his place as equal heads; but he appointed one, as the head, and leader, and pastor of the universal flock, Simon Peter, saying—'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church; and I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven;' and 'feed my sheep.' Which things are read to have been specially said to no other but Peter, so that unity and the highest authority is contained in Peter. Nor is any other but Simon called Peter, from the rock (Petra); that we might understand that Simon Peter is the only one who holds the place of that true and solid rock—that is, of Christ, as Paul expounds it; who alone drew his sword for his master when exposed to danger. Peter, therefore, and his successors, the Roman pontiffs, held the primacy in the Church. . . . And whosoever is set over the Roman Church, according to the canonical rules, as soon as he is elected in the sacred college, obtains supreme power immediately from God, and diffuses it in order through the whole Church, whose sins are to be left to be punished by the divine judgment."* And again, "Whoever has sat as chief priest of Rome, rightly appointed in the legitimate way, of election, called by God like Aaron, all people, all kings, all clergy, all bishops have venerated him as the vicar of Jesus Christ, and the successor of blessed Peter, the head, and ruler, and leader of the universal Church."†

We ask our readers to mark carefully how contrary these two statements are to each other.

1. Æneas Sylvius says it is *not the Pope*, but Christ, who is the head of the Church. Pius II. says *the Pope* is the head of the Church.

2. Æneas Sylvius says the Pope is only the Vicar *of the Church*, and not the Vicar of Christ. Pius II. says the Pope is the *Vicar of Christ*.

3. Æneas Sylvius says the Pope is subject to the Church. Pius II. says the Pope is ruler of the Church.

4. Æneas Sylvius says that the Pope may be judged by a general council, and that it is heresy to deny it, or to say that the Pope can be judged by God only. Pius II. affirms that the Pope can be judged by God only.

5. Æneas Sylvius ridicules the attempt to prove the supremacy of the Pope out of the passages commonly quoted about Peter, and especially that one, which does look a poor proof, of Peter having drawn his sword. Pius II quotes all these passages, the sword included, to prove the supremacy of the Pope.

Thus it appears how opposite are the two views of the spiritual power of the Pope, which have each been so widely held in the Church of Rome.

That these views are, in fact, so opposed, that one must be rejected in order to hold the other, is very plainly shown by Pius II. himself, who emphatically says—"Æneam rejicite, Pium recipite"—"REJECT ÆNEAS, AND RECEIVE PIUS."

Our readers will, perhaps, be surprised to learn (and we trust their surprise will be instructive as well as amusing) that Æneas Sylvius and Pope Pius II. were the same man! But so it was. As Æneas Sylvius (before he was Pope) he exposed the extravagant claims made for the Popes, and said that these were only the words of "Popes extending their own borders," or the words of those who flatter Popes. But when he himself became a Pope extending his own borders, and listening to his own flatterers, then he could find nothing to prove his own claims by, except the very arguments which formerly he had said were "easily answered!"

Here, then, we find the Roman communion itself quite divided about the extent and nature of the Pope's spiritual power. One large body of them leaving him hardly any; another large body maintaining that God has given *all* power to the Pope.

Either Popes have been falsely usurping spiritual powers which God never gave them, or millions of Roman Catholics have for ages been denying and disputing the powers which God gave to the Pope.

We trust that the statements we have given of the two opposite opinions, both given under such different circumstances, by one who was a wise and learned man, will help our readers to judge which opinion has the most honest foundation, and which has rested on usurpation and flattery.

RECENT CONTROVERSY AT BOULOGNE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

(Continued from page 33.)

SIR—I think it scarcely fair to the pressure upon your limited space, and to the excellence of your other contributions, to trespass any longer upon the pages of the LAYMAN, especially as the account of this controversy already given is quite sufficient to show the mode in which it was conducted. I shall, therefore, with your permission, conclude with the present number, unless some reason may subsequently occur to show the continuation to be desirable.

The discussion was mainly confined to the question of infallibility. I had proposed it because, as it is *the* doctrine upon which the whole claims of the Roman Catholic Church really rest, I felt that being the most important doctrine, it was that one which its advocates were supposed to be best capable of defending. I, on the other side, felt assured I could show it to be impossible of proof. Thus the subject was one not only the most important, but, likewise, that which Roman Catholic controversialists should be most willing and best able to establish. I declared myself content to rest my whole cause upon the proof of this doctrine.

My own argument was, in fact, just that which any one who maintains infallibility ought, if that doctrine be true, to be able most easily to answer, because it was simply an examination of the steps necessary to prove it—nothing more.

It is evident that the main support of the doctrine is the passage—"Thou art Peter," &c. Therefore, because it is, in the judgment of Romanist writers, their strongest text, I was ready to rest my case on it, as I should have been on any other.

Roman Catholics have never yet decided whether it be the Church, or the Pontiff, or both, who are infallible.

This indecision is, of itself, sufficient to show how little really can be made from the passages of Scripture alleged in proof. However, though my two opponents disagreed on this very essential point, we entered upon this text as a proof of papal infallibility and jurisdiction.

Now, it is clear that in order to establish the doctrine from it (or from any other which speaks of Peter), three distinct steps are indispensable, or the claim falls to the ground. It must be shown—first, that this passage (or any other) does really convey, or promise, infallibility or supreme jurisdiction to Peter; secondly, that the same prerogatives are declared to be continued to his (presumed) successors; and, thirdly, that such successors are, *solely*, the Roman Pontiffs. If any of these three separate propositions be incapable of clear proof, the whole claim is destroyed. I felt sure that each of the three was thus incapable.

Now, then, for the *first* of these steps (the same mode of argument applying, of course to all). I put the question, and I believe the difficulty—*how* do you propose to prove it? There are but three modes of proof—infallibility, private interpretation, or the universal consent of the Fathers.

The first of these must be set aside, since it cannot be assumed for proof of itself. The second is subject to all the uncertainty which, according to the Roman Catholic doctrine, attends and invalidates it.

The only available medium of proof then is, what the

---

* If our readers will look back to our number for January, 1854, in the article "Forged Decretal Epistles, No. II.," page 3, columns 1 and 2, they will find that the two things which Æneas Sylvius reports to be cried out by the supporters of the Pope in his day—viz., "that the Roman Pontiff is reserved to the judgment of God alone," and that "neither by the emperor, nor by all the clergy, nor by kings, nor by the people can he be judged," are both taken from the forgeries of the middle ages, and have no other foundation. Æneas Sylvius, who was a really learned man, might, therefore, well say, that these things could be easily answered. But our readers will be surprised when they come to the end of this article, and learn by whom these things, so easily answered, were again set up.

† Opinio omnium mortuorum est, si opinio vincri debet quæ idoneis confirmatur autoribus, quia Romanus Pontifex universali ecclesiæ subjectus existit; neque hoc vivantes negare audent. Audent illud autem, apud aliquos revocatur in dubium, an id quoque de generali concilio credi oporteat. Sunt enim aliqui, sive avidi gloriæ, sive quod adulando præmia expectant, qui peregrinas quasdam et omnino novas prædicare doctrinas cœperunt, ipsumque summum pontificem ex jurisdictione sacri concilii demere non verentur. Excrescavit namque illos ambitio, a qua non solum hoc modernum, sed omnia usque ad hanc diem schismata, suborta reperiuntur. . . . . Modernam hæresim illi præcipue nutriunt, quos jam mendicare suppudet, quorum alius clamat, subditorum facta judicari a Papa, Romanum vero Pontificem solius Dei reservari arbitris. Alius dicit, quia primam sedem nemo judicabit, quod neque ab Augusto, neque ab omni clero, neque a Regibus, neque a populo valeat judicari . . . . Nec considerant miseri quis quæ præsumant tantopere verba, aut summorum Pontificum sunt suas fimbrias extendentium, aut illorum qui eis adulabantur. Et quia hujusmodi dicta solutionem habent, recurrunt statim ad Evangelium, et verba Christi non prout spiritus sancti sensus exposcit, sed stupide ingenio interpretantur. Plurimumque illud extollunt, quia Petro sit dictum, tu vocaberis Cephas, per quod illum caput ecclesiæ faciunt: Tibi dabo claves Regni Cœlorum: et quodcunque ligaveris super terram: et rogavi pro te, Petre, ut non deficiat fides tua: et, pasce oves meas: et duc in altum rete: et noli timere, ex hoc aris homines capiens: quodque soli Petro, tamquam apostolorum principi, Christus mandaverit, pro se ut pro illo statierem dare: et quia Petrus traxit ad terram rete plenum piscibus magnis: et quod solus Petrus ad Christi defensionem gladium evaginavit. Quæ omnia hi homines miro modo sublimant, expositionibus sanctorum doctorum postpositis.—De Gest. Concil. Basil., L. I. Edit., Basil, 1551, pp. 11, 12.

‡ Quia cum sit Papa vicarius ecclesiæ, nemo dubitat quin Dominus vicarios suos possit ad nutum suum destituere; nec dubium est, verius dici Papam ecclesiæ vicarium quam Christi.—P. 15.

§ The expression "ministerial head," means no more than "head servant."

¶ Quicquid tamen dicant aliqui, ego cum illis non sentio, qui Romanum Pontificem caput ecclesiæ dicunt, nisi forsitan ministeriale; legimus enim, quia Christus est ecclesiæ caput, non Papa.—P. 15.

¶ Ipsa Synodus in spiritu sancto legitime congregata, generale concilium faciens, et ecclesiam militantem representans, potestatem immediate a Christo habet, cui quilibet cujuscunque status vel dignitatis, etiamsi papalis existat, obedire tenetur in his quæ pertinent ad fidem, et extirpationem dicti schismatis, et ad generalem reformationem ecclesiæ Dei in capite et in membris.—Labbe and Cosa., Con. Gen., vol. xii., col. 477.

** Veritas de potestate concilii generalis, universalem ecclesiam representantis, supra papam et quemlibet alterum, declarata per Constantiense, et hoc Basileense Generalia Concilia, est veritas fidei Catholicæ.—Labbe and Cosa., Con. Gen., vol. xii., col. 619.

* Sicut Grues unam sequuntur; et in apibus unus est rex; ita in ecclesia militanti, quæ instar triumphantis habet, unus est omnium moderator et arbiter, Jesu Christi vicarius; a quo, tamquam capite, omnis in subjecta membra potestas, et auctoritas derivatur, quæ a Christo Domino Deo nostro sine medio in ipsum infusa. Nec protecto in alium, tamquam sui exercitus ducem, supremam auctoritatem Christus principaliter derivavit, quam in suum vicarium, qui primus fuit Petrus, cui commissum novimus dominici gregis curam. Nec duos plurosve Petros evangelistæ commemorant, nec duos aut plures instituit Dominus, qui suum locum tanquam capita tenerent æqualia; sed unum constituit, ut verticem ac ducem et pastorem universi gregis. Simonem Petrum, dicens: Tu es Petrus, et supra hanc petram ædificabo ecclesiam meam; et tibi dabo claves regni cœlorum, et quodcumque ligaveris super terram, erit ligatum et in cœlo; et quodcumque solveris super terram, erit solutum et in cœlo. Et pasce oves meas. Quæ nulli alteri eorum dicta legimus, nisi Petro, ut in Petro unitas et summa constituretur auctoritas. Nec alius a petro dictus est Petrus, nisi Simon; ut intelligeremus unicum esse verum et solidæ Petræ, id est Christi (ut Paulus exponit) locum tenentem, Simonem Petrum, qui solus pro domino in periculo constituto exsenit gladium. Petrus igitur, et successores ejus Romani Pontifices primatum in ecclesia tenuerunt. . . . . Et quicunque Romanæ secundum canonicas sanctiones præfectur ecclesiæ, quamprimum electus est in sacro collegio, supremam a Deo potestatem sine medio consequitur, et per ordinem in omnem diffundit ecclesiam, cujus peccata Dietus judicis prælenda relinquitur.—Labbe and Cosa., Con. Gen., vol. xiii., col. 1,408-9.

† Qui Romæ sederit antistes rite institutus per legitimam electionis tramitem, tamquam Aaron vicarius a Domino, hunc omnes Christiani plebes, omnes populi, omnes reges, omnes clerici, omnes episcopi tanquam Jesu Christi vicarium, et beati Petri successorem, universalis ecclesiæ caput ac rectorem ac ducem venerati sunt.—Idem, col. 1,411.

Roman Catholic Church asserts it possesses, the universal consent of the Fathers.

I then put the simple question—produce now plain statements which show that the Fathers did really interpret this text as conveying infallibility and jurisdiction to St. Peter. Give me nothing else than proof of what you assert—that they really did concur in your interpretation.

I should suppose I was here only putting the question just in the very way in which a Roman Catholic, if this claim be true, would wish me to put it. It is clearly the most direct way of testing a valid proof.

I need scarcely say no advocate of that Church has ever yet stood this test. Their whole argument here is the common sophism of *ignoratio elenchi*. They produce extracts which prove not this fact, but something else which they hope may be mistaken for it. On the other side, the Protestant controversialist need only, because of the claim made to *universality* of consent by his opponents—a claim which, be it well remembered, they are *forced to make*—produce a single accredited writer who interprets the passage in a *different* sense. Your readers can judge whether the quotations made from the Fathers were relevant or not. To assume infallibilty when called on to prove it is, a *petitio principii*. The argument from the Fathers is, as used by Romish writers, an *ignoratio elenchi*. These are the two great sophisms of the Roman Catholic Church in its attempted proof of the cardinal doctrine of infallibility.

On the other side, when, as the only chance left, private judgment is used as an interpreter, the Protestant controversialist is enabled to urge an unanswerable *argumentum ad hominem*.

My opponents, as other advocates of their Church, endeavoured to escape from this difficulty by asserting, that upon the Protestant principle of interpretation their claim could be made out. To this I replied, as any one would, such mode of proof is not, upon your own principles, open to you; you contradict them in using it. You have, however, really no option in the matter, and *must, at last*, whether you like it or not, come to that mode of proof, though, in doing so, you prove both your own inconsistency and the truth of the Protestant principle, which you affect to decry.

It will be observed that, as yet, we were but upon the first step of the argument—namely, the proof that the Fathers did unanimously interpret the words—"Thou art Peter," &c., as conveying infallibility and jurisdiction of power over the whole Church of God to Peter. Whether all, or even *one* among them all, did explicitly so say, can be easily decided by any person who considers even the passages which Romanist writers, and my opponents, adduce as the strongest.

But, now, let us suppose they did with one voice do, what not one among them did—interpret the passage, as giving these prerogatives to Peter. Yet, there is then the question—Were those prerogatives held to be transmissible? were they not personal to Peter? even allowing this passage (or any other) to speak at all of infallibility and jurisdiction.

How can it be proved that these privileges (allowing them to be contained in those words) were intended by the Lord to be transmissible to *any* line of men.

This was the second step of the proof indispensable to be made out by Roman Catholic controversialists, or the claim fails.

To this second step I applied just the same test which I had already applied to the first. You cannot use your infallibility for that interpretation; nor can you employ your own judgment. You have nothing left but the universal consent of the Fathers. Therefore, produce now extracts from their writings by which it shall unmistakeably appear that they did, with one voice, declare their belief that this passage did say those privileges of infallibility and jurisdiction were *hereditary*.

I added here, I desire to direct your attention strongly to this, because I consider it to be the real strength of my argument.

The controversy was here brought to a sudden and very unexpected termination.

Mr. Gretton said—We may go on for ever at this rate. I shall take a course which you may possibly think Jesuitical. I say the passage does convey that meaning; you assert it does not. I shall assert the direct reverse of anything you maintain. How, then, can we end? I replied—This is to surrender your case as incapable of proof. It will bring the discussion at once to an end. Mr. Gretton refused to give any other answer.

I grieve to say, that the young lady on whose account I had, though an entire stranger to me, undertaken a long journey, and a very unpleasant controversy, here interposed, and said—"You have engaged in this controversy on my account, I *demand*, therefore, that you change your mode of proceeding. You must, I insist on it, give up your attack, and show to me some 'better way' than that of the Catholic Church."

To this I answered—"That 'better way' is in the Church you have quitted. But I now warn you of what you are doing. You have interfered at the most essential part of my argument, as I have declared this to be. You are striving to shield your own advocates from certain defeat. Is it not utterly unreasonable of you to demand that I should, as I certainly shall not do, give up what I conceive to be the right mode of proceeding, and adopt a bad one?"

Notwithstanding this, the young lady persevered in her demand, and Mr. Gretton in his refusal.* I, therefore, said—So far as I am concerned, this controversy is ended. I am ready to defend the Church of England at the proper time; but I will not be turned aside at the crisis of our discussion to do so. If Mr. Gretton persists in his refusal, he terminates the controversy. I shall then be ready to defend the doctrines of the Church of England.

The following are briefly the objections made—

Mr. Langdon endeavoured to show the Church of England not to be a true Church, because she did not come up to the conditions of a Church in Ephesians iv.—"One Lord, one faith, one baptism." He said, Protestants, differing among themselves, had not "one faith." That Mr. Gorham, the Bishop of Exeter, and the Archbishop of Canterbury differed about *baptismal regeneration!* therefore, the Church of England had not "one baptism."

The answers are, of course, very plain—

As to "one faith," he was confounding the articles of the Established Church with the opinions of individuals on subjects not determined by the articles. The faith of the Church of England was manifestly "one," being always in accordance with that of the Church of Christ, derived solely from the Bible, concentrated in the creeds, and maintained in the four great general councils. The Church of Rome, *by his own argument*, could not be the true Church. It had not "one faith." Its articles differ from those of the primitive Church. No early creed contained them; yet the creeds were the accredited summaries of faith. Pius IV. added new articles. The Church of Rome admitted that communion in one kind was neither the doctrine nor practice of the primitive Church. The immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary was a plain novelty. The faith of the Romish Church, among all Churches, had the least title to be *one*.

As to "one baptism." If Mr. Langdon can get any one to agree with him in translating ἓν βαπτισμα, "a community of view as to the doctrine of *baptismal regeneration*," his argument might stand—but not *till then*.

Mr. Langdon read extracts from various writers against the Church of England, and in favour of Rome: among them from Mr. Macaulay, who, in a well-known passage, says—"She may still exist in undiminished vigour when some traveller shall take his stand on a broken arch of London Bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Paul."

To this I replied—Opinions of men are not to be considered as doctrines of the Church of England; that it would be easy to produce numbers of Roman Catholic writers who spoke of the corruptions of the Church of Rome; that as to Mr. Macaulay, it was easy to neutralize the passage which Mr. L. had read, by producing another from the same writer, in which he speaks of the debasing influence of the Church of Rome, as now constituted, in terms of strong condemnation. I then read the striking passage, which declares that the transition from a Roman Catholic country to a Protestant may be known from the different appearances of each; that, for the last three centuries, "to stunt the growth of the human mind has been the chief object of the Church of Rome."

Mr. Langdon's reply to this was—That the passage I had quoted referred only to temporal things; that Protestants looked to them, and did advance in civilization! that he could not but admire the goodness of God, who had given some comforts to Protestants in this world, seeing *they would have none in the world to come!*

Mr Gretton then endeavoured to convict the Church of England of a contradiction. In her catechism she said, "the body and blood of the Lord are verily and indeed taken," &c., while in one of her articles, she denied transubstantiation.

The answer, of course, was—There is a wide difference between the words "real" and "corporal." There is no inconsistency whatever in the doctrine of the Church of England. She denies a "corporal," and maintains a "real" presence in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. She specifically mentions and condemns *that form*, or phase of a *corporal* presence, known as the doctrine of transubstantiation, which is the most absurd and inconceiveable of all modes of "a corporal" presence.

Again Mr. Gretton sought to fix another inconsistency on the Church of England, because she allows the Church to be a witness or keeper of Holy Scripture, and yet denies her infallibility. It was not clear whether he meant this as an inconsistency, or as an error in doctrine.

In either case, the reply was plain. The assertions of the Church relate to different things. In the one article the Church of England speaks of the Church as a *witness* to the canon of Scripture, whereas, Mr. G. spoke of her infallibility as an interpreter of it. The credit of the Church at large, as a witness testifying to a matter of fact, was a very different thing from the claim of a section of that Church to infallibility as an interpreter. The Church of England did not assert the testimony to be infallible. When she denied the interpretation to be so, there was neither inconsistency nor error.

Mr. G. then spoke of the absolution services, and maintained that the Church of England held and denied the doctrine of the Church of Rome. The reply is too well known to be repeated. Your readers can see from these objections how little force there is in the charge of inconsistency made against the Church of England.

I proposed to take the peculiar doctrines of the Church *seriatim*, and discuss them either in the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, or in an accredited French paper. I said I was ready to go through the controversy, if Mr. Gretton, and his friends, would accept the proposal. Written controversy would induce caution of statement. Every proposal was declined.

I have to add, that I was aware fully, ere I undertook this discussion, of its hopelessness to all human judgment; the young lady being quite satisfied of the truth of the doctrines of the Church of Rome. But no matter how hopeless to human view may be the expectation of a good result in any such like case, I trust I shall ever be ready to undertake it, when it is in my power to do so. Were another case of the same character to occur, I would do as I have done in this, and commit the result to God, whose strength is made perfect in weakness. I did, however, expect in this discussion to do what I was sure I could do, and so declared—namely, to show that it was impossible for any Roman Catholic controversialist to defend his faith without resorting to the defence of irrelevancies and subterfuges; that the true point at issue was ever evaded, and that the effort always was to hide the disingenuity of defence; and that the religion which not only required such unworthy defences, but could, moreover, blind men of natural truth and candour to so much dishonesty as to make them employ it without, I have no doubt, in many cases, feeling its criminality, could never be the religion of Christ Jesus, which, by *manifestation of truth*, commends itself to the conscience of men. Whether I have done this, the readers of your paper are, perhaps, among the best judges in the world.

I have now only to account for the undue share of space which I have made my own arguments to occupy.

I had offered—the offer was repeated by a friend—that each party should write out his own arguments, and, on mutual correction, the whole should be published. This was refused. My opponents published an account quite different from the real facts, not only without allowing me to see the MSS., but against the remonstrance of a friend, who, on learning the purpose, offered, on my part, to give every facility to a true publication.

This report of my opponents I have, and from it I have taken their arguments, so far as they have been there given. The form is condensed; the argument being merely stated.

Each man is familiar with his own mode of stating things. I had long been used to one way of conducting the argument against infallibility. I could remember my own form of statement, even to the words. I could not do the same for my opponents. Hence, in order to secure verbal fairness, I was anxious they should write out their case, and allow me to do the same for mine; this being refused, I had no option but to state my own arguments in my own way, giving those of my opponents from their condensed account, and from my own notes. Hence, the disproportionate length which I have given to myself.

I am, dear Sir,
Very truly Yours,
EDW. B. MOERAN, D.D.

* A gentleman present at this discussion has published, at Boulogne, an able letter upon it; he declares therein that, upon remonstrating with Mr. Gretton afterwards upon the manner in which he had brought the controversy to its abrupt conclusion, that gentleman admitted to him "it was a trick!"

Correspondence.

INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Agreeably to my promise, I now bring forward other passages from the Sacred Volume which demonstratively prove the infallibility of the Church. I affectionately call the attention of your truth-seeking and common-sense readers to those very plain and convincing passages. In our Lord's last discourse with his apostles He thus addresses them—"All power is given to me in heaven and in earth. Going, therefore, teach ye all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and, behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world."—St. Matt. xxviii. 18, 19, 20. It is plain that the apostles were not to live unto the end of the world, and, hence, their successors must be implied in the promise. It is equally plain, that if Jesus Christ be with them to the consummation of ages, they cannot fall into error against faith.

We read in St. Matthew (xviii. 17) these words—"And if he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and publican." From this, I think, it undeniably follows that a Church exists, that we are bound to hear her under pain of damnation, and that we would not be commanded to listen to her voice under such a grievous penalty, unless it were impossible for her to lead us into error, since it would be unreasonable to condemn us for not believing a seducer. The meaning which you, Mr. Editor, attach to this passage reminds me of the verse—

> "By various texts we both uphold our claim—
> Nay, often ground our titles on the same:
> After long labour lost, and time's expense,
> Both grant the words, and quarrel for the sense."

Indeed, the verse is as applicable to all the controverted points, as well as to the one just given from St. Matthew; but the potent deciders—common sense and disinterest—ought to be allowed to put an end to the quarrel.

Infallibility of the Church is also proved—expressly and irrefragably—from the holy Apostle Paul's first Epistle to Timothy, third chapter and fifteenth verse, where he terms this unerring guide—"The Church of the living God, the pillar and the ground of truth;" and, in his Epistle to the Ephesians, he describes the tender concern of Christ for His divine spouse—"That he might present her to himself without spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing." What, Mr. Editor, can be more secure from falling into error than the very pillar of truth? What more pure and inviolate in faith than the "glorious Church" of Jesus Christ our Lord, which He has presented to Himself without wrinkle and without stain?

Again, Protestants, by denying the infallibility of the Church, leave the Holy Book without a single witness to say that it was divinely written. We believe the Scriptures, because they contain the pure word of God, and were written by divine inspiration. But, setting aside the authority of the Church, men cannot have a certain knowledge that all the books of Scripture were written in that manner. St. Augustine positively declared to the Manichees that he would not believe the Gospels themselves, unless the authority of the Church induced him to it. Now, I ask your readers, of what use would that authority be, upon which St. Augustine so confidently relied, unless it was infallible? Indeed, it would be utterly worthless.

That holy doctor advances nothing but what is evident to common sense; for no book is Scripture, because it says it is so; otherwise the Alcoran might be such. Much less is any book Scripture, because it is written in an humble, grave, serious, or majestic style; for although this dress becomes the word of God, yet it no more makes it to be so than purple makes a king, or gives him a title to the crown. Neither is a book Scripture because it contains nothing but what is true; for all true relations of things are not Scripture. How, then, is it possible for mankind to have, without a miracle, a certain assurance that such and such books (written near two thousand years ago) are Scripture, if the Church, by which they are recommended as books written by divine inspiration, be fallible?

"This is the Holy Church, the one Church, the true Church, the Catholic Church, which combats all heresies. She may fight, but she cannot be overcome. All heresies have gone out from her like useless branches lopped off from the vine, but she remains in her root, in her vine, in her charity. The gates of hell shall not overcome her."—St. Augustine. I will conclude with this quotation, which, I am bold to assert, is worth all the arguments you could advance on the other side.

I remain, Sir, your humble servant,

WILLIAM ROUREE.

1st March, 1855.

P.S.—I will, with your permission, accede to the request of your correspondent "A," in my next letter.—W. R.

When first Mr. Rourke favoured us with his communications, we did not think it strange that his first letter should contain a number of arguments and texts of Scripture which had been amply discussed in our pages previously; we looked upon him then as a new reader of our paper; and, for the benefit of our other new subscribers, we entered again into a full discussion of all that Mr. Rourke had to bring forward; but when he brings forward over again the same texts and arguments to which we have already replied, and that without taking the least notice of what we said, we think we have some reason to ask, how often we are expected to slay the slain? We do not see how any controversy can be brought to a conclusion unless each of the disputants condescend to take some little notice of the arguments of his opponent. We beg Mr. Rourke to refer to our answer to his very first letter (vol. ii. 121), which contained a very full examination of every text he now brings forward. Unless he can state that the interpretations we there give are erroneous, he has no right to present us with his refuted arguments.

On the present occasion we are spared the necessity of proving that Mr. Rourke has failed in his attempt to establish the infallibility of the Church by Scripture proof, since the second part of his letter is a refutation of the first. The second part of this letter is an attempt to show that we have no ground on which to rest the authority of Scripture except the infallibility of the Church. Now, how can any one prove the infallibility of the Church by Scripture proofs, if we must first believe the infallibility of the Church before we can have any certainty as to the authority of Scripture? We have, therefore, earnestly to request, that Mr. Rourke will tell us plainly, in his next letter, which line of argument he means to follow. Let him take his choice which he will prove, the infallibility of the Church by Scripture or the authority of Scripture by the infallibility of the Church. But he cannot do both; if he chooses to prove Scripture by the Church, we beg he will tell us where he finds the Church, and how he knows it to be infallible; and if he chooses to prove the infallibility of the Church by Scripture, we ask how he can consistently maintain, that before we have found the Church we can ascertain what is Scripture, and what is the meaning of it? We shall look anxiously to Mr. Rourke's answer to this question?

THE LIVING ROSARY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—In the tract called the "Living Rosary," published by James Duffy, 10, Wellington-quay, Dublin, 1846, he states, that it commenced in the city of Lyons, in the year 1826, and that "his holiness, Gregory XVI., was graciously pleased to give it his solemn sanction and approbation, and issue a brief in confirmation of it."

The publisher gives the brief *in extenso*, in which the Holy Father "grants to all the faithful in Christ, of both sexes, who are enrolled amongst the servants of the Virgin, according to the practice of the devotion which they call the living rosary, a plenary indulgence." And then the Pope adds—"But endeavouring on this, that the minds of all may be influenced with a more intense desire of respect, love, and devotion towards the Virgin Mary, and, whilst we, therefore, seek to furnish incentives to those even who are already running on, by proposing a most abundant reward of indulgences, we, at the same time, most earnestly urge this, that all diligently discharging also the other duties of religion, charity, and the virtues, and their morals being made conformable to the rules of Christian profession, they would present themselves more dear to the most holy mother, who promises that they shall possess eternal life, who shall have endeavoured to make her honoured."

May I beg to call the attention of your Roman Catholic correspondents to the last clause above. Perhaps some of them would, through the LAYMAN, kindly inform your readers, at what time did the most holy mother make the above promise? and to whom did she first reveal it?

It would also be desirable to know, has the power of promising eternal life, which the Pope ascribes to the Virgin, been made a dogma of faith? if so, by what councils, and when? I am, Sir, faithfully yours, W. M.

WHAT IS A GHOST?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

YOUR HONOR—I once wrote a letter that you printed,* and I'm going to write another, for I'm puzzled entirely with a story I read in the last CATHOLIC LAYMAN. Your honor took it out of a book written by one of the saints, but I can't neither call his name nor spell it. I can spell any of the blessed apostles, thank God; but it's a poor thing that I can neither call nor spell the saints; for how will I pray to them if I can't spell their names? But sure your honor will know the man I mean, and that will do. [It must be St. Alphonsus Liguori—see our last number, p. 29.—Editor.] Well, your honor, I'm bothered a good deal with ghosts, for I've got a farm now, and there's an old church-yard at the back of the byre, and when the girls goes out to milk there's all kinds of work, and when the boys goes to mind the cattle at night it's as bad; and whatever the boys and girls does, there's still a ghost in the church-yard to lay the blame on. Well, your honor, it wouldn't do at all, for the business wasn't done, with their tricks; so I set about thinking, and, says I, the ghosts isn't it; for them that's buried, says I, their bodies is in under the ground, and their souls is either in purgatory—if there be such a place—or else their souls is either in heaven or hell, and then how can the dead people be askerreting about the church-yard of a night, says I; so I'll have no more of it, says I, but I'll see the business done in byre and barn. Well, with sticking to that I got things mighty quiet, and there was no more bother with the ghosts. But, now, if the saint's story is true, I am wrong entirely, and I'm in dread the ghosts will be as bad as ever; for, your honor sees, what done the job was this—that their bodies was under the earth, and their souls was in their own proper places, wherever that be; so the dead people couldn't be there, stopping the business; for, look at the saint's story about them two young reprobates that went to the bad house; and one of them goes home to bed; then the other comes to him, and what does he say? Why, he says, "my body is lying dead in the street," says he, "and my soul is away in hell," says he; "and here I am myself," says he. Now, your honor, who was he, or what was he at all? He wasn't his body, for that was in the street; he wasn't his soul, for that was in hell; and is there anything else in a man to make himself? so who was he at all? Now, your honor, I'm thinking may be he was about as humbugging a ghost as them that the boys and girls makes in the church-yard, just to cover their own tricks; and I don't want your honor to be setting up the boys and girls again with their ghosts, and telling them the saints is for it, when I go through the church-yard myself every night of my life, and never seen anything in it worse than myself. So I hope your honor will consider it, and tell how he *couldn't* be there, when his body wasn't in it, nor his soul neither, by his own story.

Your humble servant to command,

PAT MURRAY, of Westmeath.

* CATHOLIC LAYMAN, October, 1851.

We think there is much sense in our correspondent's ideas about ghosts. A man is composed of two parts—one is his body, the other his soul or spirit. The word "ghost" means nothing else but the soul or spirit of a man. It is all nonsense to talk about a man's "ghost" being where his body is not, and where his soul is not. But our correspondent need not be uneasy about the story we told out of the "Glories of Mary," by Alphonsus Liguori, for in the first page of Liguori's book we find the following:—

"PROTESTATION.

"In obedience to the decrees of (Pope) Urban VIII., I protest that of the *miraculous deeds* and gifts ascribed in this work to certain servants of God, and not already approved by the Holy See, I claim no other belief than what is ordinarily given to history resting on mere human authority."

Now, if the writer of the book himself finds reason to protest that he does not think his own stories any more entitled to belief than the stories of ghosts which our friend Pat Murray has heard on the mere human authority of his boys and girls, we do not see why any one else should put any more faith in them. It does seem strange that "saints" who may have the Word of God, that cannot lie, should chose *rather* to support their moral lessons with lying stories, which they themselves do not firmly believe; but since such is the case, our friend Pat Murray will do well to disregard such stories, and follow his own sensible plan of making the boys and girls do their business, and never allowing them to see anything worse than themselves. Let him stick to that and he won't be far out.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Can you, or any of your correspondents, inform me—1st, When the Church of Rome first omitted God's commandment against image worship, from the Decalogue? and 2nd, When the Bishop of Rome first claimed universal obedience as Jesus Christ's Vicar, as being necessary to salvation?

Yours, &c.,

G. F.

There is some little difficulty in replying to the first of our correspondent's questions, owing to the form in which it is put. The Church of Rome only holds herself responsible for those formularies which she has expressly authorized; and our correspondent will find the Second Commandment given in full in the Catechism of the Council of Trent. Nevertheless, it is certainly true that this commandment is omitted from a great number of the popular Roman Catholic Catechisms which are in common use, both in this and other countries. We do not know at what particular time this omission began to be practised, as most of the works to which we refer are of a very ephemeral kind, and are frequently varied from time to time.

We believe that the first Bishop of Rome who claimed universal obedience to himself, as being necessary to salvation, was Boniface VIII., who occupied the Papal chair at the end of the 13th century. An extract from his famous Bull, entitled "Unam Sanctam," in which this claim is made, will be found by our correspondent in the CATHOLIC LAYMAN for March of the present year (p. 30).

Perhaps some of our other correspondents may be able to afford "G. F." fuller information on the points to which his letter refers.

FARMING OPERATIONS FOR APRIL.

[*From the Irish Farmers' Gazette.*]

April Wheat may be sown about the 10th of the month. It appears from the discussion lately in the GAZETTE, that this species does not do so well when sown much earlier; but that if sown any time about the middle of the month it is a most profitable crop, yielding well and fetching a fair price, and that it is a most excellent crop to sow small seeds with.

Potato planting should be proceeded with and finished without delay, as much sprouting reduces the strength of the set considerably; in fact, the potato should be planted before the eyes shoot out at all.

Oats.—Sowing should now be finished without delay, on poor, cold soils; or if late sown, an increase in the quantity of seed is desirable, in order to prevent tillering, and uneven ripening.

Parsnips may still be sown; but, as it is getting late, we would recommend germinating as directed last month, by which a good crop may be secured, even if sown in the last week of the month.

Carrots may be sown up to the middle of the month, but we would recommend germinating the seed also.

Peas and Beans, of early varieties, may still be sown. Steep the seed in water for twenty-four hours, then roll, and cover up lightly. See directions for the two preceding months.

Spring Vetches.—Sow another breadth, mixed with oats.

Fallows, where still practised, should now get a good harrowing or grubbing, and be again ploughed up.

Paring and Burning should be proceeded with vigorously, as weather serves.

SELECTION OF

NEW WORKS

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

THE IMPERIAL DICTIONARY; English, Technological, and Scientific. Adapted to the present state of Literature, Science, and Art. Illustrated by above 2,000 Engravings on wood. 2 vols. Imp. 8vo. £4 10s.

ABRIDGED STATISTICAL HISTORY OF SCOTLAND; Illustrative of its Physical, Industrial, Moral, and Social Aspect, and Civil and Religious Institutions, from the most Authentic Sources. By James Hooper Dawson. 8vo. 25s.

MEMOIRS OF THE RIGHT HON. RICHARD LALOR SHEIL. By W. Torrens M'Cullagh. 2 vo's. 8vo. 24s.

MEMOIR OF THE LIFE AND WRITINGS OF JAMES MONTGOMERY; including Selections from his Correspondence and Conversations. By John Holland and James Everett. 2 vols. Post 8vo. 21s.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF THE REV. WM. JAY; with Reminiscences of some distinguished Contemporaries, Selections from his Correspondence, &c. By George Redford, D.D., and J. A. James, D.D. 8vo. Second Edition. 12s.

MEMOIR OF THE REV. J. J. WEITBRECHT, Missionary at Bengal. By his Widow. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

MEMOIR OF OLD HUMPHREY. Author of "Pithy Papers," "Half Hours," &c. 2s.

THE PICTORIAL BIBLE; Illustrated with Steel Engravings, and many hundred woodcuts, representing Landscape Scenes, and subjects of Natural History, &c. With original notes, by John Kitto, D.D. A new edition, with additional notes, based on the Discoveries of Recent Travellers. Vol. I. Super Royal 8vo. 12s. (To be completed in 4 vols.)

CONNYBEARE AND HOUSTON'S LIFE AND EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL. With beautiful Steel Engravings and Maps. 2 vols. 4to. £2 8s.

THE CHRISTIAN CYCLOPEDIA; or, Repertory of Biblical and Theological Literature. By the Rev. James Gardner, M.D. Royal 8vo. 15s.

CHRIST, AS MADE KNOWN TO THE ANCIENT CHURCH: an Exposition of the Revelation of Divine Grace, as unfolded in the Old Testament Scriptures. By the late Robert Gordon, D.D. 4 vols. 8vo. £2 2s.

A TREATISE ON BIBLICAL CRITICISM; exhibiting a systematic view of that Science. By Samuel Davidson, D.D. 8vo. 18s.

"CHRIST IS ALL;" the Gospel of the Old Testament —Genesis. By the Venerable Henry Law, Archdeacon of Wells. 3s.

THE GLORY OF THE HOLY GHOST. By Rev. Peter M'Laren. 3s. 6d.

HENGSTENBERG'S COMMENTARY ON THE PSALMS. 3 vols. 8vo. 33s.

HENGSTENBERG ON THE REVELATION OF ST. JOHN. Expounded for those who read the Scriptures. 2 vols. 8vo. 21s.

OLSHAUSEN'S COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPELS AND ACTS. Adapted expressly for Preachers and Students. 4 vols. 8vo. 42s.

OLSHAUSEN'S COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

OLSHAUSEN'S COMMENTARY ON FIRST AND SECOND CORINTHIANS. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

OLSHAUSEN ON THE EPISTLES TO THE GALATIANS, EPHESIANS, COLOSSIANS AND THESSALONIANS. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

OLSHAUSEN AND WRESINGER ON THE EPISTLES TO THE PHILIPIANS, TO TITUS, AND THE FIRST TO TIMOTHY. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

OLSHAUSEN AND EBRARD ON THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

ELLIOT'S HORÆ APOCALYPTICÆ; or, a Commentary on the Apocalypse, Critical and Historical; including also an Examination of the Chief Prophecies of Daniel. 4 vols. 8vo. 54s.

COMMENTARY ON THE ROMANS. By Robert Haldane. 3 vols. 15s.

EXPOSITION OF GALATIANS; By James A. Haldane. 3s. 6d.

MEMOIR OF THE LIVES OF ROBERT AND J. A. HALDANE. By Alexander Haldane, Esq. 8vo. 12s.

BICKERSTETH'S CONDENSED NOTES ON SCRIPTURE; being the Substance of Sermons, selected from his MS. Notes, and revised by his Son. 10s. 6d.

THE PULPIT FOR 1854. Sermons by eminent living Ministers. Vol. I. and II. 7s. 6d. each.

BLAND'S PLAIN PARISH SERMONS. 5s.

PLAIN DISCOURSES ON IMPORTANT SUBJECTS. By Rev. John Brown, D.D. 4s.

THE FOOTSTEPS OF ST. PAUL. By the Author of "The Faithful Promiser." 5s.

THE MIND OF JESUS. By the Author of "Morning and Night Watches." 8d. Cloth. 1s.

BIBLE HANDBOOK: an Introduction to the Study of the Scriptures. By Rev. J. Angus, D.D. 5s.

IMPRESSIONS OF CHINA AND THE PRESENT REVOLUTION. By Captain Fishbourne. 6s.

CHRISTIANITY IN TURKEY: the Armenian Race and Church, with some account of their Doctrines and Rites, &c. By Rev. F. S. O. Dwight, Constantinople. 5s.

HOPE DEFERRED, NOT LOST: An account of the Mission to Patagonia. By Rev. G. P. Despard. 5s.

LYNCH'S NARRATIVE OF THE EXPEDITION TO THE JORDAN AND DEAD SEA. 3s. 6d.

MINISTERING CHILDREN By Author of "Visits to the Poor, &c." 5s.

THE LEISURE HOUR FOR 1854. With numerous Engravings. 6s.

THE SUNDAY AT HOME FOR 1854. With numerous Engravings. 4s. 6d.

ISRAEL IN THE WORLD; or, the Mission of the Hebrews to the great Military Monarchies. By W. H. Johnstone, M.A. 3s. 6d.

LADIES OF THE REFORMATION; Memoirs of distinguished Female Characters belonging to the period of the Reformation—England, Scotland, and the Netherlands. By Rev. James Anderson. 12s. 6d.

THE EARNEST STUDENT; being memorials of John Macintosh. By the Rev. Norman Macleod. 6s.

MACAULAY'S CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL ESSAYS. 2 vols. 8s.

THE ECLIPSE OF FAITH; or a Visit to a Religious Sceptic. 9s. 6d.

THE RESTORATION OF BELIEF. 8s. 6d.

DETACHED THOUGHTS AND APOPHTHEGMS, extracted, by permission, from some of the writings of Archbishop Whately. 3s.

THE ENGLISHWOMAN IN RUSSIA; or, the Russians at Home. Described by a lady 10 years resident there. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

A HISTORY OF THE WAR; forming a complete narrative of the origin and progress of the War. Compiled from Public documents, and other authentic sources. With Maps of the Crimea. 2s.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS COMPARED WITH THE OLD TESTAMENT. 3s. 6d.

THE CHARACTERISTIC DIFFERENCE OF THE FOUR GOSPELS CONSIDERED AS REVEALING VARIOUS RELATIONS OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST. By Andrew Jukes. 2s. 6d.

THE ENGLISH CLERGY LIST FOR 1855. Containing also a List of the Clergy in Ireland, Scotland, and the Colonies, &c., &c. 9s.

CLERGYMAN'S PAROCHIAL REGISTRY AND VADE MECUM. 2s. 6d.

WORKS RECENTLY PUBLISHED

BY

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-ST., DUBLIN.

I.

In F.cap 8vo, cloth, price 1s. 6d.,

THE PRINCIPLES OF ELOCUTION,

Compiled from the "The Elements of Rhetoric, by Archbishop Whately,"

With additions and alterations.

II.

In F.cap 8vo, cloth, price 2s. 6d.,

THE FIRST RESURRECTION,

Being Comments on First Corinthians, Chap. xv.

BY

THE REV. ROBERT NOBLE, A.M.,

VICAR OF ATHBOY.

III.

In F.cap 8vo, price 2s. 6d.,

THE COLLECTS OF THE LITURGY

Of the Church of England,

CATECHETICALLY EXPLAINED,

Compared with Scripture, and briefly commented on.

BY

THE REV. CHARLES MILLER, A.B.,

INCUMBENT OF BALLYMAKENNY,

With recommendatory preface by the Bishop of Meath.

IV.

In Demy 8vo, price 1s. 6d.,

A CHARGE,

Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Meath, at his primary visitation in September, 1854.

BY

J. H. SINGER, D.D.,

LORD BISHOP OF MEATH.

Immediately will be Published, in Demy 8vo,

I.

A Digest of the Evidence,

TAKEN BEFORE THE

SELECT COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS,

Appointed to Inquire into the Working of the National System of Education in Ireland.

By the Rev. WILLIAM LE POER TRENCH, D.D., Rector of Killeeran, Diocese of Tuam, and one of the Honorary Secretaries of the Church Education Society for Ireland.

II.

Just Published, in Demy 8vo, cloth, Price 8s.,

An English-Irish Dictionary,

Intended for the use of

STUDENTS OF THE IRISH LANGUAGE,

and for

Those who wish to Translate their English Thoughts or the Works of others into Language intelligible to the Present Irish-speaking Inhabitants of Ireland.

BY DANIEL FOLEY, B.D.,

Prebendary of Kilbragh, Cashel, and Professor of Irish in the University of Dublin.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Just Published, in 2 vols., 8vo with Maps and Plates, price 12s.,

Journal of a Deputation,

SENT TO THE EAST

BY THE

COMMITTEE OF THE MALTA PROTESTANT COLLEGE IN 1849,

Containing an Account of the Present State of the Oriental Nations, including their Religion, Learning, Education, Customs, and Occupations, &c.

BY A LAY MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE.

"These Volumes contain a large amount of deeply-interesting information, respecting places and people intimately associated with the Records of the Word of God."—*Evangelical Christendom.*

"They comprise wide discussions, historical, geographical, social, and political. Mohammedanism is admirably illustrated, while the ecclesiastical and political history of Egypt, from the introduction of Christianity to later times, is ably and copiously detailed. The Work deserves a place in every library, both public and private."—*British Banner.*

London: J. NISBET and Co., 21, Berner's-street. Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Just Published, Second Edition, small 8vo., Price 4s. 6d.

OUR FRIENDS IN HEAVEN; or the Mutual Recognition of the Redeemed in Glory Demonstrated. By Rev. J. M. Killen, M.A.

"Here is a subject of touching interest very well treated. Mr. Killen argues on right principles, and comes to a right conclusion."—*Church of England Magazine.*

"A full, earnest, and conclusive investigation of the entire subject."—*British and Foreign Evangelical Review.*

"Mr. Killen has not indulged in any fanciful or dream-like speculations on the subject. His object is steadily kept in view, and thoroughly accomplished, and the result is an amount of edifying and enlightening instruction, for which few, perhaps, are prepared. The character of his volume is pre-eminently that of Scriptural sobriety."—*The Edinburgh Witness.*

"The author has done invaluable service both to the cause of theological truth and to the religious community at large, by this publication. He has left no material fact untouched; he has ably combated the false criticism so often employed since the days of Warburton; every objection, whether suggested by philosophy or drawn from other sources, is successfully obviated, and the author has been singularly happy in bringing his reasoning before the reader's mind with attractive interest, as well as with convincing power."—*Londonderry Standard.*

"The author has long been known to us as an able and accomplished man, a ripe scholar, and a profound theologian. The book is a real addition to our theological literature. It abounds with an amount of Scripture testimony never furnished by any previous writer."—*Irish Presbyterian.*

Edinburgh: Shepherd and Elliott. Dublin: William Curry and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher, WILLIAM CURRY, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.
APRIL, 1855.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Glóir do Dhia añ ṙna háṙdaiḃ, agus ṙíoḋċáin air an dtalaṁ deaġċoil do na dáoinib.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED THE MIDDLE OF EVERY MONTH, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. IV.—No. 41. MAY, 1855. { Annual Subscription, 3s. 6d. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

	Page
The Holy House of Loretto	49
St. Liguori	81
St. Bonaventura's Psalter	82
The Abbé Labordo at Rome	84
Autobiography of a Roman Catholic Priest—No. VII.	86
How do the Fathers describe a true Catholic?	85
CORRESPONDENCE.	
Theba and the Talk of the Road	87
The Rev Dr. Cahill and Controversy, by W. Richardson	88
On the Douay Bible, by Dan Carthy	88
On Maunday Thursday at Rome, by T. Callaghan	89
Farming Operations for May	89

THE HOLY HOUSE OF LORETTO.

On the slope of the eastern Apennines, where the mountains jut out towards Ancona—in the northern part of the Papal States—there stands, within about two miles of the sea, the little city of Loretto. Its situation is singularly beautiful. The city is built on the brow of a hill which overlooks the blue waters of the Adriatic, studded with many a white sail. The view to the west is bounded by the ranges of the Apennines, whose bare slopes are covered, towards the base, with olive and chesnut trees, and other rich vegetable productions. The fertile valley of the Musone runs along the foot of these hills; while scattered over the plain are the remains of the pine forest which once extended for miles along the coast—

"Ravenna's immemorial wood,
"Rooted where once the Adrian wave flowed o'er,"

the scene of many an old Italian legend.

It is not, however, the beauty of the landscape, or the interest attached to poetic fiction, that, for many centuries, has drawn to Loretto the steps of unnumbered pilgrims from all parts of the world, and has gained for it the fame of the wealthiest and most frequented sanctuary in Christendom. Its attraction is of a very different kind. The *Chiesa della Santa Casa*, or Church of the Holy House, which crowns the summit of the hill on which the city is built, contains beneath its dome a building which, if the legend be true, no Christian can look upon without the deepest emotion. This building is said to be the *very identical house* in which the Angel Gabriel announced to the Virgin Mary the Incarnation of our Blessed Lord.

If the story of the *Santa Casa* of Loretto were one of the many legends once circulated in the Roman Catholic Church, which rested only on the authority of some obscure monk of the middle ages, but which have long lost all claim to popular belief, we should deem it a superfluous task to expose its weakness and improbability; but the supposed miracle of Loretto stands upon very different grounds. The crowd of devotees who, to this day, frequent the shrine of the *Santa Casa*, prove how generally believed is the story of its Eastern origin. Its genuineness and sacredness have been affirmed by a long succession of Pontiffs, from Boniface VIII. downwards. If ever the infallibility of the Roman Catholic Church was committed to the support of an ecclesiastical miracle, it is to that of Loretto. Pius IX. refers to it in his late Bull on the Immaculate Conception; and, as we shall presently see, even Dr. MacHale, in his last Lenten pastoral to the people of Tuam, published a few months ago, distinctly affirms the truth of the miracle. It becomes, therefore, a duty which we owe to our readers, both Protestant and Roman Catholic, to put them in possession of the chief features of this wondrous story, and to discuss its historical probabilities.

In the first place, we desire to remind our readers that a miracle is a *fact*, which, like other facts, must be proved by the testimony of competent witnesses. When our Blessed Lord, for example, raised Lazarus from the dead, a crowd of spectators were present who could judge, by the evidence of their senses, whether the miracle really took place. The testimony of one or more such witnesses, recorded either by themselves or by trustworthy authors, becomes an evidence to subsequent ages of the truth of the event; but in no case are we bound to believe in the reality of any historical fact or narrative, much less in the truth of any miraculous event, unless it comes to us attested by evidence which, on the face of it, bears plain marks of credibility. This principle is so obviously just, that Roman Catholic writers, who have defended the truth of the story of the *Santa Casa*, have endeavoured to obtain as much historical evidence in support of it as they could collect. It was felt that the mere *assertion* of the truth of the miracle by one or more Popes could not establish the reality of a *fact*, supposed to have happened centuries before their time, and of which they could, therefore, have had no *personal* knowledge. What the value of the historical evidence for the truth of the miracle of Loretto is, we shall now proceed to inquire; but, for the sake of persons not deeply versed in ecclesiastical antiquities, we shall commence by giving a brief account of the miracle itself, taken from the best Roman Catholic sources.

Those of our readers who are familiar with the Gospel narrative, will remember that the Annunciation to the Blessed Virgin of the Incarnation of our Lord took place at Nazareth, a town which still exists, and may be visited by any traveller in the Holy Land. "In the sixth month," writes St. Luke (i. 26), "the Angel Gabriel was sent from God unto a city of Galilee, named Nazareth." Supposing, as is not improbable, that the angelic salutation took place in the house which Mary then inhabited (although upon this point St. Luke is silent), the question is, how has this house shifted its place from Nazareth to Italy? The answer which the Church of Rome gives, and to the truth of which she has pledged her infallibility, is, that the house was miraculously carried from one country to the other. The following is the account given by Natalis Alexander, one of the most learned and sober Roman Catholic writers:—

"In the first year of the Pontificate of Boniface VIII., A.D. 1294, the sacred house of the Blessed Virgin, in which she heard the angelic message, and conceived the Son of God by the Holy Ghost, was borne, by a miracle, from Dalmatia into the territory of Picenum, and settled down in a wood near Recanati, belonging to a pious matron whose name was Lauretta. Thence it derived the name of the house of the Blessed Virgin of Loretto. Moreover, it has been handed down that, by a repetition of the miracle, the house *thrice* changed its place in the Picenian territory within one year. On this subject the reader may consult the elegant Jesuit writer, Horatius Tursellinus, in his history of Loretto."[a]

It will be observed that Natalis Alexander states that the Holy House was miraculously borne from Dalmatia (which is on the eastern coast of the Adriatic Gulf) to Loretto, on the western or Italian side; but how did it get from Nazareth to Dalmatia? This part of the story is detailed at length by Rohrbacher, a modern Roman Catholic historian, whose statement, from its prolixity, we are obliged somewhat to abridge.†

"It was in the year A.D. 1291, on the 10th of May, about the second watch of the night, that the sanctuary of Nazareth had been deposited on the shores of the Adriatic, between Tersatz and Fiume, in a spot commonly called Rauniza by the natives of the country.

"Towards daybreak some of the inhabitants were astonished on beholding the new edifice placed in a spot where nobody had ever, up to that time, seen either house or cabin. The report of the prodigy soon spread; people flock thither, examine, admire the mysterious building. It was constructed with small square red stones, held together by cement. All are astonished at its singular structure, its air of antiquity, its oriental shape; but the thing of all others that was most inexplicable was, how it maintained the erect position it did on the bare ground, without any foundation whatever to rest upon.

"Their surprise, however, was greatly enhanced on penetrating into the interior. The chamber formed an oblong square. . . . A tolerably large door, open on one of the sides, gave ingress to this mysterious abode. On the right opened a solitary narrow window; in front, somewhat elevated, stood the altar, made of square solid stones, on which was an ancient Greek cross. Near the altar one saw a small cupboard of singular simplicity, made to hold the necessary utensils for a poor establishment. It contained small vessels, similar to those which mothers use for the purpose of feeding their infants. There was placed a statue of cedar representing the Blessed Virgin, erect and bearing the child Jesus in her arms. . . . . Such was the disposition of the holy chapel when it commenced its sojourn in Dalmatia."

Our readers will perceive, by the foregoing statements, that the history of the Holy House of Loretto involves *four* distinct miracles. There was, first, the transit across the Mediterranean Sea from Nazareth to Dalmatia; there was then the passage across the Adriatic Gulf, from Dalmatia to Italy; and then there must have been two further miracles, if the story of Natalis Alexander be true, that the Holy House changed its place *thrice in one year* after its arrival in Italy.

Tursellinus—the writer to whom Natalis Alexander refers us for further details—gives us a curious account of the cause of all this seeming capriciousness and love of change exhibited by the *Santa Casa*. After detailing the earlier part of the story—how the angels took up the Holy House on the 9th of May, in the year 1291, and brought it through the air into Dalmatia, distant from Galilee about two thousand miles (for our legendary authors love to be exact about dates and distances)—he goes on to say, that at first there was a mighty concourse of people that came together upon the fame of this great miracle, but their zeal continued not; whereupon the Virgin, not finding there the honour she expected, ordered the angels a second time to take the house, and transport it across the Adriatic Sea into Italy. This the angels accordingly did, and set it down in the territory of Recanati, in the midst of a wood belonging to a certain lady called Loretta. This new prodigy of the second transportation of the Holy House rekindled men's devotion to the Virgin, and there was great flocking to it from all quarters; but the situation of the chapel was an occasion of a great many robberies and villanies committed on the poor pilgrims, because the forest (of which we have before spoken) afforded shelter to the rogues and bad characters, who sallied out from it to rob and plunder those who passed by. [It appears somewhat strange that neither the angels nor the Virgin seem to have foreseen the possible bad consequences of their imprudent choice of a locality for the *Santa Casa*; but this objection the learned Tursellinus discreetly passes over in silence.] At length the angels thought fit to remove the Holy House from the midst of the wood, and they carried it a little farther to a mountain that belonged to two brothers, who, in a short time, made a very profitable business of it by the resort of pilgrims, and the rich presents that were made. [We may remark, by the way, how invariably *money* is sure to come in, sooner or later, in the narrative of these ecclesiastical miracles.] As the two brothers were not able to agree in the division of the spoil, the Virgin, continues Tursellinus, was very angry, and thought they were unworthy of the honour she had done them, and, therefore, ordered the angels to transfer it to another place. Up they, then, took it for the fourth time, and set it in the highway, where now it stands. But nobody could tell from whence this house came till a long time after, when the Blessed Virgin appeared in a dream to a certain man, an intimate friend and servant of hers, and revealed the whole matter to him, as has been just related.

[a] Pontificatus Bonifacii Papæ octavi anno primo, A.D. 1294, sacra Deiparæ Virginis ædicula, in qua filium Dei de Spiritu Sancto, angelo nunciante, concepit, e Dalmatia in Picenum miraculo delata, in Recinetensia agri sylva pia matrona, cui Lauretæ nomen, propria consedit. Inde Lauretanæ domus B. Virginis appellatio, quam et in ipso Piceno ter sedem infra annum mutasse, repetito miraculo, memoriæ proditum est. Qua de re legendus Horatius Tursellinus, Soc. Jes., scriptor elegans in Historia Lauretana.—*Nat. Alex. Hist. Eccles.* sec. xiii., tom. xv., p. 79. Paris, 1744.

† Rohrbacher, Hist. Univ. de l'Eglise Catholique, vol. xix., p. 321 et seq. Paris, 1851.

Such is the tale told by Tursellinus. And now, before we proceed to examine the evidence on which it rests, it may be right to inquire, how much of this wonderful story is the Church of Rome responsible for? We have said above that her infallibility is pledged to the truth of the miracle; and it is right that we should know *to what extent* she has involved the faith of the whole Roman Catholic Church in this matter.

Cardinal Lambertinus, who was afterwards Pope under the title of Benedict XIV., has given us, in his treatise on the festivals of the Virgin Mary, a satisfactory reply to this question.* He tells us, that in the Roman martyrology, under the date of December 10, there is the following entry—"The sacred house of Mary, in which the Word was made flesh, was translated to Loretto in the Picenian territory." This paragraph was inserted in the martyrology by the decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites on the 31st of August, 1669. Further, a proper service was drawn up for this day, and the sixth lesson of this service was appointed to be read as follows, by Pope Innocent XII.:—

"The house which was the birth-place of the Virgin, and consecrated by Divine mysteries, was transported out of the power of the infidels, first into Dalmatia, then into the territory of Loretto, in the Picenian province, in the time of Pope Celestine V. And it was proved to be the very same house in which the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, partly by Papal diplomas and the veneration of the whole world, partly by the continued exercise of miracles and the bestowal of heavenly benefits. In consequence of which facts, Pope Innocent XII., in order that the faithful might be more fervently stirred up, and put in mind of the worship of our most exalted mother, commanded that the translation of her Holy House, which is commemorated by an anniversary solemnity in the province of Picenum, should be celebrated by a proper Mass and office of its own."†

This addition to the proper lesson of the Mass for this festival of the translation of the *Santa Casa* was discussed and approved of by the Sacred Congregation of Rites (the highest authority in the Roman Catholic Church on such matters), by their decree of September 16, 1699, and the use of this Mass was subsequently extended to the Venetian, Spanish, and other states.

It is, doubtless, to this Mass that Pius IX. alludes in the following passage from his late Bull on the Immaculate Conception:—

"Our predecessors gladly granted the privilege, that in the *Litanies of Loretto*, and in the preface of the Mass itself, the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin should be proclaimed; and thus that the *belief* of the Church should be fixed and defined by its *prayers*."‡

According to the principle thus dogmatically laid down by the Pope himself, if the Roman Catholic Church sanctioned the Litanies of Loretto (which presuppose the truth of the miracle), she must be held to have formally declared her belief in the miracle itself.

Benedict XIV. makes mention, moreover, of various apostolical constitutions, testifying that the Santa Casa of Loretto is *the very same* house as that in which the Annunciation took place. The authors of these constitutions are as follows—Paul II., Julius II., Leo X., Paul III., Paul IV., and Sixtus V.§ Here, then, we have the infallible attestation, not of one but of *seven* Popes, to the truth of the story we have detailed. They do not, indeed, expressly assert that the Holy House was carried by angels across the sea, or that it changed its place in Italy thrice within one year. But, as regards the essential features of the story, the *removal* of the actual house of the Blessed Virgin, at Nazareth, first into Dalmatia, then to Loretto, and the *identity* of the present house with that in which the Annunciation took place, to the truth of these points the Church of Rome is pledged by the formal adoption of a solemn Mass to Almighty God, sanctioned by the authority of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, and approved of by the infallible authority of seven different Popes.

After such high authorities, it may seem almost superfluous to add, that Dr. MacHale, in his late Lenten pastoral, has taught his flock to believe in the truth of this miracle. Speaking of the Blessed Virgin, he says—"Nay, even her own native land did not escape the punishment, and God himself miraculously interposed in favour of the sacred house in which the mystery of the Incarnation took place, by transporting it to the shores of Loretto."*

And now let us inquire on what evidence this whole story really rests. Let us treat it as a plain matter of fact, to be proved or disproved, like other facts, by an examination of the reasons alleged in support of it. If satisfactory proof of the truth of the legend can be adduced, then, doubtless, however improbable the story may at first sight appear, all Christians who admit the possibility of miracles are bound to believe it. But if we can show that the story is utterly destitute of any contemporary evidence—if, further, it can be proved that, for many centuries before the supposed miracle, there was no house of the Virgin to be seen at Nazareth—and if, lastly, it be demonstrably evident that the house now shown as the *Santa Casa* could not have occupied the supposed site of the annunciation—if any or all of these points can be established, then we think the most credulous Roman Catholic reader must admit that the miracle is untrue, and that all the seven Popes were in error.

To begin with the first point—the utter absence of any contemporary evidence—the miracle of the first transportation to Dalmatia is said to have taken place, as we have seen, on the 9th of May, A.D. 1291. But on whose authority does this story come down to us? If Natalis Alexander, who was the first author we quoted, had himself been an eye-witness of the miracle, or if he had even lived at the time, then we must confess the tale would have much greater weight; but Natalis Alexander, like a truthful writer, takes care to tell us that he had the story from Tursellinus. And where did Tursellinus get all the particulars which we have quoted above? He does not think fit to inform us. In our search for contemporary authorities, we are are at last obliged to fall back on the following statement of the German historian, Gieseler:—

"The first writer who notices the sanctuary of Loretto is Flavius Blondus, secretary to Pope Eugene IV. (about the middle of the fifteenth century). From his remarks we may infer that the wonderful removal was then either wholly unknown or only known as a popular tradition. *The first writer who mentions the account of* this wonderful removal, which is now found at the sanctuary itself, is Baptista Mantuanus (Opera, Antwerp, 1576, tom. iv., p. 216). . . . . The account was undoubtedly written between 1450 and 1480, and was the means of spreading the story."†

In other words, this wonderful event, which, if true, stands unique in the history of the world, *is not noticed in a single authentic document* of any kind for two whole centuries; there is not a Pope who even speaks of the shrine of Loretto for one hundred and fifty years; and, then, when notice is first taken of it, it is successively mentioned by a Papal secretary, and by Pontiffs themselves, in high terms of praise, but without the most remote reference to that crowning event, which, if true, would have distinguished it far above all other Christian sanctuaries. And then, finally, the first author who mentions the miraculous removal happens to have been General of the Carmelites, an order, as he says himself, "specially decorated with the title of the mother of God;" while his *sole authority for it* is, by his own candid confession, found to have been nothing more than a musty, worm-eaten tablet, without date, affixed to the walls of the church itself. We ask our readers, would such evidence be admissible in a trial before a jury in any of our courts of justice? And shall we believe that the laws of nature were suspended, and a series of miracles performed, upon the faith of testimony which no judge would listen to for a single instant in a trial between man and man?

But, in the second place, have we any reason for believing that the house of the Blessed Virgin really existed at Nazareth, for 1200 years after her own time? Let us examine a few of the statements made by authors who wrote about Palestine during that period.

We will begin with the eminent writer, S. Jerome. He lived in the Holy Land for upwards of thirty years; he composed a most graphic account of all the places which he visited, and the interest which attached to each; but while Bethlehem, the birthplace of the Saviour, is described with singular minuteness, all that he remarks about Nazareth is, that the name signified the flower of Galilee, and that it was the place where Christ was brought up. Of the supposed house of the annunciation he does not say a single word.

The first author who has left any specific mention of the buildings which Nazareth contained in his day, is Adamnan, who writes as follows:—‡"Nazareth has vast stone edifices, and likewise two very large churches built there. One is in the midst of the city, constructed upon two vaults, where *formerly had been built* the house in which our Saviour was brought up. . . . . The other church is erected over the spot where the house *had been built* in which the Angel Gabriel visited the Blessed Mary, and spoke to her when he had found her alone the same hour. This information respecting Nazareth I had from the holy Arculfus, who remained there two nights and as many days."

In the days of Arculfus, therefore—that is, in the eighth century—there were supposed to *have been* two houses of interest at Nazareth, *not one*; and that in which our Lord had been brought up, was not the same with that in which the Angel Gabriel visited the Virgin Mary. Venerable Bede, who was a contemporary of Adamnan, and quotes that author in his history, plainly implies that the two houses no longer existed. "One house," saith he, "is in the midst of the city, standing upon two arches, *where had formerly been* the house (ubi quondam fuerat domus) in which our Lord was brought up when a child. The other church *is* where the house *was* (ubi domus erat) in which the angel came to the blessed Mary.

John Phocas made a journey to the Holy Land in A.D. 1185, and has left us a minute description of Nazareth, from which the following is an extract:—*

"In the midst of the various hills, and at the bottom of a valley formed by them, stands the town of Nazareth. Immediately on entering the first gate of this village-town, there is the Church of the Archangel Gabriel, and on the left side of the altar in it is seen a small cave, in which there is a bubbling fountain, that sends up pure streams. Here the most immaculate Mother of God, after she had been entrusted by the priests to holy Joseph, and placed under his protection, used to come to draw water daily; and here it was that she was first saluted by Gabriel; and when, in her consternation, she had gone off trembling to the house of Joseph, she heard there from the angel those words—'Hail, thou that art highly favoured.' This said house of Joseph *was afterwards transformed into a most beautiful church*, on whose left side, near about the altar, there is a cave. . . . Proceeding from the mouth within the cave, you come down a few steps, and thus gain a view of that which was anciently the house of Joseph, in which, after her return home from the fountain, as I said before, the Archangel saluted the Virgin. On the spot where the salutation took place, there is a cross of black stone graven upon white marble, and above it an altar, and on the right side of the said altar, a small cot (οικισκος), in which the ever Virgin Mother of God had her chamber. But on the left side of the place of the salutation is seen another small cot, without inlet for the light, in which our Lord Christ is said to have dwelt."

It is clear, therefore, that whereas, in the days of Arculfus, there were two separate churches built over spots *once occupied* by two distinct houses; in the time of Phocas, three centuries later, one church had been rebuilt upon one of the sites, and a cave near the high altar contained what claimed to be those two very houses. Now, among all these descriptions of eye-witnesses of the scene of the Annunciation, what trace do we find of the existence of such a house as that which now stands at Loretto? The *Santa Casa* is a building thirty-six feet long, by seventeen feet wide. No *such* house could possibly have existed at Nazareth without attracting the notice of such a devout pilgrim as St. Jerome. No remains of such a house could possibly have been standing at the time when Arculfus informed Adamnan that, as Bede says, a church was standing on the spot where the house *had once been*. No such house or remains of such a house could have been standing at the time when the church described by Phocas was rebuilt from its foundations.

Benedict XIV. saw the utter hopelessness of attempting to reconcile the express statements of the earlier writers with the present condition of the *Santa Casa* at Loretto. If the house which was the scene of the Annunciation was no longer standing in the time of Venerable Bede in the eighth century, how could it possibly be transported to Italy in the thirteenth century? If, again, we take the other alternative, and suppose the house to have been converted into a church, how does it come to pass that we now find it changed back into a house again? Nay, if we are to believe the legend of Tursellinus, the house and furniture are now in the exact condition in which the Virgin left them, eighteen centuries ago! After stating various conjectures, Benedict XIV. at last tries to take refuge in the statement of Phocas, that the "cot" in the cave was a part of the original house, and that this was the part which was moved to Loretto. But here, notwithstanding, there are absolute physical, as well as historical, improbabilities involved, which not even that most ingenious of all Popes could solve. For Phocas tells us that he saw *two* houses, not one; both of them within a cave, some way from the mouth, which was not wide, and subterraneous; both, too, were perfectly distinct from the *actual spot* of the Annunciation, which was external to them, although near them. To have got one of these houses entire and unbroken through the mouth of the cave, would have been, at least, as great a miracle as to have transported it afterwards by angelic agency to the shores of the Adriatic, and yet nothing of the kind has been recorded; besides, even so, we may still ask, would it have contained within it the scene of the Annunciation?

---

* *Vide* Bened. xiv., Opera. de Festis B. M. V., lib. ii., c. xvi., tom. ix., p. 210. Venet., 1788.

† Ipsius autem Virginis natalis domus divinis mysteriis consecrata, ab infidelium potestate in Dalmatiam prius, deinde in agrum Lauretanum Picenæ provinciæ translata fuit, sedente S. Cœlestino V.; eandemqna ipsam esse, in qua Verbum caro factum est, et habitavit in nobis, tum Pontificiis diplomatibus, et celeberrima totius orbis veneratione, tum continua miraculorum virtute et cœlestium beneficiorum gratia comprobatur. Quibus permotus Innocentius XII., quo ferventius ergo Matris amplissimæ cultum fidalium memoria excitaretur, ejusdem sanctæ domus translationem anniversaria solemnitate in tota Piceni provincia venerandam missa et officio proprio celebrari præcepit.—Benedict. xiv. Oper. ut supra, p. 210.

‡ Enimvero Prædecessores nostri . . . gavisi sunt quam libentissime facultatem tribuere, ut in Lauretanis Litaniis, et in ipsa Missæ præfatione, Immaculatus ejusdem Virginis proclamaretur conceptus, atque *adeo lex credendi ipsâ supplicandi lege statueretur.*—*Bull of Pius IX. Vide Tablet, January* 27, 1855.

§ Commemorantur apostolicæ constitutiones, quæ Lauretanam sacram domum eandem esse cum ea testantur in quâ verbum divinum humanam carnem assumpsit. Hac vero constitutiones sunt, Pauli II., Julii II., Leonis X., Pauli III., Pauli IV., Sixti VI.—*Bened. XIV., Opera ut supra*, p. 210.

* *Vide Tablet*, February 24, 1855.

† Gieseler Eccl. Hist. § 144, note, vol. iii., p. 314. Philad., 1836.

‡ Adamn. de locis sanctis, ii. 26. Act. Sanct. Ord. S. Ben., Sæc. iii., pars. ii., p. 516. Paris, 1672.

* Compend descrip. c. 10. ap. Leon. Allat. Opusc., pp. 11, 12. Colon., 1653. For this, and various other authorities cited in this article, we are indebted to a very interesting paper in the "Christian Remembrancer," entitled "The Holy House of Loretto." April, 1854.

But, even granting, for the sake of argument, that Arculfus and John Phocas saw a fragment of the house of the Virgin, when they visited the scene of the Annunciation, have we any reason to believe that either the two churches of Adamnan, or the single church of Phocas, were in existence at the date of the alleged miracle? Alas! when the Saracens regained their ascendancy, in the year 1188, the sacred places in Palestine were successively reduced to ruinous heaps. That this fate befell the church of Nazareth in particular is rendered certain by the testimony of Pope Urban IV. He was Patriarch of Jerusalem when he was suddenly elevated to the pontificate, A.D. 1261; he must, therefore, have been intimately acquainted with the state of all the hallowed spots which, as he says himself, his eyes had seen. He announces the utter destruction of the sacred places in Nazareth, which took place in the following year, to his beloved son, S. Louis, in the following terms:—

"The Babylonian Soldan . . . laid sacrilegious and destructive hands upon the venerable church of Nazareth, . . . and *destroying it entirely* by means of the sacrilegious and nefarious ministers of his wickedness, he *levelled it to the ground by the demolition of its illustrious edifice*."*

We ask any impartial reader, can he really believe that the house of the Virgin, supposing it to have then existed, could have survived this *total* demolition, or would Pope Urban IV. have used the language we have quoted above, and mourned the utter overthrow of the *illustrious edifice* of Nazareth, if the *Santa Casa* had, by some good fortune, escaped the destructive rage of the Saracen king?

We may add, that the testimony of Urban IV. is confirmed by that of subsequent writers. William de Baldensel, who visited the Holy Land in A.D. 1335, thus describes the scene of the Annunciation:—†

"In this spot there *was* a beautiful church, and large withal; but, alas! it has been, as it were, destroyed. A small place, however, has been covered over, and is diligently guarded by the Saracens, where, *near a certain marble column*, they assert that the venerable mysteries of the conception were consummated."

Sir John Maundevile, who travelled a few years later, confirms this account. Speaking of Nazareth and the scene of the Annunciation, he writes thus:—

"This salutacioun was don in a place of gret aweteer of a faire Chirche, that was wont to be som tyme; but *it is now alle downe*."‡

One argument more, and we have done. The monks of Nazareth at the present day point out to any inquiring traveller the space which is said to have been occupied by the Holy House before its flight into Italy. This space is a vestibule in front of the grotto, into which the house is alleged to have opened.§ But the position of the grotto is, and must always have been, absolutely incompatible with any such appendage as the *Santa Casa*. Whichever way the house is supposed to be placed against the rock, it would have closed up with blank walls the very passages by which alone the house could be entered. A comparison of the masonry of the so-called workshop of Joseph, at Nazareth, with the material of the House of Loretto, may be considered no less fatal to the theory. The former is composed, as might be expected, of the grey limestone of the country, of which, no doubt, the houses in Nazareth were in all times built: the *Santa Casa*, on the contrary, is built in a manner quite unlike anything in Nazareth. It has a chimney; whereas the Abbé Michon informs us that no such appendage is ever found attached to a house throughout Palestine. The walls of the sanctuary, moreover, are built, not of the native *grey stone* of Nazareth, but of a *red brick-like* stone, which, according to the competent authority of M. Saussure, *perfectly resembles the red stone of which the poorer cottages in the neighbourhood of Loretto are composed*. Singly, these objections are of considerable weight; but when all are united, their force may be thought well-nigh irrefragable.

Our inquiry has been protracted, we fear, to an undue length; but it will not have been in vain, if any of our readers should be induced, by what we have written, to examine into the subject, and think for themselves. The fiction of the Holy House of Loretto is one which has exercised, and is still exercising, more practical influence over thousands of Christians than the plainest precepts of the Gospel. It has been sanctioned and defended by divines, by bishops, and by Popes; surely, then, it is an important question, is this story true, or is it false? A large portion of Christendom insists upon Papal infallibility as an essential principle of Christianity; has this Papal infallibility been solemnly pledged to a true miracle, or to a false and glaring imposture? The object of our inquiry has been to contrast the story of the *Santa Casa* at Loretto with authentic history; and, for ourselves, we feel persuaded that there can be but one opinion of the result—even Papal authorization cannot create a *fact!*

* Ejusdem structura nobili *omnino* destructa. Raynald, Contin. ad. Baron. A.D. 1263, n. 7. Tom. xiv., p. 82. Colon. 1692.

† Apud. Canis. Thesaur. Eccl. Mon., Ed. Basnage, tom. iv., p. 354. Antwerp. 1725.

‡ Cap. x., p. 112. London, 1839.

§ *Vide* Quarterly Review, vol. 93, p. 442.

ST. LIGUORI.

It is the boast of the Church of Rome that she never leaves her children at any loss what to believe. Whenever a dispute arises as to any article of faith, we are told that she is ready with her decision, rejecting every rashly invented novelty, and pointing out, without fear of error, what opinion her followers can rightly adopt. We shall not now inquire how far the boasts of her advocates in this matter are well founded; nor shall we discuss whether her decisions on matters of belief are as prompt or as true as they are represented to be. We have given enough of instances in former articles to show that the sentence of the infallible judge is most commonly pronounced, not with the confidence of one who knows himself to be in possession of the power of discriminating, with certainty, truth from falsehood, but rather with the hesitation of one who is unwilling to risk his credit by committing himself rashly in a doubtful controversy—of one who waits to see which opinion will get the upper hand, and then, when the battle has ceased to rage, steps forward to announce the victory of the winning side. Let us, however, concede that the Church of Rome is as prompt as can be desired in telling her children what to *believe*; and it only becomes the more wonderful why she should be so remiss as she is in directing them what to *practice*.

Right practice is surely a thing of as much importance as right belief—nay (if we may draw a comparison between two things both, indispensable), right practice is the more important of the two. For the Christian religion contains no revelations calculated merely to gratify curiosity; it discloses nothing on mere speculative points which do not concern us. Everything, that we are given to believe, has a direct reference to practice, and is designed to make us, not only wiser, but better. True belief, if it have no effect upon the heart and life, is pronounced by our sacred writers to be in no respect different from that faith which the devils themselves possess. It would seem, then, that a Church which made purity of faith the object of its especial solicitude, would be in a far higher degree desirous to promote sanctity of life in all its members.

But in the system of the Church of Rome right belief is not regarded as a means to an end, but as the very highest end itself. The smallest error in an article of faith is held to be of infinitely more dangerous consequence than the grossest violation of Christian duty. A Roman Catholic will regard the most virtuous of Protestants as having less hope in his death than the most abandoned profligate who has always held the right faith. A Roman Catholic believes that an error in faith is of such fatal consequences, that God interferes by a perpetual miracle to keep the head of his Church from falling into any mistake; and yet, he holds that no such interference takes place to prevent the head of the Church from falling into sin; on the contrary, he acknowledges, without scruple, that some Pontiffs have been monsters of iniquity, prodigies of ambition, cruelty, and lasciviousness. An excellent illustration of the feelings of the Church of Rome on this subject at the present day was afforded by the celebrated Achilli trial three or four years ago. If we are to believe the statements made on that occasion by the advocates of the Church of Rome, the life of the plaintiff, while he was a member of the Romish Church, was disfigured by the grossest and most scandalous vices; and yet, those vices, though known to his superiors, were no bar to his promotion; he was advanced from step to step; and it was only when he began to doubt of the truth of the *doctrines* of the Church that he incurred serious censure.

It is quite in keeping with the facts we have mentioned, that, however ready the Church of Rome may be to pronounce on disputed questions of doctrine, she does not interfere at all to decide the differences that have arisen on questions of morals. There are in the Church of Rome two schools of casuists, whose principles are so opposite to each other that one can hardly believe them to be believers of the same Church. The one, the school of *rigorists*, inculcate with fidelity the strictest morality of the Gospel; the other lay down principles so lax and accommodating, that the man must be abandoned indeed who desires to practice more vice than he can find in their books a justification for.

We copy the following passage from Mr. Macaulay's History of England, as describing, in language more forcible than ours, the charges commonly brought against some of the moral teachers of the Romish Church:—

"It was not strange that people of all ranks, and especially of the highest ranks, crowded to the confessionals in the Jesuit temples; for, from those confessionals, none went discontented away—there, the priest was all things to all men. He showed just so much rigour as might not drive those who knelt at his spiritual tribunal to the Dominican or the Franciscan Church. If he had to deal with a mind truly devout, he spoke in the saintly tones of the primitive Fathers; but with that very large part of mankind who have religion enough to make them uneasy when they do wrong, and not religion enough to keep them from doing wrong, he followed a very different system; since he could not reclaim them from guilt, it was his business to save them from remorse; he had at his command an immense dispensary of anodynes for wounded consciences. In the books of casuistry which had been written by his brethren, and printed with the approbation of his superiors, were to be found doctrines consolatory to transgressors of every class. There, the bankrupt was taught how he might, without sin, secrete his goods from his creditors; the servant was taught how he might, without sin, run off with his master's plate; the pander was assured that a Christian man might innocently earn his living, by carrying letters and messages between married women and their gallants; the high-spirited and punctilious gentlemen of France were gratified by a decision in favour of duelling; the Italians, accustomed to darker and baser modes of vengeance, were glad to learn that they might, without any crime, shoot at their enemies from behind hedges; to deceit was given a licence sufficient to destroy the whole value of human converse and of human testimony. In truth, if society continued to hold together, if life and property enjoyed any security, it was because common sense and common humanity restrained men from doing what the Society of Jesus assured them that they might, with a safe conscience, do."

It may, however, be said that though, no doubt, passages may be selected from the writings of individual casuists, where decisions so lax as those alluded to by Mr. Macaulay, are to be found, still we are not to make the whole Church responsible for the errors of individuals. The Church may be pure and sound, no matter into what extravagancies private doctors may have fallen. But if this be so, why has not the Church condemned these extravagancies? Why is it, that in a Church which boasts to have a living judge of controversies, two such opposite schools of moralists are allowed to flourish, while private members of the Church are left in uncertainty which guide they ought to follow? Our Roman Catholic friends must forgive us if we are forced to suspect that it is only worldly policy which has kept the judge's mouth silent. We copy the explanation which Pascal has offered, of the reasons which have induced the Jesuits to tolerate two such schools of moralists in their society; for, it seems to us what Pascal says with regard to the Society of Jesus, applies equally to the whole Church.

He is relating a conversation which he had had with a friend on the subject of the Jesuit morality—

"In the conversation which I had with him, he told me such strange things that I could hardly believe him, till he showed them to me in the books of those Fathers, so that there was nothing left for me to say in their defence, but that these were the sentiments of a few individuals which it was not right to attribute to the whole body; and, in fact, I assured him that I knew some of them who were as rigid as those whom he cited were lax. It was on this that he disclosed to me the spirit of the society, which is not known by everybody, and which you will, perhaps, be glad to learn. Here is what he said—

"'You think that you are doing much in their favour to show that they have some Fathers whose teaching is as accordant with the spirit of the Gospel as that of the others is opposite to it; and you conclude thence, that those relaxed opinions do not belong to the whole society. I am quite aware of this; for if the society had adopted those relaxed opinions they would not permit any of their body to publish the opposite sentiments. But since they have some members, whose doctrine is so licentious, you, too, must admit, also, that the spirit of the society is not that of Christian severity; for in that case they would not suffer teaching so opposite to it.'

"'Well, then,' answered I, 'what can be the design of the entire body? No doubt they can have no settled plan, and every one of them has the liberty to say at random whatever he thinks.'

"'That cannot be,' replied he; 'so great a body could not exist without a soul to govern and regulate all its movements; and, besides, it is one of their express regulations that none shall print anything without the approval of their superiors.'

"'Well, but,' cried I, 'how can the same superiors consent to maxims so contradictory?'

"'This is what I must explain to you,' returned he. 'You must know, then, that their object is not at all to corrupt men's morals—such is not their design. But neither, however, is it their only end to reform men's minds—this would be bad policy. But their plan is as follows:—They have so good an opinion of themselves as to believe it to be useful, and almost essential to the good of religion, that their credit should extend everywhere, and that they should be the governors of all consciences. And because the severe maxims of the Gospel are fit for governing some sorts of people they make use of them on all occasions, when such maxims are favourable to their purpose. But as there is a large number of people with whose plans these same maxims are not found to accord; why, with regard to such people, they lay them aside, in order to be able to satisfy everybody. It is just because they have to do with people of different nations, and all sorts of conditions, that it is necessary for them to have an assortment of casuists to match all this diversity.'

"From this explanation you will at once perceive that if they had only casuists of the lax school, they would ruin their principal design—namely, that of embracing all the world—since those who are truly pious look for stricter discipline; but as there are not many of this sort of people, a few strict directors are enough to conduct *them*; while a crowd of lax casuists is provided for the crowd of those who prefer laxity.

"It is by this obliging and accommodating conduct, as Father Petau callast, that they open their arms to everybody; for, should any one, for example, present himself to them, who has made up his mind to make restitution of some ill-gotten gains, do not suppose that they will dissuade him from it; on the contrary, they will praise and confirm him in such a pious resolution. But should another come who wishes

to be absolved without making restitution, it will go hard with them if they do not find means to gratify him. And in this way, they preserve all their friends and defend themselves against all their enemies; for, if they are reproached with their extreme laxity, forthwith they produce to the public their anstere directors, with some books which they have written on the severity of the Christian code of morals; and simple people, who do not look below the surface of things, are qnite satisfied with these proofs of the falsity of the accusation."—Provincial Letters, letter 5.

Such is the account given by this pious and eloquent Roman Catholic of the reasons which induced the Jesuit body to tolerate among them two such opposite schools of moral teachers. Pascal never dreamed of making his whole Church answerable for the doctrines which he believed to be confined to one of its religious orders. But if he had lived to our day, and if he had seen that, during the century and a half which has since elapsed, the doctrines against which he remonstrated have found in his Church hosts of plausible defenders, while no Pope has interfered to condemn them, we know not how he could have refrained from pushing his conclusions somewhat further than he advanced them. The explanation he has given, at least, shows reasons why it is exceedingly convenient that there should be, in the Romish body, divines to suit all consciences—rigid moralists for the pious, and lax casuists for the thoughtless and ungodly. Those, then, who reject this explanation, are bound to provide some other. If it be not motives of worldly policy which have kept the Pope silent, what, then, is the reason why he has never employed his infallibility to decide the important practical questions on which so many Roman Catholic divines are totally at variance among themselves?

Whatever be the reason, it causes us considerable embarrassment in our attempt to discuss the moral teaching of the Church of Rome. If we want to discuss her opinions on a hundred points of speculation, we have decrees of Popes and councils to refer to, and can tell with certainty what the authoritative teaching of the Church is. But on questions of morals she has absolutely nothing fixed or settled, and her divines assert or deny as it suits their own convenience. And, accordingly, the adversaries of that Church are quite at a loss to know what it is they have to contend against.

In this uncertainty, we are sure that we do the Church of Rome no injustice in selecting ST. LIGUORI, as the representative of her moral teaching. His work on "Moral Theology," professes to steer a middle course between the extremes of severity and laxity; and his success in the execution of his plan has been attested by the highest authority. In the year 1803, when Liguori was a candidate for beatification, all his works came under the examination of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, who decreed that in all the writings of Alphonso de Ligaori, severely examined according to the discipline of the Apostolic Seat, there was found *nothing worthy of censure*. We have the testimony of Monsignor Artico, Prince Prelate of the Papal Household, that this examination was made with particular severity, and that his system of morality had been more than twenty times rigorously discussed by the Sacred Congregation, and that in all their decisions the cardinals had agreed *voce concordi, unanimi consensu, unâ voce, unâ mente*. Further, in the year 1831, Cardinal de Rohan-Chabot, Archbishop of Besançon, propounded the following questions for the oracular response (oraculum requirit) of the Sacred Penitentiary:—1. Whether a professor of sacred theology may, with safety, follow and profess the opinions which the blessed Alphonso de Liguori professes in his "Moral Theology?" 2. Whether a confessor should be disturbed for following all the opinions of the blessed Alphonso de Liguori in the confessional, simply on the grounds that the holy Apostolic See had declared that it found nothing in his works worthy of censure? The answer given to the first question was in the affirmative. Liguori's opinions might be followed and professed with safety. The answer to the second was in the negative. No such confessor was to be disturbed in his course. This decision was formally signed and dated, as issuing from the Sacred Penitentiary, on 5th July, 1831. Immediately the Cardinal Archbishop wrote to his clergy, requiring that the "judgment of Rome should be fully adhered to, and that the opinions of the blessed Alphonso de Liguori should be followed and reduced to practice, all doubt whatever being thrown aside." Pope Gregory XVI. confirmed the decree in a few weeks, and, in 1839, Alphonso exchanged his title of *blessed* for that of *saint*.

It is not necessary for us to discuss a question which has been started by the *Dublin Review*, whether after all this Roman Catholics are at liberty to dispute the decisions of St. Liguori. It is enough for us that they have shown no inclination to do so. Many Protestants have objected to the lax doctrines that Liguori has sanctioned; and eminent Roman Catholic divines have replied. But not one of them has attempted to throw Liguori overboard. They all accept and defend his conclusions. If, then, Liguori is wrong, he has certainly led with him into error the majority of the bishops and teachers of his Church; and it is incredible that, if the Pope believed Liguori to be wrong, he would remain silent while he saw his clergy giving pernicious instruction to their people. We are sure, then, that we are doing the Church of Rome no injustice in identifying her teaching with Liguori's. If Liguori's teaching be subversive of the plain principles of morality, nobody can excuse from blame the Church which has bestowed its highest honours upon him, and given so strong a sanction to his doctrines. But, before we enter into a particular examination of Liguori's work on "Moral Theology," we must notice one or two preliminary objections which his defenders have advanced.

It has been said that Liguori's "Moral Theology," and the other casuistical books we object to, are musty old Latin volumes which lay Roman Catholics never look into; and, therefore, supposing even that they have not arrived at right conclusions in a few instances, this is a mere speculative question, and that their errors have done no great harm to anybody. The persons who have made this objection must have counted on very thoughtless readers. Any one who reflects for a moment that these books were written as manuals for confessors, must know that there are no books in a priest's library which are so constantly and regularly reduced to practice. The lessons given by the priest in his public addresses to his congregation may or may not be listened to; but his private instructions in the confessional are certain of being attended to, and of producing a lasting impression. Now, though we cannot be present in the confessional to hear what instructions the confessors give their penitents, yet we have in St. Liguori's works the means of learning the rules which guide the confessors, and of making ourselves acquainted with the lessons given to the penitents. No lay Roman Catholic needs to be at the trouble of consulting for himself the musty old Latin volumes in which the decisions of casuists are contained. He can have them related to him by his own priest as often as he chooses to present himself for confession. If St. Liguori has made one single mistake, if he has, in any one instance, pronounced that to be innocent which the Gospel condemns as sinful, it does not remain a mere speculative error. In thousands of confessionals the uneasy scruples of penitents are lulled to rest with the assurance that the act which has caused them remorse has been pronounced, on sufficient authority, to be no sin at all. The penitents, with disburthened consciences, go their way; they feel no fear of committing the same act again themselves, and, if they are tolerably good-natured, will take care, too, to enlighten any of their friends who may not be so well informed as themselves. And so, in a short space of time, the whole public opinion of Roman Catholic countries is infected, and the morality of Liguori supplants the morality of the Gospel.

We think, then, that it is plain that the question is no speculative one; and that if the "Moral Theology" of Liguori contain errors, it is of the greatest practical importance that these errors should be exposed.

There is another objection which Dr. Wiseman has brought against taking Liguori as a type of Roman Catholic morality. But this involves too many important topics of discussion to be brought in at the end of an article. We shall, therefore, pause here, and resume the subject in another number.

ST. BONAVENTURA'S PSALTER.

OUR readers may recollect that in our number for January we presented them with an imitation of the *Te Deum*, taken from a book published at Rome, in 1834, under the highest sanctions that the Roman Church supplies, entitled "Preci Quotidiane alla Madre di Dio," &c.—"Daily Prayers to the Mother of God to obtain a happy death; taken from the Psalter of *St. Bonaventura*."* We should, perhaps, state, for the sake of our Protestant readers, that Bonaventura was born in 1221, and died in 1274. He was of the order of St. Francis, Bishop of Albano, one of the six suffragans of Rome, and passed through all degrees of ecclesiastical dignities, short only of the pontifical throne itself. Pope Clement IV., in 1265, offered to him the Archbishopric of York, which he refused, and his successor, Gregory X., elevated him to the dignity of Cardinal Bishop. He was canonized as a saint by Pope Sixtus IV., on 14th April, 1482; was afterwards enrolled among the most illustrious doctors of the Church by another Bull of Pope Sixtus V., and his works are made the standard of their schools by the Franciscan order according to a decree of Pope Pius V.; in short, we think we shall show that it is not possible for any human authority to give a more entire and unqualified sanction to the works of any human being, than the Church of Rome has given to the writings of Bonaventura.

We stated frankly in our former article, that some eminent Roman Catholic authors had disapproved of this Psalter, and endeavoured to exonerate Bonaventura of its authorship, and their Church of its adoption; but informed our readers that its genuineness had been fully discussed and decided by a learned writer in our own country, the Rev. Robert King, in a pamphlet published by Grant and Bolton, Dublin, in 1840, and that its genuineness had, in fact, been fully sanctioned by the Church of Rome at the canonization of Bonaventura.†

Having recently, however, been informed by a respected correspondent, that the authenticity of this "Psalter" has been lately again disputed by an English Roman Catholic ecclesiastic of high position in that Church, we are induced to think it may be desirable to go a little further into proof than we were able to do in our former article, especially as we believe the same view has been adopted by other conscientious Roman Catholics, who, finding it impossible to justify the daring impiety of ascribing to any creature, however exalted, the praise due alone to the Creator, would therefore willingly believe that such an effusion has never had the sanction of their Church, but has actually been repudiated by what they believe to be an "infallible guide."

The only "authority" to which we have been referred by our correspondent in proof of the assertion that the "Psalter of the Virgin" was not really the work of St. Bonaventura is, the Rev Alban Butler's "Lives of the Fathers, Martyrs, and Saints," published in Dublin, in 1833, and reprinted in London, in 12 vols., in 1847—in a note to the 7th vol. of which latter edition, p. 161, there occurs the following passage:—"The Psalter of the Blessed Virgin is falsely ascribed to St. Bonaventura, and unworthy to bear his name.—See *Fabricius* in Biblioth. med. ætat., *Bellarmine* and *Labbe*, de Script. Eccl., *Nat. Alexander*, Hist. Eccl. Sæc xiii."

Here, it will be observed, four writers of the highest authority in the Roman Catholic Church are confidently referred to as authorities for the position that the Psalter in question is "falsely ascribed to St. Bonaventura, and unworthy to bear his name;" and that, not in an obscure publication, but in a work most extensively circulated among Roman Catholics, and highly approved of by the Roman Catholic hierarchy.*

If this statement be true, will our correspondent favour us by procuring for our readers some explanation of the fact, that a work *condemned* on such high authority as *spurious*, should be contained without the slightest hint as to its real character, not only in the first printed edition of Bonaventura's works, Strasburg, 1495, but in the Vatican edition, published at Rome, under the direct sanction of Pope Sixtus V., in 1588, in the Mentz edition, 1609, and also in that published in 1668, at Lyons (the place where St. Bonaventura himself died, and was buried); and how it comes to have been reprinted hundreds of times under his name, and translated into nearly every modern European language, as a "work of the most profound piety, worthy of the great genius of the seraphic doctor;" and, above all, how it comes to pass that in Rome itself, where the Congregation of the Index so indefatigably plies its task of prohibiting and expurgating works disapproved of by their Church, no less than ten editions of it, under the title of "Tributo Quotidiano di affettuose preghiere e lodi per ciascun giorno della Settimana alla Immacolata Madre di Dio, tratte dalle opere del Seraf. D. S. Bonaventura," should have been published in modern Italian, with the express approbation of the late Pope, Gregory XVI., between the years 1834 and 1844, to say nothing of subsequent editions during the present Pontificate?

We believe we might assert that scarcely any work of "Roman Catholic piety" has been so frequently reprinted as this Psalter, or has been more vaunted as a master-piece of profound devotion. We may here, in support of this assertion, specify some of the editions of the "Psalter of the Blessed Virgin by St. Bonaventura" which have, besides those already referred to, from time to time appeared, bearing the following dates:—Venetis, 1476; Argentinæ, 1495; Venet., 1504; Belnæ, 1521; Brixiæ, 1553; Ingolst., 1593; Brixiæ, 1596; Parisiis, 1596; Coeln., 1605; Valencenis, 1605; Genevra, 1606; Colon., 1608; Constantiæ, 1611; Ulisipone, 1611; Matriti, 1613; Genuæ, 1616; Hispali, 1624; Matriti, 1625 and 1628; Insulis, 1659; Brux., 1672; Paris, 1677; Matriti, 1697; Antv., 1700; Brux., 1701; Liege, 1702; Neuhusii, 1709; Rouen, 1823; and many subsequent, both in Latin, Italian, and French.

Among some of the more recent editions, we may mention two several translations into French, one by Le R. P. J. Gallifet, Lyons, 1850, and the other by Henry de Riancey, Paris, 1852, from the preface to the latter of which we beg to give the following extracts:—

"Of all the little works composed by St. Bonaventura in honour of the glorious Mother of God, and which breathe a piety so profound, and a doctrine so elevated and sure, there is none more celebrated than that which has for its title the PSALTER OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY.

"It is a collection of 150 Psalms suggested by the Psalms of David. Each Psalm begins by the same words as those of the royal Prophet; the general sense of them

* Any one who wishes to get a copy of this book at Rome should go direct to the publisher, Marini, No. 4, Piazza de Collegio Romano, as it is not the custom in Rome for booksellers to sell the publications of one another, and they often affect to be ignorant of the existence of books which they do not publish themselves.

† The Bull of canonization by Sixtus IV., is given at length in Bonaventura's works, tom. vii., p. 823. Lugduni, 1668.

* Both the editions of the "Lives of the Fathers, Saints," &c., are *stereotyped*; and the Dublin edition, R. Coyne, 4, Capel-street, 1833, has the following approbation, signed by Archbishops Murray and MacHale, and twenty-six other Roman Catholic bishops:—

"We, the undersigned Archbishops and Bishops, having seen a stereotype edition of the 'Lives of the Saints,' by the Rev. Alban Butler, in 2 vols., royal 8vo, now published by Richard Coyne, of Capel-street, Dublin, and being satisfied of its conformity with the 12-volume edition of the same work, do most earnestly recommend the same to the clergy and laity of our respective dioceses. We assure them of the exceeding utility of this most pious and learned composition, and are glad to express our most ardent desire that a copy of it were placed in the hands of every family of the numerous people committed to our care."

is preserved and applied to the Holy Virgin with a rare aptitude of expression, and an admirable poetry of thought and language. At the end of them are placed the Canticles in imitation of those of the Prophets, a Hymn which answers to the *Te Deum*, and a Creed like that of St. Athanasius. All the faithful servants of the Blessed Virgin are acquainted with this book, and recite with pleasure those prayers, which breathe so sweet a charm and so touching a sublimity. We have followed the order traced by the seraphic Doctor, and we have applied ourselves to reproduce, as much as lay in our power, the simple and majestic expressions of that great saint. . . . . All that is included in the present book is taken from St. Bonaventura. The more one studies this great genius and those of his century, the more one is inspired with love and veneration toward their works, where reigns a faith so ardent, a theology so luminous, and a piety so sanguine and so sweet; we could propose for the Christians of our days nothing more worthy of them, than to borrow the learned and authorized voice of the illustrious Doctor, so justly admired by our Fathers. We beseech them to remember us in their prayers, and we love to believe that the Blessed Virgin Mary, protectress of France, our patroness and our mother, will deign to cast a look of mercy upon this humble homage, a feeble echo of the work of one of the greatest Saints who devoted himself to sing her praises!" —Passy, the Feast of the Compassion of the Holy Virgin, 1852.*

Surely, it must sound strange to ears accustomed to the sound of "*Catholic unity*," to hear what discordant voices proceed from their ecclesiastical guides touching the self-same matter, and almost at the same moment in England and France. In England and Ireland the faithful are solemnly counselled to believe that this oft-published work is "falsely ascribed to St. Bonaventura, and unworthy to bear his name." In France, "of all the works composed by this illustrious Doctor and greatest of Saints, there is none more celebrated, none of a piety so profound, or of a doctrine more elevated and sure, than that which has for its title the Psalter of the Blessed Virgin Mary!"

To which side shall we incline in this most perplexing contradiction? We have the Rev. Alban Butler and the Irish Roman Catholic Bench of Bishops on the one side, and the voice of Roman Catholic Europe, during six centuries, upon the other!

But we must not forget the great names referred to by Mr. Butler in support of his assertion; and really we do think, if it be true, as stated by the Rev. Alban Butler, that such learned Roman Catholic writers as Fabricius, Cardinal Bellarmine, Philip Labbe, and Natalis Alexander have pronounced this work spurious and unworthy of so great a man as Bonaventura, it is scarcely fair, either to his memory or the unlearned world, to whose devout attention it has been so often recommended under the sanction of his name, that the ecclesiastical authorities should not interpose to suppress, even at the eleventh hour, so audacious a fraud.

The truth is, however, that the Rev. Alban Butler, though the "learning and piety" of his "Lives of the Fathers," &c., was vouched for by the united signatures of all the Roman Catholic Bishops in Ireland in 1833, has signally failed, either in learning or piety, or both, in the present instance; for we have now to inform our readers that *not one of the four* eminent writers so confidently referred to by him—*Fabricius*, *Bellarmine*, *Labbe*, or *Natalis Alexander*—when treating of Bonaventura and his writings, *asserts that the Psalter of the Blessed Virgin was not written by Bonaventura*. We have ourselves carefully consulted them all, and we think it will be found impossible to point out one line in any one of the writers so flippantly referred to, which asserts that the Psalter of the Virgin was falsely ascribed to St. Bonaventura or was unworthy of his name. To facilitate our Roman Catholic friends in their search, we here subjoin, as is our usual practice, the exact references to volumes, pages, and editions, where such mention would probably be found, if any such passages really existed; and we hope that should any new edition of "the Lives of the Saints" be published in England, the compilers, before again stereotyping errors so flagrant, will take the trouble to peruse the authorities to which they refer, and see whether their character for "learning and piety" will not be better promoted among Roman Catholic readers by expunging the note we have exposed, than by continuing to misrepresent distinguished authorities to relieve themselves from a present difficulty in arguing with Protestants.†

As we wish, however, to set this subject at rest in the minds of our readers for ever, we cannot close this notice without briefly recurring to the Roman Catholic authors who *have* endeavoured to show that Bonaventura was not the author of this celebrated production, and the reasons which have induced us, as well as the Roman Catholic world in general, to hold the opposite opinion.

Cardinal Du Perron, in his reply to King James I., published at Paris in 1620, is the first who appears to have disputed its authenticity (though he admits he had never either seen or met with it), and the only reason he assigns for doing so is, that neither Trithemius nor Gesnerus make any mention of it.‡

This argument we shall answer by referring to another eminent Roman Catholic authority, published at Paris in 1638, under royal authority, and with the approbation of the Doctors, the "Martyrologium Franciscanum a V. P. Arturo a Monasterio Rothomagensis," July 14, section 10, &c., p. 239.

"I know," says Arturus, "that King James of Great Britain, in the book, entitled '*Triplici nodo triplex cuneus*,' condemned, with much indignation, the Psalter of the most Blessed Mary, put forth by St. Bonaventura himself (as is asserted by Bellarmine, Marcus Ulyssiponensis, Willot, Galesius, Walding, and Poireus), and expressed his horror at it, as if it were some impious production; in which he was afterwards followed by some heretics raging with the same black malice, who were, however, vigorously met by the most illustrious Cardinal Perron, Archbishop of Sens, in his reply to the King of Great Britain, and by Ignatius le Gault, now Vicar-General and Apostolic Commissary of Gaul, who say that the work is, at all events, spurious and falsely attributed to St. Bonaventura; *for neither Trithemius nor Gesner have made mention of it*. But how futile this reasoning is, may be clearly seen from the circumstance, that we are not bound to reject whatever has been omitted or unnoticed by Trithemius and Gesner, when they are mentioned by others of the highest reputation. Wherefore the most illustrious Cardinal Bellarmine ingenuously confesses that it is the genuine work of the most holy Seraphic Doctor, and uses the following language in his learned apology for his answer to the book of the aforesaid King of England," &c., &c., ch. ii., vol. 7.

The weakness of Cardinal Du Perron's argument from the *silence* of Trithemius and Gesner will appear in a still clearer light to any one who will take the trouble of consulting their original works, as we have done. Trithemius enumerates but a part of the universally-admitted works of Bonaventura, and does not even pretend to give the titles of the whole;† on the contrary, he expressly adds that Bonaventura wrote other works than those he has enumerated; and as Trithemius published his catalogue of ecclesiastical writers in 1494, before the first edition of Bonaventura's works was published, and died in 1513, seventy years before the Vatican edition was published by Pope Sixtus V., it is not at all surprising that he should never have met with his minor works, among which the Psalter of the Virgin is. As to Gesner the same observations may be made; he died at Zurich, in 1565, also before the publication of the Vatican edition of Bonaventura's works, and, moreover, was much more distinguished as a physician and naturalist than in any other capacity. His "Bibliotheca Universalis seu Catalogus Librorum," published at Zurich (Tigurinum), in 1545, tom. i., p. 236-7, under the title of "Eustachius" (another name for Bonaventura), merely follows Trithemius, adding in his very words, "Alia insuper nonnulla edidit, quæ ad notitiam meam non venerunt," showing that he did not pretend to be acquainted with *all* Bonaventura's writings. To argue from the mere *silence* of such writers as Trithemius or Gesner, under such circumstances, only shows how hard Cardinal Du Perron found it to give any plausible ground for disputing the authority of this Psalter, when pressed with the character of its contents by King James.

The only other Roman Catholic writer we need name is, Fr. Jo. Hyacinth Sbaralea, who published a supplement and corrections of Wadding's "Scriptores Ordinis Minorum," in 1806, and objects to the Psalter as doubtful (p. 159), on the ground of certain strange and barbarous phrases to be met with in it. The principal ones of these, however, which he mentions, do not occur in the Psalter at all, but in the litanies annexed, and are not worse than others to be found in works acknowledged to be genuine works of Bonaventura by Sbaralea himself (as may be seen in Mr. King's book already referred to, p. 81); others are mere typographical errors, which do not exist in the corrected edition (the Vatican); to say nothing of the difference in matters of taste between writers of the 13th and 19th centuries, which alone would render such criticisms of scarcely any weight whatever. We candidly admit that two respectable Protestant writers, Orsiline and Chemnitz, have urged the same barbarisms and extravagance as objections to the genuineness of the Psalter, but we think with Mr. King, that the weight of authority is among the other way, and both Sbaralea and Orsiline treat in far too arbitrary a manner the works of St. Bonaventura, and cut off too much by wholesale, much as the one may suit their taste. If, indeed, all the works attributed to Bonaventura, except one or two, were written in a pure and elegant style, the argument might have some force, and the one or two be deservedly suspected; but when these authors find it necessary to condemn as spurious such a multitude of writings, one is tempted to think that the former ones might as well have been pronounced not his, on account of their disagreement in style with the numerous ones which bear an inferior character."

If anything further were required to set the matter at rest, we think, as far as Roman Catholics are concerned, it is furnished by what they can scarcely deny to be authority, the Decretal Epistle of Pope Sixtus V. in 1587, issued nearly simultaneously with the publication of the Vatican edition of Bonaventura's works, published under Pope Sixtus's orders, and superintended by the Cardinal Constantius à Sarnano, the sixth volume of which contains the Psalter in full, pp. 478-91. This authoritative document is headed, "S. D. N. Sixti Papæ Decretales litteræ quibus Sanctus Bonaventura, &c., inter eximios egregioseque sanctos Catholicæ ecclesiæ doctores annumeratur," and contains the following passages:—

"It was through admiration of the grace which abounded in his (*i.e.* St. Bonaventura's) lips and pen, that our predecessor, Pope Sixtus IV., hesitated not to use the expression, that 'the Holy Spirit seemed to have spoken in him.' . . We likewise . . . in virtue of our Apostolic authority, by these presents, decree and declare that the aforesaid Bonaventura, having been deservedly enrolled and numbered by the said Sixtus IV. among the company of holy doctors, be estimated and honoured amoog the chief and principal of those who have excelled in the attainments of the theological profession; and for this reason . . . we will and decree that his *books, commentaries, tracts*—in fine, *all his works, as they are published in the most correct manner from our Vatican* † *press* . . . be in the same way, as the works of other doctors who are held in repute, cited, adduced, and brought forward when the occasion shall require, not only privately, but publicly, in seminaries, academies, schools, colleges, in lessons, disputations, interpretations, addresses, discourses, and all other ecclesiastical studies and Christian exercises. To no person, therefore, is it allowed to infringe, or by rash adventure to contravene, this page of our constitution, enrolment, act, statute, mandate, concession, relaxation, indulgence, admonition, and will. But if any shall presume to attempt this (opposition) let him know that he will incur the displeasure of Almighty God, and of the blessed Peter and Paul, his apostles."

This authorized Vatican edition,‡ as we have before said, contains the "Psalter of the Blessed Virgin" in full;§ and if Popes Sixtus V., Gregory XVI., and Pius

* The Lady Psalter of Bonaventura is over and over again quoted as his by *St. Alphonso Liguori* in his "Glories of Mary," as may be seen by any one who takes up the book.—See the French edition, Paris, 1832 (for which we are much indebted to a friend and correspondent), pp. 268, 270, 273, 274, 276, 288, 291, 328, &c., &c. We are informed, on good authority, that the "Psalter," and Liguori's "Glories of Mary," are the most frequently used devotional books at Rome; and those who are in the habit of visiting Italian families seldom enter a house without seeing them.

† J. A. Fabricii Bibliotheca Latina Media et Infimæ Ætatis, tom. i., p. 253; Patavii, 1754; Robert Card. *Bellarmin* de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis, p. 201; Lugduni, 1613; *Philip Labbe* de Scriptoribus Eccl. R. Bellarm. tom. vii., p. 448; Venetiis, 1714; *Natalis Alexander* Historia Ecclesiastica, p. 143, tom. vii. Paris, 1714. One passage exists in Natalis Alexander which is not referred to by the Rev. Alban Butler, which speaks of the Psalter as being the production of *either* St. Bonaventura or some other *pious* man. Even in that passage he by no means asserts it to be "falsely ascribed to Bonaventura, or unworthy of his name;" on the contrary, he speaks of it as "an exercise of *skill and piety*," which he would scarcely have done if he had considered it a spurious work, unworthy of Bonaventura. This passage occurs not in Sæc. xiii., vol. vii., under the title Bonaventura, but in one of the dissertationes annexed to Sæc. v., vol. v., p. 851. Paris Ed., 1714.

‡ Replique a la response du Roy de la Grand Bretagne. Paris, 1620. Page 274.

† See Bibliotheca Eccl. Hamburg, 1718. Page 113.

* We should, perhaps, add here, that the nameless editor of the Venetian edition of 1751-1756, in his preface, p. 121, also tries to discredit the Psalter on the ground that it is "attributes praises to the Virgin which are due to God alone," but he yet prints the work in full, tom. 13, p. 232, with the following predatory statement, expressly asserting that Bonaventura composed it—"Suppono opusculum cui titulus est Psalterium B. Virginis antiquitus tantum Davidici Psalterii—*Sanctus Bonaventura* composuit." That the editor of this Venetian edition is held in light esteem by some eminent Roman Catholic divines of the present day, may be seen from the recent work of Bishop Ullathorne on the Immaculate Conception, p. 294, in which, after citing the second sermon of St. Bonaventura, on the Blessed Virgin, he says—"In the Venice edition of 1756, a doubt of its genuineness is raised, but on no other ground than that it asserts the Immaculate Conception. But no one acquainted with the saint's peculiar style and method, can, I think, doubt of its being from the pen of the seraphic doctor." Yet, the Rev. J. Waterworth, a Roman Catholic priest, in his Correspondence with the Rev. J. Venn asserts (though upon what other ground than that of present convenience, we cannot see) that this Venetian edition is the only critical one; a rather hasty assertion, considering the immense pains taken by Cardinal Sarnano and Pope Sixtus V. to make the great Vatican edition a complete and correct one. Where, however, authorities like Dr. Ullathorne and Mr. Waterworth differ so widely as to the power of infallibility of the Venetian editor, of whose very name we are ignorant, we may well assume that no great weight is to be attached to a mere opinion based upon no *historical* evidence whatever.

† An attempt has been made to make the world believe that this refers to a previous Vatican edition, which may not have contained the Psalter; but we can trace no mention whatever of any earlier edition printed at the Vatican; and as it was Pope Sixtus V. himself who erected the fine printing-office near the Vatican, which goes by that name, we think no one will believe that in this epistle Sixtus referred to any other edition than *his own*, though the printing of it was not completed for some years afterwards. Why Pope Sixtus should have thought fit to ratify, under an anathema, a work while in the press, and not have waited till it was actually published, we cannot pretend to explain with certainty; but he cannot be supposed to have done so till his "imprimatur" was affixed to the copy or MSS. from which the corrected edition was in the course of being printed; and the reasonable inference is, that the Decretal Epistle was simultaneous with that "imprimatur."

‡ Sixti V. justa diligentissime emendata.

§ The testimony of the Vatican editors ought, we think, to have set the question at rest; for they assure us, that they threw into the *Appendix* all the works *about the genuineness of which there was any doubt*, and that Bonaventura wrote many works not mentioned by Trithemius, which they published from the Vatican press; see preface to tom. vi.—"Quos vero de nonnullis opusculis, controvertitur, Bonaventuræ sint necne, ea, ut superioribus certis ab incertis, statim post quartum partem in appendicem redegimus." That appendix is given in the seventh volume, page 646, and is thus headed—"Appendix ad septimum tomum operum S. Bonaventuræ complectens ea opuscula de quibus an sint S. Bonaventuræ controversum est, et nonnulla alia quorum subjiciuntur indices." The

IX., treated it as genuine, who is Alban Butler that he should presume to dispute it, and that on no better authority than a false reference to respectable writers, who never said anything like what he imputes to them?

We shall probably take occasion to refer to "the Lady Psalter" again; but whatever it contains, one thing, at least, is plain, that we were perfectly justified in stating that the attempt to exonerate Bonaventura from its authorship, or the Roman Catholic Church from its adoption, is a perfectly futile one. *We* attach, indeed, but little importance to the question, who was the author of it; the latter question is the only really important one; and, until the Church of Rome repudiates what she has so often sanctioned and allowed to be circulated under the respectable name of one of her canonized saints, we think the evidence we have given is conclusive, that she is responsible for the sentiments contained in it.

THE ABBE LABORDE AT ROME.

WE presented our readers, in a recent number, with an important letter from the Abbé Laborde, a distinguished Roman Catholic priest in Paris, addressed to the present Pope, in August, 1854, some months prior to the dogmatic decree of 8th December last, protesting in very solemn and eloquent language, on behalf of himself and many other French priests and faithful persons of both sexes who agreed with him, against the danger and impolicy of adding a new dogma to the faith once delivered to the saints; proving most conclusively, at the same time, that the new doctrine is utterly unsupported by Holy Scripture, and contrary to the well-known sentiments of the Fathers from the earliest times.

The Abbé followed up this timely remonstrance, in which there can be little doubt that he was supported by his metropolitan, the Archbishop of Paris (who was one of the dissenting bishops at Rome), by actually undertaking a personal visit to Rome, on a mission from his brethern in France who concurred in his sentiments, and has since published a deeply-interesting and graphic narrative of the treatment he experienced in that city, which, as we think our readers will consider it instructive in the highest degree, we shall give at length. The pamphlet is entitled, "Narrative and Memoir of the Opponents of the Novel Dogma of the Immaculate Conception, by the Abbé Laborde, of Paris," and is published in French by E. Dentu, Palais Royal, Galerie D'Orleans 13.*

"I. I arrived in Rome on the 16th November, 1854. There were then but few bishops there; but they were arriving every day. By the letters they had received from those who were on the way, or who intended to set out, they expected they should have about two hundred. They did not know then what they should do with them: whether they should have an assembly, or what they should propose to them.

"The Bull containing the definition was drawn up, completed, and ready to be published on the 8th December. On the 20th of November they convened the bishops who were present to conferences, without regard to those who were on the way. They ought, however, to have waited, according to ecclesiastical regulations; and they would undoubtedly have done so, if they had attached importance to these conferences. They gave to the bishops three cardinals as presidents, of whom the first was the Cardinal Brunelli. It appeared that what caused these assemblies, were the complaints of some bishops, who would not take the trouble to come so far merely to hear a reading. They continued until the 26th—that is to say, they had in all, five, or, at most, six meetings. The particulars of what passed have remained secret; but it is certain they declared to the bishops that the Pope reserved to himself alone the whole definition, direct or indirect, as well as the question of seasonableness, and that they permitted them to discuss only as to the form.

"II. For my part, during the first days after my arrival, Providence led me into connection with persons, who by their position, rank, and station, knew all, and were able to give me, regarding matters that might be divulged, the most accredited documents. I learned also some very useful particulars during some favourable opportunities which I enjoyed.

"III. As soon as I observed the assemblies had commenced, I drew up, on the 22nd November, a petition requesting to be heard. I finished it, and double signed it, and dispatched it directly by post (for I had no other means) to our holy Father the Pope, and to the cardinal president of the assemblies. The petition is as follows:—

"'To our holy Father the Pope, Pius IX., and the Bishops assembled.

"'PETITION.

"'M. the Abbé Laborde (of Lectoure), in his own name, and that of many priests and faithful Catholics of Paris, requests to be admitted in order to unfold and prove the following *theses*, in opposition to the proposed definition of a new dogma of Faith, of the Immaculate Conception of the holy Virgin:—

"'1. "The Doctrine of the Church is that, which having been taught by Jesus Christ, or given by inspiration of the Holy Spirit to the apostles, has been preached by the same apostles, and has come from them to us in succession."—*Council of Trent.*

"'2. In the Church Catholic, the rule of faith is, that which is contained in the Scriptures, and transmitted, as of faith, by tradition, which, passing by the Fathers, returns again to the apostles.

"'3. The Church does not create new dogmas of faith.

"'4. It is a sin to decree new dogmas of faith in the Church; it is a sin to receive them.

"'5. The Church is infallible in her decisions on matters of faith; but, whether she decides in a council, or without a council, there are certain essential rules, in the absence of which the decree has neither the force of law, nor any effect upon the conscience.

"'6. The doctrine of the Immaculate Conception is in the Church but a novel opinion, which is not contained in the Scriptures, and has not come from the apostles by the course of tradition.

"'7. In all that has been hitherto done in order to arrive at the adoption of the Immaculate Conception as a dogma of faith, the ecclesiastical regulations have not been observed.

"'8. In the Bull which requested the advice of the bishops, taken each in detail, the question has been proposed in an equivocal form.

"'9. A great number of the bishops answered without any examination of the matter, and it is not proved canonically that the question has been examined, as was necessary, by any of them.

"'10. The bishops did not give their sentence, as judges of the faith, but their mere opinion, as individuals.

"'11. The mere opinion of the bishops has not been unanimous.

"'12. Four or five, at least, answered in the negative.

"'13. A certain number gave an uncertain and evasive answer; and the circumstances require that these should be counted as opposed to the decree.

"'14. A certain number of the bishops made answer to the Pope, *that the clergy and faithful of their dioceses united with them* to request of the holy Father a definition; while, in fact, neither the clergy nor the faithful had been consulted; while also there were in their dioceses some of the well-informed people, and of respectable priests, who did not admit the Immaculate Conception, even as an opinion, and that threats and violence were employed towards these latter, to prevent them from making known their minds.

"'15. There was also a moral pressure on the bishops themselves, at least in France, by the intrigues and secret practices of a strong party, assisted by a violent newspaper, against which they feared to compromise themselves, and were not free to speak.

"'16. There is reason to believe that if the matter had been freely examined and discussed in a council, according to the practice of the Church, the reasons of those who were opposed to the definition would have been made known to the others, and that they would have acquiesced in their opinion.

"'17. The College of Cardinals has not been consulted on the matter, and the decree had been made and prepared without their acquiescence.

"'18. The undersigned priest, as much in his own name, as in the name of the priests and faithful who sent him to Rome, requests of his Holiness, Pius IX, and the assembled bishops, to be admitted at a convenient time to develop the above articles, and to present the proofs.

"'19. The same undersigned priest declares, as much in his own name, as in the name of his constituents, that, if it is refused him to be heard at a convenient time, he will believe, and they will believe it right to add this to the other reasons for the nullity of the future decree, that they were not permitted to be heard.

"'Completed, and double signed in Rome, in the Hotel Minerva, the 22nd November, 1854.

"'*L'Abbé Laborde (of Lectoure), Priest of the Diocese of Auch, resident in Paris.*'

"On the 30th of November, I was obliged, in case of accident, and for a reason which will appear, to attach to this document the following form:—

"'A third copy of the present petition, and the rough draught of the same, were on last night, 29th November, seized at my house by the Lieutenant of Police of the Cardinal Vicar. I have been obliged to restore it from memory, as it appears in this document. I declare it to be as like as possible to the original.

"'Made, certified, and signed in Rome, in the Hotel Minerva, the 30th November, 1854.

"'*L'Abbé Laborde (of Lectoure), opponent of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, in my own name and the name of those who sent me for this purpose.*'

"IV. In answer to this petition, I received a secret order to leave Rome as soon as possible. This order was given to me on the 27th, in a very retired apartment in the *Segreteria*, Place St. Augustine, whither I had been drawn on the occasion of the request I had made, on the 24th, to say Mass. It was M. Ternassi, a canon, secretary general of the cardinal vicar, who gave it to me on the part of our holy Father the Pope himself: that was very explicit.

"V. I was not allowed to surrender myself on such an order; so I did not surrender.

"VI. In the morning of the 29th November, from half-past ten to eleven o'clock, the lieutenant of the police of conscience arrived in my apartment, by order of the cardinal vicar, with agents and witnesses, to effect a visitation of my residence, and to seize my two pamphlets—'*The belief in the Immaculate Conception cannot become an article of Faith,*' *and the* '*Letter to our Holy Father, the Pope, Pius IX.,*' &c.

"I had presented some copies of these writings, adapted to instruct the mind, to the bishops in company with whom I found myself in the ship during the voyage, or to their vicars-general. Certain of these prelates had accepted them; others had asked for them in Rome even during the conferences. I had given them to some priests and laymen. In fine, as it was reported at the conclusion of the bishop's conferences, that the following week would be devoted to the conferences of cardinals, I had addressed the remaining copies, by post, to the members of the Sacred College, who were esteemed as the most influential and the most learned. I had retained one copy for myself, in case I should require it. It was then seized by the Commissary of the Police.

"That officer tried much to ascertain from me how many copies I had brought to Rome, and the names of all those to whom I had addressed or distributed them. I told him the number of the pamphlets, as far as I was myself aware; but I refused to name any of those who had them. I told him I did not wish to compromise any one. He replied that I would not expose them to any trouble; that they only desired to seize the books.

"One may thus perceive with what party spirit, with what preference, with what desire to check the truth they prepared themselves for the definition of the new dogma. While with such care they suppressed my writings, they posted and reposted every day in large characters, upon all the walls of Rome, the book of Father Passaglin.

"VII. Nevertheless, the Lieutenant of the Police of the Cardinal Vicar did not confine himself to seizing these two writings: his agents rifled my furniture, my portfolio, my clothes, the very bed. They took all that they could find of manuscript, and all the books and printed documents, whether of devotion, or of controversy, that they met with, excepting my Breviary. They did not fail to lay their hands upon the copy of the petition which I had made for myself, and which, by a just apprehension of the result, I had concealed as well as I could: which proves that they searched for it. They would not leave with me even the first composition covered with erasures.

"VIII. An important occurrence is again connected with this seizure. On the evening of the 28th, on returning to the hotel, I had found a printed invitation to present myself anew on the 29th, at ten o'clock, at the Secretariat of the Cardinal Vicar. Thinking they intended to issue an injunction more definite and immediate to depart, I had drawn up a protest against this violence, and proposed leaving it in the hands of the secretary. My desire to copy this document delayed me to the hour appointed. I was setting out, however, when the Lieutenant of Police entered.

"As soon as the object of his visit was announced, before I allowed him to proceed, I begged him to hear two words with his company. I said that I did not offer any resistance to exterior power, and had no reason to disguise anything; that I had come to Rome to acquit my conscience; that I opposed the new dogma which they proposed to decree, because I was certain it would be a great disaster to the Church; that this opposition was the sole cause of all these troubles; that I had already been proffered advice to leave the city; that I was at this moment on the point of going to the Secretariat, where I thought they were about to renew this order; that I had drawn up a protest intended for the secretary, and, by his interference, for the Cardinal Vicar and his Holiness; but that seeing this seizure, doubtless, superseded my appearance at the Secretariat, I protest here and lay my protest in the possession of the Lieutenant of the Cardinal Vicar, requesting it might have the same effect as at the Secretariat, and that it might be given to the proper authority. I immediately presented it open to the Commissary, in the presence of his rightful witnesses; he received it, and promised to deliver it, in his capacity of minister of the Cardinal Vicar. The protest is as follows:—

"'PROTEST of M. the Abbé Laborde (of Lectoure) committed in the presence of witnesses to the possession of the Lieutenant of Police of the Cardinal Vicar,* against the violence which has been done to M. Laborde, in the matter of his opposition to the new dogma of the Immaculate Conception.

"'1, the undersigned priest, commissioned to Rome by many priests and faithful Catholics of France, to watch the progress and the issue of the undertaking, as to the new dogma of faith of the Immaculate Conception of the Holy Virgin, and to request to be heard at a convenient time, as to the reasons which oppose the definition of this new faith, have seen, that instead of doing justice to the petition addressed by me to the rightful authorities, on the 22nd instant, for the aforesaid object, they have resorted to violence in desiring me to depart from Rome.

"'1. I protest against the irregularity of the notice given by M. Ternassi, Canon, Secretary in the *Segreteria del Vicariato*, between four walls and without writing, to depart from Rome as soon as possible, by reason of my opposition to the definition of a new dogma of faith of the Immaculate Conception of the Holy Virgin.

"'2. I declare that this present document shall remain as an authentic evidence that violence is one of the means employed in order to arrive at the pretended definition, which can have no other effect than to shake the foundations of the faith, and to kindle the flame of division in the Church.

"'3. I protest that I have a personal right as a Christian, as a priest, and as a theologian, to see how matters proceed in this affair; because, that this is of the last importance to my

Psalter is not in the Appendix. There is also a life of St. Bonaventura given at the commencement of vol. i. of his works, in which there is an express statement that St. Bonaventura did write the Psalter of the Virgin. It is as follows, Sect. vi., De Meditationibus contemplationibus et orationibus—"Beatissimam porro Dei genetricem, Mariam Virginem sibi patronam cœlestem delegit, et eximia pietate coluit; ideoque opuscula confecit, quibus ad ejus laudes ipse et ae et alios salutariter instruxit. Librum enim quod Mariale appellatur, et Speculum beatæ Virginis *Psalteriumque ejusdem Scripsit.*"

* We have taken the translation from the pamphlet of the Rev. Robert Maguire, entitled, "The Abbé Laborde in Rome; his Protest and Persecution."—Published by Seeley and Co., 54, Fleet-street, 1855.

* In the original it was, in the possession of M. Ternassi, Canon secretary in the *Segreteria del Vicariato* in Rome.

conscience and my faith, and that I require it for my future conduct.

"'4. I protest that I have the same right on behalf of the priests and the faithful, my constituents, because they have, in this weighty matter, the same interest as myself.

"'5. I protest that his Holiness, in his capacity of Vicar of Jesus Christ, the chief of the religion, and the spiritual father of all the faithful, cannot prevent my seeing the conduct and issue of this undertaking; my understanding the verdict of the decree, if there be one; and my demonstrating, as far as possible, the truth in that which is right, before he has done it himself: the opinions and the conscience of Christians are essentially free, and *the word of God is not bound*,* nor can they be enchained.

"'6. I declare that so far as concerns my body, I am at the disposal of his Holiness, as a king; that he can, in his sovereign capacity, have me arrested, imprisoned, or transported to the frontiers of his states; that on this point I offer no resistance; as also I will not submit except to violence, after the example of Jesus Christ.

"'7. As to what remains, I place myself under the protection of the French authority, and I commit myself for assistance against all violence to the General commanding for the Emperor in Rome.

"'8. I protest that since I have been in Rome, I have conducted myself as a peaceable citizen, and I have done nothing calculated to disturb the public security.

"'9. I declare that I demand an acknowledgment or *procès-verbal*, of the present protest from M. the Lieutenant of Police† in his capacity as such.

"'10. I declare that every refusal to receive this protest, and to give me an acknowledgment or *procès-verbal*, will be a new act of violence in this matter.

"'Made, and double signed in Rome, in the Hotel Minerva, and delivered in person to M. the Lieutenant of Police of the Cardinal Vicar,‡ effecting in my apartment the seizure of my books and papers, in the presence of witnesses, the 29th November, 1854.

"'*L'Abbé Laborde (of Lectoure), commissioned to Rome by many priests and faithful of Paris, for the matter of the Immaculate Conception.*'

"As the Commissary seized the copy of this protest which I had reserved for myself, and did not leave a vestige, I retraced it the same day from memory, and extended in case of accident, with a form similar to that which appeared after the petition, whereby I declared, as I do still declare, that it was, as far as possible, like the original.

"IX. Next day, 30th November, I received a notice to deliver myself immediately to the criminal tribunal of the Inquisition. The document is as follows:—

[ITALIAN ORIGINAL.]

"'The Vicariat, 30th Nov. 1854.

"'The undersigned authority officially requests Signor, the Abbé Laborde, to present himself before him immediately, this morning, at the Chancery of the Criminal Tribunal, situated in the Piazza St. Augustine, number 18, without fail.

"'Signed,

"'RAPHAELE NICALI.'

"I confess that this notice made me somewhat afraid. I was apprehensive lest they should retain me as a prisoner in the holy office if I should go. Under this reflection, I had determined not to surrender myself, but to retire into my apartment, expecting them to come and seek me, if they had any intention of seizing me. However, upon reflection that my non-appearance would wear the aspect of defiance, and attach, perhaps, some feature of wrong to my cause, I surrendered myself. I went, besides, to the French police and to the office of our Embassy, where I was reassured against the danger of imprisonment. I awaited, however, a charge in respect of orthodoxy: there was not any. They rehearsed to me the burden of the song already delivered—that I must go. The officer wrote something, I know not what, and just then turned to me, and, with an air severe enough, displaying three fingers, he said in Italian—'They give you three days; on the 3rd December you will begone, or you will go; do you understand?' I replied, 'perfectly; three days, and the 3rd of December.' I asked him if he would not give me the copy of that which he had written; he answered that that was not the custom. I do not criticise this mode of justice. If, perchance, it is equitable, it is also very profitable. To take advantage of proofs of other people's doings, just as they please, and to give none of what they do themselves, is the means employed to surprise others and secure themselves.

"X. On the 2nd December, I was invited to submit myself to the direction of the General of Police, of the first class. The clerk that I found there, assured me, with much consideration and kindness, that he was obliged to signify to me the order to depart, and that I was allowed three days to leave the Roman States. He said the order emanated from the Pope, and inquired whether I was disposed to fulfil it. I replied that such was not possible. I showed him my *permis* issued by the Roman police, quite *en regle*, and permitting my sojourn for three months. I told him I had positively done nothing calculated to disturb the public peace, and that it was thus very strange that the police should, notwithstanding, desire to expel me. He was not unaware of the reason of this course of conduct; he seemed to me to feel the odium of the task; and I have no doubt but that he would have conciliated, if he had possessed the power. He proceeded to consult with his superior. In fine, having returned, he said to me, 'You refuse, then?' I replied, 'I *refuse*.' He then asked what were my reasons. I set forth three in number—1. That my business in Rome was not finished; 2. That beside the visit to my apartment, and the seizure effected at my residence, there was the commencement of a process, the issue of which I had a right to know; that I could not leave as a culprit, who deemed himself fortunate in avoiding judgment by a hasty departure; that they ought, then, before giving orders for my departure, to make known that they had no cause to prosecute me, and, also, truly and honestly, to restore to me the effects which had been seized, or, if they supposed me blameworthy, to judge me in proper form; 3. That I could not go by sea without a vessel, and that thus, even if I were disposed to leave, that depended on the sailing of the ship in which I had already paid for my return.

"He said that he was bound to draw up a *procès-verbal*, in order to prove that he had discharged, with regard to me, the commission which he had received. I replied, that I asked no better. He then, accordingly, wrote a *procès-verbal*, importing that I had appeared before him: that he had signified the order to leave the Roman States in three days; that I had refused, for the reasons assigned above, and that he had translated these, as I found when he consulted me about the document, with the same force as that in which I had given them, so far as I could judge from the Italian which he read to me. He signed, and I signed.

"XI. I believe I ought to report all the particulars of this scene. The party would try to deceive, and to raise a suspicion that I had been expelled from Rome by force, for other reasons than that of my opposition to the new dogma; it was, then, important to render this pretext impossible.

"XII. I omit in this narrative many circumstances, curious in themselves, and such as ought to be known as the affairs which occur in Rome; but these are of but little importance in comparison with the serious subject which I have here to keep solely in view; I have reviewed them in the full narrative of my voyage to Rome, which I propose to present very soon to the public.

"XIII. I must be brief then. At six o'clock in the evening I entered the office of the Director of the general police; as he informed me that it was determined to make me leave that day, willingly or by force, I presented to him the following protest, and requested of him to give me the form:—

"'PROTEST.

"'I, the undersigned Roman Catholic priest and theologian, an opponent of the future dogma of the Immaculate Conception, for myself, and in behalf of a certain number of the priests and faithful of France, protest against the formal order and disposition of his Holiness our Holy Father, Pope Pius IX., communicated to me by the direction of the general of the police in Rome, at *Monte Citorio*, to leave Rome as soon as possible before the 8th December, on which day is to take place the decree concerning the aforesaid dogma, interesting to all Catholics.

"'I protest that in executing the said order of his Holiness, I do nothing but yield to force, and do depart but to avoid the noise of deeds of violence.

"'I protest against the retention by his Eminence the Cardinal Vicar of a portion of the effects seized at my residence by his Lieutenant of Police, and especially of the portfolio of my private papers.

"'I demand of the Director of the Police General, the form of the said protest.

"'Completed, the 6th December, 1854.

"'L'ABBÉ LABORDE.'

"XIV. The Director read this protest; he had it read also by the chief of his officials, who had come to act as interpreter; for he did not speak French, and I did not speak Italian. They both said they could not receive it. However, the Director-General was unwilling to resort to violence. Seeing his hesitation, I said to him—'You have three courses to take.' 'Ah! let us see,' said he. 'They are these: either to allow me to leave of my own will; or to receive the protest, and I depart to-morrow of myself; or to have recourse to violence.' 'Let us examine them. The first expedient appears impossible, the second equally so.' 'Ah, well,' I said to him, 'the third is at your service. See my Breviary, which, when coming here, I took with me; I am at your service; you have nothing to do but to arrest me this very moment, if you deem it right.' 'No,' he remarked, 'I do not wish to have you imprisoned in Rome; you are a Frenchman, and the French nation we esteem and greatly love. I will escort you to Civita-Vecchia with the respect that is due to you.' 'I observed that it was rather late for to-day; for it was already past four o'clock.' 'True,' he said, 'then it must be to-morrow.' 'In that case,' said I, 'I withdraw; to-morrow you will conduct me whither you propose.'

"XIV. As to myself, the following day I did everything as usual. As it was a fast day in Rome, Thursday, the 7th December, I arranged to dine at noon, which approached; but about half-past eleven o'clock, a soldier, disguised as a civilian, came to arrest me in my apartment, by order of the Director. He told me to prepare my portmanteau; I did so. In coming down stairs he demanded the key of my apartment, which I had locked; I gave it to him. I carried my cane and my umbrella. The hall of the hotel was full of people—these were so many witnesses of my departure; and my gaoler placed the key of my chamber in a desk, advising me to deliver my luggage to the person who should [illegible] instead of him to take it. I was conducted to an [illegible] of the police to wait for a carriage. When I was *ready* I accosted to company with a *gendarme*. He, also, was dressed as a civilian.

"XVI. We did not arrive at Civita-[illegible] till eight o'clock, because of the [illegible] weather. It was ten o'clock when we passed through the [illegible]. All the bells of the town blended their [illegible] in harmony, and artillery thundered forth the announcement of the hour of the ceremony [the Immaculate Conception]. I was conducted, in view of the people, first to the police; then, passing again through the multitude, the *gendarme* and an agent of Civita, carrying in their hand an open order, conveyed me to the harbour. Midway they hailed a boat; in which they placed my effects, and then myself. This boat brought me alongside the *Saint Pierre*, a pontifical brig lying in harbour. It was at this moment gorgeously decked out, and all the colours flaunted in the breeze.

"XVII. I was then consigned as a prisoner in this vessel; Providence, without doubt, willing it, that my presence should be there to the last, as an [illegible] protest. Less favoured than was St. Paul, when a captive in Pagan Rome, I continued in the floating prison four entire days, without being able to set foot on shore, not even to go with a guard to hear Mass on the day of the Conception, and the Sunday following. The *Capri*, which was to convey me back to Marseilles, arrived on Tuesday morning, 12th December, to start again at four o'clock. At a quarter to four the Commissary of Police came, in full dress, to take me in a boat, and transferred me in view of all the passengers, to the Neapolitan vessel, whereupon I, at length, regained my liberty.

"I have been obliged to report successively all these things that concerned me; I now return to other transactions.

(To be continued.)

* 2 Tim. ii. 9.

† It was in the original, from M. Ternassi, Canon, Secretary.

‡ It was in the original, to M. Ternassi, Canon, Secretary to the *Segretaria del Vicariato*.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We are requested by Mr. Curry to put our friends again in mind that their subscriptions are payable in advance. We have already explained the difficulty of making special applications.

We have again to apologise to several of our subscribers for postponing [illegible].

To diminish the chance of [illegible], all letters should be for[illegible] by the Cashier of the week.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville st.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal, which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, MAY, 1855.

In the present age of daring hierarchical assumption on the one hand, and pusillanimous servility and truckling to expediency on the other, we think it truly refreshing to watch the course of a noble and independent mind, like that of the gifted and intrepid Abbé LABORDE, of Paris, honestly, and without regard to personal consequences, combating for what he believes to be the truth, against innovations which he holds to be, not only profane novelties, but fraught with danger to the Church of which he is a member.

In the preface to the work from which we have given copious extracts in another column, entitled "Relation et Memoire des Opposants au Nouveau Dogme de L'Immaculée Conception et la Bulle Ineffabilis," the worthy Abbé of Lectoure thus describes his feelings and his position in taking the course he has done at this critical period:—

"I freely confess, had I consulted the laws of a certain kind of prudence, I should have been more guarded than to have proceeded as I have done. Such prudence, however, instructs man to arrange on every occasion so as to be able, whatever may happen, to find himself in agreement with the stronger party; it tells him he must, doubtless, love truth and justice, but only up to a certain point; that it is not wise, for instance, to exhibit zeal for true doctrine so far as to commit oneself with those in power, more especially so as to lose the favour of superiors, who have in their power to do you much good, or to do you much harm; not only, by not promoting you to honours and ecclesiastical benefices, but also by depriving you of what you already have. I have had experience of this prudence; but I have discovered—and I give all the glory to God—that this pretended wisdom has positively no other first principle or final end than the interests of this world, and,

consequently, that it is nothing else than that which is called, in Scripture language, 'the wisdom of the flesh,' which the apostle declares distinctly to be 'enmity against God.'"

"It is, then, according to the laws of another wisdom I have taken my part in this question. I said to myself—'the interests of the truth, especially the interests of God himself, ought to be kept in view by the Christian, much more by the minister of Jesus Christ, that God Man, who came into the world to teach us to love the truth, to serve and defend it.'

"Besides, it cannot be denied, that all the great men that religion has rendered illustrious regulated their wisdom, under similar circumstances, according to this principle."

"When there arose in their day any novelty, or any doctrinal dispute appeared, they went straight to Scripture and tradition, as the source of truth. There they faithfully sought the truth, and when they found it, they declared themselves for it with distinctness, and set themselves frankly for its defence against all those who assailed it, without exception. They doubted not nor did they hesitate; they neither dissembled nor kept silence; they varied not. They were not doubled-faced—that is, ever ready to say, sometimes 'yes,' and sometimes 'no,' according to times and circumstances. They did not consider that to be good and true in Rome, which they had found to be false and evil in Paris; they were always the same, because they loved the truth which changes not.

"It was this wisdom, this firm attachment to principles, this conduct ever consistent, that made them not men of luxury and happiness according to the judgment of this world, but great saints and great men—a St. Cyprian, a St. Athanasius, a St. Ambrose, a St. Basil, a St. Chrysostom, a St. Augustine, a St. Gregory Nazianzen."

"It is under such characteristics as distinguished themselves, that the holy Fathers describe the true Catholic."

"Can it be, then, that we are to-day so far from the mind of the holy Fathers, that their wisdom passes among us for folly! Yes. We are to such a degree in that state foreseen by the prophet, wherein evil is called good, and good is called evil, where darkness takes the name of light, and light receives the name of darkness, that the picture which the holy Fathers traced for us of a true and free Catholic is regarded as the description of a heretic. In fact, attach yourselves, as the holy Fathers did, to the study and knowledge of Scripture and tradition; appeal with them to antiquity against novelty; plead for principles against the abuse of a universal laxity; do but determine following the counsel of the apostle, to hold fast that which you have received from the beginning; you have the leprosy of individual opinion, you are charged with the heresy of private judgment, you are *Protestant!* If you wish to be Catholic, abjure your reason and your conscience, leave there your holy Fathers, cast aside the Word of God, make yourselves *blind*, and devote your whole life to the danger of being led by others as blind as yourselves."

We have been induced by these passages from the Abbé Laborde to look into the works of some of the Fathers to whom he has referred, and think we cannot do better than present our readers with a few extracts from their writings, which will show whether *they* deemed it a duty *blindly* to follow ecclesiastical *authority*, or whether they would themselves have acted like the Abbé Laborde, had such an emergency arisen in their day, and a new dogma, like that of December last, been urged on their acceptance.

Now, what do these great Fathers exhort their readers to do?

Hear first the great St. Basil.

St. Basil says—"The hearers that are instructed in the Scriptures must *examine the doctrine of their teachers;* they must receive those things which are *agreeable to Scripture*, and reject those things which are contrary to it."*

Hear, also, what the great St. Cyprian says—"That *Christ alone* is to be heard, the Father witnessed from Heaven. We are not, therefore, to regard what others before us thought, but what He that was above all, Christ, first did, for we are not to follow the custom of men, but the truth of God."†

Hear, also, what Clemens Alexandrinus says—"That the *standard* by which things are to be *examined* is not the testimony of men, but the word of the Lord. *We do not believe the assertions of men*, they must not only say, but *prove*, and that, *too, from the Scriptures.*"*

Hear, next, St. Chrysostom—"Let us not carry about the opinion of the multitude, but *let us examine things.* Is it not absurd, that, when you are to receive money, you do not trust other men, but *examine it yourselves;* but when you are to judge of things, then to be drawn away by other men's opinions? And this is the worse fault in you, because you have the Scriptures." "You have an exact standard and rule of all things—I beseech you do not regard what this or that man thinks, but inquire all things of the Scriptures."†

Can any testimony be stronger than those passages from Clemens Alexandrinus, St. Basil, St. Cyprian, and St. Chrysostom, that, in their times, the Church of Christ did not require the faithful to submit, *blindly and implicitly*, to mere *authority*, but encouraged and enjoined their hearers to *examine* into the *doctrine of their teachers*, and avail themselves of that *exact standard and rule* which the Holy Scriptures supplied them with, to test the accuracy and truth of what was told them, and see thereby whether they were following the "customs of men," or the "truth of God." If the modern doctrines of the Church and Court of Rome had then been known or believed, is it possible that such inconsistent doctrines could have been cotemporaneously proposed by such eminent Fathers as those above cited?

We may here add the testimony of St. Augustine, who, in speaking of the Holy Scriptures, in contrast with all other writings, says that—"Those are to be read with a *necessity of believing*, but these with a *liberty of judging.*‡ That which is confirmed by the authority of the Holy Scriptures is, without doubt, to be believed; but for other witnesses and testimonies, you may receive them or reject them as you shall judge they have more or less weight."§ And again, when he was pressed with the authority of six or seven of the Greek Fathers, he thus answers—"I have learned to give this honour and reverence to the books of Scripture alone, to believe there is no error in them; but as for others, how learned and godly soever they be, I so read them that I do not believe anything to be true, because they *thought* so, but because they *proved* it so to be by the Scriptures."‖

One would almost think it was one of the Reformers and not Augustine that wrote those passages, so identical are they with the Protestant doctrines of the Reformation.

Perhaps, however, we may feel less surprised at St. Augustine speaking thus, if we find some of the Popes themselves holding similar language. What shall we say to the following striking passage from no less an authority than *Pope Gregory the Great*, himself a saint of the Roman Catholic Church—"The Church," says he, "which has been trained in the school of humility, does not command with *authority*, but *persuade by reason*, her children whom she believes to be in error, to obey what she has taught them."¶

Under such guidance as the unanimous counsel of such eminent saints and fathers as Clement of Alexandria, St. Basil, St. Cyprian, St. Chrysostom, St. Augustine, and St. Gregory the Great, we would earnestly counsel our intelligent Roman Catholic countrymen, rather to follow the example of the Abbé Laborde, and attach themselves, as these holy fathers did, to the intelligent study and knowledge of Scripture than to abjure their reason and conscience, and casting aside equally the exhortations of the Holy Fathers and the Word of God, blindly devote their lives and peril their salvation by implicitly giving themselves up to be led by others who, for all they know, may be more blind even than themselves.

THE LIFE OF A PRIEST.

(Continued from page 28.)

The next subject of interest which engaged my serious attention, and ought to occupy the minds of all those who have the eternal welfare of the human family at heart is—Why the cup is withheld from the laity in the administration of the Lord's Supper. I find very weighty reasons why the people should partake of the cup, without the semblance of one for withholding it. Not to receive the communion in both kinds is contrary to the express injunctions of our Saviour, to the commands of the Popes of the early ages, and a wide departure from the practice of the primitive Church. Christ, at the institution of the sacrament, took bread and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said—"Take, eat, this is my body;" and he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying—"*Drink ye all of it.*"—St. Matt. xxvi., 26, 27. St. Mark also says—"And he took the cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them; and *they all drank of it.*"—Chap. xiv. 23. St. Paul, in the first epistle to the Corinthians (chap. xi. 28), says—"Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread *and drink of that cup.*" From these words of the apostle, which were addressed to all the Corinthians, it is evident the people received the sacrament in *both* kinds in those days, and from the hands of the apostles themselves. The same apostle says, in the same chapter, xi. 26.—"As often as you shall eat this bread, *and drink this chalice*, you shall show the death of the Lord till he come." "Amen, amen, I say unto you, except you eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and *drink* his blood, you shall not have life in you. Whosoever eateth my flesh and *drinketh* my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up the last day."—St. John vi., 53, 54. It appears to me to be not only a direct infringement, but a studied violation of Christ's injunction, to withhold the cup from the laity. There are not more simple or positive texts of Scripture in the Bible than those I have quoted; and the precept of partaking of the cup appears to be even more stringent, and more urgent than that of receiving the other moiety of the blessed sacrament. Every reflecting person must observe that the word *all* was exclusively annexed to the participation of the wine only; no doubt because our blessed Lord foresaw that, in course of time, the Church of Rome would withdraw the cup from the people; and, therefore, was more urgent in his command about the reception of the wine than of the bread.

Pope Gelasius I., and Pope Leo the Great, ordered the wine to be given to the laity, and pronounced it *sacrilege* to withhold the cup from the people, as you have already noticed in your publication.* Cardinal Bona, a man of great eminence in the Church of Rome, says that communion in both kinds was given to the people for fourteen hundred years, until the Council of Constance, in the commencement of the fifteenth century, prevented the use of wine, and thereby reduced the sacrament of the Lord's Supper to *half* a sacrament, which is no communion according to the intention of Christ and the practice of the apostles and the primitive Church. But this defect has been removed by the Reformation, and the cup has been restored to the people by the Church Catholic of England.

The Church of Rome has been driven to resort to a very flimsy argument to support her practice on this point; and endeavours to get out of the difficulty by what she fancifully calls the principle of *concomitance*. She says that when you receive the *bread*, you receive not only the body, but also the *blood* of our Saviour; and, therefore, it is not requisite to receive the wine. In answer to this argument, I say, did the Fathers of Constance know better how to administer the sacrament of the Last Supper than Christ, who instituted it, or the primitive Church that followed the injunction of Christ, and who, wishing to enforce his command, threatened an eternal commination against all those who refused to participate of the communion in both kinds. If it were proper to resort to a philosophical argument to explain a clear Scriptural injunction, I might say, Christ would not have acted contrary to that great principle—"Entia non sunt multiplicanda sine necessitate;" and, therefore, would not have used both bread and wine, if one or the other was sufficient for his purpose.

Here is a manifest departure from a practice of the

---

* In Moralia. Regula 72, in initio—"Οτι δεῖ τῶν ἀκροατῶν τὰς πεπαιδευμένας τὰς γραφὰς δοκιμαζειν τα παρα τῶν διδασκάλων λεγομενα, καὶ τὰ μὲν συμφωνα ταῖς γραφαῖς δεχεσθαι, τὰ δε αλλότρια αποβαλλειν."—Bened. Ed. (Paris, 1722), tom. ii., p. 306.

† Cyprian Epistola 63 ad Cœcilium.—"Quod Christus debeat solus audiri, Pater etiam de cœlo contestatur. . . Quare si solus Christus audiendus, non debemus attendere quid aliua noa facieadum esse putaverit, aed quid, qui ante omnes est, Christus prior fecerit, neque enim hominis consuetudinem sequa oportet, sed Dei veritatem."—Bened. Ed. Paris, 1726, p. 108.

* Clem. Alex., Lib. 7 Stromatum, pp. 890-1. Oxon, 1715.

† "μὴ τὰς τῶν πολλων δόξας περιφὲρωμεν, ἀλλα τὰ πράγματα εξετάσωμεν. . . . γραφὴν ἔχετε ἀκριβῆ ζύγον ἁπάντων καὶ γνωμόνα καὶ κάνονα. ἀφέντες τί τῶ δεῖνι καί τῶ δεῖνι δοκεῖ περὶ τινων, παρὰ τῶν γραφῶν ταῦτα πάντα πυνθανεσθε."—S. Chrysost., in 2 Cor. vi., Hom. xiii., Tom. x., p, 631. Paris, 1839.

‡ August. contra Faustum., l. xi., c. 5.—Ed. Ben., tom. 8, col. 221.

§ Epist. 147 ad Paulinam., Ben. Ed., tom., ii., col. 475.

‖ Tom. ii., col. 190, Epist. 82. ad. Hieronymum.

¶ "Quia vero Sancta Eccleaia ex magisterio humilitatia inatituta, recta quæ errantibus dicit, non quasi ex *auctoritate* præcipit, aed ex *ratione* persuadet."—Opera. Benedict. Ed. Paris 1705, tom i., lib. viii., in caput vii., Beati Job, cap. ii., aect. 3, p. 242.

* Catholic Layman, Vol. i., p. 63.

Church that is coeval with Christianity itself, and an usurpation of wisdom superior to infinite wisdom, that instituted the sacrament in both kinds. You have shown in the article to which I have referred, that St. Jerome, St. Basil, and St. Chrysostom (to say nothing of other Fathers of the Church) distinctly recognise communion in both kinds, without any difference between the priest and the people.

I may be permitted to deviate a little from the subject in question to inquire how it is possible that the Council of Constance which decreed, A.D. 1414, that the communion should be given to the laity in one kind only (and which, I contend, is no communion *at all*), could have been influenced in her decisions by the unerring influence of the Holy Ghost? The Council of Constance was guilty of atrocious crimes. It deliberately engaged to respect the safe conduct given by the Emperor Sigismond to John Huss, the Professor of Prague, and his friend, Jerome, and notwithstanding, in violation of public faith and of their sacred promise, both these good men were detained prisoners until they were examined by the Council, pronounced heretics, and *burnt alive* by that very assembly. Jerome and Huss were both men of unblemished character, whose only crime was that they inveighed, with all the eloquence of enlightened reformers, against the vice and immorality of the Pontiffs, the Court of Rome, the bishops, and clergy, and the monks, which was a common practice of that day, and daily done, even in the Council of Constance itself.

Is it possible to view this conduct as anything but treachery and murder? No extenuation can be attempted; and, to make the matter worse, the whole proceedings were sanctioned by Poggio, the Pope's legate; though he is recorded to have said, upon that melancholy occasion—"These men spoke like ancient Romans, and died with the constancy of Socrates." Yet, this is the execrable council, who, after having assisted at high Mass, and themselves partaken of the holy communion, passed a summary law, by which the entire human family, except the priesthood, were deprived of their birthright, and the inestimable blessings that accompany the due participation of the sacred mysteries; but, no sooner had the Papal trumpet proclaimed from the summit of Adrian's Mole, that the communion which has been given hitherto in both kinds, according to the injunction of Christ, should, in future, be administered in one kind only, than a nerve of exquisite sensibility was touched, which thrilled in every bosom, from the shores of the Baltic to the banks of the Euphrates, and wars were kindled in Bohemia and elsewhere, which long raged with unabated fury.

Having thus, in the way I have very imperfectly described, examined, according to the advice of St. Paul, the doctrine of the Church, I could not but see clearly that the Church of Rome was *not* the first Church, "the matron and mistress of all other Churches," as alleged by her advocates, and that she had no pretence either to greater holiness or more freedom from error than any other Church within the Christian pale. I became also convinced that there was no sacrifice at the Last Supper, and what is called the sacrifice of the Mass is a mere delusion, introduced into that Church to magnify the power of the priesthood, and enable them to traffic upon the souls of mankind. I found, also, that the alleged change of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ is not supported by either Scripture or the authority of the early Fathers, while it is perfectly repugnant to our reason, and to the combined testimony of our senses. I found that purgatory and jubilees are not proved or recognised by the Word of God, but taken from the works of heathen mythologists. In the course of this inquiry I also found that the Church of Rome was not infallible any more than the Church of Antioch, which was certainly founded by St. Peter, and yet failed. I found, also, that auricular confession was not introduced in the practice of the Church of Rome until the Pontificate of Innocent III.; that the compulsory celibacy of the clergy, which I cannot but think a monstrous deviation from the divine and natural law, meriting the stern reprobation of mankind, is unsupported by the sanction either of the Old or New Scripture, and was forced upon a reluctant Church by the tyrannical Gregory VII. The Pope's supremacy I could only find as an usurped authority, unknown to the early Churches, which were all small federative republics, united together by a common faith, and the hope of a happy resurrection; and, lastly, the withdrawal of the ecclesiastical cup from the laity, by the Council of Constance, I found equally contrary to the injunction of Christ, the teaching of the apostles, and the practice of the Catholic Church until the beginning of the 15th century.

After having bestowed six months' labour, in compliance with St. Paul's precept, in examining carefully, and without prejudice, the principal tenets of that Church to which I belonged, and endeavoured, according to the text of the Word of God, to prove its genuineness, I found the Church of Rome light in the balance, and determined upon the spot to quit a Church which I see clearly has all the signs of apostacy about her, and which has established a temporal system, repugnant to the Gospel, and subversive of the vital principles of the Christian religion. I obeyed at once that striking exhortation contained in the Book of Revelations—"Come out of her my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." I call upon you, my Roman Catholic brethren, to observe how signally manifest the finger of God has been in my conversion. If the landed proprietor, with whom I usually spent the Sundays, had lived, and if the officers had still continued to occupy the barracks, it is most likely I should never have had leisure to reflect; and I should have, probably, continued to depend for my eternal salvation on the doctrine contained in the Catechism, and in the Maynooth Text-book. The observation of Dr. Johnson, which I before mentioned—"That it is time for a man at fifty to be in earnest about his religion," made a forcible impression upon my mind in my life of solitude, and I believe, under the guidance of God, was the proximate cause of my conversion. I earnestly recommend the same thought to the consideration of every person in the community who is anxious about the safety of his soul, and has passed the period of youth. It is a sermon in itself; and happy will those be who are led by it to resort to the written Word, as the parent of all religious instruction, and the fountain of eternal life.

The only reparation I can now make to an offended Deity, for all the absolutions, penances, indulgences, and anointings, given during a period of twenty years, is thus to acknowledge that I did so when I was steeped in vice, and engulphed in wickedness. I have now no abject fear of God's justice, but an humble confidence in his tender mercies, through the merits and all-sufficient sacrifice of Jesus Christ. The Church of Rome is an incongruous building, composed of heterogeneous materials, heaped together through various ages, and consolidated by the agency of Rome, and appearing to me now like a pyramid huge even to deformity, whose sides are formed of unequal triangles, and to whose privileges there is no access without a passport of gold. To reduce this incongruous building to the noble simplicity of the design laid down by the Divine Architect, ought to be the earnest desire and object of every person who has at heart the welfare of his country. How is this to be effected? Not, in my opinion, so much by the agency of those missionaries who are supported by the voluntary subscriptions of the English Protestants, as by the suppression of Maynooth, the Vesuvius of Ireland, which emits not only noxious and sulphurous exhalations, but launches forth an annual swarm of locusts the week after Pentecost, to prey upon the living and the dead—a lava, in my eyes, more disastrous in its consequences than that which overturned the cities of Pompeii and Herculaneum. I would say also, in addition to this, the Government ought to make a respectable provision for every *priest of unblemished character* who embraces the doctrine of the reformed Church Catholic of England. At present, if a priest becomes a convert, he must either fly from his fatherland, or, if not possessed of a private independence, submit to undergo the slow extinction of a country workhouse. A premium of this kind was held out to converts at the period of the Reformation; and I believe I am correct in stating, that Doctor Brown, the Catholic Bishop of Dublin, became its first Protestant reformed Archbishop. My only source of consolation is to think that I now belong to that true Church which was founded by Christ and his apostles, and was the subject of the world's wonder in its day. When the people gained a view of the wonders of the Christian Church, and beheld its followers pursuing with earnestness and joy the path pointed out to them by the first teachers of Christianity—men who possessed no outward marks of pre-eminence—they wondered—they reviled—they persecuted—but they ended by bowing down before a power they could not comprehend, although they saw the fruit of it visible before their eyes. The kingdoms of the world bowed down before those humble teachers, and the cross in God's good time surmounted the diadem and the sceptre.

And now, my dear Mr. Editor, I must ask your pardon for the great length to which this communication has run; it was, I assure you, no personal pride or contemptible vanity that induced me to prolong it to its present length, but an earnest desire to induce others to examine carefully, and unsophistically, the doctrines they have been taught, and which I inculcated for so many years, without seriously thinking about or inquiring into their truth, and, at the same time, to show that no pains or labour should deter us from personally investigating those truths that alone can stand us in stead at the day of general doom: when there will be no longer any time for unavailing repentance, and change of religion will be a matter of impossibility. Blessed be God, there is still time for us, and the Word of God is open for our examination, and every man who studies it will find, in that charter of man's salvation, that our eternal happiness does not depend upon our conforming ourselves to exterior rites or human ceremonies, but to the doctrine taught by Christ and practised by the apostles. If we adopt the doctrine of the primitive teachers, we can look forward with joy to the finishing of the mysteries of God; and though, in the rapid progress of events, the pillars of the earth may be shaken, and the "heavens rolled together like a scroll," still we can look forward beyond the foreground of this picture, into the golden distance where Christ will be pleading for his redeemed people with surpassing eloquence.

In conclusion, I take leave to say, that in forsaking the Church of Rome I was not actuated by any momentary impulse, or propelled by any ecclesiastical censure, but induced by a deep anxiety about saving my immortal soul, which I now consider, after a careful comparison of the doctrine of the Church of Rome with the Scripture, not only dubious, but almost impossible within the pale of that Church. I earnestly implore every other person in that Church to go and do likewise. Other priests have done the same; some, it is to be feared, impelled by motives foreign to mere firm conviction in the doctrines they embraced, and who have returned back again, and are now performing penance on the mountains of Waterford for the scandal they have given; there are others, however, whom it is needless for me to name, who are now labouring with indefatigable zeal in the vineyard of the Lord. There were ages in which men durst not make a public avowal of their change of belief, or the dungeon or the scaffold would have been the certain reward of such announcement—ages, when royalty herself resigned her crown at the feet of the Pope's chair, and exchanged the purple for a hair shirt and ashes; when Pope Celestine could kick the crown from off the head of Henry Barbarossa, and a Hildebrand could detain the Emperor Henry the Fourth for three days at his gate, suing in vain for mercy. But, thanks to God, those days are past, and man can now, theoretically at least, walk abroad in conscious dignity, under the shadow of the British constitution, inhaling the pure air of civil and religious liberty, and disregarding alike the prisons of Tuscany, and the dungeons of the Inquisition. That we have our sufferings, however, is not to be denied; but I shall not increase the length of this article by detailing the indignities I have endured from my nearest relations—such a description would be useless and unavailing. All human suffering is relative, and what have I to complain of in comparison with the sufferings of Christ and his Apostles? One alone of my bereavements I will mention: it is the loss of those bosom friends, those silent yet powerful teachers and counsellors, my books, which, I mourn to say, I was obliged to sell for the one-third of their value; and if any of your readers are disposed to criticise this communication, let them be just enough to take into consideration that, during the time I was writing it, I actually had not a book in my possession but the Bible I exchanged, in Paris, for my Breviary, and a Church of England Prayer Book.

If, however, what I have written should assist to rescue one person from the errors of Rome, I shall not have written in vain. Happy, indeed, would the writer be if he only conducted one individual to think seriously of securing his future happiness and of the stern but glorious realities of an eternity. He now, in the language of the apostle, says—Farewell. "Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith," "Prove your ownselves," and remember, if you are in the faith, that the rain may descend, and the floods come, and the winds blow, and beat upon your house, but it shall fall not, for it is founded upon a rock.

I have the honour to be, Mr. Editor,

Your obedient servant,

Πρεσβυτερος.

Correspondence.

THEBA AND THE TALK OF THE ROAD.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Sir—I have been reading the Catholic Layman for April, and must confess myself greatly astonished at the "Talk on the Road." Any one ignorant of the teaching and practices of Catholics would conclude from it, that Catholics never confessed their sins to God. I have, at this moment, six prayer-books lying beside me, published in the following places:—London, Liverpool, Dublin, Belfast, Paris, and Menin; and, in every one of them confession to God is made part of the evening prayer. I copy for you the whole prayer:—

"I confess to Almighty God, to the Blessed Virgin Mary, to the Blessed Michael the Archangel, to the Blessed John the Baptist, to the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, and to all the Saints, that I have grievously sinned in thought, word, and deed: through my fault, through my fault, through my exceeding great fault; therefore, I beseech the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Blessed Michael the Archangel, the Blessed John the Baptist, the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, and all the saints in heaven, to pray to the Lord our God, for me."

So, you see sir, Catholics do confess their sins to God; at least, they are taught to do so, and the same prayer is used by Catholics at the beginning and end of their confessions to the priest. And moreover, sir, if Pat (the man who, it is pretended, reads the Bible) only waits to go to confession till he can find confession to a priest in the Bible, he may go to confession as soon as he can get any priest to hear him, after what he has said. If you will look to the 27th chapter of Matthew, in the Douay Bible, you will find that Judas, as soon as he had repented having betrayed our Saviour, "came to the priests and ancients, saying, 'I have sinned in betraying innocent blood,' and, casting down the pieces of silver in the temple, he departed."

Now, sir, I beg you to observe that, besides confession to a priest, you have here on good authority, the three parts of the Catholic sacrament of penance—contrition, confession, and satisfaction. Judas first repented, then confessed to a priest, and then made what satisfaction was in his power, by restoring the money he had wickedly obtained.

I should advise the writer of the "Talk on the Road," to learn a little more correctly what Catholics do practise before he writes again about them; because, by not telling the

whole truth, he has led many Protestants to believe what is untrue.—I am, sir, your obedient servant,

THEBA.

We beg to assure our correspondent, that when we published in our last number, what Pat said about confession, we were perfectly aware of the existence of the "Confiteor." Whatever our fault may be, it certainly was not ignorance of that remarkable document—"I confess to Almighty God, to the Blessed Virgin Mary, to the Blessed Michael the Archangel, to the Blessed John the Baptist," &c.. &c.

Whoever uses this confession, confesses to St. John the Baptist, and all the others, in precisely the same way, and in the very same words, in which he confesses to Almighty God. Either St. John the Baptist and all the others are raised to an equality with God in the matter of confession of sin, or else God Almighty is reduced to the level of his creatures as respects the confession of sin. Either way we think this form of confession is dishonouring to God; we think it a confession which a jealous God will not receive; and, therefore, we cannot accept it as proof that the Church of Rome teaches men to make an acceptable confession of sin to God.

But, while admitting (which we have never denied) that the Church of Rome does make some show of teaching men the duty of confessing their sins to God, we, at the same time, hold that the teaching of the Church of Rome, respecting the confession of sin, has a natural and necessary tendency to lead men to think little of confessing their sins to God, and to think much of confessing their sins to the priest. And this teaching of the Church of Rome about confession of sin, is so well calculated to produce this effect, that it would be a marvel if such an effect were not generally produced in the majority of ignorant persons, as we believe, in fact, it very often is.

The teaching of the Church of Rome about the confession and forgiveness of sins we believe to be this:—

1. If a man confess his sins to God, with *perfect* contrition, he will receive pardon from God without confessing to a priest.

2. This perfect contrition is a thing so difficult and so rare that few, if any, can expect to receive pardon of sin from God by it.

3. God did, therefore, provide an easier way for sinners to be saved—namely, by confessing their sins to a priest—in which method *perfect* contrition is *not* necessary; so that the majority of men who could *not* obtain the pardon of their sins by confessing to God, *may* be able to find pardon by confessing to a priest, who will let them off on easier terms.

If our correspondent, "Theba," will look to what the catechism of the Council of Trent says of confession, under the sacrament of penance, he will see that we have rightly stated the doctrine of the Church of Rome on this subject.

We think the effect of such teaching must necessarily be, to lead men to think much of confessing to a priest, and little of confessing to God. Most ignorant Roman Catholics will naturally say, "a saint, indeed, may get pardon by confessing to God with perfect contrition; but *I* cannot *be a saint* in the Church of Rome; *I* cannot have *perfect* contrition; I must be content to get forgiveness in the easiest way which God has provided; so *I* must look to the priest, and not to God, for pardon of sin."

We believe that this teaching does work out its natural consequences among Roman Catholics to a large extent, and we do not think that the "confiteor"—which actually puts creatures on a level with God in the matter of confession of sin—is calculated to correct this error.

But our friend, "Theba," undertakes to teach Pat where he may find confession to a priest in the Bible; and we will be happy to explain "Theba's" teaching to Pat, and see if it be sufficient to convince and to satisfy a poor Irishman who reads his Bible. Judas, when he had betrayed our Lord, confessed to the priests, and made restitution and satisfaction. "Confessing to the priests," may *sound* a little to the purpose; but Pat knows that these were the Jewish priests who put Christ to death, and not the ministers of Christ. Such difficulties are very small to a man who studies his Bible.

As to Judas's CONTRITION, we are decidedly of opinion that "Theba" has fallen into an error in applying that word to Judas. "Theba" ought to have said "ATTRITION." The difference, according to theologians of the Church of Rome, appears to be this—*contrition* means sorrow for having offended God; it is sorrow for sin, *because* it *is* sin; whereas *attrition* is merely sorrow for the punishment of sin. Judas certainly had not *contrition*—he had no godly sorrow for sin—but he had *attrition*—dread and horror at what he had brought on himself; and he had this *attrition* to a very high degree, for even the sight of his money became so odious to him that, covetous as he was, he could not bear to look at it, but cast back the price of blood to those who gave it. Thus, the horror which Judas had of his sin was great, and it worked a great effect; yet "attrition" did not save him. St. Paul says—"Godly sorrow worketh repentance unto salvation, not to be repented of; but the sorrow of the world worketh death" (2 Cor. vii. 10); and so, indeed, it proved with Judas, for his "attrition" so tormented him, that he went and hanged himself, that, as St. Peter says, "he might go to his own place."—Acts i. 25. Such, we believe, has often been the effect of "attrition"—that is, of sorrow for the punishment of sin, without a godly sorrow for having offended God by sin; an awful warning, we think, against the doctrine that "attrition, with confession to a priest," is effectual for salvation.

Some persons, we believe, are perplexed at the expression in our translation of the Bible, that Judas "repented;" we may explain that the Greek word applied to Judas is not *μεταυοεω*, which means a change of heart, but *μεταμελομαι*, which means only a change of purpose or conduct, in which sense the word "repent" is sometimes used in English.

No doubt, "Theba" makes out a very fair case for "confession, attrition, and satisfaction" in the case of Judas; but we must, at the same time, remind "Theba" that, after all, the main thing in the "sacrament of penance" was wanting in the case of Judas; for we do not read that the High Priest said to Judas, "I absolve thee." But, query, if the High Priest *had* said this to Judas, would it have made the "attrition" of Judas effectual for his salvation?

After all, "Theba" may be *scarcely in earnest* in bringing up this strange argument about Judas to us; but till some other correspondent can give us a better on the subject, we hope that Pat and Biddy, and many more, may think that Pat's simple way of confessing to God is better than either, "the confiteor," said a hundred times over, or the confession of Judas to the priests.

THE REV. DR. CAHILL AND CONTROVERSY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—As I am a Catholic, of course I wish to see the priests of the Catholic Church defending the doctrines which are held and taught by us, not only in our own chapels and at our regular services, but also when challenged by Protestant ministers to a *public discussion*. But, really I never was more astonished and disappointed than when I read the letter of the Rev. Dr. Cahill, in reply to an invitation sent him by seven Protestant ministers to meet them at Sligo, and have a public discussion on the disputed points of our faith. I read that letter, which purposed to be a "reply" to the ministers; I expected to find argument in it in support of our faith; but could not find *one*, from beginning to end. There was plenty of abuse in it, however, and, indeed, if Dr. Cahill *thinks* that he will convert Protestants by such language as he uses in his "reply," I fear the Catholic Church will have *very few* converts. But he says one thing which puzzles me a good deal. He says the Protestant Church is only 300 years old, and, during that time, it has changed no less than 754 times! so that it would be very difficult for him (if he did accept the challenge) to know what Protestants believe in the year 1855. But Dr. Newman, in his "Theory of Development," says, *that the more a Church changes, the more perfect she becomes*. Now, which of these two doctors are right? According to Dr. Cahill, the Protestant Church, with its regiments of "lemon-coloured soupers," &c., is the apostasy predicted by St. Paul; according to Dr. Newman, it ought to be the *most perfect* Church in existence. I must confess that I am puzzled which to believe; or ought I to believe any of them? But Dr. Cahill says he would not be allowed by his bishop to defend his Church. Here, in Dublin, there's nothing going on but sermons, and meetings, and goodness knows what else against "Popery," and not one to defend it, except, indeed, a few laymen, that have'nt got the knowledge to meet ministers and trained Bible-readers, as well as the priests, and then Protestants will come up to *us* and say—"Your religion is wrong, it is contrary to the Bible," &c., and bring a lot of texts against us that *we* can't meet; and yet St. Peter says, that we ought to give a reason to every one that asks for the hope that is in us. Then there is your paper, where you invite any one to "break a friendly lance" with you, as you said in your last number; but no priest will do it. I am sure I can't but think that if St. Peter or St. Paul were alive now, and believed Protestants were heretics, they would not let them alone. But, now, sir, I want to get a little light thrown on what Drs. Newman and Cahill have written, to know which is right; and if some of the Catholics, who correspond so often with you, would explain it (and, indeed, I wish that Dr. Cahill would do it), for the information of one who is not so wise as themselves, they would confer a great advantage, not only on me, but on many others who are just in the same predicament.—I am, sir your humble servant,

W. RICHARDSON.

THE DOUAY BIBLE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

MR. EDITOR—I sometimes get a loan of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN from one Jerry Donovan, a sister's son of mine, and I see that poor boys like myself sometimes write to your honour for advice, when they're any way troubled in their minds, and, more by token, you never give them a cross word. Well, sir, I was coming from Cork, after seeing off two boys of mine who left for America, when who should I meet but Jerry Donovan himself; and as it was three months since I left Keelovenogue, I was mighty glad to see Jerry, to hear how the wife and children were getting on. "How did you leave all at home?" says I. "Bravely," says he. "And how's the neighbours?" says I. "Purty well," says he. "And how's his Riverence, Father John?" says I. "Bad enough, then," says he. "And what ails him?" says I, "he was hearty and well when I left." Says he, "if you saw him now you'd hardly know him, he looks so bad." "Was it the 'fluinzy that took him?" says I. "No," says he. "Was it an attack of the rhumaticks?" says I. "No," says he, "but an attack of the Romish controversy." Well, sir, I was dumbfoundered at this, for I heard a deal about the Romish controversy in Cork, and I seen the blue, and green, and yellow placards stuck on the walls, but still I couldn't think how this would make poor Father John look so bad as Jerry said; so, says I, "tell us all about it." "I will," says he; so with that he began his story, and says he, "every creature in Keelovenogue is mad about the controversy, and that's what fretting Father John; and I'll tell you how it all came to pass. When first the Protestant clargyman began the lectures, some of us went out of curiosity to hear what he had to say." Well, Mr. Editor, when Jerry told me that he had gone to such a place, I was mighty vexed, and says I, "you mean-spirited rascal, is it turning souper you are? I suppose you'll soon be a jumper on our hands; didn't Father John warn us from the altar against going to such places? didn't he tell us that if we listened to lectures, or Scripture-readers, or missioners, we'd all become soupers and jumpers? Well, sir, Jerry got a little vexed at this, and says he, "I'm no more a souper nor yourself, and I think our religion would be a very poor one if listening to a Protestant clargyman for an hour would take it away from us." "Oh! you villian," says I, "is it crying down our holy religion you are?" "No," says he, "but it's you and Father John that's crying it down." "What do you mean by that?" says I. "Why," says he, "when Father John and you says that hearing a lecture, or talking to a reader, would make us all turn Protestants, isn't it all one as admitting that our religion is a very weak one?" Well, Mr. Editor, I was mighty vexed at this twist of Jerry's, 'specially as I hadn't an answer ready, and the fellow was too cute for me in the logic; so, says I, "go on with your story." "Well," says he, "after we were some time in the room, the minister said some prayers, and I must admit they were as good words as ever I heard." "Why, then, how did you know that?" says I; "sure with all your impudence you don't purtend to know Latin, and maybe 'twas cursing you he was all the time." "Why," says he, "'twasn't Latin at all." "What else was it?" says I. "'Twas good English," says he. "Oh! the ignorant cratures," says I; "'tis because them Protestant clargy don't know the Latin that they speak all the same as one of ourselves." "No, indeed," says Jerry, "that's not the reason, anyhow; for the minister was at Dublin College, and knows Latin and Greek as well as I know the 'ladder of larning.'" "Why, then," says I, "if he's so knowledgeable, isn't it a wonder he wouldn't say the prayers in Latin, like our clargy?" "Maybe 'tis for a reason he has," says he. "What reason could he have?" says I. "Maybe," says Jerry, "he thinks the people would understand the prayers better in English." "Cock them up with understanding," says I; "how bad they are for understanding; but," says I, "I see what you're at, you villian, you're defending the heretics, and finding fault with our own clargy." "'Deed I'm not," says he; "I was only trying to answer your question. But," says he, "the minister said one thing that night that stuck in us greatly. 'Boys,' says he, 'I like fair play, and I don't want to have all the talk to myself, and, perhaps,' says he, 'if your priest was to come here of a night, or if he was to appoint a place where we could both meet, he might be able to say something for his religion.'" Well, sir, when I heard Jerry getting on this way, I couldn't help interrupting him, and, says I, "Sure, Father John was the man for him; sure he often told us that he was longing to meet one of the spalpeens that's abusing our holy religion, till he'd give him a sacking. Why didn't you tell Father John of the fellow's boasting, and he'd soon take the shine out of him?" "Why," says Jerry, "only you stopped me I was going to tell you that we told it all to Father John next day." "And what did he say?" says I. "Why he said that, of course, if he thought it worth his while, he could put him down in less than no time, but that he wouldn't demean himself to argue with such a spalpeen, that he wouldn't be up and down with the likes of him." "And sure," says I, "Father John was right; is it for a holy man like him to be arguing with a set of jumpers and soupers?" "Why, then," says Jerry, "'tis soon you've changed your tune; five minutes ago you said that Father John was the very man to put them down, and that he was only *longing* to meet one of them to take the shine out of him." Well, Mr. Editor, I was clean caught—the fellow was too strong for me in the logic. So, says I, "go on with your story." "Well," says he, "some of the boys wern't quite satisfied with Father John's excuse, and as the Protestants were throwing it in our faces that we hadn't a word to say for our religion, we thought that, as our priests wouldn't speak for us, we'd speak for ourselves. So we asked Humphrey Carey, the great disputer, to come to the next lecture, and answer the minister. And, sure enough, he did, and well he spoke, too; and thinks I to myself, we owe more to poor Humphrey than to our priests; for though we pay them well, not one of them would speak up for us; but Humphrey stood his ground like a man, and gave the minister word for word, and text for text, so that

we were all delighted with him; and, by the same token, we made a good collection for him after the meeting, and he was the greatest man in Keelovenogue, greater than Father John himself. But, to hasten with my story: one evening the clergyman said that the priests were against letting the people have the Bible, and Humphrey says, quite stiff, that they wern't against the Douay Bible. Humphrey was foolish (as we told him afterwards) in saying this, but he was only trying to stand up for the priests. Well, the minister took him up at once, and says he, 'Will you come with me to Father John to-morrow, to ask if he has any objection to letting his people have the Douay Bible?' Humphrey was fairly caught, and couldn't draw back, so he said he was ready to go with him whenever he liked. So the next day the minister and the clergyman of another parish, and two other gintlemen went with Humphrey to Father John. "Stop, Jerry," says I, "how do I know that you're telling me a word of truth? maybe its deceiving me you are; sure I know that Father John wouldn't let the likes of them inside his door." "Why," says Jerry, "I suppose he thought 'twas no use to be denied to them; for if he dldn't see them that day, they'd have gone the next, and the next, until they caught him; and besides," says he, "it must be true, for I've the whole matter here in my hat in a printed paper." So with that, sir, he took off the caubeen and pulled out a printed paper all about the visit to Father John. "But," says I, "Jerry, how do you know but it's lies are in the paper? There's many a thing printed that aint true, and maybe the parsons made it all out of their own heads." "So I thought at first," says Jerry; "but I brought it to Humphrey Carey and asked him if 'twas true, and he allowed that every word in it was true." "Well," says I, "read us your paper." Well, sir, Jerry read ont of the paper how the parson asked Father John, whether he had any objection to the people having the Douay Bible, and Father John said at once that he hadn't the least objection in life. "Stop, Jerry," says I, "there must be some mistake there; are you quite sure Father John said that?" "'Deed, I am," says he, "here it is in black and white." "Why, then," says I, "sure it's not six months since Father John warned us against the Bible; 'for,' says he, 'boys, 'twill only make soupers of you.' "That's all true," says Jerry; "but still what I read for you is true too." "Tear-an-ages, man," says I, "how can *both* be true? Sure he can't be *for* the Bible and *against* the Bible at the same time." "Why," says Jerry, "the priests have one answer for us and another for the Protestants; they're ashamed to cry down the Bible before Protestants, so they purtind they havn't the least objection in life to it." "Oh, you slandering villian," says I, "you desarve to be cursed with bell, book, and candle, for saying such a thing of your clargy." "Well," says he, "if you don't like my interpretation give us a better yourself." Well, sir, I was nonplushed again by the fellow's logic, and I didn't know how to account for Father John saying one thing to us in the chapel, and saying quite the opposite to the Protestants. "So," says I, "go on with the paper." "Well," says he, "the parson then asked Father John, why he didn't give out lots of Bibles to his people? 'Why,' says Father John, 'I'd be quite willing to give them out, but I havn't the money to buy them.'* 'Oh,' says the minister, 'that's a pity, and I'll tell you what we'll do, WE'LL BUY DOUAY BIBLES IF YOU'LL LET US GIVE THEM TO YOUR PEOPLE.' Well, Father John was greatly vexed at this, and said he wouldn't allow any such thing. 'Then,' says the minister, 'are you against the Bible?' 'I'm not,' says he, and he even said that 'twas his *wish** that every one of his people who could read had one." "Well, Jerry," says I, "if Father John really wishes us to have the Bibles, and hasn't money to buy them himself, why wouldn't he let the Protestants buy them for us? Sure, let them be ever so bad, the touch of their hands wouldn't poison the book. Sure I'd eat an egg that came out of a dirty hand, for I know that the dirt could'nt get into it; and in like manner if the Bible is a good book, it would'nt be made bad by coming ont of a Protestant's hands." "Oh," says Jerry, "Father John knows all that as well as you; but he was only trying to get out of the hobble the best way he could; he was in a *regular fix*, for he did'nt like before the Protestants to speak against the Bible, and still he wouldn't for the world that the people got a hould of it." "Why, then, Jerry, says I, "that's not fair play; that's not honest of Father John." "Oh," says he, turning quite sharp on me and laughing as if he'd burst, "who's the souper now?" Well, Mr. Editor, I was vexed to say that I had given the cunning rogue such an advantage over me; so, says I, "stop your laughing, and go on with your story." "Well," says he, "Father John determined not to let it all go with them, so he looked quite stiff at the minister, and, says he, 'isn't it a shame for a clargyman like you to be disputing with poor unlearned men; you should be ashamed of yourselves,' says he, 'for arguing with poor tinkers and weavers, who never went through college.'" "Hurra," says I, "Father John for ever, more power to his elbow, sure I knew he had it in him if he was put to it." "Stop a while," says Jerry, "Father John never said a more foolish word in his life." "How so?" says I. "Because," says he, "it brought him into the very middle of a hobble; the parson took him up at once, and, says he, 'Father John *you're* the last man in the world that should bring this charge against us. Sure,' says he, '*why* is it that we argue with unlearned men, but because the learned men like yourself won't come forward.'" "Oh, murder," says I, "that was a hard cut." "'Twas so," says Jerry, "and Father John felt it sorely; he hadn't a word in his mouth; and, what was worse than all, he saw that he had brought it upon himself." "And what did poor Father John say then?" says I. "Why," says Jerry, "he tried to make some excuses which I havn't time to repeat for you now;" so with that we parted. But now, Mr. Editor, I must tell you that though I did'nt let on to Jerry, still my mind is greatly troubled about Father John and the Bible. I know that our clargy are against it, and I know that our priests count it a dangerous book, that would only make Protestants of us; and I know that heavy penance would be put on any of us that had a Bible in the house; and, after all this, isn't it the queerest thing in the world that Father John told these Protestant gentlemen that he *had no objection* in life to the Bible? and even said he *wished** we all had Douay Bibles. Now, Mr. Editor, how can you explain this? At first I explained it myself by thinking that what Father John told us in chapel was the true story, and that what was in the paper was a lie; but I had to give up this explanation, for a thousand of the papers were distributed, giving the clergymen's names, and the priests' names, and the names of the gentlemen who went with the clergymen; and these papers were stuck up about the town, and given to all the people; and still Father John never denied that he said what was in the paper; and Humphrey Carey admitted that every word was true. Still, sir, I can't think Father John would be so unfair as to have one answer for us, and another for the Protestants. Sure this wouldn't be like an *honest man*, much less like a holy priest of the old and true Church. I'm sure that all the difficulty lies in my own ignorance, and because I don't know anything of logic; but I think a learned man like your honour could explain what seems to be a contradiction to a poor ignorant man like me. Do, then, Mr. Editor, and good luck to you, set my mind at ease on this point.

Your humble servant to command,

DAN CARTHY.

We readily insert Mr. Carthy's letter, having heard many similar accounts of the *double* conduct of Roman Catholic priests about the circulation of the Douay Bible. Our conviction is, that the time is rapidly approaching when, if the Roman Catholic clergy and laity do not establish a Bible Society for their own people, Protestants will feel it their duty to do so, so as to let the people of Ireland, who are advancing in education and intelligence every day, have the only Bible which they can believe to be a true one, at the same moderate price that Protestants can procure *their* authorized version. For ourselves we feel no difficulty about the matter, and should wish the Douay Bible to be in the hands of every man in Ireland that can read, and is unwilling as yet to trust the accuracy of the Protestant version. We have published our reasons pretty fully for preferring the latter; but believing the original Hebrew and Greek Old and New Testaments to be truly the Word of the living God, we think any translation of it extant to be preferable to none at all; and if the Douay Bible were once in the people's hands it would, we think, be the greatest step ever made in the progress of true national education.

* Fact.

MAUNDAY THURSDAY AT ROME.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—A short time ago a friend of mine wrote you a letter about the Mass in the Crimea, and the height of an altar, and the like, and signed himself "Poor Paddy" [CATH. LAYMAN, vol. iv., p. 23]. Now, sir, that you know is not his real name. He was afraid to give it out and out; but as I know him—and, indeed, I put him up to write that letter—I am sorry nobody has answered his questions; but that is not your fault, for you invited them to answer him; and, as "Poor Paddy" knows me, and is in the secret of this letter, I think he will be offended if nobody answers this. So that it will be between us, your honour.

I suppose you know, sir, that every man among us feels himself honoured when his parish priest is honoured, and, indeed, your honour, we, poor people in Clerkenwell, have been very much honoured entirely, because our parish priest Father Kyne, was invited to Rome; and we hear that he had some hand in making the new faith there, last December, about the Immaculate Conception; and, sure, that's equal, anyhow, to writing a part of the Bible; and, like the Hail Mary, at all events, that took three parties to make it to its present size, so the faith of the Church has been partly made by our parish priest, Father Kyne; and it's he can make great doctrines, your honour, when he likes to put himself to it, so he can.

But that's not all—it's not my *question*, anyhow. What I want to know is, what I read in the *Tablet* (of April 28th last, in page 260), where we are told that Mr. Kyne, our parish priest, had the honour of preaching a sermon, in English, in Rome; and the sermon was all about us and our neighbours; and the man that writes to the *Tablet*, all the way from Rome, goes on to say these words—"Your readers will be interested to hear that Father Kyne *was* one of "the apostles" in the ceremonies of Maundy Thursday—that is, *he had his feet washed* by the Holy Father," &c.

Oh, *your honour*, what a washing that must have been! and Father Kyne, I'm sure, never had such clean feet since he was born as when his H[illegible] washed them; and wasn't it mighty kind of the Pope to do that to our parish priest? But what bothers me entirely is, that the *Tablet*-man says that "Father Kyne *was* one of the apostles." Does he mean to say that he *actually was* one of them? or that he was transubstantiated into one of them? And, what vexes me more than all is, that the parson about here read it, too; and, sure enough, it wasn't long after my breakfast, that he walks in, and, sitting down, with an arch smile on his face, he says to me—"Well, Callaghan, so Father Kyne has had his feet washed in Rome." "So it's *reported*," said I; "and I hope that came to no stranger to him." "Well," said the minister, "it's strange for him to have such a servant, anyhow." "True for you," said I. "But, Callaghan," says he, looking mighty cute, "you remember our conversation the other day about 'This is my body'—don't you?" "I do," says I. "And," says he, "do you still stick to the literal interpretation of the word *is*?" "To be sure I do," says I; "and why shouldn't I? Doesn't it mean that it really was his body, or, as the Church says, was transubstantiated into his body?"

The minister stopped awhile, and took out the *Tablet*, and says to me, "Sure, Callaghan, but, what do you think, Father Kyne was transubstantiated the other day into one of the apostles." "Into one of the apostles, your honour! (not Judas, I hope); but you're not serious. Are you?" "Why, I only tell you what I see here in the *Tablet*, that 'Father Kyne *was* one of the apostles.'" "Oh," says I, "is that all the proof you have? Sure that doesn't mean he *was* really one of the apostles, but that he only *represented* one of them?" "What do you mean, Callaghan?" says he. "Do you mean to say the *Tablet* tells a lie in saying he was one of the apostles, when all the time he was no such thing?" "I mean to say, your reverence, that he wasn't one of the apostles, anyway." "And why not believe literally what the *Tablet* says?" said the minister. "Why, because it is impossible," said I. "But," says the minister, "with God all things are possible." "Sure you don't mean to say," said I, "that God would turn Father Kyne into one of the apostles this time of day?" "And why not?" said he. "Because, your reverence, couldn't the people see Father Kyne, and feel him, and hear him speak, and know by his looks, and his voice, and by every bit of him, that it was Father Kyne still, and that it wasn't one of the apostles?"

The minister put up the *Tablet* again, and I looking at him as though I had put him down altogether in his queer notions, when he says to me, "Well, Callaghan, you are an inconsistent fellow; you told me just now that 'This is my body' means this *is really* my body, changed and transubstantiated; and now you tell me that the words 'Father Kyne *was* one of the apostles,' mean that he *really was not* one of the apostles, and can only mean that he *represented* one of the apostles. Now, you know, Callaghan," says he, "*is* and *was* are parts of the same verb, only different tenses, and what one means the other must mean; and if you would know Father Kyne to be Father Kyne, by feeling him, and seeing him, and hearing him, can you not also know that the wafer, after consecration, is a wafer, by feeling, tasting, seeing, and smelling it?" "It's mighty queer," says I to him. And so I say now to you, Mr. Editor, "It's mighty queer."

"Poor Paddy" and myself talked over the matter that evening, and we resolved that I should write you my letter, your honour; and we are in hopes somebody will give us an answer to it, and say whether Father Kyne was (that is, *really* was) one of the apostles, or if the word means *represented*; and, if so, how can I be sure, "This is my body?" I'll be keen to hear some words about it from the Protestants, never fear, and something every day, until I am able to clear up the difficulty.

Won't you help me, Mr. Editor? and, if you print this, you will oblige

Your humble servant,

TIMOTHY CALLAGHAN.

Clerkenwell, London, May 3, 1855.

FARMING OPERATIONS FOR MAY.

(From the *Irish Farmers' Gazette*.)

Vetches—Sow, according to circumstances, recommended breadths of vetches, mixed with oats and tares, once or twice during the month.

Beans should be hoed and thinned.

Carrots and Parsnips should be hand-hoed between the rows; if sown early they will be ready for singling out by the end of the month, after which they should be hand-hoed, or grubbed, or dug between with Parkes's digging-forks.

Potatoes will require close attention in weeding, hoeing, and earthing up, if not done, and weeding and careful earthing from the furrows, in the ridges of lazy-beds.

Winter-sown Salading Crops, such as cress and radishes, will be coming into use by the end of the month, salads are consumed the land should be put in preparation for turnips, &c.

New Pastures should be sown here to prevent the plants seeding, prevent filling, and cover the ground quickly to form a close sward.

Just published, 300 pp. demy 8vo, price Six and Sixpence (per Post, Seven Shillings),

A Digest of the Evidence,

TAKEN BEFORE

THE SELECT COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS,

APPOINTED TO INQUIRE INTO THE WORKING OF THE

NATIONAL SYSTEM OF EDUCATION

IN

IRELAND;

WITH ADDENDA AND APPENDIX.

BY THE

REV. WILLIAM LE POER TRENCH, D.D.,

Rector of Killereran, Diocese of Tuam, and one of the Honorary Secretaries of the Church Education Society for Ireland.

Clergymen and others wishing Copies of the above, are respectfully requested to transmit their Orders as speedily as possible, as but a limited number of the work has been printed.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London: Wertheim and Macintosh, Paternoster-row; Seeley, Jackson, and Co., Fleet-street; and Thomas Hatchard, Piccadilly.

Just published, in demy 8vo, cloth, price 8s. (per post, 9s.),

An English-Irish Dictionary,

INTENDED FOR THE

USE OF STUDENTS OF THE IRISH LANGUAGE,

And for those who wish to Translate their English Thoughts or the Works of others into Language intelligible to the Present Irish-speaking Inhabitants of Ireland.

BY DANIEL FOLEY, B.D.,

Prebendary of Kilbragh, Cashel, and Professor of Irish in the University of Dublin.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London: Wertheim and Macintosh, Paternoster-row.

SELECTION OF

NEW WORKS

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

ALISON'S HISTORY OF EUROPE, from the Fall of Napoleon, in 1815, to the Accession of Louis Napoleon, in 1852. Vol. 4. 8vo. 15s.

THE CHRIST OF HISTORY; an Argument grounded in the Facts of his Life on Earth. By John Young, M.A. 7s. 6d.

MEDITATIONES HEBRAICÆ; or, a Doctrinal and Practical Exposition of the Epistle of St. Paul to the Hebrews. By the Rev. William Tait. 2 vols. 17s.

THE TYPOLOGY OF SCRIPTURE; viewed in connection with the Entire Scheme of the Divine Dispensation. By Patrick Fairbairn, D.D. 2 vols. 18s.

CHRIST, AS MADE KNOWN TO THE ANCIENT CHURCH: an Exposition of the Revelation of Divine Grace, as unfolded in the Old Testament Scriptures. By the late Robert Gordon, D.D. 4 vols. 8vo. £2 2s.

THE CHRISTIAN CYCLOPÆDIA; or Repertory of Biblical and Theological Literature. By the Rev. Jas. Gardner, M.D. Royal 8vo. 15s.

BICKERSTETH'S CONDENSED NOTES ON SCRIPTURE; being the Substance of Sermons, selected from his MS. Notes, and revised by his Son. 10s. 6d.

MINISTERING CHILDREN, a Tale; dedicated to Childhood. By the Author of "Visit to the Poor," &c. 5s.

LETTERS TO A CHILD. By the Author of "Ministering Children. 2s. 6d.

THESAURUS OF ENGLISH WORDS AND PHRASES, Classified and Arranged so as to facilitate the expression of ideas and assist in Literary Composition. By Peter Mark Roget, M.D. 10s. 6d.

DETACHED THOUGHTS AND APOPHTHEGMS, extracted, by permission, from some of the writings of Archbishop Whately. 3s.

ESSAYS ON THE SPIRIT OF THE INDUCTIVE PHILOSOPHY, the Unity of Worlds, and the Philosophy of Creation. By Rev. Baden Powell. 12s. 6d.

THE SOUTHERN CROSS AND THE SOUTHERN CROWN; or, the Gospel in New Zealand. By Miss Tucker. 3s. 6d.

TONGA AND THE FRIENDLY ISLANDS; With a sketch of their Mission History. Written for young People. By Sarah S. Farmer. 5s.

OLD TESTAMENT PROPHESIES, relative to the Return and Restoration of the Twelve Tribes to the Land of Palestine; together with the Setting up of Messiah's Kingdom on Mount Sion during a Period of 1,000 Prophetic Years. By James Alleis. 3s. 6d.

THE THISTLE AND THE CEDAR OF LEBANON. By Habeeb Risk Allah Effendi, M.A.C.S. 10s. 6d.

A NEW SOLUTION OF THE CONTEMPORANEOUS SYMBOLS OF THE REVELATION OF ST. JOHN. By the Rev. R. Gascoyne. 5s.

A PRACTICAL DISCOURSE ON GOD'S SOVEREIGNTY; With other Material Points derived thence. By Elisha Coles. 3s. 6d.

THE FOUNTAIN OF LOVE. By Rev. Alfred Wm. Snape. 3s. 6d.

GOD IS LOVE: An Exposition of 1 John iv. 8. By Adolphe Monod. Translated from the French by John Charlesworth, B.A. 1s. 6d.

A PASTOR'S SKETCHES; or, Conversations with anxious Inquirers respecting the Way of Salvation. By J. T. Spencer, D.D. New York. Edited by Rev. J. A. James. 3s. 6.

THE FOOTSTEPS OF ST. PAUL. By the Author of "The Faithful Promiser." 5s.

THE MIND OF JESUS. By the Author of "Morning and Night Watches." 8d. Cloth, 1s.

THE WORDS OF JESUS. By the Author of the "Mind of Jesus." 8d. Cloth, 1s.

THE WORDS OF JESUS AND THE MIND OF JESUS. Bound together, Cloth, Gilt edges, 1s. 6d.

IMPRESSIONS OF CHINA AND THE PRESENT REVOLUTION. By Captain Fishbourne. 6s.

CHRISTIANITY IN TURKEY: the Armenian Race and Church, with some account of their Doctrines and Rites, &c. By Rev. F. S. O. Dwight, Constantinople. 5s.

HOPE DEFERRED, NOT LOST: An account of the Mission to Patagonia. By Rev. G. P. Despard. 5s.

MEMOIR OF THE LIVES OF ROBERT AND J. A. HALDANE. By Alexander Haldane, Esq. 8vo. New and cheaper edition. 5s. 6d.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF THE REV. WM. JAY; with Reminiscences of some distinguished Contemporaries, Selections from his Correspondence, &c. By George Redford, D.D., and J. A. James, D.D. 8vo. Second Edition. 12s.

MEMOIR OF THE REV. J. J. WEITBRECHT, Missionary at Bengal. By his Widow. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

MEMOIR OF OLD HUMPHREY. Anthor of "Pithy Papers," "Half Hours," &c. 2s.

SOME ACCOUNT OF MRS. CLARINDA SINGLEHEART. By the Author of "Mary Powell." 7s. 6d.

Just published, 18mo, price 6d.,

Questions deducible from easy Lessons on Money Matters,

For the use of Young People, with Notes and an Appendix. By the Rev. Launcelot Dowdall, A.M., Rector of Rathfarnham, Dublin.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London: Wertheim and Macintosh, Paternoster-row.

Just published, 24 pp. demy 8vo., price 6d. (per post, 10d.),

THE ADDRESSES

Presented to

THE LORD PRIMATE OF IRELAND,

On his attaining the Fiftieth Year of his Episcopate, with his Grace's Answers;

And an Account of the Proceedings at Armagh, on March 29, 1855.

In a Letter to a Clergyman, from one who was present on the occasion.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Just published, price 6d. (per post, 10d.),

The Evangelization of Italy;

A Sermon.

BY ALESSANDRO GAVAZZI.

(Published by permission of the Author.)

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London: J. Nisbet and Co.; Seeley, Jackson, and Co.; Partridge and Oakey. Edinburgh: J. Nichol. Sheffield: R. Leader, J. W. King, and Ridge and Jackson.

Just published, price 2d. (per post, 3d.),

SPAIN.

"Thy people think on her stones."
"El Alma" (the dawn.)

☞ The Profits arising from the sale of this Work will be devoted to the promotion of Christ's work in Spain.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London: Wertheim and Macintosh, Paternoster-row.

PRESENT RELIGIOUS AND SOCIAL STATE OF THE TURKISH EMPIRE.

The profits to be applied to the FREE EDUCATION of Oriental Missionary Pupils.

Recently Published, two vols. 8vo., pp. 886, with Plates and Map, price 12s.,

Journal of a Deputation,

SENT TO THE EAST

BY THE

COMMITTEE OF THE MALTA PROTESTANT COLLEGE IN 1849,

Containing an Account of the Present State of the Oriental Nations, including their Religion, Learning, Education, Customs, and Occupations, with outlines of their Ecclesiastical and Political History; of the Rise and Decay of Knowledge among them; and of the Doctrines and Discipline of the Ancient Christian Churches.

BY A LAY MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE.

"Most cordially do we recommend this useful work to the attention of all who seek for information as to the past or present state of the East. It will be found a valuable companion to all travellers visiting those regions. In particular we would strongly recommend it to the attention of our clerical friends, who, especially of late years, must have felt the want of such an addition to their libraries. The immense mass of information which it contains in so comparatively small a compass, and its very low price, will render it as easy of acquisition as useful in possession. Besides its intrinsic interest, its value as a book of reference, with regard to the state of the East, cannot be over-estimated."—*Record Newspaper.*

"These volumes contain a large amount of deeply interesting information. They are eminently calculated to promote the godly zeal of British Christians in favour of those parts of the world to which they themselves are indebted, under God, for the knowledge of the common salvation."—*Evangelical Christendom.*

"It is a work which I recommend to all who desire to become better acquainted with the present condition of Greek Christianity."—*The Rev. R. Burgess, on "Greek Christianity," to the Young Men's Christian Association.*

"These volumes might not inaptly be designated a delineation of Mohammedanism, or of the Christianity in the East, or of the present state of the Jews. We could not wish a more luminous and masterly disquisition on the great points here set forth. The origin and decline of knowledge in the East generally is discussed with consummate care and ability. The work deserves a place in every library, both public and private."—*British Banner.*

London: J. NISBET and Co., 21, Berner's-street. Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher, WILLIAM CURRY, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.
MAY, 1855.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Glóir do Dhia aṅ na hárduib, agus síodcáin air an dtalamh deagḟoil do na dáoinib.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED THE MIDDLE OF EVERY MONTH, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. IV.—No. 42. JUNE, 1855. { Annual Subscription, 2s. 6d. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
The Queen of Heaven	61
Roman Catholic Moral Theology—St. Liguori and Cardinal Wiseman	62
The Abbé Laborde at Rome—continued	63
The Lady of La Salette—L'Abbé Delson of Grenoble, and Right Reverend Dr. Ullathorne of Birmingham	64
Religious Liberty in Italy—Domenico Cecchetti	67
Religious Toleration in England	68
The Apocrypha	68
CORRESPONDENCE:	
The Two Versions of the Bible, by Inquirer	69
Charity to Protestants, by Dan. Carthy	70
On Prayers for the Dead, by Mr. E. Power	70
The Protestant Bible, by S. M. N.	70
Farming Operations for June	71

THE QUEEN OF HEAVEN.

If we were asked what we considered the distinctive characteristic of the Church of Rome at the present day, we should, without hesitation, say, it is the worship of the Virgin Mary. Not that it is a modern invention, but because it has, of late years, assumed a prominence, all-pervading and all-absorbing, which it had not known before. So far is this from being a disputed matter, that an eminent English clergyman—to whose writings we have often been indebted—the Rev. Hobart Seymour, states, that on once remarking to an ecclesiastic in the City of Rome, that it appeared to him that the religion of Christ, as received in that city, would more fitly be entitled *the religion of Mary*, the priest replied, approving the sentiment, that every year it was becoming more and more developed as the religion of Mary. The late dogmatic decree of Pope Pius IX. seems to have since put the top stone on her temple, by withdrawing her from the fallen race of Adam, and clothing her, from the first moment of her existence, with the sinless human nature of her Divine Son. Henceforward the Spanish form of doxology would seem to be the only orthodox or fitting one—

"Glory be to the Father,
Glory be to the Son,
Glory be to the Holy Ghost,
Glory be to the most Holy Virgin,
Through all ages for ever and ever. Amen."

We have never written, and trust we shall never write, one word disparaging of, or disrespectful towards, the Blessed Virgin Mary, the mother of our Divine Master in his *human nature*, as *perfect man*; but we earnestly believe that to confound the divine and human natures of our Blessed Lord, by calling his human mother the QUEEN OF HEAVEN, is a dangerous delusion, closely verging on idolatry, and derogatory to the divine glory of every member of the ever blessed Trinity.

Let us look back a little into the history of the world, and seriously examine and reflect whether this tendency to exalt a female to the throne of the universe has not its roots as deep and as universal as fallen human nature itself.

In almost all the mythologies of ancient times, whether in the east or in the west, there was a female divinity—a goddess whose maternity was worshipped. In one mythology it was Astarte, of the Assyrians; in another, it was Ashtoreth, of the Sidonians; in another, it was Bawancy, of the Hindoos. In the classic mythology of Greece and Rome, eclectic as it was, there was a Venus adopted from the one, and a Juno from the other. It is said that the image of Diana of the Ephesians was that of a female, from whose body, in every part, there seemed to be issuing all the various animals of creation, symbolizing the conception and production of all things. The Egyptians on one hand, and the Etruscans on the other, had their Isis, the same symbol—a female divinity whom they regarded as "the mother of the gods." Even the Scandinavian mythology had its Freigha; and of the two great systems of religion that prevailed in the Roman Empire, Judaism and the classic mythology, the latter styled Juno "the Queen of Heaven;" and the former, when corrupted by the admixture of the heathenism around it, was charged by the prophet Jeremiah with having also its "Queen of Heaven."—Jerem. vii. 18., xliv. 17.

This Divinity, in all the systems, had a mysterious and indefinite position. We do not believe that in any of them she was considered as actually *supreme*. Her power and province were left very much to the imaginations or feelings of her votaries; and it would seem as if it was an element congenial with all natural religious systems, as answering some impulse or feeling in the fallen and natural heart, that there should be the embodiment of some such idea—the symbol of the creation and production of all things, enthroned among the Gods, as the Queen of Heaven. The only charge we make against the Church of Rome is, that—perhaps with the apparently politic object (as M. Bougnet* considers it) of facilitating the adoption of Christianity by Pagan nations—she accommodated herself to that element and tendency of heathenism, instead of imitating the Prophet Jeremiah in denouncing this worship among the Jews—instead of following the Apostle Paul in opposing it among the Gentiles—instead of counteracting this tendency of the people of the Roman Empire, she rather encouraged it; and with the zealous, but we think short-sighted policy we have mentioned, of inducing a more rapid and extended profession of Christianity, she allowed the Easterns to accept the Virgin in the place of Astarte—*their* previous Queen of Heaven; and the Westerns to reverence Mary instead of Juno, the Queen of Heaven they had previously worshipped; and we think it is not the least startling fact connected with this matter, that the two favourite titles ascribed to Mary in the Church of Rome, and which are to be found in almost all her devotional books at the present day—namely, "the Queen of Heaven," and "Mother of God"—are the very same titles ascribed to their female divinity—the *goddess* of the ancients. She was entitled in the East, the *Mother of the Gods*; and in the West, the *Queen of Heaven*.

But, however it originated, there is no doubt that Mary is now as much recognised and worshipped in the Roman Church as was the Queen of Heaven in the widely-extended Roman Empire. In all its essential elements, the Roman Empire and the Roman Church—the Pagan Rome and the Papal Rome—are in accord in this matter. The transfer to Mary of all the devotion previously paid to Juno, Astarte, Ashtoreth, or Isis, could hardly alter the nature of the thing; and we can scarcely believe that with all the subtle distinctions theoretically drawn by theologians of the Church of Rome, in actual practice, the popular worship of Mary leads to less practical idolatry than that of Juno or Isis among the ancient Pagans.

There are persons in Italy and Spain who freely and readily admit much of this, and say that the prevalence of this conception, of a female divinity among so many ancient mythologies, was, as it were, the dispersed and scattered elements of a coming truth—a sort of all-pervading prophesy or anticipation of a future reality—and that all was to be fulfilled in the exaltation of the Virgin Mother. They imagine, that as the promise of a Messiah was once universally spread among the families of Noah, and as it passed by tradition through many generations, so the woman, through whom He was to come, became a hope, a creation in their mythologies, and was thus the great archetype of all those female divinities of the heathen world. Persons who believe this, argue that when the nations lost all knowledge of the true God, and created false gods for their worship, and worshipped them in his stead, their idolatry consisted not in their worshipping of idols or images, but in the worshipping of false gods; and, in like manner, the idolatry of the heathen was not their worshipping a female divinity, but in worshipping those that were false, instead of her who is revered as the only true one—even Mary. This view of the subject is a favourite one in countries where Mary is worshipped, not, indeed, in name and title, *as a goddess*, but with all the same reverence and devotion, in service and worship, *as if she were a goddess*. There can be no question as to the fact, that in those countries she is the divinity, prayed to more frequently, loved more fervently, worshipped more devoutly, and depended on more entirely than God the Father, the Son, or the Holy Spirit. Whether the Church of Rome *approves* of this is another question; but of the matter of *fact*, there can be no doubt whatever.

The answer which they usually give on this subject is, that they do not worship Mary *as a goddess* or *as a divinity*, but they regard her as a creature, the most exalted of all, even as Queen of angels and of men, but a creature still—that they feel as strongly as ourselves the heinous sin of giving divine worship to a creature; but they give to her a different worship, an inferior worship, to that which they give to God. And, inasmuch as they do not worship her *as a god* or *a goddess*, they say they are not liable to the charge of idolatry, which, in their view, consists in giving to a creature that kind and degree of worship which belongs only to the Creator.

But wherein consists the practical difference between the worship paid to Mary and the worship rendered to God? The offering prayer—the presenting hymns of praise—the making solemn vows—the consecration of the votaries to her service—the devoting gifts and offerings of wealth—the dedication of children—the sacrifice of the Mass—the trusting to her in the hour of death—all these are done to Mary, or in honour of Mary, as well as to God, and in honour of God. They pray to her by her sufferings beneath the cross. They plead her merits even as they do those of Jesus Christ. Wherein, then, consists the distinction in the Church of Rome between the practical worship paid to Mary and the worship paid to God?

The general answer is, that there are two great points of distinction, and that they are so marked as to place the two kinds of worship as wide apart as the poles. The *first* is, that they never pray *through the merits of Mary*, but only through the merits of Christ; pleading not the merits of a creature, but only the merits of Christ. And, *secondly*, that they never pray to Mary, as if she could grant anything of her own power, or as if she could grant any blessings of herself; but only to exert her influence with Jesus Christ, that He may grant the petition. They state that they never pray for anything *by her merits*, or ask her to do anything *by her own power*.

This is a statement of fact, and must be examined like every assertion of fact, and accepted or rejected according to the evidence.

Let us lay aside the private statements or practices of individuals, and look at the devotional books in use in the Church of Rome—the authorised formularies of that Church.

We have now before us the four volumes of the Roman Breviary, in each of which, p. cxxxv., may be found the Offices of the Blessed Virgin, "Officium Beatæ Mariæ in Sabbato; Officium Parvum B.M.; Officium B.M. in Adventu." In these offices we find several times repeated, pp. 136, 151, and 159, the following prayer:—"May the Lord conduct us to *the kingdom of heaven*, by the prayers AND MERITS of the *Blessed ever Virgin Mary*, and *all the Saints*. Amen."*

Let us now turn to the Missal—in the service of the Mass, the priest bows before the altar and prays thus—"We beseech thee, O Lord, by the *merits of thy Saints*, whose relics are here, and of all the Saints, that thou wouldst vouchsafe to forgive me all my sins. Amen."†

In the Missal, published in England, for the use of the laity (1836, p. 527), there is the following prayer to be used in a votive Mass:—

"O God, who, by the most glorious Mother of thy Son, was pleased to appoint a new order in his Church for delivering the faithful out of the hands of the infidels, grant, we beseech thee, that we also may be delivered from the slavery of the devil, by *her merits* and prayers, whom we devoutly honour in the institution of so charitable a work."

The following is the form of absolution, as given in the "Ursuline Manual," a book in very general use among Roman Catholics both in England and Ireland:—

"May our Lord Jesus Christ absolve thee from every bond of excommunication *or interdict*, as far as I have

* See Meyrick's "Working of the Church in Spain."

* See our article on the Invocation of Saints, No. 3—CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. iii., p. 116.

* "Precibus et meritis Beatæ Mariæ semper Virginis et omnium Sanctorum perducat nos Dominus ad regna cœlorum. Amen."

† "Oramus te, Domine, per merita Sanctorum tuorum, quorum reliquiæ hic sunt, et omnium Sanctorum et indulgere dignaris omnia peccata mea. Amen."—Ordinary of the Mass [Missal for the laity]. Published by Richardson and Co., Derby, 172, Fleet-street, London, and 9, Capel-street, Dublin, with approbation of Nicholas, Bishop of Mellipotamus—now Cardinal Wiseman.

power, and thou hast need. I, therefore, absolve thee from all thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen. May the passion of our Lord Jesus Christ, *the merits of the Blessed Virgin Mary*, and of all the saints, may whatever good thou shalt do, and whatever evil thou shalt suffer, be to thee unto the remission of sins, the increase of grace, and the recompense of life everlasting. Amen." p. 182.—Ed. 1851, R. Coyne, Capel-street, Dublin, printer and bookseller to the Roman Catholic College, Maynooth.

Such instances might be multiplied almost indefinitely. They seem to set at rest the question as to whether Roman Catholics are taught to pray *through the merits of the Virgin Mary*.

We, of course, do not mean to say that they do not also trust in the merits of Christ; but we do say, that such prayers are dishonouring to the merits of the Saviour, and revolting to the spirit of true Christianity. Not content with the infinitely precious *merits of Christ*, they require, also, the *merits of Mary*, as if the merits of Jesus Christ were not adequate, without pleading the merits of Mary also—as if the Creator needed the assistance of any creature, however exalted, to complete his work.

But there is a second assertion, that though they pray to Mary, it is only for her *intercession;* and that they never suppose that she has any power, or can herself do anything, but only that she intercedes for those who pray to her.

This, likewise, is a question of fact, and must be determined, not by the statement of any individual as to his own belief or practice, but by evidence.

The evidence is abundant; the only difficulty is in selection; and our space at present compels us to be brief.

In the "Brief Account of Indulgences conferred on the Order of the Virgin Mary of Mount Carmel"* (p. 13), occurs the following passage:—

"The affection of an earthly mother bears no proportion to that of the Virgin, who, to show herself truly the mother of those who wear her holy scapular, did not rest fully satisfied with having preserved them from bodily harm, and kept them out of hell, as far as lies in her, through the mediation of her powerful protection, but also promised as a truly loving Mother, not enduring the sight of her dear and beloved children suffering in the flames of Purgatory, that she would free them as soon as possible, particularly on the first Saturday after their death, as being a day set aside for her honour, and bring them to eternal joy in paradise."

That this is not by way merely of prayer to God or intercession with her Son to free them from Purgatory, but by her own personal act, is put beyond dispute by the words of the Bull of Pope John XXII., bearing date March 3, 1322, generally known as "The Sabbatine Bull." As this may be unknown to many of our readers, we transcribe the words of it, which they may also see, given verbatim, in the "Devotion to our Lady of Mount Carmel"† (p. 17):—

"One day that Pope John XXII. had, as usual, risen very early to pour forth his soul in prayer, being on his knees, in a kind of ecstacy, the Queen of Heaven, the comfort of the afflicted, appeared to him, surrounded with supernatural light, and wearing the Carmelite habit, and spoke thus to him—'John, vicar of my Son, it is to me you are indebted for your exaltation to the dignity which you enjoy, in consequence of my solicitations in your behalf with my Divine Son, and as I have delivered you from the snares of your enemies, so do I expect that you will give ample and favourable confirmation of the holy Carmelite order, which was first instituted on Mount Carmel, and which, descending from Elias and Eliseus, has been always particularly devoted to me. . . . And if among the Religious or Brethren of the Confraternity, who depart out of this life, there shall be any who for their sins have been cast into Purgatory, I, their glorious Mother, *will descend in the midst of them into Purgatory*, on the Saturday after their death, and *take them* up to the holy mountain, in the happy regions of eternal life."‡

This Bull was confirmed, in 1412, by Popo Alexander V., by another Bull, which commences "Tenore cujusdam privilegii;" and, again, by Pope Clement VII., in 1524, in the Bull "Dilecti filii," which, after recounting the indulgences and privileges given to the Carmelites, continues thus—"And, on their departure from this life, the glorious Virgin Mother of God herself will, on the Saturday succeeding the death of the members, whether brother monks or sister nuns, *visit them, and free their souls* from the punishment of Purgatory. Pius V. conferred the same privileges, in a Bull, "Superna dispositione," dated 18th February, 1566, and Pope Gregory XIII., in the Bull, "Ut laudes," 18th September, 1577. The same statements are reiterated in a work, entitled the "Wonders of God," published, with authority, at Rome itself, in 1841, under the pontificate of Pope Gregory XVI., vol. ii., p. 31.

Here, then, we have no private statement, but the Bull of one Pope confirmed by four other Bulls, from four subsequent Popes, and republished, by authority, at Rome, so late as 1841, teaching that the Virgin Mary herself *visits Purgatory* every Saturday, and *releases* certain privileged persons.

We might add, if space permitted, many further proofs that the power attributed to Mary is not that of mere prayer or intercession—though, doubtless, she is constantly prayed to both as intercessor and mediatrix. But here we must close our observations for the present, hoping to resume them at no distant period.

* Ed., Dublin, 1826.

† Published by Richardson (9, Capel-street, Dublin; 172, Fleet-street, London, and Derby) as revised and approved by a prelate of the Carmelite order.

‡ "Die quo ab hoc seculo isti recedunt, properato gradu accelerant Purgatorium, ego Mater gloriosa descendam Sabbato post eorum obitum, et quos invenero in Purgatorio liberabo, et eos in montem sanctum vitæ æternæ reducam."

ROMAN CATHOLIC MORAL THEOLOGY.

In our last number we inserted an article, which was intended to be the first of a series, on the moral teaching of the Church of Rome, and we gave some reasons for thinking that the "moral theology" of St. Alphonsus de Liguori was the most authentic representative of that teaching to which we could refer; but we are met here by some preliminary objections of Doctor Wiseman,* which we are bound to consider. We are obliged somewhat to compress Dr. Wiseman's essay; but we shall faithfully reproduce all his arguments, and, as far as we can, preserve his words. His point is, that the moral theology of St. Liguori is a book written for the guidance of confessors, and not for general instruction in morality. The "moral theology" of the Church, he tells us—which is altogether remedial of sin committed—is quite different from her moral teaching, which is directed to the formation of character.

The office of a confessor may be compared to that of a physician. "Sin is the 'disease;' the state of grace is the condition of spiritual health, and the sacrament of penance is the ordained means of recovery. The confessor, like the physician, is bound, by the obligations of his office, to get his patient out of trouble as well as he can; and treatises of moral theology are his guides as to the most improved method of doing his work." But these treatises, which are mainly occupied with the circumstances of *disease*, are quite different from those which give directions to the healthy how they may avoid sickness. "To confound the one with the other is as absurd as to confound a book of culinary receipts with one of medical prescriptions. If a gentleman in a good state of health were to propose sustaining himself upon beef-tea and barley-water, instead of roast mutton and port wine, he would not make a greater mistake than would the Catholic who should seek for spiritual *direction* in the pages of Busenbaum, or any other work of the kind."

True, Cardinal Wiseman. But suppose a man wished to know whether certain symptoms with which he found himself affected were consistent with sound health, or whether they indicated disease, he would consult a medical work, and not a treatise on diet. If a Roman Catholic is in doubt whether certain actions are, in the opinion of his Church, sinful or innocent, we should say that the most proper work he can consult is one of those treatises which informs confessors whether such actions are justifiable, or whether they are venial or mortal sins—whether they require absolution or not. If the objection brought against Liguori had been, that he was too strict and ascetic, then it might have been in point to say, "we prescribe penances to those who have fallen into sin, which we do not think it necessary to impose on those who have not erred. You must not confound the *medicine* which is necessary for the restoration of the sick with the ordinary diet of Christians." But, in fact, the objection is quite the reverse. The charge is, that the morality of Liguori is altogether too lax—that he regards as innocent, equivocations which Protestant gentlemen feel to be shameful lying; and treats as pardonable, appropriation of other men's goods, which we should call downright stealing. What answer to this is it to say, that such lessons are only intended to be given in the confessional? Are truth and honesty to be compared to roast mutton and port wine? Are they virtues which a Christian can only safely practise when he is in rude spiritual health, but which he cannot indulge in if, through frailty, he has fallen into sin? Surely, if we are asked what is sin, and what is not, we must give the same answer, whether saint or sinner ask the question. Let us hear, however, what reasons Dr. Wiseman gives for the opposite opinion. Our quotation will be a long one, but it is necessary to do justice to the cardinal's argument.

"A physician must provide, not for what he himself might desire, but for what his patient can bear. But his object, above all, must be that of hindering despondency. In the pursuit of this object, he will practise a prudent reserve in speaking to his patient; he will make the best even of serious disease, not from any love of dissembling, still less any habitual untruthfulness, but simply in pursuit of his object, which is, to lighten, not to aggravate; to heal, not to wound. A pretty kind of doctor would he be, who should go about frightening his patients in their first respite after danger, and ere they were well out of it, by telling them, in their feeble state, all that he would say of their maladies to their friends in health, or to themselves when recovered! When he sees them too easily elated, ready to presume upon a momentary amendment, or to calculate upon years, when he knows their days to be numbered, then, cautiously and kindly, but firmly, he advises them of the danger, or, at least, moderates their sanguine hopes. But, in a case where calmness and confidence are the very conditions of recovery, to speak to a sick man of his disease, after the fact, in the same terms in which you would speak to a sound man of the same disease, before it, would be a course of action for which worldly men would very soon find a suitable, and not very complimentary description, were it to be practised in regard to themselves and their families.

"The penitent, moreover, has a claim upon his confessor for tenderness, which is peculiar to himself. A sick man does no violence to his natural feelings in having recourse to a physician; on the contrary, he acts in obedience to them. He *feels* his malady, which all sinners unhappily do not. And even when sinners are moved by the promptings of divine grace to go to a confessor and disburden their consciences, what a victory must they not gain over their self-love! They may, if they please, keep their secret to themselves, so that even their best friends shall not know of it. Unlike the man attacked with illness, they have neither natural inclination within, nor friends without, to force them on using remedies. They may stay away from confession if they please, but they actually prefer, for their souls' health, to do a thing most repulsive to their natural self-love. Are such the persons for a sinner, like themselves, to frighten and discourage? Is it for him to exaggerate, or even to exhibit, in formal shape, the sin which, as it is, appals them by its hideous appearance? Does not human kindness, as well as sacerdotal duty, suggest to a confessor the course of gentleness and moderation? And has not his Lord warned him against bruising the broken reed and quenching the smouldering flax? We repeat, it is one thing to warn from mortal sin as a danger, quite another to deal with it as a fact; and it would be just as unchristian to use, in the confessional, the language of the pulpit, as to tell men, whom we wish to maintain in innocence, of all the excuses which might be made for them, if, unhappily, they should fall into sin.

"It may be said, indeed, that a sin is as much a sin at one time as at another, and that the course we are now advocating is favourable to hypocrisy and falsehood. But how different is the fact? The preacher, or spiritual director, speaks of sin, in the abstract, as hateful to God and destructive of the soul. The confessor, on the contrary, who deals with sin as a fact, has to view it in connection with all its circumstances, in the particular case—such as the amount of knowledge or deliberation with which it was committed, and the degree of completeness to which it was carried; its place in the series of which it is one; its relation to the temperament and situation of the penitent, &c. It will be hard, indeed, if there be no extenuating circumstances in the particular instance; one fact to move compassion and suggest tenderness there must always be—the fact of the confession itself. A penitent always deserves mercy, but a hearer does not even always claim it.

"*Hence it is, that so great a part of moral theology consists in framing excuses for sinners.* The consideration of favourable circumstances in every variety of form, or in their effect, whether upon the intention of the agent, or the character of the act; the possibility of reducing the sin to some less aggravated class of transgressions, or of accounting for it upon some indulgent hypothesis; the admissibility, without compromise, of some lenient construction, or the adoption of some moderate opinion of a divine of weight, upon which the confessor, desiring to be lenient, might safely act. These and the like are topics which receive so prominent a place in our authorized treatises on confession, that it is no wonder if hasty observers should carry away from the perusal of them notions at variance with the strictness of Catholic morality, though a wonder it is that men of credit should persevere in misrepresentations, which have been so often and so completely exposed."

We do not think that Dr. Wiseman has a right to complain of misrepresentation; for it appears to us that, as to the matter of fact, he is quite agreed with the censurers of Liguori, and that his difference with them is only a matter of opinion. We have marked in italics his acknowledgment, that a great part of Roman Catholic works on moral theology is taken up in framing excuses for sinners, and he owns that hasty observers would carry from the perusal of them notions at variance with the strictness of Christian morality. As to the general tone of laxity, then, that pervades the moral theology of Liguori and his brethren, there is no dispute—*habemus confitentem reum*—and the only question to be discussed is, whether this *ought* to be the characteristic of a work intended to be a guide for confessors.

Now, the defence of Liguori that we have just copied, is based on an extraordinary confusion of thought. If Protestants denied the possibility of pardon for sin, even when repented of; if they required that a confessor should terrify his penitent with denunciation of judgment, and teach them to despair of the mercy of God, then it would be quite in point to say that a good physician would not needlessly alarm his patients, and it would be a fair answer to appeal to the example of our Lord himself, who would not break the bruised reed, nor

* See the "Dublin Review," October, 1851, p. 122, &c.

quench the smoking flax, and who "dismissed even the woman taken in adultery with the admonition, 'go, and sin no more.'" The fact is, however, that Protestants hold no such doctrines; they acknowledge the fulness of forgiveness which Christ is willing to bestow on penitent sinners, in terms as ample as can be desired; but they hold, that the first step, in order to obtain such forgiveness, must be, the conviction of sin, and sorrow for it. The penitent must *feel* his malady before he will accept the services of the physician. We find fault with Liguori, not because he teaches confessors to bestow forgiveness on sinners, but because, as Cardinal Wiseman acknowledges, he "makes excuses for sinners," and tries to show that the actions for which we condemn them are, in reality, not sinful, and do not require forgiveness.

It is one thing to *repudiate* a debt; another to acknowledge it, and ask, at the same time, to be forgiven it. The latter is the course which the sinner is directed to pursue by Protestant teachers; the former, that which he would be taught by confessors trained in the school of Wiseman and Liguori.

Let us, in fact, compare the different instruction which a penitent sinner would receive if he sought for spiritual consolation from a Protestant clergyman, and if he made his confession to one who adopted Dr. Wiseman's views as to the duties of a confessor. The Protestant clergyman, however tender his feelings towards the penitent might be, would never dream of giving him consolation by diminishing his conviction of the guilt of the sin which he had committed. He knows that there is no sin too great for the blood of Christ to blot out; while, therefore, he is able to repress every suggestion of despair by fixing the sinner's thoughts on that all-sufficient remedy, he would prefer to deepen in his mind his sense of the guilt of his sin, and endeavour to fix in his soul such a lasting abhorrence of it, as should prevent him from falling into the same sin again.

There are good reasons why a Roman Catholic clergyman, if really anxious for the moral improvement of his flock, should be even more careful than a Protestant clergyman to deepen convictions of sin before pronouncing words of comfort. For every one must admit that the Roman Catholic institution of confession has too often the effect of leading the penitent to suppose that he has got rid of the sin the moment the priest's absolution is pronounced. The Author of our nature has willed that the commission of sin should always be attended with certain remorse and uneasiness, and these uncomfortable feelings are the natural means provided to guard against the repetition of the sin. Now, one of the principal objects for which people resort to the confessional is, in order to get rid of those unpleasant feelings. A judicious confessor, therefore, would be careful how he removed these safeguards against future sin before he had taken advantage of them to gain a security for reformation. Just the opposite of this is the course which Jesuit confessors have been charged with pursuing. It might be expected that Cardinal Wiseman would have denied the truth of the accusation; but any one who reads over the passage we have cited will see that the method which Dr. Wiseman says a confessor ought to pursue, is precisely the same as that which Jesuit priests have been accused of pursuing.

According to him, it is the confessor's business to get his patient out of trouble as well as he can; and the very fact of the penitent's coming to him gives him a claim on his tenderness and compassion. He is to show this tenderness by putting in practice the lessons he has learned from the science of moral theology, in framing excuses for sinners. If he finds his penitent overwhelmed with undue sorrow for his sin, he is kindly to point out that the case was by no means so bad as might be supposed. He is to consider the "relation of the sin to the temperament and situation of the penitent." It was a sin to which, perhaps, he was greatly addicted, and from which the poor fellow would have found it difficult to abstain; or, perhaps, he had provocation, and so may stand excused. Then must be taken into consideration favourable circumstances with regard to the "intention of the agent." When we shall have expounded, in a future article, the Jesuit doctrine of "guiding the intention," the reader will see what resources this alone affords the confessor for reducing the character of the sin, and how fully they have been recognised by Cardinal Wiseman. Then, we are told, the confessor is to consider the possibility of "accounting for the sin upon some indulgent hypothesis, or the admissibility, without compromise, of some lenient construction, or the adoption of some moderate opinion of a divine of weight, upon which, desiring to be lenient, he might safely act." The reader will not understand the full force of these recommendations unless he is acquainted with the Jesuit "doctrine of probability," and knows how confessors are instructed that they may treat as innocent, actions, which they themselves believe to be sinful, provided that some respectable divine has pronounced them innocent. And so lax are the decisions of some of the Jesuit doctors, that a confessor, wishing to be indulgent, need scarcely have recourse to any other method than this of getting his patient quickly out of trouble.

We return, then, to Cardinal Wiseman's own illustration, and ask how a physician might best show his tenderness to his patient. He would, to be sure, not needlessly terrify the sick man's friends, by expressing distrust of the ultimate result, provided the patient made use of the remedies which he knew were sufficient to overcome the disease. But would he show his leniency and moderation in the manner suggested by Cardinal Wiseman? According to him, the physician ought never to admit, if he could help it, that the patient was affected by serious disease, and ought to try to account for his distressing symptoms, on some lenient hypothesis. Perhaps they only indicate some small constitutional derangement—at all events, even if the physician cannot convince himself that they indicate mere trifling disease, still, if he can find in any approved medical work that the symptoms complained of might possibly exist without formidable disease, he is not to act on his own opinion, but he is to do everything in his power to avoid the employment of severe remedies. Now, how would our readers like to call in a medical man who told them that the rule of his practice was, never to employ a strong remedy if he could possibly help it; who, if he was called in to treat a bad fever, would say, "perhaps it is only a heavy cold;" or, if called in for a case of apoplexy, would say, "probably the patient is a man of sleepy habits, or possibly he has taken a trifle more than is good for him; let us deal leniently with him, and by no means have recourse to any severe remedy." We fancy our readers would not much admire the gentleness and moderation of such a physician; but would have recourse to the doctor who was not afraid to act "severely," provided that was the proper way to make them well.

We confess, then, that we cannot understand how our Roman Catholic friends, if they think over the matter, can have any confidence in the efficacy of absolutions pronounced by confessors who acknowledge that they act on such rules as Dr. Wiseman lays down. We do not say a word here against the efficacy of absolution in general. We are willing here, for the sake of argument, to accept the account which Roman Catholics give of it. But every one is agreed that, in order that the absolution should be effectual, it must be pronounced with perfect understanding of the case—the remedy must be adapted to the disease. If the penitent mislead the confessor, and pass off on him his mortal sins for venial, and his venial sins for no sins at all, why, then, the absolution does not reach down to the root of the evil, and the penitent still remains loaded with the guilt of his sins. And it must be all the same if the confessor mislead himself; if he lay down such rules for his guidance as will always lead him to form too low an estimate of the guilt of his penitent. It will follow, then, too, that his spiritual remedies will not be proportioned to the malignity of his disease, and so the sinner will remain unabsolved and unforgiven.

It would be even well if the mischief were only that the one past sin remained without absolution. But what encouragement will the sinner receive for a repetition of his offence. When he goes as a penitent to his confessor, filled with remorse or uneasiness for his ill conduct, and when his spiritual adviser informs him that his scruples were unfounded; that his natural character, and the provocation he had received, must be regarded as mitigating circumstances, and that what he had done is, in the opinion of some grave doctor, no sin at all: what will be the practical effect of such teaching as this? Evidently that he will take care not to give himself unnecessary anxiety on another occasion, and that he will commit, without scruple, the actions which he has found by experience he may commit with impunity. To illustrate this, we may employ the example which Dr. Wiseman himself has selected. He says—"The nice distinctions, which our theologians draw, (between sins that destroy and such as only wound the soul, for instance) are apparently believed to be devised for the special purpose of enabling young Mr. A. to murder his enemy with only a venial quantity of deliberation, or Lady B. to play her cards so neatly as to commit a decided *faux pas* without forfeiting the good opinion of her spiritual adviser. Such an imagination is not less ludicrous than would be that of supposing all the vagabonds in Hampshire to subscribe, in order to get Mr. Justice Coleridge to go down to some central spot in the county, that they might repair into his presence, and consult him as to the approved method of housebreaking, or other such practices, so as to come off with the least quantity of punishment at the next ensuing Winchester Assizes."

Now, Dr. Wiseman must be very simple if he supposes that the vagabonds aforesaid need any other opportunity of instruction than the Winchester Assizes themselves. If they find that house-breakers are in the habit of getting off there with impunity, they will not require any further instruction to know how far it will be safe for themselves to venture in the same way; nor could they have a better instructor in vicious practices than a judge whose invariable rule was to secure the acquittal of the prisoners.

We think we need say no more as to the moral tendency of the general rules laid down by Liguori and approved by Dr. Wiseman; and we shall on a future occasion return to give some practical illustrations of the application of them.

THE ABBE LABORDE AT ROME.

(Continued from page 44.)

"XVIII. When the Episcopal Conferences were ended, on the 25th November, the great *proportion* of the bishops had not yet arrived. They arrived on the following days; but they had nothing more for them to do; and, indeed, they themselves had done nothing.

"XIX. It must here be observed, that the bishops of Spain had not answered the invitation they had received. They had urged three reasons which had hindered them presenting themselves:—The first, that it did not appear to them a fitting time to define this question; the second, that as the cholera was raging in Spain, they could not leave their flocks; the third, that the government opposed their journey. There came no more than one or two, and these for some particular motive. The Archbishop of Toledo, having some time before been promised the cardinalate, came to receive the cardinal's hat—as he has, in fact, received it in the public consistory, which took place in St. Peter's, on Thursday, the 21st November.

"XX. They have not had any conferences of the cardinals; there was only a secret consistory held on the 1st December. What was said there? What was done there? No one knows; but it is certain, that, had they wished, they might, in this one session, have examined the question to its root. Moreover (not to suffer any doubt), their part had been resolved upon—the Pope willed, and his will was known. For, according to the habitual customs of the Court of Rome, even the Sacred College believes itself warranted in always submitting in silence, as soon as the Pope has said, 'I will.'

"XXI. I will add some particulars with reference to those things which the newspapers published, after the account of the Abbé Gaume, about that 'unparalleled enthusiasm,' and that 'general intoxication' (of joy), in which 'Rome was plunged' on the 8th December. It was not possible, as has been seen, that I could have witnessed this; but it must have been, either that this enthusiasm and intoxication were a very sudden outburst, or that they had no other existence than in the heated imagination of the 'Apostolic Notary.'

"Up to the 7th, at two o'clock in the afternoon, when I departed from Rome, I can affirm that no symptom of this enthusiasm and intoxication had as yet presented itself. For five days, at least, the Cardinal Vicar had caused to be advertised a lengthy instruction, to prepare the people for this unparalleled event in the Church, and to animate their devotion. I have read it throughout on the walls of Rome, it enjoined prayers, sermons, and exhibitions of the holy Sacrament in the Churches. The solemn day approaching, a second exhortation followed the first. I had intended to inform myself accurately, both by my own experience and that of others, as to the sentiments with which the people were animated. With this design I visited many Churches, as well during the week, as on two consecutive Sundays, 26th November and 3rd December. I saw in many places the great scaffoldings of monuments prepared for the statue of the holy Virgin, much tapestry displayed, many draperies of all colours, many wax candles; this was the work of the Sacristans; but the enthusiasm of the people—the people—nowhere!

"XXII. During the week, I attended on one occasion an evening sermon, in St. Mary, of Ara-Cœli, a large church, which had, at other times, been the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus. In the middle of the nave, in front of a raised dais, on which a *cordelier* was preaching, I saw a small circle reserved for females, and in the sanctuary five or six religious of the house. I attended twice at the morning exercises, and at the High Mass, in the Church of the Holy Apostles. There were about fifty persons there, besides many who took the opportunity to see the Church, and were going in and out.

"XXIII. On Sunday, 26th November, I spent a great portion of the afternoon in the large parish church of St. Ambrose and St. Charles, in the Corso, in which the Holy Sacrament was exhibited all the day, for the appointed prayers. I hoped to have heard vespers there; but there were not any. In Rome, the *curés* do not give themselves the trouble to perform the office of vespers on Sunday in the parish churches. I wish to be candid—people came in some proportion, men and women, to adore the Holy Sacrament. Each fell upon his knees before the altar, richly illuminated, and withdrew. When I was retiring, I was induced, by the sound of the bell, to enter the Church of St. Lawrence, another parish church in the vicinity of the Corso, to attend at evening prayers. It had, also, but few people in the long aisles, fewer than were in St. Ambrose; but not at all the concourse that we are accustomed to see in France. On the same Sunday, and following (3rd December), I visited other parish churches at the time when vespers ought to have been sung—the Holy Sacrament was exhibited in these also. But, notwithstanding that, I attended in some well-disposed districts, where I saw no one but a priest in adoration before the altar, and three or four persons in the whole church.

"XXIV. On the latter Sunday, I proceeded as far as St. Mary Major, hoping to hear the Roman vespers at least once; for there is a Chapter there bound by the State to sing them. St. Mary Major is the first church in Rome after St. Peter's. This occurred in the midst of the Novena, and was the first Sunday in Advent. The Holy Sacrament was

exhibited with pomp, and the Abbé Gaume was speaking as one who is excited to greater enthusiasm by the exhibition of the relics of the 'Cradle.' I saw a very small number of persons at the entrance of the chapel where the Holy Sacrament was, a school of little children, and some priests and gentlemen who moved about in the quite empty church, visiting it as an edifice.

"But, what is beyond all expression, the workmen wrought with great diligence, as on every other day of the week, in the Chapel *Borghese*, the most beautiful of the Basilicas; and here, while on this subject, is an anecdote to occupy us.

"While waiting for the choir to be opened, where they go to sing vespers, I was near an adjoining confessional, engaged in praying to God from my Breviary. A French priest approached me with a sad and irritated countenance, and said to me—'Sir, there ought to be weighty reasons of necessity to induce these folk to work as they are doing to-day, Sunday, and in the very church; however, such reasons do not appear, and we have not heard them say that any ceremony is to be performed here. Can you inform me of these reasons, to relieve me of the scandal that I suffer?' 'Sir,' I answered, 'I am not aware of any such reasons from necessity, nor can I see any more than yourself why these things should be.' 'But,' he replied, 'are you not employed in this church?' 'No, sir,' I rejoined, 'I am a stranger.' 'I beg pardon,' said he, 'I thought, by seeing you here, that you were the vicar commissioned to hear the confessions of the French.' And he withdrew with a murmur, profoundly scandalized by the religion of Rome.

"Immediately after, the choir was opened. The vespers were sung *rondément* by seven or eight canons, and there was no one else present that I saw, save another man and myself. I remarked they did not sing the vespers of the Sunday. Consequently, they had not performed the Sunday service. The first Sunday in Advent is, however, privileged, following the rubrics of the Roman Breviary, and not yielding to any saint. Evidently at Rome, for the sake of good example, they save themselves the recitation of the Sunday service as is directed in the Roman Breviary, because they find it too long!

"XXV. Can it be that a people, who see so little faith at home, and so great indifference—who practise religion so badly, and who so prepare themselves, in the midst of such preparations and exhortations, for the proclamation of a new dogma—can it be, that they would be suddenly seized with enthusiasm and spiritual exultation, amounting even to intoxication ('*ivresse*') on the day in which the new dogma was proclaimed.

"XXVI. The truth is, that the Roman people were very indifferent to the new faith which has been announced. Such of the laity as had received any instruction did not regard it with any gratification. The people properly so called—the masses—did not understand even what was intended to be done. It must be known that, in Rome, the people, so far as religion is concerned, are in such ignorance, the like of which is nowhere seen. I have been myself informed in Rome, by respectable, well-informed persons, that this ignorance amounts even to brutishness. When they saw so many bishops arriving, they inquired for what reason they came; and they said among themselves—it was related to me in Rome—that it was to apply a remedy to the public misery, by giving some freedom to agriculture, to commerce, and to industry. Women and girls who practised religion, believed that they had come to decide that the holy Virgin is a virgin, and showed in the confessionals that they were scandalized, because the priests were not all agreed upon this matter. I have learned this fact from a sincere man, and one who knew what was passing.

"XXVII. The great bulk of the Roman ecclesiastics of all orders and of all ranks continue in Rome itself, in proportion, as ignorant as the people. Can we wonder, then, that it should be easy to make them receive the Immaculate Conception as of Faith! I have, however, positively learned that among the priests and the religious who have any information, one cannot fail to find some who entertain, regarding the new dogma, the same difficulties as myself. One person of exalted dignity assured me, that the Dominicans of the Minerva have always held the doctrine of St. Thomas, and even engaged me to see them. But in Rome, none has any liberty to think, nor liberty to speak, nor liberty to write, according to the purity of the Gospel and the spirit of the Fathers; in Rome there is the Inquisition to strangle the truth. Father Perrone and Father Passaglia have liberty to write everything: but true and sincere men, nothing.

"XXVIII. The Abbé Gaumé instances, as elements of the 'general intoxication,' the music that the *Pifferari* play before the Madonnas at the corners of the streets. I have heard the music, and have seen the musicians. They are simply two wretched men, clad in rags, of whom one plays on the fife, and the other on the pipes. Government pays them; I ascertained this from a trustworthy source.

"The other element of enthusiasm was the nightly procession of the brotherhood of *Ara cœli*. The Abbé Gaume says, 'that with their song mingled the deep responses of the heart:' I have not heard them but in the distance, crying *Viva Maria*, which seems to be the burden of their song; but some persons who have heard them near at hand, have assured me that their music resembled more a burlesque, than the seriousness of religion. I do not wish to contradict the Abbé Gaume, who is, doubtless, experienced, and to assert that a person may not heartily join in their procession and their song; but it appears that no Frenchman, at least, will take part in their melody.

"In fine, the Abbé Gaume devotes himself, in his poetic spirit, even to the lamps suspended before the Madonnas, and observes—'Even the poorer classes exhibited little lamps in their windows, and the numerous Madonnas were illuminated with lights.'

"It is true there were in Rome Madonnas at the corners of every street, and almost at every step. More frequently the venerated image had a lantern before it. To read the inscriptions, each of these Madonnas is more miraculous and more celebrated, one than another. I left them to enjoy in peace their old titles, and the celebrity which they possessed in the eyes of the people, by reason of the miracles they had wrought at other times. Far be it from me, at least, to refuse them the common legitimate respect due to them all, as representing the image and the remembrance of the Virgin, Mother of God. In this respect, I willingly rivalled the people of Rome. But not having seen the rest with the same eyes, nor with the same imagination as the Abbé Gaume, I cannot help saying, that I was disgusted on seeing almost every Madonna and lantern covered with filth. Thus I must bring home to those who had the duty of keeping them, the charge of hideous negligence rather than of true religion. As for the lanterns, I saw them so densely blackened with smoke, that the light burning in them by night could with difficulty be distinguished.

"It must have been that they had been washed, or rather re-cast, when the Abbé Gaume sees them to be so brilliant as to enhance the splendour of a general illumination; but this I gravely doubt. These little attentions to cleanliness are not the social character of the Romans.

"XXIX. I conclude my narrative for the present. I proceed in my Memoir to examine the authority of the Bull of the 8th December. I shall continue to speak without reserve. I have led my readers to understand that we deal here with a question of faith, and that when we deal with matters of faith, we must lay aside compliments. I will imitate the liberty, and, if I can, the power of the Fathers. If I have uttered truths which appear harsh, so much the worse for those who, according to the apostle's language, will corrupt the word of God—*Adulterantes verbum Dei.* I ought in a question which excites by reason of the feelings which it arouses, but nevertheless a question wholly of faith and salvation, to be as Jesus Christ, our master and our model—'a true teacher, teaching the way of God in truth, having no regard for any man, nor considering the person of men.'"

We must pause here for the present, as the Memoir attached to the above narrative is too long and too important to attempt to give even an outline of it in our present number. The *narrative* which we have given in detail requires no comment from us, and we shall only say we deeply sympathize with the wrongs and insults inflicted on this learned and heroic champion of truth by the tyranny of ecclesiastical authority at Rome, more worthy of the middle ages than the nineteenth century; practised, also, be it remembered, towards a distinguished Roman Catholic priest, and a citizen of the great French nation, but for whose continued support the monarchy of the Papacy would, most probably, at this moment, be no more.

LA SALETTE.

SOME months ago, we presented our readers with the *prospectus* of a work printed at Grenoble, by several of the diocesan clergy of that place, with the object of laying before the Pope a memorial, exposing, in detail, the imposture of the alleged apparition of the Blessed Virgin on the Mountain of La Salette, and showing the dangers attending the (Roman) Catholic Church from the adoption of such false miracles; and at the same time we called our readers' attention to the persevering exertions of the ultramontane journals—the *Tablet*, *L'Univers*, and *Catholic Standard*—to uphold the apparition as "*a stupendous supernatural event* which happened in an unbelieving age, to confound the infidel and blasphemer!"

The French work itself, which we have now before us, consists of a closely printed octavo volume of 368 pages, and is entitled "La Salette devant le Pape, ou Rationalisme et hérésie découlant du fait de La Salette, suivie du Memoire au Pape, par plusieurs Membres du Clergé Diocésain; signed *L'Abbé Deleon*, de Grenoble; and printed by E. Redon, Rue Bayard No. 13, Grenoble; and as it is rather difficult of procurement in this country, and has, so recently as the 2nd May, 1855, been made the subject of legal proceedings before the civil tribunals of Grenoble, we think it may be interesting to make known its contents somewhat particularly, and the more so, as it affords an instructive lesson, how easily false miracles may have been palmed upon the credulous in former ages, by showing how a similar one can be got up, even in such a country as France, at the present day, and in the enlightened nineteenth century.

The whole subject is too large, and has been too minutely dealt with by the Abbé Deleon and his colleagues, to be satisfactorily disposed of in a single article, and we, therefore, propose to confine ourselves, for the present, to that part of the work alone which has reference to the lady plaintiff in the court of Grenoble, and which will enable our readers to understand, without going any deeper into the supposed mystery, why *Mademoiselle Lamerliere* should have brought an action against the *Abbé Deleon* for 20,000 francs damages for alleged injury done to her character by the publication of the work in question, and, at the same time, to estimate, at somewhat of its real value, the importance of the decision at Grenoble, as bearing on the veracity and faithworthiness of the reverend author and his colleagues, when we state that the court *dismissed her proceedings, with costs.*

We propose, also, in order to make the matter more fully intelligible, to annex some extracts taken verbatim from the recent work of the Right Rev. *Dr. Ullathorne*, Roman Catholic Bishop of Birmingham, which contains some important admissions and statements upon the subject, and which, as coming from the pen of a professed advocate of La Salette, will naturally carry more weight with those predisposed to believe such matters (if such persons exist in this country) than any statement made by the open opponents of the prodigy, even though those opponents should be (as, in fact, they are) Roman Catholic priests, of high character, living near the spot, and in the very diocese in which the disputed miracle occurred.

What follows is a verbatim translation (and, perhaps, may be considered by some *too* literal a one) of the early part of the 4th chapter of the Abbé Deleon's book, pp. 59-69.

THE APPARITION *on the Mountain of La Salette on the 19th September*, 1846—*Mademoiselle Lamerliere.*

MADEMOISELLE CONSTANCE LAMERLIERE, de Saint-Ferréol, was born of rich parents, and received a careful education. After several years' sojourn in the Convent of St. Pierre, at Grenoble, under the religious direction of M. Rousselot, Canon and Vicar-General of Grenoble, she entered the Convent de la Providence, in 1822. That convent had only just been established, and had at its head a lady of high merit, Madame Chantal. Mademoiselle Lamerliere filled several offices in this convent, and was at last chosen as the mistress of the novices. Gifted with a lively imagination, she became remarkable for an exaggerated piety, and gave herself up to practices the most mystical. To fulfil the rules of her convent was not sufficient for her ardent zeal. In her class, in her cell, in fact, everywhere, she desired to have little shrines which might recall to her more particularly the presence of God and the Holy Virgin. By the aid of a fluent speech, she easily fascinated her pupils—simple, young, country girls, who were scarcely initiated into the first elements of the most ordinary instruction. This continued tendency to fanaticism excited the solicitude of her superior, Madame Chantal; and, as it was her duty to guard the novices of the institution against rash innovations, or any dangerous exaggerations, Madame Chantal submitted the explanations and commentaries of a private catechism, which Mademoiselle Lamerliere had composed, to the consideration of M. Desmoulins, at present attached to the Seminary of St. Joseph, at Grenoble.

This surveillance annoyed Mademoiselle Lamerliere, who already had made known to her pupils and the sisterhood her project of founding particular congregations (the Holy Family, La Crêche, &c., &c.); and, after eight years' sojourn in the establishment as teacher of the novices, she suddenly pretended to have need of repose, in order to give herself up more completely to the exercises of an absolute retreat.

Madame Chantal readily yielded to this request, and Mademoiselle Lamerliere entered into retreat, which she did in a manner so complete, that she shut herself up in her cell, and never quitted it but to go to the church or the refectory.

Three months thus passed on, when, without giving any one notice of her intention, Mademoiselle Lamerliere quitted the house as a fugitive, and directed her steps to Notre Dame du Laus, in the Diocese of Gap. There she rested for some days, and then commenced her route for Marseilles, on foot. On her way, she visited all the churches, pointed out to the curé of each place defects to be corrected, and repairs to be made, and, to induce them to enter into her views, put down the name of C. LAMERLIERE, *de Saint-Ferréol*, for large sums, which she promised should be paid as soon as they informed her that the improvements were made. It is needless to say that not one of these promises were fulfilled. Arrived at Marseilles, she associated herself with a priest who was occupied with several institutions and pious works, among others, societies for the working classes. This excellent clergyman, however, died, and Mademoiselle Lamerliere proceeded to Valence. There she associated herself with an ecclesiastic whose name had had much notoriety, and she only left him when he himself sunk under the reverses of ill fortune. During her sojourn there, however, Mademoiselle Lamerliere had pursued the realization of her favourite dream, and had organized the congregation of "the Holy Family," and made desperate efforts to obtain the patronage of the Bishop of Valence, Monseigneur Latourette.

At Grenoble, where she came often, she placed her-

self under M. Rousselot, the first director of her conscience, and M. Canon Bouvier, the second director.

Among all these projects she dissipated her fortune, and her correspondence evinced such a constantly-increasing change in her intellectual faculties, that some members of her family became alarmed, and tried to lead her back by kindness. Mdlle. Lamerliere took no notice, however, of their friendly overtures; and, as matters appeared only to grow worse, her own sister and brother-in-law commenced proceedings for her protection before the tribunal of Saint Marcellin on the 28th August, 1846, and the 5th September following, the court assigned to Mdlle. Lamerliere guardians appointed by the court (*un conseil judiciaire*).

Deeply wounded by this measure, and, above all, irritated because it had been taken at the instance of her brother-in-law (a military officer, whose name already is distinguished, and will probably figure still more hereafter in the records of our history), remembering also, with complacency, the benevolent reception she had experienced from several members of the clergy at Grenoble, Valence, and Marseilles, Mdlle. Lamerliere at once formed her resolve. Having been placed under a kind of tutelage by the magistrates of her country and at the instance of her own family, it was by means of the clergy of her country and by a bold stroke that she was to regain her liberty.

The clergy take the lead in matters of civilization; it is their duty, and their disposition; if the clergy, therefore, should bow before her proceedings, and proclaim her *above* the laws which govern feeble humanity—if this proclamation should be accepted by the Catholic world—if the magistrates themselves should respect it and keep silence—the decision of the 5th September would be, in fact, reversed, and the superhuman nature of Mdlle. Lamerliere, and the success of her divine mission, would be for her an ample compensation! Thus thought Mdlle. Lamerliere, and thus she set herself to act.

Very skilful in the art of embroidery, she prepared an aerial costume; it was a white robe, trimmed with a garland of silver flowers, ornamented with arabesques, rising in graceful designs to the waist; on the front of the body was embroidered a brilliant cross, which appeared supported by a chain embroidered in the same manner; on either side, two similar embroideries represented the *pincers* and *hammer*, the instruments of the passion of the Saviour. A *yellow* apron, surrounded with a silver fringe, a scarf, bordered with roses, shoes of white satin, ornamented with a little garland of flowers, and, lastly, *yellow* stockings were prepared by her; and, as if one single costume was not sufficient for her purpose, she further prepared a dark blue dress, and another rose-coloured one, and, carefully packing them up in a paste-board box, set off for Grenoble.

At St. Marcellin she took the *diligence;* and, as the conveyance was already full, she was obliged to mount the imperial, and share the seat of the conducteur, whose name was Fortin.

She had with her her precious box. Her whole soul was set on the execution of her project. She commenced speaking mysteriously at first, but afterwards without disguise, to her "compagnon de voyage." "Her brother-in-law had rendered his name illustrious by his feats of arms; she aspired to acts of renown of another kind. She was going to the mountains of the Alps; there she was sure of success!" The conducteur, Fortin, laughed, and, like an agreeable traveller, began to banter Mdlle. Lamerliere; but, far from disconcerting her, she displayed the resources of her imagination, and her brilliant and fluent elocution charmed her companion, who was satisfied with becoming a listener. When they reached Grenoble, he restored her box to his fair passenger, and wished her good fortune, and complete success.

The same day Mdlle. Lamerliere presented herself at the house of M. X——, a merchant, at Grenoble, and asked for a particular kind of trimming ("galons en points d'Espagne"). She specified the size which was necessary to enable her to complete her work; and, as the merchant could not satisfy her with the lace which he showed her, of which the breadth was not exactly what she required, Mdlle. Lamerliere opened her box, took out her several dresses, and displayed, before the eyes of the merchant and his family, the white robe embroidered and ornamented with arabesques and garlands, and especially the cross, pincers, and hammer, which decorated the upper part; the yellow apron, yellow stockings, scarf trimmed with roses—in short, the whole contents of her box. In vain the merchant searched his stock for trimming which would match those so artistically used by Mdlle. Lamerliere. He was obliged to ask for a delay of 48 hours to enable him to get it from Lyons, but the traveller was too much hurried to agree to his proposal—for she wished to continue her journey the next day. The merchant then gave her the address of Messieurs X—— or Y—— as the only persons in Grenoble who could supply her.*

Mdlle. Lamerliere, in the presence of all the members of the family of the merchant, shut up her goods again in the box, and retired, leaving them in a state of astonishment; for none of them could comprehend the design or aim of a costume so eccentric.

The next day she returned; she had found, at one of the places to which they had directed her the evening before, the kind of material which she was seeking for. She thanked the family of M. X—— for the assistance they had given her, and left them, to re-appear no more.

All this took place in the early part of September, 1846, and before the event of La Salette, which occurred on the 19th of the same month.

Mdlle. Lamerliere betook herself towards the Alps.

In the very heart of the mountains, at a few miles distant (huit kilomètres) from Corps, there is a village called La Salette-Fallavaux, of difficult access, and which is surmounted by wild and abrupt mountains, which serve as pastures for cattle. Every day the children of the village climb these mountains, and drive there the beasts of their parents or masters, and, in the evening, lead them back to the hamlet.

Melanie Mathieu, a native of Corps, and who had been for nine months in the service of Baptist Pra, met on this mountain, on the 18th September, 1846, *Maximin Giraud*, also a native of Corps, whose services his father had given for eight days only to Peter Selme. She descended the mountain with him, promised to meet him again the next day; and, on the 19th September, the two children again betook themselves to the mountain.*

Maximin was always accompanied by his master, who, not to lose sight of him, went to till a field, from which the little shepherd could watch the cows, and sent him, at noon, to water them at a rivulet which flowed near the place, desiring the child to rejoin him immediately. On this 19th September, at noon, Peter Selme despatches his young herd to the fountain. Maximin commenced by calling Melanie; then joined, and went away with her, and, contrary to his usual custom, did not come back to his master. He did not, in fact, rejoin him until the evening, at his house; and when the latter scolded him for the liberty he had taken, Maximin replied by telling a story of a *beautiful lady* who had appeared to him, and also to Melanie, and had *amused* them for a long time, and had made them both *talk familiarly* with her ("les a fait *deviser* l'un et l'autre").†

I extract these details and the chief part of those which follow from a report of MM. Rousselot et Orcel, printed under the title "Verité sur l'Evènement de La Salette," p. 51, &c.

The question is, who was this beautiful lady? and under what circumstances did she appear to the two shepherds?

Having lunched *tête-a-tête* at a little fountain called "fontaine des hommes," Melanie and Maximin betook themselves to the other side of the rivulet (le Sezia), and, contrary to their habit, went to sleep at some distance from one another. Melanie awaking first, woke Maximin. The two shepherds crossed the brook, set about searching for their cows, then came down again to get their bags, which had remained near the place where they had gone to sleep, when all of a sudden their dazzled eyes perceived a lady bright with light seated on the stones of the fountain, in an attitude which indicated profound grief.

Frightened at first, the children, however, soon regained courage. The lady rose, advanced towards them, invited them to approach her, then crossed her arms, and announced to them that she was there to tell them great news, which she then proceeded to relate. Her language, at first, was French; she perceived afterwards, however, that she was not understood, and, without recommencing, she continued her discourse in patois, then finished in French, and, taking some fifteen paces (quinzaine de pas) to ascend to the highest part of the hillock, she then disappeared (Verité sur l'Evènement de La Salette, par MM. Orcel et Rousselot, pp. 32, 3, 4).

The beautiful lady had risen, and the children had been able to see her costume.

It was a white robe, with pearls all over it, a handkerchief with roses round it, a *yellow* apron, *yellow* stockings, white shoes with roses round them, a small chain to which a cross was suspended, on the right, the *pincers*, on the left, a *hammer* (Verité sur l'Evènement de La Salette, page 39).

Now this costume is precisely that which Mdlle. Lamerliere displayed some days before, at Grenoble, in the warehouse of M. X——. This costume was distinguished particularly by the fantastic yellow apron and yellow stockings, a colour which has never in any place been employed to ornament the statues, altars, or chapels of the Holy Virgin. It was distinguished still more by the pincers and hammer, which it never occurred to any painter or sculptor to annex to a statue of the Blessed Virgin, and it is certainly something very singular that such a coincidence should exist between the costume previously imagined by Mdlle. Lamerliere, without any foundation in the pious usages regarding the Holy Virgin, and the costume worn by the beautiful lady of La Salette; and still more singular is the coincidence between La Salette, the mountain on which "the beautiful lady" appeared to the two shepherds, and the mountain of the Alps towards which Mdlle. Lamerliere directed her course some days before, carrying with her the costume of the Lady of the Apparition, and with the design of doing "something which was destined to make a great noise in the world."

But these two striking coincidences are not the only strange things in the *story*.

"The beautiful lady" commenced speaking in French, and then, when she had recounted *one half of her* great news," she perceived that the children did not understand French, and, without going over again what she had already said, she proceeded in *patois*, and, subsequently, began again to speak French, to tell the children what must have been the most unintelligible to them of all—"You will make this to be known to all my people" ("Vous le ferez passer a tout mon peuple")—(Verité sur l'Evènement, par MM. Orcel et Rousselot, pp. 56, &c., 61, &c.).*

The Holy Scriptures inform us that Jesus Christ, after his ascension, sent down his holy spirit on the apostles, and enabled them to speak in divers tongues, to the end that every one of the nations collected at Jerusalem—Parthians, Medes, Elamites, Mesopotamians, Egyptians, Lybians, Jews, Cretes, and Arabians—might all hear, in their own tongues, the wonderful works of God; and, accordingly, 3,000 souls were converted to the faith in one day. God was with the apostles, He rendered his presence sensible by a miracle, the miracle produced its proper effects, and nonesense would have been the man who would attempt to deny it.

But at La Salette, the Lady of the Apparition (who came also, according to MM. Orcel et Rousselot, to perform an apostolic office, for the conversion of the world) employs the common language of the country, which the shepherds did not comprehend; and instead of reproducing in a simple form, in reference to the two children, the miracle which the apostles had wrought in a multiform manner with relation to twenty different nations, she accommodates herself to the ignorance of the two shepherds, and speaks "*patois*" to them, but only after her young auditors had let her know that they could not comprehend her. Could the most ordinary mortal have acted in a different manner?

But this is not all. The lady announces to the shepherds that she is come to La Salette to tell them great news (Verité, pp. 55 et 65). She adds that their duty is to make it known to all the people (Verité, pp. 57 and 68). Both these important paragraphs were announced in French, a language that neither of the children understood. Those shepherds are the channel chosen of God to communicate to all Christian people the great news which so miraculously reached them. Was it not necessary that they should understand what was told them, in order that the Divine communication should be preserved in all its purity, and that the first intriguer who met with them might not be able to change it to his own purposes? Both the honour of God and human reason seem to demand that this should have been so.

But how did things really happen?

The lady related, in French, the half of her news, and then only when the children informed her that they did not understand it, she continued in "*patois*," but without repeating what she had already said, and which was, moreover, the essential part, the very soul of the mission which she came to fulfil; for it is the expression of the Lord's complaints of the iniquities of his people.

On this capital point did the Lady of the Apparition, after the example of the apostles, open the understandings of the two shepherds? Let us see. MM. Orcel and Rousselot have taken on themselves to inform us.

In their joint work (Verité, p. 57), they represent, as *inspired*, the answer which they put into the mouth of Melanie, when pressed with questions on the difficulty she must have experienced in remembering the recital of the lady—"Oh! no," said she, "she (the lady) told it to me *but once*, and I remember it well; whenever I did not understand her well, in saying what she said to me, *those who understand French* comprehend it, *when even I did* NOT *comprehend it; that is sufficient.*"

If that was sufficient, why did the lady change her language with the object of making herself understood? If that was not sufficient, why did she not repeat the part of her news which was not understood by the shepherds?

In either case the white lady has to choose between the absurd and the ridiculous—a dilemma not unnatural for Mdlle. Lamerliere, but superlatively indecent to imagine, much less to say, in reference to the Holy Virgin. The answer of Melanie, so far from being inspired, was either silly or impious.

One other strange thing, and I proceed.

The white lady, after having fulfilled her mission, ascends to the highest part of the hillock, her feet only *touch the top* of the grass; then she disappears, by rising into the air (Verité, pp. 58 and 68).

Now, in the first place, in those high parts of the mountains where the ground is scarcely covered with a light

* A feeling of strict propriety, and, still more, the duty of not exposing to inexorable attacks the persons whose testimony I appeal to in the course of my story, is the reason that I designate them by mere initials: but their names and addresses have been placed in the hands of his Eminence the Metropolitan Cardinal De Bonald, Archbishop of Lyons, also of the Archbishop of Paris, the Archbishop of Avignon, the Bishop of Gap, and his Excellency the Apostolical Nuncio; and if Mdlle. L. shall ever take it into her head to bring her case before either an ecclesiastical or civil tribunal, each of these persons to whom I have referred, will appear, and will find their security in the publicity of the legal proceedings.

* Dr. Ullathorne states that Maximin was then eleven years of age, and Melanie, fourteen.

† Dr. Ullathorne, p. 18, states his words to have been "Qui nous a amuses long temps et qui nous a fait deviser avec Melanie."

* Our readers will understand this better if they take the trouble to read the extracts in the next page, taken verbatim from the work of Dr. Ullathorne, Roman Catholic Bishop of Birmingham, on "The Holy Mountain of La Salette."

coating of earth, and the grass is so short that it does not even afford the teeth of the sheep or goats anything to lay hold of, how could the feet of the lady touch anything else than the top of the grass, since the top is, in fact, the whole of it?

Moreover, why was this ascension of the white lady from the very top of the hill? The Holy Virgin could just as easily have raised herself to heaven from the bottom of the hollow where she was; then every natural explanation of the phenomenon would have been anticipated and prevented. In surmounting the hollow, she reached a crest which presented at the other side a rapid descent, and allowed a human being to disappear and vanish adroitly before the dazzled eyes of two little ignorant peasants—a precaution very suitable to Mdlle. Lamerliere, but which it is ridiculous to attribute to a messenger from heaven.

Thus, the agreement between the Lady of La Salette and Mdlle. Lamerliere in the choice of a fantastic dress, and in the choice of a mountain of the Alps destined to become the theatre of a great event, affords, in the first place, a strong presumption that Mdlle. Lamerliere *is* the Lady of La Salette; for without a divine revelation, Mdlle. Lamerliere could not have foreseen either the eccentric costume which the Holy Virgin was to choose, or the apparition of the 19th September on La Salette, a mountain of the Alps. This presumption is strengthened still more by the nature and variation of the language of the white lady to the shepherds, and by the human precautions which she took to disappear adroitly from their view. I am still, however, only at the preface of this sad drama, which they call *the Event of La Salette*. As we proceed, this probability will soon change to certainty.

"THE APPARITION.

(Extracted verbatim from Dr. Ullathorne's work, entitled "The Holy Mountain of La Salette." By a Pilgrim of the year 1854. Published by Richardson and Son, 172, Fleet-street, London.)

"The 19th of September, 1846, fell on a Saturday. It was also the eve of the Festival of Our Lady of the Seven Dolours. Maximin and Melanie, conducting their cows, came down together from the mountain of La Salette upon the level, or terrace, called *Sous-les-Baisses*. The day was serene, the sky cloudless, the sun shone brilliantly. It was about mid-day, for they heard the distant sound of the Angelus bell. They took their provisions, and ate them by the side of a little spring, called *des hommes*, on the right of the little stream called Sezia. When they had finished their repast they descended, crossed the stream, and laid down their bags separately near the place where another spring sometimes flowed, but was at that time dry, though soon to become for ever famous. They descended a few more paces, and then, contrary to their usual habits, as they afterwards said, they lay down at a little distance from each other, and fell asleep. Melanie awoke first, and not seeing the cows, she awoke Maximin. They then crossed the stream together, ascended in a straight line to the opposite ground, and, on turning round, saw the cows lying on a gentle slope of Mount Gargas. They were about returning towards the dried-up spring to pick up their bags, but scarcely had they turned, when they saw a bright and dazzling light. Here we will give the recital of the children. We will give it exactly as they gave it on the same evening to their employers; as they gave it the next morning to the Curé of La Salette; as Melanie recounted it the same day to Monsieur Peytard, the Mayor of La Salette; as they gave it on the following days, Melanie to the inhabitants of La Salette, Maximin to the inhabitants of Corps; and as they have constantly given it to all inquirers ever since.

"MELANIE'S RECITAL.

"We fell asleep.....then I woke first, and I did not see my cows. I woke Maximin. 'Maximin,' I said, 'quick, let us go and look for the cows.' We passed the little stream which went up straight before us, and saw the cows lying down on the other side; they were not far off. I was coming down first, and when I was five or six steps off the little stream, I saw a brightness like the sun, it was far more brilliant, but it had not the same colour; and I said to Maximin, 'Come, quick, and see the bright light down there;' and Maximin came down, saying, 'Where is it?' I pointed to it near the little spring, and he stopped when he saw it. Then we saw a Lady in the bright light; she was sitting with her head in her hands. We were afraid; I let my stick fall. Then Maximin said, 'Keep your stick; if *it* does anything, I will give it a good knock.' The Lady rose up, crossed her arms, and said to us, 'Come near, my children, be not afraid, I am here to tell you great news.'

"Then we crossed the little stream; and she advanced to the place where we had been sleeping. She was between us both. She said to us, weeping all the time that she spoke (I clearly saw her tears falling)—

"'Si mon peuple ne veut pas se soumettre, je suis forcée de laisser aller la main de mon fils.

"'If my people will not submit, I shall be forced to let go the hand of my Son.

"'Elle est si forte, si pesante, que je ne peux plus *la maintenir*.

"'It is so strong, so heavy, that I can no longer withhold it.

"'Depuis le temps que je souffre pour vous autres! Si je veux que mon fils ne vous abandonne pas, je suis chargée de le prier sans cesse.

"'For how long a time do I suffer for you! If I would not have my son abandon you, I am compelled to pray to Him without ceasing.

"'Et pour vous autres, vous n'en faites pas cas.

"'And as to you, you take no heed of it.

"'Vous aurez beau prier, beau faire, jamais vous ne pourrez récompenser la peine que j'ai prise pour vous autres.

"'However much you pray, however much you do, you will never recompense the pains I have taken for you.

"'*Je vous ai donné six jours pour travailler, je me suis réservé le septième, et on ne veut pas me l'accorder.* C'est ce qui appesantit tant la main de mon fils.

"'Six days have I given you to labour, the seventh I have kept for myself, and they will not give it me. It is this which makes the hand of my Son so heavy.

"'Ceux qui conduisent les charrettes ne savent pas jurer sans y mettre le nom de mon fils au milieu.

"'Those who drive the carts cannot swear without introducing the name of my Son.

"'Ce sont les deux choses qui appesantissent tant la main de mon fils.

"'These are the two things which make the hand of my Son so heavy.

"'Si la récolte se gâte, ce n'est rien qu'à cause de vous autres. Je vous l'ai fait voir l'année passée, par les pommes de terre; vous n'en avez pas fait cas. C'est au contraire, quand vous trouviez des pommes de terre gâtées, vous juriez, vous mettiez le nom de mon fils. Elles vont continuer ; *que* cette année pour Noël, il n'y en aura plus.'*

"'If the harvest is spoilt, it is all on your account. I gave you warning last year in the potatoes, but you did not heed it. On the contrary, when you found the potatoes spoilt, you swore, you took the name of my Son in vain. They will continue to decay, so that by Christmas there will be none left.'

"And as I did not well understand what was meant by potatoes (*pommes de terre*), I was going to ask Maximin what was meant by potatoes, and the Lady said to us—

"'Ah! my children, you do not understand; I will say it in a different way.' Then she continued—

(Melanie continues the recital in the *patois* of the country.)

"'Si las truffas se gastoun eï rien que per vous aoutres; vous öou aïou fa veyre, l'an passa, n'aïa pas vougu fas conti; qu'éra öou countrère, quand troubava de truffas gastas djurava, l'y bitava lou nouc de moun fis öou mey.

"'If the potatoes (*las truffas*) are spoilt, it is all on your account. I gave you warning last year, but you would not take heed of it. On the contrary, when you found the potatoes spoilt, you swore, and introduced in your oaths the name of my Son.

"'E van continua, qu'aqèy au per tsalendas n'y öourè plus.

"'They will continue to decay, so that by Christmas there will be none left.

"'Si ava de bla, föou pas lou semenas, que tout ce que semenaré las bestias vous lou mendjarein, é ço qne vendrè tombarè tout en pouasièra quant l'eyquoïre.

"'If you have corn, it is no good to sow it; all that you sow the beasts will eat. What comes up will fall into dust when you thrash it.

"'Vendrat una granda famina.

"'There will come a great famine.

"'D'avant que la famina vène lous maris öou dessous de sept aus prendren un tremble, muriren entre las mas de las personnas que lous tendren, è lous äoutres feren leur penitença de famina.

"'Before the famine comes, the children under seven years of age will be seized with trembling, and will die in the hands of those who hold them; the others will do penance by the famine.

"'Las nouzes vendren boffias, lous rasins puriren.

"'The walnuts will become bad, the grapes will rot.†

"'Si se couvertissoun, las peyras, lous routsas seren de mounteous de bla, las truffas seren ensemensas per las terras.

"'If they are converted, the stones and the rocks will change into heaps of corn, and the potatoes will be self-sown on the lands.

"'Fasa bian vouatra priéra, mous marris?'

"'Do you say your prayers well, my children?'

"Tous deux nous avons répondu—'Pas guaïre, Madama.'

"Both of us answered—'Not very well, Madam.'

"'Tsöou bian la fas, mous marris, vèpre é mati, quant diria öoumen qu'un Pater é un Ave Maria, quant pouiré pas mey fas; é quant pouiré mey fas n'en maï dire.

"'You must be sure to say them well, morning and evening. When you cannot do better, say at least an *Our Father* and an *Hail Mary*. But when you have time say more.

"'Vaï que quaouqua fena un paou d'iadje à la messa, lous aoutres trabailloun tout l'stiou la dimentsa; é l'hiver quant saboun pas que fas lous garçous van à la messa per se mouquas de la relidjiou; é la careyma van à la boutsaria couma lous tsis.

"'There are none go to Mass but a few aged women, the rest work on the Sunday all the summer; and in the winter, when they know not what to do, the boys go to Mass, only to mock at religion. During Lent they go to the shambles like dogs.

"'N'ava djis vegu de bla gasta, mous marris?'

"'Have you never seen corn that is spoilt, my child?'

"Maximin répondit—'Oh! nou, Madama.' Moi je ne savais pas à qui elle demandait cela, et je répondis bien doucement—'Nou, Madama, n'ai dgis vègu.'

"Maximin replied—'Oh! no, Madam.' For me, I did not know of which of us she asked this question, and I replied very gently—'No, Madam, I have never seen any yet.'

"'E vous, moun marri, n'en deva bian avé vegu, un viadje vès lou Couïn embe vouetre païre.

"'You must surely have seen it, you, my child (turning to Maximin), once when you were near the farm of Coin with your Father.

"'Que lou mestre de la peça, que disia à vouètre païre d'anas veyre soun bla gasta, é pey lé anera tous doux, prenguera dous trés éipias de bla din vouatras mas, las froutera, é tseyguet tout en poussièra é pey vous n'entournera; quant era plus que dimé houra luen de Counrp vouetre païre vous beyllé una pèça de pa en vous disant: Té moun marri, mendja encas de pn aqueytan, que sabou pas quin'en vaï mendjas l'an que ven, si lou bla countinua couma quo?'

"The master of the field told your father to go and see his ruined wheat. You went both together. You took two or three of the ears into your hands and rubbed them, and they fell all into dust; and then you returned home. When you were still half-an-hour's distance from Corps, your father gave you a piece of bread, and said to you, Here, my child, eat some bread this year at least; I don't know who will eat any next year if the corn goes on like that.'

"Maximin a répondu—'Oh! si, Madama, m'en rappellou avus, adès me n'en rappellavou pas.'"

"Maximin replied—'Oh! yes, Madam, I recollect now; just this moment, I did not remember.'"

"After this the Lady said to us in French, 'Well, my children, you will make this to be known to all my people.'

"She passed the little stream, and turned again to us to say, 'Well, my children, you will make this to be known to all my people.' Then she ascended to the place where we had gone to look for our cows.* She did not touch the grass. She moved along on the tips of the grass. I and Maximin followed her; I passed before the Lady, and Maximin a little on the side, two or three steps. And then this beautiful Lady arose a little from the ground (Melanie raised her hand a yard, or more, above the ground, by way of illustration), then she looked towards heaven, then towards the earth; then we saw her head no more, then the arms no more, then the feet no more; we saw nothing more but a brightness in the air; after this the brightness disappeared. And I said to Maximin—'Perhaps it is a great saint.' And Maximin said to me—'If we had known it was a great saint, we would have asked her to take us with her.' And I said to him—'Oh, that she was here still!' Then Maximin darted his hand out to catch a little of the brightness; but there was nothing there any more. And we looked well, to see if we could not see her. And I said—'She will not let herself be seen, that we may not see where she goes.' Afterwards we looked after our cows.

"At this point Melanie is asked—Did she tell you nothing else?

"*Melanie.*—No, Sir.

"*Q.*—Did she not tell you a secret?

"*Melanie.*—Yes, Sir, but she has forbidden us to tell it.

"*Q.*—What did she speak about?

"*Melanie.*—If I tell you what about, you will soon find out what it is.

"*Q.*—When did she tell you your secret?

"*Melanie.*—After speaking of the walnuts and the grapes. But before giving it to me, it seemed to me that she spoke to Maximin, and I heard nothing.

"*Q.*—Did she give you the secret in French?

"*Melanie.*—She told it me in Patois.

"*Q.*—How was she clothed?

"*Melanie.*—She had white shoes, with roses round them of all colours, gold-coloured stockings, a gold-coloured apron, a white robe, with pearls all over it, a white cape over her shoulders, with roses round it; a white cap, a little bent forwards; a crown with roses round her cap. She wore a very small chain, on which was hung a cross, with a figure of our Lord; on the right were pincers, on the left a hammer. At the extremities of the cross another large chain fell, like the roses round the handkerchief. Her face was white and elongated. I could not look at her long together, because she dazzled us" (pp. 23-29).

"The Abbé Lagier was one of the earliest and most searching of their interrogators. He said to Melanie—You do not know French, you do not go to school; how could you recollect what the lady said? She told you several times over? She taught you to remember it well?

"*Melanie.*—Oh, no; she told me but once, and I remembered it. And even if I did not understand it, those who know French understand it; that is sufficient.

"Mdlle. Des Brulais was on the most familiar and affectionate terms with Melanie. She asked—

"*Q.*—Did you know French before the 19th of September, 1846?

"*Melanie.*—I did not know it.

"*Q.*—Did you understand it?

"*Melanie.*—I did not understand it.

"*Q.*—Did you immediately afterwards repeat in French what the Blessed Virgin told you in French?

"*Melanie.*—Yes, I said it as she said it to me.

* To this point it will be observed that the Lady spoke wholly in modern French.—ED.

† The Abbé Deleon has proved that these words about the walnuts and grapes were not part of the original recital, and never appeared in any narrative prior to that of the 22nd of May, 1847, when the children were interrogated by M. Long, the "Suppléant du Juge de Paix," and their statement transmitted by him as a *procès-verbal* to a magistrate of Grenoble.—p. 115.

* Maximin's statement, which we have not room to give in detail, contains the following passage:—"Then she ascended some fifteen paces, gliding over the herbage as if she was suspended and moved on by other hands—her feet only touched the top of the herbage; *we followed her up the ascent*," &c.—Dr. Ullathorne, p. 30.

"*Q.*—You are very sure you repeated it in French, and not in *Patois?*

"*Melanie.*—I said in French what the Blessed Virgin said in French, and in *Patois* what she said in *Patois.*

Q.—You are very sure, quite sure, you did not say it in *Patois* the first day when you came from the mountain?

"*Melanie.*—How could I manage to say it in *Patois* when I could not *say* it (for translate it). I did not know French.

"*Q.*—How could you repeat in French what the Blessed Virgin said in French, since you only knew the *Patois?*

"*Melanie.*—Well, I said it as she said it.

"*Q.*—Do you know what you said?

"*Melanie.*—I said it as she had said it "(pp. 41-2).

The account given of Maximin's and Melanie's previous character in Dr. Ullathorne's book is also worthy of notice; we have only space for the following passages:—"Maximin was eleven years old; he was utterly without education—could neither write nor read. . . . His father declared it had taken three or four years to teach him, and that with difficulty, to say the "Our Father" and the "Hail Mary". . . When asked some time after the event of his life, "Maximin, I am told that, before the apparition of La Salette, you were somewhat of a story-teller?" he smiled, and honestly said, "They have told you true; I told lies, and I swore when I threw stones after my strayed cows." Such was Maximin Giraud.—p. 17. Then, as to Melanie—"Her parents were of the very poorest, and at an early age she had to earn her bread by guarding cattle; she rarely entered a church; for her employers kept her at work on Sundays and festivals as well as on week-days. She had scarcely any knowledge of religion; and her ungrateful memory could not retain two lines of her catechism. . . She was idle, disobedient, and inclined to pout."—p. 18. Interrogated at a later period, the superioress said—"During the year past, Maximin, though taught almost every day, has not learned to serve mass well, nor has Melanie learnt to say well by heart the 'Acts of Faith, Hope, and Charity,' though I cause them to be taught her twice a day."—p. 22.

We must here close for the present our extracts from Dr. Ullathorne's account of the "stupendous event" of La Salette, but have, we hope, given enough to enable our readers to follow the Abbe Deleon's masterly exposé of what we believe to have been the most *palpable imposture* of the present age.

(To be continued.)

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

In consequence of the large number of Subscriptions still unpaid, the publisher will, henceforward, be obliged to discontinue the paper to such *Subscribers* as are in arrear. A coloured wrapper will, it is hoped, be taken as a sufficient notification. We have already explained the difficulty of making special applications.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, JUNE, 1855.

A KNOWLEDGE of the real nature and tendency of any religious system may, in general, be arrived at in two ways. We may either examine its doctrines and the statements of its advocates, in order to learn the principles on which it is professedly founded, or we may study the system itself, and observe the actual result of its operation, in those cases where it is allowed free scope to develop its tendencies, and display its true character to the world.

If the Church of Rome be studied under either of these aspects, we fear that we must arrive at the conclusion, that *intolerance* is one of its essential features, and one most deeply rooted in its constitution. In order to see Romanism as it really is, we must study it, not as it appears in Protestant countries, where its action is controlled and modified by a variety of conflicting influences, but we must examine it *at home.* Italy and Spain are the countries where the Roman Catholic Church holds undisturbed away; and by an examination of the amount of religious liberty which is there enjoyed, we shall be enabled to form a correct opinion, whether the zeal for freedom which is so often professed by Roman Catholics in Ireland, is really in accordance with the principles by which the Church of Rome is actuated when she feels herself at liberty to stand forth in her true colours.

A trial has taken place within the last few months before one of the law courts at Florence, which appears to us calculated to throw considerable light on the question—what degree of liberty in religious matters is conceded to a person living under a purely Roman Catholic government? An account of the legal proceedings to which we allude has appeared in many of the public papers.* The facts of the case are briefly as follows:—

Domenico Cecchetti, a cigar worker by trade, was brought before the Council of Prefecture of Florence, on the 21st of March, 1855, on a charge of "*irregular conduct in matters of religion.*" It was proved that, on the evening of the 16th of December, 1854, the police having proceeded to make a perquisition in the house of Cecchetti, found him, in the company of two of his sons, and of another person, seated at a small table, on which there were lying open a copy of the Bible, translated by Diodati, another copy shut, a third copy being found in the drawer of the table. The judicial decree then proceeds as follows:—

"Considering that it results from the inquiries made, that on certain fixed evenings there met in Cecchetti's house persons not belonging to his own family; and that there is just reason to believe that such meetings were held for the purpose of propagating the anti-Catholic ideas entertained by the accused—Cecchetti having himself confessed that whilst reading the Bible, according to his constant custom, there have been present not only the members of his own family, but persons unconnected with the same, and that he did not refuse to give, but actually held it to be his duty to impart explanations on religious subjects to those who asked him.

"Considering that in this state of matters it appears necessary that the efforts of Cecchetti to damage the Roman Catholic religion be rendered ineffectual, and that the government authorities are bound to take steps for the prevention of further mischief; for these reasons, having seen the articles of the law of 16th November, 1852, the council hereby decree that Domenico Cecchetti *be condemned to imprisonment for one year in the House of Correction.*"

We ask our readers to consider for a few moments the facts of the foregoing trial—a trial not of ancient occurrence, but which took place a few brief weeks since, in the middle of the nineteenth century, in one of the most polished and refined capitals of Europe. A quiet, inoffensive man, after his day's labour, is seated in his own house, in the midst of his family, engaged in reading to them the Holy Scriptures; while so employed, the agents of the government, inflamed with zeal for the Roman Catholic religion, break into his house; they lay hands on every copy of the Scriptures they can find; they bring this unoffending individual before the courts, and cause him to be sentenced to imprisonment, as a common felon, for the space of twelve months!

Now, why do we call attention to the foregoing facts? Because we believe that this and similar occurrences are calculated to throw much light on the real nature of the authority which the Church of Rome seeks to exercise, wherever she can obtain the means and the opportunity of doing so. Whatever professions of liberality her advocates may make on her behalf in this country, she is at heart essentially intolerant, and it behoves all persons who sincerely value religious liberty, to study well the consequences that will infallibly take place, if the Romish Church should unfortunately ever obtain among ourselves the same amount of power and influence which she now wields in Tuscany, and of the disastrous consequences of which poor Cecchetti has had such painful and melancholy experience.

We have seen that in Italy the possession of a copy of the Holy Scriptures appears to constitute a heinous crime in the eyes of these modern inquisitors. Every corner and recess is explored which may, by possibility, contain a copy of the sacred volume. The modern *Christian* Church of Rome seems disposed to wage the same unrelenting hostility against the circulation of the Holy Scriptures in Italy as was carried on by the *Pagan* Emperors of Rome in the days of the early martyrs. We have met with an account of a transaction of this latter description which appears to us to bear some resemblance to the case of Cecchetti, and from which we are tempted to make a short extract, as it is given by an ancient author. It relates to the martyrdom of Felix, an African bishop, in consequence of his refusal to give up his copies of the Scriptures, in obedience to the commands of the Roman Emperor.

"On the next day (writes the ancient martyrologist) the Bishop Felix came from Carthage to Tibiura. He was addressed by the magistrate Magnilianus—"Bishop Felix, give up the books and parchments that you are possessed of." Felix replied—"I have them, but I will not surrender them." The magistrate Magnilianus subjoined—"Your words must give way to the Emperor's orders. Surrender up your books, that they may be burnt." Bishop Felix replied—"It is better that I myself should be burned rather than that the divine Scriptures should be given to the flames; 'for it is right to obey God rather than man.'" The magistrate Magnilianus said—"You must go before the chief governor." The chief governor said to him—"Why will you not surrender these useless Scriptures?" Bishop Felix replied—"I have them, but I will not surrender them." Then the chief governor ordered him to be cast bound into the lowest dungeon of the prison. And he said again—"Felix, why will you not give up the Scriptures? perhaps you have them not?" He replied—"I have them, but I will not give them up."†

It will be seen, from the above interesting fragment of antiquity, that the heathen governors were in the habit of *burning* any copies of the Scriptures that fell into their hands. We cannot tell whether the Florentine inquisitors consigned to the same fate the three copies of Diodati's Bible that they found in the house of Cecchetti, but we can refer to a notable example of a similar circumstance, which took place in England shortly before the Reformation. On Sunday, the 11th of February, A.D. 1526, Cardinal Wolsey sat in state in St. Paul's Cathedral, in London, while Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, preached a sermon against Luther. Before the pulpit, within the rails, stood great baskets full of books (copies of Tyndale's New Testament, in English), gathered up from search made by the Romish agents in London, Oxford, and Cambridge, ready to be burnt in the great fire before the crucifix, at the north part of St. Paul's. Thus Testament after Testament were consumed.

Most persons will, we think, concur in the justice of the remark which Burnet the historian makes, with reference to this method of destroying the Word of God—"This burning had such a hateful appearance in it, that people from thence concluded *there must be a visible contrariety between that Book and the doctrines of those who so handled it;* by which both their prejudice against the [Romish] clergy and their

* We copy the account given in the *Daily Express* of the 29th ultimo.

† Vide Acta S. Felicis, apud Ruinart, Acta primorum martyrum, p. 256. Amstel. Wetstein, 1713.

desire of reading the New Testament was increased."*

We trust that the persecution of Cecchetti will have the effect of stirring up many of his countrymen to read and study the Word of God for themselves, notwithstanding all the obstacles and impediments which the agents of the Church of Rome may interpose. And we ought to return thanks to Almighty God, that He has been pleased to place us beyond the power of Romish inquisitors, and that we have been born in a free land, where we need not fear that we shall be cast into a felon's cell, if we venture, in the privacy of our chambers, to read and meditate on that blessed Book, which "is able to make us wise unto salvation through faith that is in Christ Jesus".—2 Tim. iii. 15.

RELIGIOUS TOLERATION IN ENGLAND.

WHAT is toleration? The dictionary defines it to be an allowance given to that which is not approved. What, then, is religious toleration? An allowance given to the free and unconstrained exercise of a religion which those who have the power to prevent it do not approve. Our Roman Catholic brethren in England and Ireland, living under a Protestant Queen and Protestant constitution, which does not approve of their form of faith, but, on the contrary, solemnly protests against its errors in many important respects, and yet enjoying the free and unconstrained permission to exercise their religious worship as they please, have the largest and noblest exemplification of what is meant by religious toleration that, perhaps, the history of religion has ever afforded. Do we grudge them all this? Far from it; we rejoice at it and glory in it. We would persuade their understandings and convince their judgments by fair argument and sound reason; but we would never for a moment coerce or control their religious liberty.

But civil and religious liberty has been a party cry among politicians of a certain class, who style themselves liberals, and has been for thirty years a party toast among Roman Catholic agitators, at every political demonstration. The Roman Catholic Archbishop, Dr. Cullen, at the Rotundo meeting in Dublin, some time since, stated that the Pope and the bishops (Roman Catholics) were the true friends of civil and religious liberty. But what do they mean by religious liberty? In a Protestant country, we know very well that they mean liberality to themselves—that liberty to exercise their own religion in Protestant countries freely which they deny to all other religions in Roman Catholic countries; elsewhere religious liberty means the liberty to oppress and banish all other professions of faith but their own. "But if he were lord in the land, and the Protestants in a minority, if not in numbers, yet in power, what would he do to you? If it would benefit the cause of (Roman) Catholicism, he would tolerate you, if expedient he would imprison you, fine you, or, perhaps, banish you, (as the Pope did the respectable Roman Catholic priest, the Abbé Laborde, a few months ago); but be assured of one thing, he would never tolerate you for the sake of the glorious principle of civil and religious liberty." These are not our sentiments, but the candid avowal of a widely-circulated Roman Catholic publication in England (the *Rambler*), expressed in the year 1851.

If the Roman Catholics of any parish in Ireland were anxious to build a chapel, and had collected the necessary funds, and had purchased an eligible site, but, after they had just laid the foundation, were prohibited by a Protestant Government from putting a single stone of the edifice upon another, would they not consider it a mockery and a mere humbug to say that this was religious liberty? And how would they be satisfied if they were told that as the English nation prohibits the burning of widows in India, so the Queen of England is in duty bound to hinder, if she can, the perpetual burning of the souls of her own people in hell? Yet this is the very apology given by the *Tablet* newspaper, for the Pope's preventing the erection of a Protestant Church in Rome; and this is what Dr. Cullen means by religious liberty when he says that the Pope is the friend of religious liberty; he means only in those cases in which liberty is to be *received* at the hands of the liberal and enlightened Protestants, to whom the slightest reciprocity or return is contemptuously denied. No better reason is vouchsafed for prohibiting their reading of the Bible in Tuscany, or the decent burial of Protestants in Lisbon or Madrid. In Italy, Naples, Spain, or Portugal, where the power of the Pope is dominant, the public exercise of their religion by Protestants is a crime. Compare with this, the condition of our Roman Catholic brethren in Ireland and England. Their reason is addressed when it can be approached; their attention is affectionately and respectfully invited to the hearing of truths from which they may forbear if they will; they are sometimes, we rejoice to say oftentimes, convinced, but never coerced. The only invasion of their religious liberty comes from their own priesthood and bishops who employ menaces and terror, and sometimes physical force, to influence their religious conduct and profession. But so far as the Protestant government under which they live, and the Protestant ministers by whom they are surrounded, are concerned, they hear but the words of kindness and of protection, of counsel and encouragement.

We are not about to enter into the vexed politics of the day, or to meddle in any way with the recent discussions in Parliament or elsewhere relative to the Maynooth Endowment; but we ask any dispassionate Roman Catholic reader, does not the very existence of an endowment, in a Protestant state, of a seminary for the education of Roman Catholic priests, present the most extraordinary instance of religious toleration that even the history of Protestant England could produce? Those who struggle for its withdrawal complain—we do not say whether rightly or wrongly—that it passes beyond the fair limits of toleration, and amounts to an encouragement and patronage of what the Queen and the Parliament profess to be a schismatical creed, in the most substantial and unequivocal shape. We do not ask our readers to consider whether these people are justified in their complaints or not; such considerations as these are beyond the sphere of our inquiries, and we meddle not with them; but let them endeavour to realize the fact of an endowment of a Protestant seminary for Protestant clergymen, patronized and endowed by the Pope and cardinals in Rome, and when they have stretched their imagination to such a point as this, then, we believe, they can more temperately estimate the conduct of those Protestants, whether in England and Ireland, who are demanding the withdrawal of the *endowment* from the College of Maynooth by the Parliament of a Protestant country.

Liberty is one thing, liberality is another; but endowment is certainly a step considerably in advance of either; and those who are willing to concede the fullest liberty to the exercise of a faith of which they cannot approve, and are disposed to act with the greatest liberality towards those who profess that faith, may, nevertheless, with perfect consistency (but whether wisely or not we do not now pretend to say), decline to bear the responsibility of its propagation, by the endowment of seminaries for the purpose of educating a priesthood in what they believe to be serious errors in doctrine and morals.

THE APOCRYPHA.

THE controversy between Protestants and Roman Catholics respecting the Rule of Faith involves two principal questions—first, Is the Rule of Faith contained in the *written* Word alone, or must we join to it the *unwritten* Word (Tradition)? Secondly, What constitutes the written Word? Does it include the apocryphal Scriptures or not? Does the Protestant Bible contain the *whole* or only a part of it? In short, what is the *canon* of Scripture?

The Church of these realms agrees with the Church of Rome respecting the canon of the *New* Testament; not so, however, with respect to the *Old* Testament. *We* acknowledge those books only to be canonical which our blessed Lord and his inspired apostles stamped with their authority, and which the Christian Church, during a period of fifteen centuries, recognised as divine. Roman Catholic theologians admit that our Lord and his apostles sanctioned the Jewish canon (which excluded the Apocrypha); they allow, moreover, that the Apocrypha was not admitted into the Christian canon for the first three or four centuries; but they contend that, at that date, and in virtue of the developing power inherent in the Church, the apocryphal books were enrolled in the Christian canon, and thenceforward continued to be recognised as the canon of the Church; and that the Council of Trent merely *declared* what had been the immemorial doctrine of the Church upon the subject, when it pronounced the Apocrypha to be divinely-inspired Scripture, and anathematized all who should dare to deny it.

The proofs usually relied on by Roman Catholic writers of the reception of the Apocrypha as divine by the Church, from the fourth century onward, are the following:—1. The catalogue of canonical books given by Augustine at the end of the fourth century. 2. The decree of the Council of Carthage, also about the same date. 3. The decretal of Pope Innocent I., at the beginning of the fifth century. 4. The decretal of Pope Gelasius, at the close of the fifth century. 5. The decree of Pope Eugenius IV. in the "Instruction to the Armenians," drawn up after the close of the Council of Florence, about the middle of the fifteenth century (1439).

Now, without dwelling at present upon the insuperable objection to the canonicity of the Apocrypha, arising from its admitted non-reception as canonical during the first four centuries, and which fatal objection the ingenious fiction of gradual development in vain attempts to remove, —without, we say, enlarging on this now, we will address ourselves to the so-called proofs, by which it has been attempted to show that since the fourth century the Apocrypha has been acknowledged by the Church to be inspired. We have already shown (CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. ii., pp. 112, 125) that the authenticity of the documents enumerated above under the second, third, and fourth heads, is more than questionable, and, in fact, that the evidence of their spuriousness is so strong as to deprive them of any weight as proofs of the point under discussion. We have shown, with reference to the decree of the Council of Carthage, that it contains a gross anachronism of no less than twenty years. We have also shown that Pope Innocent's decretal, which purports to have been written at the opening of the fifth century, was first brought to light late in the ninth century—more than four centuries and a half after it professes to have been written. And, lastly, we have shown that the evidence on which Pope Gelasius's decree rests is, in the highest degree, precarious. But, even admitting the genuineness of these questionable documents, we are prepared to prove that they lend no countenance to the Tridentine decree respecting the Apocrypha. We commence, then, by making a very important distinction, upon which the whole question turns, and which, therefore, Roman Catholic controversialists endeavour, as much as possible, to keep out of sight and ignore. The distinction referred to is that between the restricted meaning which we now exclusively attach to the terms "canonical," "Scripture," "sacred Scriptures," and the wider sense in which they were frequently used by the earlier writers. We moderns restrict their application to the *inspired* Scriptures exclusively, and this is the sense in which the terms are always understood in the controversy between Protestants and Roman Catholics. But it was otherwise in times when controversy did not oblige men to use theological terms in a precise and definite sense: hence we occasionally find the term "canonical" applied by early writers, not merely to the inspired books of Scripture, but to one or more of the apocryphal books, not with the intention of placing them in the same category, as to divine authority, with the inspired books, but simply in order to express the fact that these apocryphal books were *read in the churches*, and were held in reverence, *as containing rules* (canones) for the *practical guidance of life*. The truth of this assertion we will establish presently, and especially we will adduce in support of it the express authority of one of the greatest of the Romish divines themselves—Cardinal Cajetan. Similarly, the earlier writers frequently quote the apocryphal books as "Scripture," and sometimes even as "divine Scripture;" but what they meant thereby was merely to distinguish the books *read in the churches*, and which, on that account, might, in a certain sense, be called *sacred* books, from the legendary stories, and spurious apocryphal writings, which, even then, certain superstitious or even heretical persons were endeavouring to palm off as genuine productions of the apostles or other inspired men. In contradistinction to these *spurious* forgeries (which were sometimes also called *apocryphal* books, because their authors and their origin were alike unknown)* the Church writers occasionally applied, as we have said, the terms "Scripture," "sacred Scripture" to what *we* now exclusively call the apocryphal books, to denote that they were *genuine* works, valued by the Church for the useful lessons which they contain, and, on that account, read in her public services. For this reason they were sometimes also designated *ecclesiastical* books. We may add, that another very probable reason why the term "Scripture" was so often extended to the apocryphal books in ancient times is this, that these books were bound up in the *same volume* with the inspired books, and so were naturally called by the same name.† However, that the writers who thus extend the term "Scripture," &c., to the apocryphal books had no intention whatever to *canonize* them (in our sense of the word) is clear from this, that those very same writers elsewhere apply the terms "Scripture," "divine Scripture," "Revelation," "holy Inspirations," and the like, not only to those apocryphal books which the Church of Rome rejects equally with us, namely, the third Book of Esdras, and the fourth Book of Maccabees, but even to the Prophecy of Enoch and the Shepherd of Hermas.‡ So that it is plain the terms in question were employed in a wide and loose sense, and that any argument founded upon such patristic usage by the advocates of the Tridentine decree would be useless, because it would prove too much. In further illustration of this patristic usage, we may observe, that in the English books of Homilies, the authors of which were certainly very far from recognising the divine authority of the Apocrypha, the apocryphal Book of Wisdom is several times quoted as Scripture, and even as holy Scripture.§ Nay, more, we find the highest Roman Catholic authorities themselves using the terms "Scripture," "divine Scrip-

* Burnet's History of the Reformation, vol. i., p. 120. Dublin, 1730.

* It is very necessary to bear this fact in mind, in order to avoid confusion; what we term apocryphal books the ancients frequently call *ecclesiastical*, and what they sometimes call apocryphal we should term spurious forgeries.

† The Apocryphal books and portions of books, which were all either originally composed in Greek or very soon translated into it, were incorporated with the Septuagint version of the Old Testament not long *after* the time of our Lord and his apostles; from the LXX. they were transferred into the Latin translations of the Old Testament, which, before the time of Jerome, were all made immediately from the LXX.

‡ Thus Clemens Alexandrinus and Theodoret quote the third Book of Esdras; so does Athanasius, who yet, in his catalogue of the inspired books, excludes the Apocrypha. Ambrose quotes the fourth Book of Maccabees. Irenæus and Tertullian quote the Prophecy of Enoch; and Origen quotes the Shepherd of Hermas.

§ The first book of Homilies is generally thought to have been composed by Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer; the bare mention of whose names is a sufficient evidence of their opinions respecting canonical Scripture. The second book was published simultaneously with the Thirty-nine Articles in 1562, in which revised edition of the original Articles an addition was made to the article concerning Holy Scripture, the object of this addition being to draw a distinct line of demarcation between the canonical books and the Apocrypha, and to declare that the latter were not to be applied to establish any *doctrine*.

ture," &c., in the same wide sense, as distinguished from merely secular writings. Thus Pope Nicholas I. speaks of "the divinely-inspired opinions of the Fathers": Pope Innocent III. quotes a passage of Augustine as "sacred Scripture," which expression Melchior Canus tells us is to be understood in the same sense as when the Papal laws are called "sacred"—viz., in order that they may be distinguished from the laws of temporal princes: and Bellarmine says, that "although the canons of councils and the decrees of popes are distinguished from and inferior to divine Scripture, yet that, *in their own way* (suo modo), they are, and may be called, *sacred and canonical Scripture*, in order to distinguish them from the writings of profane authors and of the Church Fathers, which are not a rule."—De concil. auct., lib. ii., c. xii.

Having premised thus much respecting the usage which prevailed in ancient times relatively to the the terms "canonical," "Scripture," &c., we proceed to examine the documents above enumerated, and which are those whereon Roman Catholic divines found their defence of that part of the decree of the 4th session of the Council of Trent which concerns the Apocrypha. First, then, we take the famous passage of Augustine, in his treatise "*de Doctrina Christiana*" (lib. ii., cap. 8). Speaking of the study of writings connected with sacred subjects, which (in accordance with the usage above noticed) he calls by the generic name of "divine Scriptures" (*divinæ Scripturæ*), he recommends that particular attention should be bestowed on the Scriptures called *canonical*. He then proceeds—"The following method is, therefore, to be observed in reference to the *canonical* Scriptures; those which are received by all the Catholic Churches are to be *preferred* to those which some of the Churches do not yet acknowledge; and in the case of the latter class, again, those which are received by the more numerous and more important Churches are to be preferred to those which are received by the fewer and less important." Having laid down this general principle, he then gives a catalogue of all the *canonical* Scriptures ("*totus canon Scripturarum*"). In this catalogue he includes Tobit, Judith, two Books of Maccabees, Wisdom, and Ecclesiasticus.* This catalogue has been termed the Canon of Augustine, in contradistinction to the Canon of Jerome (from which the Apocryphal books are excluded); and is the Canon which the Council of Trent has ratified, declaring all the books, with all their parts, to be sacred and canonical. The advocates of the Council appeal to the authority of Augustine in justification of the canonization of the Apocrypha; but the slightest attention to Augustine's words shows that he uses the word "canonical" in a very different sense from that in which the Tridentine Fathers employ it. With them "canonical" means "inspired;" he uses the term in a much wider sense, as denoting the books which were held in reverence and read in the Churches, in which category, besides the inspired books, the apocryphal were also contained. And that the word, as employed by him, must be understood with this latitude of meaning is obvious, from what he says as to the *preference* to be given to some of the canonical books over others. In the case of *inspired* Scripture, it would be absurd to talk of preference. Inspiration does not admit of degrees. The divine element of the Scriptures is not a quantitative thing, conferring different values on different parts of the Scriptures, in proportion to the amount of it that may be found or thought to exist in them. The above is no new explanation of Augustine's words in the passage under consideration; it was given by one of the most renowned Roman doctors, and one, moreover, who was the personal antagonist of Luther, Cardinal Cajetan. We shall quote his own words, as they occur at the close of his Commentary on the Book of Esther. The whole passage is most remarkable, and, therefore, we will make no apology for giving it at length:—"Here we end our commentaries on the historical books of the Old Testament; for the remainder—viz., Judith, Tobit, and the Books of Maccabees—are not included by St. Jerome among the canonical books, but are placed, along with Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus, among the Apocrypha. Do not be uneasy, tyro, if you should anywhere find those [apocryphal] books enumerated amongst the canonical, either by holy councils or by holy doctors; for the words both of councils and of doctors must be reduced to the judgment of Jerome; and, according to his decision, *those books* [the apocryphal books enumerated], and if there be any others like them in the canon of the Bible, are *not canonical*—that is to say, do not contain rules *for confirming articles of faith; they may, however, be called canonical, as containing rules for the edification* of the faithful, inasmuch as they have been admitted into the canon of the Bible and authorized for this very purpose. With *this distinction* you will be able to discern the meaning of the *words of Augustine* (de Doctr. Christ., lib. ii.), as, also, of the decrees of the Council of Florence, under Eugenius IV., and of the provincial Councils of Carthage and Laodicea, and of Popes Innocent and Gelasius."† These striking words were penned before the Council of Trent had uttered its anathema against all who should dare to deny the canonical authority (in the *fullest* sense of the word canonical) of the apocryphal books. We learn from them—First, that a Roman cardinal (who is described by his contemporaries as an "incomparable theologian," "to whom, as to a common oracle, men were wont to resort in all difficult questions of theology"), an avowed enemy of the Reformation, writing shortly before the Council of Trent, adopts Jerome's canon, and rejects the Apocrypha as authority in questions of *faith*, while he allows its value for the *edification* of the faithful; thus assigning to it exactly the same place as the Church of England does in her 6th Article. Secondly we learn that, in the passage of Augustine under consideration, as also in the other documents referred to by Cajetan, the word "canonical," when applied to the apocryphal books, is used in a wide sense, which must not be confounded with that which it bears when applied specially to the inspired books. Thirdly, we see from Cajetan's own usage, that, even in his day, the phrase "*Canon* of the Bible" (Canon Bibliæ) meant the whole list of books contained in the Vulgate, comprising the *non*-canonical as well as the strictly canonical Scriptures.

Bearing in mind, then, this usage of the word "canonical," we come to the primary argument in support of the divine authority of the Apocrypha, derived from the decree of the Council of Carthage. We said we would consent to waive all the objections to the genuineness of this decree, weighty as they are, and admit its evidence in the case. Let us hear, then, what it is. In the 47th canon it is decreed, "that, with the exception of the *canonical* Scriptures, nothing should be read in the Church under the name of divine Scriptures" [*i.e.*, no forgeries or legendary tales pretending to be the compositions of inspired men]. Then a catalogue is given of the "canonical Scriptures" ("sunt autem canonicæ Scripturæ," &c.), which agrees exactly with that given by Augustine, except that in it the authorship of the books of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus is attributed to Solomon, which is a manifest error, and, of itself, invalidates the claim of the council, not only to be regarded as infallible (for this it can hardly claim, in any case, having been only a *provincial* synod), but even as competent to pronounce an opinion upon the subject. Without, however, insisting upon this, and allowing the decree all the weight that its advocates claim for it, our simple answer is, that the word "canonical" is used in the wide sense above explained—the sense in which Augustine, who is said to have been present at the council, himself employed it—the sense, moreover, in which Cajetan expressly tells us we must understand it. Nay, more, the decree itself explains the sense in which the word "canonical" is used in it; for at the close thereof we read, that the council declared the aforesaid books to be canonical, "because they received them from their ancestors "*to be read in the Church*" ("in Ecclesia legenda"). And, lastly, that the African Church of the fourth century never intended to place the Apocrypha on a par with the inspired Scriptures—to *canonize* it, in the modern sense of the term—is clear from the explicit testimony of the two African bishops, Junilius and Primasius, who wrote about a century and a half later (the middle of the 6th century). Junilius expressly excludes from the canonical Scriptures (strictly so called) the books of Judith, Wisdom, and Maccabees; and, for this reason, because the Hebrews and Jerome excluded them—a reason, which, of course, excludes the rest of the Apocrypha also. And Primasius, commenting on the 4th chapter of the Apocalypse, says, that St John, in mentioning the twenty-four wings and twenty-four elders, alludes to the number of the books of the old Testament, "which number," he adds, "*we have received* as possessed of *canonical authority*."* Surely, the African Church of the 6th century, speaking through two of its most eminent bishops, may be allowed to be a better expositor of the sense intended to be assigned to the word "canonical" by their great bishop, Augustine, and a council at which he assisted, only a century and a half before, than a few Italian bishops of the 16th century, who, as we shall hereafter see, were very far from being unanimous respecting the conclusion which was, at last, arrived at.

In our next number we hope to resume this subject, and complete our examination of the proofs usually urged in support of the Tridentine decree respecting the Apocrypha.

---

* Augustine does not expressly mention the Book of Baruch or the apocryphal parts of Daniel and Esther, but it may be assumed that he intended to include them: because the African Bible was a translation from the LXX., in which they form constituent parts of Jeremiah, Daniel, and Esther, respectively.

† Hæc in loco terminemus Commentaria Librorum Histor. Vet. Test. Nam reliqui—viz., Judith, Tobiæ, et Maccabæorum, libri a B. Hieronymo *extra canonicos libros* supputantur, et inter *Apocrypha* locantur, cum libro Sapientiæ et Ecclesiastico. Nec turbaris, novitio et alicubi reperteris libros istos inter *canonicos* supputari, vel in oecto conciliis, vel in sacris doctoribus. Nam ad Hieronymi limum redervadas sunt tam verba conciliorum, quam doctorum; et juxta illius sententiam, libri isti, et si qui alii sunt in *Canone Bibliæ* similes, non sunt canonici: hoc est non sunt *regulares* ad firmandum ea quæ sunt *fidei*; possunt tamen dici canonici, hoc est regulares ad ædificationem fidelium. Utpote in Canone Bibliæ ad hoc recepti et authoritati. Cum hoc enim distinctione discernere poteris et *dicta Augustini* in lib. 2. de Doctr. Christ., et Scripta in Conc. Flor., sub Eugen. IV., Scripta quæ in provincialibus Concilijs Carthag. et Laodic, et ab Innocentio ac Gelasio Pontificibus. Cajetan. In omnes authenticos Vet. Test. hist. Bib., Comment., p. 482. Parisiis, 1546.

* The Christian Fathers generally, and, amongst them, Jerome, not unfrequently arranged the Old Testament Books as received by the Jews (and, consequently, exclusive of the Apocrypha), so as to correspond in number to the letters of the Greek alphabet (24), just as the Jews made it 22 books, in conformity with the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet.

Correspondence.

THE TWO VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I have been induced by your paper to compare some chapters of the Douay and English versions of the Holy Scriptures together, and am struck with their substantial agreement.* I wish, however, to know which translation (for they are both, of course, only translations) is really correct in the following passages. The Prophecy of Isaias, ch. i., v. 18, Douay Bible, has—"Come and accuse me, saith the Lord." The English Bible translates the same words—"Come now, and let us *reason* together, saith the Lord."

I cannot but think this appeal to reason savours strongly of Protestantism, though I confess I cannot well make sense of the Douay translation; for why should "learning to do well, relieving the oppressed, or defending the fatherless and the widow," lead any one to *accuse God*; or why should *accusing* God make sins that are as red as *scarlet*, white as snow. The expression, to say the least of it, is not a happy or very intelligible one, though I doubt if your English version be a bit more so; for what has *reason* to do with the forgiving of sins, any more than *accusing* God could lead to such forgiveness.

I dare say I am only displaying my own ignorance by these remarks; but not pretending to be a learned scholar myself, I am really anxious to know from those who are learned in said matters, what they have to say on the subject. As to asking a (Roman) Catholic priest for such information, I have long since given that up as useless, or worse; for I should at once be marked as a heretic if I did so.

When my hand is in, I may as well ask you about another passage—Isaias, ch. ii.; after speaking, in the 18th and 19th verses, of the total destruction of idols, and man going into the holes of the rocks and caves of the earth from the face of the fear of the Lord, and the glory of His Majesty when he shall rise up to strike (or shake terribly) the earth, proceeds, according to the Douay Bible, in v. 20, thus—"In that day a man shall cast away his idols of silver, and his idols of gold, which he made for himself to adore, moles and bats." Your authorized version has it—"In that day a man shall cast his idols of silver and gold which they made to worship, *to the* moles and *to the* bats." This may appear to be a trifling difference, but there must be some reason for it; both cannot be right. Can you tell me whether idols of silver and gold were ever made by any one in the shape of moles and bats. Did any nation ever worship moles and bats, or, rather, silver and gold images of them? I am sincerely anxious to come at the truth, and especially with reference to the note of the Douay version on v. 18 of that chapter—Your obedient servant,

AN INQUIRER.

The two questions put by our correspondent can be shortly answered. On the first point—namely, whether the translation of Isaiah i. 18, given in the Douay Bible, or the English authorized version, is the correct one, we have no hesitation in giving a preference to the latter, for the following reasons:—The particular form of the Hebrew verb† which the Douay Bible translates "accuse," and the authorized version "reason," unquestionably means, "to argue a point, reason." Thus, for example, Gesenius, the best modern Hebrew authority, stands as the meaning, "disputavit cum aliquo," to dispute with any one. The LXX version of this word, in the passage before us, is ἐλεγχθῶμεν, and the Syriac version reads ܢܬܬܟܚ, both of which give the same interpretation as the authorized English translation. It may be added, that this form of the verb *never* has in Hebrew the active meaning "to accuse." Our Roman Catholic readers can satisfy themselves on this point by referring to the only other passages where it occurs—viz., Gen. xx. 16, and Job. xxiii. 7. Our correspondent appears to have found some difficulty in perceiving what *reason* has to do with the forgiveness of sins; but a moment's consideration of the entire passage will, we think, remove this objection. The verse contains an invitation *to discuss* the question whether God was willing or unwilling to show mercy, implying that reason, as well as justice, was on his side, and asserting his power and his willingness to pardon the most aggravated sins. The implied conclusion of the reasoning is, that God's willingness to pardon the Jews threw the blame of their destruction on themselves. The fulness and freeness of this offer of pardon arose from the fact, that God had himself provided a way, whereby, in the fulness of time, a full and sufficient atonement would be made for the sins of the whole world; a way whereby all mankind might "be justified *freely* by His grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus."—Rom. iii. 24.

The second question of our correspondent, with reference to the "moles and bats," may be disposed of more briefly. Here the Douay version appears plainly wrong; for the preposition "to" (in Hebrew ל), occurs before *both* the words moles and bats in the original. The Vulgate version (which the Douay translator, as usual, has ser-

---

* Both versions, for instance, of Isaiah i. 18 are literally the same—"Incense is an abomination to me."

† יִוָּכְחָה

vilely followed) appears to have concluded the sense of the passage to be, that the idolaters were either to worship images as blind as moles and bats, or to worship moles and bats themselves (*ut adoraret talpas et vespertiliones*). But the context obviously relates, not to the moral deterioration of idolaters, but to their terror and despair. It is absurd, however, to infer, as the note in the Douay version does, that because men on their first conversion to Christianity threw away their idols of silver and gold, that such a form of idolatry was *never afterwards* to arise in the bosom of the Christian Church. The Douay writer might with as much reason infer, that because the early Christians, as we are told in the Acts, had "all things common," therefore, all distinctions of property are henceforth to cease in the world.

We shall be very glad to hear again from our correspondent, with respect to any further differences he may discover between the authorized and Douay versions.

THE PROTESTANT BIBLE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I have thought that the following testimony from an enemy, to the excellence of our English translation of the Bible may interest some of your readers. It is taken from Faber's "Essay on the Characteristics of the Lives of the Saints," p. 116:—

"Who will say that the uncommon beauty and marvellous English of the Protestant Bible is not one of the great strongholds of heresy in this country? It lives on in the ear like a music that never can be forgotten—like the sound of church bells which the convert hardly knows how he can forego. Its felicities seem often to be almost things rather than mere words. It is part of the national mind, and the anchor of the national seriousness—nay, it is worshipped with a positive idolatry, in extenuation of whose grotesque fanaticism its intrinsic beauty pleads availingly with the man of letters and the scholar. The memory of the dead passes into it. The potent traditions of childhood are stereotyped in its verses. The power of all the griefs and trials of a man is hidden beneath its words. It is the representative of his best moments; and all that there has been about him of soft, and gentle, and pure, and penitent, and good, speaks to him for ever out of his English Bible. It is his sacred thing which doubt never dimmed, and controversy never soiled. It has been to him all along as the silent, but, oh, how intelligible voice of his guardian angel; and in the length and breadth of the land, there is not a Protestant with one spark of religiousness about him, whose spiritual biography is not in his Saxon Bible. S. M. N.

ON CHARITY TO PROTESTANTS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

MR. EDITOR—I crossed the mountain to Jerry Donovan's, the other evening, to hear something more out of the paper about Father John. I found Jerry, and the wife, and childer sitting down to supper, and, of course, I took a seat; but 'twasn't like the supper in the old times, when we had the praties, enough and to spare; and, says Jerry, "I wonder will them good old times ever come back to us again." "Please God they will," says I; "sure the praties looks beautiful this blessed minute." "True for you," says he, "and glory be to God for that same; sure 'twas he sent the blight, and 'tis he can take it off again if he pleases; and," says he, "Dan, I'm thinking we never feel our blessings till they're taken from us; but then we see how good God has been to us all along, and we never giving him a bit of thanks for it." Well, sir, when the childer finished their supper, Nelly took the creatures off to bed, and I asked Jerry to get the paper about Father John, and read the rest of it. "Where did I leave off?" says he. "You were just beginning," says I, "with Father John's reason for not arguing with the minister." "Here's the place," says he. "The minister turned to Father John, 'and,' says he 'either you or I must be wrong, and 'twould be well to find out which of us is wrong; for we can't *both* be right.' 'That's true, anyhow,' says Father John; 'but 'tis easy known which of us is wrong; for,' says he, 'every heretic must be wrong, and you're a heretic; therefore, you must be wrong.' 'Well,' says the minister, 'I think I could pick a hole in your logic if I wished; but,' says he 'even granting, for argument sake, that we Protestants are heretics, isn't it your duty to reason with us, and set us right?' 'Sure 'tisn't with heretics I'd be arguing,' says Father John. 'Why,' says the minister, 'the worse heretics we are, the more you ought to try to convert us; don't you care at all,' says he, 'for our poor souls? and, if we're wrong, would'nt it be a charity to try to set us right?' 'Well,' says Father John, 'I do care for your souls, and I pray that you may all be brought into the true Church before you die.' 'But,' says the minister, 'tisn't enough to pray for us; you should give us lectures, and put up notices, saying, that on such an evening you'd prove the Protestant religion to be wrong; and you should invite us all to come to hear you; and,' says he, 'if you did *that*, I'd believe that you felt some care for us; and,' says he, 'I'd go to hear you myself; for,' says he, 'all I want is to get at the truth; and,' says he, 'nothing brings out the truth like a good discussion; and' says he, 'if we're wrong, 'tisn't intentionally; 'tisn't our fault, but our misfortune.'" "That's fair, Jerry," says I; "nothing could be fairer; and it reminds me of what Bill Flaherty, the jockey, once said to poor old Father Ned of Kilbarry. Bill sold him a horse, that he swore hadn't a fault in the world; but, he wasn't three days bought when 'twas found that he was blind of an eye, and had the spavin. So Father Ned sends for Bill, and, says he, 'you deceiving villian, is that the horse that you told me had'nt a fault in the world, and he only fit for the crows.' 'Arra, your Reverence,' says Bill, 'don't be slandering the poor beast, sure that isn't his *fault*, but his *misfortune*;' and, in like manner, we shouldn't be running down the Protestants because they hadn't the luck to be born Catholics like ourselves; but we should do our best to convert them; and 'tis often my heart bleeds for the poor creatures when I think of their miserable state; sure 'twould be the greatest charity for our clargy to try to set them right." "True for you," says Jerry; "and 'twas last Sunday in chapel I was thinking that same, when Father John was telling us of the elegant mission the priests are sending out to convert the black niggers in foreign parts; sure we've poor niggers of Protestants here at home who are as ignorant as any heathen; they never say a prayer to the Blessed Virgin, nor a Rosary, nor even a 'Hail Mary;' they never ask the intercession of a saint, nor care for holy water, nor even as much as cross themselves, and all for want of our priests teaching them the differ, and proving to them that we're right. But to go on with the paper—the parson told Father John, 'that 'twasn't enough to pray for Protestants; but that the surest way to set them right, if they were wrong, would be to reason with them.' 'But' says Father John, 'I've many things of my own to look after, that are of more importance than attending to Protestants.'* 'Well,' says the minister, 'that surprises me; you think that we're all going astray, and that our souls will be lost: don't you?' 'To be sure I do,' says he, 'only 'tisn't *think* it I do, but *know* it.' 'Why then, if that's the case,' says the minister, 'how could any business be more important than trying to save us? and,' says he, 'if you really believe what you say, you ought to preach to us, and try to set us right.' 'Sure we do preach to you,' says Father John, '*by our example.*'* 'Oh,' says the minister, 'the Apostle Peter wasn't content with setting a good example to the people in his time; but he reasoned with them, and proved that his religion was the right one; and why don't you follow his example?'" "Why, Jerry," says I, "that's the very way Father John told us they converted the niggers; he said they reasoned with them, and proved that the heathen religion was wrong, and that the Holy Roman religion was right; and sure 'twould be as easy to prove this for the Protestants as for the niggers." "Anyhow," says Jerry, "they ought to try it; for charity should begin at home, though it shouldn't end there. But to go on with the story; the parson stuck to Father John, and hunted the poor man from one excuse to another, till he was almost beat out; but when Humphrey Carey saw him so hard pushed, he came to his help, and, says he, 'I'll tell you the reason why the priests of the Holy Catholic Church don't enter into discussions with heretics, because,' says he, 'the word of God forbids it.'† 'What part of it?' says the minister. 'The verse in Corinthians' says he, 'where St. Paul *forbids us to be contentious.*'"‡ "Well, Jerry," says I, "Humphrey is a real clever fellow; that was chapter and verse for the parson; sure 'tis well I knew the priests must have some good reason for never meeting the Protestant ministers in discussion; and sure they couldn't have a better reason than St. Paul being against it; but I suppose Father John was glad of the help." "'Tis he that was," says Jerry; "he looked, for all the world, like a man just let off the tread-mill, smiling with delight, but very tired; and, says he to the parson, 'I hope you'll take St. Paul's word, if you won't take mine!' Well, the minister began to laugh, and says he, 'that text won't save your bacon.' 'Why so?' says Father John. 'Because,' says the parson, 'St. Paul was a regular controversialist;' and, says he, 'if you read your Douay Bible as often as you read your Breviary, you'd know that St. Paul was one of the greatest disputers ever lived;‡ and, moreover, says he, 'that text has nothing at all to say to religious discussion.' 'Arra what else?' says Father John. 'Why,' says he, 'it merely refers to whether women should have their heads covered in church, or not.'" "Oh, murder, Jerry," says I, "that was a pity. Sure I thought Father John was all right when I heard the text." "But," says Jerry, "the worst of all was, the Protestants began to laugh, and Father John began to lose his temper; and, when the minister asked for some other reason why he wouldn't enter into discussion, he got fairly vexed; and, says he, 'the truth is, *when we see people determined on going to old Nick, we think it as well to let them alone.*'"§ "Oh, murder, Jerry," says I, "did Father John really say that?" "'Deed he did," says Jerry, "and 'twas a hard word for a Christian and a priest to use to poor creatures that don't know the differ; sure Father John is always talking to us about charity, but I don't think there was much charity in that; and," says he, "I seen a thing in Cork that might be a pattern to Father John, in the way of charity." "What was it?" says I. "Why," says he, "I was standing near Patrick's Bridge, watching the steamers, and, among the crowd, I saw a great, fierce-looking sailor, with a squint in one eye that would look round a corner, and a big cut across his face, and as much curled hair under his chin as would stuff a bed; and while I was looking at him, a poor creature fell into the sea, and, as he couldn't swim, he was sinking fast. We all began to screech and bawl, but never a one of us did anything to help the poor man; but the big sailor whips off his jacket, and jumps into the sea, and brings the poor fellow out by the hair of the head. Well, the boys gave a cheer for him that would rise the cockles of your heart, and a grand-looking gentleman began to praise him for what he had done; but, says he, 'sir, I only did my duty; and, moreover,' says he, 'sure the poor fellow was a countryman of my own, and even if he was my worst enemy I'd have done the same.' Well, the crowd gave another cheer that almost lifted the roofs off the houses. And I'm thinking, Dan, that same big sailor might be a pattern to our priests in the way of charity. There's the poor Protestants drowning, according to their account—drowning, body and soul—and still they won't say a word to hinder them from going down to hell." "Oh, Jerry, says I, "that's a hard word of yours; I don't think myself that every Protestant will go to hell; there are some very honest, decent people among them." "Well," says Jerry, "if it's a hard word, it isn't mine; for" says he, "don't you remember the words of the book that we were taught out of, and that the priests teach our childer out of, and where we're told that no person can be saved who does not belong to our Church; that out of the Church there is no salvation; and that no Jew, Turk, heretic, or schismatic belongs to that Church.* Sure that's only a civil way of saying that every Protestant must go to hell, or to Old Nick, as Father John said; and" says he, "there's nothing makes me so doubtful of the truth of the priests' religion, as seeing that, with all their talk about charity, they never try to convert Protestants." "But, Jerry," says I, "what do poor ignorant boys like us know about such things? You may be sure our priests have wise reasons for not arguing with the Protestants." "True for you," says he, "and 'tis what I'm thinking myself this long time; but 'tisn't any of the reasons Father John gave." "What other?" says I. "By my word, then," says he, "I think the truth is, that our priests are *afraid* to argue with the ministers; I'm thinking that's the *true* reason." "Jerry," says I, "I'm ashamed of you; Jerry," says I, "you're a disgrace to the woman that owns you; Jerry," says I, "arn't you afraid the roof would fall on you for speaking such blasphemy of your clargy?" "Why," says he, "I can't think of any other reason; but if you know of any other, let us hear it." Well, Mr. Editor, as I hadn't an answer ready, I turned again on Jerry, and, says I, "why should our priests be afraid to meet the Protestant clargy; sure they know the Latin and Greek as well as any of them." "I don't deny it," says he; "but 'tisn't Latin and Greek would do for them in an argument with the ministers; 'tis out of the Bible they should argue, and 'tis myself thinks our priests don't know much about *that book*, whatever they may about the Latin and Greek." Well, sir, on this I was so vexed with Jerry, that I got up and left the house; but as I went along, I began to think over the matter, and I tried hard to find a good reason for our priests never meeting the Protestant clargy; but the more I tried, the more I couldn't find one. It seemed to me that even if our priests didn't care for *winning a victory* over the Protestants, still for *charity's sake* they ought to reason with them; for, surely, if our religion is the right one, the priests ought to be able to *prove it;* and then the Protestants would come over to the true Church, and their poor souls would be saved. Still, I know there must be some good reason for our priests not doing so; and if your honour knows it, maybe you'd tell it to me, and set my mind at rest.

Your humble servant to command,

DAN. CARTHY.

* Fact

† 1 Cor. xi. 16. Douay Bible.

‡ See Acts xvii., 17; Acts xviii., 19; Acts xix., 8, 9; Acts xv., 2—Douay Bible.

§ Should any Roman Catholic doubt that the priest used these words, the Editor is willing to give him Mr. Carthy's address, who will satisfy him on this point.

ON PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I fear the dreary, monotonous repetition of extracts from the Fathers cannot long be agreeable to the taste of the generality of your readers; but your reply to my letter, in CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. iv., p. 34, col. 1, renders it necessary to cite again a passage from St. Cyril, given under the above reference.

You decry the argument which this holy patriarch uses to illustrate the nature of prayers and sacrifice for the relief of the dead as *very poor*, and not to the taste of some Roman Catholics.

To highly-intellectual minds, trained to abstruse metaphysical disquisitions, and profound theological deductions,

*Abridgment of the Christian Doctrine, by way of Question and Answer. Dublin: Printed by C. M. Warren, Wholesale Catholic Bookseller, 21, Upper Ormond-quay, 1850, pp. 17 and 18.

it may appear trifling; but, for my part, I fancy it is quite appropriate, and capable of combining into regular system the elementary instructions hitherto given to his *neophytes*.

He submits to them the example of an earthly king, punishing offenders against his crown and person, and of their obtaining pardon, through the mediation and supplication of friends; and to imprint this illustration indelibly on their memories, that they may be able thereby to carry it in their minds throughout the whole of what he next proposes to teach them, he intimates to them the necessity of doing so by *κατα αυτον τροπον*, which is indicative of a repetition of the example proposed—"After the same manner that they supplicate the king to obtain pardon," &c.—*και ημεις υπερ των κεκοιμημενων αυτῳ τας δεησεις προσφεροντες, καν αμαρτωλοι ωσιν, ου στεφανον πλεκομεν, αλλα Χριστον εσφαγιασμενον υπερ των ημετερων αμαρτηματων προσφεραμεν, εξιλεουμενοι υπερ αυτων και ημων τον φιλανθρωπον.*—"So do we offer up supplications to God for *those that are dead, if they be sinners*; we do not propose a crown, but we offer Christ slain for our sins, propitiating, both for them (*the dead*) and for us, Him who is so beneficent." This passage is of paramount importance; it is plain and simple in construction, and cannot be misunderstood; it is the climax of all St. Cyril has advanced respecting prayers, &c., for the relief of the dead; and if allowed to be the exponent of the doctrine of the Christian Church on this point, the controversy is at an end, and the distinction between prayers for the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, &c., and those for the other dead must be admitted. This you are aware of, and throughout paragraphs No. 1 and No. 2 of your reply to my letter referred to above, after a number of varied, desultory, but ineffectual attempts to ignore the plain, obvious meaning of this passage, you resign it as hopeless, and concede to me, on the authority of St. Cyril, this very distinction. An inextricable dilemma presents itself before you—you must either agree to the truth of St. Cyril's teaching, "If they (*the dead*) be sinners, we offer supplications for them; we offer Christ slain," to propitiate God for them, to make atonement for them, to obtain pardon for them, &c.; and the admission of this would be fatal to the Church of England doctrine in Article xxii. of her religion; or you must adopt the only alternative at your disposal, which, I think, still involves you in no trifling difficulty. This latter course you take, and, in pointed allusion to the doctrine enunciated in the foregoing passage of St. Cyril, you ask—"How, then, are we to account for the fact of St. Cyril being driven to justify prayers for those who died in their sins—*αμαρτωλοι?*" Now, if anything can be a proof, clear and inevitable, this query affords such proof—first, that I have not been guilty of "*evident misconstruction*" with regard to the passages of St. Cyril; second, that I was justified, on their authority, in making the *distinction*, as I have done, between "*commemoration* of patriarchs, &c., that God, through their *prayers* and *intercessions*, may *receive our supplications*," and prayers, &c., for the relief of *the dead*, "*if they be sinners;*" thirdly, that all you have attempted by way of argument to disprove this distinction is purely gratuitous, and utterly inconclusive—in fact, no argument at all.

These observations are supported by other arguments of yours, equally incontrovertible. In the reply you afford to the above query, you answer—"There is only one possible account of it; this corrupt practice had grown up of praying for such, and St. Cyril had the weakness to try and defend it," &c. Thus, you admit that St. Cyril inculcates prayers and sacrifices to obtain pardon for the dead, to free them from the punishment of sin; hence the purifying and cleansing of souls after death, and the consequent doctrine of purgatory—virtually, I allow; but the word *virtually*, in this case, is, I maintain, explained by *verily* and *indeed;* and these latter words are not to be taken in the sense in which you use them with respect to the *real presence* in the Eucharist—that is, to express *a real absence;* but in *reality* and in *truth*, *without any doubt*. These prayers, &c., you call "*a corrupt practice*," and that it had "grown up;" but you do not tell us where it had grown up; "and that St. Cyril had the weakness to try and defend it," &c.

Now, as this *corrupt practice* of prayers and sacrifice for the relief of the dead is admitted by you to have prevailed in the time of St. Cyril—nay, more, that it "*had grown up*" before his time; for you do not charge St. Cyril with having originated it; and as this practice differs nothing from the doctrine of purgatory taught by the Catholic Church of the present day, and as you say "St. Cyril had the weakness to try and defend it," &c., I think, in justice to the cause of truth, you cannot refuse to afford the most ample and unequivocal proofs of these statements, instead of having them come begging, supported only by a *petitio principii*, the mere *dictum* by which you have asserted them. If St. Cyril had, as you assert, to try and defend a corrupt practice in opposition to the teaching of the Church, let us see this corrupt practice traced to its origin. When, and where, and how. I ask you, did it spring up? Who planted it? Who watered it and watched over its progress, until St. Cyril took it under his fostering care and ingrafted it upon his *Explanations* of the *Christian Liturgy?* What council, pope, bishop, or priest, if we except Aerius—an apostate priest in the beginning of the fourth century—ever denied the efficacy of prayers, &c., for the relief of the dead? And, as you so confidently assert, that, in the time of St. Cyril, this *corrupt practice* had neither the sanction of the Church, nor of the Liturgy—and as the different phases of the Church, whether bleeding under the sword of the persecutor, or embroiled by the turbulent and poisoning influence of heretical factions, or spreading far and wide the enlivening rays of the Gospel, are faithfully recorded on the page of history, from that time forward—you cannot fail to inform us, at what subsequent period this *corrupt practice* became a *dogma* of Catholic faith; this, surely, is not too much to require from you. You have before you the ecclesiastical records of every age of Christianity, the decrees of councils, the volumes of the Fathers—deduce from any of them, if you can, clear, decisive evidence on the different points I have here enumerated; or, in default of such evidence, all you have stated with respect to St. Cyril must pass for empty sound, mere assertion, a figment worthy of no credit. If, as you say, the Church gave no sanction to these prayers for the dead, how could St. Cyril charge those, who denied their utility, with having contradicted the Church? This disposes of another of your conclusive arguments. Lastly, I require of you to show that the word *αμαρτωλοι* means hardened sinners only; or, as I understand you, those who die in mortal sin; and that St. Cyril uses it in this sense.

When you satisfy me with information on all these points, I will then show you that the liturgies agree with St. Cyril in the distinction for which I contend. I will show you that in the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom, *Goar's Rituale Græcorum*, page 63, is stated a doctrine in substance thus—"By the intercession of the most holy, Immaculate, blessed above all, our glorious Lady, Mother of God, and our Virgin Mary, &c., and of all the saints, may Christ, our true God, have mercy on us." And, again—"We offer thee this rational service, for the sake of the prophets, apostles, martyrs, and particularly the most holy, pure, blessed above all, our glorious Queen and Mother of God, ever Virgin. Perfect us, O God, by the prayers of St. John the Baptist, the saint whose memory we celebrate, and of all the saints." And, in page 78, I will show you a paragraph for the relief of the dead, to this effect—"We entreat thee for the repose and pardon of the soul of thy servant, in a place of rest from which grief and lamentation are far removed." Thus do St. Cyril and the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom afford corroborating evidence; and, on the authority of the former, until you shall prove that he teaches a *corrupt practice*, I am justified in rendering *αναπαυσιν*, by repose, relief, rest, from *pain*, *trouble*, *torment*, &c.; and, further, that the whole of your long paragraph No. 5 of reply is utterly inconclusive and nugatory. The substance of that paragraph amounts simply, to this—"Those who have no '*rest*' are in hell, and those who have '*not*' are in heaven, from the time of their death," and because, these two conditions are, as you have stated; and because, in Apocal. xiv. 11, 13, "there is not one word to prove the *pain* and *torment* of purgatory," you would thence reason your readers into the belief that there is no such place as purgatory!! I think, as a lover of truth, I have stated my views of these points honestly and openly, and with the same unbiassed feelings, I shall return again to a consideration of the remainder of your statements. I am, Sir, yours with respect.

EDMOND POWER.

Mullinavat, May 30, 1855.

We are happy to hear from Mr. Power again, after so long a silence.

We shall first notice briefly what is NOT in Mr. Power's letter.

In his last letter (No. for March, 1855), Mr. Power asserted that prayers for the dead may be offered for *other* purposes besides getting souls out of purgatory. We agreed to this, and we asked Mr. Power if he could produce, out of the ancient liturgies, a single prayer which *cannot* be for anything else but for getting a soul out of purgatory. Mr. Power says nothing about this. It is clear from his letter that he HAS searched the ancient liturgies, and it is also clear that he has *not* found in them any prayer for getting a soul out of purgatory. This is an important point to have settled.

Mr. Power affirmed in that letter that there was a distinction in the ancient liturgies—*commemoration* being made for the saints, and prayers and intercessions for the *other* dead.

We proved, from the ancient liturgies themselves, that there is no such distinction in them; Mr. Power does not now produce any such distinction in the liturgies (which he has been studying); but he says he was justified by St. Cyril in saying that there is such a distinction in those liturgies. To this we answer that, since there is no such distinction in the liturgies, neither St. Cyril nor any one else can justify Mr. Power in saying that there is.

Mr. Power in that letter quoted *two* passages from St. Cyril—the *first*, about "commemoration," the *second*, about sacrifice for the dead. We said that, in the *first*, Mr. Power argued on an evident misconstruction. Mr. Power does not attempt to justify his construction of *that* passage, but he says he did not misconstrue the *second* passage (which we never charged him with), and that, therefore, we have no right to charge him with misconstruction of St. Cyril. We think there *is* danger that our readers may get tired of such arguments.

The real point raised in this present letter of Mr. Power is this—he produced a passage from St. Cyril, arguing in favour of prayers for the dead who were "*sinners*"—*αμαρτωλοι*. We admit this passage is now in St. Cyril's works. Mr. Power says, that if this passage be "allowed to be the exponent of the doctrine of the Christian Church on this point, the controversy is at an end."

We admit this IF, but we deny the fact, we affirm that this passage is *not* an exponent or example of the doctrine of the Christian Church, and we prove it thus—In the liturgy of the Church in St. Cyril's time, there was *not* anything to justify prayers for the dead who were "*sinners*"—*αμαρτωλοι*. If there be, Mr. Power would have produced it, but there is not. The liturgies only authorise commemoration for those "who had gone to rest, in hope of the resurrection of eternal life"—not for "*sinners*"—*αμαρτωλοι*. Therefore, when St. Cyril argues for praying for the dead who are sinners, *αμαρτωλοι*, he is only arguing for an opinion of his own, not for the doctrine of the Christian Church.

Mr. Power argues from this passage of St. Cyril as if the production of a single passage from one Father was enough to prove a doctrine or practice to be right. But Mr. Power must know that such an argument may be produced to prove anything, however erroneous. The Fathers were men subject to error like ourselves. Does Mr. Power admit or deny this?

How are we to account for St. Cyril defending a use of the liturgy, which was opposed to the liturgy itself? We can only account for it thus—a practice had probably grown up of praying for "sinners."—*αμαρτωλοι*—in the public service of the Church, although that service itself did not warrant such a practice. Some justified the practice, others condemned it. If St. Cyril argued in favour of that practice, instead of saying boldly that it was an abuse of the liturgy, he was guilty of a great weakness, unworthy of a Christian bishop.

But Mr. Power calls on us to tell the name of the man who first introduced that abuse, and the precise time when he introduced it, all which we promise to tell Mr. Power, if he will first tell us the name of the man who sowed the tares in the field, and on what night he did it.—See the Parable of the Tares, Matt. xiii. 24-30. When we see the tares, we are sure that somebody sowed them, even though we do not know the name of the man.

Mr. Power also says—"lastly, I require of you to show that the word *αμαρτωλοι* means hardened sinners only; or, as I understand you, those who die in mortal sin; and that St. Cyril takes it in this sense."

We subjoin a note* of FORTY ONE places in the New Testament in which the word *αμαρτωλοι* is used for sinners; and in every place, the word seems to us to be intended to express those who are in mortal sin. Will Mr. Power show us in which place it means those who are under venial sin? or can he show us that the word ever was used in that sense?

FARMING OPERATIONS FOR JUNE.

(*From the Irish Farmer's Gazette*).

TURNIP CULTIVATION should be proceeded with briskly; and, in order to prevent undue evaporation in dry weather, keep the harrow, and rollers going close after the plough. Let the Swedes be got in with as little delay as possible, to be followed by the hybrids, then the Aberdeens, and, last of all, the soft white turnips. The land under the soiling crops of vetches, rye, or rape, should be prepared and sown, as fast as cleared, with suitable varieties of turnips.

Carrots and Parsnips should be singled out to intervals of about 8 to 9 inches, and kept well hoed, and grubbed between, during the summer.

Cabbages.—Continue planting in well-tilled and highly-manured land. Cabbages planted during this month, or early in July, will produce much valuable food for sheep and cattle, during the winter and early spring months.

Beans and Peas should be kept hoed, and the earth slightly ridged up, when cultivated in drills; when sown broadcast, careful hand-weeding can only be resorted to.

Potatoes will require much attention in weeding, and, if in drills, drawing up a little earth to the stems as they advance, taking care not to bury the leaves. Those in beds should have a little fine, fresh earth cast over them from the furrows, just as they are coming to the surface, but before the leaves are developed.

Buckwheat may be sown as soon as all danger of frost is over. It is useful for ploughing in as a green manure, for a soiling crop, or for seed.

Hemp, when sown in rows, should be singled out to 10 or 12 inches apart, as soon as fit, and subsequently kept clean by the hand and horse hoe. If sown broadcast, hoe and single out to 12 inches apart, and keep it clean by the hoe till grown so much as to smother all weeds.

Fallows should be well harrowed during the month, grubbed if required, and ploughed up again.

* Matt. ix. 10, 11, 13; xi. 19; xxvi. 45. Mark ii. 15, 16, 17; viii. 38; xiv. 41. Luke v. 8; vi. 32, 33, 34; vii. 37, 39; xiii. 2; xv. 1, 2, 7, 10; xviii. 13; xix. 7; xxiv. 7. John ix. 16, 24, 25, 31. Rom. iii. 7; v. 8, 19; vii. 13. Gal. ii. 15, 17. 1 Tim. i. 9, 15. Hebrews vii. 26; xii. 3. James iv. 8; v. 20. 1 Peter iv. 18. Jude 15.

Just published, 344 pp. demy 8vo, price Six and Sixpence (per Post, 6s. 10d.),

A Digest of the Evidence,

TAKEN BEFORE

THE SELECT COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS,

APPOINTED TO INQUIRE INTO THE WORKING OF THE

NATIONAL SYSTEM OF EDUCATION

IN

IRELAND;

WITH ADDENDA AND APPENDIX.

BY THE

REV. WILLIAM LE POER TRENCH, D.D.,

Rector of Killereran, Diocese of Tuam, and one of the Honorary Secretaries of the Church Education Society for Ireland.

"The invaluable 'Digest of the Evidence,' by Dr. Trench, has placed the substance of the 'Blue Book' in a clear, comprehensive form before all those who are interested in this great question. It was a work of great labour, of no ordinary patience, and requiring the utmost discrimination. But the result has been eminently successful. The plan of the 'Digest' is admirable; and the subjects so well classified, that immediate reference can be made to the most important evidence on every branch of the inquiry. It is a volume which will never lose its interest, so long as there is a friend of Scriptural Education to be encouraged, and an advocate of a godless expediency to be put to shame."—*Christian Examiner.*

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London: Wertheim and Macintosh, Paternoster-row; Seeley, Jackson, and Co., Fleet-street; and Thomas Hatchard, Piccadilly.

Just published, in demy 8vo, cloth, price 8s. (per post, 8s. 6d.),

An English-Irish Dictionary,

INTENDED FOR THE

USE OF STUDENTS OF THE IRISH LANGUAGE,

And for those who wish to Translate their English Thoughts or the Works of others into Language intelligible to the Present Irish-speaking Inhabitants of Ireland.

BY DANIEL FOLEY, B.D.,

Prebendary of Kilbragh, Cashel, and Professor of Irish in the University of Dublin.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London: Wertheim and Macintosh, Paternoster-row.

New Works and New Editions,

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

*** Messrs. W. CURRY and CO. beg to announce, that according to the new post-office regulations, any book or *packet of books*, under 4 oz., can be sent, post free, for 1d.; 8 oz., 2d.; 1 lb., 4d.; 1½ lb., 6d., and so on, 2d. being added for every additional half pound or fraction of a pound; the ends of the packet to be left open. Parties in the country, therefore, ordering books can now have them at a merely nominal charge for postage, and without delay.

THEISM: the Witness of Reason and Nature to an all-wise and beneficent Creator; being the Burnet Treatise (second prize). By the Rev. J. Tulloch, D.D. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

MEMOIR OF THE REV. SYDNEY SMITH. By his Daughter—Lady Holland. With a selection from his Letters. Edited by Mrs. Austin. 2 vols. 8vo. 28s.

JOHN DE WYCLIFFE, D.D.; a Monograph; with some account of the Wycliffe MSS. in Oxford, Cambridge, the British Museum, &c. By Robert Vaughan, D.D. 16s.

THE LIFE OF JOHN BRADFORD, Prebendary of St. Pauls, martyred in Smithfield, July 1, 1555. 2s. 6d.

THE BULWARK; or, Reformation Journal. Vol. 4. 3s. 6d.

A GLANCE BEHIND THE GRILLES OF RELIGIOUS HOUSES IN FRANCE. 5s.

THE REVELATION OF OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST, Historically and Critically interpreted. By the Rev. Philip Gell. 2 vols. 21s.

THE HOLY GHOST: His Nature and Office. By the Rev. Joshua R. Watson. 3s. 6d.

THE GIFTS OF THE KINGDOM: being Lectures delivered during Lent, 1855, at St. George's, Bloomsbury, by Twelve Clergymen of the Church of England. 5s.

THE DIVINE LOVE: a series of Doctrinal, Practical, and Experimental Discourses. By the Rev. John Eadie, D.D., LL.D. 5s.

THE FOUNTAIN OF LOVE. By Rev. Alfred Wm. Snape. 3s. 6d.

GOD IS LOVE: An Exposition of 1 John iv. 8. By Adolphe Monod. Translated from the French by John Charlesworth, B.A. 1s. 6d.

THE CHRIST OF HISTORY; an Argument grounded in the Facts of his Life on Earth. By John Young, M.A. 7s. 6d.

URGENT QUESTIONS, Personal, Practical, and Pointed. By the Rev. Dr. Cumming.

MONASTIC INSTITUTIONS, their Origin, Progress, Nature, and Tendency. By Samuel Phillips Day, formerly of the Order of the Presentation. 7s. 6d.

THESAURUS OF ENGLISH WORDS AND PHRASES, Classified and Arranged so as to facilitate the expression of ideas and assist in Literary Composition. By Peter Mark Roget, M.D. 10s. 6d.

NOTES OF A TOUR IN THE VALLEYS OF PIEDMONT IN THE SUMMER OF 1854. By the Hon. and Rev. B. W. Noel. 3s. 6d.

THE FOOTSTEPS OF ST. PAUL. By the Author of "The Faithful Promiser." 5s.

MEMOIR OF THE LIVES OF ROBERT AND J. A. HALDANE. By Alexander Haldane, Esq. 8vo. New and cheaper edition. 5s. 6d.

IMPRESSIONS OF CHINA AND THE PRESENT REVOLUTION. By Captain Fishbourne. 6s.

CHRISTIANITY IN TURKEY: the Armenian Race and Church, with some account of their Doctrines and Rites, &c. By Rev. F. S. O. Dwight, Constantinople. 5s.

THE SOUTHERN CROSS AND THE SOUTHERN CROWN; or, the Gospel in New Zealand. By Miss Tucker. 3s. 6d.

MINISTERING CHILDREN, a Tale; dedicated to Childhood. By the Author of "Visit to the Poor," &c. 5s.

LETTERS TO A CHILD. By the Author of "Ministering Children. 2s. 6d.

THE MIND OF JESUS. By the Author of "Morning and Night Watches." 8d. Cloth, 1s.

THE WORDS OF JESUS. By the Author of the "Mind of Jesus." 8d. Cloth, 1s.

THE WORDS OF JESUS AND THE MIND OF JESUS. Bound together, Cloth, Gilt edges, 1s. 6d.

THE GREAT HIGHWAY: a Story of the World's Struggles. By S. W. Fullom. 2s.

THE CRIMEA, its Towns, Inhabitants, and Social Customs. By a Lady resident near the Alma. 2s. 6d.

PICTURES FROM THE BATTLE-FIELD. By the Roving Englishman. 5s.

SISTERS OF CHARITY—Catholic and Protestant—Abroad and at Home. By Mrs. Jameson. 4s.

WIDOW-BURNING: a Narrative. By Henry Jeffreys Bushby. 3s. 6d.

TALES AND SKETCHES OF NEW ENGLAND LIFE. By Mrs. H. B. Stowe. 2s. 6d. Cheaper Edition, 1s.

Just published, 24 pp. demy 8vo, price 6d. (per post, 10d.

THE ADDRESSES

Presented to

THE LORD PRIMATE OF IRELAND,

On his attaining the Fiftieth Year of his Episcopate, with his Grace's Answers;

And an Account of the Proceedings at Armagh, on March 29, 1855.

In a Letter to a Clergyman, from one who was present on the occasion.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

RYLE'S NEW TRACTS.

Just Published, price 2d. each,

I.

"The Reading which is Blessed,"

Being Thoughts on Revelation i. 1–3.

II.

St. Peter at Antioch:

A TRACT FOR THE TIMES,

BY THE

REV. J. C. RYLE, B.A.

London: WERTHEIM and MACINTOSH. Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

The Young Irish Soldier in the Crimea.

Just published, price 1s. (by post, 1s. 1d.),

I.

EARLY HISTORY

of

PHILIP O'FLAHERTY,

THE YOUNG SOLDIER;

with Graphic Notices of the War, and of his intercourse with Turkish Officers.

II.

Price 6d. (by post, 7d.),

SKETCHES OF THE WAR;

Being a Second Series of Letters.

BY PHILIP O'FLAHERTY.

Edinburgh: Shepherd and Elliot. Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Just published, price 6d. (by post, 7d.),

The Judgment-seat of Christ, and the Works of Man.

A SERMON

Preached in Enniskillen Church,

On May 24, 1855,

at

The Funeral of

JANE, COUNTESS OF ENNISKILLEN.

By the

REV. GEORGE SYDNEY SMITH, D.D.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London: Wertheim and Macintosh, Paternoster-row.

Important Work on Controversy.

Preparing for publication,

THE "CONTROVERSIAL CORRESPONDENCE," Between R. W. KENNARD, Esq., London, and the Rev. PAUL MACLACHLAN, Roman Catholic Priest, Falkirk.

This correspondence, conducted with great ability on both sides, has, at length, terminated by the withdrawal of the Rev. Mr. Maclachlan from the contest, who has republished the whole of his letters, WITHOUT THOSE OF MR. KENNARD! As such a proceeding is evidently unfair, and might produce evil results, it is intended that the entire correspondence, consisting of about 70 letters, shall be published, so as that the nature of the Controversy may be thoroughly understood by all parties.

Dr. Irving writes—"This is a remarkable publication. Mr. Maclachlan is sufficiently skilled in the Romish arts of controversy; but in logical dexterity, and even in theological learning, the priest is no match for the Protestant layman." Dr. Croly says of Mr. Kennard's letters—"I sincerely admire their learning, reasoning, and spirit of Christianity; and I know of no production fitter to produce a more ample assurance in the mind of any man open to rational conviction." It has also been characterized as the "most important controversy that has taken place since the days of Stillingfleet."

The work will be handsomely printed in one vol., royal 8vo, and will contain about 600 or 700 pp., with a copious Index. Price, to SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, 5s.

The names of Subscribers are requested to be sent as early as possible, to

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher, WILLIAM CURRY, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin. JUNE, 1855.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Bíoṗ do Dhia aṅ ṗna háṗduiḃ, agus ṗíoḋáin aiṗ an dtalaṁ deaṫḟoil do na dáoiniḃ.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED THE MIDDLE OF EVERY MONTH, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. IV.—No. 43. JULY 19, 1855. { Annual Subscription, 2s. 6d.; Unstamped Copies, 3d. each. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
The Catacombs at Rome	73
True and False Miracles	74
The History of the Douay Bible—Ven. Archdeacon Cotton	75
La Salette—continued	78
Roman Catholic Moral Theology—No. III.	77
Talk of the Road—No. XXIX.	79
New Post-office Regulations	79
Scripture Proofs of the Immaculate Conception, by Rev. Edward Murray, P.P.	80
The Apocrypha—No. II.	80
CORRESPONDENCE:	
How Much is your Soul Worth?—by Dan Carthy	81
St. Cyril, on Purgatory—by C. A. M.	82
The Enlightened Roman Catholic Archbishop of Lucca	82
A Portuguese Miracle	83
The Way to Save Lives in the Crimea, by H. Leary	83
Farming Operations for July	83

THE CATACOMBS AT ROME.

It was about the middle of the sixteenth century that the existence of these extensive excavations, called the catacombs,* became known at Rome. It was then discovered that, underneath the city and the surrounding campagna, there lay a vast extent of subterranean galleries, dug out of the tufa and puzzolana, of which that district consists. The greater number of these galleries had a height from about eight to ten feet, and a width of from four to five, and they often ran in stories two or three deep, communicating with each other by flights of steps. The entrance was generally by an oblique gallery, with steps, which, on reaching a certain depth, took a horizontal direction. Numerous perpendicular shafts had been sunk to these galleries, by which light was admitted. Along them were ranged five, or sometimes six, tiers of graves, some of which are still closed by slabs of terra-cotta cemented to the rock; others are partially opened; and over most of these graves were inscriptions written in various characters and languages. Many of these galleries terminated in oblong and square chambers, which appeared to be merely enlargements of the galleries, and which were generally vaulted above, and were also lined with graves on every side.

It is also worthy of remark, that we have a description of these excavations as they appeared in the fourth century, which corresponds exactly with that above given. Prudentius, who lived in that century, says—"Among the cultivated grounds, not far from the walls, lies a deep cavern, with dark recesses. A descending path, with winding steps, leads through the dim turnings; and the daylight, entering by the mouth of the cavern, somewhat illumines the first part of the way; but the darkness grows deeper as we advance, till we meet with openings cut in the roof of the passages admitting light from above. There have I prayed prostrate, sick with the corruption of soul and body, and each time obtained relief." St. Jerome, also, about the same period, thus describes them—"When I was at Rome, still a youth, and employed in literary pursuits, I was accustomed, in company with others of my own age, and actuated by the same feelings, to visit, on Sundays, the sepulchres of the apostles and martyrs; and often to go down to the crypts dug in the heart of the earth, where the walls on either side are lined with the dead; and so intense is the darkness, that we almost realize the words of the prophet—'They go down alive into Hades;' and here and there a scanty aperture, ill-deserving the name of a window, admits scarcely light enough to mitigate the gloom which reigns below; and, as we advance through the shades, with cautious steps, we are forcibly reminded of the words of Virgil—'Horror on all sides, even the silence terrifies the mind.'"

Such is the description left us of these remarkable excavations, shortly before the time when they became forgotten by the inhabitants of Rome, and such they appeared when, after the lapse of 1,000 years, they were again disclosed to its astonished inhabitants.

The number of graves contained in this vast necropolis is very great, and has been estimated as, at least, amounting to 70,000; and when it was also found that the inscriptions over them were all expressive of Christian faith and Christian hope, the interest attached to them became naturally of a great and exciting character.

The origin of these excavations seems now to be tolerably well agreed upon by antiquarians. It appears that they were, in the first instance, quarries out of which were abstracted the materials for the extensive buildings that adorned the capital of the world, and in the age of Augustus had become so extensive, as to excite alarm. When worked out as quarries, they became the burial-place of those outcasts to whom the pagan custom of cremation was denied. The quarries, however, thus used by the pagans, appear to have been confined to the Esquiline Hill, and the immediate neighbourhood of Rome, and had no other connection with the catacombs than that of a common origin. The way in which the Christians came to be connected with them seems to have been this—The arenarii or sand-diggers were, of course, persons of the lowest grade, and from the nature of their occupation probably formed a distinct class. There is reason to believe that Christianity early spread amongst them, and it would also appear from a number of testimonies, that, during the early persecutions, many of the converts to Christianity were sentenced, as a punishment, to work in the sand-pits; for we find it stated in the "Acts of the Martyrs," that the Emperor Maximian "condemned all the Roman soldiers who were Christians to hard labour, and in various places set them to work, some to dig stones, others sand." He also ordered Ciriacus and Sisinnus to be strictly guarded, condemning them to dig sand, and to carry it on their shoulders. Marius and his companions are also stated to have been sentenced to the same employment; and there is a tradition that the baths of Diocletian were built with materials procured by the Christians. If we admit the truth of these statements; of course nothing would be more natural than that the converts thus employed should not only take refuge in them themselves in times of persecution, but also gradually put the whole Church of Rome in exclusive possession of their retreats, and, for the purpose of increasing their security, extend and enlarge them.

At all events, the fact that the catacombs were, during the first three centuries of the Christian era, employed as a place of refuge from persecution, rests upon evidence that can hardly be doubted. For history informs us, that not only did the Christians take refuge there, but, also, were sometimes overtaken by their pursuers. It appears that Xystus, Bishop of Rome, and Quartus, one of his clergy, suffered martyrdom in them in the time of Cyprian. And Stephen, who was Bishop of Rome, was followed by heathen soldiers to his subterranean chapel, and there beheaded. St. Chrysostom, also, who lived not long after the days of persecution, alludes to the concealment of a noble lady under ground in an indignant remonstrance addressed by him against those who held festivities over the graves of the martyrs. "What connection," he asks, "is there between your feasts and the hardships of a lady, unaccustomed to privation, trembling in a vault, apprehensive of the capture of her maid, upon whom she depends for her daily food." Indeed, so well known to the pagans was this way of escaping their vengeance, that several of the edicts against the Christians made it a capital offence to enter the cemeteries. The rescript of Valerian and Gallienus begins with this prohibition; and, at the close of the persecution, Gallienus gave the Christians a formal license to return to the catacombs. This permission was afterwards repealed by Maximian, on the renewal of the Diocletian persecution.

In addition to the historical evidence thus afforded us of the uses to which the catacombs were applied by the early Christians, there is amongst the inscriptions found in them one strongly corroborative of the same fact; and, as the whole inscription is beautifully expressive of the trials and hopes of the primitive Church, it is given at length—

"In Christ. Alexander is not dead, but lives above the stars, and his body rests in this tomb. He ended his life under the Emperor Antonine, who, foreseeing that great benefit would result from his services, returned evil for good. For, while on his knees, and about to sacrifice to the true God, he was led away to execution. Oh, sad times, in which, among sacred rites and prayers, even in caverns, we are not safe. What can be more wretched than such a life? and what than such a death? when they cannot be buried by their friends. At length they sparkle in heaven. He has scarcely lived, who has lived in Christian times."

Such, in addition to being a place of sepulture, were the uses to which these vast excavations were applied by the early Church. Of course when Christianity ceased to be an object of persecution, and was, in the fourth century, elevated to the throne of the world, the catacombs were no longer required as a place of refuge, and, probably, ceasing at the same time to be a place of burial, quickly passed from the memory of men; and for centuries this most conclusive evidence of the persecutions and trials of the early Church lay buried and unnoticed. When, therefore, at length, they were again opened to the inquiries of scholars and antiquarians, it is, perhaps, now difficult to realize the impression their discovery made on the minds of their explorers. A vast necropolis, rich in the bones of saints and martyrs—a stupendous testimony to the truth of Christian history—a faithful record of the trials of a persecuted Church: such were the objects presented to their view. And, in the first transports of joy, Rome boasted that her cemeteries contained as many trophies as epitaphs—as many martyrs as graves. Then began the removal of the inscriptions to various museums; and as by far the largest number of them were deposited in the Vatican, it is in the galleries of that palace of the popes, and under the guardianship of the chief of the Romish hierarchy, that these records of the early Christian Church are now to be found. Thus the elements of the faith once delivered to the saints are written with an iron pen; thus the customs of the primitive ages, stamped indelibly on the walls of the catacombs, silently rebuke those superstitious practices of which no trace can be found in their simple memorials. If the Church of after ages had looked back to her subterranean home—"to the hole of the pit whence she was digged"—she would there have sought in vain for traces of forced celibacy, the invocation of saints, or the representation of the Deity in painting or sculpture. Could it be that the Church of the catacombs believed in the doctrine of purgatory when we find almost universally in their monumental inscriptions the Christian hope that the deceased now rests in peace; thus we have—"Domitianus, a simple soul, sleeps in peace;" "Irene in peace;" "In Christ died, on the calends of September, Pompeianus the Innocent, who lived six years and nine months—he sleeps in peace." Again we find—"In Christ, Bolosa—may God refresh her;" "Nicoplenus, a sweet soul, in refreshment." Still more expressive are the following:—"Lawrence to his sweetest son, Severus, the well-deserving, borne away by angels on the first day before the Ides of January." Another runs thus—"This grief will always weigh upon me; may it be granted me to behold in sleep your revered countenance. My wife, Albana, always chaste and modest, I grieve over the loss of your society, for our Divine Author gave you to me as a sacred boon. You, well-deserving one, having left your relations, lie in peace—in sleep; you will arise; a temporary rest is granted you. She lived forty-five years, five months, and thirteen days; buried in peace. Placus, her husband, set up this." Again, can we believe that the Church of the catacombs enjoined the celibacy of the clergy, when we find inscriptions in which the wives of bishops, priests, and deacons are commemorated; thus one runs—"My wife, Laurentia, made me this tomb; she was ever suited to my disposition, venerable and faithful. The Bishop Leo survived his eightieth year." Another—"The place of Basil, the presbyter, and his Felicitas. They made it themselves." Another—"Once the happy daughter of the presbyter Gabinus; here lies Susanna joined with her father in peace." Another—"Petronia, a deacon's wife, the type of modesty. In this place I lay my bones. Spare your tears, dear husband and daughters, and believe it is forbidden to weep for one who lives in God. Buried in peace." Again, can we believe that if the early Church encouraged the invocation of saints, or of the Virgin Mary, we should not find some traces of it:

* The word means a cavity under ground, from two Greek words—κατὰ, down, and κύμβος, a hollow.

in these numerous inscriptions; but not one can be produced indicative of such a practice.

We notice the above particulars because they are those which, if held by the Church of the catacombs, would most naturally find expression in the epitaphs of the dead; for, of course, it is not to be expected that monumental inscriptions would contain any elaborate discussion of doctrine, or, perhaps, allude in any way to many of the more abstruse mysteries of the Christian religion. The doctrine of transubstantiation, even if held by the primitive Church, would, we admit, hardly find a place amongst these records of the dead. On the other hand, it may be safely asserted that there is not one of those peculiar doctrines or practices which the reformed Churches allege to have been imposed on the Christian world by the usurped authority of the Roman Pontiffs, that finds the slightest support or recognition amongst these records of the early Church. Nor is this all—higher purposes still are served by the examination of these monuments, inasmuch as they express the feelings of the great body of Christians whose leaders alone are known to us in history. The Fathers of the Church live in their voluminous works—the lower orders are only represented by their simple records. And it may, perhaps, be safely asserted that their ancient Church appears in the gallery of the Vatican in a more favourable light than in the writings of those Fathers or historians. It may be that the sepulchral tablet is more congenial to the display of pious feeling than the controversial epistle, or even the much-needed episcopal rebuke. Besides the gentle and amiable character and spirit everywhere breathed, the distinctive character of these remains is essentially Christian. The name of Christ is repeated in an endless number of forms, and the actions of his life are figured with every degree of rudeness of execution. The second person of the Trinity is neither viewed in the light of a temporal Messiah, nor degraded to the estimate of a mere example; but is invested with all the honours of a Redeemer. On this subject there is no reserve, no heathenish suppression of the distinguishing feature of our religion. On stones innumerable appears the Good Shepherd, bearing on his shoulders the recovered sheep, by which many an illiterate believer expressed his sense of personal salvation. One, according to his epitaph, "sleeps in Christ;" another is buried with a prayer that "she may live in the Lord Jesus." One has his sepulchre sealed with the inscription, "Christ is God," happy in not having to learn that truth when his sepulchre shall be rent asunder. But, most of all, the cross, in its simplest form, is employed to testify the faith of the deceased. Indeed we have but to examine these records of the early Roman Church to find out that its past and present can in no way be identified, and that we gain nothing in resemblance to the Church of the catacombs by a movement towards modern Rome. That persecuted Church which in the early ages of Christianity fought and triumphed in the cause of Christ has, in truth, no affinity with that proud and intolerant Church which has deluged with martyr blood every country in Europe, which has cursed our forefathers, and retains in full force against ourselves every anathema she ever pronounced against them.

TRUE AND FALSE MIRACLES.

CARDINAL BELLARMINE, in his enumeration of the "Notes of the True Church," reckons the power of working miracles among the number. "The eleventh mark of the Church," he says, "is the glory of miracles." "This note," he continues, "rests upon two foundations—the one, that miracles are *necessary* for the confirmation of a new doctrine; the other, that they are efficacious and *sufficient*. From the first principle we deduce that the true faith cannot be among our adversaries; from the second, that it exists among ourselves."*

It is not our intention to discuss the validity of the two principles here laid down by the learned Cardinal—as, with some limitations, they represent pretty nearly the opinions of most Protestant divines. There is no doubt that both the Jewish and Christian dispensations, at their first promulgation, were accompanied and attested by a series of extraordinary and stupendous miracles; and, upon this point, all fair readers of the Bible, both Protestant and Roman Catholic, are agreed. It is not quite so clear, however, whether miracles *alone*, and considered merely by themselves, are *sufficient* to establish the truth of a divine revelation. It appears *possible*, for anything we know to the contrary, that evil spirits may be permitted by God to perform supernatural prodigies, for the purpose of leading mankind astray. Our Blessed Lord forewarned his disciples that, "in the last days, false prophets shall rise, and shall show signs and wonders, to seduce, if it were possible, even the elect."—Mark xiii. 22. And St. John, in the Revelation, when describing the second beast that was to arise in after times, represents him as "doing great wonders, so that he maketh fire come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men, and deceiveth them that dwell in the earth by the means of those miracles which he had power to do."—Rev. xiii. 13, 14. These passages sufficiently show that miraculous signs, taken by themselves, cannot be regarded as *sufficient* to establish the truth of a revelation, independently of all consideration of the nature of the doctrines which that revelation contains.

But we hasten to consider the two conclusions which Cardinal Bellarmine deduces from the principles he had laid down. "From the first principle," he says, "we deduce that the true faith cannot be among our adversaries." He means, we suppose, to assert, that no Church can be a true Church which does not possess the power of working miracles; and, therefore, as no Reformed Church claims to possess this power, Protestants cannot be members of the one true Church of Christ.

Now, we beg leave to enter a decided protest against the misapplication which the learned Cardinal here makes of the principle which he himself laid down. "Miracles," he says, "are necessary for the confirmation of a new faith." So far we agree with him. But although miracles may be necessary, when a *new* religion is for the first time promulgated to the world, this fact by no means proves that they must be *always* necessary. We are as earnest as Cardinal Bellarmine in upholding the truth of the miracles wrought by our Blessed Lord and his apostles, for confirming the truth of Christianity. But when the Christian Church had been firmly established in the world, we do not see that there was any necessity for a further display of miraculous power. We find it nowhere stated in Scripture that the Christian Church was always to possess within itself the power of working miracles. Protestants now profess to believe the same doctrines which were preached by St. Peter and St. Paul; they hold the "faith which was once delivered to the saints."—Jude 3. If the miracles by which the first preaching of the Gospel was accompanied were true miracles, the evidence which they afforded to the early Christians ought to satisfy us. If we believe the Bible, we must be satisfied of the truth of the miracles then wrought; and, therefore, we must believe the faith which those miracles were intended to confirm. Protestants have added no new doctrine to the Christian faith, as the Church of Rome has lately done. When the Church of England and Ireland thinks fit to promulgate a new dogma, which is not to be found in Scripture, and was not taught by the early Church, and when she requires all her members to assent to it on pain of forfeiting their everlasting salvation, it will be time enough to demand of her to attest her claim by miraculous evidence—but not till then.

We have thought it right to make these few brief remarks on the unfair and illogical application which we conceive Bellarmine to have made of his own fundamental principle. Until he can show that it is *essential* to a true Church to possess the power of working miracles, he has no right to conclude that those who dissent from the Church of Rome cannot belong to the true Church, because they do not claim to possess this power. Roman Catholic controversialists have sometimes put the question in a taunting way to members of the Protestant communion—"Can you show us any miracles that ever were wrought in testimony of the truth of your religion?" The observations we have already made will, we think, furnish our readers with a satisfactory reply to this question. The religion which we now hold is that same holy Christian religion which was taught by our blessed Saviour and his apostles; and, therefore, all those miracles which they anciently wrought in confirmation of their doctrine do at this day confirm ours also, which, inasmuch as it is the same with theirs, needs no fresh or additional confirmation. When our first Reformers rejected those Romish errors which had overlaid and corrupted the ancient Christian doctrines, as they needed no extraordinary commission for their reformation, no more did they need any miracles to confirm their commission. And when, after removing those abuses which in latter times had crept into the Church, they preached the pure doctrines of that primitive Gospel, which had been abundantly confirmed already by mighty signs and wonders, it is plain that they no more needed any new miracles than if such errors and abuses had never been brought in.

But we must now proceed to consider Cardinal Bellarmine's next assertion—namely, that the existence of miracles within the Church of Rome proves her to be the true Church of Christ. Now, even if, for the sake of argument, we should grant that real, unquestionable miracles were performed within the bosom of the Romish Church, yet a moment's consideration will show that it would by no means follow from thence that the Church of Rome was the only true Church. For example, in the time of the prophet Elijah (1 Kings), who wrought such astonishing miracles—who called down fire from heaven, and raised a man from the dead—we know that the Israelitish Church in Samaria was so fearfully corrupt, that there were but 7,000 persons who had not fallen into gross idolatry. True miracles prove that the individual who performs them acts under divine direction in that particular message which he delivers; but they do *not* prove that either he, or the body to which he may belong, are, in all respects, infallibly true.

But, then, the important question arises—are the miracles of which the Church of Rome tells us so much, really true, or are they not? If they are, then, doubtless, they demand our serious and reverent attention. However strange or improbable the circumstances connected with any supposed miracle may appear, yet, if we are once satisfied that a miracle *has* actually taken place, all seeming objections arising from its antecedent improbability are at once silenced.

Now, it is needless for us to undertake to demonstrate in detail the absurdity of many of the miraculous stories to which the Church of Rome has given her sanction, and which she has even introduced into her public services; for this is fully acknowledged by many learned and impartial writers of that communion. Peter, Abbot of Cluny, had the honesty, even so far back as the twelfth century, to complain of these lying legends. "You know," saith he, in an epistle to one of his friends, "how irksome these false hymns in the Church of God must needs be to me."* And a little after, in the same epistle, he adds, that "he had found, at least, *four and twenty lies* in one hymn of Benedict."† Lindanus, another learned writer, cites a bishop of Lyons, who states, that he had corrected the Antiphonary, "having cut off many things which seemed superfluous, trivial, *false*, *blasphemous*, and fantastical;"‡ and then Lindanus adds, in his own person, that if that bishop had lived to see the Missals in *his* days, "*Deum immortalem! quo ea nomine pingeret?*" Good God! by what name would he have described them?" We are told also by Melchior Canus, one of the most eminent of the Roman Catholic Canonists, "that he cannot deny but that even their best writers, especially in describing the miracles of the saints, have gathered up *scattered rumours*, and transferred them to posterity in their writings, herein too much indulging themselves, or the ordinary sort of believers, whom they supposed not only ready to believe, but also *vehemently desirous* of such miracles."§ When the great majority of people are so prone to credulity, as to be willing to yield implicit credence to scattered reports, and to be *vehemently desirous* of new miracles, it requires but little experience to predict that they will never want writers willing to gratify their taste for the marvellous and improbable. Whether such legends, however, are to be classed among Cardinal Bellarmine's "Notes of the Church," or among the "lying wonders" which are to characterize the apostasy of the latter days, (2. Thes. ii. 9) we leave all impartial readers to decide.

But let us come down a little nearer to our own times. It may be said that we have no adequate means of knowing the truth or falsehood of the reputed miracles of the dark ages. Be it so. But surely we ought to be able to judge of the truth of such as are said to be performed in the present time. Cardinal Bellarmine, as we have seen, goes the length of asserting, that the true Church *must* possess the power of working miracles. If so, then Protestants may surely ask, are there any clear, well-attested miracles wrought in the Church of Rome in our own day? If there are, let us be informed of them; if not, what becomes of Cardinal Bellarmine's mark of the true Church?

We fear we may search in vain the history of the modern Roman Catholic Church in Ireland, for even the semblance of a miracle. Whether it be that Irish Romanists have now grown "cold in the faith," and do not deserve to have a miracle performed amongst them—or whether the close proximity of inquisitive Protestants holds out but little chance of establishing a general belief in a miracle upon insufficient grounds—certain it is that few such attempts have been made in our own days, and that Ireland enjoys the unenviable distinction of being almost the only country professing allegiance to the See of Rome, which cannot boast of a modern miracle.‖

When we turn our eyes to France, we do not meet with much greater success. Those of our readers who have read the history of the miracle of La Salette, given in our last number, will there find a most instructive example of the way in which the story of a miracle may be *got up*. In this case the imposture was so cleverly managed that it deceived the Roman Catholic Bishop of Grenoble, along with a large proportion of the people of his diocese; and we doubt not that there are great numbers of Romanists, not only in France, but even in England, who are still ready to fix their faith upon one of the most audacious acts of fraud and mendacity that ever imposed upon the credulity of an unthinking age.

Spain is the next Roman Catholic country which invites our notice. Here, at least, there are no heretics to infuse doubts into the minds of the faithful and obedient subjects of the Pope, or, if any such do exist, they are compelled, by the strong arm of the law, to keep their doubts to themselves. Accordingly, we find that there is no lack of

* Undecima nota est gloria miraculorum; sunt autem duo fundamenta præmittenda. Unum, quod miracula sint necessaria ad novam fidem, vel extraordinariam missionem persuadendam; alterum, quod sint efficacia et sufficientia. Nam ex priore deducemus, non esse apud adversarios veram fidem; posteriora deducemus, eam esse apud nos.—Bellarm. de Notis Ecclesiæ., lib iv., cap xiv., vol ii., p. 84. Colon, 1615.

* Nosti quantum ma pigeant falsa in Ecclesia Dei cantica.—Petr. Abbas Cluniacens. l. v., Epis. 89.

† Mendacia ad minus viginti quatuor, canticum id citato percurrens animo, reperi.—Epist. 89, ut supra

‡ Amputatis quæ superflua, levia, falsa, blasphema, phantastica, multa videbantur.—Lindanus, de interpretandis Scripturis, lib. iii., cap. iii.

§ Quanquam negare non possumus, viros aliquando gravissimos, &c. Melch. Canus. Loc. Theol. lib. xi., cap. 9.

‖ The only modern attempt to get up a miracle in Ireland is, we believe, the case of the Ecstatica of Youghal, in 1843, which may still be in the recollection of some of our readers. We have the published account of it, and may, probably, on some other occasion, record the substance of it for the edification of our readers.

modern Spanish miracles. We copy from a Dublin paper of the last month* an account of one of the most recent of these "notes of the true Church."

"Within the last few days (May 18) a report was spread in Madrid, that a figure of the Saviour, in the Church of St Francisco the Great, sweated blood and water out of grief for the sale of the church property! Forthwith the people thronged to the place to behold the miracle, and there was much excitement. Some of the faithful and credulous were heard to declare that they had wiped the exudations from the countenance of the graven image, whose eyes and mouth others imagined they saw move. The ferment was such that the authorities were obliged to clear the square in front of the church, and some soldiers removed the figure from its niche, as no workmen could be got to do it. It need hardly be said, that neither the soldiers, nor officers who commanded them, detected any supernatural appearance in the image."

On reading this story we were at once reminded of a similar event which took place in the Cathedral of Christ's Church, Dublin, about the time of the Reformation. As the authenticity of the narrative is unquestionable, and the matter excited considerable interest at the time, we think many of our readers will be glad to have an opportunity of comparing it with the Spanish miracle of our own day.

When Queen Elizabeth succeeded to the throne of England, in November, 1558, one of the first measures adopted by the new government, with reference to the Irish Church, was the restoration of the use of the Church service in English as it had been adopted in the reign of Edward VI. The prospect of a revival of the reformed worship was little pleasing to the more bigoted of the Romish party, who were ready to go any length, or have recourse to any expedient, rather than resign, without a struggle, the use of the Latin Mass. Something must be done, now or never, to keep up the reputation of the old superstition; and a miracle appeared the most suitable expedient.

On Sunday, September 3, 1559, the Lord Lieutenant, (Sir Anthony St. Leger), the Archbishop of Dublin, and the rest of the Privy Council, were assembled in Christ's Church Cathedral, and the Litany was sung in English, as part of the divine service. "There was in that Cathedral" (we copy the words of the historian, Strype)† "an image of Christ in marble, standing with a reed in his hand, and the crown of thorns on his head. And, while service was saying before this great assembly, blood was seen to run through the crevices of the crown of thorns, trickling down the face of the crucifix. The people did not perceive it at first; therefore, some, who were in the fraud, cried out to one another, and bade them see how our Saviour's image sweat blood! Whereat several of the common people fell down with their beads in their hands, and prayed to the image. Vast numbers flocked to the sight, and one present, who, indeed, was the contriver, and formerly belonged to the priory of this cathedral, told the people the cause—namely, 'That he could not choose but sweat blood, while heresy was then come into this church.' The confusion hereupon was so great that the assembly broke up; but the people still fell upon their knees, thumping their breasts.

"But the Archbishop of Dublin, being displeased, caused a form to be brought out of the choir, and bade the sexton of the church to stand thereon, and to scrub and wash the image to see if it would bleed afresh. The man soon perceived the cheat, observing a sponge within the hollow of the image's head. This sponge, one Leigh, sometime a monk of this cathedral, had soaked in a bowl of blood, and, early on Sunday morning, watching his opportunity, placed the said sponge, so swollen and heavy with blood, over the image's head within the crown; and so, by little and little, the blood soaked through upon the face. The sponge was presently brought down, and showed to these worshippers; and some of them arrested Father Leigh, who was soon discovered, and three or four others that had been contrivers with him.

"The Archbishop, the next Sunday, preached in the same church, before the Lord Lieutenant and the council, upon the text (2 Thess. ii. 11)—'*God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie;*' exposing the cheats, who openly stood there with Father Leigh, upon a table before the pulpit, with their hands and legs tied, and their crime written upon their breasts. This punishment they suffered three Sundays, were imprisoned for some time, and then banished the realm. This converted above one hundred persons present, who swore they would never hear Mass more."

We make no apology for the length of the foregoing interesting and instructive extract; and we are sure that our readers will at once perceive how closely it resembles the recent Spanish miracle of the 18th of last May. In both cases the priests had a direct personal motive for their conduct. In Ireland, they wished to retain the old Latin liturgy; in Spain, they wanted to prevent the sale of the Church lands. In both cases the pretended miracle was precisely the same—namely, the production of the appearance of drops of blood upon the face of an image of our Saviour. In Dublin, the energy and sagacity of Archbishop Curwen at once detected the imposture; and, doubtless, if the present Archbishop of Madrid had been a man of the same stamp, the exposure of the Spanish miracle would have been just as crushing and complete. It is one of the proud boasts of the Church of Rome that she is *unchangeable*. In one respect we are ready to acknowledge that there is some truth in the assertion—she is unchangeable in the devices she has recourse to, in order to impose upon the credulity of mankind.

We have not space to discuss the notable modern miracle of the winking image of the Virgin at Rimini, or any other of the stories of the same class which abound in every part of Italy. On some future occasion we may return to the subject. Meanwhile, we request our readers seriously to consider how far a Church, professing to be guided by a love of truth and sincerity, can be justified in having recourse to such deliberate fraud and imposture. We have seen that this is no new practice of the Church of Rome. From the twelfth century downwards, honest and impartial writers have complained of the atmosphere of falsehood and deceit which hung, like a thick cloud, over the religious services of the Church of Rome. To this day the Romish divines do not venture to defend the absurd legends of their own Breviary, many of which we have recently exposed at length in former numbers of this journal. Now, what defence can be offered for these lying legends and false miracles? If the rulers of the Church of Rome were really in earnest in their professed love of truth, they could have no difficulty in rooting out of their system all such "refuges of lies." If, according to the laws of our realm, the forgery of the Queen's signature justly subjects the offender to a heavy punishment, what shall we think of the conduct of those persons who take part in, or give countenance to, the perpetration of a false miracle, which is nothing less than a wicked attempt to give to a lie the attestation of the God of Truth? And if, in fine, the gift of miracles claimed by Bellarmine for his Church, is to be estimated by the specimens which we have indifferently selected from France, Spain, and Ireland, we think the learned Cardinal has no reason to pride himself on *such notes of the true Church.*

* *Vide Daily Express*, May 26, 1855.

† Strype, life of Archbishop Parker, vol. I., p. 90. Oxford edition.

THE HISTORY OF THE DOUAY BIBLE.

THE history of the Douay Bible, and the various steps and attempts by which it has been brought to its present state, has lately received an elucidation more full and complete than we had hoped ever to possess.

The Ven. Henry Cotton, Archdeacon of Cashel, has published a work, entitled "RHEMES AND DOUAY—an attempt to show what has been done by Roman Catholics for the Diffusion of the Holy Scriptures in English." Oxford, 1855.

The importance of such a work is very great. The Church of Rome claims to have sole power of giving the true sense of Scripture. She boasts that to her it belongs to judge of translations and supply interpretation. What can be more important than to be able to know how the Church of Rome has fulfilled her duty in this respect?

We have, from time to time, called attention to this subject; but we have felt deeply how much remains to be done before this subject could be fully treated. We felt the necessity of the various and successive editions being collected and arranged before the history of the Douay Bible could be fully known; and we hardly hoped to see so great a task efficiently performed.

The manner in which this task has been performed by Dr. Cotton is deserving of admiration. With vast labour he has collected all the editions, and noted their several peculiarities, both in the text and the notes, and also the "approbations" given to each.

The tone and temper of Dr. Cotton's work is equally deserving of approval. He has, of course, to give quotations in which Roman Catholics and Protestants say very hard things of each other; but all that is written by Dr. Cotton himself is precisely in that temper which we desire to maintain—giving credit where credit is due, and speaking with moderation where censure is required.

We invite the attention of the Roman Catholic priests to Dr. Cotton's work. We trust they will feel their obligation to a Protestant clergyman, who has given them what they must feel was wanting—a history of their own translation of the Bible.

The book is not the less valuable from Dr. Cotton having confined himself to ascertaining facts—"My chief object has been to ascertain facts, to supply correct information, to collect and arrange materials, from which my readers may be enabled to draw their own conclusions, and to pursue the subject, if they choose, to the full extent which its importance may be thought to justify. All which I propose to do here is to exhibit the present state of the Roman Catholic Bible in these countries, and to trace the successive steps and stages by which it has been brought to that condition."

Our readers may remember an article in our number for June, 1853, in which we showed in what a vast number of places the Douay Bibles now in use differ from the Douay Bibles first published, and the importance of many of the alterations. We then stated our inability to give a full history of all these changes. But all this has been cleared up by Dr. Cotton's labours. We cannot, of course, go through his observations on each separate edition, many of which were mere reprints of former editions, but Dr. Cotton gives a classification of the various Roman Catholic translations and editions—viz.:—

I. Those which have been published by authority.

II. Those put forth by individuals.

Among the former he reckons—(1) Rhemish Testament, published in 1582, 1600, 1621, 1633, 1738, 1738, 1789.

(2). Douay Bible (Old Testament), published in 1609-10, and again in 1635, and never since.

(3). Dr. Challoner's revised Old Testament, published in 1750, and often since reprinted.

(4). Dr. Challoner's New Testament; first edition, 1749; second edition, 1750; third edition, 1752. The second of these editions differed from the first in 124 places. The third differed from the first in more than 2,000 places (p. 49).

Dr. Cotton classifies other later editions, which are not without interest, but the above are the most important, because Dr. Challoner's second edition of the Old Testament, and his third edition of the New Testament, are the basis of all the Roman Catholic translations now in circulation, although several of the editions in circulation still differ more or less from each other: but to Dr. Challoner belongs the credit of the greater number of differences between the old and modern Roman Catholic Bibles, which we noticed in our number for June, 1853.

The things which have been most insisted upon by Roman Catholics respecting translations of the Scripture have been—(1) approbation by the authority of the Church; (2) notes directing to the true sense of Scripture. The facts collected by Dr. Cotton are most important in both respects.

Dr. Cotton gives the "approbations" prefixed to each addition, with a table of all the "approbations," in page 172.

From this table it appears that up to the year 1783—that is, until seventy-two years ago—no edition of the Roman Catholic Bible ever had the approbation of a Roman Catholic bishop prefixed to it; up to that time the "approbations" or recommendations were all from Roman Catholic divines, who were NOT *bishops*.

It further appears that Dr. Challoner's editions of the Old Testament had no "approbation" from either divines or bishops. Dr. Challoner's first edition of the New Testament, published in 1749, had an "approbation" from *two* divines, but not from any bishop. His second edition had none. His third edition, which differed in 2,000 places from his first, and which is the basis of all the modern editions, had none! The modern Roman Catholic Bibles have, therefore, sprung from the learned labour, the private judgment, of an individual bishop, and though subsequent bishops have given to his translation an "approbation" which the bishops of his own time did *not* give, yet *they* also acted on their private judgment; there is no English translation of the Scripture authorized by the Church of Rome; the approbation of Roman Catholic bishops is a late invention, only seventy years old, and does not give the authority of the Church of Rome to the translations so approved; for if there were an "authorized translation" of the Church of Rome, how could Bishop Kenrick have made a new one in 1849?

There is much more in Dr. Cotton's book, which shows of how little value or weight these "approbations" are; but we must be content for the present with the foregoing, which is quite enough to prove that there is no English translation of the Bible authorized by the Church of Rome, and that the Douay translation, as it now stands, is the fruit of "private judgment."

The same conclusion is true of the NOTES in the Douay Bible. Nearly all the original notes have been rejected. The present notes in the Douay Bible have nothing to rest on, but the *private judgment* of persons whose names even we often do not know. We quote from Dr. Cotton's book, p. 167, the evidence given by Dr. Doyle before a committee of the House of Lords, A.D. 1825—"The notes carry, in our editions of the Bible, no WEIGHT, *for we do not know the writers of many of them.* If we find them clear enough in explanation of doctrine, we leave them there; *but whenever we find anything exceptionable, we put it out*" (Report, &c). Dr. Cotton's brief comment upon this appears to us to be very forcible—"It is difficult to prevent the question from continually recurring to one's mind—that if notes are of *no authority* and *no weight*, what is the paramount necessity (as alleged) for their being always appended to the text?"

We shall often have to recur to Dr. Cotton's valuable labours, and we recommend his book to all who are desirous of knowing the history and authority of the Douay Bible, with a strong conviction that the perusal of it will tend to lead intelligent Roman Catholics to a more fearless and diligent study of Holy Scripture.

LA SALETTE.

(Continued from page 67.)

On the evening of the 19th September the two shepherds described the apparition of the beautiful lady to their respective masters, who treated it very lightly, Melanie declaring that he attached no faith to the recital (Verite, p. 46), and Maximin's master not even taking the trouble to accompany the two children to the cure's house, when they went there the next day, Sunday, the 20th, before Mass, to tell the whole to the cure. So little did he mind what he

stated, that he took Maximin to Corps, without allowing him time to hear Mass, at which neither one or other were present, and the young shepherd did not return to La Salette (Verite, p. 48).

M. Perrin, Curé of La Salette, however, though scarcely informed by the children of the event of the day before, made it the subject of his sermon; his intentions were very good without doubt, but he stammered in such a way that no one knew what he wanted to say. At this point, the members of the municipal council, when they met together after Mass, and were interrogated by the Mayor, M. Peytard, "if there were any of them who could make out what Monsieur the Curé had wished to say in his sermon," all answered, "no" (Nouveau Récit de l'Apparition, par Mgr. Villecourt, p. 198).

The earnestness of M. the Curé Perrin had been without result at La Salette. The good old man in the earnestness of his zeal, however, departed that very evening for Grenoble, and, having completed in the one night a journey of forty miles, which separates his parish from that city, he recounted this *great event* to his bishop.

Doubtless the good Curé was able to make himself better understood than he had done the day before to his parishioners; for on the very day after—viz., the 22nd September —Mgr. de Bruillard, the Bishop of Grenoble (then an old man of eighty-one),* having gone to Corene for the closing of the annual retreat of the governesses nuns, then collected together in the convent there to the number of 400, himself announced to them the great news, and those 400 sisters, who separated that very day to return to their respective schools, spread over the whole extent of a diocese of 600,000 souls, proceeded in their turn to announce it to the respective scholars under their care; more than 20,000 children who frequented these schools repeated what they had heard to their respective families, and thus, in less than five or six days, the apparition of the Holy Virgin on the mountain of La Salette was known through the whole diocese, and the parishes which adjoin it. No inhabitant of the country dreamed of calling it into doubt; how could they, when it was on the credit of their bishop that it had been announced to them?

The Curé Perrin is a man of simple manners and language (Verité, p. 83). He was seventy years of age, and had exercised his ministry for forty years at La Salette and other parishes of the Canton de Corps; the event which he had heralded had earned for him the right of ending his days at La Salette, but his simplicity might have been *compromising*, after the official announcement of the fact by Mgr. de Bruillard, and he was carried off from his parish and banished to St. Sixte, a little hamlet of the Canton of St. Geoire, more than sixty miles from La Salette. This change was effected ten days only after the 19th September, and operated to the profit of another Perrin (Verité, p. 83).

As for the shepherd Maximin, a liar by nature, and without education or discipline (Verité, p. 39, &c.), such a witness remaining on the spot might also become indiscreet. He returns, therefore, to Corps, not to his family, but in the character of a boarder in the house of the nuns, who were the teachers of the parish (Verité, p. 42). Under this continued *surveillance* his levity would no longer be attended with any danger.

As for Melanie, she alone remained at La Salette; she was fourteen years of age, but "she was careless, lazy, and pouting to that extent that she was unwilling even to answer those who interrogated her (Verité, pp. 44-45). With such a character, Melanie was not likely to be *compromising*.

While all these things were taking place apart from Mdlle. Lamerliere, the Lady of La Salette took the road to Notre Dame du Laus (Diocese of Gap), and arrived there on the 25th September. She was welcomed by the nuns who manage the establishment appropriated to pilgrims, and was lodged in a chamber on the ground floor. She did not wish to have anything to do with the persons whose piety had attracted them to Laus; her *dignity* would not permit it! This language astonished the good and humble nuns, and they manifested their surprise. "I am here," said the stranger, "to pursue the mission which I commenced at La Salette; Mother of God, I come to bring you news of heaven!" More and more surprised, the nuns went to impart to their superior the language which had struck them so much, and, when they returned together, they found the stranger clad in an emblematical robe, with *cross*, *pincers*, and *hammer*, nothing wanting; they heard her repeating the same language, and the moment they set about making some observations on her, the Lady of La Salette made her escape from them through the window, and took a rapid flight over the side of the mountain, with her aerial costume.

They hastened to give information on the subject to the Bishop of Gap; but while he sends to Laus to obtain such exact information as would enable him to act, they came to tell him, that a strange lady, clothed in a white costume, with flowers and emblems of the passion of our Lord, had presented herself as the Mother of God in a hotel at Gap. Mgr. Deperry at once took on himself the duty of putting a stop to these pious freaks; the lady, however, by departing precipitately, relieved him of this trouble.

The shepherds of La Salette are, therefore, no longer the *sole* heralds of the event of the 19th Sept. (page 72); the nuns of Laus, and mine hosts of the hostelry of Gap, are henceforth called on to share in this task. The apparition cannot fail to make noise enough.

All had been effected for the Alps, something already done for the department l'Isere; it was in l'Isere that the self-esteem of Mdlle. Lamerliere had been wounded by the legal decision which placed her under tutelage; it is there, therefore, that it behoved her to make the event resound, which was to compensate for all her mortification. She arrives at Tullins, a town between St. Marcellin and Grenoble, in the end of September; there she finds an asylum at the house of a schoolmistress, who soon became her faithful companion. Her feet were bruised by the fatigue of her journey, and the course she had taken over the rocks of the Alps. She received, for some days, the attentions of her hostess, and those of a young governess, Mdlle. F——, and they bathed her feet with spiced wine, and bound them up with soothing bandages. Touched with these marks of affectionate kindness, Mdlle. Lamerliere soon yielded them her full confidence. "It was in fulfilling her mission at La Salette that she was reduced to this state, but God had rewarded her zeal, and willed that her supernatural character should be recognised by all, even by the animals who climbed the holy mountain; for that, in descending from La Salette, *an ass had bent his knees before her*, in a part of the road where no accident was possible." The young F—— and her companion listened and sighed and redoubled their care for their incurable patient. The 1st October arrived. At Parmenie, a hill which overlooks Tullins, there is an oratory, long served by a priest, who was attached to the *petite eglise*, and, since his death, was a place of pilgrimage, confided to the care of the Capuchin fathers, and afterwards to the friars of Marie. The 4th October was the Sunday of the Rosary; the pilgrimage had drawn there a number of the inhabitants of the neighbouring country. Mdlle. Lamerliere learned this, and, notwithstanding the pain which the ascent of the Parmenie caused her, she mounts to the chapel, clothed in the costume of La Salette, and proceeds there again to announce herself as the Mother of God, as deputed by her Son to visit mankind with intentions of mercy and pardon.

While Mdlle. Lamerliere was performing these various evolutions, the apparition of the Holy Virgin, at La Salette, had begun to be spread abroad by the sisters of La Providence, to whom the Bishop of Grenoble had announced it, on the 22nd September. The conducteur Fortin heard it spoken of, and immediately thought of Mdlle. Lamerliere and her conversation with him, on their journey; he had no doubt that it was her doing, and that the shepherds were the dupes of their own simplicity. The eccentricities of Mdlle. Lamerliere were well known at Tullins; but when Fortin shrugged his shoulders at some medals which were shown him struck off in honour of our Lady of La Salette, exclaiming "La Salette! it is all a trick of Mdlle. Lamerliere," his language was considered improbable and absurd. He explained, however, his reasons for this opinion, and, while actually discussing them, providence permitted that Mdlle. Lamerliere should, at that very moment, come in to visit the family M——. Far from being disconcerted at the sight of her, Fortin laughed, and commenced the history of their journey together. Madame M—— relieved him from proceeding, and, taking on herself the conversation, repeated to Mdlle. Lamerliere all that Fortin had just said. "You ought not to believe the conducteur," she contented herself with answering coldly; "that would do injury to religion." Fortin laughed again; he was obliged at the time to rejoin his *Diligence;* but, some days after, in passing through Tullins, he espied Mdlle. Lamerliere, and accosted her, saying—"We are here alone to-day, all disguise would be useless, tell me what whim induced you to go to La Salette to play the Holy Virgin?" In vain Mdlle. Lamerliere seeks to escape from her questioner, he had her in his grasp, and recalled to her mind all the confidential disclosures of the carriage. She was overcome and reduced to say to him, "Well! be it so, you are at liberty yourself to disbelieve; but, at least, allow others to believe; that will be for the good of religion!"

Since this definite reply, Mdlle. Lamerliere has met Fortin many times, but has always refused to speak to him; she pretends even never to have known him.

In the course of the month of November, 1846, one of the persons who played the most active part in the affairs of La Salette came from the Canton of Corps to Grenoble, to superintend a legal affair with his attorney, M. Z——. When interrogated by M. Z——, in the presence of his chief clerk, upon the *great event* of La Salette, he at first contented himself with smiling, and making no answer; but when, pressed again and again, he was reduced to the necessity of speaking, it was only to make this decisive revelation—"We all know in the locality that the apparition was the act of Madame X—— and of *Mademoiselle Lamerliere!*"

Such an unequivocal admission, made within two months after the 19th September, at a period, too, when no one was thinking of Mademoiselle Lamerliere, would, in itself, be sufficient to remove all doubt, even if any remained after the details already given."

Thus far we have followed the Abbé Deleon in detail, translating his narrative of the events with a verbatim exactness, which may not be quite agreeable to our more cultivated readers. Our limited space, however, warns us that we must abridge what remains within a narrower compass than it occupies in the elaborate and painfully-interesting volume, in which the writer has exposed, in so masterly a manner, every stage of the proceedings, by which this gross imposture has been given currency to among a certain party in France.

Dr. Ullathorne, in page 38 of his pamphlet in advocacy of the truth of the apparition, entitled "The Holy Mountain of La Salette," makes the following statement:—

"Miracles, through the instrumentality of the water of the fountain, began to be reported at a very early period, and, as the cases increased in numbers, they began also to be inquired into.

"On the first anniversary of the apparition, a most extraordinary and unlooked-for spectacle took place on the mountain. The anniversary occurred on a Sunday. It was anticipated that far greater than the usual number of pilgrims would come, and in order that the obligations of the Sunday might be satisfied, the bishop allowed Mass to be said for the pilgrims. But, to the astonishment of every one, *for no measure had been taken, either to invite or draw persons together*, and the clergy of the diocese were yet under the injunction of silence, from fifty to sixty thousand persons, of all classes, came together on the mountain. They arrived from all parts of France, and even from other countries. Amongst them were two hundred and fifty clergymen. Though as yet there was neither habitation nor place of shelter, and the rain fell heavily from eight the night before until ten next morning, fifteen hundred persons passed the night on the mountain. And by one in the morning, illuminating the darkness with torch-light, the head of a procession began to ascend the mountain, whilst its farther extremities extended some twelve or fifteen miles along the various roads in the directions of Gap and Grenoble, besides crowding the different paths of the mountain; and every hour of the morning poured some thousands of persons upon the scene of the apparition. Two altars were erected, and covered over with sheds, and on these the holy sacrifice was offered, some thirty or forty times. Pressed together as this vast multitude was, yet by all accounts there was no disorder. Only four gensdarmes were on the spot, and their sole occupation was to open the passage to the altars for the communicants, or to the fountain, for those who came to drink of its waters. A thick cloud covered the mountain, and filled the valleys beneath, so that for a considerable time the pilgrims could only see the masses of human heads buried in the fog at a hundred paces from where they severally stood, though the whole breadth of the mountain resounded with pious canticles. At last the sun raised the cloud from the top of the mountain, and revealed the entire scene, whilst the stream of fresh arrivals were emerging out of the mists that still lay below. The *Magnificat* was chaunted in two choirs by some thirty thousand voices. And then, an ecclesiastic, tall of stature, and with stentorian voice, rose up above the multitude, and cried out over the vast assembly—"My brethren, let us pray for France." Then one common emotion united the hearts of all in one, and their prayers for their country were offered up with many tears. Mary had indeed called *her* people together through the voice of her young apostles. They were there, those two simple children, almost forgotten in the multitude. And it was only a year since they had been there alone, with Mary in their company. There has never been such an assemblage, though the anniversary has not once passed without calling together many thousands."

M. L'Abbé Deleon, in page 78, gives us a somewhat more credible account of the scene—

"The anniversary day approached; they took care to spread a report through the country that the Holy Virgin *would appear a second time on* the 19th September, 1847. From all sides were seen pilgrims, drawn there by curiosity. In arriving at the mountain, on the day indicated, they all pressed about the chapel, they pray, they wait, they invoke the realization of the promise which had been made to them. It was needful to satisfy their pious credulity, to fortify their faith in La Salette. M. Gerin, curate of the Cathedral of Grenoble, undertakes this charge, and, in a mystical address, utters these words—'If the Holy Virgin has not appeared on this mountain, she is under obligation to show herself to-day; if she does not show herself there, it is because she has already appeared' (Verité, par MM. Orcel et Rousselot, page 99). And as all the auditors, with their eyes raised to the sky, waited with a holy awe, hoping still for a new apparition, M. Gerin has recourse to a pious stratagem—describes the splendour of the apparition of 1846, and speaks 'of angels placed at the windows of heaven to contemplate the Holy Virgin in the for ever happy moment when she was descending the preceding year upon the holy mountain.' He then announced that the holy mysteries would be celebrated at La Salette by a special authority from the bishop, without interruption, to the 3rd October, and that thus, for fifteen days, hymns in honour of Mary would resound upon the holy mountain."

Dr. Ullathorne, the pilgrim from Birmingham, and the Abbé Deleon, of Grenoble, differ as widely upon other matters of fact; as to which, we think it much more likely that a French priest, resident on the spot, should be accurately informed than an English pilgrim, even though he may be a bishop.

Dr. Ullathorne asserts, page 56, that "a vast conversion has taken place. Swearing has ceased amongst the

* He was born in 1765.—See "La Salette devant le Pape," p. 41.

mountaineers, and the Sunday is observed to a very great extent. There is a great religious change in all the south of France, and the pilgrimage to La Salette has been a main instrument of this conversion."

MM. Rousselot and Orcel, in pp. 94 and 208 of their report, also assert that "though the population of the Canton of Corps amounts to between five and six thousand souls, there are not a hundred who are not converted!"

"But," says M. Deleon, p. 105, "the pilgrim strangers who traverse the country on every side to reach La Salette see the inhabitants working on Sundays just as they did before; see them eat meat on prohibited days, as they did before; and hear them blaspheming the name of God, as they did before; though these three grave faults are precisely those of which the lady had complained upon the mountain, and which had provoked her menaces.

"The establishment of these facts by all the pilgrims rendered it needful for M. Rousselot to change his ground, and in another work of his, published 3 years afterwards, in 1850 ("Nouveaux Documents sur L'Evènement de La Salette," page 26), he pleads the contrary cause. In speaking of the revolution of 1848, in which he finds the accomplishment of the first prophetic words of the Lady, and the secret of the two shepherds, he adds, 'who knows if the other parts of the prophecy may not also have their terrible accomplishment, *if the people are not converted.*'"

Which of these two statements is most to be relied on? If the former, MM. Rousselot and Orcel, through inadvertence, no doubt, have forgotten to tell us why "the rocks were not changed into corn, and the potatoes self-sown on the lands" according to the formal promise of the prophecy!—See last No. of CATHOLIC LAYMAN, p. 66.

Dr. Ullathorne, p. 96, proceeds thus—

"I will now select a few examples of these miracles, and will give a brief account of them. Those who wish to read the attestations may refer to them, as they are recorded in the works I have so often quoted.

"Sister St. Charles Pierron, of the Hospitalières of St. Joseph of *Avignon*, was reduced to the last stage of decline; for eight years she had been compelled to lie in bed, and besides the severe affection in her lungs, had violent pains of stomach, frequent spittings of blood, dysentery, and a continuous slow fever. In December, 1846, her sufferings became much aggravated, her throat, tongue, and palate grew ulcerated, and emitted a fetid odour; she had great difficulty in swallowing, as well as in speaking so as to make herself understood; and from that time until the 16th of April, 1847, the day of her cure, she took no solid food, and only a small quantity of fluid daily. In the month of February, her two physicians, to quote the attestation of one of them, 'gave her up to her sad destiny.' The superioress of the community *had a great desire to obtain a confirmation* of the evidence of the two children of La Salette; and as the maladies of Sister St. Charles had been long and publicly known, *she selected her case* in preference to that of any other of the sick of her community. But when it was proposed to Sister St. Charles, that her cure should be sought through our Lady of La Salette, this good religious declared that she had no desire to recover her health, as it would keep her from eternity. The superioress *urged the proposal* upon her repeatedly; but as the sister continued reluctant, the superioress used her authority, and told her that she had no right to consider herself, but only the glory of God and the augmentation of the honour of the Blessed Virgin. Sister St. Charles then *consented*, and expressed a conviction *that she should be healed*, and a small quantity of the water of La Salette was provided for her to drink. She was requested to point out herself the exercises to be followed during the novena. Each day of that novena, a sister of the community went to holy communion in reparation for the sins of blasphemy and the profanation of the Sunday, which the Blessed Virgin had pointed out. There were three fasts for the same intention, and each day the community recited the *Salva Regina*, three *Aves* with the invocation, *O Mary conceived without sin*, &c., and the *Mater Admirabilis*.

"On the seventh day of the novena, Sister St. Charles was not only worse, but swooned and cast up a great quantity of blood. Seeing her condition, the superioress said to her—'I think the Blessed Virgin is going to cure you by sending you to heaven." Whereupon the sister replied—'All my maladies do not weaken my confidence; as I have *only three days more* to suffer, I pray our good Mother not to spare me.' In fact, she would have everything made ready, and begged that her habit and veil, which had not been used for a long time, might be put by her bedside. On the Friday morning, the day before the conclusion of the novena, after a very bad night, she spat blood as usual. The community on that morning anticipated their general communion for her, as the Bishop of Chalon said the Mass in their chapel. This was a trial to Sister St. Charles, as she had hoped the following day to make her communion with them. She was planning in her mind to ask for a general communion again for the following morning, in which she hoped to be able to join, and was full of this thought, when she suddenly felt a great revolution in her frame, her maladies ceased at once, and she felt, to use her own expression, as if a invisible hand had raised her up. She cried out, 'I am healed.' Sister St. Joseph, who was in bed in the same room, did not understand what she said, and thought, on the contrary, that she was becoming worse; she was the more alarmed, as she was alone at this moment, and too ill herself to go and help her. Sister St. Charles hearing her weep, quitted her own bed and went herself to console her. She did the same to the portress, who looked after the convent during Mass, and was terribly frightened at hearing some one running about the room in which she had only left sick people in bed. She came rushing in quite out of breath and feeling quite ill. Sister St. Charles calmed her, gave her something to drink, as well as to the Sister St. Joseph, and assured them that she was cured. She then went down to the chapel, and heard the remainder of the Mass, kneeling without any support. Her two physicians were astounded when they saw her, and declare in their testifications that they could not believe their own eyes. She joined the labours of the community, was as active as any other sister, could carry heavy loads, and remained in perfect health.

"This cure is declared by the physician-in-chief of the hospital of Avignon, to have taken place in a manner beyond the intervention of art, and to partake of the nature of a prodigy. It is certified in similar terms by two other medical men, also by the three Capitular vicars general, by one of the first barristers of Avignon, and by the superioress and officials of the community."

The Abbé Deleon in treating of this alleged miracle, p. 147, proceeds as follows:—

"On the 5th Sept. Mgr. de Bruillard writes to his colleague of Rochelle—'I have ascertained the certainty of the miracle wrought in favour of the nun of St. Joseph, Sister St. Charles, of Avignon. His Grace the Archbishop is preparing a *mandement* as to this fact.'

"This double assertion has nothing equivocal, it was repeated at the conferences at the bishop's house; the majority of the commissioners accepted it without examination; but it was from Avignon that the light ought to come; for in the terms of the decree of the Council of Trent, no miracle ought to be proclaimed without the approbation of the bishop of the place. Avignon, however, preserves silence; a year elapses and the announced *mandement* does not appear; the archbishop dies; he has a successor, a prelate who would not allow himself to be taken in by the artifices of Rose Tamisier; that prelate speaks, but it is only to declare positively that *the miracle did not exist!* He declared this to his colleague and friend, the Bishop of Gap, and on the 23rd June, 1850, the Bishop of Gap, in the presence of a dozen priests, collected at the rectory of Vizille, communicated this canonical sentence to M. Chambon, vicar-general, and to M. Bonvier, the Dean of the Chapter, and afterwards honorary vicar-general of Grenoble. M. Rousselot learned this sentence of the Archbishop of Avignon from his two colleagues; and how did he reply to it? One way alone was open to a Catholic priest—to obtain a revision of the sentence of the archbishop of the place, or to maintain a respectful silence. Neither one course or the other was resorted to in regard to this pretended cure of the Sister St. Charles. The miracle of this cure does not exist; priests, the faithful, the Catholic world, have been all deceived, first by rashness, and afterwards by design."

We must here pause, not to weary our readers, who, probably, have read enough to satisfy their minds as to the true character of the whole matter. There is much, however, remaining to be told as to the means used to give currency to the affair, which we may hereafter recur to, if our space should permit.

ROMAN CATHOLIC MORAL THEOLOGY.—No. III.

In the articles on this subject, inserted in our last two numbers, we complained that while the Church of Rome boasts of her readiness to pronounce a decision on disputed matters of faith, nothing is more difficult than to obtain an authorized exponent of her system of morality. In default of any more authoritative guide we selected, as the representative of her moral teaching, one of her last canonised saints, St. Liguori; and we answered the objections which have been made against our taking such works as his as fair specimens of the morality taught in the Church of Rome. Having thus disposed of preliminaries, we come to the questions what are the actual contents of St. Liguori's work, and whether his moral teaching reaches a high standard or not.

In selecting his doctrine of equivocation and mental reservation to begin with, we are guided principally by the consideration, that it is one for which materials are the most abundant, and in which the theory of Liguori has been recently adopted, defended, and put in practice by high authorities in the Church of Rome. A couple of years ago Dr. Murray, of Maynooth, who, as a controversialist, possesses more courage than discretion, and who seems to have a particular fancy for knocking his head against stone walls, selected this topic of equivocation and mental reservation for the subject of one of his theological essays, and did all that an ingenious man could to make a plausible defence for the Jesuit doctrine. The controversy was renewed in a very able article in the *Christian Remembrancer*, January, 1854 (Liguori's "Theory of Truthfulness"),* to which we shall be much indebted, and in which a complete account was given of all that part of Liguori's work which treats of the subject now under discussion. This article received two replies—one in the *Rambler* for April, 1854, founded on Dr. Murray's essay, and reproducing all his arguments; the other in the *Dublin Review*, January, 1855, so dull and heavy that we consider we have given great proof of self-devotion to the cause of enlightening our readers, by reading it conscientiously through, and enabling ourselves to give a summary of its principal contents. With all these materials, then, we think it will be easy to find what is now the received doctrine in the Church of Rome on the subject of equivocation and mental reservation; and what is the best defence that can be made for it. We may add, as another reason for selecting this subject, that it is one the application of which very frequently occurs in practice. Numbers of people, who are under comparatively little temptation to murder, or theft, or adultery, will often be tempted to offend with their tongues; many of our readers will, therefore, feel a practical interest in knowing what is recommended as right, or condemned as wrong, by persons who are considered by thousands of Christians as approved moral guides.

Nothing can, at first sight, be more promising than the doctrine of Alphonsus on the subject of lying. "A lie," says he, "is always a sin, even though it be told in joke, or to benefit our neighbour; even though by a lie a man could save his life, it would not be lawful to tell it."† So, likewise, Theophilus Raynaud—"So foully venomous is a lie, that even though honour, life, or the salvation of the world, were at stake, and could be saved by ever so slight a lie, which would bring injury to none, yet ought that little lie to be rejected, and the world's destruction rather permitted." We seem to hear the voice of one bred up in the very strictest school of morals; and men of the world will be tempted to take fright, and receive no counsel from so impracticable a theologian. But let them not be startled so easily. We shall find, as we study the Jesuit moral theology, that its general method is to lay down a rule, strict enough to satisfy the demands of the strictest of theorists, and then to eat out the heart of the rule with exceptions, numerous enough to permit of the laxest of practice. And so all parties are satisfied; for the pious are gratified by the conformity of the rule to Gospel morality; while all who do not want to sin for the mere pleasure of sinning will find that means will be found to enable them to gratify all their wishes, without ever encountering this rule, which looks so formidable. For instance, what could seem more inconvenient to a man who desired to deceive his neighbour than this rigorous condemnation of "ever so small a lie," even were one's "own life, or the salvation of the whole world at stake." But it will be seen that though we may not deceive our neighbour we may lawfully take steps to let him *deceive himself*. And what a hardened sinner must that be who would prefer to accomplish his object by a sinful lie, when he could, with a good conscience, attain the same end by an innocent equivocation. But we had better begin at the beginning, and give St. Liguori's explanation what equivocation is.

"Equivocation may be in three ways—1. When a word has a double sense, as the Latin word 'volo' means either to *wish* or to *fly*. 2. When a sentence has two meanings—for example, This book is Peter's, may mean either that Peter is the owner of the book, or the author of it. 3. When words have two senses, one more common than the other; or one literal, the other metaphorical. . . . . Thus, if a man is asked about something which it is expedient to conceal, he may answer, *I say no*—that is to say, I pronounce the word 'no.' Cardenas doubts about this; but, saving his better counsel, he seems to do so without reason, since the phrase *I say* really has two meanings; it means to *pronounce* a word, or to *assert*; and here we use it in the former sense, *pronounce*."

"These things being laid down, it is certain and admitted by all the doctors, that, for a good reason, it is lawful to use equivocation in any of the ways we have explained, and to confirm it by an oath. And the reason is, that we then do not deceive our neighbour, but allow him to deceive himself; and, on the other hand, we are not bound to speak according to the understanding of others, if there be a good reason. And any honest end, in order to preserve things good for the spirit, or useful to the body, would be a good reason."

We do not intend, in this article, to enter into the discussion whether Liguori's morality is good or not; we only want to learn what his doctrines are, and we have it here stated distinctly enough, that *for a good reason we may use equivocation, and confirm it by an oath*; and that the *preservation of any temporal or spiritual advantage is to be considered as a good reason.* To illustrate, by example, the three kinds of equivocation just described—Suppose that we are asked whether we have seen a woman, and that we wish to conceal the fact that we *have* seen her, we must, on no account, answer "No;" for this would be a lie, and it is not permitted us to deceive our neighbour, even if the salvation of the whole world were at stake; but we may let him deceive himself in any of the three following ways:—1, We may answer, *I saw her not*—meaning "I saw the knot in which she tied up her hair;" or else meaning "I am not cutting her with a saw;" and if the hearer is so careless as to suppose us to mean that we did not see her, he is only deceiving himself, and we are not responsible. 2, We may answer, "I saw persons

* This has been since reprinted in a separate form. London: J. and C. Mosley.

† St. Alph. Instr. Cat., part 1, c. viii., cited *Dublin Review*, p. 342.

who were in search of her, but did not see herself;" we mean that the persons who were in search of her did not see her; and if the hearer supposes us to mean that *we* did not see her, his own carelessness and not we are to blame. 3, Or, lastly, we may answer, "*I say, no;*" and as it is literally true that we do say the word no, of course there is no danger of our being guilty of a lie in the matter.

It may happen, however, that, at the moment we are asked a question, equivocal words may not be in readiness; in that case we must have recourse to MENTAL RESERVATION. It will be convenient, for reasons which will presently appear, before giving St. Liguori's opinion as to the lawfulness of mental reservation, to commence by giving the explanation of this method, which we find in Pascal.—Provincial Letters, let. ix.

"Do you know what is to be done when no equivocal words can be got?"

"No, father."

"I thought as much," said the Jesuit, "for this is new; it is the doctrine of mental reservation. Sanchez gives it in the same place. 'We may swear,' says he, 'that we have *not* done a thing (although, in reality, we *have* done it), if we understand in our minds that we did not do it on such a particular day, or before we were born, or if we supply some other such circumstance without making it known in the least by the words we employ.' This is very convenient on many occasions, and is quite innocent if necessary or conducive to our health, honour, or advantage."

"What, father, is not that a lie, and a perjury, too?"

"No," replied the Jesuit; "Sanchez proves it at the same place, and so does our father Filiutius, because he says, 'it is the intention which regulates the quality of the action.' But he gives another surer way of avoiding falsehood; it is after having said aloud, 'I swear that I have not done it,' add, in a whisper, '*to-day;*' or after having said 'I swear,' aloud, then add in a whisper, 'that I say,' and go on aloud, 'that I have not done it.' This, you perceive, is speaking the truth."*

"I confess it," said I, "but I fear it is speaking the truth in a whisper and a falsehood aloud; and, besides, I should be afraid that many people would not have presence of mind to make use of these methods."

"Our fathers," replied he, "have taught in the same place, for the benefit of those who are not expert in the use of these reservations, that, in order to avoid lying, it is sufficient to say simply that they have not done what they have done, provided they have, in general, the intention of giving to their language the sense which an able man would give it."

The quotation we have given is taken from the celebrated work in which, as many of our readers are aware, Pascal, himself a devout Roman Catholic, unsparingly exposed the relaxed morality which was then taught with approbation by the Jesuit divines. The Jesuits attempted to reply, but with a total want of success. And though they obtained in Louis XIV. of France a powerful protector, yet, within a score of years, they found themselves in the disagreeable position of being disowned by the Pope. Innocent XI., who has been even called a Jansenist Pope, condemned (on March 2, 1679) 64 propositions, including several of the most remarkable of those tenets of the Jesuit casuists which were held up to scorn by Pascal. On this subject of equivocation he condemns the three following propositions:—

26. "If any one, either alone or in the presence of others—either in answer to questions, or of his own accord—either for amusement or for any other reason—swears that he has not done what he really has done, understanding in his own mind something else which he did not do, or another way from that in which it was done, or any other added circumstance which is true—he, in fact, tells no lie and is not perjured."

27. "There is a good reason for using these equivocations as often as it is necessary or useful for the protection of his person, honour, or property, so that the concealment of the truth is then counted expedient and desirable."

28. "Whoever has been promoted to a public office by means of a recommendation, or by bribery, may take the oath required by the king's mandate, with mental restriction, without respecting the intention with which it is exacted, because he is not bound to confess a hidden crime."

These three propositions, then, being among those condemned by Pope Innocent XI., Rome has spoken, and surely all controversy ought to be at an end. It must be disagreeable for members of the Jesuit body, no doubt, to condemn, as contrary to sound morality, teaching published under the sanction of the society; but when the infallible judge has pronounced his decree, surely no alternative is left them. Can any means be devised at once to save the credit of the Jesuit society and to preserve the reverence due to the infallibility of the Pope? To effect this miracle a word of power is appealed to, DISTINGUENDUM EST. To quote from the *Christian Remembrancer*—"Given the problem, how to retain a certain practice, and at the same time to pay outward respect to a Papal decree forbidding it, the method to be adopted is the following:—Take the thing condemned, and divide it into two species, distinguished from each other by a distinction without a difference; assume that the Papal condemnation applies to one of these species, but not to the other; range everything which you wish to do under the uncondemned head; whatever you have no temptation towards, under the other; the result will be the conclusion desired. Thus the Pope condemned mental restriction; immediately mental restriction is divided into two kinds—pure mental restriction and non-pure mental restriction." A similar distinction is made between formal and material—or, as it has been translated, between discoverable and undiscoverable—equivocation.

An undiscoverable equivocation is when the words employed have but one real meaning, and that is *not* the meaning intended by the speaker. Thus, to use the example given by Dr. Murray, of Maynooth, if we were to take it into our heads to understand by the word *horse*, what is commonly understood by the word *man*, and say, "I saw a horse sitting on a sofa and discussing metaphysics with another learned horse from Maynooth;" this is an undiscoverable equivocation, and, if spoken seriously, must be considered as a lie. But the case is very different when the words employed really *have* two meanings, as in the examples given above; then the equivocation is discoverable, and is perfectly innocent. And the theory of mental reservation is the same, when the concealed idea is wholly undiscoverable, then the mental restriction is pure, and is forbidden by Pope Innocent XI.; but if the concealed idea is discoverable by proper sagacity and attention on the part of the hearer, then this is non-pure mental restriction, and it would be unreasonable to suppose that Pope Innocent XI. meant to condemn anything so innocent. Thus, for instance, the method which Pascal ascribes to Sanchez of mentally supplying part of the sentence, without giving the least indication of it in words, is pure mental restriction, and is condemned; but the method of Filiutius of speaking the lie aloud and the truth in a whisper, or under cover of a cough, is non-pure mental restriction and may be lawfully employed.

We give another illustration from the *Christian Remembrancer*—"As St. Francis, of Assisi, was one day walking, he was passed by a person whom he recognised. Hardly was this person out of sight when there came by others in search of him, and asked St. Francis if he had passed by? The saint did not wish to say yes. His conscience forbade him to say no. What was he to do? He threw his arms into the air, brought his hands together, and in so doing pointed with his finger down his sleeve. Then he answered with a safe conscience—'He has not passed *this* way.' It was quite true, he had not passed down the saint's sleeve. Now, had he not pointed down his sleeve, this would have been a case of *pure* mental reservation, and would have been a mortal sin; but the adroit movement of the finger altogether withdrew the act from this class of sins and placed it among justifiable and right acts. St. Francis' soul would have become spiritually dead, had it not been for the finger; he would have been 'deprived of God's grace,' but for the finger; he would have earned eternal damnation, but for the finger; but the finger was a talisman." Liguori's doctrine, then, on the subject of mental reservation is, that while purely mental reservation is condemned by the decree of Innocent XI., non-pure mental restriction is not. "For if it were not allowable to use non-pure mental restriction, there would be no way of lawfully concealing a secret which a man could not discover without loss or inconvenience, and this would be as hurtful to intercourse between man and man, as lying. The condemnation passed by the Pontiff on mental restriction is rightly to be understood of restriction purely and strictly taken, for that alone ought to be called true mental restriction, which takes place solely in the mind, and which there remains concealed, and can by no means be discovered from outward circumstances."—De juramento, Dub. iv., art. 152.

And, again (Art. 168)—"Is it lawful to swear something false, adding in a low voice some true circumstance? Yes, answer Hurtado and Prado with others quoted by the Salamanca doctors against Torre. They say that it is enough to make the words true, that there should be some external conformity with the conception of the mind, whether shown by a gesture or whisper, and that the other's not hearing it is a matter of accident. The Salamanca doctors, however, with more correctness, allow of such a whisper if it can be at all perceived by the other, even though its meaning be not caught; but not so if the whisper is wholly concealed from the other."

We now proceed to give some of Liguori's applications of his theory to particular examples. It will be seen that there is a good deal of difference between the saint's doctrine and that popularly received by English gentlemen. We should have been inclined to think that the intention to deceive is the essence of a lie, and that the form of words by which the deceit is accomplished is a matter of minor importance; however, it will be found that in Liguori's principles everything depends on the cautious use of the *words* employed.

(1) We shall commence with the common instance of a servant saying—*Not at home.* We do not mean here to discuss the lawfulness of instructing a servant to give this answer when his master really is in the house; but we should have supposed that the only grounds on which it could be defended would be, that these words have acquired, by use, a conventional meaning; that they were universally understood as implying no more than the master did not wish to receive visits; and that, therefore, no one was deceived by them. And if this could not be asserted with truth, then we should pronounce this answer to be indefensible. St. Liguori, however, treats the matter in a very different way. One answer which some Roman Catholic divines recommend the servant to make, we fear, cannot be practised in England. The servant might lawfully answer—"Non est hic." For, as profound Latin scholars are aware, these words may not only mean "He is not here," but also, "he is not eating here;" in which latter sense the words are supposed to be true. However, St. Liguori is too thoughtful to provide only for the use of servants who answer in Latin. His solution is as follows, Art. 165:—

"May a servant, by his master's order, deny that he is at home? Cardenas asserts that the servant may fix* his foot on a stone, and say he is not *here* [*i.e.*, on the stone]; because this is not a mental restriction; but I do not agree with him if the other could, by no means, perceive the action. [If the other could not see you strike your foot on the stone, it would be a *pure* or *undiscoverable* mental restriction; but it would seem that if you strike your foot in an off-hand way, as if meaning nothing, but still, so that the other could see the action, then this answer becomes lawful.] But I should rather allow him to say, *He is not here*, meaning not in this door, or in this window, or (as Tournely says), understanding, not so that he can be seen. Cardenas also says, that he may answer—"He went out," meaning that he went out yesterday, or at some other past time; for (as he says with Lessius) we are not bound to answer according to the meaning of him who asks the question, if there be good reason. This, however, will not do, if he is asked, "Did your master go out this morning?" So also Cardenas says "that in the case of a nobleman who is in mourning, the servant may answer that he is out, meaning that he is removed from society." Now, our readers will see that in place of Liguori making the defence, that the words, "Not at home," are used only in a conventional sense in which they are not *intended* to deceive, he suggests different senses in which the words, "He is not here," may be literally true; but yet, in every one of which there is an attempt to deceive, which, in our opinion, cannot be cleared of the guilt of falsehood.

(2) We pass to another example. It is Lord Brougham, we think, who somewhere tells a story of a gentlemen travelling in Italy who, to his great surprise, was sued at law for a sum of money which he had never received, and which was asserted to have been lent him by a man whom he was not at all acquainted with. The gentleman put the matter in the hands of his lawyer, and presented himself before the judge. He heard the debt proved against him by several witnesses, on oath, who swore that they had seen the money given him by the alleged creditor, and he wondered how his lawyer would contrive to break down this mass of testimony, and expose its perjury; but what was his surprise to hear an equal number of credible witnesses brought forward on his own side who swore that they had seen him return the money! and to obtain, triumphantly, by these means, a judgment in his favour. We had always considered this story to be rather libellous on Italian morality, but really we do not know what to say now, when we find the converse case treated of by Liguori—Art. 158—"He who has received a loan, but afterwards paid it, may deny that he received it, understanding in his mind so as to be bound to pay it."

(3) We pass on to another case by which St. Liguori attempts to add a good deal to the comfort of travelling abroad. What can be more vexatious often than quarantine regulations? How annoying to be detained on one's journey for a fortnight or three weeks, when we know that we are perfectly free from plague. Well, St. Liguori teaches that if we know the place we have come from not to be infected, we may deny that we have come from it. Thus, for example, suppose that we are asked at Constantinople, have we come from Cairo? We have come from Cairo, but we know that there is no plague there at the time. Since the object for which we are asked is only to guard against plague, we may deny that we have come from Cairo. A great number of doctors teach that even if the plague were at Cairo, but if we had passed quickly through, so as to be sure we had caught no infection, we might still deny that we had come thence—meaning not so that danger might be feared from us. St. Liguori, however, does not agree with this.

(4) Art. 160.—If a guest is asked, if his dinner is good, when really it is bad, he may answer, that it is good—meaning, good for mortification.

(5) Suppose a man has spoken ill of his neighbour, which ill is true, but yet which the speaker ought not to have divulged; what is he to do? I am accustomed, says Liguori, to recommend people to equivocate and say—"I said it out of my own head;" for all words do come out of the mind, for which the head is taken. Or else the speaker may say—"I have told a lie;" for he has done wrong in what he has said; and St. John says (where?) that all sin is deceitfulness, and a lie.†

* Another example of mental reservation is cited by the *Christian Remembrancer*, from the "Treatise on Equivocation," by Garnet, the Jesuit, p. 31—"I will give you a hundred pounds," mentally subjoining, "if I find it in Cheapside."

* There is an unaccountable misconception of this in Blakeney's translation of Liguori.

† Homo. Apostolicus, Tr. xv. 18., cited by *Christian Remembrancer*.

(6) Art. 162.—May an unfaithful wife declare to her husband that she has not committed adultery, meaning (aside) so as to have to tell him? She may assert equivocally that she has not broken the marriage, for the bond still exists. And if she has sacramentally confessed her adultery, she may answer, "I am innocent of this crime," because it has been taken away by confession. So Cardenas, who, however, remarks that she may not make that affirmation with an oath, because the probability of a fact is sufficient for asserting a thing, but certainty is required for swearing. But it is replied that *moral* certainty is sufficient for swearing; and moral certainty of the remission of a sin can be had when a person has received the sacrament of penance with a good moral disposition.

Thus we see two ways provided to enable an unfaithful wife to deny her adultery without being guilty of falsehood, and the saint proceeds to give more. If in danger of death, she may say, "I have not committed adultery"—meaning, I have not been guilty of idolatry; for idolatry is called adultery—Ez. xxiii. 37; or, fourthly, if the crime is really concealed, she may deny with an oath, and say, "I have not committed it," in the same way that a culprit may say to a judge who does not legitimately interrogate him, "I have not committed it"—meaning that she has not so committed it as to be bound to declare it unto him.

We must not trespass too long on the patience of our readers, or we could go on for another page in giving specimens of the notions entertained by Liguori on the subject of truthfulness. Next month, however, we hope to return to the subject, and shall discuss the examples produced by the defenders of Liguori. We shall enquire how far the statement of the *Rambler* is true that "private life would be intolerable without equivocation," and that "the common proverb, 'ask me no questions and I'll tell you no lies,' embodies alike the Catholic doctrine and the common judgment of humanity." We readily admit that if St. Liguori is to be taken as a representative of "*Catholic doctrine*," asking questions would seem necessarily to involve telling lies as its consequence; but as to the "common judgment of humanity," we shall beg leave to differ with him.

TALK OF THE ROAD—No. XXIX.

"Jem, did you ever see a holy well?" said Pat.

"Why wouldn't I, Pat," said Jem; "sure there's enough of them, though they're not as plenty as they were when I was young; but there's enough still; and I seen them many a time, with the rags on the bushes, and the cut knees, and the whisky, and the prayers, and the card-playing, and what not? But why do you ask, Pat?"

"Well," said Pat, "I was down in Galway to fetch up some sheep, and I come in for a pattern at a holy well, and it was a sight anyway; of all the people ever you saw there was there; and some crawling on their knees round the well, and some praying, and some drinking, and some courting; and for the thorn bushes you would take them to be patchwork quilts, with the sewing left out; and I took to thinking what was it for at all; so I goes up to an old creature that was cutting her knees creeping round the well, and, says I, 'what are you serving your old bones that way for?' says I. 'Isn't it getting quit of my sins,' says she. 'Well,' says I, 'sure I'm a Catholic long enough, and I never got quit of my sins that way, and never a priest ever told me of that way of getting quit of them.' 'Och, jewell,' says she, 'sure you're at the right place at last, and why don't you turn up the knees of your breeches and get quit of your sins?' And now isn't that the quare way, Jem? and is it the Catholic religion at all?"

"Well, Pat," said Jem, "it *is* the Catholic religion, or it *isn't*. If it *is*, why did the priest never tell you that way to get quit of your sins? and if it *isn't*, why does the priests allow them poor creatures to be deceiving their own souls with such folly?"

"Well, Jem," said Pat, "I learned something about that anyway; for I was stopping in a decent man's house, and, indeed, he's a very knowledgeable man, and he has a deal of old Irish books, and I fell to talking to him about the holy well; and, at first, he wouldn't let on that he knew anything about it; 'but,' says he, 'sure the people always did it;' but when he seen that I didn't think much of the well, he let out his mind; 'and sure,' says he, 'I have something about it here in a book;' and he fetched down a book that was written by Dr. O'Connor, that was a priest, and, he said, was the learnedest priest that ever was in Ireland, and one of the real ould O'Connors of Ballynagare, that come of the Kings of Ireland; and he showed me out of the book that Father O'Connor said the holy wells was all paganism; and how the heathens had the holy wells in Ireland in the time of St. Patrick and Columbkill, and how some stuck to it after, in spite of them; and how it was part of the worship of Baal, the God of the heathens, that the Israelites worshipped on Mount Carmel, in the time of Elijah.—1 Kings xviii. 3 Kings, Douay Bible. 'So,' says he, 'there's something old in our religion anyway; for holy wells is older than the Christian religion itself, for they're as old as paganism; so it's a fine old religion, it is,' says he."

"And the rags, Pat," said Jem; "where did they get them?"

"Well, if he didn't show me that, too, out of Father O'Connor's book," said Pat; "for I asked him, and he just turned to a page where Father O'Connor says, that some travellers were going through a heathen country, away beyond the Crimea, where the soldiers is, and they found a tree all covered over with rags, just the same as a bush beside a holy well, and it was people with the ague stuck them there to get cured; so there's paganism again for you, Jem."

"I wonder why the Catholic Church lets people follow paganism instead of the Christian religion," said Jem.

"Well, I seen in Father O'Connor's book that the canons of the Church is against it," said Pat; "and that the Catholic Church isn't to be blamed for it at all; and he says a deal of the bishops would like to stop it.

"And why *don't* they stop it, then?" said Jem.

"Well," said Pat, "I suppose it was because the people were so fond of the holy wells that they couldn't."

"Well, Pat," said Jem, "if the bishops wasn't able to stop paganism, isn't it enough to make a body guess that they wern't the right bishops at all? But did any one ever hear tell of them trying?"

"Well, Father O'Connor doesn't say they did," said Pat. "But he tells about Bishop Milner anyway; that's the man that wrote a book called 'The End of Controversy,' that the priests get all their learning out of, against the Protestants."

"Aye, I seen that book with the priest's clerk," said Jem; "but what about Bishop Milner?"

"Why, Father O'Connor allows that Bishop Milner wrote a book crying up the holy well of St. Winifred, for the miraculous cures that it worked; and seemingly, Bishop Milner was mighty mad at Father O'Connor, for saying what he did of holy wells," said Pat.

"And did Bishop Milner cry up the rags, too?" said Jem.

"Well, I can't say for that," said Pat; "for I didn't see that book; but *there is* one bishop for you anyway that helped on the paganism, instead of stopping it."

"And did any ever try to stop it?" said Jem.

"Well that's just what I asked the man that showed me the book," said Pat; "says I, 'did any priest ever try to stop the people going to a holy well?'

"'Deed did they,' says he; 'I seen them do it a few years back.'

"'And *could* they do it?' says I.

"'Quite easy,' says he, 'once they tried it in earnest. The people just quit the well at once when the priests gave the orders.'

"'Well,' says I, 'there's some of the priests anyway that's for stopping paganism.'

"'Sorrow bit you'll say that,' says he, 'when you hear why they did it. It's down the country a bit,' says he, 'and it was the greatest well at all, with rags enough on the bushes to cure all Ireland, if it was any good; and there comes a clergyman out of Dublin, one Mr. Gregg, and he just takes a slip of a branch off the bush, with all the rags on it, and away he goes about England and Ireland with it in his hand, just to show people the Catholic religion; and with that there comes lots of Englishmen just to look at the well and the bush; and then the priests gave out that no one was to go to the well any more; and there was an end of the holy well at wonst.'"

"I seen that same man and his twig," said Jem; "I was in Kilcommon one day, and I seen a great meeting, and I just went to it, and I seen him with the twig in a glass-case, and him holding it up, and it with the rags on it, and *that's* the man that *has* the Irish tongue; now you could'nt help listening to him, like as if he was singing a song; and he told how that twig built a church and a school-house, beside that same holy well; and how the church is full of people that gets the water of life out of the Holy Scriptures now. So I don't wonder that the priests made the people quit *that* well; for maybe them that went there would get *the living water once for all*, like the way the woman of Samaria got it at the well."—John iv. 10-15.

"So you see, Jem," said Pat, "the priests *can* stop the paganism, when the Protestants makes them ashamed and afraid."

"Aye," said Jem, "the priests is following, not leading, when they put down the like of that. Why didn't they do it always? and why don't they do it everywhere now?"

"Well, Jem," said Pat, "sure it's getting plain every day that it's the Word of God, and not the priests, that will drive out the darkness and ignorance out of the people's minds, and let the true light shine in old Ireland. Will we ever see the paganism and the darkness put out, and the religion of Christ just what he made it himself, and the people looking to the Saviour only to put away their sins?"

"Well," said Jem, "isn't it going on anyway? Isn't there two of us that has learned a deal these last two years; is'nt there hope that a deal more may learn the same way?"

Those that have this hope, we trust will be stirred up to aid in promoting the enlightenment of the Irish people. Every one who learns to look at the True Light, is himself an instrument to show that light to others.

If any one should wish to see more of the book that was shown to Pat, he may find it in "Columbanus' Letters," written by Dr. Charles O'Connor, an Irish priest, of whose learning and talents Irishmen may justly be proud. The passage relating to holy wells is in the 3rd letter, vol. i., pp. 73 to 105, and is well worthy of being read by any one who wishes to understand what is practised in Ireland, and the origin of the practice. The letter was published in the year 1810, and very soundly Dr. O'Connor was handled for it by Bishop Milner and others. Dr. O'Conner speaks of Bishop Milner's "miraculous pamphlet" in *defence of the well of St. Winifred*. We have not seen that pamphlet, and should be obliged to any of our readers who can tell us where it can be found; coming from the author of the "End of Controversy," it is deserving of notice.

We know the truth of the story about "the twig" that built the church and school-house. Now that Pat and Jem have got upon the holy wells, we think it would be very desirable if our readers, in various places, would send us the particulars of "holy wells" in their several localities, with a brief account of what is done at them, and whether the practice is declining.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

In consequence of the large number of Subscriptions still unpaid, the publisher will, henceforward, be obliged to discontinue the paper to such *Subscribers* as are in arrear. A Blue Cover will, it is hoped, be taken as a sufficient notification. We have already explained the difficulty of making special applications.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the week.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, JULY 19, 1855.

NEW POST-OFFICE REGULATIONS.

To prevent disappointment to such of our friends and subscribers as are in the habit of transmitting the CATHOLIC LAYMAN to other parties through the post, we request their particular attention to the following new regulations, which have just come into operation under the provision of the recent statute, 18 and 19 Vict., c. xxvii.:—

1. No newspaper or stamped periodical can be sent free through the post, unless posted within fifteen days from the date of publication, which must be henceforth printed at the top of every page; consequently, *after fifteen days* from the date of publication, the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, whether stamped or unstamped, can only be forwarded by post on affixing *a penny postage stamp*, under the regulations of the Inland Book Post, which we shall give below for the convenience of our readers.
2. To go free through the post within the fifteen days, the paper must, as formerly, either have no cover or a cover open at the ends; and must be so folded that *the whole of the stamp shall be exposed to view, and be distinctly visible on the outside*. If the paper be otherwise folded, it will be marked in the post office, *stamp not visible*, and a postage of one penny will be charged on it, in addition to any other postage to which it would have been liable, if properly folded.
3. It must contain no enclosure whatever.
4. It must have no writing or other mark on either the paper or cover, but the name and address of the person to whom it is sent.
5. If sent through the post from one part of Dublin to another, within the limits of the General Post-office delivery, it must have a penny postage stamp affixed to it.

Our friends will observe that it follows, from No. 1 of the foregoing new regulations, that we shall no longer be able to forward back numbers of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN free through the post;

but such back numbers will be post paid to all new subscribers who desire to commence from the preceding January, without any additional charge, on payment of their subscriptions, which are, as usual, *payable in advance.*

N.B.—Copies of almost all the back numbers can still be had by subscribers requiring them for completing sets, or lending in their neighbourhood, on forwarding *penny postage stamps* to Mr. Curry, the publisher, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin. No charge will be made to subscribers for such back numbers, beyond that of a penny stamp for each number, *to cover the postage.*

In future an *unstamped* edition will be published, price 3s. per annum, and the price of the *bound* volume at the completion of each year will be reduced to 5s.

The new REGULATIONS of the *Inland* BOOK POST are as follows :—

1. Any book, or packet of books, not exceeding two feet in length, width, or depth, will be transmitted through the post, if sent either without a cover, or in a cover open at the ends or sides, at the following postage rates :—

For a packet not exceeding 4 oz.		1d.
Ditto,	exceeding 4 oz., and not exceeding 8 oz.	2d.
Ditto,	exceeding 8 oz., and not exceeding 16 oz.	4d.
Ditto,	exceeding 1 lb., and not exceeding 1½ lbs.	6d.

and so on, 2d. being charged for every additional half pound, or any less weight.

The postage must be pre-paid in full by means of postage stamps affixed outside the packet on its cover.

There is no restriction as to the number of separate books or publications which may be enclosed in one packet or cover, nor as to whether same are bound or unbound.

2. No book or packet must contain any letter, closed or open, or any enclosure, sealed or otherwise closed against inspection, nor must there be any letter, or any communication of the nature of a letter, written or printed in any such packet, or on its cover.
3. The head post-master who first receives a book packet must, whenever he has ground for suspecting an infringement of the above conditions, and occasionally, even where there is no ground for suspicion, open and examine the packet; and every book packet, which shall not be open at the ends or sides, or shall exceed two feet in length, width, or depth, or shall have any letter or any communication of the nature of a letter written or printed on it, or upon its cover, or shall bear no postage-stamp, will be sent up to the dead-letter office in London, Edinburgh, or Dublin, as the case may be. If deficiently stamped according to the above regulations, it will be charged with the deficient book postage, together with an additional stamp of 4d.

SCRIPTURE PROOFS OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION.

WE have just met with a pamphlet, by the Rev. Edward Murray, P.P., Kilfian, which, on the title-page, is respectfully presented to the candid judgment of the Protestant clergy. It is called the "Orthodox Sword of the Word," and purports to contain Scripture proofs of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary. Nothing delights us more than to find our Roman Catholic friends appealing to Scripture, and we are always happy to meet them on that ground. We, therefore, proceed to give to Mr. Murray's Scripture proofs the benefit of our circulation. We cannot afford space for the 35 pages of comment with which Mr. Murray accompanies them; but, surely, if it were the intention of the Spirit of God to declare in Scripture the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, He was able to do so in words sufficiently intelligible to a plain reader. We wonder that it escaped Mr. Murray's sagacity, when he employs twenty pages in deducing the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception from his first text, that he inevitably forces his readers to feel that an interpretation deduced by so laborious a process cannot be the true one. His proof must be not only a proof out of Scripture, but a long way *out of* Scripture indeed.

Here, then, are the proofs. We give the authorized translation and the Douay :—

AUTHORIZED.	DOUAY.
1. Luke i. 35.	
Therefore, also, that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.	And, therefore, also, the Holy which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.
2. St. John i. 16.	
And of his fulness have all we received, and grace for grace.	And of his fulness we all have received, and grace for grace.
3. Luke xi. 27.	
Blessed is the womb that bore thee, and the paps which thou hast sucked.	Blessed is the womb that bore thee, and the paps that gave thee suck.
4. Luke i. 42.	
Blessed is the fruit of thy womb.	Blessed is the fruit of thy womb.
5. GEN. iii. 15.	
I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed, it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.	I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed; she shall crush thy head, and thou shalt lie in wait for her heel.*
6. Prov. xxxi. 10.	
Who can find a virtuous woman? for her price is far above rubies. The heart of her husband doth safely trust in her so that he shall have no need of spoil.	Who shall find a valiant woman? jewels from the uttermost coasts is the price of her. The heart of her husband trosts in her, and he shall have no need of spoils.
7. Cant. iv. 7.	
Thou art all fair, my love; there is no spot in thee.	Thou art all fair, O my love, and there is not a spot in thee.
8. Cant. viii. 5.	
I raised thee up under the apple tree: there thy mother brought thee forth; there she brought thee forth that bare thee.	Under the apple tree I raised thee up; there thy mother was corrupted, there she was deflowered that bore thee.†

We leave these texts as a puzzle for our readers; and we shall give any of them great credit for ingenuity who may succeed in finding the slightest connection between any of these texts and the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. And as these, no doubt, are the *best* texts that can be had in support of the doctrine, we leave our Roman Catholic readers to judge what is the Scripture foundation on which this doctrine rests.

One word more. We think it would have been consistent in one who has pledged himself never to interpret Scripture but according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers, to name some early writers who have put the same interpretation as he has done upon the texts quoted. We are far from approving all the interpretations of Scripture we find in the works of the Fathers; many of them we make no scruple to reject; but we think, on the other hand, that it is a strong presumption against the truth of an interpretation if it is started in 1855, for the first time, nor do we think that the true sense of these passages of Scripture was left for Father Edward Murray to discover.

* Note to Douay Version.—"*Ipsa*, the woman; so divers of the Fathers read this place, conformably to the Latin (vulgate); others read it *Ipsum*—viz., the seed. The sense is the same: for it is by her seed, *Jesus Christ*, that the woman crushes the serpent's head."

† Note to Douay Version.—"That is, that Christ redeemed the Gentiles at the foot of the cross, where the synagogue of the Jews (the mother Church) was corrupted by their denying him, and crucifying him.

THE APOCRYPHA.

IN our last number we were engaged with the examination of the arguments urged by Roman Catholic theologians in support of the Tridentine Decree respecting the Apocrypha. We discussed the passage quoted from Augustine, and the Decree of the Council of Carthage (on the supposition of its genuineness); and we proved, unanswerably we believe, that the word "canonical," as therein applied to the apocryphal books, is not used in the restricted sense in which we employ it—viz., as denoting *inspired* books—but in a wider sense, as designating writings approved by the Church, and read in her public assemblies on account of the *rules* (canons) of conduct which they contain, and the *edifying* lessons which they inculcate.

We come next to the Epistle of Pope Innocent I. to Exuperius, which professes to have been written at the commencement of the fifth century, and which enumerates some of the apocryphal books in "the Canon of the Scriptures." We have already given the weightiest reasons for concluding that this epistle is a forgery, concocted no less than four centuries after its pretended date.—See CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. ii., p. 126. But, even admitting its genuineness, the very same remark may be made upon it that we already made respecting Augustine and the Council of Carthage—viz., that the word "canon" is not used in the restricted, but in the wide sense before explained. In support of this assertion we have, as we said in the last number, Cardinal Cajetan's authority.

The next document which presents itself is the Decree of Pope Gelasius (at the end of the fifth century), which professes to have been drawn up by him together with a Roman council of seventy bishops. In this decree, a list—or, rather, three lists, differing more or less from each other—of the Books of the Old Testament is given, which includes the Apocrypha. We have already shown (CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. ii., pp. 112, 126) that the gravest doubts exist as to the genuineness of this decree, and we might, accordingly, fairly refuse to admit it as evidence. But, as in the three preceding instances, we will consent to receive it, and then set it aside by the "distinction" before made, and which Cajetan teaches us to apply to this very case.

Down to the end of the fifth century, then, the Western Church, equally with the Eastern, knew nothing of the Tridentine doctrine of the equality of the Apocrypha to the Jewish Scriptures. The words "canon" and "canonical" were, indeed, frequently applied to *all*, indifferently; but, then, it was only in the sense of a list or catalogue of writings, stamped with ecclesiastical authority, and read publicly in the churches. It was never intended to confound the fundamental distinction which Jerome, and Cyril of Jerusalem, and many other western and eastern Fathers expressly made between the *inspired* and the *non*-inspired books contained in the *same volume*—between the *canonical* books (strictly so called) and those which were properly designated *ecclesiastical* (our Apocrypha). That the Western Church did not, down to the period specified, and even for a century later, intend to confound this distinction, is proved, beyond all question, by the decisive authority of Pope Gregory the Great. This eminent pontiff, in the 19th book of his "Moralia," written at the close of the sixth century, expresses himself, in reference to the Apocrypha, in very nearly the words of Jerome (whom we, Protestants, follow). Being about to cite a passage from the 1st Book of Maccabees, Gregory introduces the quotation with the following *apology* :—"Concerning which matter we do not act irregularly if we bring forward a testimony from books, which, though *not canonical*, have yet been *published for the edification of the Church.*"* Gregory here uses the word "canonical" in its restricted sense—viz., as applied to the inspired books of the Old Testament; and, as the head and organ of the Roman Church of the sixth century, he declares that in *this sense* the term was not applicable nor applied to the Apocrypha.

The next authority, after the decree of Pope Gelasius, adduced by Roman Catholic divines, is a catalogue contained in the decree of Pope Eugenius IV., passed at the close, or, rather, after the close of the Council of Florence, A.D. 1439. It is, certainly, somewhat striking that this is the only *synodical* authority in support of their canon which Roman Catholics can even pretend to adduce during the eleven centuries and a half which elapsed between the Council of Carthage and the Council of Trent. However, the catalogue in question professes to form part of Pope Eugenius's "Instruction to the Armenians," which document Roman Catholic writers contend must be regarded as included among the acts of the Council of Florence. Now, in the first place, there are strong doubts as to the genuineness of this catalogue, and weighty reasons have been adduced to show that it is a *forgery* of Caranza, the epitomizer of the councils. But, in the second place, even admitting its genuineness and that it did really form part of "The Instruction to the Armenians," this latter document, having been drawn up by the Pope himself, after the breaking up of the council, does not possess synodical authority, and, therefore, does not bind the Church, even on Romish principles. And, lastly, admitting it to have emanated from the council as such, yet this synod has no claim whatever to the title of a general council, even so far as regards the *Western* Church; for the majority of the western bishops refused to attend it, and remained at Basle. In fact, so far were they from acknowledging the authority of the Council of Florence, that they anathematized it as a *schismatical assembly* and a *synagogue of Satan.* Consequently, the *Latin* Church (to say nothing of the Greek, which has never, to the present hour, admitted the canonicity of the Apocrypha) never, up to the date of the Council of Trent, received the Apocrypha as of equal authority with the rest of Scripture; never, in other words, recognised it as *canonical* in the sense that we hold the *Hebrew* Bible and the New Testament Scriptures to be canonical.

In corroboration of our assertion that the Council of Florence was not deemed to have canonized the Apocrypha any more than the Council of Carthage or Pope Gelasius's Council had done, we can adduce the recorded opinions of some of the most eminent divines of the Latin Church, who lived in the interval between that Council of Florence and the Council of Trent, and who have most clearly distinguished between the canonical Scriptures (properly so called) and the apocryphal books; denying most emphatically that the latter are of co-ordinate authority with the former in matters of faith, and agreeing with Jerome and us (Protestants) in assigning to them the subordinate function of being *useful for edification* and moral instruction. Of these witnesses in our favour we will adduce a few as a specimen of the entire. *Antoninus*, who was canonized by Pope Adrian VI., and who was present at the Council of Florence, and, therefore, may be presumed to have known what that council

* De qua re non inordinate agimus si ex libris, licet *non canonicis*, sed tamen *ad ædificationem ecclesiæ editis*, testimonium proferamus. Tom. i., p. 622, edit. Bened.

decreed respecting the canon of Scripture, writes thus—"The Hebrews reckon xxii books in all as authentic. They designate as apocryphal the books of Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Tobit, Judith, and Maccabees. The Church, however, receives the *Apocrypha* also as *true, useful, and moral*, although *not valid* for proof in *controversy concerning matters of faith*."* More decidedly, if possible, in our favour, is the testimony of *Alphonsus Tostatus*, the contemporary of Antoninus, and who was regarded as the wonder of his age in learning of every kind. We will quote but one of the numerous passages to the same effect, which occur in his writings—"None of those *apocryphal books* (although it may be inserted amongst the other books of the Bible, and may be read in the Church) is of such authority as that the Church can argue from it *to prove any truth*; and so far forth as this she *does not receive* them. And in this sense Jerome is to be understood, when he says—The Church knows nothing of the Apocrypha."† We come next to *Cardinal Ximenes*, to whose piety and munificence we are indebted for one of the noblest monuments of human learning—The Complutensian Polyglott. In the preface to that work, the reader is specially informed that "*the books outside the canon*, which the Church receives rather for the edification of the people than to confirm the authority of ecclesiastical dogmas, are written in Greek only (not in Hebrew)."‡ These books are enumerated—viz., Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Maccabees, and the apocryphal additions to Esther and Daniel. Now, when we remember that the Complutensian Polyglott, preface and all, was published by the authority of Pope Leo X., to whom it was dedicated, we have a very striking proof that, at the commencement of the 16th century (A.D. 1517), at the very time when Luther commenced his opposition to Rome, neither the Pope nor the Church of Rome held the canonicity (in the strict sense of the word) of the Apocrypha, but regarded it in the same light as Jerome, whose very words, in reference to it, Cardinal Ximenes quotes in the passage above cited.

Another eminent witness on our side is the great *Erasmus*, who, in addition to his vast general learning, was the first Biblical scholar and critic of his age. In his explanation of the Apostle's Creed and the Decalogue, he proposes this very question, as to the number of Books contained in canonical Scripture, and he answers it by adducing the catalogue of Ruffinus (of Aquileia, and a contemporary of Jerome), in which our apocryphal Books are expressly separated from the canonical, and designated by a distinct name—viz., *ecclesiastical*. Again, in his epistle to students of Scripture, prefixed to the 4th volume of his edition of Jerome's works, Erasmus says—"It certainly is of great moment to ascertain *what* the Church receives, and with *what intention* she does so; for, although she may attribute the *same* honour to the (22) Books of the Hebrews and the Gospels, *she certainly does not mean* that the *same weight* should be assigned to Judith, Tobit, and the Books of Wisdom as to the Pentateuch."§ What a striking prospective commentary on the decree of Trent, passed about sixteen years after, in which it was asserted that the Church always received the Apocrypha as of equal authority with the rest of the Bible!

Cardinal Cajetan's testimony we have already adduced in our last number. His works abound with statements of a similar kind. We will here quote two more, if possible stronger than that which has been referred to. One occurs in his commentary on the first chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews—"We have adopted Jerome's rule to prevent us from error in the determination of the canonical Books; for we esteem as canonical those which he delivered as such, and those which he separated from the canonical Books we hold to be outside the canon."‖ The other passage is found in the Dedicatory Epistle to Pope Clement VII., prefixed to Cajetan's Commentaries on the Historical Books of the Old Testament. "Most blessed father," he writes, "the universal Latin Church is most deeply indebted to St. Jerome, not only on account of his annotations on the Scriptures, but also because he distinguished the canonical books from the non-canonical, inasmuch as he thereby freed us from the reproach of the Hebrews, who otherwise might say that we were *forging* for ourselves books or parts of books belonging to the ancient canon, which they never received."* Cajetan's work appeared but twelve years before the Council of Trent, and was dedicated, as we have just said, to Pope Clement VII., and received his approbation. Consequently, Jerome's rule, relative to the broad distinction between the canonical books (properly so called) and the apocryphal, was then recognised by the Roman Pontiff himself.

Such was the state of opinion respecting the canon of Scripture, among the greatest divines of the Western Church, and even some, at least, of the Roman Pontiffs, immediately prior to the Council of Trent. Disregarding, however, everything but the exigencies of the moment, that Council published, in 1546, its portentous decree, whereby it swept away the barrier which had existed for seventeen centuries between the canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament and the Apocrypha. The one great object of the Council was, to arrest, by every possible means, the reformation movement, and to sustain, by every available expedient, the corruptions in the doctrines and practices of the Western Church, which had been for many ages making silent but sure progress. The Reformers appealed to *Scripture*, and to it alone, as the arbiter of the points of dispute between them and the Church of Rome. The Tridentine Fathers, while they refused, and for a very plain reason, to rest everything on the decision of Scripture, alleging, as a co-ordinate authority, the traditions of the Church, yet were naturally anxious to have Scripture on their side as far as possible. With this view they enlarged the limits of canonical or inspired Scripture, admitting within its sacred pale the apocryphal writings, because from them they thought they might derive what they searched the canonical Scriptures for in vain—viz., some show of proof in support of such dogmas as purgatory, the worship of angels, and the atoning efficacy of alms-deeds.

The history of the manner in which the Tridentine decree in question was passed is highly instructive. In the "Congregations," or preliminary meetings, held prior to the fourth Session the question of the Canon of Holy Scripture was debated. Some of the divines recommended that the distinction made by Jerome, and approved by Pope Gregory, between the canonical and non-canonical books of the Old Testament, should be still maintained. Others were of opinion, that no distinction should be expressly stated, but that a general catalogue should be drawn out of all the books together, like that of the Council of Carthage, and nothing more said on the subject. Others, again, suggested that a *threefold* division should be made, the third class being composed of the books that had never been received as inspired by the Church—viz., the Apocrypha. A fourth party, the smallest in point of number, but the most zealous and energetic, proposed that the Apocrypha should be placed upon the same footing as the rest of Scripture, and an anathema pronounced against all who should dispute it. This opinion at last prevailed, and the famous Decree *de Canonicis Scripturis* was passed, in the fourth session, by some *fifty* bishops, of whom sixteen, at least, utterly dissented from it in reality, and merely acquiesced in the opinion of the majority. Such is the way in which this awful decree was passed, and such is the authority on which it rests. Fifty-three bishops, or rather thirty-seven, with a specific object in view, to the attainment of which they felt themselves constrained to make any sacrifices, assumed the privilege of raising to the rank of inspired Scripture books which hitherto had not only not been admitted within the sacred pale, but had been expressly excluded from it by many of the greatest Fathers and Doctors of the Church.†

We have, then, on the one side, this decree, passed by the men, and in the manner just described. We have, upon the other side, the authority of our Blessed Lord and his inspired apostles; we have the undisputed authority of the Church of God, Jewish and Christian, during a period of seventeen centuries; we have the deliberate opinions of the greatest Fathers and Doctors down to the very time when the Council of Trent was assembled; we have all the reformed Churches of Western Christendom, and the whole orthodox Eastern Church from the remotest times to the present hour. We are willing to take our stand upon *this* side; we accept, as regards the Old Testament, the canon of the Jews, notwithstanding the contemptuous epithet of "the canon of the Scribes and Pharisees," with which some of our opponents, with more zeal than reverence, have stigmatized it. The idle taunt, that this is a *Jewish*, not a Christian canon, the Protestant can easily afford to disregard, when he bears in mind that an inspired apostle has expressly enumerated it amongst the privileges of the *Jews*, that "to them were committed the oracles of God;" and when he further recollects that two of the greatest Fathers of the Christian Church deemed it no disgrace to Christianity to be indebted for the Old Testament to the *Jews*. "The Church," says *Jerome*, "knows nothing of the the Apocrypha; *recourse must be had to the Hebrew books*, from which the Lord speaks, and out of which the disciples take their examples."* "The *Jews*," says Augustine, "*carry the volume* on which the Christian faith is built; they have been constituted our librarians."† And as to the anathema with which the Fathers of Trent have thought fit to sanction their decree, we console ourselves with the assurance of the inspired sage—"The curse causeless shall not come."

---

* S. Antonin. Sum. Hist., part. i. Tit., 3, c. vi. "In totum xxii. ponunt Hebræi Libros authenticos. Apocrypha appellent librum Sapientiæ, &c. Ecclesia tamen etiam Apocrypha recipit ut vera, utilia, et moralia, etsi in contentione eorum quæ sunt fidei non urgentia ad arguendum."

† Tostatus in exerr. præfat. in Lib. Paralip. q. 7. "Nullus tamen istorum librorum apocryphorum (ellemsi sit scriptum inter alios libros Bibl. et legatur in ecclesia), tantæ auctoritatis est ut ex eo ecclesia arguat ad probandum aliquam veritatem; et quantum ad hoc non recipit eos. Et de hoc intelligitur quod dicit hic Hieronymus—scil. Apocrypha nescit ecclesia."

‡ Fr. Ximenius Præf. ad Lect. "At vero *libri extra canonem*, quos ecclesia potius ad ædificationem populi quam ad auctoritatem ecclesiasticorum dogmatum confirmandam recipit, Græcam tantum scripturam habent."

§ Erasmi Epist. ad dicin. liter. stud., Tom. iv., oper. Hier. "Magni certe refert, quid quo animo comprobat ecclesia. Ut enim parem tribuat auctoritatem Hebræorum voluminibus et quatuor Evangeliis, certè non vult idem esse pondus Judith, Tobiæ, et Sapientiæ libris, quod Mosis Pentateucho."

‖ Cajetani comment. in 1 cap. Ep. ad Heb. "Hieronymi sortiti sumus regulam, ne erremus in discretione librorum canonicorum; nam quos ille canonicos tradidit, canonicos habemus; at quos ille a canonicis discrevit extra canonem habemus."

* Cajetani Ep. dedic. ad P. Clem. VII., ante comm. in Lib. Hist. V. T. "S. Hieronymo, Pater beatissime, universa ecclesia Latina plurimum debet, non solum ob annotatas Scripturas, sed etiam propter discretos ab eodem Libros canonicos a non canonicis. Liberavit siquidem nos ab Hebræorum opprobrio, quod fingemus nobis antiqui canonis libros aut librorum partes, quibus ipsi penitus carent."

† Roman Catholic controversial writers, we may observe, usually divide all the books of the Bible into two classes—which they term respectively the *Proto-canonical* and the *Deutero canonical*. The first class comprises the 22 Jewish books of the Old Testament, and the entire of the New, with the exception of the seven epistles, whose canonical authority was not universally established so soon as that of the rest. The second class embraces the seven apocryphal books and parts of books of the Old Testament, and the aforesaid seven epistles of the New. By this classification, a twofold advantage is secured—first, by admitting a quasi-distinction between the Apocrypha and the Jewish Scriptures less violence *seems* to be done to antiquity; and, secondly, by placing the Apocrypha in the same category as the said seven epistles, of whose inspired authority the Church at large never entertained any doubt, an argument is tacitly insinuated for the inspiration of the former.

* Hieron. Præf. in Paralipom. "Apocryphus scribit ecclesia. Ad-Hebræos revertendum est, unde et Dominus loquitur, et discipuli exempla præmunt."

† August. in Psalm lvi., ¶ 9. "Codicem portat Judæus unde credat Christianus. Librarii nostri facti sunt."

Correspondence.

HOW MUCH IS YOUR SOUL WORTH?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Jerry Donovan, and myself, and a lot of the neighbours went down to old Ned Bryan's, the other day, to see his boy, who's just come home from California, with a mint of money; for though Ned is a Protestant, still he's a very decent man, and we were all glad to hear of his luck; and while he was telling us all that he seen in his travels, and how the lumps of gold were as thick in the ground as the praties used to be in the old times, who should come in but the minister himself. "God save all here," says he. "God save your reverence," says we. "Well, Ned," says he, "I'm glad to hear that your son has come back to you, and has brought something with him." "Thanks be to God," says Ned, "he has come back safe and sound, and brought enough with him to stock a farm; and I'm telling him that he must be careful not to lose what he has got; for if once he lost it, he'd find it hard to get it back again." "True for you," says the minister; "and," says he, "Ned, that's a hint we should all take; we should all look sharp after the treasure God has given us; for if once it's lost, it's lost for ever." "Why, then, your reverence," says I, "there's some of us that won't have much trouble in looking after our treasure; for," says I, "we haven't any to look after." "Deed, then, you have," says he; "poor as you are, you have each a great treasure that's well worth looking after." "What can it be at all?" says the boys; "sure we haven't amongst us what would buy a fat pig." "Still, for all," says the minister, "it's truth I'm telling you, when I say that each one of you, Protestant and Roman Catholic, possesses a treasure that's worth more than all the gold young Ned brought home with him; for," says he, "boys, each one of you has an immortal soul that's worth more than all the gold in California;" and with that, he took down Ned Bryan's big Bible that was on the shelf, and read out for us a verse which said that "'twould be no profit to a man if he gained the whole world and lost his soul." Well, the boys began to look at each other, and, says Mick Flyn, "he's going to attack our holy religion out of the Protestant Bible." "And," says Jerry, "that's the Protestant Bible, sir, and sure we don't care for a word that's in it;" "and," says another of the boys, "didn't Father John tell us it was the devil's book;" "and," says another, "sure 'twas made by Luther and Henry VIII." "Easy, boys," says the minister, "don't get into a passion; and," says he, "is the Douay Bible the devil's book?" "No," says Mick Flyn, "that's the real sort, that's the genuine article." "And," says the minister again, "was it made by Luther, or Henry VIII.?" "No," says Jerry, "they had no call to it, and we'll believe anything that's in it." "Very good," says the parson, "that's all I want;" and with that, he put his hand into his pocket, and pulled out a real Douay Bible. "Now, boys," says he, "is that your own Bible?" So Jerry, and some of those who were knowledgeable about such things, allowed that it was our own Bible. So the parson handed it to Jerry, and, says he, "find out the Gospel of St. Mark, viii. chap., 36th verse. Well, Jerry looked very foolish, and twisted and turned it, hither and over, but all to no purpose; so he handed it to Mick Flyn, but Mick passed it on to the next, and, at last, it came round to me; but the never a one of us could find out the place. So the parson began to laugh, and, says he, "boys, I think you know as little about your own Bible as about ours." So he found out the place himself, and gave it to Jerry, and, says he, "I'll read first out of the Protestant Bible, and then do you read out of your own Bible." So with that, he read, "*For what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?*" Then Jerry read out of the Douay Bible, "*For what shall it*

profit a man, if he gain the whale world, and suffer the loss of his soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" "Well, boys," says the minister, "I don't think there's much difference there; and now," says he, "didn't I tell you the truth, when I said that each one of you possessed a treasure that's worth more than all the gold in California?" "True for you," says Jerry, "and 'tis myself that never thought much about the matter; for," says he, "though I knew that I had a soul, still I never thought of how much 'tis worth." "Well," says the minister, "you now see that a man's soul is worth more to him than *the whole world;* and," says he, "boys, I'll show you another way of finding out the value of the soul;" says he, "if you went into a shop to buy a coat, how would you know the value of it." "By the price I'd have to pay for it," says Jerry. "Just so," says the minister; "and if you knew the price that was paid to save our souls, you'd know the great value of a soul." "Why, then," says Jerry, "there's not a boy in Keelovenogue that knows it better than myself; sure I paid Father John £1 10s. for my father's soul, and £1 5s. for my mother's soul; for he took off five shillings on account of her belonging to the Holy Order of the Scapular; 'tis I that know the price right well, for it set me hard to scrape it together." With that, the minister looked Jerry straight in the face, very sorrowful like, and, says he, "'twas a greater price than that I was thinking of." "Maybe," says I, "your reverence, was thinking of old Jim Crowly, the miser, who made all his money during the famine by robbing the poor starving creatures; his son had to pay £5 for his soul; but sure Father John couldn't do it for less, and it's myself thinks 'twas cheap for such an old villian." With that, the minister turned to me, and, says he, "my poor man, I'm sorry to find you so ignorant; but," says he, "I pity you more than blame you; for," says he, "I can hardly blame a Roman Catholic for the mistake you have made, as long as the priests make such bargains with you; but," says he, "I'll tell you the price that was paid for our souls, 'twas the precious blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; nothing less would pay for our sinful souls, so he laid down his life upon the cross to save those souls; and now, boys," says he, "don't you see the great value of your souls?" "But," says Mick Flyn, "won't every one's soul be saved at that rate?" "No," says the minister; "only those who come to Christ in humble faith, and in the way that he has pointed out, and," says he, "that's the reason I'm showing you the great value of your souls, that you may try whether you are going the right way to have them saved." "Well," says Mick, "I leave it to the priest; for it's his business to see after it." "But," says the minister, "I think it's *your own business*, and you should see to it yourself; and," says he, "when Ned's son made his money in California, I'm sure he didn't trust to any one to look after it for him, but he looked after it himself." "True for your reverence," says young Ned; "'tis a poor account I'd have of it, if I didn't look after it myself; for there's fellows there that would steal the teeth out of your head, if you slept with your mouth open." "Well," says the minister, "bad as the thieves are in California, there's a worse thief here at home, that's looking out for your souls, and that's the devil; and," says he, "boys, he'll surely rob you if he can, and that's the reason I'm telling you to look sharp about your souls." "But," says Jerry, "if we're wrong, 'tis the priests that will be punished for it, and not us; for we only do what they bid us." "Don't trust to that," says the minister, "every man will have to render an account for himself, and it's for that reason I'm urging you to look well after your souls." "At all events," says Jerry, "I'm no worse than others; and if I'm lost there's many will be lost along with me" "I suppose," says the minister, "there's many of you think that a good argument; but," says he, "boys, do you see that red sod of turf in the middle of the fire." "We do your reverence," says we. "Well, now," says he, "*is that sod of turf anything cooler for having a dozen other sods burning around it?*" Well, Mr. Editor, we all looked at each other, and we couldn't but allow that it was nothing cooler, but, on the contrary, hotter. "Well," says the minister to Jerry, "if your poor soul was in hell, would you be any better off for having many others in hell with you? boys," says he, "don't be satisfied with the argument that others are as bad as yourselves; for," says he, "it's a bad argument, and if you trust to it, you'll find the differ when *too late*." "But," says Jerry, "is it wanting us to quit our holy religion you are? the old, ancient religion that our fathers and grandfathers held before us." "No," says the minister, "I don't want you to give up your religion for my words, all I want of you is to *examine it;* and surely if it's the right religion, the more you examine it the more you'll be convinced of its truth. Some other time," says he, "I may try to show you that your religion is a *new* religion, and not an old one; but," says he, "as I like to take a man on his own ground, even supposing your religion to be the old one, yet, if it be the wrong one, you shouldn't hold to it; and," says he, "do you remember when first the English farmers began to plant turnips for the cattle how you were all against it? and when first the iron ploughs came into fashion many of you declared that you'd rather stick to the old wooden ones that your fathers and grandfathers used before you." "That's true," says Ned Bryan; "sure I held out myself against the turnips and iron ploughs until I tried *both ways* of farming, and then I found that the new way was the best." "That's the very thing I'm at," says the minister; "though you were all against the new plans, still, when you *tried both*, you found the new so much better, that you gave up the old. Now," says he, "all I want of you is to *examine both religions*, and don't be content with holding your religion because your father held it before you; for if you act on that principle, you ought to go back to the old wooden ploughs again." "But," says Jerry, "Father John tells us one thing, and your reverence tells us another, and how are we to know which of you is right?" "How did you know which way of farming was best?" says the parson. "We tried both ways," says Jerry. "Very good," says he, "that's just what I want you to do with respect to religion; try what Father John tells you, and what I tell you, by your own Bible, and see which of us sticks closest to that; remember," says he, "all I want of you is to *examine* your religion; I'm not saying whether it is right or wrong, all I say is, EXAMINE IT; for," says he, "boys, remember that your souls are of more value than the whole world, and remember that those souls will be lost unless you're going the right way about having them saved, and remember that if your religion be right it will do it no harm to examine it;" and with that he left the house. So when he was gone, all the boys began talking; and, says Jerry, "I'm thinking that's not bad advice the minister gave us; for surely 'twill do our holy religion no harm to examine it." "Take my advice," says I, "and don't examine it at all; for," says I, "every one of the boys that began examining never stopped till they left it." "Why, then," says Ned Bryan, "'tis a bad sign of a religion, if the more you examine it, the less you like it." "True for you," says Jerry, "and I'm determined to get a Douay Bible by hook or crook, and examine for myself." "Jerry," says I, "if once you take to the Bible you'll never stop till you become a jumper." "Why, then," says he, "if our own Bible is against our Church, it's time to jump out of her; but," says he, "I'm sure the Bible is *for* us, if we only examined it; anyhow," says he, "I heard a verse out of it this day that I won't forget to the hour of my death—'*What shall it profit a man, if he gain the whole world, and suffer the loss of his soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?*'" I don't know, Mr. Editor, whether Jerry will have the courage to get the Bible; but if he does, I'll let you know.

Your humble servant to command,
DAN CARTHY.

ST. CYRIL ON PURGATORY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I read your admirable paper with great pleasure, and derive much valuable information from the pages of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN; but there is, perhaps, no part of it I admire more than your manner of treating correspondents who write on controversial topics. The tone of Christian courtesy, the entire absence of all low, vulgar abuse, the concise method with which you fairly sum up an opponent's arguments, and the skill and learning displayed in your answers, must surely command the respect of every candid, well-informed man, whether he agrees with you or not.

These remarks I make with reference especially to the controversy going on some time between you and Mr. Power; that gentleman, indeed, deserves the courteous treatment he receives at your hands, for he is no contemptible opponent, and puts forward exceedingly well the very best and strongest arguments that can be urged in favour of his Church, avoiding the rock on which almost all his co-religionists split—unmeaning and unmeasured abuse; such painful vocabulary as men like Drs. Cahill, O'Connell, and Marshall think indispensable, when speaking of those that choose to differ from them.

Mr. Power has, to my mind, found it impossible to prove that the doctrine of purgatory was held by the early Christian Fathers, and I think that you have satisfactorily shown that the practice of praying for the dead did not, of necessity, arise from belief in a purgatorial region. In your last number he has chiefly built his argument on a passage from St. Cyril; but as you have already in a former number explained this passage, I need not say anything respecting it. It is quite evident, that if the Liturgy spoke one language and St. Cyril another, that so long as that Liturgy remained unchanged, the opinion of St. Cyril must be only regarded as the opinion of a private individual, and not that of the Church at large; but though the opinion of St. Cyril has great weight and high authority in this matter with Mr. Power, yet I am sure he would not receive his testimony where that testimony was opposed to the language of the public Liturgy. If we admit that St. Cyril in this instance spoke of purgatory, and that the passage could fairly be adduced as a proof that Cyril believed in the existence of such a place, would any one say that the doctrine was true because such a man held it? I should, for my own part, be very sorry to bind myself to a quarter of the statements made by St. Cyril; and we may see from his solitary example the danger of taking as guides any uninspired man.

What must any rational person think of St. Cyril—what value can be placed on his testimony—of what worth are his opinions—when he makes such outrageous statements as the following—viz., "That the state of virginity is equal to that of the angels; that when Christ descended into hell the door-keepers of that place, on seeing Jesus, all ran away in terror; that Simon Magus mounted in the air in a fiery chariot, drawn by a pair of dragons; that St. Peter and St. Paul dissolved his enchantments, and he fell to the ground, and broke his bones." And what must we say, but that St. Cyril was a very poor and left-handed friend to Christianity, when he considers that the resurrection is proved by St. Clement's absurd and utterly false account of the phœnix, and that one of the proofs of the truth of the crucifixion is, the fact of the world being full of the chips of the cross!

It is, indeed, high time that those who seek for the truth should look for other teachers than St. Cyril, and not take such a dull and credulous writer as an exponent worthy of the least attention. Many of the men who are styled "Fathers" of the Christian Church, are venerable *only* for their age, but never gave an opinion on Scripture of the slightest value, and were utterly unable to decide a controversy even in their own day; many of them having written things which prove that they were neither wise nor learned in their generation, compel us to ask of their productions the question put by a shrewd observer of human nature—

"Si meliora dies ut vina poemata reddit,
Scire velim pretium chartis quotus arroget annus?"

Had some of the "Fathers" lived in the time of the apostles, if they occupied any station at all, it would have been in the arrangements of St. Paul, only in giving "judgments of things pertaining to this life;" such being the occupation of those who were "least esteemed in the Church."—1 Cor. vi. 4. How the lapse of centuries could render a foolish or unscriptural opinion of any value or authority, I must confess I never could understand.

Faithfully Yours,
C. A. M., C. T. R.

In inserting our correspondent's letter, we wish to explain why we have not taken up the line of defence which he suggests. We were quite aware that when the authority of any Father is quoted against us, it would in many cases be easy to show that the writer cited did not possess a sound judgment, and that many of his opinions and interpretations are false, and even ridiculous. We feared, however, that this line of argument would leave the impression on the minds of many of our readers that we were against the Fathers, only because we knew the Fathers to be against us. Now we are persuaded that this is not the case.

We are persuaded that it is just as hard to prove the peculiar doctrines of the Church of Rome out of the early Fathers as it is to prove them out of the Bible. We have, therefore, never shrunk from the appeal to antiquity. When any of our Roman Catholic correspondents can succeed in finding any of the peculiar doctrines of Romanism maintained by any writer of the first three centuries, it will then be time enough for us to enter into the further discussion what the opinion of that writer is worth, and how far we are bound to follow him.

AN ENLIGHTENED ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—The following pastoral letter, addressed during the last year, by the Archbishop of Lucca, to the people of his diocese, in consequence of the re-appearance of the cholera and its dreadful ravages in Italy during last summer, may be acceptable to your readers, first premising a few words concerning the prelate from whom it emanates. Not many years ago he was known in Florence and other Italian cities as "Padre Giulio Arrigoni," of the order of Franciscans, and enjoyed a very high reputation as a popular preacher. Indeed, whenever, during Lent, he delivered a course of sermons either in the "Duomo," at Florence or in the Grand Duke's Chapel, the crowds of people that flocked to hear him (and amongst them hundreds of English and continental Protestants), could hardly be imagined. It was not, however, so much the superiority of his rhetoric, or the purity of his diction (for he spoke with a harsh Lombard accent) as the superiority of his *matter* and the purity of the *doctrine* he propounded from the pulpit, which excited the greatest interest and astonishment, and rivetted the attention of his numerous hearers. Often and often did the writer of these lines go to hear him preach, and often was he in raptures with the beauty and simplicity of the evangelical sentiments abounding in those sermons. Some of them (and even some English clergymen, who formed part of the audience, will bear him out in the statement) could have been preached, *in their integrity*, in any English Protestant Church, and not even the most rigid critic could have impugned their orthodoxy. The names of the Virgin Mary, or of the saints, were scarcely, if ever, mentioned—at least, "*not as intercessors.*" The Saviour was pointed out as being all in all—our only example—our only *way*—our only hope. The follies and vices of the people, especially those by which the Italians distinguish themselves from other nations, were severely animadverted upon, and even the *priests* themselves did not escape his censure. If there was any defect in

those discourses, it was that they sometimes had the character of what one would call *moral* dissertations. The text was always given out in Latin, which is customary in the Roman Church, and is another instance, amongst so many, of the utter reluctance that Church evinces against the Scriptures being heard "read, marked, learned, and inwardly digested" in the *vernacular* tongue, not even giving the people a chance of hearing a portion of it "by way of a text." "Bibliophobia" would not be an improper term for that characteristic aversion That such a style of preaching must have been highly displeasing in *some* quarters—that the plain-spoken "Padre" suffered persecution, nay, that he even received anonymous threats of being poisoned, or assassinated, if he persisted in that line—will, hence, not be surprising, and is *too* well known and remembered. On hearing him preach, one was forcibly struck with the idea, "That man knows the truth."

After this the question might naturally be asked; Why did the intolerant and wary Church of Rome appoint such a man to an office of that power and eminence? The reason perhaps, is, that in so doing it made him "less obnoxious," as troublesome commoners are sometimes got out of the way, by being raised to the peerage (the so-called *full up stairs*), or to lull the apprehensions of Protestants as yet "half inclined," and to allure them over, by seemingly patronizing evangelical principles, thus more effectually to hide the danger, lurking behind, that of "superstition and slavery." The reader of that circular will observe two points particularly striking—first, that the name of the Virgin or of any of the saints is not even mentioned, and secondly, that the archbishop attributes the scourge of the cholera to divine chastisement, looking upon it as a visitation for the sins of the people (not like the archbishop of Genoa, who, in *his* letter, attributes it to "the liberty of the Press!") It is also remarkable that he dissuades people from walking in procession and attending extraordinary church solemnities in great crowds, confessing naively that experience has proved such assemblages to be highly prejudicial to public health, and that people should *pray*, but not tempt God. I shall only add further, that recent accounts from the neighbouring city of Leghorn describe it as completely deserted in consequence of that visitation, that the greater part of the shops were closed, and that the railway companies have suffered to a large amount through the panic, the excursion trains having been discontinued, as there was no one to go by them.

'I am, sir, your obedient servant,
VIATOR.

The following is the translation of the letter alluded to.

PASTORAL LETTER OF THE ARCHBISHOP OF LUCCA.

"If, when scrutinizing our consciences without pride and self-deception, we feel that our guilty lives are the cause of that pestilence that comes every day nearer and nearer to us; if, to appease the divine anger roused against us, our first care ought to be to detest our wickedness, to implore God's forgiveness, and to make all the amends in our power, that does not dispense with our duty to use all those precautions which experience as well as the theories of men of science have pointed out as necessary for preserving these our frail bodies from the Asiatic cholera, which is threatening us at present, and, indeed, we find it written in Ecclesiasticus (xxxviii. 1, 2, &c.)—"Of the most High cometh healing. The Lord hath created medicines out of the earth, and he that is wise will not abhor them. The virtue of remedies belongs to the knowledge of men and the Lord has revealed their properties to them. With such doth he heal men, and taketh away their pains. My son, in thy sickness be not negligent, but pray unto the Lord, and he will make thee whole; leave off from sin, and order thine hands aright, and cleanse thy heart from all wickedness, and then give place to the physician; and let him not go from thee on account of thy necessity, for the highest Lord has created him."

Not wishing, therefore, to disregard those precautions which are universally recognised as useful for the preservation of our bodily health in the present dangerous contingencies, we have determined as follows:—

1. So long as in this our diocese the Asiatic epidemic has not ceased, we give everybody permission to eat meat on the forbidden days and each day that dispensation is taken advantage of, we desire (without fettering your consciences thereby) that you would recite an act of contrition, abominating all the iniquities that have called down God's anger upon us. And here, brethren and children, we cannot refrain from putting you in mind of the duty of temperance, which, if always a duty of a Christian conscience, is now also a certain means of preservation against the threatening mortality. We read again in Ecclesiasticus xxxi. 20, xxxvii. 30—"The pain of watching, and cholera, and pangs of the belly, are with an insatiable man—excess of meats bringeth sickness, and surfeiting will turn into cholera."

2. In case symptoms of cholera should have manifested themselves in any locality, we forbid all processions and extraordinary religious ceremonies likely to attract great crowds of people, since it has now become an historical well-ascertained fact that such assemblages are prejudicial to public health, on account of the facility of contagion. We ought to *pray*, but not to tempt God.

3. We recommend to the parish priests and sacristans the attending most particularly in the present time to the cleanliness and decency of the churches, taking care to have them properly ventilated, especially during the time of public worship.

4. We order all priests to recite in the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice of the Altar instead of the prayer—"A domo tua," the following:—"Pro vitanda mortalitate," and that until the cessation of the present epidemic. And here, permit us, dearest, again to remind you that "sin is a reproach to any people" (Proverbs xiv., 34)—that, let the Almighty cast us down or lift us up, let Him afflict or comfort us, it is always for our benefit—that He wills not the death of a sinner, but that he should be converted and live. O combat, therefore, with the energy of your souls an evil endangering our mortal existence; humble yourselves under the omnipotent hand of God; reform your lives, and the scourge which appals us now with so many horrors will be changed for us into a mercy and we shall afterwards be able to give thanks and rejoice for those days of sorrow and affliction.

The all-merciful God grant you peace, concord, charity, tranquillity of mind, resignation such as, with our blessing, we wish you all to obtain from on high.

Lucca, from our Archiepiscopal Palace,
August 16, 1854.

✠ T. Giglio, Archbishop.
Carlo Biscotti, Chancellor of the Diocese.

A PORTUGUESE MIRACLE!

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Sir—Allow me to send you a short story, illustrative of the modern miracles which you have been lately exposing in your paper.

In Lisbon, the priests, some years ago, found, or pretended to have found, an image dug up from the earth, and proclaimed it to be the effigy of an eminent saint. It was, accordingly, set up in one of the churches, where crowds of devotees assembled to offer their devotions. To his saintship was referred the decision of the then disputed point—"Who was the legitimate monarch of Portugal?" The officiating priest put the question in an audible voice—"Is Don Pedro the lawful sovereign of the realms? The saint shook his head as a negative indication. "Is Don Miqual the sovereign?" The image nodded assent. This was repeated on various occasions to increased congregations, and was considered by the multitude as an astonishing miracle. At one time, in the presence of my informant, the first inquiry had been replied to as usual; to the second, no answer was returned, upon which the priest several times repeated the question, and at length assumed great vehemence of manner, when a boy popped out his head from behind the curtain, and exclaimed, "It is not my fault, sir, *the string is broken*."

Possibly, sir, the winking image of the Virgin, at Rimini, may have ceased to wink from some similar reason. Can any of your readers inform me whether any Italian priest has ventured to expose this imposture in the same manly way in which the French Abbé Deleon seems to have done that of our Lady of La Salette—*alias* Constance Lamerliere!

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
Scrutator.

THE WAY TO SAVE LIVES IN THE CRIMEA.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Honoured Sir—I got your paper to read a couple of times from a friend, and I was greatly took with it; for your honour seems to be very kind to poor men like myself, who has but very little larning. Well, sir, when I seen Dan Carthy's letter in your paper, says I to myself, he is a kind, good gentleman to print such a poor man's letter, and maybe he would be good enough to print a letter for me too—moreover, as my letter may do some good for the poor soldiers who are fighting to death out in the war.

The way, your honour, that I came to know about doing the soldiers so much good entirely was, as I'll tell you straight.

The other day a woman came to me, and says she—"Humphrey, dear, I came to trouble you for to write a couple of words for me to my son, who is fightin with the Rooshins in Sebastable; 'tis only a couple of words," says she, "I have to tell him, and you won't be a minute writing it," says she. So, your honour, I began to write the letter as well as ever I could; for I thought it would look mighty disgraceful entirely to send a bad letter so far away. I *filt up* the paper, and was going to give it the finishing stroke, and says I—"I am going to put your name to it now." "Oh, Humphrey, avourneen," says she, "for the love of all the saints keep a little corner of it empty a while, for I am sending him something," says she, "and I want you to explain it to him." "But," says I, "I *filt* it all up, only one little bit that will be hardly long enough for your name." "And," says she, "will you fill another piece of paper for me, for I want to send him a thing that *will save his life*." With that, your honour, when I heard that she was to save his life, "of course I will write," says I." Well, sir, when I began to write she pult a little weeney bit of a red silk purse out of her bosom, that was for all the world as big as a tailor's thimble; "and," says she, "Humphrey, agra, tell my son that I am sending him the *blessed stones* of Barigowen well inside in this purse; and tell him, that if he'll *receive* them, and wear them in this purse round his neck with the same faith that his own mother is sending them to him, that there will be *no* fear of him, please God; and that he will come home *safe* and *sound* again; for any one that ever wore them blessed stones about his neck *could not be harmed*." Well, your honour, I looked mighty curious at the little purse, and I thought it very quare entirely that a small little bit like that could save one's life. To be sure I knew that Biddy Corcoran, and many of the neighbours, took her lame child there to be cured; but I never heard that the little pebbles had any power at all; and so I says—"Is it in earnest you are, or do you think them stones will save him?" "Oh," says she, "I am sure if they overtake him alive that there will be *no fear* of him." Well, then I remembered to hear many one say that the priest wouldn't let one go to a well; "and," says I, "I'll bet my life Father Mick won't let you send the stones, nor go to the well at all at all." With that, sir, she gave a jump, "and," says she, "'deed, then, Father Mick knows that I gave rounds at the well for my son, and that I sent him the *lining** of the well in a letter, and he did not say 'ill you did it' to me when I told him of it." Well, I hadn't a word to say when I heard that Father Mick knew all about it. So I stopt for a while, "and," says I, "after all, I am thinking it might be better for you to pray to God to spare your son to you than to be sending those little stones; for I read somewhere that God is mighty jealous of his honour; and, perhaps, you or your son may lose your life by provoking him against you." With that, sir, she looked very cross; "and," says she, "I will send the stones at any rate, for I am sure they will do the good." So, then, when I saw that she could not be put off, and that she kept a firm hold of the purse, I told her son that his mother was sending him the stones of Barigowen well, and that she said they would save him from the Roosbea bullets. Since she sent off that letter, she sent for the priest to say Mass for her son; so that between the stones and Mass I suppose he is all right. To finish, sir, the reason I send this account to you is, that, if you think the stones could save our poor countrymen who are fighting in the trenches, you would advise the people to send them off at once; they wouldn't increase the postage much, for a little sample of them would save ever so many.

I remain, sir, your humble servant till death,
Humphrey Leary.

FARMING OPERATIONS FOR JULY.

(*From the Irish Farmer's Gazette*).

In the more favoured districts this is the principal month for hay-making, some general directions for which we gave in our last impression, and would recapitulate the principal points necessary to attend to, which consist in preserving the nutritious saccharine matter, by cutting before the principal grasses form woody fibre. Cut as close as possible, tedding it out after the scythe, gathering it up into windrows or lap-cocks, before the dew begins to fall, to keep airing it, and gradually increasing the size of the cocks each day, so as to permit the expulsion and evaporation of the superabundant water, and retain the concentrated juices and colour; avoid cutting in wet weather, and lose no time, after being properly seasoned, in permanently securing it in ricks, to prevent waste and deterioration in quality.

Weeds now spring up in every direction, and should be quickly destroyed by hand or horse hoeing, or scuffling between the crops, and by the scythe or reaping-hook along the ditches, pastures, or roadsides, and thistles and docks pulled out of the corn; the earlier in their growth weeds are destroyed the better; but none should be allowed to mature their seeds—"one years' seeding entails seven years' weeding"—and not only seven but many more years. Weeds make a great addition to the manure heap, if gathered before perfecting their seeds; but if the seeds are matured, or nearly so, they must be burned.

Potatoes, if planted early, will have their second earthing given long since, whether in drills or ridges; but no time should now be lost in doing so, where that operation has been neglected.

Mountain or Bog Land, in a state of reclamation, may still be pared and burned, when the ashes should be spread, and either ploughed or dug in, well pulverised with the harrows and roller, and sown with rape—to be eaten off by sheep—cut and carried for house feeding or let stand for a seed crop.

Rape or Cabbage plants sown last month may be planted after the early potatoes are dug, or in land lately occupied with winter vetches, removed too late for sowing turnips.

Cabbages of the dwarf or large York varieties should be sown in rich, well-tilled beds by the middle of the month, for planting out in September and October; they give a large amount of nutritive feeding to sheep or lambs in April and May.

* The moss which grows on the inside of the well.

Just published, 344 pp. demy 8vo, price 6s. 6d.,

A Digest of the Evidence,

TAKEN BEFORE

THE SELECT COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS,

APPOINTED TO INQUIRE INTO THE WORKING OF THE

NATIONAL SYSTEM OF EDUCATION

IN

IRELAND;

WITH ADDENDA AND APPENDIX.

BY THE

REV. WILLIAM LE POER TRENCH, D.D.,

Rector of Killercran, Diocese of Tuam, and one of the Honorary Secretaries of the Church Education Society for Ireland.

"Dr. Trench has extracted the Substance of the Evidence, on the subject of Public Education in Ireland, and has produced it in a concise and systematic form. His 'Digest' is intended to enable persons interested in the Educational movement in progress in Ireland, to understand, at a glance, the results of the inquiry alluded to."—*Athenæum.*

"The invaluable 'Digest of the Evidence,' by Dr. Trench, has placed the substance of the 'Blue Book' in a clear, comprehensive form before all those who are interested in this great question. It was a work of great labour, of no ordinary patience, and requiring the utmost discrimination. But the result has been eminently successful. The plan of the 'Digest' is admirable; and the subjects so well classified, that immediate reference can be made to the most important evidence on every branch of the inquiry. It is a volume which will never lose its interest, so long as there is a friend of Scriptural Education to be encouraged, and an advocate of a godless expediency to be put to shame."—*Christian Examiner.*

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London: Wertheim and Macintosh, Paternoster-row; Seeley, Jackson, and Co., Fleet-street; and Thomas Hatchard, Piccadilly.

Important Work on Controversy.

In the Press, and will be ready shortly,

THE "CONTROVERSIAL CORRESPONDENCE,"

Between R. W. KENNARD, Esq., London, and the Rev. PAUL MACLACHLAN, Roman Catholic Priest, Falkirk.

In Demy 8vo., price 5s. to SUBSCRIBERS ONLY.

This correspondence, conducted with great ability on both sides, has, at length, terminated by the withdrawal of the Rev. Mr. Maclachlan from the contest, who has republished the whole of his letters, WITHOUT THOSE OF MR. KENNARD! As such a proceeding is evidently unfair, it is intended that the entire correspondence, consisting of about 70 letters, shall be published, so as that the nature of the Controversy may be thoroughly understood by all parties.

Dr. Irving writes—"This is a remarkable publication. Mr. Maclachlan is sufficiently skilled in the Romish arts of controversy; but in logical dexterity, and even in theological learning, the priest is no match for the Protestant layman."

The Rev. John Evans writes—"This correspondence furnishes decidedly the best *Handbook* of the Romish Controversy yet extant."

The Venerable Dr. Croly says of Mr. Kennard's letters—"I sincerely admire their learning, reasoning, and spirit of Christianity; and I know of no production fitter to produce a more ample assurance in the mind of any man open to rational conviction." It has also been characterized as the "most important controversy that has taken place since the days of Stillingfleet."

The Controversy embraces the modern arguments of Romanists, having reference more particularly to History than Doctrine; and the Book will form an excellent companion to Dr. Cumming's Controversy with Mr. French, known as the Hammersmith Discussion, which is exclusively Doctrinal.

The Work is now publishing in one Volume, Demy 8vo, and will contain above 700 pages, with a copious and useful Index. Price 5s. to SUBSCRIBERS ONLY.

The names of Subscribers are requested to be sent as early as possible to WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

New and Recent Works,

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

*** All Books above 1s. sent Postage free.

MEMOIR OF THE LIFE, WRITINGS, AND DISCOVERIES OF SIR ISAAC NEWTON. By Sir David Brewster. 2 vols. 8vo. 24s.

ESSAYS, ECCLESIASTICAL AND SOCIAL. Reprinted, with additions, from the "Edinburgh Review." By W. J. Conybeare, M. A. 8vo. 12s.

MEMOIR OF THE REV. SYDNEY SMITH. By his Daughter—Lady Holland. With a selection from his Letters. Edited by Mrs. Austin. 2 vols. 8vo. 28s.

MEMOIRS AND A SELECTION FROM THE LETTERS OF THE LATE REV. CHARLES JERRAM. Edited by the Rev. James Jerram. 10s. 6d.

PILGRIMAGE FROM THE ALPS TO THE TIBER; or, the Influence of Romanism on Trade, Justice, and Knowledge. By the Rev. J. A. Wylie, LL.D. 7s. 6d.

A MODEL FOR MEN OF BUSINESS; or, Lectures on the character of Nehemiah. By the Rev. Hugh Stowell, M.A. 5s.

THE TRUTH AND THE LIFE. By Bishop M'Ilsaine. 5s.

THE HISTORY OF WOMAN, and her Connection with Religion, Civilization, and Domestic Manners, from the earliest periods. By S. W. Fullom. 5s.

CONSTANTINE; or, the Last Days of an Empire. By Captain Spencer. 2 vols. 18s.

THE CRIMEA, ITS ANCIENT AND MODERN HISTORY: the Khans, the Sultans, and the Czars. By the Rev. Thomas Milner. 10s. 6d.

THE CRIMEA, its Towns, Inhabitants, and Social Customs. By a Lady resident near the Alma. 2s. 6d.

THE SOUTHERN CROSS AND THE SOUTHERN CROWN; or, the Gospel in New Zealand. By Miss Tucker. 3s. 6d.

CHRISTIANITY IN TURKEY: the Armenian Race and Church, with some account of their Doctrines and Rites, &c. By Rev. F. S. O. Dwight, Constantinople. 5s.

THE FOOTSTEPS OF ST. PAUL. By the Author of "The Faithful Promiser." 5s.

NOTES OF A TOUR IN THE VALLEYS OF PIEDMONT IN THE SUMMER OF 1854. By the Hon. and Rev. B. W. Noel. 3s. 6d.

MEMOIR OF THE LIVES OF ROBERT AND J. A. HALDANE. By Alexander Haldane, Esq. 8vo. New and cheaper edition. 5s. 6d.

MONASTIC INSTITUTIONS, their Origin, Progress, Nature, and Tendency. By Samuel Phillips Day, formerly of the Order of the Presentation. 7s. 6d.

A GLANCE BEHIND THE GRILLES OF RELIGIOUS HOUSES IN FRANCE. 5s.

MINISTERING CHILDREN, a Tale; dedicated to Childhood. By the Author of "Visits to the Poor," &c. 5s.

THE BISHOP OF OSSORY'S CHARGE TO THE CLERGY OF THE DIOCESE OF OSSORY, FERNS, AND LEIGHLIN, in September, 1854—The Irish Education Question. 2s. 6d.

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER, as now in use, and as revised and corrected by a Royal Commission, in 1689. 3s. 6d.

THE TREASURES OF WISDOM; or, Thoughts on the connection between Natural Science, and Revealed Truth. By the Rev. T. R. Birks. 3s. 6d.

ARCHBISHOP WHATELY'S CHARGE IN JUNE, 1855—The New Dogma of the Church of Rome. 1s.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE BRITISH FERNS, AND THEIR ALLIES. By G. W. Francis, F.L.S. 5s.

MOORE'S POPULAR HISTORY OF BRITISH FERNS, AND THEIR ALLIED PLANTS, Comprising the Club-mosses, Pepperwort, and Horse-tail. With Coloured Illustrations. 10s. 6d.

HANDBOOK of ANGLING: teaching Fly-fishing, Trolling, Bottom-fishing, and Salmon-fishing. By Ephemera. 5s.

THE SEASIDE BOOK: being an Introduction to the Natural History of the British Coasts. By W. H. Harvey, M.D. New Edition. 5s.

A BOOK FOR THE SEASIDE. With Numerous Engravings. 3s. 6d.

A POPULAR HISTORY of BRITISH SEA-WEEDS, With Notices of some of the Fresh-water Algæ. By Rev. D. Landsborough. 10s. 6d.

In the Press, and immediately will be Published, price 6d.,

A SERMON,

PREACHED ON THE OCCASION OF THE DEATH OF THE LATE

ARTHUR GUINNESS, ESQ.,

IN BETHESDA CHAPEL,

On Sunday, June 17, 1855,

BY THE REV. JOHN ALCOCK, A.M.,

With Appendix by the Rev. DAVID PITCAIRN, Torquay, Author of "Perfect Peace," &c.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Now ready, foolscap 8vo, cloth, gilt, price 6s.,

O'GORMAN'S

PRACTICE OF ANGLING,

PARTICULARLY AS REGARDS IRELAND.

"Mr. O'Gorman is a devotee of the noble arts of fly-fishing and trolling. He is familiar with the rivers and lakes of Ireland, as well as with the characteristics of the country. In his 'Practice of Angling' he gives full directions upon all subjects, not even omitting the inferior kinds of fishing."—*Spectator.*

"We see the man, and recognise his characteristics from the first page—a sportsman wedded to his rod more indissolubly than constancy itself to its rib—one who ties a fly faster than another man would catch one, and would make nothing by hooking leviathan itself on a single gut."—*Warder.*

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London: Wertheim and Mackintosh.

Just Published, price 1s. 6d., Cloth,

The Irish Widow;

OR,

A Picture from Life of Erin and her Children.

By the Author of

"POOR PADDY'S CABIN."

London: WERTHEIM and MACINTOSH. Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Just published, in 8vo, 420 pp., with Map, price 3s. 6d., Cloth,

Old Testament Prophecies,

Relative to the Return and Restoration of the Twelve Tribes to the Land of Palestine, together with the setting up of Messiah's Kingdom on Mount Zion, during a period of One Thousand Prophetic years.

BY JAMES ALLIN.

London: Wertheim and Macintosh, Paternoster-row. Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Just published, SECOND EDITION, small 8vo, cloth, elegant, Price 4s. 6d.,

OUR FRIENDS IN HEAVEN;

OR,

The Mutual Recognition of the Redeemed in Glory Demonstrated.

BY THE

REV. J. M. KILLEN, M.A., COMBER.

"Here is a subject of touching interest very well treated. Mr. Killen argues on right principles, and comes to a right conclusion."—*Church of England Magazine.*

"Its author is an eminent minister of the Presbyterian Church, and it contains a full and masterly discussion of mutual recognition in Heaven, characterized by a sound judgment, and invested with the attractive grace of a most chaste and classic style."—*The Belfast Protestant.*

Edinburgh: Shepherd and Elliot. Dublin: William Curry and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher, WILLIAM CURRY, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.
JULY 19, 1855.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Gloir do Dhia an rna hárduib, agus síodcáin air an dtalamh deagdoil do na dáoinib.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED THE MIDDLE OF EVERY MONTH, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. IV.—No. 44. AUGUST 16, 1855. { Annual Subscription, 3s. 6d.; Unstamped Copies, 3d. each. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
What Guide shall we Follow?	85
Pope Pius IV. and the General Councils.	86
The Young Convert.	87
Roman Catholic Moral Theology—No. IV.	88
Dialogue between Father D—— and William —— on Transubstantiation	89
Talk of the Road—No. XXX.	91
The Devotions of St. Alphonsus Liguori	91
The Shrines of Jerusalem	92
The Annual Miracle at Naples	93
CORRESPONDENCE:	
On St. Cyril of Jerusalem—by Scrutator	94
Legends of the Blessed Virgin—The Sparrow	94
The Archbishop of Lucca—Guillo Arrigoni	94
Why are the Priests against Inquiry—by Dan Carthy	95
Farming Operations for August	95

WHAT GUIDE SHALL WE FOLLOW?

MANY years since, we happened to spend a few days, in company with a friend, in exploring the magnificent scenery of the Savoy Alps. One fine morning we crossed the pass of the St. Gothard, which leads from the valley of Andermatt, in Switzerland, to the pretty Italian village of Airolo. At this village we parted company, as our friend wished to return by another route, in order to see a waterfall in the mountains; but we agreed to meet for supper at Andermatt. Hours passed away, but our companion never appeared; and we did not meet again for several days. It seems that he had engaged a guide at Airolo, to conduct him to the waterfall, who professed to be well acquainted with all the passes of the mountains, but who, in point of fact, was utterly ignorant. Darkness came on; and, after much wandering, they found themselves on the brink of a tremendous precipice, at the bottom of which they could hear the roar of a wild mountain torrent. The false guide was seized with terror; he threw himself on his knees, and exclaimed, in all the agony of despair, "O signor, siamo perduti!"—"We are lost, sir; we are lost!"

The above anecdote affords us a good example of the obvious rule, which travellers are sometimes apt to forget, that we ought not to take a guide merely upon *trust*; but that we ought to have some guarantee for his knowledge of the road, before we submit ourselves to his guidance. And we desire, in connection with it, to call the attention of our readers to a point of great practical importance, which we have more than once discussed in this journal—namely, what guide has God provided for us in our journey heavenward?

It is acknowledged on all hands, that man needs a guide in religion. Natural reason is, of itself, unable to instruct him what he is to believe and what he is to practise. In order to make up for its deficiencies, God has been graciously pleased to give mankind a revelation of His will, which is contained in the Holy Scriptures. Roman Catholics and Protestants both acknowledge that the Bible is the Word of God; and that it is the duty of Christians to believe the doctrines which it teaches, and to perform the duties which it enjoins, if they desire to attain to eternal salvation.

So far all professing Christians are agreed. But here Roman Catholic divines go a step further. The Bible alone, say they, is an *unsafe* guide, for a man may misunderstand what it says; and it is an *insufficient* guide, for it does not tell him all that he wants to know. There must be a living, infallible guide, which can speak with authority, and save a man from all risk of danger and error; and this guide is the Church.

Now, it has always appeared to us, that the Roman Catholic system, when reduced to practice, is open to the obvious objection, that it *increases* the danger against which it professes to guard. A man who trusts to his Bible is, at least, sure of this, that he has in his hands the very Word of God. If he opens the Gospels, he finds there the very words in which our blessed Lord instructed his disciples, while he was upon earth. If he opens the Epistles, he finds there the very words in which St. Peter and St. Paul instructed the Churches which they founded and established in the world. It is possible, doubtless, that he may not understand their full meaning; but he is, at least, sure of this, that, so far as he does understand them, he hears in them the *very voice of God*, speaking to his heart and conscience, and making known to him the truths that concern his everlasting peace.

Let us now take the case of a sincere, devout Roman Catholic, who seeks to learn the way of salvation. He has, we will suppose, the Douay Bible in his hands; he believes it to be the Word of God, and he knows that it will certainly guide him right, if he can understand it. He is told, however, that it is a very dangerous thing for him to rely upon his private judgment; and, therefore, he lays his Bible aside, and consults his priest. But is it not plain, that, by doing so, he gives up a *certain*, to follow an *uncertain*, guide? Even if we should grant, for the sake of argument, that the Pope and a general council are infallible, yet nobody ever believed or asserted, that *every individual parish priest is infallible*. For all practical purposes, a Roman Catholic who gives up his Bible, makes his priest infallible, and places him in the stead of God. But we all know that priests are fallible, mortal men, apt to err in judgment and conduct like other men. If a priest gives way to anger or intemperance, if his life should happen to be stained by faults or vices, why should a Roman Catholic conclude, that he will always prove an infallible guide to every member of his flock? Is it not *possible*, to say the least, that such a priest may be, like the Italian guide of whom we have spoken, ignorant of the true path himself, and, therefore, unable to direct others unto it?

Again, let us suppose the priest to be a grave, decorous, and well-informed man; grant him to possess all these and other good qualities; still, he is not infallible. He *may* tell his flock to believe something that they ought not to believe, or to do something which they ought not to do. Is it not *safer*, in such a case, to go to the unerring Word of God for advice and instruction? "Yes," a Roman Catholic may reply, "I grant it is *safer* to do so, if I could only understand it; but, then, the Bible is so very dark and obscure. Now, I can always understand what the priest tells me; and, therefore, I think it better to follow his instructions." But, surely, it is obvious to common sense, that a path is not necessarily safe because it is easy. Some books of Holy Scripture are, indeed, hard to be understood, as must always be the case when the finite mind of man seeks to comprehend the infinite. Is not the greater part of the Bible, however, written in such a plain and simple style, that even a child can understand it? Are we to believe that the Almighty cannot speak in such a manner in His Word, as to be intelligible to all devout readers? The greater part of the Gospel history contains an account of the discourses which were addressed by our blessed Lord to his disciples and to the Jews. It is plain that in these discourses He must have spoken in such a manner as to be understood by those to whom he spoke. And if his *first* hearers were able to comprehend the meaning of the "gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth," surely we, who read these very same words, as they are written in the New Testament under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, ought to be able to understand and to profit by them now.

And this brings us to the point which we wish especially to impress upon the minds of our readers in connection with this important subject. It is plain that religious teaching, like every other kind of instruction, may repose upon one or other of two principles, *reason* or *authority*. Protestants, who refer everything to the Word of God, appeal to the former. Roman Catholics, who rely upon the infallibility of the Church, take their stand on the latter. Now, the Gospel narrative places in the hands of every Roman Catholic a simple and satisfactory test for judging which of these two methods of instruction God intended us to follow. All Christians are agreed, that, if ever there was an infallible teacher in the world, that teacher was our Lord Jesus Christ. He who was "God over all, blessed for ever," who had created man, and who knew what was in man, came down from the bosom of the Father to teach men the way of salvation. He might have claimed implicit submission to his words, as the Sovereign Lord and Ruler of the universe. He might have said to his hearers—"Distrust your own reason: it will lead you astray. Look not to any former revelation made by Moses or the prophets: they are dark and obscure, and you cannot understand them; but listen to *me*. Do not ask for any confirmation of the truths which I teach you; let it be sufficient for you that it is I who speak them; any demand for further proof is wrong."

Such *might have been* the method of teaching pursued by our blessed Lord—a course founded on authority, and on authority alone. Such *is* the course now commonly pursued by the authorized teachers of the Church of Rome. They say—"Listen to the truths *we* teach: we speak in the Church's name, and by her authority. If you attend to what we say, you will be safe. If you ask for proof of our doctrines, you show a want of proper submission and teachableness of spirit. A true son of the Church is content with our authority. None but heretics ever appeal to reason."

But, what plan of instruction did our Lord *actually* take? Let us open the pages of the New Testament, and we shall find, beyond all contradiction, that *he put the very highest honour upon the Word of God*. He brought it forward upon every occasion; he derived from its teaching his arguments, his warnings, his precepts. In fact, we may confidently assert, that, so far as we can gather from the Gospel history, no inspired teacher ever made so much use of Holy Scripture as did our Lord, who might, had he thought fit, have dispensed with it altogether. He might have spoken to the Jewish multitudes with the voice of authority alone; he might have avoided all appeals either to reason or Scripture, and called upon his hearers, as they valued their eternal welfare, to obey his words, without further inquiry. And such is, in point of fact, the course which the Church of Rome always adopts whenever she possess the power to do so. But such was *not* the method of teaching pursued by Him who "spake as never man spake." His object was not to *overbear the reason* of his hearers by the language of authority, but to *lead and convince* them. And, as one of the chief instruments in this work—nay, as the very first and most effectual weapon—he deliberately chose "the sword of the Spirit, which is *the Word of God*"—Ephes. vi. 17. We now proceed to furnish our readers with some examples of the fact we have alleged: if we were to bring forward *all* the passages which our Lord cited from the Old Testament, we should transcribe a considerable part of the Gospel history.

We are told, that, on one occasion (Luke x. 35), a Jew came to our Lord, with the inquiry, "Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?" We can easily conceive the answer which the Church of Rome would give to such an inquiry. But what said our blessed Lord? He referred his inquirer to the *written Word of God*—"He said unto him, What is written in the law? how readest thou? And he answering, said, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbour as thyself. And he said unto him, *Thou hast answered right*: this do, and thou shalt live." Our Lord plainly took for granted, that the man who came to him with this solemn question, was familiar with the revelation which God had already given; and that, if he searched aright, he would find in this Word an answer to all his inquiries.

Again, on another occasion (Matt. xix. 3), the Pharisees came to him, to know whether it was lawful for a man to put away his wife. Our Lord's reply, as before, was founded on Holy Scripture—"And he answered, and said unto them, *Have ye not read*, that he which made them at the beginning, made them male and female." At a time when books were scarce, and reading must have been attended with far greater difficulties than at present, the knowledge of the Word of God seems to have been diffused so widely among the Jews, that our Lord might, and did, safely appeal to their own familiar knowledge of its contents, as supplying them with a safe guide in the concerns of every-day life.

At another time, we read that the Sadducees, a sect of the Jews who did not believe in the resurrection, put a question to Christ, founded upon one of the laws of Moses, from which they attempted to draw a conclusion favourable to their own erroneous views.—Matt. xxii. 23, &c. And how did our Lord expose their error? He traces it up to their ignorance of the Word of God. "Jesus an-

swered, and said unto them, *Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures.*" We request our readers to study well these emphatic words, spoken by Him who was truth itself. *Ignorance of the Word of God* is the fruitful parent of error in religion, according to our blessed Lord; whereas, according to the teaching and practice of the Church of Rome, it is a dangerous thing for a man to read the Bible, lest it should lead him into error. All our readers, we doubt not, are sincerely anxious to be preserved from religious error. We ask them, are they prepared to use the means which our Lord has pointed out as the best and surest preservative from this danger?

Many charges were brought against our Lord by his enemies during the time of his ministry, and on almost all these occasions he defended his conduct by a reference to Scripture. At one time (Matt. ix. 11) the Pharisees censured him for eating and drinking with publicans and sinners. His reply was taken from the Prophet Hosea. "Go ye," saith he, "and learn what that meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice." On another occasion (Matt. xii. 3) he was reproached with a breach of the Sabbath, and, as before, he justified himself by examples from Scripture history. "*Have ye not read* what David did, when he was an hungered, and they that were with him? or have ye not read in the law, how that on the Sabbath days the priests in the temple profane the Sabbath, and are blameless?" Thus we see, that, at all times and circumstances, an appeal to the Word of God was the chief instrument used by our blessed Lord to convince the minds of his hearers, and to remove their prejudices against the truth.

The same course was adopted by him in the instruction of his own immediate followers. When he met his two disciples, for example, on the road to Emmaus, after his resurrection (Luke xxiv. 27). what was the subject of his discourse? We are told, that, "beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them *in all the Scriptures* the things concerning himself." In fact, there are few books of the Old Testament, from Genesis to Malachi, that our Lord did not quote or refer to, at some time or other, during the course of his ministry. And, in order to show that the reading of the Word of God was a duty incumbent upon all men, we need only refer, in conclusion, to his own emphatic words—"*Search the Scriptures*, for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and they are they which testify of me."—John v. 39.

It is perfectly plain, therefore, that when a Protestant goes to the Bible, in order to learn the will of God, he can plead the express command and direction of our blessed Lord himself. But may not a Roman Catholic say, that he, too, has the sanction of Scripture for consulting his priest, and believing what he tells him? Thus, for instance, we find the following passage in a modern Romish Controversial Catechism*:—"In Malachi ii. 7, the people are commanded to seek the law from the lips of the priesthood. Now, surely, these commands to obey the pastors, or teachers, in the Jewish Church, *evidently suppose that body to be infallible;* for a good God could not command his people, under pain of death, to obey men who might lead them into error."

It is really marvellous to see a learned and acute writer advance an argument which is so obviously untenable. We ask Mr. Keenan, who were the persons most active in condemning our Lord to death? Why, the *chief priests* of the Jews—the very pastors and teachers who, according to Mr. Keenan, are *evidently infallible!* Pilate's words to our Lord were these—"Thine own nation and the *chief priests* have delivered thee unto me" (John xviii. 35); and St. Mark tells us, that "the *chief priests, with the elders and scribes, and the whole council,* bound Jesus, and delivered him to Pilate.—Mark xv. 1. The *whole body* of the pastors and teachers in the Jewish Church were the most active agents, therefore, in crucifying the Son of God, and bringing down on the whole nation the curse of innocent blood. And yet, Mr. Keenan has the assurance to state, that it was impossible for them to lead the people into error!!

In truth, if there be one fact more obvious than another throughout the whole of the Gospel history, it is this, that our blessed Lord, instead of commanding his disciples implicitly to obey the priests and pastors of the Jewish Church, and to submit to their authority without further inquiry, gave them the *very opposite* directions. He told them to "beware of the Scribes and Pharisees."—Luke xii. 1; xx. 46. He calls them "*blind guides.*"—Matt. xxiii. 16. He charges them with hindering, rather than promoting, God's truth in the world, and denounces a seven-fold woe against them in consequence.—"Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites; for ye *shut up* the kingdom of heaven against men: for *ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in.*" —Matth. xxiii. 13. Yet, these men, whom our Lord, who was Truth itself, stigmatizes as "blind guides and hypocrites," Mr. Keenan, with admirable assurance, asserts to be "evidently infallible!!" We greatly fear, that, if this be his real opinion, he can be little better than a "blind guide" himself.

Our conclusion, then, is briefly this—A man who is in earnest about his soul's salvation, and is sincerely desirous to learn the truth, has two courses open before him. He may either have recourse to the Word of God, of which David, writing under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, declares—"Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path" (Psalm cxix. 105); or he may neglect the Bible altogether, and give himself up into the hands of his parish priest, who may prove a "blind guide," like the *infallible* Jewish priests of old. We ask our readers, in all sincerity, as men in earnest for their souls' welfare—*What guide shall we follow?*

* *Vide* Father Keenan's Controversial Catechism, p. 72. Edinburgh, 1851

POPE PIUS IV. AND THE GENERAL COUNCILS.

THE ancient Catholic creed consisted of twelve articles.

There were two *forms* of that creed; one called "The Apostles' Creed," which is the simplest; the other called "the Nicene Creed," because it was professed in the first general council of the Church, held at Nice, in the year 325. This form is fuller in explanation, but contains the same twelve articles.

These twelve articles of faith were found to serve all the purposes of the Catholic Church for FIFTEEN HUNDRED YEARS. In the year 1546 the Council of Trent itself, at its first meeting, recited the Nicene Creed, declaring this creed to be "that summary in which all who profess the faith of Christ do necessarily agree, and that firm and ONLY foundation against which the gates of hell shall not prevail."*

Yet the Council of Trent was no sooner over than Pope Pius IV. published a new creed, adding TWELVE *new* articles of faith, which had never before been found in any Catholic creed; and this Pope Pius pronounces to be "the true Catholic faith, without which no one can be saved."†

One of the new articles is as follows:—"I likewise, undoubtingly, receive AND PROFESS all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred canons and general councils, and particularly by the Holy Council of Trent."‡

We showed in our number for October, 1853, p. 116, that no Roman Catholic has any means of knowing with certainty how many general councils there are, and that the Church of Rome herself has never been able to tell.

None of our Roman Catholic correspondents, clever and acute as they are, have ever attempted to deny this. If Roman Catholics cannot know what councils are general, and what are not, they cannot know what things have been defined by general councils; and in that case to make them "PROFESS ALL THINGS delivered, defined, and declared by the general councils," is to make them profess they know not what, and the Church cannot tell what. So the Catholic faith, without which no one can be saved, contains things of which no one—not even the Church—can say what they are! Yet to profess these things, is necessary to salvation.

This is a difficulty in the Roman Catholic creed that can never be got over, until the Church of Rome can succeed in telling what councils are general, and what are not.

But though the Church of Rome *cannot give a list* of the general councils, she ventures to say of *some* that they are general.

All Roman Catholics are agreed that these four councils are general councils—the Council of Nice, held A.D. 325; Constantinople, A.D. 381; Ephesus, A.D. 431; Chalcedon, A.D. 451.

Here, at least, we can know PART of what general councils have decreed, and our readers would, doubtless, like to know *some*, at least, of the things "delivered, defined, and declared" by the general councils.

The General Council of Nice, in its sixth canon, thus decreed:—"Let the ancient CUSTOMS prevail, that the Bishop of Alexandria should have power over all those who are in Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis—since that is *the custom* of the Bishop of Rome also; and in like manner in Antioch, and the other provinces, let their privileges be preserved to the Churches."§

In the library of the Vatican at Rome there is an ancient Latin translation of this sixth canon of Nice, which translation was made for the use of the Church of Rome, not very long after the Council of Nice was held. This translation is somewhat different from the one we have given above, it is as follows:—"It is an ancient CUSTOM that the Bishop of the City of Rome should have dominion, so as to govern by his own care the suburbicary places, and all the province; but that the Bishop of Alexandria should have the care of all places which are in Egypt; and in like manner concerning Antioch, and in the other provinces, let their own privileges be preserved to the metropolitan Churches."‖

The "suburbicary places" were the districts subject to the civil governor of the city of Rome, and included all places within a hundred miles of the city. Within these places were many bishops, and these were subject to the Bishop of Rome.

Thus the sixth canon of the Council of Nice "defined and declared" that the power of the Bishop of Rome over the bishops subject to him was "of ancient custom"—*not* of divine right. That canon of Nice also defined and declared that by the same "ancient custom" the Bishops of Alexandria and Antioch had the same charge and power in their provinces that the Bishop of Rome had in his.

These things are "delivered, defined, and declared" by the sacred canons and general councils. Therefore, let Roman Catholics remember that they are bound by the creed of Pope Pius IV. "undoubtingly to receive and profess" that the Bishop of Rome has the charge and government only of a limited district, which did not include Ireland, and that only by ancient custom; and let them not give heed to the Bishop of Rome when he claims to have the care of all the churches, as committed to him by divine right.

The fourth canon of the Council of Nice declares that bishops are to be constituted by the bishops of the province, and that the confirmation of all that is done by them is to belong to the metropolitan. Not a word about the Pope, who had then no power to interfere in the appointment of bishops except in the province of which he was metropolitan.

The Pope now claims the whole power of appointing bishops for himself; and at the same time requires every one "to receive and profess" what "the sacred canons and general councils" have delivered on the subject; which seems to us to be a mistake as respects his own claim, and hardly fair to others who are thus required *both* to receive and to reject the "sacred canon" on this subject.

The 13th canon of Nice provides "that the ancient and canonical law shall be observed, that they who are departing this life shall by no means be deprived of the rites of the Church."*

Every priest in Ireland has sworn "to receive and profess" this law: and, now that it is known, we trust that at the next general election no priest in Ireland will threaten to violate it.

The second canon of the General Council of Constantinople is as follows:—"Let those bishops who are over a province not meddle with the churches situated beyond their boundaries, nor confound the churches."†

The creed of Pope Pius IV. requires every one to receive and profess what is here delivered by the General Council of Constantinople; yet the Bishop of Rome is by no means willing to observe it himself.

This General Council of Constantinople wrote a synodical epistle to Damasus, Bishop of Rome, in which they "declare" that "the Church of Jerusalem is the mother of all other churches."‡ The creed of Pope Pius IV., therefore, requires all Roman Catholics "to receive and profess" that Jerusalem is the mother of all other churches; yet this same creed of Pope Pius IV. requires all Roman Catholics to acknowledge that the Church of Rome is the mother of all churches.

The seventh canon of the General Council of Ephesus is as follows:—"The holy synod has decreed that it shall not be lawful for any one to bring in, or to write, or to compose another faith, besides that which was defined by the holy Fathers assembled at Nice through the Holy Spirit. But whoever shall dare to compose or bring in another faith, or to offer it to those who wish to return to the knowledge of the truth from paganism, or Judaism, or from whatever heresy, if they are bishops or clergy, let them be deposed from being bishops or clergy; but if they be laity, let them be anathema."§

Pope Pius himself "composed another faith besides that defined at Nice," by adding TWELVE new articles to the Nicene Creed.

The Church of Rome now offers that creed to all who return from what she calls heresy, and requires them to profess it.

Yet this very creed of Pope Pius IV. requires every Roman Catholic to receive and profess this seventh canon of the General Council of Ephesus, which "defines and declares" that all who should compose, or offer such a creed, shall be condemned.

The eighth canon of the General Council of Chalcedon is as follows:—"Let the clergy of the hospitals, *and of the monasteries*, and of the martyries, remain under the power of the bishops who are in each city, *according to the tradition of the Holy Fathers*, nor let them presumptuously withdraw from their own bishop. But those who dare, by any means, to overthrow this constitution, nor subject themselves to their own bishop, if they be clergy,

* Principium illud, in quo omnes, qui fidem Christi profitentur, necessario conveniunt, ac fundamentum firmum et unicum, contra quod portæ inferi nunquam prævalebunt.—Sess. III.

† Veram Catholicam fidem, extra quam nemo salvus esse potest.

‡ Cætera item omnia a sacris canonibus, et œcumenicis concilii, ac præcipue a sacrosancta Tridentina Synodo tradita, definita, et declarata, indubitanter recipio atque profiteor.

§ Antiqui mores obtineant; qui sunt in Ægypto, Libya, et Pentapoli, ut Alexandrinus episcopus horum omnium habet potestatem, quoniam illa est Romano etiam episcopo consuetudo; similiter autem et in Antiochia, et in aliis provinciis privilegia serventur Ecclesiis.

‖ Antiqui moris est ut Urbis Romæ episcopus habeat principatum, ut suburbicaria loca, et omnem provinciam sua solicitudine gubernet, quæ vero apud Ægyptum sunt, Alexandriæ episcopus omnium habeat solicitudinem; similiter autem et circa Antiochiam, et in cæteris provinciis privilegia propria serventur metropolitanis Ecclesiis.—Sirmond. Censur. p. ii., c. 4., p. 68. Bibliotheca Justelli et Voelli. 284.

* De his qui vita excedont, vetus et canonica lex nunc quoque servabitur, ut si quis vita excedat, ultimo et necessario viatico minime privetur.

† Qui sunt super Diœcesim Episcopi, ad ecclesias extra suos terminos sitas ne accedant, neque confundant ecclesias.

"Diœcesis" was then the name of the province of a metropolitan. "Parœcia" was the name of the diocese of a bishop.

‡ Ecclesia Hierosolymitana, quæ est aliarum omnium mater.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ii., page 965.

§ Decrevit sancta synodus, non licere cuiquam aliam fidem afferre, vel scribere, vel componere, præter eam quæ sanctis patribus Nicææ congregatis in Sancto Spiritu, definita est. Qui vero aliam fidem audent componere, vel adducere, vel offerre eis qui ex paganismo, vel Judaismo, vel ex quacumque hæresi ad veritatis cognitionem redire volunt; eos, siquidem sint episcopi, vel clerici, ab episcopatu alienos esse episcopos, et clericos a clero: si autem sint laici, anathematizari.

let them be subject to canonical punishment; but if they be monks or laity, let them be excommunicated."*

The Pope has since everywhere exempted the clergy of the monasteries from the authority of their bishops, in order that those clergy might be wholly dependent on the Pope himself; and the clergy of the monasteries have everywhere accepted that exemption from the authority of their bishops, in violation of this constitution, and of the "tradition of the Fathers." Yet the creed of Pope Pius IV. requires the clergy of the monasteries, and all other Roman Catholics, to "receive and profess" what this general council has delivered and declared—that the clergy of the monasteries should remain subject to their own bishops.

The twenty-eighth canon of the Council of Chalcedon says—"THE FATHERS by right gave privileges to the See of old Rome, BECAUSE *it was the imperial city*; and the hundred and fifty bishops most beloved by God (the General Council of Constantinople), moved by the same consideration, gave equal privileges to the most holy See of new Rome;† rightly judging that the city which is honoured with the empire and the senate, and which enjoys equal privileges with the old royal Rome, should, even in matters ecclesiastical, be exalted and magnified *no otherwise than it*, being the next to it."‡

Here we have the real nature and origin of the authority and privileges of the Bishop of Rome. THE FATHERS *conferred* those privileges on him (limited to his own province, as we have seen), *because Rome was the imperial city*. And for the same reason the Fathers at Constantinople and Chalcedon conferred EQUAL privileges on Constantinople when *it* became the imperial city.

"The general councils and sacred canons" have thus "delivered, defined, and declared" the real nature and extent of the privileges and authority of the Bishop of Rome; and these things all who receive the creed of Pope Pius IV. are bound "to receive and profess."

Probably our readers are now tempted to exclaim, "what could have possessed Pope Pius IV. when he was composing his new creed, to require Roman Catholics 'to receive and profess all things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred canons and general councils,' when he must have known that the canons and general councils delivered and declared such things as these?" We can understand their surprise; but still we think that Pope Pius IV. acted wisely in putting that in his creed—"for the children of this world *are* wiser in their generation than the children of light."

It sounded very fine to have it in his creed that people should profess all that the sacred canons and general councils defined and declared; and Pope Pius might hope that Roman Catholics would never find out what things were really in the canons, but that they would go on supposing that the sacred canons and general councils had delivered that the whole Church was committed to the Pope by divine right.

And this has really been the case. For nearly 300 years, perhaps, of all the Roman Catholics who have professed the creed of Pope Pius IV., not one in ten thousand has known that the "sacred canons and general councils" have delivered and declared that the authority of the Bishop of Rome extends only to a *part* of the Church, and that that authority was given to him by the Fathers, only because Rome was the imperial city.

Thus it is that Roman Catholics have been hoodwinked, being taught to think that they were holding the things declared in the ancient canons, when, in fact, they were holding the very reverse; whereas we, who want people really to hold what the sacred canons and general councils delivered, are only anxious to show them what those canons contain.

We shall return to this subject, and show them something more out of the laws which the general councils made for the ancient Church.

THE YOUNG CONVERT.

SOME years since a Roman Catholic family emigrated to America. They were the relics of an old family once possessed of considerable influence and property; but, owing to a change of circumstances, the last representative—a man of much energy and good sense—became irretrievably embarrassed, and, having many children, resolved upon emigration. He took with him all his family except one little daughter, aged between five and six years, whom he committed to the care of an aunt—a lady of some property—who was attached to the child, and who promised to provide for her. This lady, a strict Roman Catholic, brought up the child truly, religiously, and affectionately, to the best of her judgment. When the girl was about seventeen years old, the Protestant clergyman of the parish—who was in the habit of holding evening lectures in his parish school-room—observed her on one or two occasions amongst the persons in attendance; and on inquiry he learned that she had been induced by one of her young companions to read the Scriptures; that she had been strongly affected in reading them; that she had been led to attend several of the lectures, and had, at length, become, in all but the name, a Protestant.

She was a person of very prepossessing appearance—gentle, timid, and retiring, but an universal favourite amongst her equals in station—that is, amongst the class of inferior shopkeepers in a small town. The outline of her subsequent history is thus described by the clergyman:—

"One evening, as I visited one of my sick people, I observed her enter and seat herself to listen to me as I prayed and read the Scriptures.

"The subject led me to speak of the love of the Saviour as shown in his leaving the heavens, dwelling among fallen men, suffering death for us on earth, and now (as our High Priest in the heavens) interceding for *us*. In speaking of the institution of the Lord's Supper, I pressed upon my hearers that the graces and blessings for the communicants were not through the mere elements or material things, but through the faith developed in the tone and spirit of their souls when thus engaged. While thus expressing myself, I was asked by an elderly man who sat beside me to explain the words, 'this is my body,' and 'this is my blood.' He added that Roman Catholics understood these words strictly and literally, and that all the graces and blessings were, in their view, derived to us through the consecrated and transubstantiated elements, and did not depend on the belief or unbelief of the communicant. He said that he asked the explanation for the sake of others present as well as for himself.

"I stated, in reply, that we Protestants understood that our Lord designed the sacrament to be a commemoration of his death on the cross. On giving the bread he said, 'Do this *in remembrance* of me;' so that we have his own words for believing this sacrament to be a commemoration or memorial of his death on the cross. When he said—'Take, eat, this is my body,' he meant to convey that we were to partake of that sacrament, receiving the bread as the memorial of his body that was broken on the cross; and when he said—'Drink ye all of this, for this is my blood,' he meant that we were to partake of that wine as the memorial of his blood that was shed on the cross. This is the true and natural interpretation of the words, involving no contradictions, conformable to the usages of language, and in accordance with the customs of the Jews. Nothing is more common than the habit of calling the memorial or representation of a thing by the name of the thing itself. Thus, if we enter St. Paul's cathedral, or Westminster Abbey, we look on a statue, and say, 'This is Nelson;' on another, and we say, 'This is Marlborough;' and so, when we look at the pictures in a gallery of paintings, we are told that one is 'Wellington,' another the 'Queen;' and we never suppose our informant means to tell us these lifeless pictures are really the Duke or the Queen. And if Roman Catholics point out to us the images or pictures of Mary, of Peter, or of our Lord, using the words—'This is the Blessed Virgin,' 'This is St. Peter,' 'This is Christ,' they mean to convey nothing more than that these images or pictures are the representations of those persons they name, not the persons themselves.

"This mode of expression is also of frequent occurrence in the works of the sacred writers. In the history of Abraham we read—'This *is my covenant*, which ye shall keep, between me and you and thy seed after thee; every man child among you shall be circumcised. And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall *be a token* of the covenant betwixt me and you.'—Gen. xvii. 10, 11. Circumcision is here in one verse called *a covenant*; and in the next *a token* of a covenant. This form of expression is so constantly used in every part of the sacred volume, that the difficulty is in making a selection. 'These bones *are* the whole house of Israel.'—Ezek. xxxvii. 11. 'The rough goat *is* the King of Grecia.'—Dan. viii. 21. It is evident that these bones were not the reality, but the emblem of the house of Israel; and that this goat was not substantially, but only in the way of representation, the King of Greece. So when our Lord says—'I *am* the door,' and 'I *am* the vine, ye *are* the branches,' it is self evident that he did not mean that he was literally, truly, substantially changed, or transubstantiated into a door or vine; or that his people were transubstantiated into the branches of a vine. The same remark applies to the passages where it is said—'That rock *was* Christ,' and 'This Hagar *is* Mount Sinai.' We, therefore, argue that when our Lord gave the bread to his disciples, and expressly desired them to eat it *in remembrance* of him, he used the words—'This is my body,' intending to convey that it was to be a memorial or emblem of his body broken on the cross; and used the words—'This is my blood,' as meaning to convey that the wine was the memorial of that blood which was shed on the cross; and that every Christian, in partaking of these, should show his belief in the atonement and propitiation wrought in the death on Calvary, and should testify that he looked to it and relied on it for redemption, forgiveness, and salvation.

"My aged friend seemed to be satisfied with this explanation, but said there was a question often asked by his Roman Catholic neighbours, and as some of them were present, he would wish me, for their sakes, to resolve it. The question was, whether our Lord had not given to the clergy of his Church a power to turn the bread and wine into the body and blood, and soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ? To this I replied, that so extraordinary a thing, so great a miracle as turning bread into God—one that, *if true*, is the greatest miracle the world has ever seen—ought to be provable by evidence more clear and decisive than a mere expression capable of a figurative interpretation, as all must admit was the case with the words of our Lord. But even if we adopted, with Roman Catholics, the literal interpretation of our Lord's words, and adopted the notion that our Lord did truly, literally, change the bread into his own 'body and blood, and soul and divinity, and bones and nerves,' yet it would by no means follow, that because Christ, being God, was able to perform the miracle, every priest of the Church should also be able to perform the same miracle. He walked on the waters, stilled the waves and winds, multiplied the loaves and fishes so as to feed thousands, healed the sick, the blind, the deaf, the maimed, the leprous, and he raised the dead; it does not follow that the priests of the Church of Rome, or any other Church, can work any of these miracles. His having been able to perform, and having actually wrought those miracles, is no proof that priests can now perform miracles of a similar nature, or any miracles at all. Therefore, even if we suppose, for the sake of argument, that our Lord did work a miraculous transubstantiation on the occasion in question, this exercise, by him, of the Divine power is no proof that any being upon earth possesses now a similar power.

"A Roman Catholic who was present, here suggested that when our Lord said, 'Do this in remembrance of me,' he commanded them to do the same thing that he himself did, and, of course, must be supposed to have given them power to do it. Therefore, if he transubstantiated the bread and wine into his own body and blood, and soul and divinity, as the Church believes, then, he must have given the apostles power to do the same in remembrance of him.

"I replied that this expression of our Lord appeared to me simply to mean, that as he and his apostles were then solemnly sitting and eating together in holy communion, love, and brotherhood, so, in after ages, they should still meet together, and eat and drink together, in holy love and fellowship, in remembrance of his love in dying for them, in remembrance of his sufferings and death for their salvation; and that these words have no distinctly doctrinal or controversial intention, but simply desire all his loving and believing people to hold such holy and brotherly communion together in remembrance of him. I availed myself of the opportunity afforded me by this, to express myself on the importance of Christians cultivating a tone of mind and a habit of feeling, characterised by kindness, charity, and love, each of us showing, upon all occasions, and however engaged, our remembrance of Him who loved us and gave himself for us.

"On my way home I learned, what, indeed, I had suspected, that the young person already referred to was the one at whose desire the question was proposed to me as to the meaning of our Lord's words. It was the first time she had heard anything from me on a controversial subject. It led to much communication afterwards, and, at length, she openly avowed herself a Protestant, and became a regular attendant at my lectures in the school-room; though, in deference to her aunt's wishes, she did not attend the services of the Church.

"Her sufferings for the truth's sake soon commenced. Her aunt threatened, and her priest argued. She bore the threats of one she dearly loved with a sweetness and meekness and, at the same time, with a depth of affection that was a knife in her very heart; but she replied to the arguments of the priest always with some appropriate passage of the Scriptures, and ever with a quiet and gentle spirit. Indeed, it was not in her nature to do otherwise. The result was a system of slow but ceaseless persecution, originating, no doubt, in the best intentions, but not the less bitter and unrelenting. She was at first compelled to long fasts; she was then deprived of her shoes and necklaces, to prevent her attending the lectures; and, at length, her aunt turned her out of doors, and refused any longer to support her.

"Her condition now can more easily be imagined than described. Separated from her parents, brothers, and sisters, by the broad Atlantic, left wholly destitute, she could but at first sit down and weep bitterly. After a while she calmed her heart and turned to Him who desired her to cast all her care on Him, knowing that He careth for us. She remembered the words of the Psalmist—'I have been young and now am old, yet never saw I the righteous forsaken or his seed begging bread.' These words, she told me afterwards, were like the tree in a sunny evening after a day of rain; the breath of evening shakes the leaves, and all becomes a shower of sparkling diamonds. She felt assured that God would raise up some means of deliverance. As she comforted herself with these thoughts, one of my poor people, very poor, took her to her own home, and told her she should have a home with her own three daughters as long as she needed it.

"All this was immediately communicated to me. Every effort was made to soften the feelings of her aunt, but she refused to give way, unless upon the condition of the young

* Clerici ptochiorum, monasteriorum, et martyriorum, sub potestate episcoporum, qui sunt in unaquaque civitate, secundum sanctorum patrum traditionem, permaneant, nec per præsumptionem a suo episcopo recedant; qui vero audent ejusmodi constitutionem quocumque modo evertere, nec suo episcopo subjiciantur, si quidem clerici fuerint, canonicis pœnis subjiciantur; si autem monachi aut laici, communione priventur.

† "New Rome" was Constantinople, which was then the seat of the Roman Empire.

‡ Sedi senioris Romæ, quod urbs illa imperaret, Patres jure privilegia tribuerunt; et eadem consideratione moti centum quinquaginta Deo amantissimi episcopi, æqua privilegia tribuerant sanctissimæ sedi novæ Romæ, recte judicantes, urbem quæ et imperio et senatu honorata sit, et æqualibus privilegiis cum seniore regia Roma fruatur, etiam in rebus ecclesiasticis non secus ac illa extolli ac magnificri, secundam post illam existentem.

girl's return to the Church of Rome. I made arrangements, unknown to the girl, that her maintenance should be no additional expense to the Christian family who sheltered her; but I felt it was not advisable to do more than was barely necessary for her subsistence till she could amply prove to the world the sincerity of her profession by suffering for it. She now regularly attended the parish church, and the evening lectures in my schoolroom; but such was the disgraceful state of the country, and such the supineness of the authorities, that every evening, as my little congregation issued from the schoolroom, a double line of men and women, ranged outside the doorway, assailed her with yelling, hooting, jeering, and opprobious names and epithets; and nothing would have saved her from personal violence but the steadiness and determination of some of the men of my congregation. This system continued many weeks, till the people got tired of persecuting her, when they saw it produced no effect, and when the priest gave up all hope of reclaiming her.

"I now began to consider what was best to be done for the ultimate provision of one who had proved the sincerity of her profession, and had thus withstood all means and all efforts to induce her to abandon her adopted faith. While I was thinking over her case, in the midst of doubt, and misgiving, and perplexity, an unseen hand was interposing in a mysterious way for her deliverance.

"One morning, as I sat in my study, a man was announced, and entered. After a pause, and a rather rough salutation, he sat down, and I had time to examine him. He had the appearance of a skipper of a merchantman, with a free, frank, and rough manner; but I could see there was something at his heart; for, with all his free manner, there was something like a tear starting to his eyes. I felt disposed to like him, and I asked him his name and business.

"'My name,' he said, 'is ———, from the State of Ohio.'

"I instantly recognised the name, and asked if he was not the person who had emigrated from that parish many years before, and had left one daughter behind.

"He said he was the very man. He had lost his wife, and was now come back to the old country to recover his child and bring her to America to keep house for him, his other children being all married and settled in that country.

"The God of love and mercy had himself opened out the best and fittest provision for the young creature. Her father had come for her!

"He told me he had arrived that morning and had gone at once to see his child at her aunt's. He expressed himself shocked and indignant at the conduct of her aunt in turning her out, and exposing her to poverty, and destitution, and temptation, for no misconduct, no crime, but merely because she had changed her religion. He turned to me and, with emotion, with a fearfulness of manner, as if afraid of my answer, and yet with the yearning of a father's heart, asked me about his child's character, and what had become of her? I told him in a few words. Never will I forget the effect produced by them. The strong, rough man was subdued, melted into tears, and sobbed like a child. I felt now that I had a duty to perform to the child as well as the father. I hoped, in his then state of feeling, to exact from him a promise not to interfere with the religion of his daughter. He smiled good-humouredly, and told me I need be under no apprehension; that in America no man interfered with the religion of another; that there, every man was free, and that, indeed, so many Roman Catholics read the Scriptures, and attend Protestant worship and preaching, that it would be impossible to interfere with them. He further, in answer to my inquiries, told me that where he had settled there was no regular Church, but clergymen of different Churches made periodical visits to the district. One week a Church of England clergyman came to the house of one settler, and all the other settlers attended there for worship; the next week a Presbyterian or a Wesleyan minister came to another house, and all met there for another form of worship. He stated that he and his family never wished or cared to see a Roman Catholic priest, but that they acted like all the other settlers, and went wherever they had the preaching; feeling that every one of the pastors who visited them was a good earnest man; and he added, 'my little girl shall always go with us to meeting if you have no objection, for all my children always do so.'

"The meeting of the father and child was a happy one for both parties. Within a few days he had his daughter well dressed, and they caused no small sensation in the place. In faith, and hope, and charity, as well as in prayer, we soon parted, and he returned with his now happy child to the land of his adoption."

ROMAN CATHOLIC MORAL THEOLOGY.

WE promised last month to return to the subject of equivocation and mental reservation, as taught by St. Liguori, and we proceed to fulfil our engagement. We do not think it necessary to add to the examples given in our last article, or we could give many other instances (some of them grotesque enough) of equivocations which St. Liguori pronounces to be perfectly innocent. But our readers will remember that the general drift of his teaching is, that provided there be a sense in which our words are true, it is no matter how false an impression we may leave (and *intend* to leave) upon the mind of the person with whom we are conversing. We beg it to be distinctly understood, however, that Romish doctors do not permit equivocation to be used on *all* occasions. We are bound, they tell us, to speak truth *sometimes*, and to *some* people. Thus, if we are interrogated by a person who has a "right to demand the truth" from us, we are bound to tell it. The *Rambler*, in his defence of Liguori, is careful to remind us that "the relation of a parent to a child, of a master to his servant, of a judge to a witness, of a physician to a voluntary patient, even (say) of a bankrupt's creditors to a bankrupt, is quite different to that of persons who are in a condition of perfect equality, and who are bound by no peculiar engagement to one another. St. Alphonsus all along presupposes that the person *whom we have a design to mislead*, is one who has no kind of right over us, and who, therefore, *ought* to be prepared for equivocal replies, and to be content to be thrown on his own wits for discovering the precise truth."

We, therefore, beg our readers to put out of the question, for the present, those cases, where the one party has some special right to information from the other; what we are now discussing is, what is right and allowable in the ordinary intercourse of society between persons who meet on a footing of perfect equality, and who are bound by no peculiar engagement to each other. In this case we have it even plainer from Liguori's defenders than from Liguori himself, that it is allowable to "design to mislead" each other—that we *ought* to be prepared for equivocal replies, and be content to be thrown on our own wits for discovering the precise truth. Such is the pleasant state to which the intercourse of society is reduced where the teaching of Liguori is received. And this teaching does not always remain mere theory, but is carried into practice; and very necessary it is that any persons who have occasion to converse with disciples of Liguori should know what they have to expect, and how they are to exercise their own wits to elicit the truth from the statements made to them.

As an illustration of the practical application of Liguori's maxims, we can cite no more instructive example than the case of Cardinal Wiseman and Mr. Taylor, which we had occasion to notice for another purpose.—Vol. ii., p. 42. The history is as follows:—Mr. Taylor, of Weybridge, had a family of two sons and three daughters, and had made a will dividing his property among his children, as was natural. However, when in his eighty-first year, after a protracted illness of twelve months, and but three months before his death, he altered his will, giving his children only a life interest in his property, the ultimate reversion being given to the Vicar Apostolic of the London District. During the excitement consequent on the Papal aggression, in the year 1850, the circumstances of the case began to be whispered abroad. It was said that five children of an aged father had been disinherited, and that Cardinal Wiseman and his Church were to reap the benefit. Upon this, an English dissenter, a Mr. John Dean, who had heard the rumour, took the straightforward course of writing to the cardinal, mentioning the report, and saying that he would be glad to be put in a position to contradict it. To this application the cardinal replied in a letter, from which we gave the following extract:—

"DEAR SIR—I am much obliged for your manly and straightforward application to me. I never in my life saw, nor spoke to, nor corresponded with the late Mr. Taylor. I am not named in his will. Since coming to London I have had the pleasure of making the acquaintance of Mr. Taylor's excellent family. I am on terms of perfect good understanding with Mr. James Taylor, the *supposed* disinherited son, who, with his sisters, enjoys every farthing of his father's property."

We are bound to believe that Cardinal Wiseman had no intention to *deceive* Mr. Dean, but only to permit him to deceive himself, as that gentleman forthwith proceeded to do. He inferred from the cardinal's letter that the story of Mr. Taylor's property being given to the Church of Rome was a mere fabrication; and he sent his letter to a dissenting journal, *The British Banner*, which published it, with observations denouncing the report in question as a malignant lie. And yet, all the time, the story was substantially true. Dr. Wiseman, no doubt, was not *named* in the will, but yet Mr. Taylor's bequest was vested in him as the Vicar Apostolic of the London District, which office Dr. Wiseman then held. And though Mr. Taylor's children were, at the moment, in possession of their father's property, they held it but for their lives; and if, at the moment the cardinal wrote, the property had been sold and divided between the tenants for life, and those entitled in remainder, two thirds of the proceeds would have gone into the cardinal's pocket.

Mr. James Taylor, the son, published a letter, from which we gave the following extract:—

"The will contains no power enabling me to make any provision whatever in favour of a wife or children; but, on the contrary, my life estate is coupled with very stringent provisions against any attempt at incumbrance or alienation. Such a will appears to me to create, not a *supposed*, but a real and effectual disinheritance, and such I have always felt it to be. I should add, that the will was executed by a most kind and affectionate parent, after he had attained the age of eighty years and upwards, and when his mind was affected by severe illness, and in immediate contemplation of that great change, *the approach of which renders the strongest and best prepared wholly unable to resist any influence which may be brought to assume the sanction of religion.*"

Now, we do not mention this story because it appears to us to be discreditable to Cardinal Wiseman. It is contrary to our principles to assail the character of individuals, nor would it advance our cause in the least, were we to resort to such a line of argument. Could we bring instances by the dozen of distinguished Roman Catholic ecclesiastics who had been guilty of gross crimes, a Roman Catholic might very justly reply—'There are bad men in all communions; but all this proves nothing against the truth of our religion; there was even a Judas numbered among the apostles.' If, then, Cardinal Wiseman had done anything which he knew to be wrong, and which his Church condemned as wrong, we should not have said anything about it. But the case is very different when Roman Catholic divines teach that to be innocent which we know to be wrong—when they teach it to others and practise it themselves. It is the system then that is in fault, and not the man. When Protestant writers look into Liguori and such like books, they are met by Roman Catholic divines with the assertion, that Protestants do not rightly understand Roman Catholic works of theology, and that they put wrong interpretations on them. It is, then, an excellent plan to compare the theoretical instructions of the theological books with the practical conduct of those whose business it is to explain them; and when we find the two agree, we cannot doubt that we have the right interpretation of the former.

We shall not insult the moral sense of our readers by formally proving to them that such an answer as that given by Cardinal Wiseman was wrong—that it is wrong to compliment a man for his manliness and straightforwardness in putting a question to you, and then to proceed by your answer to lead him astray as far as you can. But, according to St. Liguori, such conduct was perfectly innocent and justifiable; nor do we think that Cardinal Wiseman would have acted as he did, had he not thought so too. And, we say with confidence, that Cardinal Wiseman's confessor was not entitled (according to the rules of his Church) to censure him for a *breach of truth* in what he said, although, no doubt, he might find fault with his want of *prudence* in not ascertaining that Mr. Taylor would be silent before he committed himself by his letter to Mr. Dean. Mr. Dean was neither the cardinal's parent, nor his judge, nor his confessor, &c., but a mere equal, who, on Liguori's principles, had no *right* to truth, and who could not complain if he met with equivocation. We challenge, then, the defenders of Liguori, in place of wasting their time in fictitious examples, to say whether this real example is to be approved or condemned on Liguori's principles; and if they are forced to defend it (as they must), then we conclude that the morality taught by Roman Catholic divines, and practised by their prelates, is far below that which is practised by English gentlemen whom they call heretics.

But, in the ordinary intercourse of society, it is not merely equivocations which meet with indulgent treatment from Roman Catholic moralists. Lying itself is but a venial sin. It is true that there are some lies which are mortal sins; for instance, a malicious lie told to injure our neighbour, would be a mortal sin; but then it is the malice and the intention to do injury which changes the character of the act. A mere lie is only a venial sin, unless there is some special reason to the contrary. Now, Protestants are not all acquainted with the essential difference between mortal and venial sins in Roman Catholic teaching. "A mortal sin puts a man out of the grace of God; on account of its grave importance, destroys favour and friendship with God, and deserves eternal punishment; a venial sin, on account of its insignificant importance, does not take away favour or friendship, though it diminishes our fervour of charity, and deserves temporal punishment." A mortal sin takes away the principle of spiritual life; a venial sin is so light a thing that it need not even be confessed. Supposing that we admit, for the present, the justice of this distinction, in which class should we expect lying to be found? Surely no reader of Scripture can suppose a sin to be merely deserving of temporal punishment which he knows to be threatened by God in such words as these—"All liars shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone." "There shall in nowise enter into [the heavenly city] anything that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination or maketh a lie." "Without are murderers, and idolators, and whatsoever loveth and maketh a lie." Such is the language of the Bible concerning lying; and how comes it that Roman Catholic divines treat it so much more tenderly? We have done our best to find their reasons, and will give our readers the result of our inquiries. We first give an extract from a work of Father Faber, just published, called "The Blessed Sacrament," of which we hope to give a more detailed account before long. Father Faber's own language on the subject of truthfulness is quite satisfactory, and more in accordance with the teaching of the Church in which he was brought up than of that into which he has now betaken himself. But in the course of his disquisitions on the subject, he makes use of the following words, which have quite puzzled us, and which we submit to the ingenuity of our readers:—

"I think it is St. Augustine who says, somewhere, that the devil so envied God the possession of his beloved

Word, that he strove to mimic the eternal generation of the Son, and to produce a word himself, which should be, as far as was in his power, consubstantial with himself, and that he straightway begot a lie; so that a lie is the devil's word—a daring, foul, and loathsome image of the ever-glorious and only-begotten Son of God. This explains the intensity of God's hatred of a lie. And then the saint, or the old Italian commentator, where I found it long ago, goes on to say, that God made lying to be but a venial sin, in order to destroy its empire and degrade its power, and because of the facility of the sin and the pressure of the temptation, and in contempt of Satan's craft. This is an exposition of our Lord's name for the devil—the father of lies."—Blessed Sacrament, p. 233.

Did any one ever see such a conclusion drawn from such a beginning? The beginning of the extract seemed intended to show (in a manner as to the good taste of which we shall raise no question) how abominable a lie is in its origin, and how intensely it is hated by God. And then he goes on to say that for all this God made lying to be but a venial sin—that is to say, that it does not take away God's favour and friendship to those who are guilty of what he so intensely hates! We think Mr. Faber guilty of an attempt to bring the Fathers into disrepute when he puts forward poor St. Augustine as the possible author of such an exposition.

Not being able to see the force of the reasons given by Mr. Faber, we turn to the *Dublin Review*, and we there find a concise account enough of the matter. "According to Catholic theology, a mere falsehood, which does no great harm to any one, is a venial sin; because it is not a great offence against charity." We could not have a better guide to the views of Roman Catholic moralists than this writer in the *Dublin Review*, of whose article we gave some account in our last number; for he seems to have absolutely no moral sense of his own; but whenever a question is proposed as to the lawfulness of an action, he turns to his schoolmen and tries to find out from them whether it is right or wrong; and, if so, why? Thus, he proposes the question wherein the sinfulness of lying consists; and very much puzzled he is to give any satisfactory account of the matter. We cannot forbear giving an extract of his lucid reasonings, that our readers may feel properly grateful to us for what we go through for their sakes.

"The word truth is used to imply either a habit or a fact—used in the latter sense, it means the agreement or conformity of terms; and according as the agreement is dependent on human mind, it is called subjective or objective, formal or material truth. Thus it is either the agreement or conformity existing between the understanding and its object, or between the external sign and that which it is intended to signify, between the object and its idea as existing in the divine mind. Here, then, we have three kinds of truth or agreement. 1st—Between objects and their ideas, reflected in the human mind. 2ndly—Between ideas and their representative signs. 3rdly—Between objects and ideas as reflected in the divine mind. Truthas a habit, or, as it is more usually termed, truthfulness, in its generic character, may have truth for its object matter in any of the above forms, but the virtue we are concerned with is that special one, the distinct province of which is to see that thoughts and words harmonize. But if we look to the formal object from which it derives character as a virtue, we shall find it to be none other than a certain debt due to human society, and founded upon the natural exigencies of the same, which requires, that men if they make use of language at all, shall do so in such a way, that the end for which it was instituted be not perverted. From this double nature of its object matter—viz., that it is concerned with the fulfilment of a duty to society, and that it looks to equalization—truthfulness has been reckoned by St. Thomas as a species of universal justice; it differs, however, from justice proper, inasmuch as the debt it has to supply does not depend upon legal, but upon a moral obligation."

And so he goes on, and by the time that he has got his readers fairly out of their depth, and ready to submit to any terms he may choose to impose on them, he is able to draw triumphantly his conclusion that equivocation is not lying.

"Discoverable equivocations and non-pure mental reservations cannot be said to be the material objects forbidden by the precept against lying; for the material objects which this precept forbids, have already been shown to be words or representative signs, determined either in themselves or by circumstances to a false meaning; such, by the force of the terms, discoverable equivocations and mental reservations, cannot be considered."

We have given these extracts, not as doing justice to the writer's arguments (which we are not now considering), but merely as specimens of his style. The style, however, is not a bad one for its purpose. When a sophist wishes to persuade his hearers to accept wrong conclusions on a very plain subject, there is no better plan than to muddy the waters a little, and so, under cover of obscurity, arrive at the desired end. But what we consulted the *Dublin Review* for at present, was, in order to discover why lying was made but a venial sin. And it would seem, as far as we can see, that the reason is, that in the moral systems of the schools it was found difficult to deduce the obligation to truthfulness from other obligations. The best plan seemed to be to class truth under justice, and so it turned out that when a lie involved no great injustice and no great injury to a neighbour, it came to be reckoned scarcely a sin at all. We should be very much disposed to burst through the cobwebs of the schools, whenever we found them interfere with our following the dictates of conscience and the plain statements of Scripture. If there is any difficulty in making out lying to be a sin, when truth is classed under other virtues, why, then, let veracity set up for itself, as a virtue on its own account. This is, if we remember right, the course adopted by Bishop Butler in his ethical works.

It is remarkable, however, how soon an error committed in theory finds its way into practice, and how soon the mistakes of the moral teachers of a people will affect their character and lower their moral tone. And there is no better example of this than the different light in which a lie is regarded in Protestant and Roman Catholic countries. We do not require our readers to take the fact on our assertion. It appears plainly enough from the attempts of the defenders of Liguori to represent (as the *Christian Remembrancer* has it) uprightness and truthfulness to be a *curious national peculiarity*, like red hair or an aquiline nose, instead of a Christian virtue. They take pains to remind us that the tone of feeling, with regard to truthfulness, is quite different in England from which it is on the Continent, and they tell us that it is not fair to judge of one nation according to the standard of another. Thus says the Dublin reviewer, "The society for which St. Alphonsus wrote is Italian, and his theology is, consequently, to a great extent, shaped to suit the moral exigencies of that people, and presupposes all their customs and conventionalities. It is scarcely possible to imagine two characters more widely different than the Italian and English, nor any two less capable of judging one another." And he fairly acknowledges that the Italian is naturally less truthful than the Englishman."

Father Faber, too, in the passage from which we have made an extract before, suggests that the doctrine of equivocation, however good in itself, is not adapted for use in England.

"Some of the best writers say that when equivocations and mental reserves, even when we seem in strictness to have a right to use them, are so against the custom and genius of a country that they would have the effect of a direct untruth, and would weaken the foundations of public faith, we are at not at liberty to use them. How far, it may be suggested, does not this render the whole teaching about them inapplicable to the country in which we are living, and to that virtue of truth which, like hope in Pandora's box, seems to many persons (truly or not) to have remained when all else that was godly made wings to itself and flew away."—Page 235.

We think, then, that there can be no doubt, even on the confession of our adversaries, as to the matter of fact that there is a very different tone of feeling on the subject of truth in Roman Catholic countries from that which exists in Protestant England. And the question arises, whose fault is this?

We think the matter is easy enough to account for. We believe the cause to be, that in England men follow the teaching of the Bible, while, in Roman Catholic countries, men give up their consciences to be formed by such directors as St. Liguori. And the Dublin reviewer fairly acknowledges that this is a difference for which his Church is responsible. He undertakes to answer the following objection:—

"I am willing to grant that the Italian may be actually less truthful than the Englishman; but how does this excuse your Church? You have said, truly enough, that the usual progress of a nation is in proportion to the standard of excellence instilled into it by education. Now, from whence does the Italian get his education except from the Church? Is it not in her power to make truthfulness so much the standard of excellence as to counteract the natural tendencies of the people? Why, then, is so little prominence given to this virtue in the works of your theologians?"

The answer of the Dublin reviewer to this question is principally borrowed from a passage in Dr. Newman's "Lectures on Anglican Difficulties," which we have elsewhere quoted at length.—See vol. iii., p. 21. The substance of his defence is as follows:—"There are some which may be called natural virtues, and others supernatural; the former are those about which the world is solicitous; the latter those upon which the Church sets especial value. And, again, sins are of unequal gravity; and though all are offensive to God, and incur their measure of punishment, the Church's great object is to discriminate between sin and sin, and to secure in individuals that renunciation of evil which is implied in the idea of substantial and unfeigned conversion. She has neither warrant nor encouragement to enforce upon men in general more than those habits of virtue, the absence of which would be tantamount to their separation from God; and she thinks she has done a great deal, and exults in her success, does she proceed so far; and she bears, as she may, what remains still to be done, in the conviction that, did she attempt more, she would lose all. There are sins which are incompatible with contrition and absolution under any circumstances; there are others which are disorders and disfigurements of the soul. She exhorts men against the second; she directs her efforts against the first."

Now, it will be observed that this whole defence turns on that distinction between mortal and venial sin, of which we spoke before. A mortal sin creates a separation between God and the soul; a venial sin is only a disfigurement of the soul. The Church must exhort all men to abstain from the former; to abstain from the latter, is a counsel of perfection only absolutely necessary for those who are aiming at being saints. And it is quietly assumed that lying belongs to this latter class of sins; and we are given to understand that the reason that the Church of Rome does not take more pains to deter her people from it is, because she has deliberately judged it to belong to that class of sins which are a mere disorder of the soul, and do not produce any separation between the soul and God!

For any who have the Scriptures in their hands, a formal refutation of such doctrine is unnecessary; and we are sure that there are many of our Roman Catholic friends who are "wiser than their teachers," and who are persuaded (notwithstanding all they may learn to the contrary) that lying lips are an abomination to the Lord. And we beg of our sincere and honest Roman Catholic brethren to consider whether it is likely a Church can be infallible whose moral teaching is so different from the morality of the Bible.

We have a great deal more to say on the subject of St. Liguori, and his defenders; and if we find our readers are not tired of the subject, they shall hear from us again.

DIALOGUE BETWEEN FATHER D—— AND WILLIAM ——, ON TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

Father D.—I am glad to meet you, William, and I hope you will allow me to call to your mind the subject of our last conversation.

William.—Oh, yes, sir; that conversation on the subjects of debate between the two Churches has occupied my mind, since very much.

D.—There is only one way to free your mind from all doubt; and that is, to "hear the Church," and to believe, without hesitation, ever after what the Church teaches.

W.—I assure you, sir, I am sincerely desirous to find out what Christ taught, and what his true Church teaches.

D.—Well, then, try the Catholic Church, which cannot err.

W.—You mean your own. I have considered what your Church teaches; and I frankly tell you, that there is one thing in your doctrine which I cannot believe nor receive; if you make that plain to me, I will be more disposed to listen to all you have to say in favour of the Roman Catholic Church.

D.—What is that? I will be most glad to remove your objections, and to explain what you may fairly demand that I should explain.

W.—If I became a Roman Catholic, I must profess and believe "that the body and blood of Christ, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, are truly, really, and *substantially* in the sacrament of the Eucharist, and that a *change* is made of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and the whole substance of the wine into the blood—a change which is called Transubstantiation." All this I read in Pope Pius's Creed.

D.—If God has said it, we ought to believe it, although the consecrated elements *seem, to our senses*, to have undergone no change.

W.—I will, then, endeavour to persuade myself to believe this hard saying, provided you bring me as clear proof that God has said that such a change is really made, as I have that the consecrated bread is still bread, and the consecrated wine is still wine.

D.—Here is the proof. The Lord Jesus Christ said, when he took the bread and brake it, "This is my body." This was when he instituted the sacrament. We stand, then, on the precise words of Christ. To do so should be enough for all Christians.

W.—But did not our Blessed Lord speak in parables often?—Mark iv. 33, 34. Surely, also, he mixed figures very commonly in his discourse.

D.—But can you show any figure as bold as you must take this to be, if you reject Transubstantiation?

W.—Yes; several—as when Christ said "I am the way," "I am the door" (John x. 9); "I am the vine."—xv. 1. No one dreams of anything miraculous in these things; but that Jesus is as a door, because men enter into the kingdom of God through him; that he is as a way, because it is by faith on Him that we come to the Father (John xiv. 6); and that He is like a vine-stock in giving life, support, and fruitfulness to the members of His body—*i.e.*, to all true Christians.

D.—A figure is not to be supposed without necessity, especially in the institution of a sacrament.

W.—But, to my humble judgment, that appears exactly the occasion in which a figure is most natural. For is not a sacrament "a sensible *sign* of an invisible grace?"—Rom. Cat. It may be very natural, then, to call the sign by the name of what it signifies.

D.—Still I insist on the word "is." "This is" (not *signifies*) "my body."

W.—That is, simply, you deny that there is a figure. But which is easier, to allow a natural figure, or to believe that Jesus Christ held his own body in his hands—that when it was broken, every part was his entire body, and every one present ate the body of Christ, while they beheld

him sitting alive before them? Now, to take the words figuratively, will prevent this incomprehensible difficulty.

D.—You will never *believe* as you ought, if you try to satisfy your reason thus in everything.

W.—But, it appears to me, that even the Roman Church allows a figurative expression in the institution of this very sacrament.

D.—I do not admit that. We are for the literal sense.

W.—Let us see. I refer to St. Luke's account of the institution (xxii. 20)—"This is the chalice of the New Testament in my blood which shall be shed for you."—(Douay Bible.) Do you think that the chalice is literally a testament? How could a cup be a will or covenant, but by being the *sign* of it? So may the bread be the body of Christ by being the sign of it.

D.—Is it not more plainly given in the Gospel of St. Matthew? Where is the figure there?—Matt. xxvi. 27.

W.—There is a figure even there; for Christ, taking the chalice, gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of *this*.—(Douay Bible.) Now, "this" is the chalice; for no other substantive comes before it. It is plain, then, that the cup is put for what was then *in* the cup, although substances quite different.

D.—I would advise you, my young friend, not to trust to your own reason so much, but hear the interpretation which the Church gives of mysteries like the sacrament. But, if you require Scriptural proof, you will find it in John vi. 54—"Amen, Amen, I say unto you, except you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you."

W.—But here there is no doubt at all that our Lord spake in the manner of a parable.

D.—Why so? I do not see any sufficient reason for believing that he did not mean what he said clearly and solemnly.

W.—We have our Lord's explanation in the 64th verse—"It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing. The words that I have spoken unto you are *spirit* and life." By which Christ taught his disciples that it was the living on him by faith which gave life everlasting; and that it was the indwelling of his spirit, and not the partaking of his flesh and blood, which quickens the soul and gives the pledge of heavenly life.

D.—Your explanation may be subtle, but it is not convincing to me.

W.—What, if I show you that you must yourself use a figure in interpreting part of this very chapter?

D.—What instance can you give? For it seems to me that I take literally all that Christ said about his flesh and his blood.

W.—At the 51st verse, Jesus says, "I am the living *bread* which came down from heaven." Now, explain that literally, as you do the rest.

D.—The bread in the sacrament is Christ; but Christ came down from heaven.

W.—But the *bread* of the sacrament did not come from heaven. If it be Christ, by consecration, then it is *no longer bread*; so, though Christ came from heaven, the *bread* has not come from heaven.

D.—Yes; but he calls it the living bread.

W.—Precisely so. There is the figure. By *your doctrine* of Transubstantiation there is no *living bread*; for before consecration it is bread, and not living; and, after consecration, it is living Christ, but not living *bread*.

D.—I must allow a slight figure here.

W.—Well, then, why not allow a figure where so surprising an idea occurs as eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ, when the very notion of drinking blood, to the Jews, was abominable?

D.—But why should our Lord use so strange a figure?

W.—His design was to try the faith of those who crowded after him for the loaves and fishes; and so he spake darkly to them. This, one may surmise, by the result which our Blessed Lord foresaw.

D.—If you were as well disposed to listen to the teaching of the Church as you are to search for reasons to justify opinions which are not Catholic, I would not despair of your finding the true Church.

W.—But I have tried to believe Transubstantiation, and failed, not only because my reason is not satisfied, but because that bread should be a living body, and, at the same time, bread, to all appearance and in all qualities, contradicts my senses.

D.—I would advise you not to look for evidence of the senses in things divine and miraculous.

W.—Will you inform me what proof Jesus Christ gave to the Jews of his divine mission and authority? Did he not appeal to his miracles (John xv. 24), and give, as the *surest sign* of his resurrection, that, as Jonas was three days in the belly of the whale, so the Son of Man should be three days in the earth, and then should be restored to life?—Matt xii. 39-40.

D.—Well?

W.—Let me ask you, then, sir, have we as clear evidence that Christ rose from the dead as we have that the bread after consecration is still bread?

D.—There is satisfactory proof that the apostles *saw*, and *heard*, and *felt* Jesus Christ after his resurrection. St. John xxiv. 39—"See my hands and my feet that it is I myself." *Handle* and see, said our Saviour to the disciples, for their further conviction, "for a spirit hath not flesh or bones, as ye see *me have*."

W.—Then I say that the *apostles themselves* had not stronger evidence of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus than I have that a consecrated wafer is still a wafer, or a piece of bread, and not the whole body of Jesus Christ; for I *see*, and *taste*, and *smell* it to be bread; I know by the *touch* that it is not a human body. Here is the *joint testimony of four senses* out of the five against Transubstantiation.

D.—The greater the difficulty of believing God's Word, the greater is the merit; besides, the senses often err.

W.—If one sense errs another corrects it; or the experience of the man corrects his first wrong inferences from impressions made on some of the senses. But you must yourself admit that the senses are competent judges of a miracle. All Christianity, in fact, hinges on their capability to appreciate a matter of fact.

D.—But once that I am satisfied of revelation, then I stagger not through unbelief at the great miracle of Transubstantiation.

W.—But now, as the senses can judge of a miracle, such as the resurrection of Lazarus, the reality of Christ's risen body, &c., they must equally be relied on when they testify that the consecrated bread is bread. You cannot assume that to be a miracle which contradicts the evidence of all miracles, and of revelation itself.

D.—How is it that you object to Transubstantiation when you admit the mystery of the Trinity, which contradicts your reason and your senses.

W.—See now how dangerous a course you are driving on, for sooner than allow that our Lord speaks figuratively when he said, "This is my body," you venture to shake the very foundations of Christianity.

D.—I am only showing that you admit Scripture against reason and the senses.

W.—I do not admit any such thing; for, if so, how could I give a reason of the hope that is in me? How could I or any one give a reason for things directly contrary to reason?

D.—But the doctrine of the Trinity is against reason and sense—namely, that three should be one.

W.—God forbid that it should be *against* either, though it is not within the province of either. If it were said that three Gods were one God, or three persons were one person, there would be a contradiction; but there is no contradiction, nor anything contrary to reason, when the terms are as different as "Person" and "God." I see nothing whatever inconsistent in saying that three *persons* are one *God*.

D.—You don't see that there is such a contradiction, but others do.

W.—Unless you can prove it, I am not concerned in what others think of the matter. Now, I say that, by believing or affecting to believe things clearly contrary to reason, the Roman Church overturns the proof, not only of Christianity, but of Theism itself. If reason determines falsely in so plain a conclusion as that the body of Jesus *cannot* be in ten thousand places at one moment, nor in ten thousand fractions, every one of which is the whole body, then reason is not capable of attaining certainty on *any* subject.

D.—I rest on revelation, written and unwritten, not on reason.

W.—You believe in the *truth* of revelation, because it comes from God; don't you?

D.—I do, and because God cannot deceive nor be deceived.

W.—How do you know this? This must be settled before you argue from His Word as infallible.

D.—We have an instinctive sense of the infinite perfections of God, and our reason confirms it.

W.—How can revealed religion, then, afterwards contradict our instinct, and spurn at reason as useless or dangerous?

D.—Simple faith becomes a being like man.

W.—But if you cannot give a reason for your faith (and no reason can be given for a faith *contrary to reason*), how are you more likely to be right than a Mahometan, who has undoubted faith in the Koran. He says, too, he is for *simple faith*. So is the Hindoo in his Brahmin and his Shasters.

D.—But having found the true religion, we are not after that to dispute against the nature of the things clearly contained therein.

W.—But if, as in the case before us, two interpretations of Scripture are offered, one of which supposes a result contrary to the conclusions of reason and the evidence of our senses, while the other does no violence either to reason or the senses, and only supposes an easy figure as used by Christ, who spoke much in figures and parables—which are we to choose?

D.—The Church has always interpreted literally the words, "This is my body."

W.—So far as I have been able to learn, the most ancient Fathers of the Church did not.

D.—I can bring you a "cloud of witnesses."

W.—I have heard Fathers quoted against Fathers, and even against themselves; doctors, uninspired, differed then as they do now. But it is idle to refer to authority for a doctrine contradictory to sense and reason.

D.—But is it so clear that Transubstantiation contradicts reason? Cannot the substance be changed while the qualities (as taste, colour, &c.) remain?

W.—Do you think that the Lord Jesus had a real, substantial body?

D.—I do.

W.—One of the properties inseparable from bodies is extension; and figure is a property of all *living* bodies.

D.—I cannot deny that. But what do you mean to infer?

W.—Why this; that the extended substance of Christ's body, and one possessed of a certain figure, could not exist under the form of a wafer, or a crumb; and, further, that the body of Jesus Christ, like other real bodies, occupies a certain space, and *that only*, at any given instant. Now, Transubstantiation is altogether opposed to these clear inferences of reason.

D.—It is enough for me to believe that nothing is too hard for the Almighty, not even Transubstantiation, which I allow is a miracle and a mystery.

W.—No *miracle* is too hard for God; but Transubstantiation is not a miracle, which is a *fact*, though a preternatural one. Transubstantiation is an *absurdity* not of God's making; for it represents God as making a thing to be and not to be at the same time. This is either a juggle or an impossibility by the very terms.

D.—This is a bold assertion, which cannot be received without clear proof.

W.—They who teach that Transubstantiation is a work of God, represent God as making a visible substance to have all the properties of bread, and yet to have all the properties of a living human body at the same time; so that the same thing is figured in a particular manner, and is not so figured at the same instant; it is as small as a crumb, and yet full-sized as the body of a man; it is destitute of the characters of a *living* body, and yet it possesses them, and so on; for I need not go further with this chain of contradictions. A contradiction in terms is an *absurdity*; so that God Almighty's power is not derogated from by supposing that he does not work an absurdity.

D.—We cannot tell how far Christ's body may be altered so as not to be subject to the ordinary condition of human bodies.

W.—Was Christ's body so altered before his crucifixion?

D.—Evidently not.

W.—I argue, then, that whatever change is made now by the words, "This is my body," must have taken place when the same words were used by our Lord at the Last Supper. Therefore, your Church teaches that, at that time, the *natural body* of Christ, like in all respects to ours (sin excepted), was *seen* at the table distributing the portions of the consecrated bread; and, at the same time, it was wholly present in each of these portions, and, in fact, was the substance of them!

D.—It is, nevertheless, dangerous to doubt God's power to work the most incomprehensible wonder.

W.—But, I repeat, to make a thing to be and not to be the same, at the same instant, is, in fact, to do nothing but in pretence or imagination.

D.—After all, why do you make so much difficulty about the doctrine of the Catholic Church, if you hold all the time a real presence in some sense or other?

W.—I do hold Christ to be really present, but in a *spiritual* manner. Your objection may be pointed against Lutherans, but not against those whose profession of faith agree with the articles of the Church of England.

D.—Well, then, you hold at least, a spiritual presence, and in eating of the body of Christ after a spiritual manner. What so great matter if you were to hold also that Christ's body is there concealed under the qualities of bread?

W.—The adoration of the Host makes it a very great matter; for the Roman Church requires all in her communion to worship with the highest adoration the consecrated elements.

D.—But cannot one direct the act of worship to God the Son under the appearance of bread?

W.—The second commandment* forbids me to *worship* even God himself under the likeness of anything in heaven or earth, and, therefore, under the semblance of *bread*, as much as under the guise of a golden calf. For the Israelites pretended that they adored the god who brought them out of Egypt, while they worshipped their new idol. In fact, all manner of idolatry may be defended in that way, so long as the worshipper pretends to adore the true God under some material object which may be conceived to represent the presence of the Deity.

D.—We reject with abhorrence the calumny that we worship a breaden god. You may see in one of our books a curse pronounced against any one who does so?

W.—Because you believe that is *no longer bread* when you adore it. Therefore, you are not in your conscience worshipping a god of bread; but if no change take place, through defect of intention in the sacrificing priest, or by reason of some other defects which vitiate the consecration according to the rubrics of the Missal, what are ye then directing your most solemn worship to?

D.—To God always in intention.

W.—If you make a mistake it is an awful one; for idolatry is a fearful sin, whatever excuses may be made for it.

* In the "Abridgement of Christian Doctrine" the second commandment of the two tables is either omitted—as in the smaller catechisms for the use of the poor—or it is recited as part of the first while the number, ten, is preserved by the division of the tenth as it stands in Exodus.

D.—I regret to find, my young friend, that you are still unwilling to submit your own judgment to the infallible interpretation of the Church?

W.—I said at the beginning, sir, that I would hear *Christ's teaching* in his Church. But holy Scripture, my reason, and my senses, all assure me that Transubstantiation is not the doctrine of the true Church of Christ. Therefore, I cannot conclude that Transubstantiation is *true*, because the Church of Rome imposes it as a matter necessary to be believed; but rather, being convinced that it *is false*, I am persuaded that the Church of Rome teaches not as Christ does in this matter.

D.—You refer to the Holy Scripture; but I have not heard you bring forward any argument from it against Transubstantiation.

W.—May I ask you what are the sacramental elements after consecration by the priest?

D.—The bread is changed into the body of Christ; the wine is changed into the blood of Christ, really and substantially.

W.—Can they be afterwards strictly called bread and wine?

D.—Undoubtedly not.

W.—But our Lord Jesus Christ calls the wine after consecration the fruit of the vine (Matt. xxvi. 29)—*i.e.*, *wine* still. It is plain, then, that he did not know of the change which is called Transubstantiation. Nor did St. Paul; for that apostle calls the *consecrated bread* simply "this bread."—1 Cor. xi. 26. What Roman Catholic priest now would speak of the consecrated host as bread? If so, he *adored bread* when he consecrated it, which you repudiate.

D.—St. Paul, and even our Blessed Lord, may have spoken so in accommodation to the senses and common perception.

W.—That is, you allow a figure when the bread of the sacrament is called bread, or the wine, wine; but no figure at all when the bread is called the body of Christ, and the wine or the cup the blood of Christ?

D.—Always remember, William, that we have the unwritten word as our further guide. You are too confident in interpreting the written word by your private judgment.

W.—In this case, I have not only the words of Holy Scripture to satisfy me that the consecrated bread is still bread, and the wine, wine; but my senses also combine to assure me of the same; and, lastly, reason satisfies me with the clearest evidence that the contrary is impossible.

D.—I have not leisure at present to follow up this argument further. Good morning to you. When you are less confident in your own opinion, I shall be glad to talk further with you.

W.—Good morning, sir, I assure you I am quite open to conviction, if you will only satisfy me that your doctrine is that taught by Jesus Christ and his apostles. If you cannot do that, I rest upon what my reason and senses, as well as God's revealed Word, join in teaching me. Farewell.

TALK OF THE ROAD.—NO. XXX.

"Jem, it beats all this time," said Pat, when they next met on the road lately.

"What's in it now, Pat?" said Jem.

"Well, if the Pope is anything at all, he's a greater man than ever I thought he was," said Pat.

"What's his greatness now, Pat," said Jem.

"Sure, Jem," said Pat, "the Pope has got the Blessed Virgin Mary under his thumb (that's if it's true), and just orders her about, and lays out the work for her wherever he pleases, just as the bishop would with a curate."

"Why, how can that be, Pat," said Jem; "isn't she the Queen of Heaven? and wasn't a new crown put on her in heaven last December, when it was found out, at last, that she was conceived without sin? and, if she is greater now in heaven than she ever was afore, won't the Pope have to take his orders *from her*, instead of going to use her like a young curate just out of Maynooth."

"Well, Jem, I wonder you are that innocent," said Pat; "sure, wasn't it the Pope that put the new honour on her, and put the new crown on her head; and, if he could do that to her, why wouldn't she have to serve him better, and work for him more nor ever she did?"

"Well, Pat, there's reason in that sure enough," said Jem; "but what has the Pope put on her now?"

"Well, Jem," said Pat, "sure I got the loan of the *Tablet* newspaper,* and there's the whole story, how the Bishop of Meath had a meeting of a hundred of his clergy, on Saturday, the 21st of July, to tell them the news; and sure here's the paper for yourself, just to read what he told them."

So Pat pulled out the paper out of his pocket, and Jem read—

"His lordship called the attention of the clergy to a communication, under date the 11th of February of the present year, which he had had the honour of receiving from the Holy See, and in which the Holy Father was graciously pleased, in compliance with his lordship's humble supplication, to declare the Blessed Virgin Mary *sub titulo immaculatæ conceptionis*" (Jem had to *spell* this part of it), "to be henceforth A SPECIAL PATRONESS for the Diocese of Meath. His lordship, therefore, instructed the clergy to make known to their flocks the benign condescension of the Holy Father in conferring this high privilege on the diocese to which they belonged, and also to excite the ardour of their devotion to the Blessed Virgin, *under the illustrious title of the immaculate conception.*"

"Well, what do you think of that, Jem?" said Pat.

So Jem looked back at it again, and considered; and Jem said, "The Bishop of Meath got the start of them, anyway; sure it was about Christmas we heard it was found out that the Blessed Virgin was conceived without sin; and on the 11th of February the job was done, and the Blessed Virgin, conceived without sin, was set down for the Diocese of Meath; that was looking sharp, anyway," said Jem.

"Quick work, sure enough," said Pat; "but the bishop was in no hurry to tell the news, when he kept the letter five months in his pocket afore ever he said a word about it."

"How come *he* to be the first?" said Jem, considering.

"Well, he took the notion afore any other bishop," said Pat; "and mighty sharp it was."

"Wait a minute, Pat," said Jem; "I wonder is St. Patrick in heaven."

"Well, if he isn't, who is?" said Pat.

"And why but he asked *first*, when he had the start, and was on the spot?" said Jem; "and wouldn't *he* ask for his own old Diocese of Armagh? I wonder, now, does the saints in heaven intercede for the like of them things? But I'm thinking, now, maybe St. Patrick is at the back of the hills in heaven; for sure the Protestants say he was a Protestant, and maybe knew nothing about the immaculate conception; 'cause why, it wasn't found out in his time; and then how would he get the start about '*the illustrious title of the immaculate conception?*' Wouldn't he be just ashamed to go to ask the Blessed Virgin any favour about it, and he knowing that he never said one word for it, good or bad, in all his life? And sure I often think it's little we hear of St. Patrick now, and that little getting less every day; why, the Catholics seem to think they have got beyond him entirely; so maybe it wouldn't be any good *his* asking now."

"Why, man alive," said Pat, "don't you see the job wasn't done in heaven at all, but only at Rome?"

"Well, that makes it plainer," said Jem; "sure the bishop would get the start *there* afore St. Patrick. But I wonder *is* the Queen of Heaven under orders at Rome? Sure that isn't like being the Queen of Heaven at all! Wouldn't they have to take their orders from her?"

"Aye; but if it was the Pope that *made* her the Queen of Heaven!" said Pat.

"Well, that doesn't stand to reason," said Jem; "sure only God himself could make her the Queen of Heaven. And if He made her queen, would she be under the Pope's orders to run here and there whenever he bid her, to do whatever work he would lay out for her? Maybe it's to Botany Bay he will be sending her next. But what if it isn't the Pope that's setting her to mind Meath at all! What if it is herself, and that the Pope only tells what she is going to do herself? Sure that would be the great thing for the Diocese of Meath entirely."

"It would be the fine thing for them that lets lodgings," said Pat; "sure the lodging money should be higher nor at the salt water itself; why, wouldn't all Ireland be coming into Meath, the way they would have the Blessed Virgin herself to look after them. But it is my opinion, Jem, that the never a word was said to the Blessed Virgin about it, neither 'by your leave, nor with your leave.'"

"Well, Pat," said Jem, "sure the Pope couldn't have the face to go to put the Blessed Virgin to watch one diocese more nor another, without saying one word to herself about it. Sure doesn't the scapular say that the Blessed Virgin appeared to Simon Stock? And isn't there stories about her appearing to the Pope? And who knows but she come to the Pope, or the Pope went and axed her, and she said she was going to mind the Diocese of Meath herself."

"Not a bit of it, Jem," said Pat; "sure if Popes could talk to the Blessed Virgin that way, wouldn't she have told some of them, afore this, that she was conceived without sin? And more foreby, Jem, it's plain the Pope *didn't* say not one word to her afore he put the Diocese of Meath on her."

"And how is that plain, Pat," said Jem.

"Why isn't it here, in this newspaper," said Pat; "doesn't the bishop say that it was THE HOLY FATHER that conferred this privilege on the Diocese of Meath? And the bishop didn't say, nor the Pope didn't say to him, that the Blessed Virgin said it herself; and if she said one word to them about it herself, sure it's not *that* they would forget to tell."

"Well, but Pat," said Jem, "sure they might *say* the Blessed Virgin said it herself, whether she did or not."

"True for you, Jem," said Pat, "they might say that, as well as a deal more they do say; but then *they didn't think of saying it*. Sure if they went to do the job themselves, without ever axing the Blessed Virgin a word about it, or without a notion in their heads to ax her, why then they might *never think of saying* that she said it herself; but if she *had* come to say it herself, *that couldn't be forgot*, and they would be sure enough to tell it. So now you see Jem how it is; the bishop and the Pope just got it up between themselves; and they didn't think one bit about the Blessed Virgin that same time, not even enough to see that it would be only decent to tell a lie about her; that's what it is, Jem; and it was the great mistake entirely *for them to make*."

"But maybe, Pat," said Jem, "when the Pope has made the Blessed Virgin the special patroness of the Diocese of Meath, maybe she just hasn't one hand's turn to do for it more than she had afore; and then sure the Pope wouldn't have to go to ask her at all afore he put it on her, for it wouldn't make any difference to her, and so the Pope might do what he liked."

"And isn't that the pretty humbug to put on the Diocese of Meath," said Pat; "cooking them up with a fine name as empty as a sucked egg. And if people aren't one bit the better for having the Blessed Virgin for their SPECIAL patroness, how do they know but it's all talk, and no better, about her being a patroness at all? And sure it's only the Pope's word we have for that, when it's not in the Bible. If the Blessed Virgin is not a bit more of a patroness, and hasn't a hand's turn more to do for her clients, when she is made special patroness, sure it's all humbug the Pope writing over to make her special patroness. And if she *has* more to do for them, when the Pope has put it on her, who's the fool to believe that the Queen of Heaven, if she be the Queen of Heaven, could be ordered about, and have more work put on her by the Pope, without so much as a 'by your leave'? It's making too free with her entirely, so it is, if the Pope believes only the half of what he says about her. It's enough to make us see the way we are made fools of, in trusting to the Pope's word, and his letters, about patrons."

"But, Pat," said Jem, "tell me this, anyway; what *will* the people in all the other dioceses say when they see the march that was stole on them, and how the Meath people was up early enough to get the Blessed Virgin, conceived without sin, to themselves, before another could get a chance at her."

"Why, then, Jem," said Pat, "if they have any sense, isn't it proud they will be, that the Pope didn't go for to make fools of *them*, when he was up to his work."

"Well, Pat," said Jem, "it will be the proud day for Ireland when the people can't be made fools of, with things that no man with sense can believe, in what concerns their souls. But when *will* that day come at all?"

"When every man has his own Bible in his own hand, Jem," said Pat; "that's the day, and none other."

* July 28, page 472.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st. Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, AUGUST 16, 1855.

We have so frequently alluded in our pages to the works of St. Alphonsus Liguori as a fair specimen of the views of modern Romanism, that we are not sorry to be able to corroborate our views by giving our readers the following extract from the *Tablet* of 11th August instant, which satisfactorily proves that we have not exaggerated or misrepresented the true position of St. Liguori among the saints of Rome:—

"A correspondent enables us to give an outline of the Rev. H. Marshall's sermon at Clapham on the Feast of St. Alphonsus. That in the morning was preached by the Bishop of Southwark. Mr. Marshall's discourse was divided into three parts. In the first he dwelt on the mercies of God, showing for what purposes saints were sent into the world, and that each had his own peculiar work allotted him. After panegyrising other great saints he came to St. Alphonsus, who, he said, was emphatically *The Saint of modern times*. He spoke of him as the founder of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer, and replied to the arguments of those who preferred the active to the contemplative orders. They know not (said the Rev. preacher) from whence many of the graces we continually receive come to us; they think not of the pains in purgatory, which are shortened by the prayers of these holy contemplatives,

and by the indulgences which they obtain from the mercy of God. He showed how closely St. Alphonsus followed his Divine Master by seeking out the sinner and restoring him, by his preaching and his other charitable labours, to the grace which he had forfeited. Our Blessed Lord (said the preacher) shed one drop of His sacred blood upon His Holy Mother when standing at the foot of His cross, and another upon the beloved disciple; but upon the sinner, the penitent Magdalene, He poured forth a deluge as she embraced His feet. In the second part of his discourse he spoke of the writings of St. Alphonsus, *the sweet effusions* on which he seemed to have poured forth his whole soul and which embraced every subject of Christian meditation and practice. Thus we were instructed on the necessity of prayer and the Sacraments; on devotion to the Sacred Passion, the Holy Eucharist, and the Blessed Virgin, whose praises he preached and published during a long and laborious life, and who rewarded him with many wonderful favours. Your readers are probably aware that a new and much-improved English edition of the works of Saint Alphonsus is in course of publication by one of the Redemptorist Fathers—a work for which the Bishop of Southwark has obtained the especial blessing of the Holy See. A new translation of the "Glories of Mary" was lately published by Mgr. Weld, a beautiful Litany and Hymn (indulgenced by the Bishop of Southwark) in honour of St. Alphonsus were used on his feast, and the greatest devotion was manifested on the occasion. The Cardinal Archbishop has frequently preached at Clapham on this feast, and he observed on one occasion that there was not a confessional in England which was not more or less under the influence of the saint's mild theology. The new translation of the "Glories of Mary" (which may be had of Mr. Wallwork, Great Marlborough-street, Regent-street) is put forth with the Archbishop's approbation, who strongly recommends it to Catholics."

We have also before us at this moment a copy of the "Glories of Mary," published by Dolman, New Bond-street, and Dunigan, New York (1852), under the imprimatur of the Roman Catholic Archbishop of New York, in page 783 of which occur the following passages, some of which exceed (if possible) anything we have yet published as proofs of the *fervour of devotion* inculcated towards the Virgin by the modern Church of Rome:—

"The most holy Mary *revealed* to a soul devoted to her that it pleased her much to be honoured by her servants with the following devotions:—

"I thank Thee, oh Eternal Father, for the power given to Mary, thy daughter. Our Father; Hail Mary; Glory be to God.

"I thank Thee, oh Eternal Son, for the wisdom given to Mary, thy mother. Our Father; Hail Mary; Glory be to God.

"I thank Thee, oh Eternal Spirit, for the love given to Mary, thy spouse. Our Father; Hail Mary; Glory be to God.

"To thee we cry, oh Queen of Mercy, turn towards us, and let us behold thee *dispensing favours, bestowing remedies, giving strength*. Show us *thy* compassionate countenance, and we shall be safe.

"Oh mistress of all things—saint of saints—our strength and refuge—*God*, as it were, *of the world*—glory of heaven—accept those who love thee; hear us; for thy Son honours thee, and denies thee nothing.

"Come, hasten, oh lady, and aid with thy mercy thy most sinful servant, who invokes thee; and deliver him from the hands of the enemy. Who will not sigh to thee? With love and grief we sigh. How, then, shall we not sigh to thee, oh solace of the miserable, refuge of outcasts, deliverer of captives? We are secure that if thou dost see our miseries, thy compassion will not be slow to relieve us.

"Oh our lady and our advocate recommend us to thy Son. Obtain, oh blessed one, by the grace *thou hast merited*, that he who did condescend, with thy mediation, to become a participator of our infirmity and misery, may, also, by thy intercession make us to share in his blessedness and glory.

"In thee I have placed *the hope of my whole heart*. It is not possible, oh lady, that thou shouldst abandon him who places his *hope in thee*. If thou dost only wish for our salvation, it will be impossible that we should not be saved. Hail, daughter of God the Father; hail, mother of God the Son; hail, spouse of God the Holy Ghost; hail, temple of the whole Trinity.

"Oh Virgin, how beautiful art thou!

"Mother of my God, my heart is enamoured with thy goodness.

"Thanks be to God and to Mary.

"May all things be to the eternal glory of the Most Holy Trinity, and of the immaculate Mary.

"Live always, Jesus our love, and Mary our hope, with Joseph and Theresa our advocates."

We beg our readers to remember that the above effusion, not inferior, we think, even to the *Psalter of Bonaventura* in daring adulation, is taken, not merely from the undisputed works of a canonized saint, but of, emphatically, THE *Saint of Modern Times*, a work, too, for which (if we are to believe the Rev. H. Marshall, and the *Tablet*) the Bishop of Southwark has obtained the especial blessing of the Holy See!

We can scarcely trust ourselves to make any comments upon it, but we ask any of our readers whether they can either believe that the language we have quoted was *revealed*, or *safely* address to any creature, however honoured or exalted, the attributes, and even the name of God himself?

We read in the 46th Psalm—"God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble;" but, according to St. Liguori, Mary is to be prayed to as "our strength and refuge; *God*, as it were, *of the world*, and the glory of heaven."

We do not deny that there are passages in the above effusion which show that the Virgin is appealed to as an *intercessor* with her Divine Son, as well as the *dispenser* of favours, the *bestower* of remedies, the *giver* of strength, just as our blessed Lord himself is addressed by us as our *intercessor* with God the Father, and the *mediator* between God and man, though he is Himself one of the persons of the Ever-blessed Trinity; but let any man of ordinary understanding and straightforward principles say, whether even the most ingenious refinement can interpret *all* this to mean a *mere* invocation of the Virgin Mary *to pray for* the person who uses such devotions, or for his fellow-creatures. Is it not rather the language of one who was resolved, at all hazards, to exalt the Virgin to an equality with the Almighty, and to lead others to honour her *as* God? What effect must the circulation of such a book have on the large mass of persons to whom it is recommended by the highest sanction of the Church of Rome?

We solemnly think, not merely that the direct and practical tendency of such worship is to derogate from the honour due to the Ever-blessed Trinity, but that it has an inevitable tendency to render the Almighty himself an object of *fear*, and the Virgin an object of *love*: to invest Him, who is the father of mercy, and God of all comfort, with unapproachable majesty and awe, and the terrors of eternal justice; and then in direct and striking contrast, to array Mary with mercy and benignity, and compassionate tenderness and omnipotence in her love.

We find, in page 279 of the same volume, the following passage, strongly corroborative of what we have just said:—

"In the Franciscan chronicles it is related of Brother Leo, that he once saw a red ladder, upon which Jesus Christ was standing, and a white one upon which stood his holy mother. He saw persons attempting to ascend the red ladder; they ascended a few steps and then fell; they ascended again, and again fell. Then they were exhorted to ascend the white ladder, and on that he saw them succeed, for the Blessed Virgin offered them her hand, and they arrived in that manner safe in paradise."

"Mary is, in a word," as Richard of St. Laurence says, "the mistress of paradise, since she *commands* according to her pleasure, and introduces into it whom she will." Therefore, applying to her the words of Ecclesiasticus, he adds, "My power is in Jerusalem; I *command* what I will, I introduce whom I will. And as she is the mother of the Lord of paradise, she is, with reason, also," says Rupert, "the Lady of paradise. She possesses, *by right*, the whole kingdom of her Son."—Page 280.

We have always held that even to offer prayers to God in the name and through the mediation and intercession of the Virgin Mary—much more prayers *to her* for her intercession—was a departure from the ancient doctrine and practice of the primitive Church, and, in fact, one of the devices superadded to the original truths of salvation, which was directly repugnant both to the written Word of God and to the faith and practice of the primitive Church. Here, however, we have a doctrine and practice which leaves prayer to the Holy Virgin for *her intercession* with God far behind, and teaches a species of *worship* more suitable to the "glories" of a *goddess* than to the reverence due to the most exalted of women.

We hope our readers will bear us witness that we have never spoken disparagingly or irreverently of the Blessed Virgin Mary, or acted as if we thought that the cause of the Son of God is to be promoted, or his mediatorship or honour to be exalted, by decrying the worth and dignity of his mother. We trust that we, in common with every enlightened member of the reformed Church of England, shall never forget that she was "highly favoured," and "blessed among women." The Church of England, in her liturgy, her homilies, her articles, and in the works of her standard divines and most approved teachers, ever speaks of the Blessed Virgin Mary in the language of reverence, affection, and gratitude. But when we are exhorted by the saints of the Church of Rome to address supplications to the Virgin Mary, such as those we have above transcribed, and have no alternative but either to do so, or to protest against the errors of our fellow Christians, who, led away by the exaggerations of mistaken piety, consider St. Alphonsus Liguori as emphatically the saint of modern times, and a safe guide to follow, we can have no ground for hesitation—our love of unity must yield to our love of truth. We cannot join in a worship which would exalt a woman to the throne of the universe, and ascribe to her that sovereign power which is the exclusive attribute of God himself.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

In consequence of the large number of Subscriptions still unpaid, the publisher will, henceforward, be obliged to discontinue the paper to such *Subscribers* as are in arrear. A Blue Cover will, it is hoped, be taken as a sufficient notification. We have already explained the difficulty of making special applications.

SHRINES OF JERUSALEM.

The shrines of Jerusalem, which attract crowds of pilgrims from all parts of the Christian world, have been for a long time a subject of dispute between the Latins and the Greeks, and it is well known that the politico-religious complications in which Europe is at present involved have partly, at least, arisen from the claims of Russia relating to those shrines. It will, therefore, we think, be not uninteresting to our readers to see the *devout* manner in which these shrines are worshipped by the pilgrims of the Græco-Russian Church; and we subjoin the two following accounts of this subject, written at an interval of a century and a half, in order that our readers may be able to judge for themselves whether the progress of civilization during this period has had much influence on the pilgrims alluded to above.

Possibly some of our friends may deduce from the sad narrative useful hints as to how dangerous it is for the priesthood of any religion to *commit* themselves to practices which will not bear close examination; and how deplorable is the degradation of both priests and people where popular superstitions have been long sanctioned by ecclesiastical authority, and the people are, in consequence, not sufficiently educated and enlightened to shake them off for themselves.

The first of these accounts is an extract from the diary of an English clergyman, the Rev. Henry Maundrell, a Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford, and chaplain to the English factory at Aleppo, who visited Jerusalem in the year 1697:—

"*Saturday, April* 3.—We went about mid-day to see the function of the holy fire. This is a ceremony kept by the Greeks and Armenians, upon a persuasion that every Easter Eve there is a miraculous flame which descends from heaven into the Holy Sepulchre, and kindles all the lamps and candles there, as the sacrifice was burnt at the prayer of Elijah.—1 Kings xviii.

"Coming to the church of the Holy Sepulchre, we found it crowded with a numerous and distracted mob, making a hideous clamour, very unfit for that sacred place, and better becoming bacchanals than Christians. Getting, with some struggle, through this crowd, we went up into the gallery, on that side of the church next the Latin convent, whence we could discern all that passed in this religious frenzy.

"They began their disorders by running round the Holy Sepulchre with all their might and swiftness, crying out as they went, '*Huia!*' which signifies '*This is he*,' or,

'*This is it*,' an expression by which they assert the verity of the Christian religion. After they had by their vertiginous circulations and clamours turned their heads, and inflamed their madness, they began to act the most antic tricks and postures, in a thousand shapes of distraction. Sometimes they dragged one another along the floor, all around the sepulchre; sometimes they set one man upright on another's shoulders, and in this posture marched round; sometimes they turned men with their heels upwards, and hurried them about in such an indecent manner as to expose their persons; sometimes they tumbled round the sepulchre, after the manner of tumblers on the stage. In a word, nothing can be imagined more rude or extravagant than what was acted upon this occasion.

"In this tumultuous frantic humour they continued from twelve to four of the clock, the reason of which delay was because of a suit that was then in debate before the cadi betwixt the Greeks and Armenians, the former endeavouring to exclude the latter from having any share in this miracle. Both parties having expended (as I was informed) five thousand dollars between them in this foolish controversy, the cadi at last gave sentence that they should enter the Holy Sepulchre together, as had been usual at former times. Sentence being thus given, at four of the clock both nations went on with their ceremony. The Greeks first set out in a procession round the Holy Sepulchre, and immediately at their heels followed the Armenians. In this order they compassed the Holy Sepulchre thrice, having produced all their gallantry of standards, streamers, crucifixes, and embroidered habits on this occasion.

"Toward the end of this procession, there was a pigeon came fluttering into the cupola over the sepulchre, at the sight of which there was a greater shout and clamour than before. This bird, the Latins told us, was purposely let fly by the Greeks to deceive the people into an opinion that it was a visible descent of the Holy Ghost.

"The procession being over, the suffragan of the Greek patriarch (he being himself at Constantinople), and the principal Armenian bishop, approached to the door of the sepulchre, and cutting the string with which it was fastened and sealed, entered in, shutting the door after them, all the candles and lamps within having been before extinguished in the presence of the Turks and other witnesses. The exclamations were doubled as the miracle drew nearer its accomplishment, and the people pressed with such vehemence towards the door of the Sepulchre that it was not in the power of the Turks set to guard it with the severest checks to keep them off. The cause of their pressing in this manner is the great desire they have to light their candles at the holy flame, as soon as it is first brought out of the Sepulchre, it being esteemed the most sacred and pure, as coming immediately from heaven.

"The two miracle-mongers had not been above a minute in the Holy Sepulchre when the glimmering of the holy fire was seen, or imagined to appear, through some chinks of the door, and certainly Bedlam itself never saw such an unruly transport as was produced in the mob at this sight. Immediately after came out the two priests, with blazing torches in their hands, which they held up at the door of the Sepulchre, while the people thronged about with inexpressible ardour, every one striving to obtain a part of the first and purest flame. The Turks, in the meantime, with huge clubs, laid on them without mercy; but all this could not repel them, the excess of their transport making them insensible of pain. Those that got the fire applied it immediately to their beards, faces, and bosoms, pretending that it would not burn like an earthly flame; but I plainly saw none of them could endure this experiment long enough to make good that pretension.

"So many hands being employed, you may be sure it could not be long before innumerable tapers were lighted. The whole church, galleries and every place, seemed instantly to be in a flame, and with this illumination the ceremony ended.

"It must be owned that those two within the sepulchre performed their part with great quickness and dexterity; but the behaviour of the rabble without very much discredited the miracle. The Latins take a great deal of pains to expose this ceremony as a most shameful imposture, and a scandal to the Christian religion, perhaps out of envy that others should be masters of so gainful a business; but the Greeks and Armenians pin their faith upon it, and make their pilgrimages chiefly upon this motive; and it is the deplorable unhappiness of their priests, that having acted the cheat so long already, they are forced now to stand to it, for fear of endangering the apostasy of their people.

"Going out of the church after the event was over, we saw several people gathered about the stone of unction, who, having got a good store of candles lighted with the holy fire, were employed in daubing pieces of linen with the wicks of them and the melting wax, which pieces of linen were designed for winding sheets; and it is the opinion of these poor people that if they can but have the happiness to be buried in a shroud smutted with this celestial fire, it will certainly secure them from the flames of hell."—P. 127, *et seq.*, eighth edition, 1810.

Many people may, however, believe that scenes of such an outrageous description as that witnessed by Maundrell, might have happened in his time—viz., 1697, but that their repetition is quite impossible in our own enlightened age. The following account of the same scenes by Mr. Calman, whose veracity is attested by a high authority, and who had an opportunity of seeing it only a few years ago, which has been reproduced in a little, and now particularly interesting book, "The Shrines of the Holy Land," may enable our readers to judge of the influence which the boasted march of intellect has produced on the Græco-Russian pilgrims, who assemble every Easter at Jerusalem.

"To notice all that was passing," says Mr. Calman, "within the church of the Holy Sepulchre during the space of twenty-four hours, would be next to impossible, because it was one continuation of shameless madness and rioting, which would have been a disgrace to Greenwich and Smithfield. Only suppose for a moment the mighty edifice crowded to excess with fanatic pilgrims of all the Eastern Churches, who, instead of lifting pure hands to God, without wrath and quarrelling, are led, by the petty jealousy about precedency which they should maintain in the order of their processions, into tumults and fighting, which can only be quelled by the scourge and whip of the followers of the false prophet.

"Suppose, farther, those thousands of devotees running from one extreme to the other, from the extreme of savage irritation to that of savage enjoyment, of mutual revellings and feastings, like Israel of old, who, when they made the golden calf, were eating and drinking, and rising to play. Suppose troops of men stripped half naked, to facilitate their actions, running, trotting, jumping, galloping to and fro the breadth and length of the church, walking on their hands with their feet aloft in the air, mounting on one another's shoulders, some in a riding and some in a standing position, and by the slightest push are all sent to the ground in one confused heap, which made one fear for their safety.

"Suppose, farther, many of the pilgrims dressed in fur caps, like the Polish Jews, whom they feigned to represent, and whom the mob met with all manner of insult, hurrying them through the church as criminals who had been condemned, amid loud execrations and shouts of laughter, which indicated that Israel is still a derision amongst these heathens, by whom they are still counted as sheep for the slaughter.

"About two o'clock on Saturday afternoon, the preparations for the miraculous fire commenced. The multitude who had been hitherto in a state of frenzy and madness, became a little more quiet, but it proved a quiet that precedes a thunderstorm. Bishops and priests, in full canonicals, then issued forth from their respective quarters, with flags and banners, crucifixes and crosses, lighted candles and smoking censers, to join or rather to lead a procession, which moved thrice round the church, invoking every picture, altar, and relic in their way to aid them in obtaining the miraculous fire.

"The procession then returned to the place from whence it started, and two gray-headed bishops, the one of the Greek and the other of the Armenian Church, were hurled by the soldiers through the crowd, into the apartment which communicated with that of the Holy Sepulchre, where they locked themselves in; there the marvellous fire was to make its first appearance, and from thence issue through the small circular windows and the door, for the use of the multitude. The eyes of all—men, women, and children—were now directed towards the Holy Sepulchre with an anxious expression, awaiting the issue of their expectation. The mixed multitude, each in his or her own language, were pouring forth their clamorous prayers to the Virgin and the saints to intercede for them on behalf of the object for which they were assembled, and the same were tenfold increased by the fanatic gestures and the waving of the garments by the priests of their respective communions, who were interested in the holy fire, and who were watching by the above-mentioned door and circular windows, with torches in their hands, ready to receive the virgin flame of the heavenly fire, and carry it to their flocks.

"In about twenty minutes from the time the bishops locked themselves in the apartment of the Holy Sepulchre, the miraculous fire made its appearance through the door and the two small windows, as expected. The priests were the first who lighted their torches, and they set out on a gallop in the direction of their lay brethren; but some of these errandless and profitless messengers had the misfortune to be knocked down by the crowd, and had their fire-brands wrested out of their hands, but some were more fortunate, and safely reached their destination, around whom the people flocked like bees, to have their candles lighted. Others, however, were not satisfied at having the holy fire second hand, but rushed furiously towards the Holy Sepulchre, regardless of their own safety, and that of those who obstructed their way, though it has frequently happened that persons have been trampled to death on such occasions.

"Those who were in the galleries let down their candles by cords, and drew them up when they had succeeded in their purpose. In a few minutes thousands of flames were ascending, the smoke and the heat of which rendered the church like the bottomless pit. To satisfy themselves, as well as to convince the Latins, the pilgrims, women as well as men, shamefully exposed their bare bosoms to the action of the flame of their lighted candles, to make their adversaries believe the miraculous fire differs from an ordinary one in being perfectly harmless.

"The two bishops, who a little while before locked themselves in the apartment of the Holy Sepulchre, now sallied forth out of it. When the whole multitude had their candles lighted, the bishops were caught by the crowd, lifted upon their shoulders, and carried to their chapels, amidst loud and triumphant acclamations. They soon, however, reappeared at the head of a similar procession to the one before, as a pretended thanksgiving to the Almighty for the miraculous fire vouchsafed."—P. 121, *et seq.*

It appears, by comparing these two narratives of one and the same thing, though separated by a distance of a hundred and fifty years, that the only difference which will be found between them is, that in the time of Maundrell, 1697, the miraculous fire was produced in about one minute's time, whilst the performance of the same trick required twenty when it was observed by Mr. Calman. And, indeed, it has been justly observed by both these writers, that the exhibitors of the miraculous fire, having continued so long to practise this imposture, cannot leave it off without ruining their authority and influence over those whom they have thus been cheating for many centuries. This circumstance has been most pointedly expressed by the author of the work from which we have extracted Mr. Calman's description of this pious, or rather impious, fraud, and who says:—

"Had it been an occasional miracle, as time had rolled on, and truth had more and more illuminated the human mind, the practice might have been gradually discontinued. As the priests had grown more honest, and the people more enlightened, they might have mutually consigned these pious frauds to the oblivion of the darker ages; and if the blush of shame had risen up at the memories of the past, the world would have respected them the more for their honesty of purpose.

"But an *annual miracle*, always of the same specific kind, exhibited on the same spot, and at the same hour—an *annual miracle*—at what point of time should this be discontinued? and, if discontinued, would it not be manifest either that heaven had forsaken its favourites, or that all the past had been delusion and imposture?"—P. 127, 128.

Few, probably, will have read the foregoing narratives without having been reminded of a somewhat similar, and scarcely more decorous scene, which annually takes place somewhat nearer home than Jerusalem. We allude, of course, to the spectacle of the *annual miracle* of the liquefying of the blood of St. Januarius, at Naples, which might possibly have long since been discontinued, but for a similar apprehension on the part of the priesthood. We are sure that there are many enlightened Roman Catholics who are heartily ashamed of such exhibitions, and believe in the *miracle* as little as we do; but any of our readers who have not witnessed the ceremony, may like to see the graphic account given of it by an eye-witness in the present year, published in the *Illustrated London News* of 23rd June last. It is as follows:—

FESTIVAL AT NAPLES.

"The scene which we here present to our readers is the interior of the Church of Sta. Chiara, in Naples. It has a twofold interest—from its historical associations, and from the fact that the miracle of the liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius takes place annually in this Church, on the first Saturday in May. It was founded in 1310 by King Robert, who dedicated it to the Host; whilst his wife attached to it a monastery for the Sisters of Sta. Chiara. In this monastery are now educated the daughters of the first families of the kingdom. The Kings of the Two Sicilies are buried in this church; and the body of the first Queen of his present Majesty is not only the subject of a continued miracle, but works miracles—*Ipse dixit*. We now consider it however, merely as the site where once a year is wrought the noted miracle of the liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius. We premise, however, that King Robert commanded that the procession, on occasion of the grand fete of Corpus Domini, should walk from the Cathedral to this church, followed by the Sovereign and the grandees of the kingdom. That custom is still observed.

"On the first Saturday in the past month we went to see the blood of St. Januarius liquefied, and took up our station near the gallery erected for musicians on the right. The body of the church on each side was crowded with curious or devout spectators; on the left side of the altar, in the *best reserved seats*, were women of the lowest classes, who claim (and have their claims allowed) to be relatives of the saint, who suffered martyrdom A.D. 305. Above the arches, through these grated and highly-ornamented windows, or openings, we could catch a view of the nuns, who were looking down on the scene below. Poor creatures! it was their great field day. The choir performed some fine sacred music, and then at intervals the relations of the saint raised their voices in the loudest and most unearthly shriek, and some said they were praying or saying a rosary. The statue of the saint had been brought to the church in the morning, and now reposed on the high altar. His mitre, which was presented to him by the Council of Naples in 1713, cost 30,000 scudi. It is ornamented with 3328 diamonds, 198 emeralds, and 168 rubies. The pallium is of silver, and was made by Domenico Vinaccia, at an expense of 8,300 scudi. After

a long suspense, a general hush announced the approach of the procession from the cathedral. The spectacle was magnificent. One after the other, forty-seven statues of saints (who are the protectors of churches or religious bodies in Naples), followed by their respective orders or devotees, were taken round the church, and then carried back to the cathedral. As each passed the altar, the relatives of St. Januarius yelled or shrieked a prayer. The wealth expended on these statues must be immense; so great, indeed, that, though made at the expense of the several parishes of Naples, they are all kept in the cathedral, and are not permitted to leave it even for the annual fetes performed in their honour at the respective churches, unless a deposit has been made to the full amount of their value. The statue of the Archangel Michael, the special protector of Ferdinand II., was surrounded by the Regal Guard. The procession closed with the ampulla containing the blood of the Saint in a golden shrine, and under a canopy of gold and crimson cloth. It was carried by the Cardinal, and immediately preceded by the Seminaristi, Municipality, gentlemen of Court, and dignitaries of the cathedral, whilst a military band followed, playing several selections from the "Traviata." Prayers were offered on the high altar by the Cardinal, who, taking the ampulla in both hands, worked it round and round. Immediately behind was a light, at which his eminence, stopping every now and then, examined the blood to ascertain if it were liquified. At each disappointment there were murmurs and shrieks, and prayers uttered. The words it was difficult to distinguish; but they generally are as follows:—

Tu sei morto per la Santa Fede,
Impetra a noi la grazia della Santa Fede,
E facci il miracolo.

If the miracle is delayed longer than usual these words are uttered:—"Faccia giallinta, come tu sei dispettosa! Campione di Christo, tu sei un bello santo!" "You yellow-faced fellow, how spiteful you are! Champion of Christ, you are a pretty saint!" A little bell in twenty minutes announced that the miracle was wrought; and from doubt, remonstrance, and despair, everything was changed in a moment to rejoicing. There was a buzz of congratulation through the church. "Thankee, thankee, St. Genuarino," said a man by my side. "We shall be safe from the cholera and make plenty of wine this year," said a young priest. "Last year, sir, it took a long time to liquefy, it became indurated again, and, and—we had the cholera." We have no farther concern with this *miracle* than as a spectacle, and, therefore, suspend all other observations. The Neapolitan populace, who believe it most profoundly, never think of inquiring about it, and seem to have adopted the maxim of the ancient Germans—"Sanctius ac reverentius de Diis credere quam scire" The King, too, during the following week goes in state with all his court to the cathedral, to kiss the ampulla.

Correspondence.

ST. CYRIL OF JERUSALEM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—As you are rather severe in your last number on an eminent Father, whose catechetical lectures have come down to us as a valuable relic of antiquity—St. Cyril of Jerusalem—I think it but fair to call your attention to some passages from his works, which show that he was as great a lover of the Holy Scriptures as you yourself profess to be. As a lover of fair play, I hope you will have no hesitation in inserting them in your next number. I remain, sir,

Your obedient servant,
SCRUTATOR.

EXTRACT FROM ST. CYRIL.

"Embrace and keep," saith this eminent Father, "the faith which is now delivered to you by the Church, TAKEN FROM ALL THE SCRIPTURES; for as all cannot read the Scriptures, but some are prevented by unskilfulness, and others by occupation, lest any soul should perish through ignorance, we comprehend the whole doctrine of faith in a few verses. * * * And this faith I commend you to have as your *viaticum* through life, *and to receive nothing more besides it, not even if we ourselves should change, and speak contrary to those things which we now teach you*; nor even if an opposing angel, transformed into an angel of light, should seek to lead you into error. For although we or an angel from heaven should preach unto you another Gospel besides that which you receive, *let him be anathema.* And what you have taken in words, retain in your memory, and TAKE THE ORIGIN (Gr., *σύσταοιν*) OF EACH HEAD, at a fitting time, FROM THE DIVINE SCRIPTURES. For the sum of the faith was not composed as it pleased men, but the most important things (Gr., *καιριώτατα*), SELECTED OUT OF ALL THE SCRIPTURES, *complete one doctrine of faith.* And even as the mustard seed includes many branches in a little grain, so this *faith*, in a few words, incloses, as in a bosom, all the knowledge of piety contained as well in the *Old as in the New Testament.* Behold, therefore, my brethren, and hold fast *the traditions* which you now receive, and write them in the breadth of your hearts."*

"Who can know the deep things of God, except the Holy Spirit alone, *who has dictated the divine Scriptures?* And yet the Holy Spirit himself has not spoken in the Scriptures concerning the generation of the Son from the Father. *Why, then, should you laboriously inquire into those things which the Holy Spirit has not written in the Scriptures?* Why shouldst thou, who knowest not those things which are written, seek to penetrate what is not written? There are many questions in the divine Scriptures: we do not comprehend what is written. Wherefore should we fatigue the mind *about what is not written?* Let it suffice us to know that God begat his only Son."*

We readily comply with the request of our correspondent, and can assure him we have no wish to keep back any part of the writings of the Fathers, especially those relating to subjects on which all the earlier Fathers are in truth unanimous, such as the passages he has quoted from St. Cyril.

We are obliged to "Scrutator" for calling our attention to those passages, from which we think some important conclusions may be deduced.

The extract given from Cat. 5, p. 78, contains one of the most distinct statements to be found in the writings of the Fathers, that the original creed of the Church was drawn *entirely from the Holy Scriptures*, and is, in fact, nothing but a brief compendium of what is taught therein, and was not founded on an independent *tradition* orally delivered. It speaks indeed of *traditions*, notwithstanding their Scriptural origin, because everything contained in the Holy Scriptures was *transmitted* or *handed down.* The word *tradition* we could easily show is employed by the other Fathers just in the same way. It seems too obvious to require any argument to prove it, that the *traditions* of faith contained in the creeds, and derived entirely from the Scriptures, do not yield the slightest warrant for that *kind* of tradition relied on by the Church of Rome, which presumes to add *new* articles of faith, of which the ancient Church, even in the days of St. Cyril, had no conception, not only without warrant from the Word of God, but even against it. Again, can any one believe that St. Cyril would have spoken of the sonship of Christ as an impenetrable mystery, which no man could safely venture to explain, as he has done in the second passage cited, if he believed that there was vested in the Church a power of *developing* doctrines not revealed in the Holy Scriptures, as now taught by Mr. Newman, the head of the Roman Catholic University of Ireland.

We are so far from wishing to conceal such passages, or to deny that St. Cyril (with a good deal of superstition and credulity) held, theoretically at least, the same sound views of *Scriptural authority* as most of the Fathers in early times, that we have pleasure in adding a further passage to those to which "Scrutator" has called our attention, and which, perhaps, is still more striking than either of them. When treating of the Holy Spirit, St. Cyril says:—"*Let us speak only those things which are written;* if anything *be not written, let us not curiously* seek to know it. THE HOLY SPIRIT HIMSELF HAS UTTERED THE SCRIPTURES; He has said whatever He chose concerning Himself, and *all that we were able to receive.* Let us speak, therefore, those things which are dictated by Himself, for *what he has not said, we dare not.*"†

We would entreat our friend Mr. Power, who attaches so much weight to St. Cyril's authority, to weigh well the foregoing passages, and honestly say whether he believes that if St. Cyril had been at Rome on the 8th of last December, he would have *dared* to promulgate a new doctrine which the Holy Spirit has not uttered in the Scriptures, and which was unknown to the whole Church for, at least, twelve centuries.

LEGENDS OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—As you seem desirous of noticing the Roman Catholic literature of the day, allow me to invite your attention to a handsomely got up volume, printed by Charles Dolman, New Bond-street, entitled "*Legends of the Blessed Virgin*," collected *from authentic sources. By J. Collin De Plancey.* Translated from the French.

The translator, in his preface, apologizes for the title under which the sacred *narratives* which compose it are introduced. "Legends," or readings, are pieces of *sacred literature* (*legenda*, "to be read" as distinct from things *credenda*, or *agenda*, "to be believed or done"), not matters of faith, and, therefore, not of precept; but *edifying narratives*, which the faithful may read *with profit*, and which may, by God's blessing, be the means of arresting the attention of others to the marvels of the spiritual world. The volume contains, among other marvellous *legends*, that of the Holy House of Loretto, which, as you have already so fully examined its pretensions to be placed among the "*credenda*," or things "to be believed," I shall not occupy your time further with it.

Perhaps, however, you may find space to transcribe the following specimen of the *edifying* narrations contained in the book, which is taken verbatim from pp. 4-6.

I remain, sir, your obedient servant,
A CONSTANT READER.

THE SPARROW.

"Sancta Maria." "Holy Mary."

Holy Mary! How many charming legends are attached to the sweet name of Mary! Here is one which is generally regarded as a pious tale or parable.—

"In the early ages of Christianity, a pious solitary, great in the sight of God, but little known to men (though St. Bernard twice preached his panegyric, and composed the office for his festival), lived on the borders of the Aube, in a forest of Champagne. The ancient Gauls had here worshipped one of their gloomy divinities, for whom the Romans had substituted Saturn. The spot was thence called *Saturniacum*, when the solitary, whose name was Victor de Plancey came there, and built a chapel and a small hermitage.

"Numerous miraculous events followed this work. Among the most suprising were conversions, by which souls sold to perdition were redeemed to heaven; and hearts once frozen by egotism, and corrupted by vicious practices, were inflamed with charity, and brought forth such flowers of virtue as even the world is constrained to admire—phenomena which perplex the mind, but are easily explained by faith.

"The saint felt that the hours which he passed alone in his cell were the sweetest of his life. The only living creature near him was a tame sparrow, which he fed and cherished, regarding him as the emblem of solitude. Tenderly devoted to the Blessed Virgin, the holy hermit invoked her incessantly, and the only words he uttered aloud were, *Ave Maria!*

"Long accustomed to hear these words, and only these words, the sparrow learned to form them; and great (as may be imagined) was the joy of the recluse the first time the bird flew on his shoulder and cried in his ears, *Ave Maria!*

"At first imagining some holy spirit had come on a divine mission, the saint fell on his knees in reverence; but the bird continuing to chirp *Ave Maria! Ave Maria!* soon made him aware of the real source of those sweet sounds. The bird, from an innocent distraction, became a friend—almost a brother—*a praying creature of God!* He redoubled his care of him, and henceforth his solitude was agreeably enlivened.

"The modest bird, to whom the people gave the name of 'the little monk,' seemed on his part to share his master's joy. At the dawn of day his first cry was, *Ave Maria!* When Victor threw him his crumbs, the little bird *sang a grace of Ave Marias*; and on the hermit kneeling to his devotions, the bird would perch on his shoulder and softly whisper, *Ave Maria!*

"Victor cultivated a small garden. Could he for one instant have lost sight of the constant object of his thoughts, the faithful sparrow, on a tree, would have instantly recalled it by his *Ave Maria!*

"The christians of the country, who came to consult the holy hermit in their troubles and doubts, much esteemed the little bird; and, on saluting them with his little prayer, they could not consider it to be otherwise than a miraculous favour, accorded to the solitary by our Blessed Lady.

"The sparrow, when free, took short flights into the country; and, when the hermit, in his meditative walks, had rambled further than his wont from his cell, he was sure to be reminded by the bird chirping an *Ave Maria!*

"One day in spring, as Victor lay ill upon his mat, he opened the wicket of his cell, and his little friend flew out, as was his custom. A few minutes afterwards, Victor was alarmed at seeing a sparrow-hawk pursuing his favourite. The bird of prey opened his beak, and spread his talons to seize and devour the poor sparrow, when the little bird, almost feeling the sharp claws of his enemy, screamed out *Ave Maria!* At this wonder, the hawk, startled and terrified, arrested his course, and the gentle sparrow had time to reach the cell; and, falling on the breast of Victor, faintly chirped an *Ave Maria!* and died."

[ED.—From what *authentic sources* Mons. Collin de Plancey derived this *pious* tale, unless he be a lineal descendant from the holy hermit (whose sirname, we observe, he bears), and has received it by *unerring family tradition*, from "the early ages of christianity!" we are at a loss to conceive, and should, indeed, almost suspect that the writer was desirous of bringing "Legends of Mary" into ridicule, by commencing with such an unedifying fable, if the very next chapter in his "Legends,' was not one on the Council of Ephesus, in which St. Cyril of Alexandria, presided. We feel obliged to our friend for the volume, which we shall, probably, at a future period mention again.]

PADRE GUILIO ARRIGONI.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

(Translated from the Italian.)

MR. EDITOR—Reading to-day your most interesting journal, I was much delighted with the article, entitled "An Enlightened Roman Catholic Bishop." What your correspondent states as to the nature of his preaching is only the exact truth. He never used to speak of the Virgin or the saints, and when occasionally obliged to make some panegyric on them, he always invited his hearers only to imitate the virtues of Mary and the saints, but not to adore

* Cyril Hierosol. Cat. 5. De Fide et Symbolo, p. 78.

* Ib. Cat. 11. De Filio Dei, p. 151.
† Cat. 16. De Spiritu Sancto, p. 244.

them. His sermons were full of texts from the Scriptures, which, contrary to the usage of the Romish Church, he always cited in Italian. The Archbishop of Florence, the same who now causes those to be put in prison who read the Bible, ordered him to quote the passages from the Scriptures in Latin. Arrigoni obeyed; but after the citation in Latin, he repeated the same text in Italian. I was then a collegian, studying theology, to become, eventually, a priest. His sermons led me to study the Word of God, and I may say they were even one of the means which God made use of to liberate me from the darkness of Romanism, and to lead me, step by step, to the knowledge of Jesus Christ as my only Saviour.

I caused to be printed, in Florence, a sonnet in praise of this celebrated orator, which was sold about the streets of the city, and in the neighbourhood of the cathedral.

The following is the sonnet:—

"Dappoi che in Flora il tuo parlar s'udio
Veste un nuovo fulgor l' ALTARE e il TRONO:
E chino a terra, smascherato, il rio
Vizio stramazza di tua voce al suono.

Tuonor tuoi detti, ed in profondo oblio
Gli odii, le risse, e le vendette sono.
Tra preghi e l'ira provocato Iddio
Ferma il vento, la pioggia, il lampo, il tuono.

Mentre dai vite agl' inspirati accenti
Freme l' inferno debellato e vinto
Al vibrar de 'tuoi fulmini eloquenti.

Salve, eccelso orator, di mille onori
Ti ammanti l'arbe, perche il ciel ti ha cinto
La fronte giovenil di eterni allori."

The verse I have underlined compromised me.* I was expelled from the college, and exposed to persecution. This circumstance made me reflect, and from one circumstance to another I was led, finally, to abandon Rome and to embrace the Gospel. It is now, by the grace of God, 14 years that I labour in the vineyard of the Lord—to Him be the glory and the honour.

I remain yours faithfully,
SALVATORE FERRETTI.

* "Since thy preaching was heard in Florence
A new lustre invests the altar and the throne."

WHY ARE THE PRIESTS AGAINST INQUIRY?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

MR. EDITOR—As I was coming from the fair last week, I met Jerry; and, says I, "have you got the Douay Bible yet?" "No," says he; "I searched every shop in Keelovenogue, and never a one could I get for love or money. There were plenty of 'the Glories of Mary' and 'the Garden of the Soul,' and 'the Key of Heaven,' and 'the Path to Paradise,' but the never a Bible; but," says he, "I'll get one before long, if I have to send to Cork for it." "And," says I, "what makes you so eager to get it when your clergy are warning you against it?" "Why," says he, "the life is fairly worn out of me on account of it; for every dirty little spalpeen of a Protestant throws it in my face; 'and,' says he, 'sure it's in *your own* Bible;' 'and,' says he 'sure *your own Bible* says so;' 'and,' says he, 'don't you know *your own* Bible?' and I knowing no more about it than if there wasn't such a book in the world; and besides," says he, "what the minister says is true, 'twill do our religion no harm to examine it;' and it's myself thinks 'twould be a poor religion if it wouldn't stand examination; and," says he, "some things happened lately that have set me on more for examining our religion that ever I was." "What things?" says I. "Why," says he, "the great Father Ignatius was here lately, preaching in the chapel, and two Protestants came to hear him; but Father John wouldn't let them in. So the minister wrote to Father Ignatius next day, asking him to give a public lecture, that Protestants might attend, and offering him the use of a room any evening he wished, but he wouldn't hear of it, and ran out of the town that very day. I thought to myself if the arguments he gave us in the chapel were any good he needn't be afraid to let Protestants hear them; and, when the minister afterwards spoke to us about it, old Dan Hurley defended him by saying, 'that he was in too great a hurry to stop to lecture;' and then the parson began to laugh; 'and,' says he, 'boys, that's the real truth, he was in *too great a hurry;* and,' says he, 'it's a queer thing that your priests *always* seem to be *in a hurry* when we ask them to come forward with the Douay Bible, and prove their religion.'" "Well," says I, "that's a sore cut, and we haven't a word to say against it, for it's too true." "But," says Jerry, "I've worse to tell you yet. A few days since, old Dan met the parson in the street, and began about Henry VIII. being the first Protestant, and about 'Ward's Cantos,' and 'where was your religion before Luther;' and we all gathered to listen to them, and they began about the new doctrine the Pope has put on us; and Dan asked the parson why he wouldn't believe the Immaculate Conception? and the parson said, because he couldn't find it in the Bible; and he asked Dan whether St. Peter knew all about the Virgin? and Dan allowed that, of course he did, seeing that he lived at the same time, and was with her constantly. 'Then,' says the minister, 'isn't it a queer thing that St. Peter doesn't say one word about the Immaculate Conception?' 'But,' says Dan, 'new things are learned every day, and maybe 'tis only now it's discovered.' 'Well,' says the minister, 'I don't think it likely that anything could be found out now about her that wasn't known when the apostles wrote; and,' says he, 'do any of you remember the good old minister that was here some years ago?' 'We do, well,' says several of the boys. 'And do you think,' says the parson, 'that, in 1800 years, any person would be able to give a better description of him than you could now? or do you think that, in 1800 years, anything will be found out about him that isn't known now?' Well, the boys allowed that it would be foolish to suppose such a thing; and, says the minister, 'isn't it just as foolish to suppose that anything could be discovered now about the Virgin Mary that wasn't known to the apostles who lived at the same time with her?'" "What did the boys say to that?" says I. "Why," says Jerry, "we hadn't a word to say against it; but I'm coming to the worst of it now. The parson began to talk about the priests never coming forward, and Dan tried to defend them; for says he, 'they have too much to do, but I'm ready to meet you myself any day you like.' Well, the boys gave a cheer for him, and the minister made him fix the day before them all; so, when the day came near, the parson sent to him, asking what doctrine he would discuss; but Dan had got frightened, and wished to back out; but he had pledged himself before a large crowd, and both Catholics and Protestants were expecting it; so he was ashamed to say plainly that he wouldn't come forward; but what does he do but sends the minister word that he was ready and willing to meet him, but only *on condition that no person should be allowed to be present at the discussion;* that they two were to go into a room by themselves, and argue, without any person hearing them." "Well, Jerry," says I, "that's the meanest thing I ever heard. If Dan was afraid to meet the parson he should have said so honestly, but that was a dirty way of getting out of it." "True, for you," says Jerry, "and we were all ashamed of it; but, bad as that is, there's worse to come." "What could be worse?" says I. "Why," says he, "when the parson got Dan's message he was mighty vexed; and he wrote down to Father John, telling the whole matter, and asking him to take Dan's place, and defend the doctrines of his Church before an equal number of Catholics and Protestants; but when Father John's servant heard that the letter was from the parson, she wouldn't take it at all; and then the parson printed some papers on it, showing that Father John's servant wouldn't refuse a letter addressed to her master if he hadn't put her up to it." "Jerry," says I, "bad as the rest was, that beats all; sure 'twas true for the minister, the servant wouldn't refuse the letter unless her master had given her orders." "That's the plain truth," says Jerry, "and we can't look a Protestant in the face since; we're clean beat out of the field; we haven't a word left in us." "But," says I, "why didn't you get Humphrey to come forward, for the credit of the Church?" "Well," says he, "there's another bad story about that; *Humphrey's gone!*" "Gone!" says I; "what made him go?" "I'll tell you," says he; "while Humphrey came forward at the lectures to argue with the parson, all the boys in the town went to listen; they used to be packed as thick in the room as herrings in a barrel; and the minister had five minutes, and then Humphrey five minutes, to argue, and so on, for a couple of hours each night, and all Father John could do he couldn't keep the boys from it." "Did he try?" says I. "He did," says Jerry, "and there was the finest play-acting you ever seen, one Sunday in chapel on the head of it." "What play-acting?" says I. "Why," says he, "Father John made a plan with some of the old people that he would give the boys a fright, by pretending to curse them, and then the old people were to beg them off. So the next Sunday, Father John read out from the altar the names of the boys that were most forward in the business, and let on that he was going to curse them at once, so with that the old people came up and began to beg them off. 'No,' says Father John, 'if St. Patrick himself was to ask me, I wouldn't listen to him.' Well, they begged and besought him to let them off this once. 'By this and by that,' says he, 'if all the saints in the calendar were to intercede for them, I wouldn't let them off.' Well, the old women began to screech, and the children began to bawl, and such a howl you never heard as they set up; at last he began to soften a little, and in the end he let them off for that time." "And," says I, "were the boys much frightened?" "No," says he; "for I was told that one of them overheard the priest making up the plan with his father the night before; so they were only grinning all the time, for they knew how 'twould end." "But," says I, "what has that to say to Humphrey?" "Why," says he, "I'm coming to it as fast as I can; you see," says he, "when this didn't stop the boys going to the lectures, Father John saw that the only plan was *to stop Humphrey from coming forward;* for as long as he argued, the boys would go to listen." "And," says I, "how did he get Humphrey to stop?" "Well," says he, "I was present when the minister one day asked Humphrey why he had stopped coming. 'Well,' says Humphrey, 'the truth is, *I'm under a promise to Father John not to argue any more;* he sent for me one day, and, says he, "Humphrey, I beg of you not to argue any more with the minister; and," says he, "I make this request, not for my own sake, but *for God's sake;*" 'and,' says Humphrey, '*he spoke to me as pitiful as a child,*" and entreated me to give him a promise; *so I had to pledge myself not to argue any more.*'" "Well, Jerry," says I, "Father John was brought very low when he had to speak in that way to Humphrey." "True for you," says Jerry; "but he would have gone on his knees to him if it would *stop* the discussion." "But," says I, "what was he afraid of? sure Humphrey spoke right well, and gave the minister word for word." "Well," says Jerry, "I'm thinking it wasn't the minister Father John was afraid of, but the discussion itself; *for* the boys were getting such a liking for Bibles and books on controversy; and I heard the minister allow that there were many priests as clever as the Protestant ministers, and as well able to speak, and that 'that's the ministers they're afraid of, but the *spirit of inquiry* that would rise among the boys." "Well," says I, "there's some truth in that, for the priests are greatly against inquiry; but," says I, "you haven't told me yet about Humphrey leaving the town." "Well," says Jerry, "he stayed very quiet for some time, and never came forward at the lectures; but Father John felt afraid that he would begin again, as he had a great liking for discussion, and, moreover, the boys used to make a good collection for him after each argument; so he sent him off out of the place entirely, and that's how it came to pass that we couldn't get him to argue with the minister." "Well, Jerry," says I, "I've been thinking a deal about why our priests won't meet the ministers; and, I think, what Father John says must be the truth, that such holy men wouldn't be up and down with the likes of them." "Don't believe that," says Jerry; "for I can tell you, though the priests pretend that 'tisn't worth their while to argue with the minister, still they're fairly vexed about it, they're at their wit's end to know what to do; and," says he, "Father Ned, in the next parish, spoke from the altar about it, and had one of the minister's papers in his hand, and he defended the priests for not coming forward, and *that doesn't look as if they cared nothing about it.*" "And what reasons did he give?" says I. "Well," says Jerry, "he said to the people that twasn't afraid of the ministers they were, but that *their bishops wouldn't let them enter into discussion.*" "And," says I, "were the people satisfied?" "Well," says he, "the old people were quite satisfied, but the young people who had some spirit of inquiry weren't satisfied at all; 'for,' says they, 'he doesn't tell us WHY the bishops forbid it;' and," says Jerry, "its fretting me to say that even the Turks and Heathens have something to say for their religion, but we aren't allowed to speak a word for ours; and, if we ask the priest a question, it's only 'heretic,' and 'souper,' and 'jumper,' we get for our pains; and," says he, "I'm sure what the minister says is true, that many of the young priests would be ready and willing to dispute, but the old ones, *who have more sense,* won't let them; and," says he, "I can't help thinking it a bad sign of a religion to be so much afraid of inquiry; and," says he, "the Protestants aren't afraid of inquiry; they tell us to examine their religion, and try it by the Word of God; but," says he, "it's a bad sign of anything when it won't stand examination; and," says he, "that's why I'm so eager to get the Bible to examine for myself; for," says he, "if there isn't something wrong, why are the priests *so much against inquiry;* and," says he, "if we're wrong, I'm very sure the priests won't bear our punishment hereafter; and," says he, "I can't get that verse out of my head that we heard at Ned Bryan's—'*What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and suffer the loss of his soul?*'" Well, Mr. Editor, I wasn't so much against Jerry getting the Douay Bible as I was; for, surely, these things are enough to make us anxious to examine our religion; and, though I wouldn't touch a Bible myself for half Ireland, still I'd like to hear something out of it; and, if Jerry got it, he'd tell me what he found in it, and I wouldn't come under the priest's curse, for he didn't think of forbidding that.

Your humble servant to command,
DAN CARTHY.

† His own words.

FARMING OPERATIONS FOR AUGUST.

HARVESTING the corn crops should almost exclusively engage the farmer's attention this and the succeeding month.

Cabbages are becoming, like the parsnips and carrots, as much a farming crop as it has been hitherto a garden one; it will be, therefore, necessary that sowings of these valuable crops be made as early in the month as possible. Early York, Wellington, nonpareil, Fulham, or Vanack, some for planting out early in October, to come in early; the greater portion should be kept over for planting out in February and March for a general crop. The drumhead, green Savoys, hundred-headed cabbage, and borecole, for planting out during the spring months, for a general late crop.

Laying down with Clover and Grass Seeds.—This month is the best in the year for laying down with permanent grass seeds. There are many chances against spring-sown seeds; but those sown at this season have everything in their favour. The ground should be well pulverised and thoroughly cleaned for their reception. A little rapeseed may be sown amongst grass seeds at this period with advantage—say about 4 lbs. per Irish acre, if the land be rich; if poor, double that quantity may be sown.

Important Work on Controversy.

In the Press, and will be ready shortly,

THE "CONTROVERSIAL CORRESPONDENCE,"

Between R. W. KENNARD, Esq., London, and the Rev. PAUL MACLACHLAN, Roman Catholic Priest, Falkirk.

In Demy 8vo., price 5s. to SUBSCRIBERS ONLY.

This correspondence, conducted with great ability on both sides, has, at length, terminated by the withdrawal of the Rev. Mr. Maclachlan from the contest, who has republished the whole of his letters, WITHOUT THOSE OF MR. KENNARD! As such a proceeding is evidently unfair, it is intended that the entire correspondence, consisting of about 70 letters, shall be published, so as that the nature of the Controversy may be thoroughly understood by all parties.

Dr. Irving writes—"This is a remarkable publication. Mr. Maclachlan is sufficiently skilled in the Romish arts of controversy; but in logical dexterity, and even in theological learning, the priest is no match for the Protestant layman."

The Rev. John Evans writes—"This correspondence furnishes decidedly the best *Handbook* of the Romish Controversy yet extant."

The Venerable Dr. Croly says of Mr. Kennard's letters—"I sincerely admire their learning, reasoning, and spirit of Christianity; and I know of no production fitter to produce a more ample assurance in the mind of any man open to rational conviction." It has also been characterized as the "most important controversy that has taken place since the days of Stillingfleet."

The Controversy embraces the modern arguments of Romanists, having reference more particularly to History than Doctrine; and the Book will form an excellent companion to Dr. Cumming's Controversy with Mr. French, known as the Hammersmith Discussion, which is exclusively Doctrinal.

The Work is now publishing in one Volume, Demy 8vo, and will contain above 700 pages, with a copious and useful Index. Price 5s. to SUBSCRIBERS ONLY.

The names of Subscribers are requested to be sent as early as possible to WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

Just published, 344 pp. demy 8vo, price 6s. 6d.,

A Digest of the Evidence,

TAKEN BEFORE

THE SELECT COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS,

APPOINTED TO INQUIRE INTO THE WORKING OF THE

NATIONAL SYSTEM OF EDUCATION

IN

IRELAND;

WITH ADDENDA AND APPENDIX.

BY THE

REV. WILLIAM LE POER TRENCH, D.D.,

Rector of Killcreran, Diocese of Tuam, and one of the Honorary Secretaries of the Church Education Society for Ireland.

"Dr. Trench has extracted the Substance of the Evidence, on the subject of Public Education in Ireland, and has produced it in a concise and systematic form. His 'Digest' is intended to enable persons interested in the Educational movement in progress in Ireland, to understand, at a glance, the results of the inquiry alluded to."—*Athenæum.*

"The invaluable 'Digest of the Evidence,' by Dr. Trench, has placed the substance of the 'Blue Book' in a clear, comprehensive form before all those who are interested in this great question. It was a work of great labour, of no ordinary patience, and requiring the utmost discrimination. But the result has been eminently successful. The plan of the 'Digest' is admirable; and the subjects so well classified, that immediate reference can be made to the most important evidence on every branch of the inquiry. It is a volume which will never lose its interest, so long as there is a friend of Scriptural Education to be encouraged, and an advocate of a godless expediency to be put to shame."—*Christian Examiner.*

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London: Wertheim and Macintosh, Paternoster-row; Seeley, Jackson, and Co., Fleet-street; and Thomas Hatchard, Piccadilly.

New and Recent Works,

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

*** All Books above 1s. sent Postage free.

MEMOIR OF THE LIFE, WRITINGS, AND DISCOVERIES OF SIR ISAAC NEWTON. By Sir David Brewster. 2 vols. 8vo. 24s.

MEMOIR OF THE REV. SYDNEY SMITH. By his Daughter—Lady Holland. With a selection from his Letters. Edited by Mrs. Austin. 2 vols. 8vo. 28s.

MEMOIRS AND A SELECTION FROM THE LETTERS OF THE LATE REV. CHARLES JERRAM. Edited by the Rev. James Jerram. 10s. 6d.

PILGRIMAGE FROM THE ALPS TO THE TIBER; or, the Influence of Romanism on Trade, Justice, and Knowledge. By the Rev. J. A. Wylie, LL.D. 7s. 6d.

THE END; OR, THE PROXIMATE SIGNS OF THE CLOSE OF THIS DISPENSATION. By the Rev. Dr. Cumming. 7s.

REPLY TO THE REV. DR. CUMMING'S LECTURES ON "THE END OF THE WORLD." With a slight glance at his "Apocalyptic Sketches." By H. Bland, Comedian. 2d.

MAUD, AND OTHER POEMS. By Alfred Tennyson, Poet Laureate. 5s.

THE WAR: FROM THE LANDING AT GALLIPOLI TO THE DEATH OF LORD RAGLAN. By W. H. Russell, Correspondent of the *Times* 5s.

THE CRIMEA, ITS ANCIENT AND MODERN HISTORY: the Khans, the Sultans, and the Czars. By the Rev. Thomas Milner. 10s. 6d.

THE CRIMEA, its Towns, Inhabitants, and Social Customs. By a Lady resident near the Alma. 2s. 6d.

THE SOUTHERN CROSS AND THE SOUTHERN CROWN; or, the Gospel in New Zealand. By Miss Tucker. 3s. 6d.

THE FOOTSTEPS OF ST. PAUL. By the Author of "The Faithful Promiser." 5s.

THE HISTORY OF WOMAN, and her Connection with Religion, Civilization, and Domestic Manners, from the earliest periods. By S. W. Fullom. 5s.

MINISTERING CHILDREN, a Tale; dedicated to Childhood. By the Author of "Visits to the Poor," &c. 5s.

THE BISHOP OF OSSORY'S CHARGE TO THE CLERGY OF THE DIOCESE OF OSSORY, FERNS, AND LEIGHLIN, in September, 1854—The Irish Education Question. 2s. 6d.

A SCHOOL ATLAS OF ASTRONOMY. Comprising, in eighteen Plates, a complete Series of Illustrations of the Heavenly Bodies. By A. Keith Johnston. 12s. 6d.

AN EASY GUIDE TO THE CONSTELLATIONS. With an Atlas of the Stars. By James Gall, jun. 1s.

MY NOVEL; OR VARIETIES IN ENGLISH LIFE. By Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton. 2 vols. 4s.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE BRITISH FERNS, AND THEIR ALLIES. By G. W. Francis, F.L.S. 5s.

MOORE'S POPULAR HISTORY OF BRITISH FERNS, AND THEIR ALLIED PLANTS, Comprising the Club-mosses, Pepperwort, and Horse-tail. With Coloured Illustrations. 10s. 6d.

HANDBOOK of ANGLING: teaching Fly-fishing, Trolling, Bottom-fishing, and Salmon-fishing. By Ephemera. 5s.

THE SEASIDE BOOK: being an Introduction to the Natural History of the British Coasts. By W. H. Harvey, M.D. New Edition. 5s.

A BOOK FOR THE SEASIDE. With Numerous Engravings. 3s. 6d.

A POPULAR HISTORY of BRITISH SEA-WEEDS, With Notices of some of the Fresh-water Algæ. By Rev. D. Landsborough. 10s. 6d.

GLAUCUS; OR, THE WONDERS OF THE SHORE. By Rev. Charles Kingsley. 3s. 6d.

FRASER'S HANDBOOK FOR IRELAND. New Edition. 10s. 6d.

BLACK'S GUIDE-BOOK FOR TRAVELLERS IN IRELAND, 5s.; Scotland, 8s. 6d.; England and Wales, 10s. 6d.; Wales, 5s.

BRADSHAW'S GUIDE-BOOK TO PARIS AND THE EXHIBITION. 2s. 6d.

BRADSHAW'S ILLUSTRATED HANDBOOK TO FRANCE. 5s.

BRADSHW'S CONTINENTAL RAILWAY GUIDE, AND GENERAL HANDBOOK. 3s. 6d.

In the Press, and Will be Published Shortly,

Macaulay's History of England. Vols. III. and IV.

The names of Subscribers are being received by WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

Just Published, Demy 8vo, price 6d.; by post, 7d.,

A SHOCK OF CORN FULLY RIPE.

A SERMON,

PREACHED ON THE OCCASION OF THE DEATH OF THE LATE

ARTHUR GUINNESS, ESQ.,

IN BETHESDA CHAPEL,

On Sunday, June 17, 1855,

BY THE REV. JOHN ALCOCK, A.M.,

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London: Wertheim and Macintosh.

Just Published, 18mo, cloth, price 1s. 6d.,

St. Patrick's Cathedral,

A TALE OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

BY

LUCY O'DONNELL.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London, Wertheim and Mackintosh.

Now ready, foolscap 8vo, cloth, gilt, price 6s.,

O'GORMAN'S

PRACTICE OF ANGLING,

PARTICULARLY AS REGARDS IRELAND.

"Mr. O'Gorman is a devotee of the noble arts of fly-fishing and trolling. He is familiar with the rivers and lakes of Ireland, as well as with the characteristics of the country. In his 'Practice of Angling' he gives full directions upon all subjects, not even omitting the inferior kinds of fishing."—*Spectator.*

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London: Wertheim and Mackintosh.

Just Published, price 1s. 6d., Cloth,

The Irish Widow;

OR,

A Picture from Life of Erin and her Children.

By the Author of

"POOR PADDY'S CABIN."

London: WERTHEIM and MACINTOSH. Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Just published, in 8vo, 420 pp., with Map, price 3s. 6d., Cloth,

Old Testament Prophecies,

Relative to the Return and Restoration of the Twelve Tribes to the Land of Palestine, together with the setting up of Messiah's Kingdom on Mount Zion, during a period of One Thousand Prophetic years.

BY JAMES ALLIN.

London: Wertheim and Macintosh, Paternoster-row. Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Just published, SECOND EDITION, small 8vo, cloth, elegant, Price 4s. 6d.,

OUR FRIENDS IN HEAVEN;

OR,

The Mutual Recognition of the Redeemed in Glory Demonstrated.

BY THE

REV. J. M. KILLEN, M.A., COMBER.

"Here is a subject of touching interest very well treated. Mr. Killen argues on right principles, and comes to a right conclusion."—*Church of England Magazine.*

Edinburgh: Shepherd and Elliot. Dublin: William Curry and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher, WILLIAM CURRY, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.
AUGUST, 1855.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Sloinn do Dhia an fna hárduibh, agus síodcáin air an talamh deagdoil do na dáoinibh.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED THE MIDDLE OF EVERY MONTH, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. IV.—No. 45. SEPTEMBER 15, 1855. { Annual Subscription, 2s. &c.; Unstamped Copies, 3d. each. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
The Priests of Italy	97
The History of Purgatory	98
Why the Church of Rome discountenances the General Study of the Bible	99
Roman Catholic Moral Theology—No. V.	100
The Succession of the Popes	102
Talk of the Road—No. XXXI.	103
The Sure Foundation	103
The Campagna di Roma	104
CORRESPONDENCE:	
On the Church of Christ—by John Miller	105
How Poor Irishmen get Bibles—by Dan Carthy	106
Christ and His People	107
On the Immaculate Conception—by H. C. O.	107
Farming Operations for September	107

THE PRIESTS OF ITALY.

WHEN travelling in the north of Italy, many years since, we became acquainted with a Genoese priest, of great simplicity of mind and amiability of manners, who made a very earnest effort to convince us that there was no religion of the *heart* outside the pale of the Roman Catholic Church, and who *did* convince us that it was quite possible so to train the mind as not only to contract it to a very narrow view of things, but to make it believe, with the blindest faith, things which, to men of a more enlarged sphere of vision, are self-evident absurdities, unworthy of a moment's serious thought.

It is not our intention to trouble our readers with any narrative of the mediæval legends which this good priest repeated for our edification, and relied on as if they were "demonstration strong as proofs of holy writ" of the truth of the Church to which he belonged. We have no wish to render ridiculous an individual who, though credulous, was earnestly sincere, and represents, we believe, a numerous class among his order in other countries as well as Italy; and we merely refer to the occurrence because we have, ever since, been practically convinced that it is a grievous error, or a gross calumny, for Protestants to represent *all* Roman Catholic priests as *intentional* deceivers of the people, though we fear no stretch of Christian charity can exculpate the *whole* of them from such a charge.

We have been confirmed in the views which we adopted so long ago, from our own personal observation, by the testimony recently given by two unprejudiced Protestant clergymen, who have travelled extensively in Italy, and have published the conclusions to which their own minds had arrived upon the subject, after an extensive acquaintance with Italian society. We allude to the Rev. M. Hobart Seymour, in his "Mornings among the Jesuits at Rome," and the Rev. J. A. Wylie, in his "Pilgrimage from the Alps to the Tiber."

The former eminent writer (p. 269) narrates a conversation which he had at Rome with one of the priests of the Collegio Romano, who was defending the reality of the conversions and the holiness of the American Indians who had been converted by their missionaries, in which he stated, that what he called a most wonderful miracle had occurred when the missionary was administering the holy communion to them. "He was holding," said the priest, "the host in his fingers thus"—my friend suiting the action to the word—"and, as the poor Indian was too far from him, the missionary priest could not place the host in his mouth, the poor, humble, devout Indian knelt so far away that the priest could not reach him"—and here my reverend friend lifted his hands in an attitude of awe, looked devoutly to heaven, and then earnestly and solemnly addressed me—"the host *flew out of his fingers*, flew over to the poor Indian, and *flew into his mouth!* Oh," he added, in a tone of the most reverential devotion, "the blessed Lord Jesus so loved that poor savage, that he longed to enter into his heart, and thus miraculously flew into his mouth! How anxious he was to get into him!"

"I could no longer doubt the sincerity of this priest; there was a fervour, an earnestness, a devotion of manner, that showed he fully believed what he thus narrated, and the personal character of the man was such that I had no right to doubt him after so solemn a statement. He narrated it as a miracle wrought by God in behalf of the Church of Rome. He mentioned it as illustrating the blessing of God upon the missions of that Church. He, believing that the age of miracles is not yet passed, but that miracles are still constantly working, imagined that his narrative would be credited by me; but it only proved to my mind that the missionary priest had evidently invented the story to exalt and magnify his own labours, and was now telling it among his brother Jesuits of the Collegio Romano, that such of them as were simple, and credulous, and superstitious enough to believe it, might spread it through the world as a new testimony of God to the Church of Rome. My reverend friend evidently believed it, and expected that I should believe it.

"I shall never forget," adds Mr. Seymour, "this portion of our conversation. It was a practical confutation of those—and, I must confess, I was myself once among the number—who suppose that the Romish priests are all infidels; that the simple, and superstitious, and ignorant may, perhaps, believe what they are taught, but that the talented and educated are infidel as to some of the doctrines which they inculcate. I am fully persuaded that, while this may be true of some, it is not true of many whose acquaintance I was enabled to make during my residence at Rome. They were educated, learned, astute, and talented men, and, yet, they believed things contrary to all experience, reason, and revelation. The reverend Jesuit who made to me the communication respecting these Indians was one of the most polished and educated men at Rome; he was conversant with the entire range of European literature; he spoke English, German, and French with almost the same facility as his native Italian, and was as learned and astute as a man might be expected to be who was selected for a professorship in the principal educational establishments of the order of Jesuits at Rome. He fully believed, and expected me to believe, his narrative. This, certainly, is a phase of mind not very intelligible in England; but when it is considered that these men are brought up from childhood in certain principles, that they are taught to believe implicitly everything which the Church is said to teach; that they never see the holy Scriptures, which might call in question the principles which they are thus taught; that believing that miracles are still as constantly wrought as in the days of the apostles; that looking on every doubt in the mind as a horrid infidelity, to be hated and loathed, and the source of every woe, here and hereafter; that being thus habituated to receive implicitly everything that seems to come in conformity with the Church, their minds are in a different train, and act on a different principle altogether, and they must not be judged by the same rules as might hold among us whose minds are so differently constituted and trained. I am fully convinced that, in supposing all these men—however it may be with some—to be secretly infidels, we do them the greatest injustice. I am satisfied that multitudes among them believe, with the fullest and most implicit faith, the dogmas of their Church; and, therefore, instead of regarding them as the hypocrites, and monsters of deception and wickedness, which such a supposition implies, I regard them as melancholy evidences of the fall of human nature, and sad monuments of the shipwreck of the human judgment, evidencing to the world that no reach of human intellect, and no grasp of mental genius, and no range of this world's learning, can bring the true and saving knowledge of God to the mind or heart of man. The record may be a saddening one, but it is true—'The world by wisdom knew not God.'"

Our readers will probably remember a letter of the ex-Abbé Miel, which we published in our last December number (vol. iii., p. 151), presenting a similar tolerant and charitable view of the characters of the priesthood of his native country (France), and in which he satisfactorily explains the process by which the mind may be—and, in fact, practically is—trained to confide in the merits of an unreasoning assent, and to precipitate itself into the bosom of a faith justly called blind, and which would treat temptations against faith in the same category as temptations against chastity, and make the supreme virtue consist in believing without proof, and almost hating reason.

The Rev. Dr. Wylie, in p. 418, thus deals with the subject:—"The first question that arises is, in what light do the priests in Italy regard their own system? Do they look upon it as an unrivalled compound of imposture and tyranny—a cunning invention for procuring mitres, tiaras, purple robes, and other good things for themselves? or do they regard it as, indeed, founded in truth, and clothed with the sanction of heaven? They are behind the scenes, and have access to see and hear many things which are not meant for the eye and ear of the public. The man who pulls the strings of a winking Madonna can scarce persuade himself, one should think, that the movement that follows is the effect of supernatural power. The priest who liquefies the blood of St. Januarius, by the warmth of his hand, or the warmth of the fire, must know that what he has performed is neither more nor less than a very ordinary juggle. The monk who falls a rummaging in the catacombs, or in any of the old graveyards about Rome, and finds there a parcel of decayed bones, which he passes off as those of St. Theodosia or St. Athanasius, but which are as likely to be the bones of an old pagan, or a Goth, or a brigand, can hardly believe, one should suppose, his own tale. If the Pope believes in his own relics, what conceptions must he have of Peter? What a strange configuration of body must he believe the apostle to have had! Peter must have been a man with several heads, a score of arms, and a hundred fingers or so on each arm; in short, a perfect realization of the old pagan fable of the giant Briareus. The Pope must believe this, or he must believe that he gives his attestation to what is not true. Above all, one can hardly imagine it possible that any man, in whom reason had not been utterly quenched, could believe in the monstrous dogma of transubstantiation. What! can a priest, at any hour he pleases, give existence to Him who exists from eternity? Can he enclose within a little silver box that Almighty One whom the heaven, even the heaven of heavens, cannot contain? Let a man confess, at the bar of any court of justice, that he believes himself to be God, and the court will pronounce that man as insane, and will hold him incompetent to manage his affairs. Seeing, then, the priests are called every day to do things which their senses must tell them are juggles, and to profess their belief in dogmas which their reason must tell them are monstrous and blasphemous absurdities, is it possible, you ask, that the priests in Italy can believe in their own system? I must here say, that I *do* think the *majority* of them do believe in it.

"A considerable number, however, of the priests of Italy are Infidels. They no more believe in the Pope than they believe in the pagan Jupiter. But, then, were they to speak out their disbelief, and to say that purgatory is a mere bugbear for frightening men and getting their money, they know that a dungeon would instantly be their lot; and infidelity has little of the martyr spirit in it. These men, like Leo the Tenth—as thorough an infidel as ever lived—hold that it would be the height of folly to quarrel with a fable that brings them so much gain. Others are mere worldly men. They were never at the pains to inquire whether their system is true or false. They sing their Mass in the morning; they pass their afternoons at the café, sipping coffee, and taking a hand at cards; a stoup of wine washes down a substantial dinner; and, after a saunter along the Corso, or an airing on the Pincian, they doff their clerical vestments, and go to sup with the nuns, who have the reputation of being excellent cooks.

"Others there are whose minds are occasionally visited with strong misgivings. The cloud, so to speak, will open for a moment, and reveal to their astonished sight, not the majestic form of truth, but a gigantic and monstrous imposture. A mysterious hand, at times, lifts the veil, and lo! they find themselves in the presence, not of a divinity, but of a demon. They disclose their doubts when they next go to confession. 'My son,' says the father confessor, 'these are the suggestions of the evil one. You must arm yourself against the tempter by fasting and penance.' A hair shirt or an iron girdle is called in to silence the voice of reason and the remonstrances of conscience; and here the matter ends. And there are a few—in every age there have been a few such in the Church of Rome, and at present they are very considerably on the increase—who, in the midst of darkness, by some wondrous means, have seen the light. A tract, a Bible, or some Protestant friend whom Providence had thrown in their

way, or some one of the few passages of Scripture inserted in their Breviary, may have taught them a better way than that of Rome. Instead of stopping short at the altar of Mary, or any of the thousand shrines which Rome has erected between the sinner and God, they go at once to the Divine mercy-seat, and pour their supplications direct into the ear of the Great Mediator. You ask, why do these men remain in a Church which they see to be apostate? Fain would they fly, but they know not how or where. They lift their eyes to the Alps on one side—to the ocean on the other. Alas! they may surmount these barriers; but more difficult still than to scale the mountains or to traverse the ocean is it to escape the power of Rome. Woe to the unhappy man who begins to feel his fetters! He awakes to find that he is in a wide prison, with a sentinel posted at every outlet, escape seems hopeless, and the man buries his secret in his breast.

"Some few there are who, more daring by nature, or especially strengthened from above, adventure on the immense hazards of flight. Of these some are caught, thrown into a dungeon, and are heard of no more. Others find their way to England, or some other Protestant state. But here new trials await them. They are ignorant of our language, perhaps. They find themselves among strangers, whose manners seem to them cold and distant. They are without means of living, and, carrying with them too, it may be, some of the stains of their former profession, they encounter difficulties which are the more stumbling that they are unexpected. On these various grounds, the number of priests who leave the Church of Rome has been, and always will be, small, till some great revolution or upbreak takes place in that Church.

"But, making the most ample allowance for all classes—for the men who are atheists and infidels—for the mere worldlings, whose only tie to their Church is the gain it brings them—and for those who are either doubters, or whose doubts have passed into full conviction that the Church of the Pope is not the Church of Jesus Christ—making, I say, full allowance for all these, I have little doubt that the majority of the priests in Italy—it may not be much more than a majority, but still a majority—are sincere believers in their system."

Such is the picture drawn from their own personal observations by eye-witnesses well capable of judging correctly of the characters of the priesthood of Italy—a sad picture indeed, but one that ought to excite our compassion rather than our hostility, and lead us fervently to bless God who has not subjected us to similar difficulties or trials, or, at least, has lightened them by the sympathies of that numerous class among our fellow-countrymen who have imbibed the spirit of true Christianity under the freer atmosphere of Britain, where, thanks be to God for his mercies, a man may follow the dictates of revelation without extinguishing or abandoning his reason, and sincerely feel and fearlessly maintain that the lights of reason and revelation equally emanate from the throne of God.

HISTORY OF PURGATORY.*

The doctrine of purgatory, or a place of expiatory suffering into which the faithful pass at death, nowhere occurs in the writings of the early fathers. Tertullian, in the second century, contended for a sort of *negative* purgatory, consisting merely in the delay of final complete happiness.† Cyril, too, in the middle of the fourth century, approves of this notion, but adds that MANY, even then, denied that the souls of the departed, whether they quitted this world with sin or without sin, could be at all benefited by the prayer offered up on their behalf over "the holy and most tremendous sacrifice of the eucharist."‡ Ambrose, too, who lived in the last quarter of the fourth century, says that those whose sins have not been expiated in this life, will experience a purgatorial fire during the period which will elapse between the first and the final resurrection; and he adds, that the punishment of some will extend even beyond the final resurrection.§ Augustine, the pupil of Ambrose, speaks more fully on this subject, although his views display considerable hesitation and inconsistency. The passage in which the doctrine of a purgatory is most clearly stated, is the following:—

"By that transitory fire—concerning which the apostle says, 'he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire'—not deadly, but only minute sins are purged. Whoever is conscious that any deadly sin rules within him, that person, unless he shall have worthily reformed himself, and (if space be afforded him) shall have done penance for a long time, and shall have been bountiful in almsgiving, and shall have abstained from sins, that person cannot be purged in the transitory fire of which the apostle speaks, but the eternal fire will torment him without any remedy. . . . But if we neither give thanks to God in tribulation, nor buy off our sins by good works, we must, in that case, remain in the fire of purgatory just so long a time as it may require to burn away our smaller sins, like 'wood and hay and stubble.'"‖

From other passages of his works it is clear that he placed the period of this purgatorial fire at the end of the world.*

It thus appears, that those fathers of the first four centuries who make the slightest reference to any future temporary suffering, differ from each other, not only as to its nature, but, also, as to the period of its occurrence. The Church of Rome, again, differs from all these fathers, and makes purgatory a place of torment into which souls pass *at once*. Without quoting, then, the numerous testimonies of the early fathers who oppose this notion, it is abundantly evident, from the diversities of opinion already noticed, that the dogma of a purgatorial fire, as now held in the Church of Rome, possessed no place in the creed of Christians during the first four centuries.

It was not until the end of the sixth century that the existence of a place of expiatory suffering, into which men passed at once, was inculcated as the doctrine of the Church. The merit of this discovery belongs, unquestionably, to Gregory the Great. In the fourth book of his *Dialogues*, he gives several marvellous revelations concerning the world to come, which, as he says, had been made known to men, "now that the end of all things was approaching." It does not appear that Gregory considered that there existed any common receptacle of souls, in or near hell, as is taught by Romanists. On the contrary, he distinctly mentions divers localities in which the souls of men were confined till they were purged from sin. In his book of dialogues, for instance, he relates how the master of a bath, in consequence of his sins, was compelled, after death, to act as servant in the bath, until due satisfaction for him was made. It fortunately happened that a priest became acquainted with the circumstance, and offered mass on his behalf for one week; on which the man at once disappeared (lib. iv.).

The introduction of purgatory into the Latin Church must, then, we think, be assigned to Gregory the Great. It was, however, long before the doctrine was generally received. Its progress was, doubtless, much hastened by the visions invented by crafty monks, in order to promote this superstition.

The earliest vision of purgatory on record is that of Fursey, an Irish saint, who lived in the seventh century. Bede, in his *Ecclesiastical History*, relates of this saint of the Romish calendar, that once on a time, having fallen sick, three angels appeared to him, and after conveying his soul away from his body, accompanied him into the invisible world. As he proceeded on his way, he heard the howlings and cryings of demons eager to arrest his progress. The bodies of these foul spirits, so far as he could discern them, were deformed, and black, and skinny, with long extended necks and swollen heads. They threw at him fiery darts; but these were warded off by the angels' shields, and the devils at length driven away. One of his angelic attendants then told him to look down upon the world, and when he looked, he saw a dark vale far below them, and in the vale four vast fires burning at some distance from each other. The angel said, "These are the four fires which shall burn the world: the first fire burns the men who have loved falsehood; the second, the souls of those who have been avaricious; the third, those men who have been stirrers up of strife and discord; the fourth, those who have practised fraud and impiety. Fear nothing, for these fires will only burn the souls of sinners." Upon this they approached the fire, and it separated, and left them a path through the midst. In the fire, Fursey saw devils flying about, and fighting terribly, and some came and shot at him, and tried even a second time to molest him, but were always repulsed by the angels who attended him. Shortly afterwards he was taken back by the angels, and restored to his body.†

Another vision, also given in Bede's history, is that of Drithelm. This saint, who dwelt in Northumbria, within the borders of Scotland, had lived a pious life, and in his latter days was favoured, like Fursey, with a journey to the world of spirits. On the return of his soul to his body, he became a monk in the Abbey of Mailross. He told his story to Hæmgils, from whom Bede seems to have learnt it.

When his soul first left his body, he said, he was led in silence by a shining angel in a white garment. They proceeded towards the north-east, and as they walked along, they came to a valley, which was broad and deep, and infinitely long. One side of the valley was filled with roaring flames, the other side was not less intolerably cold, with furious storms of hail and snow driving about in all directions. The whole valley was full of souls, who were tossed continually from one side to the other, and were equally tormented in each by the heat and the cold, as well as by the foul spirits that were everywhere flying about. Drithelm began to think that this must be hell, but his conductor said, "Think not so; we have not yet come there." He afterwards informs him, "This great burning vale is the place in which are punished the souls of those who, neglecting to confess and amend their sins till their last day, have been penitent at the moment of death. All, however, who have confessed and repented, even in death, will come to heaven in the day of doom. But many are helped by the prayers of the living, and by alms and fasts, and, above all, by the sacrifice of the Mass, so that they are delivered before doomsday." On proceeding onwards, they came to a region of extreme darkness, where he could hardly distinguish the form of the angel that accompanied him. Suddenly, he beheld, as it were, globes of dusky flame rising apparently from a great pit, and constantly falling down into it again. When he approached it, his guide suddenly left him in the midst of the darkness, and he now saw that the globes of fire were full of souls, who were thus continually tossed up from the pit, the stench of which filled the country around. And as he stood, terrified, and doubtful which way to turn, he suddenly heard behind him a sound of miserable wailing, mingled with shouts of laughter, like that of persons exulting over captured enemies. Then he saw a crowd of evil spirits dragging along five souls, who were lamenting grievously, whilst the fiends were mocking at them. The pit was hell, whence none who entered ever returned.

When Bede published these visions in the eighth century, the doctrine of purgatory was by no means generally established. It was a subject of speculation amongst the learned whether such a place really existed or not. The influence of these wondrous revelations, added to the arts employed by the monks, rendered this notion popular; and, accordingly, in another century or two purgatory was as much an article of faith as heaven or hell. In the language of Mosheim—

"The fears of purgatory, of that fire which was to destroy the remaining impurities of departed souls, were carried to the greatest height in the tenth century, and exceeded by far the terrifying apprehension of infernal torments; for they hoped to avoid the latter easily, by dying enriched with the prayers of the clergy, or covered with the merits and mediation of the saints, while from the pains of purgatory they knew there was no exemption. The clergy, therefore, finding these superstitious terrors admirably adapted to increase their authority and promote their interest, used every method to augment them, and by the most pathetic discourses, accompanied with monstrous fables and fictitious miracles, they laboured to establish the doctrine of purgatory, and also to make it appear that they had a mighty influence in that formidable region."*

Perhaps the most striking illustration of the popular belief in purgatory during the middle ages, is afforded by the legend of St. Patrick's purgatory, which was commonly an article of faith until the time of Luther.

The original source of our information respecting St. Patrick's purgatory, is Henry of Saltrey, a Benedictine monk, born and educated in Huntingdonshire, and, according to Bale, a man enslaved by superstition from his childhood. This author, indeed, would have us believe, that his story of Patrick's purgatory was nothing but an invention of his own, helped a little by the book of dialogues written by Pope Gregory. It is, however, certain, that Henry was reported to be the dupe of others, one Bishop Florentian, and Gilbert de Suda, a Cistercian abbot.

According to this authority, it would appear, that St. Patrick long preached to his countrymen, and among other doctrines included that of purgatory. They disbelieved in its existence, but offered to embrace its belief if any one would go there and again return to them. Vexed at the obstinacy of his hearers, Patrick prayed that God would enable him to give them a convincing proof, that he was not deceiving them. Accordingly, as he was one day alone in the wilderness, Jesus Christ appeared to the saint, and gave him a book containing the gospels, and a staff, which latter was afterwards called baculus Jhesu, "the staff of Jesus." Christ then led him into the wilderness, and pointed out a secret entrance, saying that whosoever entered therein, and remained there a day and a night, and then returned, would have strange wonders to relate, and should, moreover, be free from all liability to enter purgatory ever again. Our Lord then left him, and St. Patrick soon afterwards built an abbey on the spot, and placed a strong iron-bound door to keep fast the entrance to this wondrous cave. Even in the days of the saint, the legend informs us, many persons ventured into this fearful place. Some perished, while others remained unhurt, and told the wonderful tortures which they had suffered, and of equally wondrous visions of happiness which they had afterwards seen.

Their revelations were, by St. Patrick's own directions, taken down in writing, and preserved in the church. A minute account is also given of the ceremonies prescribed by the saint to be practised whenever an individual presented himself to become a visitor to the cave. A striking resemblance may be traced between these and the ceremonies in use by the ancient Greeks at the cave of Trophonius. Whenever a pilgrim entered this purgatory, the prior immediately made fast the door, and opened it no more till the next morning; when, if the pilgrim was there, he was taken out and conducted with great joy to the church; and after fifteen days' watching and praying, was dismissed. If he was not found when the door was opened, they concluded that he had perished in his pilgrimage through purgatory; the door was again closed, and his name was never again mentioned.

The principal object of Henry of Saltrey, however, is to relate the marvellous adventures of the knight Owain,

---

* Reprinted, by permission, from the "Journal of Sacred Literature," of July, 1855. London: A. Heylin, Paternoster-row.

† *De Anima*, Oper., p. 689, cap. 58. Basil, 1550. CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. I., pp. 67, 8; vol. III., pp. 87, 137.

‡ Cyril Hieros., Catech. Myst. V., p. 241. Paris, 1631. CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. I., pp. 50 and 140; vol. IV., pp. 34 and 71.

§ Ambrose, Enarr. in Psalm I., Oper., col. 1286. Paris, 1549.

‖ Augustine, *de Igne Purgat.* Sermo iv., Opera, vol. X., p. 382. Col. Agrip., 1616. CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. III., p. 76.

* Vespera autem illa *finis est seculi*, et caminus ille veniens dies judicii (*Enar in Psalm*, cili., Opera vol. viii., p. 430, &c. Qualis tunc erit velut aurea per ventilationem ita per judicium purgata novissimum eis quoque igne mundatis, quibus talis mundatio necessaria est (*De Civitate Dei*, lib. xx., cap. xxv.).

† Wright on *Purgatory*. P. 10.

* Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.*

who, in order to purge out the sins committed during a life of rapine and violence, visited St. Patrick's purgatory in the twelfth century. The account given in Wright's work is taken from an ancient English version made in the fifteenth century.

After relating the ceremonies undergone by Sir Owain, we are told that he was locked up in the cave, and, shortly after, went forth. At first he had a very little light, but this, by degrees, disappeared, and he was obliged to grope his way in utter darkness, till a sort of twilight at length appeared. He first met with fifteen men in white garments, one of whom told Owain all he should have to suffer in this pilgrimage; how he would be attacked by unclean spirits, and by what means he must defend himself. He then encountered, amidst the most fearful lightning and thunder, a troop of devils, who welcomed the knight, and pretended to rejoice that he had not, like other men on earth, waited till the end of his life, but had come beforehand, to suffer the punishment of his sins. Having successfully resisted their attack, by invoking the name of Christ, another party of fiends came up:—

"Then come develes other mony mo,
And badde y° kny with hem to go.
And ladde him into a fowle contreye,
Wher ever was nygth and never day.
For hit was derke and wonther cold,
Yette was there never man so bolde,
Hadde he never so mony clothes on,
But he wolde be colde as ony atone.
Wynde herde he none blowle,
But fast hit frese both hye and lowe.
They browghte hym to a felde full brode,
Overe such another never he yode.*
For of y° lengthe none ende he knewe.
Thereore algate† he most nowe.
As he went he herde a cry,
He wondered what it was and why.
He syg‡ ther men and wymmen also.
That lowde eryed for hem was wo.§
They lyen thykke on every londe;
Feste nayled both fote and honde,
With nayles glowing alle of brasse.
They ete y° erthe so wo hem was.‖
Here¶ face was nayled to y° grownde.
Spare they eryed a lytylle stounde.**
The develes wolde hem not spare.
To hem peyne they thowgte yare."††

This was the first *field* of punishment. In the original Latin legend, the knight was led successively through four such fields. In the second and third the souls suffered much the same kind of torments as in the first, with this only difference in the second, that they were fixed to the ground with their backs downward, and were persecuted by multitudes of fiery serpents and toads. In the fourth, the souls were hung up in fires by the various members which had been most sinful, and some were roasted on spits and basted with molten metals. In the next place they were turned about on a great wheel of fire:—

"Some of y° fendes turned ageyne,
And forthe they ladde Sir Owayne,
Full ferre into another felde.
In such one bare he never shelde.'
Hit was lenger and welle more,
Than that felde was byfure.
And as he loked him besyde
He syg ther pyttus mony and wide;
Thykke they were as they mygth bene;
Onethe‡‡ was ther a fote hem betwene.
And all manner of metaile,
He eyg there yn the pyttus walle.§§
Men and wymmen ther were also,
In y° pyttus abyding wo.
Some were therenne up to ye chinne,
And yet had they oogt bete‖‖ here synne.
And some were yn to shappus;¶¶
And some were op to y° pappus;
And some were yn to y° kne,
They wold full fayne out be."

Owaine was pushed by the devils into one of these pits, and dreadfully scalded. He was afterwards brought into a place where souls were punished in a lake of extreme coldness. He was then dragged to the mouth of hell, and afterwards taken to paradise. Finally, he was obliged to return and spend the remainder of his days on earth.***

We have given this celebrated legend of Sir Owaine at some length, from the importance of the subject with which it is connected. It was appealed to in the middle ages as authority on all questions relative to purgatory, and, according to Wright, was, in the original Latin of Henry, spread probably over every country where the Roman faith prevailed. It was also soon translated into the modern languages of Europe. There are still extant three different early French versions—all metrical. There are also two English metrical translations under the title of *Owayne Miles*. It is certain from the mention of St. Patrick's purgatory in Cesarius, that so early as the commencement of the thirteenth century it had become famous all over Europe. "If any one doubt of purgatory," says he "let him go to Ireland, and enter the purgatory of St. Patrick, and he will no longer have any question of purgatorial torments."* The pilgrimage to this place became a common thing in the thirteenth and following centuries, and even men of rank and wealth visited Ireland for this purpose. In the patent rolls of the Tower of London, under the year 1358, we have an instance of testimonials given by the king (Edward III.) on the same day to two distinguished foreigners—one a noble Hungarian, the other a Lombard, Nicholas de Beccarlis—of their having faithfully performed this pilgrimage; and still later, in 1397, we find Richard II. granted a safe conduct to visit the same place to Raymond, Viscount of Perchlos, Knight of Rhodes, and Chamberlain of the King of France, with twenty men and thirty horses.† Raymond, on his return to his native country, wrote a narrative of what he had seen in the Limousan dialect, of which a Latin version was printed by O'Sullivan in his *Historiæ Cathoicæ Ibernie* (Lisbon, 1621).‡

In the fifteenth century the numerous copies of the original history by Henry of Saltrey, as well as the various translations, tended greatly to increase the celebrity of St. Patrick's purgatory. At the close of this age, however, it fell into disgrace.

"A monk of Eymstadt, in Holland, who proved either more conscientious, or less credulous than former visitors, undertook the pilgrimage to Lough Derg. When he arrived at the lake, he applied for entrance to the prior, who referred him to the bishop of the diocese, without whose license no visitors were received. The monk then repaired to the residence of the bishop, but as he was 'poor and penniless,' the servants refused to admit him into their master's presence. Having, however, with difficulty obtained an audience, he fell down before the bishop and begged permission to enter St. Patrick's purgatory. The bishop demanded a certain sum of money, which he said was due from every pilgrim who came on this errand. The monk represented his poverty, and, after much urgent solicitation, the bishop granted the necessary license. He then went to the prior, performed the usual ceremonies, and was shut up in the cavern. There he remained all night, trembling with fear, and in constant expectation of a visit from the demons; but when the prior let him out the next morning, he had had no vision of any kind, and dissatisfied with the result of his pilgrimage he hastened to Rome, where he made his complaint to Pope Alexander VI. The Pope acknowledged himself convinced of the imposture, and sent orders for the destruction of the purgatory, which were put into execution with great solemnity on St. Patrick's day, 1497."§

It was not long before the place recovered its ancient reputation. The office of St. Patrick inserted in the Roman Missals of 1522 was almost entirely devoted to the celebration of the purgatory of that saint; and although this office was rejected two years afterwards, the fame of St. Patrick's purgatory continued to increase, and the legend was generally adopted by Roman theologians. During upwards of two centuries its reputation continued to spread through France, Italy, and Spain.‖

Such was the belief of purgatory prevalent in the Romish Church up to the period of the Reformation. The reader will not fail to notice how far the crude notions hinted by Augustine, and afterwards by Gregory, differed from the doctrines taught in after ages. From this obvious variation it is most evident that the dogma, as held in modern times by the Church, was completed only by slow degrees, and after centuries had passed away.

(To be continued.)

WHY THE CHURCH OF ROME DISCOUNTENANCES THE GENERAL STUDY OF THE BIBLE.

IT is a fact, which needs no proof, that the Church of Rome systematically discountenances the general reading of the Holy Scriptures. Indeed, so far are the advocates of that Church from wishing to deny or extenuate this fact, that they seek to justify the prohibition as wise and salutary. That the Church of Rome is perfectly *consistent* in acting so, there can be no doubt; nay more, it is not difficult to show, that, if her characteristic doctrines (those doctrines, we mean, which Protestants reject as innovations on the ancient faith of the Church) be true, it is not only her sound *policy*, but her bounden *duty*, to restrain the people, as much as possible, from the use of the Bible. A brief consideration of some of these doctrines will set this seeming paradox in a clear light.

1. Let us, then, begin with the worship of the Virgin. We shall not now insist on the recent development which Mariolatry has received by the papal declaration of the Immaculate Conception as an article of faith. We shall content ourselves with the adoration heretofore paid to the Virgin in Roman Catholic countries. We find, then, upon the one hand, that the honour actually paid to her, though theoretically inferior to, is practically far greater than that bestowed on our blessed Saviour himself. We find, on the other hand, no warrant, in the pages of the New Testament, for such adoration. The notices of the Virgin are brief, scanty, and incidental. The recorded addresses of our Lord to her are few in number, and certainly not of a kind calculated to lead his disciples to pay her anything like divine honours. In the Epistles she is never once named, even by that disciple who was specially charged with her care by his dying master.* All this cannot be accidental. We are, therefore, irresistibly forced to conclude, not only that our Lord and the New Testament writers do not recognise the Virgin Mary as an object of adoration, but that they do all in their power to prevent, by anticipation, the superstitious worship which they foresaw would *naturally* be paid to her. Upon this point, therefore, it is at least *politic* of the Church of Rome to restrain the people from studying the New Testament; as such study must necessarily give rise to very grave suspicions as to the soundness of the Church's practice. And if the rulers of the Church of Rome *really believe* that Mariolatry is in accordance with the will of God, it is their bounden *duty* to be cautious of putting into the hands of the people documents which seem so clearly to disown and prohibit it.

2. As a second instance, in illustration of our position, we may take the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome, as the divinely-appointed successor of St. Peter. To a person taught to believe this as a divine verity, it must cause a very violent shock to find, upon studying the New Testament, that, from beginning to end, no such personage as the Bishop of Rome is ever mentioned; that not the remotest hint is given of any peculiar privileges being attached, either actually or prospectively, to the Church of Rome; that not the slightest allusion is made to St. Peter's having visited that city; while, on the contrary, very strong inferential proof is supplied that he never was there at all; and, finally, that, even admitting he visited Rome and was Bishop of that Church, there is not a shred of proof by which his apostolic prerogatives can be shown to be the *perpetual inheritance* of his successors in that See. The *policy* of the Church of Rome necessarily prevents her from exposing the faith of her votaries to so great a shock as discoveries of this kind in the pages of Holy Writ must occasion. And if she believes that her dogma respecting the Pope as the successor of St. Peter and the representative of Christ upon earth is true, it is also her *duty* to take care that her people are not put in the way of drawing inevitable inferences from Scripture tending to the weakening or the complete overthrow of their faith in the dogma.

3. The worship of images is another case in point. The Church of Rome allows the worship of the images of the Virgin and the saints. The Bible absolutely prohibits the worship of "*any* graven image." This palpable contradiction is attempted to be removed by subtle scholastic distinctions between various kinds of worship. It is *politic* to inculcate on the people the danger of reading a book, which, without such refined distinctions, must be misunderstood by the vulgar, to the detriment of the Church's infallible authority. And if the Church of Rome really believes that the worship of images, which was prohibited under the Jewish dispensation, is commanded under the Christian, (notwithstanding the absence of the slightest hint to that effect in the New Testament), then it becomes the *duty* of her rulers to discountenance the reading of a book so infinitely likely—nay, so necessarily certain—to mislead as the Bible.

4. The same may be said of the invocation of saints, and the efficacy of their intercession. The Bible says, in language which any plain reader would consider clear and unmistakeable enough, that "there is *one mediator* of God and men, the man Christ Jesus" (1 Tim. ii. 5, Douay Bible), and that, "if any man sin, we have an *advocate* with the Father, Jesus Christ the just" (1 John ii. 1, Douay Bible). Any plain reader, we say, would naturally infer, from these and similar passages, that there was *only one* mediator between God and men, and *only one* advocate with the Father—viz., the Lord Jesus Christ. The Church of Rome teaches that there are many mediators and many intercessors (the number of whom is increasing with the canonization of every new saint), and that our Blessed Lord sustains these characters not exclusively, but merely in a peculiar sense. The vulgar could never discover this profound distinction from the seemingly unambiguous words of Holy Writ; and, accordingly, *policy* dictates that they should not be permitted to read a book which common sense is incapable of comprehending. And if the invocation of saints and the efficacy of their intercession be conscientiously held by the Church of Rome, it is the *duty* of those charged with the spiritual interests of her members to discountenance the general reading of a volume which seems, both negatively and positively, most plainly to contradict the practice of the Church.

5. Take, once more, the case of transubstantiation. The Church of Rome teaches that there is here a stupendous—nay, to human conception, an impossible—miracle constantly performed. In this instance, she insists, contrary to her usual canon of interpretation, on the literal sense of the words of Scripture; and she triumphantly refers her people—vulgar and all—to the sacred Record itself. But, then, they must not go beyond the passages

---

* Went. † At all events. ‡ Saw.
§ They had woe. ‖ Had so much woe. ¶ Their.
** A little while. †† Quickly. ‡‡ Scarcely.
§§ Boil. ‖‖ Made amends for. ¶¶ Loins.
*** Wright as before, chap. iii.

* *Dialog. de Mirac.*, lib. xii., cap. xxxviii.
† *Fœdera*, vol. iii., part i., p. 174; and part iv., p. 136.
‡ Wright as before, p. 126.
§ *Acta Sanctorum Martii*, vol. ii., p. 590.
‖ Wright as before, p. 154.

* St. John. See John xix. 27.

selected for their inspection, because they should find our Lord elsewhere frequently employing language equally strong and explicit, and which must be understood *metaphorically;* and they should, accordingly, be exposed to the risk of suspecting that, in the case of the eucharist also, a metaphorical meaning was much more probable than the existence of a mystery which it took the Church many centuries to discover—the mystery of transubstantiation. *Policy* would here, also, dictate the propriety of refusing the people unrestrained access to such dangerous sources of information; and, assuming (which it is very hard to do) that the heads of the Church of Rome really believe this doctrine, we can have no difficulty in admitting that their *duty* requires them to withhold from the faithful what must, inevitably, lead them to question its truth.

These instances are sufficient for our purpose. The case, then, stands thus: if the characteristic doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome be true, it is at once her policy and her duty to discountenance the general circulation and reading of the Scriptures. These writings, interpreted according to the ordinary rules of criticism, and in the sense which a person of average intelligence and unprejudiced judgment would elicit from them, do not bear out—nay, often directly contradict—the doctrines and practices in question. In order that there may be anything like an agreement between the Word of God and the peculiar dogmas of Romanism, the former must be interpreted in a way which none but the initiated have any idea of, and which utterly transcends the capacities of the vulgar multitude. "*Procul, o procul este profani,*" is, accordingly, the language of the privileged class to whom belongs the unfolding of the mystic pages of Scripture. The Bible, say they in effect and even in express words, is a grand enigma, which no individual Christian can venture to unravel, except at the imminent risk of making shipwreck of his faith. One renowned Romish theologian calls it a "Sibyl's prophecy;" another, "riddles of the Sphynx;" a third, "a leaden rule;" a fourth, "a nose of wax," which may be twisted backwards and forwards, and moulded into any shape; a fifth informs us that, without the sanction of the Church, Scripture could no more claim to be received than the Fables of Æsop; and a sixth asserts that it has no higher internal evidence than the Koran. If all this be true, it is not to be wondered at that the unsophisticated vulgar should be withheld from too close contact with a book so dangerous in its tendency; and the Church only fulfils a plain duty in protecting her children from the perilous consequences that must result from its free study.

But if the Bible contain a *revelation* of God, designed to make known to the world His will and purposes, so far as He condescends to make them known; if it be written by men supernaturally endowed for the express purpose of conveying the revelation free from all human error and imperfection; if these men wrote, as they manifestly did write, in a way which they conceived to be level to the capacities of the generality of Christians, without mystical subtleties, or enigmatical reserve; if all the ancient Fathers acknowledge the Scriptures to be the plain and unmistakeable rule of faith and practice; and if, notwithstanding, these Scriptures cannot be made to speak the characteristic language of the modern Church of Rome, except by a system of interpretation, which, applied to any other book in the world, would be called forced, unnatural, and inconsistent with itself; then, surely, there is strong reason to suspect that motives of *policy* alone lie at the foundation of the dislike which the Church of Rome evinces to the general diffusion of the written Word of God; and it may be fairly concluded, that if she is influenced by a feeling of *duty*, it is a feeling which cannot be referred to God as its author or its object.

ROMAN CATHOLIC MORAL THEOLOGY.

No. V.

WE have some fear lest many of our readers should have had enough of St. Liguori and his crooked ways, and should be rather tired of the subject of equivocation and mental reservation. However, as what we have said did not contain a full exposure of his doctrines, we venture to devote one article more to the subject. It will be remembered that the teaching we have hitherto considered related to the ordinary intercourse of society between persons who are under no peculiar obligation to each other. In such cases we found the moral teachers of Rome holding that we are not bound to speak the truth, and that any equivocation, short of absolute falsehood, was perfectly innocent. They add, besides, that we may not only utter these equivocations, but also confirm them with an oath; for, as they very logically conclude, if it is no sin to say these things, of course it can be no sin to swear them. However, we are promised a stricter morality in the case of persons who hold a special relation to one another. As we quoted from the *Rambler*, last month, "the relation of a parent to a child, of a master to his servant, of a judge to a witness, of a physician to a voluntary patient, even say of a bankrupt's creditors to a bankrupt, is quite different to that of persons who are in a condition of perfect equality, and who are bound by no peculiar engagement to one another."

Let us, then, inquire into the particulars of some of these picked cases, and see what kind of morality is supplied when the dealers of the Church of Rome offer to furnish the article of superior quality and of the purest description. And the first thing which strikes one as odd in this passage from the *Rambler* is the curious, doubtful way in which the case of a bankrupt is introduced—"even, say, of a bankrupt to his creditors"—as if the obligation in this case were not so great as in the one mentioned before, that of a physician and a voluntary patient. We are led to suppose that if a patient, in obtaining the advice of a physician, were to keep concealed some of his ailments, it would be a mortal sin; but that if a bankrupt were to keep concealed some of his property from his creditors, the case would not be so clear. Let us shut up the *Rambler*, and turn to the fountain-head, and see what St. Liguori tells on the subject; and, in fact, we find the saint laying down (iv. 158), that he who wants for his support goods which he has concealed, may answer the judge that he has got none. In like manner, an heir who has concealed goods, without an inventory, if he is not bound to satisfy the creditors out of them, may answer the judge that he has concealed nothing—mentally subjoining, "of the goods out of *which he is bound to make satisfaction.*" And Liguori is not the only Roman Catholic moralist who is thus indulgent to bankrupts.

The great Blaise Pascal, in the eighth of his celebrated Provincial Letters, alludes to some of them, as follows:—

"I have now to say a little," cried the monk, "in regard to those who are in embarrassed circumstances. Our casuists have sought to relieve them according to their condition of life. For, if they have not enough of property for a decent maintenance, and at the same time for paying their debts, they permit them to secure a fortune by making a bankruptcy with their creditors.* This has been decided by Lessius, and confirmed by Escobar as follows:—'May a person who turns bankrupt, with a good conscience, keep back as much of his personal estate as may be necessary to maintain his family in a respectable way—*ne indecorè vivat?* I hold, with Lessius, that he may, even though he may have acquired his wealth unjustly, and by notorious crimes—*ex injustitia et notorio delicto;* only, in this case he is not at liberty to retain so large an amount as he otherwise might.'"

"Indeed, father! (says Pascal) what a strange sort of charity is this, to allow property to remain in the hands of the man who has acquired it by rapine, to support him in his extravagance, rather than go into the hands of his creditors, to whom it legitimately belongs!"

"It is impossible to please everybody" replied the father; "and we have made it our particular study to relieve these unfortunate people. This partiality to the poor has induced our great Vasquez, cited by Castro Palao, to say that 'if one saw a thief going to rob a poor man, it would be lawful to divert him from his purpose by pointing out to him some rich individual, whom he might rob in place of the other.' If you have not access to Vasquez or Castro Palao, you will find the same thing in your copy of Escobar; for, as you are aware, his work is little more than a compilation from twenty-four of the most celebrated of our fathers. You will find it in his treatise, entitled 'The Practice of our Society in the matter of Charity towards our Neighbours.'"

"A very singular kind of charity this," I observed, "to save one from suffering loss by inflicting it upon another! But I suppose that to complete the charity, the charitable adviser would be bound in conscience to restore to the rich man the sum which he had made him lose?"

"Not at all, sir," returned the monk; "for he did not rob the man—he only advised the other to do it. From such a mass of evidence you ought to be satisfied now of the futility of your objections; but we are losing sight of our subject. To revert, then, to the succour which our fathers apply to persons in straitened circumstances—Lessius, among others, maintains that it is lawful to steal, not only in a case of extreme necessity, but even where the necessity is *grave*, though not extreme."

"This is somewhat startling, father," said I. "There are very few people in this world who do not consider their cases of necessity to be *grave* ones, and to whom, accordingly, you would not give the right of stealing with a good conscience. And though you should restrict the permission to those only who are really and truly in that condition, you open the door to an infinite number of petty larcenies, which the magistrates would punish in spite of your 'grave necessity,' and which you ought to repress on a higher principle—you who are bound by your office to be the conservators, not of justice only, but of charity, between man and man—a grace which this permission would destroy. For after all, now, is it not a violation of the law of charity, and of our duty to our neighbour, to deprive a man of his property, in order to turn it to our own advantage? Such, at least, is the way I have been taught to think hitherto."

"That will not always hold true," replied the monk; "for our great Molina has taught us that 'the rule of charity does not bind us to deprive ourselves of a profit, in order thereby to save our neighbour from a corresponding loss.' He advances this in corroboration of what he has undertaken to prove—'That one is not bound in conscience to restore the goods which another had put into his hands, in order to cheat his creditors.' Lessius holds the same opinion on the same ground."*

Let us, however, come on to examine the general case of a witness in a court of justice. We find it laid down here (iv. 154) that, 'a witness, not legitimately questioned, may swear that he does not know of a crime which he really does know—mentally subjoining, that he does not know of any crime *legitimately inquired of;* or that he does not know it, *so as to give evidence of it.* The same is the case if the witness, for some other reason, is not bound to give evidence; for example, if he is himself quite assured that the act committed is without guilt, or if he knows the crime only as a secret, and no ill repute has got abroad. When, however, the witness or defendant is legitimately questioned by the judge, he must not use any equivocation, because he is then bound to obey the rightful precept of his superior. This is the common opinion, and the same must be said about an oath in onerous contracts, because otherwise injury would be done to another. Except in the case of a trial, the crime be altogether concealed, for then a witness may, *nay, he is bound to say that the defendant has not committed it;* and so may the defendant, if there is not already half full proof. So says Tamburini, with the common opinion, because then the judge does not question legitimately."

It will be seen, then, that it is a very important question—When does a judge inquire legitimately? The *Christian Remembrancer* gives the following answer to this, from Garnet's "Treatise on Equivocation."† The order of law requires these five things—

"First, that the party who examineth must be a lawful superior. . . . Secondly, he must have authority over the person whom he examineth. . . . Thirdly, the matter itself must be subject to the judge. . . . Fourthly, he must proceed according to a just law, for, whereas a judge is, as Aristotle calls him, a living law, as the law itself is a dumb judge; even as the law, when it is unjust, is no law, so a judge, in the execution of an unjust law, is no judge. Finally, it is very necessary that the judge do not proceed against a man to examine him, or call him into question, but in cases which are public and manifest, or when great suspicions and presumptions, or common reports, do seem to condemn the party, or sufficient testimony convince him."

So likewise St. Liguori, Lib. v. 276:—

"It is certain that a witness is not bound to confess the truth to a judge, when he does not legitimately interrogate; for, then, he may lawfully answer, even with an oath, that he does not know the crime (aside) *so as to be bound to declare it unto him.* But, it is asked, when does a judge question legitimately? The reply is—when there is already half full proof. When there is this, the crime is no longer said to be secret; and, therefore, the judge has a right that the witness shall declare the truth. So in common, Lessius, Navarrus, and others, with the Salamanca doctors, who observe that no witness is bound to answer in this way, unless repute of the guilt, or half full evidence of it, or clear signs of it be already proved and shown to him by the judge—unless, indeed, it is quite certain that the judge is a good man, and he declares that he is legitimately questioning. . . . . A judge does not legitimately question unless there has previously been notoriety, ill repute, or other half full proof."

And we are told further on that a witness commits a crime in five ways, one of which is—if he discover the truth which he ought to conceal!!!

Let us now test this doctrine of Liguori by a particular example. Many of our readers will remember the trial of Boyle *v.* Wiseman, which took place last year. The object of the plaintiff was to prove that Cardinal Wiseman was the writer of a certain libellous letter, which had been published with his name; and several witnesses were brought forward, to whom, it was supposed, the Cardinal had confessed his authorship of the letter. The following is a report of part of what occurred:—

"Dr. T. Grant was examined—He said, I am the Roman Catholic Bishop of St. George's, Southwark; I know the defendant, and am on intimate terms with him; I remember going to Paris on the subject of this libel; but *I don't remember* having had any conversation with the defendant relating to it; I had a conversation with a gentleman belonging to the *Univers* journal, but he did not give me any MS.; I am quite sure that the defendant never

* The Jesuits exemplified their own maxim in this case by the famous bankruptcy of their College of St. Hermangilda, at Seville. We have a full account of it in the memorial presented to the King of Spain by the luckless creditors. The simple pathos and sincere earnestness of this document preclude all suspicion of the accuracy of its statements. By the advice of their Father Provincial, the Jesuits, in March, 1645, stopped payment, after having borrowed upwards of 450,000 ducats, mostly from poor widows, and friendless girls. This shameful affair was exposed before the courts of justice during a long litigation, in the course of which it was discovered that the Jesuit fathers had been carrying on extensive mercantile transactions, and that, instead of spending the money left them *for pious uses*—such as ransoming captives, and alms-giving—they had devoted it to purposes of what they termed "our poor little house of profession."

* Molina t. ii., tr. 2, disp. 328, n. 8. Lessius liv. ii., ch. 20, dist. 19, n. 168. Escobar lr. 3, ex. 1, n. 23, lr. 5, ex. 5, n. 53. Pascal adds to this letter that the best editions of Escobar are the Lyons edition, having in the title-page the device of a lamb lying on a book, sealed with seven seals, and the Brussels edition of 1651. There has, however, since Pascal's time, been a new and corrected edition, printed at Paris, by Piget (see Nicole's edition of the Provincial Letters). We may here add, that not one of the charges brought against the Jesuits in this eighth letter, has been met by Father Daniel in his celebrated reply.

† The quotations from Liguori which follow are also taken from the same article in the "Christian Remembrancer," to which we have a ready expressed our obligations in this series of articles. We happe to write at a distance from the greater part of our books, and th volume of Liguori, here cited, is not at hand.

told me that he wrote the letter which is the subject of the present action.

The Rev. George Spencer, known as Father Ignatius, was examined. He said—"I am intimately acquainted with Cardinal Wiseman, but I don't see much of him. I remember reading the article in the *Catholic Standard*, and I had a few words with the Cardinal on that subject; *all I can remember* that he said was, that he had reason to know that Boyle had communicated the article that appeared in the *Ami de la Religion*. He did not say a word of the authorship of the letter." "Did you say to him 'I have read your letter, Cardinal Wiseman?'" "*I don't remember.*" (The witness gave his evidence in such a low tone, and so confusedly, that the jury several times requested him to speak louder and more plainly, as they could not hear what he said.) "I cannot say how the conversation began; the Cardinal did not send me to the plaintiff to try to arrange the matter, but I did go to Mr. Ivors on the subject. *I don't remember* the words that passed afterwards between me and the Cardinal; I am certain he did not tell me the letter was his, and I did not tell him it was his; I went to Mr. Hoyle of my own accord, and I afterwards communicated with the Cardinal; my object was, to endeavour to settle this action." "Surely, you can tell us what passed between you." "*No; I don't remember.*" "Why, how long is it since this occurred?" "About a month." "And you mean to swear you have no recollection of what occurred?" "I do—*I only recollect* what I have told you." "What else did the Cardinal say relative to the matter?" "*I don't recollect.*"

Now, as we know nothing of Dr. Grant or of Father Ignatius, it is very possible that these gentlemen may have particularly bad memories; and it is very possible, too, that they have never opened St. Liguori's works; and it is possible, therefore, that we are to attach the same meaning to their denial which we should give to the statement of any other Englishgentlemen. But let us consider, as a hypothetical case, and, in order to illustrate St. Liguori's maxims, what evidence ought Dr. Grant and Mr. Spencer to have given according to the principles of Roman Catholic theology, supposing they had recollected that Cardinal Wiseman had told them that he was the author of the letter signed by his name. They must have done exactly what they did; otherwise they would have sinned by discovering the truth which they ought to have concealed (v. 270). *If in a trial the crime is altogether concealed, the witness may, nay, is bound to say, that the defendant has not committed it*, (iv. 154). Now, in the present instance, this was just the case. The trial was, in fact, quashed, because the crime of having written the libel was concealed. Therefore, the witnesses were bound, even if they had known the contrary to be true, to say the defendant had not committed it.

Or, again, suppose that, in the judgment of Dr. Grant the act of writing the libel was not criminal at all, then the judge would not legitimately examine, and he might also deny that the defendant had done what he was accused of.

We think this specimen enough of the "best quality" of Liguori's morality in the cases picked by his advocates: and we now go on to consider the defences which have been made for him.

We shall principally refer to the essays of Dr. Murray of Maynooth, one of which is devoted to the subject of equivocation and mental reservation. It is true that it was not written with any special controversial object, still, as being infinitely more readable than the article in the *Dublin Review*, and as being the source whence the writer in the *Ramblet* drew almost all his arguments and illustrations, it is the essay on the Roman Catholic side which is best deserving of attention. Dr. Murray's essay does not refer to St. Liguori in particular; it was written in a fit of indignation at hearing the name of the order of the Jesuits identified with fraud of speech and action; he cites, for instance, Webster's Dictionary as defining JESUITISM—canning, deceit, hypocrisy, prevarication, deceptive practices to effect a purpose. Dr. Murray, then, being a chivalrous man, and accustomed to attempt desperate enterprises, sallies forth in defence of the order of Jesuits, and endeavours to prove their doctrines consistent with Gospel morality. And by screwing up the Jesuit teaching as high as he can, and the Gospel morality down as low as he can, he makes something like an attempt to get the two to agree. We will do Dr. Murray the justice to say, at the outset, that he seems to us a much better man than his system; he seems to us to be a plain, outspoken man, with no love for equivocation himself, though in his love for the Jesuits he tries to put the best construction on their doctrines, and exerts the utmost of his ingenuity to put the most presentable of them in a plausible light.

The impatience with which we turned to Dr. Murray's pages for information as to the Jesuit doctrines, was destined to meet with a check; for the learned professor seemed in as little hurry to enter on the subject of his essay as the condemned criminal of old, who

> "Now fitted the halter, now traversed the cart,
> And oft took his leave, but was loath to depart."

The first thirty pages of his essay contain an account of the manner in which theology is taught at Maynooth, but are more particularly devoted to the explanation of the *fact* (?) that while respectable Roman Catholic theologians always fairly state the Protestant doctrines, Protestant divines constantly misrepresent the Roman Catholic doctrines. The principal explanation of this given by Dr. Murray is, that the Roman Catholic books of divinity are very dry and repulsive, and can only be read with ease, even by their own professors, after some years of teaching, while Protestant divinity is quite easy reading, and is in a much plainer and more popular form. But it seems to us that there is an explanation which will much better account for the matter. When a statement is clear and consistent, it is likely that those who hear it will be able to understand it readily and repeat it correctly; whereas if it is only saved from contradiction and absurdity by subtle distinctions, it is probable that those who try to repeat it will not be able to do so without making its absurdity palpable. A China vase, if sound, may be carried from one place to another without injury; but if it consist of broken pieces carefully put together, with the cracked side turned away from the spectator, then, no doubt, it is likely to fall to pieces at the first touch from one who has not been trained to handle it discreetly.

After long preliminaries, however, Dr. Murray does come to the point at last; and here we soon find what an advantage he enjoys in not being committed to the defence of any particular book. He is at liberty to pass over in silence all the worst part of the Jesuit teaching, and only picks out the most presentable parts, as if they were fair specimens of the rest. We should like to cross-question him a little, and to ask whether he would undertake the defence of those instances of equivocation which we have already cited from Liguori. Would he think it innocent to deny a truth, with the phrase, "I say no," meaning only "I pronounce the word no;" or would he consider it right to deceive his hearers into the notion that some true thing which he had said was false, and without authority by telling them, "I said it out of my head," although, no doubt, the words did come ont of his head. As far as we can guess the answer which Dr. Murray would make to these questions, he would endeavour to escape the painful necessity of condemning St. Liguori by insisting on the difference of usage in different countries. Dr. Murray tells us:—

"The meaning of each language is regulated by *its own* usage. For example—suppose that in Portugal [I am merely supposing a case; I am ignorant of the Portuguese language] it is customary for a person to disengage himself from a bore in the street, or from any other unpleasant company, by saying 'I have particular business at home.' In Portugal the phrase is by the supposition perfectly intelligible as a courteous way of getting rid of an intolerable social nuisance. Suppose that in Italy or England the words have not, from usage, this second meaning—then to use them in Italy or England with such meaning would clearly be to use an undiscoverable equivocation. . . . Hence it is evident, that equivocations which are discoverable in one language or country, may be undiscoverable in another. Therefore supposing them to be allowable in the former language or country, it does not follow that they are allowable in the latter; and *vice versa*, supposing them to be unlawful in the latter, it does not follow that they are unlawful in the former; therefore, it does not follow that because a number of Italian and Spanish divines state that certain equivocations are intelligible, and hence (with the restrictions to be named by and bye) allowable in their country; therefore, the same equivocations are intelligible and allowable in ours. Neither does it follow that because such equivocations are unlawful here, they are, therefore, unlawful there. The *principles* in which all approved theologians agree I hold to be perfectly sound, and these very principles lead me to reject some of the decisions of those theologians on particular cases, so far as these countries are concerned. Whether the decisions are just, even in the circumstances to which they were intended to apply, it comes as little within my province as it comes within my power to determine."

We think this extract, then, pretty well enables us to judge what answer Dr. Murray would give, supposing that he were asked, "Is it lawful to deny something true by answering 'I say no.'" He would reply. "No, this is not allowable in England and Ireland." "Well, then, do you condemn St. Liguori, who considers this answer allowable?" "You must excuse me from passing judgment on this question. I have not lived long in Italy to say whether such an equivocation may not be a discoverable one in that country, and, therefore, there allowable." An ingenious way, no doubt, to escape coming into collision with a canonised saint. But we may appeal to the common sense of our readers whether such a defence will bear examination. No doubt the first Jesuit who devised the ingenious dodge of answering, "I say no," made use of a perfectly undiscoverable equivocation; and, therefore, according to Dr. Murray's principles, was guilty of a sin. But by degrees the device comes to be seen through, and sharp fellows come to know that they must not be satisfied if any one answer them, "I say no," without sifting deeper, and finding out whether he only means to utter the word no, or whether he is giving them a denial. When things have come to this state, according to Dr. Murray's principles the equivocation has become a discoverable one, and, if any one be deceived by it, he has only himself to blame for not having used proper attention. The person who answers, "I say no," does not deceive, but suffers his hearer to deceive himself. According to Dr. Murray's principles, it would be a sin in an upright English gentleman to make use of equivocation, for his hearers would naturally think that he was employing words in their clear obvious sense, and the equivocation would be undiscoverable; but, if a tricky Italian employ equivocation, it is no sin, for if his hearers take his words in their most obvious sense they have only themselves to blame for their unpardonable neglect in supposing that he will not take advantage of any double sense of which his words may be susceptible. And thus Liguori's declaring certain equivocations to be innocent will soon have the effect of making them to be innocent; for, when a man declares himself to be a disciple and admirer of Liguori's, no person of proper attention can think it strange if he employs equivocations which that saint has pronounced to be allowable; and, therefore, such equivocations are *discoverable* in his mouth though not in that of another. We think it follows as the legitimate consequence of Dr. Murray's principles, that a man may, if he lie often enough, make it impossible for himself to lie at all. As long as you are a miserable half-hearted liar you will be perpetually falling into sin; but lie boldly and establish a character for yourself, and by the time that you have become so thorough-paced a liar that no sensible man will believe you—by the time that any wise man will suspect any assertion you make of containing some equivocation or mental reservation—then what would be lies in another man's mouth would be only *discoverable equivocation* in yours. This, we think, is the necessary consequence of Dr. Murray's attempt to be friends at once with truth and with St. Liguori, and of his endeavour to make out that what would be a lie in an Englishman would be no lie in an Italian or Spanish disciple of Liguori.

All through his defence Dr. Murray's individual dislike to deceit leads him to substitute a better morality of his own instead of that which he is called on to advocate. For instance, when the case is discussed of a witness in a court of justice, who, it is admitted, is generally bound to tell the truth, one of the first exceptions mentioned by Liguori is the case of a confessor who is questioned concerning a sin which he had heard in confession. We suppose we are not to complain that when God's law—to speak the truth—comes into collision with the church's law—to keep the secret of the confessional—the former is compelled to give way. But we bring forward the subject to show how differently it is treated by Liguori and Dr. Murray. Liguori recommends the confessor to answer flat, that he does not know anything on the subject on which he is questioned, with the mental reservation, that he does not know as a man, but as a minister of Christ. And the reason he says is because the questioner has no right except to communicable knowledge, which that of a confessor is not. Dr. Murray's words, on the other hand, are as follows:—"A confessor cannot, in any conceivable circumstances, reveal what he has heard under the seal of sacramental confession. By doing so directly or indirectly, he would, according to the universally received doctrine, be guilty of a most heinous crime. This is known and always supposed in every Catholic country, and I take it in this country also. If, however, a doubt of this should exist in any case, the matter can be easily settled by the clergyman simply stating the Catholic doctrine before he takes the oath as a witness. The sacredness of the seal of confession is, I believe, respected by our judges. If the contrary should occur, the confessor is bound to suffer death rather than reveal confession." If, then, we understand Dr. Murray right, while St. Liguori recommends the confessor to deny all knowledge of the subject inquired of Dr. Murray advises what would naturally occur to an honest man, that he should refuse to answer, and persist in his refusal to the risk of his life. It may be said that St. Liguori, writing in a Roman Catholic country, only contemplated questions put by judges who would not intend their questions to refer to things known only under the seal of confession. The very next sentence in Liguori disproves the supposition. He says, that the same denial is to be given even if the questioner should ask whether the confessor have heard as minister of Christ; because the confessor is always to be supposed to answer as a man; for as a minister of Christ he cannot speak. It appears, then, that while Liguori recommends the confessor to deny his knowledge, because the questioner has no right to it, and to trust to a mental reservation to make his words true, Dr. Murray recommends the confessor to make sure that the questioner should understand that the denial does not extend to the case of things known under the seal of confession. Again, Dr. Murray is careful to inform us that equivocations are only to be used in cases of urgent necessity. He describes in a passage which we shall quote presently, the mischievious consequences of habitual equivocation on slight occasions. He gives as his examples, the case of a minister of state entrusted with a secret, the disclosure of which would entail some dreadful evils on the commonwealth; or the case of an assassin bent on murder, who should ask the son of his victim to tell him on pain of death where his father was to be found. But even if the reader should be tempted by these examples to admit the lawfulness of equivocation on cases of urgent necessity, is there not still good reason to doubt whether the doctrine defended by Dr. Murray is the same as that advocated by Liguori, who maintains that any honest end for keeping things good for the spirit or useful to the body, is a sufficient cause for equivocation; and who tells us a little farther on, that to swear even with equivocation (except in the case of trials or of contracts) an absolutely grave cause

is not required, and that any rational cause is sufficient, such as to free one's self from the troublesome and unjust questions of another.

Many of Dr. Murray's examples, too, would cause very little embarrassment to a person who was ignorant of the doctrine that it is lawful to tell a lie when speaking the truth is inconvenient. In the case just mentioned, if Lord Palmerston or Lord John Russell were questioned as to the progress of negotiation or any other state secret, by one who had no right to put such a question, we fancy they would not find it necessary to resort to falsehood, in order to reduce the questioner to silence; or, in the next case, suppose a lawyer engaged in a case, and entrusted by his client with a weighty secret bearing closely upon it, were to be pumped by a cunning emissary from the other side, we do not think he would, in most cases, find much difficulty in his course of proceeding. Indeed in this case Dr. Murray's education in these countries has suggested to him an answer not to be found in Liguori. He says that it would be best—nay, would be a strict duty—to say in such cases, "Sir, your question is impertinent, and I will not answer it," or words to this effect, or to remain silent, if either line could be taken without serious inconvenience, or if silence were not equivalent to a revelation of the secret. We believe that the course of conduct suggested here would afford the clue to the greater part of Dr. Murray's difficulties.

We must hurry on, or we might touch on another disagreeable case which Dr. Murray propounds. Suppose we had some cash in hands, and were asked for the loan of twenty pounds by a man notorious for not paying his debts, but still whom it would be inexpedient to offend by a flat refusal, Dr. Murray rules that in such a case it would be quite lawful to deny that we have got so much money. The decision is, at least, convenient.

But we wish to give our readers a favourable specimen of Dr. Murray, and shall, therefore, lay before them the passage to which we before alluded, in which he expresses his own dislike to the habit of equivocation—

"It is evident that if such a practice were allowed, no man would trust his neighbour for a single moment. I could not be sure but that every fifth or tenth sentence I hear does not involve an equivocation; and as I know not in what particular sentence the trap is hidden, I know not in which I may be caught, and I suspect all. Social intercourse would resemble a journey on a dark night, over a road full of pitfalls. I am not sure when I may tumble in, but I have no doubt that I shall go down somewhere, and I fall into a state of feverish uneasiness, which continues to the end. In trying to scan the speaker's mind, the understanding loses its uprightness of attitude and directness of movement, and acquires a wriggling, shuffling, uneasy action. It gets a mean and dishonest turn, like a man who accustoms himself to peep round corners and listen at keyholes. Every motion of the equivocator's tongue becomes as much distrusted as the motion of a pickpocket's fingers. . . . . A man who practises equivocation is always in the imminent danger of sheer lying. Lie he most certainly will from time to time; and the probability is, that, in the long run, the habit of equivocation will end in a habit of lying, as the habit of hard drinking often ends in a habit of downright drunkenness. . . . . The habitual equivocator is both mean, despicable, and ten times more hateful than the habitual liar. The latter makes his choice 'for better for worse;' the former woos truth openly, and pays his secret addresses to falsehood, without intending to wed either. To insincerity he adds meanness and hypocrisy, and either of the latter is detestable in every aspect and every relation."

These extracts justify us in saying that Dr. Murray is a better man than his system; but, after all, what is this passage more than an expansion of Mr. Macaulay's assertion, that the world could not exist if men were generally to do what Jesuit divines have taught that with a good conscience they may do. Can a habit of equivocation be a bad thing, and the single acts of equivocation be all innocent? How are people to be taught that they may, with a safe conscience, practise acts of equivocation and yet be prevented from forming the habit. It is pretty plain that if Liguori's doctrines be true they are still not good for common ears, and that the less the public are taught of them the better. This is just Dr. Murray's judgment. He says—"The duty of observing strict veracity, and the sin and odiousness of lying, especially of habitual and deliberate lying, are certainly fit subjects for the pulpit; nor can the Christian preacher too strongly commend the one and repudiate the other. But if he does touch on equivocation he should reprobate it too; his plain and simple teaching should be condemnatory." And Dr. Murray cites, with approbation, the advice of an eminent divine—"To a person asking, *is it lawful to use equivocation or mental reservation?* the answer should be, *it is not lawful.*" What! when Liguori, and all approved Roman Catholic divines, teach that equivocation for a just cause is perfectly innocent, and when Dr. Murray has written a long essay to justify the doctrine, will he still tell an inquirer simply that equivocation is not lawful? The force of equivocation can no farther go. With this equivocation on equivocation we take our leave for the present.

THE SUCCESSION OF THE POPES.

ONE of the marks of the true Church which eminent Roman Catholic writers lay down is "apostolicity;" a very good mark in itself, and one which we heartily wish all Roman Catholics rightly to understand.

Bishop Milner thus defines the mark "*apostolical*"—"An uninterrupted series of successors of the apostles in every age since their time—that is to say, successors to their *doctrine*, to their *jurisdiction*, to their *orders*, and to their *mission*. Hence it follows, that no religious society whatever which cannot trace its succession in these FOUR points up to the apostles has any claim to the characteristical title APOSTOLICAL."—End of Controversy, Letter xxviii.

It would seem that in applying this we must FIRST know what the apostles' doctrine was, before we can learn what Church is apostolical by tracing its succession in doctrine. This appears to us to be very sound and agreeable to reason; but we are bound to say that it is not exactly what Bishop Milner meant.

But, independent of the *truth* of doctrine, there may be a difficulty in tracing the *succession* of doctrine. For instance, it would be difficult to trace a succession of Popes holding the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception; because the present Pope is the first who has established that doctrine; so it would be unreasonable to expect in that point a *succession* in doctrine.

But there cannot be a succession in doctrine, or in anything else, unless there has been a succession of men. We propose, therefore, to begin at the beginning, and examine the succession of the Popes to each other.

We do not write either to under-rate or to exaggerate the importance of a succession of ministers in the Church wherever it can be shown (as it can in the Church of Ireland); we value and prize such an external manifestation and evidence of the perpetuity of the Church on earth. But where such an external manifestation is wanting, we do not therefore conclude that the continuity of the Church itself must have been broken, being entirely of the opinion of the learned Roman Catholic divine, Father Paul Sarpi, that Christ would have had a Church on earth, "although there should never more have been a Pope."—Treatise of Ecclesiastical Benefices, chap. 19.

It is, therefore, for the satisfaction of others, rather than for our own, that we undertake to trace the "succession of the Popes." Those Roman Catholics who are ready to stake the truth of the claims of their Church on the clearness of the succession of her Popes, may fairly expect to find the succession so clear that no Christian in any age could ever have had room to doubt who was the actual and lawful successor of St. Peter. If it should appear, as we proceed, that it has many times been a most puzzling question to find out the true successors, the fault is not in us, but in our materials; for we take our succession from the learned Jesuits, Labbe and Cossart, in their great work on the Councils of the Church.

We pass over for the present the question, who succeeded St. Peter as Pope. Roman Catholic writers are fond of telling us that several ancient writers—Eusebius, Irenæus, Optatus, Tertullian, &c.—have given lists of the early Popes. But those Roman Catholic writers seldom quote the lists they speak of. The reason is, because the ancient lists differ from each other, and Roman Catholics do not know which list to choose.

It seems to us that if God had thought the succession of the Popes essential to the Church, he would have provided that we should know which list to rely on. If any Roman Catholic will give us a list of the first six Popes after St. Peter, we will discuss this subject further.

In the meantime, we proceed to consider the succession in after ages.

We know nothing which gives a better general view of the history of the Papacy, than the list of the Popes published by Labbe and Cossart in the "Concilia Generalia," vol. xvi., col. 130.

It is a simple list, stating the year in which each succeeded to the Papacy, and the time of his death.

Here and there a line is introduced, stating when two persons, or sometimes three or four persons, were claiming at the same time to be the successors of St. Peter.

We shall give each of these lines, prefixing the date preceding the schism.

A.D. 251. "The first Antipope, Novatian, the Heretic."
A.D. 366. "Felix II., so called by some."
A.D. 367. "The second Antipope, Ursicinus."
A.D. 418. "The third Antipope, Eulalius, the Archdeacon."
A.D. 498. "The fourth Antipope, Laurentius, the Archdeacon."
A.D. 530. "The fifth Antipope, Dioscorus."
A.D. 686. "A schism, Peter and Theodore being elected."
A.D. 687. "A schism, Theodore and Paschal being elected."
A.D. 757. "A schism, on account of Theophylact, the Archpresbyter."
A.D. 768. "Constantine, Antipope, brother of Toto, Duke of Nepi. (Here the Jesuits got tired of *counting* the Antipopes.)
A.D. 824. "Zinzimus gave occasion to a schism."
A.D. 844. "John, the Deacon, raised tumults against Sergius."
A.D. 847. "Here the POPESS Joan is absurdly inserted by some." (Note—The story of the *woman Pope* is told by Roman Catholic historians, *not* by Protestants.)
A.D. 890. "Sergius and Boniface VI. created tumults."
A.D. 896. "Romanus, the Galesian, intruded by force."
A.D. 963. "Leo VIII, the Antipope, put in by Otto."
A.D. 974. "Boniface VII., or Franco, Antipope."
A.D. 996. "John XVI., Antipope, by the faction of Crescentius."
A.D. 1013. "Gregory, the Antipope, is ejected by the Emperor."
A.D. 1043. "Silvester III., and John XX., the Archpresbyter of the Roman Church, Antipopes."
A.D. 1059. "John Mincius, called Benedict X., Antipope."
A.D. 1061. "Cadolaus, the Antipope, called Honorius II."
A.D. 1080. "Clement III., Guibert of Ravenna, Antipope."
A.D. 1099. "Guibert being dead, THREE Antipopes in a short time."
A.D. 1118. "Mauricius Burdinus, Archbishop of Braca, Antipope."
A.D. 1124. "Callistus II., Theobald, yielded to Honorius."
A.D. 1130. "Peter Leonis, Anacletus II., Antipope. Gregory, called Victor III., Antipope."
A.D. 1159. "Octavian, called Victor IV., Antipope Guido Cremensis, called Paschal III., Antipope. John the Abbot, called Callistus III., Antipope."
(THREE Antipopes at one time was *too* much.)
A.D. 1268. "The See was vacant two years, six months, two days."
A.D. 1291. "The See was vacant two years, three months, two days."
A.D. 1313. "The See was vacant two years, three months, seventeen days."
A.D. 1378. "Robert of Geneva, called Clement VII., Antipope."
A.D. 1394. "Benedict XIII., Peter de Luna, Antipope."
A.D. 1415. "The Roman See was vacant two years, five months, ten days."
A.D. 1424. Ægidius, Antipope, called Clement VIII."
A.D. 1439. "Amadeus, Duke of Savoy, Felix V., Antipope."

The above is a plain story, from the highest Roman Catholic authorities, and needs few comments.

ANTIPOPE means "opposition Pope."

Our readers can count for themselves how often there have been "opposition Popes;" and how many "opposition Popes" there have been at a time.

If any one should suppose that it MUST have been always easy to see who was the true Pope, and who was the "opposition Pope," if he look carefully at the above list he will see his mistake.

Let him look to the year 890, in the above list, and he will see "Boniface VI." as a false Pope. Boniface VII. is set down as a false Pope in the year 974.

Boniface V. succeeded, in the year 617; Boniface VIII. in the year 1294.

There is no Pope Boniface VI. or Boniface VII., between them in the list of the Popes given in Bishop Milner's "End of Controversy."

How came this?

It could only happen in this way—Historians, writers, and people in general, reckoned Boniface VI. and Boniface VII. to be Popes; and, therefore, when another Boniface arose everybody called him Boniface VIII. This shows how commonly Boniface VI. and Boniface VII. were taken to be Popes.

If our readers will look over the list above given they will find that no less than *eighteen* of those who are now set down as "Antipopes" have numbers attached to their names.

There are NO Popes of similar name and number in what is now counted the *true* list of the Popes.

For instance, there is a Pope John the 19th in the list of true Popes of the Church of Rome, and a Pope John the 21st; but there is no Pope John the 20th!

He who was counted Pope John the 20th while he was living, was put out of the list long after he was dead.

And so of all the other false Popes who have numbers to their names. They were counted Popes by multitudes while they were living, and were put out of the list long after they were dead, to try and make the list such as Roman Catholics would now wish it to have been.

The list, even now, might well be weeded a little more. There are worse weeds in it still than were ever cast out. But such weeding out in later times does little good to the multitudes who, in almost every age, were deceived by false Popes in their own day. The correction of such errors comes too late in after ages. If it be necessary to know the true Pope, men ought to know who he is while they are alive. There is no repentance nor knowledge in the grave.

Nor does there seem to be much hope in purgatory for those who were deceived by false Popes on earth. It *does* seem a case in which some mercy *might* be hoped for

because when two men were fighting for the Papacy, it was really hard to know at the time which Pope was the true successor, until it was seen which Pope beat the other; and some excuse, therefore, might be made for those who did not know the true Pope, until victory and the lapse of time had settled the list. Yet, we never heard of any victorious Pope doing anything for the souls of the followers of the conquered Pope, to get them out of purgatory.

It might have seemed a graceful and a generous act in a successful Pope, to grant an indulgence to all dead followers of his defeated enemy, by passing a Bull to let them all out of purgatory. But somehow it never was done. We can only account for it by supposing that the followers of all false Popes go direct to hell; and, therefore, nothing can be done for them in purgatory.

But this makes it more than ever necessary that every man while alive should know which is the true Pope—that is, if there be really any great difference between them, besides success and failure in the object of their ambition.

But those very awkward-looking gaps, in all modern lists, of Popes of the same name, afford conclusive proof that while the so-called "Antipopes" were living, men took them for true Popes, and called them Pope so long that it was hopeless in after times to alter the numbering of the list.

There must have been a total confusion in the public mind about those *now* called true Popes, and false Popes, at the time when it was most essential that the difference (if there really was such a difference) should be clearly understood.

It is quite evident that there was not any practical way of deciding at the time which of the rival claimants (if either) was the true successor of the apostle.

If our readers could know the crimes, the bloodshed, the confusion, and the misery to mankind, and the shame and disgrace to the Church of God, which have arisen from all the various disputes that have happened by reason of the rival claims to the Bishopric of Rome, they would feel more ashamed of "the succession of the Popes" than, perhaps, of anything else connected with the Church of Rome; they would see that the Papacy has not been a source of unity to the Church, but of war and bloodshed to Christendom.

We may give some of these sad histories hereafter. We have said enough now to put it to the consciences of religious Roman Catholics to consider whether the succession of the Popes has been such that they can with confidence point to it as a proof of the APOSTOLICITY of the modern Church of Rome?

TALK OF THE ROAD.—No. XXXI.

"Jem," said Pat, "I wonder did God Almighty mean that the priests was to govern the country?"

"Well, Pat," said Jem, "it isn't likely; for didn't Jesus Christ say his kingdom was not of this world?* and if the priests are only the ministers of Christ, what business would they have governing the country? But what set you thinking of that, Pat?"

"Well, Jem," said Pat, "I got another loan of the *Tablet* newspaper, and it's the greatest paper at all for telling a thumping bit of truth betimes. Maybe a man couldn't make out a newspaper if he hadn't a good bit of truth in his pocket, with a fine bag of lies beside it."

"Well, and what's in the *Tablet* now, Pat?" said Jem.

So Pat pulled out of his pocket the *Tablet* of August 25th, and they fell to reading the great article in it; and Pat read out:—

"This country of ours is a Catholic country; the real constituents of it are the bishops and the priests; we take this for granted, and we do not see how it can be questioned. There are, of course, exceptions—places where lay influence predominates; but, on the whole, the Irish representation is the work of the priesthood. The Irish members are in Parliament because *the priests* have sent them there; they know it perfectly well, and the Protestants are not ignorant of it."

"Well, that's true anyway," said Jem; "sure it's the priest makes the member, and no mistake; but why does the people get the worst of it? What call have the people to it at all? Isn't it the poor case for them that has votes to be ordered one way by the agent and the tother by the priest? And where's the differ, only that no one gets beat at a fair or a market for voting again the agent? But wouldn't it be the fine thing if parliament would make a law that the priests would just send their own members without bothering the people at all, and getting them into trouble? I wonder is that what the *Tablet's* after? it would be the fine thing for the people anyway; sure its the greatest of peace they would get."

"Well, it would be peace anyway," said Pat; "but that *isn't* what the *Tablet* set me a-thinking. *Did* God Almighty mean that the priests was to return the members?"

"Well," said Jem, "if the kingdom of Christ isn't of this world, what business would the priests have, only with the kingdom of heaven?"

"Well, it *will* be the great day anyway," said Pat, "when the clergy thinks of nothing only of getting the people to the kingdom of heaven, without harrassing about elections. Maybe it is what Jesus Christ would like after all."

"Well, now," said Jem, "I'm thinking the clergy ought to keep to the kingdom of heaven. But I wonder how it is in foreign parts, and in America? Is it always the priests that returns the members?"

"Well, man alive," said Pat, "isn't that the very thing the *Tablet* tells us? Sure here it is;" and so Pat read out of the newspaper—

"The *Irish* priests are also the ONLY priests in EUROPE or AMERICA who have such powers. . . . . They can do in Ireland what the priests CANNOT DO in France, Belgium, or Piedmont.'"

"Well, if that isn't something to know," said Jem; "and what call have they to it in Ireland, if they havn't it in any other part of the world? Sure it can't be no part of the religion of the Church of Rome at all!"

"Well, Jem," said Pat, "it's little I'm caring now for what's part of the religion of the Church of Rome. Sure I want to get the religion of Christ. And did Jesus Christ mean that the priests was to have the power of returning the members of Parliament, and governing the country their own way?"

"Well, that's clear anyway," said Jem, "that he didn't mean that at all, when he said his kingdom wasn't of this world. But if the clergy could get us good members, what would stop them doing it?"

"Well, Jem, you omadhaun," said Pat, "sure isn't that what the *Tablet* is all about; just showing that the members the priests returns is the greatest set of villians and cheaters in all the Parliament! Sure here it is, that the members the priests sends to Parliament thinks of nothing but asking the government for 'judgeships, clerkships, and other favours.' And doesn't the *Tablet* 'beg to ask them whether they have not sacrificed not only the material interests, but even the spiritual welfare, of the poor Irishman, to their own political and personal convenience.' And now, Jem, isn't that enough to show that the priests is the worst at all to return the members for the country, when them they sends thinks of nothing but what they can get out of it for themselves, and cares nothing at all about the people?"

"Well, sure enough that's fit for the people to think about," said Jem. "But what's 'material interests,' anyway.

"Well, Jem," said Pat, "sure that's the praties or the meal we eat, and the bit of thatch on the roof that want's the new straw, or the rotten sticks that's breaking under it in every cabin you go into, and the stool that has lost the leg, and the old pot that's cracked, and the sod of turf that can't be got, and the window with the old hat that's stuck in it, and the door that won't keep out the cowld, and for the ould blanket and the bed, we'll say nothing of them; them's the '*material interests*,' Jem," said Pat.

"Oh, then, sure enough its little the priest's member ever did for the 'material interests,'" said Jem. "Sure the Rev. Mr. Owens did more for that, anyway, when he gave me the blankets that's over the children. But what does the TABLET mean about *the spiritual welfare of the poor Irishman?* What did the priests' members do with that at all?"

"Well, then, Jem," said Pat, "I'm not quite clear about what they done with that; but, sure, here's what the *Tablet* lays the blame on them for;" and so Pat read out of the paper—

"Ireland is not only losing her population, but *the Church* is losing that population in other lands. It is not merely that Irishmen emigrate bodily, but it is that Irishmen *emigrate* SPIRITUALLY. This is the question for the constituents."

"Them *constituents*, you know, is the priests', Jem," said Pat.

"Oh, then, I know what that means anyway," said Jem, "though I don't see what the members has to do with it; but I know what *emigrating spiritually* means well; sure isn't that what Father Mullin said in his letter,* that the Irish all turns Protestants in America?"

And with that Jem turned round on Pat, and got a grip of his arm, and, says Jem, "why wouldn't we both go to America, Pat, like so many of the boys that wants to turn?"

"Oh, Jem," said Pat, "don't talk about that; sure that's what's killing me. Sure I could go to America, and not be ashamed of Christ there, if the wife and childer would beg till I send for them; but why would I be afraid to confess Christ IN IRELAND, and maybe have him ashamed of me; and don't talk of what's killing me, now anyway," said Pat.

So Jem allowed he wouldn't talk about it *then*.

"But if the priests' members is that bad," said Jem, "as the TABLET allows they are, does God Almighty mean that the priests is to return the members, and to govern the country?"

"Well, if the priests' members is the worst of all," said Pat, "sure that shows that God Almighty meant the priests to mind the kingdom of heaven, and let the people get the best members they could. But I'll tell you what, Jem," said Pat, "we'll *have* to talk about going to America, or speaking out like men in Ireland."

And if they do, we shall have to tell it.

* St. John's Gospel, ch. xviii., v. 36.

* For Father Mullin's letter, in which he calculates that 1,000,000 Roman Catholic emigrants have been lost to the Church since the year 1825, see the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. 1., p. 193.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Rathbone st.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to assistants of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal which has not been paid for as ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, SEPTEMBER 15, 1855.

IT is ever with a solemn sense of responsibility that we endeavour to convince our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen, that many of their most cherished religious opinions are erroneous.

We are sensible that men who begin to doubt what they have long believed, may be in danger of allowing doubt to transgress its due limits; and believing an assured and settled faith to be of all things most precious to man, we feel the responsibility of any course that brings it into question.

At the same time we feel that no faith can be settled or secure which is not founded on the promise of God. Credulity has always ended in unbelief. Those who see, as many Roman Catholics cannot but see, that there are many impostures in their religion, must be ever in danger of taking religion itself for an imposture, especially if they observe that priests would rather countenance some manifest impostures, than submit the evidence of religion to examination.

We believe that in the long run faith will be preserved in the world by those who have sufficient faith in truth to be fearless in assaulting error. We, therefore, do not fear to urge our fellow-countrymen to reject whatever has no warrant from God, and no proof from reason; but, at the same time, we earnestly desire that they should keep before their eyes those great truths which all the efforts of Satan and his servants have never been able to shake.

"THE FOOL hath said in his heart, there is no God."—Psalm xiv. 1.

If there be found upon a road the simplest and rudest instrument which bears the marks of contrivance to answer a purpose, none but a fool will believe that the contrivance had no intellectual Being for its author.

He who looks upon the heavens by night, or the earth by day—upon the greatest or the least of the works and operations of nature—and does not see the evidence and handwriting of the Creator of all, is a fool past all reasoning with.

Yet this is the smallest part of the witness for God. HE bears witness to HIMSELF. God is in the voice of conscience; in the sense of sin and fear, He makes His own Being FELT in the heart of man.

ALL *men* HAVE *felt*, that which no man would feel, if he could, the sense of SIN and GUILT. Man *cannot* hinder God from making His Being known *in the heart of man*.

That we have SOULS is proved by the mere fact that we are capable of a sense of sin and guilt. Mere animals have no such sense, and are not capable of it.

The immortality of the soul, and the reality of a life to come, is proved by the very fact, that man is a being capable of forming ideas, and of feeling hopes and fears respecting it. Man is capable of longings and desires which this world is NOT *capable* of satisfying. All nature proves that whatever desires God has made any living creature capable of forming. God has also provided somewhat capable of satisfying those desires.

Man cannot help looking forward beyond the grave; and cannot, if he would, divest his mind of fear of what *may* follow.

Thus, God compels us to *feel*, respecting a life to come.

The sense of sin and guilt is God's own handwriting upon our souls within, that He has appointed a day, in which he will judge the world.

And with respect to His own goodness, "He left not Himself without witness, in that He did good, and gave us rain from Heaven, filling our hearts with food and gladness."—Acts xiv. 17. And mankind has acknowledged that witness.

A great society of people, called His "Church," has existed for 1800 years. That Church has preserved and handed down to us a BOOK which claims to have come from God. We can trace that society, and THAT BOOK, in every age. WE KNOW that we have that Book, just as it was written, some of it 1800 years ago, some of it 3,300 years ago.

TWO THOUSAND FOUR HUNDRED AND FIFTY YEARS AGO, when Egypt was the mightiest kingdom of the earth—ruling over the nations, and bidding fair to rule over them for ever—executing works and buildings which remain to this day as the wonder of the world—works that never have been, and never will be equalled in the world—THAT BOOK declared of Egypt, "It shall be the basest of the kingdoms; neither shall it exalt itself any more above the nations: for I will diminish them, that they shall *no more rule over the nations. . . . . There shall be* NO MORE *a Prince of the land of Egypt.*"—Ezekiel xxix. 15; xxx. 13.

For TWO THOUSAND FOUR HUNDRED years, up to this present day, Egypt, that once mighty kingdom, has been in subjection to all the nations round in turn; and has never had an independent government or Prince of its own!

BABYLON was the greatest imperial city the world has ever seen; and while it was at the height of its greatness, THAT BOOK declared of it, "The wild beasts of the desert shall dwell there, and the owls shall dwell therein; and it shall be *no more inhabited for ever:* neither shall it be dwelt in *from generation to generation.*"—Jeremiah l. 39.

For TWO THOUSAND years, Babylon, that mighty city, has been a desert—a howling wilderness. It is so at this day. It will be so for ever, for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it.

EIGHTEEN HUNDRED YEARS ago our Saviour said—"Jerusalem shall be trodden down by the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled."—Luke xxi. 24.

TWO THOUSAND FOUR HUNDRED years ago, THE BOOK had said—"Thus saith the Lord, which giveth the sun for a light by day, and the ordinances of the moon and of the stars for a light by night, which divideth the sea when the waves thereof roar; the Lord of Hosts is his name: IF those ordinances depart from before me, saith the LORD, then the seed of Israel also shall cease from being a nation before me for ever."—Jeremiah xxxi. 35, 36.

It would seem impossible, according to all human experience, that those TWO prophecies should BOTH come true; that a country should be trodden down by its enemies for so many ages, and yet, that the people of that country should never cease to be a nation! No such thing has ever happened in the history of the world.

Yet, BOTH these prophecies have been fulfilled. FOR EIGHTEEN HUNDRED years, Jerusalem has been trodden down by the Gentile nations; yet, the Jews, the seed of Israel, though driven out of their own country, and scattered throughout every nation under heaven, have no more ceased to be a nation than the sun, or the moon, or the stars have ceased to shine.

Upon that prophecy of our Saviour, the truth of God and the powers of Satan have been fairly tried.

About the year 361 there arose an emperor of Rome—JULIAN, THE APOSTATE. Of him, in respect of his political wisdom and power, it has been truly said by Montesquieu that, "since his day, there has not been a prince more worthy to govern mankind." A Christian he had been—an infidel he became. He made it the object of his reign and empire to extinguish Christianity, by proving Christ an impostor. He fixed upon that prophecy about Jerusalem, and undertook to falsify it, by rebuilding the Temple at Jerusalem and restoring the Jews. A Christian Bishop of Jerusalem, St. Cyril, like the prophet on Mount Carmel, called on the world to witness and abide by the result.—Socrates, Eccl. Hist. lib. iii., c. 20.

All the power of this world was at command to accomplish what Christ had said should not be done. The workmen commenced their labours. The earth quaked under their feet: the flames burst forth from the foundations they had opened. The work was abandoned before the hand of God!

And then that Christian bishop stood forth before his congregation on Mount Zion: with uplifted hand he pointed to the Temple, and exclaimed—"Behold the Temple of the Jews: God hath destroyed it; have men been able to rebuild it?" And, pointing then to his hearers, the living stones of a spiritual Temple, he exclaimed—"Behold the Church of Christ: God hath established her; have men been able to destroy her?"

Since that day FIFTEEN centuries have rolled away. Jerusalem is still trodden down of the Gentiles, yet the seed of Israel has not ceased to be a nation.

The historian Gibbon, the most learned historian the world has produced—himself an infidel—who wrote his history to make a mock at God—has acknowledged the failure of the Emperor Julian; and has declared that the proofs of the miracle "should satisfy a believing, and must astonish an incredulous mind."—History of the Decline and Fall, chap. 23.

Even the infidelity of man has borne witness to God.

Let the world now judge between those who would falsify the words of Christ, and those who put their trust in them.

The proofs of the truth of THAT BOOK, are more than we can number. ONE there is greater and more precious than any we have given—its power to reveal to man his inmost thoughts; the approval it exacts from his noblest feelings; its capability of supplying every want and aspiration which an immortal spirit is capable of entertaining. We may return hereafter to this best and noblest proof. We must be satisfied for the present to rest upon what St. Peter calls "the sure word of prophecy" (2 Peter i. 19) in proof that THE BOOK is indeed given by the inspiration of HIM who holds in his hand all the kingdoms of the earth, and ruleth all things after the counsel of his own will.

THAT BOOK is the source and foundation of our faith; and it is the object of all our labours that it should be a sure and firm foundation for the faith of all our fellow-countrymen.

This is the Book of which some Roman Catholics do tell us, that we could never have known whether it were truly the Word of God or no, unless the Pope of Rome had been pleased to tell us so!

But we say of the Pope of Rome, and of every living man to whom the Word of God has come, that the Word which God has spoken, THAT WORD shall judge him at the last day.—John xii. 48.

Let none of our readers now suppose or fear that our arguments against the superstitions or inventions of men are designed, or are likely, to shake or to unsettle their faith. Our object and our work is for this alone—that every imposture, every superstition, every invention of man, should fall before the truth of God, in order that the Word of Him who cannot lie may stand, and be established, for ever and ever.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

In consequence of the considerable number of Subscriptions still unpaid, the publisher will, henceforward, be obliged to discontinue the paper to such *Subscribers* as are in arrear. A Blue Cover will, it is hoped, be taken as a sufficient notification. We have already more than once explained the difficulty of making special applications.

CAMPAGNA DI ROMA.

SUCH of our readers as have not had the advantage of visiting the Eternal City themselves, will, we think, read with interest the following extracts from the Rev. J. A. Wylie's recent work, entitled "Pilgrimage from the Alps to the Tiber,"* a volume well worthy of the serious attention of all who desire to know the results of Romanism on the political and social condition of those who live under its sway:—

"Rome, like all other great capitals, is placed on a site worthy of her greatness and renown. No one needs to be told that the seat of that city which, for so many ages, held the sceptre of the world, is the Campagna di Roma.

"I need not dwell on the magnificence of that truly imperial plain, to which nature has given, in a country of hills, dimensions so goodly. From the foot of the Apennines it runs on and on for upwards of a hundred miles, till it meets the Neapolitan frontier at Terracina. Its breadth from the Volscian hills to the sea cannot be less than forty miles. Towards the head of this great plain lies Rome, than which a finer site could nowhere have been found. By nature it is most fertile; its climate is delicious. A boundary of glorious hills encloses it on all sides save the south-west. On the south-east are the gentle Volscians, clothed with flourishing woods, and sparkling with villas. Running up along the plain, and lying due east of Rome, are the Sabine hills, of a deep azure colour, with a fine mottling of light and shade upon their sides. Shutting in the plain on the north, and sweeping round in a magnificent bend towards the west, are the craggy and romantic Appennines. Such was the stage on which sat invincible, eternal Rome. This plain was traversed, moreover, by thirty-three highways, which connected the city with every quarter of the habitable globe. Its surface exhibited the richest cultivation. From side to side it was covered with gardens and vineyards, in the verdure and blossoms of an eternal spring; amid which rose the temples of the gods of Rome, the trophies of her warriors, the tombs and monuments of her legislators and orators, and the villas and rural retreats of her senators and merchants. Indeed this plain would seem, in imperial times, to have been one vast city, stretching out from the white strand of the Mediterranean to the summit of the Volscian hills."

What is its state now?

"I had seated myself in front of the vehicle, in the hope of catching the first glimpse of St. Peter's, as its dome should emerge above the plain; but so wretched were our cattle that, though we started at mid-day, and had only fifty miles of road, night fell long before we reached the gates of the Eternal City. I saw the country well, however, so long as daylight lasted. We kept in sight of the shore for twenty-five miles, and glad I was of it; for the waves, with their crest of snow, and voice of thunder, seemed old friends, and I shuddered to think of plunging into that black silent wilderness on the left. At the gates of Civita Vecchia the desolation begins; and such desolation! I had often read that the Campagna was desolate—I had come there expecting to find it desolate—but when I saw that desolation I was confounded. I cannot describe it; it must be seen to be conceived of. It is not that it is silent; the Highlands of Scotland are so. It is not that it is barren; the sands of Arabia are so. They are as they were, and should be. But not so the Campagna. There is something unnatural about its desolation. A statue is as still, as silent, and as cold as the corpse; but, then, it never had life; and while you gaze on the one, the other chills you to the heart. So *is it* with the Campagna. While the sands of the desert exhilarate you, and the silence of the Swiss or Scottish Highlands are felt to be sublime, the desolation of the Campagna is felt to be unnatural; it overawes and terrifies you. Such a void in the heart of Europe, and that, too, in a land which was the home of art—where war accumulated her spoils, and wealth her treasures—and which gave letters and laws to the surrounding world—is unspeakably confounding. One's faith is staggered in the past history of the country. The first glance of the blackened bosom of the Campagna makes one feel as if he had retrograded to the barbarous ages, or had been carried thousands and thousands of miles from home and set down in a savage country, where the arts had

* Edinburgh: Shepherd and Elliot, 15, Prince's-street. London: Hamilton, Adams, and Co. 1855.

not yet been invented or civilization dawned. Its surface is rough and uneven, as if it had been tumbled about at some former period; it is dotted with wild bushes, and here and there lonely mounds rise to diversify it. There are no houses on it, save the post-houses, which are square, tower-like buildings, having the stables below, and the dwellings above. It has its patches of grass, on which herds depasture, followed by men clothed in sheepskins and goatskins, and looking as savage almost as the animals they tend. It is, in short, a wilderness, and more frightful than the other wildernesses of the earth, because the traveller feels that here is the hand of doom. The land lies scathed and blackened under the curse of the Almighty. As the night grew late, the inquiries became more frequent—'Are we not yet at Rome?' We were not yet at Rome; but we did all that men could with four, and sometimes six, half-starved animals, bestrode by drowsy postilions, to reach it. Now we were labouring in deep roads, now fording impetuous torrents, and now getting along on the hard pavement of the Via Aurelia. By the glimpses of the moon we could see the milestones by the roadside, with ROME upon them. Seldom has writing thrilled me so. To find a name which fills history, and which for thirty centuries has extorted the homage of the world, and still awes it, written thus upon a common milestone, and standing there amid the tempest on the roadside, had in it something of the sublime. Was it, then, a reality, and not a dream? and should I, in a very short time, be in Rome itself—that city which had been the theatre of so many events of world-wide influence, and which, for so many ages, had borne sway over all the kings and kingdoms of the earth?'

We cannot at present find room to give our readers any idea of what our author saw in "the Eternal City," for we are only treating of the country surrounding it—the CAMPAGNA DI ROMA. That the state of Rome is not one of surpassing prosperity, may, however, be collected from what follows:—

"The commerce of Italy is extinct. The Italians produce nothing for export. There are no factories, no mining operations, no ship-building, no public works, no printing-presses, no tools of trade. They make nothing but a few articles of *vertù*, and even in those arts, foreigners excel them. The best sculptors and painters at Rome are Englishmen. As regards their soil, which might send its wheat, and wine, and olives, all delicious naturally, to every part of the world, its harvests are now able but to feed the few men who live in the country. The wide waste of the Campagna di Roma is of the richest soil, and, spread out beneath the warm sun, might mingle on its surface the fruits of the torrid with those of the temperate zone. As to imposts, the Pontiff has enclosed his territory with a triple wall of protective duties and monopolies, to keep out the foreign merchant; and thus not only are the Romans forbidden to labour for themselves, but they are prevented profiting by the labour of others. There is a monopoly of sugar-refining, a monopoly of salt-making, and, in short, of everything which the Romans most need. These monopolies are held by the favourites of the government; and though generally the houses that hold them are either unwilling or unable to make more than a tenth part of what the Romans would require, no other establishment can produce these articles, and they cannot be imported but at a ruinous duty.

"In the absence of trade there is a proportionate amount of idleness; and that idleness, in its turn, breeds beggary, vagabondism, and crime. The French Prefect, Mr. Whiteside tells us, published a statistical account of Rome; and how many paupers, does he say, there are in it? Why, not fewer than thirty thousand. Thirty thousand paupers in one city, and that city, in its usual state of but about a hundred and twenty thousand inhabitants! Subtract the priests, the English residents, and the French soldiers, and every third man is a beggar.

"I was fortunate enough, one evening, to meet in a certain shop in Rome, an intelligent Roman, willing to talk to me on the state of the country. The shopkeeper, as soon as he found the turn the conversation had taken, discreetly stepped out, and left it all to ourselves. 'I never, in all my life,' I remarked, 'saw a city in which I found so many beggars. The people seem to have nothing to do, and nothing to eat. There are here some hundred thousand of you cooped up within these old walls, and one half the population do nothing all day long but whine at the heels of the English travellers, or hang on at the doors of the convents, waiting their one meal a day. Why is this? Outside the walls is a magnificent plain, which, were it cultivated, would feed ten Romes, instead of one. Why don't you take picks, or spades, or ploughs—anything you can lay hands on—and go out to that plain, and dig it, and plant it, and sow it, and reap it, and eat and drink, and be merry?' 'Ah! so we would,' said he. 'Then, why don't you?' 'We dare not,' he replied. 'Dare not! Dare not till the earth God has given you?' 'It is the Church's,' he said. 'But, come now,' said he, 'and I will explain how it comes to be so.' He went on to say, that one portion of the Campagna was gifted to the convents in Rome, another portion was gifted to the nunneries, another to the hospitals, and another to the pontifical families—that is, to the sons and daughters, or, as they more politely speak in Rome, the nephews and nieces of the popes. These were the owners of the great Roman plain, and in their hands almost every acre of it was locked up, inaccessible to the plough, and inaccessible to the people. Even in our country it is found that corporations make the worst possible landlords, and that lands, in the possession of such bodies, are less productive than estates managed in the ordinary way. But what sort of farming are we to expect from such corporations as we find in the city of Rome? What skill or capital have a brotherhood of lazy monks to enable them to cultivate their lands? What enterprise or interest have a sisterhood of nuns to farm their property? They know they shall have their lifetime of it, and that is all they care for. Accordingly, they let their lands for grazing, on payment of a mere trifle of annual rent, and so the Campagna lies unploughed and unsown. A tract of land, extending from Civita Vecchia to well nigh the gates of Rome—which would make a Scotch dukedom, or a German principality—belonging to the *San Spirito*, does little more, I was told, than pay its working. The land labours under an eternal entail, which binds it over to perpetual sterility. It is God's—*i.e.*, it is the Church's—and no one—no, not even the Pope—dare alienate a single acre of it. No Pope would set his face to such a piece of reformation, well knowing that every brotherhood and sisterhood in Rome would rise in arms against him. And even though he should screw his courage to such an encounter, he is met by the canon law. The Pope who shall dare to secularize a foot-breadth of land, which has been gifted to the Church, is by that law accursed. Here, then, is the price which the Romans pay for the Papacy. Outside the walls of the city lie the estates of the Church, depastured, at certain seasons, by a few herds, tended by men clad in skins, and looking as savage as the animals they tend; while inside the walls are some hundred thousand Romans, enduring from one year to another all the miseries of a partial famine. Nor is there the least hope that matters will mend. While the Papacy lasts, the Campagna, once so populous and rich, will be what it now is—a desert.

"All have heard of the Pontine marshes—a chain of swamps which run along the foot of the Volscian mountains, and are the birthplace of the malaria, a white vapour which creeps snake-like over the country, and smites, with deadly fever, whoever is so foolhardy as to sleep on the *Campagna* during its continuance. These marshes, I understand, are increasing; and the malaria is increasing in consequence. That fatal vapour now comes every summer to the gates of Rome; it covers a certain quarter of the city, which, I was told, is uninhabited during its continuance; and if nothing be done to lessen the malaria at its source, it will, some century or half century after this, envelope in its pestilential folds the whole of the Eternal City, and the travellers will gaze with awe on the blackened ruins of Rome, as he does on those of Babylon on the plain of Chaldea; so, I say, will he see the heaps of Rome on the wasted bosom of the Campagna deserted by man, and become the dwelling-place of the dragons and satyrs of the wilderness. But matters are not come to this yet. An English company (for every attempted improvement in Rome has originated with English skill and capital) was formed some years ago to drain the Pontine marshes. They went to the Vatican; and Sir Humphrey Davy being then in Rome, they induced him to accompany them, in the hope that his high scientific authority would have some weight with the Pontiff. They stated their object, which was to drain the Pontine marshes. They assured the Pontiff, Gregory XVI., that it was practicable to a very large extent; and they pointed out its manifold advantages, as regarded the health of the country and other things.

"'Drain the Pontine marshes!' exclaimed Pope Gregory, in a tone of surprise and horror at this new project of these everlasting scheming English heretics. 'Drain the Pontine marshes! God made the Pontine marshes; and if He had intended them to be drained, He would have drained them Himself.' Pope Gregory would not allow even an iron bridge to be thrown across the Tiber. The Romans solicited this, to get rid of a ferry-boat by which the Tiber is crossed at the point in question. But no; an iron bridge there could not be. And why? 'Ah!' said Gregory,' if we have an iron bridge in Rome, we shall next have an iron road; and if we have an iron road, "*adio*," the Papacy will take its departure, and that by steam.'

"But the Pope had another reason for withholding his sanction from the iron bridge; and as that reason shows how some wretched crotchet, springing from their miserable system, is sure to start upon all occasions and defeat the most needed improvement, I shall here state what it was. At the point where it was wished to have the bridge erected, the Tiber flows between two populous regions of the city. There is, in consequence, a considerable concourse, and the passengers are carried over, as I have said, in a ferry-boat, for which a couple of baiocchi is paid by each person to the ferryman. The money thus collected forms part of the revenues of a certain church in Rome, where the priests who receive it sing masses for the souls in purgatory. If you abolish the ferry boat, it was argued, you will abolish the penny; and if you abolish the penny, what is to become of the poor souls in purgatory? And for the sake of the *souls*, the living were forced to do without the bridge."

Correspondence.

THE CHURCH OF CHRIST

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

KIND SIR—I wrote a letter to you about four weeks ago, describing my situation in life, and containing several remarks on your fine-printed paper, and concerning your crying down the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, and requiring of you to be so kind and charitable as to tell us poor benighted Papists, as we are called by several of our brethren, which of the sects that call themselves Christians is the Holy Catholic Church, the communion of saints, which you (I suppose) and we truly and surely profess to believe and obey; which of them is our Saviour's holy spouse, his love, his dove, his undefiled; which of them did be* sanctify, cleansing it by the laver of water in the Word of Life, that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish; which of them, kind sir, is the pillar and ground of truth; which of them is that great city compared to a great city on the top of a mountain, so visible that the people of all nations are more or less flowing into her from her foundation to this present day; which of them is that great city on whose walls there are strong towers full of watchmen that hold not their peace day nor night, but crying out to their flocks to be aware of the wolves and tigers that surround *them*; which of them is that visible Church in all ages that men and women that refuse to hear and obey her precepts, are compared to a heathen or a publican; in a word, sir, which of them have the visible succession of head pastor from our Saviour's time to the present day? Let there not one link of the golden chain be broken; it makes no odds to us if some of them were loose in their morals, or whether they chopped or changed discipline as often as the laws, or customs, or clime required it, as long as they did not change the articles of our faith, which they could not do under God's eternal promise, that the gates of hell should not prevail against his Church; nor it makes no odds to us if some of them were turned out for their faults, and others elected in their *place*; nor it makes no odds, too, whether they resided in Italy, France, England, Germany, or Spain; wherever they reside they are still the heads of the Church, according to our Saviour's promise, who said, "And other sheep I have that are not of this fold, them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd."—St. John x. 16. It would be good for all the sectaries if they would ponder well on this tenth chapter of St. John; if they did they would not be so apt to separate from the guidance of God's visible shepherd. See also St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians; our Redeemer prayed to his Heavenly Father to have all his followers one, as he and his Heavenly Father were one. So you see, kind sir, there is no room left by our Saviour nor St. Paul for Christians to be divided into sects or parties, but that they should be all one, under one head shepherd, called and consecrated, and elected in due succession from our Saviour's time down to the present day.

Now, sir, if you can, prove that the Romans lost this succession; be pleased to prove to us (according to common sense and reason, for we know no other) which of the sects that call themselves Christians have them signs I described to you. So you see there is but one only to have them according to our Saviour, St. Paul, and the apostles' traditional creed—ninth article of said *creed*. Mind, kind sir, if you do not prove to us that your favourite Church have the signs I mentioned—that is, unity, holiness, and catholicity—do it in your next CATHOLIC LAYMAN, or never again send us one of them; for we will consider them antiscatholic. Excuse my blunders, for I know no grammar.

Sir, your most obedient humble servant,
JOHN MILLER.

We received John Miller's former letter, but from press of matter were unable then to attend to it, as the importance of the question contained in it deserved.

As the letter which we now print contains all that was important in the former letter, repeated in the same words, it is now unnecessary to print that former letter.

John Miller asks us "Which of the sects, that call themselves Christians, is that Catholic Church, the communion of saints? which of them is our Saviour's holy spouse, his love, his dove, his undefiled one? which of them did be sanctify, cleansing it by the laver of water in the Word of Life, that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish?"—Ephesians v. 26 & 27.

To this we answer—

FIRST.—Since the way of life is narrow, and there be few who find it, the Church of the saved cannot be the LARGEST visible society of professing Christians.

SECOND.—EVERY MEMBER of that Church which is the spouse of Christ, shall be with Christ in glory for ever; for Isaiah says, "ALL thy children shall be taught of the

* Epistle of St. Paul to the Ephesians, chap. v. verses 26, 27.

Lord, and great shall be the peace of thy children."—Isaiah ch. liv. 13. Therefore, ALL the children of that Church, of which the prophet speaks, shall be saved.

But multitudes of the members of the Church of Rome, who are liars, drunkards, fornicators, thieves, or such like, "shall not inherit the kingdom of God."—Galatians v. 19-21. Whoever is a member of that Church, which is the spouse of Christ, will be saved, simply *because* he *is* a member of that Church. But no man will be saved simply because he is a member of the Church of Rome, Therefore, the Church of Rome cannot claim to be that Church which is the spouse of Christ.

THIRD.—That glorious Church which Christ has cleansed, that he might present it to himself, is holy and *without blemish*. The Church of Rome is *not* without blemish—not even in her head. Therefore, the Church of Rome is not that spouse of Christ which is without blemish.

When Pope Sergius III. was "a robber, an apostate"—when Pope Lando kept a harlot, who made her lovers archbishops—when John X. was made Pope by his harlot—when Pope John XI. had a Pope for his father, a harlot for his mother, and was himself "a monster"—when Pope John XII., who had lived in adultery, was killed in the act of adultery—when Pope Boniface VII. was a murderer—when "a three headed beast, rising from the gates of hell, most miserably infested the most holy chair of Peter—THEN the Church of Rome was not *without blemish*.* John Miller must certainly feel that an adulterous Pope is a blemish in the Church of Rome.

We go farther: we say that every wicked man is a blemish in the Church to which he belongs

We say that NO Church which contains in it a multitude—perhaps a majority—of wretched men, children of the devil, *can* be the "spouse of Christ," the GLORIOUS Church, not having *spot*, or *wrinkle*, or any such thing, but holy and without blemish.

When John Miller asks us WHICH community of professing Christians on earth IS *this* Church, glorious and without blemish, we say that none is; for we can find no Church on earth which is not grievously blemished with wicked members.

If he will find us a Church on earth which is without such blemishes, we will acknowledge that to be the glorious Church which is, indeed, the "spouse of Christ."

But if no such Church or fellowship is visible on earth, then John Miller ought to agree with us, that the "spouse of Christ" is that "general assembly and Church of the first-born which are *written in heaven*."—Hebrews xii. 23. No wicked men are *written in heaven*. Therefore, the list which is "written in heaven," is *not* the list of the members of *any* Church on earth.

Many members of the "Church of the first-born" are now on earth; but they are not distinguished from evil men by belonging to any outward or visible fellowship or society.

"If any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is *none* of Christ's."—Romans viii. 9.

There are many members of every visible Church on earth, who have not the spirit of Christ. These are not written in heaven.

The Church, of which glorious things are written—the Church which shall be glorious with Christ at the latter day—is the "general assembly" of those in whose hearts Christ now reigns, by his spirit dwelling in them; whose names are written in heaven.

Who these are, does not now appear outwardly to men, but "the Lord knoweth them that are His."—2 Tim. ii. 19; and THIS Church shall be made visible to the universe, when it shall be presented to Christ, "glorious, holy, and without blemish."

If John Miller think that these are Protestant and heretical notions, then he must confess that the great St. Augustine, who lived in the fourth century, was a Protestant. For it was St. Augustine who taught us these notions about the Church. We have shown this in our number for October, 1853, p. 113.

This error of applying to the visible Church of Rome, the things said in Scripture of the Church which is written in heaven, runs through all John Miller's letter; and we do solemnly entreat him to consider the fearful blasphemy into which it has betrayed him.

He quotes our Saviour's words—"Other sheep I have that are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one fold, and one shepherd" (St. John, chap. 10, verse 16); and then he goes on—"It would be good for all the sectaries if they would ponder well on this tenth chapter of St. John. *If they did* they would not be so apt to separate from the guidance of God's VISIBLE SHEPHERD."

John Miller first mistakes the "one fold" for the Church of Rome. Having made this mistake, he then naturally goes on, and mistakes the Pope for the "one shepherd;" for, of course, it is the Pope that he means by "God's visible shepherd," whom he thinks all Christians ought to learn of from the tenth chapter of St. John.

But in that very place that John Miller has quoted, Jesus Christ himself explained who the shepherd is: "I AM the good SHEPHERD;" and then Jesus Christ applies it, "Them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one fold and one SHEPHERD;" where it is as clear as the sun that the "one shepherd" is Jesus Christ himself. Yet John Miller takes it to be a "visible shepherd," who, of course, must be the Pope.

We ask John Miller to look over again that list of popes which we have given above, and to consider, was each of these popes, in his day, the ONE SHEPHERD of the ONE FOLD, spoken of in the tenth chapter of St. John's Gospel?

Surely the Protestants are right, who say that the "one shepherd," in the tenth chapter of St. John's Gospel, is JESUS CHRIST HIMSELF, yesterday, to day, and for ever!

We do warn John Miller, and all our readers, against those false notions of the Church which lead men to put MAN into the place of GOD.

But while we thus apply to the spiritual and heavenly Church the things which Scripture has spoken about IT, we do also acknowledge that Christ and his apostles have established a visible Church on earth; a visible society and fellowship of men, with a ministry instituted by the apostles and continued to this day. We hold that it was the will of Christ that this visible society should be ONE; and that His apostles have left rules in Scripture for preserving its unity; and that all Christians are bound, as they will answer to Christ at the great day, to adhere to the rules of unity, which the apostles have left us in Scripture.

We excuse none who have violated those rules. We object to the Church of Rome that more than any other, she has violated those rules, and given occasion to men to violate them.

To those rules of unity we adhere, as we do to all other rules we find in Scripture. We desire to show those rules to all our readers.

If John Miller had asked us the plain, practical question—"To what society of Christians in this country ought we to join ourselves, in order to obey the rules of unity which the apostles gave to the Church?" We should have been ready to answer him.

He has NOT asked us *this* question, and yet we will answer it. We will perform this promise in our next.

For all these facts, as stated by Roman Catholics themselves, the reader is referred to our number of February, 1855, pages 15 and 16.

* Matt. iv. 18. Acts iv. 12.

HOW POOR IRISHMEN GET BIBLES.

MR. EDITOR—They say that "a long threatening comes at last," and signs on—Jerry has got one of our own Testaments after being these three months hunting for it; but the queer part entirely is, that 'twas from a Protestant he got it, and by the same token there's more where that came from, and I'm thinking that many of the boys will be looking for Douay Testaments now that they're so easily got. But I must tell your honour how it all came to pass. You see, sir, myself and a lot of the boys were cutting turf for the master, and after the day's work we sat down in Jerry's house that's convenient to the bog, and while we were talking, who should come in but a decent-looking man, and, says he, "Good evening to ye, boys." "Good evening kindly," says we; so down he sat forenent us. After a while, Jerry says to him, "I think, sir, you're a stranger in these parts?" "Well," says he, "I'm not long in this part of the country." "And what's your trade?" says Jerry, "if I may make so bold." "Why," says he, "my trade is reading the Bible for all who will listen to it." Well, sir, we all knew what he was then, and the boys began at him; and, says Mick Flynn, "I suppose you're a jumper?" "Well," says he, if you tell me what you mean by a jumper, I'll tell you whether I'm one or not." "Why," says Mick, "a jumper is a turncoat; one that changes his religion." "Well," says the reader, "at that rate I am a jumper; and," says he, "I'm not ashamed of being one; for," says he, "St. Paul was a jumper, and so was St. Peter, and so were all the apostles." Well, sir, when he said this, you never heard such a row as the boys kicked up; "and," says Mick, "you slandering villain, how dare you say such a thing of the holy apostles?" Says he, "I'm only saying what's true, and if you give me fair play I'll prove it;" and with that he pulls two Bibles out of his pocket; "and," says he, "I'm ready to give you the proof either out of the Protestant Bible, or the Douay Bible." "Give them to us out of the Douay," says all the boys. "Well," says he, "I'm content; for though I consider the Protestant Bible much more correct than yours, still I can prove my religion out of the Douay Bible, and I can prove out of it that the apostles were jumpers like myself." So he read for us how our blessed Lord found Peter and Andrew fishing, and how he called them to be his apostles;* "and," says he, "what religion was St. Peter when Christ met him?" "He was of the Jewish religion, of course," says Mick. "And what religion was he when he preached to the people about Christ, and told them that there was 'no other name under heaven given to men whereby they must be saved?"† "He was a Christian, then," says Mick. "Very good," says the reader, "that's all I want. St. Peter changed his religion; so, according to your own words, he was a jumper; and now," says he, "I'll prove that St. Paul was a jumper;" so he read about his consenting to Stephen's death, and his persecution of the Christians; and how he dragged men, women, and children to prison because they believed on Christ;‡ "and," says he, "what religion was St. Paul then?" "He belonged to the Jewish religion," says Mick. "And what religion was he," says the reader, "when he preached Jesus in the synagogues, that he is the Son of God."§ Well, Mick had to allow that he was then a Christian. So the reader turned to us, and, says he, "boys, haven't I proved my words that the holy apostles were jumpers; and," says he, "I'm not ashamed of the name while I've them to keep me company—

> 'I rejoice to acknowledge, when jumper you name me,
> That I've jumped out of darkness, and now I can see.
> I may well jump for joy, though you foolishly blame me
> For choosing with Peter and Paul to be free.'

"Well, Mick," says one of the boys, "I think the reader has the best of the argument; and," says he, "I'll never abuse a jumper again, seeing that the holy apostles were jumpers themselves." Well, the reader had the crow entirely; and, says he, "boys, if you read your own Douay Bible you'd have known that all the apostles changed their religion; "and," says he, "'tis what's ruining you entirely, is the want of God's Word. Sure," says he, "your souls are worth as much as the Protestants' souls—and you've as good brains as the Protestants—and you'd be as well able to understand the Bible as they are—and it's a thousand pities that you don't get the Word of God, to know what He's saying to you in it." "But," says Mick, "how could the likes of us understand it? Sure it's only those who go through college that could understand the Bible." "Well," says the reader, "I'm thinking it can't be so difficult as all that; for, surely, when God provided a book for our instruction, he didn't make it so dark that we couldn't understand it; for," says he, "what would be the use of giving it to us at all at that rate?" "Sure," says he, "if the master wrote one of you a letter about something on the farm, he'd take care to write it so plain that you could understand it; and do you mean to tell me," says he, "that God couldn't write it plain too." "Well," says Jerry, "that's common sense; and," says he, "there's the 'Talk of the Road' in the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, written by a man like ourselves, and still it's put so plain that we can all understand it; and would any of you say that the Great God, who knows all things, couldn't write plain enough for his creatures to understand him? Sure," says he, "what use would the book be at all if we couldn't understand it?" "True for you," says the reader; "there may be some parts that are difficult; but, that don't hinder our understanding the easy parts; and," says he, "the more you read it, the more you'd understand it; and," says he, "it's so easy, that even the children can understand it; for St. Paul says to Timothy, '*from thy infancy thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which can instruct thee to salvation, by the faith which is in Christ Jesus;*'‖ and," says he, "they couldn't have been very hard, when a child could know them; and," says he, "see what a knowledge of the Scriptures did for him—*it instructed him unto salvation;* and," says he, "boys, what more do any of us want than to be instructed unto salvation?" "Troth, then, that's true for you," says Jerry, "that's all we want, and I suppose 'twould instruct us, as well as it did Timothy." "Never doubt it," says the reader; "for," says he, "that's what God intended it for." "But," says Mick, "Father John tells us that it's only intended for the clergy." "Well," says the reader, "that's what Father John says; but now listen to what God says—'*These words which I command thee this day, shall be in thy heart, and thou shalt tell them to thy children.*'¶ Now, boys," says he, "you know that your clergy have no children to tell them to, so the command must be to all, and not to the clergy only; and," says he, "the fathers and mothers must read God's words, to be able to tell them to their children." "But," says Mick, "if that's the case, why is it that the priests are so much against the Bible?" "Well," says the reader, "I'll answer that question by asking another." "Tell me," says he, "why is Tim Donovan, the poacher, always against the game laws?" "That's easily answered," says Mick; "he's against them, because they're against him." "Why, then, I'm thinking," says the reader, "that *the priests are against the Bible for the very same reason—because the Bible is against them.*" Well, sir, the boys began to abuse him; "and," says they, "you turncoat villain, how dare you say such a thing? and," says they, "who'd take your word against the priest's word?" "And," says Mick, "it's easy for you to say it, but you couldn't prove it." "I could," says the reader, "if you'd only give me fair play;" and with that he pulls the Douay Bible out of his pocket. "Don't listen to him at all," says some of the boys; and when Jerry wanted them to hear him, they all cried out at him for allowing the jumper to stay any longer in the house, and he abusing the clergy. "Well, boys," says the reader, "I see that you won't let me prove it, and with that he put the Douay Bible back into his pocket; "but, says" he, "without going into any proofs at all, isn't it as plain as the nose on your face that the priests are afraid of the Bible; and," says he, "*why would they be afraid of it if it was for them?* and," says he, "if the priests thought that you'd pick Romish doctrines out of the Bible *they'd be eager to give it to you;* they'd give it out as freely as they do 'The glories of Mary,' or 'The Garden of the Soul;' but," says he, "when you hear them ordering the people not to read the Bible, isn't it a plain proof that the Bible is against them? and," says he, "if the Bible was against the Protestants they'd be as much afraid of it as the priests are;

‡ Acts vii. 57, viii. 3. § Acts ix. 20. ‖ 2. Tim. iii. 15
¶ Deut. vi. 6, 7.

but, "says he, "you see them giving them out to men, women, and children; and, therefore, *it must be that the Bible is for them;* and now, boys," says he, "without going into any other proofs, *isn't it plain from this, that the Bible must be for the Protestants and against the priests?*" Well, the boys were quite silenced, and hadn't a word in their mouths; for what the reader said was plain common sense that they could all understand; so, at last, Jerry says to him, "It's the honest truth you've told us; and," says he, "it's myself is looking for a Douay Bible these three months, and not one can I get for love or money." "Well," says the reader, "I think I'll be able to help you; for," says he, "I'm ordered to sell Douay Testaments at half price to any one who can't afford more; and," says he, "my clergy had to give tenpence each for them, but they'll give them to you for fivepence; for," says he, "*they're so anxious that you should have the Word of God, that they're willing to lose five-pence on each;* for though they consider the Protestant Bible by far the best, still they'd rather you should have the Douay Bible than none at all." "Well," says Mick Flyn, "that beats all I ever heard; and," says he, "I can't doubt any longer that the Douay Testament is for the Protestants, and against the priests." "And," says the reader, "we'd be willing to give the whole Douay Bible if we could, but they're too dear, and we couldn't afford to give them for half price; but," says he, "the New Testament contains most of the points of difference between us; and," says he, "I'll lend the whole Bible to any of you that wish to compare it." Well, sir, Jerry pulled out the pence and got the Testament; "and," says Mick, "I'd buy one too, if I could get the priest's leave; but," says he, "I know he wouldn't let me, and I'd be afraid to get it against his orders." "Well," says the reader, "if a Pope gave you leave to read it, would you care for the priest forbidding you?" "Of course I wouldn't," says Mick; "for a Pope's word is greater than a priest's word." "Well," says the reader, "here's the Douay Bible, and read out for us what Pope Pius the Sixth says about it." Well, Mick took the Bible, and first he looked to see whether it was the real Douay Bible; and when he saw the index at the end of it, showing the texts that prove "purgatory" and "extreme unction," and all the other doctrines of our holy Church, he was satisfied that it was our own Bible. So with that he turned to the first page and began to read, and here is what he read—

"*The following letter of his Holiness Pius the Sixth, to the Most Reverend Anthony Martini, Archbishop of Florence, on his translation of the Holy Bible into Italian, shows the benefit which the faithful may reap from their having the Holy Scriptures in the vulgar tongue.*

POPE PIUS THE SIXTH.

Beloved son, health and apostolical benediction! At a time that a vast number of bad books, which grossly attack the Catholic religion, are circulated even among the unlearned, to the great destruction of souls, you judge exceedingly well that the faithful should be excited to the reading of the Holy Scriptures, for these are the most abundant sources, which ought to be left open to every one, to draw from them purity of morals and of doctrine, to eradicate the errors which are so widely disseminated in those corrupt times. This you have seasonably effected, as you declare, by publishing the sacred writings in the language of your country, suitable to every one's capacity, especially when you show and set forth that you have added explanatory notes, which, being extracted from the Holy Fathers, preclude every possible danger of abuse."†

"Now," says the reader, "haven't you the Pope's leave to read the Bible? Doesn't he say that the faithful should be *excited* to the reading of the Scriptures? and doesn't he say that they should be left *open to every one?* and," says he, "which is right—the Pope or the priest? and," says he, "look to the bottom of the same page, where Bishop Denvir approves of it, and says, '*I hereby sanction its circulation among the faithful;*' and," says he, "look to the first page of the Testament§ and you will find Bishop Murray's approval. He says, '*This new edition of the English version of the New Testament, printed, with our permission, by James Duffy, we, by our authority, approve; and we declare that the same may be used by the faithful with great spiritual profit, provided it be read with due reverence, and with the proper dispositions.*'" "Well," says Mick, "that beats all that ever I heard; and," says he, "I'll buy a Testament myself, if Father John was to curse till he got black in the face." Well, sir, with that three more of the boys got Testaments; "and," says they, "if Father John says against it, we can tell him that we have the Pope's leave, and Bishop Denvir's leave, and Bishop Murray's leave to read them." "And, what's more," says the reader, "we've leave from one that's greater than Pope or bishop." "Why, then, who's greater than the Pope?" says Mick. "Jesus Christ is greater," says the reader, "and we have his leave to read God's Word. He said to the Jews, '*Search the Scriptures*'; ‖ and sure if it was right for the Jews to search them, it's right for us to do the same; and," says he, "the Evangelist praises the Bereans for searching the Scriptures, and he says that '*these were more noble than those in Thessalonica, because they received the word with all eagerness, daily searching the Scriptures whether these things were so;*' * and," says he, "look at the note to this verse in the Douay Testament, where your Church praises those Bereans for searching the Scriptures, and then, boys," says he, "tell me *why do the priests curse the people for doing the very same thing that the Bereans were praised for?* and now," says he, "I must be going; but before I go I would urge you to read your Bible, for God commands you to do so; read it, for the Evangelist praises those who did so; read it, for it is so plain that it can make even a child wise unto salvation; read it, because you yourselves will be judged by it at the last day." So with that he left the house; but if ever he comes again I'll let your honour know.

Your humble servant to command,

DAN. CARTHY.

† First page of the Douay Bible, A.D. 1850.

§ First page of Rheimish Testament, published by James Duffy, A.D. 1853.

‖ John v. 39.

* Acts xvii. 11.

CHRIST AND HIS PEOPLE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—It has often occurred to me that, if the Roman Catholic doctrine of purgatory be true, Christ must be there now; for Christ and his people are united—they are *one*. St. Paul says, "We are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones;" and again, "He is the head of the body" (the Church); so that all things which Christ has suffered, has been for his people, and as their representative. Thus in his death, St Paul says, that "We are crucified with Christ;" and again, "We are *buried* with him by baptism into death." The thief on the cross was, no doubt, one of Christ's people, and we may take him as a type of the whole body of believers dying with Christ; and Christ's words to him were, "This day shalt thou be with me in paradise." This shows that where Christ is, his people are also. But Roman Catholics hold that when the *faithful* die, the great majority of them, at least, go direct to purgatory. St. Paul says, that nothing shall separate us from Christ, not even death. If, therefore, there is such a place as purgatory, and that the members of Christ's body go there, why Christ himself, who is the "head of the body," must be there also.

Perhaps some Roman Catholic will explain whether Christ is in purgatory now, or not; and if he is not, why it is that the "members" are separated from the "body" of Christ, and go to purgatory.

Your obt. servant,

JOHN WILLIAM ROBERTS.

ON THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I lately overheard the following conversation between a Romanist and a Protestant, both, I believe, sincerely attached to their different creeds:—

P.—Did I understand you correctly, Mr. S., when you said the Church of Rome has never added to or taken from the apostles' creed?

R.—Most certainly you understood me correctly.

P.—If I mistake not, a Romanist could be saved without his believing in the Immaculate Conception before the issuing of the Bull on that subject a short time ago.

R.—He could certainly be saved then without believing it, as it was not decided upon by the Church as a dogma.

P.—Can a Romanist be saved now if he refuses to believe in the Immaculate Conception?

R.—He certainly cannot.

P.—Then, to be consistent, you must admit your Church has made a new article of faith.

R.—I do not admit it.

Now, will any kind-hearted Roman Catholic condescend to explain how it is that before the issuing of the Bull a man might be saved who refused to entertain the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, but since the issuing of the Bull, if he dares to refuse the dogma, he must be counted as a heretic, and lost, and yet at the same time to insist it is not a new article of faith.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

H. C. O.

Ashford, Kent, August 24, 1855.

DOES THE CHURCH APPROVE OF MR. DUFFY'S "YOUNG CHRISTIANS' LIBRARY?"

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—When in town a few days ago I searched several of the Roman Catholic book shops for some of Mr. Duffy's "*sweet little books*," without being able to procure them. One of the booksellers, Mr. Grace, of Capel-street, gave me as a reason for this, that these books were not approved of now. I wonder, Mr. Editor, have you heard of it? or has your article on St. Rose of Lima had anything to do with it? I shall add, Mr. G. mistook me for an alumnus of Maynooth or All-Hallow, and, perhaps, spoke more freely than he would had he known at first that I was

A PROTESTANT READER OF THE LAYMAN.

FARMING OPERATIONS FOR SEPTEMBER.

(*From the Irish Farmers' Gazette.*)

HARVESTING OPERATIONS.

THE weather during the past fortnight has been of a very unsettled character, causing much inconvenience to both farmer and labourer in harvesting operations; but though much rain has fallen, and in many districts the crops have been much laid, still the intervals of rain have been so alternated with bristling winds, that the corn has speedily dried again, and little or no damage has yet been done, except from shedding where they have been over ripe, which cannot be much, as the farmers have been more vigilantly on the alert this season than usual, taking advantage of every dry moment for cutting down and stooking the corn as it has become fit. In such uncertain weather, reaping, binding, and stooking, should follow in rapid succession on the heels of each, and heading or capping the stooks as corn should not be neglected. Stooks in boisterous weather being so liable to be knocked about and the grain shed, some care should be taken to set them up firmly, and of sufficient size to prevent it; or if the straw be well ripened, dry, and free from weeds, making small hand-stacks, loose to let the air through, but well capped to exclude the rain, will be by far the best mode; both straw and grain will season under every disadvantage, and be fit to draw home to the stack-yard, from time to time, as the weather permits.

Stacking.—When fit to be carried, make the stacks with long shanks and short heads, taking care that they are well ventilated, by carrying up one or more chimnies from the bottom to discharge into horizontal flues placed to open out immediately under the eavings; and so soon as finished, let the stack be thatched without delay.

Sowing Wheat.—Where the system of summer fallowing is followed, about the middle of this month it should get its final harrowing, the seed-furrow raised, and then sown, provided sufficient rain has fallen to give the land the necessary degree of consistency; but in case it be too dry, and loose, it will be necessary to wait for rain.

Winter Vetches.—A large breadth of winter vetches should be sown this month; the land should get a liberal dressing of manure, and evenly spread; then plough into eight or ten feet wide ridges; harrow the land lightly; sow the seed broadcast, and harrow it in well; and finish by scouring out the furrows with the shovel, to allow a free escape for water. Mixing the vetches with three or four stones of rye or winter oats, will be of much service in keeping the vetches off the land, and prevent their rotting; and three or four lbs. of rape will add greatly to the bulk of spring fodder.

Rye may also be sown alone as a soiling crop, or for giving an early bite to ewes and lambs, of which it yields a large quantity, on stubble land lightly ploughed up, sown thickly, and harrowed in.

Italian Rye-grass should be sown early in the month, on rich, well-prepared soil, such as that from which potatoes have been dug; it is an early soiling crop, and yields several cuttings during the season, if dressed with liquid manure or rich composts, after each cutting.

Grass Seeds and Clover.—During the present month will be a suitable time to lay down stubble, or other land in good condition, with grass and clover, either permanently or for soiling crops. The grass and clover seeds would be the better of being of the present season's produce, as they will vegetate much more rapidly than last season's seeds, and a week's starting will be sensibly felt, or observable in the strength of growth, before the cold weather sets in.

Winter or Russian Beans should be sown between this and the middle of next month. They are a most productive variety. The land should be well manured, and the seed may be either sown broadcast, and harrowed in, or in drills two and a half to three feet apart, to allow of thorough pulverising between by the drill grubbers and horse-hoes. There is no better preparatory crop for wheat than beans.

Rape, sown in June last in nursery-beds, should be transplanted as soon as possible in the stubble land. A dressing of manure, if it can be spared, will be well repaid in the luxuriant growth and bulk of food produced. The manure may be dropped in regular rows; and, as the ploughing is being performed, a boy lays in the plants in every third furrow, a foot apart; a man then puts in the manure on the root, and the next turn of the plough covers it up; or the land may be prepared as if for turnips in drills, and the plants dibbled in at the top of the drill.

Rape may still be sown in rich, warm land, in early climates; but, in cold, backward ones, it seldom comes to profit when sown so late.

Cabbages.—Early cabbages, sown by the middle of July last, will be ready to plant out where to remain sometime in this or early next month; the land should be well manured and deeply tilled, and then planted in rows two feet apart by twelve to fourteen inches plant from plant in the rows. In field culture they may be put in as directed for rape planting; and we have seen as early and as fine crops produced in this way as by the most careful hand culture. Cabbages are an expensive crop to get in, and anything saved, by substituting horse for manual labour, will be so much gained.

Clover Leas intended for wheat should now be ploughed up, first eating them down or mowing them closely. The land-presser will be particularly serviceable in closing and consolidating the furrow slices. A liberal dressing of lime will materially benefit the crop.

Odds and Ends.—Keep the teams well employed; if not at plough, keep them under the cart, drawing dry bog-stuff if within any reasonable distance; scourings of ditches, road-scrapings, &c., to the compost heaps.

Important Work on Controversy.

In the Press, and will be ready immediately.

THE "CONTROVERSIAL CORRESPONDENCE,"

Between R. W. KENNARD, Esq., late Sheriff of London, and the Rev. PAUL MACLACHLAN, Roman Catholic Priest, Falkirk. In Demy 8vo., price 5s. to SUBSCRIBERS ONLY.

This correspondence, conducted with great ability on both sides, has, at length, terminated by the withdrawal of the Rev. Mr. Maclachlan from the contest, who has republished the whole of his letters, WITHOUT THOSE OF MR. KENNARD! As such a proceeding is evidently unfair, it is intended that the entire correspondence, consisting of about 70 letters, shall be published, so that the nature of the Controversy may be thoroughly understood by all parties.

Dr. Irving writes—"This is a remarkable publication. Mr. Maclachlan is sufficiently skilled in the Romish arts of controversy; but in logical dexterity, and even in theological learning, the priest is no match for the Protestant layman."

The Rev. John Evans writes—"This correspondence furnishes decidedly the best *Handbook* of the Romish Controversy yet extant."

The Venerable Dr. Croly says of Mr. Kennard's letters—"I sincerely admire their learning, reasoning, and spirit of Christianity; and I know of no production fitter to produce a more ample assurance in the mind of any man open to rational conviction." It has also been characterized as the "most important controversy that has taken place since the days of Stillingfleet."

The Controversy embraces the modern arguments of Romanists, having reference more particularly to History than Doctrine; and the Book will form an excellent companion to Dr. Cumming's Controversy with Mr. French, known as the Hammersmith Discussion, which is exclusively Doctrinal.

The Work is now publishing in one Volume, Demy 8vo, and will contain above 700 pages, with a copious and useful Index. Price 5s. to SUBSCRIBERS ONLY.

As the Subscription List will close very shortly, intending Subscribers are requested to transmit their names to WILLIAM CURRY and COMPANY, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin, without delay, as, after publication, the book will be raised in price.

In the Press, and will be ready Shortly,

Vols. III. and IV.,

MACAULAY'S HISTORY OF ENGLAND,

FROM THE ACCESSION OF JAMES THE SECOND.

Subscribers' names received by WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

New and Recent Works,

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

MAUD, AND OTHER POEMS. By Alfred Tennyson Poet Laureate. 5s.

MEMOIR OF THE LIFE, WRITINGS, AND DISCOVERIES OF SIR ISAAC NEWTON. By Sir David Brewster. 2 vols. 8vo. 24s.

MEMOIR OF THE REV. SYDNEY SMITH. By his Daughter—Lady Holland. With a selection from his Letters. Edited by Mrs. Austin. 2 vols. 8vo. 28s.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF REV. WILLIAM JAY, of Bath. Edited by Dr. Redford and J. A. James, D.D. Cheaper edition. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

DIVINE LOVE IN CREATION AND REDEMPTION: a Course of Sermons from Septuagesima to Trinity. By Henry Alford, B.D. 12mo. 5s.

GLORY IN ITS FULNESS: THE FUTURE OF OUR REDEEMER AND OF THE WORLD. By the Rev. Henry Woodward. Crown 8vo. 5s.

KRAUSE'S LECTURES, delivered in Bethesda Chapel, Dublin. Vol. 3. 5s.

LITTLE MILLIE, AND HER FOUR PLACES. By Miss Brewster, author of "Work." 3s. 6d. Cheaper edition. 1s.

THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE. By R. G. Latham, F.R.S. Fourth edition. 2 vols. 8vo. 28s.

THESAURUS OF ENGLISH WORDS AND PHRASES, classified and arranged, so as to facilitate the expression of Ideas, and assist in Literary Composition. By P. M. Roget, F.R.S. 10s. 6d.

HALLAM'S VIEW OF THE STATE OF EUROPE DURING THE MIDDLE AGES. New edititon. 3 vols. 18s.

HALLAM'S CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY OF England, from the Accession of Henry VII. to the death of George II. Vol. 1. 6s.

PILGRIMAGE FROM THE ALPS TO THE TIBER; or, the Influence of Romanism on Trade, Justice, and Knowledge. By the Rev. J. A. Wylie, LL.D. 7s. 6d.

NOCTES AMBROSIANÆ. By Professor Wilson. Vol. I. (Professor Wilson's Works). 6s.

THE FERNS OF GREAT BRITAIN, and their Allies, the Club-Mosses, Pepperworts, and Horsetails. By Anne Pratt, Author of "Our Native Songsters," "Wild Flowers," &c. With 41 beautiful Illustrations, printed in colours. 8vo. 12s. cloth.

GLAUCUS; OR, THE WONDERS OF THE SHORE. By Rev. Charles Kingsley. 3s. 6d.

EMBASSIES AND FOREIGN COURTS. A History of Diplomacy. By "The Roving Englishman." 5s.

MEDITATIONES HEBRAICÆ: or, a Doctrinal and Practical Exposition of St. Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews. By William Tait, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo. 17s.

GLIMPSES OF JESUS: or, Christ Exalted in the Affections of his People. By W. P. Balfern. Second edition. 3s. 6d.

THE SOUTHERN CROSS AND THE SOUTHERN CROWN: or, the Gospel in New Zealand. By Miss Tucker. 3s. 6d.

THE FOOTSTEPS OF ST. PAUL. By the Author of "The Faithful Promiser." 5s.

THE MISSIONARY OF KILMANY: being a Memoir of Alexander Paterson. By the Rev. John Baillie. Cheap Edition. 1s.

A SCHOOL ATLAS OF ASTRONOMY. Comprising, in eighteen Plates, a complete Series of Illustrations of the Heavenly Bodies. By A. Keith Johnston. 12s. 6d.

MY NOVEL; OR, VARIETIES IN ENGLISH LIFE. By Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton. 2 vols. 4s.

LARDNER'S MUSEUM OF SCIENCE AND ART. Vol. 7. 1s. 6d.

FRASER'S HANDBOOK FOR IRELAND. New Edition. 10s. 6d.

BLACK'S GUIDE-BOOK FOR TRAVELLERS IN IRELAND, 5s.; Scotland, 8s. 6d.; England and Wales, 10s. 6d.; Wales, 5s.

BRADSHAW'S GUIDE-BOOK TO PARIS AND THE EXHIBITION. 2s. 6d.

BRADSHAW'S ILLUSTRATED HANDBOOK TO FRANCE. 5s.

BRADSHAW'S CONTINENTAL RAILWAY GUIDE, AND GENERAL HANDBOOK. 3s. 6d.

WAKEMAN'S GUIDE TO DUBLIN AND SUBURBS. With Map and Plan. 1s.

Just Published, Demy 8vo, price 6d.; by post, 7d.,

A SHOCK OF CORN FULLY RIPE.

A SERMON;

PREACHED ON THE OCCASION OF THE DEATH OF THE LATE

ARTHUR GUINNESS, ESQ.,

IN BETHESDA CHAPEL,

On Sunday, June 17, 1855,

BY THE REV. JOHN ALCOCK, A.M.,

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London: Wertheim and Macintosh.

Just Published, 18mo, cloth, price 1s. 6d.,

St. Patrick's Cathedral,

A TALE OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

BY

LUCY O'DONNELL.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London, Wertheim and Mackintosh.

Just Published,

I.

Demy 8vo, price 1s. 6d.,

Moral Theology of the Church of Rome, No. 1:

SAINT ALFONSO DE LIGUORI'S THEORY OF TRUTHFULNESS.

II.

Demy 8vo, price 2s.,

Moral Theology of the Church of Rome, No. 2:

Certain points in S. Alfonso de Liguori's Moral Theology considered in nineteen letters,

BY THE REV. H. E. MANNING, AND THE REV. F. MEYRICK.

III.

Demy 8vo, price 1s. 6d.

Mariana's Theory of Regicide,

In an appendix to two sermons preached before the University of Oxford.

BY THE REV. F. MEYRICK, M.A.

To be had at Messrs. W. CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

Just published, in 8vo, 420 pp., with Map, price 3s. 6d., Cloth,

Old Testament Prophecies,

Relative to the Return and Restoration of the Twelve Tribes to the Land of Palestine, together with the setting up of Messiah's Kingdom on Mount Zion, during a period of One Thousand Prophetic years.

BY JAMES ALLIN.

London: Wertheim and Macintosh, Paternoster-row. Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Just published, SECOND EDITION, small 8vo, cloth, elegant, Price 4s. 6d.,

OUR FRIENDS IN HEAVEN;

OR,

The Mutual Recognition of the Redeemed in Glory Demonstrated.

BY THE

REV. J. M. KILLEN, M.A., COMBER.

"Here is a subject of touching interest very well treated. Mr. Killen argues on right principles, and comes to a right conclusion."—*Church of England Magazine.*

"This work is infinitely superior to any on a cognate subject."—*Banner of Ulster.*

"Its author is an eminent minister of the Presbyterian Church, and it contains a full and masterly discussion of mutual recognition in Heaven, characterized by a sound judgment, and invested with the attractive grace of a most chaste and classic style."—*The Belfast Protestant.*

"This delightful volume will be welcomed by many a bereaved heart. The accomplished author was just such a man as could undertake successfully the preparation of such a work."—*English Presbyterian Messenger.*

"A delightful, cheering, precious book it will no doubt prove to many. He answers the objections to the doctrine with great ability, and expounds it with a force and felicity of illustration which cannot fail to bring conviction to the minds of those who have done themselves the injustice of doubting one of the most cheering views of immortality."—*Scottish Press.*

"The work sheds a fresh and peculiar interest on many passages of the Word of God. A work dealing with the whole subject of Heaven in the same spirit of holy caution which honourably characterizes the reasonings of our author, is perhaps a *desideratum.* Mr. Killen might do worse than attempt it."—*News of the Churches.*

Edinburgh: Shepherd and Elliot. Dublin: William Curry and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher, WILLIAM CURRY, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin. SEPTEMBER, 1855.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Ɠlóir do Dhia añ ṗna háṗduiḃ, agur ṡíoḃċáin air an dtalaṁ deaġġoil do na dáoinib.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED THE MIDDLE OF EVERY MONTH, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. IV.—No. 46. OCTOBER 17, 1855. { Annual Subscription, 2s 6d.; Unstamped Copies, 2d. each. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
The Life and Miracles of St. Wenefrede, Patroness of Wales	110
Religious Toleration at Rome—The Pope's Confessor	112
The Succession of the Archbishops of Dublin	112
The Resurrection of the Body	113
Talk of the Road—No. XXXII.	114
Freedom of Religious Inquiry in Spain	115
CORRESPONDENCE:	
The Rules of Church Unity, in reply to John Miller	116
Myths and Miracles—by a Lover of Fair play	117
Christ and His People—by a Catholic	118
The Protestants' Purgatory—by Dan Carthy	118
Farming Operations for October	119

ST. WENEFRIDE'S WELL.

HOLYWELL may be considered at present as the principal town in North Wales. Its population, its wealth, its commerce, and its manufactures entitle it to that station. Its situation is highly propitious for trade. The powerful current of the far-famed fountain of St. Wenefride propels the machinery of several large factories in its short course of about a mile to the sea. The expansion of the Dee is ready at hand, to bear on its bosom the produce of its industry; and its inhabitants are both wealthy and public-spirited. The town is spacious, healthy, and agreeable, pleasantly embossed in encircling hills. The houses in general are good, and their tenants of the female sex, in many instances, handsome and accomplished. It altogether bears an air of considerable opulence, and has of late been brilliantly lighted with gas. To those who require the use of a cold-bath, few places are more proper; for, besides the excellence of the waters, exceeding good medical assistance, and comfortable accommodations may be found here; and the mind entertained and the body exercised in a variety of beautiful rides and walks. An admirer of the works of art may, at this place, find his taste amply gratified by viewing the numerous works of lead, calamine, copper, brass, and cotton. Its population amounts to 8,000 inhabitants, and the number of houses 2,000.

At the foot of this town is that remarkable spring from which it received its name, and which has excited so much surprise and curiosity.

The spring is the finest in these kingdoms; it never freezes, and scarcely varies in the quantity of water in droughts, nor after the greatest rains. After a violent fall of rain it becomes rather discoloured. It boils up with vast impetuosity out of a rock, and is formed into a beautiful polygon well, covered with a rich arch, supported by pillars. The roof is exquisitely carved in stone. Immediately over the fountain is the legend of St. Wenefride, on a pendant projection, with the arms of England at the bottom: a number of fine ribs secure the arch, whose intersections are coupled with sculpture. It exhibits a remarkable spectacle, and is one of the most wonderful works of nature. The water rises with such force, and in such vast quantities, that, although but a mile from the sea, it instantly forms a river, and constantly supplies several mills and manufactories.

The accommodation for bathers is exceedingly convenient; every person has the immediate benefit of the water as it springs up, and need be under no apprehension of receiving the ill effects of former bathers, as the water which each person bathes in is immediately carried away by its vast impetuosity.

Such is the description given of St. Wenefride's Well, in vol. x. of Mr. Duffy's *Weekly Volume of Catholic Divinity*, entitled, "The Life and Miracles of St. Wenefride, Patroness of Wales,"* a publication which, we think, deserves some little attention at the present moment, when his Eminence Cardinal Wiseman has just returned from a pilgrimage to this surprising spring, in which he is said to have bathed for cure of rheumatism.

We presume his Eminence was attracted thither by the following passages in St. Wenefride's life, which must be very attractive to every true believer in either hagiology or hydropathy:—

"The historians of her life, St. Elerius and Robert of Shrewsbury, concluded, that it would be an undertaking to swell volumes if they registered all wonders done at her shrine and fountain; they thought it sufficient to acquaint the reader, that the blind, lepers, and other diseased persons, were perfectly cured by drinking the water, or bathing themselves in the holy well. This became so famous, that tender mothers made no difficulty of casting their sickly children into the stream, which was a speedy cure. Such as lived at a great distance, and were tormented with agues, or hot burning fevers, caused the water to be brought to them, and drank of it as a certain remedy to relieve them in their maladies. Those in very remote places used to put *one of the bloody stones which was taken out of the well* into other spring water, and they were cured. It is said that the virgin martyr herself prescribed the first use of this last remedy, who, soon after her second death, appearing to many, who in dangerous distempers devoutly called upon her, she directed them, for their speedy recovery, to apply the water and stones of the well in the aforesaid manner. Such as had swellings or old sores bathed the part affected and they found present relief.

"At this wonderful spring almost daily miracles were wrought, according to a petition St. Wenefride made to God before she left Finhon, that he would vouchsafe to bless corporally, and sanctify spiritually, *all those who in future ages should devoutly visit her fountain*, and there acknowledge the many benefits with which He had favoured her. Frequent miracles were likewise wrought at her tomb. Multitudes of diseased persons became perfectly cured by praying and kissing the earth where her sacred remains were deposited.

"The holy author of St Wenefride's life and death was not satisfied with a general relation of miraculous cures: he descends to particulars, that unbelieving posterity might be induced to allow credit to what he had recorded as to daily wonders." p. 25.

That the eminent Cardinal "*devoutly* visited the fountain," we cannot doubt; and as "almost daily miracles are wrought at this wonderful spring," we can scarcely suppose that his Eminence has not been perfectly cured of his rheumatism, and take for granted that he will, in due time (as in duty bound), acknowledge publicly the "*benefits*" with which he has been favoured on his visit to Holywell. This may be the more necessary, as we observe some of our unbelieving contemporaries have scoffingly insinuated that his Eminence's sufferings have not been materially alleviated, much less cured, by his devotions at Holywell. Can it be possible that the application failed because the Cardinal did not sincerely believe in the *whole* of the picturesque history of the life of this eminent saint? If so, he, of course, has only himself to thank, and has no right to blame St. Wenefride for it.

We present our readers with a slight abridgment of Mr. Duffy's reprint, which will give them an outline at least of what all should believe, who would *devoutly* visit the miraculous fountain with a fair prospect of being partakers of its "*benefits*:"—

"In the seventh age, after man's redemption, flourished many saints of both sexes. I shall only mention those chiefly concerned in this short history. St. Beuno, the glorious instrument of St. Wenefride's second life and sanctity, was born of noble parents in Montgomeryshire, at the fall of the river Rhyw into the Severn, therefore called Aberhyw. His father, Binsi, descended lineally from Cadell, prince of Glesiwig, and his mother derived her pedigree from Anna (who was married to the king of Picts), sister to the mighty and renowned king Arthur, who departed happily this life, and was interred at Glastenbury, in the year 542. His grandfather was Saint Gundeleius, and he was near related to several eminent saints; amongst the rest, he was cousin german to Saint Kentigern*, Bishop of Glasgow, who, forced from Scotland, founded the bishopric of Saint Asaph, from his disciple of that name, whom he left to govern that church.

"This zealous monk, having finished his monastery at Clynog Vawr, in Carnarvonshire, found himself powerfully inspired to visit his relations in Flintshire. It is true, he had long before bid adieu to all ties of flesh and blood, but he understood this call as a voice from heaven. A rich and potent lord, in that part of North Wales where now the holy well is, had married the virtuous and noble lady Wenlo, sister to St. Beuno. His name was Thewith —some write him Trebwith; but a manuscript now before me of one of the most learned antiquaries of the last age says his name was Tyvid.

"St. Wenefride, the glory of West Britain, was born in the troublesome reign of king Cadwallawn; and St. Beuno made his visit to his brother in-law's house, in the reign of king Elnith, the second of that name.

"It was her parent's intention to marry her to some nobleman of the country, and to bestow on her a most plentiful fortune; but her ever blessed Redeemer, in those tender years, was disposing her sweetly for his service. By St. Beuno's frequent discourses, she understood how great, how good, and how glorious the heavenly spouse was; that voluntary virgins are like angels upon earth; that they follow the Lamb wherever he goes—(Apoc. xiv.); that the honours of the world are vain, and its pleasures short lived; so that the very thought of an earthly husband became hateful unto her.

"The implacable enemy of mankind, suspecting that such high beginnings of perfection in tender years might prove a powerful invitation to other noble virgins of despising themselves and the world, employed one of his incarnate emissaries to defeat the design of the Holy Ghost. What hell cannot effect by its own immediate suggestions, it too frequently brings about by the insinuating arguments of lewd mortals. Cradocus, King Alen's son, became sottishly enamoured with the charms of her person, not casting an eye on the beauty of her virtues; so waited for an opportunity to gratify his brutish passion, which thus happened:—One Sunday, Saint Wenefride's parents being gone to church before her, and she for a short space detained at home on a charitable account, soon to follow after; the prince having intelligence, entered the house, under pretence of business with the Lord Thewith. At first, the holy maid, not at all suspecting his insincerity or design, received him very courteously, with an humble apology for her unworthiness to entertain one of his royal birth: "But, if you please," added she, "to repose yourself in a more convenient room till divine service is ended, my father will be at liberty to serve you." To this candid and obliging answer of the bashful virgin, Cradocus, now more than ever inflamed with sinful desires, replied in the greatest disorder, that nothing could be more agreeable than to stay in her company, since it was then solely in her power to make him happy. If she complied with the ardent desires of a passionate lover, she might expect all the happiness his power and quality was capable of bestowing upon her.

"Although the virgin blushed and trembled at the immodesty of this wicked proposal, yet being perfectly present to herself, in the dangerous occasion, and fortified with divine grace and light from heaven, she answered, that there was not the least doubt to be made of enjoying honours, wealth, and worldly happiness, by being espoused to so noble a prince; that she was in great confusion to be so suddenly surprised in such mean attire, not becoming his presence: 'Wherefore, permit me (said she) to enter my chamber adjoining to this, to better my dress.' Cradocus, in the heat of his passion, unwillingly gave ear to the virgin's petition, yet could not refuse a request accompanied with so much modesty and seeming deference to his quality. She no sooner got clear of so impudent a guest, but, slipping out privately by another door, she immediately ran towards the church, sure of meeting with protection there from so villainous an attempt. Meantime, the prince, impatient of so long a delay, and but without some suspicion of what had happened, rushed into the room to which she retired; not finding her there, he pursued her so eagerly that he overtook her on the descent of the hill before she could gain the church. There, with a drawn sword in his hand, and with fury in his face, he threatens to separate her head from her body, unless she quickly consented to his will.

* Published by James Duffy, 23, Anglesea-street, Dublin, 1845. It was originally printed in 1712, and, as the preface informs us, was translated from the Life of St. Wenefride, written in Latin by Robert of Shrewsbury (Robertus Salopiensis). It has since appeared in various forms. Mr. Duffy's edition seems to be reprinted verbatim from one printed in London by W. E. Andrews in 1817.

* Of whom more below.

"St. Wenefride had two sorts of death waiting for an answer—a separation of the soul from the body, or a separation of the soul from God; she did not balance upon the matter, but undauntedly and heroically replied, 'that by her parents' approbation, she was holily espoused to the Son of God, who infinitely exceeds all power and beauty upon earth; that she would be faithful and constant in her pure affections, and rather lose her life than admit any rival. Neither shall your menaces and terrors (said she) draw me from the sweetness of his love, nor so overawe me as to make me recede from executing what I have promised. As it happens sometimes, that despised carnal love turns into rage, so it fared with barbarous Cradocus, who, seeing himself scorned (as he thought), gave such a deadly blow to the virgin's neck that the first stroke severed the head from the body, which, falling upon the descent of the hill, rolled down to the church, where the congregation were kneeling before the altar. As they were terrified with the bloody object of her head, so they were astonished to behold a clear and rapid spring gushing out of that spot of ground her head had first fallen upon; which, to this very day, is visited from all parts by devout pilgrims.* The place of her martyrdom had, before her death, the name of the Dry Valley, or Barren Bottom, which was changed into the title of Finhon, which, in old Welch, signifies a fountain or well. It was also observed that the stones of the well were tinctured, as it were, with blood, to perpetuate the memory of what she had shed for the love of Christ; and in process of time it was taken notice of, that the moss growing round the well had a very fragrant smell! as an emblem of the odour of her angelical virtues (p. 9).

"To close the last act of this inhuman tragedy, and to relate the dreadful stroke of Divine justice on the cruel tyrant, we are to premise, with brevity, that the just grief of the holy virgin's parents is not to be expressed, seeing their dear child so villainously butchered, almost before their eyes. St. Beuno's virtue was also put to the test, to bear with true resignation the loss of so devout a creature. Tears came trickling down his cheeks at the sight of the horrid murder. The afflicted people, with united voices, called upon Heaven for speedy execution against him who had committed that heinous outrage. Indignation accompanied compassion, when they beheld the unrelenting assassin wiping his bloody sword upon the grass, and glorying in the detestable fact, without any fear of God or man. St. Benno was preparing to offer the unbloody sacrifice of our redemption; but being inspired by Him who declared, 'Revenge to me, and I will repay it' (Deut. xxxii. 35.), he left the altar, and taking the blessed martyr's head in his trembling hands, he mounted the ascent towards Cradocus.

"Being come up to him, he said: 'Thou wicked man! who, without regard to innocence or beauty, has massacred a princely virgin, no less nobly born than thyself. Nor dost thou repent, or seem sorry as thou oughtest to do, for this horrible sacrilege. I here beseech my heavenly Lord, that, for an example to others, he will please to execute his divine judgment against thee, who has murdered his spouse, troubled his people, violated his Sabbath, and besprinkled this holy house with blood, which I consecrated to his service.' As the earth swallowed up rebellious and perverse Corah, so some affirm, that at St. Beuno's last words, Cradocus not only dropped down dead, but also that the earth opened to give passage to the luxurious body to sink towards his monstrous soul, or the master whom he had served, the devil, carried it off; for it is certain, that the carcase of the cruel murderer never after appeared.

"St. Benno earnestly exhorted the parents and people to turn from lamentations, and to address the Creator of souls, raiser up of dead bodies, that as he commanded back Lazarus to life, rotting in his monument, so to his greater honour and glory, and for the comfort of the sorrowful parents, who had so generously dedicated this darling child to his service, he would graciously vouchsafe to restore her to life. He then joined the sacred head to the pale body, covering both with his cloak; after which he offered up the holy sacrifice of our salvation.

"After mass was ended, he lifted up his hands to heaven, and prayed that she might be restored to life. The pious people, drowned in tears, having, with sighs and moving sobs, answered devoutly, Amen, the virgin arose, as newly awaked from sleep. She wiped her eyes and face to clear away that glorious dust which had settled on her lovely head when it tumbled towards her dear St. Beuno. The decollation of St. Wenefride is celebrated on the 22nd of June (p. 10).

"One particular in this surprising resuscitation is very remarkable, viz.: When her parents and others fixed their eyes upon her neck, they observed a pure white circle, no larger than a small thread, quite round it, denoting the place where the separation had been made, which always after remained. From this, the great veneration of the people for her changed her name, which was Brewa, into that of Wenefride. Wen, in the old British tongue, signifies white, and other letters were, by an alteration, added to this syllable, to render more agreeable the sound of the new name. In the many apparitions after her second death, when she showed herself to her devout clients, they always took special notice of the aforesaid white circle, which intimated to them the indelible mark of her spouse's affection for suffering that mortal wound so courageously for his sake (p. 11).

"When the ancients of Ephesus had heard St. Paul declare unto them, that they should see no more his face (Acts, xx. 25.), they fell upon his neck, and there was great weeping. In like manner, when St. Wenefride was acquainted by her admired master, that she should not see him any more in this world, a lawful grief seemed to overwhelm her. To comfort her in such deep affliction, St. Beuno took her by the hand, and led her to the crystalline fountain, the place of her martyrdom, where they sat on a stone, bearing to this day the name of St. Beuno's stone, and which lieth now in the outward well; 'You see (said he) the monument here of your sufferings. Behold also the stones, as tinctured with your blood, which was shed for the glory of your heavenly spouse. Be you therefore attentive, and mindful of what I do foretell you, concerning three special favours, whereby your glorious spouse, Jesus Christ, will hereafter honour yourself, and by your prayers benefit others. The first is, that these bloody spots shall never be washed off from the said stones, but ever remain as triumphant signs of your blood spilt in defence of your chastity. The second is, that any person who shall devoutly ask temporal blessings, or freedom from spiritual or corporal distresses, to be obtained by your merits and intercession, the same shall compass his request, if it be to the honour and glory of God, by paying their devotion three times at this well. If what he petitions for be not for the advantage of his soul, and therefore is not granted, at his death, by your prayers he shall reap more ample fruit, and in the next world everlasting blessings. The third, that after my departure into a more remote part of this island God will give me a cell near upon the sea shore; so that whenever you send any letters or tokens to me, as I entreat you to do at least once every year, only cast them into the stream of this fountain, and they will come safe unto me. Which wonders will be gloriously divulged of you to the end of the world.'

"St. Wenefride had a most grateful soul; she honoured St. Beuno as an eminent servant of God; she loved him as a father; she respected him as a master; and could never sufficiently acknowledge her duty to her greatest benefactor, after him who had made her.

"To make some small return, she sent him every year a token, after the manner he had prescribed. In the beginning of May, almost a year after his departure, with the help of her religious sisters, she finished a curious embroidered vestment; and wrapping the same in a woollen cloth, she went down with her religious and others to the well side, and casting the bundle into the water, she said, 'Holy father, according to your command and my promise, I send unto you this small token of my love.' To the great astonishment of numerous beholders, it passed down the stream into the river, then into the sea, and it landed near the monastery where St. Beuno then dwelt, many miles distant from the holy fountain.

"The holy man was then walking on the sea shore, and wondered what that bundle should be; but on opening it he remembered the charge he had given to St. Wenefride, and that, as he had foretold, it came miraculously to him, without the least sign of wet or moisture. This vestment he preserved with great care in the church, for the celebration of holy mass.

"The virgin never intermitted to send him a yearly present, till his most happy death was revealed unto her, and the glorious reward he was crowned with in heaven. This last passage may appear to incredulous persons the most surprising of all others in the history of St. Wenefride's life, therefore, Divine Providence thought fit to authenticate the memory of it to this very day, and after this manner: in Carnarvonshire, eight miles distant from the town of Carnarvon, there is a little creek where the sea runs up, called in Welsh, Porthy Casseg (corruptedly, as I could instance in other appellations), for Porthy Cassuel, or the Port of the Vestment. Here the first present of our Saint miraculously landed; and the place retains the name to this day. Near unto this inlet there stands a large parish church, called Clynog, in which St. Beuno was buried, his tomb is yet extant, and is held in great veneration by the inhabitants. The history of St. Wenefride's life was curiously represented in the glass windows of Clynog church; but has been so defaced that little now appears. What can be more *persuasive* to obtain credit to this miracle than so ancient and so certain a tradition, even to those who use their utmost efforts to destroy the memory of miracles?* The Port of the Vestment solves the objection from the year 660 to this of 1838. As apostolical tradition is the unwritten word of God, and by it we receive the scriptures, and the secret interpretations and true sense of them, as what regards infant baptism, &c., let it be lawful for me to say, that as to human faith, uninterrupted tradition from father to son for so many centuries is a *clearer* attestation of fact than if it had been recorded in written history" (p. 17).

Who can doubt the truth of such persuasive arguments? Can it be possible that fathers could be so wicked as to deceive their children? Did they who *saw* St. Wenefride's head rolling down the hill, and afterwards *saw* it joined to her shoulders again, and listened to her admonitions for years afterwards, *know* the truth of what they saw? Would they not speak truth to their children? How, then, could there be any clearer attestation of fact?—especially where so many similar wonders are equally well authenticated. One would really think that there had been something strange or uncommon in people being able to live after their heads were cut off, whereas nothing was, in fact, more common in the good old times (unless *certain* tradition is to be set at nought by modern scepticism) than people *living*, and *moving*, and *talking* after their heads were cut off!! That our well-disposed readers may not suppose that we are speaking without book in such a matter, we would crave their serious attention to a few examples, taken from works of the gravest authority and antiquity, and which, we are certain, are quite as well founded as that of St. Wenefride.

The first instance we shall give is that of *St. Maxentia*, whose life, as given by the learned Augustine, John Capgrave, appears to have been nearly a counterpart of that of St. Wenefride. She consecrated herself to a life of celibacy, and was cruelly beheaded by a disappointed lover, in a fit of rage at his rejection. "No sooner," says Capgrave, "had this servant of Satan retired, than the body of the sacred virgin (as is related by the faithful, who received it from their fathers by a truthful narrative), arising from the ground, took her own head in her hands, and carried it with drooping arms from the place of her martyrdom to that in which she now rests by the will of God."*

The same venerable writer tells us (fol. 259, 2) of *St. Paternus*, that on one occasion his servant, who was wandering in the woods of the monastery, fell among robbers, and was killed and beheaded by them. St. Paternus, having heard of it, went into the wood, and called his servant by his proper name, saying, "Answer to your master." Then the head, which had been torn from the body, answered, "Here I am, Sir." Guided by the voice, the Saint arrived at the place from which it came; and seeing the servant's head cut off from the body, raised his eyes to heaven and blessed the corpse; whereupon the head suddenly becoming joined to the body, rose up alive.†

The story goes on to say how a noble lord of that province, whose servants the robbers were, came and begged pardon of the Saint, and granted him a part of his lands in compensation for their misconduct—a not uncommon result, we opine, of saintly miracles in those ages.

Our next example we shall take from a more recent writer, Father Cressy, of the holy order of St. Benedict, who wrote an elaborate Church History of Britain, published in a large folio volume in 1668. (Permissu superiorum et approbatione Doctorum). He narrates of *St. Edmund* as follows:—

"After the Danes had cut off the head of this holy martyr (King Edmund), their rage and malicious fury did not cease, but casting out his body despitefully, they kept the head to revenge themselves yet further on the tongue which had so constantly sounded forth the name of Christ. And after they had used all manner of contemptuous scorn upon it, they cast it into a secret place in a thicket of the wood adjoining, lest the Christians should venerate it, and decently bury it with the body. There it remained a whole year's space: after which the pagans retiring out of the country, the first care of the Christians was to honour their holy king and martyr. Assembling themselves, therefore, together out of their lurking places, they devoutly took his body out of the

* There is a similar story related of a French saint. Perhaps the one story is a mere echo of the other; though which was the original we cannot pretend to determine. "A holy woman, named Reine, suffered martyrdom about Alise, a little village near Flavigny. When she was beheaded, at the very place where the head lighted on the ground, a spring bubbled up at that very instant, for a perpetual miracle, in witness of God's approbation of the confession of faith made by his handmaid." This spring is also remarkable for its healing qualities. The monks of St. Francis have a chapel beside it, as St. Wenefride had for ages at her holy well. (Frauds of Romish Monks and Priests, vol. i, p. 4).

* A gentleman at Preston, we learn from the *Tablet* of 25th August last, has just opened a chapel in Frenchwood-street, under the title of "Our Lady of Salette," the window over the altar in which is fitted with stained glass representing the apparition of Our Lady to the two children, Melanie and Maximin, on the mountain of La Salette, in honour of which the chapel was founded. What a *persuasive* proof this window will be, 500 years hence, of the "stupendous event!" The Right Rev. Dr. Goss, coadjutor of Bishop Brown, of Liverpool, attended the ceremony, and delivered a discourse on the occasion; we hope he did not forget to render due homage to Mademoiselle *Constance Lamerliere*, whose history we lately published from the "La Salette devant le Pape" of the Abbé Déléon.—See CATHOLIC LAYMAN, Vol. iv., pp. 64-76.

* "Recedente autem ministro Satane corpus sacræ virginis (pront a fidelibus qui hoc a suis patribus relatu fideli acceperunt) a terra consurgens caput proprium in manibus sumpsit et a loco martirii ad eum in quo nunc dei voluntate quiescit pendulis brachiis deportavit."

Legenda Angliæ Johannis Capgrave, printed by Wynkyn de Worde in 1516—fol. 228—1.

John Capgrave died in 1484, and was no obscure writer, but a learned Doctor of Theology at Oxford, the Provincial of the order of the Augustines, and the most learned Augustine who was ever in England. "A man (says Pitseus) of such excellent parts, that he had scarce any equal, none superior in England in his time."—Johannes Pitseus de illustribus Angliæ Scriptoribus.—Paris, 1619—p. 671.

† "Quodam enim tempore Sancto Paterno adhuc superstite dum quidam ejus minister monasterii silvas visitaret, incidens in latrones occisus est. Quo audito Paternus silvam adiit, et ministrum proprio nomine vocavit dicens, Respondeas magistro tuo. Tunc caput a cadavere revulsum respondit. Hic adsum domine. Cum qua voce pervenit. Episcopus ad locum responsionis et videns caput ministri a corpore sectum elevatis in cælum oculis cadaver benedixit et capite subito corpori conjuncto viveus surrexit."—Capgrave, fol. 259—2. De Sancto Paterno.

nucleon place where it had been cast, and then with all diligence sought for the head. And whilst every one of them with equal affection searched each corner of the wood, there happened a wonder not heard of in any age before.* For whilst they dispersed themselves in all parts, and each one demanded of his companions, where it was that the Danes had cast the head, the same head answered them aloud in their own tongue "here, here, here!" Neither did it cease to cry out in the same words, till it had brought them to the place. And to add to the wonder, there they found a mighty and fierce wolf, which, with its fore-feet held the head, as if appointed to watch and defend it from other beasts; when they were come, the wolf quietly resigned it to them. So, with joyful hymns to God, they carried and joined it to the body; the wolf in the meantime following them to the place where they buried it; after which the beast returned into the wood, in all which time neither did the wolf hurt any one, neither did any one show the least intention to hurt the wolf. This I find received and attested by all the ancient authors, without exception, particularly by William of Malmesbury who holds the prime place amongst all our most ancient historians, both for the fidelity of his narrative, and maturity of his judgment."†

The same story may be found in Capgrave, of which we give an extract in the original Latin, in the note‡:—

After this we need not feel any surprise at *St. Justinian* the *Martyr*, whose death (as the same faithworthy historian tells us) was succeeded by wonderful miracles. We think it best to give the narrative in his own words:—

"When the Devil saw himself every way vanquished by the holy man, he infused the poison of his malice into the hearts of the holy man's servants. Insomuch as they having been reproved by him for their idleness and misspending their time, they were inflamed with fury against him, insomuch as rushing upon him, they threw him to the ground, and most cruelly cut off his head. But in the place where the sacred head fell to the ground, a fonntain of pure water presently flowed, by drinking of which, in following times, many were miraculously restored to health. But miracles greater than those immediately succeeded his death, for the body of the blessed martyr presently rose, and taking the head between his two arms, went down to the sea shore, and walking thence *on the sea, passed over* to the port called by his name; and being arrived in the place where a church is now built to his memory, it fell down and was there buried by St. David. His commemoration is on the three-and-twentieth of August."§

The case of *St. Ositha*, called by William of Malmesbury Osgitha, is even less remarkable, because she had assistance of two angels at least, if not more.

Cressy's account of the matter is as follows:—

"As soon as her head was cut off, her body presently rose, and taking up the head in her hands, by *the conduct of angels* walked firmly the straight way to the churches of St. Peter and St. Paul, about a quarter of a mile distant from the place of her suffering; and when it was come there, it knocked at the door with the bloody hands, as desiring that it might be opened, and therein left marks of blood. Having done this, it fell then to the ground."‖—

St. Clarus had also like assistance of angels, as Cressy¶ relates the story:—"Whose head being cut off, presently after arose, and with his hands taking up his head, by the assistance of angels, carried it to a fountain not far distant, into which he *cast* it: and then carried the same back to the oratory of his cell, and going on a little further to a village seated near the river Epta, he there consummated his course, and transmitted his blessed soul to heaven."

We do not quite approve of the *rough* way that St. Clarus treated his head on this occasion** (though being *his own*, perhaps he had, in strictness, a right to do what he pleased with it), and we think the proceeding of St. *Decumanus* was more humane and decorous, of whom Cressy states††: "That when his head was cut off from his body, the trunk, raising itself up, took the head, which it carried from the place where he was slain to a spring not far off, which flowed with a most crystalline water, in which, with the hands it *washed* the blood away."

After all these *equally well-authenticated* stories, it seems scarcely worth while noticing what Cressy tells us of *St. Juthwara*;‡‡ and we are almost afraid of wearying our readers with what may to many of them appear like so many reverberations or echoes of the same story or at best the *same tune with variations*; but here it is.

"Immediately after this, the holy virgin with her own hands took up her head, being cut off, and, to the astonishment of all (as we may easily imagine, if unbelievers, otherwise it was no great wonder after all), carried it back *steadily* to the church. And moreover, for a further proof of the holy virgin's sanctity, Almighty God caused a fountain to burst forth out of the place where the head fell, and over the fountain *as miraculously* a tree began to grow!"

That a tree should grow near a fountain seems to us somewhat *less* miraculous than that a beheaded saint should *steadily* carry her head afterwards! *St. Cadocus's* case is, however, more worthy of note: for the subject of it was an Irishman who was ill-treated by his Saxon fellow-workmen, which must (in Ireland, at least) naturally carry our belief in the *certain tradition* to a demonstrative height.

Capgrave relates it as follows:—

"There came a certain Irishman to the place where St. Cadocus was building his oratory, who surpassed (as of course was natural in an Irishman) all the workmen of the saint as a skilful artificer. The others, through envy, wickedly killed him, and having cut off his head and tied a large stone to the body, cast it into a deep pool. Cadocus, having heard the lamentations of the sons of the deceased, spent the night with his clergy in vigils and prayer, that the Lord would deign to reveal what was done. But when the morning came, the beheaded artificer, with his head in his bosom, and the great stone on his back, presented himself all bloody, with a horrid appearance, to the holy man, and the amputated head uttered the following words:—'O servant of God, fix me on my neck in the same state I was before, and I will tell you all about it.' St. Cadocus *having done so*, he divulged to him the wickedness of the workmen, and how, led by envy, they had flagitiously murdered him. The saint then said, 'Choose which you wish, either henceforward to live with us in this world, or return to eternal life, there to reign for ever with God.' To which he replied, 'Master, let my soul return to eternal rest;' and having said this, he expired."*

While talking of workmen, we may as well tell our readers of another Irishman, whose history is recorded by Father Colgan, in his life of *St. Ita*, which may be found in his costly folio Latin volume, called *Acta Sanctorum*.†

A good workman, named Beoanus, undertook to build a house for St. Ita, who gave him in return some land, and her sister as a wife. It happened, in those troubled times, that poor Beoanus, in a war between two chieftains, took the field, and was killed, by having his head cut off. This displeased St. Ita very much, for she had promised Beoanus that he should have a son, whereas, his wife had up to that time been sterile. When she came where the truncated body of Beoanus lay, and could not find his head, she prayed that he would show her the head, and the head, by Divine power, *flew through the air*, and stood where the body was before the Saint, and the Lord, at the instance of his servant, caused the head to adhere to the body, as strongly as if it had never been cut off, and only the scar of a wound remained. In about an hour afterwards he rose up alive and well, and saluted St. Ita, and gave thanks to God; after which Beoanus, according to St. Ita's promise, had a son by his sterile wife, who was called Pulcherius,‡ and became the most holy abbot of Liathmore, in the King's County.

St. Denis's story is well known, and, perhaps, will appear after this tame, but as it is related in the Breviary, (Para Autumnalis, p. 398. 9 Oct. Lectio vi.), and perhaps is the longest walk of a dead man on record, we shall give it in the very words of the Breviary itself—"He took up his head after it was cut off, and carried it in his hands for *two thousand paces*."

Have any of our Roman Catholic readers courage to ask their parish priest, whether this is not in his Breviary, and whether, he *believes* it to be true? Our copy of the Breviary, is the Breviarium Romanum, printed by Richard Coyne, Dublin, 1815. §

Our next instance shall be in honour of our Lady of Loretto, taken from the history of Loretto by the learned Jesuit Tursellinus, and, in a somewhat abbreviated form, is as follows:—

"A Sicilian girl, of better form than fame, fled at Venice for many years earned a disgraceful livelihood as a courtesan. Having made her fortune, she was seized with a longing for home, and determined to return there. When she had arrived at the wood of Recanati, she was attacked by her own servant, who desperately wounded her in many places, and finally cut her throat. She, swimming in her blood, and just about to expire, commended herself to the Blessed Virgin, who immediately appeared in a white robe, shining with celestial light, took her in her lap, and with a touch healed her wounds, admonished her to lead a chaste life, and then vanished from her sight. The woman, as if awaking from sleep, saw the scars of her recent wounds already drawn together, and feeling with her hand, found the wound in her throat already completely healed. When she came to Ancona, to prove what had happened, she showed the recent scars of the deadly wound in her throat, and there was added a manifest and divine proof of so great a miracle, for around her neck there was a *golden circle*, like a necklace, so that one might easily know that it was the divine hand of the blessed Mary that had touched and healed the wound."*

Of all the acts of kindness, however, of which we have read, we think the following decidedly the most remarkable, as recorded by Capgrave in his life of *St. Meleras*. St. Meleras was a young prince of Cornwall, of seven years old, and was murdered by one Cerialtanus, instigated thereto by Rinaldus, a tyrannous uncle of the saint, who had usurped the dukedom, and was afraid that if the boy came to man's estate he would deprive him of the principality.

Cerialtanus, it appears, while carrying the head (which he had cut off) to Rinaldus, was so much heated by running that he was almost fainting with thirst, and cried out "Oh miserable man that I am, and worthy of all punishment and torture, what shall I do to avoid dying of thirst? This he repeated very often, when the head of the boy thus addressed him:—"Cerialtanus, thrust the staff which you carry in your hand into the ground, and you will see a fountain suddenly arise from the earth, by drinking plentifully of which you will escape your imminent danger from thirst."—And when he had fixed his staff into the ground, it immediately struck its roots into the earth and became a most beautiful tree, and produced branches and leaves, and from its roots a never failing fountain began to flow, and Cerialtanus having refreshed himself with drinking of it, brought the head to Rinaldus, who received it with great joy."†

Not to weary our readers, we shall only mention one case more; it is that of *St. Kentigern*, which perhaps goes as low, or as high, in the scale of saintly miracles as any we have met with in the course of our researches.

St. Kentigern (who it will be remembered, from the above history of St. Wenefride, was cousin-german to St. Beuno), indeed seems to have treated such feats as mere child's play; for when one of his schoolfellows had pulled off a robin redbreast's‖ head, he took the head and put it to the body§ and by his prayers and the sign of the cross, raised the bird to life again, as not only Capgrave but Bollandus¶ relates the story. Whether there remained a ring round the bird's neck afterwards, however, does not appear, or, if so, what colour it was.

Here, then, we have no less than seventeen stories (including this instructive case of the robin redbreast) in which decapitation either wholly failed in destroying life, or at least effected only a qualified or temporary separation between the head and shoulders; and all of the cases authenticated by the same *uninterrupted tradition* for 1000 years at least, which, according to the historian of St. Wenefride, is "a *clearer* attestation of fact, than if they had been recorded in written history!"

---

* In this the learned Benedictine was in error, for St. Pancras's decapitated servant did just the same thing, as we have already shown.

† Cressy's Church History of England under Saxon Monarchs—Book xxvii, ch 27, p. 736.

‡ "Cumque in sylva densissima caput sanctissimum lustrando pergerent et alternatim (ut moris est) inter se clamarent, ubi ea; ecce mirabile auditu caput martyris patria lingua respondebat, dicens, 'Heer, heer, heer,' quod est interpretandum hic, hic, hic; nec unquam eadem repetendo clamare destitit quousque omnes ad eo perduxit."—Capgrave, fol. cvB. 2, cviii.

§ Cressy—Book xi., c. 8, n. 3, p. 283.

‖ Cressy—Book 17, c. 15, n. 5., p. 424.

¶ Book 17, ch. 3. n. 7, p. 411.

** It is, perhaps, fair to St. Clarus to state that *Capgrave*, in his Life of that Saint, says nothing of *throwing* his head into the fountain, but merely that he carried it to his cell, and got it decent burial "Qui caput proprium in manibus suis accipiens a loco in quo decollatus fuerat usque ad suum cenobium deportavit: ubi cum honore sepelivi meruit—Fol. lix, 2.

†† Book 21, ch. 3, n. 6, p. p. 576.

‡‡ Lib. 23, ch. 9, n. 8, p. 693.

* Supervenit quidam Hibernicus ad locum in quo S. Cadocus oratorium fabricavit, qui operarios omnes sancti subtili artificio superabat. Invidentes ob hoc ceteri, ipsum nequiter interfecerunt, et amputato capite ejus et magno saxo circa truncum corpus alligato in altum stagnum precipitarunt. Cumque planctum filiorum occisi sanctus audivisset Cadocus, cum suis clericis pervigil in orationibus pernoctavit, ut rem gestam dominus ei revelare dignaret. Facto autem mane, decollatus artifex caput in alum suo gestans, et magnum lapidem super tergum ferens, cruentus horrida specie viro sancto se ostendit, proclamavitque caput in hæc verba prorumpit. Serve Dei, age me supra collum in pristino statu et quæ tibi incognita hactenus de hoc re gesta fuit denudabo. Quod cum fecisset, indicavit ei cujus artificium et quomodo invidia emuli illum flagitiose trucidarent. Et ait sanctus. Eligo quod vis, aut in hac vita mobiscum denuo vivere aut in eternum vitam cum Deo pervenire regnaturum remigare. Et ille, "Domine ut in eternam requiem regrediatur anima mea. Et hoc dicto, expiravit."—Capgrave de S. Cadoco, fol. lIII., 1.

† Vol. i, p. 68, 15th January. Louvain, 1643.

‡ Whose life Colgan and the Bollandists published at 13th March.

‖ "Deque illud memorise prodituin est, abscissum avium caput suæ inditisse et progressum ad quo militia passerum in manibus gestans."—Para Autumnalis, Oct. 9, lectio vi., p. 8vi.

Circa eodem circitur aures mentis in modum reigebat, ut facile divina B. Mariæ manu plagam iram tectam, cum stamque cruentam. Horatii Tursellini Romani E Soc. Jesu. Lauretanæ Historiæ Magnum 1600, p. 229, 31. 9 Lib ch. 28

† "Cumque hæc multitudo replicare ei erupit pavet in verba humana prorumpens tali voce cum affatur. Cerialtane, inquam quem modo gentes in terra impiger fixe, et hastam aqua labile de fonte erui videbis ex quo copiose refectus hunc bene ditte pericultus evades. Cum autem baculum in terram fixisset in palo terribilem arborem virens radicitus terra adhesit, ramos et folia pr duxit, et de radice ejus fons limpidissimus emanare cœpit, at Cerialtanus jam recreatus cœpit ad Rinaldum detulit. Qui cum gaudio magno illud recipiens [illegible], &c., &c."—Fol. 229, 2.

‡ Quendam avisulum ob ruborem corporculi rubiculum vocitant.

¶ The *crimson* used by the saints on such occasions (which, unfortunately for our brave warriors in the East, appears to have been lost in modern times) seems, it will be remarked, to have been of various colours: St. Wenefride's was white, the Sicilian courtesan's golden, and St. Edmund's *red*, as we collect from Capgrave:—

"Cum autem postea corpus beatissimi Edmundi martyris transferri deberet, invenerunt vestimenta et [illegible] corpus, et caput corpori reintegratum nullisque omnino vulneris aut cicatrix conspicua. Tantum enim in ejus cervice ob nimium sanguinis [illegible] rubet erat tenuissima rugæ in modum fili circumeat, erant tantum erat nullus quantum devota femina Osgytha—fol. cviii, cviii.

" But when, at a subsequent time, the body of this most holy martyr, Edmund, was about to be translated, it was found incorrupt, and uncorrupt, and the head rejoined to the body. No appearance of a wound or a cicatrix appeared. Only on his neck, as a token of his martyrdom, appeared a very slender red seam, like a crimson thread, as the devout Osgytha was accustomed to say."

That the crimson answered as well for ornament as colour, appears from the case of Walter, Earl of Northumberland, who was beheaded for rebellion against William the Conqueror, and was in every other way dead, but found with his head fastened to his body, and only a bloody red about his neck, where it was cut off.

‖ Capgrave, fol. cevIII., 2. Bollandus Acta Sanctorum Tom I. p. 918. Antwerp, 19th Jan., Vita Kentigerni Episcopi Glasguen. c 2, n. 7.

We may as well state for the information of our unlearned readers, that the *Acta Sanctorum* of Bollandus and the fathers consist of more than 50 folio volumes in Latin, and are not yet complete. The last volume we have seen was that printed at Brussels as lately as the year 1850. Whether such costly and elaborate volumes were designed for the credulous vulgar, or for the learned and intelligent classes, our readers will judge.

We have no doubt that if we had had time to dive more deeply into the pages of Father Cressy, Father Colgan, William of Malmesbury, Johannes Capgrave, and the Acta Sanctorum, we might have added greatly to the list; but of those we have given—if there can be any choice among such edifying histories—we venture to state that the most satisfactory of all were the cases of St. Wenefride, the Venetian courtesan, St. Ita's workman Beoanus, St. Paternus's servant, and the robin redbreast, as *they* were fully restored to life, which poor St. Edmund and the rest were not. We think the cases of St. Edmund and Count Wallen were altogether unsatisfactory ones, as, after the cementing process was gone through, the beheaded bodies unfortunately remained as dead as before. The cases of St. Denis, St. Decimanus, and the rest, who merely *carried their heads* to their places of burial, with or without the *assistance of angels*, we confess we never liked much, and have always wondered what the angels were about in not carrying the miracle a little further, unless, indeed, Angels have *less* supernatural power than Saints, and are only able to *lead* dead men, and not to *cure* them!

Will our readers allow us to ask one serious question before, in sober sadness, we close this article. If they do not *believe* in these *traditions* (as we are sure a great many intelligent Roman Catholics do not), but think them merely anile fables, unworthy of a moment's serious thought, what do they think of a Church which permits and encourages the circulation of such palpable falsehoods, and even records some of them in her authorised prayer-book, the Breviary, which every Roman Catholic priest is *compelled* to read daily; while it discourages, if it does not prohibit, the reading of the inspired records of unerring truth?

RELIGIOUS TOLERATION AT ROME.

By the kindness of a friend, we have been provided with a copy of the "Theses on Religion of P. F. Joseph Palermo, of the Order of Eremites of St. Augustine," printed and published at Rome, A.D. 1823, in order to a public discussion.

We do not know whether any account of the discussion was published. We fear not; but if any of our friends could tell us anything about it, we should be grateful to them.

In the meantime, we publish some extracts from the "Theses." We shall then consider briefly what degree of importance is to be attached to the publication of such a work at Rome, so late as the year 1823.

We take Joseph Palermo's notions of "Religious Toleration" as a specimen of the doctrines which he published at Rome, and undertook publicly to defend.

In page 17, after some discussion about religious toleration, he lays down this conclusion, "Let it fall headlong into hell, from whence it broke forth, with its snake-haired forehead, that most impious and most insane religious toleration!"*

Joseph Palermo then goes on to show the application and the grounds of his doctrine about religious toleration, as follows:—

"Therefore, let the public exercise of religions opposed to the *Catholic* (he means *the Roman)* be forbidden by Catholic Princes, UNLESS CHRISTIAN PRUDENCE HINDER IT; for, indeed, each ought to do to others what he ought REASONABLY to wish to be done to himself by others; but princes, if they were subjects, *ought* to wish that princes, by every better method which Christian prudence would teach them, would employ themselves to drive away every cause of their eternal misery, if it were only a probable cause of it; therefore, the princes themselves are bound to fulfil this for their subjects."†

This appears to us a good instance of the power of argument which some Roman Catholics possess. Our Saviour says, "All things, therefore, whatsoever you would that men should do to you, do you also to them" (Matthew vii., 12.) "There, you see! (says Joseph Palermo) princes ought to punish every one who differs from them, for worshipping God according to his own conscience!"

We ask our Roman Catholic readers to consider what they would think of this argument, if the Protestant government of England were to act towards them on the reasoning of Joseph Palermo?

But "heretics" are unreasonable beasts: they *ought* to be persecuted, and they *wont* wish it!

But Joseph Palermo proceeds, a little farther on—"Wherefore, unless that condition exist (Christian prudence hindering it), it is very gravely unlawful to tolerate the public exercise of the religion of the Mahomedans, Jews, Calvinists, Lutherans, and of *all others opposed to ours*, especially of Atheists."‡

We never before heard of ATHEISTS' having *public worship:* we suppose they are put into the list of "public worshippers" only to try to throw disgrace on "all others opposed to ours"—that is, on Christian churches not subject to Rome.

What a glorious day it would be for the Church of Rome, if she could effectually prohibit every man throughout the whole world to worship God except as the Pope may now please—or as he may hereafter please, according to doctrines not yet promulgated or invented!

But what is the meaning of "that condition," *i.e.* "unless Christian prudence hinder it?"

The Waldenses were exterminated in the 13th century. The Protestants were massacred in France on St. Bartholomew's Day. In England, in Queen Mary's reign, all who dared to worship God according to their conscience were burnt alive. Three or four years ago, the present Pope entered into a "concordat" with Spain (now happily set aside by Espartero), that any Spaniard who worshipped God otherwise than as a Romanist should be consigned to a dungeon.

"Christian prudence" forbad none of these things; because the sufferers were weak, and the power of arms was against them. But at the present day, Joseph Palermo would not enforce such laws in England, or France, or America, because the thing could not be done; and "Christian prudence" forbids the Church of Rome to attempt such things where she would certainly be beat; just as "Christian prudence" admonished the Russians to march out of Sebastopol when they could stay in it no longer.

But what if Joseph Palermo did print and publish these persecuting doctrines at Rome? Is the Church of Rome answerable for that? So Roman Catholics in this country may ask, and they are entitled to an answer.

We reply, that at Rome no person is allowed to print any book until he first gets the sanction and authority of the Church of Rome for doing so. This is a law of the Church of Rome, made by a Pope and General Council, in the year 1515.

"We appoint and ordain that for all future times no one shall priot, or cause to be printed, in our city (Rome) any book or other writing, of whatever kind, unless they be first diligently examined in this city by *our Vicar* and *Master of the Sacred Palace*, and APPROVED by subscription of their own hand."*

This law was made by Pope Leo X., in the Fifth General Council of Lateran, A.D. 1515.

This law is still in force at Rome, and under this law Joseph Palermo's book, which undertakes to defend these outrageous notions about religious toleration, was actually approved for publication. For thus we find it printed at the end of the book:

IMPRIMATUR

Si vid. Rev. Patri Mag. Sac. Pal. Apost. *J. Della Porta Patriarcha Constantinopol. Pro-Vic.*

IMPRIMATUR

F. Philippus Anfossi. Sac. Pal. Ap. Mag.

Thus, this book of Joseph Palermo's was formally sanctioned at Rome, in the year 1823, by the two officials—the Pope's Vicar, and the Master of the Sacred Palace—who were specially appointed by the Pope and a General Council to examine *and approve* of books before they can be printed.

It certainly appears that the teaching and defending of such doctrines as Joseph Palermo's *does not meet any discouragement* at Rome; and it is fortunate that the Joseph Palermos of the Church of Rome have the "Christian prudence" not to attempt putting their doctrines in practice where people are able to resist them.

Since the above was written, we have found reason to think that Joseph Palermo's doctrine about religious toleration has found great encouragement at Rome.

We find in the *Tablet* of August 25, p. 532, the following announcement:—"The most Rev. Father Paul Micallef, a native of Malta, has been appointed by the Pope General of the Order of St. Augustine. He succeeds the late General, the most Rev. Father JOSEPH PALERMO, who has resigned, by reason of his promotion to the Episcopacy and office of Sacristan and *Confessor in Ordinary to his Holiness.*"

We suppose this is the Joseph Palermo who wrote the Theses on religious toleration. His opinions, it seems, are not an obstacle, but rather a recommendation for promotion. The fact of his being made Confessor to the Pope, and director of the Pope's conscience, is a significant circumstance, in the present state of Spain, Sardinia, &c., and of Rome itself.

If Joseph Palermo had written a book *in favour* of "religious toleration," and had undertaken to prove that princes ought not to persecute any man for worshipping God according to his own conscience, *would he have got leave to publish his book at Rome*, and would he have been made CONFESSOR TO THE POPE?

THE SUCCESSION OF THE ARCHBISHOPS OF DUBLIN.

IN our number for August, 1854, we published an article "On the Succession of the Irish Bishops."

In that article we quoted the following passage from the "Historia Catholica" of Philip O'Sullivan Bear:—"There are four archbishoprics in Ireland, and a great many bishopries, and ALL of them, *at this day*, are possessed by the leaders of Heresy; and on account of that, *Catholic Prelates* ARE NOT APPOINTED to the Titles of them, EXCEPT ON RARE OCCASIONS."*

This was published in 1621—EIGHTY-SIX years after the beginning of the Reformation in Ireland.

This evidence, from a Roman Catholic historian, is decisive against the common boast of Roman Catholic priests, that the Church of Rome has kept up an unbroken succession from the ancient Bishops of Ireland, in all the Irish Sees.

In our number for October, 1854, we published "The Succession of St. Patrick," showing an uninterrupted succession up to Lord John Beresford, the present Primate of Ireland.

We then called on "all Roman Catholic archbishops in Ireland (especially Dr. Dixon), on all Roman Catholic bishops, priests, and laymen, to send us a list of Roman Catholic archbishops (of Armagh) in succession from Primate Cromer, with the dates of the vacancies and appointments, and the proofs of each."

We did NOT expect that such a list would be sent to us, because we know well that no list can be given of a Roman Catholic succession at Armagh, which could stand examination for one moment.

A YEAR has now elapsed; and no Roman Catholic has ever ventured to send us such a list!

We now call on all Roman Catholics to mark this striking fact; and we ask them again, are they willing to let it thus appear to the world that they have NO SUCCESSION FROM ST. PATRICK?

Will any Roman Catholic *now* send us such a list?

We now proceed to give "the succession of the Archbishops of Dublin." We give this succession in a different form from that of Armagh. No Roman Catholic author that we know of, has published the Roman succession of Armagh; we therefore gave only the succession of the Irish Church in the See of Armagh, leaving it to Roman Catholics to furnish the Roman succession. But Mr. D'Alton, an Irish Roman Catholic barrister, and a learned Irish historian, has published a valuable history of the Archbishops of Dublin. At the end of this work (page 370, to the end), he has given the Roman archbishops of Dublin. Here, therefore, we are able to give the Roman succession, as stated by a learned Roman Catholic. We, therefore, give BOTH successions in the See of Dublin; and we ask our readers to consider *which* of them is really A SUCCESSION. We give the succession of archbishops of the Irish Church, from Harris's edition of Ware's Irish Bishops, down to John Hoadley, who was archbishop of Dublin in the year 1739, when that work was published; and we complete the account from a list made from the Registers themselves. The succession is acknowledged on both sides down to John Allen, who was murdered by the Fitzgeralds in the year 1534. We therefore begin with his successor, George Browne, who was Provincial of Augustine Friars in England, and who, while he held that office, "advised the people to make their applications to Christ alone; for which doctrine he was much taken notice of." As archbishop of Dublin, he never acknowledged any subjection to the bishop of Rome, but exerted himself to the utmost to have all things ordered in the Irish Church according to the Word of God.

We take up the Roman succession where Mr. D'Alton enables us to do so.

THE SUCCESSION OF ARCHBISHOPS IN THE IRISH CHURCH.	THE ROMAN SUCCESSION.
George Browne, from 1535 to 1554.	No Roman archbishop, for twenty years.
Hugh Curwen, from 1555 to 1567.	Curwen in communion with Rome for three years only; 1555—1558.
Adam Loftus, from 1567 to 1605.	No Roman archbishop of Dublin from 1558 to A.D. 1611. Matthew de Oviedo was nominated by the Pope, in 1600, but was not consecrated.
Thomas Jones, from 1605 to 1619.	Eugene Matthews, from 1611 to 1623.
Lancelot Bulkeley, from 1619 to 1660.	Thomas Fleming, from 1623 to 1666.
James Margetson, from 1660 to 1663.	
Michael Boyle, from 1663 to 1678.	Peter Talbot, from 1669 to 1680.
John Parker, from 1678 to 1681.	
Francis Marsh, from 1681 to 1693.	Patrick Russell, from 1683 to 1692.
Narcissus March, from 1694 to 1702.	Peter Creagh, from 1693. Time of his death not known.
William King, from 1702 to 1729.	Edmund Byrne, from 1707. Time of his death not known.
	Edward Murphy, from 1724 to

* Historia Catholica, p. 297. Dublin, 1850. Edited by the Rev. Matthew Kelly, Professor of the College of Maynooth.

* Ruat igitur ad orcum, unde anguicrinita fronte erupit, impiissima, et insanissima religiosa tollerantia.

† Stricte idcirco a Catholicis principibus vetetur publicam religionum Catholicæ oppositarum exercitium, nisi obstet Christiana prudentia: enim vero unusquisque debet aliis facere, quod rationabiliter debet velle sibi ab aliis fieri: atqui Principes, si forent subditi, deberent velle, ut Principes omni meliori modo, quem ipsos edoceret Christiana prudentia, satagerent ab ipsis arcere quamcumque etiam tantumodo probabilem causam suæ æternæ infelicitatis; ergo et ipsi pro suis subditis hoc implere teneantur." Page 17.

‡ Quare, nisi adsit ista conditio, graviter illicitum est tollerare publicum exercitium religionis Mahumethanorum, Hebræorum, Calvinistarum, Lutheranorum, cæterarumque omnium nostræ adversantium, præsertim Atheistarum. Page 17.

* Statuimus et ordinamus quod de cetero perpetuis futuris temporibus nullus librum aliquem seu aliam quamcumque scripturam in urbe nostra . . . imprimere seu imprimi facere præsumat, nisi prius in urbe per Vicarium nostrum at Sacri Palatii magistrum . . diligenter examinentur, et per eorum manu propria subscriptionem approbentur. CONCIL LATERAN V., Sess. 10. LABBE & COSS, vol. xiv., p. 257. The words omitted provide for the same being done with books printed in other places. On this subject, see CATHOLIC LAYMAN for October, 1853, p. 110, 11.

John Hoadley, from 1729 to 1743.
Charles Cobbe, from 1743 to 1765.
Wm. Carmichael, from 1765 to 1766.
Arthur Smyth, from 1766 to 1771.
John Cradock, from 1772 to 1778.
Robert Fowler, from 1778 to 1801.
Earl of Normanton, from 1801 to 1809.
Euseby Cleaver, from 1809 to 1819.
Lord John G. Beresford, from 1819 to 1822.
Wm. Magee, from 1822 to 1831.
Richard Whately, from 1831 to present time.

Luke Fagan, from 1729 to 1734.
John Linegar, from 1734 to 1750.
Richard Lincoln, from 1757 to 1769.
Patrick Fitzsimon, from 1763 to 1769.
John Carpenter, from 1770 to 1780.
John Troy, from 1786 to 1823.
Daniel Murray, from 1823 to 1852.
Paul Cullen, from 1852 to present time.

From the above table it appears, *first*, that there was always a succession of archbishops in the See of Dublin, in which succession the present Archbishop Whately now stands. *Second*, that there was no Romanist archbishop of Dublin for 76 years (from 1535 to 1611), with the exception of *three* years (from 1555 to 1558; for Hugh Curwen renounced obedience to the pope in 1559). Therefore, it is the Irish Church, and not the Roman Church, which has succession in the See of Dublin.

Matthew de Oviedo, who was nominated by the Pope in 1600, was *not a bishop*. He was a political agent of the King of Spain, sent over by him to carry on war against the Queen of England; and the Pope, to give credit to his mission, gave him *the title only* of archbishop of Dublin, by naming him as the person *to be appointed* to that See; but Oviedo was not consecrated. This appears from the fact that Peter Lalor was "Vicar General of the Apostolic See," in the Diocese of Dublin, in 1606, and had been so for many years*—showing that while Oviedo was living, the Pope had only a vicar-general, and not an archbishop, in the See of Dublin. The fact was, that if Ireland had been conquered by the King of Spain, Oviedo *was to have been made* the Pope's archbishop in Dublin. But as Ireland was *not* conquered, he never was consecrated; and he never set foot in Dublin. Our readers may see another case of the same kind in our article "On the Succession of the Irish Bishops," in our number for August, 1854.

Thus, for SEVENTY-SIX years (that is, from 1535 to 1611, omitting the three first years of Hugh Curwen), the Pope never had an archbishop in the See of Dublin.

It is, therefore, mere ignorance now to boast of a succession of Roman Catholic archbishops in the See of Dublin.

When Eugene Matthews was appointed by the bishop of Rome in 1611, Thomas Jones, a Catholic prelate, holding the Catholic creeds, and canonically consecrated, was in legitimate possession of the See of Dublin. The appointment of Eugene Matthews to a See which was then canonically filled, was unlawful and void. By the laws of the Catholic Church, there can be but one bishop in a See; and a second bishop appointed to a See in which there is a bishop already, is NO BISHOP.

Eugene Matthews, and all his successors, labour under this sentence. By the laws of the Catholic Church, none of them are bishops.

We ask, will any Roman Catholic lawyer have the boldness to discuss this question in our pages?

We further affirm, that no law or canon of the Catholic Church has given to the Bishop of Rome a power to nominate or appoint the other bishops of Christendom.

If any such law or canon can be produced, let it be sent to us, and we will publish it.

How long will Roman Catholics fail to answer every such challenge of ours?

They *cannot* answer, until truth shall change sides. There lies the rub!

* Davis' Reports; Premunire Case.

THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY.

WE have ever held it to be one of the heaviest charges against the Church of Rome, that she has made additions to the articles of the Christian Faith, as handed down in the Catholic creed.

Twelve new articles, added to the creed fifteen hundred years after the time of Christ, can have no claim to be "the faith once delivered to the saints."

Roman Catholics, however, do not easily see the greatness of this offence. Their priests are naturally more anxious about upholding the new articles than the old ones; partly because the old are able to stand alone, and the new are not; and partly because those who study the Scriptures do not attack the old articles, and do attack the new ones. Thus Roman Catholics hear much about the importance of the new articles and but little, perhaps, about the old ones.

If Roman Catholics really understood the importance of "the articles of the Christian faith"—if they knew how those articles do meet the wants of men's souls, and appeal to the affections of their hearts—they would be more jealous of the inventions and additions of men.

Such an understanding of the Creed, as containing the great truths proposed by God himself to occupy our minds and engage our hearts, is also a strong confirmation of our faith, in addition to the great argument of prophecy which we stated in our last number.

We wish, therefore, to call attention to the articles of the ancient Creed.

We designedly begin with that article of the creed which, perhaps, our readers may have the most overlooked—"the resurrection of the body."

Mankind have always been anxious and uneasy about their future destiny after death; for of all creatures in this world, God has made man alone capable of looking beyond the grave.

The heathen nations always believed in the immortality of the soul. Some small sects among them denied it, as the Sadducees did among the Jews; but the mass of the heathen, not being led by the false philosophy of the few, always believed in the immortality of the soul and a future existence.

The Latin poet, Virgil, who lived not long before the birth of Christ, has left us an account of the popular belief about that future existence, with its rewards and punishments.

He has succeeded well in describing the torments of the damned, and well, too, in describing the process by which the heathen believed that souls were gradually purged of the stains of sin—a description which has been largely adopted into the debased Christianity of later ages.*

But his description of heaven, though he did his best to make it attractive, is such as NO LIVING MAN *could* wish to obtain in exchange for this life.

In his description, the whole state of the dead appears cold and dreary in the extreme—

> "Regions void of light,
> Through the vast empire of *eternal night*."

And every attempt to ascribe happiness to the dead only makes the unreality of the scene the more painful—

> "But reach your hand, oh parent shade, nor shun
> The dear embraces of your longing son!
> He said, and falling tears his face bedew,
> Then thrice around his neck his arms he threw,
> And thrice the flitting shadow slipt away,
> Like winds, or empty dreams that fly the day."
> (*Dryden's Virgil*, Book vi., 918.)

Existence *like a dream* can never be an object of desire to man.

If Virgil's heaven contains one object of desire, it arises from the doctrine of the transmigration of souls—

> "Those happy spirits which, ordained by fate,
> For future beings and NEW BODIES wait."

Yet what an object of desire!—

> "That, unremembering of its former pain,
> The soul may suffer mortal flesh again."

Yet, doubtless, such an offer would have been gladly embraced by any shade in Virgil's heaven.

So cold and dreary was the brightest conception that a heathen could form of happiness in a life to come.

There must have been—and there was—a reason for this failure.

God created the first man, Adam, a being composed of body and soul; Adam, so created, was immortal; he was always to have body and soul united. But when Adam sinned, the sentence went forth that he must die: and so death passed upon all men (Romans v. 12).

"Death" did not mean that his soul should cease to exist; it meant the destruction of the body and the separation of the soul.

The state of a disembodied spirit, is, therefore, the state of death.

Virgil, knowing the immortality of the soul, but being ignorant of the resurrection of the body, could only describe the *state of the dead*; and, do what he would to make that state seem happy, the inmost feeling of mankind, more true than man's philosophy, turns, and will ever turn, with instinctive aversion from the hateful picture. The "rising from the dead" (Mark ix. 10) can alone be the hope of immortality.

Alas, that many Christians should have no higher notion of the life to come than the heathen had!

Their minds are turned away from the articles of the Christian faith, and fixed on the inventions of men. The doctrine of the *heathen* poet and the Council of Trent, that "there is a purgatory," is ever before their eyes; the CHRISTIAN doctrine of "the resurrection of the body," never! and, consequently, their great concern about the life to come, is how they may *escape* from the torments of purgatory—*not* how they may "attain unto the resurrection of the dead" (Phillipians iii. 11).

Most of our readers are probably conscious, that their notions of HEAVEN are so cold and gloomy that to them it is hardly an object of desire. If they *must* die, they would rather go there than to hell or purgatory; but if they could choose for themselves, they would rather stay in this world than do either.

This feeling does not altogether proceed from a fear of the judgment of God; it proceeds in part from not being fit for the enjoyments of heaven; but it proceeds in great part, too, from not understanding the state of existence we shall have in the life to come—from not believing and understanding the resurrection of the dead.

For, independent of the sense of guilt and the fear of judgment, the idea of being a mere disembodied spirit is repulsive to the nature of man; because that is not the state of existence for which God created man, nor is it the state to which God designs to restore him; and the marriage of man's nature can be satisfied by that alone for which God created man. Therefore, the notion of being a mere spirit, stript of the body, must ever produce in the soul a sense of shrinking and shivering, like that which going naked would produce in the body.

But if the body shall be raised out of the grave, and body and soul again become a living man, then man triumphs *over death*; and if the body, risen from the grave, shall be freed from all the sickness, pain, and weakness, which it now suffers in consequence of sin—if it rise glorious and incorruptible, as Adam's body was before he fell—then *every desire* of immortality which man is naturally capable of forming, is fulfilled in the life to come. All this, and more, the scripture promises.

St. Paul acknowledges the nakedness of a disembodied spirit, and promises something better; when speaking of the present body, he says—"In this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house that is from heaven; if so be that being clothed, we shall not be found naked. For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened: *not that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon*, that mortality might be swallowed up of life" (2 Cor. v. 2-4).

The Corinthians erred (not like the Sadducees, by denying the existence of spirits), but by doubting the resurrection of the body; and to them the apostle says—"Now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive" (1 Cor. xv. 20, 21). And God who giveth a new body to the seed which rots under the earth, can raise up again that body which death has consigned to the worms and the dust.

That very body shall be raised, but how changed! "It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption: it is sown in dishonour; it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power: it is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body" (1 Cor. xv. 42-44).

It is true that "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God," any more than corruption can inherit incorruption (verse 50); but there are celestial (or heavenly) bodies, as well as terrestrial (or earthly) bodies (verse 40): there is also a "spiritual body," as well as a "natural body" (verse 44).

The "natural body" is that which we now have; the "spiritual body" is that which Christ now has. And as we have borne the image of fallen Adam by having a body like his, so shall we bear the image of Christ by having A BODY like his (1 Cor. xv. 49).

For Christ "shall *change* our vile body that it may be fashioned *like unto his glorious body*" (Phil. iii. 21).

What that "glorious body" is, he showed at his transfiguration on the Mount, when "his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light" (Matthew xvii. 2).

Christ was then—and he is now—in his glorious body; and he has promised to "change our vile bodies that they may be like to his glorious body."

And then, "when this corruptible body shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal body shall have put on immortality, THEN shall be brought to pass the saying *that is written*, DEATH IS SWALLOWED UP IN VICTORY" (1 Cor. xv. 54).

Who has not stood by the grave of a parent or a child, a wife or a husband, or some one who was dear, and *felt* the reign of death? Who does not shudder at the thought of lying down like them in the grave? Who does not long that "Death, the last enemy, shall be destroyed?" (1 Cor. xv. 26).

There was a grave once by which Jesus stood and called, "Lazarus, come forth. And he that was dead came forth" (John xi. 43, 44).

Lazarus came back into a world of woe: yet was there joy at his rising from the dead.

But "the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the grave shall hear his voice, and shall come forth" (John v. 28). They that are his, with glorious incorruptible bodies, to "new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness" (2 Peter iii. 13).

Until that victory over death be won, we "wait for the adoption, to wit, *the redemption of our* BODY" (Rom. viii. 23). And, therefore, it is placed among "the articles of the Christian faith," as that which can animate all our hopes, and give an object to all our desires, "I believe in the resurrection of the body."

All this, we know too well, is nothing to all those whose hearts are yet possessed with the natural enmity of fallen man to holiness and to God (Rom. viii. 7). But to those who are seeking for Christ's salvation—whose minds are in any degree conformed to Christ—to them, we believe, there is no greater encouragement and help than to know that "the things which God has prepared for them that love him," are indeed the things that are able to supply all the desires which their nature is capable of forming.

If such should desire to learn more of "the articles of the Christian faith," we will endeavour to meet such desires.

In the meantime, we ask them to consider that it is not without reason that we "earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the saints" (Jude 3); and that we are so jealous lest that faith should be overborne by the inventions and corruptions of men!

* See the CATHOLIC LAYMAN for May, 1853, page 58.

TALK OF THE ROAD.—No. XXXII.

"Well, Jem," said Pat, "it is stuck in me at last; and there's no use talking—I'll have *to do something.*"

"Is that in regard of what you were saying the last day, Pat?" said Jem.

"That's it, Jem," said Pat. "I'll have to do what's right."

"And why would you have to do more than you have done these two years back?" said Jem. "Arn't you reading the Bible, and won't that do?"

"Well then, Jem, *it won't;* without we do what is *in* the Bible," said Pat.

"And what's in the Bible?" said Jem.

"Do you mind what we were talking of once," said Pat, "that them that is ashamed of Christ and his words, Christ will be ashamed of them?"*

"Them words isn't easy forgot," said Jem.

"Them words stuck in me all along," said Pat; "and I couldn't quit thinking wasn't I ashamed of Christ and his words, and would not he be ashamed of me. Well, I was reading a while ago in the Douay Bible, and I came on this, '*If thou confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus,* and believe in thine heart that God hath raised him up from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart we believe unto justice, but *with the mouth* confession is made unto salvation."†

"And what would that mean?" said Jem. "It isn't like confessing to the priest anyway."

"People doesn't go to the priest *to confess Jesus Christ,* but only to confess their sins," said Pat.

"And what does confessing Jesus Christ with the mouth mean?" said Jem.

"Well, I suppose," said Pat, "when the heathens believed in Jesus Christ, they had to say it out, and go to church like men, instead of pretending they didn't believe on Him."

"Well, that's plain anyway," said Jem; "they wouldn't get salvation by Christ, if they didn't acknowledge Him; but what has that to do with us? or how have we to confess Christ with our mouths?"

"Jem," said Pat, "don't we know that we must believe in Jesus Christ only, and follow His words alone, and nothing else?"

"We know that surely," said Jem.

"And if we say that out, that is making confession with the mouth," said Pat.

"It is," said Jem; "there is no use saying against that."

So Pat turned round on Jem, and said, "*Why don't we do it,* Jemmy Brannan? Speak the truth, like a man."

"Why, then, because we're afraid; that's the truth," said Jem.

"We are just afraid of men, and so we are ashamed of Christ and of his words, and we durst not confess him with our mouths," said Pat.

"Pat, we would be killed entirely if we did it," said Jem; "and get no work neither, and the childer starve or else go to the poorhouse. Wouldn't *that* be the quiet plan for them that turn?"

"Jem, we'll have to come back on the words of Christ," said Pat; "them words won't let us alone." So Pat read out of the Douay Bible: "Fear ye not them that kill the body, and are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear Him that can destroy both soul and body into hell." (Matthew x. 28.) "Now, Jem," said Pat, "will we stand *that,* sooner than make confession with the mouth unto salvation?"

"How can we do it at all?" said Jem. "Couldn't we confess Jesus Christ and his words, and still not leave the Church of Rome at all?"

"*We can't,* Jem," said Pat. "Sure we will have to confess that we believe in Jesus Christ only, and follow his words only. And sure that is clean contrary to the religion of the Church of Rome. Sure Father John himself will tell you, that them that says that, is flying in the face of the Church of Rome. And how can we stick to both? Sure there is no use in imposing on God and on the priest too."

"I wish we could do what's right in the Church of Rome," said Jem.

"WE CAN'T," said Pat; "and there is no use talking of it. I tell you, Jem," said Pat, "we'll have to go out of BABYLON to deliver our own souls."

"And *is* the Church of Rome Babylon?" said Jem.

"Enough, to make us go out of her;" said Pat.

"Is there anything about it in the Bible?" said Jem.

"Plenty," said Pat, "and in the Douay Bible too."

So they fell to searching the Douay Bible; and they found it easy, for Pat had the places marked. So they read this out of the Prophet Jeremiah, chapter li., verses 6 and 7: "Flee ye from the midst of Babylon, and let every one save his own life; be not silent upon her iniquity; for it is the time of revenge from the Lord, he will render unto her what she hath deserved. Babylon hath been a golden cup in the hand of the Lord, that made all the earth drunk: the nations have drunk of her wine, and therefore they have staggered." "And here's a great one," said Pat, reading verse 9; "We *would* have cured Babylon, but *she is not healed;* let us forsake her, and let us go every man to his own land."

"Well, now, Pat," said Jem, "didn't the Prophet Jeremiah live a long time before Jesus Christ?"

"He did, surely," said Pat, "for it's in the Old Testament it is."

"Well, there wasn't a Church of Rome then," said Jem.

"There couldn't be," said Pat.

"Well then, Jeremiah be to be talking of something else," said Jem; "wasn't there a great city then called Babylon?"

"There was," said Pat; "for I read about it in the last CATHOLIC LAYMAN."

"It be to be that he was talking about, Pat," said Jem.

"Well, the CATHOLIC LAYMAN allows it was that city he was talking about," said Pat; "but if he was a prophet, why wouldn't there be another meaning in it too?"

"And what right would we have to put another meaning on it?" said Jem.

"Stop a bit," said Pat, "there's more. Didn't the Prophet Jeremiah say that the old city of Babylon would be destroyed? Sure here it is—'It shall be no more inhabited for ever, neither shall it be built up from generation to generation' (chap. l., verse 39). And doesn't the CATHOLIC LAYMAN say that it *was* destroyed 2000 years ago? and isn't that before Jesus Christ came? and that it never was built; and no one ever lived in it since? Well now, Jem," said Pat, "if the Bible said *anything more* about Babylen AFTER that, doesn't it stand to reason that it *be* to have another meaning?"

"That stands to reason, Pat," said Jem; "but *does* the Bible say any more of Babylon *after* that?"

So Pat found out the 18th chapter of the Book of Apocalypse or Revelation. "And now mind, Jem," said Pat; "St. John the Apostle wrote this after Jesus Christ came, and after the city of Babylon was destroyed and never built again; and for all that he speaks of Babylon *going to be destroyed;* for only listen to this:" and Pat read verse 21—"And a mighty angel took up a stone, as it were a great millstone, and cast it into the sea, saying, with such violence as this, *shall* Babylon that great city be thrown down, and shall be found no more at all." "Now, Jem," said Pat, "wouldn't that be the quare thing to say of a city that was dead and gone long before, if it hadn't another meaning?"

"It *be* to have," said Jem; "but what more does it say of Babylon?"

"Here's what St. John says of it," said Pat; and he read out of that same 18th chapter of the Book of Revelation, verses 1, 2, 3—"And after these things I saw another angel come down from Heaven, having great power; and the earth was enlightened with his glory. And he cried out with a strong voice, saying: Babylon the great is fallen, and is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every unclean spirit, and the hold of every unclean and hateful bird; because all nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication."

"Them's terrible words," said Jem.

"Mighty like what Jeremiah said of the old city of Babylon," said Pat, "sure here's what *he* said, 'therefore, shall dragons dwell there, with the fig-fauns, and ostriches shall dwell therein'* (ch. 50. 39); only St. John makes the words harder still," said Pat, "and that's may be because he explains the meaning."

"Well, but did it all happen while St. John was living?" said Jem, "for sure if it did it's all past and gone."

"It didn't," said Pat, "for St. John only saw it, like as you would see it in a show-box. And before he saw it, the voice out of heaven said to him, 'I will show you the things that must be done *hereafter*' (Revelation iv. verse 1.) So you see, Jem, it was all a prophecy, and St. John just took the words about Babylon to show it; so you see, Jem, Babylon *be* to have another meaning."

"Well, it *be* to have, Pat," said Jem, "but still the Revelation is the hardest book of all, and may be we ought to read the rest of the Bible, and not come to that."

"Well, Jem," said Pat, "there's more things in that part of the Bible that I can't come up to, than in any other; but there's *one thing* in the Book of Revelation plainer nor in any other, and here it is for you, Jem." So Pat read chapter i. verse 3: "Blessed is he that readeth and heareth the words of this prophecy."

So Jem allowed it ought to be read after that.

"Well, wait till I read you what St. John says of it all," said Pat; so Pat read chapter xviii. verse 4, "And I heard another voice from Heaven saying, go out from her, my people, that you be not partakers of her sins." "Now," said Pat, "didn't he take the words of Jeremiah† and fit them on to what he was speaking about? And if the voice from Heaven bids us go out, won't we go?"

"Well, Pat," said Jem, "there's one thing I want yet. St. John *wasn't* talking of the city of Babylon that was destroyed for ever before he was born, that's plain any way. And he *was* talking about something *that was to come,* and fitting on the words about Babylon to it. But what was it at all? Was it the Church of Rome he meant? That's what we havn't got at yet."

"It's coming, Jem," said Pat; "it'll be got, that same. So Pat turned to the 1st Epistle of St. Peter, chapter v., verse 13, in the Douay Bible, and he read—"The church that is in BABYLON, elected together with you, saluteth you."

"Sure there wouldn't be a church in a city that was destroyed, and no man living in it," said Jem.

"Well, in course there wouldn't," said Pat; "but the Douay Bible explains that for us." So Pat turned to the preface printed before the Epistle of St. Peter, in the Douay Bible; and he read—"He wrote it at Rome, which figuratively *he calls* BABYLON." And then said Pat. "If the Douay Bible itself allows that St. Peter himself called Rome BABYLON, why wouldn't we do it too?"

"Well, that beats all," said Jem; "Rome is Babylon surely."

"Jem," said Pat, "do you mind all our talk these two years and more? Isn't it the Church of Rome that sets up other mediators? and tells us to worship Mary and Joseph? and bids us trust in the scapular and blessed medals? and that cuts out God's commandments, for fear we would learn to obey *Him* and not *her?* And, more nor all, isn't it the Church of Rome that says the word of God will set us astray? and doesn't that show *her* gone clean against the word of God? and isn't it the Church of Rome that taught that same to all the world? and what would make her Babylon, if going against God himself wouldn't?"

"Oh, Pat," said Jem, "how *could* we turn at all? sure it's killed we would be entirely."

"Jemmy Brannan," said Pat, "wasn't it you put me on the reading, when I was more loath nor you were, and *will* I go out of Babylon afore you?"

"What *will* we do to get out, Pat?" said Jem: "will we go to America?"

"We *won't,* Jem," said Pat, "mind you this, Jem," said Pat, "it *isn't* only about getting out: it's about not being ashamed of Christ and of his words; and it's about confessing him before men; and will I sneak out of old Ireland, only because I'm ashamed of Christ? And besides the children is too many, and will I leave them and Biddy behind me? And more foreby, Jem, America isn't the place it was: it's getting worse every year on them that goes there, and old Ireland getting better, and the wages good."

"Well, that's what the priests is preaching everywhere," said Jem, "for the people to not go to America, any more."

"Well, I wouldn't blame them, if it was only the good of people they were thinking of," said Pat; "but sure you know, Jem, the priests have no country only Rome; and it's Rome they're still thinking of, and not old Ireland; and it's Rome they're thinking of, and neither Ireland nor America, when they tell the people to stay at home."

"Well, I'm thinking that betimes," said Jem, "but I don't know a'most why."

"I'll tell you why to think it, Jem," said Pat: "sure I got another loan of the *Tablet,* and here's a letter from Father Reardon* in America to a priest in Ireland, and here's what he says:" so Pat read out of the letter:

"'I solemnly believe that if the vessels which bring them over were suddenly to founder, and carry every creature on board into the depths of the ocean, they would have a better chance of salvation than they have after they have lived for some time in this country.'"

"Oh, Pat! stop a bit," said Jem, "isn't that the awful thing to think of; of a ship full of creatures, may be five hundred men, women, and little children, God save us, and the men holding their wives, as I have read in letters, and the poor mothers hugging their little babies on their poor breasts, and all them going down, screeching, at once into the roaring sea to death! and isn't it the cruel thing to hear a priest speaking as if he would *like* that ship to sink! Oh, mercy on us!" said Jem, "sure that's the poor thing."

"Well, sure Father Reardon can have no wife or children of his own," said Pat, "and he mightn't understand our feelings; and why would he stop at that, to save souls in his own fashion? but that isn't the part of his letter I want now," said Pat; so Pat read on.

"'So entirely convinced am I of the fearful havoc of souls which is the result of coming here, that were Almighty God to give me the power of building A WALL OF FIRE round Ireland, to prevent its people from leaving it, it should be built before the ink with which I write this line would dry. For the love of Jesus, try to keep your people at home. For every individual you keep, you snatch a soul from hell.'"

"Well, that's mighty fine," said Jem, "if every one that staid in Ireland would go to Heaven. But it's another thing he was thinking of: them that go to America leaves the Church of Rome, and them that stays in it is afeared to leave it; and that's all as one with him as the differ of going to Heaven or Hell: but I am afeared there's a deal of good Catholics in Ireland that won't get to Heaven."

"But what do you say of the wall of fire round Ireland to keep us in?" said Pat.

"Isn't the fires of Purgatory enough for them to govern us with?" said Jem.

"Deed and it's not then," said Pat; "the people is getting to think little of Purgatory, and that won't keep them in now; and it's the wall of fire the priests wants now."

---

* Talk of the Road, No. 10. CATHOLIC LAYMAN, March 1853, page 30.—Mark viii. 38.

† Romans x. 9, 10.

* The wild beasts of the desert, with the wild beasts of the islands shall dwell there, and the owls shall dwell therein. (Protestant version) Those birds were unclean among the Jews.

† Jeremiah li. 6.

* *Tablet,* Sept., 8, 1855—page 572.

"And if they had the wall of fire round Ireland, to keep in them that snap their fingers at the priests when they get to America," said Jem, "wouldn't they have a good bit of fire *in the middle* of Ireland too, for the boys that won't mind the priests at home?"

"Well it's a nice Patrick's Purgatory it would be, more nor even St. Patrick thought of," said Pat, "if Father John, and Father Reardon got their way. But it's not come to that yet anyway."

"I'm in dread it's too hot for them, that will turn," said Jem.

"Well, Jem," said Pat, "it will be worse yet for them that is ashamed of Christ, and that won't confess him with the mouth. Anyway that is stuck in me, and I *can't* be without *some* church; and I'll have to find one that will let me confess Christ and his words: that's the church for me, Jem, and maybe I'll find it better here nor in America. My mind's made up anyway, and if I'm beat, sure I can go to America *then* as well as *now*; and not feel then that I'm skulking out of it, like a man that is ashamed of Christ."

So if we should hear anything more of poor Pat's future history, our readers may like to know it, as well as we. For there are clear heads, and some brave hearts too, among the poor people of Ireland; and the humblest of them is worth caring about. Such men may be scarce in Ireland before long: and it concerns us all, that Ireland should not be too hot for them to stay in.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, OCTOBER 17, 1855.

Every period of the world's history has its own peculiar marks and characteristics; and it may be said, without fear of contradiction, that our's is pre-eminently an age of *inquiry*. There is scarcely any question, physical or moral, which is not, from time to time, brought under investigation; and, to any person who is sincerely anxious for the promotion of truth, it is a subject of the deepest interest to mark the growth of enlightened views, and the dying-out of antiquated prejudices, both at home and abroad. And this interest must be obviously increased, in proportion to the intrinsic importance of the question which gives rise to such gratifying results.

Our readers, we trust, scarcely need to be reminded that, from the commencement of this Journal, we have always laboured, to the best of our ability, to impress upon our fellow-countrymen the paramount duty which devolved upon them, as intelligent men and as Christians, to seek out truth, and especially religious truth, for themselves. We have urged them to disregard the impediments and restrictions with which interested persons, whether priests or laymen, would seek to surround them; and we have called upon them to assert and practice the right of free inquiry upon the most important of all subjects which could concern them as immortal beings. We felt thoroughly persuaded that, in the end, the cause of religious truth could never suffer from such investigation, conducted in a fair and candid spirit. It is falsehood, and falsehood alone, which has any cause to shun the light.

It is not now our purpose to dwell on the success which has attended our efforts—a success, we are rejoiced to say, in many instances far beyond our expectations. We merely advert to the subject, for the purpose of drawing the attention of our readers to the striking confirmation of the soundness of our views, which has lately been presented in a quarter where it might have been least expected—namely, in the Cortes, or Parliament of Spain.

Spain, as our readers are aware, is a thoroughly Roman Catholic country; perhaps, in some respects more thoroughly Romanist than even Italy itself. It was for many centuries the chosen seat of the Inquisition; and the fearful cruelties perpetrated on all persons who were even suspected of heresy have often been detailed in all their hideous enormity. The animosity of the priests and inquisitors extended even beyond the grave. If a person not of the Romish communion died in Spain, no funeral rites could be performed over his remains. His family were obliged to convey the body privately and by stealth to the place of interment, and deposit it in the ground without prayer or ceremony of any kind. A remarkable instance of this intolerant bigotry occurred some few years ago, and drew forth a spirited remonstrance from Lord Howden, the English ambassador, addressed to the Spanish Government: and it was said in the newspapers at that time, that if the Duke of Wellington, who had rescued Spain from French domination, had had the misfortune to die in the country which he delivered, his body, according to law, would have been treated worse than that of a common malefactor, and buried in the ground like a dog.

In such a country, where all the power and influence of the Government were directed to the promotion and support of the Roman Catholic faith, the obstacles to enlightened discussion might, at first sight, appear almost insurmountable. We might expect that scarcely any person would have the boldness, in the face of so much intolerance, to raise his voice in defence of free inquiry and religious liberty. Such an event has happened, however (as we learn from the public papers), in the course of the last few months*; and the cry has been raised, not in an obscure corner of the country, but in Madrid itself, in the highest deliberative assembly of Spain. How true it is, that all the efforts of priestly domination can never permanently succeed in stifling the earnest longing of the human mind for truth and freedom! The Romish clergy may keep a country in darkness and bondage for centuries; but sooner or later, in spite of all their precautions, some rays of light will break in.

The man who had the courage and resolution to act as we have described was the deputy from Barcelona, Don Raphael Degollado. A motion had been made in the Cortes, to the effect that any person who, from religious conviction, had ceased to belong to the Roman Catholic Church in Spain, might be at liberty to embrace another creed. This measure, the very first step in the path of religious toleration, was, as might be expected, violently opposed by the priestly party and their advocates; and it was in answer to them that Don Raphael Degollado delivered the bold and manly speech to which we have adverted. We request the attention of our Roman Catholic readers to the arguments which he employed. They have been frequently advanced in our pages; but, perhaps, they may come home with more force to some minds, from the recollection of the fact that the speaker is, and has been, a sincere member of the Roman Catholic Church. In reading the accounts of the bitter persecution to which our own poor countrymen are often exposed, who have had the courage to follow the dictates of their conscience, and leave the Church of Rome, we often felt that it would be well if *all* Romanists in Ireland acted on the fair and honest principles which the deputy from Barcelona so truthfully describes:—

"I come here," said he, "to defend toleration upon strictly religious grounds. Intolerance and exclusiveness are directly contrary to the Christian religion. If the gates of hell are not to prevail against the Word of God, why this puerile, this impious fear that injury could be done by another religion to the religion of Christ? This insulting fear is a negative—at the least, a doubt—of the truth of prophecy; and from doubt to infidelity is but one step. He who uses constraint, whether physical or moral, to secure the fulfilment of prophecy, can have no faith in it. The partisans of intolerance ignore the force of truth.—'Truth has in itself an irresistible force, it is as the light; our lips cannot deny its presence when our eyes behold it.'"

He defends himself ably from the charge of being influenced by indifference or hostility to religion, in advocating the cause of religious toleration:—

"My conscience could never know peace were I to refrain from telling you all I feel, all I think on this momentous subject. Let it not be thought, either within these walls or outside of them, that when I come here to defend religious liberty, I do so as an infidel, or a sceptic, or an indifferent. All these I have formerly been. I have been even a fanatic—a violent fanatic; but, by the grace of God, I have been enabled to escape those dangerous quicksands, where mere human reason too often makes shipwreck. And it is because I observe in this country the rapid progress of incredulity, hypocrisy, and a revolting cynicism, that I so ardently desire the triumph of religious liberty, which alone can arrest this fatal progress."

We pause in our extracts for a moment, in order to call attention to the picture of the state of morals and religion in Spain, drawn by an unimpeachable witness, the chosen representative of the important town of Barcelona. He, a Spanish gentleman, was addressing an assembly of Spaniards upon a question of momentous social importance; and he would have exposed himself to instant contradiction if his sentiments and statements were false or exaggerated. And in what terms does he describe the social condition of his countrymen? The picture is indeed a gloomy one. "There is," he declares, "a *rapid and fatal progress* of incredulity, hypocrisy, and revolting cynicism;" which latter word may be taken to imply a kind of savage, unsocial selfishness of character. This, then, is the state to which the teaching of the Church of Rome has reduced one of the finest countries in Europe. Romanism can throw the blame on no other quarter. For several centuries she has had the entire teaching of the Spaniards in her own hands. Not only religious liberty, but even the most trifling toleration, was sternly refused to any other persons or teachers, save her own. Have we not a right, then, to judge of the truth of her system by its fruits? She has made the Spaniards unbelievers and hypocrites; she set before them, under the garb of Christianity, a tissue of doctrines which they could not believe, and then compelled them, by persecution, to conceal their unbelief under the mask of hypocrisy. We greatly fear that there are many other Roman Catholic countries to which such a melancholy description would too truly apply.

To return, however, to the speech of the deputy from Barcelona. He argues, in forcible terms, against the superstitious dread of toleration which some sincere Romanists might possibly entertain:—

"Of all religions," he asks, "which is that which must appear to us to have the firmest faith in the truth of her dogmas?—that which shuts herself up, as it were, in an impenetrable enclosure, discusses nothing, tolerates nothing, and persecutes all outside her pale? Or is it that religion which discusses and which tolerates the free exercise of other forms of worship? Is it Catholic Spain, which stifles in her bosom, by every possible means, religious liberty? or Protestant Norway, who opens her doors to Jews and Catholics, whom she had for so long a period repulsed? Or Protestant England, who extends her toleration even to permitting the establishment of colleges of Jesuits, the most implacable enemies of the Reformation?"

We may observe, in passing, that the policy adopted by the Church of Rome nearer home appears to resemble very closely that which characterises her conduct in Spain. She shuts herself up, as far as she can, in an impenetrable enclosure. She steadily sets her face against discussion of any kind. She stifles religious liberty by every possible means; and we are constrained to add, that in those parts of Ireland where the balance of numbers is on her side, the lawless violence of the mob is not unfrequently employed, in order to check, by terror and in-

* *Vide the Daily Express* of Thursday, the 19th of July last.

timidation, the progress of Scriptural inquiry, which the Romish priests are unwilling openly to oppose.

The Spanish orator next brings forward a moral argument for free discussion, which we have frequently urged ourselves, but which we are glad once more to reproduce, in the words of an enlightened Roman Catholic:—

"If," argues the Catalonian deputy, "persons belonging to other communions are in error, instead of repulsing them, ought we not rather to draw them towards us by tenderness and love? Can they regard us with a favourable eye when we persecute them—when we calumniate them? If souls are led astray by error, permit discussion. Truth will triumph, sooner or later. Those whom we shall be unable to convince by our *words*, let us attract by our *works*, by example, by the practice of evangelical virtues—the most effectual, the most rare of all propagandas."

Our readers may well ask, can this be a voice from Spain, the land of the stake and the rack, the country of the Inquisition and the *auto da fé?* We will not now stop to inquire into the causes which have produced this revolution of feeling in the Spanish mind; but we cannot avoid calling attention to the simple but pregnant words in which Don Raphael Degollado has advocated the freedom of religious inquiry. "*If souls are led astray by error, permit discussion. Truth will triumph, sooner or later.*" This is the principle which we ourselves put forward, in one of the early numbers of this Journal, as the guide and motive of our labours; and it affords us unfeigned pleasure to find it re-echoed from the midst of the parliament of Spain. We may be permitted to add, that those persons, whosoever they are, who believe their countrymen to be in religious error, and yet endeavour to stifle free inquiry, exhibit a sad want of Christian love for the souls whom they believe to be led astray.

We can afford space but for one or two extracts more. The Spanish orator proceeds to notice and to refute the common objection, that religious unity would be endangered if free religious discussion were permitted:—

"Religious unity, so earnestly called for by all, is by myself as anxiously desired as by any; but my wish is, that it should be real, not counterfeit, like that which we already seem to possess. If by unity we are to understand external unity in worship and observances, that unity already exists, since we are not permitted to observe any form of worship save that alone of the Catholic Church. But if we are to understand true unity to be that of doctrines and creeds, then the commission must be perfectly aware that such unity has no existence. It knows, also, that there are not wanting Spaniards who long to profess a different religion; that infidelity and indifferentism have their partisans; that from their very pulpits the clergy loudly complain of this; and that numbers of Catholics are as far removed from gospel truth as a Mahometan could possibly be;—*so that to maintain that religious unity exists is willingly to perpetuate a lie, which deceives no one.*"

These remarkable words, we must remind our readers, are not ours, but those of a Roman Catholic—the chosen deputy of one of the most important towns in Spain. The unity of the Church, we must remember, is the cardinal doctrine of the Romish Church. In order to preserve this cherished dogma, every person must surrender his private judgment; every individual opinion must give way, it is said, to the voice of the universal Church. Well, the Church of Rome has, for many centuries, had her own way in Spain. We have often been told that Spain is the chosen seat of Catholicity. The very title of the Spanish Monarch is "Sua Majesta Catolica"—"Her Catholic Majesty." And, now, what is the result? Let us hear the account given by a most competent and unexceptionable witness. He tells us that "it is not a real, but a counterfeit unity;" that "the true unity of doctrines and creeds has no existence;" that "there are not wanting Spaniards who long to profess a different religion, and that numbers of Catholics are as far removed from gospel truth as a Mahometan could possibly be!" After this avowal, we trust we shall hear no more from Romish Controversialists of differences of opinion in the Protestant Church. Protestants in general are at least free from the charge of professing a religion which they do not believe. In the midst of much outward disagreement, we rejoice to think that there exists among Protestant Churches a real inward unity of doctrine and belief of the great fundamental truths of the gospel, without which all external professions of unity are but vain and nugatory.

In the Church of Rome, on the other hand, the substance is sacrificed to the shadow; the inward reality to the outward form. She has crushed the right of private judgment so long, that at last, thinking men are obliged to take refuge in hypocrisy and infidelity. In order to secure the semblance of an external unity, she prohibits all free discussion wherever she has the power; and she at length flatters herself that she has gained her object, when, in truth, the only unity which exists in her communion resembles the sameness and uniformity of colour which takes place everywhere at night, when light is entirely withdrawn. The rising of the morning sun brings the real state of things into view.

We shall add but one extract more:—

"The question of liberty of conscience has been for nearly half a century knocking at our gates, and offering itself to every serious mind for solution, which in every other civilized nation it has found. But what is the point in discussion? Is it to constrain Catholics to abjure their faith, in order to embrace another? Certainly not; but that we should come to the decision, that when any one ceases here in Spain, as elsewhere, to have faith in the Catholic religion, such person should have power to embrace another. If more than this be demanded, it is not to uphold religion, but the theocracy—a theocracy not the government of men by God, but man taking advantage of his fellow man, and that by no honest means."

This is the liberty which we demand for our fellow-countrymen at home. All we ask is, that when any Irishman ceases to have faith in the Roman Catholic religion, he should be left at liberty to embrace another, undeterred by the threat of popular violence or priestly intimidation. This liberty we shall continue to advocate temperately but firmly; and if any persons set themselves to oppose this freedom of action on the part of their neighbours, we will only say of them, in the words of the Spanish orator, that they are "men taking advantage of their fellow men, and that by no honest means."

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

In consequence of the considerable number of Subscriptions still unpaid, the publisher will, henceforward, be obliged to discontinue the paper to such *Subscribers* as are in arrear. A Blue Cover will, it is hoped, be taken as a sufficient notification. We have already more than once explained the difficulty of making special applications.

Correspondence.

THE RULES OF CHURCH UNITY.

ANSWER TO JOHN MILLER.

(Coutinued from our last number.)

WE published, in our last number, a letter from John Miller, in which he tried to prove that the spouse of Christ, the Church which is without spot or blemish, needs must be the Church of Rome.

John Miller rightly thinks that no other Church on earth is without spot or blemish, and therefore he jumped to the conclusion that the Church of Rome *must* be so.

But as evil members were SPOTS in the Church in the days of St. Jude (Jude, verse 12), so they must be now in the Church of Rome.

And since there is, therefore, *no* Church on earth without spot, that heavenly spouse must be "the Church of the firstborn which are written in heaven." (Hebrew, xii. 23.)

All the firstborn among the Jews belonged especially to God (Numbers, viii. 17). "The Church of the firstborn" is, therefore, composed only of those who are indeed the children of God, whose names are written in heaven.

This only is the Church without spot or blemish.

But Christ has also constituted his Church as a visible society in the world; this Church is so far from being "without spot" that it is compared to a net cast into the sea, which gathered both good fish and bad: and so it shall be to the end of the world (Matthew, xiii. 47—49.)

For the Church so spotted and blemished in this present state, Christ and his apostles have given rules in Scripture, which all faithful Christians are bound to observe.

We promised to point out those rules in this number, and we now proceed to do so.

Our Saviour has declared HIS WILL, that his Church should be one unbroken and undivided body.

He has declared this in the most solemn manner, by praying to His Father that it might be ONE.

"Neither pray I for these alone (the apostles), but for them also which shall believe in me through their word, THAT THEY ALL MAY BE ONE, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in Thee, that THEY *also may be* ONE *in us*" (John, xvii. 20, 21).

We believe that this prayer was especially intended of the VISIBLE communion of Christ's people on earth; because our Lord goes on immediately to declare why He *desired* and *prayed* for this unity; "That THE WORLD may *believe* that Thou hast sent me." It was, therefore, a unity which "THE WORLD" could SEE—that is, a VISIBLE unity—which Christ prayed for.

It is true such a unity has been but partially accomplished.

Our Lord prayed for the apostles—"I pray for them" (verse 9), yet Judas fell.

Our Lord prayed "for them also which should believe on him through their word" (verse 20), yet St. Paul writing "unto the Church of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints" (1 Cor. i, 2), says he hears that there are divisions or schisms among them (Ch. i. 10 and 11, xi. 18.)

And in most ages since, there have been divisions.

"It must needs be that offences come, but woe to that man by whom the offence cometh" (Matthew xviii. 7.)

So also there must needs be divisions; yet Christians should strive to be clear of the sin of division.

The apostles of Christ have left rules in the Church which, if observed, would accomplish that visible unity for which Christ prayed.

St. Paul has left this rule—"Now, I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them (Rom. xvi. 17.)

He does not say "those who separate themselves," but "those who cause separations" (διχοστασίας ποιοῦντας); it is those who *cause* the division, who are guilty of the offence.

St. Paul says also to the Church at Corinth, "I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you." And he forbids any one to say, "I am of Paul," or "I of Apollos," or "I of Cephas" (that is, of St. Peter), because these things lead to divisions (1 Cor. i. 10, 12.)

To the Hebrews—that is, the converted Jews—St. Paul says (Hebrews xiii.)—"Remember your rulers who have spoken unto you the word of God, whose faith imitate, considering the ending of the life they led.* (verse 7.)

And to this he adds (verses 8, 9) "Jesus Christ (is) the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever. Be not carried about with divers and strange doctrines."

At the seventeenth verse he says to them "obey your rulers and submit yourselves, for they watch for your souls as they that must give account."

Verse seven exhorts them to remember St. James, their first bishop, and others who had lately suffered martyrdom with him, and to imitate their faith so gloriously proved.

Verses eight and nine remind them that as Jesus Christ can never change, no new or strange doctrine besides what St. James taught could ever be admitted into the Church.

Verse seventeen exhorts them to be obedient to Symeon, who succeeded St. James, and those who were then labouring with him, because the watching for their souls was committed to them. But this does not mean that if Symeon or his successors should bring in a new doctrine the people were bound to receive it, for the same St. Paul says, "If ANY MAN preach any other Gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed" (Gal. i., 9.).—And St. Jude exhorts all Christians that they "should earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the saints" (verse 3.)

The faith itself, "ONCE DELIVERED," is therefore the great thing. The succession of prelates and priests, the very Church itself, was instituted to support that faith once delivered. If Prelates or Churches set themselves to alter or corrupt that faith, they betray the very object for which they were created; they so far forfeit the authority of their office; for the authority which God gives, is no authority when turned against Him; and no man is to follow or obey them in such a course.

The unchangeability of the faith lies at the root of all unity. For men cannot be united for an object, unless the object itself be fixed and settled. If the faith itself be a shifting thing which men can change, then change

* This is the exact meaning of the original. (τὴν ἔκβασιν τῆς ἀναστροφῆς).

itself will be a source of dissention. Therefore, one *unchangeable faith* is the first rule, as well as the great end, of Church Unity.

One more principle the Scripture gives us. We must obey God rather than man. So said Peter and the other Apostles to the Prelates of the Jewish church. (Acts iv., 19; v. 29).

And therefore if any church require us to do what God has forbidden, as terms of communion with her, we are bound to refuse; and the guilt of that separation lies on those who require such terms of communion, and not on those who reject them.

These, therefore, are the rules which we have from the Apostles for preserving the unity of the church, according to the will of Christ.

RULES OF CHURCH UNITY.

I.—To follow the faith once delivered by the Apostles; and to reject any *new* doctrine, by whomsoever introduced.

II.—To obey God rather than man, and to admit no terms of communion contrary to what God commands.

III.—Not to make causeless divisions by separating from others.

IV.—To mark those that make such divisions, and to avoid them.

V.—To show all due submission to the rulers of the church in each country, provided they teach no other Gospel than what Christ and his Apostles preached; and require nothing contrary to what they commanded.

VI.—Not to call ourselves the followers of any human teacher, or even of any Apostle.

But the Apostles did *not* lay down a rule, that all christians must be subject to the Bishop of Rome.

The rules which the apostles gave are sufficient for the purpose for which they were given; for if these rules had been observed always and by all christians, the visible Church would have continued one undivided body to this day; "Rules" can do no more.

These rules have not always been observed, and, therefore, there have been divisions, as St. Paul foretold there would be.

But these rules are sufficient to preserve from guilt all who will adhere to them.

We desire to follow these rules ourselves, and to hold up these rules to all others.

But the church of Rome first violates all these rules, and then pronounces anathemas on us, because we will not forsake those rules, to follow other rules of her own invention, which were never given by Christ or his apostles.

(1) The Church of Rome has violated the first rule, by adding *twelve* new articles to the faith in 1564, and a *thirteenth*—the immaculate conception—in December last.

This calls our attention to a passage in John Miller's letter, as follows: "It makes no odds to us if some of them (the Popes) were LOOSE IN THEIR MORALS (that is, were adulterers, murderers, fornicators, &c.*) or whether they chopped or changed discipline as often as the laws or customs or clime required it, as long as they DID NOT CHANGE THE ARTICLES of our faith."

What is the main question between us and Rome, as respects faith? Is it not this? WE say that as respects articles of faith, it is sufficient for salvation to believe and profess the ancient Catholic creeds: the Church of Rome says that all who believe only the Catholic creed *shall be damned*, unless they will also believe whatever the Church of Rome has pleased, or may hereafter please, to add to it. Is it no changing of the ancient faith to say that the ancient faith can only lead to damnation without the modern additions?

We say, therefore, that the Church of Rome *has changed* the ancient faith, and has violated the essential object for which the Church ought to be united; and this is the chief cause of the existing divisions of the Church.

(2) The Church of Rome requires us to obey the traditions of men in opposition to the commands of God.

The Lord has said, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve;" or, as it is in the Douay Bible, "The Lord thy God shalt thou ADORE, and Him only shalt thou serve" (Matthew iv. 10.)

The Church of Rome requires us to *worship* and to *adore* consecrated bread and wine, *which is* NOT GOD.

"Let all the faithful of Christ, according to the custom always received in the Catholic Church, render to this most holy sacrament the worship of LATRIA, *which is due to the true God*; nor is it, therefore, the less to be ADORED because it was instituted by Christ the Lord to be eaten."—Council of Trent, session xii. c. 5.† And she separates from all who will not commit this idolatry.

Therefore *she*, and not they, is guilty of the separation thus made; for we must obey God and not men.

3. The Church of Rome is guilty of making divisions, for she has formally and wilfully separated from all who hold the ancient Catholic creeds alone; and who refuse to give to consecrated bread and wine that worship which belongs to the true God.

The Church of England and Ireland always was, and now is, willing to communicate with the Church of Rome, on the terms laid down by the apostles; but the Church of Rome will not communicate with the Church of England and Ireland on those terms.

Therefore the making of division, and the guilt of it, lies on the Church of Rome, and not on the Church of England and Ireland.

4. The Church of Rome does not avoid those that make divisions, but encourages and joins with them.

All Christians in England and Ireland worshipped in the parish Churches, according to the purely reformed worship, for many years after the Reformation. The Church of Rome then encouraged some to separate, and joined with them; so the Church of Rome was guilty of joining with those who made the division, instead of avoiding them.

5. The Church of Rome teaches men to violate the fifth rule also; for whereas there were bishops in England and Ireland, deriving their authority by lawful succession from the ancient bishops of England and Ireland, the Church of Rome did all she could to persuade all Christians in England and Ireland to refuse all submission and obedience to those bishops, and even sent over to these countries persons as bishops and priests, whose ordination was unlawful and invalid, to withdraw the English and Irish from obedience to their own lawful bishops.

6. The Church of Rome violates the sixth rule also. She says—the Pope is the successor of Peter; on the strength of that invention, she exclaims, "I am of Peter (Cephas); the See of Peter; the Church founded on Peter; I am of Peter." And it is by virtue of shouting out what the scripture has expressly forbidden and condemned, that she thinks herself entitled to violate all the rules of Church unity which the Apostles have laid down in scripture!

Thus she makes void the commandments of God, by her own traditions (Mark vii. 9, 13).

We ask our readers to consider well a principle which lies at the root of this whole question.

The Apostles established Churches at Jerusalem, Antioch, Corinth, Philippi, Rome, Ephesus, and many other places. And many of these Churches were older than the Church of Rome.

Did the Apostles appoint that the Church of Rome should govern and swallow up all other Churches?

Did the Apostles give authority to the Church of Rome, to impose new articles of faith on other Churches, and to violate all the rules of Scripture for the unity of the Church?

If the Apostles *did* give such power, then of course, the Church of Rome is right, and all other Churches must submit.

But if the Apostles gave her *no such authority*, then the Church of Rome is the great usurper of the liberties of the Church, the great disturber of the Church's peace, the great violater of the Apostolic rules for the unity of the Church.

WE KNOW that the Apostles gave no such authority to the Church of Rome; for—

First—We find no such thing in their writings!

Second—We find that the church of Rome had no such authority over other churches for many centuries.

For 300 years, at least, the authority of the Bishop of Rome was confined to the "Loca suburbicaria—" that is, to a circuit of 100 miles round the walls of Rome—and the freedom of all other churches was secured by canons of a much later date.

We put it to Roman Catholics this way—let them shew in our pages, if they can, that the Church of Rome had the supremacy over all other churches, during the first 300 years.

If they cannot, let them confess that any separation between the church of Rome and any other church, then or now, must be judged of by enquiring which party was guilty of violating the rules of church unity as laid down by the apostles in scripture.

We, for our part, are content to be judged by these rules, and to submit to them.

If the Church of Rome had been content to abide by these rules, the Church would have been ONE to this day.

We have not put "the succession of pastors" among the rules, because we do not find it expressly commanded in Scripture; yet the rules given in Scripture do provide for it—for no man may take this office on himself; and the ministers of the Church must be ordained by those who were ministers before.

The succession of doctrine is of more importance than the succession of men; and hence, perhaps, the one is expressly commanded, the other only provided for. Yet we do not underrate the succession of pastors: where it goes along with the succession of doctrine, it makes evident, that a Church has not arisen from division; and it is, therefore, a good mark of the unity of the Church.

On this ground, too, we are ready to meet the Romanists in these countries. The bishops of the Church of England and Ireland have succession from the ancient bishops of England and Ireland. The Roman Bishops in this country have not.*

As for the succession of the Bishops of Rome, we think it open to objections, from which the succession of the English and Irish bishops is free.

On this subject we have been much struck with an expression in the letter of John Miller, which has given rise to this paper; he says of the bishops of Rome—"Let there not one link of the golden chain be broken." Let him look to his chain, and he will find it very bad brass, with many a link left out!

For instance, in the list given by Bishop Milner ("End of Controversy," letter xxvii.), how comes it that there is a Pope Felix III., but no Felix II.; Pope Stephen V., but no Stephen IV.; Boniface VIII., but no Boniface VI. or VII.; John XVIII., but no John XVI., or XVII.; Benedict XI., but no Benedict X.; Leo IX., but no Leo VIII.?

Will any one explain to us how *there* COULD be a NINTH Pope Leo, *without* an EIGHTH Pope Leo?

We could give more such vacancies, but in the above it appears that EIGHT links at least of the "golden chain" are wanting.

We now say to John Miller—"Let there not one link of the golden chain be broken!"

Let him search through Bishop Milner's list of popes for these EIGHT links; if he can find them, let him write us a letter to say so, and we will publish it; if he cannot find the eight links, let him say no more of his "golden chain."

While protesting as we do against the offences of the Church of Rome, it is far from our intention to justify any Protestants for anything they have done amiss.

Those Protestants who are separated from the prelates in their own countries, only because they will not profess falsehood, or do what Christ forbids, are simply following the course of Christian duty; and are, therefore, sound members of the visible Church on earth; as well as members of the "Church of the firstborn, written in Heaven," if they indeed follow Christ.

Those who have separated without such cause, are answerable to their own Master for violating his rules. It is not our place either to judge or excuse them. We do not suppose that a violation of His rules about Church unity does separate from the visible Church, any more than a violation of his law against other evil actions. Yet all violation of his precepts is sin; he alone can tell how far a sinner is excusable by ignorance and sincerity, so as to be justified by Christ. WE cannot justify anything which is contrary to His Word. Such separations have given great cause of offence to Roman Catholics, and great occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme (2 Sam., xii 14.)

At the same time, it was indeed the Church of Rome that gave the handle for all these causeless separations; for her Popes and councils, through ambition and lust of dominion, were content to force a large part of Christendom into just and necessary separation, sooner than sacrifice their own usurpation and gain. And, when separation is once begun, even on necessary grounds, the majority of men will not distinguish nicely.

But these questions about other Protestants are beside our present purpose. For we invite our fellow-countrymen to join the Church of England and Ireland, in which all the scriptural rules of unity are observed.

Those who follow these rules must be right as respects the visible unity of the Church. And, by being united to Christ their Head, they are in union with "the Church of the first-born who are written in Heaven."

MYTHS AND MIRACLES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Though you have given your readers various specimens of modern miracles in your paper, I do not think you have ever noticed a distinction taken by Roman Catholic writers on the subject, which it seems to me absolutely necessary to bear in mind, in order to give fair play to your antagonists, and avoid misrepresenting their opinions. I think it can scarcely be unknown to you, that, whatever ignorant and superstitious Roman Catholics may believe upon the subject of saintly miraculous stories, the educated classes, whether clergy or laity, consider them as mere pious legends, written for the purpose of edifying the people, as many modern writers compose acknowledged works of fiction of a religious character, which no one that is not very simple ever supposes to have actually occurred, exactly as it is narrated. Mr. Newman, in his sermon on Development, preached before the University of Oxford, before he became reconciled to the Church of Rome, explains, better than I am able to do, this important matter.

"Mythical representations, at least in their better form, may be considered facts and narratives, *untrue*, but like the truth, intended to bring out the action of some principal point of character, and the like. For instance, the tradition that St. Ignatius was the child whom our Lord took in his arms, may be unfounded; but it realizes to us his special relation to Christ and His apostles, with a keenness peculiar to itself. The same remark may be made upon certain narratives of martyrdom, or of the details of such narratives, or of *certain alleged miracles*, or heroic acts, or speeches, all of which are the spontaneous produce of reli-

* See the list in our number for February, page 15.

† "Omnes Christi fideles pro more in Catholica Ecclesia semper recepto latriæ cultum, qui vero Deo debetur, huic sanctissimo Sacramento in veneratione exhibeant. Neque enim ideo minus est adorandum quod fuerit a Christo Domino, ut sumatur institutum.

* See the article "On the Succession of Irish Bishops," in our number for August, 1854, page 94, and the article on "The Succession of St. Patrick," in our number for October, 1854, page 117, and supra, p. 112.

gious feeling under imperfect knowledge. If the alleged facts did not occur, they *ought* to have occurred (if I may so speak); they are such as might have occurred, and would have occurred under circumstances; and they belong to the parties to whom they are attributed, potentially, if not actually; or the like of them did occur; or occurred to others similarly circumstanced, though not to those very persons."

You see, therefore, sir, that all intelligent Roman Catholics do not treat as matters of faith, but as myths or legends invented by pious writers to edify men of imperfect knowledge, many of the wonderful narratives handed down to us by our mediæval ancestors; and that it would be very uncandid to assert, that every one who embraces the faith of Rome must necessarily credit every myth or legend which pious ingenuity has composed for the edification of the more ignorant classes, who are, perhaps, incapable of appreciating more solid reasoning or historical evidence. As you seem to pique yourself on giving fair play to both sides, I hope you will not refuse to insert this letter.

Yours, &c.,
A LOVER OF FAIR PLAY.

We are always sincerely anxious not to misrepresent our opponents, or to attribute to them a belief of anything which they repudiate; and we readily, therefore, insert, in our paper, the foregoing letter.

We doubt, however, very much whether Father Newman's defence of "mythical representations," or "alleged miracles," is such, as our correspondent can safely rely on as one approved of or sanctioned by the Roman Catholic Church.

We are aware that Mr. Newman has written what our correspondent has quoted; and in the preface to the "Lives of the English Saints," published under his sanction, and which preface is, we believe, written by himself, and signed with his initials, we find a similar doctrine thus expressed—

"The question will naturally suggest itself to the reader, whether the miracles recorded in these narratives, especially those contained in the life of St. Walburga, are to be received as matters of fact; and, in this day, and under our present circumstances, we can only reply, that there is *no reason why they should not be.* They are the *kind of facts proper to ecclesiastical history*, just as instances of sagacity and daring, personal prowess or crime are the facts proper to secular history."

Thus, if we are to believe Mr. Newman, it is lawful to ascribe miracles to the saints, on any the slightest foundation, or on none whatever, merely because "they are *the kind of facts proper to ecclesiastical history*;" and if they did not occur, yet they *ought* to have occurred, "and belong to the parties to whom they are attributed, *potentially*, if not actually"—propositions which we boldly assert to be as destructive to piety and religion, as incompatible with correct notions of truth.

We think we cannot too strongly protest against such an attempt to escape from the difficulties of Protestant objections, by a mode of argument which, if permitted, would allow *fictions* and historical *facts* to be propagated indiscriminately, at the pleasure of the inventor.

Were we to deal with solemnly-told miraculous stories, not as facts, but as merely mythic legends, and admit it to be a lawful exercise of imagination to *invent*, in the absence of history, and to relate, *as facts*, anything which, according to the writer's notions of fitness or congruity, *might*, or *could*, or *should* have happened, we should consider ourselves *tampering with truth*, in a manner which could not fail to tend to the most disastrous consequences.

To assent to Mr. Newman's doctrine that "miracles" are among the matters which may be lawfully ascribed to the hero of a legend, though they had no foundation in fact, because, "if the alleged facts did not occur they ought to have occurred," would be nothing less than to recognise the principle, that *falsehood may be innocently used to propagate religion*—a doctrine which would undermine all belief in any religious truth based on human testimony.

We can see no similarity, whatever, between writers of acknowledged fiction and of such pseudo-histories, which ought to be kept as distinct from one another as the region of serious history is from that of poetical romance. The latter never claims our belief, or misleads any one. The pleasure it affords is simply *as* a work of fiction and imagination. The pleasure of history solely consists in its *truth*. Let any one find it stated at the close of a saintly legend that none of the miraculous stories therein related really occurred, but that they were mere imaginary descriptions of what *might* or ought to have occurred, but, in point of fact, never *did* occur, and the reader would at once throw down the book in disgust, and not, perhaps, without a feeling of anger at having been thus trifled with. The whole charm, in fact, of such stories consists in their *real* or *supposed* truth. The moment the cheat is discovered the mind revolts at the profaneness of the story. How can one say a miracle *ought* to have occurred without implying that the Almighty *ought* to have worked it? and who shall dare to say what the Almighty ought or ought not to do? To relate a miracle as a matter of fact, merely to embellish a narrative or give dignity to a hero, is neither more nor less than to assert that the Almighty has done a certain act (an act which no other person could do) without having any reason for believing that He has done it; a degree of profaneness, which none, we think, can be guilty of without the risk of undermining his own belief and the belief of others in the whole Gospel history.

If it were harmless in modern writers to invent fictitious miracles in a credulous age, to give sanctity to superstition, how are we to know that *good* men may not also have imposed a false revelation on the world?

We cannot help questioning whether men, who, like Mr. Newman, would sanction such absurd figments as *calculated to promote piety*, do really believe the evangelical history a whit more firmly than they believe those legends?

To those who believe, and teach it as a part of their system, that one is at liberty to give a colour and sacredness to their mythic legends by fictitious imitations of the miracles of the Holy Scriptures, we can easily understand that it might appear to be a high and saint-like exercise of Christian piety and devotion, to allow the imagination a similar license with regard to the life, and actions, and miracles of the Lord himself, and to use the facts recorded in the Gospel as the basis of a legend and a myth. It is but one step further in this natural progress of error and disregard of truth, to represent the Gospel history itself as nothing more than a myth or legend. For men who think at all, must perceive that, if it be lawful to take such liberties with truth *now*, it was just as lawful eighteen hundred years ago. If men may construct a myth *now*, it was as competent for the apostles and primitive Christians to do so then. There is, in fact, but one step, and a very brief one, between such teaching and the worst species of German Neologianism.§ Mr. Newman and others *may* stop at the point of error they have already reached; but if such positions and maxims be allowed to take root and spread, their disciples will, in all human probability, become Neologians, if not infidels.

CHRIST AND HIS PEOPLE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—In your number for September, page 107, there is an article with the above heading, and signed by a Mr. Roberts, calling upon any Roman Catholic "*to explain whether Christ is in purgatory now or not; and if He is not, why it is that 'the members' are separated from 'the body' of Christ, and go to purgatory?*"

Were it not that the letter is now before the public, it would be difficult to imagine that any man possessing common sense would put forth such *as argument;* but that it is looked upon as argument I may assume from the fact of its receiving insertion in THE LAYMAN, and shall, therefore, crave space in your paper for a few remarks upon it. His first argument is—"*Christ and His people are united: they are one;*" and his fertile imagination draws a conclusion, that if His people are in purgatory, Christ must be there also. Does Mr. R. believe that Christ's people are on earth? if so, according to his own logic, Christ is on earth, and people need not protest so loudly against transubstantiation. But if Christ's people be not separated from Him by being on earth; and if Christ, though in heaven, be united to His people here, why may not His people in purgatory be united to Him. If the space between earth and heaven does not prevent such union, no more does the space between purgatory and heaven. Again—"*The thief on the cross was, no doubt, one of Christ's people, and we may take him as a type of the whole body of believers dying with Christ; and Christ's words show that where He is His people are also.*" What authority, I ask, has Mr. Roberts for taking the thief as a type of Christ's people? On the contrary, his repentance and death were under very peculiar circumstances—at a moment when the sins of the world were cancelled by the Saviour's blood, and before there was time for his falling again into transgression; so that, suppose the words of Christ to prove that the thief went to heaven on that day (which cannot be shown, inasmuch as Christ himself did not go to heaven on that day, as appears from John xx. 17, where He says, "touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father)"—suppose this to be the case, it does not follow that all Christ's people go there immediately after death. One can hardly repress a smile at Mr. Roberts' paraphrase of the passage in the 8th of Romans—"*Nothing shall separate us from Christ, not even death.*" Mr. Roberts should have seen that it is not separation from Christ, but a separation from the *love* of Christ, which is spoken of. The meaning of the Apostle is, that none of those things which he enumerates in verses 35, 38, 39, should prevent his loving Christ; and to this truth every Roman Catholic subscribes; and, I might add, that not even purgatory, frightful though it may appear to Mr. Roberts, will hinder the Roman Catholic loving Christ.

From the above remarks, I think it plain that the question, "whether Christ be in purgatory because His people are there," is simply absurd.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
CATHOLIC.

Nothing gives us greater satisfaction than to receive proof, from time to time, that Roman Catholics are carefully watching our Journal, to lay hold on anything which they can answer; because this shows that Roman Catholics must feel the force of what they do not answer.

On considering the contents of our last number, we think there were many things in it which the intelligent writer of the above letter would have thought it better worth his while to answer if he could have done so. We trust he feels the force of the arguments which he does *not* answer.

Considering the nature of the letters which we publish from time to time, we think it must be evident to every reader that the conductors of this Journal are not responsible for the opinions and arguments contained in the letters which they publish.

Our object is to promote discussion. We open our pages to all sides. Any letter which leads to discussion has a fair claim to a place in our pages. We are always slow to reject a letter, especially if it be short.

We think Mr. Roberts' letter raised a fair question for discussion as to the relation which exists between Christ and His people in purgatory—supposing them to be there. With that view we published it; and we think it is not sufficiently answered by saying that his question is "simply absurd."

Our Saviour's prayers for His disciples contained these words, "Father, I will that they also, whom Thou hast given me, be with me where I am"—(John xvii, 24). We think it quite fair to ask, how is this performed to those in purgatory, if Christ be not in purgatory? and we would suggest to the writer of the above letter to try and give it some better answer.

We trust our correspondent will not suppose that by publishing his letter we become responsible for the arguments contained in it; even for those that we do not refute or discuss. His letter promotes discussion, and we therefore publish it; and we hope this will induce him to write to us again.

THE PROTESTANT'S PURGATORY.

(TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.)

MR. EDITOR—As we were going home last night after the day's work, who should we meet but the Reader that I told you about in my last letter. As soon as we met him the boys began to argue with him, and says Jerry, "Don't you, Protestants, say that you'll believe anything that we can bring Scripture for?" "Yes," says the Reader, "we'll believe whatever can be proved out of Scripture." "Well, then," says Jerry, "why don't you believe in a Purgatory for cleansing the soul and taking away the stains of sin?" "Why," says the Reader, "I do believe in a Purgatory for cleansing sin, but I don't know whether it's the same as your Purgatory." "Well," says the boys, "tell us what kind is your Purgatory." "I will," says the Reader, and with that he pulled out the Douay Testament, and read for us these verses—"God, who at sundry times and in divers manners, spoke in times past to the fathers by the prophets, last of all in these days hath spoken to us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the world, who being the brightness of his glory, and the figure of his substance, and upholding all things by the word of his power, *making purgation of sins*, sitteth on the right hand of the Majesty on high."* "Now," says the Reader, "this tells us that it's our Lord Jesus Christ that maketh purgation of sins, that is (as the note in the Douay explains it) *purges away our sins by his passion;* and," says he, "here's another text—'So also Christ was offered once *to exhaust* the sins of many.'† And," says he, "listen to the note your Church puts to this verse—'To exhaust, that is to empty or draw out to the very bottom by a plentiful and perfect redemption.' And," says he, "I'll give you one more text—'If we walk in the light as he also is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son *cleanseth us from all sin.*'‡ Now," says he, "there's the Protestant's Purgatory; there's what we trust to for cleansing our sins; we believe that our blessed Lord purges away his people's sins; we believe that he was offered on the cross to exhaust the sins of many; we believe that his precious blood cleanseth from *all* sin, and we find this in the Roman Catholic Bible as well as in the Protestant Bible. And," says he, "boys, I think you must allow that mine is a good purgatory for cleansing away sins; and now," says he, "tell me what kind is yours." "Well," says Jerry, "I can't deny that yours sounds very well, but," says he, "our Purgatory is very different; it's a place or state of punishment in the other life where some souls suffer for a time before they can go to Heaven.'"§ "Well," says the Reader, "I don't like that Purgatory at all; for," says he, "I thought that our Lord Jesus Christ suffered the punishment on the cross that was due to sin, and I thought that his people would be let off of the punishment, because he took their place and suffered in their stead; and," says he, "isn't this what the Douay Bible says—'He was wounded for our iniquities, he was bruised for our sins, the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and *by his bruises we are healed.*'‖ And," says the Reader, "do you think that God would come down on us and punish us, after our blessed Lord

* Heb. i. 1, 2, 3. † Heb. ix. 28.
‡ 1 John, i. vii.
§ Jerry quotes from Dr. Butler's Catechism, page 26.
‖ Isaiah liii. 5.

had borne the punishment in our place? Sure," says he, "if a friend paid your rent, the master wouldn't come down on you and ask for the rent *a second time*; and," says he, "Christ paid the debt that was due on account of our sins, and God won't ask it a second time from any of Christ's people. But," says he, "tell us something more about this Purgatory of yours; who are them that go there?" "Well," says Jerry, "since it's a place of punishment, of course it's the bad people go there?" "Arra, hold your tongue," says Andy Kelly, the priest's schoolmaster, "sure," says he, "you're going against the doctrines of our Church entirely; for," says he, "'tisn't the bad people go there at all, they go straight to Hell; but," says he, "the Catechism of the Council of Trent tells us that, 'tis *the souls of the pious* people that go there."* "Why, then," says the Reader, "'tis the queer place to send the pious people; and," says he, "I thought the pious people went to Heaven; for," says he, "I thought their sins were blotted out by the blood of Christ." "Well," says Andy, "their mortal sins are blotted out, but their venial sins are left to be worked out in Purgatory." "Well," says the Reader, "that's the most curious thing I ever heard; for," says he, "I thought 'twould be harder to get rid of the mortal sins than the venial ones; and still," says he, "you tell me that although the blood of Christ will get out the mortal sins, it can't get out the venial ones at all; and," says he, "I don't know how to believe that; and," says he, again, "isn't your Purgatory good for any but venial sins?" "Well, never that I heard of," says Andy. "And," says the Reader, "isn't it any good for the mortal sins?" "No," says he; "for those who die in mortal sin go to Hell for all eternity." "Why then," says the Reader, "I don't think your Purgatory is good for much; for," says he, "even by your own account 'tis only good for venial sins; now," says he, "my Purgatory is good for mortal as well as venial sins; for," says he, "it cleanseth from *all* sin; every sin," says he, "both big and little can be cleansed by the blood of Christ; and," says he, "unless you have something more to say for your Purgatory, I'll stick to my own." "Well," says Jerry, "it seems you don't like ours; but," says he, "may be you'll go *farther* and fare worse!" Well, the boys had a great laugh at the Reader, and indeed he took it very good-humoured. "Aud," says he, "at all events let us hear something more about it, what's the punishment," says he, "that the pious souls suffer there?" "Well," says Jerry, "Father John told us that in his sermon last Sunday. He was warning us to lose no time in seeing after the souls of all belonging to us, and says he, boys, won't you do anything for the souls of your decent parents, to try and have them out by Christmas day at least, and says he, remember the place they're in—in the middle of a terrible fire, as hot as Tom Hurley's big oven." "And so it ought," says the Reader, "*for it's there he makes his bread!*" Well, sir, the boys then turned the laugh on Jerry, but Andy came to his help, and says he, "Father John didn't say a word about an oven, he only said that 'twas a terrible big fire." "Troth then," says the Reader, "*that's the fire that makes his pot boil!*" Well, the Reader had the laugh against Andy entirely, more by token as Andy had paid Father John £2 the week before for the souls of some of his people. So Andy got a little vexed, and says he, "joking won't prove anything." "And moreover," says Jerry, "there's too much truth in them jokes to be pleasant." "But to stop all joking," says Andy, "I can prove our Purgatory out of the Bible." "Do so," says the Reader, "and I'll believe it myself." Well, Andy took the Douay Bible, and read for us these words. "Be at agreement with thy adversary betimes, whilst thou art in the way with him, lest perhaps the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison. Amen, I say to thee, thou shalt not go out from thence till thou repay the last farthing."† "Well," says the Reader, "where's Purgatory in that verse?" "Why," says Andy, "the prison is Purgatory." "Well," says the Reader, "you must be badly off for texts when you bring that forward, for," says he, "can't the word 'prison' ever mean anything but Purgatory? You remind me," says he, "of one evening that the minister was lecturing on Purgatory, and before he began he read some prayers, and among the rest that part of the Litany where we ask God to 'have pity upon all prisoners and captives.' And when we came out after the lecture, a Romanist came up to me, and says he, 'in spite of all the minister said against Purgatory, he believes in it, for,' says he, 'if he didn't believe in it, why did he pray for the souls in Purgatory.' 'He didn't do any such thing,' says I. 'He did,' says he, 'sure I heard him with my own ears pray for all prisoners and captives,' and says he, 'who could they be but the souls in Purgatory?' And I'm thinking," says the Reader, "that you're of his opinion, that there can be no prisoners but the poor souls in Purgatory. But at all events," says he, "there's not a word in the text about fire, nor a word about souls, nor a word about venial sins. And," says he, "I'll engage Father John didn't give you that text as a proof of Purgatory." "Well, he didn't," says Andy, "but why wouldn't he give it if he thought of it?" "Because," says the Reader, "'twould ruin his trade entirely." "How so?" says Andy. "Why," says the Reader, "how does Father John tell you the souls are to be got out?" "By masses," says Andy. "And who says the masses?" says the Reader. "The priest of course," says Andy. "Then," says the Reader, "it's the priest that gets out the souls." "To be sure it is," says Andy. "Well," says the Reader, "read your text again, and see who it is that gets the soul out." Well, Andy read again, "Amen, I say to thee, thou shalt not go out from thence till *thou* repay the last farthing." "Well," says the Reader, "who is 'thou'? Is it the priest?" Well, sir, Andy seemed as if he was stunned, and not a word out of his lips; but the Reader stuck to him, until he had to allow that "*thou*" meant the soul himself, and not the priest at all. Well, the boys were greatly astonished, and says Jerry, "often as I read that verse I never seen before that 'tis the soul himself must work out its own sins." "Well, you see now," says the Reader, "that if that text proves Purgatory, it proves that neither masses, nor priests, nor money, can get out a soul; but that he must suffer there until he has worked out the last farthing." "And," says Jerry, "if that's the way, we're fools to be spending our hard-earned money in masses, when they can't do a bit of good for the poor souls; and," says he, "it's true for the Reader, Father John wouldn't give us *that* text, for 'twould spoil his own market." With that, the boys began counting up all the money they had paid for masses, and says they, "we're sold entirely if that text means Purgatory." And, says Mike Flinn, "I pawned the blankets from under the children to pay Father John for getting out my mother's soul, and," says he, "I didn't grudge the money, for it's she was the good mother to me, and," says he, "it's good reason I had to spend the last penny I could raise if it would give her peace and rest; but," says he, "'tis what frets me entirely is to think, that may be she's in Purgatory still, burning away until she works out the last farthing; and," says he, "if that's the case, I might as well have left the poor children the blankets, and the cold winter coming on." "Well," says Andy, "perhaps after all, that text doesn't mean Purgatory; more by token, as Father John didn't mention it in his sermon, but says he, "I've other texts that will do as well." "Let us hear them," says the Reader. So with that Andy read out the text in St. Peter's epistle "Because Christ also died once for our sins, the just for the unjust, that he might offer us to God, being put to death indeed in the flesh, but enlivened in the spirit, in which also coming, he preached to those spirits that were in prison, which had been some time incredulous, when they waited for the patience of God in the days of Noe, when the ark was a-building."‡ "Well," says the Reader, "there's the prison certainly, if that will do anything for you, but there isn't a word about the big fire, nor about masses getting them out." "Never mind that," says Andy, "for so sure as three angles of a triangle are together equal to two right angles, so surely I'll prove that these three verses are equal to Purgatory." "Stop a minute," says Jerry, "I've got Dr. Butler's catechism that the children learn out of, and he doesn't bring that text to prove Purgatory at all, but to prove Limbo."§ "Arra, hold your tongue, you omadawn," says Andy, "sure Keenan's catechism says that this text proves Purgatory."‖ "I don't care what it says," says Jerry, "I'll hold by Dr. Butler, who was a greater man than ever Keenan was, and his catechism is recommended by the four Roman Catholic archbishops of Ireland;" and, boys," says he, "do you think it likely that they'd be wrong?" Well the boys allowed that Butler's catechism must be the right one, seeing that it was backed by the four archbishops. But Andy wouldn't give in a peg, and says he, "I've the four bishops of Scotland to back Keenan, and here's their names in the first page," and says he, "do you think they're wrong?" Well, sir, we didn't know what to say after that, for Butler had the four Irish bishops, and Keenan had the four Scotch bishops, and one said the text meant Limbo, and the other said it meant Purgatory, so we were in a regular fix; and worse than all, the Reader was laughing at us, and says he, "Take it easy, boys, don't get into a passion about it, 'fair play for ever,'" and he grinning at us all the time. But at length Mick starts up, "And," says he, "boys, may be it's all about nothing you're disputing, for perhaps," says he, "Limbo and Purgatory are all one. May be Limbo is the Latin for Purgatory." Well the boys were greatly pleased at this, but the Reader turns to Jerry, and says he, "What sort of a place does the catechism say that Purgatory is?" "A place or state of punishment,"† says Jerry. "And what kind of a place does it say that Limbo is?" "A place or state of rest,"‡ says Jerry. "Well," says he, "they can't both be the same place, seeing that one is a place of *punishment*, and the other a place of *rest*." Well, the boys were fairly puzzled to know what to make of it, and the Reader turned to us, and says he, "I think you ought to settle it between yourselves before you bring it to Protestants, for," says he "it looks very queer to have four bishops on one side, and four on the other, and," says he, "some of them must be wrong." "Troth then," says Jerry, "I wouldn't wonder if they were all wrong, and," says he, "may be it doesn't mean either Limbo or Purgatory." "I'm thinking you're not far out," says the Reader, "and," says he, "you must bring some better texts if you wish to prove your Purgatory." Well, Andy was regularly choppfallen, the stuffening was quite taken out of him, and says he, "I can't stay any longer to-night, but the next time we meet I'll have other texts for you," and with that he left us. The Reader then turned to us, and says he, "Boys, I'll stick to the Protestant Purgatory, and if you'd take my advice you'd do the same, at all events until you find a better. Remember," says he, "that even if your Purgatory were true, 'twould only cleanse you from *venial sins*, while my Purgatory," says he, "the *precious blood of Christ, cleanseth from all sin*, mortal and venial, big and little, all are washed out in his blood. What does the Douay Bible say? 'If your sins be as scarlet, they shall be made as white as snow, and if they be red as crimson, they shall be white as wool.'" So with that he wished us good night, and turned up the boreen that leads to his house.

Your humble servant to command,

Dan Carthy.

* Part I., chap. iv., quest. 3.
† Matt. v. 25, 26.
‡ 1 Peter iii. 18, 19, 20.
§ Thirty-second edition, page 13.
‖ Third edition, page 130.
* Title-page.
† Page 20.
‡ Page 13.

FARMING OPERATIONS FOR OCTOBER.

(*From the Irish Farmers' Gazette.*)

The very fine weather we are at present enjoying, and the dry state of the land, should induce our farmers to exertion, in thoroughly cleaning their stubble land, particularly that intended for green crops next season, for large holders, with abundance of horse-power to work it effectively, we do not know a better implement than the improved Bentall's broadshare; it completely cuts the weeds at any distance, at pleasure, from 3 to 9 or 10 inches under the surface, without disturbing it; on the application of the harrows the weeds are brought to the surface, which are then readily gathered by the horse rake, and left in rows to be carried off. For small occupants, a very suitable implement is a sort of plough with a broad share, armed with upright cutters, invented by the late Rev. T. D. La Touche, and exhibited at several of our shows, of which a model has been presented to the Royal Dublin Society, and may be seen now in their Agricultural Museum, as also that of a novel and suitable harrow to follow it.

Wheat sowing should be concluded this month on land that has been fallowed, or after clover, peas, beans, summer vetches, or potatoes. Much care should be taken in the selection of the seed, which should be got at some distance from home, and thoroughly cleansed of any seeds of weeds found mixed with it; and, as a precaution against smut, steeped in some of the steeps mentioned in our last impression.

Winter Beans should be sown by the middle of the month, in well cleaned, deeply ploughed, and well manured land; they may be sown broadcast in ridges, or in drills, 2½ feet apart, if the land be free from wet during the winter; sown at this time they come early to harvest, and are an excellent preparatory crop for wheat the ensuing season.

Winter Vetches, to be able to withstand the winter wet and frosts, should be sown early in the month 4 bushels, mixed with 3 or 4 stones of winter oats or rye, are sufficient for an Irish acre, sown in beds or ridges 8 feet wide, and the furrows well shovelled up; to insure good crops the land should be liberally manured.

Rye is also an excellent early soiling crop, if sown in ridges at the rate of 16 to 18 stones to the Irish acre, it is also an excellent feeding crop for ewes and lambs, to which it affords an early bite, when sown on stubble land and lightly ploughed in.

Bere should be sown some time during the month, after potatoes; it comes in early, generally about the middle or end of July, in time to afford new bread to the harvesters.

Peas, if the land be sufficiently dry and warm, may be sown in limited quantity; if they escape through the winter they will come in early; but the best time to sow the general crop will be by the end of February, or early in March.

Parsnips, when sown by the middle of this month, come in early, and yield the best roots and heaviest crop. The land should be well and deeply tilled, and well manured. If the land is sound and dry sow in drills, 28 inches apart; if inclined to damp, it will be safest to sow in ridges, in which they may also be drilled at the same distance; 6 lbs. of seed will be ample for an Irish acre.

Cabbages, to come in early, should be finally planted out this month; they require well-tilled and well-manured soil; plant in rows two feet apart, and one foot plant from plant in the rows; it is a good and economical plan after planting the cabbages, to sow parsnips midway between the rows; the cabbages will be off the land before they can be injurious to the parsnips.

Potatoes, of the early sorts, may be planted this month, either in drills, if the land be dry—or in ridges, if inclined to damp; they require a liberal manuring, and six inches of cover, at least, to ward off the injurious effects of frost.

Pigs.—Sows should now be put to the brawn, to have litters early next spring, and store pigs should be put up to fatten.

Important Work on Controversy.

Just ready.

THE "CONTROVERSIAL CORRESPONDENCE,"

Between R. W. KENNARD, Esq., late Sheriff of London, and the Rev. PAUL MACLACHLAN, Roman Catholic Priest, Falkirk. In Demy 8vo., price 5s. to SUBSCRIBERS ONLY.

This correspondence, conducted with great ability on both sides, has, terminated by the withdrawal of the Rev. Mr. Maclachlan from the contest, who has republished the whole of his letters, WITHOUT THOSE OF MR. KENNARD! As such a proceeding is evidently unfair, and calculated to be productive of mischievous results, if not counteracted, the entire correspondence, consisting of about 70 letters, is in course of publication, so that the nature of the Controversy may now be thoroughly understood by all parties.

Dr. Irving writes—"This is a remarkable publication. Mr. Maclachlan is sufficiently skilled in the Romish arts of controversy; but in logical dexterity, and even in theological learning, the priest is no match for the Protestant layman."

The Rev. John Evans writes—"This correspondence furnishes decidedly the best *Handbook* of the Romish Controversy yet extant."

The Venerable Dr. Croly says of Mr. Kennard's letters—"I sincerely admire their learning, reasoning, and spirit of Christianity; and I know of no production fitter to produce a more ample assurance in the mind of any man open to rational conviction." It has also been characterized as the "most important controversy that has taken place since the days of Stillingfleet."

The Controversy embraces the modern arguments of Romanists, having reference more particularly to History than Doctrine; and the Book will form an excellent companion to Dr. Cumming's Controversy with Mr. French, known as the Hammersmith Discussion, which is exclusively Doctrinal.

The Work is now publishing in one Volume, Demy 8vo, and will contain above 700 pages, with a copious and useful Index. Price 5s. to SUBSCRIBERS ONLY.

As the Subscription List is about to be closed, intending Subscribers are requested to transmit their names to WILLIAM CURRY and COMPANY, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin, without delay, as, after October 20th, the book will be raised in price, to 10s. 6d.

In the Press, and will be ready about Christmas.

Vols. III. and IV.,

MACAULAY'S HISTORY OF ENGLAND,

FROM THE ACCESSION OF JAMES THE SECOND.

Subscribers' names received by WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

New and Recent Works,

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

MEMOIR OF THE REV. SYDNEY SMITH. By his Daughter—Lady Holland. With a selection from his Letters. Edited by Mrs. Austin. 2 vols. 8vo. 28s.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF REV. WILLIAM JAY, of Bath. Edited by Dr. Redford and J. A. James, D.D. Cheaper edition. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

A GENERAL SURVEY OF THE HISTORY OF THE CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT DURING THE FIRST FOUR CENTURIES. By Brooke Foss Westcott, M.A. 12s. 6d.

"THE ISLAND OF SAINTS;" or Ireland in 1855. By John Elliot Howard. 5s.

BROKEN BREAD—SHORT COMMENTS FOR FAMILY USE. By Rev. Capel Molyneux. 5s.

THE PROTOPLAST; a Series of papers. Second Edition. 9s. 6d.

LYRA GERMANICA: Hymns for the Sundays and chief Festivals of the Christian year. From the German by Catherine Winkworth. 5s.

LITTLE MILLIE, AND HER FOUR PLACES. By Miss Brewster, author of "Work." 3s. 6d. Cheaper edition. 1s.

GLIMPSES OF JESUS: or, Christ Exalted in the Affections of his People. By W. P. Balfern. Second edition. 3s. 6d.

THE FOOTSTEPS OF ST. PAUL. By the Author of "The Faithful Promiser." Second Edition. 5s.

MEDITATIONES HEBRAICÆ: or, a Doctrinal and Practical Exposition of St. Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews. By William Tait, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo. 17s.

THE SOUTHERN CROSS AND THE SOUTHERN CROWN: or, the Gospel in New Zealand. By Miss Tucker. 3s. 6d.

MINISTERING CHILDREN, a Tale; dedicated to childhood. By the Author of "Visits to the poor," &c. Twelfth Thousand. 5s.

CHRISTIANITY IN TURKEY: a Narrative of the Protestant Reformation in the Armenian church. By the Rev. H. G. O. Dwight. 5s

THE CRIMEA AND ODESSA: Journal of a Tour, with an account of the climate and vegetation. By Dr. Charles Koch. 10s. 6d.

HEARTSEASE: or, The Brothers' Wife. By the Author of the "Heir of Redclyffe." Fourth Edition. 6s.

THE LIVES OF OUR HEROES OF THE CRIMEA. By George Ryan. 3s. 6d.

EMBASSIES AND FOREIGN COURTS. A History of Diplomacy. By "The Roving Englishman." 5s.

HALLAM'S VIEW OF THE STATE OF EUROPE DURING THE MIDDLE AGES. New edition. 3 vols. 18s.

HALLAM'S CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY OF England, from the Accession of Henry VII. to the death of George II. Vol. 1. 6s.

THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE. By R. G. Latham, F.R.S. Fourth edition. 2 vols. 8vo. 28s.

THESAURUS OF ENGLISH WORDS AND PHRASES, classified and arranged, so as to facilitate the expression of Ideas, and assist in Literary Composition. By P. M. Roget, F.R.S. 10s. 6d.

SMITHS' SMALLER DICTIONARY OF GREEK AND ROMAN ANTIQUITIES. 7s. 6d.

PHOTOGRAPHIC VIEWS OF EGYPT, Past and Present. By the Rev. Joseph Thompson. 2s.

GLAUCUS; OR, THE WONDERS OF THE SHORE. By Rev. Charles Kingsley. 3s. 6d.

WEBSTERS' POCKET PRONOUNCING DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE; condensed from the original Dictionary of Dr. Noah Webster. 2s. 6d.

HISTORY OF REMARKABLE SIEGES. By William Robson. 5s.

GEOLOGICAL FACTS: or, the Crust of the Earth—What it is, and What are its Uses. By the Rev. W. G. Barrett. 3s. 6d.

ADULTERATION OF FOOD, DRINK, AND DRUGS: Evidence taken before the Committee of the House of Commons. Fcp., Cloth. 1s. 6d.

Just Published, Demy 8vo., price 6d.; by post, 7d.,

A SHOCK OF CORN FULLY RIPE.

A SERMON,

PREACHED ON THE OCCASION OF THE DEATH OF THE LATE

ARTHUR GUINNESS, ESQ.,

IN BETHESDA CHAPEL,

On Sunday, June 17, 1855,

BY THE REV. JOHN ALCOCK, A.M.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London: Wertheim and Macintosh.

Just Published, 18mo, cloth, price 1s. 6d.,

St. Patrick's Cathedral,

A TALE OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

BY

LUCY O'DONNELL.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London: Wertheim and Macintosh.

Just Published, in 8vo, 420 pp., with Map, price 3s. 6d., Cloth,

Old Testament Prophecies,

Relative to the Return and Restoration of the Twelve Tribes to the Land of Palestine, together with the setting up of Messiah's Kingdom on Mount Zion, during a period of One Thousand Prophetic years.

BY JAMES ALLIN.

London: Wertheim and Macintosh, Paternoster-row. Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Just Published, price 3s. 6d.,

The British and Foreign Evangelical Review, October, 1855.

(Published quarterly.)

Contents—1. The Logic of Religion; 2. Nahum's Prophecy concerning Nineveh: 3. Bishop M'Ilvaine on the Church; 4. The Zurich Letters; 5. Presbyterian Liturgies; 6. Parochial Life; 7. Congregationalism, 8. Mental Philosophy; 9. Reformers before the Reformation; 10. Convocation and the Book of Common Prayer—Progress of the Revision Question; 11. Alliott on Psychology and Theology; 12. Waldegrave's Bampton Lectures for 1854; 13. Critical Notices.

"One of the most attractive Quarterlies, whether to the Theologian or to the Man of Letters. Besides original contributions of value, it contains a choice selection of articles from the best American and continental reviews, in which we recognize the masculine vigour of intellect and originality of thought for which our friends are distinguished."

Edinburgh: Johnstone and Hunter. Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street, by whom the names of subscribers are received.

Just Published,

Post 8vo, cloth elegant, price 7s. 6d.,

PILGRIMAGE FROM THE ALPS TO THE TIBER;

OR, THE INFLUENCE OF ROMANISM ON TRADE, JUSTICE, AND KNOWLEDGE.

By the Rev. J. A. WYLIE, LL.D., Author of "Modern Judea;" "Scenes from the Bible," &c.

"This is a remarkable book. Its descriptions are literally fascinating. The great scenery of Italy has been painted by tourists since the days of antiquity, but the sketches of Dr. Wylie possess a freshness and an interest peculiar to the author; and it is no exaggeration to say that many of these sketches, in relation even to familiar objects, are surpassed by no similar descriptions in the English language. . . . Dr. Wylie's book administers to the Roman Papacy a deadlier blow by far than any merely theological disquisition could have inflicted, and for this paramount reason, that its social workings are here exhibited in the shape of undeniable, terrible facts."

"After an interval of many years, Dr. Wylie has brought the old town (Rome) as vividly, and more truthfully, before our eyes than Robert's great picture in this year's exhibition."

"We do not think that from any book of travels we ever read, we gathered more exquisite and vivid pictures of the scenes through which he passed than from Dr. Wylie's."

"The production of a man who, with one shrewd Presbyterian eye upon the moral and religious features of the country in which he travelled, has kept the other fully open to the charms of nature and of art, the records of departed glory, and the imperishable beauties of the living world."

Edinburgh: Shepherd and Elliot. Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Just published, with Engraving, price 1s. 6d., limp cloth; or in cloth boards, extra, 2s. 6d.

The Irish Widow;

OR.

A Picture from the life of Erin and her Children.

By the Author of

"POOR PADDY'S CABIN."

From the *Standard*.

"Whoever wishes for full information upon the subject would do well to read a little book published by Mr. Wertheim, under the title of 'The Irish Widow,' by the author of 'Poor Paddy's Cabin.' The ingenious and eloquent writer gives, under the form of a most interesting narrative, the whole history of Irish emigration. . . . An exceedingly interesting tale, which we have already recommended for general perusal."

London: WERTHEIM and MACKINTOSH, 24, Paternoster-row; Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher, WILLIAM CURRY 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.
OCTOBER, 1855.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Glóir do Dhia aṅ pna háṙduiḃ, agus ṙíoṁċáin aiṙ an ṫalaṁ ṫeaṁṫóil do na ḋáoiṁḃ.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED THE MIDDLE OF EVERY MONTH, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. IV.—No. 47. NOVEMBER 17, 1855. { Annual Subscription, 3s. 6d.; Unstamped Copies, 2d. each. Payable in Advance

CONTENTS.

	Page.
The Blessed Cornelius; or, Some Tidings of an Archbishop of Armagh in the 12th Century	121
Religious Processions—Jubilee of Our Lady of Hanawyck	123
Faber on the Blessed Sacrament—1855	124
The Ancient Mansion—A Parable	126
Talk of the Road—No. XXXIII.	126
Bones *versus* Bibles—The Most Rev. Dr. Dixon and the Redemptorist Fathers	127
Reasons for *not* Reading the Bible—by St. Patrick	128
CORRESPONDENCE:	
On Certain Relics in Oviedo in Spain	129
On Bible Burning—by "In Earnest"	130
On Religious Controversy—by a Munster-Man	131
On the Effect of Prayer—by Pat Murray of Westmeath	131
On Holy Wells—by Humphrey Leary	131
Farming Operations for November	131

THE BLESSED CORNELIUS.

Archbishops write books only on great occasions.

We have now before us a book, just published, called "THE BLESSED CORNELIUS;" or Some Tidings of an Archbishop of Armagh who went to Rome in the 12th century and did not return; the title page of which tells us (in bold defiance of the statute in that case made and provided), that it was written by the most Rev. Joseph Dixon, Archbishop of Armagh, and Primate of all Ireland.* It is a learned work on the thigh-bone of one of his predecessors.

In the *Catholic Layman* for October, 1854 (p. 117), we called on Dr. Dixon, or any one else who believes him the successor of the ancient Archbishops of Ireland, to give the list of his succession, which we undertook to publish. In October, 1855 (p. 112), we pointed to the fact that, during a whole year, no one had attempted to produce such a list. We now find that Dr. Dixon has been looking for his predecessors during that year; and here is the result. Instead of a succession, which he has not to show, he makes a flourish with a thigh-bone, which he has certainly got, but which, we think, is not the thigh-bone of the man whom he supposes to have been the owner.

We take the account of this *important discovery* from Dr. Dixon's book. In chapter xi., p. 68, he tells us "how I came to hear of the blessed Cornelius." All he had ever heard of him before is comprised in this sentence from the "Annals of the Four Masters," one of the highest authorities in Irish history. Under the date 1175, they say—"Connor (Cornelius) Mac Concoilleadh, Abbot of St. Peter and St. Paul's, and afterwards Coarb of St. Patrick (Archbishop of Armagh), *died at Rome*, whither he had gone to confer with the successor of St. Peter."† All the best Irish authorities agree in this account—viz.: Lanigan, Ecclesiastical History, vol. iv. p. 220 and 229;‡ Colgan, Trias Thaumaturga, who calls him Conchovar; Ware on Irish Bishops, who calls him Concobar. All these authorities give the same account as the Four Masters; and, beyond this, nothing was known of Cornelius by Dr. Dixon or any one else.§ However, when Dr. Dixon was at Rome, in December, 1854, where he had gone to help in making the new article of faith, he happened to see, *in a newspaper*, a statement that "St. Concord," whose bones are kept in a glass case, on the altar of the Church of Lemenc, at Chambery, in Savoy, was the identical Cornelius of Armagh, who had been so long missing.

In December, 1854, Dr. Dixon received from the bishop of St. Maurienne, in Savoy, an account of this Cornelius, or Concord, asking for more information about his life in Ireland, and offering to give a piece of his remains to Dr. Dixon. In consequence of this document, Dr. Dixon resolved to go home by Chambery, and get his prize to bring to Armagh.

Dr. Dixon thus describes (p. 68) the state in which he found the saint:—"For a long time his holy relics had reposed in a *poor* walnut shrine, and were covered with *still poorer* ornaments, when, on the occasion of repairing the church, the happy idea was adopted of replacing this precious treasure in a more suitable state. The *wretched panel* which formed the front of the shrine was replaced with a handsome plate glass; and, thanks to the zeal of several pious persons, the holy bishop is richly adorned. On Saturday, *July* 1st, 1854, he was replaced upon his altar."

A pamphlet written by Count Firnex on that occasion, and inserted in Dr. Dixon's book (p. 78), gives this account of what was done:—"Some months had elapsed since the relics were brought from Rome, where they have been *recognized* and *authenticated* by the venerable prelate who is charged to perform this duty. For this purpose documents had been forwarded to the Eternal City, relative to the life of this Saint and the veneration in which he is held by all in this country, in virtue of the authorization of the Holy See; and they were found so interesting that, to enter on a closer examination, they have gone so far as to open the head of this revered body. God has, doubtless, permitted this minute investigation in order to manifest more clearly the glory of his servant, for, in the interior portion of this sacred part of the relics, which have been for nearly seven centuries entombed (on the altar?) the brain was found hard and still coloured with blood, though it is well known that this organ is of a soft nature, and is consumed in ordinary bodies in a very short space of time. Struck by this discovery, the Roman Examiner before whom the operation had been made, availing himself of his right to some portion of the holy relics, wished to retain this part, but the Rev. Father Alphonse, Capuchio, charged with the commission, having insisted on his making choice of some other portion, the interesting part was returned to increase the treasure of Lemenc, where it is enshrined apart in a silver reliquary." (p. 78).*

Count Firnex proceeds (p. 80) to describe the dress:—"The saint's body is apparelled in mitre and chasuble, the latter cut in an antique form, and its texture is like that of the other accessories, of white silk, embroidered with gold. The alb appears to be beautifully worked; and the cushion that supports the head is of red damask, trimmed with gold fringe. The pallium is spread out near the mitre. In a word, all connected with the apparel shows a perfect coincidence with *the most approved taste*."

We feel satisfied that no Paris milliner could have done it better. Dr. Dixon evidently found the saint "in full fig." certainly he had been grossly neglected before, but it was well-arranged that the saint should be "new done up" for the important part he is henceforward to act, and that just in the nick of time to receive Dr. Dixon.

Dr. Dixon then relates his arrival and his reception at Chambery, and how "the devout throng had assembled to see the successor of the Blessed Concord, at a distance of 700 years from his time, saying mass at his altar." (p. 74). Dr. Dixon then went to the monastery where S. Concord died. "From this house we went to visit the convent of the Carmelite nuns: this community, too, had a special interest for us. To these good nuns had been committed the office of dressing (and of undressing, as it seems) the blessed Concord in the new Pontifical ornaments which he now wore. They had also been good enough to prepare, in a beautiful case, a SMALL *relic* of the holy man, intended as a present for the church of Armagh. But now they were about to establish the strongest claim of all on our gratitude, by taking the trouble—and it was no slight trouble—*to undress the saint*, and procure for us the bone of the thigh, that we might thus have a CONSIDERABLE *relic* to bring to Armagh. All this was to be done *privately*, that the people of the parish might not be generally aware of what had happened; for, great as was their respect for the successor of the blessed Concord (that's himself), they would hardly have endured to see so much of the bones of their revered patron and protector carried away from them. May God reward those good daughters of St. Teresa for their trouble. One good nun rose from her sick bed, where she had been confined for a month, to take a share in it" (p. 74, 75).

This narrative calls for some observations from us. 1. We think Dr. Dixon plumes himself too much on so petty a larceny. If Dr. Dixon were worth anything—and if the "blessed Cornelius" were worth anything, too—the doctor should have had him body and bones. 2. We think Dr. Dixon exaggerates the risk of the larceny. We cannot suppose that Dr. Dixon, having got his own bones safe in a distant country, would expose these poor nuns to the fury of a deceived and injured populace, it would be a base return for kindness—but since Dr. Dixon has not scrupled to expose them in a book, which will, of course, be popular at Chambery, we trust that the danger is imaginary.

What Dr. Dixon did carry off is safely lodged—"the portion of the rib at the presentation convent in Drogheda, and the bone of the thigh at the convent of the SACRED HEART, Armagh" (p. 104). It might have been more suitable to have placed the *rib* at the *heart*, but this, of course, is only temporary. Before long there will be a grand religious display, on occasion of placing the bones on the altar of God.

The object of bringing home these bones is thus pointed at: "I have applied to the Sacred Congregation of Rites in Rome for permission to have his office celebrated in the diocese of Armagh, under the same rite as at Chambery" (p. 104). That permission will, of course, be granted: the bones of Cornelius are to be an object of "veneration," and Cornelius himself is to be "worshipped."

Roman Catholics sometimes try to justify the worship of Saints by saying, "we do not pray to them; we only ask them to pray for us." This idle distinction is not to be observed in the worship of Cornelius. Dr. Dixon gives in his book a "PRAYER TO ST. CONCORD," which runs thus, "Oh, glorious St. Concord, ... I come profoundly humbled, to prostrate myself at thy feet, to obtain, through thy powerful protection (*not* intercession) *a grace very necessary for the salvation of my soul* [here the particular favour which one seeks is specified]. *Draw me* from this urgent peril, and *give me* the courage and strength necessary to overcome the attack of the enemy who seeks my destruction and eternal damnation, &c" (p. 104). Here St. Concord is asked *himself to give and to do* the things prayed for. There is not a word in the prayer, asking him to pray to God for the things required. So the Irish Roman Catholics are to be taught to pray to St. Concord, that *He* will save them from the devil and damnation.

At the end of the Introduction (p. xiii), Dr. Dixon acknowledges that Cornelius has not been canonized by the Pope. Yet, in page 104, Dr. Dixon teaches men to offer actual prayer to Cornelius. We have hitherto thought that Roman Catholics were allowed to pray only to Saints who have been canonized by the Pope. Such a precaution would seem only reasonable; for, surely, if men want infallible direction in anything, they should have it concerning the object of prayer. But, it seems we were wrong: Roman Catholics are taught by Dr. Dixon to pray not only to canonized Saints, but to dead men who have not been canonized. It, therefore, becomes a question of the highest interest—what degree of proof or certainty Roman Catholics have that the objects of their worship, and the beings they pray to, are really right ones. We have, therefore, to examine the documents on which Dr. Dixon relies for his facts about Cornelius, which facts, be it observed, are these:—1. That Concord of Chambery and Cornelius of Armagh are the same person. 2. That miracles have been worked by his bones since the time of his death.

THE DOCUMENTS.

Dr. Dixon produces—

1. An extract from a newspaper (p. 68).
2. A communication from the Bishop of St. Maurienne in Savoy, written in December, 1854 (p. 69).
3. A pamphlet called, "A Tribute to the blessed Cornelius, written in July, 1854, by Count Firnex, of which Dr. Dixon publishes part, but not the whole" (p. 77).
4. A life of St. Concord, printed in Chambery, in [illegible]. Dr. Dixon professes to give some facts from this life, but he does not publish the life itself (p. 99).

* Published by James Duffy, 7, Wellington-quay, Dublin, 1855.
† Ed. Connellan, Dublin, 1846, p. 10. ‡ Ed. Dublin, 1822.
§ Dr. Dixon himself says—"Here we have an Archbishop of Armagh, of whose life his country has preserved no details, and with the place of whose death it has been hitherto unacquainted."—Introduction, p. 10. Yet at p. 104, Dr. Dixon tells us that, 300 years ago, the people of Chambery wrote to Hugh O'Reilly, then Roman Catholic Archbishop of Armagh, telling him all about it.

* This passage throws light on the practice at Rome about relics. Dr. Dixon, by producing it, gives it authority. There is a Bishop at Rome whose business it is to judge of the genuineness of relics. A post-mortem examination is made. It will appear that very little documentary proof is required; the surgical evidence appears to be chiefly relied on; though we think it would puzzle the College of Surgeons to ascertain the former state of a man's soul by an anatomical examination of his bones. The operator is probably a surgeon, and he seems to be paid by *choice bits*, which we suppose sell well.

5. An extract from a letter of Ferrandus to Bollandus, in 1653, with a note by Papebroch (p. 116); with a hymn to St. Concord (p. 106); all taken from the Acta Sanctorum of the Bollandists.

Dr. Dixon tells us of *other documents*, which, he says, do exist, but which he does *not* publish in his book. I. Dr. Dixon tells us (p. 101, 102, and note to 103) that a bull was issued by Pope Clement X. in the year 1671, establishing a confraternity of St. Concord, at Chambery. Dr. Dixon does *not* insert this bull in his book; for which we imagine he had an excellent reason.* 2. The pamphlet of Count Firnex, which Dr. Dixon publishes (p. 78), tells us, "Some months have elapsed since the relics were brought from Rome, where they have been recognised and authenticated by the venerable prelate who is charged to perform this duty. For this purpose, *documents* had been forwarded to the eternal city, *relative to the life of this Saint.*" It would have been most interesting to have seen the documents on which the relics of St. Concord were officially pronounced authentic. But Dr. Dixon does *not* produce these documents. 3. Some document must have been issued by the venerable prelate, charged with the duty of authenticating the relics. But Dr. Dixon does *not* produce that document. 4. Dr. Dixon might have published the life of St. Concord, which he says was printed in 1809, and which he says he has got. But he does not publish it, but only tells us something out of it.

In the introduction, p. viii., Dr. Dixon says: "And whereas the details of the history of this Archbishop are but scanty, as far as I could discover, *I was obliged to introduce some other subject* in order to give anything like the dimensions of a book to this publication." That, under such circumstances, Dr. Dixon should *not* insert the bull of Pope Clement X. and the "documents relating to the life of this saint," and even the life itself at length, gives rise to grave suspicion. The omission can only be accounted for thus:—Either these documents do not really exist; or Dr. Dixon is conscious that they would not bear examination: in other words, the case is a fraudulent case, to be established only by the suppression of truth. We can well imagine the reason of the suppression of those documents. At p. 116 Dr. Dixon produces the conjecture of Ferrandus and Papebroch in 1653, that Concord of Chambery was an Irish archbishop or bishop. In p. 103 he states that the people of Chambery, before the year 1656, wrote to Hugh O'Reilly, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Armagh, inquiring about the history of Concord as archbishop of Armagh. How very awkward, then, to produce a bull, dated 1671, showing that the Pope at that date did not treat Concord as an Irishman at all! If the Bull *had* called him an Irishman, it would certainly have been produced 2. To produce the documents on which he says it was officially determined that the bones at Chambery belong to Cornelius of Armagh would have been still more awkward, since no such documents exist. 3. To produce the decree of authentication itself would have been most natural, if such a decree really exists, which we greatly doubt. 4. Dr. Dixon lets out the reason why he does not publish the life of St. Concord, printed at Chambery in 1809. It contains "some things regarding the state of the Irish Church in the days of Cornelius which have been drawn from sources not the most reliable" (p. 95). It was evidently from this pamphlet that the Bishop of St. Maurienne took his statement, and it would never have done to have exposed its blunders. So Dr. Dixon was forced to leave out all these important documents, and fill up his book about "blessed Cornelius" with sad accounts of his own sea-sickness; and of his, Dr. Dixon's, "Introduction to the Scriptures," splendidly bound by Mr. James Duffy, which the Pope very naturally observed, "as it was written in English, could be but of little service to him" (p. 6). These evident suppressions make us examine more carefully the documents which Dr. Dixon produces. The only important ones are the communication from the Bishop of St. Maurienne, and the extracts from the Bollandists. That sent by the Bishop of St. Maurienne is demonstrably inaccurate, for it makes Cornelius "one of the lights of the Councils of Cashel and Armagh, presided over by Cardinal Paparo;" whereas, Dr. Dixon himself has to confess (note, p. 96) that no trace of such council as this at Armagh can be found; and Cardinal Paparo, as every tyro in Irish history knows, had actually left Ireland twenty years before the synod of Cashel was held. Hence it appears that this document is not founded on authentic evidence, but is the production of some one grossly ignorant of Irish history.

This document betrays equal ignorance of the history of the popes—ignorance so palpable as to make it evident that forgery had been at work in the matter. We do not bring the charge of forgery against Dr. Dixon or the Bishop of St. Maurienne. Their statements are evidently taken from the "Life of St. Concord," printed at Chambery in 1809. But Dr. Dixon himself admits that this life contains things which have been drawn from sources not the most reliable (p. 95). And although labouring under a lack of material, he does not venture to publish that life. Yet he adopts statements from it which his knowledge of the history of the Papacy should have at once pointed out to him as forged. We refer to the following passage:—"Immediately afterwards, he (Cornelius) went to Rome on important business. The Pope ALEXANDER III. being made acquainted with the merit and high sanctity of this prelate, loaded him with favours and distinctions" (p. 70).

Dr. Dixon gives the following account, as from the printed life, though, not in the words of the life:—"Concord, seeing that after all his solicitude and labours in the cause of religion, there were still reforms to be made in the discipline of his Church, would not undertake these reforms without visiting Rome, and taking counsel with the Pope. He, therefore, set out for the Eternal City, where he arrived on the 16th January, 1176. We shall give *the rest* in the words of his biographer:—'ALEXANDER III., fully instructed regarding the piety of this bishop, immediately granted his request,'" &c., (p. 98).

Now, we are able to prove that Cornelius did not see Pope Alexander III. at Rome; neither was it to see Pope Alexander III. that he went to Rome. For this good reason—that Pope Alexander III. was not there, and Cornelius must have known that he was not there. Pope Alexander III. had fled from Rome some years before; he was certainly not at Rome in the years 1175 or 1176; and did not get back to Rome until at least two years after Cornelius was dead. And this was notorious to all the world; and, least of all, could the Irish prelates be ignorant of it, who had heard but too much of Pope Alexander III. for the last three years, as we shall see.

That Cornelius should have gone to Rome in 1175 or 1176, to see Pope Alexander III., would have been about as absurd as if Dr. Dixon had gone to Rome in 1848 to see Pope Pius IX., when all the world knew that he had fled from it.

But do not "the Four Masters," and all the best Irish historians, say that Cornelius "went to Rome, to confer with the successor of St. Peter, in 1175?" They do say so; but they do not say that it was Pope ALEXANDER III. that he went to confer with. We must explain this puzzle for our readers. If they will look back to our number for September, p. 102, they will see that there were such things as "opposition Popes," and a good many of them, too.

Now, it happens that, while Cornelius was at Rome, there were two Popes at once, as there very often were—namely, Callistus III. and Alexander III.—and CALLISTUS III. was then in possession of ROME, where Alexander III. dared not show his face. We take the facts of this schism from the learned Roman Catholic historian, Du Pin, Doctor of the Sorbonne.

Pope Adrian IV. died at Rome in 1159. Cardinal Roland was then chosen Pope at Rome, under the title of Pope Alexander III. At the same time, Octavian was also chosen Pope at Rome by others of the Cardinals, under the title of Victor III. The Emperor interfered to settle the dispute, and Alexander withdrew to Anagnia. A council of fifty archbishops and bishops met, and gave judgment in favour of Victor, as lawful Pope. In the meantime, Alexander took refuge in Sicily, till he could get away to France. He arrived in France at Easter, 1162, and at Paris 1163. Octavian died in 1164, and Guy of Crema was elected in his place, under the title of Paschal III. Alexander was recalled to Rome in 1165. Great contests and wars then followed; sometimes Alexander had possession of Rome, and sometimes Paschal; but in 1170 Alexander retired to Anagnia, and then to Benevento. About 1170, Paschal III. died in possession of Rome, and his party chose for Pope, John, Abbot of Struma, under the title of Callistus III., and the Emperor acknowledged him as Pope. "Although Alexander's affairs prospered every day more and more, *the Romans could not be induced to receive him into their city*, and he usually resided either at Frescati or in Campania." The Emperor, being unsuccessful in war, was obliged to come to terms with Alexander III. They met at Venice in 1177, and the Emperor agreed to abandon Pope Callistus III., and to acknowledge Alexander as Pope, and to restore him to "the Regalia of St. Peter." In the following year, 1178, he was recalled to Rome by the clergy, senate, and people of that city (Eccl. Writers, vol. ii., p. 332. ed., Dublin, 1724).

Every fact or document that we can collect confirms the proof that Pope Alexander III. was not in Rome in 1175 or 1176 (the only years in which Cornelius could have been there), but that he was residing and performing all his official acts elsewhere. In December, 1174, at Ferentinum, he granted a charter to the monastery of Palermo (Baronius, annals xii. 654). In February, 1175, at Anagnia, another charter to the same. (Idem). In March, 1175, to another monastery, at Ferentinum (Bullarium Rom. II., 435, A.D. 1746). In July, 1175, at Ferentinum, he confirmed the order of St. James in Spain (Labbe & Coss. x 1383). In October, 1175, at Anagnia, the order of St. Basil, at Messina, (Idem 1385). To two other monasteries at Anagnia, in May, 1176, (Bull. Rom. II., 440, 441). In June 1176, Baronius states that he was "residing at Anagnia," where his "consistory" was then held (Annals xii, 660). Four other charters to monasteries in June and July, 1176, at Anagnia (Bull. Rom. II., 441, 444, 445.) In September, 1176, at Anagnia, he confirmed the order of Carthusians (Labbe & Coss, x 1386). In February, 1177, he set out from Anagnia to Venice, and got back to Anagnia in December, 1177, the whole year being fully accounted for. In all those years no trace is to be found in any Italian historian of Alexander III. having been at Rome. Nor does the Bullarium give *a single document* issued by Alexander III., from Rome, from the year 1169 to 1178. In 1178, he was recalled to Rome, and the account of his recall given by Baronius, from the acts of Alexander III. in the Vatican library, demonstrate that he was not, and could not have been, at Rome during the preceding years. The cardinal says, "Year 1178; in which year Pope Alexander being recalled by the Romans, betook himself to Rome. But how he was received, the acts of his life thus deliver. In the meantime the whole clergy of the Roman Church, and the people, seeing that the Emperor Frederick was prostrate at the feet of Pope Alexander, but that the evil of schism was extinct through the Divine protection, considering also that they had incurred most heavy loss, as well in spirituals as temporals, *during long times*, by the absence of that Pontiff; by common counsel, they bound themselves by oath concerning the restoration of that pontiff to the see of St. Peter. They therefore sent to him to Anagnia seven men of the best citizens of Rome, with letters from the clergy, senate, and people, suppliantly entreating *that he would now think fit to return to his own city*, and to the people specially entrusted to him, and have the charge of them. But the Pontiff, although their humble and devout *change* was very pleasing to him and all the fathers, yet recalling to his memory his *former recall** by the same clergy and people, from the countries beyond the Alps, how, after a short time, they had heaped injuries and reproaches on him and his brethren, he, with reason, hesitated to trust in their bland promises, and refused to return to that city, which he knew contained many disturbers of peace, without certain and firm security." This answer being brought back to Rome, they resolved "That they would perform fidelity and homage to the lord Pope; that they would freely restore into the hands and power of the pontiff, *the Church of St. Peter*, and his royalties, *which had been seized by them;* that they would, moreover, inviolably observe peace and security to the Pope himself, and to his brethren, and to their goods, and to all those coming to him." And then follows the account of his public entry, "all, indeed, grieving at this, that, by their own fault, they had been deprived of so great a good *for so long a time.*"—*Baronii. Annal.* 1178.

From this account of his restoration, it evidently appears that Pope Alexander III. had not been in Rome for a long time; and from the security which he extracted, it appears that it would not previously have been safe for him, or any one coming to him, to have shown their faces in Rome. It further appears that "the Church of St. Peter" had been seized on by his enemies, and, of course, served by the priests of Callistus III., who were under sentence of excommunication by Alexander III. The importance of this fact will appear further on.

If, then, Cornelius, as we are informed by the most authentic historians, did go TO ROME, in 1175 or 1176, *to confer with the Pope*, it was Pope Callistus III. that he went to confer with, and not Pope Alexander III. And, if he conferred with him, he joined in communion with him too.

It is curious that all the accounts which Dr. Dixon gives agree in attributing these words to Cornelius, when he entered the monastery of Lemenc—"I have officiated in St. Peter's, of Armagh; I visited St. Peter's, at Rome; and I come to die in St. Peter's of Lemenc, (p. 70, 80, 99, 108). And the Bishop of St. Maurienne makes it, "I have offered my devotions in the Church of St. Peter of Rome" (p. 70).

Either these accounts are all forged, or "the blessed Cornelius" was a schismatic and a rebel against Pope Alexander III., by joining in schismatical worship. And, in that case, the fact that Cornelius should have worked miracles, and should immediately be worshipped all through Savoy, and that his worship should continue to this day, may be rather perplexing to Dr. Dixon, and all the rest who now believe that Alexander III. was the true Pope.

It was on this written communication from the Bishop of St. Maurienne that Dr. Dixon acted. He appears to have relied on it implicitly, without even looking to see how many popes there were at that time.

The only ancient or genuine document which Dr. Dixon gives respecting this Concord of Chambery is the letter of Ferrandus to Bollandus, written in 1653, and the hymn to Concord, both of which are in the Acta Sanctorum of the Bollandists (die quarta Junii). "Among these (the monks of Lemenc), the whole body of St. Concordius, an Irish Archbishop, is religiously preserved and worshipped, of whose life I have not been able to gather or learn anything, except a hymn inscribed in very ancient characters, before the altar, sacred to the holy man, which I insert verbatim, disfigured with foul misspellings, as was the barbarous practice of those times, "which hymn speaks only of Concors, bishop of "Illand."†

On this, Father Papebroch, observes—"We have never known any such place as 'Yllandia' or 'Illandia. Ferrarius understanding Ireland, (Irlandia), has announced him to us as an Irish Archbishop. The Fullienses (monks of Lemenc), understanding it Iceland,

* This Bull is *not* given in the Bullarium, though we find there one of same date, January 28th, 1671, confirming the worship of the blessed Ludovico. Bull. Rom. Cocq. Romæ, 1746, vii. 86.

* This recall took place in 1165. Du Pin. II. 332.

† Salve Præ ul pretiose, Quondam *Pater* Illandiæ. (p. 103.)
Dr. Dixon translates "*Pater*," "Primate," in order to help out his case.

(Islandia), &c." Papebroch thinks the monks must give up their opinion when they find there is no bishop named Concord in the catalogue of the bishops of Iceland, and that they had no Archbishop in Iceland. "We must therefore," he says, "return to the opinion of Ferrandus interpreting Illandia, Ireland". But here Papebroch honestly confesses that just the same difficulty arises about making Concord an Irishman, as we find no bishop of that name in the Irish catalogue. But, at least it might seem that there is a difficulty less about Ireland, as there were Archbishops there. But to this Papebroch gives a very candid answer, which answer Dr. Dixon leaves out, viz.:—"The dignity of Archbishop *is not free from suspicion*, being *no where expressed in the hymn itself*, but only affixed to the title of the hymn." In fact, the hymn only calls Concord *bishop*, Præsul; and the word Archbishop at the end of the title bears evident marks of having been added by an ignorant person; for the title runs thus—"Prayer of the Confessor Illustor B. Concord, *Archbishop* of Illandia," which is about as absurd as if any one were to call Dr. Dixon "*Bishop* Dixon, *Archbishop* of Ireland!" There is, therefore, reason to suppose that the "*Archbishop*" was added by some ignorant person, especially as an Archbishop is called by the name of his see, not of his country.

Papebroch goes on to give a remarkable instance how the dignity of Archbishop is applied in the Acta Sanctorum to another Irishman, who certainly was not an Archbishop, in the instance of Silanus (Acta Sanctorum. 21. Maii) who died in 1094, and is represented as wearing the Archiepiscopal Pallium, which as Papebroch justly observes, was never worn in Ireland until 1152. Papebroch therefore concludes, "I have thought it sufficient, therefore, to write Concord a *bishop* in the heading, leaving the further investigation of his age and see to the learned Irish.

It is here clear that the learned Papebroch never dreamed that the Latin names Cornelius and Concord could be the same; but thought, perhaps, that some *Bishop* Concord might yet be found in Ireland, which discovery has never been made.

It remains to inquire, whether the hymn inscribed at Chambery, can possibly apply to Cornelius, Archbishop of Armagh. The hymn has no date; it does not mention Cornelius, nor Alexander III.; but it contains this unlucky verse:—

Io Illandia servivi	I have served St. Peter in Illand,
Petro Apostolo Sancto,	I have visited St. Peter *at Rome*,
Romæ Petrum Visitavi,	I shall be buried in Lemenc.
Tumulabor in Lemenso.	

If this hymn be fixed to the date of 1175 or 1176, (in which years only it could apply to Cornelius,) then Concord, whoever he was, worshipped in the church of St. Peter at Rome, when that church was served by priests who acknowledged Pope Callistus III., and were actually under sentence of excommunication by Alexander III., and this is all the hymn can prove about Cornelius. In which case, Dr. Dixon's thigh bone can really be fit for nothing now, but to break the head of the Editor of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, if he can be got at.

Now, we ask, where is the proof that Concord of Chambery, and Cornelius of Armagh are the same person? We find that only in the statement of the Bishop of St. Maurienne, and the pamphlet of Count Firnex, *both written in the year* 1851; and also in the life of St. Concord, printed in 1809 (which Dr. Dixon was ashamed to publish), and IN NO OLDER OR MORE CREDIBLE DOCUMENT. Such evidence is really contemptible. Miracles which happened 700 years ago (if they happened at all) cannot be proved by documents written yesterday.

The hymn does not speak of Cornelius, but it does speak of miracles.

In transitu hujus sancti	At the death of this saint,
Miracula fiunt multa;	Many miracles are wrought—
Ægri eunt sani effecti	The sick are healed through his
Per sua magna merita.	great merits.

But the hymn only *specifies* one miracle; and that is one which it will puzzle Dr. Dixon to apply to Cornelius:—

Depositio præsulis	The death of the priests
Fuit a Deo relata,	Was published by God; for,
Nam in libris ab angelis	Angels described it in books
Per orbem fuit descripta.	All over the world.

The prayer, which is also given by the Bollandists, and which Dr. Dixon has given in his book (p. 118), makes this miracle still more plain. "O God.... who that thou mightst make the day of his death venerable *throughout the whole world*, didst cause his name to be inscribed, marvellously, on the same day, by thy holy angels in martyrologies, &c."

Now, if this miracle be true, how came it never to be found in a book in Ireland until now, as Dr. Dixon himself confesses in his introduction, p. x. We have seen too much of miraculous stories of the middle ages to believe in such nonsense as this.

To us, Irishmen as we are, nothing seems more natural than that Cornelius, Archbishop of Armagh, should have gone to Rome in 1175 or 1176 to see Pope *Callistus III.* Nothing more unnatural or more base than that he should have gone to see Pope *Alexander III.* Cornelius was an Irishman, and an Irish churchman. Pope Alexander III, was at that time the deadly enemy of Irish independence. Only three years before, he had sold Ireland to Henry II. and the English, and had foully calumniated the Irish church, to cloak his own wickedness. What more natural, than that an Irish Archbishop, zealous for the liberty of his country and the honour of his church, should go to Rome, (as all Irish historians say Cornelius did in 1175,) to Pope CALLISTUS III., who was then in actual possession of the see of Rome, to try if he could find *in him* any decency or virtue, or honour, becoming his station? Yet, Dr. Dixon is not ashamed to say that it was to Pope ALEXANDER III., the great betrayer of Irish nationality, the great calumniator of the Irish church, that Cornelius went. And, it is simply on the very ground that Cornelius went to this arch enemy of Ireland, that Dr. Dixon calls on Irish Roman Catholics to fall down and worship Cornelius. But, we have shown that the wretched life of Concord, published only forty-four years ago, and which Dr. Dixon was himself ashamed to reprint, is the only document that ever said that Cornelius went to Pope ALEXANDER III. And the story is proved by the plainest facts of the history of that age to be a contemptible forgery. But, on this contemptible forgery Irish Roman Catholics are now to be called on to sacrifice every feeling sacred to the history of their country, before the shrine of Roman ambition.

Our readers may remember what we said in our number for Dec. 1853, p. 137, on the wholesale manufacturing of forged epistles of Popes of the early ages, to support the supremacy of Rome. We then showed to what an extent Roman doctrines are actually founded on such forgeries. We may yet have space, as we have abundant material, to make this exposure more full.

Rome boasts of being unchanged and unchangeable. What wonder, then, that the manufacturing of forgeries is still in operation to sustain the impostures of Rome. All this may be not without an aim. Rome has ever been hostile to nationality. Not that Rome avows this. It would defeat the object. She usually professes to cherish, and she flatters nationality, that she may get it into her embrace; but the secret managers of the policy of Rome have always looked steadily to the extinction of national feeling. For Rome demands for herself what patriotism gives to one's country. In the twelfth century she destroyed the nationality of Ireland, to bring Peter's Pence to Rome. True to the same principles, she seeks now to humble Irish nationality before the dead bones of its betrayers. What greater triumph could Roman policy now have in Ireland, than to see Irishmen bow down before the bones of Cornelius, on the ground of his alleged submission to the Bull of Pope Alexander III.?

It is not without a deep design that the era of 1170 was fixed upon for the selection of a thigh-bone to be worshipped. That era determined Cornelius as the man. And though this involved a contradiction between the document which had to be framed, and the awkward fact of two Popes at the one time (the wrong one being in the right place) yet this seemed not insurmountable—perhaps even desirable. For what if homage to Alexander III. must be based on a transparent forgery? Yet it might succeed, as so many similar attempts have succeeded. And if successful, the greater is the exaltation of Rome, in triumphing at once over the nationality, the intellect, and the moral sense of her victims. Choose this solution, or one less flattering to the wisdom of the forgers—that they are profoundly ignorant of the most notorious facts in the history of the Papacy itself. A clearer case of forgery never was convicted. Yet, on this convicted forgery, a grand religious display will, no doubt, be celebrated, notwithstanding. We would have healed our countrymen, and they are not healed. We must look longer yet on the spectacle of forgery and fraud in the deceivers, and credulity and degradation in the deceived. This is the spectacle afforded by a church that prohibits free discussion. Yet it will not be lost on those that have the courage to think. In the depth of the degradation into which men are driven, lies the last hope of their deliverance.

RELIGIOUS PROCESSIONS.

READER, did you ever hear of angels on horseback? Perhaps you have seen one. If not, read the following description, transcribed verbatim from page 25 of the "*Legends of the Blessed Virgin*," published in London in 1852, by Charles Dolman, and you will be able to judge how much edification or amusement we lose by the law which, in these countries, prohibits the enactment of *religious* processions:—

"Malines, or Mechlin, is perhaps the only city in the world which has preserved in all their original perfection the religious *fêtes* or shows of the middle ages. In 1825, at the Jubilee of St. Rombould, to whom it is indebted for the knowledge of the Gospel, and in 1838, at the Jubilee of our Lady of Hanswyck (the name of a venerated image held in great esteem), this old Christian city exhibited the magnificent and popular spectacle of those gigantic processions, rich in allegory, and studded with those attractive costumes which delight the crowd, whose appearance reminds one of the times of Philip the Good, when the same *fêtes* took place exactly in the same manner, the spectators alone differing.

"We will here faithfully describe in all its details the grand procession of 1838, in the persuasion that they will be appreciated by our readers, few of whom, perhaps, have ever assisted at any *fête* of so remarkable a nature.

"First marched a band of music on foot, in the costume of the present day, after which rode a squadron of cavalry. This formed as it were a modern preface to an ancient work. The following was the order of the procession:—

"A group of sixteen angels on horseback, with large extended wings and azure bodies, sounding golden trumpets around the herald who carried the standard of the Jubilee. They announced the coming of the representation of the Litany of the Blessed Virgin of Loretto.

"This sweet and favourite devotion of the people was represented by emblematical figures. First came thirty-six maidens, mounted on horses, elegantly dressed in white, in the modest and becoming fashion of Christian art, wearing crowns on their heads, from which fell rich lace veils. Each one carried in her left hand the attribute she represented—the *Tower of David*, the *House of Gold*, the *Tower of Ivory*, the *Mystical Rose*, the *Mirror of Justice*, &c.; and from their right hands waved banners of white silk. On every banner was worked, in letters of gold, some title given to our blessed Lady—as, *Amiable Mother*, *Admirable Mother*, *Powerful Virgin*, *Clement Virgin*, *Cause of our Joy*, *Health of the Sick*, *Refuge of Sinners*, *Consolatrix of the Afflicted*, and *Help of Christians* &c. Thus the show was for the people a continual prayer.

"The concluding portion of the Litany, in which the dignity of Queen is so justly attributed to Mary, called forth still more majestic representation. Eight triumphal chariots bore the groups emblematic of these glorious titles of our heavenly queen.

"Before the cars rode choirs of angels, with snow-white wings and starry foreheads, playing on harps and psaltering, mounted on palfreys magnificently caparisoned. The *Queen of Angels* was in the first car, drawn by six cream-coloured horses. She was raised on a golden throne, around which knelt many heavenly spirits. Seraphim, cherubim, archangels, and angels, surrounded their Queen; the powers, principalities, and dominations carried crowns and sceptres. All these characters were borne by young girls, taken from the noblest families of Malines.

"The *Queen of Patriarchs* was in the second car, attended by the venerable personages of the old law—Adam, Noah, Abraham, Jacob, &c.

"Next came the *Queen of Prophets*, round whose throne might be seen the inspired men, whose voices recorded the future as plainly as the past from Abraham to St. John the Baptist.

"The fourth car bore the *Queen of Apostles*, who sat on a high throne, covered by a canopy, over which was raised the arms of the See of Peter, the eternal emblem of the Church. Among the twelve Apostles, the chosen ones of Christ, who were directly commissioned by him to propagate his holy gospel, might be seen their successors, who had been chiefly instrumental in spreading the Christian religion in the north of Gaul—St. Rombauld, St. Servais, St. Amand, St. Lambert, St. Lievin, St. Gomer, and St. Willibrod.

"The *Queen of Martyrs* sat in the fifth chariot, which represented the whole of the earth; for where has not the blood of Christians been shed for the faith? Princesses and recluses, bishops and soldiers, children and old men, young girls and mothers—all were there bearing their palms of triumph.

"The sixth car was formed like a pulpit, and carried the *Queen of Confessors* and her militant court; the young girl who held the reins bore also a naked sword, to show that they who laboured in the propagation of the faith must always be ready to shed their blood, if necessary, in its defence.

"Next came the *Queen of Virgins*. The fair charioteer of this car trod the pleasures of the world under her feet; behind her was a wheel and a palm, and on her right a lamb, emblem of innocence.

"The eighth chariot was made to represent the heavens, in which reigned the *Queen of all Saints*, surrounded by her heavenly court, round whom shone a brilliant glory. The Grand Harmonic Society of Malines followed the Litany; but it sadly marred the effect of the whole to see the members dressed in the modern costume. Better had it been to give them the characters of the court of David, or some others corresponding with the allegorical nature of the festival. But see, here is *Malines* herself, represented by a beautiful child crowned with towers, and surrounded by nine maidens, bearing emblems of the virtues of the city—*faith*, *prudence*, *charity*, *union*, *constancy*, *fidelity*, *valour*, *modesty*, and *justice*.

"The cavalry officers, the king's aides-de-camp, and the grand officers of the court, followed on horseback. Behind them is a royal car drawn by eight horses, in which are faithfully represented, by children of twelve years of age, the king and queen of the Belgians upon their throne. The attributes of the arts, commerce, justice, and war, group at their feet. The car is led by fidelity, religion, justice, goodness; Belgium, wisdom, and generosity are the attendants of their majesties.

Four winged angels, at each corner of the car, bear aloft the national standard, surmounted by the lion.

"A party of naval officers forms the transition to another spectacle. It is a ship, representing the *country's welfare*, an ingenious emblem—navigation is to all countries the source of wealth.

"The *country's welfare* is a three-masted ship, with her sails, cordage, flags, and cannon. An emblematic figure of Belgium commands her; she has her officers and sailors. She sails along the streets by mechanical contrivances, and is followed by fantastic personages, serving as fore-runners to the horse *Bayard*, an enormous animal, on whose back ride four mediæval knights: they are the sons of Aymon.

"In the tradition of the country, Aymon was a count of Termonde. His four valiant sons defended Malines and Brabant, and Bayard, their trusty steed, often came to feed in the forest of Soigne, where he left the mark of his foot upon a rock; he browsed formerly in the fertile plains watered by the Dyle.

"After Bayard followed the giants, for which the northern cities are so famous. Here come three children, fifteen feet high, whose father and mother look over the houses; the lady being a colossal princess, holding a fan as large as those with which domestics in the Indies cool their employers. The grandfather is even taller than his son, to show that each generation degenerated in size. He is seated in a monster tilbury of antique form, escorted by two monster camels mounted by cupids. This is, it is said, a relic of the crusaders, who were the first to import these animals into Europe.

"After these great figures comes, as a kind of moral to the show, a good old man smoking his pipe on a wretched nag, who draws Dame Fortune's wheel. The goddess herself is borne on high, around whom are grouped figures, who, as she makes a movement, rise or fall, showing what freaks the dame plays with mankind. These personages are well-dressed representations of harlequin and a beguine; a hunter and a milk-woman; a courtier and a coquette; a hermit and an old woman. Bursts of laughter greet the vicissitudes which these various persons undergo as they pass along. The cavalcade closed as it opened, with a large body of cavalry.

"Such is a rapid glance at the curious procession which passed four times through the city of Malines during the fifteen days of the jubilee, from the 15th of August to the 1st of September, in the year 1838."

Such, too, were the *religious fêtes* of the middle ages in all "their original perfection," which a certain party would gladly revive in "heretical" England, in the nineteenth century. Whether the *bursts of laughter* which greeted the mingled throng of angels on horseback, giants, cupids, harlequins, and nuns were calculated to promote the cause of devotion, or to encourage secret infidelity among the population of this "old Christian city," we leave our readers to judge; but we confess we are better pleased that the *Litany of Loretto* should have been the subject of this profane parody than that the more solemn events of sacred history should be made the subject of these *tableaux vivants*, as they too often were in the "magnificent and popular" theatrical spectacles of the middle ages, and still are in countries like Spain and Italy, where the Church of Rome has absolute sway, and it is thought politic to *amuse* the populace, to divert them from the more intellectual but dangerous (!) occupation of *thinking*.

FABER ON THE BLESSED SACRAMENT.*

MR. FREDERICK WM. FABER is one of the little knot of English clergymen who, a few years ago, abandoned their Church for the Romish communion; and he has proved himself since, with one or two exceptions, the most active and energetic of their number. In addition to performing with zeal the ordinary duties of a clergyman of the church to which he has joined himself, he has done his best to forward her interests with his pen, both in works published with his name, and in periodical publications. And yet, we must confess that there is nothing about what Mr. Faber has written that gives us the idea of *reality*. We are wholly unacquainted with his private character, and take our opinion of him solely from his works; but nothing which we have seen from his pen impresses us with the belief that when the writer makes a statement he does so because he is convinced that it is true, but rather because he feels it to be suitable to his position to profess a belief in it. It strikes us as if, when Mr. Faber joined the Church of Rome, he felt that it became his duty to maintain the character of a good Romanist, and as if he forthwith set himself to make up and dress for the part to the utmost of his skill. He takes pains to weed his phraseology of every trace of Anglicanism, and to learn the vocabulary of his new communion. If a doctrine or opinion comes before him for consideration, he never dreams of asking what evidence there is for its truth; all he inquires is, what side of the question is most unlike the view which Protestants would take. We do not speak of doctrines promulgated as articles of faith by the authority of the Church of Rome: with regard to these we can understand that he would consider it his duty to believe without evidence and without examination. But we speak of those debatable questions on which Roman Catholic divines have held different opinions; stories of asserted revelations, from which sober-minded Roman Catholics have always felt themselves at liberty to withhold their assent, or extreme views of doctrine which they have considered they might, without disloyalty to their Church, refuse to receive. In every case of this kind Mr. Faber takes his line decidedly. When the miraculous story is one which a Protestant would consider peculiarly unfounded and absurd, and which cooler Roman Catholics turn away from as likely to do their cause more harm than good, Mr. Faber, without producing any evidence for it, quietly assumes it as a certain fact, which no one had ever questioned or doubted. If a doctrinal view is embarrassed with difficulties to which more timid Romanists have tried to shut their eyes, Mr. Faber delights in stating these difficulties in their most startling form, as if there was the more merit in believing the doctrine in spite of them. With some readers, we doubt not, this style of writing may have an effect. Bold and confident assertion, and quietly taking things for granted, will often give the most absurd statements an air of reality. Gulliver's Travels, for instance, have more of an air of truth than the histories of many more veracious travellers. But, for ourselves, we cannot get over the feeling of hollowness which we find in all Mr. Faber's works. His belief is so manifestly destitute of evidence, so plainly governed by the exigencies of his theological position, that we constantly feel that, after all, it is not believing, but make-believing.

When, however, we want information as to the actual state of feeling and opinion in the Church of Rome, we learn more from ten pages of Mr. Faber than from a hundred of Dr. Murray of Maynooth. Foreigners sometimes have learned to speak a language so perfectly that they can only be distinguished from natives by their greater anxiety for purity of diction, and their greater fear of committing a solecism. We believe that more Latin idioms and Ciceronian turns of expression can be found in a page of Dr. Parr, or some other modern scholar, than in half a dozen of Cicero himself. And so, we find that Mr. Faber, in his ever-vigilant care to speak as he thinks a Romanist ought to speak, gives us more information, in a small compass, about prevalent Roman Catholic opinion than we should easily find in the works of an original Roman Catholic.

Accordingly, we have on a previous occasion brought largely before our readers Mr. Faber's former work "All for Jesus," and have given from it plentiful samples of the extraordinary mass of doctrine which has been added to the Roman Catholic creed since the time of the Council of Trent. We now proceed to notice Mr. Faber's last published work, "The Blessed Sacrament," from which, however, we cannot premise to give any extracts so interesting as those we gave from the book just referred to. We must say that this new book has, on the whole, a degree of dryness and heaviness about it, not usual with Mr. Faber, and that we have had some little difficulty in making our way through it.

The principal reason, probably, why this work is more dry than other productions of Mr. Faber is, that it is more full of the scholastic theology. Mr. Faber tells us in his preface that "his treatise is an attempt to popularize certain portions of the science of theology, in the same way as hand-books and manuals have popularized astronomy, geology, and other physical sciences." This being his object, private revelations, which are so largely quoted in "All for Jesus," are much more sparingly employed in the present work. He tells us (p. 510), "There are two sources from which we learn [the relations of Mary to the blessed sacrament] theology and private revelations. We should be out of harmony with the Church if we lightly esteemed these revelations to the saints, especially those that enjoy the countenance of ecclesiastical approval in any of its various degrees. But my object in this treatise has been to follow theology rather than these revelations; and where I have referred to them at all, I have left them in their own uncertainty."

With all Mr. Faber's attempts to make the scholastic theology popular, a book which contains much of it will always be somewhat repulsive to the generality of readers. His book, however, gains in solid value what it loses in interest. We look with great satisfaction on any attempt on the part of the religious guides of Roman Catholics to make them know what they are really required to believe. There are many Roman Catholics who have but a vague idea of the doctrines of their own religion: who (for example) think they believe the doctrine of the Transubstantiation; when, in reality, perhaps they believe no more than what is taught by the Church of England—that "the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." Such persons would turn away with suspicion if we Protestants were to attempt to draw out in detail from the school divines all the absurdities which are involved in the doctrine of transubstantiation. They would think that we were purposely falsifying the teaching of their schools, in order to make it seem incredible or ridiculous.

It is, then, convenient to us when there is a book of their own, easy of access to them, by the help of which they can readily verify whether we are reporting their doctrines fairly or not. The use, then, which we shall make of Mr. Faber's work in this article is to give from it a detail of all that must be believed by any one who gives the Romish interpretation to those words of our Lord, "This is my body;" and we shall give our references to Mr. Faber as we go along. First, then, we give Mr. Faber's general remarks on the wonderful mystery of transubstantiation:—

"Transubstantiation may be described as the true change and substantial conversion of the whole substance of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, produced under the species by a real productive act, proximately subject to the accidents of bread and wine, but without any adhesion to them, the substances of bread and wine perishing altogether in the act.

"St. Thomas says that the blessed sacrament is the compendium of all miracles; for in it we behold one body at one time in all hosts, and in all parts of all hosts, and that without extension. We see matter putting on the properties of spirit, and accidents without a substance, producing all the same effects as substances. Thus, another author calls it the abridgment of the miracles of grace. It is miraculous in the substance, he says, for it destroys the substance of bread and wine, and substitutes the body of God in their room. It is miraculous in quantity, for a body ought to have extension, and the body of Jesus under the species has none. It is miraculous in quality, for a body ought to be sensible and palpable, yet the body of Jesus is here invisible, neither is it subject to the action of any one of the senses. It is miraculous in the action, for, on the one hand, the word of a man gives even to God a manner of being altogether new, in order that he may nourish himself on Him, while, on the other, instead of changing that food into the man's own substance, the food transforms him into itself, and communicates to him its qualities. It is miraculous in a sort of passion endured therein, for we behold here a free prisoner, a living one dead, an impassible one suffering, a body separated from the blood and yet united with it, risen and still buried, eaten and not consumed, consumed and not destroyed. It is miraculous in local movements, for at one and the same time He is placed in different positions, He is lifted up and taken down, He is borne to the right and to the left as well, to the east and to the west both at once. It is miraculous in the situation, for our Lord has His eyes in the same place as His heart, and the heart in the same place as the head; and the head in the same place as the feet; all parts of His adorable body are all together, and yet, nevertheless, they undergo no confusion. It is miraculous in all the accidents of bread and wine, for they are detached from their subject, and have no other support than the almighty hand of the Son of God, who holds them up."—pp. 74, 75.

Let us, however, examine the subject in more detail. Every time that a consecration of the Eucharist takes place, a believer in transubstantiation must believe that no fewer than twelve miracles, or miraculous actions, take place: of these twelve miracles (says Mr. Faber, p. 77), two concern the substance of the bread and wine, two more the species, six the body of our Lord and its concomitants, and two the consecrator in the Mass, &c.:—

"The first miracle is the destruction, the annihilation, the perishing, the vanishing, whichever word we will choose, of the substance of the bread and wine. It is not the customary language of theology to speak of them as annihilated, because, according to the divine intention, their ceasing to be does not end in nothingness, but in the position of the body of Christ in their room. Nevertheless, nothing whatever of the substance, of bread, for instance, remains, neither form nor matter nor existence nor any degree of it, but the whole perishes utterly, and is as if it were reduced to nothing, without anything to succeed it. —p. 78.

"The second miracle, which also concerns the substances of the bread and wine, consists in the reproduction and restitution of the perished substances, when the species are corrupted or changed, and our blessed Lord has withdrawn. It is not that the species themselves act the part of the matter, or minister the material for corruption, or that they only appear to do so. But though separated from the substance which sustained them, they follow its laws, and suffer change in due season. Thus, when the change of the species has reached that point when it would not be natural for the proper substances of bread and wine any longer to consist with the accidents, at the moment by His wisdom and omnipotence our Lord restores and reproduces the substances, withdraws His sacramental presence, and the usual laws of creation resume their uninterrupted sway. All this is done in so occult a manner that there are no external signs by which we can detect either the original disappearance, or the fresh substitution of the substance, so that there is nothing to break the meritorious exercise of supernatural faith.—p. 79.

"Both these miracles concerning the substances of the bread and wine are, to use the emphatic word of one holy doctor, so 'exotic' and so remote from the natural order of causes, we know of nothing at all parallel to them outside this mystery of transubstantiation."—p. 80.

In other words, besides the miracle of destroying the substance of the bread and wine, and the substitution of that of our Lord's body and blood in their room, a new miracle takes place, if the Host is kept so long as to become spoiled or corrupted.* In this case, by a new miracle, the Lord's body is withdrawn, and another is re-created to supply the void thus occasioned.

We proceed now to the miracles which concern the species.

"The first of the two miracles, which concern the species, is that they exist and hold together without leaning upon any subject. This prodigy may be conceived to happen in one of three ways."

* The Blessed Sacrament; or, the Works and Ways of God. By Frederick William Faber, D.D., Priest of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri. London: Richardson and Son. 1855.

* We use, for shortness, Protestant language. Instead of the periphrases necessary to describe this change in the Roman Catholic hypothesis.

We leave out these three attempts at explaining the mystery, and content ourselves with the conclusion of the writer. "Anyhow" (to use Mr. Faber's favourite expression)—

"Whatever comes of these endeavours to explain it, the miracle itself is absolutely certain; the sacramental species remain, when their substances are withdrawn from them.

"The second miracle which concerns the species is, that they suffer the same contingencies and receive the same impressions, and are accompanied by the same qualities, as if their substances had not perished. Thus they grow warm, or cold, or dry, and undergo similar mutations, just as they would do if their subjects existed; and this not in appearance, for the purpose of deceiving the senses, but in reality. In other words, those qualities—such as heat, cold, dryness, and the like, are produced there by the power of God in a miraculous way, without any subject to receive, suffer, and sustain them; and they mingle with and run into each other just as if they were tied together in a common subject."—p. 82.

In short, the believer in transubstantiation must suppose that there is heat, and yet nothing which is hot; dryness, and yet nothing which is dry, and so forth. We heartily assent to Mr. Faber's concluding remark:—

"Nowhere out of the mystery of transubstantiation does it seem that God has vouchsafed to give His concurrence to qualities without a subject; and this shows us the singularity and eminence of the transcendent mystery which we are thus venturing to analyze.

"We have now to consider six miracles which regard the body of our Lord and its concomitants; and the first is the production of the body and blood of Christ, existing and permanent in heaven, under the species of bread and wine, so that He is not less truly, less really, or less substantially in the host than He is in heaven; and this most magnificent dogma is of divine faith. You must not quarrel with me just now for using hard words. A clear idea of this mystery in your mind will soon result in increased love in your heart, and deeper adoration in your spirit. Bear with me patiently, at least for a few more pages. The question is, how this great mystery, this production of the body of Christ, is effected? By what manner of divine operation is it under the species as it is in heaven? How are we to qualify and describe the action which accomplishes this stupendous wonder?"—p. 83.

We need not give the explanations of the mystery which Mr. Faber rejects; it is sufficient to give that which he pronounces most satisfactory:—

"They maintain that the body of Christ is placed under the species by a productive action, which may be called a reproduction of the same substantial being, whereby the same being which it has in heaven is conferred on it, and somehow reproduced under the species, although with another method of existence. If God can restore what has perished, and reproduce it altogether the same, as He does when He restores the perished substance of bread, He can also produce for a second time that which continues to exist. We surely cannot deny this to be within the compass of omnipotence. And not for a second time only. The actual existence of the thing does not hinder but that God could produce it elsewhere a thousand times. He is, of course, not dependent on the circumstances which render this impossible in the natural order of things. From one man, says Lessius, he could produce an army. As in the stores of His wisdom and power there lie countless individuals of the same species, so also in the same stores each individual may lie countlessly, and He could give forth infinite reproductions of the same individual. And although a thing thus reproduced in itself is in act one and the same, yet virtually it is manifold; for it is equal to many in localities, in operations, in beginnings and endings. Thus, it fills distant places, and in a certain sense is distant from itself. It can accomplish different and even contrary effects in different places, and thus really avail to do of itself the work of many. When it begins or ends in one place, it does not necessarily begin or end in another. In one place it may be hot, in another cold; here it may ascend, there it may descend; here it may cease and die, there it may begin and be born."—pp. 87, 88.

We allow readily enough that from one man God could make an army. But, then, if we understand the meaning of language, none of the individuals so produced could be the *same* as he from whom they sprung. It is quite beyond our power to conceive the possibility of the same man existing in different places, and there accomplishing different or even contrary effects; being hot in one place, cold in another; being born in one place, and at the same time dying in another. All this, however, must be believed by those who receive the doctrine of transubstantiation.

We add, without farther comment, Mr. Faber's enumeration of the other miracles which concern our Lord's body:—

"The second miracle which concerns the body of our Lord is the presence with it of His blessed soul, with all its sanctity, beatific love and vision, and all its ornaments and gifts natural and supernatural, under the same species. In the language of the Council of Trent, we say that our Lord's soul is present under the species, not by the force of the words of consecration, but by what the Council calls concomitance—that is, it was befitting and honourable for our Lord's body that it should be accompanied by His soul into all its surpassing beauty, and that in a manner as real as is its own presence in the sacrament. It was not, therefore, necessary that the soul should come, neither did it directly, by virtue of the consecration. And though it comes by force of natural connection with the body of Christ, as the Council speaks, yet as the body was produced under the species of an intimate, peculiar divine influx, which did not reach the soul, the presence of the soul requires a new distinct productive influx touching its substance, as the former one touched the substance of the body. So that here is a fresh act of beauty and of power in order to produce the soul of Christ under the species, and it is there as true, really, and substantially as the body itself."—p. 90.

"The third miracle which has reference to the body of Christ is the presence under the species of the hypostatic union, by which the flesh and soul are united to the Divine Word. From this union the flesh of Christ receives its dignity and all its power of sanctification; and it is present under the species by a productive action of its own. For although the Divine Word is everywhere, yet the union of the body and soul of Christ with the word is not everywhere; because the body and soul of Christ are not everywhere, but are circumscribed in a particular place. Nevertheless, the hypostatic union is so intrinsic to them that they cannot exist without it. Therefore, as the body and soul of Christ are present in the blessed sacrament by a peculiar action, so also is there union with the word. Thus the Divine Word is present in the blessed sacrament by concomitance—that is, not merely by reason of His immensity as God, by which He is in all things, but also by reason of the hypostatic union. Hence, furthermore, though let it be carefully observed not by any productive action, which cannot extend thus far, the Father and the Holy Ghost are also present under the species by reason of connection and identity with the word."—p. 91.

"The fourth miracle is the spiritual manner in which the body of Christ exists with all its corporeal qualities under the species. The body, with all its bulk and its qualities, is by a divine virtue raised above the condition of a body, and receives a spiritual mode of existence, by which it is contracted as it were into a point, and is simultaneously and continuously so diffused through the species, that, like a spiritual substance, it is whole under the whole species of bread, and whole under every one of its parts; just as a man's rational soul is whole in his whole body and whole in each of its parts. This is perhaps the most stupendous prodigy of all this resplendent collection of wonders, and has no just parallel out of this mystery of transubstantiation. That a thing extended by parts should be empowered to exist spiritually and without extent; and that when the substance and existence are both corporeal, the mode of being should nevertheless be spiritual!—p. 91.

"The fifth miracle is the multiplication, so to call it after the example of theologians, of the body of Christ; its manifold presence, or method of existing multiplicdly. See how the case stands with a man's soul. The soul is whole in each part of the body, yet not fully or completely, but imperfectly; for it depends in one part on its existence in other parts; so that if a limb is cut off, it cannot preserve the soul in it unless by a miracle, in which case even it would be in a certain sense incomplete. Now, the body of Christ is totally and completely in every particle of the species, however small, and to the sense indivisible, as perfectly as under the whole species; neither does His existence in one particle in any way depend on His existence in the neighbouring ones, but under each one He exists perfectly and independently, so that when the species is divided, He remains complete in each part without any additional miracle. This prodigy differs from the preceding one, and is additional to it; for it does not follow from His body having the gift of a spiritual existence that it should have also what theology calls the gift of 'multiplicity of complete existence.' He might, for instance, have given Himself once under one species. Thus, the former miracle gives to His body the prerogatives of a spiritual substance, and this one adds to that a multiplicity which not even a spiritual substance possesses. And this multiplicity of Himself, His flesh, His blood, His soul, the hypostatic union, what is it all but love, the same abundant, prodigal, spendthrift love which moves our tears in His blood-sheddings and in all the mysteries of His dear passion, and the actions of His three and thirty years?—p. 92.

"The sixth miracle is the retiring of the body of Christ from the species when they corrupt. When by any external agent or by the internal conflict of qualities, the species so far suffer change as that the substance of bread, if it were there, would naturally be corrupted, in the very moment in which the substance of bread would suffer alteration, the body of Christ withdraws. It is not that the body of Christ has any natural dependence on the species, as the substance of bread would have; but that the body of Christ being there by a special productive influx of God, that influx is withdrawn, and it ceases to be, so that if it were not in heaven, or in the blessed sacrament elsewhere, it would cease to be altogether, and be annihilated. Nevertheless, our Lord suffers in no way by this; for it is all one to Him whether He exist once or a thousand times, for existing once He has the plenitude of all goods and all power, and a million times ten million existences could add nothing to Him. And this beautiful, worshipful marvel closes the series of those which concern His body."—p. 93.

Mr. Faber's remaining two miracles are so in a less strict sense of the word than those that precede:—

"But our survey of this great work of God, the mystery of transubstantiation, would not be complete, if we did not add to it two more miracles, which devout writers, using the word in a loose and poetical sense, are wont to notice, and which concern the consecrators of the body of God. They are miracles rather of love than of power. One of them consists in the prodigal abundance with which our Lord has bestowed this immense gift of consecrating His body. If one man had the power once in a century, how would the world fling itself in pilgrimage upon the one spot where the chosen pontiff was to accomplish this stupendous work. Yet God has given it to a huge motley multitude of priests. He does not require holiness of life to make the consecration valid, nor yet the profession of the true faith, nor even freedom from dreadful crimes. Even blasphemers, schismatics, heretics, and apostates, so long as they were validly ordained, retain this power, and use it to the ignominy and shame of our dearest Lord, and to the profaning of His most holy presence. They make our Lord common and vile and wearisome to the people. They make merchandize of Him, and dishonour Him by simony and sacrilege. Yet He seems to care nothing for it. He looks only at us, consults only our interests, legislates only for our convenience. He must be at our doors. The adorable sacrifice must be easy and ready for all of us. Opportunities of communion must be cheap and common as the air we breathe. This is the best for us, sweetest for us; and as our good is the rule of God's goodness, so it is! Who will quarrel with us for calling this a miracle?—p. 94.

"Once more our last and twelfth miracle is in the [illegible] of consecration. When a priest works miracles, first of all he *is* a priest, and that is to be remembered, for it tells of long years of prayer and conflict, and modest courses of ecclesiastical austerity. But if long fasting and great heart-searching and much toil, and a cycle of preliminary ceremony, were necessary before consecration, it would seem an easy exercise of power when we consider the stupendous majesty of the work performed. But no! Five little words, and it is done!"—p. 94.

Such, then, are the wonders which attend every celebration of the Lord's Supper. But there is one celebration of the Eucharist which demands special notice—the first occasion on which it was celebrated. Every one will admit that the true sense of the words "This is my body" is the sense in which they were spoken by our Lord on the night before his passion, and in which they were then understood by his disciples. Are we, then, to suppose that our Lord meant that he was then holding his body in his own hands? Are we to believe that the apostles understood the Saviour to mean that he was then taking up his own body, that he put his whole body into his mouth, and eat it before them? If by the word body is understood what is commonly meant by the phrase, this is certainly a contradiction in terms; and yet this is what must be maintained by every believer in transubstantiation. Let us hear Mr. Faber's account of the institution of the Eucharist:—

"The awful words have been spoken. This is My body. It is the first time earth has heard them. If it were not inanimate, it would have reeled to its very foundations, even as the gates of hell are vehemently shaken by the assertion of the mass. Our Lord stands, cognizable as Mary's son and in the dimensions of mature mortal age. On His face is a light of love, more bright than a saint's ecstacy. He stands there, body, soul, and divinity, holding in His hand with unconceivable thrills of joy His own very body, with the soul and the divinity. He holds it forth for a moment for the adoration of His apostles, and then enters Himself into the richest inheritance which He has left to His church, by communicating Himself with Himself. By virtue of the incarnation the incarnate Lord received Himself incarnate, was held in His own hands, lay upon His own tongue, descended into His own heart, by the most real reality on earth, His own real presence in the blessed eucharist."—p. 476.

We have only space for one more of the wonders connected with the Sacrament of the Eucharist—one which, to our mind, is the most astonishing of them all, and this is, that there is not a syllable about all these wonders in the New Testament. We quote again from Mr. Faber:—

"In what way should we expect that our blessed Lord would give us this sublime institution? We might have thought He would have founded it with all the solemnities of a Divine Legislator, that it would have been given to us as a boon for which we could never sufficiently thank Him, as a trust the responsibility of which ought to weigh gravely upon our whole lives, as the reward of our faith in Him, over which we might triumph and rejoice perpetually. It would seem as if the Holy Eucharist rather than the Resurrection would be put forward as the reason for completing the number of the apostles, as the prime evidence of the mission and love of the Son of God, and as the glorious end of His merciful coming. We might suppose that the epistles of the New Testament would contain little more than the enforcing of the doctrine of the Eucharist, or the rubrics for its consecration, or the varieties of loving devotion with which it would be our duty to surround it. Yet if we fancied this, we should have shown how little we knew our Lord's way, or had caught the true spirit of the Incarnation."—p. 561.

Here we close, for the present, our citations from Mr. Faber. We own that these things which he has described are wonderful in the highest degree; but we must first ask ourselves are they true. Those who have not Mr. Faber's wonderful gift of taking the imaginations of their own minds for realities, will ask what evidence there is for them? We do not dispute the omnipotence of God. When he tells us that he has done a thing, we bow with humble reverence; nor do we count anything impossible with Him. The only question in this case is, whether God ever has said that He performs these twelve wonderful miracles enumerated by Mr. Faber. The silence of Scripture with regard to any religious doctrine is a wonderful circumstance, which we may, with Mr. Faber, speak on and philosophise about, and try to account for, provided we have some other means of making sure that the doctrine is *true*. But in this instance, what are these means? The foundation of the whole fabric is the right understanding of the words, "This is my body." If Mr. Faber is mistaken on this point, all his system tumbles to the ground. We have to choose whether we will understand these words in a sense conformed to our Lord's habit of speaking in several other instances; the sense in which, as far as we can perceive, they were understood by the apostles at the time; the sense in which they were understood by the fathers of the early Church, who had certainly acuteness to know all the consequences of their opinions, and yet who never discovered in their doctrine of the Sacrament those twelve miraculous actions reckoned up by Mr. Faber. We have to choose, we say, whether we will understand the words in this plain sense, or in one which is embarrassed with innumerable difficulties and counter-fictions, which requires to explain it a language and a philosophy of its own, not invented for hundreds of years after our Saviour's words were spoken. We conclude by asking our readers to consider well the following, which are only a few of the instances in which our Lord's hearers were

misled by putting a gross and carnal, but, as they thought, a literal interpretation, on the words he made use of:—

Matthew xvi., 5–12—"And when his disciples were come over the water, they had forgotten to take bread. Who said to them: Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees. But they thought within themselves, saying: Because we have taken no bread. And JESUS knowing it, said: Why do you think within yourselves, O ye of little faith, for that you have no bread? Do you not yet understand, neither do you remember the five loaves among five thousand men, and how many baskets you took up? Nor the seven loaves among four thousand men, and how many baskets you took up? Why do you not understand that it was not concerning bread I said to you: Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees! Then they understood that he said not that they should beware of the leaven of bread, but of the doctrine of the Pharisees and Sadducees."

John ii., 19–22—"JESUS answered, and said to them: Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up. The Jews then said: Six and forty years was this temple in building, and wilt thou raise it up in three days? But he spoke of the temple of his body. When, therefore, he was risen again from the dead, his disciples remembered that he had said this, and they believed the Scripture, and the word that JESUS had said."

John iii., 3, 4—"JESUS answered and said to him: Amen, amen, I say to thee, unless a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God. Nicodemus saith to him: How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter a second time into his mother's womb, and be born again?"

John iv., 9–14—"Then that Samaritan woman saith to him: How dost thou, being a Jew, ask of me to drink, who am a Samaritan woman? For the Jews do not communicate with the Samaritans. JESUS answered, and said unto her: If thou didst know the gift of God, and who he is that saith to thee, Give me to drink, thou, perhaps, wouldst have asked of him, and he would have given thee living water. The woman saith to him: Sir, thou hast nothing wherein to draw, and the well is deep; from whence, then, hast thou living water? Art thou greater than our father, Jacob, who gave us the well, and drank thereof himself, and his children, and his cattle? JESUS answered, and said to her: Whosoever drinketh of this water shall thirst again, but he that shall drink of the water that I will give him shall not thirst for ever; but the water that I will give him shall become in him a fountain of water springing up into life everlasting."

31–34—"In the meantime the disciples prayed him, saying: Rabbi, eat. But he said to them: I have meat to eat which you know not. The disciples, therefore, said one to another: Hath any man brought him to eat? JESUS saith to them: My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, that I may perfect his work."

XI. 11–13—"These things he said; and after that he said to them: Lazarus, our friend, sleepeth; but I go that I may awake him out of sleep. His disciples, therefore, said: Lord, if he sleep, he shall do well. But JESUS spoke of his death; and they thought that he spoke of the repose of sleep."

THE ANCIENT MANSION.

A great many years ago, a certain owner of a very large estate built a house upon it, and by his will left it to his children, with a strict command never to alter it, but always to keep it up in the very same state as he had left it. In order that this direction should be the more exactly carried out, he caused a full description of it to be written in his last testament. His descendants continued long to occupy it; and, from an anxious desire to fulfil the intentions of the builder, some of the early occupants caused surveys to be taken of the house, three of which, together with the will, have come down to us in the present day. These three early documents all agree in describing the house to consist chiefly of twelve commodious rooms; and in this respect they fully agree in every respect with the account in the will; and though they are not of equal authority with it, they wonderfully corroborate all the particulars mentioned in it. Through succeeding generations, however, many changes took place; not that any part of the old house was altogether removed, but from time to time great additions were gradually made. The directions of the will that no part of the house should ever be taken down were well known and strictly observed; but as the will itself was not much read, the same care was extended to the several additions which successively were made to the original building. These additions, in process of time, became so great, and had been built in such a way as well nigh to render useless the original edifice. They darkened the windows, which had been at first large and open; they rendered the old rooms cold and comfortless, and well nigh superseded them altogether, and they became at last so numerous, that on a subsequent survey the house was found to consist not merely of the twelve original rooms, but actually of twelve others in addition, each of which it was thought needful to keep up in perfect order, according as the commands in the will were understood. The trouble of keeping up the house in this enlarged form became very great. The old mansion being well built, and on a rock, was easily preserved in repair; but the additions which had sprung up around it being badly built, and on a loose sandy foundation, required continual propping up, and entailed a most burdensome expense on the inhabitants. The occasion of the last survey was remarkable. One of the inmates being of an inquiring disposition, and fond of antiquarian researches, happened to find the old will describing the original house; and on taking it in his hand, and going with it from room to room, he discovered that the new buildings were not mentioned at all in it, but that the old part of the house was most accurately described. He had, however, some trouble in exactly drawing the line between the old and the new parts; the new had been in many places so artfully fitted to the old that, without much care, he found it would be difficult to remove the additions without doing injury to the first original building. At last, however, he succeeded, by very diligently studying the testament, aided, also, very much by the three early surveys. Having satisfied himself, he became anxious to communicate his discovery to others, many of the most sensible of whom were soon convinced that these additions were contrary to the will of the founder; and a resolution was come to that the house should be again restored to its original fair proportions, its severe grandeur, and massive strength; and they set about to pull down all the gaudy additions which encumbered the old building, and gave it no additional support, and at the same time supplied very unsafe accommodation. Upon this a violent contest arose. The more enlightened part of the tenantry on the estate, who were able to read and comprehend the will, at once saw that the object was restoration, and not destruction. They clearly understood that the strictest compliance with the original will never required that all the after additions of many centuries were to be regarded as embraced in the first builder's directions. And, moreover, they saw that as these injured the building, and rendered the original rooms almost uninhabitable, the removal of the novel additions was, in fact, the only way to observe the directions of the will, so as to keep the house in perfect order. But, though the more enlightened thus viewed the matter, and rejoiced at the thought of being able to carry out the intentions of the founder, the more ignorant, who are always the greater number, raised a violent outcry, saying that the provisions of the will were about to be set aside. The builder, they said, had ordered that no stick or stone should ever be removed from the house; and now, they said, these modern reformers had come to violate all that was sacred, and to go in direct opposition to the will. It was in vain that they were asked to read the will; they said they did not want to see it; that they knew very well what it ordered; that they had themselves seen the house as it had been from their earliest recollections; and that their old grandfathers could tell them that, in the memory of the oldest inhabitant, it had always stood as it then was. They accused the reformers, as they called them, of all manner of evil doings, and of every wicked motive; and, in order more fully to protect the house from the slightest alteration, they caused a new survey to be made of the premises as they then stood. In doing so they could not gainsay the three original surveys which were in their hands, and in which there was not a word said about the additions; but, having held a general meeting, they decreed that the house now consisted of *twenty-four* rooms; namely, the twelve mentioned in the old surveys, and twelve others which now, for the first time, were written down in the new survey. And they further resolved, that any one who did not maintain that the original house consisted of these twenty-four rooms should be shut out of the house altogether. The contest has been carried on to this day; and, even now, the dispute is as hot as ever—those who have the will, and study it, declaring that it does not contain anything to support the comparatively new additions; and that, though some of them may lay claim to considerable antiquity, none of them are as old as the house itself, by many centuries. Those, however, who have not the will, or, if they have it, do not care to read it, say, they do not mind what may be said in the old will; they know the whole building has been standing for many years; they accuse the reformers, as they still call them, of novelty, and insist that they want to pull down the old house altogether, and to build up a house entirely new, of which the original founder knew nothing. These people will listen to nothing; they will neither study the will nor be satisfied with the old surveys. Nay, so strongly are they prejudiced that, though they have themselves actually added a new room to the building within the last year, yet they still obstinately contend that, though it now contains twenty-five rooms, albeit it had but twelve months ago only twenty-four, that it is even still the same house as it came from the hands of the original founder, and that his directions never to alter the house extends to this last addition as much as to the building he had erected himself hundreds of years ago.

Reader, do you not think the best way to settle this dispute is, for both sides to read and study the will; that the one party may take nothing away from the house which is in the will; and that the other may require nothing to be retained as needful according to the founder's intention, but what the will directs; for, surely, it seems to be a reproach on the architect either to add or diminish ought from his work, which all admit was perfect?

This is a parable. Who will interpret it?

W. R. M.

TALK OF THE ROAD.—No. XXXIII.

"Well, Pat," said Jem, when they met again, "are you going to be quiet, or what are you going to do at all?"

"About what we were speaking of, Jem?" said Pat.

"Aye, sure that's what we have to think of," said Jem.

"Well," said Pat, "as for thinking, sure I can think of nothing else; but for *what to do*, sure *that's* the thing to think of."

"Aye," said Jem, "to think how a man will live; but sure, that's nothing: but to think how will a man give a bit to the childer if he can't get work, sure that's the thing to think of."

"Aye, and the sore thing in earnest," said Pat; "for a man to take his two choices, to be ashamed of Christ and His Word, or else to have the childer screeching to him for their bit; and him to see his own childer hungry, and give them no more than a stone—that *is* the hard thing, Jem; and isn't it the hard church that puts a man to that? Is it the church of Jesus Christ at all?"

"Oh, if they would only give us the Word of God; and let us give the childer their bit ourselves," said Jem.

"They can't do it at all," said Pat; "sure they're too far gone for that: sure their church couldn't stand if they did it."

"And what's to be done with the childer," said Jem. "Sure it's not in man to see them want their bit."

"Is the Bible true at all, Jem?" said Pat.

"Oh, God save us! don't say the like of that," said Jem.

"Is there a word of truth in it at all?" said Pat.

"Oh, sure it's not in earnest you are now, Pat," said Jem.

"It's in earnest I am now, for the soul that's in me, and for the childer that God gave me," said Pat; and then Pat turned round on Jem—"and is it *you* that's in earnest," said he, "about the Word of God? *Is it* His Word at all, or is there any truth in it?"

"It's the Word of the living God, that will stand for ever and ever," said Jem.

"And would you take His word, if He spoke to you?" said Pat.

"Oh, God help me! and isn't that what I would like to do," said Jem: "but isn't it hard when the church stands between Him and me, and between the childer and their bit?"

"Jem, have you sense in you," said Pat, "and do you think that *it is* the church that stands between us and the hearing of what He says? sure *that be* to be something else besides the church that He made Himself."

"It *be* to be something else, that stands between a man feeding his own childer and hearing the Word of God," said Jem; "but what will a man do, Pat, when the childer is crying in the house, and him walking the road and doing nothing? Sure flesh and blood can't stand it. But what does the Word of God say about it at all?"

"Jem," said Pat, "did you ever see a bird lying dead on the ground, because it was starved?"

"I never did," said Jem; "and isn't that the quare thing to think of, now, in the hard winter, and the long snow we had last spring? and I didn't see one of them dead in the snow; and I didn't think of that before. And how did the creatures live at all, I wonder? sure there's as many as ever this summer; and, now, isn't it a wonder, and we not to think of it: sure that's another wonder, too."

"I'll tell you why, Jem," said Pat; "sure here it is in the Word of God;" and Pat pulled out his Bible, and read it out (Matthew, ch. vi., v. 26) 'Behold, the fowls of the air; for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; yet your Heavenly Father feedeth them: are not ye much better than they?' Now, Jem," said Pat, "do you see why you didn't see the birds lying dead in the snow?"

"Well, it's ever more the little things that's biggest in the Word of God," said Jem. "Sure the birds gather up nothing for the winter, and still they get through: sure it's God done that; and it's little we think of it, till the Word of God shows it to us."

"Well, sure it isn't for the birds it's written, Jem," said Pat; "sure it's God that feeds them; but they can't read it."

"Well, now, I see it," said Jem, "what Jesus Christ said it for: he wasn't talking to the birds, when he said, '*Your heavenly Father feedeth them; are ye not much better than they?*' Now, wouldn't that mean that He will care better still for us?"

"Stop, now, Jem," said Pat; "there's more." So Pat read verse 33, "But seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, *and all these things shall be added unto you.*"

"Well, that isn't the way people takes," said Jem. "Sure everybody thinks they has to look for their bit first; and if they can serve God after, and make their souls, well and good."

"And isn't that why I axed you, if there is any truth at all in the word of God, or if you will take His word when He says it?" said Pat.

"Well, that's new entirely," said Jem; "but it's not new in the word of God; for sure it was always written there, only it's new to see it. I wonder how would it be with us now, if we were just to take the word of God as if He said it to us? If we were to take Him at his word now, would He do it?"

"Isn't that just what I axed you, Jem," said Pat. "Would you take the word of God if He spoke to you, or would you leave it?"

"Aye, then, I never thought of it that way before," said Jem; "and it's frightened I was when you asked me would I take the word of God; who wouldn't, thinks I; and is the man mad that asks me, or what is he after; is it going to deny it he is? And now sure it's the very thing to ask myself, is it the word of God to ourselves, or is it not? and will I take it, or will I leave it?"

"Aye," said Pat, "isn't that what it comes to? Sure its reading the word of God we are, and don't we *call* it the word of God? but *is* it the word that God says to us, and *will* we take Him at His word? If He was to say it to us, would we tell Him we wouldn't take it? and did Jesus Christ say that for *us*, that if we seek His kingdom FIRST, that food and clothing will be added to us?"

"And how will it be, Pat, if we just take that same as if Christ said it to ourselves?" said Jem. "Was it meant now, just for you and me? for sure if it was, what would stop me to take the promise of Jesus Christ himself for the childer and me?"

"Jem," said Pat, "does Jesus Christ tell *you* to seek the kingdom of God?"

"What else would I seek in heaven or earth?" said Jem; "or what else in heaven or earth would Jesus Christ bid me seek?"

"Well, then, Jem," said Pat, "isn't it for me, and for you, and for every one that has to seek the kingdom of God, that Jesus Christ said this, 'Seek ye *first* the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and *all these things* shall be added unto you?' Didn't He mean just to clear us of them things that stops us, with His own blessed promise, that if *we* seek *that*, *he'll* mind the rest?"

"And will He do for us and the childer, too?" said Jem; "sure that's what goes against us."

We cannot *show* men in our pages: we cannot *show* the power of faith, and the energy in man that springs from a principle divine. But those who have felt it may imagine the earnestness of Pat, as he exclaimed—

"Will it be worse with us nor with the birds? Will He let *us* die in the snow no more nor *them*?"

We think that Pat has come near to the kingdom of God. We think he is reading God's Word as if it were in truth the Word of God, that cannot fail to them that lay hold upon it. We think his faith is becoming that victory which overcometh the world (1 John, v. 4); the faith of prophets, apostles, and martyrs; the faith of the children of God, that makes them His children, and lifts up their hearts and hopes to their Father in Heaven. And we shall look to hear what that faith leads him to do; and what it brings upon him from that Church which stands between his little children's bread and the word of God.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, NOVEMBER 17, 1855.

MANY of our readers will, we dare say, remember the case of the monk who was convicted at the Mayo Assizes in Spring, 1852, for having, shortly before, publicly burnt a Protestant Bible in the parish of Ballyowny, near Ballinrobe, in that county; and they may possibly, also, recollect that "Brother John" was defended at the trial by an eminent counsel, Mr. Keogh—the same, we believe, who at present fills the high office of Attorney-general for Ireland.

They may possibly, also, remember that in calling their attention to the circumstance, we gave them, in our number for April, 1852, some extracts from a leading article in the *Tablet*, highly approving of the act, in the course of which the writer stated (we use his own words) that—

"If Brother John was guilty of an offence, he, the writer, was equally an offender. He has burned a Protestant Bible, and is prepared to burn a thousand more if he can gratify his taste economically; and we heartily wish that the whole seed, breed, and generation of them was extinguished. We beg leave perfectly to associate ourselves with 'Brother John' in this particular—to scoff at the book which he scoffed at, and to pronounce it a book put together by some of the most active friends and servants of the Fire King—in other words, 'the book of the devil.'"

The defence, of course, was, to use "Brother John's" language, that it was "*not* the Word of God, but the *devil's book*, that he was burning." A sentiment which another zealous Roman Catholic advocate of the day, the Rev. Dr. Cahill, followed up not long afterwards by making the somewhat astounding assertion that "*he would rather a Catholic should read the worst books of immorality than the Protestant Bible!*"*

That these were not solitary instances of the deadly hostility which Roman Catholic priests in Ireland have always evinced towards the authorized version of the Scriptures may be seen by consulting the First Report of the Commissioners of Irish Education Enquiry (Appendix, p. 510), where it is recorded in the evidence that certain priests in Connaught told their flocks that "if they read the Bible, or took it into their houses, they should be *damned, and that the devil was in the Bible;*" meaning, we presume, the Protestant version of it.

We thought at the time these things had enough (though it did not very greatly concern the discussions carried on in the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, as the writers in it generally quote Scripture from the Douay Bible), but had hoped that we should hear no more of such outrages, especially after the just rebuke which a witness (who objected to be sworn on the Protestant Testament) not long ago received, we believe, at Kilkenny, from the learned assistant-barrister, himself a Roman Catholic, when he stated that "he had carefully compared the two Bibles, and that he saw no reason at all why Roman Catholics should object to be sworn on the Protestant Bible, and that, in point of fact, two Roman Catholic bishops had lately taken their oaths on the very book refused by the witness, and that those bishops made no objection at all to it." We are sorry to find, however, that our anticipations have been falsified, and that all previous outrages against the Holy Scriptures have been wholly cast into the shade by a scene enacted within the last few days, almost, we may say, in the metropolis of Ireland, in which not merely one obscure monk or noisy controversialist was concerned, but in which several much-lauded Roman Catholic priests seem to have been actively engaged—an occurrence we could scarcely have credited but that the substantial truth of the account has been testified by eye-witnesses beyond all impeachment.

We take the following brief account from our respected contemporary the *Daily Express* of Friday last:—

"THE REDEMPTORIST FATHERS CELEBRATING THE FIFTH OF NOVEMBER.

"Unauthenticated rumours and correspondence reached us on Tuesday, referring to an alleged case of wholesale Bible-burning by the Redemptorist Fathers at Kingstown. The accounts conveyed to us were almost too dreadful for belief, and we consequently abstained from giving them currency in our columns. We have since received indisputable evidence of the scandalous business; for we have not only conversed with a person that was an eye-witness of what took place, but we have seen with our own eyes a fragment saved from the 'burned sacrifice.' It appears that for some time past these fathers have been holding a series of services in Kingstown, the object of which was to spread dismay and terror among those who possibly might have come under the influence of clerical zeal or Scripture-readers connected with the Protestant Church. On Monday morning the effect of their ministrations was made visible. A fire was kindled in front of the Roman Catholic Chapel, at mid-day, in the open air, and in the presence of a large number of persons who looked on, some exulting like fiends, some excited by strong indignation, and others more in 'sorrow than in anger.' A whole load of Bibles and other sacred works was committed to the flames. The police, who saw it all, did not interfere. Is this, we ask, a Protestant country, and can it be that we are governed by Protestant laws? The Protestant Bible publicly burned by a fanatic and bigoted throng, and yet no interposition, no penalty, no punishment! The thing is monstrous!"

The following account is taken from the *Dublin Evening Packet* of Tuesday, Nov. 6:—

"*To the Editor of the Evening Packet.*

"SIR—I have this day witnessed an awful scene. You are, perhaps, aware that the Redemptorist Fathers have been holding a variety of services in the Roman Catholic chapels, at Kingstown, during the last fortnight. Large crowds have attended, and there has been great excitement among the people. A few days ago they erected, in this chapel-yard, a great red cross for the adoration of the multitude; but this morning they reached the climax, by procuring a large number of copies of the authorized version of the Holy Bible, and burning them, in open day, before the public gaze, some of the metropolitan police passing up and down till they were consumed. Comment here would be out of place.

"AN ERE WITNESS."

The Editor of the *Evening Packet* adds—

"Had we not the fullest confidence in the veracity of our correspondent, who sends us his name in attestation of the above, we could not believe it possible that this occurrence took place, as we may say, in the metropolis of Ireland."

What her Majesty's Attorney-General may think of such matters we know not; or whether the offence was committed in the hope that the defender of the Partree monk will not prosecute the Redemptorist Fathers, we know not; we leave such matters to the public authorities, whose duty it is to vindicate the laws: we are much more concerned in the question, what view the heads of the Roman Catholic Church will take of the affair; but we collect, from the tone of approbation with which Dr. Dixon, in his new book on the thigh-bone of the blessed Cornelius (which our readers will find some notice of in another columns), speaks of the seizure of Protestant Bibles at Nice, that the ecclesiastical authorities in Ireland are not likely to disapprove very highly of *destroying* any more than of *seizing* them. The passage we allude to is an extract from a newspaper published at Nice, in Piedmont, called *La Verité*, which alludes to a fact of very recent date, as follows:—

"We have spoken, in our last number, of a seizure of Protestant Bibles and heretical works effected at Nice, at the house of MM. Gay and Leon Pelatte, Protestant ministers, as also in an English family, Wilson, and at Menton, in the house of M. Trenca, Adjutant-Major of the National Guard. We are assured that in the house of one only of these gentlemen twenty-eight chests of these books were found; but that which, beyond all question, is the most striking feature of this affair is the protest addressed to the English Consul at Nice, by M. Wilson, and inserted in the journal *l'Avenir*. It confirms victoriously the efforts which England has made to Protestantize Piedmont, and the aid and assistance in this attempt which she is known to have given the ministry that directs the cabinet of Turin. Here is the protest—

"'I protest, in the name of the Earl of Shaftesbury, the noble President of the British and Foreign Bible Society, who, when he was at Nice, confided to my care the Bibles and New Testaments belonging to the society. He made me then promise to apprise him as soon as possible of every effort that would be made to seize these books, or to put an obstacle to their legitimate use, in order that he might, without delay, refer the matter to the government of Turin, through the medium of his friend, the Count de Cavour.

"'W. CARUS WILSON.'

"*La Verité* concludes by calling on the independent and Catholic press to give all the publicity in their power to these facts, which throw so much light on the misfortunes of Piedmont."—(See Dr. Dixon's book, p. 62.)

If Dr. Dixon considers the misfortunes of Piedmont to be (as we may infer he does from quoting this article) referable to the circulation of the *Protestant* Bible, one would naturally suppose that the remedy he proposes to avoid similar *misfortunes* in Ireland would be the establishment of what we have more than once ourselves suggested—a ROMAN CATHOLIC BIBLE SOCIETY, for the circulation of the Douay Bible and Rhemish Testament. The most cursory perusal of his book, however, will easily satisfy any one that *his* remedy for the misfortunes of Ireland is one of a very different character. He has, in fact, made the important discovery that it is *bones*, not *Bibles*, which Ireland wants for her welfare and protection at the present period. The principal object which Dr. Dixon seems to have in view is, to promote the worship or veneration of *relics* in general in this country by importing "a thigh bone and one of the ribs"

* See the *Tablet*, Dec. 17, 1853, p. 804, for which, however (as a violation of all common sense and decency), he was shortly after soundly castigated by the *Rambler* of February, 1854.

of a supposed predecessor, who lived 700 years ago, and introducing "*his* office and mass into the ancient city of Armagh, according to the rite of the *greater double* which they hold at Chambery, in Savoy." In p. 56 he thus describes his grief at the want of such relics in Ireland:—

"We arrived at the Cathedral of Fiesole (a small city near Florence) just as the people were coming out after last mass. The clergy, who were in the church, paid us every attention, and immediately gave orders to have the shrine of St. Donatus, which is kept on a side altar, opened, that we might see the relics of our sainted countryman, and venerate them. The interior of the shrine is beautifully ornamented, and the *bones* of the holy bishop are *all* there. On looking at that *precious treasure*, we could not help reflecting, with grief, on the absence from our own dear Ireland of the relics of her saints. They went to enlighten the continent by their preaching and to edify it by their holy lives, and they have left their *bones* to it as a *precious inheritance*, which has been most jealously guarded by the depositaries of that sacred treasure."*

Dr. Dixon's taste for such *treasures* seems to have been largely gratified during his journey. He thus describes some of his visits:—

"Commencing our journey for Sienna, we left the city (Rome) by the Porta del Popolo. It gave me great pleasure to think that I was to visit Sienna, the city of St. Catherine (whose *head*, it appears from another passage, p. 53, is kept at one of the altars of the church of the Dominicans in that place), and remained there for a night. I had, whilst in Rome, been delighted to see the improvements that are going on in the great Dominican Church of the Minerva, where the *body* of St. Catherine rests, in a marble sarcophagus, under one of the side altars. As soon as the improvements shall be finished, the body will be removed to the high altar. I had the gratification of contributing my mite towards the fitting up of this new shrine of that holy virgin. We had travelled for a great part of the day before I was aware of another *happiness* which I was to enjoy, even before reaching Sienna, and that was to visit Viterbo, the city of St. Rose. It was in Viterbo that we rested for dinner. Immediately after dinner, before the diligence resumed its journey, Mr. Farrelly and I were so fortunate as to find time to visit the *body* of St. Rose.†

"We were received with great kindness by the good nuns of the convent in which the body is kept. The saint rests on a couch placed in a gorgeous shrine. We were admitted to *kiss her hand*. That body, the great treasure of the convent and of Viterbo, so miraculously preserved for near six hundred years, is *whole and entire*. Glory be for ever to the great God!

"I was reminded by this visit of the body of another saint, which I had the happiness of visiting, and of which I was permitted to kiss the hand, in 1846, in Bologna, who died in that city on the 9th March, 1463, being then forty-nine years of age. This body is not only *whole and entire*, but has retained its natural flexibility like a living body; and, dressed in the nun's habit, it sits, with an air of great dignity, in an arm-chair, in a graceful and natural position, without being fastened in any way."

The secret of these apparent miracles is, however, somewhat *naively* let out in other passages, when explaining how the remains of the blessed Cornelius, or rather St. Concord, have assumed their present imposing appearance:—

"His relics, which had reposed for a long time in a poor walnut shrine, covered with still poorer ornaments, were, on the occasion of repairing the church, replaced by a happy idea, as a precious treasure, in a more suitable state. The wretched panel which formed the front of the shrine was replaced with a handsome plate glass, and, thanks to the zeal of several pious persons, the holy bishop is richly adorned—p. 68. This year (1854) the entire head of this holy body has been sent to Rome to have the face *filled up with wax*."—p. 70.

The work of the Count de Firnex, which Dr. Dixon reprints for our edification, goes into something more of detail in this matter:—

"These preliminaries (*i.e.*, the examination of the brain of the blessed Concord by the ecclesiastical authorities at Rome) terminated, the relics were enclosed in a waxen bust, representing the saint with that natural and true expression they know so well how to give in the city of the saints. The head is a fine one, and the beholder is pleased to see imprinted on the stranger's brow the noble dignity, the serious and meditative air of the inhabitant of the North of Europe, joined to a sweetness and serenity of expression which at once recalls the distant birth-place of St. Cornelius, his exemplary life, and early death."—p. 79.

Who can say whether, without informing Dr. Dixon, the remains of St. Catherine of Bologna and St. Rose of Viterbo, "whose graceful and natural postures" in the couch and the arm-chair he, in his simplicity, referred to *miraculous agency*, were not really indebted for their attractions to the *same miraculous power* by which ecclesiastical artists in the city of saints "knew so well" how to impart to a waxen bust, in the year 1854, the natural and true expression of the fine head of St. Cornelius, who died 700 years before! We suppose, when the visit of St. Concord's *head* to Rome is forgotten, pilgrims in ages to come will (not knowing that *all the bones* of the good bishop are not still there) give glory to God for the miraculous preservation of his body, "*whole and entire*," and kiss his hand of wax, believing devoutly that it has been miraculously preserved from decay for seven or eight centuries!

One observation more we must make about these holy relics before we have done. It appears that it has been "a great source of joy and special exultation to the good people of Chambery to have succeeded in preserving those relics of the holy archbishop from indignity during the period of the French Revolution; and they have found by long experience that many favours have been placed by God at the disposal of the blessed Cornelius; one of which is, *the procuring of rain for their parched crops*, from whence arises such a *special devotion* to the blessed archbishop among the farmers of the whole country around" (p. 102), which Count de Firnex (p. 81) thus describes a little amusingly:—

"Since his decease he has often proved to our city that he has adopted* it for his country, by obtaining signal favours for it, through his powerful influence. A great number of cures have been operated at various epochs by his intercession, and the inhabitants remember with gratitude the beneficial rains which, after a long drought,† suddenly refreshed our harvests, *because* St. Cornelius was publicly invoked, or when some extensive demonstration of homage had been paid him. At one time, this celestial benefactor was so earnestly and unceasingly invoked, that he *seemed to forget the honour due to his mortal remains* (!) and during a procession in which his holy relics were borne, the clouds gathered quickly, and then poured their refreshing showers upon the parched earth so bountifully that, *to save the Saint's body* (we suppose to prevent the dry bones from being washed away), the bearers were obliged to enter a house in the suburb Reclus."

"Thus, this sacred *treasure* is considered as the *most powerful resource of the country in unusually dry seasons*; and, not only immense crowds of the people of this city, sometimes headed by their magistrates, but even the population of the surrounding parishes crowded to Lemenc, to invoke this powerful protector."

We cannot help wondering at the hardness of heart which could rob the poor farmers of Lemenc of half their "most powerful resource in dry seasons," and bring it over to Ireland, where our climate is generally deemed rather too moist already, and where, therefore, "the favours at the Saint's disposal" will be rather prejudicial than otherwise; and we cannot help sympathising with the just horror of the magistrates and population when, upon finding, at some future time, that they only procure *half rain enough* to refresh their parched harvests, that the real cause is that their patron saint can only now stand on one leg, the most Rev. Dr. Dixon having privately, but rather treacherously, carried off the other. "All this," Dr. Dixon admits, in page 74, "was done *privately*, that the people of the parish might not be generally aware of what had happened; for great as was their respect for the successor of the blessed Concord, they would hardly have endured to see so much of the bones of their revered patron and protector carried away from them." And who could say they would have been wrong, if the success of their harvests depended on their possession?

Dr. Dixon, it is evident from his whole book, is one of those pious believers who look not very pryingly into the truth or falsehood of statements, or the propriety or impropriety of conduct, as long as the cause of Rome is likely to be promoted by either the one or the other. He tells us that he saw the *miraculous crucifix* that bowed the head to St. Francis of Sales, in the presence of the people to whom he was preaching! (p. 63); and that he visited, in Paris, the chapel in which the Sister of Charity was favoured with the vision of the *miraculous medal!* (p. 65). He narrates the story of the painting of the Saviour, in the church of St. Maria, in Monticelli, at Rome, which was observed *to open and move its eyes*, for several months, in the year 1854! (p. 40); and he *rejoices* to state that Monseigneur Ginoulhac, the present bishop of Grenoble, has not the most remote doubt of the truth of the *apparition of La Salette!* (p. 46.) Nothing is too hard, in fact, for Dr. Dixon to swallow, except the Protestant Bible—which he looks upon as "the cause of all the misfortunes of Piedmont," and we presume heartily thanks the Redemptorist Fathers for burning them *en masse* at Kingstown, on the 5th November, as a substitute for the somewhat obsolete effigies of Guy Fawkes.

The struggle has fairly begun, and though, perhaps, it may be a century hence before Ireland will have finally settled the difficult question in modern theology, whether it is safer for her to *put her trust* in *bones* or *Bibles*, we entertain not the slightest doubt as to the ultimate result, in spite of the Redemptorist Fathers, or even the thigh-bone of the blessed Cornelius, *alias* Conchovar, *alias* St. Concord, *alias* Conor Mac-Concoille, *alias* Mac-Concalede, *alias* Mac-Conchailleadh, whether he were a Bishop of Iceland or an Archbishop of Armagh, a canonized saint, a schismatic, or a traitor.

REASONS FOR NOT READING THE BIBLE.

TO THE ROMAN CATHOLICS OF IRELAND.

BELOVED COUNTRYMEN—Various attempts have been made to prove that it is "the right and the duty of all men to read the Holy Scriptures."

The arguments advanced in support of this opinion have usually been drawn from three sources: from reason, from the Scriptures themselves, and from the writings of the fathers.

It has, for instance, been argued, that God in giving to mankind a revelation of his will, must have intended it for all men alike, all men alike requiring it, and must have designed that it should be as free to every man as the light which shines around us and the air which we breathe.

It has further been insisted, that the Bible itself declares this to be the design of its Author; and great stress has been laid upon those words of our blessed Redeemer, addressed to the common people, "SEARCH THE SCRIPTURES:" which they allege contain not merely a command to all to *read* the Scriptures, but even a solemn injunction to *study* them *with diligence*, exploring their hidden meaning, as men *digging in a mine* for gold or precious stones.

To the objection drawn from the obscurity of the Scriptures, and the difficulty, especially to poor and unlearned persons, of understanding them, it has been replied, that most parts of the Scripture are plain and easy to be understood, though some are obscure and difficult; that there are "shallow places," as a great Bishop of Rome once said, "in which a lamb may walk, as well as deep places in which an elephant may swim." That enough is intelligible even to a child to "instruct him to salvation," as Scripture itself testifies. That the Gospel was *preached* to the poor, and, therefore, may be *read* by them; and that it is not *human learning* which is required to enable any man to understand the Scriptures, but *divine teaching*, an express promise of which is given to all who by prayer seek it.

Then, with regard to the *danger* of exercising the right, as it is called, of private judgment, seeing that men may put a wrong meaning upon what they read, and thus "wrest the Scriptures to their own destruction,"

---

* The *italics* above are our own.

† Dr. Dixon here anticipates, not unnaturally, "But some one may ask, who was St. Rose of Viterbo?" The answer he gives is, no doubt, remarkable. "She was born in that city, in the year 1249, of poor parents; and God *inspired* her with such wisdom, that she—a poor uneducated child—was *authorised by the Holy See* to preach publicly and explain the Scriptures to the people, in the *streets of Viterbo*, at the *early age of ten years!* and such was the fervour of her preaching, and so great the *miracles* which accompanied it, that she was able effectually to counteract the evil influence of the Emperor, Frederick II., in the city of Viterbo, and to overturn there the heresy and schism which followed in the train of that impious opponent of the Holy See."

* If so, pray, what right had Dr. Dixon to interfere with him?

† As far as our experience goes, rain generally does follow a *long drought!* At least, in Ireland, *such* miracles are not uncommon!

and among other evils, endless sects and divisions arise; it is commonly answered, that God, in publishing a revelation, and commanding mankind to read it, must have foreseen all these consequences; and that everything is liable to abuse as well as the Scriptures, even the best and most necessary things; so that if the argument from the *abuse* of anything against its *use* were to stand, then it would be reasonable and right for men in general to abstain from *food* itself, as multitudes abuse it by sinful excess, to the destruction of their bodily health.

It is moreover asserted, that the divisions and differences referred to as consequent upon the free use of the Scriptures are more apparent than real, all who thus use them agreeing in the belief of one and the same Saviour, one and the same way of salvation, however they may differ in lesser things; so that there is a real and essential unity, though not an outward and visible uniformity.

There is, it must be confessed, considerable force in these reasonings, so that one cannot be surprised to learn that many have been convinced by them; nay, it is commonly reported, that many, impressed by the arguments thus put forward, have gone so far as to possess themselves of copies of the Scriptures, and are secretly, if not openly, engaged in the study of them, expecting that God himself will become their teacher, by sending his Holy Spirit to "guide them into all truth," in answer to their prayers to Him to this effect, offered in the name of his Son, Jesus Christ.

However this may be, in justice and faithfulness as your friend, I am bound to inform you, that however cogent may be the reasons which some have advanced for *reading the Scriptures*, there are, also, on the other hand, many weighty and powerful ones for *not reading* them.

The object of this letter, therefore, shall be to point out to you, with all plainness and honesty, *what those reasons are.*

In general, then, let me observe, that great disquietude and disturbance of mind are oftentimes produced by reading the Bible. A man living in the practice of any sin, or leading a worldly and ungodly life, the moment he opens the Bible, a light from heaven, as it were, flashes forth from that wonderful book, and all at once he begins to see himself and his character in their true colours. The sight is a painful one—the discovery is alarming. Either he must give up sin or close the Bible. What worldly-wise man would not choose the latter, and prefer a false peace, founded on ignorance, to parting with his sins and earnestly seeking the favour of God? Our blessed Saviour describes the very case (John, iii. 19, 20, 21):—"This is the judgment: because the light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, for their works were evil. For every one that doth evil *hateth the light*, and *cometh not to the light*, that his works may not be reproved. But he that doth truth cometh to the light, that his works may be made manifest, because they are done in God."—*(Douay Bible.)*

Thus, you see there are strong and powerful reasons, operating in general to hinder or deter men from reading the Scriptures.

To come now to your own particular case as Roman Catholics, the following results would most probably follow were you to become Bible-readers—results attended with serious disturbance of mind and manifold inconveniences, as you yourselves must plainly perceive, and as I shall afterwards more fully explain. You would almost necessarily be led to make the following discoveries, among others:—

1. That Jesus Christ, the Son of God, by His ONE *oblation of Himself*, ONCE *offered upon the Cross*, made a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world.—Is. liii. 6; John, i. 29; Heb. ix. 25-28; x. 10; 1 John, ii. 2. *(Douay Bible).*

2. That, having risen and ascended into Heaven, He is there "*always living to make intercession for us*;" for which reason he is "able also to save for ever them that come to God *by Him*."—Heb. vii. 25.

3. That, as there is "one God," so there "*is* ONE *Mediator of God and men*—the man Christ Jesus."—1 Tim. ii. 5; John xiv. 6.

4. That *confession of sin* is to be made to *God, who alone can forgive sin*, and who *will* forgive it for His dear Son's sake.—Psalm xxxi. 5; Pa. l. 6; Is. xliii. 25; Dan. ix. 9: Mark ii. 7; 1 John i. 9.

5. That God *promises* to bestow *pardon of sin* and *eternal life*, as a *free gift*, upon every sinner who *believes in Jesus*, trusting in His merits and blood.—John, iii. 14-16, 36; v. 24; vi. 40, 47; Acts, xvi. 30, 31; x. 43; xiii. 38, 39; Rom. iii. 20-28, vi. 23; x. 1-10.

6. That "*the blood of Jesus Christ*," the Son of God, *cleanseth us from* ALL *sin*."—1 John i. 7; and that "by ONE *oblation* He hath *perfected for ever* them that are sanctified;" so that "there is NO MORE *an oblation for sin*."—Heb. x. 10, 14, 18.

7. That, consequently, there is no necessity at all, nor can be any, for either *penances* in this world, or *Purgatory* in the world to come; no need of *absolutions* or *indulgences*, or of *masses* either for the living or the dead, however lucrative such things may be to those who deal in them; no need of *other Mediators than Jesus Christ*, full of compassion and power as He is—"yesterday and to-day, and the same for ever."—Heb. xiii. 8.

Light would by this time break in on your minds as to the *true motives* which some may have for withholding the Bible from you.

Further you would discover:—

8. That there was not a shadow of foundation in the Scripture for the *invocation of angels and departed Saints*, or for prayers to the Blessed Virgin, or for *bowing down to the images or pictures* of any of these, or to the *crucifix*; but the very contrary of any warrant or authority for so doing.

9. You would, I am persuaded, be astonished and shocked to find, as you would very soon find, that there was an express commandment of God contained in your *Bible* (Exod. xx. Deut. v.) forbidding all that idolatrous veneration and worship last mentioned, which commandment was deliberately and dishonestly (query, prudently) left out of your *Catechisms*.

10. You would, very soon also discover that, by a similar fraud, or even worse, certain passages of Scripture (Apocalypse, xix. 10, and xxii. 8, 9,) *directly prohibiting* religious honour to be paid to angels and departed saints, were so garbled in that well-known book, Dr. Doyle's "Abridgment of Christian Doctrine," as to *justify and encourage* the very practices which they were intended by God to condemn.

11. You would, in common with all Protestants, soon be enabled to interpret according to the analogy of Scripture, that is, *figuratively*, our blessed Saviour's words at the institution of the Eucharist, "This is my body;" and would learn to shrink back with horror from the terrible guilt of offering *adoration* to that which was not God. You would plainly perceive that *Transubstantiation* was false, as well as absurd and ridiculous; that the worship of the Host was, therefore, nothing short of idolatry; and that there being no Transubstantiation, there could consequently be no such thing as a propitiatory sacrifice (as of Christ's body and blood) for sin in the mass.

12. To your astonishment, you would discover that what you have been taught to regard as a venerable and most precious sacrament, viz., *Extreme Unction*, without which you would be unwilling to die, was no sacrament at all; and that no passage of Scripture can even be pretended for it but one in which mention is made of *anointing with oil sick persons in order to their recovery.* (James, v. 14, 15.)

13. I have no doubt that your wonder would also be moved to find that so far from *Celibacy* being enjoined by Christ upon the ministers of His Church, as especially conducing to sanctity and fitness for their holy office, the very contrary is the fact—(see Epistles to Timothy and Titus), and that *celibacy* is the *exception* and *marriage* the *rule* for such, according to Christ's institution and God's word; the very "forbidding to marry," together with commanding "to abstain from meats," being in Scripture among the marks of the apostasy or departure from the faith which was to arise in the latter times. You would probably ask yourselves to *what Church* that you know of these marks belong, and to *what Church* ONLY?

14. Your notions respecting "*The Church*" itself you would speedily find to be grossly erroneous, supposing it, as you do, to be limited to one particular denomination or communion, as that of Rome, and not to consist of all true believers in Christ, of every name and in every place; or, again, that it consists of the clergy alone, who, at the best, can compose but a very small part of it.—John, x. 9; 1 Cor. i. 2; xii. 13; Eph. i. 22; ii. 20-22; vi. 22; Col. ii. 19; 1 Peter, ii. 4, &c.; Acts, xv. 4; xx, 28.

15. But the most astounding discovery of all would be that to which, in due time, probably, you would be conducted—namely, that so far from your Church being, as you now fondly suppose, THE Church of Christ, to the exclusion of the claims of every other Church in the world, she is, emphatically, the false and corrupt Church doomed to destruction, of which the Lord says, "Go OUT FROM HER, MY PEOPLE; THAT YOU BE NOT PARTAKERS OF HER SINS, AND THAT YOU RECEIVE NOT OF HER PLAGUES." (Apoc. xviii. 4.)

Beloved friends, that your minds would be seriously disturbed by these discoveries, cannot for a moment be doubted. You would feel like men suddenly awakened out of sleep and false security to the sight and consciousness of the most imminent danger. You would resemble mariners in a foundered bark, the waves and the billows every moment threatening to overwhelm you; the foundation which you deemed to be a "rock" would tremble and totter under your feet. What would you then do? The course prescribed by a regard to your *eternal interest* would be plain and inevitable—forsake the sinking ship, flee out of the doomed city. But other *present considerations* would render this course difficult. Your companions, unless they, too, saw their danger, would refuse to accompany you; nay, they would probably ridicule you as madmen, or fools, or hypocrites; perhaps violently and bitterly oppose you as enemies.

Do you not see, then, to what Bible-reading would lead you? Are there not weighty and powerful *reasons against it?* You would have to choose between God and men, between your soul's eternal welfare and present ease, comfort, and, perhaps, worldly interest.

The spiritual power you have so long been accustomed to dread, if you take but one step in the direction of your safety, would break forth against you in wrathful fury; thunders would roar and lightnings would flash. It is true they would not be the thunders and lightnings of heaven; they would be impotent of themselves to harm you. The anathemas, mine-denunciations, however noisy, would be innocuous, just like the petty crackle that mimic heaven's sublime terrors in the theatre. There should not "an hair of your head perish" by mere *spiritual* power alone. Look at the Pope of Rome—poor man! How little did his spiritual power avail, when some time since he fled from his own subjects in disguise; and never would have dared be return to this day, except under the cover and protection of foreign bayonets. Unguarded by these, he would not be safe one hour in his own capital.

All the power of your clergy to oppress is derived from the people. They never can be your tyrants without your permission. One, or two, or three, or twenty in a place may, if they fall away from them, and forsake them, be persecuted by the majority who remain blindly devoted to their interest; but let members arise, and nobly assert, in the face of heaven, their rights as men and as Christians; their right to possess and to read God's Holy Word, and to think for themselves, refusing any longer to be led blindfold in matters of eternal moment, and the iron despotism, which has so long unrighteously lorded it over men's consciences and God's heritage, will crumble into dust, and its deluded victims marvel at their own former fatuity.—I am, beloved countrymen, your faithful servant in Christ, and ardent well-wisher,

ST. PATRICK.

Correspondence.

RELICS AT OVIEDO.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—I shall feel much obliged if you will inform me whether there is any method by which the genuineness of relics can be ascertained, or whether there is any authority in the Roman Catholic Church empowered by the Pope to distinguish true relics from spurious ones. My reason for making the question is as follows:—I lately obtained possession of the following list of relics, which are exhibited in the church of St. Salvador, at Oviedo, in Spain. This catalogue is of very modern date, being published with the sanction of the dean and chapter of Oviedo, in the year 1845. Now, although I am no very great admirer of antiquity, yet some of the relics specified in the list are so curious that I would gladly pay a visit to Oviedo, were it in my power, in order to see with my own eyes these interesting memorials of past ages, as well as the wooden chest which contains them. But here lies the difficulty. I would not like to have my journey for nothing, and to find, perhaps, at the end of it, that I had been imposed upon by an impudent fabrication. A reasonable amount of fair evidence would satisfy me—evidence, for example, which, if any of the relics were stolen, would suffice to establish their identity, and prove the right of the dean and chapter of Oviedo to the possession of them before a jury of honest men: but I must candidly confess, that I can scarcely believe that some of the bread of the last supper, of the manna that was rained down on the Jews in the wilderness, of Moses' rod, or of the roasted fish and honeycomb that our Lord ate along with his disciples, besides countless other relics, are all actually at this present moment in the Church of Oviedo, merely because the dean and chapter say they are genuine. These relics, doubtless, bring in a great deal of money to the Church; and it is an old maxim, that no man is an unprejudiced witness in his own cause.

There is one other question that I would wish to ask before I conclude. What religious benefit does to the people of Oviedo from the possession of all these objects, supposing them to be genuine? For example, the list specifies the pouch of St. Peter, part of the skin of St. Bartholomew, one of the water pots of Cana of Galilee, and various other miscellaneous articles. Now, it is plain, from the short history prefixed to the catalogue, that the presence of "the chest of imperishable wood," with its sacred contents, never saved the country which it visited from temporal evils;—for all these various places, Jerusalem, Persia, Africa, and Spain, have from time to time been overrun by infidels, and devastated by other terrible calamities. It is plain, therefore, that the chest brought no *temporal* blessings along with it. And what proof have we that any *spiritual* blessings have accompanied it in the course of its pilgrimage, or now actually belong to it? If a man disbelieves St. John's account of the miracle of Cana of Galilee, will the sight of the water-pot in the chest at Oviedo convince him? Do the people pray to the pouch of St. Peter? or do they offer up their devotions to the piece of the rock of Mount Sinai on which Moses fasted? We read in Holy Scripture that the good king Hezekiah broke in pieces the brazen serpent that Moses made, because it was the cause of the Israelites

falling into idolatry. Can it be that the Church of Rome teaches her people to commit a similar offence now?

I enclose a copy of the list referred to, and beg to remain,

Your obedient servant,

INVESTIGATOR.

LIST OF RELICS AT OVIEDO.

"Brief summary of the holy relics that are venerated in the sacred depository of Oviedo, exhibited out of cases, after, through the divine mercy in the year 1075, at the instigation of our Lord the King Don Alfonso the Sixth, they were opened in the presence of many of the prelates of Spain, who, through its general overrunning (by the Moors), found themselves refugees in the said city; and likewise of the indulgences granted to this sanctuary which these persons gain who visit them, and meet as members, in virtue of this Bull.

"To all and to each of the faithful Christians to whom the present writings may come—We give to know that God, our Lord, by his wonderful power, transferred a certain chest, formed of imperishable wood by the disciples of the holy apostles, and full of their great remains, after that the holy city of Jerusalem had been subjugated by the King Chosroes—from Persia to Africa, from Africa to Carthagena in Spain, from Carthagena to Seville, from Seville to Toledo, from Toledo to the Asturias to the mountain called the Sacred Mount, and thence to this holy Church of *San Salvador* DE OVIEDO, where the said chest was opened, and the faithful found in it many golden caskets, and others of silver, of marble, and of coral, who unfolding with supreme veneration, certain labels that withinside were tied to each relic declared clearly what every one was: they found a large portion of the holy linen cloth with which our Saviour was wrapped in the sepulchre, and his precious cloth from the face (*sudario*), tinged with his most holy blood in which his most beautiful face and his sacred head had been enveloped, which with all possible veneration and reverence is to be taught every year three times; and it is well to know the periods—on Friday in the Easter week, on the 14th of September at the feast of the Exaltation of the Cross, and on St. Matthew's day, both morning and evening: a great part of the real cross of our Redeemer; eight thorns of his sacred crown; a piece of the reed that the Jews used in ridicule upon Christ; [a piece] of his tunic, of his sepulchre, of the swaddling clothes that wrapped him in the manger, of the bread of the last supper, of the manna which God rained down for the children of Israel; an image of Christ crucified, one of the three that Nicodemus made of his portrait; a large piece of the apostle Saint Bartholomew's skin; the alb which the Sovereign Queen of Heaven gave to San Ildefenso, Archbishop of Toledo; some of the milk of herself, the Mother of God, and of her precious locks and robes; one of the thirty pieces of silver for which the Jews sold Jesus Christ. They found also a phial of blood shed from the side of an image that Christians had made in the likeness of Christ, that the Jews, obstinate in their ancient unbelief, set up as a mark, and wounded the right side with a spear, from which issued forth blood and water. Some of the earth on which the feet of our Redeemer stood, when he ascended up to heaven; and [of that] when he raised Lazarus from his own tomb; of the mantle of the prophet Elijah; of the forehead and locks of St. John the Baptist; of the hair with which the blessed Mary Magdalen cleansed the feet of Christ; of the bones of the holy innocents, and of the three youths, Ananias, Azarias, and Mishael; part of the rock that closed the Lord's sepulchre; of the olive branch that he carried in his hand, when he entered Jerusalem on the ass; of the rock of Mount Sinai, on which Moses fasted; a part of the rod with which Moses divided the Red Sea; a piece of the roasted fish and of the honeycomb that our Lord eat along with his disciples, when he appeared to them after his resurrection; the vestment of San Tyrso, the martyr; a hand of the proto-martyr, Stephen; the sandal or sole of St. Peter, the apostle, and part of his chain; a pin, or spoke (navaja), from the wheel that martyrized Santa Catalina (Catharine), the martyr; relics of the twelve apostles, of the prophets, and of their bones; the pouches of St. Peter and St. Andrew, apostles; four bones from the head of St. Librada, virgin and martyr; relics of St Lawrence and St. Stephen; and of Saints Cerveo and Daminn; and Stephen, the pope and martyr; Bishop Martin, Facundus, Primitivus, Justus, Pastor, Adrian, Natalia, Mames, Verisimo, Maximius, Vedulus, Pantaleon, Cyprian, Christopher, Cucufatus, Suplicio, Aguedn, Emeterius, Celedonius, Fructuosus, Augurius, Eulogius, Victor, Justa, Rufina, Seroanda, Germamio, Sergius, Bachius, Julian, Felix, Peter, the exorcist; Eugenius, the deacon; Vincent, St. Anna, Felix, Faustus, Beatrice, Petronilla, Eulalia, the Barcelonese; Emilia, Jeremias, the martyr; Pomposa, Colegius, and Exportalius. And besides these, many bodies, bones, and relics of saints, prophets, martyrs, confessors, and virgins, are treasured amongst the others, whose number God alone knows. Outside of the said chest, there was also a cross of the purest of gold, wrought in the same church by the hands of angels, like that celebrated cross with which the King Don Pelago conquered the army and arrogant Saracens, during their general overrunning of Spain, which gave a happy beginning to its restoration to the Catholics. One of the six water jars in which Christ our Lord changed the water into wine; and the bodies of the holy martyrs, Eulogius and Lucretia; that of St. Eulalia, of Merida, our patroness; those of St. Pelago and St. Vincent, abbots and martyrs; those of St Julian, Archbishop of Toledo, and of St. Serranus, bishop. There are, also, in this church, the bodies of King Don Alonso, the chaste, who founded it, and of many other ancient kings of Spain.

"Whomsoever God calls to visit such precious and glorious gifts, know ye, that by apostolical authority, granted for the purpose by the bishop of this holy church, the third part of the penalty of their merited sins is forgiven, besides which, they obtain one thousand four years and six lents (*cuarentenas*) of indulgence. You are made members and participants of all the sacrifices in this church, and likewise the Pope Eugenius IV., and other pontiffs, by these Bulls and apostolic deeds, will concede plenary indulgence, even in the article of death, to all believers who visit this said church, truly repentant of your faults and holding firm intention to make confession at the periods that the canonical law appoints—the day of exaltation of the cross in September, and when it may fall on Friday during thirty other days before and following; and also every year in whatever day the said fiers happens, for a week before and a week after, which apostolic concession and favour will last for ever.

These are the gifts with which divine mercy has enriched this sacred church, fortified the Christian religion, and liberated [it] from captivity by the Moors, in testimony of which, we, the Dean and Chapter of the Sacred Church of Oviedo, cause these notifications (presentes) to be given forth. Printed by Don. Benito Gonzales and Co. 1845."

We thank our correspondent, INVESTIGATOR, for his letter, and the interesting document which he has kindly enclosed in it. The list of relics, we believe, is not of modern invention. It has been long in existence; and a translated copy, very similar to what has been just given, appears in the *Miscellaneous Tracts* of Dr. Michael Geddes, London, 1705, vol. ii., pp. 227-230.

With regard to our correspondent's questions, we fear we can scarcely hope to give such replies as will entirely satisfy him. There is, we believe, an officer at Rome whose proper duty it is to certify the truth and genuineness of such relics as are brought to him for inspection. If INVESTIGATOR will take the trouble of referring to a book lately published, containing the account of the Most Rev. Dr. Dixon's journey to Rome, he will find mention made of the functionary to whom we allude. And we may remark, in passing, that the supposed case put by our correspondent, of some of the relics at Oviedo being *stolen*, happens just to apply to Dr. Dixon's case; for, as all the world knows that that reverend prelate has lately been engaged in *stealing*, or at least appropriating (if a polite word must be used) and carrying off the thigh-bone of the blessed St. Concord, he ought to be a fit judge of the question of identity himself. But the best judges will sometimes be mistaken. It is a provoking thing, when a thief picks a pocket of a purse, to find the purse empty; and we think that, in another part of the present number, we have given pretty clear proof that Dr. Dixon has fallen into a similar predicament with regard to what he took for the thigh-bone of Archbishop Cornelius.

We have not space to enter upon the consideration of the second question fully; but we reply that we know of no benefit which can possibly accrue to any church or people from the possession of any relics whatsoever. Some people, no doubt, allow their veneration for Christ and his apostles to vent itself on tangible objects supposed to be connected with them, or on supposed holy places, to which they make pilgrimages. Our divine Master "left us an example that we should follow his steps;" instead of which, they go to Jerusalem, to tread literally on the ground he trod. Instead of "putting on Christ" as the apostle exhorts us, they venerate a *tunic* He is supposed to have worn, or bits of wood of the supposed "true cross;" or procure a bottle of water from the river Jordan for baptizing their children. Instead of being "followers of the apostles, even as they were of Christ Jesus," they bow down before the fragments of their bones, or locks of their hair, &c. All this, in our opinion, is as if some one, when shown a tree bearing delicious and wholesome and nourishing fruit, should neglect the *fruit* and try to feed on the *leaves* or bark; or as if, when he had received a package of the most valuable goods, he should lay them by, and make no use of them, but wear with much pride the *canvas wropper* in which they are packed up. There is not a single text of the New Testament which either mentions relics or sanctions their use, or attaches any spiritual benefit to the possession of them. If there be, we shall feel much obliged to any of our Roman Catholic correspondents who will call our attention to it. Suppose that we could be put in possession not only of "a piece of the skin of St. Bartholomew," and of "the sandal of St. Peter," but of the bones of *all* the apostles, what good would they do to us, if we wanted the faith and obedience of those holy men? "Blessed are they," said our blessed Lord, "who have not *seen*, and yet have believed" (St. John xx. 29). The people of Oviedo may pride themselves, if they will, upon the possession of the "precious locks and robes of the Virgin Mary." We agree with our correspondent in thinking that the mere assertion of the dean and chapter of the Church of St. Salvador is rather scant evidence on which to rest the genuineness of such relics. But to us the question of identity is immaterial. The relic which, for our parts, *we* should desire to be possessed of, is to be made partakers of the blessing which our blessed Lord bequeathed to His church, when He said, "Whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and sister, and *mother*" (Mark iii. 31.) This is a treasure which *every* sincere Christian, whether in Ireland or elsewhere, can labour to obtain. It is one which does not depend for its reality upon the word of any man or set of men; and if a Christian, according to our Lord's promise, can, even in this life, be brought into the same relationship to Him in which his mother stood, he will need to care very little for the locks of St. John, the hair of Mary Magdalen, or the bodies, bones, and relics of saints without number, which are said to be enshrined in the marvellous chest at Oviedo.

ON BIBLE BURNING.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—You have, from time to time, inserted in your paper inquiries from me concerning doubts that had arisen in my mind relative to some doctrines that are taught in the Catholic Church, and some articles of faith proposed to those who are educated in her creed.

Will you now permit me to address to you a few observations on a subject on which I never had, and never could have, the slightest doubt. I allude to the manner in which the word of God is spoken of and treated by some members of the Catholic Church. I think of it with heart-felt sorrow, and confess it with the keenest shame; and I feel confident that my feelings are shared by many Catholics who have never, as yet, felt other reason to doubt the doctrines or to blush for the deeds of their Church.

I trust the circumstance related in yesterday's *Saunders* is either utterly untrue or a gross and aggravated misrepresentation; perhaps, even if any books were burned, the Bible was not amongst them. It is so long since I heard of such an atrocity that I had persuaded myself it could never occur again.

I have compared many parts of the Douay and the authorized versions, and, so far as I have seen, there is but one word on which any rational complaint of a difference of translation could be founded. The similarity is so nearly complete, that if I were to burn an authorized, that is, a Protestant Bible, I should feel I had burned all that is revealed as necessary to salvation in the Douay or Catholic version. In recalling such portions of both versions (bearing on this subject) that I can remember without immediate reference to both, the impression on my mind is, that the first crime proposed by Satan to man was a disregard of God's word. He first insinuates, by a contemptuous exclamation, his disbelief that what Eve had heard could be really the word of God, and then boldly declares that word to be untrue. We all know that this led to a practical defiance of God's word on the part of Eve; but who amongst us can really estimate the results of that defiance—a defiance or disregard of the *spoken* word of God. The curse that followed on the destruction of God's *written* word by the impious Joakim is not less terrible than that announced to Adam. What woe, what suffering, what destruction, was not intimated in "all the evil" that God had pronounced on Joakim, on his children, his servants, and his subjects, "after that the king had burnt the roll."—Jeremias xxxvi., 29.

At first sight, these threats appear to contain all the evil that could be inflicted on those who attempt to bring discredit upon, or to destroy the Word of God; but our Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, discloses in His own words, in the New Testament, the further attempt of Satan to take the word of God out of the hearts of men, and reveals his reason for doing so—"Lest they should believe and be saved." Where he succeeds, there is no further curse for man. What reward will he give to those who aid him? Should he even bestow on them the bishop's mitre, the cardinal's hat, or the Pope's tiara, would it not be "better for them that a millstone were hanged about their necks and that they were drowned in the depths of the sea?"—I am, sir, yours, &c.,

IN EARNEST.

We fully appreciate our correspondent's sentiments, and are quite sure that the whole of the respectable Roman Catholic laity of Ireland feel nothing but shame and horror at the atrocious outrage alluded to. We entertain no doubt whatever that a number of Protestant Bibles were publicly burned in the chapel-yard at Kingstown, on the 5th of this month, though we have just learned that one of the six or seven Redemptorist Fathers who were there at the time, the *Rev. L. De Buggenoms*, has publicly disclaimed that *he* ordered or sanctioned it, and says that if it was done it was "contrary to his wishes." How far it can be proved to have been done by the directions of any particular Roman Catholic priest, parochial or otherwise, will, we presume, be, ere long, tried in a court of criminal law; and, therefore, we forbear any remarks upon that subject, further than to say that we find it rather difficult to believe that a bonfire of any kind could take place in the open day, in the immediate precincts of a large parochial chapel, without the knowledge and approbation, at least, of *some* of the ecclesiastics connected with it.

ON RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—The part of your paper which I often read with most interest, and which I have reason to believe that others read with equal satisfaction, is the correspondence. Although a Protestant myself, yet I always like to see what able and well informed Roman Catholics can say in defence of the faith of their church; and I am sure it will be generally admitted, that many of the letters which, from time to time, have appeared in your journal, from Roman Catholics, have done great credit to their ability and learning.

There is one point, however, in which I must confess I feel disappointed. All these letters have been from *laymen*, and no Roman Catholic priest has ever come forward to accept the challenge you have so often given, to enter upon an amicable and temperate discussion of the leading points of controversy between the two churches. And why should this be so? St. Peter has left the Christian church an express command on this point, which I think no one claiming the character and office of a Christian minister can safely afford to disregard. "Be ready *always* to give an answer to *every man* that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you" (1 Peter iii., 15). If all the ministers of a religion will always keep obstinately silent, they have only themselves to blame if the public at last conclude that they have not much to say for themselves.

The chief reason for my writing to you is to call your attention to the reasons which Mr. Faber, in a work lately published, gives for the silence of his brother priests, but which, I must confess, appears to me far from satisfactory. It is plain, from his remarks, that he was galled and nettled at hearing the charge put forward in some quarter or other, when he must have been conscious that there was so much reason and truth in it; and his efforts at defence seem to leave the matter pretty much where it stood before. He says (*vide* the "Blessed Sacrament", page 371):—

"From the Council of Trent downwards, the church has had a succession of theologians of the most profound thought and the most brilliant genius, yet we hardly ever see in modern Anglican controversy the slightest vestige of the writers having read Vasquez, Suarez, De Lugo, Viva, and the like, but, on the contrary, plain evidence that they have not."

Surely, if Roman Catholic priests have all the arguments ready made to their hand, by "theologians of the most profound thought and the most brilliant genius," it would be, to say the least, but common charity to their erring Protestant brethren to bring forth a few crumbs of spiritual food from their abundant stores, especially when the editor of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN promises to be at the cost of paper and print.

But, sir, I think Mr. Faber does plain injustice when he speaks of modern Anglican writers not affording the slightest vestige of having read the works of Vasquez, Suarez, and the like. Sure I am that I have, more than once, seen their names in the foot-notes of your pages; and, I will make bold to say, that you have given more copious citations and references to their great champion, Cardinal Bellarmine, than are to be found in many Romish works of theology. Mr. Faber's excuse, therefore, will not apply to you. And, indeed, when I turned over to the next page of his book, I saw pretty plainly that he felt his own argument insufficient. When men cannot give a good defence for themselves, they generally lose their temper; and so Mr. Faber, for want of satisfactory reasons, begins to scold and call names. Here is what follows:—

"And yet, these very men (the Anglican divines before mentioned) are writing books which professedly treat of theological subjects, and when we ignore them, or leave their *precious lucubrations* unanswered, they think it passing strange and *peevish* in us that we can find anything more important or more interesting in life than to answer their objections, which have been answered completely a hundred years ago."

The italics, I may remark, are mine, not Mr. Faber's; but the whole tone of the passage indicates an uneasy consciousness that, after all, these "*precious lucubrations*," as he terms them, *ought* to be answered, and that priests are apt to grow fretful and "*peevish*" when they are asked to reply to them, and are obliged, from some cause or other, to maintain an obstinate silence.

I hope, sir, that out of the two thousand priests in Ireland, some one will at length be found willing to commence a discussion in your pages, of one or more of the chief points of controversy. I am confident that his arguments would be read with deep interest by all your numerous readers, both Roman Catholic and Protestant; and the character for impartiality which you have so justly earned would, I am sure, induce you to take every care that both sides should have fair play.—I am, sir, yours, &c., A MUNSTER MAN.

We feel obliged to our correspondent for directing our attention to Mr. Faber's remarks. We agree with him in thinking that there must be some *other* reasons for the silence of the Roman Catholic priests than those which Mr. Faber puts forward. For ourselves, we can only repeat, what we have a dozen times said already, that our pages are freely open to any Roman Catholic correspondent, whether priest or layman, who, in a candid and temperate spirit, desires to lay his views before the public. Our only object is the promotion of truth.

THE EFFECT OF PRAYER.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

YOUR HONOUR,—On the last Sunday in October, I was passing a church after dusk in the evening, and thinks I, I'll just turn in, and sure nobody will know it. Well, your honour, I was well pleased; for sure I heard the Protestants singing the hymn of the Blessed Virgin herself, where she said that all generations should call her blessed; and thinks I, the Protestants can't be so bad at all—sure it can't be their religion to hate the Blessed Virgin when they sing that. But it isn't about that I am writing at all, your honour; it's about the beautifullest prayer that ever I heard with my mortal ears; and there was a man kneeling down beside me that had a prayer-book, and he let me read it, and I just took and got it by heart; and it's night and morning I'll pray that prayer, for sure it's just the very prayer I want; and I'll tell it to your honour, for sure I have it by heart, and maybe there is other poor men would be as glad of it as me. Well, your honour, here it is—

"Grant, we beseech thee, merciful Lord, to thy faithful people pardon and peace, that they may be cleansed from all their sins, and serve thee with a quiet mind, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen."

Well, now, if God would just give me pardon and peace, and just cleanse me from all my sins, instead of sending me running after stations, and penances, and indulgences, and still hunting for pardon and peace and never finding it, and trying to leave a little money behind me, to pay for masses to get me peace when I was dead; if he would just get me quit of all that, and give me pardon and peace *now*, and cleanse me of my sins at once, isn't it I that would love to serve Him with a quiet mind, after what He done for me. So, your honour, I never quit praying the beautiful prayer I got. Well, your honour, as I was walking away, who would I fall in with only the clergyman himself, and he bid me good evening kindly, and asked me was I in church; and I told him I heard the beautifullest prayer at all; and many's the time, says I, I wished for a prayer like that. And did you never hear it before? says he. Never heard it before, your reverence, says I. And were you never at mass, on this Sunday of the year? says he. Always regular, your reverence, says I. Then you always heard that same prayer, says he. Please your reverence, says I, as I'm a living man, I never heard that prayer afore, since pussy was a cat. Well, your honour, up comes a man and calls him away, in a hurry to see a man that was dying, so I couldn't learn any more out of him, and I didn't know what to think at all. Well, the next day, I meets a neighbour that was just come out of Dublin, and he has with him a beautiful blue book, that was just written by Dr. Dixon; that's our primate, your honour. Well, I hadn't much time for the book, only I just read the first chapter, that told how he was at Rome itself, and how he saw the Pope, and give him a copy of a book he wrote about the Scripture, and how his Holiness said the book couldn't be any good to him at all, 'cause why, it was written in English. Well, your honour, with that it just come across me all at once, may be the Church of Rome has the beautiful prayer in the Latin, and may be that's just the reason why I never knew one word about it, good nor bad, when I don't know one word of the Latin, no more nor the Pope does of English; and then how would the prayer do any good to me, no more nor the book would to him? Well, I just thought I would ask your honour; for sure isn't it the quare thing, if the churches is so different, that they would both have the one prayer, and no difference at all only the Latin and English. But sure, your honour, isn't that all the differ in the world to a poor man like me?

Your honour's servant to command,
PAT MURRAY, of Westmeath.

Pat Murray is quite right; both churches have the beautiful prayer, and a great many other prayers too. These prayers have come down from a very early time of the church, before there were any differences among Christians. The only difference about these prayers is this—the Church of England and Ireland wishes people to understand the prayers of the early church, and the Church of Rome does not; and we agree with Pat Murray, that in the matter of prayer, this makes all the difference in the world.

HOLY WELLS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

MR. EDITOR,—In your number of the LAYMAN for July last, you had the goodness to publish a letter of mine relative to the sending of the *blessed* stones of Barigowen well to Sebastopol, in order to save the life of one of our brave soldiers engaged in that protracted siege; and as you said that you would wish to hear more about those "holy wells," I now take the liberty of furnishing you with an account of what's done at a few of them, and which I have visited often since my boyhood, in company with a great many others, who went from curiosity to see so many people praying at them.

Within three miles of the flourishing town of Tralee, and two of the ancient borough of Ardfert, is to be found "Tobar na mult," i.e. Weather's Well, to which thousands of both sexes resort, of all ages, from every corner of Ireland. The blind and lame, halt and maim, the deaf and the dumb, flock there to be cured of their diseases; and such as cannot go themselves are sure to have their "rounds" given by proxy. At the north-east end of the field stands "the holy well," or "great well," as some call it; it is surrounded with a high wall, and is kept carefully locked, open only for the pilgrims, who pay a-pence for washing in its sanctified waters, and is entered by a descent of stone steps. Those who cannot pay for the "great well" wash in the stream which flows from it, gratis; but they are informed that no benefit is to be derived without paying for it, and bathing in the large well, where there is a trout, the Saint of the well, which is seen once in every seven years by some favoured ware-shipper. You cannot imagine the eagerness with which the water is drank; although, while it is being handed round, more than one diseased person is washing in it in a state of nudity. Whilst this strife is going on at the well for the water, a number of other pilgrims are going round an old tree and a little cabin at the western end of the well, repeating their paters and aves, which they tell over by the decades on their beads: each as had no beads counted their ave marias, beginning at the little finger of the left hand, and ending at the little finger on the right: thus they hasten on to a mound of earth, on which is built a low altar of stone, before which they prostrate themselves, and walk round on their bare knees three times, stopping before the western side of the altar each time, and kissing three pictures of stone, which are fastened with mortar into the altar, nine times, and rubbing them nine times more with the right hand, which is to be rubbed as many more times to the part diseased. Those pictures are said to be "constantly sweating." When the devotions of the day are over, the jaded pilgrims hasten to partake of the stimulating beverage, freely offered for sale in several tents, where the lively strains of the bagpipe and fiddle drive away the remembrance of this troublesome penance, and soon afterwards they join in the merry dance.

Barigowen well, which is within a few miles of Askeaton, is also a very great resort, and is accounted famous for working miracles. I saw a priest's sister and nephew at this well, who travelled to it a distance of forty-six miles; and as I wish to have no secrets from you, the priest's name is Mr. ———, curate of ———.* The field surrounding this, on St. John's eve, was literally crowded with people, some of them *very well dressed*; and as you approach the well, from the road, the low monotonous chant of the paters and aves which fall on the ear is more easily conceived than described.

Three years ago I had a conversation with a man near Belmullet, in Mayo, on the dishonour paid to God by visiting such unhallowed places. "Arrah, hold your tongue, man," said Monaghan, "and leave off wid your talk; in troth, I wish you seen the trout that's in the *blessed* well near Castlebar, and one side of him fryed; for a heretic (a Protestant) saw him one evening swimming about in the well. He ran into the blessed well, and caught the trout, and got him fryed by the cook of the Castlebar hotel for his dinner; but when the cook went to turn him, he gave one jump up the chimley, and never stopped till he came back to the well again; for the trout was the blessed Saint of the well." "Did you see the trout in the well after being fryed, Mr. Monaghan?" said I. "In troth, then, I did, and seen the side that was fryed as brown as a berry from the pan, and, more by token, the other side was as bright as a [illegible]. Och, but where's the use in talking; you won't believe what a man seen with his eyes!"

Hoping, sir, that you will excuse the length of this letter, I remain, your humble servant till death,
HUMPHREY LEARY.

FARMING OPERATIONS FOR NOVEMBER.

Wheat sowing should be proceeded with as fast as the root crops are removed. Split the drills with the double mould board plough, to raise the manure, and harrow well to spread it equally over the surface, the seed may then be sown broadcast, and ploughed in; or, if the soil be sufficiently loose and friable, it may be put in by the drilling machine; if the latter is not in use on the farm, the land may be ribbed up with the common plough, at any distance from twelve to eighteen inches apart, the seed sown broadcast, and covered with short tined harrows, first in the direction of the ribs or drills, and then across them.

Winter Vetches may be sown in the early part of the month. If the land be dry, sow in beds six to eight feet wide, covered from the furrows. A liberal dressing of manure should be applied. Four stones of vetches will seed the Irish acre; and if three or four stone of rye, or winter dun oats be mixed with them, they will protect and support the vetches.

Potatoes.—In dry, favourable weather, plant some early potatoes. Apply a liberal quantity of stable manure. Plant in lazy beds, three and a half to four feet wide, and give at least six inches of cover, which will effectually protect them from frost and [illegible] wet.

* The names are given, but to avoid giving offence to individuals we omit them.

New and Recent Works,

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN:

THE PICTORIAL HISTORY OF ENGLAND. Being a History of the People, as well as a History of the Kingdom. Illustrated with many Hundred Wood Engravings. Vols. 1 and 2. Super Royal, 8vo. 12s. each.

HISTORY OF THE REIGN OF PHILIP THE SECOND, KING OF SPAIN. By William H. Prescott. 2 vols. 28s.

MEMOIR OF THE REV. SYDNEY SMITH. By his Daughter—Lady Holland. With a selection from his Letters. Edited by Mrs. Austin. 2 vols. 8vo. 28s.

THE LIFE AND WORKS OF GOETHE: with Sketches of his Age and Contemporaries. By G. H. Lewes. 2 vols. 30s.

EIGHT YEARS' WANDERING IN CEYLON. By S. W. Baker, Esq. 15s.

MISCELLANIES: Prose and Verse. By W. M. Thackeray. Vol. 1. 6s.

PASSAGES SELECTED FROM THE WRITINGS OF THOMAS CARLYLE: with a Biographical Memoir. By Thomas Ballantyne. 7s.

VILLETTE. By Currer Bell. Cheaper Edition. 6s.

THE LANCES OF LYNWOOD. By the Author of "Heartsease." 6s.

HEARTSEASE: or, The Brother's Wife. By the Author of the "Heir of Redclyffe." Fourth Edition. 6s.

LARDNER'S HAND-BOOK OF NATURAL PHILOSOPHY.—Mechanics. 5s.

LARDNER'S POPULAR ASTRONOMY, with One Hundred and Nineteen Illustrations. 2s. 6d.

LARDNER'S COMMON THINGS EXPLAINED. With One Hundred and Fourteen Illustrations. 2s. 6d.

OUTLINES OF THE HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE. For the use of the Junior Classes in College, and the Higher Classes in Schools. By George L. Craik. 3s. 6d.

EMBASSIES AND FOREIGN COURTS. A History of Diplomacy. By "The Roving Englishman." 5s.

LITTLE MILLIE, AND HER FOUR PLACES. By Miss Brewster, author of "Work." 3s. 6d. Cheaper edition. 1s.

THE FAMILY COMMENTARY; or, the New Testament, with Notes adapted to the use of Family Worship, and made into short readings. By the Rev. T. Raven. 7s. 6d.

THE WAY OF SALVATION. Illustrated in a Series of Discourses. By the Rev. Albert Barnes. 5s.

THE MAN, CHRIST JESUS. By the Rev. Robert Craig. 6s.

BRITISH ELOQUENCE—SACRED ORATORY: Sermons by Eminent Living Divines of the Church of England. (Contributed by the Authors.) With an Introductory charge on Preaching. By the Venerable Archdeacon Sinclair. 3s. 6d.

PASTORAL ADDRESSES. By Joshua Fawcett, A.M. 2s. 6d.

LYRA GERMANICA: Hymns for the Sundays and chief Festivals of the Christian year. From the German. By Catherine Winkworth. 5s.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM IN SPAIN. By an Old Resident. 4s.

CHRISTIANITY IN TURKEY: a Narrative of the Protestant Reformation in the Armenian Church. By the Rev. H. G. O. Dwight. 5s.

THE GIFT AND THE GUAGE; OR, GOD'S GIFT, AND MAN'S RESPONSIBILITY. By Robert Cowe, A.M. 5s.

DUNELLAN MANSE: or Times and Trials of the Disruption. By Sarah Elizabeth B. Patterson. 4s. 6d.

DOCTOR ANTONIO: a Tale. By the Author of "Lorenzo Benoni." 7s. 6d.

SUPPORT UNDER SUFFERING; or, Letters to a Young Relative. With a short Sketch of her Life. By the Rev. Thomas Furlong. 1s.

AN EXAMINATION OF THE REV. R. J. WILBERFORCE'S CHARGE AGAINST THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, CONTAINED IN HIS "INQUIRY INTO THE PRINCIPLES OF CHURCH AUTHORITY." 2s.

ABRIDGEMENT OF THE SUNDAY SERVICES: a Simple Plan for effecting it. By the Rev. Ashton, Oxendon. 6d.

In the Press, and will be ready about Christmas.

Vols. III. and IV.,

Macaulay's History of England,

FROM THE ACCESSION OF JAMES THE SECOND.

Subscribers' names received by WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY. An Address delivered in Trinity College, Dublin, at the opening of the Eighteenth Session of the College Theological Society. Nov. 6, 1855. By the Auditor, Horatio Langrishe Nicholson, B. A. 6d.

"THE END OF THE WORLD." Correspondence between the Rev. Dr. Cumming and H. Bland, Comedian. 1d.

RYLE'S NEW TRACTS:—
STRIVE! being Thoughts on Luke XIII. 23. 2d.
LOT'S WIFE: being Thoughts on Luke XVII. 32. 2d.
CORN-SEED. A packet of 100 Tract Hand-bills. 8d.

NEW POCKET BOOKS FOR THE YEAR 1856.

SOLD BY WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY.

SUTTABY'S POCKET BOOKS. Various. Roan tuck. 1s. to 2s. 6d.
FULCHER'S AND PAWSEY'S POCKET BOOKS. Roan tuck. 2s. 6d.
POOLE'S AND MARSHALL'S GENTLEMEN'S POCKET BOOKS. Roan tuck. 2s. 6d.
THE CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER. Roan tuck. 2s. 6d.
SCRIPTURE POCKET BOOK ALMANAC. Roan tuck. 2s. In cover, 1s. 4d.
THE CHRISTIAN ALMANAC. 6d. Gilt Edge, 8d.
TRACT SOCIETY PENNY ALMANAC. 1d.
TRACT SOCIETY POCKET BOOK ALMANAC. Interleaved and Gilt Edges. 2d.
TRACT SOCIETY SHEET ALMANAC. 1d.
CHURCHMAN'S SHEET ALMANAC. 2d. The same as a Book, 1d. and 2d.

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Just Published, in Demy 8vo., 5s., cloth lettered,

Apostolical Succession Overthrown, and Evangelical Succession Established,

By a Comparison of the Qualifications, Functions, and Endowments respectively assigned by Jesus Christ to the Apostles, and to their successors in the Ministry of the New Covenant.

BY A CLERGYMAN OF THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH.

"The author proves that the Apostles, as such, had no successors; that the commission given to them, as ministers of the Gospel, was totally distinct from the commission under which they exercised apostolic authority; and that the radical error of Rome and Romanizers consists in claiming not only the untransferable prerogatives of the Apostles, but even greater powers than the apostles ever attempted to exercise. The argument is elaborised with much care, and the book deserves an attentive perusal."—*Achill Missionary Herald.*

"We recommend 'Apostolical Succession Overthrown, and Evangelical Succession Established' as a judicious treatise on this important question."—*Record.*

London: James Nisbet and Co., Berner's-street. Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co.; and all Booksellers.

Preparing for Publication, in 12mo.,

The World in which I Live, and my Place in it,

BY E. S. A.

Edited by the Rev. JOHN H. BROOME.

The object of this book is to present a succinct history, from the creation to the present time, in connection with Scripture, and with the progress of the Church of Christ.

It is hoped that this slight sketch of the History of the World and of the Church may help the young reader to discern God's moral government and man's duty.

The study of History invariably inculcates principles.

The Romish Church, alive to this fact, is most careful that the Histories put into the hands of her children shall be those of her own writers. But the Protestant Church has hitherto possessed no Epitome of History sufficiently simple to meet the requirements of her youthful students.

The plan of the book embraces a general view of the History of all known nations, having regard to their chronological connection with each other, with copious and comprehensive indexes; and by thus commencing the study of history from the beginning, a good foundation will be laid for the fuller study of any particular History.

The Book will be Published by Subscription, price 5s. 6d., and the Names of intending Subscribers are requested to be sent to WILLIAM CURRY and Co., Dublin, or to Wertheim and Macintosh, London, as early as possible.

Just Published, in 8vo, 420 pp., with Map, price 3s. 6d., Cloth,

Old Testament Prophecies

Relative to the Return and Restoration of the Twelve Tribes to the Land of Palestine, together with the setting up of Messiah's Kingdom on Mount Zion, during a period of One Thousand Prophetic years.

BY JAMES ALLIN.

London: Wertheim and Macintosh, Paternoster-row. Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Just published, price 6d., by post 7d.,

Practical Observations on the Treatment of Scarlatina,

With Remarks on Preservation from Infection.

BY HENRY TWEEDY, M.D.

Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street. London: Wertheim and Macintosh, Paternoster-row.

New Serial Work by Mr. Charles Dickens.

Uniform with "DOMBEY AND SON," "DAVID COPPERFIELD," "BLEAK HOUSE," &c., &c.

On the 30th of November will be published, to be completed in Twenty Monthly Parts, One Shilling each, the First Monthly part of a New Work of Fiction called

Little Dorrit,

BY CHARLES DICKENS.

With Illustrations by HABLOT K. BROWNE.

The names of Subscribers received by WILLIAM CURRY and Company, Dublin.

Just Published,

Post 8vo, cloth elegant, price 7s. 6d.,

PILGRIMAGE FROM THE ALPS TO THE TIBER;

OR, THE INFLUENCE OF ROMANISM ON TRADE, JUSTICE, AND KNOWLEDGE.

By the Rev. J. A. WYLIE, LL.D., Author of "Modern Judea;" "Scenes from the Bible," &c.

"This is a remarkable book. Its descriptions are literally fascinating. The great scenery of Italy has been painted by tourists since the days of antiquity, but the sketches of Dr. Wylie possess a freshness and an interest peculiar to the author; and it is no exaggeration to say that many of these sketches, in relation even to familiar objects, are surpassed by no similar descriptions in the English language. . . . Dr. Wylie's book administers to the Roman Papacy a deadlier blow by far than any merely theological disquisition could have inflicted, and for this paramount reason, that its social workings are here exhibited in the shape of undeniable, terrible facts."

Edinburgh: Shepherd and Elliot. Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

In the Press, and will shortly be published, in One Volume 8vo.,

WITH NUMEROUS ILLUSTRATIONS AND ENGRAVINGS,

TE IKA A MAUI;

OR, NEW ZEALAND AND ITS INHABITANTS.

Illustrating the Origin, Manners, Customs, Mythology, Religion, Rites, Songs, Proverbs, Fables, Language, &c., &c., of the Natives; together with the Geology, Natural History, Productions, and Climate of the Country; its several Provinces, and their advantages as regards Emigration, &c., &c.; the state of the Country with reference to Christianity; sketches of the lives of the principal Chiefs, and their present position: with copious Indexes.

A Map of the Country, and Coloured Plates of Birds, Vegetables, Butterflies, Shells, &c., derived from personal observation.

BY THE REV. RICHARD TAYLOR, M.A., F.G.S. Many Years a Missionary in New Zealand.

London: Wertheim and Mackintosh, 24, Paternoster-row. Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher WILLIAM CURRY 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.
NOVEMBER, 1855.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Θlóiṙ vo Ohia añ ṙna háṙvuiḃ, agur ṙíoṁċáin aiṙ an vṫalaiṁ veaġċoil vo na ṁáoiniḃ.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED THE MIDDLE OF EVERY MONTH, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. IV.—No. 48. DECEMBER 15, 1855. { Annual Subscription, 2s. 6d.; Unstamped Copies, 2d. each. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS:

	Page.
Savonarola	133
The History of Purgatory, (continued from page 99)	135
Pastoral Letter of the Most Rev. Dr. Cullen on the Feast of the Immaculate Conception—1855	136
Has a Roman Catholic a Right to Read the Bible without Asking the Priest's Leave?	138
Trial of the Rev. Vladimir Petcherine on a Charge of Bible Burning	139
The Attorney-General's Speech	140
Mr. Thomas O'Hagan, Q.C. do.	140
Offer to the Roman Catholic Priests	141
CORRESPONDENCE:	
On Bible Burning—by X. A.	141
Pious Birds	141
Some More Words on Purgatory—by Dan Carthy	142
On Cloricaunes and Fairies	143
Farming Operations for December	143

SAVONAROLA.

We are informed by travellers in Persia, that the following strange and remarkable phenomenon is occasionally beheld in those regions. Some time before day-break, the eastern horizon presents all the usual symptoms of the near approach of dawn. Faint streaks of light are seen in that part of the sky, which gradually increase in brilliancy, and the inexperienced traveller imagines that night is at an end, and that the day, whose arrival he has, perhaps, long wished for, is at length about to break. Soon, however, the light fades away, and is succeeded by a darkness like that of midnight, which seems the more intense from its contrast with the momentary splendour which preceded it. To this phenomenon is given the name of the false dawn.

It has often seemed to us that the foregoing circumstance furnishes no unsuitable emblem of the fate of those isolated reformers, of whom we occasionally read in history, who have lived *before their time*. When the world has long groaned under some system of tyranny and corruption, men of loftier spirits, full of warning and zeal, from time to time make their appearance, and raise their voice against the evils of the age. Such men, after diffusing a momentary light among their own contemporaries, have sometimes been suddenly removed by death at an early age, leaving behind them but little trace of their existence; and the minds of those who read the chequered narrative of their lives are impressed with a feeling of despondency and regret, that, owing to untoward circumstances, such great talents and energies have been lost to the world, which, under happier auspices, might have raised their possessors to a high place among the illustrious benefactors of mankind.

The remarkable individual whose name we have placed at the head of this article—Girolamo Savonarola—appears, from all that we know of his history, to have been a man such as we have just described. Had he lived about twenty years later than he did, we see much reason to believe that his ardent zeal for the cause of truth and holiness would have led him to co-operate with the great German reformer, Martin Luther, in the important work of the Reformation. But in the days of Savonarola, the minds of men, at least in Italy, were not yet ripe for such a change; and all the efforts which he made to produce an impression upon his countrymen, and to stir them up for a vigorous effort for Church reform, ended in disappointment, and brought Savonarola himself to a cruel and untimely end. Such men, however, do not live in vain. We feel convinced that no person whose own heart is animated by a sincere love of truth, can fail to leave *some* impression behind him. If he labours earnestly and diligently for the spiritual good of others, his exertions, sooner or later, will lead to salutary results, although not always, perhaps, in the way which we should expect. The motives of Savonarola have, indeed, been called in question, and his sincerity impugned, by various writers, both in ancient and modern times. We are far from asserting that he was a faultless character, or that his conduct was in all respects worthy of imitation, but we fully believe him to have been sincere in his labours for the good of his countrymen; and, as the events of his chequered career were so strange and tragical, we trust the following brief account of them will not prove unacceptable to our readers.

Girolamo Savonarola was born at Ferrara, in the year 1452, and was admitted a friar of the Dominican order, at Bologna, when he was of the age of twenty-two. His Superiors at first employed him to teach metaphysics and natural philosophy; but at length he grew weary of this avocation, and applied himself entirely to the reading of pious books, and especially the Holy Scriptures. In the year 1489, he removed to Florence, where he soon acquired great fame as a powerful and convincing preacher. Florence at that time was governed by Lorenzo de' Medici, the father of Pope Leo X.; and the dissolute morals of both court and people, and their utter disregard for religion, must have awakened no ordinary feelings in the breast of a zealous and ardent man like Savonarola.

It would be impossible, consistently with our usual limits, to give our readers any idea of the lamentable state of morals and religion in Italy during the latter half of the fifteenth century. We will content ourselves with citing the unimpeachable testimony of Cardinal Bellarmine. "Some years before the rise of the Lutheran and Calvinistic heresy, according to the testimony of those who were then alive, there was an almost entire abandonment of equity in the ecclesiastical judgments; in morals, no discipline; in sacred literature, no erudition; in divine things, no reverence; *religion was almost extinct.*"* However the advocates of the Papal cause may endeavour to excuse and palliate this fearful state of things, the fact itself remains on record, that vice and irreligion rose to an unprecedented height at a time when the Pope and clergy of the Church of Rome had uncontrolled sway; and that, so far from checking those things, they themselves set an example of every kind of enormity. In a recent number of the able Roman Catholic periodical, the "Dublin Review," the writer of an eloquent article on the life of Savonarola makes the following remarkable statement on this subject:—

"The time in which he (Savonarola) lived, was such as to task the strongest intellect and the firmest will; well might he strive to look forward to the future for light, when the present closed so dark around. Well might he turn to read and expound with ardent longing the prophecies which told of the Church's never-failing life and perpetual renovation, when he saw so many of her *ministers* around him, *sunk in vice, and simony enthroned on the chair of Peter.*"†

The two Pontiffs who occupied the Papal chair in the time of Savonarola, and one of whom is alluded to in the last paragraph of the foregoing extract, were Sixtus IV. and Alexander VI. In former numbers of this journal, we have made some remarks on the characters of these two men;‡ and the facts of their history must have been indeed notorious, to have wrung such a sentence of condemnation from the pen of a Roman Catholic writer as that which we have just quoted. Sixtus IV., has been charged with unnatural crimes; and it is recorded that he devised a new mode of replenishing the sacred treasury—namely, the establishment of brothels in Rome! It would be superfluous to say a word about Pope Alexander VI. A Romish historian was obliged to combine three of the most atrocious monsters to be found in the annals of pagan Rome, in order to obtain any thing like a parallel to the enormities of this man. Nero, Caligula, and Heliogabalus must be united, in order to shadow forth the character of—if it may be said without impiety—this vicar of Christ. His next successor but one, Julius II., scarcely, if at all, fell short of his wickedness. Perjury, poisoning, assassination, drunkenness, unnatural crime, were laid to his charge. He was, moreover, a ferocious and merciless soldier. It was a saying of those times, that the earth drank in more blood in a single day, shed through his means, than he himself and his fellow-revellers had drunk wine during his whole pontificate. Such were the characters of the men who occupied the papal chair, and were the infallible depositories of the Roman Catholic faith, at the close of the fifteenth century!

It is with much reluctance that we have cited some of the foregoing particulars; but when Roman Catholic controversialists attack the conduct of the *Reformers*, and impugn the sincerity of their motives, we are compelled to open the pages of *their own* historians, and to point out to them there the scenes of iniquity perpetrated at the very time of the Reformation, by the supreme rulers of their Church, which claims to be *exclusively* holy and infallible. Without some knowledge of the facts to which we have alluded, it would be impossible for the ordinary reader to form any notion of the fearful torrent of vice and immorality, which Savonarola, alone and almost unaided, undertook to stem. Nothing, as it appears to us, but the greatest singleness of purpose, and the most undaunted courage, could have induced him to commence so arduous and almost hopeless a task.

The success of Savonarola's efforts at reform in Florence however, soon became visible to all men. The mass of the people were aroused from their sloth and sensuality, and flocked in crowds to the Church of St. Mark, which soon became unable to contain the multitudes that were drawn together by the fame of the preacher. The writers of that time have left on record statements with regard to the wonderful results of his eloquence, which might almost seem exaggerated, if their testimony was not so clear and unanimous. "He thundered," says one writer, "against the dissolute morals of the age with such marvellous eloquence and such great success that he beat the minds of his auditors whithersoever he desired, and infused a zeal for piety and religion even into the most abandoned breasts. All Italy seemed to hang upon the mouth of the speaker."* The times of the ancient prophets, according to another writer, seemed to have returned, and Jonah's preaching to the people of Nineveh, recorded in holy Scripture, was the only fitting counterpart of that of the Dominican monk. "The stories that are told of the Christian eloquence of Savonarola," saith he, "might seem strange and incredible if they were not borne out by his writings. . . . He not only recalled the people of Florence to a more sober and modest course of life, but even stirred up among them a spirit of mourning like that of the Ninevites, from which circumstance the name of "mourners" was given to them."† The name *Piagnoni*, or "Weepers," which is here alluded to, and which was commonly given to the followers of Savonarola, is the best proof of the influence wielded by this remarkable man over the susceptible minds of his countrymen, and of the success of his efforts for their improvement. So high was his character for piety and zeal, that Lorenzo de' Medici, although personally hostile to Savonarola, received him when he was on his death-bed, in 1492, and asked for his benediction.

It soon became manifest to the earnest mind of Savonarola that the greatest enemies and obstacles to a reform in morals and religion were the bishops and clergy of the Church of Rome. He saw plainly, that if any permanent improvement among the people was to be effected, the whole system of that Church must be thoroughly reformed. John Picus Mirandola, the friend and biographer of Savonarola, and who was intimately acquainted with his opinions, draws the following melancholy picture of the state of the Romish Church at that time, and assigns this as the chief cause which stirred up the Florentine reformer to take the course which he subsequently pursued. "The Popes were openly accused of having obtained the Papedom by craft and stratagem, perfidy and simony, so that scarcely any one could be found who doubted the truth of the assertion. It was likewise alleged that when they had obtained the Papal chair, their time was occupied with harlots and impure men, and the heaping up of gold; and, moreover, that the Cardinals and Bishops who were under them followed their example. Among them there was not even the most moderate regard paid to the worship of God or religion; nay, it was even alleged that some of them did not worship God at all, and uttered contemptuous and reproachful sayings regarding our holy faith. Many of those priests, moreover, who had adopted a religious life, and professed

* Bellarm. Opera. Concio xxviii. Tom. vi., p. 296. Colon., 1617.
† Dublin Review, Sept. 1854, p. 214.
‡ Vide CATHOLIC LAYMAN, November, 1853, p. 133; May, 1854, p. 56.

* In primis certum mores deformare coepit, tanta eloquentia, tam facili persuasione usus, ut quotcunque animos quo vellet pervertendo flectebat; . . . adeo ut tota Italia a divinis ore pendere videretur. Jo. Fr. Picus Mirandola in vita ejus apud Cave, vol. ii, p. 169. Basil. 1741.
† Vincentius Bérnulus, Apol. Ord. Prad. Tom. 3, p. 3, p. 330, 331.

the usual rules, by degrees glided into hypocrisy."* What an awful account of the state of a Church calling itself Christian, and claiming to be the sole and exclusive depository of faith and morals! Popes, bishops, cardinals, priests, monks, stained with simony, avarice, sensuality, hypocrisy, infidelity! Well may we ask, where were the people to look for religious truth, when such was the fearful condition of those who claimed to be their divinely appointed guides to heaven!

The Romish advocates assert, however, that all these evils did not invalidate or destroy the infallibility to which their Church lays claim, and that this was admitted even by the Florentine reformer himself. "It is here well to observe (writes the Dublin reviewer) that Savonarola never disputed the authority of the Church in morals as well as in faith, and of the Pope as its head." We will not now stop to inquire what authority a man like Pope Alexander VI., whose life was stained by every enormity, might be supposed to have either in *morals* or *faith*. We will simply ask one question. How, or by whom, was the authority of the Church to be exercised, or its voice made known, in the days of Savonarola? If Pope, bishops, cardinals, and all were alike corrupt, as the foregoing extracts would lead us to believe, it is repugnant alike to common sense and to Scripture to suppose that any wholesome precept or sound doctrine could proceed from the lips of such teachers. Was *faith* to be learned from prelates who sneered and scoffed at Christianity? Were sound *morals* to be taught by bishops and cardinals whose chosen companions were harlots and abandoned men?

We fully admit that Savonarola himself may have been loth to abandon the idea of the infallibility of the Church, which he had imbibed from his earliest years. It is a hard task for any man to uproot from his mind those inward convictions which have grown with his growth, and which form the basis of his belief. We know how slowly and gradually the truth dawned on Luther's mind; and it is no wonder that the case should have been the same with Savonarola. We will make some remarks on his religious opinions before we conclude. At present we will content ourselves with observing, that the man who could write, as he did, to the princes of Christendom in 1496, urging them "to save the Church which was tottering to its fall; *for that from the sole of her foot to the crown of her head there was no soundness in her, and that the very abomination of desolation stood in the Holy place*"†—the man who could write *thus*, could not, we think, have formed a very exalted notion of the authority of the Church either in faith or morals.

But the career of Savonarola was now drawing to a close. The monks and clergy, irritated by his frequent denunciations of their vices and hypocrisy, brought their complaints to Pope Alexander VI. We quote again from the friend and biographer of the Reformer:—"The most bitter persecutors of Savonarola were the men of depraved morals, and *chiefly the prelates of the Church*, the vileness of whose lives had filled the world with the stench of their vices. He inveighed against their lust and avarice, their luxury and simoniacal guilt, preaching both publicly and privately that men should fly from Babylon (that is to say, Rome), because some malignant demon had made it the cess-pool of every kind of wickedness."‡

The Pope, by no means displeased, perhaps, at the opportunity of silencing a man whose zeal and virtues put his own scandalous conduct to the blush, first summoned Savonarola before him, who, not unnaturally, refused to put himself in the power of a man so notoriously unscrupulous as Alexander VI. After some delay, the Pontiff issued a letter to the Superior of the Dominican Order, directing him to enquire into the guilt of Savonarola, and meanwhile suspending him from preaching. Savonarola obeyed for a time; but at length, on Feb. 11, 1498, he resumed his accustomed place in the pulpit of the Church of Sta Maria del Fiore. The grounds which he alleged for this decisive step were these:—In the first place, that the Pope having been elected by simony, his authority was invalid; secondly, that the Pope's sentence being manifestly founded on misrepresentation might be considered as null; thirdly (in a sermon on the text, "We must obey God rather than man,"—Acts iv. 29), he urged that "on all occasions where it can be obviously seen that the commands of superiors are contrary to the commandments of God, and especially the precepts of charity, none should obey in such a case." A man who could urge such reasons as these was plainly an advocate for the liberty of private judgment; and those of our readers who are familiar with Luther's early history will be able to trace many points of resemblance between his conduct, shortly before his final rupture with the Papal See, and that of Savonarola.

The result of such open rebellion against the authority of the Pope was obvious. A bull of excommunication was thundered forth from the Vatican. Florence became divided into two great parties—the *Piagnoni*, or "weepers," who were the friends of Savonarola, and the *Arrabiati*, who were his enemies. The Franciscan monks, who were jealous of the fame and popularity of the Dominican orator, sided with the latter, and in them Alexander VI. found his most able and active auxiliaries. Strange, indeed, it is, that when such facts are recorded in the page of history, the advocates of Rome can yet pride themselves upon the *unity* of their Church, and claim this attribute as one of her distinctive marks!

The Dominican party published seven theses, or propositions, the principal of which were—1. That the Church of God wants a reformation. 3: That it will be reformed. 7. The excommunication of Savonarola is null, and that those who pay no regard to it do not sin.* A Minorite friar of the Franciscan order, Francis of Apulia, declaimed against these theses in his sermons, and offered to maintain that they were heretical. He was seconded by his brethren, as Savonarola was by his; so that there arose a great dissension between the two orders. The Dominicans declared that they would prove the truth of their theses before an unsuspected judge, and they chose *fire* as such a judge. And then there ensued a contest which is, perhaps, unparalleled in the history of the world.

The Franciscans having accepted the ordeal of fire, Dominico de Pescia, one of the most ardent followers of Savonarola, signed a writing, by which he engaged to enter the fire with the Minorite friar who had preached against the theses, and declared that he hoped to come out from the midst of the flames safe and sound. The Minorite friar declared that he was ready to dispute with Savonarola, and that *another* Minorite friar would enter the fire with Dominico de Pescia! "I am certain of perishing," said he; "but Christian charity teaches me not to withhold my life, if, on sacrificing it, I might precipitate into hell an heresiarch, who has already drawn into it so many souls."† It was thought strange that Savonarola did not accept the challenge of the Franciscan; but he justified himself by saying, that it was not worth his while to enter the fire with a single Franciscan; but that if his enemies, especially those who resided at Rome, would expose themselves to the fire, he would accompany them into it.

Enthusiasm spread beyond the two convents; many priests and seculars, and even women and children, more especially on the side of Savonarola, earnestly requested to be allowed to enter the fire. On the morning of the first Sunday in April, almost all the hearers of Savonarola, in the Church of St. Mark, shouted aloud with great fervour, "Here I am, sir; I will enter into the fire for your glory."‡ The magistrates of Florence consented that two monks only, Dominico de Pescia, and Francis of Apulia, should devote themselves for their respective orders, and directed the pile to be prepared.

On the 7th of April, 1498, a scaffold, dreadful to look at, was erected in the public square of Florence; two piles of large pieces of wood, mixed with faggots and brooms, which would quickly take fire, extended each eighty feet long. Every window was full; every roof covered with spectators; almost the whole population of the republic was collected around the place. The Dominicans arrived at their station in the portico called the Loggia de Lanzi, chanting canticles. Some persons suspected that one or the other of the friars, or perhaps both, had concealed some charm under their gowns, and they were therefore ordered to pull off their clothes and take others. The Minorite friar agreed to this, and even offered to enter into the fire quite naked. The Dominican protested that he would not enter the fire without a crucifix. This was granted him likewise, at the desire of the Minorite friar, who observed that the crucifix was of wood, and so, instead of being a preservative against the fire, it would be burnt with the Dominican. The latter then demanded a new favour, that he might be allowed to enter the fire with the holy sacrament. The Franciscans immediately declared that they would not permit the host to be carried amid flames. The dispute upon this point grew warm. Several hours passed away. The multitude, which had waited long, and began to feel hunger and thirst, lost patience; a deluge of rain suddenly fell upon the city; the piles were so wet that they could no longer be lighted; and the crowd separated with a feeling of disappointment that they had lost the miracle they had so impatiently looked for.

The enemies of Savonarola took courage. On the day but one after (April 9) his convent was besieged by the *Arrabiati*, eager to profit by the inconstancy of the multitude; he was arrested, with his two friends Dominico de Pescia and Silvestro Marruffi, and sent to prison. A criminal prosecution was commenced against them; Alexander VI. despatched judges from Rome, with orders to condemn the accused to death. We cannot afford space to dwell on the mock trial that ensued—the tortures inflicted on Savonarola *seven* different times—the falsification of the answers of the accused by the notary Ceccone, and all the other steps of this unjust process. Savonarola was too weak to support the torture; he appears to have avowed in his agony all that his enemies imputed to him; and, with his two disciples, was condemned to death. The three monks were burnt on the 23rd of May, 1498, in the same square where, six weeks before, a pile had been raised to prepare them a triumph.

Such was the tragical end of this remarkable man, at the comparatively early age of 46. In the above account of the circumstances which led to his death, we have intentionally abstained from embarrassing our narrative with allusions to the political and other charges which were brought against him. The impartial Roman Catholic historian, Natalis Alexander, has briefly, but emphatically summed up the whole case in the following words:—"Savonarola was *persecuted* by Alexander VI., and condemned by an *unjust anathema*."* We see but little reason to discredit the confession which Savonarola himself made on this subject during his imprisonment. After denying the calumnies which were alleged against him, he averred "that the predictions which he had delivered were not founded upon any divine inspiration, but were the results of his own observation, and the study of Holy Scripture; that his object was not to obtain any ecclesiastical dignity or promotion for himself, but that he earnestly desired that a council of the whole Christian world should be called, by whose authority and decrees the clergy might be reformed, and the state of the Church might be restored, as far as possible, to the purity of Apostolic times."† Such were the objects which he professed, and, we believe, sincerely professed, to have in view. No one, after reading the foregoing account of the state of the Church at that time, can question the *necessity* of the reform which he advocated. Had his efforts been crowned with success, —had the rulers of the Romish Church been gifted with the most ordinary prudence, the Reformation might have been averted, or, at least, delayed. But the Pope and his advisers were blind to the signs of the times. The very men who professed to be infallible could not or would not see that the whole Papal system was held in detestation by all who had any regard for religion. The cup of Rome's abuses was full. The profligate sale of indulgences by Leo X. was the last drop which made it overflow.

It remains to add a few words upon the peculiar religious views held by Savonarola. In many points his opinions seem to have been in accordance with what are considered the orthodox tenets of the Roman Catholic Church—for example, with regard to the Sacrifice of the Mass, the doctrine of seven sacraments, prayers for the dead, and some others. On the other hand, it appears certain that the study of Scripture, to which, as we have seen, he was devoted from an early age, induced him to reject many of the doctrines of Romanism, fully as important as those just enumerated; nay, perhaps *more* important, as bearing more directly on the Gospel message of salvation for perishing sinners. He decried human traditions; he owned no salvation but by free, gratuitous justification through faith in Christ, on which alone he relied, without admitting any other merit; he maintained the communion in both kinds; he denounced indulgences; and, as well with respect to life as doctrine, he owned that Antichrist was in the Court of Rome.‡ The evening before his execution, in the gloom of his prison-house, and in the full prospect of a cruel and ignominious death, he composed Meditations on the 31st and 50th Psalms, in the most glowing language, and full of the deepest spirituality of mind; and in these Meditations he dwells especially on the doctrine of gratuitous justification.§ It was of course to be expected that books containing such doctrines as these should be condemned by the Court of Rome, and put in the index of prohibited books. On the whole, we are much more inclined to wonder that Savonarola, alone and unsupported, with all the influence of education and early prejudice to struggle against, should have arrived at sound Scriptural views on the important points we have just indicated, than to feel any surprise that he should still have clung to the Romish doctrines which we have noticed above. And it will ever remain a disgrace to the Church of Rome, that a man so highly and deservedly admired for his exalted learning, severe morals, probity, and incredible eloquence, should have been brought to a cruel and untimely end, in order to gratify the malice of a rival monkish order, and the hostility of a wicked and unscrupulous Pope.

---

* Pontifices summo astu et dolo, necnon simoniaca perfidia supremum ancupari sacerdotium dicebantur palam, sic ut nec quisquam id fere auroquea coacervando vacare, fama circumferebat, atque ad eorum exemplum qui auberant Cardinales et Episcopi sese instituere. Nullus in eis vel modicus Dei cultus, ils eadem vivendi ratio, nullaque religio. Quin etiam ferebatur, eorum aliquos Deum non colere, et in fidei nostræ contemtum et contumeliam pleraque spargere. Sed et plures eorum, qui religiosæ vitæ addicti, et traditas regulas profitebantur, ad hypocrisin dilabebantur. Jo. F. Picus Mirandola, Vita Savonarolæ, p. 112. London, 1681.

† Scriptis ad Christianos principes literis, zelum ipsorum ac pietatem excitare ut ecclesiæ labanti succurrerent, in qua a planta pedis usque ad verticem capitis nihil sani esset; et abominationem desolationis stantem in loco sancto.—Nat. Alex. Hist. Eccles., vol. xv., p. 355. Paris, 1744.

‡ Inter omnes vero persecutores Hieronymi hi acerrimi inventi sunt, qui moribus pessimis et potissimum Ecclesiæ præsides, quorum vita fœdissima universum orbem fœtore repleverat . . . . Illorum libidinem avaritiamque, illorum luxum simoniacasque vitas insectabatur, publice privatimque monere solitus a Babylone (Roman intelligene) fugiendum esse, quoniam . . . malignus dæmon . . . ipsam flagitiorum omnium sentinam cloacamque effecisset.—J. F. Picus Mirandola *ut supra*, p. 118.

* Excerpta ex Diario Burchardi. P. 46. Hanov., 1696.

† "Bench'io creda ardere, ma per salute dell 'anime son molto contento che io ardi."—Burchard p. 48, ut supra.

‡ "Gridando ciascuno, ecco io, ecco io, andarò in questo fuoco per gloria tua, Signore."—Burchard, p. 5 .

* "Ab Alexandro VI. vexatus, et injusto anathemate confixus." Nat. Alex. Hist. Tom. xv., p. 356. Paris, 1744

† "Se illud summopere expetivisse, ut totius Christiani nominis concilium convocaretur, cujus auctoritate ac decretis clerus reformaretur, et ecclesiæ status ad Apostolicorum temporum puritatem, quam maxime fieri posset, revocaretur."—Nat. Alex. Hist. *ut supra*, p. 356.

‡ Traditiones humanas, quantum potest, evertit. In gratuita justificatione per fidem in Christo spem omnem suam collocat Passioni Christi affixus hæret. Unum Christi meritum agnoscit; Communionem sub utraque specie tuetur; in indulgentias detonat; et porro seu vitam seu doctrinam intuearis, anti-Christum in Curia Romana regnantem quasi indigitat."—Plessis du Mornay, Mysterium Iniquitatis, p. 602, Salmurii, 1611.

§ Inter ipsos carceris horrores, et imminentis supplicii angustias meditationes edidit in Psalmos xxxi. et l., vivis verbis, animatis sententiis, et spiritus fervore flagrantissimis.—Nat. Alex. Hist. *ut supra*.

We conclude in the words of the eloquent Padre Marchese—"But though his enemies destroyed his body, they could not destroy his memory, which has been honourably recorded by every writer who does not shrink from stating truth. For more than two centuries, on the anniversary of his death, the ground that drank his blood was covered with garlands; and this fact attests the veneration in which Savonarola was held, and proved that his precepts did not perish from the memory of the Florentines."*

HISTORY OF PURGATORY.

(Continued from page 98.)

The existence of a purgatorial state in which departed souls were long and fearfully tormented, was urged upon the people's belief more earnestly and perseveringly than almost any other dogma of the church during the middle ages. The reason of this is obvious: not only did this doctrine increase the reverence with which the priests were regarded, on account of the vast influence which they were supposed to possess in that region, but still more on account of the great pecuniary emolument which it afforded them. From the time of Gregory I., at least, it was constantly believed that the torments of purgatory could be eased and abridged by the suffrages of the living; and chiefly by prayers, alms, and masses. The prayers were always performed by the clergy; the alms denoted money contributed to the church, and none but priests could perform mass. Thus, to inculcate the belief and dread of the flames of purgatory was the most direct way to *fill the coffers of the Church*, and most vigorously was the work effected. Century after century sermons were preached, books were written, visions were related, miracles invented, and every effort made by interested men to inspire mankind with the most alarming terrors respecting this fictitious place of woe. Nor can we wonder, that in a dark and superstitious age, the picture drawn of the torments of purgatory should inspire the people with overwhelming apprehensions. "To be nailed to the ground foot and hand; to be led by their torments to eat the ground; to be cast into cauldrons of burning metal, some up to the loins, others up to the breast," was surely enough to alarm the stoutest heart. All fear of hell was supplanted by the dread of purgatory, and the great concern of a sinner, under the influence of Roman teaching, was not to flee from the wrath to come, but to escape from the purgatorial fire.

The natural effect of all this was to drive men to those means which, as they were taught, were infallibly connected with the more speedy release or entire freedom from the tormenting flames. In the words of an old writer—

"The new doctrine and invention of purgatory, bred by superstition and nursed by covetousness, as it was managed, became a most forcible engine continually to drain the people's money: For, when men were made to believe that after death their souls should enter into a region of fire, there to suffer long and bitter torments, to be purged and fitted for the region of bliss, but yet to be eased there, and the sooner released, according to the measure and number of the masses, offices, and prayers, which should be made on their behalf here, while they lay broiling in that fearful state; people were put upon it to make the best provision they could in their lifetime, or at least at their deaths, that such helps and means should be used on their behalf as they might reasonably reckon upon a short and tolerable continuance there. . . To this purpose, the founding and endowing of monasteries, abbeys, and nunneries, by the best and richer sort; and the colleges, free chapels, and chantries, by the middle sort of people, according to their respective abilities, and the apprehensions they had of this future state, all pointed at the good of the founder's soul after death, and the souls of such others as he appointed.

"But yet, not trusting to the uncertain charity of others, most persons strained to the utmost, and many most excessively, their fortunes considered, to leave some provision behind for that purpose, and most commonly by their last wills and testaments, which were accounted sacred; and thereby, or by acts executed in their lifetime, it was not rare for many men, though they had many children to provide for, or many debts to pay, to postpone all relations and considerations to this concern of the soul; and to appoint, and to take order for *masses satisfactory, anniversaries, obits, requiems, dirges, placebos, trentals, lamps, lights*, and other *offices*, to be performed daily, weekly, monthly, or yearly, as far as the sums destined would afford, for the ease and comfort of the testator's soul."†

These were not the only means of deliverance from the purgatorial flame. Indulgences were rendered available to *souls in purgatory*. It is only since the year 1300—the commencement of the Romish jubilees—that these Papal impostures extended their influence even to the dead. Ecclesiastical historians attest the rapid progress of this superstition. In less than a century it spread everywhere, and at length the monks did not hesitate to say that they saw the souls leave purgatory the moment that the people purchased from them the indulgences for the dead.‡

Alexander VI., in the Constitution for the Jubilee of 1500, it is well known, offered to all the penitent faithful who were willing to give alms for the repair of St. Peter's, a plenary indulgence, by virtue of which they could deliver from the fire of purgatory the souls of their parents, their friends, or other faithful Christians, on whose behalf they had contributed money. The words of the bull itself are given in Raynald.§ Since the time of Alexander VI., the following Popes have extended indulgences to souls in purgatory in their jubilee bulls—Clement VII., Julius III., and Gregory XIII.

Without speaking of plenary indulgences and those for the article of death, which have the necessary effect of conducting the soul immediately to paradise, which gains them; it is well known that there are an innumerable number of indulgences for the dead, both in the city of Rome, and the rest of the Roman Catholic world. Besides, the popes have granted them to many confraternities of regulars and seculars. They participate in all the prerogatives of the indulgences attached to the stations of Rome, where souls are delivered from purgatory. The Bull of *Crusado* places the Spaniards and Portuguese in a position to deliver an infinite number. It is even proved from a calculation made, that as, according to the bull, there are nine days in the year in which every one of the faithful, from the age of seven years and upwards, is able to draw a soul out of purgatory; the Spaniards alone might have sufficed, and more than that, to have delivered from Purgatory the souls of all the Roman Catholics who have died in the faith and in charity, from the very establishment of Christianity.† The Bull of Adrian VI. in favour of the Portuguese obtained the same advantage for them.

To these kinds of indulgences for the dead, must be added also those which are attached to privileged altars.‡ There are few churches which have not privileged altars attached to them, either in perpetuity, or, what is more common, for seven years, and to which the popes grant that the priest, who on certain days shall celebrate there a mass for the dead, shall deliver a soul from purgatorial § flames; so that as the Jesuit Santarel has agreed, it would be easy in one day to deliver all the souls in purgatory.‖

The frivolous conditions attached to certain indulgences of the dead deserve one notice. According to Thiers, the Carmelites pretend to have received from John XXII. a bull which they call the Sabbatine Bull, which promises to whosoever shall belong to this order, and wear the habit called the scapular, a plenary indulgence, with the promise of being at once delivered from purgatory. The Blessed Virgin is then introduced, saying—"I, the mother of grace, will descend the first Saturday after the death of all those who shall wear my habit, and who for the love of me have entered into my order, or my confraternity, or my society, and who have lived worthily in this life; I will deliver them from the pains of purgatory, and I will gloriously conduct them to the holy mountain of eternal life."¶ Other privileges, referring to souls in purgatory, belonging to the girdle of St. Augustine and of St. Monica, are mentioned by the same writer.**

A still more extraordinary means of delivering souls from purgatorial fires belongs, or did belong, to another order of monks in the Church of Rome. According to a distinguished Romish writer—"The friars minors had once, they have it still in the present day, a very easy means of delivering souls from purgatory; for they declare that this may be accomplished as many times as a person enters and passes out of the church of our Lady of Portiuncula, from the first vespers of the first day of August until the second vespers of the following day; so that for another entry and departure out of the church one does not deliver more than one." This is stated by Cardinal Bonaventure de Vitalinis in his "Commentary on the Clementine Constitutions." It was confirmed by Honorius III., and by various bulls and briefs of the successors of Honorius. The actual words of the writers of this order are given by Thiers."

The popes have never dared to say that they had any knowledge of the particular state of every soul after this life; they never ventured to decide positively, "these go to heaven, these depart to hell, these others remain in purgatory." How could they know? and in this ignorance what certainty can their indulgences for the dead possess? Granting the case that God has condemned a soul to one hundred years of purification in this middle state, is it not natural to believe that it will remain there one hundred years? Who can deliver it? The Pope! Is he able then to exalt himself above God?†† To absolve those whom God has condemned? To mitigate or remove the punishment denounced on sinners by the decree of his justice??

It now remains to give some particulars respecting the modern history of purgatory, and the superstitions connected with that unscriptural dogma. It is unnecessary to say that the Council of Trent—the modern standard of Romanism—openly declared its truth, and anathematized any one who entertained any doubt on the subject. The following is the decree of the council, passed at its twenty-fifth session:—"Since the Catholic Church, instructed by scripture and the ancient tradition of the fathers, hath taught in sacred councils, and most recently in this general council, that there is a purgatory, and that the souls detained there are helped by the suffrages of the faithful, especially by the sacrifice of the altar, the holy council enjoins the bishops to take diligent care that the sound doctrine on the subject of purgatory, taught by the holy fathers and sacred councils, be believed by the faithful, be held, taught, and everywhere preached." After prohibiting difficult and subtle questions, and also such as are of doubtful character, the decree proceeds as follows:—"Let those things which tend to mere curiosity or superstition, or savour of filthy lucre, be prohibited as scandalous and offensive to Christians. Let the bishops take care that the suffrages of the living faithful—viz., masses, prayers, alms, and other works of piety, which the faithful have been accustomed to perform for departed believers, be piously and religiously rendered according to the institutions of the church, and whatever services are due to the dead, let them not be performed slightly, but diligently and carefully."

The advice here given, with reference to the manifold evils arising from the doctrine, might just as well have been spared. It is utterly irrational and absurd to suppose that an order of men entrusted with an engine of such tremendous power, could abstain from using it for selfish purposes. And such, indeed, has proved the case. The monstrous abuses springing out of this dogma, and the practices connected therewith, have increased rather than diminished since the Council of Trent.

The fathers of that Synod have exercised a very discreet prudence in the amount of information which they have thought proper to give respecting purgatory. They simply state the fact that there is a purgatory; and that the souls detained there are helped by the suffrages of the faithful. We are compelled, therefore, to go to the doctors of the church in order to ascertain, more particularly, the notions prevalent among Romanists in modern times on this important subject.

One of the most able and learned champions of the Romish Church was Cardinal Bellarmine. His writings have been repeatedly quoted by English Roman Catholics, as authority for explaining what the doctrines of that Church are; and from them we give the following extracts, as illustrating the sentiments entertained respecting purgatory, subsequently to the sitting of the Tridentine Synod. At the commencement of his "Treatise on Purgatory," the Cardinal defines it to be "a certain place where, as in a prison, those souls are purified after this life, which were not purified here, in order that they may be able to enter into heaven." "It is appointed," he says, "for those who die with *venial sins*, and again, for those with the temporary punishment of sin undischarged, though the sins themselves have been remitted." He describes the pains of purgatory as most horrible (*atrocissimæ*), exceeding, beyond all comparison, any sufferings upon earth, according to the uniform doctrine of the fathers. He says, also, that "the belief of purgatory is an article of faith, so that they who do not believe it shall never arrive there, but must be tormented in the eternal fire of hell."§

"Since many persons," says Bellarmine, "will not believe what they have never seen, it has pleased God sometimes to raise his servants from the dead, and to send them to announce to the living what they have really beheld."

---

* *Dublin Review*, *ut supra*, p. 216.
† *Rom. Horsebech.* Lond. 1760.
‡ *Ruchat. Hist. de la Ref. de la Suisse*, i., pp. 38, 39.

* Ad an. 1449, n. 25, 27.
† *Les Taxes de la Chanc. Rom.* Edit. de France, 1744, pp. 70, 74.
‡ PRIVILEGIO ALTARIS. *Inscription on a marble slab in the Chapel of St. Mary and St. Francis, in the Church of St. Lorenzo, in Lucina.*
Gregory the XIII., Pope. As a perpetual memorial of the thing. Bearing the stead, though unworthy, and following the example of our Saviour, our Lord Jesus Christ, consubstantial and co-eternal with the Father; who for the redemption of the human race, deigned to descend from the highest throne of heaven to the abyss of this world, and to assume our flesh from the Virgin's womb; we study to afford to the souls of Christ's faithful dead existing in purgatory—who, in charity united to God, have departed this life, and have deserved to be assisted by the suffrages of the pious—opportune assistance from the treasures of the church; so that, as far as it shall please divine goodness, they may be more able to reach their heavenly country. Confiding, therefore, in the divine mercy, and led to it by prayers on the part of our beloved son, Luigi Franco de Formanis, Master of the ceremonies of our chapel, humbly offered to us for this purpose by the tenor of these presents, we grant in perpetuity that as often as at the altar under the protection of the blessed Mary of grace, and of St. Francis, situated in the Church of St. Lawrence, in Lucina of the city, any priest, secular or regular, shall, of his own or of another's will, celebrate a mass for the liberation of one soul existing in purgatory, the same soul shall, from the treasure of the church, the merits of the same our Lord Jesus Christ, and all his saints, obtain the same indulgences, and remission of sins by the acceptance of divine clemency, and the said mass shall operate for the liberation of the same for which it shall be celebrated, as it would have obtained, and as it would have operated, if the aforesaid priests should for this cause celebrate a mass for the dead, at the altar situated in the church of St. Gregory of the city, deputed for that purpose. Ours concerning the not conceding indulgences, for the like purpose (*ad instar*) and other apostolic constitutions, and ordinances, and whatsoever other things to the contrary notwithstanding. Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, under the ring of the Fisherman, the 8th day of April, 1578. In the sixth year of our Pontificate.—*Cæ Glorierius.*
On one side of the altar of the church of *St. Maria della Pace*, we find the following—"Every mass celebrated at this altar liberates a soul from purgatory."
Over the entrance to the catacombs in the church of St. Lorenzo fuori le mura—"This is that tomb most celebrated in the whole world of the cemetery of St. Cyriac Martyr, where if any one shall perform the sacred rite for the dead, he will evoke their souls from the pains of purgatory through the merits of the divine Lawrence." [A great number of inscriptions of a similar nature may be seen in Percy's *Romanism, &c.*, pp. 1—3, and 77.]
‖ Thiers lii., *c.* xciii. p. 313.
¶ *De Jubil.*, c. 3, dub 12, apud Thiers, ibidem
** Thiers ubi sup. cxvi., p. 503. See this Bull in the Speculum Carmelitanum, Antwerp, 1680, p. 343 and 349.
†† Thiers, p. 256.

* Thiers iii., cap. xvii., p. 330.
†† Thom. chap. ii., 4.
‡ John IV., of Portugal, died loaded with relics and plenary indulgences, and yet in spite of these indulgences, he had scarcely breathed his last, when prayers were at once commenced for the repose of his soul before privileged altars. And there, 30,000 masses were celebrated by his orders in the poorest convents of the kingdom, to which 100,000 masses (neither more nor less) to be said, with an equal, for the same object; and, as though these 100,000 masses were not sufficient, they hastened to establish, in the monastery where the king was buried, four masses to be said each day, for ever, for the peace of his soul, and its deliverance from purgatory
§ *De Pury.*, cxv.

The Cardinal here refers to certain revelations, exhibited by him in another work, two or three of which we shall here give as strikingly illustrative of the actual belief of the Church of Rome:—

"A pious father of a family, in Northumberland, died after a long illness, in the early part of one night, but to the great terror of those who watched by his body, came to life again at the dawn of the following day. All but his faithful and affectionate wife fled at the sight of him; and to her he communicated, in the most soothing terms, the peculiar circumstances of his case; that he had indeed been dead, but was permitted to live again upon earth, though by no means in the same manner as before. In short, he sold all his property, divided the produce equally between his wife, his children, and the poor, and then retired to the monastery of Melrose. He there lived in such a state of unexampled mortification, as made it quite evident, even if he had not said a word on the subject, that he had seen things, whatever was the nature of them, which no one else had been permitted to behold."

But he disclosed it all.

"'One,' said he, 'whose aspect was as light, and his garment glistening, conducted me to a valley of great depth and width, but of immeasurable length; one side of which was dreadful beyond expression, for its burning heat, and the other for its no less intolerable cold. Both were filled with the souls of men, which seemed to be tossed, as by the fury of a tempest, from one side to the other; for being quite unable to endure the heat on the right hand, the miserable wretches kept throwing themselves to the opposite side, into the equal torment of cold, and thence back into the raging flames. This, thought I, must be hell, but my guide answered to my thought, that it was not so —"This valley," said he, "is the place of torment for the souls of those who, after delaying to confess and expiate their sins, have at length, in the article of death, had recourse to penance, and so have died. These at the day of judgment will all be admitted into the kingdom of heaven, by reason of their confession and penance, late as it was. But, meanwhile, many of them may be arrested, and liberated before that day, by the prayers, alms, and fastings of the living, particularly by the sacrifice of the mass.'"

In the seventeenth century, St. Patrick's purgatory was made the subject of a religious drama by the Spanish poet Calderon. The piece begins with the entrance of Egenias, King of Ireland, clothed with skin, and very furious, attended by his two daughters. St. Patrick, and a recent convert to Christianity, by name Ludovicus Ennius, are wrecked upon the Irish coast, and appear before the impious monarch. St. Patrick relates to the king his life, and preaches the truths of the Gospel, but with no success. Subsequently the saint, horrified at the blasphemies of the king, prays for a divine manifestation to convert his countrymen, when two angels make their appearance, and reveal to him the celebrated cavern. The mouth of this fearful opening is exhibited on the stage, and, according to the stage directions, is to be the most horrible that can be contrived, and within it an aperture on the stage. The impious king is induced to enter the cave; but instead of passing into purgatory, he falls through the apertnre into the pit of hell. He sinks in with much noise—flames rise from below, and great cries are heard. The awful death of their sovereign leads to the conversion of his people. In the course of the drama, Ludovicus Ennius enters the cave, but with better fortune. He passes through purgatory, and on his return relates to his auditors the wonders of that fearful region. His account is nothing more than an abridgement of the old legend, which we have already given, of the descent of Sir Owaine. Ludovicus finishes his relation by giving a long list of authorities—many of them of modern date—in proof of the truth of the legend of the purgatory of St. Patrick.*

At the commencement of the eighteenth century, appeared in France a work intended for popular use, entitled "A History of the Life and of the Purgatory of St. Patrick, Archbishop and Primate of Ireland, with numerous prayers; translated into French by R. P. François Bouillon, of the Order of St. Francis, and Bachelor in Theology." This book was widely circulated in France, it appears, for more than half a century, for the first censorial approbation bears the date of 1701, whilst the other is dated 1742. It contains a life of St. Patrick, composed from all the most absurd legends in existence respecting him. The writer then proceeds to give a description of the state of souls after death. Afterwards we have the history and description of the purgatory of St. Patrick, and the various ceremonies connected with it, and the various visions which have been seen there, in the truth of all of which he expresses his fullest belief. Finally, the latter part of the book is occupied with "The veritable relation of the History of Louis Ennius, chiefly taken from the drama of Calderon;" to which reference has already been made.

About the middle of the eighteenth century we find Pope Benedict XIV. preaching and publishing a sermon at Rome, expressly in favour of this ridiculous legend of St. Patrick.

It is well observed by the author, to whom we are indebted for our knowledge of this work, that it serves—

"To show the kind of religious information which was spread among the middle and lower classes of society in France by the (Roman) Catholics, so late as the last century. Two doctors in theology, of the faculty of Paris, sign their names to an approbation dated 1742, in which they declare that they 'have read through this mass of absurdity and falsehood, and that they have found nothing in it contrary to faith or morals!' It was, indeed, not more than two or three years after the date first mentioned, that Pope Benedict XIV. preached and published at Rome a sermon in favour of St. Patrick's purgatory. By such doctrines and representations, the Popish system kept its hold on the minds of the simple and ignorant people, and the same policy which led the (Roman) Catholic priesthood to continue them in this condition, and to perpetuate their influence, made them oppose and persecute men of science, such as Galileo, who were labouring to enlighten the world, and whose experiments and discoveries naturally tended to dispel the cloud of superstitious legends."*

It is not our intention here to refer to the effect of this doctrine in dishonouring the Saviour, and rendering his salvation an incomplete work. We have already dwelt upon this. Our object now is simply to point out the demoralizing influence which purgatory and its practices have exercised upon members of the Romish Church, for upwards of a thousand years. The pernicious consequences of the doctrine arise chiefly from the two following causes:—In the first place, it removes all fear of hell from the mind of Roman Catholics, and substitutes for it the dread of a temporary state of suffering. Secondly, it associates the performance of prayers, the celebration of masses, &c., with deliverance from this place of temporary woe. The believer in this unscriptural dogma constantly lives under the influence of a spiritual opiate.

It is the acknowledged doctrine of the Romish Church, that no Roman Catholic can go to hell, except he dies in mortal sin—unconfessed and unabsolved. But if he applies to the priest, he is bound to grant him absolution on the mere profession of regret for such a sin, and thus the eternal punishment is instantly converted into the temporary suffering of purgatory. The consequence is, that the fear of hell is virtually banished in the Church of Rome: we do not mean merely from the exemplary and moral, but also from the abandoned and the profligate. The only possible case under which any Romanist would be doomed to "*the outer darkness*," the place of eternal woe, according to the Church, is, by failing through some accident to obtain a confessor in his last hours. The probabilities of this chance are so exceedingly small, that it is rarely thought of. There is, too, a saint worshipped in the Church of Rome—St. Barbara—whose special office it is to deliver her votaries from this possible calamity. Hence, as a general—we may perhaps say universal—thing, the people consider themselves as free from any danger of incurring the sentence of eternal death, as if the doctrine were entirely blotted out of the Word of God.

In the place of this eternal punishment, the Roman Catholic looks forward to the sufferings of purgatory, which, although considered by some doctors to be equal in *intensity* to those of hell, possess this essential difference—that they are *limited in their duration*. And here the fearful evils of this doctrine at once appear. It is the eternity of future punishment which gives it all its weight with those who are under the dominion of worldly or sensual passions. Take away the endless duration of "the wrath to come," and men will brave even the frowns of an angry judge. By substituting purgatory, then, for the punishment of hell, papal doctors removed the only effectual check to wickedness which worldly men experience. The passions of the heart are violent and ungovernable—the temptations of the present life are strong and overpowering—the pleasure which is offered to us by our lusts is a *present*, a *sensible*, and a *certain* good. On the other hand, the punishment which men are taught by the Bible to dread, as the consequences of gratifying their sinful desires, is a *future*, a *vague*, and to them an *uncertain* evil; yet it contains, amidst all this, one element, which compensates for all these disadvantages. IT IS ETERNAL. It is justly remarked by a modern writer—"A profligate will face unshrinkingly the prospect of distant suffering, and bear, even in the thought of hell, everything but its eternity and its despair; and Popery, to meet his weakness, converts hell into purgatory." What, then, should we say to a system of religion which deliberately and advisedly withdraws this element from the future woe, and leaves man thus exposed to the temptations arising from the world, the flesh, and the devil? Surely the exercise of the largest charity cannot justify us in acquitting Romanism of thus removing from society one of its chief barriers against human depravity, increasing, to an extent which we can hardly estimate too greatly, the amount of human wickedness and crime!

But this is not all. As we have observed, there is a second consideration which must not be omitted. Not satisfied with practically substituting for hell, purgatory, and thus converting the eternal punishment of the second death into a mere temporary state of suffering, Rome provides her votaries with such an endless variety of deliverances from this temporary state, that, even *that* is reduced oftentimes to a nonentity, especially in the case of the rich. There are *masses*, and *obits*, and *requiems*, and *dirges*. There are confraternities, and indulgences, and privileged altars, and blessed beads, and such a countless host of other Papal impostures, all having for their object the important task of fetching out souls from the terrible fire, that it would weary the reader's patience only to recite their names.

We are able to confirm the conclusions to which we have thus been led by the testimony of one of the most intelligent and able witnesses at the bar of the House of Lords, during the agitation of the Roman Catholic Relief Bill. The Rev. John Burnet, then a dissenting minister at Cork, declared as follows:—

"No Roman Catholic of the lower orders has any dread of a final perdition. I have spoken with them frequently on this subject, and never found one of them that supposed he could go to hell. If they die in mortal sin, their doctrine is, that they must go to perdition; if, however, they apply to the priest for absolution, he must give it; and in the case of absolution, which is administered on their professing a regret for their sins, they go only to purgatory, and they depend on these books of orders for their release from it, and hence the punishments of futurity in their estimation are only temporary punishments, and this conviction has a very injurious effect upon the views and conduct of the people." *

Here the conclusions of reason and the experience of actual life perfectly harmonize. We know not, then, how it is possible to escape the lamentable fact, that one of the most essential and important doctrines of the Romish faith is fraught with such evil results, that wherever it prevails, it must necessarily produce immorality and crime. The effect of the doctrine of a state of purgatory, from which the suffrages of the faithful could deliver them, upon men of the world, was to take away that which constitutes the great check to depravity—the dread of everlasting woe, and thus the sinful passions were left to riot in unrestricted freedom.

DOCTOR CULLEN'S PASTORAL.

TWELVE months have just elapsed since Pope Pius IX. announced to the world that a new glory had been added to the crown of the Virgin Mary, and "her honour increased" by a dogmatic decree, in which he declared that from the first instant of her conception she was by a special grace and singular privilege, preserved from all stain of original sin, and that it had been so revealed by God himself.†

Our readers will, no doubt, also remember that in the same letter apostolic Pope Pius asserted that the Church had *always held the same doctrine*, and that all the illustrious monuments of a venerable antiquity, and the clear, unanimous opinions of the most eminent Fathers and Doctors of the Church, testified that it had done so.

We have now before us a pastoral letter addressed to the (Roman) Catholic clergy and laity of the diocese of Dublin, by the Most Rev. Dr. Cullen, on the Feast of the Immaculate Conception, in which after exulting in this great achievement, by which "the last wreath of glory has been added to the crown that adorns the Virgin's brow," he reminds his readers of "the raptures of joy with which the decision of the Sovereign Pontiff was received," when, "in the centre of Christendom, it was greeted with the peals of a thousand joyful bells and the thunders of artillery, and an illumination of the whole city." "The immortal Pontiff," says Dr. Cullen, "having examined the teaching and tradition of our forefathers in the faith, and considered the *wishes and pious desires* of all faithful Christians, issued, after mature deliberation, on the ever-memorable day of the 8th of December, 1854, his solemn and infallible definition declaring that "the doctrine has been revealed by God, and is, therefore, to be firmly and constantly believed by all the faithful, which teaches that the Blessed Virgin Mary, in the first moment of her conception, was, by a special grace of the Almighty, and by a singular privilege, through the merits of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the human race, preserved from all stain of original sin." "Rome," he adds, "has spoken, and all controversy has ceased." Dr. Cullen has, however, not thought it wise to add the next paragraph in this decree of the Pope:—"Wherefore, if any shall *dare* to *think* otherwise, let them know and understand that they are condemned by *their own judgment*—that they have suffered shipwreck of the faith, and subjected themselves to the penalties justly established, if *what they think* they should *dare* to signify by *word, writing, or any other outward means.*"

Dr. Cullen probably knew that high-sounding threats in this country would scarcely intimidate men from saying or even printing what they think, or induce them to believe that they must make "shipwreck of the faith once delivered to the saints," or feel condemned by their own judgment, if they did not at once rejoice at the new wreath of glory so tardily conferred by Pope Pius on the Blessed Virgin in the middle of the 19th century, or fail to feel "*all ground for difficulties and doubts removed*" by what "is now *proposed* to the Church under the seal and sanction of infallibility." He, therefore, resorts to other methods; and in condescension to "*the doubts and difficulties*," which he expects to remove by means somewhat more suited to the atmosphere of Great Britain than anathemas and excommunications, after promising to all the faithful who shall attend the devotions of the present *Novena* a *plenary indulgence*, he goes on, with an unusual condescension in one who fills so high an office as that of "*Delegate Apostolic*," to quote some of the "ancient Fathers" to show, he says, with what "decisiveness *antiquity professed the doctrine* of the Immaculate Conception." Nay, by what we must certainly consider an additional favour, Dr. Cullen actually condescends to add the *very editions, volumes, and pages* where his extracts are to be found, as if he really felt that the practice which the CATHOLIC LAYMAN has adopted from the very first was (as we are sure it really is) the *only one likely to satisfy* those who *dare* to think or inquire for themselves upon such subt

* Wright, as before, pi 166.

* Wright, as before, p. 169.

* Evidence before the Lords, p. 290, 16th April, 1825.

† "A Duo revelatami"

jects, notwithstanding the *penalties* threatened against them by the Holy See.

Now, this kind condescension of Dr. Cullen gives us exactly what we wanted, and regretted that we could never get at before—the proofs relied on in support of this dogma.

Our readers may remember that we reviewed, in several of our earlier numbers,* all that we could find in the ancient Fathers of the first and second centuries respecting the Blessed Virgin, and showed that not one of those primitive writers contain a single passage to justify the present pretensions or practices of the Roman Catholic Church in respect to her.

We called our readers' attention successively to the epistle ascribed (whether correctly or not) to the Apostle Barnabas, and to the works of Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp, the Shepherd of Hermas, Justin Martyr, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian, none of which give any support to those pretensions, and though nearly three years have since elapsed, no one has attempted to refer us to any writer of the first three centuries who affords countenance to any of the peculiar doctrines of Rome in respect to the Blessed Virgin.

Dr. Cullen, however, at last comes forward to enlighten the unlearned and convince the sceptical; and having the power to choose from what he calls "the invariable testimony of Christian antiquity," (an extensive field, no doubt,) we may fairly presume that he has selected, of course, the *most* convincing and *decisive* testimony in favour of the new decree.

His very words are as follow:—

"To show how unfounded are the assertions of heresy, we quote some few passages of ancient Fathers, which will serve as an illustration of the fervent devotion they bore to the Mother of God, and the *decisiveness* with which *antiquity* professed the doctrine of her Immaculate Conception."

When we had read thus far we confess we rejoiced to think that we had at last found a fair and learned opponent, who, seeing the importance of the work, had taken the trouble of examining and sifting all the illustrious and venerable remains of primitive antiquity, and was about to give the world the valuable fruits of his learned industry, and conclusively to confute all gainsayers.

We anticipated, of course, that the authorities Dr. Cullen was about to select would be taken, if not from the Fathers of the first three centuries, at least from the *undisputed* works of the *most celebrated* Fathers whose writings had gone through the ordeal of learned Roman Catholic criticism, such as St. Athanasius, St. Hilary, St. Basil, St. Gregory, St. Ambrose, St. Chrysostom, St. Augustine, all of whose works have undergone the scrutiny and learned labours of the Benedictine editors, who, from time to time have done so much for the works of these great fathers, by separating their genuine productions from the forgeries or works of inferior and later writers, which were too long palmed off on the world under the sanction of their names.†

We confess, therefore, we were not a little disappointed when we found not only that Dr. Cullen passed over, unnoticed, all the primitive fathers of the first, second and third centuries, but that even when commencing so late as the 4th century, he did not cite a single writing, even of that century, which has the stamp of the Benedictine editors, as genuine. This is, perhaps, the more remarkable, because we find that Dr. Cullen had not forgotten or overlooked the works which those learned Roman Catholics thought worthy of their erudition and vast industry, but actually had them under his mind's eye at the very moment that he preferred citing others, whose works have never undergone the same searching and enlightened, though still, we think, imperfect, examination. Perhaps we may presently be able to see why Dr. Cullen has made so remarkable a selection. But let us hear his own words:—"In the fourth century," says Dr. Cullen, "in page 11, shortly after liberty had been granted for the first time to our holy religion" (as if all the fathers of the first three centuries had written under compulsion!) and when the Church was adorned by the genius and eloquence of her Basils, her Gregorys, her Athanasiuses, and her Hilarys—when the teaching of the first general council still resounded in the ears of the faithful; St. Ephrem—one of the most distinguished luminaries of the East, and the friend of St. Basil—thus expressed his feelings in a prayer to the Holy Virgin:"—

We must ask leave to pause here for a while, and ask why Dr. Cullen has passed by St. Basil, St. Gregory, St. Athanasius, and St. Hilary, "whose genius and eloquence adorned the 4th century, in which they lived," and preferred St. Ephrem, the friend of St. Basil, in preference to St. Basil himself? We don't deny that St. Ephrem was a distinguished man, and that he lived in the same century; but we think it does seem singular to go to a simple priest, or, perhaps, deacon, of Edessa, in Syria, for proofs of the teaching of the Church of the fourth century, when she had, at the same period, such eminent saints and bishops as St. Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria the great champion of the Catholic faith, St. Basil the Great Archbishop of Cesarea, St. Gregory Bishop of Nyssa, St. Gregory Theologus, Bishop of Nazianzum, and St. Hilary, Bishop of Poictiers, all copious and eminent writers, whose genuine works have been not only safely preserved and handed down to us, but more or less carefully distinguished from the spurious ones formerly attributed to them by the ignorance or design of after ages.*

We can perhaps account for this, as far as *St. Athanasius* and *St. Basil* are concerned, because it so happens that the only passages which, we believe, could be cited with any effect from their alleged writings (though falling far short of the new dogma) have clearly been established to be *spurious*, though such eminent controversialists as Cardinal Wiseman and Dr. Milner did not scruple to rely on them, until Protestant writers called public attention to the proofs of their spuriousness.†

We can account also for Dr. Cullen passing over St. Hilary in a still more simple way; for, we believe, it would have been absolutely impossible for Dr. Cullen to have referred to any passage from St. Hilary's works, genuine or suppositious, which would have given any colour to his assertion. St. Hilary, we are almost certain, never refers to any especial honour as paid to the Blessed Virgin, either by himself or his fellow-Christians, or considered by him to be her due. He never alludes to her as exercising any *patronage* or having any *power* or *influence* in heaven or on earth, or as having already been received into glory, much less to her "immaculate conception;" but, on the contrary, speaks of the necessity of her undergoing the final *general judgment* of God, like the rest of mankind, though she was the mother of our Lord. We put out of the case such passages as merely contrast the evils brought into the world by Eve with the blessings of which Mary was the channel, because they appear to us to prove no more than is admitted by every Protestant—viz., that the Blessed Virgin was the means of bringing our Blessed Lord into the world, and therefore the human instrument of the great mystery of his incarnation. Of the two Gregorys of Nazianzum and Nyssa we think it would be equally difficult for Dr. Cullen to have cited any passage affording any support for his present object. That the tragedy entitled "Christus Patiens," written after the manner of Euripides, which has sometimes been cited in defence of the worship of the Virgin, was not written by Gregory of Nazianzum, nor in his age, is agreed with one voice by the greatest Roman Catholic authors and historians, Tillemont, Dupin, Baillet, Baronius, Rivet, Vossius, Bellarmine, Labbe, and Ceillier.‡

As to the writings of Gregory of Nyssa (brother of Basil the Great), we believe it would be needless upon the present question to enter upon any discussion as to which of them are received as genuine and which not; for in none of the works, whether rightly or incorrectly referred to Gregory of Nyssa as the author, is any countenance given to the invocation of the Virgin Mary, much less any hint as to her possessing a peculiar privilege, which would place her high above any other saint in the calendar. With *Gregory of Nyssa* God in Christ is all in all. Such, we think, are some of the reasons which induced Dr. Cullen to talk of, but not quote any of these eminent writers, whose "genius and eloquence adorned the fourth century." It is, however, time to return to the fathers whom Dr. Cullen *does* quote as authorities to prove his assertion, that the Church from the most ancient times held the doctrine so lately promulgated by the Church of Rome.

The first writer quoted is, as we have stated, Ephrem the Syrian, of Edessa, who died somewhere about A.D. 380. His works in Syriac have been published in 3 vols. folio, and Theodoret§ and Sozomen‖ both say that he was unacquainted with Greek; but a number of works in Greek (among which are Dr. Cullen's extracts) are given as his by his Roman editor, Asseman, from whose work Dr. Cullen quotes, but which other learned and eminent writers reject altogether, or attribute to *another* Ephrem, called *the younger*, who lived about the middle of the 6th century, if not of some still later writer. Cardinal Bellarmine declares himself to be unable to pronounce whether they were genuine or not. We can scarcely conceive any authority, therefore, less satisfactory than that of the *Greek* writings attributed to St. Ephrem, which have been so much disputed among learned critics; and for ourselves, at least, we freely confess we should require somewhat stronger evidence of their genuineness than the mere assertion of Asseman, (who, in the true spirit of a partisan, seems to have adopted as genuine works of Ephrem everything which had ever at any time been attributed under his name,) unless, indeed, we were prepared to swallow the fable or miraculous legend which records that he spoke only his own language (the Syriac) till he was ordained by St. Basil, when he *suddenly spoke Greek as fluently and as accurately as his native tongue.*¶ We are happily, however, relieved in the present instance from all difficulty in deciding whether the Greek prayers cited by Dr. Cullen from Asseman's edition, and which do not exist in the Syriac at all, and were never published till Asseman produced them, for the first time, in his edition of St. Ephrem's works, published at Rome in 1732—1746, are genuine or spurious, because even Asseman himself does not positively represent them as prayers of St. Ephrem, but confines us, in fact, to pronounce that they were not his.

As this is a matter of grave moment from the prominence given to these prayers by Dr. Cullen in his pastoral, we must entreat our readers' patience while we, as briefly as possible, bring before them the grounds on which we base this assertion.

The facts are these:—The three prayers given by Dr. Cullen are taken from the third vol. of Asseman, pp. [illegible], 534, and 545, all of which purport to be taken from a Greek codex in the Vatican Library, No. 1190, p. 1137, 1147. Asseman in his prolegomena (vol. I, clxvi., No. 101) represents these prayers as being found not only in the Vatican MSS., but also in that of the Coislinian Library in Paris, though he omits to tell us (what Montfaucon† states expressly) that the first *penitential* prayer, with the opening of the second, is all that is contained in the Coislinian MSS., the rest being entirely lost. The Coislinian MS., however, is of great importance, because it gives the heading of the *penitential* prayers in full, which that in the Vatican, No. 1190, does not. It is as follows—"Penitential prayers of the *most holy* mock *Thecaras*, collected from Divine Scripture, but *for the most part* from holy Ephrem, for those who desire to contend against their own inclination towards the passions and pleasures." In the Vatican MS. the heading omits the word "penitential," and suppresses the name of Thecaras. The prayers are, however, the same which Asseman publishes in his edition of Ephrem's Greek works, vol. iii., p. 492 to 523. But when the prayers of this series are brought to a close, a short prayer is introduced (bottom of p. 523) from the "Hierologium Græcorum in mesonyctico," from another MS. in the Vatican, wholly different from that which contains the prayers of Thecaras. Then come the prayers to some of which Dr. Cullen appeals, p. 524 to p. 545, headed severally Ἐυχὴ τῆς Θεοτόκου (a prayer of the mother of God) without any reference to Ephrem or Thecaras, or any other author. Asseman, indeed, of his own mere will, has introduced in Latin (top of p. 541) the word "ejusdem"—"of the same"—in his general heading to the prayers which follow; but for this he has no more reason than a Latin editor and translator of the New Testament would have for ascribing the Acts of the Apostles to St. John, because that book followed next in the Greek manuscript. The Vatican MS. does not pretend to be a MS. of Ephrem's works, or even of his prayers; for example, between the third prayer to the Virgin, p. 1135, and the fourth prayer, p. 1137, in page 1136, intervenes a prayer to the Virgin, called a prayer of *Barsanuphius* (vol. i., p. cxxxvi., col. 2), and instead of any general heading or any allusion to Ephrem, or even to Thecaras as the author, the MS. calls each separately "a Prayer of the Mother of God," or, "a Prayer of the Most Holy Mother of God," &c.; and what is worthy of remark, Asseman himself, in his preface, vol. iii., p. iv., confesses that though he cannot bring himself, with some late writers, to think the prayers *unworthy of Ephrem*, yet in prayers of this kind *some epithets* were added by amanuenses, either from their own piety towards the Virgin, or drawn from the writings of holy men.

We believe we may safely add that these prayers have never appeared in any earlier edition of Ephrem's works than that of 1746, nor are they to be found in any other MSS. than the Cod. Vat. 1190. Even Venetus, who in his dedicatory epistle to the Pope, is [illegible], says he has brought to light *all* the writings of Ephrem, some of which had never before been published, especially from the Italian, and more particularly the [illegible] MSS. makes no allusion to any of these prayers. And Possevinus, *though he speaks of the Vatican MSS.*, does not allude to *these*. One or two somewhat similar prayers contained in the former editions of St. Ephrem, also containing similar exaggerated [illegible] in honour of the blessed Virgin, are rejected as wholly unworthy of this holy man, and inconsistent with the spirit of the age in which he lived, by Tillemont, Cave, Dupin, and Cave;‖ and we certainly cannot help being astonished at the *coolness* with which Dr. Cullen cites these prayers as *undoubted works* of Ephrem Syrus, as no better evidence than what we have above referred to.

We may, perhaps, however, put the matter in a still clearer light, by citing some short passages from the in-

---

* See CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. i., p. 116–135. Vol. ii., p. 41.

* All the works of Athanasius were splendidly published in three volumes folio by the Benedictines, Paris, 1698; those of St. Basil in three volumes, folio, Benedictines, Paris, 1721–1730, and those of St. Hilary by the Benedictines, Paris, 1693, and John Salles, Rome 1731. The first volume of the long-expected Benedictine edition of Gregory Nazianzum appeared at Paris in 1778.

† For conclusive proofs that the homily "On the Annunciation of the Mother of God," attributed to *St. Athanasius*, and the Epistle to Julian the Apostate, attributed to *St. Basil* are spurious, see CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. iii., p. 81.

‡ The only other passage we have seen quoted in favor of *prayer* to the Virgin is contained in an oration said to have been made by Gregory in laudation of Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, which is pervaded with such a tissue of inconsistencies and contradictions, biographical and historical, from beginning to end, that it is impossible to believe it to have been the composition of a bishop deeply imbued with literature in all its branches—sacred and secular. We shall probably make these spurious works of Gregory the subject of a future notice, as for the present it would too much interrupt the course of our observations on the subject in hand, none of them having been relied on by Dr. Cullen in this pastoral.

§ l. iv., c. 26. ‖ l. iii., c. 16., also Tillemont, t. viii., p. 743. See Fabricius, Bibl. Græc., vol. viii., p. 354, Hamb., 1802.

[illegible]

† Monf. Bibl. Coislinianæ. Paris, 1715, p. 498, col. 2, [illegible]

‡ Tillemont Hist. Eccl., t. viii., p. 162. Ceillier Hist. Gen. des auteurs Eccl., t. viii., p. 63; Ed. Paris, 1745. Cassander Oration Comm. de Script. Eccl., t. i., p. 846. Cave Hist. Literaria, t. i., p. 191

disputably genuine works of St. Ephrem, taken from the original Syriac, from which the true nature of his devotional language may be safely learned, subjoining the Latin translation from Asseman himself, lest it might be suspected that we had mistranslated the original Syriac:—

"O Christ, most loving parent of all, be thou to me in so many difficulties a port of safety and refuge and most sure defence."—Tom. iii, p. 432.

"O Jesus, hope of the penitent, open to me the door of thy mercies, and stretch forth thy hand, to bind up my wounds and heal my sores. Thy treasures are open to all who seek thee."—P. 448.*

Let us now, however, proceed with Dr. Cullen's quotations. His second selection is from a discourse in honour of the holy Virgin, cited from the second volume of the works of *St. Epiphanius*, edition of Petavius, Paris, 1622, page 293 et seq. Now, this discourse, or panegyric, is not only utterly inconsistent with other undoubted passages from the works of St. Epiphanius, of the 4th century, who was Bishop of Salamis, about A.D. 370, but it has been pronounced by all the learned, even Petavius the Jesuit himself (whose work Dr. Cullen cites), of much later date—though whether of the 7th or 9th century does not appear. Our space prevents us from citing the passages at length, from Ceillier, Tillemont, Cave and Oudinus, but we subjoin the exact references† and the very words of Petavius, which establish its spuriousness beyond all reasonable doubt, though we have not the additional advantage of the judgment of the Benedictines, they never having published an edition of the works of Epiphanius. Any of our readers who may wish to contrast what Epiphanius really wrote with this spurious panegyric referred to by Dr. Cullen, may easily do so by consulting THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. iii., pages 71 and 83.

With respect to Dr. Cullen's third authority, *St. Proclus*, who, he forgets to inform us, was of the 5th, not the 4th century, but whom he names as a Patriarch of Constantinople, and the successor of the holy doctor, *St. John Chrysostom*, we might, we think content ourselves by merely transcribing the passages, to show how little they are worth in such a controversy; but if any one should deem such extracts evidence that the Church of Rome, in the 5th century, believed *that the Blessed Virgin was free* from every stain of sin, *original* or *actual*, we only refer him to what *St. John Chrysostom* himself, the glory of the Greek Church (as St. Augustine was of the Latin), has recorded of *his* sentiments, which were not only that the Blessed Virgin was not free from *original* sin, but that she was not free from *actual* sin, which we have shown at large from copious extracts from the 7th vol. of St. Chrysostom's works, Benedictine ed., p. 407.—In our 2nd vol., p. 41.

Dr. Cullen's extracts, however, from St. Proclus, are verbatim as follows:—

"In his first discourse on the Blessed Virgin (Bibl. Galland, vol. ix.) he styles Mary "the spiritual paradise of the second Adam: one formed by God himself: a house which He himself had constructed: a vase made by his own hands: His dwelling place created by himself:" thus, adds Dr. Cullen, declaring the especial solicitude with which God, in creating Mary, watched over her integrity and sanctity.

"Again, in his *sixth* discourse:—" Mary is the heavenly globe of the new creation, in which the Sun of Justice never sets, repelling from her soul every darkness of sin." What words, says Dr. Cullen, could more simply and yet more emphatically convey to us the Catholic teaching, that the holy Virgin was ever illumined by the heavenly rays, and that no shadow of sin had for an instant darkened her pure soul?

"Again, in the *same* discourse, alluding to the intended separation of Joseph from the Virgin, he says—"He did not bear in mind that she could well become the temple of God, who was herself formed of pure clay; it was concealed from him how, by the pure hands of God, a second Adam had been formed from another virginal paradise."

Two out of the three of these extracts, it will be observed, are taken from the 6th discourse, which is, to say the best of it, of very doubtful authenticity. The learned Ceillier, 13th vol., p. 487, calls it "une mauvaise piece," and that it bears the name of Proclus only in one MS, adding the following description. "It is a long and tedious dialogue between Joseph and the Virgin Mary, on the subject of her pregnancy, founded solely on imagination, or some old apocryphal stories."

Let the remaining quotation from St. Proclus go for what it is worth, but any one who takes the trouble to refer to the learned Dupin's character of these discourses, in the Life of Proclus, vol. iv., p. 49, will agree with us that fifty such extracts would not weigh a feather in the scale when judging of the opinions even of the fathers of the 5th century.

Dr. Cullen cites but one other of the fathers, and that one also of the 5th century, being a passage from an oratorical eulogy on the Virgin, of St. Cyril of Alexandria, when presiding at the Council of Ephesus, which condemned Nestorius for denying her maternity, A.D. 431; but which, from beginning to end, does not contain a single phrase which proves that he considered her to have been "conceived without sin," neither the word "immaculate," nor anything equivalent to it, being to be found in the whole passage, the whole of which, however Dr. Cullen does not give, omitting, in fact, a great deal of it, including a part which clearly shows what the speaker meant by all his rhetorical laudation, which is briefly summed up in the description given of it by the learned Ceillier, tom. xiii., p. 285, when he says—"This oration" (for it was not a *prayer*, as insinuated by Dr. Cullen), "is, properly speaking, a mere eulogy on the Blessed Virgin, whom he represents as the source of all blessings, *because she brought into the world Him by whom the human race was rescued from destruction*;" which St. Cyril distinctly expresses in some of the words omitted by Dr. Cullen, viz.:—"per quam unigenitus Dei Filius iis qui in tenebris et in umbra mortis sedebant lux resplendit"—"thou by whom the only begotten Son of God shines forth as a light to those who sat in darkness and in the shadow of death."

Dr. Cullen's quotation is as follows:—

"Hail, Mary, Mother of God, venerable treasure of the universe, inextinguishable lamp, crown of virginity, sceptre of orthodoxy, temple which cannot be destroyed, ... through whom the Holy Trinity is glorified; through whom the precious cross is celebrated and adored all over the world . . . through whom churches are founded throughout the universe; through whom nations are brought to repentance, ... What mortal can adequately celebrate the glories of Mary?" He then points out, by a beautiful comparison, the exemption of the Holy Virgin from every sin:—"Who has ever heard," he says, "of an architect, after constructing an edifice for himself, to *invite* his enemy to be its first occupant and possessor?" "Quis unquam audivit architectum qui domum sibi ædificavit, ejus occupationem et possessionem primo suo inimico cessisse?" Which words, whilst showing forth Mary, formed by the All-wise Architect as a peculiar edifice in which He alone should dwell, *clearly* asserts says Dr. Cullen, that her pure soul was unsullied by the presence of sin, and *never* subject to the slavery of Satan."

In the same spirit this doctor of the church elsewhere exclaims (Opp. tom. 5, part 2, page 389 seq. edit. Paris, 1638):—"Hail, O Mother of God! through thee the ineffable and jordanic baptism of sanctification has shone forth. Hail (Deipara), Mother of God, *by whom* John and the Jordan are sanctified, and Satan is overcome. Hail thou, *by whom* the demons are put to flight, tempting Satan falls from Heaven, and the fallen creature is lifted up thither!"

We trust our readers will not consider us *reviling* the Blessed Virgin when we say, that we cannot help thinking that it would be nearly as just to assert that the Countess of Mornington won the battle of Waterloo, because she was the mother of the Duke of Wellington!

The remainder of Dr. Cullen's *proofs* are connected with our own country, and the way he deals with them does seem to us something remarkable. His first witness is *St. Patrick*. Those who are familiar with the writings of this great man must know it to be *a fact*, (and a significant one we think it is,) that neither in his Confession, nor *anywhere else in his writings*, is there even a single mention of the Virgin Mary's name; and we have shewn that in the ancient hymn of Secundinus, written in praise of St. Patrick, and which we printed in full in our 2nd volume, p. 134, while the writer speaks fully of the chief objects of the Christian faith, the three persons of the Trinity, the Angels, the Apostles, the Church, the Scriptures, Earth, Heaven, and Hell, it contains not one word of devotion to the Virgin Mary. Yet, what says Doctor Cullen: "Arriving in Ireland, and sent by St. Celestine,* a Pontiff who was a strenuous defender of the divinity of the Mother of God, and who had hurled his anathemas against the impugners of her divine maternity, *we are not to be surprised* that *St Patrick* bore with him a glowing love for Mary, and that he transmitted to his spiritual children a tender devotion to the Mother of God as *all powerful in Heaven*, as a *virgin all immaculate*, and free from every stain of original sin"! We are too old in Roman Catholic controversy to be ourselves much *surprised* at mere bold assertions, however devoid of any foundation in fact, but it is certainly somewhat *surprising* that Dr. Cullen should think his fellow-countrymen so simple as to believe his assertions, merely because *he says* we *ought not to be surprised* at them! Let Dr. Cullen cite a single line from St. Patrick's writings, (which have all been collected and published by the learned J. L. Villanceuva, Graisberry, Dublin, 1835,) that even colourably makes out his position, and we will apologise most heartily for our ignorance of the writings of the Patron Saint of Ireland, and admit that we have done grievous injustice both to St. Patrick and to Doctor Cullen's Pastoral Letter.

We pass over some poetical passages from the Paschal Poems of St. Sedulius, about "rosebuds and thorny briars" in which he contrasts Eve and Mary, after the fashion we have before mentioned when speaking of St. Hilary, and go on to Dr. Cullen's remaining Irish authorities, which, fortunately for our readers' patience, will not detain us long—St. Columbanus, and the *Leabhar Breac*. We must, however, to do justice to them, cite Dr. Cullen's exact words.

"We might here also quote another Irish writer, born about the middle of the sixth century, the great founder of monasteries, *St. Columbanus*, who, in his *Commentaries on the Psalms*, speaks in the same glowing terms of the privileges of the Virgin. But, we pass over his words to make room for another decisive document of the tradition of our Church, which is found in an ancient manuscript collection entitled *Leabhar Breac*."

As to the *glowing terms* of St. Columbanus, we think there is a very good reason why Dr. Cullen did not cite them; for we are nearly sure that it was as much out of his power to give such words as to give similar words from St. Patrick—the work in which they are said to be contained being, we believe, *long since totally lost*. We have never, at least, seen it, or been able to discover its existence; and the learned Ceillier,* in his Life of St. Columbanus, speaks of his "Commentary on the Psalms" as one of his works which are lost.

As to the Leabhar Breac, so far from its being a *decisive* document of the tradition of the Church from the remotest antiquity, it is sufficient to tell our readers what it really is—to show that it is of no value at all in a matter of this kind. We need scarcely say that, before the era of printing, it was the custom of scholars to transcribe and collect together in a volume or volumes all the manuscript works they could collect, and the Leabhar Breac Mac-Eodhagain, Anglice the "Speckled Book of MacEgan," which is preserved among the manuscripts of the Royal Irish Academy, is nothing more than a manuscript transcript of a variety of writers in the Irish language, of various ages and dates, transcribed for or by one MacEgan, in the 14th century; so that, without informing us what was the name and date of the author who composed the prayer taken from it, there is no ground whatever for knowing whether it belonged to the 6th, or the 10th, or the 14th century. If we were ready to *admit*, with Dr. Cullen, that the (Roman) Catholic Church *never* changes her doctrines, of course it would signify little whether the documents he cites were of the 19th or the 4th century; but we respectfully think that when he is purporting to *prove* that the NEW *dogma* is an ANCIENT *doctrine*, it would be *somewhat* more satisfactory to prove it by documents of the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, or even 4th century, than by those which may not be more ancient than the 14th.

There are some other topics treated of by Dr. Cullen in this pastoral letter which we should like to notice, but we must refrain from doing so for the present month at least, from want of room.

HAS A ROMAN CATHOLIC A RIGHT TO READ THE BIBLE WITHOUT ASKING THE PRIEST'S LEAVE.

A DISCUSSION BETWEEN FATHER HUGH AND BARNEY BRANNIGAN.

Hallo! Barney (says Father Hugh), is it true what I hear, that you've taken to reading the Bible, and never asked my leave?

Barney—If it's any crime to read the Bible, sure enough, your reverence has heard no lie of me; and indeed the more I read it, the better I like it; it's a fine book entirely, and a good warrant it has to be that same, for sure it's *God's Book*.

Priest—Well Barney, I always thought 'till now that you were a good Catholic, and an example for the parish, but I see you've been talking with the jumpers, and it's afraid I am that you'll be after losing your soul through their means.

Barney—God forbid, your reverence. Sure it's for the good of my soul I'm striving, for I know well that "*'twouldn't profit a man if he gained the whole world, and suffered the loss of his soul*,"† and indeed if it wasn't for the good of my soul I read the Bible, I wouldn't read it at all; for your reverence knows, as well as I do, that 'tis very bad for one's *body* to have anything to do with it, for it's sticks, and stones, and abuse we get for reading it, and if 'twas only the good of our bodies we were looking to, we'd have nothing to say to it.

Priest—It's not for reading the Bible that I'm angry with you, but for not asking leave. A good Catholic should never open a Bible without leave from his clergy.

Barney—Will your reverence show me where it's written in the Bible that I should ask any one's leave to read God's Word?

Priest—It's easy to show you that 'tis written in the book itself that "the lips of the priest shall keep knowledge, and they shall seek the law at his mouth,"‡ that is, you're to come to us when you want information about religion; we're God's trustees, and it's to us you should come for instruction.

Barney—Well, your reverence, I never thought that verse meant that the priests should lock up the Bibles and Testaments, and keep them from the people. I thought it meant that the priests should be so well ac-

---

* Opera S. Ephremi, tom. iii.; Syriace et Latine. Asseman, Roma 1740. Christe parens omnium amantissime, esto mihi tot in angustiis salutis portus et refugium, et tutela certissima.—p. 432.

Spes pœnitentium Jesu, aperi mihi ostium misericordiarum tuarum et porrige mihi manum tuam, quæ obliget vulnera mea, et ulceribus medeatur. Patet thesaurus tuus quærentibus te.—p. 448.

† Tillemont, Hist. Eccl., vol x, p. 515. Paris, 1705. Cave, Hist Lit., vol. 1, p. 186. London, 1688. Ceillier, tom. viii., p. 720. Oudinus, Com. de Scrip. Ecc., vol. i, p. 533., Leipsic, 1722, all enumerate this oration among his suppositious works. The preface to the edition of Petavius, Opera Epiphanii, tom. ii., contains this passage:—

"Iam orationes illæ, quæ Epiphanii nomine fucum jamdudum faciunt, satis cum stylo ipso, tum aliis quibusdam indiciis, alterius vel Epiphanii, vel authoris se esse declarant"—Epiphanios enim fuisse complures Cypri etiam episcopos, observabat R. P. Jacobus Sirmondus hoc est præter nostrum illum et insignem, duos. Alter Cypri Archiepiscopus fuit' cujus nomine in Synodo vi. subscripsit Theodorus, etc. Alter Archiepiscopus perinde Cypri cujus extat epistola ad Ignatium. Horum igitur alteri, vel ambobus, vel cuivis denique potius quam Epiphanio nostro Orationes istæ tribuendæ sunt."

These orations are eight in number, and extend from p. 251 to p. 303, of which the one cited by Dr. Cullen is the seventh, p. 291, &c.

We may add that Cardinal Bellarmine (de Script. Ecclesiasticis, Lugd. 1613, p. 74), in enumerating the works of Epiphanius, makes no mention at all of these orations.

* We have already proved in our life of St. Patrick, that there is not the least reason for believing that St. Patrick had anything to do with St. Celestine, or that he derived any commission whatever from the Bishop of Rome.—See CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. I, p. 25.

* Ceillier, Histoire Generale des Auteurs Sacres et Ecclesiastiques, tom. 17, p. 493. Paris, 1750.

† Mark viii. 36. ‡ Mal. ii.

quainted with the Bible, that when a poor ignorant man like myself found anything hard in it, all he had to do was, go to his priest, and bring his Bible with him, and that the priest, being knowledgeable in such things, and being well acquainted with God's Word, would be able to help him out of the difficulty, and explain what he found hard.

Priest—I wouldn't demean myself by arguing about the meaning of Scripture with the likes of you, but just look at the Protestants and see the fruits of allowing every man to read the Bible. Look at all the sects and religions they have among them. There's what the Bible has done; no wonder then that Pope Leo XII. called the Protestant Bible "*the Gospel of the Devil*," and no wonder that he exhorted all bishops and pastors "to turn away their flocks from those *poisonous pastures*;"* sure 'tis it that causes all the sects and divisions among heretics, while on the contrary, the Catholics are one and the same everywhere.

Barney—I'm thinking, your reverence, there's other reasons for Catholics being united, besides their not having the Bible; sure we can't differ from your reverence, and your reverence can't differ from the bishop, and the bishop can't differ from the cardinals, and the cardinals can't differ from the pope, and that's the reason there's a *kind* of unity amongst us. The thruth is, we'd be *afraid* to differ from your reverence, for if we did, 'tis abuse, and beating, and stoning we'd get. Sure we wouldn't get a day's work through the country, and we couldn't show our nose at a fair or a market, without a cry being raised after us, as if we we're robbers or murderers, and that's the reason there's a kind of unity among us; but in troth, your reverence, I'd rather have a little difference between us, like there is among the Protestants, than a kind of unity that depends upon the horsewhip and the curse. If the priests put *them* aside, and if every man could do as he pleased, I'm thinking there wouldn't be much unity amongst us, any more than there is in America, where I hear the Catholics are beginning to think for themselves, and read the Bible too, without leave or license from priest or Pope.

Priest—I see, Barney, that it's all over with you: a Protestant couldn't argue better; I see that you're fairly corrupted.

Barney—Your reverence, I deny that the Bible ever corrupted any man, and I couldn't stand by and hear it said that God's holy Word was the curse of mankind, and the cause of all heresy, without saying a word in its defence; and indeed I'm sorry to hear a priest crying down the holy Scriptures.

Priest—I'm not crying them down. I'm only saying that no man has a right to read them without leave from the Church.

Barney—And please your reverence if some tyrant was to say that you had no right to see the light of the sun, or drink the water of the well, or breathe the air of heaven, would you give in to him?

Priest—Of course I wouldn't, because those things are necessary to my life and health, and God only, who created them for my use, has a right to deprive me of them.

Barney—Just so, your reverence; and the Scriptures are as necessary to the life and health of the soul; they are light, as David tells us, and I'm sure that I've a right to see them. They are the streams of living water, and I have a right to drink them; they are the breath of the Holy Spirit, and who has a right to forbid my breathing them?

Priest—No one said that you shouldn't, only you should come to the Church for leave.

Barney—Why then, your reverence, shouldn't it be quite the other way? *Sure it's the Church that should come to me with them*; it's the Church that should *urge* us to read God's holy Word, instead of hindering us; and your reverence might as well say that you are appointed to see all the light, and drink all the water, and breathe all the air, and eat all the bread for me and every man in the parish, as to say that you can be religious for us, and that you have a right to keep the Bible from us as you please.

Priest—Hold your tongue man, I'm fairly vexed listening to you. Sure I knew well that it's with the jumpers you've been.

Barney—I hope, your reverence, that I've said nothing but the truth, and by my word the time is coming when the people won't allow themselves to be kept in darkness here, any more than in Dublin or the North, where Mr. O'Hagan, the great Catholic counsellor, says that 400,000 Douay Bibles has been sold within the last seven years—100,000 in Dublin, and 300,000 in Belfast—and it's me that's glad to hear that same any way; I tell your reverence plainly, that I deny the right of Pope or bishop, or priest, or church, to lock up the Scripture and keep it away from any of us, that is able to read it, and there's many more of my way of thinking. Sure you might as well say that the priest has the right of keeping under lock and key all the money in the parish, and giving it out as they please, by pence and half-pence, as to say that you have a right to keep from the people that which is worth more than thousands of gold and silver*—God's own word!—my mind is that your reverence might just as well undertake to save us the trouble of swallowing by eating for us yourself, as to say that you'd keep us from reading the Bible by reading it for us yourself. Take my word for it, the people will have their rights; and if your reverence and the other priests of Ireland won't give them the Scriptures they'll just take them from Protestants, or jumpers, or wherever they can get them. Sure I wouldn't care from whose hand I got a loaf of bread if I was starving; and in like manner I tell you the time is coming when the people will take the Word of God from whoever is kind enough to give it to them. They won't allow their precious souls to be starved to death for want of the bread of life while they can get *their own* Bible from the Protestant minister. More by token, when Christ himself tells us that "man liveth not by bread alone, but every word of God.†

Priest—But ignorant people like you would pick a wrong meaning out of it, and then 'twould do you harm instead of good. That's the reason why it's better for us priests to read it, and take the right meaning out of it, and then explain it to you.

Barney—Troth then, your reverence, though, I mean no offence, 'tisn't much of the Bible we'll get if we're trusting to what we get of it from the priests. And as to what your reverence says about poor ignorant men not understanding the word of God, I find it in the Bible that 'twas mostly the *learned* people that didn't understand it. St. Paul tells us that "the world by *wisdom* knew not God"‡ that is, they thought themselves so knowledgeable, and were so proud of their learning, they wouldn't submit to the simple plan of salvation that God had set forth for learned and unlearned. Again St. Paul says, "if any man among you seem to be wise in this world, let him become a fool that he may be wise,"§ that is, I'm thinking, that the learned man wasn't to trust to his learning but to come with an humble spirit, like a little child, ready and willing to be taught by God. And your reverence knows that the poor fishermen of Galilee understood Christ's words better than the learned scribes and doctors of the law, for the one saw the truth of his words and believed on him, while the others rejected and crucified him. So I don't think it's always the most learned that are best at understanding God's word. And moreover, if your reverence will let me tell you my real mind, I think many of the priests don't understand a great dale about it themselves.

Priest—Don't be slandering your clergy, Barney. It's they that know it, and a good right they have to know it, for it's taught them in Maynooth.

Barney—They *ought* to know it your reverence, but sure all the world knows that nothing frightens priests in general equal to the Bible. If a scripture-reader, or even a poor jumper pulls out the bible, it's enough to put a priest to flight. And besides I'm thinking if it's such a bad book for us, how can it be a good book for the priests. More by token, how seldom they read it, or speak about it. When a priest is going along the road he always has a book in his hand, but 'tisn't the Bible. It's his offices, and I'd like to see the man that ever seen a priest walking about with a *Bible* in his hand. I'm thinking that would be a sight good for sore eyes. And as for what they learn at Maynooth, I wouldn't give much for it, for I seen on a paper that in the year 1846, there were only 10 Bibles or Testaments found among 400 scholars, that were to be the makings of priests. But that's more than 7 years ago, and before Bibles was sold so cheap as Mr. O'Hagan says they now are at Belfast. But if we looked to the rights of the case, the priests would want to be even better instructed in the Bible than the Protestant ministers.

Priest—What do you mean by that?

Barney—I mean, your reverence, that our priests should know the Bible on their fingers' ends, for *we're trusting entirely to them for everything* about our religion. The Protestants hear service in English that they can understand, and every Protestant has a Bible that he can read for himself, so that even if his minister didn't know much about it, he could read the Word of God for himself; but we're trusting entirely to our priests, and I'm afraid it's the blind leading the blind, for some of them know as little about it as we do ourselves.

Priest—Barney, I only thought you an omadhaun before, but now I see that you're an out and out heretic; you're abusing your clergy, and standing up for the Protestant Bible, that all the world knows is a corrupt version.

Barney—I'm sorry to offend your reverence, but I must speak the truth whether it's pleasing or not; and after all I'm not so sure that the Protestant Bible is corrupt, for if it is, ours is corrupt too; for I've compared both, and there's but little differ between them; and I read in Mr. O'Hagan's great speech, that the great Bishop Doyle said that the Protestant Bible was one of the *noblest books*, and one of the *ablest translations* that ever was made, though he admitted it to have many inaccuracies; and besides it's out of the Douay Bible the Protestant ministers argue with us, and it's the Douay Bible they're giving out to us, and even *your reverence won't say that it is corrupt.*

Priest—I won't argue any more with the likes of you; I see that you're gone to the bad; you're a Protestant already, and you've left the old religion that your father and grandfather lived and died in.

Barney—Well, your reverence, to tell you the honest truth, I tried hard to remain in the Church of Rome, but I heard the voice of God calling to me out of his holy Word, and saying, "Go out from her my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that you receive not of her plagues." But what made up my mind was seeing your reverence and the other priests so much against letting the people read the Bible; for, says I to myself, how can that be God's Church which is so much against God's Word? and how can they be *God's ministers* who are always keeping his Word from the people? And remember what I'm telling your reverence; the time is coming when, if the priests don't preach the Word of God in the chapels, the people will go to the church to hear it; and the day is coming when if the priests don't give out Bibles, the people will take them from the Protestants, or wherever they can get them; for God gave that Word to be "a lamp to our feet, and a light to our paths;"† and why should poor Irishmen be kept in darkness because the priests choose to lock up the candle? and God gave that Word to be food for the soul,‡ and why should poor Irishmen starve because the priests think it better to lock up the loaf? God gave that Word to be like living water, refreshing our souls, and making them bring forth fruit unto eternal life;§ and why should poor Irishmen be left to die of thirst because the priests choose to lock up the water of life? No, your reverence, 'twon't last, for with God's help, "there's a good time coming," when poor Irishmen will get their rights; and the first right they'll ask for is the Word of God. And now may God bless your reverence, and may he open the eyes of the priests of Ireland, and show them that in shutting up the Bible from the people, they are shutting out both themselves and others from the kingdom of heaven.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

To diminish the chances of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, DECEMBER 15, 1855.

SINCE our last publication, as most of our readers have no doubt already learned, the Reverend Vladimir Petcherine has been tried and acquitted of the charge of participating in the scandalous outrage on public decency committed on the 5th November last, in the chapel-yard at Kingstown, by publicly burning the Holy Scriptures among a number of immoral and irreligious works. We have no disposition whatever to impeach the fairness of either the trial or the verdict—whether that verdict was based upon a conviction that the rev. gentleman was *not* aware that there were Bibles in the heap burned in his presence and by his directions, or upon a deficiency of evidence to satisfy the jury (of whom the foreman was a Protestant, and the remainder Roman Catholics) that he *was* aware of it. In either case the rev. gentleman was properly acquitted; and we are far from asserting that the jury came to an unsound conclusion in the matter. According to the humane and enlightened laws of Great Britain, every man—be he native or foreigner, clergyman or layman—must in law be considered innocent until he has been found guilty on legal evidence; and though we may regret that the real culprit, be he who he may, has, for the time at least, escaped, we are not disposed to regret that the jury should have found that the crime was perpetrated without the concurrence or authority of the clergyman, who, *prima facie* at least, was responsible for what was done on

---

* Encyclical Letter, May the 3rd, 1824, published by E. Coyne, Dublin, 1824.

* Psalm cxviii. 105. † Luke iv. 4. ‡ 1 Cor. i. 21. § 1 Cor. iii. 18.

* Apoc. xviii. 4. † Ps. cxviii. 72. ‡ Luke iv. 4. § Isa. iv. 10, 11

the occasion. Two things of importance have, at any rate, resulted from the trial: first, the law has been published and put beyond dispute; and secondly, the determination of the Government and the law officers of the crown to enforce the law, no matter by whom violated, has been publicly demonstrated in a way which we have no disposition to criticise, even though the prosecution has failed to convict the particular individual suspected of its violation.

Such a prosecution we think was rendered the more imperatively necessary by the fanatical and turbulent language used and countenanced by some other Roman Catholic clergymen, even pending the proceedings against the Redemptorist Father.

On *Sunday*, the 25th Nov., the Very Rev. Dr. M'Evoy, P.P. of Kells, when takingthe chair at a numerous meeting of the electors of the county of Meath, at which we are told a large number of Roman Catholic clergymen were present, among other things is reported to have used the following words, when speaking of the pending prosecution :—

"Would you know what is the nature of that charge? It was that of committing to the flames *a thing* which pretends to be the Bible, but which is a *vile and blasphemous perversion and corruption of the Word of God* (loud cheers). It was for committing to the flames a volume, which, *if I myself*, in the absence of Attorneys-General and Solicitors-General, were going to commit to the flames, *I should take it up with a pair of tongs, for fear of soiling my fingers; and so with the tongs would I hurl it into the consuming fire* (*tremendous cheering*)."

Surely, when such language could be used at a public meeting by a *Very Rev.* Roman Catholic clergyman, in the presence of a number of others, and such a sentiment be received with tremendous cheering, it was high time for the law officers of her Majesty to take some steps to vindicate the law, and show such men as Father M'Evoy that they cannot violate it without running the risk at least of incurring a serious punishment. We rejoice to think that there can no longer be any dispute either about the law or the disposition of the Government to enforce it by all legal means within their power; and we sincerely trust that this trial will be the means of deterring some persons from committing similar outrages, who, but for it, might have been led into crime in the expectation of impunity.

Having said thus much to atone for the doubts expressed in our last as to the course likely to be pursued by the Attorney-General in the matter, and recorded our ready acquiescence in the acquittal of Father Petcherine, we should not further notice what took place at the trial but that we think the speeches delivered both by her Majesty's Attorney-General, and the eminent Queen's Counsel, Mr. Thomas O'Hagan, who conducted the defence (both, be it recollected, themselves Roman Catholics) contain matters of great importance, which deserve to be universally known and remembered in this country. We would gladly, if our space permitted it, insert both these speeches at large in our pages, as specimens of forensic eloquence, of which any true Irishman might well be proud. But even limited as our columns are, we cannot deny ourselves the gratification of recording at least a few extracts from these speeches, which we think will be as acceptable to our readers as they have been agreeable to ourselves. We trust the passages quoted by the Attorney-General from Archbishop *Kenrick*, and by Mr. O'Hagan from the celebrated Dr. *Doyle*, as to the excellence of the Authorised Version of the Scriptures, will not be lost on our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen; while the facts stated by Mr. O'Hagan as to the large circulation which the Douay version has obtained during the last few years, will afford all true lovers of the Holy Scriptures the sincerest pleasure. It will not be forgotten that *we* have never omitted an opportunity of encouraging the circulation of the Douay Bible (while steadfastly maintaining our conviction of the superior accuracy of the authorised translation), nor that, in order to facilitate that fair and free discussion which we have now laboured for four years to promote among our fellow-countrymen, we have always quoted the Douay version in preference to any other, though sincerely believing it to be inferior to our own.

The following are the extracts from the speeches of the Right Hon. the Attorney-General and Mr. Thomas O'Hagan, Q.C., on the trial, above referred to :—

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL.

Gentlemen, from the humblest individual in this country to the Sovereign who sits upon the throne, there is no security—none—for anything, be it life, or be it property, except what is based upon the Authorized Version of the Word of God. And, gentlemen, what is the law which governs this case? Upon that subject you will have information on the high authority of their lordships; but, speaking under their correction, I will state to you what is the law on the subject, as laid down by the greatest authorities, and recognised and established in these countries. Gentlemen, the law is thus stated:—Offences against God are, by the common law, indictable, as are all blasphemies against God, denying His being or His providence, or profane scoffing at the Holy Scriptures, or exposing any part thereof to contempt and ridicule. That is laid down in "Hawkins' Pleas of the Crown," p. 359, and Blackstone, in his fourth volume, p. 59, cites Chief Justice Prisot, in the reign of Henry VI., who says that "the Scriptures are the foundation of our common law;" and when was this said? It was not since the Reformation—it was not since the Authorized Version was given to the people of England—it was not since that translation was made. And remember, gentlemen, that these are the words, in all human likelihood, of a Roman Catholic Chief Justice, words spoken before the Reformation in England; and what says he? "The Scriptures are the foundation of our common law," on which all other laws are founded. These, gentlemen, are ancient and venerable authorities; but I regret, deeply regret, that I can refer to later cases—cases occurring in this country. Gentlemen, I consider it a great disgrace to this country that I am enabled to refer to other cases of this description. But, gentlemen, the people of this country—the Roman Catholic people of this county—are not to be held accountable for the acts of over-heated fanatics; and accordingly when I refer to these acts I do believe that the Roman Catholic population of this country do not agree in the acts complained of. Gentlemen, in the year 1852, so late as that, at the Spring Assizes of the county Mayo, a man was tried before the present Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench. It was my duty, as counsel for the prisoner, to suggest such topics in his defence as occurred to me, and I trust, and I know that every member of the bar will, with his utmost zeal and ability, press upon the court to lay before the jury such matter as may prove favourable to his client. That man was found guilty of the offence, which was the burning of a single copy of the New Testament. I was present, and I will not forget the words used by the eminent judge to whom I have referred in sentencing the prisoner. I will state it, for I know it to be the fact, that he was tried by a mixed jury of Protestants and Roman Catholics, and he had such assistance as my humble abilities were able to afford him. He was found guilty of the offence, and the eminent judge used these words:—"In this case the prisoner is indicted for burning a copy of the Authorized Version or Translation of the New Testament; and the offence is equally applicable to any other version or translation of the Scriptures, whether it be the Douay translation of the Old Testament, or the Rhemish translation of the New Testament, or the Authorized Version of the Bible." Gentlemen, you are aware—such of you as are Roman Catholics—that the Douay is the Roman Catholic translation of the Old Testament, and the Rhemish is the Roman Catholic translation of the New Testament. And what said that learned and eminent judge? "The offence is the same no matter what translation the book may be." In that case there were contemptuous words used at the burning, and it was laid down that the words used, and the want of reverence for the Scriptures, were blasphemous, for it is not because fallible men cannot agree upon a translation that any one version of it is to be treated with contempt; it is not because it may not be a perfect translation it is to be treated with vilification. Gentlemen, that man was found guilty, and he listened to these words, and heard an exhortation which I thought would have had such weight and influence throughout the entire of this country, that whatever might be our sectarian differences, however closely we might each hug the persuasions in which we were educated and brought up, still that we might join, and find a common ground whereon to join, in respecting and reverencing the Holy Scriptures. Still more recently—and it is with regret that I have to say it should be so—another transaction of the same character occurred. In the case of the Queen *v.* M'Quaid, tried at the summer assizes of last year, an humble man, not with the advantages of education, an humble peasant, was accused of having burned contemptuously a copy, a single copy, of the Sacred Scriptures. He was tried before an eminent and as merciful a judge as ever sat upon the bench—Baron Pennefather. Gentlemen, what was his language; what were the words of this eminent judge? "The offence," he says, "is complete, no matter whether it is an Authorized Protestant or Roman Catholic version of the Scriptures. It is an act of gross impiety, and I would say the same of any Protestant who would destroy, in so contemptuous a manner, the Douay copy of the Holy Scriptures. Whatever differences exist between these volumes—and they are slight indeed, it must be acknowledged by all that they both contain truths of deepest worth—truths that have been revealed to us for our eternal salvation; and the destruction of either is an offence against the law of the land, and an indignity offered to the oaths taken upon the Sacred Volume." That is the law, as laid down in the highest authorities. That is the law, as recognised by eminent judges who still live to adorn the Bench. That is the law acted upon in those two cases I have mentioned, when Roman Catholic jurors—and I say it to their honour—thought it right to convict the prisoners. This was the principle recognised by the best teachers of the Roman Catholic Church; and, if I am rightly informed, instead of wishing to cast contempt and ignominy on any version, they have spoken of the Authorized Version with honour, as a work deserving of the highest admiration and respect. Perhaps you will excuse my reading, gentlemen, from a public copy of a Roman Catholic, and a recent Roman Catholic version of the Sacred Volume. I have here in my hand a translation recently made by one of the most eminent divines, at this moment an Archbishop,* and when he made this translation a bishop of the Roman Catholic Church. For, gentlemen, you ought not to think for a moment the Roman Catholics have one fixed copy of the Sacred Scriptures, and that no one is to presume to make any other translation. The learning and the piety of man, from the earliest ages down to the present time, have thought it right in searching for truth to turn back again and again to the great originals; and accordingly, I find this rev. divine searching the most minute points of etymology, in order to make clearer and more plain the solemn truths of the Holy Scriptures. He says:—"In adopting occasionally the words and phrases of the Protestant version, I have followed the example of others, who have from time to time revised the Rhemish translation. It is not to be regretted that whilst we point to errors which need correction, we acknowledge excellencies which we are free to imitate, thus diminishing the asperity of censure by the tribute which we willingly render to literary merit." There is that volume—there is that translation published in the year 1851—emanating from a Roman Catholic bishop, now a Roman Catholic archbishop. There is that splendid tribute paid by him, in the face of the whole Roman Catholic world to the Authorized Version of the Sacred Scriptures. But, gentlemen, is it necessary in this day that we should refer to the authorities so late as that? Let us take up the Roman Catholic version of the Scriptures, and quote from that Roman Catholic version. What says the apostle himself, speaking upon the value of sacred writings?—"All Scripture [says St. Paul] inspired of God is profitable to teach, to reprove, to instruct in justice, that the man of God may be perfect, furnished to any good work." Has that been ever disrespectfully commented upon by any minister of the Roman Catholic Church? Where are we to search for the true lights of the Roman Catholic Church if not amongst those greatest bishops and teachers who are acknowledged as amongst its greatest ornaments? Let us turn to the almost inspired page of Masillon. Let us hear him tell us that the Deity, who scarcely ever appears in the profane page of ancient history, appears distinctly and openly almost always in the Divine writings, and that it is by their light only, that profane history can be advantageously studied. Let us look to the confession of St. Augustine, where he says, "that the Scriptures may be ever his chaste delight—that no day may pass without his finding a time to meditate on the sacred things of the law." Let us hang upon the eloquent lips of Bossuet, as he indignantly exclaims—"The greatest calumny of all which has ever been used against the Roman Catholic Church is that which attributes to us that we consider the Holy Scriptures dangerous. I ask who amongst us has ever dared to advance this blasphemy?" Well then, gentlemen, if these be the views and opinions of Roman Catholic clergymen, and of those most celebrated teachers and divines,—if these are the words and instructions of the Roman Catholic version of the Scriptures,—I ask, if those facts be proved before you which I have shortly endeavoured to detail, what will be said on behalf of the traverser? I well know that everything which talent, genius, and legal ability can suggest on his behalf will be suggested to you by my learned friend on the other side, but, gentlemen, I am much deceived—I have much deceived myself—if a word should fall from his Roman Catholic lips—even one single word—disrespectful of

* F. P. Kenrick, Archbishop of Baltimore, U.S.

the Authorized Version of the Sacred Writings. He may, and he will, if he can, challenge the fact, and say the Word of God has not been treated with disrespect by the traverser, and that is a complete and sound defence. He may, and he will, if he can, say that it was not wilfully and knowingly committed by the traverser at the bar; but, as I have said, I shall be astonished, indeed, if my learned friend says a single word of a disrespectful kind of the Holy Scriptures. What, in fact, the defence will be, it is not for me to speculate upon. I have adopted the views of all Roman Catholic writers in telling you what I have told you, that it is the duty of every Roman Catholic to reverence and respect the Sacred Writings; and if he should ask you, without any evidence, to arrive at the conclusion that, because these doctrines have been laid down by the heads of our church, it is impossible that any man, any minister of the church, could show disrespect to this sacred Volume, —then, gentlemen, I will warn you against arriving, without sufficient grounds, at that conclusion; because the history of the world tells us that there are men influenced by fanatical zeal who can see nothing right save in that instrument which they have themselves used. If the facts I have stated are proved in evidence I would rather you would arrive at that conclusion, and consider that the traverser has been so influenced, rather than that, without evidence, you should come to the determination that whilst the Sacred Volumes were burned, whilst they were knowingly burned, still there was no contemptuous or criminal intention. Now, gentlemen, do not understand me as telling you that I believe or that I think that all versions of the Sacred Scriptures are the same. I do not mean for a moment to ask you to come to that conclusion. There are differences between different versions of the Scriptures. There are undoubtedly differences between the version of the Catholic Church and the Authorized Version. These differences are such as will continue to the end of time. Do I say that all versions of the Scriptures are alike? By no means. Differences there will exist between every sect, and each will cling to the version in which he has been taught to search for and find the truth. But Christianity is still the same. Great is the difference between the rising and setting sun, but the morning and evening are but one day. Errors will creep into every translation, for they are the work of erring men, and no temple is perfect but one, and that not made by human hands. Still, despite of differences and errors, the great original remains—that venerable record of the economy of the Supreme Being, the prophecy and the proof, the oracle and the miracle, the Royal Psalmist and the Divine Teacher—above all, the belief, the cherished belief in the atoning blood of Him, of whom it is written in all versions of the Scriptures alike, that "there is no other name under heaven given to men by whom we must be saved!" In that great name, in the name of our common Christianity, I ask you to approach this case. Act upon its precepts, and the law will be vindicated. This prosecution is not instituted for vindictive purposes, but for example. Whatever may be your verdict, I earnestly trust that there will go forth from this court a lesson of mutual forbearance: may Peace and her twin sister Charity preside over the land!

MR. THOMAS O'HAGAN, Q.C.

From the time of the invention of printing the press has teemed with copies of the Holy Scriptures; and can any one doubt the position on which I stand, when I tell you that between the period of the invention of printing and the publication of the Bible by Luther, there were 200 editions of the Bible published by the press of Europe; and not only that, but before the completion of that Bible, fifty editions in the vernacular tongues of Europe —those of France, Belgium, Spain, and England,—issued from the press? What is said by Maule in his remarkable work with respect to England. He says:— "The Holy Bible was long before Wickliff's day, by laborious and well-learned men, translated into the *English tongue*, and by good and godly people held in reverence and diligently read." And so, gentlemen, it has been down to the present moment. But before I go to this, need I ask for evidence to sustain my position beyond the very case now trying in this court? Here are the law officers of our Sovereign Lady the Queen coming to prosecute this humble minister of God. How and why? Not by reason of any statute, nor by reason of any law passed by any modern legislature. This case is founded on the old common law of England; and if there be a conviction here, it will be on that common law. That law, established by wise judges, by pious kings, and sanctioned by holy bishops, proclaimed that Christianity belonging to the Constitution of the country, and that *the Scriptures and Christianity were identified*, and that assault upon the Scriptures was an assault upon the Constitution and the law. But, gentlemen, it might be urged upon you, the impression might be upon your minds that this old system was not in existence at the present time, and that, although in the beginning of Christianity and in the mediæval times, under the influence of popes and bishops, the Scriptures were reverenced and spread throughout the world for the enlightenment and the salvation of the human race, still that in this unhappy land of Ireland there is a difference. It may be said (and my apprehension is that some of you may be under the impression) that in Ireland there is a disposition on the part of the Roman Catholic Church to prevent the circulation of the Scriptures and the cause of the Word of God. I have investigated that; I have, with a view to this trial, made a few inquiries; and I have to tell you this (and this fact ought to leave no doubt on the mind of any honest man whom I address), that in this city of Dublin there is a single publisher who, within the last seven years, has issued *three editions of the Catholic Bible* from his shop and press, under the sanction of the Rev. Dr. Mac Hale, Archbishop of Tuam, and the Most Rev. Dr. Murray, the late venerated prelate of the archdiocese; and that publisher has told me, that of these three editions he sold 42,500 *copies*, and that if all the copies which have issued from other hands in Dublin were enumerated, they would amount to 100,000 *copies*. I know this, too, that friends of mine—dear and venerated friends—in the county and town where I was born, informed me that there had been a large issue of the Holy Scriptures in the Douay Translation. *In Belfast alone copies of the Bible to the extent of* 300,000 *have been disposed of*, and at such prices as to bring them within the reach of the poorest person, varying from 6*d.* *and* 9*d.* *upwards*, and that although the publishers of that town have not the assistance or facility which the publishers of the Authorized Version possess; for whereas the latter have an *allowance of twenty-five per cent* on the paper on which it is printed, the former have not an allowance of one farthing. I think on that point I have a right to make an impression upon such of you as have any doubt upon the matter as to the *circulation of the Scriptures*, and as to the enmity of the heads of the Catholic Church to that book. And now I have to tell you, and it is right you should fully understand, that the doctrine of that church, while it is consistent with *the full and free circulation of the Word of God*, proclaims this: that that church, holding of authority—holding itself the teacher of the nations, *does not approve* of the *unadvised* and *undirected perusal* of the Scriptures. But I have to tell you further, that that church does not approve in all its parts of the Authorized Version of the Scriptures. It believes in it there are errors and corruptions, and having these, and leaving them *unexplained*, might be the means, instead of guiding men to truth, of leading them into error. But while it does that, it holds this as its true doctrine and real faith, that the *Scriptures are a most precious possession*, and that rightly read, and under right direction, the Scriptures should be circulated afar, even to the bounds of the earth. The Attorney-General was right in saying that you would hear from me no word of condemnation of the Sacred Scriptures here. Understand me as saying nothing whatever on that subject, but that if it be necessary to prove to you that Catholics have not the narrow views which some attribute to them, if it were necessary I could demonstrate to you that Catholics regard with reverence the Word of God. I have to state to you the opinion of one of the ablest and wisest men, and one of the most devoted Catholics that ever existed in this land. I refer to the *Right Rev. Dr. Doyle*. He was examined before a committee of the *House of Lords in the year* 1825, and he was asked—"Did he consider the Authorized Version of the Scriptures used in the Church of England as of a sufficiently perverse quality to warrant the description that it is the Gospel of the Devil?" and his answer was—"I have said before, God forbid that I should so consider it, for, though it has many errors, I consider it as one of the *noblest works*, and *one of the ablest translations that ever has been produced*. This I say, while I consider that it abounds in inaccuracies." In the same year, before a commission of inquiry which sat in Dublin, the opinion of four Catholic Archbishops was required. They were *Drs. Curtis, Kelly, Suffern, and Murray*. Dr Curtis said:—"We agree that the Authorized Version of the Established Church is a *very noble and a very fine work*. It uses fine language. It *surpasses ours by far in point of language*, for it is in the nature of a paraphrase; but we cannot take it, and have not done so, but *we have all of us in our controversial works praised the translation*. It is a very fine one—very good language—and harmonized more than ours." Why do I state all this? It is for the purpose of showing that there is not among the prelates of the Catholic Church the opinions attributed to them, and because I have a right to say that no such opinions are propounded by the heads of that church. And I have a right further to ask you not to assume that my reverend client acted in the spirit and with the purpose imputed in this indictment. Gentlemen the Attorney-General spoke, and truly, of the fanaticism which sometimes disfigures the Christianity we all profess. There is, unfortunately, no doubt of it. There is no doubt that men of all religions are sometimes over zelous, and that their zeal may degenerate into fanaticism, though I shall demonstrate to you that that observation has no bearing on my client.

I felt when I read those passages to you that the Church of Ireland was not obnoxious to the charge of zealotry, and I have others to read from some who rank even higher than the prelates whose words I gave you. Dr. Kelly the Metropolitan of the Roman Catholic Church in the west, was examined at the committee before which Dr. Doyle was examined in 1825, and he was asked—"Is it your experience of the Protestant Bible, or have you heard it in such a manner as to believe it, that there have been any number of cases of desecration of the Testament in the West, either *executed or enjoined by the clergy?*" He answers:—"The directions given to the clergy are, that if the versions of the Scriptures are not approved of by the Catholic Church, the faithful are to refuse to take them. If they take them, they are to be given up into the hands of the clergy, and I have not known of any instance of any clergyman destroying, by fire, or otherwise, any of them." He then, in answer to another question, says he knows nothing of a destruction of Bibles in the river at Ballinasloe, and says he would think it improper to sanction such an act, and improper to destroy such a book. Dr. Doyle says he would think it improper to treat the Word of God in that way; he might overlook the act in a person committing it from a mistaken view, but would think it very wrong. I have read this to disabuse your minds of the impression that my client, because of his religion and profession, is to be assumed guilty of that which, in fact and truth, he never did. If I have taken with me each of you as had that impression or prejudice on your minds, my work is done."

◆

We take the present opportunity, when closing our fourth volume, to repeat the offer which we made at the end of the year 1854, viz:—That with a view to facilitating fair discussion, we will undertake to forward the CATHOLIC LAYMAN during the ensuing year, *without charge*, to any Roman Catholic clergyman who will be good enough to intimate either to the Editor or Publisher, 9, Upper Sackville-street, his desire to receive it, direct through the post. We also, again, invite our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen, whether clergymen or laymen, to avail themselves of our pages to publish replies to our arguments, or otherwise defend the doctrines of their Church as they may think most likely to promote Christian charity, and the cause of truth. Anything written in a spirit of candour and good feeling will be inserted freely, and with a sincere anxiety to give the most perfect fair play to our opponents.

We hope our regular subscribers will be good enough to forward their subscriptions for the ensuing year (together with any arrears due) on or before the 1st of January next. We need scarcely remind them, though 3*s.* 6*d.* is a small sum, that when a large number of such sums is in arrear, it imposes a serious difficulty in the way of the conductors.

Correspondence.

BIBLE BURNING.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

DEAR SIR—I should be sorry to think that there are not many Roman Catholics who are offended and grieved at the profaneness of those persons, wherever they were, who were so destitute of all feelings of reverence for the holy Scriptures as to burn them publicly at Kingstown on the 5th of November last—an outrage which has filled all right-minded persons with shame and indignation. Unfortunately this is nothing new. It is quite certain, whatever be the truth of the matter as to the Redemptorist father, that Roman Catholic priests have been known to burn Protestant Bibles, and encourage others to do so, and that such zealots as the late editor of the *Tablet* have made no secret of their approval of their impiety. For this reason I should wish to propose, for the consideration of your Roman Catholic readers, two or three questions, which, I hope, they will not think improper or undeserving of an answer.

1. Why is it that Roman Catholics burn the Protestant Bibles, while Protestants never think of burning Roman Catholic Bibles?

The Roman Catholic version was made and published with a controversial intention. It was not put forth in order to encourage or facilitate the reading of the word of God in the vulgar tongue; but to guard people against the alleged corruptions in the Protestant Bible. This is distinctly avowed in the preface of the Rhemish Testament, where the misdoings of the Protestant translators are declared to be so wicked and shameful, that the word of God has been, through their "sacrilegious treachery, made the devil's word." Well, if the Protestant Bible is so utterly contrary to the Roman Catholic faith, we may fairly suppose that the Roman Catholic Bible is quite as contrary to the Protestant faith. It was got up expressly for the purpose of opposing the Protestant doctrines in the Pro-

testant Bible. It is not what it professes to be. The learned Romanists by whom it was prepared and published, and all their other learned divines who have been revising and correcting it from time to time during two centuries and a-half, have laboured to little purpose. It is an antidote against Protestantism, as far as they could make it serve such a purpose. Why, then, do not Protestants collect the Douay and Rhemish translations and burn them? Some Protestants have not shown themselves very moderate or temperate in their mode of carrying on the controversy—I regret to be obliged to confess it; and I trust the CATHOLIC LAYMAN is doing something effectual towards bringing all parties to treat such serious matters with more of the meekness of wisdom. But did ever any one hear of the wildest Protestant—gathering Roman Catholic Bibles together and making a bonfire of them? I confess, for my own part, with more than five and twenty years' experience of the controversy, I have never heard of a Protestant burning a single copy. Why is this?

2. Every one has heard of Protestants taking trouble and going to expense in order to supply their Roman Catholic fellow Christians gratuitously with copies of the version sanctioned by their priests. It is notorious that Protestants would infinitely rather see them read the Roman Catholic Bible than none at all, well knowing, all the time, that this translation was made with an avowedly hostile intention towards the Protestant faith. My second question, therefore, is this—Why do Protestants encourage Roman Catholics to read the Roman Catholic Bible, and help to supply them with it? Is it that they know that even this hostile version is, on the whole, so favourable to the spread of what they believe to be the truth, and so likely to open men's eyes to what they believe to be the errors of Rome, that they are only too thankful to induce Roman Catholics to read it? If this be not their reason I should like to know what is. If it be, I hope your Roman Catholic readers will consider the consequence.

3. When St. Paul was in prison in Rome, he wrote to the Christians at Philippi an epistle, in the first chapter of which he mentions that some persons in Rome were preaching the Gospel, not from any proper motive, but from "envy and contention—not sincerely," he says, "supposing that they raise afflictions to my bonds." In what spirit did the great Apostle bear this trial? "But what," he says, "so that by all means, whether by occasion or by truth, Christ be preached: in this also I rejoice, yea, and will rejoice." I would appeal to all calm judging men, which party among us seems to bear most resemblance to the spirit of the Apostle and his unselfish love for truth—'the Protestant, who rejoices to assist and encourage his Roman Catholic brethren to read their own Bible,' or the Roman Catholics who denounce the Protestant Bible as "the devil's word," and burn it?

These candid Roman Catholics who have taken the trouble to compare the two versions, know perfectly well that the differences between them are too trifling and unimportant for the questions at issue between the Churches to be much affected by them, one way or other. But even if this were not so—even if the Roman Catholic version were much more serviceable to their side of the controversy than it really is—my questions could lose nothing of their importance. I shall be thankful if some readers of that communion will not think them unworthy of serious consideration.—Faithfully yours,

X. A.

PIOUS BIRDS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—As you do not seem to believe the story of the pious sparrow, who was always chaunting *Ave Maria* in the ears of Victor De Planecy,* I can scarcely hope that you will give full credit to what I am about to narrate; but I can assure you I take it from no less an authority than Bonaventure† (a canonized saint of the Church), in his life of St. Francis, and the Annales Fratrum Minorum by Lucas Waddingus, published at Rome (*cum privilegio summi Pontificis*) in 1731. St. Francis having been once in dispute with himself whether it were fitter for him to spend his time in praying or preaching, sent to St. Clara and St. Sylvester to consult them thereupon; and they having both answered that he should preach, St. Francis immediately replied, "Let us go forth in the name of the Lord." And, accordingly, the next morning early, having taken two companions with him, he started off without delay, and ran so fast, and with such fervour to fulfil his divine calling, that he appeared endowed with new virtue from heaven, as if touched by the hand of God himself. He soon approached Bevagna, and, seeing a place where multitudes of various kinds of birds were gathered together, he makes haste thither, and salutes the birds as if they were reasonable creatures. The birds being all big with expectation turned towards him, and those who were in the bushes bowed their heads, that they might listen to him, in a manner quite unusual; he then approached them, and earnestly admonished them all that they should hear the Word of God, and said to them—"My brethren birds, ye ought to praise your Creator, who has given you feathers and wings, and good air, and provides for you without your care." At these excellent instructions, the birds, in a wonderful manner, began to stretch out their necks, spread their wings, open their beaks, and look earnestly at him. Then he, passing through the midst of them in an admirable fervour of spirit, even touched some of them with his tunic, but none of them stirred, till, having made the sign of the cross over them, and given them leave and his blessing, they all flew away together. All these things his companions, who were waiting for him on the road, were witnesses of.*

The same learned and pious writers go on to say that St. Francis proceeded on his travels, and came to a place called Castrum Alvianun, in Umbria, near the river Tiber, where, having collected a number of people and commanded silence, he was scarcely able to make himself heard, from the great noise made by the swallows who were building their nests in the place; whereupon, the man of God, in the hearing of all the people, thus addressed the troublesome birds, "Sisters swallows, it is now time that I should speak, you have said enough already. Hear the word of God, and hold your peace till that be done." Whereupon, as if they were rational animals, they suddenly were silent, nor did one of them move from the place until the whole sermon was finished; whereupon, all who saw it were filled with astonishment (as well they might) and glorified God. The fame of this miracle being spread around influenced many with reverence to the Saint, and true devotion of faith.†

But wonders did not cease there; for St. Bonaventure goes on to inform us that "a scholar of Paris having heard of the fame of the above-mentioned miracle, being much troubled with the continued chattering of a swallow while he was intent on study, said to his companions, 'This swallow is one of those who interrupted St. Francis when preaching, until he imposed silence on them;' and turning to the swallow he addressed him in faith thus, 'In the name of God's servant, Francis, I command you, that when you are near me you always hold your peace.' The swallow, therefore, on hearing the name of Francis, as if taught by the discipline of the man of God, immediately became silent, and placed itself in his hands, as if in safe custody. The stupified scholar immediately restored it to liberty, and heard its chattering no more."‡

Whether, Mr. Editor, you will believe these stories of docility and obedience on the part of birds, I cannot say; but think their example would be very edifying, if one only had credulity enough to believe such saintly legends with an implicit faith.

Yours, truly,

A CONSTANT READER.

[If we had not the high authority of St. Bonaventure that these things were *real miracles* and *not myths*, we should have been disposed to think they were a mere *pious pleasantry*, invented designedly to diffuse a spirit of attention and obedience among the people. We confess, however, we feel much difficulty in treating as *myths* things so solemnly related as *actual facts*, though men like Dr. Newman may consider such stories the kind of facts *proper for ecclesiastical history*, and say that if swallows did not obey St. Francis and the Parisian student, as narrated, they *might and ought* to have done so; which is all the same thing.

Our correspondent might have gone farther, and shown how St. Francis instructed a *sheep* to attend prayers, and kneel and bleat before the altar of the Blessed Virgin; and how he, at the market-place at Trevi, gently admonished an ass's foal who was running up and down and disturbing him while preaching there; and how he, with a pleasing countenance, said to him, "Brother Ass, I desire thee to stand still, and not interrupt the word of God, which I am preaching to this thirsty people." Upon which the ass (moved, perhaps, by the humility of the good man in acknowledging his poor kindred) fell on his knees and heard the sermon out.*

We shall not add a word of comment, but merely ask our intelligent Roman Catholic readers whether they *believe* these stories to be *true?* or whether they consider them silly falsehoods which must have been well known to be such by those who successfully foisted them for ages on the credulous and ignorant, and still continue to do so, wherever the light of a generally diffused knowledge and intellectual cultivation have not rendered such a deception impossible.]

A FEW MORE WORDS ABOUT PURGATORY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

MR. EDITOR—As Jerry and I were coming home from work the other night, I seen that he was very down in himself, and never a word out of him, nor a bit of a song, nor any diversion in life, and says I to him, "What's come over you at all; is it the rent that's troubling you?" "No," says he, "the pig will pay the half-year that's due, and I'm clear up to last March." "Are any of the childer sick?" says I. "No," says he; "thanks be to God they're all hearty." "Well," says I, "what is it ails you? for I see plain that something is troubling you." "Well," says he, "I won't deny it to a friend like you; I'm greatly troubled in mind since I got the Bible, for," says he, "I can't get that verse out of my head, "*What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and suffer the loss of his soul?*"† "Well," says I, "if it's the Bible is troubling you, can't you give it back to the Reader, and have done with it?" "'Twould be no use," says he, "for I could'nt get it out of my mind, and besides," says he, "though it's troubling me, still I know that it's for my good 'tis doing it, and," says he, "it reminds me of what happened the year of the great fever. I was standing at the door one day as Doctor Hennessy was passing, 'and,' says he, 'Jerry, get that dung away from your door or you'll bring the fever into your house,' but I only laughed at him, so the next day he told me the same thing, but I kept never minding, but he kept on warning me until I got fairly vexed about it, and at last I answered him quite short, and told him to mind his own business, so after that he said no more, but signs on, the fever came into the house, and stretched myself on the bed for three weeks, and carried off two of the childer, and then I saw, when 'twas too late, that though the Doctor vexed and troubled me, 'twas for my good; and," says he, "Dan, I'm thinking it's just the same with the Bible; it's vexing and troubling me, but I know that 'tis for my good, so I can't put it away from me." "And," says I, "what part of it is troubling you?" "Well," says he, "every part, for I can't open it but I find something to trouble me. I find in it that all the holy water in Ireland can't blot out my sins, for there's nothing but the blood of Christ that can do it; and it troubles me to find in it, that all the prayers I've been offering for years to the holy saints won't do me a bit of good, because there's but 'one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus';‡ and it's troubling me to find in it that the Virgin, though a holy and blessed woman, can't put in a good word for me, for it speaks of no advocate but *one*, 'Jesus Christ the just."§ These are the things that's troubling me, for I see that the Bible is against us, but how could I ever give up *the religion that I have been taught since I was the size of a sod of turf?*" "Take my advice," says I, "and put away the book entirely." "I can't," says he, "for I know that it means well by me; but I won't deny that it troubles me greatly, not being able to find a bit of our religion in it, high or low." "There it is," says I, "isn't that the very thing Father John told us?" "Sure," says I, "how could an ignorant man like you find it?" "'Tis'nt the ignorance," says he, "that keeps me from finding it, for," says he, "I can find the Protestant religion in it, and sure I wouldn't find that any more than the other if 'twas the ignorance that ailed me; and," says he, "if our religion was in it, I'd be sure to find it." "But," says I, "have you searched well?" "I have," says he, "and since the argument the Reader had with Andy Kelly about Purgatory, I've been looking all through the Bible to find it, but the more I look for texts *for* it, the more I find texts *against* it. But," says he, "I'm thinking that I can't find Purgatory in the Bible for the very reason that Billy Jones couldn't find about the war in the newspaper." "How was that?" says I. "Why," says he, "I was going along the road with the master, and who did we meet but Billy, with a big newspaper in his hand. 'What are you reading?' says the master. 'Troth then, your honour, says Billy, 'it's looking for the war I am.' 'And haven't you found it?' says the master. 'Never a word about it, says he. 'It ought to be there,' says the master, 'but have you read it all?' 'Every word,' says Billy, 'for I'm this two hours at it.' So with that the master looks at it, and says he, 'no wonder for you not to find it.' 'Why so?' says Billy. '*Because tisn't in it*, says he,' 'for that's

---

* See CATHOLIC LAYMAN for August, 1855, p. 94.
† Opera, Lugd. 1668, vol. 7, p. 293-4.

* [We feel much obliged to our correspondent for referring us to the above narrations, which we have taken the trouble to verify by reference to the Latin originals, in both Waddingus and Saint Bonaventure. We think it well to add some of the most surprising passages from the original works.—ED. C. L.

No. 33.—Cum igitur appropinquaret Bevanio ad quendam locum devenit, in quo diversi generis avium maxima multitude convenerat, quas cum Sanctus Dei vidisset, alacriter cucurrit ad locum, et eas velut rationis participes salutavit. Omnibus vero expectantibus, et convertentibus se ad eum, ita, ut quae in arbustis erant, inclinatis capitibus, cum appropinquaret ad eas, insolito modo in ipsum intenderent; usque ad eas accessit, et omnes, ut verbum Dei audirent, sollicita admonuit, dicens. Fratres mei volucres, multum debetis laudare Creatorem qui plumis vos induit, et pennas tribuit ad volandum; puritatem concessit aëris, et sine vestra sollicitudine vos gubernat. Cum autem alia haec et similia loqueretur, a vicinae modo mirabili gestientes, caeperunt extendere colla, protendere alas, aperire rostra, et in illum attente respicere. Ipse vero cum spiritus fervore mirando, per medium ipsarum transiens, tunica contingebat easdem; nec. tamem de loco aliqua mota est, donec signo Crucis factu, et licentia data, cum benedictione viri Dei, omnes simul avolarunt. Haec omnia contaebantur socii expectantes in Via. —Oper. St. Bonav., tom. 7, p. 293-4; Lugdun, 1668, tom. 5, p. 519, Venetiis, 1754; Waddingus Annales, Rome, 1731, p. 293.

† No. 34.—Venit ad Castrum Alvianum, in modico colle haud procul amna Tiberi in Umbria extructum, non longe a Tudertina civitate ibi congregato populo, et indicto silentio, propter hirundines nidificantes in eodem loco, magnisque garritibus perstrepentes, audiri vix poterat: quas vir Dei, eam ibus audicntibus alloeutus est, dicens, "Sorores meae, hirundines, jam tempus est, ut loquar et ego; quia vos usque modo satis dixistis: audite verbum Dei tacentes silentium, do nec sermo Dei compleatur. At illae tamquam intellectus capaces, subito tacuerunt; nec fuerunt motae de loco, donec fuit omnis praedicatio consummata. Omnes igitur, qui viderunt, stupore repleti glorificaverunt Deum. Istius miraculi fama circumquaque diffusa, multos *ad Sancti reverentiam*, et fidei devotionem accendit.—Ibid.

‡ In civitate namque Parisiani scholaris quidam tedolis bonae, cum socils aliis studio diligenter intentus, dum importuna garrulitate cujusdam infestentur hirundinis, dicere caepit ad socios: haec hirundo una de illis est, quae viram Dei Francisenm predicantem abjurando, donec silentium eis impeneret, molestabant; et convertens ad hirundinem fiducialiter ait. In nomine Servi Dei Francisci praecipio tibi, ut ad me veniens continuo conticescas. At illa, Francisci audito nomine, quasi viri Dei disciplinis edocta, et statim contlenit, et ipsius manibus tanquam tutae custodiae se commisit. Stupefactus scholaris statim eam libertati restituit, et ejus garritum amplius non audivit.—Ibid.

* Waddingus An. 1213, n. 6, p. 153.
† Mark viii, 36
‡ 1 Tim. ii. 5.
§ 1 John ii. 1.

an old paper of five years ago, and when that was written there was no war at all, and,' says Jerry, 'I'm thinking that's the very reason I can't find Purgatory in the Bible, *because it isn't in it*, and I'm thinking there wasn't any Purgatory at all when the Bible was written." "But," says I, "Andy is a very knowledgable man, being a schoolmaster, and he says that 'tis in the Bible." "Yes," says Jerry, "and yourself seen what a party hand he made of it when he argued with the Reader." "But," says I, "he said that he'd look for more texts, and may be he'd do better next time." Well, sir, just as we turned the corner, who should we see but Andy, and the Reader, and a lot of the boys, hard at work at the discussion, "and," says the Reader, "I'm not surprised at the priests standing up for Purgatory, for it's meat and drink, and board and lodging to them; but I'm surprised at poor men like you being so fond of it; for," says he, "if it's true, you're all in a bad way." "How so?" says Andy. "Why," says he, "How does the priest say that the souls are to be got out?" "By masses," says Andy. "And how are the masses to be got?" says the Reader. "By paying for them," says Andy. "And where is the money to come from?" says he. "Troth, then, that's easier asked than answered," says Andy. "Now," says the Reader, "don't you see that it's a bad doctrine for a poor man? and," says he, "most of you are poor men, and between the taxes and the bad times you find it hard enough to feed the childer, and when you die it's little you'll be able to leave behind for masses." "True for you," says Mick; "sure if I died to-night I couldn't leave as much as would pay turnpike for a walking stick." "And," says he, "if Purgatory is true, it's mighty hard entirely on the poor." Well, Sir, Jerry jumped up, "and," says he, out quite bold, "I'll never believe that God would be harder on the poor than on the rich, and," says he, "the Bible is against it; for," says he, "I'm not ashamed or afraid to confess that I've been reading it; and that book says that God 'regardeth not the rich more than the poor, for they are all the work of His hands;'* and," says he, "if Purgatory was true, the rich man would be well off, for he could leave plenty of money for masses, but we'd be ruined entirely; so," says he, "it *can't* be true; and, besides, doesn't St. James say that 'God hath chosen the poor of this world, rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom;'† and the word of God tells us everywhere that Christ died for one man as well as for another, and that salvation is as free to the poor man as to the rich—to the beggar as to the Queen—because Christ gives it freely without money and without price. That's the kind of salvation that would match us," says Mick, "that would be given freely, without money or price; for I'm thinking if it depends on the money we've but a poor chance." "But," says one of the boys, "I hear that the priest is coming down greatly in the price of the masses in regard of the badness of the times." "Well," says the reader, "that reminds me of what I once seen in Waterford, and I never laughed so hearty before nor since." "What was it at all?" says the boys. "Why," says he, "I seen a great crowd standing round a placard that was on the market-house door, and sure enough a queer placard it was. Here's the way it read"—

GREAT REDUCTION IN PRICES!

Cheap Fares to

PURGATORY!!!

"Well, the Romanists were very angry, for they thought 'twas the Protestants done it; but one of the boys saw at last how it happened. The Steam Packet Company had posted notices of cheap fares to Liverpool, and 'twas a tall man that put them up, and the next day a little short man posted notices of a lecture on purgatory, and put his over the others, but wasn't tall enough to cover them entirely; so you couldn't go through a street in the town without meeting a crowd of boys reading the cheap fares to purgatory." "But," says Andy, "the Bible says that 'nothing defiled' can enter into heaven,‡ and," says he, "there's none of us so good but we're defiled with sin; and therefore there must be some sort of purgatory to take away the defilement, or no one could get to heaven." "You never spoke a truer word," says the reader; "but the same book that told you that, tells you how the defilement is to be got rid of. God says, 'I am he that blotteth out thy iniquities for my own sake, and I will not remember thy sins.'§ There's who does it—'tis God himself; and then St. John tells us what the sins are blotted out with. He says, 'the blood of Jesus Christ, God's son, cleanseth us from all sin.'‖ Now," says he, "there's what takes away the defilement—there's what we trust to for cleansing our souls—there's the 'Protestant's purgatory,' and," says he, "show me a better if you can." "Well," says Andy, "I'll give you a proof out of Dr. Milner, and there never yet was a Protestant that was able for him; he says that 'Abraham's bosom,' where the soul of Lazarus was carried by the angels,¶ was Purgatory; and he proves it clearly, for he says that it wasn't heaven, 'otherwise Dives would have addressed himself to God instead of Abraham;'* and it wasn't hell, for 'twas there Dives was; and, therefore, it must have been Purgatory." "Well," says the Reader, "that beats all I ever heard. Tell me," says he, "what kind of place is Purgatory at all?" "'Tis 'a place or state of punishment,'† says Andy. "Well," says the Reader, "the Catechism of the Council of Trent says that the souls of the saints enjoyed a 'tranquil abode in the bosom of Abraham, without any sense of pain;'‡ and now, boys," says he, "you may settle among yourselves which, Dr. Milner or the Catechism, is wrong, for *one or other must be wrong*." "Why, then," says Jerry, "it's Dr. Milner that's wrong, for the note to that verse in our own Bible says that 'Abraham's bosom' was a 'place of rest;' and," says he, "we all know that Purgatory isn't a place of rest." Well, sir, Andy turned on Jerry, and says he, "You ignorant spalpeen, how dare you set up your opinion against mine and Dr. Milner's? and," says he, "isn't it enough to have the Reader against me, without having an omadhawn like you aggravating me." Well, the boys began to laugh, and Andy got vexed; and, says he, "By this and by that, I'll never speak another word in defence of our religion before a set of Ignoramuses, that don't know a parallelogram from a triangle." But the boys only laughed the more. "So," says he, "the curse of Cromwell on every mother's son of you; I won't be wasting my time any longer with the likes of you." And with that he left the place. So the Reader turned to us, and, says he, "Boys, take my advice, and stick to the plain words of the holy Apostles, and don't trust to the meanings that Dr. Milner, or Dr. Butler, or Dr. Doyle does be putting on them, for you see plainly that hardly two of them agree—one is against the other, and that one against a third; but," says he, "did you ever find St. Matthew against St. Mark, or St. Luke against St. John? or does St. Paul tell us that it's Christ's blood that cleanses sin, while St. Peter says that it's Purgatory does it? No," says he, "there's no contradiction between *them*; it's the *one word* with them all, the same story with each. They all tell us that there's nothing else can blot out our sins but the precious blood of Christ, and that nothing else is required, for that blood can cleanse us from *all* sin." So with that he left us.

Your humble servant to command,

DAN CARTHY.

* Job xxxiv. 19. † James ii. 5. ‡ Apoc. xxi. 27. § Isaias xliii. 25 ‖ John i. 7. ¶ Luke xvi., 22.

* End of Controversy, A.D. 1843, p. 617.
† Butler's Cat. 20.
‡ Chap vi., quest. iii.

CLURICAUNES AND FAIRIES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

MR. EDITOR—You may smile if I ask, do you believe in such things as cluricaunes and Fairies? Perhaps, however, your mind may be changed, when I tell you what happened here last spring.

Just after the potatoes were set, I went out one morning to look after the men, and met my friend John Connors. "Jerry," said he, "did you hear what happened yesterday?"

"No," said I.

"May I never, sin," said he, "but a labouring boy of Johnny Corkery's caught a cluricaune, making a little saddle by the side of a ditch, in one of Johnny's fields."

"Do you tell me so," said I. "How did he manage to catch him?"

Oh!" said he, "the way he did it was this. He spied something red at some distance from him, as he was coming down the field, just like a red poppy in the distance, and as he came towards it, he heard a little tap, tap, tap, like a shoemaker putting on a sole. He threw himself down on the grass, and crept on without making a noise until he came quite close to where he had seen the red thing; and, sure enough, there he saw a real live little cluricaune, with a red cap and knee breeches, as hard at work as he could be, making the most beautiful little saddle that could be seen. The cluricaune was so intent on his work, and making such a noise with his little hammer, that he did not perceive the boy coming nigh him, and before he could turn round, or make an attempt to escape, he had him caught safe in his hand. "I have you, my boy," said he, "and before I let you go, you must tell me a thing or two; and, first of all, *Will the potatoes grow this year?*"

"They will," said the cluricaune, *but you will not be there to eat them.*"

"Tell me this instant," said the boy, "where is that crock of gold that you know about?"

"I know no more than that man behind you," said the cluricaune.

The boy, not recollecting that if he took his eyes off of him, he would be sure to disappear, turned round his head to see who was behind him, and when he turned it back again, the cluricaune was gone! In his hurry, however, *he forgot to take the saddle with him*, and the boy has it now; any one that likes to go up to Johnny Corkery's can see it."§

Now, if all this be true—and who can doubt it when the saddle is there to be seen—may there not be ten thousand cluricaunes in the country, for anything that we know to the contrary; and if there are such things as cluricaunes, why not believe that there are such things as Fairies?

The Protestant parish clerk says I am an old woman if I believe any *such nonsense*. Well, maybe so. "*Be-thershin*," as we say in these parts; but, for all that, *he cannot account for the saddle*.

Now what I want to know, Mr. Editor, is this do you, with your experience, think that there is sufficient evidence in this case of there being such things as cluricaunes? I have related the matter as it was told to me. I am sometimes on juries at the sessions, and I have a general idea of what *evidence* ought to be, in common cases, but I have a high opinion of your skill and learning in solving difficulties, and I have a lurking suspicion that the evidence for the genuineness of many relics that our Clergymen tell us of, and for some extraordinary and miraculous things that are said to have been done by saints, may not be everything that a plain and reasonable man might expect. For this reason I take the liberty of asking your opinion on these matters, and hope you will give some account of what you think ought to be sufficient evidence in doubtful things.

I am, Mr. Editor, your humble servant,

J. J. O'C.

‖ For an account of the Cluricaune, see Croker's Account of the Elves in Ireland; Fairy Legends, part iii., p. 7. Murray, 1826.

[We have been highly amused with the above little story, which is so well told that it is almost a pity to throw a doubt on it. We cannot pretend to so much skill in the laws of evidence as our correspondent gives us credit for; but as far as we understand those laws we believe that the proof of the genuineness of many so-called relics and modern and mediæval miracles is much on a par with the argument by which he so satisfactorily proves the *sorority* of Johnny Corkery's boy. "There must be cluricaunes, for we cannot account for the saddle!" If the jury on the late occasion had understood the laws of evidence so, who knows but they might have come to the conclusion that the Rev. Mr. Petcherine burned the Bibles; for *there* were the burned fragments, and *who could otherwise account for them?*]

FARM OPERATIONS FOR DECEMBER.

(*From the Farmers' Gazette.*)

FROM the very favourable seed time we have had now for some time, we were in hope that the principal breadth of wheat has been got in ere this. On a recent drive through the country, however, we find that not only the wheat has not been got in, but that much of the potatoes are yet to be lifted. We have only now to recommend exertion in lifting the one and sowing the other with as much despatch as possible, which should be completed, if possible, before Christmas.

Russian beans, peas, and vetches may still be sown. For the details of culture, see operations for previous months.

Lifting and storing roots.—Take advantage of the present favourable weather in lifting and storing such of the Swedes, mangles, carrots, &c., as still remain in the ground. No time should be lost in doing so, as weather may set in rather abruptly to prevent these operations being carried into effect, to the great loss and deterioration of those roots. For details see former calendar of operations. When straw is scarce, and therefore too valuable to use for thatching the roots, sedges and reeds from bog and other rough land, as well as sedge, flaggers, and other aquatic weeds, answer equally well for the purpose, when to be had.

Early potatoes should now be planted, taking advantage of dry weather, but avoid doing so while the weather or land is wet. At this season the lazy bed system is to be preferred to the drill; the sets are more securely and evenly covered, and a perfectly dry bed for them is secured. A liberal supply of fresh stable dung, and six inches of cover, is requisite at this time of year to insure the earliest crop.

Stall fed Cattle should now be so accustomed to their new quarters as to be on full keep. Their houses should be kept moderately warm, and well ventilated, but no cold currents allowed to chill them. Food at regulated hours. Keep them thoroughly clean, and curry and wisp them down twice a day. Dispose of ill-doers; as nothing is to be gained by keeping them over.

Milch Cows should be kept closely to the house, with the exception of an hour each day for exercise, if the weather be fine and temperate. Feed liberally on cooked and raw food alternately. Keep them moderately warm, clean, and well curried and wisped down twice a-day, which will supply the want of exercise in promoting the insensible perspiration so necessary to their health.

Young Cattle should be carefully housed and well fed; they require an abundant supply of nutritious food as much, or more so, than those full grown, to supply the requirements of their increasing size, and the full development of bone, muscle, and flesh.

Farm-horses should now be on full and liberal keep, and kept at constant employment—there is no profit in keeping them idle.

Digging on small farms.—This is the proper time to dig all land not under crop; dig deeply and roughly, so as to expose as great a surface as possible to the fertilizing influence of the atmosphere.

New and Illustrated Works,

SUITABLE FOR CHRISTMAS PRESENTS,

SOLD BY

WILLIAM CURRY & CO.,

BOOKSELLERS TO THE QUEEN,

9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

THE COURT ALBUM: Book of Beauty for 1856; containing Portraits of the Female Aristocracy. Elegantly bound. 21s.

THE CAMPAIGN IN THE CRIMEA. An Historical Sketch of the War. By George Brackenbury; late Secretary at Kadikoi to the Honorary Agents of the Crimean Army Fund. Illustrated by Forty double-tinted Plates, from Drawings taken on the spot by William Simpson. (Fac-Similes of the Large Edition.) Super Royal, 8vo, handsomely bound. 21s.

PARABLES OF OUR LORD. Illustrated by John Franklin, in Twelve Beautiful Steel Engravings. Folio. 21s.

LONGFELLOW'S POETICAL WORKS. Beautifully Illustrated, with upwards of One Hundred Designs. By John Gilbert. Small 4to, cloth, extra gilt edges, 21s., Morocco, elegant, £1 11s. 6d.

MOORE'S IRISH MELODIES. Illustrated with Thirteen fine Steel Plates. By Maclise, &c. Square crown 8vo, 21s., Morocco, elegant, £1 11s. 6d.

FLOWERS AND THEIR KINDRED THOUGHTS. A Series of Illustrations beautifully printed in Oil Colours. By Owen Jones. With Poetical Descriptions by Anne Bacon. Royal 8vo, calf, £1 11s. 6d.

THE LIFE OF LUTHER, in Forty-Eight Historical Engravings. By Gustav. Kœnig; with Explanations by Archdeacon Hare. Small crown 8vo., cloth. 28s.

THE KEEPSAKE FOR 1856. Illustrated. Handsomely bound. 21s.

SABBATH BELLS, CHIMED BY THE POETS. Illustrated with Sixteen Drawings, by Birket Foster, in colours. 8vo. 21s.

POEMS OF GEORGE HERBERT. With exquisitely designed Engravings, after Birket Foster and Noel Humphreys. Crown 8vo., cloth, 18s. Calf, 24s. Morocco, £1 11s. 6d.

THE PLEASURES OF HOPE. By Thomas Campbell. Illustrated with numerous Designs by Birket Foster, George Thomas, and Harrison Weir. Small 8vo. Cloth, gilt, 7s. 6d.

THE VICAR OF WAKEFIELD. By Oliver Goldsmith. Illustrated by George Thomas. 10s. 6d.

NOLAN'S HISTORY OF THE WAR AGAINST RUSSIA. Illustrated. Div. 1. 6s.

FLOWERS FROM MANY LANDS: a Christian Companion for Hours of Recreation. With Eight beautiful Engravings in oil colours. 5s.

THE EVE OF ST. AGNES. By John Keats. Illustrated with Twenty Engravings, from Drawings by Edward H. Wehnert. Handsomely bound in cloth. 7s. 6d.

THE DESERTED VILLAGE. By Oliver Goldsmith. Illustrated with Thirty-Five exquisitely executed Engravings on Wood. By Members of the Etching Club. Crown 8 vol.; Cloth, 7s. 6d.; Morocco, 12s.

TUPPER'S PROVERBIAL PHILOSOPHY. Handsomely Illustrated. Small 4to. Cloth, elegant, £1 11s. 6d. Morocco, £2 12s. 6d.

THE LIFE AND EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL. By the Rev. W. J. Conybeare and the Rev. J. S. Howson. With numerous Illustrations on Steel and Wood of the principal places visited by the Apostles. With Maps, Charts, Woodcuts of Coins, &c. 2 vols. 4to. £2 8s. Morocco, elegant, £4 4s.

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF OLIVER GOLDSMITH. By John Forster. With Forty Woodcuts. 7s. 6d.

MEMOIR OF THE REV. SYDNEY SMITH. By his Daughter—Lady Holland. With a selection from his Letters. Edited by Mrs. Austin. 2 vols. 8vo. 28s.

THE LIFE AND WORKS OF GOETHE: with Sketches of his Age and Contemporaries. By G. H. Lewes. 2 vols. 30s.

THE STORY OF THE CAMPAIGN OF SEBASTOPOL: written in the Camp. By Lieutenant-Col. E. Bruce Hamley. With coloured Illustrations. 8vo. 21s.

THE LEISURE HOUR, for 1855. Super Royal 8vo. With numerous Engravings. Handsomely bound in cloth. 6s.

SUNDAY AT HOME, for 1855. Super Royal 8vo. With numerous Engravings. Cloth, 6s. Extra cloth, gilt, 7s. 6d.

Will be published on Monday, the 17th inst.,

Vols. III. and IV.,

Macaulay's History of England,

FROM THE ACCESSION OF JAMES THE SECOND.

WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin, are still receiving the names of subscribers, to whom copies will be forwarded with despatch immediately on publication.

Scott's Commentary on the Bible.

NEW SUBSCRIPTION ISSUE OF SCOTT'S COMMENTARY ON THE HOLY BIBLE.

Notwithstanding the large circulation to which this Commentary has already attained, the demand for it is still so great, that the Publishers have determined to issue another Edition at such a price as will enable many persons to procure it who could not do so at the price at which it was recently published—viz., SIX GUINEAS.

This is the only complete Edition that is, or *can be*, offered to the public, having the final additions and emendations of the author, extending to upwards of Four Hundred pages, which consist chiefly of Critical Remarks, most important to the Biblical Student.

The Work contains an elaborate and compendious view of the Scripture Evidences—an introduction to each Book in the Old and New Testament, with a statement of its purport and intent—copious Marginal References, various Tables, and a Chronological Index. There is also an extensive Topical Index, which places the whole contents of the Work before the Student, and which will be found of great use in the selection of subjects, or for the elucidation of doctrines.

There are also Fifteen Maps and Sixty-Nine Steel Engravings, Illustrative of Scripture Incidents and Scenery.

COMMENDATORY NOTICES:—"It is the Comment of our Age."—*Bishop of Calcutta.*

"The writer has never consulted Mr. Scott's Commentary, on difficult passages, in vain. In every instance he found brief but solid refutations of alleged contradictions, which he could find in no other work in the English Language."—*Rev. T. Hartwell Horne.*

"I believe it exhibits more of the mind of the Spirit in the Scriptures than any other work of the kind extant."—*Rev. Andrew Fuller.*

"I never like to preach a Sermon without having seen what Scott says about it. If he takes the same view, I consider then that I am tolerably safe."—*Rev. J. Harrington Evans.*

The Work was originally published at EIGHT GUINEAS, and subsequently reduced to SIX GUINEAS. It is now offered for a limited period, viz., till the 31st December, at the low price of THREE GUINEAS, to parties who may be desirous of subscribing for a copy of the Work, and who are requested to forward their names, with a Post-office order for TEN SHILLINGS, as part payment, to

WILLIAM CURRY AND COMPANY,
9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

It is expected the Work will be completed soon after the date above named, handsomely bound in purple cloth; and on the closing of the subscription list the price will be again raised.

NEW TRANSLATION OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.
Just Published, Royal 4to, Price 5s.,

The Second Epistle of Peter; the Epistles of John and Judas, and the Revelation.

(*Translated from the Greek.*)

On the basis of the common English Version, with Notes.

This Volume will be followed by other portions of the Scriptures from time to time, as they pass through the hands of the Translators. This revision is not final, but is circulated in the expectation that it will be subjected to a thorough criticism, in order that its imperfections, whatever they may be, may be disclosed and corrected.

"I am obliged to you for giving me an opportunity of examining a specimen of the new great Biblical enterprise in America, of which I had heard much previously. The impression made on my mind is that the undertaking is a valuable one, and that it seems to be in the hands of men of sound views, as far as can be estimated from a short specimen. As to the translation of *Job*, there seems to be evidence of an extensive acquaintance with what the Germans have done in this department. On the whole, my cursory examination has been as satisfactory as such an examination can be."—*Extract of Letter from the Rev. G. Sidney Smith, D.D., Professor of Biblical Greek, Trinity College, Dublin.*

London—Trübner and Co. Agents for Ireland: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9 Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

Just published, in One Volume 8vo., 16s., or with Coloured Plates, 21s.

TE IKA A MAUI;

OR, NEW ZEALAND AND ITS INHABITANTS.

Illustrating the Origin, Manners, Customs, Mythology, Religion, Rites, Songs, Proverbs, Fables, Language, &c., &c., of the Natives; together with the Geology, Natural History, Productions, and Climate of the Country; its several Provinces, and their advantages as regards Emigration, &c., &c.; the state of the Country with reference to Christianity; sketches of the lives of the principal Chiefs, and their present position: with copious Indexes.

A Map of the Country, and Coloured Plates of Birds, Vegetables, Butterflies, Shells, &c., derived from personal observation.

BY THE REV. RICHARD TAYLOR, M.A., F.G.S.
Many Years a Missionary in New Zealand.

London: Wertheim and Mackintosh, 24, Paternoster-row. Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Preparing for Publication, in 12mo.,

The World in which I Live, and my Place in it,

BY E. S. A.

Edited by the Rev. JOHN H. BROOME.

The object of this book is to present a succinct history, from the creation to the present time, in connection with Scripture, and with the progress of the Church of Christ.

It is hoped that this slight sketch of the History of the World and of the Church may help the young reader to discern God's moral government and man's duty.

The study of History invariably inculcates principles.

The Romish Church, alive to this fact, is most careful that the Histories put into the hands of her children shall be those of her own writers. But the Protestant Church has hitherto possessed no Epitome of History sufficiently simple to meet the requirements of her youthful students.

The plan of the book embraces a general view of the History of all known nations, having regard to their chronological connection with each other, with copious and comprehensive indexes; and by thus commencing the study of history from the beginning, a good foundation will be laid for the fuller study of any particular History.

The Book will be Published by Subscription, price 5s. 6d., and the Names of intending Subscribers are requested to be sent as early as possible to Wertheim and Macintosh, Paternoster-row, London, or to their Agents for Ireland, WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

NEW WORKS, by the Rev. J. C. RYLE.

I.

Foolscap, 8vo., cloth, price 3s. 6d.,
HOME TRUTHS.—Series IV.

II.

Price 2s. 6d. per dozen,
NEVER PERISH:
THOUGHTS ON FINAL PERSEVERANCE—(*John*, x. 28.)

III.

Price One Penny,
DO YOU WANT A FRIEND?
A Question for Christmas.

IV.

Price Twopence,
ARE YOU HAPPY?—A Question for 1856.

London: Wetheim and Mackintosh. Dublin: WILLIAM CURRY and Co., 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Dublin: Printed by WILLIAM S. PURDON and EDWARD PURDON, at No. 23, Bachelor's-walk, parish of St. Mary, for the Publisher WILLIAM CURRY 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.
DECEMBER, 1855.

BX 5410 .C37 SMC

55

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

AIP-1942 (MB)

U. OF T. ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE TORONTO LIBRARY